UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 90—PART 2

FEBRUARY 9, 1944, TO MARCH 21, 1944
(PAGES 1445 TO 2870)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1944

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Thou knowest our frame and rememberest that we are dust; Thy patience outlasts all our dullness of apprehension and all our stupid choices. Our baffled minds cannot encompass the explanation of this vast and varied world. Today we come for light enough to walk by. Take Thou the dimness of our souls away that above the battlefields of ancient wrongs we may see and follow the pillar of cloud and of fire which Thy guiding hand flings across the bending heavens.

Pressed by the practical problems which crowd our hours and cry for solution we would keep clear in our vision and faith the eternal things amid the tempests of the temporal. So in our time, O Thou changeless God of the changing years, cause the wrath of man to praise Thee and his scorn and pride to yield to Thy will. Establish Thy kingdom on the ruins of the shattered empires of this world. From the blackened walls of today's holocaust may the holy city of our dreams arise in all its beauty till in the streets which now groan with the lamentations of the oppressed there may rise the silvery laughter of little children and the glad song of the redeemed out of great tribulation. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, February 8, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1255. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939;

S. 1504. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; and

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Bone	Holman	Smith
Brewster	Jackson	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	Wherry
Downey	Nye	White
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	Willis
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THIRTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I wish to pay a brief but nonetheless a deep and sincere tribute to one of the greatest organizations in this Nation, the Boy Scouts of America, on the thirty-fourth anniversary of its founding. I agree with President Roosevelt when he said in his greeting to them that if the people of all countries had taken to heart the basic philosophy of Scouting, perhaps there would never have been a second world war. When there is a job to be done, the Boy Scouts are always in the van. Their record of assistance in our war effort is remarkable. Upon their young shoulders much of the civilian work of scrap collection and conservation work in this war has fallen. This is but one of their many contributions to the cause of liberty. They are doing more than their part to defend the kind of world fostered by their movement, and which looks forward to the day of world brotherhood. How different is their ideology than that of the blind hatred inculcated by Nazi leaders into their youth—a hatred which perverted young minds to the path of student book burnings, and later persecutions, and finally the brutalities of war.

When I pay this tribute to the Boy Scouts of America, I know that I also voice the sentiment of every Member of the Senate, as well as of millions of loyal Americans everywhere.

May God bless the Boy Scouts and their work.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN presented a resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

House Resolution 637

Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their best efforts to secure a reconsideration of the Civil Aeronautics Board of the decision of its examiner in relation to air line applications to operate in the Rhode Island area for routes to the south and west

Whereas a Civil Aeronautics Board examiner has recently recommended to the Civil Aeronautics Board that said Board deny several air-line applications to operate in the Rhode Island area for routes to the South and West, which would more fully meet the

needs of Providence for east-west terminal facilities; and

Whereas it is obvious that the only additional service that the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner's recommendations would allow Rhode Island would be furnished by an air line running between Maine and Boston, which would be extended to the New York City area; and

Whereas if such an unfair recommendation is allowed to stand it would be an approval of the outmoded and narrow-sighted transportation principle that has for many years kept Rhode Island completely dependent upon a single railroad system which is in itself dependent upon railroads that are controlled outside of New England; and

Whereas it is apparent that the economic growth of this area has unquestionably been severely handicapped by such monopolistic, restricted, and noncompetitive railroad service; and

Whereas the diversified character of Rhode Island's products, such as jewelry, machine tools, light machinery, lightweight fabrics, and other manufactured articles could be quickly delivered to the south and southwestern points; and

Whereas to deny the State this economic right to merchandise expeditiously its finished products to areas beyond its border, is an arbitrary denial of the inherent right to capitalize upon opportunities that modern competitive east-west terminal facilities would afford to our industries, and would be tantamount to keeping the State bottled up in the transportation strait jacket that we know from long experience will retard its economic development; and

Whereas Rhode Island is desirous of obtaining direct east-west competitive air service and is unqualifiedly opposed to such narrow regional recommendations as those approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner that would result in restricting the State to local air service which ties in with, instead of being an integral part of, air lines beyond the New England area; and

Whereas the general assembly is in hearty accord with the vigorous fight being waged by the Rhode Island Commission on Interstate Cooperation, through its chairman, in protesting to the Civil Aeronautics Board for an opportunity more fully to present Rhode Island's point of view upon this vital matter of an east-west terminal: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the general assembly, realizing the long-felt need for an adequate, competitive east-west air transportation for the future economic development of Rhode Island, does hereby request the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States vigorously to protest against the recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Board examiner, to use their good offices to secure a reconsideration by the Civil Aeronautics Board of the decision by its examiner and to seek a more adequate air service that will facilitate rather than retard the State's commerce; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, Hon. PETER G. GERRY, Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, Hon. AIME J. FORAND, and Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY.

DECLARATION OF POLICY ON WORLD-WIDE AVIATION—RESOLUTION BY BRISTOL (CONN.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. DANAHER presented a letter from the executive secretary of the chamber of commerce of Bristol, Conn., embodying a resolution adopted by that body, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Bristol, Conn., February 7, 1944.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,
Senator from Connecticut
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On July 15, 1943, 16 of the domestic airlines filed with the Civil Aeronautics Board a declaration of policy on world-wide aviation.

The directors of the Bristol Chamber of Commerce have given this declaration very serious thought and consideration, and at a meeting held on Friday, February 4, 1944, they voted to adopt the following resolution, and to send copies to our representatives in Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board. The resolution follows:

"Whereas the board of directors of the Bristol Chamber of Commerce has given due consideration to the principles set forth in the declaration of policy on world-wide aviation endorsed by 16 of the domestic air lines; and

"Whereas the members of said board are in agreement with said principles: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress be urged to make this declaration of policy operative and that the appropriate governmental agencies incorporate in their planning of foreign air transportation to be operated by the United States flag air carriers the following basic policies to be established in the world system of air transportation thereunder created:

"1. Free and open world-wide competition, subject to reasonable regulation by the appropriate governmental agencies.

"2. Private ownership and management of air lines engaged in domestic and foreign operation.

"3. Fostering and encouragement by the Government of the United States of a sound world-wide air-transportation system.

"4. World-wide freedom of transit in peaceful flight.

"5. Acquisition of civil and commercial outlets required in the public interest; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a world-wide system of air transportation should be developed in which open and free competition, reasonably regulated, be given full play. That the air lines of the United States be permitted to forge ahead under the stimulus of world competition. Their growth should not be straight jacketed by the withering effect of monopoly. Private ownership, with its encouragement of initiative and creativeness, and its attendant rewards for accomplishment should be our undeviating policy; be it further

"*Resolved*, That there should be no delay in the development of world-system air transportation policies and the consumation of negotiated arrangements to make them operative."

We hope you will support the declaration of policy by the air lines.

Respectfully yours,

J. J. HAMMEL,
Executive Secretary.

PROHIBITION OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE TRANSPORTATION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISEMENTS — PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD a letter and a petition, without all the signatures attached, which I have received from Clara L. Swenson, of Mankato, Minn., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 569, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes. This bill, introduced by me, covers all types of beverage alcohol advertising. I request that the letter with the accompanying petition be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter with an accompanying petition were received, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1944.

Senator CAPPER:

DEAR SIR: I am enclosing a petition for S. 569 with the hope that when this bill comes before Congress it will have favorable recognition. I feel that it would be a great forward step if we, like Canada, could do away with the untruthful advertising of beverage alcohol.

Sincerely,

CLARA L. SWENSON,
Mankato, Minn.

To the Senate of the United States:

To reduce the luring effects of alcoholic beverages on adults, its contribution to juvenile delinquency and the waste of materials in wartime, we, the undersigned citizens of the State of Minnesota, petition the Congress of the United States to pass the Capper bill, S. 569, which covers all types of beverage alcohol advertising.

Rev. H. A. KINGSRITER,
Mrs. H. A. KINGSRITER,
Mrs. H. L. BURCH,
CLARA L. SWENSON,
Mankato, Minn.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to which was referred the bill (S. 1509) to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 687) thereon.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING — CANCELATION OF WAR CONTRACTS, ETC.—PART 2 OF REPORT NO. 539

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report from the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, pursuant to Senate Resolution 102 creating a Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning. The report covers cancelation of war contracts, disposition and sales of surplus property, and industrial demobilization and reconversion. I ask that the report be printed in the RECORD and also printed in the usual course under the rule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, and printed in

the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

The report is as follows:

On November 18, 1943, this committee submitted to the Senate a preliminary report on three subjects: The cancelation of war contracts, industrial demobilization and reconversion, and the disposal of surplus property. Since the submission of that preliminary report the committee has heard many additional witnesses in both open and executive hearings and has carefully studied all plans submitted to it by individuals and organizations who have made a study of these subjects. It has also carefully studied the testimony given before the subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, of which Senator MURRAY is chairman; the Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, of which Senator TRUMAN is chairman; the House Military Affairs Committee, of which Representative MAY is chairman; and the House Select Committee on Small Business, of which Representative PATMAN is chairman. The information thus adduced forms the basis of this report on the three subjects.

The committee has also been working with the subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, of which Senator MURRAY is chairman, and with that subcommittee is considering legislation.

THE MAGNITUDE OF THE PROBLEMS

The study of these problems subsequent to the preliminary report in no way minimized them. Rather, it magnified the colossal size of the task and accentuated the great need for having ready completely matured and coordinated plans for demobilization against the day when peace again comes to the world. The problems are so transcendent that the economic destiny of this country may well depend upon their proper solution; no amount of study put upon them can be greater than they deserve.

That mobilization is the supreme task of this Nation until the military might of our enemies is utterly destroyed cannot be overemphasized. No thinking and no planning for conversion to peace should be permitted, in even the slightest degree, to interfere with the prosecution of the war and the supreme mobilization effort. No discussion of reconversion to peace should for an instant be construed as optimism over the early ending of hostilities.

However, it is not believed that the making of plans for reconversion to peace will in any way interfere with the all-out mobilization effort. It is the aim of this committee to set up machinery not only to coordinate all of the planning for peace but to coordinate that planning with the planning for war.

Since our entry into the war, approximately 10,000 prime contracts have been canceled for the convenience of the Government. Most of these have been replaced with other Government contracts, resulting merely in a change-over from one type of war production to another. As to the remainder, the effect upon the national economy of the delays incident to contract settlement and plant reconversion was not too serious, in the face of an existing manpower shortage. Even with this comparatively small number of cancelations spread over a considerable period of time, the average time required for settlement with a contractor has been from 6 to 8 months.

The Under Secretary of War testified before this committee that when hostilities cease the Army alone would cancel 100,000 prime contracts, which in turn would result in the cancelation of a million important subcontracts. There will be no war contracts to substitute at that time. The factories holding those contracts provide employment for a majority of the workers in manufacturing industries and indirectly provide employment for many million others in the distributive industries. To avoid disastrous unemployment totals, the period of cessation of work in those factories must be kept to an absolute minimum.

Many factories have their entire working capital tied up in one phase or another of those contracts. Until contractors are put in funds to reconvert and carry on peacetime operations, they cannot be substantial employers of labor. Even with a substantial payment against their claims, they will be handicapped in their operations until they know with certainty the total they are to receive from the Government.

Others have their factories filled with inventories for the manufacture of war goods. Those inventories must be moved out before they can convert to peacetime production. Still others have filled their plants with Government-owned machinery which must be moved out so that their own machinery can be moved back in. Still others have sold, at the instance of the Government, machinery not needed for war production but which must be replaced before peacetime production can be resumed.

Regardless of any Governmental plans that may be made for publicly financed construction programs and similar work programs, the question of whether or not this country has an intolerable unemployment situation will depend upon the speed with which private industry can be reconverted to peace. The Brookings Institution, in its study of post-war reemployment, concludes: "A state of reasonably full employment at the end of the transition period would be realized with an employment level of fifty-four millions. This would mean an increase in employment over 1940 of about eight million, or roughly 17 percent." Based on War Manpower Commission estimates, the same report concludes that if the war continues, there will be employed in December 1944, outside the armed forces, approximately 50,000,000 people. This leaves four million additional who must find employment outside the armed forces. It must be borne in mind that this is a greater number of people than have ever been employed in private industry before in America. The problem of getting these people to work will be difficult enough without complicating it by having factories remain idle because they cannot get their plants cleared of war inventories and Government machinery and their canceled war contracts settled.

Approximately $19,000,000,000 have been spent on new plants since the war started. Roughly, fifteen billion of this has been spent by the Government and four billion by private industry. Some of these plants the Government will need to keep in operation. Some they will need to retain in a stand-by condition. Others will be suitable for conversion to peacetime production and still others, for one reason or another, will have no value as manufacturing plants. Certainly, all of those that the domestic economy can absorb should be sold to private industry at the earliest possible moment.

Many private operators have options to purchase Government plants, that could well delay their operation. Certainly, those options should be respected where they exist; but, unless there is reasonable certainty that they will be exercised promptly, every effort should be made to remove them from the contracts.

The Government also owns many hundred thousand acres of land on which camp sites have been established, many port installations, pipe lines, and other facilities, all of which will have to be disposed of.

No one can make an intelligent guess as to how much movable property the Government will own at the conclusion of hostilities. Estimates of property presently owned by the Government are not indicative. The same is true of present factory inventories, which would become the responsibility of the Government upon the cancelation of its contracts. Estimates of the amount of goods that would be owned by the Government upon the termination of its contracts run as high as $75,000,000,000. Some of this will consist of materials which will be so plentiful that to dump them on the market would mean that no factory manufacturing those products could turn a wheel for years to come, and consequently could employ no one. Some of the materials will be critically scarce and must be disposed of in such a way as to prevent their concentration in a few hands, leaving other factories closed down for lack of them. The physical problem of storage will be gigantic. The problem of marketing these inventories so as to secure their greatest economic use and at the same time not disrupt the economy will tax the best minds in America.

This committee feel that these three problems, as well as many others that will arise in the reconversion period, are so inseparably linked that they cannot be handled piecemeal. It believes that an agency should be created by Congress to devote its entire attention to the working out and coordinating of all demobilization problems, under broad principles laid down by the Congress. It feels that regardless of how long the war may last, this planning should be started immediately. It feels that this agency should begin now to collect the most complete information with reference to the factories that will be affected by war-contract cancelation, their manpower requirements as war industries and as peace industries, their inventory and machinery requirements in both categories; should make plans wherever possible to have the requisite peacetime machinery and inventories available to manufacturers at the earliest possible moment after peace comes; should have inventories of not only the goods that the Government has on hand, but of those in the hands of the war production factories, so that it can have formulated in advance the necessary plans for the disposal of those inventories and can determine the necessity for continuing or relaxing price controls, rationing and allocation of materials, in order to keep the economy on an even keel.

The agency should survey the potentialities of all the Government-owned plants and should determine which of those can be sold to private interests and absorbed into the domestic economy and which of those, not needed by the Government, cannot be so sold. Plans should be made to convert the latter into warehouses for the storage of surplus property the very instant their use as war plants ceases. Plans should be worked out with private contractors in advance of cancelation so that they can know almost instantly to which of these warehouses they can ship the inventories and machinery that must be moved out of their plants.

The cutting of all red tape must be provided for in advance. To cut much of this red tape will require action by the Congress, but it will also require a mental approach different from that which has so often delayed the Government's business transactions. It must have a mental approach that brushes aside all obstacles to its accomplishment. Its intelligent and speedy accomplishment is the second most important task facing America.

The Congress should not overlook the fact that however unavoidable is the delegation of its policymaking powers in time of war, it is quite another thing for Congress to delegate its primary functions to any executive agency in time of peace and it should retain in its hands the settlement of the broad basic problems of the demobilization program out of which the structure of the peace economy will arise. The nature of the

economy of this country for many years to come will depend upon the policies and decisions which are to be followed in the demobilization. Regional, State, and local considerations have been overlooked of necessity in the mobilization for war, for in war central power is essential. They cannot be overlooked in the reconstruction program for which we are now preparing. The economic life of this Nation must not be permitted to become dependent upon Washington directives for peace as it has been for war.

The committee believes that the Congress should lay down the broad policies under which these problems are to be handled, should create the agency for coordinating them and define its duties and should immediately pass any legislation necessary to clear away obstacles to their speedy settlement and should repeal or amend any legislation that presents such an obstacle.

The committee recognizes that hostilities may cease in two stages; that the problems of reconversion may come in three steps, or may go through continuing changes as the tempo of war changes. Those changes, however, are changes in degree only and are ones with which the recommended central agency will have to deal. It is not believed that these differences in degree affect the part which Congress should play in clearing the way for the solution of the great, broad problem.

GENERAL POLICIES

The statement of policies should make it clear that:

The paramount consideration in the handling of all demobilization problems should be the preservation and strengthening of the American system of free competitive enterprise. All war plants and war surpluses should be handled by the demobilization agency so as to promote such enterprise.

Every action taken should be controlled by the compelling necessity of getting American business on a full employment basis with the minimum possible delay. The dollar value to the Government of the things being dealt with should not be lost sight of, but its consideration should not interfere with the accomplishment of this objective.

Government plants no longer necessary to the national defense should be disposed of in such way as to result in their greatest economic use, but the effect upon the general economy should be the first consideration in determining the disposition to be made of them. All plants suitable for the production of peacetime goods and not needed for the national defense should be sold, where this can be done without causing ruinous overproduction in any industry. An industry should not be severely damaged through overproduction merely for the purpose of selling a Government-owned plant, but a plant should be held off the market only where its operation would result in the production of more goods than the market could absorb at reasonably competitive prices. The leasing of plants for a period sufficiently long to determine the effect of their operation upon the economy should be authorized.

No Government plant should be disposed of in a manner to create monopoly, strengthen monopolies already existing, or otherwise encourage monopoly, but the fostering and encouragement of competitive enterprise and small business should be a prime consideration.

Authority should be expressly withheld from any agency to dispose of Government-owned plants in basic industries, where the Government holdings of those plants are sufficient for their disposal to exert a preponderant influence on the future course of that industry. In such category are airplane factories, rubber, aluminum, and magnesium plants, shipyards, pipe lines, steel mills, and possibly others. The use or disposal of plants in these industries may well have to be correlated with the Nation's foreign policy and Congress should expressly legislate further in regard to them.

Surplus goods should be disposed of in a manner to best utilize their economic value, and as expeditiously as possible. At the same time, they should not be forced on the market in quantities greater than the civilian market can absorb, without unduly disturbing the economy, or in quantites that will cause the shutting down of factories producing them. Their sale should be so timed as to take into consideration its impact on the economy. Any surpluses that cannot be absorbed in this country within a reasonable time without disrupting the economy should be sold abroad, where this can be done without also unduly disrupting the domestic economy.

No Government-owned plants should be scrapped and no surplus property should be destroyed except in circumstances where their continued existence would have such a profoundly harmful effect upon the national economy that their destruction appears imperatively necessary.

Where practicable surplus goods should be sold in quantities that will permit their acquisition by small purchasers. Methods of sale that will permit these goods to fall into the hands of speculators should not be used, but wherever possible they should be distributed through regular distributive channels.

The shutting down of factories, the stoppages of work, and the unemployment of workers, through delays in contract settlement, will cause far greater loss of revenue to the Government—to say nothing of the general economy—than could possibly be saved through conventional preaudit of contractors' claims. The prime requisites in the settlement of such claims are speed and fairness and these should not be sacrificed in an effort to detect latent fraud prior to settlement, but the most complete and adequate machinery should be set up for postaudit to detect and punish fraud.

Prime contractors and subcontractors and the various layers of contractors below subcontractors have all contributed in equal degree, according to their ability, to the war effort, and the Government owes the same obligation to all of them, whether or not their claims legally are against the Government, and its contract termination procedures must be designed to afford them equal protection certainty, speed, and fairness. Every possible effort should be made to overcome any legal obstacles that may stand in the way of this purpose.

Unless previous arrangements have been made for their retention by the contractor, Government-owned machinery, tools, equipment, and inventories should immediately be removed from privately owned plants. The fact that no adequate storage facilities exist for them should not be a deterrent to the accomplishment of this purpose. Privately owned plants moved their machinery into the weather to accommodate Government machinery, and if necessary to prevent the shutdown of private plants, the Government should do the same with its property. If there is a conflict, the reopening and reconversion of plants to enable them to give employment is paramount to the preservation of Government-owned physical property.

The Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission should determine what property in their hands constitutes surplus. The determination of what constitutes surplus in the hands of other agencies should rest with the office of demobilization, or its designee.

CENTRAL AGENCY

The committee recommends the establishment, by statute, of an office of demobilization, headed by a director of demobilization to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The director should hold office for a term of 2 years, but should be subject to reappointment at the end of that term. The director should be empowered to appoint deputy directors to head units to deal with contract cancelation, plant reconversion, disposal of surplus property, and such other units as may be necessary.

In the office of demobilization should be created a full-time board, appointed by the director, and composed of the ablest men whose services can be secured, upon whom the director can constantly call for advice and assistance. The deputy directors may be members of the board.

There should also be created a congressional committee, composed of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, to confer with the director on matters of broad general policy, and to whom he should report not less frequently than every 30 days on all general policy decisions made by him. This committee, any of its members, or its designee should be free to attend all meetings of the board of the office of demobilization.

The office of demobilization should be supreme in all matters relating to industrial reconversion to peace, except that, so long as hostilities continue, it should be subordinate to the office of war mobilization and should coordinate all of its activities with other agencies through that office, keeping the director of war mobilization constantly advised of those activities.

It should not be an operating agency, as all of the evidence before this committee indicates that the actual carrying out of plans can best be handled by agencies already established, under the over-all policies laid down by the office of demobilization. It should, however, have the power to set up its own administrative machinery, or to supplement the administrative machinery of existing agencies, in any case in which the existing agency fails to follow its direction or has inadequate manpower for the job assigned to it.

In outlining its duties and powers, it should be made plain that upon it rests the responsibility for having formulated complete plans for industrial reconversion to peace and for the coordination of all such plans, and that its power to issue orders to other agencies of the Government with reference to industrial reconversion plans and policies is absolute, subject only to its control by the office of war mobilization until hostilities cease.

It should be directed to cause a complete survey to be made of all Government-owned plants and other plants engaged in war production to ascertain which of those plants are necessary for the national defense, which of them can be converted to peacetime use, and which of them have no economic value in either category, and to promulgate plans that will result in the speediest possible conversion of those in the second class and the greatest economic use of those in the third class.

It should be directed to cause a complete inventory to be made of all Government property and to gather such information with reference to inventories in the hands of private industry as would enable it immediately to put into effect a matured plan for the handling, storage, disposition, and control of those inventories which will become the property of the Government when contracts are canceled.

It should be directed to prescribe a uniform cancelation clause for each type of contract embodying the principles set out in this report, with formulas applicable alike to both prime and subcontractors, which every prime contractor and subcontractor should be given the option to adopt in lieu of any termination clause that may now be in his contract; adopt uniform rules for the filing of claims arising out of the cancelation

of contracts, prescribe forms for the filing of such claims, prescribe the evidence necessary to support them and determine the records of settlement which are to be kept; work out with the various contracting agencies of the Government the speediest possible method of handling claims of contractors and take such steps as may be necessary to familiarize all contractors and contracting officers with the procedures worked out; establish a regular reporting system on the progress of termination settlements and disposal of property and obtain such additional information from the contracting agencies from time to time as may be deemed necessary; work out, as far as practicable, a system of advance notice to contractors of contemplated termination; appoint the review tribunals hereinafter referred to.

It should be directed to consult with representatives of industry—large and small—labor, agriculture, and with the heads of all interested Government departments to the extent necessary to familiarize itself with the problems of all segments of the economy.

It should be directed to see that no plants are scrapped or surplus property destroyed, except upon a two-thirds vote of the board, concurred in by the director.

It should be authorized and directed to utilize the services of any other agency of the Government in handling the mechanics of conversion problems, give direction to their operations in the handling of such problems, and, where necessary to carry out its policies, establish its own administrative machinery.

It should be authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations within the framework of the general policies laid down by the Congress as it may deem necessary and to do any and all other things, within the framework of those policies, that may be necessary to effectuate them.

It should be directed to report to Congress every 3 months on the exercise of its duties and powers, on the operation of each of the contracting agencies, and on the needs for any additional legislation, and to furnish Congress with any other information which may be desired.

The director and the board should hold public sessions from time to time; should be accessible to the general public; and should act as a forum in which public reactions to the demobilization program may be given expression.

ADVANCE PAYMENTS

Such a vast amount of the capital of so many manufacturing concerns will be tied up in inventories and in claims against the Government that it is absolutely essential that payment be made without any delay whatsoever. Unless congressional direction is given that will result in the Government dealing with contractors just as two ordinary business concerns would deal with each other, the traditional and entirely proper feeling that the Government's funds are sacred will result in delays that cannot be tolerated. Unless claims for inventories are paid just as a commercial invoice is paid, many companies will not be able to operate. Certainly, in relaxing the traditional rules governing payments by the Government, every safeguard against fraud, consistent with speed, should be thrown around those payments.

The committee recommends the immediate payment of the contract price for all finished goods on hand; the immediate payment of 100 percent of the direct cost of all inventories of raw materials and partially processed goods in the hands of the contractor, and as large a percentage, up to 90 percent, of all other items in the claim as the contracting agency feels will afford the Government reasonable protection.

Where the detailed ascertainment of the direct cost of inventories is apt to cause delay, the procuring agency should be authorized to make advance payments and partial payments up to 90 percent of the estimated total amount due on terminated contracts and subcontracts or groups thereof, and should be authorized to base the estimates on such certificates of the contractor or on such other evidence as they deem sufficient, or as may be prescribed by the office of demobilization.

The procuring agencies should also be authorized to make direct termination loans to contractors and subcontractors and to make guaranties of loans by public and private financing institutions, similar to the present V-loans. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Smaller War Plants Corporation should be authorized to make loans where necessary to keep plants in operation, but where the need may not arise directly out of the termination of a contract.

The office of demobilization should be authorized to direct the procuring agencies to make mandatory advance or partial payments or loans or guaranties of loans, to such classes of contractors and subcontractors, upon such terms and conditions and upon such evidence, including the mere certificate of the contractor, as the office of demobilization deems appropriate.

Inasmuch as all of the traditional rules with reference to preaudit are being relaxed, severe penalties should be imposed for overstatement of the claim. It is recommended that a penalty of 1 percent a month upon the amount of any excessive advance payment obtained by the contractor through overstatement of his claim be imposed upon him from the time payment is made to him until repayment is made to the Government, which penalty should not be a deductible expense for income-tax purposes.

If the disbursing officers have to make any study whatsoever of the great number of claims that will be submitted before paying the major portion of them the payments will be too long delayed. It is recognized that by the method suggested, some unscrupulous contractors may obtain from the Government more than is due them and in some instances it may not be possible to recover those excess payments, but it is believed that the money which will be lost through the loss in tax revenues and through unemployment benefits, due to failure of many contractors to operate, will far more than offset any possible fraudulent losses, to say nothing of losses through the stagnation of the private economy.

THE SETTLEMENT OF CANCELED CONTRACTS

Some means must be found to speed up the settlement of canceled contracts. In fact, more than a hundred thousand prime contracts, with all of their subcontracts, must be settled much faster than the 10,000 already canceled have been and are being settled.

Under the present system of contract settlement, the contracting agency deals only with the prime contractor and requires the prime contractor to settle with his subcontractors and the subcontractor to settle with his subs, subject to approval by the contracting officer, of the subcontract settlements. There is nothing in any cancelation clause so far adopted or proposed that gives to either the prime contractor or the subcontractor any yardstick or formula for the settlement of subcontracts. As the matter now stands, a prime contractor might reach agreements with thousands of subs and have all those agreements disapproved. He would then have to start over, with no more certainty that subsequent agreements would be approved. The present clauses make no provision for caring for the subcontractor's inventories or the taking over of them by either the prime contractor or the Government.

The job cannot be done in the way it is now being handled, within any tolerable time.

It is believed that, wherever feasible, the filing of over-all claims by contractors and subcontractors and the settlement with both on an over-all company basis would greatly speed the process. The use of the over-all company claim probably would result in not more than 10 percent as many claims being filed as would be filed under the present method. Its use would enable contractors to lump inventories and indirect costs applicable to Government business and avoid the necessity of undertaking to break those items down and allocate them to individual contracts. It would release a large percentage of the executive manpower of the Nation to work out the other problems of business. Under the present system, a subcontractor, with only one executive, might have to deal with hundreds of prime contractors scattered throughout the country. The entire time of that executive could be taken up for months to come. Some of the large prime contractors have thousands of subcontracts that would have to be dealt with individually, and while these prime contractors probably have more executive manpower, their problem could well be as great, proportionately. The over-all claim method would obviate most of this work, which has to be handled by company executives. Evidence was put before the House Military Affairs Committee and a subcommittee of the Senate Military Affairs Committee indicating that only 90,000 manufacturing concerns in the entire country filed income-tax returns. It may be safely assumed that this is the maximum number which would have Government contracts and that the more than one and a half million prime and subcontracts are divided among them.

It is recognized that there are many administrative obstacles to the handling of claims in this manner, but in most cases those obstacles are not insurmountable for anyone who is determined to surmount them. Because solutions for those administrative obstacles have not been worked out and in some cases cannot be worked out, the over-all claim method cannot be made mandatory, but the contracting agencies should fully explore its possibilities, with a view to utilizing it wherever it will shorten the settlement process.

Legislation would be necessary to cut across the traditional concept of the expenditure of appropriations. The Army would have to be authorized and directed to use its funds in the settlement of Navy contracts, and vice versa, with later accounting between the services. This is done, in reverse, in renegotiation. Most of the renegotiation is being handled on an over-all company basis, rather than on a contract basis.

It probably would also be necessary to cut across some of the legal concepts of privity of contracts and the objection might be made that the prime contractor would not be willing for the Government to deal with his subcontractors. There seems little difficulty, however, in the Government contracting for this right, purchasing the subcontractor's claims, if necessary.

Legislation should also be passed specifically authorizing negotiated settlements, but these settlements, like all others, should be based upon records sufficiently complete to be susceptible of post-audit for fraud. The office of demobilization should prescribe the scope of those records.

Conventional pre-audits of claims are utterly impractical and the Comptroller General should be relieved of any responsibility for pre-audits. The office of demobilization should make rules prescribing checks which are feasible and appropriate to the circumstances, but more than this would produce intolerable delays. It should be made perfectly plain that settlements agreed upon can only be upset for fraud.

At the same time, there should be the fullest opportunity for post-audit to detect fraud.

It is not the committee's belief that every claim should be fully audited but certainly any claim in which there is the slightest suspicion of fraud should be. The responsibility for having post-audits made should be placed upon the office of demobilization and it should be authorized to use any accounting agencies of the Government and set up such additional agencies as may be deemed necessary. It should prescribe the keeping of company records of every settlement, and a statute should be passed requiring every contractor to keep the prescribed records for a period sufficiently long to permit audits for fraud, and the failure to keep such records should be made a criminal offense. The statute of limitations against fraud prosecutions should be extended and provision should be made for the recovery of triple damages of any sums paid as a result of fraud. Every possible safeguard should be set up to punish fraud because of the necessity of relaxing the conventional preventive controls.

The Government should be required to pay interest on that portion of the claim which is not paid within 60 days. The interest rate should be sufficiently high to make the claim bankable, but sufficiently low not to encourage the contractor to delay settlements. It is believed that 3 percent interest would strike a happy medium.

INVENTORIES

The present cancelation clauses authorize the contracting officer to require the contractor to sell his inventories and likewise authorize the retention of the inventories by the contractor at an agreed price. Inventories in the hands of manufacturers will constitute such a very large percentage of the total of surplus goods that a planned disposal of surpluses by the office of demobilization would be impossible without including the inventories in the hands of manufacturers allocable to canceled contracts. If those inventories were sold at the discretion of individual contracting officers, their sale would disrupt any plans that the office of demobilization could make for the orderly disposition of other surpluses. It is, therefore, recommended that the office of demobilization, or its designee, be authorized to take immediate title to all inventories in the hands of manufacturers allocable to canceled contracts and that they be disposed of under the policies laid down by that office. It is not believed that this would in any way conflict with the Army's desire to be able to transfer such materials between war factories and it should not be permitted so to interfere, but to carry out the provisions of the termination clauses could well result in the market being completely glutted with certain types of goods while scarce goods fall into the hands of a few manufacturers.

Wherever inventories are not removed from a contractor's plant within 30 days, the contractor should have the right to remove and store them. Any agreements for retention of inventories by the contractor should be made under the general policies laid down by the office of demobilization, but no contractor should be required to retain title to them as a condition of his termination settlement.

REVIEW AND APPEAL

In the interest of speed and certainty, settlements reached between the Government and a contractor should not be subject to review by any independent agency, except for fraud. Where the Government and the contractor cannot agree, the contractor should have the right of appeal to an independent tribunal. To make that right of appeal real, any provisions in contracts making the findings of fact of contracting officers or department heads final in regard to the amount due on terminated contracts should be nullified by statute.

The right of appeal to the courts, if it were the only method, would be more imaginary than real. Court machinery would become so hopelessly clogged that settlements would drag interminably. It is believed that the contractor should have the right to go to the Court of Claims if he wishes, and additional commissioners should be appointed in the Court of Claims to facilitate the functioning of that court.

However, some more summary method must be found to give the contractor an opportunity to present his case to an impartial tribunal.

This can best be accomplished in three ways:

(a) By authorizing the Government to submit its controversies to arbitration and providing that arbitration shall be had under the terms of the National Arbitration Act, on the demand of the contractor;

(b) By having umpires appointed by the office of demobilization in every judicial district, with adequate salaries and adequate staffs;

(c) By setting up a review board in Washington, to be appointed by the office of demobilization.

It should be provided that no appeal could be taken until 60 days after all of the contractor's evidence had been submitted to the contracting officer, to give the contracting officer an opportunity to make a decision.

Submission to an umpire or to the Washington review board should have the same legal effect as submission to arbitration and the selection of one method of appeal should preclude all others. The contractor should have his choice of the summary method with greater speed, or of recourse to the courts, but there must be an end to litigation arising out of these contracts, and having selected the summary method, access to the courts should be denied, except to set aside an award on the same basis as arbitration awards can be set aside.

It is also recognized that in the hurry of getting out contracts, many of them contained clauses that were unnecessarily harsh or omitted clauses that should have been included. As the law now stands, contracting officers are bound to take advantage of every inclusion or omission in a contract, no matter how inequitable it may be. The First War Powers Act confers upon the contracting agency the power to amend contracts without consideration and this power is being exercised by the heads of the agencies. That power should be continued and the review board set up by the office of demobilization should be given power to review any action on the part of the contracting agency in connection with it.

MISCELLANEOUS LEGISLATION

There is a very general feeling that the imposition of personal financial liability upon contracting, certifying, and disbursing officers for overpayments causes them to be too meticulous and greatly slows down the settlement process. The amount which could be recovered from those officers is so negligible that it is recommended that this liability be removed, in the absence of fraud.

There are a great many so-called informal contracts, purchases against which contracts were not issued, and other situations in which the Government has received material for which in good conscience it should pay. An act should be passed validating all of these contracts and providing that the Government should pay for goods delivered to it in good faith and from which it benefited. The Dent Act, passed at the end of the last war, was not broad enough to cover quasi contracts. An act similar to it but broad enough to do this should be passed.

It is also believed that in order to facilitate the acquisition of inventories from war contractors incident to contract termination, the requirement that the Government purchase by competitive bidding or at the lowest price available should be removed and specific authorization should be given to sell surpluses by private negotiation and to others than the highest bidder.

CONCLUSION

Until the various Government agencies know the pattern of legislation dealing with these subjects and know what duties are to be performed by each, no final plans can be matured by them.

It is imperatively necessary that whatever legislation is to be passed be gotten under way at the earliest possible moment.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of February, 1944;

Medical Director Ross T McIntire to have the rank of vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of February, 1944; and

Civil Engineer Ben Moreell to have the rank of vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of February 1944.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Leslie W. Johnson, of Minnesota, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul; and

Sundry persons for promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Elwell K. Jett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1943, vice George Henry Payne.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1708. A bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, relating to travel allowances; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1709. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clark Gourley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1710 (by request). A bill to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1711. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize Army officers designated by the Secretary of War to take final action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property," approved October 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 758); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE), and Mr.

EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER TO MASSACHUSETTS DENTAL SOCIETY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address prepared by Senator PEPPER and, because of the illness of Senator PEPPER, read by another at the annual winter educational meeting of the Massachusetts Dental Society, at the Statler Hotel, Boston, Mass., January 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE SOLDIER VOTE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Truth About the Soldier Vote" delivered by Senator KILGORE, which appears in the Appendix.]

PIPE LINE IN MEDITERRANEAN AREA—ARTICLE FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Ibn Saud Expected to O. K. Oil Line," published in the Baltimore Sun of February 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MECCA KILLING STIRS ARAB ROW—ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a United Press dispatch entitled "Mecca Killing Stirs Arab Row," published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT AMERICA CAN HAVE—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address on the subject What America Can Have, delivered by the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, at San Francisco, Calif., Monday, February 7, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At Los Angeles I sketched briefly what America wants. Here at San Francisco I propose to describe what we can get if we really want it badly enough to plan and work for it.

Before mentioning the many fine things we can have, I want to do what I can to kill the myth that the gigantic war debt will stand in our way. We can pay the interest on this debt and have a standard of living at least 50 percent higher than in the decade of the thirties. With reasonably full employment, we can have a national yearly income of more than $130,000,000,000. We can produce $170,000,000,000 of goods and services annually. This is no dream, for in 1943 we produced more than $190,000,000,000 of goods and services. With such an income, we can carry the interest on our war deb and still have a whole lot more left over than we had at the top of the boom in 1929. The interest charge on all debts, private and Government, in 1944 will represent only 7 percent of our national income, or no more than in the decade of the twenties.

But if we allow the thought of the national debt to scarce us, it will hang as a millstone around our necks and we shall all be sunk in a sea of unimaginable difficulties. There is just one way to treat the war debt, and that is to remember that it can be carried easily if all of us are able to work hard and to use our natural resources and human skills to the maximum. The goods produced when we work hard and are fully employed will find a market if we raise our standard of living by 40 percent. We can enjoy the things we have always wanted and thereby create such prosperity that we can carry the national debt easily; or we can pinch and save and bring on a depression, and let the national debt crush us. Farmers, workers, and businessmen can all prosper provided they are all willing to cooperate with each other and with Government in furnishing the American people the things they ought to have, and then in buying and using the things that are offered for sale.

The important point now is to tell the American people about the things they can have 2 or 3 years after this war is over. We mustn't take no for an answer. The more we insist on getting the right kind of goods, the more of a market there will be for all of us. There is just one proviso. We can't afford to demand things that will hurt the welfare of the American consumers as a whole. Farmers, workers, and businessmen can't afford to cut each other's throats.

Now let's talk about these things we can have, things over and above a new car and new radio, things that it is our duty to have if this American civilization is to grow and go forward. First, there is health. The people of the United States would be at least 30 percent more efficient if they were in maximum good health. They would then be effective to a ripe old age, instead of often half effective only to middle life. Two generations ago in the United States every city dweller had to boil drinking water or run the risk of dysentery and typhoid. We cut down the death rate enormously when we made it possible for the people in the cities to get safe drinking water at a modest cost. At even less cost than for clean drinking water we can see that liberal dosages of vitamins are added to the flour and cornmeal, thus wiping out at one stroke the vitamin deficiencies which undermine the health and vigor of so many millions of our citizens, especially those who are past 40 years of age. At a cost of $2 per year per person it would be possible to wipe out all vitamin deficiency diseases, extend the working life of the average individual 10 years, and, of course, increase the vigor of at least half of our population. Any intelligent person operating in the United States for profit would undoubtedly spend at least $250,000,000 a year for vitamins. By so doing he could get his money back in increased output 10 times over the very first year.

Second to good and plentiful food I would put good and plentiful hospitals. With more hospitals adequately equipped and staffed, combined with a common-sense public-health program, we can stamp out tuberculosis, syphilis, and possibly malaria. Everyone in the United States ought to have an annual physical check-up and have the privilege of going to a hospital if a competent doctor thinks it necessary. If it is wasteful to let a soldier go without proper medical service, it is just as wasteful to let any American be sick for lack of proper medical attention. We ought to be spending 4 times as much on hospitals and doctors and nurses as we are now spending and we should be getting at least 10 times as much good out of the medical profession as we are now getting.

After good health, and closely allied to it, I would put good housing. Most of the houses of the United States are out of date and seriously run down, especially on the farms. Governmental housing authorities, both in England and the United States, have learned a lot about cheap, good housing during the past 5 years. With money available at low rates and with various types of monopoly rackets eliminated, both government and private industry can build good houses at amazingly low cost. Prefabrication will play its part in bringing the cost down. As soon as we have settled down after the war we should build at least a million houses a year until such time as we have completely modernized ourselves. Ten years from now we shall find that struggling along with an old house is like tinkering with an old car, which every few weeks runs up an expensive garage bill. When the house of the future is perfected as it can be, it will be possible for the housewife to do her cooking, cleaning, and marketing with one-third the labor which she now expends.

Next after housing I would list rural electrification. We can furnish electricity to every house in the United States except in those exceptional areas where the population is thin and the distances between farms are too great. With electricity practically everywhere, three-fourths of the housewives should have not merely electric refrigerators, but also quick-freeze or deep-freeze machines to carry garden stuff and meat over from the time of seasonal plenty to the time of scarcity. Electricity widely spread, combined with good roads, cheap automobiles, and small farm machines, will result during the next 10 or 20 years in millions of families relocating on small acreages within driving distance of the factory or business where the man of the house works. Fifty years ago the slogan, "Ten acres and liberty," was a trap which made fools out of most of those who fell for it. But today, with all the conveniences which rural electrification and good roads make possible, 5 or 10 acres can furnish an enjoyable and profitable outlet for the energies of a growing family. Sunshine and fresh air, combined with good milk and eggs and the vegetables and fruits which can be preserved the year around, will make the small farm a joy forever to all of those who have any instinct for the soil and the living plants and animals which grow upon it. Rural electrification, and the inventions which naturally go with it, will hasten the march of the common man back to the country and nature. It will restore to the family much of the significance which it had a hundred years ago. A small farmer who works most of the time in town can, with the help of his family, produce more than half of the food which he eats. He can also have a little in the way of vegetables, eggs, and milk to sell. Small, part-time farming near a city which has been growing in importance for the past 30 years can become so important by the year 1975 as to be one of the significant balance wheels of the Nation.

So far as farmers generally are concerned, there are great things ahead provided we can avoid a serious slump by having full employment in the Nation at large. The future farm economy can easily feed the 50,000,000 undernourished people better, provided they are well employed. Heretofore these people, except during a time of war, have never had enough to eat for the simple reason that they couldn't earn enough to pay for it. The biggest single marketing problem in American agriculture is to make sure that these people earn enough so that they can afford to buy the right kind of food. When the unusual European demand stops, as it probably will within a few years after the war comes to an end, it is important that these undernourished people come into the market with more and more demand, and money to pay for what they want.

Technologically, the farmers will benefit from many new devices. In the West there

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

must be more and more land brought under irrigation until all of the surplus water is utilized. Maximum water storage, both for irrigation and for power, will be needed if the Far West is to support the vast population which her manifest destiny so clearly foretells. Nothing must stand in the way of this destiny because it is the destiny of the United States itself to look as much toward the Far East as it now looks toward Europe. I well remember in 1909 sitting in Sacramento with W. A. Beard, the California member of Theodore Roosevelt's Country Life Commission, speculating as to what would have happened if the Pilgrim fathers had landed at Golden Gate instead of at Plymouth. A New Zealander was saying to me the other day that some day San Francisco will contain as many people as New York City. I can hear the tramp of the coming millions as they move in to fulfill the destiny of the West.

Perfected types of tractors and ground tillers are certain to come into use after this war. New fertilizers, new varieties of crops, new methods of feeding and perfected methods of soil conservation will be perfected. The revolution in agriculture which started with improved farm machinery three or four generations ago and with the discoveries of the experiment stations two generations ago will proceed with accelerated pace. The ability of one farm family in the United States to feed itself and four families in town is the strength of our great Nation both in war and in peace. This efficiency must and will be further improved. The only thing which can stand in the way of it is unemployment long continued in the cities, for the two indispensable halves of prosperity are growing efficiency matched by growing markets.

Next after improved health, universal electrification, and improved agriculture, I would list as a sound business proposition better schools, especially in rural America. Our children can grow up to improve and enrich this Nation only if they have good food, good schools, and good direction. We need more and better schools, more and better teachers. We need and can have Federal aid for those sections of the country where, because of poverty, the school system is lagging. The poor, agricultural regions are rich in children whereas the rich city wards are poor in children. Therefore, the children and the grandchildren of the poor have a significance far greater even than their own ancestors would have dared hope. The prevention of youth erosion is more important than the prevention of soil erosion. It is even better business to stop youth waste than to stop soil waste. Educational opportunities for young people must come first; but, as the Scandinavians discovered, improved adult education is a tremendous additional asset for any nation.

The 10,000,000 families at the bottom of the pile in the United States have demonstrated during the past 2 years that they can do good work, provided they have enough to eat and the opportunity to get good training. The salvation or damnation of the United States depends in considerable measure on how efficiently we can keep these people at work. If they are kept at work at good wages, they can furnish an annual market for at least $15,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. If these people are at work, they will buy something like a million cars a year from the automobile market. The women folks of these families, if they have the money, will buy nearly $2,000,000,000 worth of clothing and household furnishings. If they can be assured of steady jobs, these 10,000,000 poorest families will furnish a market for at least 100,000 new homes every year. Also we shall have, instead of human waste and misery and burdensome charity, 10,000,000 busy, hopeful, forward-looking families.

People talk about acres of diamonds or gold mines in the back yard. The real gold mine in our national back yard is the 10,000,000 poorest families who, before the war, bought only about $5,000,000,000 worth of stuff a year, but who can easily furnish a market for fifteen billion, if they are given opportunities in the post-war period.

When I talk at Seattle the day after tomorrow, I shall have something to say about how these people can be put to work. Tonight I am only saying that they can and must be given jobs. Their productivity, the size of the market which they can contribute to our businessmen and the health and education of their children mean too much to the rest of us to be neglected.

We can and must give our poorer people a chance to work productively if we are as serious about total peace as we have been about total war.

Most of the new goods and services we want after the war can be supplied by private enterprise. Some of the services will have to be supplied through public works which too are a source of employment.

Every township, every county, and every city in the United States should list both the private enterprise and the public works projects which it would like some day to have. Provided they have fundamental merit we can have eventually all the things that make for a high standard of living—good roads, airfields, flood control, parks, recreational projects, conservation and planting of forests, conservation of wildlife, conservation of soil, regional T. V. A.'s and all that vast multitude of things which the Government can do and which no individual can. All of these activities are self-liquidating from a long-run national point of view. They should be carried on in all years except when there is danger of inflation or shortage of labor.

The greatest economic sin is waste of human labor. In the decade of the 30's waste of human labor deprived this country of $200,000,000,000 of goods we might have had, or more than the war has cost us to date.

The greatest threat to a balanced budget is unemployment. Unemployment is the one thing that can break all of us. A would-be statesman who, in the name of budget-balancing, costs a million people their jobs will cost the national income $2,000,000,000 a year. That is a lot to pay for a few wrong ideas. The problem of budget-balancing is first of all one of keeping people fully employed producing efficiently the things we want. We have the people and the resources and the technical know-how to produce more than we ever dreamed we could. But we must have also the management know-how at the statesmen's level to keep these sources of wealth fully employed. Without that know-how our economy will be as helpless as the Army and Navy would be without a General Staff. Then the budget can be balanced and the national debt can be kept under control. No such results can be hoped for if we drift into a kind of unemployment by default. You can't beat something with nothing; we can't beat unemployment with anything but positive programs aimed at full employment.

There will be one great test of statesmanship after the war, and that is: Our ability to maintain the maximum useful employment over a long period of years, and at the same time preserve our democratic liberties. I say to the people of America that we will win the peace only if we keep the people of our country at work—in freedom, in the increased production of goods that promote the public welfare and give us an opportunity to enjoy life and educate our children. We have proved that in war when our will is roused to a great purpose, we can put forth efforts and rise to levels of national prosperity beyond anything in our history. We have found the leaders in government, in business, in agriculture, and labor who together with the millions in every walk of life have revealed our great productive power. In peace, when we are free of the terrific waste of warfare, we can devote our will and our efforts to improving our country and again we can hope to attain results beyond anything we ever had previously hoped.

We can, if we will all cooperate, produce more peacetime goods in 1954 than we did of total goods in the war peak year of 1944. The Nazis say that only war can call forth a supreme effort. I say that the challenge of peace is even greater than that of war and that we can and must measure up to it in terms of increased productivity and vital living.

TAX SIMPLIFICATION

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, many of the Members of the Senate will recall the colloquy which took place the other day between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], on the matter of the simplification of the tax returns of the citizens of this country. This subject comes very close to all of us who represent the people, and my office, as, doubtless, the offices of all other Senators, has been besieged by letters complaining about the complications and incongruities of the present tax-return form.

Representative FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, has introduced in the House of Representatives House Joint Resolution 211, which is now pending, providing for the appointment of a committee to be composed of four members of the Finance Committee of the Senate, four members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and one member to represent the public, and one member to represent labor, who will report back to Congress not later than September 15 a simplified form of taxation.

In addition thereto he has, with competent help, prepared a bill which has been introduced (H. R. 4040) providing for a new and simplified tax form, and as one who feels the need of it, as undoubtedly all my colleagues do also, I commend what he has done. I know he has had the assistance of men well qualified to deal with such matters.

This morning there came to my attention an article published in the Washington Post of even date entitled "Tax Simplification," with the subheading "Direct congressional action," written by John R. Beal, and dealing with the general subject of tax simplification. I ask unanimous consent to insert the article from this morning's Post at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAX SIMPLIFICATION

(By John R. Beal)

DIRECT CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Some 50,000,000 persons are facing the task of filling out the most complicated tax returns in history by March 15. It's safe to assume we don't need a Dr. Gallup to figure out whether these taxpayers are in favor of simplifying the job. Congress has under-

taken serious consideration of it. What are the prospects?

With respect to the March 15 returns, of course, no relief is in sight. They are on 1943 income, to be checked against estimates and payments made last year. They are extra-complicated because we are still in the process of transition to pay-as-you-go. It's expected that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will do what it can to ease the burden by postponing for a month the requirement of filing an estimate of 1944 income.

There are three main divisions to the job of tax simplification. The first involves making the arithmetic easier for individuals; the second, clearing up complexities for corporations; the third, simplification of estate and gift taxes. If Congress gets down to business and doesn't become too preoccupied with politics, it can quickly accomplish much on the first portion of the task.

The new tax bill, in eliminating the earned income credit for individuals, takes a forward step. By using the same base against which to assess normal taxes and surtaxes, it permits use of a form on which most persons will have one less tax calculation to make.

For the future, Representative FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas, original legislative sponsor of the Ruml pay-as-you-go principle, has pointed the way with a bill based mainly on what the Treasury recommended last year. CARLSON'S sponsorship of the administration program represents constructive tax statesmanship, and there is evidence that some reversal of sentiment has occurred since the program was rejected in connection with the new revenue bill.

CARLSON'S bill embodies five features:

1. It provides one tax on personal incomes, with a single base and a single set of rates and exemptions. This means repealing the Victory tax, eliminating an estimated 9,000,000 taxpayers from the roll of those contributing to the Government during wartime. But the group which pays nothing but the Victory tax contributes only 1.76 percent of the total revenue. That loss—$300,000,000—could be made up by reducing the exemption for married persons from $1,200 to $1,100 and adjusting surtax rates upward about 3 points. The question is: Are the remaining 41,000,000 taxpayers willing to pay this added cost for easier tax computations?

2. The bill eliminates the requirement of returns for those whose liability is substantially covered by withholding. The Treasury probably would oppose this provision, on the ground that returns would be needed as a check.

3. It extends to taxpayers with incomes up to $5,000 the privilege of using the relatively simple short return, now limited to the bracket up to $3,000.

4. It simplifies both the short and long form of returns for individuals. It is in the forms and not the law's language where complications beset the individual.

5. Finally, the bill permits taxpayers to revise their income estimates on January 15 after the close of the taxable year, thus eliminating all possibility of penalty for underestimating income.

Simplification is a matter of degree. Graduated withholding, keeping the great mass of taxpayers substantially current in their obligations to the Government would extend the process still further and go about as far as is practical. Simplification in the highest brackets would affect relatively few individuals and might create many inequities.

Untangling corporation tax complexities is a totally different problem, and estate and gift taxes pose equal difficulties. One obvious first step on corporations would be to eliminate the capital stock and declared value excess-profits tax. Corporations can hope for little substantial relief during the existence of the separate wartime excess-profits tax.

Simplifying levies like the corporation taxes and those on capital gains probably require spade-work study by a commission of experts. But individual tax computations can be made easier now by direct congressional action.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I returned to Washington a few days ago from a sad mission to Kansas, where I attended the funeral of a very dear friend who also was one of the great men of his time—William Allen White, of Emporia. I feel a deeper sense of personal loss in the passing of William Allen White than I can express in words.

For more than a half century Bill White and myself were bound together in a relationship that was very dear to me. Both of us had been Kansas newspapermen. Both of us had made incursions and excursions into related fields of public endeavor and service for nearly 60 years. I first met him a few years after I was graduated from high school in Garnett, Kans., and had become a typesetter and then a reporter on the Topeka Daily Capital, a daily newspaper of which I am now the publisher.

During all these years William Allen White and I understood each other so well, and loved each other so much, that we could, and at times did, disagree strongly on matters of high public policy without in the slightest degree marring or distorting our personal relations.

He was one of the few men I have known in a fairly long lifetime whose head and heart never lost the clarity and enthusiasm, the resiliency and freshness of youth. In all the years that we were friends and associates—and at times of opposing views—I never observed in him any of the signs of "closed mindedness" that often comes as the years roll by.

Will White's arteries may have hardened; his heart and soul and mind never did. He granted to every friend—and to all men, for that matter—the right to be wrong without impairing their relations to himself. If he ever hated any person, I never knew of it. If he ever failed to hate any wrong, I never knew of that. He was a grand and glorious fighter, as well as one of the greatest editors, writers, and leaders of thought of his day and generation.

I might add that he asserted for himself the same right to be wrong that he granted to others, and never hesitated to exercise that right against all comers. He was a man—and a friend—in a million; aye, in a hundred million.

I mourn his passing, but at the same time I rejoice in his having lived, and in the way he lived, and in the many good and kindly, as well as in the great and the near-great, things that he did during a long and happy and very useful life.

His death a few days ago in Emporia, where he was born and lived and worked and inspired to higher ideals his readers over all the world, was a sad blow to me, to his friends in Kansas, to the Nation, and to the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, the eloquent and well deserved tribute to Mr. White, delivered at the funeral services in Emporia, Kans., on January 31, 1944, by Mr. Henry J. Haskell, the able and brilliant editor of the Kansas City Star.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are met here this afternoon as the friends of William Allen White to show our respect and affection. We are met in a chapel that seems empty without him. Yet in a larger sense this chapel is not empty. It is crowded with memories that are more than memories—with enduring achievements that live on in the generation that he touched and moved and influenced.

"When we met him in person or on the printed page, we came like Bunyan's Pilgrim to the Interpreter's house. For primarily he was a great interpreter of life—of the human comedy or tragedy that passed before him. Interpretation was his technique. He was a preacher of righteousness, of sane and wholesome and unselfish living. But he preached largely by revealing to us our own hearts and the hearts of others.

I recall the thrill that came to me long ago when I first read his tales of the high plains—the story of drought stricken Aqua Pura and the little girl of 3 who looked up into the old man's eyes and asked, "What is rain, Mr. Barringer?"

BOOK LIFTED SPIRITS

And the Home Coming of Colonel Hucks, and the rest. Then I began to understand something of the cost of the winning of the West. A Certain Rich Man broadened our experience—and built the Gazette office, as well. Our spirits were lifted by that gay book the Martial Adventures of Henry and Me but in it we caught illuminating glimpses of the meaning of the war.

In his Woodrow Wilson he analyzed the achievements and failures of the idealist. Masks in a Pageant was a keen diagnosis of the trends of recent American history. Do you remember its significant chapter headings? "The Old Kings"—Croker and Platt; "The Early Stuarts"—Harrison, Grover Cleveland, McKinley; "The Warwicks"—Hanna and Bryan; "The Great Rebellion"—Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson; "The Restoration"—Harding and Coolidge? What a world of meaning there is in each of these titles. And finally we got fresh insight into the roaring insanity of the boom era from that penetrating study of Coolidge, A Puritan in Babylon.

It was difficult for anyone reading these books to escape being influenced by the light they threw upon the actors in the world in which we live.

BOOKS ONLY A SIDE ISSUE

But these many books, important as they were, were only a side issue with him. They represented his avocation. His vocation was journalism, which involved not only the life about him, but excursions far afield into national and international affairs.

First of all, he was editor of the Emporia Gazette, and the Gazette office was the springboard for all his work. It was as editor of the Gazette that he first skyrocketed to fame with his editorial, What's the Matter with Kansas? It was as editor of the Gazette that he was accepted into that world-wide club of the newspaper clan. It was as editor of the Gazette that he won the Pulitzer prize and that he attained the honor

that perhaps he valued most, the presidency of the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

In his last illness it was confided to him that he was to receive the unique distinction of a gold medal from the society. His comment was that nothing could gratify him more because it was recognition from the men who knew him best, the men of his chosen profession.

HIS EDITORIALS UNIQUE

I suppose that his most lasting contribution to American letters—if it is not his forthcoming autobiography—will be found in the editorials collected in the two volumes, The Editor and His People, and Forty Years on Main Street. In these editorials all his rare qualities had free play—his exuberance, his humor, his quaint ways of expression, his kindness, his sympathy, his independence, his courage. Nobody in the world but Bill White could have written them.

Consider a sample. In 1926 Tom Taggart, king of the French Lick resort, sued Edna Ferber for mentioning his name in connection with gambling. The Gazette came out with an editorial headed "Sir Galahad," nominating Taggart for the Camp Fire Girls' medal. "And the author," it continued, "who so meanly insinuates that Tom knows a white chip from a red one should get the punishment she so richly deserves. As everyone knows, Tom Taggart holds the Epworth League 1926 championship for drop-the-handkerchief and was the 1922 cup winner in post office."

And do you recall his answer to Lady Asquith's inquiry to some New York reporters, What is Kansas? "Kansas," wrote the Gazette editor, "is the Mother Shipton, the Madame Thebes, the Witch of Endor, and the low barometer of the Nation. When anything is going to happen in this country it happens first in Kansas. * * * There is just one way to stop progress in America, and that is to hire some hungry earthquake to come along and gobble up Kansas. But say, Margot, listen. That earthquake would have an awful case of indigestion for two or three epochs afterward."

In another vein, take his editorial on the death of Woodrow Wilson:

"God gave him a great vision,
The devil gave him an imperious heart.
The proud heart is still.
The vision lives."

And speaking of editorials, we cannot forget that American classic, Mary White, which already has been reprinted in the anthologies of American essays.

INTO BROADER FIELDS

His Gazette editorials introduced him into broader fields. The qualities that inspired them made him first a State and then a National figure. Kansas was proud to be represented by William Allen White at national conventions even if, as at Chicago in 1920, he strayed away with a few kindred souls after Hoover instead of going along with the rest for Harding.

Theodore Roosevelt proved a formative influence in his life as well as in the life of many others. Something essential in his make-up responded to the American liberalism of Roosevelt, and he went off in the wild and glorious adventure of the Bull Moose movement. It was this liberalism that found expression in his revolt against the intolerance of the Ku Klux Klan and led him to his sole excursion as a candidate for office when he ran for Governor. Who shall say that his great campaign for political decency did not produce a lasting effect on his State?

It was in keeping with the pattern of his life that he gave himself to arousing his apathetic countrymen to their danger by organizing the Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies. The sentiment that he mobilized contributed powerfully to changing the neutrality laws so we could sell arms to the democracies. And finally it was on his suggestion that the superb trade was made that gave hard-pressed England the 50 overage destroyers in return for the Atlantic bases.

INFLUENCE ON BRITISH

Englishmen have expressed to me their surprise that a man from far-off Kansas should have been such a factor in the salvation of the British Commonwealth and the cause of civilization itself. They could not know the long years of work that had brought this Kansas editor to his position of influence in American life.

Behind all his work was the personality of the man. He was a great human being—great in intelligence, in understanding, in courage, in zest. Life to him always was a glorious adventure. "I never have been bored an hour in my life," he wrote on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday. "I get up every morning now wondering what new, strange, gorgeous thing is going to happen, and it always happens at fairly reasonable intervals. Lady Luck has been good to me. I fancy she is good to everyone, only some people are dour, and when she gives them the come-hither with her eyes, they look down or turn away and lift an eyebrow. But me, I give her the wink and away we go."

A PART OF HIS THINKING

Lady Luck certainly smiled on him a half century ago when she brought him Sallie Lindsay. As all who know the Whites will bear witness, his wife became an essential part of his personality. What the world knew as William Allen White was a composite figure made up of Will and Sallie. She made her indispensable contribution to his thinking, to everything he did. Her taste, her grace, her intelligence, infused his entire career. To visit in their home was to be lifted to a new level of experience.

We of William Allen White's generation, who felt the impact of his influence, cannot think of him as having left us. For he has gone to—

"Join the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence; live
In pulses stirred to generosity
In deeds of daring rectitude, in scorn
For miserable aims that end with self,
In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars
And with their mild persistence urge man's search
To vaster issues."

This search to vaster issues is our heritage from William Allen White.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term "31st of March" where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term "30th of June," and by deleting from the second sentence thereof "on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less" and inserting in lieu thereof "on the basis of the cost, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower." The first appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis established by this amendment shall be made as of June 30, 1944.

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); by striking out in the first sentence of such section "February 17, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945"; and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further,* That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal year: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances of reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places

where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions."

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which programs involving such payments or losses have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but winding up and liquidating such programs shall proceed after the date of enactment of this act, and shall be completed within a reasonable time not later than June 30, 1944: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be maintained and announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and oil seed meals: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law.

SEC. 4. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at a loss perishable fruits or vegetables, owned or controlled by it, the increased production of which has been requested by the War Food Administrator, if there is danger of substantial loss through deterioration by spoilage.

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$3,250,000,000."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I engage the attention of the Senate for a moment? We are about to embark upon the consideration of the subsidy bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency. There will, no doubt, be various amendments offered to that measure during its consideration and before final completion. I simply want to urge all Senators to remain in the Chamber so as to save time in the matter of calling rolls. I doubt very much if there is any new phase of the subject which can be discussed which has not already been threshed out time and time again in the Senate and in the House and in the country.

It is very desirable, I think, that we complete the legislation this week. It seems to me we ought to be able to conclude it within 2 or 3 days. If that is done, and we then can call the calendar and dispose of some measures on the calendar, I think we may look forward to a few days of relaxation; in other words, to be more or less at ease for a few days because of the lack of pressing legislation on the calendar.

Therefore, I hope that Senators on both sides of the Chamber will cooperate to conclude the pending legislation this week. I think it can be done if all Senators will cooperate, and that means that we ought to remain here and give our attention unreservedly to this matter until it is concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate at this time on the subsidy phase of the bill proposing to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding about the provisions and the objectives of the pending bill. The impression prevails in some quarters that the purpose of the bill is to eliminate and prohibit all subsidies. That is not true. In the first place, the bill deals only with food subsidies. There is the same misunderstanding on that subject. The bill does not seek to eliminate and prohibit all food subsidies. It provides that neither the Commodity Credit Corporation nor any other Government agency shall use Government funds to make any subsidy or other payment or to pay or absorb losses on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices to consumers established on such commodities under the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended. The bill then provides that where programs have been announced on or before January 14, 1944, such programs may be carried out to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law. The bill further provides that support prices shall continue to be maintained and announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, commonly known as the Steagall Act. That is the act providing support prices for commodities to encourage production. Provision is further made that none of the foregoing provisions in the bill shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and oil seed meals, and that nothing in the bill shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended.

The real purpose of the bill is to abolish what is commonly known as consumer subsidies, nothing more and nothing less, so far as subsidies are concerned. Other provisions contained in the bill are intended to make it clear that programs are not to be eliminated by reason of a misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the prohibition against the use of subsidies to roll back prices or to maintain prices where it is found by the O. P. A. that it is necessary for the producers to have additional pay in order to meet the cost of production and to enable them to continue adequate production.

I believe it is definitely against the best interest of the American people to engage in a widespread program of using tax money or money secured by the sale of War bonds to pay in part for the food consumed by all the people at a time when most of the civilian population has more money to spend than it has ever had before. The chief, if not the only, objective of paying consumer subsidies is to prevent increases in, and, at times, reduce the price of food. What food? The subsidy does not apply to all foods alike, neither does the rate of the subsidy. The O. P. A. Administrator selects the foods to be subsidized and the amount of the subsidy to be paid on each subsidized commodity. The subsidy plan calls for a reduction in some food prices for all people, regardless of need, in order to help those who need food price reductions. If considered from the standpoint of the advisability of aiding needy people, we should seek the same results through less wasteful procedure. If considered from the standpoint of avoiding inflation, I will point out later that it will have the opposite effect.

What thoughtful citizen can fail to view with anxiety the Government, now burdened with back-breaking loads of debts, entering upon a comprehensive food-subsidy program, especially at a time when average people have more money in the banks and in their pockets, free for spending, than they have heretofore had in all the history of this country? Does anyone believe that food subsidies will be abandoned when post-war reconversion days are here, when millions of men and women are hunting employment, when wages shrink, in line with former experiences, when the establishment of new homes confronts millions of families, including the discharged servicemen? Food subsidies in some form may then be required to prevent hunger and to relieve other dire needs. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Let us wait until relief subsidies are needed before entering that field of large expenditures and more bureaus.

If subsidies are abandoned, ceiling prices can be used to stop inflationary increases in prices. If subsidies are eliminated, it would not result in excessive or wild inflation. The principal result would be an increase in the price of the particular goods that are under the subsidy program in an amount to correspond with the reduction in the price

that had been brought about by the use of the subsidy. Price ceilings would stop any additional increase in prices. If subsidies are abandoned, the price situation would revert to the status that prevailed before subsidies were applied. For illustration, the support price of butter was 46 cents a pound. A 5-cent subsidy paid by the Government reduced the price to the consumer to 41 cents. If the subsidy is abandoned, the price would go back to 46 cents. There was no wild inflation and no excessive burden on the consumers when the price stood at 46 cents. The chief difference is that the consumer would pay for what he eats, while under the present subsidy system the taxpayers pay for a part of what the consumer eats. Everyone naturally likes the lower of two prices for the same food; but the question arises, How long can a democracy survive when people call upon their Government for bounties and subsidies to support them when they are able to provide for themselves?

We have not heretofore during any of our wars made use of food subsidies to reduce food costs to our civilian population.

In considering inflation, the fact that it is the result of depreciation in the value of currency does not seem to receive the emphasis that it deserves. Many people think of high-priced foods as an evil, and it is; but they fail to appraise properly the cause of the disturbance in our price structure. Excessive prices result from depreciated value of the currency. Cheap money brings about high prices for goods. Cheap money is the result of lack of confidence in its ultimate redemption without loss in buying power, together with excessive quantities of borrowed money in circulation as compared with the quantity of goods for sale. When the quantity of money largely exceeds the quantity of goods for sale, the owners of money compete for the purchase of such goods as are available. That results in a contest of bidding for the inadequate supply of goods, and thereby results in higher and higher prices for such goods. When that occurs, inflation may proceed to bring about financial disaster.

In order to check the development of inflation, the cause must be treated, rather than effect. The cause is fundamental, and until it is properly treated there can be no satisfactory avoidance of the inflationary tendencies which have been produced

We have in this country the largest volume of currency and its equivalent in our history. On the other hand, more than 11,000,000 active, strong, ablebodied young men have been withdrawn from the production forces of the country. As the circulating medium has been increasing by billions, through putting into circulation billions of dollars of borrowed money, the production of civilian goods has been steadily reduced. The gap between purchasing power and consumer goods has been and continues to be growing wider every day. A resulting inflationary menace cannot be eliminated or very greatly reduced by holding down prices on a number of foods through the payment of subsidies. That has no tendency to reduce a dangerous inflationary gap. On the contrary, it increases it. In the same proportion that subsidy money is paid to producers and processors, the volume of circulating money, constituting the basis for inflation, is increased, and the value of currency is correspondingly depreciated. Subsidies may hold down some food prices. Depreciated currency puts up all prices. Subsidies are inflationary in that they increase the inflationary gap. Subsidies increase the national debt. Debt inflation is the most disastrous of all forms of inflation. Our national debt is now the largest in history and is soaring daily, reaching a total of $185,000,000,000 on October 31, 1943, which is equivalent to $1,204 per capita or $4,816 for a family of 4.

Instead of relying upon "soothing syrups" in the form of putting more money into circulation through the payment of subsidies to enable consumers to buy farm commodities below the cost of production, it is necessary to engage in a major operation. It should be recognized that the menace to the value of our currency can best be removed by reducing the spread between the amount of money hunting goods to buy and the quantity of goods for sale. In my judgment, we must sooner or later resort to some additional form of taxation or compulsory bond investment as a means of withdrawing a large amount of idle money from circulation, unless the volume of money borrowed by the Government and put into circulation is greatly decreased and the quantity of goods produced is greatly increased.

It is almost inevitable that demands will be made for extending the subsidy program to other activities. Already, suggestions for subsidies on cotton clothing and on rents have been made. Requests have come from administration sources that the subsidy program for this year of $1,100,000,000 be increased to $1,500,000,000. The Maloney amendment pending now to the bill so provides.

Mr. President, in connection with the subject of the handling of the subsidy program and its application to various agricultural commodities, it occurs to me to tell the Senate of an incident which came to my attention when I was at home. I met a farmer whom I knew well. He told me that he was selling a good many eggs, and had been doing well with his egg program; but he said he brought his eggs in that day and the merchant told him that the price of eggs was going to be reduced 1 cent a week for some time. He said that then he tried to buy some chicken feed, and he inquired of the merchant if the price of chicken feed had also been reduced. The merchant told him no. He said, "Senator, I do not think that is right. They ought to put the 'subside-y' on the price of chicken feed and bring it down as much as they bring down the price of eggs." [Laughter.]

One of the soundest and best ways to overcome high agricultural prices is the application of the fundamental trade law of supply and demand. The people have an overabundance of buying power, and those having it have manifested a desire to exercise it. The shortage in supply, as manifested by the necessity for the rationing program, deserves active attention. The large quantity of food bought by Lend-Lease and shipped out of this country has created an abnormal drain upon the normal supply and has thereby added a heavy inflationary factor. We cannot abandon that form of aid to our allies unless the danger of inflation from shortages in production demands it. It is appropriate to point out that the exportation last year of 11 percent of our entire food crop through Lend-Lease and the resulting reduction in our available food supplies constitute a major factor in bringing about inflation. The quantity of agricultural commodities removed from this country is the equivalent of a reduction to that extent in production. The Department does not yet know what amount will be required for Lend-Lease and other relief agencies this year, or what percentage of the food crop will be required, but that is a factor of major consideration which sooner or later we may be required to meet in some appropriate way.

We have an additional factor in the distribution in this country of foreign money sent here to be used to pay for the purchase of such agricultural commodities exported.

We cannot afford to decrease the large volume of food that goes to our armed forces. We cannot import food supplies because of lack of shipping facilities and because foreign countries are having difficulty in producing sufficient food supplies to meet their own domestic and foreign demands.

The evident answer to this complicated and tremendously important problem is to direct every available resource and effort toward increasing our production of foodstuffs. If and when we can produce more of any food commodity than is needed for our military and civilian requirements, high inflationary prices will promptly end for such commodity, unless depreciated currency has put all prices beyond control.

Some people have the idea that inflation grows primarily out of high food prices. So-called inflation which is attributed to the high price of some foods is not, in fact, inflation in its true sense. For illustration, when hogs were selling at 14 or 15 cents a pound many persons believed that destructive inflation was at hand and predicted dire disaster. As a result of an attractive support price which was announced, and appeals to farmers to increase hog production, the largest hog crop in many years was produced in 1943. A very large surplus developed and it has been and is still difficult to market the entire hog production. During the Christmas holidays I attended a meeting of farmers and O. P. A. officials, at which the subject of the marketing of hogs by the local pro-

ducers was under discussion. Numerous farmers stated that they had many hogs on hand for sale and that there was practically no market for them and that the best offer they had been able to get was 6 cents a pound. Anyone who cares to examine the report by the State director of O. P. A. in Alabama will find that statement in the report.

I am wondering what has happened to the belief that inflation was imminent as a result of the high hog prices when they are now below normal prices as a result of adequate production. How many surplus crops would it take to deflate the idea that high farm prices create dangerous inflation?

Those who think only of increase in food prices when considering the subject of inflation fail to bear in mind that the major factors in that type of increased cost of living, which is generally considered as inflation, are other than agricultural. Out of our total national income of approximately $150,000,000,000 a year, the farmers get only about 10 percent for the sale of their entire food crops. A pamphlet recently issued by F. A. Harper and W. M. Curtiss, of the department of agricultural economics, Cornell University, on the subject Inflation Is on Our Doorstep, contains the following statement:

It is frequently charged that the rise in prices of farm products is largely responsible for the inflation we now face. Of the rise in the national income of $49,000,000,000 from 1939 to 1942, the sharing has been:

	Total rise	Percent of total rise
Going to agriculture	$5,800,000,000	12
Going to nonagriculture	43,200,000,000	88
Total for the Nation	49,000,000,000	100

In other words, agriculture has been only one-seventh as much responsible for the inflation as has nonagriculture, judging from who received the money.

A fixed quantity of food now takes a smaller proportion of the pay check of the average consumer than at any time on record.

If it is true, as most economists assert, that the chief cause of inflation is the excess of income over goods for sale, then it is absolutely certain that the one-seventh which went to agriculture is, relatively speaking, a minor factor in the whole inflation picture.

Alarming predictions have been made to the effect that if the present subsidies are withdrawn there will be wild inflationary price rises, resulting in a large increase in the cost of living. Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the O. P. A., opened his statement on the hearings on the antisubsidy bill before the Banking and Currency Committee as follows:

I should like to say before I start that I think it is unfortunate in one respect that the debate as I often hear it over the radio has become quite so extreme on this subject. I heard through one loudspeaker the other night that if subsidies are continued on food we will have a collapse of our American system within a few weeks. I heard through another microphone that if we didn't have subsidies we would be papering our walls with dollar bills. I have even heard that with the subsidy program you would go to the grocery store with a small pocketbook full of money and come home with a vast basketful of groceries, and that if the bill is passed in its present form you will go out with a basket of dollar bills and come home with a purse full of goods. Now, these statements are obviously outrageous. They are ridiculous on both sides!

That is the statement of the head of the O. P. A. before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

While prices now seem high for foodstuffs as compared with prices since 1930, they are, in fact, not as high as they were during World War No. 1. On page 196 of the committee hearings will be found a table presented by Mr. Bowles showing the percentage increase in the cost of living after 50 months of war, World Wars Nos. 1 and 2.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 19.—*Percentage increase in the cost of living after 50 months of war, World Wars Nos. 1 and 2* [1]

	World War No. 1	World War No. 2
	Percent	*Percent*
Cost of living, total	56.9	26.2
Food	74.1	47.8
Clothing	95.9	32.6
Rent	4.0	3.5
Fuel, electricity, and ice	35.2	10.7
Housefurnishings	86.0	25.7
Miscellaneous	49.9	17.1

[1] World War No. 2 data show changes between August 1939 and October 1943, except for rent, where the latest available figure is for September 1943. World War No. 1 data show changes between July 1914 and September 1918 except for fuel, electricity, ice, and miscellaneous. No monthly data are available for these categories; therefore the figures show the change from the yearly average of 1914 to the yearly average of 1918.

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, this table shows that the increase in the total cost of living in World War No. 1 was 56.9 percent, while in World War No. 2 it is only 26.2 percent. It shows that the increase in the cost of living for the same length of time during World War No. 1 was more than twice what it has been during the present war.

The increase in the cost of food in World War No. 1 was 74.1 percent, while in World War No. 2 the increase is only 47.8 percent. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has adopted 1926 prices as a base for determining whether or not prices at any period are higher or lower than the accepted base. It will be remembered that the Goldsboro resolution was passed by a vote of about 4 to 1 in the House of Representatives in the early thirties, directing the Federal Reserve System to reestablish the wholesale price level of 1926. That resolution was never considered by the Senate. According to that measurement of prices, current wholesale prices are merely 3 percent above the price level of 1926. Statistics published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show that the cost of living and the cost of food to consumers in November 1943 were slightly less than in 1926. According to the record submitted by the O. P. A., the present increase in the price of food after 50 months of war is 26.3 percent lower than it was after 50 months of war in World War No. 1. There is no such alarming condition in the present cost of food as to justify the United States in entering upon a new drastic and inflationary method of price control of foods—the subsidy plan.

The testimony of the O. P. A. as presented to the committee—and, of course, it was presented in as favorable light as the witnesses could honorably justify—shows that the increase in the cost of living would be 2.922 percent, or substantially 3 percent, and the increase in the cost of food would be 7.025 percent, if subsidies are withdrawn. No wonder Mr. Bowles commented on the extravagance and wildness of the statement that the withdrawal of subsidies would bring about dangerous inflation. The cost of living—3 percent—is the test of the total effect on the consumers. Wheat for livestock feed is estimated by the O. P. A. as representing 0.416 percent of the 2.922-percent increase in the cost of living. That subsidy is not eliminated by the bill. The increase in the cost-of-living index from removal of subsidies is thereby reduced to 2.5 percent. The estimated increase in the cost of food is correspondingly reduced.

Recently I heard the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] make a most powerful, effective, and convincing argument on the subject. In his speech I recall that that was substantially his judgment after careful study of the situation; namely, that the increase would be about one-half, or perhaps less than one-half, of the amount previously estimated by the O. P. A.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should rather not yield. I have asked each Senator who has requested me to yield to allow me to complete my address.

Mr. REED. I beg the Senator's pardon. I had not known that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There is no Senator to whom I would rather yield than the Senator from Kansas.

It is urged by highly responsible students of the subject that the O. P. A. figures are excessive and that the correct figures are about one-half as high as the ones presented by O. P. A. officials.

According to a table prepared by the American Farm Bureau Federation, based on information from the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the Office of Economic Stabilization, and inserted in the committee hearings on page 41, the effect of the subsidies on daily food costs is 2¾ cents for individuals, and 11 cents for a family of four.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated effect of subsidies upon the daily food costs for a family of 4 persons

Product	Amount of subsidy per unit [1]	Estimated annual civilian consumption per capita for 1943 [2]	Effect on daily food cost for a family of 4 [3]
			Cents per day
Butter	5 cents per pound.	13.0 pounds	0.71
Cheese	4 cents per pound.	4.9 pounds	.22
Milk	1 cent per quart.	180.5 quarts	1.98
Meat	3 cents per pound.	124.0 pounds	4.08
Bread	1 cent per loaf.	92.5 loaves	1.01
Sugar	1 cent per pound.	75.0 pounds	.82
Vegetables	3.5 cents per No. 2 can.	19.2 No. 2 cans.	.74
Potatoes	1 cent per pound.	131.0 pounds	1.44
Amount per day for a family of 4.			11.00
Amount per day per individual.			2.75

[1] Based upon or calculated from information released by the Office of Economic Stabilization.

[2] Based upon data published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

[3] Calculated by multiplying the amount of the subsidy by the annual per capita consumption, then multiplying by 4 and dividing by 365.

NOTE.—The food subsidy program as now being applied by the Government amounts to about 11 cents per day for a family of 4 persons, or 2¾ cents per day per individual. Butter subsidies of 5 cents a pound amount to about 65 cents per year per person. A bread subsidy of 1 cent per loaf would amount to less than $1 per year per person. The present consumer subsidy program amounts to around $10 per year per person.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Anyone who wants to confirm the statement can take the population of the country and the amount of the subsidy and soon compute the amount per person.

Thus, if the entire food subsidies are withdrawn, it would mean an average increase in food costs of only 11 cents per day for a family of four. Some consideration should be given to the fact that hard workers require more food than those who do not engage in active physical work, and in estimating the effect of the subsidies we should bear in mind that this allowance applies only to the worker in the family. It should also be borne in mind that food costs represent only 19 percent of the income of the average consumer, which is the lowest percentage on record.

The argument that the abandonment of the roll-back consumer subsidies would be unduly burdensome on the consumers and would generate inflation, is a speculative prediction by those who want to retain subsidies. These subsidies were put into effect within the last 7 or 8 months, one of the large ones—milk—about December 1. There has been no noticeable reduction in the cost of food or of living as a result of the subsidies.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the fear of breaking the line of the Little Steel formula is one of the chief causes for the administration insisting on the continuance of the subsidies. This statement is confirmed by the testimony of O. P. A. Administrator Bowles in the Senate hearings. From page 163, I quote the following questions by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and answers by Mr. Bowles:

Mr. BOWLES. We cannot control this thing as we have controlled it without a continuation of the plan.

Senator MAYBANK. Is it because of the threat to the Little Steel formula?

Mr. BOWLES. It starts with that as the whole basis; and whether that is correct or not, I do not know.

Senator MAYBANK. After all, it resolves itself into the pressure about the breaking of the Little Steel formula.

Mr. BOWLES. Yes.

Senator BANKHEAD. Suppose the Little Steel formula is broken anyway and you have the subsidies.

Mr. BOWLES. If we have the subsidy, Mr. Davis—

He was referring to Mr. William H. Davis, Chairman of the National War Labor Board—

thinks he can hold the Little Steel formula. If the Little Steel formula is not held, we cannot hold our job.

Mr. Bowles, who is one of the highest-class men I have encountered in Government service, in saying "If the Little Steel formula is not held, we cannot hold our job," did not have in mind anything personal to himself or the job that he holds with the Government. He had in mind the job of holding the Little Steel formula. The reason I am quoting his statement is to show from official sources that this controversy about subsidies grows out of the controversy about being able to retain the Little Steel formula if the subsidies are not used.

Without going into a discussion of the various figures of earnings which have been presented to the committee by different witnesses, but accepting the statement of the Bureau of Labor Statistics that the average hourly rate for all manufacturing workers is 99½ cents, workers who are threatening the Little Steel formula in the event subsidies are withdrawn are earning on an average as much as $7.96 a day, 6 days a week. Is it reasonable to believe that with this rate of pay it would be a hardship on working people to pay 11 cents a day per family, to take the place of the withdrawn subsidies on some food commodities?

Some people assert that the fight by the farmers against food subsidies is based upon a desire to secure more pay for farm commodities. That is not true. Except in the case of roll-back subsidies, the removal of the subsidies would not result in the farmers getting any more money for their products. The immediate financial difference to them would be that, instead of the taxpayers paying in part for farm products, the consumers would pay for them in the market place, but the amount received by the farmers would be the same. If all subsidies were withdrawn, farmers would not seek any price higher than the present market price plus the amount now paid in the form of a subsidy. In short, the farmer does not ask any more than he is getting now. He wants it all paid by the consumers of his commodities and does not want to look to the Treasury of the United States to get any of his pay for his labor and property. He does not want to be required to submit proof from time to time to some Government agent of the quantity and quality of the commodity sold by him, and he does not want to go with frequency, at his expense, to the county seat to get his check.

Government agencies that have taken part in this controversy have grounded their position largely upon the assumption that the withdrawal of a billion dollars in subsidies will result in breaking the Little Steel formula by all labor organizations. We heard the same argument when Congress passed the so-called Bankhead parity bill, and the President vetoed it. That bill was intended to annul an order the President had made deducting 5 cents from the ceiling price on corn. Very greatly exaggerated statements were made predicting wild inflation if the Bankhead bill became a law. Many Senators who had voted for the bill expressed an unwillingness to vote to override the veto because of the fear that John L. Lewis would then have grounds to break the stabilization order and that such action would be followed by the representatives of organized labor throughout the country for increased wages. As a result of that expression of anxiety, the proponents of the bill could not secure two-thirds of the votes in the Senate to override the veto, and the bill was sent to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where it still rests.

Mr. Lewis got an increase, anyway, of about $1.50 a day for nearly 600,000 men. That means about $270,000,000 a year added to the spending money of the Nation. The rail workers threatened to strike unless they got increases in wages in violation of the Little Steel formula. They asked for an increase of 8 cents an hour and were finally granted increases ranging from 9 to 11 cents an hour, which will cost an estimated quarter of a billion dollars. I do not complain. If these 2 groups were entitled to it, it would have been wrong to deny them. Automobile workers are now demanding a general wage increase of 17 cents an hour; steel workers, textile workers, and many other groups are demanding general wage increases, despite the fact that the subsidy programs are still continuing. Even if Congress should continue all of these subsidy programs, it is obvious that it would not stop the demands of labor groups for general wage increases. Of course, it is ridiculous on the face of it to argue that a saving of an average of 2¾ cents a day per person by reason of food subsidies is going to persuade workers to give up demands for wage increases ranging from $1 to $1.50 a day.

A short time after the Bankhead parity bill was sent back to committee Mr. Chester Davis, Food Production and Distribution Administrator, made an order replacing the 5 cents a bushel in the price of corn which had been deducted and which caused the Bankhead bill to be introduced. Very little public notice was taken of the action by Mr. Davis.

The restoration of the 5 cents a bushel had no injurious effect on consumers or on inflation. In fact, it is now recognized that an increase of 15 or 20 cents a bushel would have been better for the country. It was definitely proven that the alarm about inflation which was

sounded and spread all over the country was totally unjustified. It was again proven that there is no infallibility in the domain of predictions. It is likely that recent excitement about wild inflation will calm down with passing time as it did on the corn controversy.

I am not opposed to all agricultural subsidies. If the pending bill repealed all subsidies I would oppose it actively.

Under the same circumstances that prevailed when we adopted soil-conservation and parity-payment programs for the depressed and heavily burdened farmers, I would gladly take the same course. I am not willing now to repeal the statutes under which authorizations for appropriations for soil conservation and parity payments were approved and the Steagall price-support program was enacted. I have never regarded the soil-conservation payments as a subsidy, but I understand the President so regards them. I do not favor over-all subsidies for price-making purposes and do not favor what is generally known as consumer subsidies. The roll-back, price-reducing, and price-maintaining subsidies are paid by the taxpayers purely for the benefit of consumers and they interfere with orderly marketing processes under which the farmer gets his pay for his commodities in the market place under the law of supply and demand and with the consumer properly protected through ceiling prices.

How does the Government secure the money paid as subsidies? There are but two chief sources of Government income, namely, taxes and loans. The taxes are admittedly totally inadequate to pay the normal expenses of the Government and to conduct the war operations. The result is that a very large amount of money must be borrowed from time to time to carry on the Government's activities. The payment of obligations in excess of the current taxes must come from money borrowed by the Government. As the present necessary obligations exhaust the taxes received, it is apparent that the money for the payment of subsidies must be borrowed, and under the present financial program it comes from the sale of Government bonds. When will these bonds be paid through taxes? We have only to look at the experiences of the past to realize that the payment of the bonded indebtedness, including the amount used in paying subsidies, will be projected far into the future. When we look at the amount currently used in the payment of subsidies we cannot fail to consider the increase in that amount which will accrue as a result of the cost of bond sales and the accumulation of interest—and the last item may, before the bonds are paid, more than double the amount paid as subsidies. Who will be the taxpayers for the service of these bonds, as well as their gradual retirement? Must our boys, on their release from the national colors, be required to pay in part for the food eaten by you and me and more than 125,000,000 others, most of whom are able to pay for what they eat? We cannot overlook the fact that the payment as a part of the taxes to pay this subsidy will fall upon our children and our grandchildren and their children under the usual method of satisfying a Government obligation which will doubtless exceed $200,000,000,000. It will not be a matter of pride to us, who are living in security, and many in comfort, to be obliged to face our soldiers as they return from battlefields throughout the world and inform them that they will be expected to take up the obligation of paying in part for the food that we ate while they were fighting for us.

It is doubtless true that a substantial segment of our population is not situated so that it can bear in comfort any substantial increase in the cost of food. The proportion of these people, however, does not justify the granting of bounties to all those who would not suffer as a result of the withdrawal of the bounties, thereby increasing some food prices. Other ways are available for providing compensatory relief to those with small incomes who have not had appropriate income increases. During the last great depression, it will be recalled, the food stamp plan was put into operation and afforded much relief to many needy people. Bills are pending at this time to put into operation the same plan or something similar to it.

I submit that a better way to avoid injurious results to low-income people from the abandonment of the subsidy program, would be to authorize rebates of the actual amount paid by low-income consumers in lieu of the subsidies which had been withdrawn. This should, of course, apply only to those with definitely low incomes and without any other inquiry into the subject of their need. The mere fact of a low income and of a desire to get back the additional money they paid in lieu of the amount covered by the subsidy which had been withdrawn, should be the only requirements necessary to qualify the consumers to secure a rebate of the extra amount they paid on account of the withdrawal of the subsidy.

It is generally recognized that when the war ends there is likely to be substantial reductions in wages and farm commodity prices. In times of declining prices farm prices go down faster and to lower levels than other prices and wages.

That is historical.

The effect of consumer subsidies is to reduce farm prices now while industrial wages are likely to be increased from time to time. No one has proposed that increases in wage rates be paid with subsidies. Does anyone believe that industrial workers would be satisfied to apply for subsidy payments from the Treasury to pay for wages earned by them? It is unthinkable.

When the time for post-war readjustment arrives, a disparity wider even than that now existing in the earnings of industrial and farm workers will prevail as a result of the subsidy program. It is an established rule that in all general price decline movements agricultural prices are the first to go down and the last to stop going down. A long, difficult struggle is then necessary to get farm prices up to a level approaching actual parity prices with the prices of nonagricultural prices and wages of workers.

It may be recalled that after the great decline in farm prices following the last war the usual parity level of prices was not regained until 1941, after a period of twenty-odd years, during which the farmers suffered through inability to get their prices on an ascending scale. The unjust and unbalanced situation I have just described will result from subsidy legislation reducing and holding down farm prices, and not from general economics. It will present a very serious problem which should not burden the farmers when this horrible war ends, in their struggle for decent standards of living.

A subsidy program is inflationary—by reducing the price of consumer goods it encourages increased consumption and increases excess purchasing power in the hands of consumers. It does not encourage production as good prices do. It adds to the public debt. It contributes to the depreciation of the currency. Certainly food subsidies should not prevail at this time of abundant money so widely circulated, and with rationing power and price ceilings available to the administration to control price rises.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a few questions in respect to the amendment which is the substitute for what is provided for in the bill which passed the House.

I understand the only provision that was added to the House bill was section 5, which increases the amount of loaning capacity $250,000,000.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; that was not the only thing added.

Mr. ELLENDER. But that was one of the principal things added?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the House provided that subsidies should terminate on December 31, 1943, and the substitute extends the time until June 30, 1944.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is true, but that is not all. I think the bill was introduced in September, and it provided for a termination of the program on the 31st of December, which allowed 3 or 4 months, some considerable time, for everyone to become adjusted before the program was terminated. When I introduced my bill in the Senate I provided that the liquidation should begin not later than the 1st of January.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is, after the enactment of the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; that liquidation should begin at that time, and that it must be completed and the programs closed by the 30th of June.

I have an amendment which would strike out the provision that liquidation should begin the 1st of January, or the 31st of December, because so much time has intervened that it would be an impossibility. I did not in the beginning wish to make the closing of the program too abrupt, too quick, so as to upset either the agency administering it, or the consumers, or the subsidy recipients.

For that reason I provided time for an orderly liquidation. Then, after so much time had elapsed before we could obtain action on the bill, I did not see any need for inserting a liquidation clause, and merely provided, as was provided in my original bill, that the program must be closed up by June 30.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's view that with the language now incorporated in the substitute, or with the amendment he proposes, the Commodity Credit Corporation could maintain the present subsidies up to June 30, 1944?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can any new subsidy programs be added?

Mr. BANKHEAD. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. MALONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Bone	Holman	Smith
Brewster	Jackson	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	Wherry
Downey	Nye	White
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	Willis
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to House bill 3477.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut has first asked for recognition by the Chair. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if it is in order, I desire to call up an amendment which I earlier sent to the desk and which has been printed. I ask that the amendment be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee beginning on page 9, line 11, and ending with line 23 on page 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, unless the Economic Stabilization Director shall find that payments for any such purpose are necessary in order to obtain needed production or distribution of a commodity consistently with the objectives of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the Stabilization Act (Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942) to prevent inflation and to stabilize prices, wages, and salaries: *Provided*, That the total amount expended by means of such payments to provide needed production or distribution of food commodities while keeping national living costs stable shall not exceed $1,500,000,000 in any fiscal year: *Provided further*, That incentive or production adjustment payments may be made in accordance with the foregoing provisions: *Provided further*, That the limitations of this section shall not apply to the making of parity payments or soil-conservation payments; or to benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or to the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Connecticut suspend for a moment? The Chair understood that the Senator from Maine had a parliamentary inquiry to propound.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the question I had in mind has been answered to my own satisfaction by myself.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, just before the speech of the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] the majority leader pointed to the fact that this is a subject with which all Senators have had an opportunity to become familiar. He reminded us that it was under lengthy discussion last year, and that it has been considered for a long period of time in the Committee on Banking and Currency and in the Senate. He expressed the hope that the debate would be brief and that the bill would be acted upon at a very early date. He urged Senators to remain in the Chamber.

For two reasons I shall be exceedingly brief. First, because of a natural desire to expedite consideration of the proposal; and second because the majority leader's admonition is unheeded and many Senators are not in the Chamber, and because I have no special desire to talk to myself about this all-important matter.

I hasten to add, Mr. President, that I do not say that by way of criticism. This is the hour of the day when many Senators are usually at lunch, and other Senators are detained for other reasons.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me say that I am here to listen to the Senator with the greatest interest. Other Senators are present, but the majority leader is not in the Chamber. So I hope the Senator will continue at least until he returns.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I was about to give the names of Senators who are present. [Laughter.] I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to have my colleague know that not only am I here, but the Governor of our State is here. It is with great pleasure that I make that announcement.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to ask the Senator if he has given any thought to the subject of the Senate adopting a lunch hour. On several occasions I have had to open the debate on a bill of considerable importance when only a handful of Senators were present. The number of Senators now present is approximately the number usually present at this hour. Senators have the habit of eating. They cannot be held in the Chamber. I know I cannot hold them. They do not often stay to listen to me. I think it would be a good idea for us to consider taking a recess for about 45 minutes at this time of day—say from half past 12 until a quarter past 1—to enable Senators to obtain their lunch. It would save time and the results would be better.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if that statement is submitted to me in the form of a question I do not agree. I do not wish to take a recess for lunch.

I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that I am always grateful for his presence. I am particularly grateful for it now, because the able Senator has devoted his attention wholeheartedly to this particular subject, perhaps to a greater extent than most other Members of this body. He needs less enlightenment than do other Senators, although I think there is some slight room for improvement in his thinking on this question. In the few minutes I shall consume I hope I can help to persuade him.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I want my friend to know that I am present, at his side.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is all I wanted. [Laughter.]

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I did not intend to be facetious. I was hoping to lay emphasis on the desire expressed by the majority leader that we have early action on the pending proposal. The dead line is the 17th of this month. Unless we are careful we may provoke another controversy such as that which caused some unusual feeling in the Senate just prior to the summer-time recess last year.

Mr. President, I had wanted to ask some questions during the course of the

discussion of agriculture's Happy Warrior, the distinguished Senator from Alabama; but at his request that he be permitted to complete his statement, I necessarily restrained that desire. I cannot remember all the instances in which I might have questioned him or offered objection. However, there is one particular item to which I wish briefly to refer.

Before doing so, Mr. President, I should like to say that during the many years I have been a Member of Congress I have resolved every doubt in favor of the farmer. I have been pretty close to the views of the distinguished Senator from Alabama on agricultural questions, whether or not such questions were of particular concern to the people of the State whence I come.

I do not like the need for food subsidies——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. President, we are in the midst of a terrible war. We have cast the die. We are operating under a food subsidy program, and I feel that wartime food subsidies are a necessary thing.

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I merely wished to confirm the statement of the Senator. I have observed his record, and I know that he has been the friend of the farmer and has supported most of the agricultural legislation.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator could go a little further than saying "most." I do not think that he and I have disagreed on enough farm bills to exhaust the count on the fingers of my hands. I do, however, appreciate his kindly reference.

During the course of his discussion, if I remember correctly, the Senator from Alabama said that under the abandonment of the subsidy program the cost of living would rise approximately 7 percent. If I am in error I should like to have the Senator correct me now.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The cost of living?

Mr. MALONEY. The cost of living.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; I said 3 percent.

Mr. MALONEY. I thought the Senator referred to the——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I said that the cost of food would rise 7 percent.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The cost of living would rise about 2½ percent.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator also said that in his opinion the subsidies would increase the national debt. He seemed to look upon this proposal as an effort to pay the Nation's grocery bills. To me he seemed to offer the suggestion that we might look for ways to withdraw money from circulation. He said that the people have an overabundance of buying power, although I know that he knew that the statement was not correct insofar as our entire population is concerned. The Senator from Alabama knows that there are millions of our people who are without an overabundance of buying power, and that there are millions of our people who do not have the money in their pockets in such abundance as he describes.

Mr. President, I know of no one who is opposed to subsidies. I doubt that there is a single Member of the Senate who has not at some time or other, if he has not advocated, at least supported subsidies of one kind or another. I do not know any farmer in this land who is opposed to subsidies. Agricultural subsidies have been in effect for probably 100 years or more. If there should come another period of overabundance, as was the situation just before our entrance into this terrible war, there would be further clamor for some kinds of subsidies for agriculture. That applies to every Senator. It includes every State. I do not believe there is a Senator who would not only refuse to repudiate subsidies, in general, but would also refuse to repudiate agricultural subsidies.

The distinguished and able Senator from Alabama, for whom I have a great personal affection and admiration, stepped out from his customary role a little while ago and offered us a subsidy for the country press of the Nation.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not think the Senator should inject that subject into the debate. He knows that we fought it out in the Senate, and that the Senate agreed that it was not a subsidy although he insisted it was. I do not know why we should get into a debate on that subject. The bill to which the Senator refers is now pending in the other House.

Mr. MALONEY. There certainly was no desire on my part to offend the distinguished Senator, and, being anxious to please him, I shall make no further reference to the matter. I do not think I have contributed to the debate by mentioning it, and I am sorry that I made the reference. I wish, however, to dwell briefly on the fact that during his address the Senator spoke about a 7-percent increase in the cost of living. Mr. President, this war has made our country the largest buyer in the world of produce and products. We are spending approximately $100,000,000,000 a year on the war. The Senator has spoken about a 7-percent increase in the cost of living——

Mr. BANKHEAD. No, Mr. President; I stated that there had been a 7-percent increase in the——

Mr. MALONEY. The cost of food.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator implied, it seemed to me, that we could increase the cost of food 7 percent and rest on our oars. There is not a Member of this body who for one moment believes that we can increase food costs 7 percent without an over-all increase in everything else.

There was much logic in the Senator's address. He talked about the low cost of food per family with or without subsidies. But every Senator knows that is because we have been successful under our stabilization program, with all its faults and frailties. Every Senator knows that if we take off the restrictions now existent, which might in some instances follow if we should abandon the subsidy program, we cannot hold the line, we cannot confine ourselves to a 7-percent increase in the cost of food, we cannot keep wage prices on an even keel, and that there will certainly be a demand—and I expect a successful demand—for wage increases.

Reminding my colleagues that the Government of the United States is the largest employer of labor, the largest buyer of produce and products in the country, does it not seem a little out of place to be concerned about the returning veterans paying the food bill of America which is, in the language of the Senator from Alabama, costing only a few cents per family per day?

Mr. President, let me try to paint the true picture. If there should be a 7-percent increase in the price of foods other prices would go up accordingly, and I dare say that we would not be able to hold the increases to 7 percent.

Let me suggest that as a small beginning prices go up 10 percent, that wages and prices, with the shackles taken off, increase 10 percent; I do not believe anyone thinks that is a fabulous or an over statement. It simply means, Mr. President, that a 10-percent increase would cost the Federal Government, as the largest employer of labor and the world's largest buyer, on the basis of wartime expenditure of $100,000,000,000 per year, $10,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator recognizes, I believe, that in the last 12 months, however, the average hourly cost of labor has gone up 12 percent in spite of the fact that prices have not gone up. What assurance has the Senator that any increase in prices will necessarily result in a greater increase in wages than is likely to occur in any event?

Mr. MALONEY. I am not a prophet, but I am not ready to surrender before the fight is made. I am not going to predict now that, regardless of what we do, wages are going up. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio is correct. He may be a prophet; he may be able to foresee the future; I do not want to disagree with him; but if there is a chance to hold the line on wages the chance is with us right now. The Senator knows——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I shall yield in a moment. As a student of all legislation, particularly the pending legislation, the Senator knows there is much that is psychological in this bill. The Senator knows that labor all over this land is now straining at the leash for increased wages; and the Senator knows that if we take the lid off prices by way of abandonment of subsidies there will be a cry for increased wages the like of which we have not heard up to now.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not know anything of the kind. There will be a constant pressure for increased wages no matter what we do. There has been, and there is now. It has resulted in an increase of about 12 percent, as I say, in the cost of labor compared to a 25-percent increase in prices during the last 12 months.

I agree it will be an additional argument for the present position of the Government, which I believe to be unsound. I think that, although prices have gone up 25 percent, they are pretending, at least, to hold wages to a 15-percent increase. In other words, my point is that all a small further increase in prices will do will be to provide a small additional argument for wage increases; there will be the demand anyway, and the argument will be made anyway.

The labor people refuse to accept the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics as to what the increase is today. They are claiming that Bureau's figures are wrong, and that there is actually a 15-percent greater increase than the figures show. There is no question in my mind that the Government is going to have this fight anyway. I doubt very much that an increase of 2 percent in the cost of living, as indicated by the Senator from Alabama, resulting from a 7-percent increase in food prices, will do more than add one more slight argument when the labor people appear before the National War Labor Board.

The Senator accuses me of claiming to be a prophet. I am not. I am asking him how he knows, for he is the one who prophesies a $10,000,000,000 increase in cost to the Government. I have not done so. I am saying we cannot tell; these things are intangible, and while there would be the basis for an additional argument, I do not think the Senator's prophecy can possibly be borne out.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have not disagreed with the Senator. I told him he had a perfect right to essay the role of a prophet if he so desired, but I am not willing to admit the correctness of his statement; I am not willing to admit that the situation will be as he describes it. I can well understand the Senator's feeling; many share his fears; but if the worst of his fears are realized and he expects that the situation he has portrayed will prevail without subsidies, he cannot entertain the slightest hope, in my judgment, of holding the line insofar as wages are concerned unless he is willing to hold the line insofar as food prices are concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have no hope of holding the line so far as wages are concerned. Although the administration said they would do that, they have not done it, and I have no doubt that wages will continue to increase at the rate of about 1 percent a month, as they have increased during the past year, regardless of the action taken by the Congress on the pending measure.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if we throw off all restraints, if we remove the restrictions which we have heretofore imposed, and wages are going to increase about 1 percent a month or 12 percent a year, the fear which I express does not sound so ridiculous, because I have only suggested that a 10-percent increase in the cost of labor and produce and products would increase the cost to the taxpayers of this country in 1 year $10,000,000,000.

It seems to me in the face of that sort of situation it is rather picayune to be talking about the Nation's food bill. This is not a question of the Nation's food bill. The question here, Mr. President, as I see it, is whether we are going to repudiate a program which we earlier adopted, which is now in operation, and which, in my judgment, is meeting with considerable success. We have held the line fairly well, all things considered. I think it was Patrick Henry who said that the only way he could judge the future was by the past.

Mr. President, I am old enough to remember some of the experiences of the last war, when we did not impose self-restraint, when we did not rigidly attempt to do something about the control and regulation of prices. Surely, the Senator from Alabama and my other colleagues in the Senate remember what happened to the prices on foodstuffs during that war. Sugar was a shining example. In the last war sugar cost almost five times as much as it does under the governmental program of this hour.

Senators will perhaps remember that steel plates in Pittsburgh during the period of the last war increased in cost 695 percent; and that is a fair example of what occurred. Senators know, or ought to know, that should we abandon the program now in effect, a program which is meeting with success, if we let subsidies go and prices rise—and that is what this means—wages will rise, and if wages rise in the steel industry that means that the cost of ships and tanks and guns and most of the other materials of war will correspondingly increase. If steel should rise in cost as the result of wage increases which are in the offing, if we abandon this program, I shudder to think of the cost to the Nation; I shudder to think of the cost to the American taxpayer; and I can join, I think, in the tears that are shed for the man overseas who is going to be compelled to bear so much of this burden.

Mr. President, in view of our long experience with the program, I am reluctant to take the time of the Senate to discuss it further, and particularly am I hesitant to impose upon the Senate after the admonition and the plea and the suggestion of the majority leader that we make haste. Insofar as I am concerned, we can act on the bill today. There are no new arguments which can be made. Whatever is said is repetition; whatever develops in this debate is a rehash, if I may use a colloquial term, of what has been said heretofore.

The question, Mr. President, is whether we will adhere to the program existing, or whether we will bring about an interruption that will throw our stabilization program into complete chaos, whether we will take off the roof, whether we will go back to the bitter experiences of 1917 and 1918, or whether we will keep the faith a little longer. The issue is whether we will permit the administration, and particularly the administration of the O. P. A., which is meeting with greater success each passing day, to continue to give the Government and the people of this country the benefit of their more successful experiences of the last little while.

I do not ask anything new. My amendment does not magnify anything now existing. It does not go a step beyond where we are. All I ask is that we continue this program for another year. The amendment is ironclad. It provides a limitation of $1,500,000,000. It sets forth in unmistakable and clearly understandable language how and when subsidies may be used.

Mr. President, I want to say again that I deplore the need for food subsidies. In ordinary times and under ordinary circumstances I would be among those hostile to this program; but we are not living in ordinary times—we are not living under ordinary circumstances. We are in the middle of a war, and in the middle of a war, Mr. President, it seems to me it would be nothing short of stupid to take off our armor.

I hope the amendment will prevail. I hope we may have early action on this all-important measure.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that if a limitation of a billion and a half dollars is put upon the amount which can be spent for subsidies, the executive department would certainly keep within that limitation?

Mr. MALONEY. Under my amendment, they would have to.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Connecticut know where the executive department is getting the money it is now paying and promising to pay in subsidies?

Mr. MALONEY. I certainly know where it is getting some of the money; it is getting it from the R. F. C.

Mr. AIKEN. Was the money appropriated by the Congress for that purpose?

Mr. MALONEY. I have made that speech many times, Mr. President. I have deplored the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was acting as an appropriation agency of this Government. I think it is a condition which should long since have been corrected. I do not like it. I would stop it now. I want to return at the earliest possible moment to a simplicity of Government. I want to repudiate those agencies which have outlived their usefulness. I want at the earliest possible moment to send them back to oblivion, whence they came, and if I am here when the war is over, I shall be anxious to set aside forever the agencies which have come into existence, almost all of them, as a result of the serious depression and the world war. I do not wish to engage

in that particular debate. I am on the Senator's side.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is satisfied that his amendment is so worded that it would prevent the borrowing of money which was not appropriated for that purpose to pay subsidies in excess of the one and a half billion dollars which it allows?

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have read in the press recently that this is an administration amendment. If it is, the administration adopted it. I think it is an iron-clad amendment. In my opinion, the answer to the Senator's question is "Yes." The intention is to limit the expenditure of funds under this program to $1,500,000,000 a year.

I hope the Senator will agree with the feeling I have that I have never engaged in subterfuge. I do not want to do so now. If it becomes necessary to continue this program, or to expand a greater sum of money, I want it done here in the Congress. I do not want the R. F. C. making appropriations. I do not want any other governmental agency than the Congress of the United States making appropriations, and I have been advocating that procedure for so long as I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Connecticut. We certainly do know him as one who does not resort to subterfuges, and I hope that, whether the amendment shall be agreed to or not, he has found a way of wording legislation so that the executive department can not misconstrue or misapply it.

Mr. MALONEY. I share the hope. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that his amendment authorizes the expenditure of $1,500,000,000 each fiscal year.

Mr. MALONEY. I said that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What I desire to call to the Senator's attention is that during the present fiscal year, under the amendment, the administration could spend $3,000,000,000. They would be limited to $1,500,000,000 for each fiscal year. There are 4 months left in the present fiscal year in which they could spend $1,500,000,000. Then, beginning July 1, and between that and the 1st of January they could spend an equal amount.

Mr. MALONEY. If that be so, I shall certainly correct it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's reference to the inevitable and inescapable relationship between prices and wages is what challenges my primary interest in connection with the pending legislation. I wish to ask the Senator whether the Committee on Banking and Currency was able to give any consideration to the basic idea contained in the so-called Monroney amendment in the House, which undertook specifically to gear wages and prices together and keep them in gear.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if my memory serves me well, that particular question was not considered at length by the Committee on Banking and Currency. But the Senator knows that it had some of my attention, because, with a recognition of his special talents and his deep interest in the subject, I talked with him about it at some length. I tried ever so hard to work out an amendment which would bring into effect the very sensible thought which the Senator has in mind, which first came to light, I think, as a result of the amendment offered in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. MONRONEY.

I discussed the matter with Government officials in Washington who were interested. I sought the help of the Office of Price Administration and other agencies of Government here in the drafting of such an amendment. I am not a lawyer, and I wanted the best legal advice. It appeared that the best legal advice available found it was impossible to write an amendment which would meet the situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can understand the difficulties the Senator has had, because I have collided with the same difficulties in undertaking to pursue the objective myself. Yet I still cling to the fundamental belief that until there is established a more definite and specific relationship between wages and prices, and particularly between the governmental authorities controlling these two factors, we are going to be in a state of constant turmoil with respect to this whole problem.

Mr. MALONEY. I am inclined to agree with the Senator. I went so far as to suggest to him that we together might work out an amendment. I think it has been most difficult everywhere. I think some such effort was made in Canada. I do not know the experience of England. But the problem is almost too difficult.

I think the closest we can approach to the stabilization of wages, or the holding of the line, is the adoption of the pending amendment, which will permit a continuation of subsidies and provide a continuation of pretty rigid price control, which I think should dissuade workers who are being sufficiently paid from asking for increases in wages. There are certain instances, as we recognized when we passed the Stabilization Act, in which wages should be increased. We provided for the adjustment of inequalities. I do not think we want to erase that action, but I think that if wages are to be stabilized, if wages are to be kept within the lines drawn by the administration, we must adopt some such amendment as that which I have offered. In my opinion, the repudiation of the amendment would be a repudiation of the Government's subsidy program and, in my judgment, would come pretty close to being a repudiation of the effort to hold the line.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the Senator's amendment, it would permit a continuation of the present subsidy, the so-called feed-milk subsidy, by which the Government is now undertaking to pay every farmer who sells any milk or sells any butter a certain number of cents a pound, a program which, I understand, has cost some $300,000,000 during the year.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TAFT. There is another subsidy which is being paid, that on wheat flour, but it seems to me very doubtful today whether it has any effect on the price of bread. Would the Senator's amendment permit the continuation of that particular subsidy?

Mr. MALONEY. It does not specifically refer to it, and it does not deny it. So I think the answer is that it would authorize continuance of that subsidy.

Mr. TAFT. There is another subsidy paid to canners of vegetables. Last year a statement was issued that canners could charge a certain price, but if the cost of labor went up so many cents they could charge the additional cost in the price of their products. The price of labor did go up. When the canners attempted to charge the additional price, Mr. Vinson said, "That is all right, but if you made more than 6 percent on your invested capital last year you cannot charge that additional price." In other words, he undertook to use the subsidy program to control profits.

Mr. MALONEY. I am against that, let me say to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. But as I read the Senator's amendment that procedure could still continue, because it provides no restriction against that kind of treatment of the canners which Mr. Vinson is now pursuing.

Mr. MALONEY. I am opposed to that idea. If the Senator can find a way to improve the language to restrict such procedure I shall not object.

Mr. TAFT. In the amendment which I hope to offer I have tried to place language to prevent such procedure.

I wish to ask the Senator one other question. The Senator proposes the spending of one and a half billion dollars. The President's message on the subject, sent to Congress about a month ago, stated that the subsidy program would cost only 1 percent of the total governmental expenses per annum. I estimate 1 percent to amount to about $950,000,000 instead of $1,500,000,000. Can the Senator give any reason why he is asking for about 50 percent more than the President suggested in his message?

Mr. MALONEY. I think the President made a mistake.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I hold in my hand the report of the United States Department of Labor which shows that there was an increase of 94 percent up to December 31, 1943, from January 1939, in the earnings of factory workers. The same report indicates an increase of only 26.2 percent in the cost of living. The items of food subsidies about which we are talking today affect principally

the class which is covered by this 94 percent increase. Does the Senator care to make any comment upon that?

Mr. MALONEY. No; I do not think I care to comment upon that. It is a subject which has been tossed around in the Committee on Banking and Currency and on the Senate floor for many months. I have seen all the sets of figures, I think, and I do not believe I could contribute anything to the debate by attempting to comment upon that subject.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am sorry I did not hear all the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I understood him to say that at present much of the funds which are available for subsidies come from the R. F. C.

Mr. MALONEY. I did not say how much. I said some of them.

Mr. WILEY. And did I correctly understand the Senator to say that if his amendment were to become law in his opinion it would affect the operation of that subsidy scheme so that no longer could funds be obtained from the R. F. C. for subsidies?

Mr. MALONEY. Excepting within the limitations of this proposal. As to food subsidies, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. WILEY. I should like to ask the Senator another question. If the Senator's amendment should not become law, is there anything in his opinion which would operate to stop the present method of obtaining funds from the R. F. C. for subsidies?

Mr. MALONEY. Not if the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued. If the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued—and I rather believe it is the desire of Congress to continue the Corporation—then there is not anything that I know of which would prevent the present practice of paying subsidies from R. F. C. funds.

Mr. WILEY. Then, in other words, whether the Senator's amendment is agreed to or not, the present practice of paying subsidies will go on; is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know what will go on, but I rather expect it will, because I expect the administration under existing circumstances and at this late hour is wise in continuing the subsidy program. Since the policy has been adopted, I have every reason to believe that if the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued the subsidy program will be continued.

Mr. WILEY. Irrespective of whether or not the amendment is agreed to?

Mr. MALONEY. I am simply giving the Senator my opinion; but I call his attention to the fact that if the amendment is agreed to, it will restrict food subsidy expenditures to $1,500,000,000 in any one fiscal year, and neither the R. F. C. nor any other governmental agency can go beyond that.

Mr. WILEY. Do I correctly understand, in accordance with the thought brought out by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], that the purpose of the proposal is to limit the amount to $1,500,000,000 over a 12-month period?

Mr. MALONEY. That is correct. I am sure the Senator is clear about that, but let me read briefly. On page 2, line 14, there is this provision:

> *Provided*, That the total amount expended by means of such payments to provide needed production or distribution of food commodities while keeping national living costs stable shall not exceed $1,500,000,000 in any fiscal year.

I think the intent is obvious. At the same time I think that technically the distinguished Senator from Alabama is correct, although that could be gotten around by expending considerable money between now and the end of the fiscal year, and I shall take steps to find language to make the necessary correction to guard against that loophole.

Mr. WILEY. Do I correctly understand that the total amount estimated for, say, the present fiscal year, or, say, the 12-month period, for subsidies is about $1,200,000,000?

Mr. MALONEY. I think something in excess of that amount. I believe that at the last meeting of the committee we were told that it reached in the neighborhood of $1,300,000,000 or a little more. There was some necessary increase for transportation costs and one thing and another.

I should like to say for my own sake that I am not the manager of this bill.

Mr. WILEY. I believe the Senator has stated rather clearly that it is his conclusion that whether the amendment is agreed to or not, the present policy of the Government with respect to subsidies will continue, and that the money will be available from the R. F. C. for that purpose.

Mr. MALONEY. I am not going to become a prophet. If I have my way the Senate will adopt the $1,500,000,000 amendment, and we will not have to speculate on what will happen thereafter.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to ask a brief question which I think the distinguished Senator from Connecticut can answer. It is limited to the area of New England. What has been the amount of reduction in the retail price of milk as the result of the subsidy since it went into effect?

Mr. MALONEY. I do not know of any reduction.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then the other question is: Does the Senator know whether there has been a reduction in the volume of production of milk in the New England area since the subsidy went into effect?

Mr. MALONEY. I am not entirely sure. There are experts present and we will have an opinion in a moment. But we have reached the difficult time in milk production, as the able Senator from Vermont knows, coming as he does from a great dairy State. I am not a farmer, but I know that the present is the low-yield period, and I suppose there may have been some reduction recently, but if the Senator will permit me to yield to his distinguished colleague I know he will have the answer.

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall be glad to.

Mr. AIKEN. I can answer that question because I definitely do know, although I do not have the exact figures with me. Since the milk subsidy was put into effect there has been a steadily increasing reduction in the production of milk as compared with the corresponding period for a year ago. I do not say that the subsidy is to blame for all of that. Poor roughage is possibly to blame. There are other factors. But there has been a steadily increasing reduction in the supply of milk available for human consumption.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, let me attempt to emphasize what the Senator has said. He divorces that completely from the subsidy program; does he not?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the subsidy has been a factor throughout the Nation; because, as I understand the matter, only approximately 70 percent of the milk producers have actually received the subsidy. That percentage may be increased later. Perhaps some of them expect they may find some way to get it. They are chiefly small producers, as I understand, who perhaps live so far from where they must go in order to apply for the subsidies that perhaps they do not do it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask my colleague a question?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. My first question is, What has been the reduction in the retail price of milk?

Mr. AIKEN. There has been no reduction in the retail price of milk, so far as I know, since the subsidy was put into effect. I think the reduction in New England since last year has been approximately 6 percent. It is hard to tell, because we are now getting in the fluid-milk-market milk which used to go to creameries for use in making butter. But I think the reduction has been 6 percent, as compared to a year ago. It is not as much as that for the entire Nation. I do not have the figures before me, but perhaps I can put them in the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], I should like to say that it is my understanding that if the so-called Bankhead bill is passed there will be no continuation of subsidies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No continuation of what kind of subsidies?

Mr. MALONEY. If the Bankhead bill passes there will be no continuation of food subsidies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. O Mr. President, the Senator is in error. I am sorry he did not stay here to hear all of my remarks.

Mr. MALONEY. Except for the food subsidies provided for in the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No; a large majority of them will continue. The only ones intended to be terminated are the consumer subsidies.

Mr. ELLENDER. Food subsidies.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes; food subsidies.

Mr. MALONEY. I hope the Senator will not insist upon being technical. I thought he understood we were dealing with food and consumer subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Bankhead bill would permit the payment of subsidies in the sum of approximately $200,000,000 or $300,000,000. It would eliminate all roll-back subsidies and most of the other subsidies. It would permit only the continuation of subsidies on vegetable oils and oil products—a considerable number of products which are handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, but not in any very large dollar amount. That is my analysis of the Bankhead bill.

Mr. MALONEY. As I understand the bill, it will erase what the Senator from Alabama refers to as consumer subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. The Bankhead bill would erase the so-called consumer subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. I do not recognize the difference between a consumer subsidy and any other kind of subsidy. It is exactly the same thing.

Mr. MALONEY. I am endeavoring to distinguish for purposes of debate and clear understanding.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. I am assuming that the Senator from Wisconsin referred to consumer food subsidies.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. But the exceptions contained in the Bankhead bill are clearly stated. They are payments "with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed and oilseed meals," "parity payments, soil conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers," "or the sale of feed wheat."

Mr. BANKHEAD. And all production subsidies under the Steagall Act. They are specifically exempt. Those are the production subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. I do not now anything about that. Support prices are authorized, but I do not see any exemption of subsidies under the Steagall Act.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will find out, and will point it out to the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask another question while the Senator from Alabama is looking for that. The Senator from Connecticut has proposed a figure of $1,500,000,000. When Mr. Bowles was before the committee, he said, as I remember, that they were then paying subsidies at the annual rate of only $1,100,000,000, and that he saw need for another $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 in sight, which he would like to have provided.

Now the Senator from Connecticut has chosen a still larger figure. I am not sure whether he adds "feed wheat" to that, also, so that the figure is somewhat larger than $1,500,000,000. Why does the Senator provide for approximately $250,000,000 more than the present program calls for?

Mr. MALONEY. Immediately after the Christmas-time recess, some of us had a meeting with Marvin Jones, Chester Bowles, and Mr. Hutson. An effort was made to have the learned senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] present at that meeting. Unfortunately for us, he was out of the city. Members on both sides of the aisle were present at the conference, and we were given further information. I cannot be sure about the figures. I hope the majority leader will have them later. It is my recollection that we were told that the total expenditures under the program were very close to $1,400,000,000 at that time.

I took the figure of $1,500,000,000—I say this in answer to the Senator's question—because I felt that some few items, some unforeseen emergencies, some unanticipated expenditures might move into the situation, and that they should have some additional money as a safeguard.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my recollection is that last spring, when we began to consider this matter, the subsidies were at approximately $500,000,000. When we came back the past fall they were $850,000,000. When we considered the matter before the Christmas recess, the figure was $1,100,000,000. Now I understand the subsidies amount to $1,400,000,000. I merely wish to suggest to the Senate that it certainly seems to me more desirable to provide some limitation on subsidies than it is to pass this bill and have it vetoed and have the increase continue for the next 2 or 3 years.

I think the figure of the Senator from Connecticut is too high. I do not think he sufficiently considers some of the kinds of subsidies of which he himself perhaps disapproves. I think there is something to be said for putting a limit beyond which the Administration cannot go in the future.

If we pass the Bankhead bill as it is, it is certain that the President will veto it, and will claim the right at least to go on increasing the figure until it reaches $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000.

Mr. MALONEY. That cannot be true if my amendment is agreed to and becomes a part of the law.

Mr. TAFT. That is true. But I think the figure is too high. I do not think the Senator has restrained the figure as I think it could and should be restrained. I shall develop my own amendment on that point later.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to take advantage of this moment to say that the Senator from Ohio is, or I hope he is, to some extent familiar wtih my view.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. MALONEY. And, of course, he is quite correct when he says there are some things about the program which I find distasteful.

Mr. TAFT. In fact, Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut and I entirely agree on the fundamental principles, so far as I can tell from our discussion. The only question is, What shall we do with the practical problem facing us today?

Mr. MALONEY. I think we do, Mr. President; and that makes me proud; and I am very hopeful that before the debate is over, the fair-minded and always open-minded and learned senior Senator from Ohio will, as a result of the information which he gathers, see fit to increase his figure just a little more, so that we may be completely in accord.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity, if I may do so, to modify the amendment I have offered. It has been suggested to me by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that the insertion of two words on page 2, in line 18, will correct the danger and will close the loophole to which the Senator from Alabama has referred. So I ask that I may modify my amendment by inserting, on page 2, in line 18, after the word "fiscal", the words "or calendar."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment? Is it not simpler to treat the whole subsidy question on the basis of a calendar year——

Mr. MALONEY. That is just what this does.

Mr. TAFT. Instead of "fiscal or calendar"?

Mr. MALONEY. The modification does just what the Senator suggests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be modified in accordance with his request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is one point about the Senator's amendment on which I should like to have light. As I understand, the language on page 2 of the Senator's amendment would authorize the legal payment of subsidies for the processing of meats. Is that correct?

Mr. MALONEY Would legalize it?

Mr. WHERRY. It would authorize it.

Mr. MALONEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator that up to this time those of us from meat-producing States have contended that there has been no legal authorization to pay the roll-back subsidy. However, it has been paid as a consumer subsidy, when all the time we have felt that if it were paid at all, it should go the other way, and go to the producer. Let me tell the Senator what has actually happened in my State, and then the Senator may make such observation as he cares to make.

Mr. MALONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator. I am anxious to yield the floor. I have not the slightest desire to yield the floor while some Senator wishes to ask a question. If the Senator wishes to make a lengthy statement, I would rather yield the floor and take my seat.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask a question before I am through, but I am attempting to lay the foundation for it, so that the Senator may have all the facts before him.

The roll-backs paid from June on have reduced the price of beef in the Chicago market $1.10 a hundred. A directive has been issued, as a result of which the top price of AA prime beef at Chicago is $15.75 a hundred. A moment ago the Senator stated that the farmers were interested in subsidies. If the roll-back subsidies were now made legal, we would

be forever foreclosed from obtaining a subsidy the other way around. I am asking the Senator if there is not some way to modify the amendment so as to provide that the production subsidy may still be in full force and effect, to make up the difference between what cattle were bringing in June 1942 and what they are bringing now, because if the consumer subsidy is legalized, we are forever foreclosed.

Mr. MALONEY. I believe the Senator is so much better informed on the subject of beef that I leave that task to him. I do not suggest any change. I do not know that I would have favored the existing program as to beef in the beginning; but I think the psychological effect of a change now would be harmful. I do not care to undertake to correct the amendment in that respect. I respectfully leave that to the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendment would bring about a change, because it would legalize a consumer subsidy on milk and we feel it should be paid to the producer if paid at all. We are making an effort to see that the subsidy is paid to the producer. The Senator's amendment would legalize the roll-back subsidy, and that would bar the subsidy from being paid to the producer. The Senator's amendment represents a change to all the beef producers in our section of the country.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut, as my colleague says, would legalize what we term "roll-back subsidies." My question is this: If such an amendment becomes law, is there any reason why the $1,500,000,000 provided for cannot all be paid out in the form of a roll-back, or become consumer subsidies instead of producer subsidies?

Mr. MALONEY. That is a blunderbuss question. I do not know any reason why it cannot. Neither can I visualize any such extreme situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Inasmuch as the question of the amount necessary has been brought up, I should like to state that representatives of labor organizations appearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry estimated that the cost of the food-subsidy program would be from $2,000,000,000 to $3,000,000,000. I assume that they are working hand-in-hand with the administration on this subsidy program. At least they expect to be.

Mr. MALONEY. I am able to inform the Senator that up to the present time they have not been doing so.

Mr. AIKEN. The one and one half billion dollars allowed by the Senator from Connecticut, if the limitation is observed, would not permit the administration to carry out the program which it has planned.

Mr. MALONEY. It so happens that this program is planned in the Federal agencies downtown. I seek my information from those who are administering the law and will continue to administer it. I cannot look far into the future, and I do not wish to look too far into the future.

Mr. AIKEN. The spokesmen of labor assured us that they did not intend to stop with these subsidies, but intended to continue until they had rolled back all prices to those of September 1942. I tried to get them to agree to have wages rolled back to December 1942, but I was wholly unsuccessful in getting any such agreement from them.

Mr. MALONEY. That was a rather ambitious undertaking.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. A while ago we discussed the subsidies which would be retained under the Bankhead substitute. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Alabama would place in the RECORD at this point any data he may have showing the subsidies which would be retained if the bill were passed as he has presented it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall be glad to place such data in the RECORD. However, I do not have them before me.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, if there are no further questions, I gladly yield the floor.

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE OIL INDUSTRY—PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

Mr. MOORE obtained the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In collaboration with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], I submit a resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee to survey the whole petroleum problem of this country.

As a preliminary I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the statement of the Petroleum Administrator for War, Secretary Ickes, on February 3, his further statement on February 6, and the outline of the principles of the proposed agreement regarding the pipe line to serve the oil reserves of the Persian Gulf, apparently executed under date of January 24, 1944, by the Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petroleum Administrator for War Harold L. Ickes announced today that the Arabian-American Oil Co. will undertake immediately in Saudi Arabia the construction of a privately owned and financed refinery to make petroleum war products for the United Nations.

The project will be financed entirely by the company, which is jointly owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co.

Administrator Ickes also revealed for the first time that expansion programs have been under way for a number of months at the Bahrein Petroleum Co.'s refinery on Bahrein Island, in the Persian Gulf, at the Abadan, Iran, refinery of the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., and at the Haifa refinery of Consolidated Refineries, Ltd. Capacity of the Bahrein plant, which also is jointly owned by the same two American companies, is being substantially increased.

Administrator Ickes said:

"Additional refining facilities in the Persian Gulf area have been under consideration by the Petroleum Administration for a long time as part of the over-all United Nations military petroleum supply program. Several proposals representing our best solutions of the supply and materials problems were presented by P. A. W. to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Army-Navy Petroleum Board. These projects have been selected and approved by the military authorities as those best fitting the many logistical factors involved in relation to other parts of the world program.

"P. A. W.'s foreign divisions are charged with fitting into the United Nations war program the facilities and properties of American oil companies abroad, as well as advising the military authorities of the over-all problems relating to petroleum resources and facilities of other United Nations.

"For many months the full utilization of Middle Eastern oil resources, both British and American, was impossible because the Mediterranean was a virtually impassable no-man's land, and there were not enough tankers to use the long sea route around Africa. United States reserves, thousands of miles closer to the battle lines, were forced to carry the load.

"Long before movements in the Mediterranean were made easier, however, we were completing plans to lift some of the unequal burden from the United States, and for many months now every refinery in the Middle East has been running full blast for maximum production of war products within the varying limits of available tanker capacity. In addition, P. A. W. from the beginning of the war undertook the study of the advisability of expanding critical materials for refinery expansion to utilize the excess crude-oil productive capacity in this and other areas whenever transportation would permit.

"Decisions were not easy, because of the urgency of United States domestic programs, particularly our own vital 100-octane-plant program. However, in our judgment the Arabian-American and Bahrein projects are of the utmost importance, and the military authorities have concurred. The same considerations have guided our recommendations on proposals affecting British-owned facilities in the Middle East.

"With the help of other interested agencies, P. A. W. will support the new Saudi Arabia refinery before the War Production Board to seek the highest obtainable priority.

"The effect of these projects on the supply of petroleum products in the United States cannot be predicted accurately now. Obviously, every gallon of petroleum supplied from outside the United States relieves us here to some extent, but present indications are that these new facilities will serve to meet additional future demands rather than replace current supplies from the United States."

The United States Government will construct a pipe line for transportation of petroleum products from the Persian Gulf area to a point on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and will obtain in that area reserves of 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today on behalf of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, of which he is president. The Directors of Petroleum Reserves Corporation are the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior, and the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration.

This project is covered under an agreement in principle between the United States Government and the Arabian American Oil Co. and the Gulf Exploration Co. That the

public may be fully informed concerning the agreement in principle, copies are being made available for public inspection.

Secretary Ickes issued the following statement in connection with this undertaking:

"The Directors of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, with the approval of the President of the United States and the State Department, and acting upon the recommendation of the War Department, and Navy Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, have authorized me to enter into an agreement in principle with the Arabian American Oil Co., operating in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and the Gulf Exploration Co., operating in the Shaikdom of Kuwait. The Arabian American Oil Co. is owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co., and the Gulf Exploration Co. is owned by the Gulf Oil Corporation.

"The agreement is conditioned, of course, upon obtaining the sanction of the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

"The Petroleum Reserves Corporation does not propose to compete with the private oil industry of this country. On the contrary, its purpose is to promote the private oil industry of this Nation, and to further the interests of the people of the United States. In addition to assisting these private American companies in the development of their oil interests in the areas covered by this agreement, the project will promote the interests of the governments and of the peoples of such areas.

"The purpose of this agreement is to make provision for a pipe line which will be constructed from the Persian Gulf area to a point on the eastern Mediterranean, and to provide a reserve of 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil for the naval and military forces of the United States. The terms of the agreement guarantee to the Government complete repayment of its investment and costs.

"The principles agreed to, which are subject to the working out of a definitive contract, provide that the Petroleum Reserves Corporation will construct, own, and maintain a trunk pipe-line system to transport crude petroleum from the Persian Gulf area to the Mediterranean. The Government will determine the most feasible plan for operation of the facilities, and will retain supervision thereof. The entire cost of construction plus interest will be returned to the Government within a period of 25 years, together with such net profit to the Government as may be agreed upon in the definitive contract. This is guaranteed by the companies. In other words, the pipe line will eventually cost the Government of the United States nothing. It is estimated that the cost will be between $130,000,000 and $165,000,000, depending on the details of plans to be worked out. The companies agree to perform at actual cost any work or services which the Government may request in connection with this project.

"The pipe-line facilities will be made available to other oil producers and shippers, in addition to the companies which are now parties to the agreement. Provision is made for other companies to utilize the facilities, provided that they fulfill certain stipulated obligations.

"The agreement of the companies to maintain a crude-oil petroleum reserve for the account of the United States, of 1,000,000,000 barrels or 20 percent of the total crude reserves if they are less than 5,000,000,000 barrels, will greatly help to assure an adequate supply of petroleum for the military and naval needs of the United States in view of the obligations which this country must assume for the maintenance of collective security in the post-war world. It will make the oil in this reserve available for Government purchase at any time for military or naval use at 25 percent below the market price in the Persian Gulf region, or of similar crude oil in the United States, whichever price is lower. The Government is not obligated to take this oil or any part of it, but it has the right to do so at any time, for a period of 50 years. In addition, in times of war or other national emergency, the Government has the option to purchase all of the crude petroleum produced by the companies and all products thereof, to be paid for at such price as may be agreed upon at the time of taking.

"The agreement in principle further provides that the companies will not sell petroleum or products to any government or the nationals of any government when, in the opinion of the Department of State, such sales would be unwise in the light of United States foreign policy and the requirements of collective security. The companies also agree that before they negotiate with the governments of any foreign countries with respect to the sale of petroleum and petroleum products from their concessions in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait they will give notice to the Department of State and the Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

"In order that the public may be fully informed concerning this agreement in principle, copies are being made available for inspection.

"The action which we have taken in cooperation with the American oil companies which have rights to oil in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait is designed to offset, in measure, the dwindling oil reserves in the United States. The known reserves in this country are estimated to be adequate for this Nation's needs for only a relatively few years. It is true that there may be inventions or improvements in technology which will result in the discovery of new reserves, or, indeed, in the development of new sources of energy. But it would be imprudent to gamble the future of the Nation in such a speculation. The construction of the pipe line will assure that huge quantities of oil in the Persian Gulf region will be available to this country when and if needed, and the setting aside of 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil for military and naval use assures to our armed forces, on very favorable terms, a supply of oil which amounts to several years' requirements at their present unprecedented rate of consumption.

"I hope that the announcement and publication of this agreement in principle will eliminate once and for all the apprehensions which have been caused by the organization and activities of Petroleum Reserves Corporation. We are making this announcement of our plans and program as soon as possible in view of the complicated negotiations affecting many agencies of our own and other nations. Premature publicity in this situation might well have made it impossible to conclude the arrangements.

"The policy of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation is to aid the private oil business of this country by seeing to it that, so far as the foreign oil situation is concerned, the interests of the United States and its military forces are protected, and to do what can be done consistently with the foreign policy of this Government as administered by the Department of State to aid the private oil industry of this country to secure against future contingencies an adequate supply of foreign oil.

"The pipe line which will be built pursuant to this agreement will serve an essential military purpose and it will also be of lasting benefit to the people of this Nation."

OUTLINE OF PRINCIPLES OF PROPOSED AGREEMENT

For brevity, Petroleum Reserves Corporation hereinafter is referred to as Government and the Arabian American Oil Co. and Gulf Exploration Co. are called the Companies.

Upon the recommendation of the War Department, Navy Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Army and Navy Petroleum Board and with the approval of the Department of State, the aforementioned parties, in appreciation of the critical importance of reserves of petroleum in war and in peace and of the necessity of assuring to the military forces of the Nation and to the people of the United States adequate petroleum supplies, have agreed upon the principles of the understanding outlined below:

1. Government agrees to construct and to own and maintain a main trunk pipe-line system, including requisite facilities, for the transportation of crude petroleum from a point near the presently discovered oil fields of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait to a port at the eastern end of the Mediterranean Sea. The size, capacity, location and terminal points of the pipe-line system shall be determined by Government. The gathering system for the delivery of oil to the intake terminus of the pipe line shall be provided by the Companies. The Government shall determine the most feasible plan for the operation of the facilities and shall retain supervision thereof.

2. The Companies will cooperate with the various agencies of the United States Government in obtaining the necessary rights for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the pipe-line system and facilities.

3. The charges for pipe-line services shall include, in addition to current maintenance and operating costs, an amount sufficient to amortize within a period of 25 years the entire investment, together with interest and such net return to Government as may be agreed upon in the definitive contract. The parties shall agree upon an amount of oil to be tendered for transport by the companies as a minimum guaranteed amount in order that the Government will be guaranteed repayment of the items above specified, within the time limited. It is the intent that the companies will guarantee payment of the above items to the Government within the 25-year period.

4. Companies agree to perform at actual cost any work or services which the Government may request in connection with this project.

5. Government may make available to other oil producers or shippers the right to a portion of the capacity of the pipe-line system upon the agreement of such party or parties to assume pro rata the obligations undertaken by the companies, and upon such other terms and conditions as Government may specify, and also subject to the rights of the government of any country through which the pipe-line system passes.

6. Upon the following conditions the companies agree to maintain a crude oil petroleum reserve available for production for the account of, and purchase by, the military forces of the United States:

(a) The reserve shall be 1,000,000,000 barrels of crude oil (gravity and specifications to be agreed upon) less amounts purchased by Government as provided for hereafter, or 20 percent of the recoverable oil content of the companies' reserves if the total proved reserves be less than 5,000,000,000 barrels. The companies will use their best efforts to maintain the proved reserves above this amount.

(b) Government shall have the right (transferable to other governmental agency or agencies) to purchase for a period of 50 years for the military forces the 1,000,000,000 barrels of reserved crude oil, which the companies agree to deliver, if required by Government, at the rate of 30,000,000 barrels per year at times and quantities to be agreed upon. The aforesaid option is a continuing one and the Government is not required to purchase any crude oil during any particular period of time.

(c) Except in times of war or national emergency, if Government wishes to purchase more than 30,000,000 barrels during any

calendar year, it must afford the companies reasonable notice to provide additional facilities required to meet such increased demand.

(d) Government shall have the option to purchase said quantity of reserved oil at a discount of 25 percent below the market price in the Persian Gulf region for oil of like kind and gravity at the time and place of delivery, or at a discount of 25 percent below the average of the market prices in the United States for oil of like kind and gravity, whichever of such prices is the lower at the time of delivery. The market price of crude oil in the United States shall be determined by the selection from time to time by the parties of certain points in the United States.

(e) The Government shall have the sole right to determine when and the manner in which the aforementioned reserve is drawn upon and may, if it elects, determine that said reserve has no relation to the purchase of petroleum made by the military forces from year to year in the normal course of supplying their requirements.

7. In times of war or other national emergency, Government shall have the first right and option, in addition to that specified in paragraph 6, to purchase all of the crude petroleum produced by the companies and all products thereof and shall pay therefor such price as the parties may agree upon at such time. Government shall specify what portion, if any, of such purchases constitutes withdrawals from the petroleum reserve provided in paragraph 6.

8. Prior notice of negotiations by companies with governments of any foreign countries relating in any manner to the sale of petroleum or products from their concessions in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait shall be given to the Department of State and to Government.

No sales of petroleum or products will be made by the companies to any government or the nationals of any government when, in the opinion of the Department of State, such sales would militate against the interests of the United States. Companies shall be afforded appropriate notice of such opinion.

The commercial and other policies and practices of the companies would conform to the foreign policy of the United States.

9. The agreement between the parties shall be sanctioned by the respective Governments of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait and nothing in this contract shall be construed to require action by the companies in violation of their covenants with said Governments under existing agreements. Companies agree to lend all possible assistance to Government in carrying out its obligations hereunder.

Companies will not construct or cause to be constructed any additional main pipe line or pipe lines for the westward transportation of crude petroleum or products from Saudi Arabia or Kuwait unless the capacity of contemplated pipe-line system installed by Government is insufficient to meet the requirements of the companies and, after reasonable notice from the companies, Government declines to install additional facilities. In any event, the companies agree at all times during the life of this agreement to utilize the pipeline system contemplated herein to the fullest extent of its available capacity should their transportation requirements exceed the available capacity of the system.

10. This memorandum does not purport to contain a complete statement of the provisions of a contract to be entered into. It is a broad outline of certain of the essential provisions with the details and related provisions and other matters to be incorporated therein left for future determination.

11. In the execution and performance of this agreement, it is the desire and intention of the parties not only to promote and assist in the development of petroleum in the areas affected by this agreement, but also to promote the interests of the Governments of such areas, and to respect their sovereignty and protect their rights. It is the desire of the United States that American nationals that enjoy privileges with respect to petroleum in countries under foreign governments shall have an active concern for the peace and prosperity of such countries and shall exercise their rights with due regard to the rights, including that of political integrity, of the governments of such countries.

It is understood that the foregoing memorandum is subject to the approval of the board of directors of the parties and of their approval of a definitive contract containing all of the agreements of the parties. The foregoing is approved in principle, and I agree to recommend its approval to my board of directors.

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Reserves Corporation.
F. A. DAVIES,
Arabian American Oil Co.
J. F. DRAKE,
Gulf Exploration Co.

The undersigned, presidents of Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co., respectively, sole stockholders of the Arabian American Oil Co., are in accord with the foregoing in principle and agree to recommend its approval by their respective boards of directors and, subject to such approval, agree to recommend its approval by the board of directors of the Arabian American Oil Co.

H. D. COLLIER.
W. S. S. RODGERS.

The undersigned, president of the Gulf Oil Corporation, is in accord with the foregoing in principle and agrees to recommend its approval by the board of directors of the Gulf Oil Corporation, and subject to such approval, agrees to recommend its approval by the board of directors of the Gulf Exploration Co. Nothing herein shall require action in violation of existing contracts with the British Government or with any corporation in which the British Government has an ownership interest.

J. F. DRAKE.

Mr. BREWSTER. In presenting this resolution and joining with the Senator from Oklahoma, I wish the Senate to realize the problem which is presented in the construction of a 1,200-mile pipe line at an expense of more than $125,000,000. I am interested to know, from the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, whether or not funds have been provided for such a purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. They have not been. There has been no suggestion in the Committee on Appropriations to that effect.

Mr. BREWSTER. If this project were being carried out, it would be done either by taking funds provided for war purposes or other purposes, or by a commitment which would subsequently be submitted to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I assume that if it is carried out there will be a requisition for an appropriation for it. I do not know of any funds which have been appropriated from which it could be paid.

Mr. BREWSTER. I feel that this is a matter which must have the very serious consideration of the Senate, as I do not understand it to be concerned with the current war effort, since I think the Senator from Oklahoma will confirm the statement that from 18 months to 2 years would be required to build this 1,200-mile pipe line and make the refining facilities available in connection with it. Embarking upon so stupendous a project constitutes a radical reorientation of our foreign policy.

On our recent trip around the world we were instructed to go into the question of petroleum. Secretary Ickes, in testifying before a subcommittee of the Truman committee, indicated that as soon as his policy was formulated in connection with the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, he would submit it to the Congress for consideration.

As the matter dragged along, because of the many rumors as to what its functions might become, the Senator from Oklahoma and I submitted a resolution terminating the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. It was organized by Secretary Jones, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with the approval of the President. Since Mr. Ickes had not seen fit to report to the Truman committee, the resolution was referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee, from which a subcommittee of five members was appointed, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. Last Friday Secretary Ickes was invited to appear before the subcommittee to state the purpose of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. His office requested delay until yesterday, on the plea that Secretary Ickes had broken his collarbone and had a bad cold.

Meanwhile, on Sunday last there was an announcement of a 1,200-mile pipe line to be constructed by this Government in the Persian Gulf-Mediterranean area. I cannot conceive that this is other than incidental; but meanwhile a further request has arrived for the delay of the Secretary's appearance from yesterday to February 15. In the statement which I filed with the Congress from the office of Secretary Ickes, the Secretary has made very clear the magnitude of this project, and what is involved. He says:

> Obviously, every gallon of petroleum supplied from outside of the United States relieves us here to some extent, but present indications are that these new facilities will serve to meet additional future demands rather than replace current supplies from the United States.

This affects very vitally our foreign policy. The pipe-line facilities, it is stated, will be made available to other oil producers and shippers in addition to other companies which are now parties to the agreement. This will greatly help assure an adequate supply of petroleum for the military and naval needs of the United States. I invite the attention of the Senate, and particularly of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to the following words:

> In view of the obligations which this country must assume for the maintenance of collective security in the post-war world—

So I think that Secretary Ickes himself recognizes that this action will vitally affect our entire foreign relations and our entire foreign policy.

At the conclusion the Secretary states that he is seeking "to do what can be done consistently with the foreign policy of

this Government as administered by the Department of State, to aid the private oil industry of this country to secure against future contingencies an adequate supply of foreign oil."

I shall close in a few moments with one other quotation, which I am permitted to make from the report of the Truman committee on the subject of petroleum, which will be filed with the Senate in the next few days. The report is practically ready now. It covers the results of our study of this situation for 8 months, and it very strongly recommends prompt consideration.

The resolution which the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and I have submitted calls for the creation of a special committee composed of nine members; three from the Committee on Foreign Relations, three from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and three from the Committee on Commerce. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Commerce, if that seems the appropriate jurisdiction, it being concerned with the production of oil, for consideration and report.

The resolution (S. Res. 253) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

Whereas adequate petroleum reserves are essential to our national security and economic welfare; and

Whereas the Petroleum Administrator for War has recently stated that the United States was not now in a position "to oil another war": Therefore, be it

Resolved, That a special committee of nine Senators, to be composed of three members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, three members of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and three members of the Committee on Commerce, to be appointed by the President of the Senate upon the recommendations of the respective chairmen of such committees, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to petroleum resources, and the production and consumption of petroleum and petroleum products, both within and outside the United States, in their relation to our national welfare and security. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for the formulation of a national petroleum policy.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, from the report of the Truman committee I quote the following paragraph taken from a letter by Secretary Ickes to the committee dealing with this problem.

If materials can be made available, it is hoped that the necessary pipe line and refinery capacity can be considered so that the British oil reserves may be drawn upon to a greater degree. Plans to this end are now under way and it will be a matter of great satisfaction to me when the time comes that the heavy drain upon American reserves may be offset by increasingly greater withdrawals from British sources.

Contrary to this announcement, the arrangement announced this past week apparently contemplates withdrawals from American reserves in this area in Arabia and Kuwait.

If the pipe line is to be used for servicing certain British reserves in this area, it is a matter which I think our appropriate legislative committees must consider.

As has been repeatedly stated heretofore when this matter has been discussed, "No question has been raised at any time as to the necessity dictating the allocation of petroleum production heretofore because of the mandates imposed by transportation and refinery requirements."

This pipe line will run either to Haifa, Palestine, or Alexandria, Egypt, in areas which have been forbidden to commerce up to 6 months ago, before any of these terminals was accessible.

The whole situation is so important to both the security of the country and to its future economy that in conjunction with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] I have submitted the resolution contemplating the creation of a special committee to consider and recommend regarding a national policy on petroleum after full consideration with the various executive departments concerned and by the competent legislative committees of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the fact that this matter is creating some interest in London I think is shown by a quotation this morning from the London Times. I do not know whether the Senator from Maine is familiar with it. In the regular daily series of "Old and True" quotations, the Times has published without comment the following quotation in London from Horace:

Icclus, are you now looking enviously at Arabia's rich treasure?

I think that should be added to the Senator's remarks.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thank the Senator. He has read a very pertinent quotation.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, at this time I desire to call attention to a development in the executive branch of our Government which, in my opinion, demands the consideration of the Congress. A few days ago I spoke concerning the organization of a Government corporation known as the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, of which the Secretary of the Interior is President. At that time I stated that the Corporation was part of a plan to engage the Government in the oil business. I also called attention to Senate Joint Resolution 110, introduced by Senator BREWSTER and me for the liquidation and dissolution of the Corporation, for the reason that we felt it was illegally formed, and if continued would involve this country in serious foreign entanglements, as well as constitute a threat to the private enterprise of our own nationals at home and abroad.

On numerous occasions Mr. Ickes has assured the Petroleum Industry War Council and other representatives of the oil industry that this mystery Corporation had formulated no policy and had no plans for actively engaging in the oil business. As late as last Thursday Mr. Ickes assured representatives of the National Oil Policy Committee of the Petroleum Industry War Council that the Corporation had no plans for entering the oil business. On Wednesday of last week the Secretary of State, one of the directors of the Corporation, called representatives of the companies operating in the Persian Gulf area to his office and gave them complete assurance that the Government would take no action concerning a foreign oil policy without consulting with and obtaining the advice of the industry. When asked about Petroleum Reserves Corporation, the Secretary said he knew of no plans being considered by the Corporation. But on Saturday afternoon, February 5, with that dramatic suddenness so typical of the dictators, there came the startling announcement from Mr. Ickes that Petroleum Reserves Corporation had completed arrangements with three American oil companies for the purchase of a billion barrels of oil in the ground, to be delivered to it from the Persian Gulf area over a period of 50 years, and to be paid for by the Corporation at a 25-percent discount on the price existing at the time of delivery. At the same time, Mr. Ickes announced that the Corporation would construct approximately 1,250 miles of pipe line connecting the oil concessions of the Gulf Oil Corporation, Standard Oil Co. of California, and the Texas Co. with the ports of the Mediterranean Sea at an expense approximately of from one hundred and thirty to one hundred and sixty-five million dollars of the public's money. The contract is predicated upon the importance of petroleum to the military forces and for peacetime uses of the people of the United States. The statement of the Secretary and the agreement frankly admit that it is a post-war project.

Mr. President, anyone having an understanding of the oil business and every believer in the preservation of private enterprise will be appalled at the provisions of the agreement. In the first place, there never has been and probably there never will be a time when there is the slightest necessity for this Government to go into the oil business as an operating agency, either as a producer, transporter, or marketer of crude oil in order to supply the military forces with petroleum and petroleum products so long as oil is available in quantities sufficient to supply our needs. During the last war it was frequently said that "America and her allies floated to victory on a sea of oil," made possible by the American oil industry. The oil industry today is as active in its patriotic effort to supply our military forces with their petroleum needs as it was during World War No. I.

Every barrel of oil owned or controlled by the American oil industry is dedicated to the war effort.

The contract between Petroleum Reserves Corporation and the American oil companies, in effect, makes the United States a partner with the three companies involved. The agreement commits this country to the building of a great transportation project within the borders of Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and possibly other countries of the Persian Gulf area. Some of these Near Eastern countries are British protectorates which are committed to the proposition that they may not negotiate with any other country without the consent of the British Government. Others are individual shiekdoms or kingdoms which present a complicated international picture of instability and diplomatic hazards. The project, of course, will require treaty agreements between these countries and the United States. It will be necessary for the Government of the United States to acquire proprietary rights within the borders of these countries. It will be necessary to obtain rights-of-way for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the pipe line. It will be necessary to secure land for the establishment, maintenance, and operation of pump stations. It will be necessary to construct residences, warehouses, roads, and other facilities. It will be necessary to maintain a force of United States civilian Government workers within the borders of these countries throughout the life of the pipe line, together with a military force to protect our interests.

It is claimed the project is essentially a post-war military facility. This may be true, but if we should be so unfortunate as to become involved in another European or Asiatic war, then I am afraid that this would be a military facility ready-made for our enemies, a facility built by government 6,000 miles from home, which would not have been built by private enterprise. Is this good military strategy? If we are to engage in a project of this character, let us keep it at home. It is projects of this character which have enabled us to bridge the gap for our own military forces and our allies, in the present war.

The pipe line and the necessary pump stations will consume thousands of tons of steel for which our own American oil industry is begging. Every day, oil men are being refused material and equipment for development in this country. It grows more apparent that our oil scarcity at home is a planned shortage.

As a sidelight on the deal, I am advised that, under the contract covering the concession of the Gulf Oil Corporation, this company is prohibited from marketing petroleum or its derivatives produced from the Kuwait concession in any area in which petroleum and its derivatives are being marketed by the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. The liberation of the Gulf interests from this contractual provision by the intervention of the Government of the United States is, of course, one of the incidental benefits which the Gulf interests hope to secure from the Petroleum Reserves Corporation agreement. The partnership oil acquired by Petroleum Reserves Corporation under the deal is to be delivered at the rate of 30,000,000 barrels a year. At this rate it will take approximately 33 years to secure the billion barrels of oil involved.

Mr. Ickes says the pipe line will not cost the United States anything because the companies guarantee the amortization of the project, including operating cost, interest, and a profit, over a period of 25 years. True, but the point is that Mr. Ickes is making an initial expenditure of $165,000,000, and probably much more of the people's money, to obtain that which this Government already has and always will have, namely, the right to buy oil from an American oil company. On the other hand, the companies give to the Government a complete monopoly of their entire oil reserves in the Middle East and agree that even the commercial and other policies and practices of the companies may be determined by government. The companies may not sell a single barrel of oil without the consent of the Government. Petroleum Reserves Corporation not only has a call on all of their oil, but has retained an option to transport every barrel produced. Actually the contract is a bad deal from Government's viewpoint and most certainly it is not a commercial deal from the companies' standpoint. If it were, the companies involved would have been anxious to construct the pipe line. The fact is that the pipe line will connect water terminals on the Persian Gulf with terminals on the Mediterranean Sea, which are now being served by ocean tankers. It is true that approximately a 2,500-mile haul will be saved, but men of experience know that this will not offset the additional cost of pipe-line transportation. We have, for many years, moved California petroleum to the east coast of the United States through the Panama Canal much cheaper than it would have been possible to have moved it by pipe line or by rail; likewise the movement of oil from Gulf ports to the Atlantic seaboard. Of course, if the companies owning California crude, or the east-coast purchasers, could have had a railroad or a pipe line built for their special and exclusive use with public funds, it would have been a profitable thing for the beneficiaries of such project.

On principle, I condemn, of course, the engagement of this country in any post-war business enterprise, whether it be the oil business or any other industry. The companies involved should be condemned for submitting to an arrangement which can result only in their own destruction and that of other private interests. This bold step by Government has chilled the American oil companies with fear—fear that they are next on the list to be bludgeoned into a deal by which their Government will become their master. This deal has discouraged American enterprise at home and abroad.

If this had been a commercial enterprise, there would have been no difficulty in obtaining the assistance of other American companies in order that the cost and hazards might be spread. If this had been a commercial deal, the companies could have readily secured the financial aid of American banking interests.

The American people have hardly recovered from the exposure of the Canol debauch, and now we are confronted with what will prove to be the Arabian debacle, if not the Arabian scandal, unless the Congress calls a halt to the ambitions of the White House planners and their front men. The Canol project may be accepted as a yardstick of the inefficiency of government in business.

I know the Arabian project will not receive the support or respect of the American oil industry. The contract and the accompanying publicity have been adroitly prepared to instill in the public mind the belief that the President has met and overcome a great emergency, and that the result will be some immediate relief to our domestic shortage of petroleum products, thus to gain public support of indirectly engaging this country in the foreign oil business, which, if done directly, would be universally condemned. There can be, of course, no immediate help to our domestic oil supply from the project, as it would require fully 2 years to complete it.

The Petroleum Reserves Corporation has committed itself to a program extending over 50 years, when, by the very authority under which it was created, the life of the Corporation is to terminate on January 22, 1947. The implication of this is that the Congress will again be circumvented by having the project dumped in the lap of another Government agency, or the Congress will be forced to extend the life of the Corporation.

The question naturally arises as to what the Government will do with the oil it has bought. No doubt Mr. Ickes and his Corporation will hide behind the answer that it is for military uses. This is hardly a satisfactory answer, though, because every barrel of oil reserves owned by any unit of the American oil industry, wherever located, is now and always will be available to our military forces.

The contract contemplates the delivery of crude oil to a Mediterranean seaport. Undoubtedly, this will be a large line, probably 24 inches, capable of delivering in the neighborhood of 300,000 barrels per day. There are no refineries in this area capable of handling additional substantial quantities of crude. Oil of itself is not a usable product. Consequently, it follows that it will be necessary for the Government to build a refinery somewhere on the east coast of the Mediterranean. This probability, I have reason to believe, is being considered by the White House planners. After a refinery is built, it will follow that the product must be marketed, and, in the end, we will have a Government corporation engaged in a fully integrated business.

The truth is that the White House planners visualize the socializing of the oil business and our other basic industries, including transportation and communications. Control of foreign oil, for example, is a convenient adjunct to world control of transportation by air or by steamship, to which the White House

planners are already looking. Soon we will begin to hear of plans for Government ownership, or control, of private shipping and transportation by water and by air. The argument will be that the Government must convert to postwar uses our immense fleet of merchant vessels and warplanes. The activities of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation are merely part of the plan. These activities and schemes of the White House planners for the future are so far-reaching and so sinister in their implications that there is imposed upon the Congress the pressing obligation to investigate this proposal of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation and all similar proposals from top to bottom.

I am inclined to believe that appropriate legislation should be offered to invalidate any contract or other agreement made by the President, or any agency created by him, or other agency or Department of Government, that heretofore has imposed or which hereafter will impose upon the United States the duty of negotiating with any foreign government for affirmative or reciprocal rights, unless such contracts, agreements, or obligations are presented to and approved by the Senate in the manner provided by the Constitution for the approval of treaties between this Nation and foreign governments.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments numbered 9, 11, and 12 to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes; that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 3 to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WORLEY, Mr. RANKIN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LE COMPTE, and Mr. ELLSWORTH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SELECTIVE SERVICE OCCUPATIONAL DEFERMENT OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair) laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. THOMAS of Utah, which was read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, February 9, 1944.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Owing to the great pressure of work in the standing committees of the Senate of which I am a member, it is with regret that I ask to be relieved of membership on the Special Committee for Deferment of Legislative Employees.

Sincerely yours,

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senator from Utah.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] presented his letter of resignation as chairman and a member of the Joint Committee on Selective Service Occupational Deferment of Officers and Employees of the Legislative Branch. Because of the resignation from the Senate of the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, and his consequent elimination from the joint committee in question it being a committee with three Senate Members, two vacancies are created on the part of the Senate, leaving the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] as the only Member of the Senate remaining.

I suggest therefore that the vacancies be filled by appointment by the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNEL in the chair). The Chair appoints the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] members of the joint committee on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets and for other purposes.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Bone	Holman	Smith
Brewster	Jackson	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	Wherry
Downey	Nye	White
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	Willis
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, while it is my intention to support the Maloney amendment, even assuming it will be agreed to, I think that to Congress and the Executive will still be left the task of finding a new formula for the relationship between wages and the cost of living. It seems to me the relevant issues are most confused at the present time, and that we should immediately address ourselves more earnestly to the important solution of the task of determining just wages than we have yet done. Personally I think it is most unfortunate, in view of the debates which are now going on that there is considerable uncertainty—at least I speak for my own mind—as to what is the true cost of living. As all of us know, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has fixed the cost of living presently at a figure around 123 or 124 percent compared with 100 percent as of January 1, 1941, and has declared that straight time hourly earnings during that period of time have risen almost exactly the same percentage according to the statistics the Bureau has. The representatives of two great labor groups, after many months of investigation, have prepared a most exhaustive report in which their claim is that over the period of time in question the cost of living has advanced, not 123 percent, but 143 percent.

I hold in my hand, Mr. President, a document entitled, "Recommended Report for the Presidential Committee on the Cost of Living by Labor Members R. J. Thomas, C. I. O. Labor Member, and George Meaney, A. F. of L. Labor Member." I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my address, the first five pages of that report, which contain a summary of the findings of the report itself.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDED REPORT FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE ON THE COST OF LIVING

I. SUMMARY

Conclusion

This report finds that the cost of living has risen by at least 43.5 percent from January 1941 to December 1943. This conclusion is highly conservative. It is based largely on data supplementary to those used by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in computing its cost of living index. A review of the principal deficiencies of that index and a statement of these deficiencies in quantitative terms confirm both the magnitude of the actual rise in living costs and the conservative character of our finding.

In view of the fact that the cost of living has actually risen by at least 43.5 percent since January 1941, whereas the B. L. S. index shows a rise of only 23.4 percent, we conclude that the B L. S. cost-of-living index is unreliable as a basis for wage adjustments during the war period. Sole reliance upon it will result in continued serious injustice to wage earners and lower-salaried workers.

Procedure

Your committee has reviewed, to the extent that time has permitted, all the available statistical data bearing on changes in the cost of living. It has consulted at length with Government experts. It has interviewed many technical and business experts conversant with developments in retail markets. It has made use of extensive field surveys conducted by both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. And finally, it has profited by reports from hundreds of workers and housewives. Among all these witnesses, laymen and experts alike, there is unanimity that the cost of living has mounted far beyond the increase indicated by the B. L. S. index.

Deficiencies of the B. L. S. index

Failure of the index to reflect all the wartime increase in the cost of living is the result of several factors:

1. The Government's price control efforts and subsidy programs have been concentrated upon those food items which are currently priced for inclusion in the index. In consequence, according to special surveys in a

number of cities, the prices of other foods, important components of workers' budgets, have risen nearly twice as fast as those priced by B. L. S. Thus, while the food index has been artificially held down by the differential administration of the price control laws and subsidy programs, the actual cost of food as a whole has not been held down. A similar result has occurred in connection with the rent component of the index. Nothwithstanding this finding, the committee wishes to commend the O. P. A. for its efforts to control prices. We need more price control, not less.

2. The construction of the index is such that it does not take adequately into account the disappearance of cheaper consumption items and the shift toward higher-priced lines. This deficiency is most striking in the case of clothing where trading up has been most clearly visible, but it is a factor also in the case of housefurnishings, food, and even housing.

3. The effect of quality deterioration, which has been very marked during this period, is almost completely neglected by the B. L. S.

4. The index is based on returns from only 34 of the largest cities (56 in the case of food prices). Retail price changes in these cities are not typical of price changes in all urban areas because the congestion resulting from wartime military and industrial activity has been most serious in smaller cities. In such areas, heavy immigration has produced such pressure on limited housing, stores and other facilities that prices have been driven up faster than in the more stable metropolitan areas. Our findings are conservative for the reason that they do not take this factor into account, except in the case of rent.

It should be emphasized that all the errors and inadequacies of the B. L. S. index are in the same direction: they all understate the price rises which have occurred since January 1941. The cumulative character of the deficiencies of the index underlines its inadequacy as an accurate basis for wage adjustments.

FINDINGS

1. The living costs of families of wage earners and lower salaried workers have risen by at least 43.5 percent between January 1941 and December 1943; that is, these families require $143.50 to purchase the equivalent of goods and services which cost them $100 in January 1941. The B. L. S. index reflects a rise of only 23.4 percent during this same period.

2. Large differences between the actual rise in living costs and the rise shown by the B. L. S. index were found for the principal components of the index: food, clothing, rent, and housefurnishings. Our findings regarding the increased cost of these types of items are shown in the accompanying table, along with the B. L. S. figures for the same period. (For purposes of this report, we have made no independent appraisal of "Miscellaneous" and "Fuel.")

Percentage price increases, January 1941 to December 1943 findings of this report and Bureau of Labor Statistics index

Commodity group	Findings of this report	Bureau of Labor Statistics index
Food	74.2	40.2
Clothing	72.2	33.7
Rent	15.0	3.0
Fuel, etc	8.6	8.6
House furnishings	62.0	27.8
Miscellaneous	15.9	15.9
All commodities	43.5	23.4

NOTE.—The figure for "all commodities" is a weighted average, obtained by adding the weighted percentage increases shown for the individual commodity groups, each group being multiplied by a weight equal to its proportion of the total of wage-earners' expenditures as calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for January 1941.

3. In the case of food, our findings of an increase of 74.2 percent (compared to 40.2 percent indicated by B. L. S.) are confirmed by official Government data wholly independent of those used by B. L. S. While consumer expenditures for food rose 70 percent during this period (Department of Commerce), civilian food consumption in terms of physical quantity declined by 3 percent (Department of Agriculture). Consequently, combining these two figures, the price per unit of food has risen 75 percent (170 divided by 97 equals 175).

4. In the case of clothing, our conclusion that costs have risen by 72.2 percent contrasts sharply with the B. L. S. estimate that retail clothing prices have risen only 33.7 percent. Our finding relies heavily upon a special study of price changes shown by mail-order catalogs of Sears, Roebuck & Co. and Montgomery Ward & Co. Independent Government data show that a finding of 72.2 percent increase is conservative. Department of Commerce figures report an increase in expenditures for apparel of 5' percent; Federal Reserve Board data indicate a decline in volume of 10.7 percent. Thus the unit price has risen 76 percent (157 divided by 89.3 equals 176).

5. Principally because its coverage is confined to 34 large cities, the B. L. S. rent index grossly understates the actual extent of rise in wartime rentals. The index shows an increase of 3 percent; the true increase is at least 15 percent.

6. The cost of housefurnishings has risen by at least 62 percent—considerably more than double the increase shown by B. L. S. Findings of the mail-order survey were utilized in this section also.

7. We have not at this time attempted to arrive at independent findings for the other major groups in the index. In the case of fuel, electricity, and ice, we believe the index to be substantially accurate. In the case of the "miscellaneous" group, our preliminary findings indicate that the B. L. S. index greatly understates the actual increases in the costs of the diverse items included in this general category. Our investigations in this field have not been completed in time for inclusion in this report. We are continuing, however, to assemble data bearing on price changes of items in this important group. It is apparent that our findings with regard to the over-all increase in the cost of living will need to be adjusted upward when these data become finally available.

8. In arriving at our findings regarding increases in the living costs of wage earners and lower salaried workers, we have made no attempt to take into account certain additional factors which have resulted in significant increases. It is common knowledge that black markets are all too frequent, yet we have not considered them. Secondly, shifts in the distribution of family expenditures caused by wartime conditions have had a marked influence on the cost of living. These, too, have not been taken fully into account in the findings of this report, though they have greatly contributed to increased living costs. In addition, there are several other similar factors which are discussed in the concluding section.

Mr. BANKHEAD subsequently asked and obtained leave to have printed at this point in the RECORD the following article:

C. I. O. AND A. F. OF L. REPORT 43.5 PERCENT RISE IN COSTS—FEDERAL INDEX IS ASSAILED AND 28.5 PERCENT WAGE LAG ALLEGED—FINDINGS CHALLENGED

(By Charles W. Hurd)

WASHINGTON, January 29.—The labor members of the Presidential committee on the cost of living stated in a report today that living costs had risen 43.5 percent since January 1, 1941, instead of 23.4 percent as given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

The labor members of the five-member committee are R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, C. I. O., and George Meaney, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor. The committee is headed by William H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, and the report of the labor members was submitted to him.

The report by the labor members drew quick response from the industry members of the committee and from A. F. Hinrichs, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics.

Mr. Davis also commented in a statement, saying that the report was "not in any sense a report of the committee."

The Senate subcommittee which is studying the economic problems of white-collar workers said that it would probably meet next week to hear the reply of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to the report by the labor members of the President's committee.

CAUTION BY INDUSTRY MEMBERS

The industry members of the President's committee, H. B. Horton, treasurer of the Chicago Bridge and Iron Co., and George K. Batt, vice president of Dugan Bros., Newark, N. J., made clear that the committee had taken no final action and that "the committee is under the responsibility not to make a final report to the President and to the public until careful consideration has been given to all the relevant data."

Mr. Hinrichs called attention to a survey made in October by an impartial committee of experts headed by Prof. Frederick C. Mills, of Columbia University, which "after months of careful study found that the index of the cost of living does satisfactorily measure changes in prices."

"Surely," Mr. Hinrichs declared, "if they had evidence that food prices, for example, have gone up twice as rapidly as is indicated by the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this fact would not have escaped attention of this committee of experts."

The report of the labor members declared that the index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was worthless as a gage in adjusting wages to the cost of living, and it contended that there was "a discrepancy of 28.5 percent between the rise in living costs and the wage adjustments (15 percent rises) allowed under the Little Steel formula."

Food costs, it added, had risen 74.2 percent instead of the officially acknowledged 40.2 percent; clothing, 72.2, instead of 33.7; rent, 15, instead of 13; and house furnishings, 62, instead of 27.8.

REPORT HEAVILY DOCUMENTED

The report, heavily documented, represented far-reaching studies by the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L.

"From 1940 to 1943, according to the Department of Commerce," the report said, "consumer expenditure rose by 36.8 percent, from $65,700,000,000 to $90,500,000,000. This increase is less than the rise in the cost of living, as shown in this report. In terms of real goods, consumer expenditures here declined since 1940."

It was contended that the statistics of the Labor Department bureau were inaccurate because their range of background was too narrow and that the Office of Economic Stabilization contributed to distortion of the price picture by confining price controls generally to the items studied by the bureau.

The report's conclusions were based on a broadened study of the basic items studied by the bureau—food, clothing, rent, and house furnishings.

The report stated that B. L. S. figures took no account of quality depreciation except as this entered into broad averages, of the disappearance of many cheaper lines of goods, of the fact that far more persons must eat meals away from home than formerly or of other little things that added up to big differences.

As an instance of the little things, the labor members quoted from a report of the Hotel and Restaurant Workers International Union, A. F. of L., that where seven or eight pieces of meat formerly went into a stew, the number now was five, and the pieces were smaller.

The 15-cent ham sandwich, it was added, had advanced to 25 cents, with only half the ham content; chicken salad often was more tuna fish than chicken, and codfish cakes, normally 80 percent fish and 20 percent potatoes, now were 50–50

"The Government's price-control efforts and subsidy programs," the report stated, "had been concentrated upon those food items used in the B. L. S. index and, in consequence, according to special surveys in a number of cities, the prices of other foods, important components of workers' budgets, have risen nearly twice as fast as those priced by B. L. S."

"Thus," the report went on, "while the food index has been artificially held down by the differential administration of the price-control laws and subsidy programs, the actual cost as a whole has not been held down. A similar result has occurred in connection with the rent-component index. Notwithstanding this finding, the committee wishes to commend the O. P. A. for its efforts to control prices. We need more price control, not less."

The report asserted that the index failed to take into reckoning such factors in living costs as black markets, various wartime changes in family expenditures, the cost of moving to new jobs, dual residences maintained by war workers to be near their jobs, increased taxes and War bonds and other forms of savings that decrease disposable income.

In its discussion of rents the report said:

"During the war the large cities have felt the impact of the war primarily on the periphery. For example, war industry in the metropolitan New York area has been largely confined to the satellite northern New Jersey cities and to the outskirts of the city itself. It is precisely in such cities that rents have moved up most.

"Between 1939 and early 1942 rents in New York City rose only seven-tenths of 1 percent, according to the index, whereas rents in the medium-sized cities of northern New Jersey, which are not sampled but are weighted by the sample taken within New York City, rose from 3 to 6 percent in the same period. Yet northeastern New Jersey comprises approximately three-sevenths of the population weight given New York City in the index."

INDUSTRY GROUP STATEMENT

The statement by the industry members of the committee was as follows:

"The industry members of the President's Cost of Living Committee, in a statement to the press, said that no final action had been taken by the committee and that no report had been transmitted through the committee to the President.

"News dispatches to the effect that cost of living had increased 43.5 percent since January 1, 1941, instead of the official figure of 23.5 percent, are based on a statement prepared by labor representatives or the committee. There has been no committee finding on this point.

"On Tuesday, January 25, 1944, the committee received a statement prepared by representatives of the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. which gives the position of these two organizations on the accuracy of the B. L. S. index of living costs.

"This statement is a voluminous and detailed document. It contains not only an examination of technical features of the Department of Labor's index number of the cost of living but undertakes to survey the movement of large numbers of prices of individual goods and services. It introduces a figure for the cost of living that is widely at variance with the official B. L. S. index and challenges the methods used in the construction of that index.

FULL EXAMINATION DEMANDED

"If the President and the public are to receive a careful, scientific, unbiased report on what has actually happened to the cost of living in this country, it is the duty of all members of this special Presidential committee to subject any material, whether submitted by labor, by industry, or by the public members of the committee, to the most careful examination.

"To review the statement now submitted by labor representatives is a considerable undertaking. It cannot receive such examination within a few days. All of the observations, estimates, and conclusions which such a report necessarily contains are obviously subject to wide differences of interpretations and disagreements on facts and, in fairness to industry, labor, and the public, ought to be reviewed by competent and accepted authorities.

"It is the opinion of the industry members of the President's committee that the committee is under the responsibility not to make a final report to the President and to the public until careful consideration has been given to all the relevant data."

Mr. Davis said that the C. I. O.-A. F. L. report was submitted to the committee Tuesday. He added:

"It is a statement of the contentions of the C. I. O. and the A. F. L. as to the cost of living and the B. L. S. index. It is not in any sense a report of the committee. Copies were given to the industry members of the committee, who will submit to the committee their comments in due course. A copy has also been given to the B. L. S. for comment. These comments and all other relevant data will, of course, be carefully studied before the committee makes its report to the President."

Mr. Hindrich's statement in defense of the B. L. S. figures was as follows:

"William H. Davis, chairman of the President's committee on the cost of living, has given me a copy of the preliminary draft of a recommended report submitted by the two labor members to the committee. Mr. Davis asked the Bureau of Labor Statistics to study the document carefully and to submit its comments and criticisms for the consideration of all of the members of the President's committee.

EARLY ACTION PROMISED

"We shall do so as quickly as possible after we receive copies of the statistical tables and other data on which the report is based. Obviously we need to know about the statistics the unions collected on prices before we can prepare an adequate report. To date no such information has been transmitted to the Bureau.

"While I cannot comment on the report in detail at this time, it may be noted that as recently as last October an impartial committee of experts, headed by Prof. Frederick C. Mills, of Columbia, after months of careful study found that the index of the cost of living does satisfactorily measure changes in prices.

"This committee was appointed by the president of the American Statistical Association on the request of the Secretary of Labor. It invited the research directors of all the unions in the country to appear before it and many of them did testify. Surely if they had evidence that food prices, for example, have gone up twice as rapidly as is indicated by the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this fact would not have escaped attention of this committee of experts.

"The accuracy of the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures was generally accepted from January 1941 to May 1942. During this period, while the Bureau of Labor Statistics food-price index rose 24 percent, the index was used in about 40 percent of the union contracts as a basis for adjusting wages. The Stabilization Act banned this use or it might have continued.

"Since May 1942 the index shows a further 16-point rise in food prices, bringing them 40 percent above January 1941. This report places the food-price rise at 75 percent.

"Here is a common-sense test anyone can apply: The food you could buy with a $10 bill in January 1941 would have cost $12.40 in May 1942, when nearly half the union contracts accepted the index as good enough to tie their wages to during the life of the contract. Then retail-price control became effective. The Bureau of Labor Statistics index shows that the January 1941, $10 basketful would now cost $14. The Thomas-Meaney report says $17.40. Every retailer knows that food prices have not gone up twice as fast since price control as before and no housewife would claim it."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I have discussed with statisticians in the Bureau of Labor Statistics their view of the report the summary of which I have just had inserted in the RECORD. While they have been helpful to me in what they have said, it is their statement that unfortunately this report has come to them so lately that they have not as yet been able fully to consider it and to prepare their analysis of it. While I have been promised some material in writing from them discussing certain limited features of the report, the written material has not yet come to me. In fairness, I must state that in a general way they challenge the accuracy of the findings of this labor report.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, I myself have not been able to carry on a sufficient investigation which would enable me to speak with certainty as to the accuracy of the conclusions stated in this labor report. But I must admit there are in the report two short paragraphs which, it seems to me, seriously challenge the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

In order properly to weight the factors in reference to the increased cost of food, it is necessary to consider many hundreds of different items, qualities, and categories and different conditions in many places in the United States. The weighting and measurement of the items going into the cost of living, so far as food is concerned, is a most difficult and, I may say, exhausting task. But the labor members claim their findings are supported by two sets of figures from other governmental bureaus. As I have already said, two short paragraphs, at least, bring to my mind the conclusion that the Bureau of Labor Statistics is upon the defensive; and until it answers these paragraphs my mind will not be satisfied.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the report is not an official report of the committee, but is merely a report by the labor members of the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWNEY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator understand that the public members of the committee take issue with the labor members on the figures they submit in their report?

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not know whether that is the case. I understand that the report is not their report, so I presume they would not agree with it.

Mr. AIKEN. I only know from a newspaper account of the report that there was a difference of opinion in the committee.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I dislike to make any ex parte presentations. My experience has been as a trial lawyer having an antagonist sitting across the table, ready to point out my mistakes. I exceedingly dislike to present one side of the issue, and I regret I do not have contrary data available.

The first paragraph I should like to read is as follows:

In the case of food, our findings of an increase of 74.2 percent (compared to 40.2 percent indicated by Bureau of Labor Statistics) are confirmed by official Government data wholly independent of those used by Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the statement indicate what period was used as the base in determining an increase in agricultural prices? In other words, did they do as most of the agencies have done, use the lowest base for agricultural prices which has prevailed since the war—the period from 1935 to 1939?

Mr. DOWNEY. No, Mr. President; I understand that the comparison is made as between the prices existing January 1, 1941, and perhaps in October or November 1943. I have the entire report here. As I say, it is exhaustive, and is an exhausting report to read, and I have not yet been able to go over it. But I do not think the implications made by the Senator from Alabama are applicable.

I should like to read this paragraph without interruption, and then I should be very glad to have interruptions:

3. In the case of food, our findings of an increase of 74.2 percent (compared to 40.2 percent indicated by B. L. S.) are confirmed by official Government data wholly independent of those used by B. L. S. While consumer expenditures for food rose 70 percent during this period (Department of Commerce), civilian food consumption in terms of physical quantity declined by 3 percent (Department of Agriculture). Consequently, combining these two figures, the price per unit of food has risen 75 percent (170 divided by 97 equals 175).

In other words, Mr. President, this group of labor economists has ascertained from the Department of Commerce the total amount of money paid during some period of time—let us say, in the latter part of 1943—as compared to the total amount paid by civilian consumers over a similar period of time 3 years ago. Having compared that, then they have determined the actual amount of food consumed by the civilian population in the two periods. On the basis of that index it would appear that the price per unit of food has risen 75 percent.

When I discussed that statement over the telephone this morning with representatives of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, I gleaned, I think, two principal objections which they had to the accuracy of that index. One is that the Department of Commerce and the Department of Agriculture, in figuring the amount of food available in the respective periods, and the amount paid for it, included liquor; and the Bureau of Labor Statistics has disregarded that item in figuring the cost of living. The statement was made that the cost of liquor has risen more than the cost of other foods, and that in any event it was not an item which should properly be calculated in determining the cost of living. I think the statement also was made that the Bureau of Labor Statistics does not take into account the increase in the price of food in hotels and restaurants, while the figures relied upon in the report do take that into account. The statement also was made that because of the shift of some persons from farms to cities, certain other factors entered into the situation, and that those factors militated against the accuracy of the figures.

Now I pass on to the next paragraph, which is as follows:

4. In the case of clothing, our conclusion that costs have risen by 72.2 percent, contrasts sharply with the B. L. S. estimate that retail clothing prices have risen only 33.7 percent. Our finding relies heavily upon a special study of price changes shown by mail-order catalogs of Sears, Roebuck & Co., and Montgomery Ward and Co. Independent Government data show that a finding of 72.2 percent increase is conservative. Department of Commerce figures report an increase in expenditures for apparel of 57.0 percent; Federal Reserve Board data indicate a decline in volume of 10.7 percent. Thus the unit price has risen 76 percent (157 divided by 80.3 equals 176).

Mr. President, upon inquiry of various agencies of the Government, I was told that for a late period in 1943, as compared with a similar period 3 years before, the actual amount of clothing being consumed by the civilian population was more than 10 percent less than it had been 3 years ago, while the Department of Commerce shows that the amount of money paid for clothing by the American people has increased 57 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has the Senator the over-all amount which has been paid for clothing?

Mr. DOWNEY. By civilians?

Mr. AIKEN. The higher quality of clothing purchased is undoubtedly reflected in the figures. For example, we see more fur coats on the working girls now than we have ever seen before. They have more money with which to buy them. They are buying better clothes than they ever bought before. I also understand that it is becoming more difficult to obtain low-cost clothing.

Mr. DOWNEY. The penetrating mind of the Senator has gone to the heart of this question. What he suggests, of course, should be considered. In order to determine the validity of these figures we must know how the quality of the clothing now manufactured in the United States compares with the quality of clothing manufactured 3 years ago.

Mr. AIKEN. I am very glad that so many persons can afford better clothes than they ever had before; but, of course, that is reflected in the percentages of costs which are shown by the labor economists. Therefore the percentages do not show the increase which would prevail if the people had bought the same grade of goods, in the same quantities, that they bought, say, 3 years ago.

Mr. DOWNEY. While my mind is not as penetrating as that of the distinguished Senator, I immediately thought of the same question, that we must determine how the quality of all the clothes, at present, weighted together compares with the quality of the clothes sold 3 years ago. In the case of shoes everyone admits a marked deterioration. Some authorities claim that the shoes now being manufactured do not have half the wearing qualities of shoes manufactured 3 years ago. I do not know whether that statement is correct, but it comes to me with some authority.

It is generally agreed that while millions of individuals are buying clothing of a better quality than they bought 3 years ago, if we compare all the clothing now being manufactured in the United States with the clothing being produced 3 years ago, the quality has deteriorated rather than increased. It is true that many girls who were working, we will say, in textile industries and receiving the unhappy wage of $18 a week, are now working in manufacturing establishments and may be making $50 a week. They now wear fur coats instead of threadbare garments, and pay more for them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. A few days ago the Director of the Bureau of the Census, Mr. J. C. Capt, appeared before a committee of which I am a member, and testified that, according to the figures of the Bureau of the Census for 1939, of all the people in the United States who received as much as $100 a year and were employed, one-half the total number received less than $1,200 a year compensation from wages or salaries. That was verified again this morning by Dr. Hinrichs, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That means that the gross income of half the total working population of the country, those who derived their income from either wages or salaries, was less than $1,200 a year. I ask the Senator this question: If half of all the working people in the United States who receive wages or salaries receive a gross amount of less than $1,200 a year, does he not agree that not many fur coats are bought in that group of our population?

Mr. DOWNEY. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Florida that not very many can be bought with such wages.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. A large percentage of those receiving less than $1,200 a year

now live on farms. The average which the Senator gives is for the whole country.

Mr. PEPPER. This morning Dr. Hinrichs assured us that those figures did not include farmers who do not receive either wages or salaries. It was testified that the 8,000,000 farm workers—proprietors, tenants, and others—were not included in the figures which I have just given.

Mr. AIKEN. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics states that about 10 percent, or 3,000,000 of all the people living on farms, are living on an income of less than $130 a year for a family of four, and 10 percent more are living on less than $430 for a family of four.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that is absolutely correct. That corroborates the point that the fur coats to which the able Senator from Vermont made reference are not being bought by the poorer elements of our population, and the war has not materially changed the status of those people, except, in some instances, to make them worse off.

Mr. AIKEN. That is very true. However, the figures which have been submitted to me show that 60,000,000 people in this country are now living on an average income of less than $2,350 a year for a family of four. We regret that. On the other hand, I think we can take a certain amount of pride in the fact that 70,000,000 people in this country are now living on incomes of more than $2,350 for a family of four. Of course, it is those people who are buying fur coats. However, we should not stop until we raise as many as possible of the low-income groups up to the point where they can have strawberries out of season and fur coats, too.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean that 70,000,000 persons in the United States are receiving annual incomes in excess of $2,350?

Mr. AIKEN. Per family of four.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator does not mean that 70,000,000 families are receiving such incomes, because there are only about 30,000,000 families.

Mr. AIKEN. No. Seventy million people are living on incomes which average $2,350 or more per family of four. That, of course, is a very high level of income for those people.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I admit the logic of the question propounded to me by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. I wish to say to him that it is my information, after querying several departments of the Government, that if we weight all the clothing now produced in the United States against what was being produced 3 years ago, we find that there is a substantial deterioration in quality. Certain kinds of garments have been improved. Certain classes of people are wearing better garments. However, taking the people as a whole—the millionaire, the poor man, and everyone in between—the quality of their garments has deteriorated.

If the figures of the Department of Commerce and of the Federal Reserve Bank are correct, that there is 10 percent less clothing and we are paying 57 percent more for it, that means that there has been a 75 percent increase in the cost of clothing. Bearing witness as one individual, let me say that, considering depreciated quality, I know that in the case of my family the cost of clothing has gone far beyond what the Bureau of Labor Statistics index seems to indicate.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that all he has to do is to consider some of the great industrial groups of New England and other sections of the country to realize how very correctly the Senator from Florida spoke in expressing sympathy for them. Prior to the war textile workers were receiving only $18 a week when they could obtain work. Their annual incomes were not 52 times $18. They probably did not receive annual incomes of as much as 75 percent of that amount.

Because of long hours of overtime, it is true that wages in the textile industry have gone up to an average of $28 a week. But when we consider the deductions for taxes, and other legal withdrawals from the wages of such workers, very few workers in textile industries have as much as $80 or $90 a month left. In the fertilizer industry the situation is worse. In the shoe industry it is worse; and in the needlecraft industry it is worse.

When we talk about a nation rolling in wealth, with plenty of money to spend, let us realize that that may be true of many businessmen and many workers in the preferred groups; but it is not true of tens of millions of workers. Tens of millions of workers are trying to pay the increased cost of living with incomes of $75 or $80 a month; and with the prices now prevailing no family in America can exist in any kind of decency on such an income.

Mr. President, of course there are other groups in America now who are in such a destitute condition that even these classes of workers are by contrast fortunate. Our pension payments to the indigent, elderly people in the United States average little more than $25 a month. The misery and the sacrifices which have been entailed upon our pension recipients by the increase of 23 percent in the cost of living should make any decent man weep.

In old-age insurance we are giving retired workers past 65 years of age an average of about $23 a month, and they are trying to live on that. Yes; there are millions of people in the fixed-income groups, some of them whose supporters are in the service of the United States, some of whom are widows or dependents of veterans who have passed away, who are receiving incomes so small that they cannot live with any degree of comfort. If any of us here had to live on two or three times as much per month, we would die under the rigors of that kind of indecent living.

So when we lightly say that an increase of 25 percent in the cost of living has been overcome by increased wages, or that adding 7 percent to the cost of food will not make very much difference, we forget millions who are measuring out the pennies to buy a loaf of bread, who go to bed hungry every night, who are suffering from malnutrition, and whose troubles are increased by every cent added to the cost of living.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that in the United States today, counting the low-paid workers in our great industries, 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 people are on fixed incomes, our pensioners, and many others who are living under conditions of unhappiness which we can scarcely describe. To them a 23-percent increase in the cost of living—or 43 percent, if the labor groups are correct—is, indeed, most unfortunate.

Mr. President, it is all very well to say, "Take off the subsidy and let food go up another 7 percent" if you have enough money so that you do not have to go to bed hungry at the end of the day. But if you do not have enough, with prices even as they are, you will look with fear and trembling upon a 5-percent or 10-percent or 15-percent increase.

Lest anyone think that I am exaggerating, I assert that within the last 3 or 4 months I have talked with many pensioners whose situation is so unhappy, so filled with sacrifice and misery, that I do not want to express it. Anyone who knows that pensions are paid only to people who have no other way of living—and the average is little more than $20 a month—dare not, in my opinion, deny the need which exists.

So, Mr. President, it is my intention to support the Maloney amendment. I think there are many grounds upon which it could be defended and supported. But the Senate is thoroughly familiar with the arguments, and I shall not intrude on the time of the Senate any further. I even regret that I have been compelled to state before the Senate dismal, melancholy, and unhappy facts. But they are facts, and they should be presented by someone.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has stated that he will support the Maloney amendment which would permit the payment of subsidies amounting to a billion and a half dollars. That would amount to about $12.50 per capita. Does the Senator from California think that $12 per capita given to all persons, including persons of very low incomes, in the event they got it—and they would not get it because the subsidies on meat and butter favor persons with high incomes—would be better than the payment of all the subsidy funds to the persons with small incomes? Does he think that persons with incomes of $26.50 a month, which is the average for those receiving old-age assistance, would thereby be benefited more than they would be if a greater subsidy were given to them, and if we let persons earning $3,000 or more pay their own bills?

I agree with the Senator in reference to the picture he has painted of the condition of approximately 20,000,000 low-income persons. However, I object to distributing one and a half billion dollars to approximately 130,000,000 people, when we should be channeling it directly to the assistance of the persons who need it most.

Mr. DOWNEY. I may say to the distinguished Senator that I am in agreement with him. I should prefer to see the incomes of the low wage earners and unfortunates of the Nation raised to some decent standard. Of course, that would be right. I would be in agreement with any kind of a proposal which the Senator would submit to accomplish that end. However, I see nothing of the kind in sight.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I am only taking the figures which the distinguished and beloved Senator from Alabama gave in showing that the elimination of subsidies would increase the food costs 7 percent. I realize the truth of what the Senator has said, namely, that most of the people to whom I have referred cannot buy any butter or milk. They are living perhaps on dry bread and beans. It is very possible that the subsidy would not help them as much as we hope. However, let me suggest that a certain group living above the level of subsistence, malnutrition, or starvation, would profit by the subsidies. Take for example the textile workers who, as I have said, have less than $75 or $80 left per family when they get through paying their bills. They would be helped by saving that 7 percent.

Moreover, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that I am told by officials of the O. P. A. that if we now break the line on food prices the entire line will break and let through the inflationary flood. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] has already expressed that situation very ably, and I agree with him.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator, and I maintain that the only fair and workable policy is to extend the subsidy directly to those people who need it, and not contribute further to the threat of inflation by extending the subsidy to those who already have an adequate or excessive purchasing power.

Mr. DOWNEY. I understand the logic and the force of what the Senator is saying, and I agree with him.

Mr. AIKEN. In order to give 20 percent of the people the same help through a general overhead subsidy that they would receive through a direct subsidy we would have to spend five times as much. It would be necessary to appropriate and spend five times as much to subsidize 100 percent of the people as to subsidize 20 percent of the people the same amount.

I maintain that all this planning for an overhead subsidy is not going to be of adequate help to the low-income group who receive from $20 to $40 a month. This group includes veterans of the Spanish-American War; it includes a very large number of veterans of the last war; it includes dependent children; it includes 2,200,000 old-age pensioners; it includes approximately 400,000 widows who are living on annuities which have been bought during past years; it includes a certain number who have benefited under the Federal old-age insurance plan. I think we are doing a great wrong when we insist on subsidizing 75 or 80 percent of the people who are not in the low-income class, although some of them, in fact a good many of them, are on the border line, in order to help the few who are desperately in need.

I had a letter this morning from a woman with five children who was struggling desperately to get along. She does not know where her husband is and she is afflicted with some kind of nerve paralysis. She is not responsible fully for her present condition; she did not bring on this war; she did not have anything to do with increasing the cost of living. We should help people such as she. We should not be spending billions of dollars to subsidize Park Avenue and people who patronize the large downtown hotels in Washington and New York and who go to night clubs. Yet that is what we are doing. When the roll-back was put on meats the price of porterhouse, tenderloin, and the best ham was reduced 11 cents a pound, but the lower-priced cuts of meat were rolled back from nothing up to from 3 to 3½ cents a pound and the price of soup bones was not rolled back at all.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not want to occupy the floor too long; I have already occupied it longer than I had intended to. Let me say that I think what the distinguished Senator has said is pertinent and persuasive; but we have not covered the entire case.

I must say to the distinguished Senator, however, that I would rather not engage further in this colloquy, because the able arguments the Senator is making involve the whole subsidy issue that has been threshed out by all of us, and I do not want to burden the Senate by repetition.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is one more comment I should like to make. The Senator from California is obviously and rightly in favor of raises to low-salaried people. However, that would be far from a solution, because, as of October, 9/10 percent of all the families in the United States had no wage earners in the family. Some of them undoubtedly were wealthy people, but most of them undoubtedly were very poor. So, by raising the wages of underpaid firemen, police, and school teachers, we would not meet the problem fully because there are so many families that have no wage earners at all.

Mr. DOWNEY. I appreciate all of what the Senator has said, and I applaud most of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure that the Senator and I both have the same objective, which is to assure a decent living to every deserving person in this country.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am sure that is true.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I regret that I did not have the privilege of hearing all that my good friend the Senator from California said. I know his heart is right; I know his sympathy and interest is with the poor and the suffering, and I know that he does not want injustice done to any workingman; but as I left the Senate Chamber, I heard the Senator read an extract from a report which I understood was about to be issued. I ask if it has been released?

Mr. DOWNEY. It was released by the labor members; yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. By the labor members?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes. The Board claimed it was a premature release, because the Board was not ready to release it. That is correct.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not know what probative effect a release of that kind is entitled to.

I am sympathetic with labor. I believe in good wages; I believe in good prices; I believe, in view of the great debt owed by the Government, that we will have to operate on a higher-priced economy than we have in the past, until we have an opportunity to collect taxes sufficient not only to serve the large debt but to reduce it. I do not think that can be done in a depression type of economy.

I merely desire the RECORD to be clear so that the figures the Senator has presented, ex parte figures which do not correspond with or represent the sentiments of the War Labor Board, so far as we know and so far as there has been any expression, may not go unchallenged. I do not want the statement to influence the subject of subsidies, though it may have proper effect when the question of wages is considered.

I said here today that there was no direct result or connection between wages of labor and the subsidy question, because the subsidy involves such a small proportion of the income that labor is now receiving that I do not consider it as being essential to the proper and fair adjustment of labor's wages. But I doubt if today's proceedings should close and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should go all over the country if it is likely to leave the impression that this partial report, this incompleted, undigested, and unapproved report of the War Labor Board is accepted as a basis for showing the cost of living at this time when it is so far out of line with the figures prepared by the official statistical agencies of the Government.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I regret the distinguished Senator did not hear all my remarks, because I think I qualified my statement so that no one reading the RECORD could misunderstand. The figures presented by me are from the labor members of the War Labor Board. They do not represent the report of the War Labor Board. They are contradicted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I cannot at this time vouch for their accuracy. They were put into the RECORD with the hope that we in the Congress will later have this issue very clearly presented to us. I think properly the Banking and Currency Committee could undertake to do that. I did discuss one particular paragraph, which, I may say to the Senator, carried conviction to me, but my mind is still open on it. Very possibly there is some explanation to show why these figures do not represent the conclusion drawn by the members of the Labor Board. I discussed that at some length while the Senator was absent.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have in my hand a news article sent from Washington to the New York Times, which we all recognize as a great newspaper, one which endeavors to report the facts correctly, whether its editorials are sound or not. Sometimes, from my standpoint, they are sound, sometimes totally unsound—generally unsound on matters affecting the farmer and agriculture.

Mr. Charles W. Hurd, one of their responsible correspondents in Washington, on January 29 sent to the New York Times a statement concerning the figures which the Senator from California has quoted. I have not really read all the article, but I have read enough of it to wish to bring it out in public as a statement of fact by a responsible correspondent for a highly responsible newspaper on this subject, so that at least both sides will be presented, the side of the representatives of labor, and that of the representative of a great newspaper.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I should have no objection to the Senator inserting the article in the RECORD to follow immediately the portion of the document I inserted. I offered only the summary. I shall be very glad to have the Senator's material follow that. I think that is most advisable.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall refer to a few lines from the article. I do not wish to take time needlessly, but I should like to have the Senators who are listening get some idea of Mr. Hurd's statement.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suggest that I yield the floor. I am through, and shall be glad to have the Senator take the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I shall read some of the article, and then ask to have it incorporated in the RECORD for information. I do not vouch for it.

The article is dated Washington, January 29, and reads:

> The labor members of the Presidential Committee on the Cost of Living stated in a report today that living costs had risen 43.5 percent since January 1, 1941, instead of 23.4 percent as given by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.
>
> The labor members of the five-member committee are R. J. Thomas, president of the United Automobile Workers, C. I. O.; and George Meaney, secretary-treasurer of the American Federation of Labor. The committee is headed by William H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, and the report of the labor members was submitted to him.
>
> The report by the labor members drew quick response from the industry members of the committee and from A. F. Hinrichs, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics.
>
> Mr. Davis also commented in a statement, saying that the report was "not in any sense a report of the committee."
>
> The Senate subcommittee which is studying the economic problems of white-collar workers said that it would probably meet next week to hear the reply of the Bureau of Labor Statistics to the report by the labor members of the President's committee.
>
> The industry members of the President's committee, H. B. Horton, treasurer of the Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., and George K. Batt, vice president of Dugan Bros., Newark, N. J., made clear that the committee had taken no final action and that "the committee is under the responsibility not to make a final report to the President and to the public until careful consideration has been given to all the relevant data."
>
> Mr. Hinrichs called attention to a survey made in October by an impartial committee of experts headed by Prof. Frederick C. Mills, of Columbia University, which "after months of careful study found that the index of the cost of living does satisfactorily measure changes in prices."
>
> "Surely," Mr. Hinrichs declared, "if they had evidence that food prices, for example, have gone up twice as rapidly as is indicated by the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this fact would not have escaped the attention of this committee of experts."
>
> The report of the labor members declared that the index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics was worthless as a gage in adjusting wages to the cost of living, and it contended that there was "a discrepancy of 28.5 percent between the rise in living costs and the wage adjustments (15-percent rises) allowed under the Little Steel formula."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the whole article be incorporated in the RECORD following summary submitted by the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the junior Senator from California a question.

I am interested in producing meat in Nebraska. If the amendment which has been proposed by the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] shall be agreed to, it will legalize the consumer subsidy, it will legalize the subsidy which is now being paid to processors of meat. Up to this time, at least, there is no legal authority for it. If it shall be legalized, Congress will foreclose whatever color of title we now have to contend that the subsidy which is being paid as a roll-back should go the other way, to producers. So the amendment is vital to all of us from the States which produce beef, because if the consumer subsidy is legalized, under the amendment which is now being considered, if it shall be agreed to, it will mean that it will foreclose any chance we have to see that the subsidy is turned the other way, as we think it should be, and go to the cattleman in the beef-producing State as a production subsidy.

I am leading up to a question to the Senator, because he comes from a State where there is a good deal of production of beef cattle, just as there is in my State. I wish to acquaint the Senator, further, with the fact that after consumer subsidies were made available, in June, the prices of double A beef cattle at the Chicago market dropped more than $1 a hundred, and the price is still under $16. I think the top price now is $15.75, the theory being that $15.75, which is the top price now, includes the subsidy of $1.10 a hundred, which should go to the producer.

I am sure the Senator will find the statements I have made to be accurate, if he will take the time to investigate. If we now adopt the proposed amendment, at least until new legislation shall be enacted, it will bar the cattle producer from getting $1.10 a hundred as a subsidy, which would put him back on the same basis on which he operated in June 1943.

I ask the Senator whether it is not just as important to consider the cattle producer of California as to consider the consumer, if what I have said be true, and I am asking the Senator, for information, whether he does not feel that if this amendment shall be adopted we will foreclose the producer from getting any additional price for his beef.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I might say to the distinguished Senator that I regret taking any more time of the Senate on this particular matter. The Senator from Nebraska raises a wide subject for discussion, but I do not want to be drawn into any further argument at this time. There are issues here on which men can argue for hours. We have argued them for many days heretofore, so I am not willing to answer further questions.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will not yield further?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words today on the subject of the basis of the present subsidy program. One reason why I shall certainly vote for the bill, even if it is not amended, is that I feel that the payment of subsidies and the assumption of the right to pay subsidies is a usurpation of authority which Congress has never granted. I do not want to be technical, but it seems to me clear that this whole program has been assumed by the Executive, up to the expenditure of $1,500,000,000 a year, without any authority whatsoever from Congress. That perhaps is a broad statement, because some of the subsidies, for example, two or three hundred million dollars paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation in the purchase and sale of feedstuffs at a loss, is justified under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act. But the important, the large subsidies, are the roll-back subsidies paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the so-called feed-milk subsidy by which the Commodity Credit Corporation pays each farmer a subsidy.

I do not think there is any legal authority for any of those subsidies. That includes the meat subsidy, the butter subsidy and the wheat-flour subsidy paid by the R. F. C., and the so-called milk subsidy paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The authority claimed for the R. F. C. is under the Price Control Act. That act provides in section 2 (e) as follows:

> (e) Whenever the Administrator determines that the maximum necessary production of any commodity is not being obtained or may not be obtained during the ensuing year, he may, on behalf of the United States, without regard to the provisions of law requiring competitive bidding, buy or sell at public or private sale, or store or use, such commodity in such quantities and in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof or otherwise to supply the demand therefor, or make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodity in such amounts and in such manner and upon such terms

and conditions as he determines to be necessary to obtain the maximum necessary production thereof.

That was an authorization measure when we passed it, and I had something to do with it, because I myself believe that it is desirable to have some power to pay subsidies when attempt is made to control prices in certain special cases, where two or three times your money's worth can be obtained by paying them. But certainly it was clearly intended that such a program should not be carried out without an appropriation by Congress, and I have no doubt if we examine the debates which took place when that matter came up, it will be found that it was intended that Congress merely provide an authorization, and if that authorization was to be acted upon as in every other case, the Administrator would be obliged to come back to Congress and obtain authority to make the payments.

What was done? The Price Control Act covered all sorts of metals. The R. F. C. has already been paying subsidies on metals, on copper, and other metals. So we provided as follows:

Provided, That in the case of any commodity which has heretofore or may hereafter be defined as a strategic or critical material by the President pursuant to section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, such determinations shall be made by the Federal Loan Administrator, with the approval of the President, and, notwithstanding any other provision of this act or of any existing law, such commodity may be bought or sold, or stored or used, and such subsidy payments to domestic producers thereof may be paid, only by corporations created or organized pursuant to such section 5d.

That is to say, by the R. F. C. The intention in agreeing to that provision was to say that the Price Administrator would have nothing to do with minerals, strategic and critical materials, but that would be handled by the R. F. C.

When administration officials wanted to pay subsidies, and did not want to come to Congress to get the money with which to pay them, the President proceeded to issue an Executive order finding that beef and butter, and later on wheat, were strategic and critical materials, and therefore they could only be sold and handled under section 5 (d) of the R. F. C. Act, and by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That certainly was not intended. It may be legally possible that that can be done, but it certainly was a direct attempt to evade the provisions of the act, which would otherwise have required the Administrator to come before Congress in the usual manner and obtain appropriations for payment of subsidies. Even then the official had this hurdle to get over. These subsidies can only be paid to domestic producers of such commodities, and in order to get around that they got the Attorney General to rule that a miller is a producer. Of course, that was not intended. The producer was meant to be the farmer. The producer of agricultural products was the farmer. But the Attorney General was prevailed upon to rule that the miller was a producer of flour, and therefore the subsidy could be paid to the miller. The ruling was made that the packer was a producer of meat, if you please, and therefore the subsidy could be paid to the packer, instead of to the original producer of the cattle. That practice was continued, even after Congress made it clear that it did not approve of subsidies. Perhaps it was continued because Congress made it clear it did not approve of them. That was shortly after the bill was passed.

Senators will remember that another bill was pending in the Senate at the time. It was opposed by the senior Senator from North Carolina, and was revised so as not to give any further authority or provide appropriations for subsidies. In order to avoid that, the machinery of the R. F. C. has been used—the R. F. C., which has billions of dollars given it for entirely different purposes—in order to pay a direct subsidy, which is a direct loss and an out-of-pocket expense to the Government, which is not in line with the R. F. C. powers, and which is far beyond the purposes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.

It seems to me perfectly clear that the Administration has usurped the power to pay subsidies to the extend of a billion dollars, and I think Congress should now clearly say, "You cannot pay subsidies unless you come down here and obtain from Congress express authority and express appropriation for the subsidies you wish to pay."

The second point I wish to make as to the illegality of subsidies is with reference to the so-called milk-feed subsidy. Suddenly, last fall, the Administration announced it was going to pay to every farmer a certain number of cents per hundred pounds of milk and a certain number of cents per pound of butter for the milk and butter which each farmer sold during each month, and that the farmer could go into the A. A. A. office in his county seat on a certain day, just the way he used to go to get the A. A. A. payments, and could present his receipts and could get a check from the A. A. A. That milk-subsidy program is infinitely more expensive than the subsidy plan which has been pursued in one or two urban districts. In my opinion, its purpose has been largely a political one. I think it is an effort again to give the A. A. A. some checks to hand out, so that it may have with the farmers some of the political influence it lost after parity payments and soil-conservation payments were largely discontinued.

Furthermore, there is no authority whatever under the Commodity Credit Corporation Act to make subsidy payments. When Mr. Hutson, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, was before our committee, I asked him, "What legal authority have you to make these subsidy payments?" He could not say then, and I have not yet heard any adequate answer. I think those who support subsidies should come before the committee tomorrow and state what possible authority the Commodity Credit Corporation has to make gratuitous payments to some 3,000,000 farmers throughout the United States for the production of the milk and butter they choose to produce.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was established with power to buy and sell foodstuffs. That gives it, incidentally, an indirect power to pay subsidies, because it may buy foodstuffs at one price and sell them at a lower price, and thereby may subsidize a producer or subsidize a distributor. But it has no power I am aware of to pay direct cash subsidies to 3,000,000 farmers. However, that is what it is doing. It is making the same kind of payments which were made under the old parity payment law or the soil-conservation law, except that those payments were expressly authorized by Congress. If Congress had not authorized them, no one in the world would have claimed they could have been made.

Now we are confronted with the payment of the subsidy by the Commodity Credit Corporation to milk farmers, or to practically every farmer who has a cow and who sells any milk, without, so far as I can determine, any legal authority of any kind at all.

Mr. President, under those circumstances it seems to me we should begin at the beginning, and should decide whether we wish to authorize subsidies. Certainly, I am not willing to vote for a general amendment such as the one offered by the Senator from Connecticut, which proposes, in effect, that we provide for the payment of $1,500,000,000, and ratify and approve everything that has been done, and say, "You can go on just exactly as you have been going on." That is what the adoption of the amendment would mean.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the $1,500,000,000 which is proposed is, I think, far more than is really necessary. The figure is a little greater than that, because it includes feed wheat, which makes approximately $1,550,000,000 of authority, as compared to the figure of $1,100,000,000 which was submitted to us by Chester Bowles, in December, as being the amount he was paying, and the figure of $1,219,000,000 which was submitted to us by Marvin Jones at the meeting referred to by the Senator from Connecticut, held during or just after the Christmas holidays. So the amendment actually proposes to authorize the payment of approximately $330,000,000 more than the Administrator himself is now paying under his present program.

The amendment I propose to submit later has two purposes. One is to provide for a smaller amount, because my own belief is that we should approve a reasonable payment of subsidies, but should limit the amount, so that the administration will have to select only the subsidies which really will produce results, and so that more money will be gotten back than will be paid out, and, finally, so that the type of subsidies paid will be limited.

The amendment I shall propose provides that before a subsidy can be paid, a price must first be guaranteed to the farmer, so that the price cannot be rolled back in the way the meat subsidy is said to have been rolled back on the producer. The second thing my amendment would do would be to provide that an amount per unit be paid, so that we would not be up against the problem of passing on the profits of every food processor and every manufacturer in existence. I shall explain the amendment later at greater length. At the present time I merely wish to say that it seems to me we must define the subsidies we wish to have paid.

I think this particular method of paying a milk subsidy which will cost approximately $300,000,000 a year is away beyond anything we should do or that it is necessary to do in order to help hold down the price of milk or to encourage the production of milk.

I also feel very strongly that the beef subsidy and some of the other subsidies should be discontinued unless a support price for beef, for instance, can be put into effect. If that can be done, so that with the fixed price for production the subsidy actually will represent the margin between the amount received by the producer and the amount paid by the consumer, then I think there is something to be said for the subsidy.

I, myself, do not approve of subsidies which cost as much as the entire saving to the consumers. If a program to save $100,000,000 to the consumers involves a cost of $100,000,000 to the Government, I do not see why we do not let the consumers pay the cost in the first place. I think it is more inflationary to pay such a subsidy, because the Government will have to borrow the $100,000,000. It will have to borrow the money from the commercial banks, because we have already exhausted our borrowing market with individuals. Then we will have an additional debt of $100,000,000 created, and that will hammer the price structure, and will make it more difficult to maintain it.

The only subsidy which I think is justified is under the following conditions: If we can, by paying a subsidy of $20,000,000, save the public perhaps $100,000,000, then I perhaps can see some object in it. If we desire to subsidize the cost of peanut oil and soybean oil, and if by doing so we can increase the production of those commodities, and still can avoid the necessity of increasing the price of lard and perhaps of cottonseed oil and other oils, then it may be that by paying a small subsidy on one product of that kind we can hold down the whole price, and can save the consumers three or four times that amount.

Undoubtedly, in the case of the copper subsidy we save the Government perhaps 10 times what we pay to the producers of copper. There are some cases in which I think similar savings can be made. I think we have paid subsidies so often that I have no objection on principle to them. But I believe that by paying the consumer a subsidy and consequently taking out of the Treasury dollar for dollar what we pay the consumer, such a procedure is more inflationary and more dangerous than it would be to let the consumer pay the increased price.

So, Mr. President, it seems to me that I should vote against the pending amendment; and it seems to me that when the Senate does adopt an amendment, it should limit the subsidies which will be paid and should limit the amount to a much greater extent than it would be limited under the pending amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not rise to discuss the amendment. I wonder if we cannot now obtain a vote. Has the Senator from Ohio concluded?

Mr. TAFT. I have finished.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], as modified.

Mr. MALONEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 4 or 5 minutes before the vote is taken.

The Senator from Connecticut has offered his amendment and has made an argument against inflation. He appeals for subsidies on the ground that subsidies will tend to prevent inflation. I know that we all dislike inflation, though we realize that we are bound to have it to a certain degree.

I should like to read to the Senate some excerpts from the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau, and his assistant, Mr. Paul, before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on October 4, 1943. On page 4 of the hearings the Secretary stated to the committee:

> From a statistical standpoint, we know where the bulk of the new money lies, and where, therefore, lies also the greatest danger of inflationary pressure.
>
> Today, four-fifths of all the income of the Nation is going to people earning less than $5,000 a year. And except for the people earning no more than a bare subsistence wage, this group presents the greatest potential danger from the inflationary standpoint. The weight of the inflationary money in the hands of this group can cause undue price rises, and can completely upset our entire economic system, unless absorbed in sufficient quantity.

On page 8 of the same report, Mr. Morgenthau says:

> As I have indicated, the exemptions suggested are $500 for single persons, $1,100 for married persons, and $300 for each dependent.

In order to drain off this excess purchasing power, he recommended additional taxes for the very low income brackets. I certainly do not agree with him.

On page 24 of the same report, Mr. Paul said:

> The Treasury has been borrowing heavily at commercial banks.

Farther down the page I find the following:

> War financing through banks is recognized everywhere as dangerous, since it leads directly to an increase in the cash assets held by the public. When a bank buys bonds it commonly sets up a "war loan account" payable to the United States Treasury. This process increases the cash assets of the Treasury, but, obviously, the bank has no right to dock any customer's account because the bank has bought bonds—

And so forth. On page 25 he said:

> For the current fiscal year Americans will have nearly $15 of spending power, after taxes are taken out, for every $10 worth of goods available.

The Secretary of the Treasury insists that the excess purchasing power in the hands of four-fifths of our people must be drained off if we are to avoid inflation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], as modified.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hawkes	Robertson
Barkley	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Shipstead
Bone	Holman	Smith
Brewster	Jackson	Stewart
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lucas	Tobey
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Davis	Murray	Wherry
Downey	Nye	White
Eastland	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ellender	Overton	Willis
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in Dun's Review for November 1943 there appeared an article entitled, "Use of Subsidies as an Aid in Control of Prices During Wartime." In connection with the article there was appended an exhibit entitled, "Government Subsidies." It listed those being paid for food, and those for nonfood, by commodities, by paying agencies, and by cost. I later checked the data which appeared in the table, and I find that there has been compiled a schedule which will afford at a ready glance a very complete summary of the entire situation. As of December 25, 1943, there was compiled a table entitled, "Subsidies at a Glance—How They Work, to Whom They're Paid, and Why."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire schedule be printed in the RECORD at this point in order that the data may be available for the study of the Senate.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Subsidies at a glance—How they work, to whom they're paid, and why

Program	Paying agency	Why subsidized	How subsidized	Paid to	Annual cost	Direct savings
					Mil. of dol.	*Mil. of dol.*
Aluminum products	D. S. C.	To bring in marginal producers	Buy output of high-cost producers above prevailing price.	Manufacturer	6	[1] 6+
Apples	C. C. C.	To cover high transportation costs of away-from-market producers.	Pay additional transportation costs	Shipper	4	30
Butter	D. S. C.	To roll retail prices back to September 1942 level.	Pay 5 cents per pound at creamery	Creamery	82	92
Canning fruits and vegetables.	C. C. C.	To compensate for higher costs	Buy pack, resell at loss; also compensate for increased wage costs.	Cannery	27	33
Cheddar cheese	C. C. C.	do	Buy output from manufacturers at 27 cents per pound, resell at 23¼-cents ceiling.	Manufacturer	29	40
Chilean nitrate of soda.	D. S. C.	To compensate for increased wartime shipping costs.	Buy nitrates at $37 per ton, resell for $30	Importer	7	11
Coal	D. S. C.	To offset increased transportation costs to east coast.	Pay cost differential between pre-war and war routes.	Consignee	25	[1] 25+
Copper, lead, zinc	M. R. C.	To bring marginal mines into production	Pay premiums to high-cost producers above specified quotas.	Producer	80	1,000
Corn price adjustment.	C. C. C.	To induce movement of yellow corn to East and Southeast where price ceilings are lower.	Pay 5 cents per bushel to sellers who ship from corn areas to East and Southeast.	Corn Belt seller	5	[1] 5+
Dairy feed	C. C. C.	To compensate for increased feed and labor costs.	Pay farmer 30 to 50 cents per hundredweight for whole milk or 4 to 6 cents per pound for butterfat.	Farmer	200	250
Dried beans	C. C. C.	To encourage production	Buy at price higher than ceiling, resell at loss.	Country shipper	10	14
Flour and bread	D. S. C.	To compensate for rise in wheat prices	Direct payment to miller	Miller	100	125
Fluid milk (in 4 urban areas).	C. C. C.	To compensate for increased prices paid to farmers.	Direct payment to distributor	Distributor	5	8
Imported metals	M. R. C.	To offset wartime transportation costs	Buy imports at above-ceiling prices, sell at loss.	"Buy and resell"	25	[1] 25+
Jewel bearings	D. S. C.	To offset higher cost of domestic production.	Buy domestic output at cost plus 6 percent, plus certain development expenses.	Producer	8	[1] 8+
Meat	D. S. C.	To roll retail prices back to September 1942 level.	Direct payments on live animals slaughtered.	Slaughterer	436	591
Miscellaneous domestic ores.	M. R. C.	To encourage domestic production of arsenic, beryllium, chrome, cobalt, etc.	Pay marginal costs, also fees	Producer or Government agent.	25	[1] 25+
Nicotine sulfate	A. M. A.	To divert low-grade tobacco to nicotine sulfate production.	Government absorbs about 50 percent of the higher raw material costs.	Nicotine sulfate manufacturer.	2	4
Peanuts	C. C. C.	To encourage production of peanuts and peanut oil.	Buy peanut crop above ceiling price, resell at loss to peanut crusher.	Peanut crusher	10	10+
Peanut butter	C. C. C.	To roll retail prices back to September 1942 level.	Direct payment to manufacturer on civilian output.	Manufacturer	15	22
Petroleum	D. S. C.	To offset increased transportation costs to east coast.	Pay cost differential between pre-war and war routes.	Consignee	100	390
Potatoes	Department of Agriculture.	To encourage production	Pay 50 cents a bushel for normal yield on all acreage planted between 90 and 110 percent of goal.	Farmer	25	[1] 25+
Prunes and raisins	C. C. C.	To offset increased prices paid by packers to growers.	Buy pack at higher-than-1942 price; resell at loss.	Packer	13	19
Soybeans	C. C. C.	To expand soybean oil output	Buy soybeans and resell at loss	Processor	10	24
Sugar transport	C. C. C.	To offset increased shipping costs	Pay increased shipping costs; also buy sugar; resell at loss.	Importer and "buy and resell."	43	[1] 43+
Sugar beet	C. C. C.	To encourage production	Pay $150 per ton to processor for higher price to growers.	Processor	11	[1] 11+
Tires	D. S. C.	To utilize extra passenger-car tires	Buy from private-car owners, resell at loss	"Buy and resell"	20	[1] 20+
Truck crops	Department of Agriculture.	To encourage production	Pay $50 an acre on all acreage between 90 and 110 percent of goal.	Truck farmer	6	[1] 6+
Wheat for feed	C. C. C.	To keep down costs of feedstuffs	Sell wheat to feeders at not less than corn parity.	"Buy and resell"	68	[1] 68+
Wood pulp	D. S. C.	To utilize (1) inferior grades of wood pulp and (2) marginal paper mills.	Pay increased costs of mills using bleached sulfite wood pulp.	Mill	1	20

[1] No direct estimate available; savings figure shown is equal to estimated cost of program and is a minimum.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know how long the leader desires to continue the debate this afternoon. I had expected to say a few words on this subject before the vote, but I had not expected to do so until tomorrow. If it is the desire of the Senate to vote at this late hour, I can say now what I wish to say. I do not know that I shall take more than a few minutes. However, I cannot promise that, because I have not had an opportunity to prepare what I had to say.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It had been my desire, as well as the desire of many other Senators, to vote on the Maloney amendment today.

Mr. GEORGE. The Maloney amendment would probably end this whole debate in the event it were agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it should be agreed to it probably would.

Mr. GEORGE. That is the reason why, if the matter should go over until tomorrow, I should not wish to take more than 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator that many Senators are anxious that the entire bill be disposed of tomorrow if possible. A number of Senators on the other side of the aisle contemplate journeys here and there for the purpose of celebrating the anniversary of Lincoln's birth on Saturday, and they do not want the Senate t be in session for any part of this week after tomorrow, if possible. I should be entirely agreeable to a limitation on debate beginning tomorrow. I have conferred with Senators on both sides of the Chamber, and it seems possible to make such an agreement. However, some Senators do not want to enter into such an agreement tonight, but prefer instead to wait until tomorrow. I do not wish to discommode the Senator from Georgia or embarrass him in any way. However, I will state frankly that I do not want this entire matter to go over beyond tomorrow unless we can reach an agreement as to when we should finally vote upon the bill.

If the Senator from Connecticut is successful in having his amendment agreed to that would practically end the matter because his amendment is practically a substitute for the bill which has been reported to the Senate, and we could probably dispose of the measure very speedily after the vote upon his amendment. For that reason I thought we might vote today. I did not know that the Senator from Georgia contemplated making any remarks on the subject. However, I shall accommodate myself to the wishes of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not care to take more than 10 or 15 minutes at most, but I do wish to speak on the Maloney amendment, because it is the heart of the debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps the Senator will have more listeners now than he would have tomorrow because we all know how difficult it is to get Senators here early in the day. Whatever the Senator wishes to do is agreeable to me.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. May I inquire of the majority leader if it is not possible to work

out some arrangement by which voting on the bill and amendments thereto may be deferred until the first of next week? Saturday is the anniversary of Lincoln's birth. From time immemorial Members on this side of the aisle as well as Members on the other side of the aisle have attended Lincoln Day gatherings throughout the length and breadth of the country. Many Senators made commitments some time ago. I had hoped that we might have an arrangement by which we could continue the debate tomorrow, with the understanding that there would be no voting, and then we could take a recess until Monday under an agreement for limitation of debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows the result in the Senate when an agreement is made to continue with the debate and not take a vote. The result is that Senators debate to empty seats. Today is only Wednesday, and tomorrow will be Thursday. I am not in charge of the Lincoln Day celebration. I might say, however, that some years ago I made a very good speech on Lincoln in the Senate, and I commend it to my Republican friends who expect to journey away from Washington to address the populace on the subject of Lincoln. If we have an understanding that we will debate tomorrow but not vote on anything until Monday, the Senator knows what will happen. There will be the greatest exodus since the children of Israel were led through the Red Sea by Moses. Many Senators will leave.

We ought to dispose of the Maloney amendment. Senators are not leaving the city tonight to keep their appointments on Saturday.

Mr. WHITE. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. They will leave tomorrow to keep their appointments on Saturday. Certainly we ought to dispose of the bill tomorrow if we cannot do so tonight.

Mr. WHITE. I am perfectly willing to stay in session tonight until the Maloney amendment is disposed of. I think many Members on this side of the Chamber would be willing to do so because of their anxiety to be certain of getting away tomorrow in order that they may keep appointments which they have made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Georgia and to all other Senators that, as we know, the present extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation expires on February 17. Whatever is to be done ought to be done by that time. If the Senate should concur in the House bill with the amendments of the Senator from Alabama, as has been said already, that action would probably result in a veto. In my judgment, the veto would be sustained. Then we would have to start again to do whatever we were going to do to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation and pass whatever subsidy legislation it would be possible to pass in the two Houses. So that the time limit is upon us, and the sooner we dispose of the pending matter the better condition we will be in to deliberate on what Congress is finally to do.

The Senator from Georgia indicates his willingness to proceed now.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am willing to proceed, not that I am prepared to say anything on the question this evening. I had hoped to make an investigation to refresh my recollection on some points and take up the argument tomorrow, but it is such an important matter that I am not willing that the Senate come to a vote on what I refer to, with all due respect, as the Maloney amendment, the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut to the bill, without saying a word.

Mr. President, the adoption of this amendment would, in my opinion, end the whole debate on this question, and would commit the Congress to a wide-open subsidy program, beginning with $1,500,000,000 a year. In my opinion, that is not a decision which should be taken lightly. But if the Senate desires to commit itself to that program, of course, it may do so; it has the power to do so; but real inflation in this country is yet ahead of us.

There has been no extraordinary increase in prices. There has been an extraordinary increase in wages. In the very beginning there was an effort to tie wages and prices together, but Congress rejected the proposal. We were told that wages could not be controlled by the Price Control Act, that that was a decision better left to the executive branch of the Government. We finally acquiesced in that decision. There has been no extraordinary rise in prices. There has been no extraordinary rise in the cost of living. There has been a considerable depreciation in the value of currency, deliberately brought about, as a matter of public policy, by the Congress, but we do face an inflation in this country, and what is proposed is the first step toward real inflation.

Unquestionably there may be those in the country who should be given the benefit of a subsidy, but not all the American people. The broad statement, the unqualified statement, that all the one-hundred-and-thirty-odd million American people are entitled to a food subsidy, a consumer subsidy, at this time, is sheer nonsense. It is worse than that, it is transparent hypocrisy, it is politics of the rawest kind. Frankly, it is appeasement, because we are warned repeatedly that if we break the line, then labor is going to demand a constantly increasing wage. If Senators care to, they may vote for any type of appeasement, but the moment they do, they are really opening the floodgates for inflation.

We are reminded to hold the line. I do not say that labor is getting too much, and I do not think it is necessary to appease labor, because the wages of labor on the whole are not out of line with the cost of living. There may be inequities and special hardship situations with respect to farm prices, agricultural prices, food prices, and wages, but those inequities should have been met, as we contemplated when considering the original price-control bill that they would be met, by specially considering those cases of inequity, and of hardship. We are now confronted by a bald proposition to approve wholesale consumer subsidies for a hundred-and-thirty-odd million people, who are said to have more money in their pockets, in their bank accounts, and in bonds already purchased, than ever before in the history of the world. Here is a proposal to subsidize the whole of America, and if there is any excuse, any reason—and there may be; I do not question that there may be—for granting a subsidy to those in the exceedingly low income earning brackets, or those without earnings at all, why not do it? Why not do it much as the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Vermont have suggested, by giving aid directly to the groups which need assistance, without granting assistance to all the American people? Why do it at the cost of the farmer? What is proposed is just as plain as that 2 and 2 make 4. The figures reach one final result in all this program, if we look at it frankly and candidly. We have to hold the line, but we are asked to break the back of the American farmer in order to hold the line.

What is proposed? It is proposed that we reduce the prices of farm products. That is what is proposed. It is proposed that we reduce the price of pork; it is proposed that we reduce the price of beef; it is proposed that we reduce the price of wheat, of flour, of all breadstuffs, all products of the American farm. How is that to be done? By reducing the farmer's price in the market, by paying him a miserable subsidy in order that he remain in the position of a producer.

The desire is not to starve him out, oh, no; it is not to destroy him. Gentlemen are dreadfully afraid that they must appease labor; certainly they are; but they are willing to break the backbone of the American farmer by reducing the prices of his products, not by letting him have what we tried to give him in the price-control bill, not by letting him have at least parity for his products.

Suppose we reduce his prices, we make him the producer of the lowest-priced products in America; and the producer of the lowest-priced commodities in our society is always the hewer of wood and the drawer of water for the other members of society. Gentlemen do not want the farmer to go into the market place and get a fair price for his product, they want to hold the line, but they want to hold it to the eternal cost of the American farmer.

Let the farmer be the producer of the lower-cost products in the United States, and how long will it take him to struggle back, after the war shall end, to something like equality with the producers of all other commodities?

Make no mistake about it, even a production subsidy is very hard to justify, because it tends inevitably to shift production in the particular field in which there is a desire to increase production at the cost of producers in other fields.

A consumer subsidy is proposed, a food subsidy, to be paid for by the American

farmer. Oh, of course, the money is coming out of the taxpayer's pocket, but when cotton goes down to 10 cents a pound, and pork goes down to 5 or 6 cents a pound, and beef cattle go back to the low prices witnessed in the depression days, and all the other farm commodities go down likewise, then let the war end and see what will happen to the American farmer. The consumer subsidies have already put in motion a lowering of prices to the farmer and that is exactly what will continue to happen to him. Hogs in the primary market in my State are now selling for 6 and 7 cents a pound for No. 2's and for not in excess of from 7½ to 8 cents a pound for No. 1's. All grade cattle have fallen far below the cost of production. Why? Because of the existence of the miserable subsidies. It was thought necessary to appease labor. It was thought necessary to appease the C. I. O. Other Senators may do as they wish, Mr. President, but I will not "take it lying down" for the American farmer. It was thought necessary to appease the C. I. O. at the cost of the farmer. Then it is proposed to take the money out of the Treasury and give it to one-hundred-and-thirty-odd million Americans who have so much money now that we are threatened, as some persons think, with a great tide of inflation.

We are approaching inflation now when we undertake to subsidize the food costs of all Americans by paying the subsidy out of the Treasury, and at the same time are directly breaking the back of the American farmer, because that is where the impact comes. Here in this one measure it is proposed to appropriate one and a half billion dollars not only out of an empty Treasury—but a hundred-fold more than an empty Treasury. If we do this we are headed toward inflation. Nowhere else can there really be an irresistible movement toward inflation save in the Congress of the United States. We have the joint responsibility in this body for appropriating the money called for to help bear the cost of living for people in the United States who, beyond all doubt, do not need it. Appropriate it now, and see how rapidly the subsidy totals will mount! How can we prevent the payment of subsidies on rents, on clothing, on drugs? How can such subsidies be stopped? The American people will know precisely what it means. Destroy the faith of the average man on the street in the integrity of the American dollar and see how fast he will run into the black markets, and how many black markets will develop overnight, where he will try to find some goods in which to put the money in which his faith has been shaken.

The American people are too sensible, they have shown that they have too much courage, too much judgment, too much information, to begin the process of inflation. They have shown that despite the fact that almost every whippersnapper of a public official has talked about inflation, preached inflation, warned against inflation. The people have stood up against that tide, and they have sense enough to keep on standing up against it. But when they lose confidence in Congress, when they think we will vote for anything, when they think we are pure appeasers, when they understand that we propose a program of subsidy which no one can stop and no one can even check, they will not have much faith left in their money, and then we will have real inflation.

Mr. President, that is the situation with which we are faced. I do not want to see it materialize. I happen to be a farmer as well as a lawyer. I happen to have invested in farms what little of this world's goods I possess. I know what this program means to the farmer. It is not a matter of theory. I have already seen farm prices go down, although they never have been high during this war except in a few minor particulars and in the case of a few seasonal products. The American farmer now stands up and says, "Do not crucify me on your cross of appeasement; do not make me the goat; do not condemn me to the status of the producer of a low-priced article, of a low-priced commodity and product, at a price below the actual cost of production, even though you give me a little hand-out from the Treasury of the United States."

Mr. President, I express the hope that we will not begin the process of inflation here by finally destroying the faith of the American people in the integrity of the legislative branch of the Government.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to try to emphasize, as I did earlier in the day when the attendance was smaller, that the real purpose of the amendment is not to provide for the food bill of America; it is intended to try and keep as near perfect as possible the stabilization program adopted by the Congress. It seemed to the administration that a continuation and a protection of the stabilization program was not possible without subsidies. The alternative of the proposal, as I see it, is an increase in the cost of farm products.

Mr. President, I am sympathetic toward the farmer, but I am not unmindful of the fact that he is enjoying the greatest prosperity in the history of the country. There are some exceptions. The dairy farmer is one. The farmer's income has increased well-nigh 100 percent in the last 2½ years. Of course, there will be black markets if the lid is removed from prices, and there will be hungry homes, because those who have the money in great plenty will buy what food is available, and there is not enough produce in the land under existing wartime conditions to satisfy everyone's desire.

Of course there is logic in the argument of the distinguished and learned Senator from Georgia. Of course, there are those throughout the land who do not need a food subsidy. Of course, there are working people who have sufficient funds with which to buy the things they need. But the purpose of the amendment and of the proposed legislation is not to pay a food bill, but to keep prices down. Perhaps appeasement to labor is the word; but I want to believe, and I do believe, that I have never cast a vote intended to appease labor. We cannot help, however, after the experiences of the last 10 or more years, but be realistic about the program.

Mr. President, I am excited to the great fears expressed by the able Senator from Georgia, but in a different direction. I do not know that we can hold the line. I do not know that stabilization will work. But as I see it, Mr. President, we are at the precipice, and this is our last chance to hold the line.

I do not think the farmer has been oppressed. In this proposal there is no effort to curtail the prices received by the farmer. The sole aim and purpose is to hold prices on an even keel, to prevent what is a real runaway inflation, to prevent the black market that anyone can see will exist unless we do have price control.

The greatest logic of the Senator's argument is that there are millions in our land who do not need a subsidy. But who is able, in the limited time we have, to differentiate? Who would make the study to find out who is entitled to the subsidy which has been suggested?

Furthermore, let me say that I would much prefer to contribute a few cents a day—I use the language of the Senator from Alabama—to help pay the grocery bills of American millionaires than I would to subject a part of our population to the stigma of pauperism and more particularly at a time when if they were allowed economic freedom they could obtain an increase in wages. Because of the conditions existing during the present war and as a result of Government action they cannot obtain the increase which they would obtain under different circumstances.

I say with all the sincerity I possess that in the interest of our Government and the national economy I am hopeful that the amendment will prevail.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, as modified, to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey (when Mr. EASTLAND's name was called). I am advised that if the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] were present and were permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. REYNOLDS (when Mr. MCCARRAN's name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. He is absent on official business. I rather imagine that if he were present and were permitted to vote, he would vote for the amendment, and therefore would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey (when Mr. MCCLELLAN's name was called). I am advised that if the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] were present and were permitted to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with

my colleague the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I am informed that if my colleague were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Therefore, I withhold my vote, because I have not been informed how he would vote.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. TOBEY's name was called). I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been obliged to leave the city because of the serious illness of a member of his family.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, during the calling of the roll announcement was made that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "nay" if they were present. In justice to them, I think the RECORD should show that they are both confined to their beds because of illness. The Senator from Mississippi has been in the Senate during the day but was obliged to go to his home because he was ill with influenza. Both Senators were anxious to be present but were under doctor's orders to leave the Chamber.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] is detained because of a slight cold.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

I am advised that if present, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—26

Barkley	Downey	Hayden
Bone	Ellender	Jackson
Chandler	Green	Johnson, Colo.
Danaher	Guffey	Kilgore
Langer	Mead	Tunnell
Lucas	Murray	Wagner
McFarland	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Maloney	Radcliffe	Walsh, N. J.
Maybank	Truman	

NAYS—49

Aiken	Clark, Mo.	Revercomb
Austin	Connally	Russell
Bailey	Davis	Shipstead
Ball	Ferguson	Smith
Bankhead	George	Stewart
Bilbo	Gurney	Taft
Brewster	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Hill	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Holman	Vandenberg
Burton	La Follette	Wheeler
Bushfield	McKellar	Wherry
Butler	Millikin	White
Byrd	Moore	Wiley
Capper	Nye	Willis
Caraway	O'Daniel	Wilson
Chavez	Overton	
Clark, Idaho	Reed	

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Bridges	McCarran	Scrugham
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Gerry	McNary	Tobey
Gillette	Murdock	Tydings
Glass	O'Mahoney	Wallgren
Hatch	Reynolds	

So Mr. MALONEY's amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], as modified, was rejected.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, many Senators are suggesting that we go ahead and vote on the Taft amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to speak for at least half an hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps it had better go over until tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. I think it ought to go over until tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Col. Omar T. Pfeiffer to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 5th day of October 1942, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. There being no Executive Calendar, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 10, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 9 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

PROMOTION, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Omar T. Pfeiffer to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of October 1942.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the Father of us all, we pray for proud and grateful hearts that the gifts we covet may be a clear conscience and duty well done. We are confronted with personal ambitions and often neglecting the bigger fact that to be Christlike consists largely of self-abnegation. Let Thy spirit lead us to test our questions under the shadow of the cross to the glory of self-sacrifice.

Almighty God, love is the sublimest gift in the world; it redeems weakness, clothes its barrenness, enriches its poverty, and leaves in its path peace and contentment. We pray that the revenues of this greatest virtue may bring forth inspiration and devotion to the things that endure. O bless every uncalendared man, the memory of any who ever achieved a noble purpose, who dared to suffer for the right and laid down his life for a clean, fresh world. Dear Lord, the day is Thine; we pray that our entire citizenry may rise a royal conception, holding high the standards which exalt national character. In the name of our Saviour who, for the joy that was set before Him, endured the cross. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13, and 14 to the bill (S. 1285) entitled "An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House numbered 9, 11, and 12 to the above-entitled bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to amendment numbered 3 of the House to the above-entitled bill, with an amendment, and that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the title of said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1612. An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayment to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of State.
3. Department of War.
4. Federal Trade Commission.
5. United States courts.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to have Senate bill 1285 as it originally passed the Senate, later passed by the House with amendments and further amended in the Senate, printed for the benefit of the Members? I think we ought to have that bill printed in full, with all amendments.

The SPEAKER. It has been printed. The Chair has seen copies of it. The engrossed copy is on the desk.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, Mr. Speaker, but I want copies printed so that every Member of the House may have copies in order that we may know just what we have before us at all times and the changes made in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. That may be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1285 as passed originally by the Senate, amended by the House and reamended by the Senate, be printed for the benefit of the Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suppose that all bills passed by the Senate with Senate amendments to House bills are printed under the rules with the amendments. Is that not so? And I ask that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. That is true in certain instances. The major bills are treated in that way. Many minor ones are not.

Mr. TABER. I think this should be.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say, to settle this, that the Chair will order that done. The Chair thinks he has authority to do so and the Chair will order the bill printed with House and Senate amendments.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw the request.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 438), as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Roads: CLAIR ENGLE, California.

War Claims: SAMUEL DICKSTEIN, New York; ROBERT RAMSPECK, Georgia; JOHN R. MURDOCK, Arizona; JAMES F. O'CONNOR, Montana; CLAIR ENGLE, California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HELEN YOUNG MITCHELL

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 429), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Mrs. Helen Young Mitchell, widow of Ignatius Mitchell, late an employee of the House, a sum equal to 6 months' salary compensation at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250, to defray funeral expenses of the said Ignatius Mitchell.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two matters, in one to include an article entitled "Ballots or Bullets," which appeared in the Boston Post under date of February 7, 1944, and in the other to include a resolution favoring the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein an editorial which appears in the New York Times of today relative to the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article which appeared on the editorial page of the New York Times by Ann O'Hare McCormick.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

THE JUNIOR MEMBERS

Mr. CARRIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARRIER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARRIER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate for me to welcome the two new gentlemen from Pennsylvania. On December 10 I took the oath of office as a Member of this distinguished body, and from that date until yesterday I was the baby of the House, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of this body, the officials, and employees have been wonderful to me. They have been kind, courteous, and helpful; yes, they have treated me as though I were a newborn babe. On account of this splendid cooperation and treatment that I have received from both sides of this House, it had been my hope that I could continue for some time to be the baby Congressman, but due to the fact that the great historic State of Pennsylvania has sent twins to this body, I relinquish to them my babyship and extend to them greetings, and assure them that their travels here while baby Congressmen will be easy and pleasant. I am now a veteran, but will take my place with you realizing that I am the baby veteran.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a distinguished Polish-American patriot, Rev. John L. Mieczkowski.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD relative to the work being done by one of the communities in my district on the juvenile delinquency problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address on the subject of subsidies delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] over the Columbia Broadcasting System on February 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics, and in one to include an address delivered by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SOLDIER VOTE BILL

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, insist on House amendments Nos. 9, 11, and 12, disagree to the Senate amend-

ment to House amendment No. 3, and request a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the Members of the House that I have discussed this matter with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], the chairman of the committee, and also the matter of selecting conferees, and this is satisfactory as far as we are concerned. We have no objection to the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. WORLEY, RANKIN, BONNER, LECOMPTE, and ELLSWORTH.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 23]

Allen, Ill.	Fulmer	May
Arends	Gale	Morrison, La.
Baldwin, Md.	Gallagher	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gamble	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Gearhart	Myers
Beall	Gifford	Norrell
Bell	Gorski	O'Leary
Bennett, Mich.	Grant, Ind.	Price
Bland	Hancock	Rogers, Calif.
Buckley	Hare	Scanlon
Burchill, N. Y.	Hart	Schiffler
Byrne	Hébert	Schuetz
Chapman	Hess	Schwabe
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Scott
Compton	Holmes, Mass.	Shafer
Cooley	Hope	Simpson, Pa.
Courtney	Jackson	Slaughter
Cullen	Jennings	Smith, Va.
Curley	Johnson,	Somers, N. Y.
Davis	J. Leroy	Starnes, Ala.
Dawson	Jonkman	Stearns, N. H.
Dirksen	Judd	Stewart
Domengeaux	Keefe	Stockman
Douglas	Kleberg	Troutman
Ellis	Klein	Weaver
Fay	Lanham	West
Feighan	Lea	Wigglesworth
Fernandez	Luce	Winter
Ford	Lynch	
Fuller	Magnuson	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 337 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4133, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4133, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. The Clerk may read, Mr. Chairman.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries: Secretary of the Treasury, Under Secretary of the Treasury, Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, two Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including the temporary employment of experts, $422,692: *Provided*, That no part of the money appropriated by this title shall be used to pay the salaries of more than 18 messengers assigned to duty in the office of the Secretary.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 6, after the comma, strike out "$422,692" and insert "$400,000"; on page 2, line 8, after the word "than", strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirteen."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in order to save $22,000 on the rolls of the Secretary of the Treasury. The committee's investigator found that there were 27 messengers on the regular roll of the Treasury Department. The committee cut a little bit. I want to go the rest of the way and get them down somewhere near earth.

There are less than 13 people in this Secretary's office altogether who are entitled to have this type of service. I have limited the number of messengers that they might have to 13 instead of 18.

There have always been vacancies on this office roll and there are vacancies now; vacancies that exist because of surplus appropriation. I do not see any reason why we should continue to carry them. For that reason I have asked to bring this appropriation down to where it belongs and to get rid of this one outstanding sore in the Secretary's office.

Just think of it. What do they want with 27 messengers there? I suppose that makes these fellows who do not have any reason at all for feeling big, swell up and puff up. That is about all there is to that set-up. Instead of good business management we have them sitting around bottoming chairs. There is absolutely no excuse for this sort of business and I hope the House will cut this out and cut it down somewhere near earth.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] stated that there are 13 persons who are serviced by these messengers. That does not conform to the official information given to me by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. D. W. Bell, whom we all know is a man of the highest probity. He tells me there are 50.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, it does conform to the information on page 4 of the Budget set-up.

Mr. LUDLOW. I took the matter up with Mr. Bell this morning and he stated that there are 50 scattered all around the building who are serviced by these messengers.

We cut the number of messengers from 27 to 18. On the basis of the personnel to be serviced, that would be 1 messenger for about every 3 persons. If all 3 would buzz for a messenger at about the same time there would not be sufficient personnel in the allocation that we have made.

The total salary obligation of the 20 that are carried on the Secretary's roll is $13,740. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] reduces the appropriation by $22,000, or $8,952 more than the total salary obligation, which is certainly very extraordinary legislative procedure.

I may say these messengers are on an 8-hour basis now. Time was when they came before the Chief arrived at his office and remained until after the Chief left his office. But now they serve only 8 hours a day and therefore that makes quite a difference.

Our cut was from 27 to 18. As I say, those 18 have to service 50 persons in a very busy focal point in the Treasury Department. In comparison with other messenger service that is far from being an excessive allocation of personnel.

The gentleman from New York stated that the experts we sent to investigate conditions in that office had called attention to what appeared to be an excess of messenger personnel. We took that into consideration when we made the cut from 27 to 18, but I would call attention to the fact that even the experts were uncertain as to whether any cuts should be made. In support of my statement I read from their findings. They say:

As a general proposition the employees of this office—

That is the Secretary's office—

appear to be fully occupied with the possible exception of the messenger force. There are 27 messengers attached to this office, many of whom occupy desks in corridors. They do not seem to be particularly busy. It would appear that the messenger service could be reorganized to function with at least fewer employees. However, the low salaries paid to these employees and the high salaries received by the officials whom they serve and to whom they are constantly available may justify the large numbers carried on the rolls.

Mr. Chairman, the office of the Secretary of the Treasury is one of the most important in the United States. We all know how closely and intimately it is integrated into the war effort, and we should not do anything here for the sake of chipping off a few dollars that would cripple the Secretary of the Treasury. If it will help win this war for him to have one or two paltry extra messengers I am willing to give him that additional personnel.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and ask unanimous consent to speak in part out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] should be supported in this effort not so much because of what is entailed as far as the $22,000 is concerned, but because it represents manpower that is being wasted at this time, manpower that today is far more important in other occupations than that of messenger. If we can shave a little here let us do so and help out this effort. Let these people occupy positions where they are of greater use in the war effort rather than sit around corridors with nothing to do a great deal of the time.

When I consider the actions of certain divisions of this Government it is rather difficult to fathom their line of reasoning. I note in the Times-Herald of today an article stating in headlines:

W. P. B. concerned by reports of idleness in steel industry.

I quote further:

Joseph Keenan, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, disclosed yesterday that W. P. B. is seriously concerned with reports of growing unemployment in the steel industry caused by the shut-down of 68 open-hearth furnaces.

I bring this up because many of us have been endeavoring to have W. P. B. allocate a larger portion of steel for the manufacture of farm implements. This would furnish employment for idle workers but W. P. B. can do little because the Army and Navy officials have vetoed plans to release more steel for the production of civilian goods. They do that, yet on the other hand they refuse to give the farmers of America the steel necessary to make the implements to produce the food that every man and woman here knows we are going to need if we are to win the peace that will follow the war. Think it over. Does it not seem to be in line with the reasoning of many of our bureau heads? In this case is it not an absolute waste of manpower to shut down 68 open-hearth furnaces when the farmers not only in my area but others, too, are crying for three times the amount of farm implements that are allocated to them this year? And, further, the article states, continuing to quote Mr. Keenan:

The uncertainty of the coming large-scale military operations have made it imperative to postpone any substantial revival of peacetime production.

How in the name of everything that is reasonable, Mr. Chairman, could war production be imperiled simply by letting these particular furnaces turn out steel, for the time being, at least, so badly needed for farm machinery? As I stated in the beginning, I cannot fathom the line of reasoning of many of our bureau heads, and in this particular instance the line of reasoning of the Army and Navy in refusing to permit W. P. B. to give to the farmers of the Nation the machinery they need to produce this food.

The article quoted by me follows:

W. P. B. CONCERNED BY REPORTS OF IDLENESS IN STEEL INDUSTRY

(By Lloyd Norman)

Joseph Keenan, Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, disclosed yesterday that W. P. B. is seriously concerned with reports of growing unemployment in the steel industry caused by the shut-down of 68 open hearth furnaces.

Keenan said W. P. B. can do little to absorb idle workers because the Army and Navy have vetoed plans to release the production of more civilian goods which would require steel. He said the uncertainty of the coming large-scale military operations have made it imperative to postpone any substantial revival of peacetime production.

"The Army and Navy fear a let-down and a loss of workers from war industries if we permit factories to resume civilian production," Keenan said. "W. P. B.'s Office of Civilian Requirements has plans for the manufacture of numerous essential civilian products but the program will have to await the outcome of the military operations."

Admitting that unemployment in steel mill areas would have an unfavorable influence on labor's morale unless new jobs are found, Keenan, who is Vice Chairman of the W. P. B. Labor Production Division, said that he has not yet determined how widespread the mill lay-offs have been. He said a survey is being made and that action will be taken to reemploy the idle workers.

"I don't know how accurate are the reports that thousands of steel workers have been laid off," he said. "I do know that large numbers of men have been released in the building industry because plant construction is tapering off."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the attention of the Committee to this amendment because I doubt if the gentleman from New York wants to have occur that which his amendment will bring about. Although the committee made a cut of about 25 percent in this messenger service, yet the gentleman from New York would reduce the amount left by $22,000. He states it would mean 13 fewer messengers, but the fact remains that if the amount is reduced by $22,000 there would be no money whatsoever to pay for any messengers, either on the force they maintain there or the 7 messengers——

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, had he paid attention to what I said, he would have known that was not the fact.

Mr. O'NEAL. What will it do?

Mr. TABER. I said there were other items that could be cut out as well. I called attention to the fact there were three or four vacancies there right now. As a matter of fact, there are seven or eight where the cut could be made.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman's amendment withdraws the amount of money for messengers and leaves no money for messenger service.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; that is not the case. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman ought not to mislead the House. I simply reduce the amount of this total appropriation $22,000, not entirely on messengers.

Mr. O'NEAL. And further, Mr. Chairman, here is a situation that we have if the gentleman's amendment is susceptible of that interpretation: We have set up in a budget item a certain amount for messengers. We have reduced the amount for messengers. If there is a further reduction, it means still fewer employees.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is one of the great departments of Government—the Treasury Department—with the office of the Secretary one of the most important offices connected with war work and civilian work. The Secretary is employing down there a few low-priced laborers called messengers. They are very essential. We have them here in the House Chamber, called pages; we have here far more than the Secretary is asking for, sitting around the back of this Chamber. We have messengers in almost every part of the Capitol. Are we in our desire for economy going to say, "Mr. Secretary, you cannot have those 18 messengers to run errands for you; you have got to do it yourself"? We are not going to let the Secretary of the Treasury get away with four or five extra page boys, or whatever they are. Why, Mr. Chairman, let us dignify these things and our attitude toward appropriations. Let us give these men who have jobs to do the help they need properly to carry out the important functions entrusted to them. If we are to make cuts, let us take something worth while; let us not say, "Mr. Secretary, if you need messenger service, you may have only a portion of what you need."

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. I believe the committee realizes that this messenger service must be furnished. If the gentleman from Kentucky is correct, as I believe he is, the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would be to take from the Secretary most of the messengers he now has.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman had listened to my statement he would realize that the Secretary would still have an adequate messenger force.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, let me say in conclusion that I hope this amendment will be voted down. This service is certainly necessary, just as these boys back here are necessary. Let us not tell the Secretary and his staff that they have to take his papers in hand and run down to the office below and deliver them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 56, noes 53.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 97, noes 80.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: On page 2 after line 9, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No part of any money appropriated by this act shall be used directly or indirectly during the fiscal year 1945 for the purchase or procurement of silver under the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act of June 19, 1934, and the act of July 6, 1939, or for the purpose of carrying out any of the provisions of said Silver Purchase Acts."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical with the amendment I offered to the Treasury Department appropriation bill of last year, which amendment carried by a voice and teller vote in this Chamber, only to be stricken out by the conferees.

My objective finally is to strike from the statute books the so-called Silver Purchase Acts which in a moment of aberration we on this side of the Chamber unfortunately passed. The time has come to make retribution, to admit our mistake, and wipe the statute books clean of the so-called Silver Purchase Acts. They are naught but a snare and delusion. In effect they benefit only silver producers and miners.

I know that the passage of my amendment will not accomplish the striking out, lock, stock, and barrel, of the Silver Purchase Acts, but if we pass this amendment, it will be an indication to the gentlemen from the silver States in the other Chamber, and this Chamber also, that we mean business here, that we are well on our way to have appropriate committees in this House and in the other Chamber take action which will finally be approved by both Chambers so as to set right the egregious wrong that has been done the Nation by these Silver Purchase Acts.

These acts are subsidies that help only 60,000 miners and employees of mine owners. They are 1½ percent of the silver States' population. They represent only one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the entire population of the Nation. All 130,000,000 of us pay the piper. We dance to the tune called by a few mine owners. We pay through the nose. We pay 71.11 cents per ounce of silver worth 45 cents and less.

The Secretary of the Treasury has condemned these Silver Purchase Acts thus:

So far as I am concerned, I will be glad to see Congress strike all silver legislation from the books.

The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee handling the pending bill, has said:

If our rubber and aluminum are held in a hole in the ground or piled up in stocks in some great warehouse, it would not do the country any good, and I do not see any difference with respect to silver.

The Economists National Committee on the 20th of April 1942, representing the finest monetary minds of the country, memorialized the Congress to take these obnoxious statutes from the books.

The Saturday Evening Post has editorially said:

There is no use for the high priests of the silver set to continue this disastrous policy. It is time for less goggle-eyed statesmen to take over.

The New York Times has said:

The fight should be renewed promptly in the coming session of Congress, and this time the objective should be to sweep clean away the whole structure of silver subsidies.

In the January 1943 issue of the American Mercury, Mr. Elliott V. Bell, who is superintendent of banking in my own State, the State of New York, provides an article entitled "The Scandalous Silver Bloc."

On the 30th of March 1942, Marriner Eccles, Governor of the Federal Reserve Board said:

In view of the war situation it is all the more urgent that the inflationary effects of the silver program be removed and that so far as possible the materials, machinery, and labor now devoted to silver production be utilized in the war effort.

My amendment will be a sort of needling or stimulating of that Chamber, with the object of galvanizing the whole Congress into appropriate action. It will not repeal the bad statutes. It will go a great way, indirectly, to put a broomstick between the Treasury's legs to prevent carrying out the mandate under the statutes to purchase silver.

The amendment adopted last year, the so-called Celler amendment, did a great deal of good. It forced the passage of the so-called Green bill, which released a quantity, even if it was a small quantity, of the vast stock pile of silver that we have in this country, a stock pile that goes to the staggering figure of 3,000,000,000 ounces. That is indeed a vast sum. I hope the adoption of this amendment again will do further good in that regard.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Can the gentleman tell the House how much silver has been sold for war purposes since the Green bill passed?

Mr. CELLER. I shall be glad to put in the RECORD the exact figures, and I will give them to the gentleman now. This is an appropriate place.

Since the passage of the Green bill in July of last year, silver has been sold to three different classifications of users.

First, there are those who use silver for photographic supplies, dental supplies, and pharmaceuticals, and they pay 45 cents per ounce. They are limited to silver imported from Mexico and other countries. There were used during the last 6 months, since the Green bill, about 20,000,000 ounces for this purpose.

In the second category are those who manufacture engine bearings, military insignia, solder, brazing alloys, and essential war products. They must use Treasury free silver and pay 71.11 cents per ounce. Note those in the first category pay but 45 cents per ounce. Do not ask me why. I do not know. There were consumed from 20,000,000 to 22,000,000 ounces of that kind of silver.

There is a third classification, namely, silversmiths, watchcase makers, and jewelry manufacturers. During the past 6 months they used about 20,000,000 ounces. They must pay 71.11 cents, and are generally limited to newly-mined domestic silver. These users get about 50 percent of their 1941 or 1942 supplies as a quota.

Thus these three classes of users consumed from 60,000,000 to 62,000,000 ounces during the past 6 months.

We have this very anomalous situation in that regard. One group of manufacturers pays 45 cents for silver and another group of manufacturers pays 71.11 cents an ounce for silver. This has created confusion worse confounded in the War Production Board and other Government agencies, as to whether this man shall pay 45 cents and that man shall pay 71.11 cents. Further, imagine what is going to happen after this war is all over and you have inventories to consider. What value are you going to put on the inventories that may be held by the different users in these various and different categories? I cite this just to give you a slight inkling of the vast, almost insurmountable difficulties created by these Silver Purchase Acts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What justification do they give for the discrepancy between those two figures?

Mr. CELLER. Goodness knows; I do not believe they could justify those discrepancies and those different prices to different individuals. The only way we can scotch that type of evil is to dump overboard the Silver Purchase Acts.

Last year I prepared and I am going to read again these charts relating to the inflationary character of the Silver Purchase Acts. You see on this first chart that 45 cents equals 71 cents and 71 cents equals $1.29. Under the inflationary silver law, the United States silver miner sells to the Treasury up to 45 cents worth of silver for 71 cents an ounce, a profit at least of 57 cents. Then as the second stage, the Treasury takes the same silver and issues it to the public at $1.29 an ounce, a second profit of 82 cents. And it is all legal under the Silver Purchase Acts. Who pays these high profits? You and I.

They speak about the security of silver, which backs our metal currency. The silver dollar contains only 35 cents worth of silver, even at the world market. This chart will illustrate the amount of silver in the silver dollar. The black tells you the amount of other metals in the silver dollar. You see, there is only 35 cents worth of silver in a silver dollar. So, when they speak of security of silver the argument vanishes and goes out the

window. It is like the tale of a misguided individual, all sound and fury, signifying nothing.

Foreigners have gained most by the purchase of silver. Since the start of the silver program the Treasury has bought, through March 1943, from Americans, newly mined silver represented by that black square, in the amount of 501,000,000 ounces. What has the Treasury bought from the foreigners? That huge black square representing 2,148,000,000 ounces. Is that helping American industry? That is helping foreign industry and foreign mine owners.

This has been going on since 1933, thanks to our silver-purchase legislation, which created an artificial price for the foreign silver and a still more artificial price for domestic, newly mined silver.

This black bar represents the price foreign sellers have been getting, thanks to the Silver Purchase Acts, namely, an average of 45 cents an ounce. This larger bar, the total bar, represents the artificial price per ounce which United States silver producers have been getting as a result of the silver program, to wit, 71 cents an ounce.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman tell us, if he can, how much has been purchased since the 1st of July; that is, practically since the time when we had this matter up last spring?

Mr. CELLER. The attached letter from the Under Secretary of the Treasury may partially answer you:

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 8, 1944.

HON. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CELLER: This is in reply to your letter of January 26, 1944, concerning the uses of silver in industry since the enactment of the Green bill, the increased amounts of other strategic metals which have been made available to industry as a result of the sale of Treasury silver under Public Law 137 (78th Cong.), and the present stocks of Treasury silver.

It is tentatively estimated by the War Production Board that 122,000,000 ounces of silver were consumed in the arts and industry during 1943, representing an increase of about 6 percent over estimated consumption in 1942. Of this amount, approximately 60 percent went into war production classified as essential by the War Production Board.

From the enactment of Public Law 137, approved July 12, 1943, to the end of the calendar year, the War Production Board recommended the sale for essential war uses of approximately 31,000,000 ounces of Treasury silver, of which 21,000,000 ounces had been delivered by the end of December. Use of Treasury silver sold under the act was restricted by the War Production Board by an amendment to Conservation Order M-199, July 29, 1943, to the manufacture of engine bearings, official military insignia, brazing alloys, and solders. Of the 21,000,000 ounces of silver delivered to industry from Treasury stocks, approximately 46 percent was used for engine bearings, 36 percent for alloys and solders, and 18 percent for military insignia.

A more detailed statement of the industrial uses of Treasury silver sold under the act, together with information on the conservation of other strategic metals effected through the sale of Treasury silver, may be obtained from the War Production Board.

The stocks of Treasury silver, exclusive of silver coin in circulation, as of December 31, 1943, were (preliminary figures):

	Millions of fine ounces
Bullion	2,364.3
Silver dollars	312.3
Subsidiary coin	10.1
Total	2,686.7

Of this amount, 1,487,900,000 ounces were held at monetary value of $1.29 per ounce as reserve for silver certificates and Treasury notes of 1890 and 1,198,800,000 ounces were held as "free" silver in the general fund. The Defense Plant Corporation, etc., held 829,200,000 ounces of the silver in the general fund.

The principal stocks of Treasury silver in addition to silver held by the Defense Plant Corporation, etc., as of December 31, 1943, were:

	Millions of fine ounces
New York (West Point and assay office):	
Bullion	725.7
Silver dollars	42.2
San Francisco:	
Bullion	537.0
Silver dollars	42.2
Philadelphia:	
Bullion	200.0
Silver dollars	139.4
Denver:	
Bullion	64.1
Silver dollars	25.4
Washington (held by Treasurer): Silver dollars	60.6

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Under Secretary of the Treasury.

No silver has been purchased of late from Mexico. Mexico has put an embargo on silver because she is minting a great deal of silver. However, I am informed that by about April 1 more silver will come in from Mexico. We mined in this country, in 1943, 5,400,000 ounces of silver, which the Treasury bought at 71.11 cents.

The gentleman may be interested in the fact that we have spent for the purchase of silver from American mine owners since the advent of the Silver Purchase Acts approximately $580,000,000.

Mr. TABER. What I am getting at is whether or not the Treasury is currently continuing the policy of buying silver.

Mr. CELLER. It is. The Treasury has been buying silver—newly mined silver. It will buy from Mexico when its embargo on exports is removed. This may occur in 1 month.

Mr. TABER. Right along now?

Mr. CELLER. Right along; the Treasury has been buying new domestic silver.

We were trying by the Green bill to make some sort of dent in this huge stock pile of 3,000,000,000 ounces we have stored away in the vaults, rotting, rusting in the vaults, but under the Green bill we have gotten rid of only about 60,000,000 ounces for war and industrial uses. Sixty million ounces does not make any sort of dent in 3,000,000,000 ounces of silver, half of which is free silver, half monetary, to back currency. Then there have been lend-lease uses, to which I shall advert subsequently.

Science has told us in recent years of the great uses to which silver may be put. It has wondrous chemical and metallurgical uses. The war has taught us the many industrial uses to which silver can be put. Yet, silver is a sacred cow under the Silver Purchase Acts, just as sacred as in the day of William Jenings Bryan. It is an obelisk as it were that we built to false gods. It is sacrosanct.

It is time that we removed the halo from silver instead of letting it rust and tarnish in vaults at West Point, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Denver, and Washington. Why leave silver in those dark caverns? Take it out and put it to better use. In competition with other metals, it will prove its worth, and, I am sure, eventually the silver States of Idaho, Montana, Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and Nevada will benefit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, we are buying all this silver from these foreign countries, including the British Empire, and I also understand that we have given several hundred million dollars' worth of silver to the British Empire, at the same time that we are buying silver from them at this fancy price.

Mr. CELLER. We have not been buying particularly from Britain, but we have been lend-leasing silver to foreign countries, and I will give you those figures. Between July 1, 1943, and January 24, 1944, we lend-leased to Australia for coinage, roughly 5,045,000 ounces; to India, for coinage, 20,000,000 ounces; to the Netherlands proper, 17,000,000 ounces; to Surinam and Curaçao, 582,000 ounces; and to Saudi-Arabia, 5,160,000 ounces; and to United Kingdom for coinage for the Fiji Islands, 196,000 ounces; and to the United Kingdom proper for industry and coinage, 11,999,000 ounces. Thus there was an over-all lend-lease silver program amounting to 60,724,000 ounces. Adding those lend-lease ounces to the 60,000,000 used in industry and the arts, and we have only 120,000,000 ounces—again, no appreciable dent in the huge stock pile of over 3,000,000,000 ounces.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, what was the original purpose of this Silver Purchase Act, and what is the justification in the minds of those advocating it today, to continue it, and what is the status of it in the committee?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman has asked three questions.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. I say that there never was any justification for it. I was fooled like other Members were fooled, and I voted for it. Frankly, there was a po-

litical aspect to the situation originally, and those political causes no longer exist. As to the status in the committee, I have offered a bill which the Ways and Means Committee has, and I have been trying to get appropriate hearings on the bill. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] was appointed chairman of the subcommittee to consider silver legislation. But that subcommittee has not considered my bill. I hope I may induce it to hold hearings. As a result of hearings before the Dingell subcommittee last year, generated by my amendment of last year, we got at least a modicum of relief through the Green bill, but we must go further than that. We must get rid of these statutes. They are obnoxious, and that is what I am fighting for, and I ask in the committee the assistance of members to that end.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman spoke of $580,000,000 having been spent on this silver purchase program. Would the gentleman indicate at what time and in what bills that money has been appropriated out of the Federal Treasury, by this Congress?

Mr. CELLER. It has not been appropriated. The Treasury simply takes the silver and issues silver certificates for it, and that gives an inflation situation which is most obnoxious.

Mr. MURDOCK. The program has furnished us sound, new money and other great benefits.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that many of the governments with whom we are now dealing refuse to accept paper money, and insist on hard money, such as India and China, and is it not true that India and China use silver almost exclusively?

Mr. CELLER. We are not India or China. We do not need to have silver to back our currency. Those countries may back their currencies as the gentleman indicates. That is no reason for us to do so.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I ask the gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. CELLER. I am answering the question to the best of my ability. I will answer it with an explanation. We also have at Fort Knox, Ky., $24,000,000,000 worth—or some amount near that—of gold. Does the gentleman want to have, in addition to that, all of that stock pile of silver to back up our currency? We do not need the silver in addition. We do not need additional metal to back up our currency. I ask the gentleman to examine the bill in his pocket and see whether it is a silver bill or not. Rarely if ever do we note what metal is behind our paper money. We accept it as legal tender because it has the words "United States" thereon—United States, with its vast resources and wealth.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman please answer the question?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] recently stated:

> When we run into the silver question we find a different situation, for you are under a mandate to purchase until silver reaches one-fourth of the total monetary stock of the country, or reaches $1.29 per ounce. Since there is no prospect that either objective will ever be reached, you are under a continuous mandate to buy silver.

We shall never reach that proportion of $1 of silver to $4 of gold. That standard of purchase of silver is a fake—as fake as a theatrical storm. It means continuous bonus prices to silver mine owners regardless of consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to see if we cannot get some agreement on time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman would be entitled to recognition in opposition if he desires.

Mr. LUDLOW. I want to be recognized, not in opposition exactly, but I move to strike out the last word. Insofar as I can express what I believe to be the sentiments of our committee on this side of the aisle, it is that this is a matter for the Committee of the Whole to decide, and I would like to call attention to the situation we will be in if this amendment be adopted, and then leave it entirely to the Committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] said we ought to get rid of these objectionable statutes. He is not going to get rid of anything by this amendment. The Silver Purchase Act places the Secretary of the Treasury under a mandate for the continuous purchase of silver until the price of silver reaches $1.29 an ounce, or until the stock of silver becomes equivalent to one-quarter of the total of monetary stocks. The adoption of this amendment will not do that. It will put the Secretary of the Treasury in the ridiculous position of having a mandate over him from Congress, without any personnel to carry out the duty which the Congress has imposed upon him. It seems to me that that is a ridiculous way in which to legislate. The way to get at this proposal is as the gentleman has indicated, and that is through the legislative committee to bring in a bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act. Do we want to continue to say to the Secretary of the Treasury, "You have got to do this, we have mandated you to do it, but you shall not have one single person to carry out the mandate." I have a good deal of sympathy personally with the purpose of the amendment, but I think this way of legislating is putting the House into disrepute, and bringing the House into disfavor with the country.

At this point I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph be closed in 30 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. That is what occurs every time this matter comes up. We spend 3 or 4 days of general debate, and when this amendment comes up they want to close debate. Let us carry on as we have carried on for the last 3 days and have a little discussion of this issue. I want 15 minutes on this issue just the same as the gentleman allowed the man who proposed the amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I interpret the statement that the gentleman just made to the House, he is not in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and he feels if we are going to change the Silver Purchase Act we should do it by direct legislation and not by writing some provision in the appropriation bills.

Mr. LUDLOW. I am not in favor of it for the reason that the gentleman just stated. I think it is not the right way to approach the subject.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And the gentleman is not in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LUDLOW. I stated my own views. I am not pretending to speak for anybody else.

Mr. Chairman, I renew my unanimous consent request to limit the debate——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold that request until the general debate has approached some stage where we can have some of the facts brought out? Why put a limitation on the debate at this point? I would like to have 15 minutes to speak on this subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want 5 minutes.

Mr. LUDLOW. I propose to protect the right of the gentleman from Idaho to speak for 15 minutes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate close on this amendment in 1 hour and that the gentleman from Idaho have 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not see why one Member should have one-quarter of the time.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very significant that this amendment, offered by a consistent supporter of the New Deal, in reality seeks to repudiate legislation which has been on the statute books for the past decade. I have no desire at this time to attempt to discuss either the merits or demerits of the silver-purchasing program, but I want to call your attention to the fact that the gentleman from New York exposed his hand when he suggested, and I quote approximately what he said, "Strike from the statutes the Silver Purchase Act and wipe the slate clean."

That is an admission that he is endeavoring to accomplish here by indirection some objective which rightfully should come within the jurisdiction of a legislative committee. I do not believe it is possible during the course of half an hour's debate to discuss this entire silver-purchasing program. It has been a national policy for the past 10 years. The gentleman from New York was the author of an amendment to this same appropriation bill a year ago. You will recall that in the conference a compromise was reached whereby the provisions of the bill introduced by Senator GREEN were incorporated in the conference report which was subsequently

approved by this body. At that time every Member of the House was in favor of the objectives which the gentleman from New York had in mind; namely, to make available for the arts and commercial uses and for all war purposes some of the vast hoard of silver which is controlled by the Federal Government. If you examine the records you will ascertain all of the objectives which he had in mind at that time have been achieved, and consequently there is no justification for proposing this amendment to this appropriation bill on this occasion.

The gentleman from New York also stated that the Government is still buying silver, presumably both domestic and foreign. I should like to refer you to a table, appearing on page 8 of the hearings, which was submitted by Mr. Bell, of the Treasury Department. I direct your attention to the fact that during the year 1942 and the first 11 months of 1943—a period of 23 months since Pearl Harbor—our Government has purchased only approximately 50,000,000 ounces of domestic silver and only 14,000,000 ounces of foreign silver. Throughout the entire year of 1943, not a single ounce of foreign silver has been purchased under the Silver Purchase Act. So I am sure that the gentleman from New York will stand corrected when he makes the statement and contention that the Federal Government is still buying foreign silver. The gentleman from New York certainly knows that not only have we lend-leased approximately 50,000,000 ounces of silver to our allies for war uses, but that likewise all of the commercial users of silver in the United States today are getting all of the silver they want for whatever purpose. My recollection is that approximately 900,000,000 ounces of Government silver have been released, not to be expendable, but to be returned, which are being used to supplement and take the place of copper in our war program.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. CELLER. Is not the type of silver which the gentleman has just mentioned what is known as nonconsumptive use of silver? The silver must be returned to the Treasury in the same shape, form, and weight as it was loaned to companies, usually in the form of bus bars?

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. For the conductivity of electricity?

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. That was the purpose of the Green bill, but that is still owned by the Treasury.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is more concerned about wiping this silver legislation off the statute books than he is in getting immediate relief by the use of this silver for our war program.

Mr. CELLER. I am interested in doing away with giving huge subsidies and bonuses to men who are not entitled to them, namely, by paying them 71 cents an ounce for silver, when it is not worth that much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. In answer to the gentleman from New York, I also want to reiterate that, during the final quarter of 1943, the Government purchased less than one-half million ounces of domestically mined silver. In other words, commercial users of silver in this country are taking all of the domestically mined silver, so that in fact the Silver Purchase Acts are inoperative at the present time. So why should the gentleman from New York project into this appropriation bill something which, in reality, should come from the legislative committee which handled this legislation when it was first approved by this body.

Mr. CELLER. That is what I have been trying to do for 4 years and I cannot get action from any committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Why does the gentleman not speak to his majority leaders?

Mr. CELLER. I have spoken to everybody in authority and I cannot get action. This is the only chance I have. Help me to get a constructive bill out of the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures and I will not offer these amendments any more. But I cannot get a solitary, single action on it.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. But the gentleman from New York in fact concedes that he is attempting to do by indirection what he has failed to do through a legislative committee.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then the gentleman from New York is out of order, and I suggest that he proceed in the regular manner.

Mr. CELLER. My procedure is perfectly in order.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If the bill introduced by the gentleman from New York had very much merit, he would not have so much trouble in getting it out of the legislative committee.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I agree with you.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the opposition to the silver program is solely by silversmiths and manufacturers of jewelry and so forth?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I cannot conceive of that being true, because they are getting all the silver they want today and are getting higher prices for their products.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, but they are the ones who want to repeal by indirection the silver purchasing program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not know about that. May I express just one more point in conclusion on this proposed amendment to which I am opposed? The gentleman from New York pointed out that he is opposed to subsidies. We know in the expenditure of approximately $200,000,000,000 in the prosecution of this war, these appropriations have all had virtually the unanimous support of the Congress and that subsidies amounting to billions of dollars have been paid to war contractors and to almost every industry in our land, because it is contended that we must use to the fullest extent not only our manpower, but our material resources in winning an early and decisive military victory over the Axis Powers. Today there is a widespread demand for lead and for zinc and for other critical metals that are playing a vital and essential part in the prosecution of this war. Certainly the gentleman from New York should know, if he knows anything about the silver industry, that lead and zinc are considered byproducts of the mining of silver; and if there were to be no encouragement of the mining of silver within the United States, then the Government would have to turn around and subsidize the war contractors, or in some other way stimulate the production of lead and zinc and these other metals which we need today.

So certainly the gentleman is not accomplishing anything when he makes this assault on legislation which has been in effect during the past decade.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. Does not the gentleman think it would be very interesting to know how the gentleman from New York votes when a real subsidy bill comes before the House?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I presume that is true.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I do not know whether the gentleman has any figures on it or not. I understand the figure that was given here was that 60,000,000 ounces have been bought in the year. I understand it is 5,700,000 ounces for 1943.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am glad to have that emphasized, as my figures covered 23 months—not 1 year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell me why we can only get 60,000,000 ounces out of 3,000,000,000 ounces that the Government is hoarding?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Because that is all the commercial users have applied for. That constitutes all of the allocations which have been made by the War Production Board. There are not any other demands. All of the demands for the use of silver in the war industries and by commercial users have been met during the past year. That eliminates any need for this particular legislation at this time.

In closing, may I say that this silver-purchase program is almost wholly inoperative. The gentleman has nothing

which he might accomplish in offering this amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has already confessed that this is a back-door effort to accomplish something by indirection. He wants by an amendment on an appropriation bill to nullify an important law. It is true that for the last 2 or 3 years those people who make silver jewelry have insisted that they have an opportunity to buy for 50 cents an ounce some of the stock of silver which we have on hand. This is an attempt to help them do that.

My colleague the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] has already pointed out that all the silver needed in the war effort has already gone into the war effort. There is no argument any further in that whatsoever. Then the idea is to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, and do it, as the chairman of this committee has said, by reducing the funds to the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the mandate which the present law places upon him.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that as we approach planning after the war this Nation of ours is mighty fortunate that we have a great hoard of yellow metal at Fort Knox and a great hoard of white metal at West Point. Those are precious metals. Our possession of them places our Government in a very favorable position. Those are the bases of the money of the world throughout all time. More than half the people of the earth have greater faith and confidence in silver as a basis for money than have faith in gold as a basis. Yet by such amendments as this we would deliberately throw away the great advantage we now have in possessing these supplies of gold and silver.

This amendment is nothing more than an indirect attempt to do just exactly that to favor private interests against public interest. I hope the House will consider seriously this amendment and vote it down.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If what the gentleman has said—that the cost of mining of this silver is only 45 cents an ounce, why does the Government pay 71 cents an ounce, which he claims is an exorbitant profit?

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from New York said a moment ago that we have already spent $580,000,000 in purchasing this silver, yet he cannot point to a single appropriation act whereby we appropriated a dollar to pay for that silver. I would like to know how you can purchase silver for the United States Treasury without appropriating money in Congress to make that purchase. Let the gentleman explain that.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I want the gentleman to answer my question.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman has already answered your question. He said the Government is selling the silver at 71 cents an ounce.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am asking the gentleman from Arizona to answer my question.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] correctly explained that silver is mined in company with copper, lead, and zinc. There are no pure silver mines to speak of. These ores are composites. It is very hard to fix the exact proportion of cost in mining silver. However, I am reliably informed that the average cost of mining silver over hundreds of years is about 90 cents an ounce. I will not say that holds true for any given year, but if that is true that it costs about 90 cents an ounce to mine silver, then of course we are making a mighty good deal if we can buy it for 71 cents an ounce.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] that the cost is only 45 cents an ounce?

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, I know of nothing to show the cost of producing silver is 45 cents an ounce and I do not agree with that at all as a fact. Cost does not always determine value, or selling price. Silver is in a peculiar position. It is money, as well as a commodity. It is a strategic metal in wartime, and it has an increasing post-war potential value. This amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and in that connection I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Are Members recognized in the order in which they get up or mostly from the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] in presenting his chart and his argument is not up-to-date. I am sorry that he presents arguments that are not in line with the facts.

Last year the gentleman from New York introduced his amendment to strike out this appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act. I wanted to ask the gentleman in all earnestness what the Government has lost by the operation of the Silver Purchase Act, and if he had been successful in securing the defeat of the Silver Purchase Act when it came to the House, what would have been the benefit to the Government, but he would not yield to me. He did not want to get any facts about silver. He simply wants to put something over on the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield briefly to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I thoroughly respect the gentleman's point of view. I have great friendship for the gentleman. My only purpose is to try to get some sort of action, to try to stimulate this House into some sort of action. My purpose is to ultimately stop these bonuses given to mine owners in your State.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman has presented a lot of fallacies that I feel I cannot fully refute in the brief time at my disposal. But I will present the gentleman with factual information from the Treasury Department, as to some benefits that have accrued to the Government and the people of the United States in carrying out the provisions of the Silver Purchase Act.

If the gentleman will take any Treasury bulletin, for instance the bulletin of January 1944, and turn to page 74, he will find the seigniorage, or profit, that the Government has made in buying and revaluing this silver and putting it out in money. I never heard of the gentleman ever refusing to take a $1 bill that is backed by silver. When you talk about velocity and all the elements of money you will find that each $1 bill is doing as much, or more, than a $10 bill in the everyday transaction of business. A $1 bill circulates 10 times as fast as a $10 bill. Every $1 bill is backed by a silver dollar. It is a piece of paper that costs on the average 35 cents a thousand to engrave and print, but it is backed in full by a silver dollar. In doing that the Treasury will inform you that commencing January 1, 1934, taking the total seigniorage, or profits, made by the Government, if you please, on this silver program, we have made $820,600,000. That is a tidy little sum for the Government to make when everybody is scraping the barrel to get money to pay income taxes. That is all wrong from the standpoint of the gentleman from New York, for the Government to make any money. This table in the Treasury bulletin shows that if they had put out in money all the silver that was authorized and purchased under that Silver Purchase Act there would have been an additional seigniorage of $967,000,000, almost a billion dollars, which for some reason our Secretary of the Treasury failed to use and save the people that much more money.

The gentleman got up here before the Committee and said we ought to put silver in uniform. What do you find? You find that silver already is in uniform. It is following every invasion, every soldier, and the Treasury is issuing bales of silver certificates backed by silver dollars, called invasion currency, and it is transacting the business of our armed forces in the invaded countries. Silver is in uniform. Silver is the metal that provides the bearings of the engines that sail these airplanes safely across the Atlantic. When you are out over the middle of the Atlantic you cannot stop to repair a hot bearing, you must have the best bearing in the world to start with, and silver provides that bearing.

All the silver of which the gentleman complains so bitterly, which Government if possible should have been prevented from buying, is the sinews of war, the sinews of finance that is carrying on for us today. Speaking of silver in the war effort, I saw in one single plant in the State of Oregon, where they are smelting the aluminum that makes the airplanes that are superior to any in the world, airplanes that are fighting our wars, I found 600 tons of silver used as bus bars in one plant at Troutdale, Oreg., conducting electricity for the smelting program that makes the aluminum used in manufacturing our airplanes. The gentleman from New York would strike that program down, he would deprive the people in this great war emergency of the silver metal that is back of the invasion forces, the metal that finances our war effort. To strike down the power to purchase silver would be to cripple other Allied Governments in this time of great emergency. They need this money to stabilize their currency. It would have prevented Australia, if you please, from getting much-needed help. The means of giving aid to these countries would be struck down by the eminent gentleman from New York in carrying forward his benevolent and wonderful program for the benefit of a few jewelers and manufacturers, that they might profit at the expense of the American people.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. Briefly.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What the gentleman says about silver applies also to pig iron and all the other basic metals, does it not? The one question is whether or not we are paying an excess profit on silver.

Mr. WHITE. I have heard the gentleman's question and I say it is a pig-iron question.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That, of course, is not an answer. I am just seeking information.

Mr. WHITE. The same policy of government applies to iron. If the eminent men in some of the Government departments that had their way 50 years ago when H. C. Frick, Andrew Carnegie, and other great industrialists were going into the hills of Pennsylvania that are now bringing forth this pig iron of which the gentleman speaks, bringing forth the raw ore and smelting it down into the steel that built our battleships, that built our guns, that made us superior to any nation on earth, had they been able to do what these gentlemen want to do we would be as helpless today as is Manchuria with all her resources, if you please, still conserved. The Manchurians did not utilize their resources and the Japs moved in on them and used them to bind chains of slavery about her. In Ethiopia we see again a policy of conservation followed, all those valuable metals locked up in their hills. The Italians moved in on them and it took a war, the very one in which we are now engaged, to straighten out the affairs of the world with the guns and ships and the armament made from ore that we dug out of the ground and used to make these things that have made us superior to any other nation; and right today it is the things we have produced and the resources we have brought forth from the ground and fabricated that have given us the strength we needed to survive.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman has gone all over the world now but he has not answered the question yet.

Mr. WHITE. That is where our ships and planes and guns and troops are—all over the world. Let us compare, if you please, the policies of our Government with those of Japan. The only thing that gives recognition to Japanese paper money is the point of the bayonet. When the Japs moved into the Philippines and tendered their paper money in payment for purchases the only thing that made it acceptable was the point of the bayonet; yet when our boys march into Italy, into Africa, or anywhere else, and asked for something they tender a good silver certificate, our invasion currency, which these people are eager to get, if you please, backed by the very silver the gentleman from New York would prevent our using if he could. He would deny us that source of strength.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What answer has the gentleman got to the observation that we are paying excessive prices for the silver we do buy? Answer that question.

Mr. WHITE. Oh, shame on the gentleman for not investigating the question. If he would read but a little to get current and up to date he would find that at this moment in India silver is worth 86 cents an ounce despite the fact that the British Government for India has withdrawn it as legal tender.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I would ask him why we pay 45 cents an ounce for foreign silver and 71 for domestic silver?

Mr. WHITE. Oh, the gentleman feels bitterly sometimes about the victimizing of Uncle Sam, and yet Uncle Sam has never bought an ounce of foreign silver except at the world market price, and the world market price today is 86 cents, it is way beyond 71 cents. I believe that were all restrictions taken off the price of silver would go about $1.29, as it did in the last war. The gentleman has answered his own question because a reading of the figures show that Uncle Sam has a ready market for all the silver he wants to sell at 71 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes; I ask to be allowed the same amount of time as was allowed the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, it is reported that Bill Nye, the great humorist, once in addressing a church gathering reached down in his pocket, pulled out a silver dollar, held it up and said: "I know that my Redeemer liveth."

I believe few realize the great part the silver dollar is playing in the financial affairs of our Government today. I believe every Member of this House could with profit study the Treasury figures. I believe they should check the daily balance sheet of the Treasury that comes to every Congressman and every bank every morning. We find that on February 4, 1942, the silver in the general fund of the Treasury was $15,015,000. On exactly the same day a year later, 1943, we find that silver stood at $19,114,000. Taking the Treasury's statement of February 4, this February 4, we find the amount has increased until it now stands at $115,161,000. The reason given by the Treasury for the accumulation is that it constitutes a reserve against this invasion currency. This silver is financing our troops in Africa and in Italy.

Silver is the most constructive thing we have. The gentleman talks about inflation. I have here the circulation statement of the Treasury as of December 31, and we find that while the amount of silver money in circulation has been reduced, the paper Federal Reserve notes have been inflated from a little over $7,000,000,000 in recent years to the $17,512,088,645 now in circulation. We are told that many of the silver dollars have been melted down to mint subsidiary coinage. The circulation statement of the Treasury shows that the amount of standard silver dollars has been reduced to $497,190,051, but most of this silver is not in circulation. Of all the silver dollars in circulation in the West, we find that the total amount of silver in circulation amounts to $94,890,312 as shown by the December Treasury statement. The bulk of the silver is being held in the Treasury. I may say to the gentleman that the small amount of silver that the Treasury allows to circulate has been substantially increased recently.

I have not the time to discuss the silver and the lend-lease of silver to other countries to back their currencies, silver that has a stabilizing influence. It is the thing that is behind these currencies where the credit of the Nation is poor.

The credit of the Nation is stabilized by having metals with which to redeem the money. Silver is just as useful and just as stable as gold if it were only used. There is an old axiom that use creates demand and demand creates value.

If you were to treat gold today as you have treated silver it would be worth less per ounce than silver because nobody uses it. I do not care what commodity or what thing you have, if nobody will use it, it is of little value. We saw water-

melons here on the fourth of July last in the city of Washington at $2.50 apiece. I have bought many watermelons just as good for 25 cents apiece. It is just a question of the demand for the watermelons. So that goes for silver, too. If the bankers of the world can induce the Nation to discard its silver and induce the Congress to discard silver, and replace silver money with bank-note money, it will not have any value, neither will gold have any value under similar circumstances.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. No. I have not the time. This is a subject I could talk on all day and then I could not tell you half of the facts about it.

Here is the last statement from the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York City, the biggest or the second biggest bank in the United States. Let us follow what is being done with gold. It is stated that the price of gold on the Bombay bullion market is $77.25. Over in Egypt we find in Cairo that gold is worth $63 an ounce. We find down in Buenos Aires that gold is worth $44 an ounce. We still value gold at $35 an ounce. The Treasury statement shows that $1,800,000,000 of this $24,000,000,000 in gold that the gentleman is so far behind on, because we only have about $21,000,000,000 in the Treasury today, $1,800,000,000 of that gold has been withdrawn from the Treasury. Why and where did it go? Of course, these eminent financiers would not profit at the expense of Uncle Sam where they can withdraw gold from the Treasury and get a double price by exporting it to the foreign countries for profit to themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to talk about silver, because I do not know much about it, but I do want to speak for a few minutes about a colleague of ours who is pure gold.

I have been requested by the Texas delegation, of which I have the honor to be chairman, to bring you the news if you do not already know it, and many of you do, that the most beloved member of the Texas delegation is 83 years young today. You will know immediately that I refer to none other than the gentleman from Texas, JOSEPH MANSFIELD.

Your generous applause, with all Members standing, expresses the affection in which you hold him and the same love and esteem is shared not only by all the people in his district but by everybody who knows him in the great Lone Star State. He has been in public office practically all of his adult life. He enjoys the confidence of every man, woman, and child who has ever known him. His integrity is of the highest, his character is of the best, and kindness, tolerance, and nobility prompt his every thought and deed. I bring him today not only the greetings and congratulations of the Texas delegation, but I am also sure that I express for you in the permanent RECORD of this House not only the affection in which every Member holds him but I also convey your congratulations and wish him many happy returns of the day.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, before I proceed to a discussion of the amendment I want to say that after having served in this House for 7 years, going on the eighth, it is my opinion that the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, is the most beloved, the most highly respected, and one of the oldest Members of the House. Whenever you appear before his committee you just feel his kindness, his generosity, and his fine character, and I join with our good friends from Texas in felicitating the distinguished gentleman. I hope that 20 years from now he will still be a Member of the House and carrying on.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. All Members, of course, join with the very appropriate sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]. We, of West Virginia, take a very real pride in Judge MANSFIELD because, although he lives in the great State of Texas today, he was nurtured and had his beginning down in the hills of our own State.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to discuss the silver question or the money question from a technical standpoint. I think the best informed man in the House on that, the best informed Member of either House, has just addressed the Committee and I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]. If we had taken the time to read his articles on the silver question we would be better informed on what is before us this afternoon.

I call attention to the fact, and I doubt that the distinguished gentleman from New York will deny it, that the forces back of this amendment are the silversmiths and the manufacturers of jewelry who want to purchase silver just as cheaply as they can at the expense of the Government.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. May I say that not a single silversmith is in my district and no one has asked me to offer this amendment. I did it of my own accord.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman that I am going to speak for a moment on what is vital to this country.

You paid only 12 cents a pound to the big companies for copper, which is a vitally strategic metal in the winning of this war. You would have had to pay much more for copper if it were not for the fact that silver is produced as a byproduct by nearly all of the copper-, zinc-, and lead-producing mines throughout the country. You could not have purchased copper for 12 cents a pound were it not for the byproducts because it could not have been mined for that price.

The Anaconda Copper Co., one of the biggest producers of copper in the world, owns the deep mines in Butte. They are expensive to operate, as they go to a depth of 5,000 to 7,000 feet. Do you think for a moment that if it were not for the byproducts such as silver, lead, and zinc those mines could be operated on an economic basis and on a commercial basis at 12 cents per pound? Were it not for the silver and the other byproducts produced in those mines—and this goes for all marginal copper mines—the Government of the United States would have paid more for copper.

I call your attention also to the fact that the very moment you wipe out the purchasing of silver you close many of the marginal copper-producing mines. Then what are you going to do? You will have miners who have spent their lives in the production of copper, zinc, lead, and silver on relief when this war is over.

Again, nearly all the countries of Latin-America are the users of the white metal and not gold. Do not forget that. China and India use almost exclusively silver. We must produce silver in order to trade with these countries.

Silver is not static. I happen to have five silver certificates of a dollar each in my pocket. Every one of them is a silver certificate. Silver is working. The only reason, I suppose, that you do not have silver instead of the certificates is that they are more convenient to handle. Every one of these $1 bills carries right at the top the words "silver certificate." If we did not have the silver bullion the Government of the United States would not dare issue this currency. Many countries do not want our paper money. They want our silver. And as time goes on its use will become increasingly important. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe it requires any more argument than has been made to convince this House of the unfairness of the proposed amendment. I was hopeful that the gentleman from New York in his fairness would withdraw his amendment, because it is absolutely unfair to all of us.

Let us look at the record just a moment. The gentleman from New York offered this same amendment a year ago, and it was adopted by the House at that time. However, there were certain very cogent reasons behind the movement then which do not exist now that caused the amendment to pass the House. At that time there was a serious question as to whether or not we were getting sufficient silver to carry on our war effort. There was also an accusation that the Treasury Department was at that time buying large amounts of foreign silver.

At the present time, it is admitted that we are buying no foreign silver. It is

also admitted that the silversmiths who want silver are getting all they want. It is also admitted that the silver that is necessary for and can be used in the war effort is being used to the fullest extent. Then what is the problem involved?

It is either one of two things. Either the House wants this group of men who represent the West and who are interested in silver to be embarrassed by not having sufficient influence in this House to defeat an amendment like this, and make the Senate do it, or else they simply want to penalize the war effort—one or the other. I say "penalize" for this reason. In order to carry on this war, it is necessary for us to have certain metals. The price on these metals has been fixed, and in that price is included the price now paid for silver. The money that is to pay for the silver comes out of this appropriation bill. You stop the money from coming from this appropriation bill for silver and you stop the production of copper, lead, zinc, and other materials that are mined with silver in all marginal mines. We need these materials to carry on this war. If you stop the production of these minerals, then you are doing something that will directly affect the conduct of this war.

I know Members of the House on both sides of the aisle are fair. I do not think you want either of these two contingencies to which I refer to happen. I had hoped that the gentleman from New York would withdraw his amendment, because it is absolutely unfair. There is no occasion for such an amendment at this time. It serves no useful purpose.

If we wished to, we could argue how silver has produced millions of dollars for the Federal Treasury, and whether or not it is a subsidy, but that is immaterial as far as this amendment is concerned because the difference between 45 cents and 71 cents is paid for newly mined silver, and in order to mine the silver and thereby mine the copper and the other materials it is absolutely necessary for us to have this subsidy, if you want to call it that. I know the Members of this House are not willing to do anything that will adversely affect the war effort. You want to do everything possible to bring this war to a speedy and successful conclusion.

Our miners and the owners of mines in Utah, and in the West generally, are struggling to the last ditch to help win this war. They are making no money. None of them has made any money during this war. They are doing everything they can to keep the mines open. If this amendment were adopted, it would mean the shut-down of hundreds of mines in the West, literally hundreds of them. I know you do not want that contingency to happen.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of the price of silver. The price of silver all over the world is in excess of the statutory price of 71 cents in this country.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Mexico will not sell us an ounce of silver. It holds it all back.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is what I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendents thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Chairman. I have been on my feet ever since this amendment was offered and have been unable to secure recognition. Three other Members have had as much as 15 minutes each. I should like 3 or 4 minutes myself.

Mr. LUDLOW. Certainly the gentleman should have it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why does not the gentleman see that I get it?

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, however important to the maintenance of peace in the world the monetary role of silver may be, the immediate importance of silver in winning the war is its direct effect upon the production of the base and other metals.

The average easterner seems to visualize a mine as consisting of shelves containing separate supplies of copper, silver, lead, gold, zinc, or what have you.

The price of silver contained in the complex ores containing copper, lead and zinc is what in most cases makes possible or impossible the production of the other badly needed metals—the difference between loss and bare profit. For instance, the great mines in the Tintic, Utah, district could not produce lead and zinc if the domestic price of silver were lowered.

Current prices paid for silver, copper, lead, and zinc are far below World War No. 1 prices; underground mining costs are more than 60 percent higher than during the last conflict.

Domestically produced silver during World War No. 1 was $1 per ounce as against 71.11 cents now.

Silver production in the United States was estimated 48,000,000 ounces short of requirements for 1943, according to Richard J. Lund, Director of the Miscellaneous Division of the War Production Board.

The United States produces 25 percent of the world's production of silver; Canada, 9 percent; Mexico, 30 percent; total, United States, Canada, and Mexico, 64 percent; total, North America, 66 percent; total, Western Hemisphere, 77 percent; total, British Empire, including Canada, 18 percent; total, British Empire, excluding Canada, 9 percent.

Very obviously, an enhancement in the price of silver will especially benefit the United States and its immediate neighbors as well as other countries in the Western Hemisphere with whom it hopes to have a large and growing trade. The United States interest in gold as a metal is far less than its interest in silver. With the British Empire, the opposite is the case.

The function of price-making of silver for the world for a century or two has been discharged by what is known as the London Fixing Board, a group comprising four brokers licensed under Crown grant in London as representatives of the silver-using nations and the great silver buyers and sellers over the world.

How unfair this price-fixing method is when you consider that the British Empire, including Canada, produces only 18 percent of the world's silver.

Mr. Chairman, after this war is over the United States is expecting a great development in China. The Chinese and the inhabitants of India have always been silver-using nations. Long centuries of experience—in China recently repeated—have taught their people the uncertainties of paper money. More than ever will they demand hard money—gold and silver, and especially silver, which best suits the purpose of the great majority of their people. If the United States wishes for the development of those nations and many others in Asia and Africa it should use its utmost efforts to restore silver to a monetary status.

During World War No. 1, Lloyd George said that the war would be won with silver bullets. The utility of the white metal is, and must be, recognized by our own Government. It may be idle to speculate on future demands. We do know, however, that immediate demands exist for more silver than can be produced.

It is claimed that the purchase by the Government of domestic silver constitutes an outrageous expense on the Government and an outrageous subsidy to the silver producers. Every time the Government buys such silver it pays the producer $71.11 per 100 ounces in silver certificates, practically at the cost of running the printing presses, and minting the bullion, if and when called on to redeem the paper. In other words, 55 ounces out of each 100 ounces are coined into silver dollars, and the remainder, or 45 ounces, are held by the Government as a free gift from the miner.

I do not think anyone who will read section 4 of the Domestic Silver Purchase Act will contend that the Government is out one penny in buying domestic silver at 71.11 cents per ounce, or will deny that the Government profits by the transaction to the extent of 45 percent of the silver purchased.

As the silver in a silver dollar is figured at $1.29 an ounce, the Government makes a profit of 45 cents on every dollar it coins, or 58 cents on each ounce of silver that goes into the coinage of a silver dollar.

The Wall Street Journal of May 20, 1943, reports that the war boosted 1942

usage of silver for all purposes in the United States to 193,933,000 ounces; that this is a gain of more than 43 percent over that consumed in 1941 and more than three times that consumed in 1940; and that about 50 percent of that consumed in 1942 was for direct and indirect military purposes. This does not include the silver leased for use as bus bars, and so forth.

The purchase of silver does not cost the Government or the people of this country one cent; it is not a subsidy.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am happy to take advantage of this opportunity to express my congratulations to my esteemed colleague the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD. He was one of the first men I met when I came to this House last year. He has helped me with advice, been uniformly kind and courteous, and I have found him at all times extremely helpful. At this time I extend the congratulations of a tenderfoot to an old-timer and wish for him many, many more years in this House, which he graces so well.

Mr. Chairman, in this matter of silver, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has referred to the faith of this country in its banking system and in the money which it issues. He says we have something like $23,000,000,000 in gold in Fort Knox, and I gathered that he thought that sufficient backing for the moneys which we have appropriated. This debt of ours is something that we cannot laugh off. The more money we appropriate the less solid backing we have and the more precarious will become the value of our paper currency. I think it is imperative that we have something in addition to faith in backing our currency and that it should be implemented by gold and silver.

Today there are no silver mines as such. In years past there have been some fabulously rich silver mines, but today there are no such mines in operation. Approximately 70 percent of all the silver mined during the past 20 years has been a byproduct of other metals, such as gold, copper, lead, and zinc. In a few cases the silver content of these ores is higher than that of other metals, but in 70 percent of these cases the silver value is considerably less than the value of the other metals produced from the same ores. Eighteen percent of the silver produced in the United States comes from copper ore. The silver values in these copper ores have a direct bearing on the production of copper. A reduction in the price of silver would necessitate a higher price for copper in order that production of these mines be maintained. The silver content in the lead and zinc ores as a whole is considerably less than the content of silver in copper ores. Silver is also a byproduct of gold mines, but the closing of gold mines will materially diminish the supply of new silver. At the present time there is sufficient silver for war uses, and the white metal is available for such purposes. The war program is consuming less silver than is available for such purpose, and up to the 1st of December 1942, as an example, the W. P. B. had taken only 16,000 tons of the 47,000 tons allotted to them. So far full use has not been made of silver already allotted for war purposes, and when the authorities use up all of the silver allotted to them in addition to the current production of 166 tons per month that would be time to call upon the balance of the silver in the Treasury, and they should find it available to them at that time, if needed.

The most essential thing about silver is that if the base metals did not contain a byproduct of silver then the United States of America could produce very little lead, zinc, and copper in competition with other countries throughout the world paying a wage scale of from 75 to 90 percent less than the American scale. The fundamental basis for fixing a higher price to domestic producers of silver over foreign producers is to give domestic mines the ability to pay higher wages and thus avoid the low standard of living of miners existing in countries competing with us in lead, zinc, copper, and other metal production.

Gold mining opened up the far western part of the United States. Idaho and Montana were settled by the men and women who came west to mine silver. Copper from Montana has kept the war industries operating.

Silver purchased since the enactment of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 has not cost the United States taxpayer one cent. But it has kept down the cost of lead, copper, and zinc so badly needed in our war efforts. That is silver's contribution to the war effort, so let us give silver its just due and not play into the hands of the money changers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I too, want to extend my best wishes to our good friend and colleague, who happens at this time to be my next-door neighbor, Judge MANSFIELD, on his eighty-third birthday. I am sure if the Members could have seen the great number of visitors that were at his office this morning and the floral tribute that was given to him, they would appreciate the high esteem in which this distinguished gentleman is held. I do not know that there is anything that I could add to the discussion of the amendment under consideration, only to observe perhaps, that inasmuch as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] annually and persistently offers this amendment, it does furnish an opportunity for our distinguished colleague from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] to educate the membership of the House on this most intricate and important question, the question of silver. In my judgment, he is the best informed man in the House on this subject and his remarks should command attention. It is regrettable to me that in the midst of a war, not knowing what the end is yet to be, that any Member of this House would take it upon himself to offer such an amendment, not realizing what the implications of it might be and what effect it might have on the production of other metals, if the silver-purchasing program were discontinued. As has been said here time and time again, silver is not mined in and of itself, in a mine. Sometimes the only reason it can be mined is because of the byproducts other than silver; while other metals, at times, can be mined only because of the value of silver. So it seems to me a dangerous procedure if this House at this time adopts such an amendment. As has been said here, if this amendment were adopted it would have the effect, no doubt, of closing many marginal mines in the territory where silver, copper, zinc, and lead are mined.

I can tell you they are having a tremendous time now in keeping these mines going and the miners employed, because the men who spend their lives in the mining of silver and in going down into the bowels of the earth to produce the sinews of war are not men who can be adapted to other kinds of work. It means, simply, that this great class of men would be unemployed. I urge that this amendment be defeated. Certainly, under any other rule this amendment would not be germane to this bill. It is only because of this kind of rule that it would be in order. It is entirely out of order. It is unfair to the membership of this House from the West to be called upon to defend the Silver Purchase Act against an amendment of the kind that has been proposed without any previous notice that such an amendment was going to be offered. I plead with the membership of the House to defeat once and for all this sort of an amendment. It can serve no purpose. It has been proposed before, and if it goes over to the other body at this time it will undoubtedly receive the same treatment it did before. It will be a waste of time for the House to pass this amendment. The silver question is a question concerning which reasonable men may differ. In years past it has been considered important enough to become a political campaign issue. It was important enough that this administration adopted the Silver Purchase Act as a national policy. It has not reversed its position, and obviously it is of enough importance that this House should not decide the merits of such a program in the space of 30 minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] complains because he cannot get a hearing on a bill that he says he introduced 4 years ago and is now before the Ways and Means Committee. This in itself ought to indicate to the gentleman that there is no widespread national clamor for his amendments, which, if adopted, would reverse a national policy.

I have heard the gentleman himself complain that it is not the function of the Appropriations Committee, by amendments such as this, to become a legislative committee, and I agree with him. So if he thinks it incumbent on him to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, that he do so by conforming to normal legislative procedure, and not, by this method of snipping and sabotage, do injury, not only to the silver producers of the West, but also injure and hamper our war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It has been intimated here that those who support this amendment are obstructing the war effort. I want to call to your attention some of the debate that took place last year when this same question was before the House. If tactics are being used to hinder the use of silver for war purposes let us make sure who the people are that are responsible for doing this.

The Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Bell, testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate when the Green bill was under consideration, as follows:

> This Department does approve a minimum transfer price of 50 cents per fine troy ounce as provided in S. 35. This approval was based on the belief that silver now held in the general fund of the Treasury should be made available for war uses without loss to the Treasury, but at a price which will permit the users to continue producing war materials with little or no increase in the cost of producing them.

Now let me read some of the testimony of Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board:

> It is felt that the minimum price of 71.11 cents per ounce will be detrimental to an expansion of the substitution of silver in place of other scarce metals for war uses.

Let me also quote Capt. R. C. McDowell, Deputy Director of the Resources Division of the Office of Procurement and Materials of the Navy Department, who testified as follows:

> If I were asked as to the use of silver for war-production purposes I would have the personal opinion that the lower price would permit a freer flow of the material.

Yet the silver interests in the face of that testimony succeeded in writing the price of 71.11 cents into the bill. I wonder, since we had that testimony by those men, whether any Member who is interested in maintaining the price of silver at 71.11 cents per ounce and continuing this silver-purchase policy will rise on the floor of the House today and say to the country that the figure 71.11 cents has not obstructed the use of silver for war purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield only for an answer to my question.

Mr. WHITE. I have just a simple question. Who do you think would benefit if the price of silver were reduced from 71 cents?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield any further. I yielded only for an answer to a question.

Mr. WHITE. Who do you think would benefit from a price lower than 71 cents?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I asked whether there was any Member in the House who would stand up and tell the country that the price of 71.11 cents which the silver interests wrote into the Green bill has not hindered the use of silver for war purposes, and no Member has done so.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Will the gentleman yield? I will answer that question. In the first place the law provides only for newly mined silver——

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield. The gentleman is not answering my question. No one is answering the question and no one can answer it. No one can stand up and say the price of 71.11 cents per ounce for silver which was written into the Green bill has not obstructed the use of silver for war purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not care to yield.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman is most unfair.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if anyone is to blame for keeping from the Army and the Navy and the other armed forces the use of silver, let that blame fall exactly where it belongs, namely upon the silver interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this subject, because the reports that you have, if you have read them, speak for themselves. This section in this appropriation bill is not operative. I want to read just a few figures, but before I do that I want to show you something that is really worth while looking at. If there was ever a more misleading chart presented to a group of reasonable-minded men, I never saw it. I wish you would look at that. It says "41 cents," then "71 cents," and then assumes that every dime between the two is lost. When the Federal Government coins this silver bullion into silver currency it has a profit of the difference between 71 cents and $1.29.

Now, who brought this amendment here? It was brought in last year—1943. I will never forget the surprise that came to my mind when I heard the great miners of this country—there are no more patriotic men in the world than the miners of America—called bloated plutocrats. Who made that statement? The very same gentleman who comes on the floor this afternoon and asks us to vote for this same amendment. This gentleman has supported every New Deal piece of legislation that has come to this floor since I have been a Member of this House, and now he comes in here and finds fault that there are still a few silver mines operating and receiving a guaranteed price for their products. What kind of consistency is this, I ask you?

Let us look at the facts and figures. I do not have time to answer all these arguments, but let me show you the figures in the hearings.

Purchase of silver—foreign silver.

Why, it is foolish to be compelled to stand up here and defend the action of this committee which brought us this bill. But just listen to these figures.

In 1934, 172.5 millions of ounces were purchased by the Federal Government.

In 1935, 494.4 millions of ounces.

But listen to this: I drop down to 1942—42.6 million ounces of foreign silver.

And in 1943, from January to September, not an ounce of foreign silver was bought.

Now, what have we been doing with this silver that we do buy? We have been putting it into the Treasury. How have we been paying for it? Have we been paying a dollar for it? Of course not. If anything at all, we have been issuing silver certificates against it. The same argument you make against silver could be made against gold. So, every man who gets up on this floor and argues against silver can change that word to gold and his argument will have the same force and effect.

Are Members willing to stand up and be counted against a bimetal form of currency in the United States?

It is time we used a little sound thinking. This program is absolutely inactive. We have not spent a dime on it. So why vote for an amendment that has nothing to do with the bill under discussion.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Do not the figures of the Treasury Department show that since the Silver Purchase Act went into effect in 1934 the Government has made $820,000,000 in buying that silver?

Mr. HILL. Of course, the Government never lost a dime on an ounce of silver in the history of the Silver Purchase Act and every man who ever studied the question for a minute knows that.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Can the gentleman see any difference between the purchase of silver and the purchase of gold? What is the difference, under our present system? We are not on the gold standard. Our money is not convertible in gold. What we are doing with reference to silver is the same thing we are doing with reference to gold.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. There is not any difference whatsoever. How any man can stand on this floor and so twist his mind so as to reason that this silver program is different than the gold program is more than I can understand.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I want to congratulate the gentleman on what he has been saying. This policy of having two different kinds of metal was started back in 1893. It is a part of our Federal act at the present time. It was adopted by a Republican administration then. The silver-purchase program has been sponsored by the Democratic administration now. How anybody can

find anything wrong with it on either side of the aisle I do not know.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman knows that in north Africa this country of ours had to take silver and send it to our boys in order for them to trade with the folks in north Africa because they did not think that paper money was worth a single dime.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. And supply it to the British as well.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be voted down by a decisive majority. It has no place in this appropriation bill. Later if considered in a separate bill it should also be voted down.

The Silver Purchase Act has meant a great deal to the metal-mining industry of the West. Silver is never found by itself in my State but always mixed with other metals such as copper, zinc, and lead. At the beginning of this war, we were very short of these strategic metals because the submarine menace and the necessity of using our ships for other purposes cut down importations from foreign nations. The Silver Purchase Act has kept alive many small mines in the Rocky Mountain area, and from these mines our war needs for copper, zinc, and lead were met to a large extent.

Metal mines cannot be opened for production in a day and once closed it often takes months to drain and again open them. When the history of this war is finally written it may well show that the strategic metals produced from these silver mines of the West kept our war production going.

To now set aside this Silver Purchase Act by the subterfuge of this amendment would be a great injustice to the men who have done so much for our war effort. The speakers preceding me have told you of the economic value of silver and gold as a national and international currency. I have briefly tried to picture to you what the Silver Purchase Act has done toward the production of copper, zinc, and lead in the war effort. I urge you to vote against this Celler amendment.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to point out that this matter of silver legislation is a mighty serious matter when viewed in the light of the continued operation of our lead, zinc, and silver mines.

They have adjusted their operations on this existing legislation. Such an arbitrary action as here proposed would throw them into something pretty close to chaos and threaten our domestic supplies of lead and zinc and silver.

Now these men who operate these mines are mighty reasonable men. They yield to none in the quality of their patriotism. They are perfectly willing to discuss this problem fully. They are perfectly willing to justify their position in detail. They are perfectly willing to make any adjustments that full hearings and sound reasoning might indicate.

I suggest that any attempt to modify our existing silver laws follow the usual legislative procedures and I offer the prophecy that a full and analytical consideration of this problem—in the regular way under the considered rules of the House—will find that our lead, zinc, and silver operators are furnishing their time, skill, equipment, and property and supplying our Nation at war with strategic materials at a mighty low figure.

I understand that no attempt has been made to bring this matter before the Ways and Means Committee—rather we find this attempt at ill-considered action.

I hope this proposal is voted down.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has offered the usual amendment to this appropriation bill. There still seems to be an organized movement against the silver mining industry of this country. Just why, I cannot say. During the past year we have witnessed the many vital uses to which silver has been put. I am certain that every Member of this House has realized that silver is playing an important part in the winning of this war. It is difficult to understand why there are those who still want to destroy this important industry.

Silver has been sent to foreign countries in order to pay the soldiers fighting in the war. Silver is now being used on a large scale in our war industries in this country, where it is replacing copper. During the past summer I had the opportunity to visit a magnesium plant and saw silver, belonging to the Government, being used in its operations. Without a supply of silver we would certainly be in a most desperate plight. This silver in industrial plants will be returned to the Treasury at the conclusion of the war. We are fortunate that someone in this country had the vision to see that a stock pile of silver was made available for such an emergency.

The mining industry is being called upon to produce more and more strategic metals for war purposes. Many of these are known as complex ores—lead, zinc, and copper. It would not be profitable to mine some of these minerals unless a fair price could be obtained for silver.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that this amendment will be rejected. This is no time to upset a policy and disturb a program that have been in effect so many years. Let us do what we can to aid and assist our mining men of the West, rather than discourage them. There has been a great deal of misrepresentation concerning the issues involved, but I feel that the Members of this House are not being deceived. Let us vote against this amendment and demonstrate to our mining industry that we favor a continuation of the present silver program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CELLER) there were—ayes 22, noes 50.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Not a sufficient number have arisen. Tellers are refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREIGN FUNDS CONTROL

Foreign funds control: For all expenses necessary in carrying out the functions of the Secretary of the Treasury under sections 3 and 5 (b) of the act of October 6, 1917, as amended (50 U. S. C. (App.) 3, and 50 U. S. C. (Suppl. 1941) 5 (b)), and any proclamations, orders, regulations, or instructions issued thereunder; and in exercising fiscal, financial, banking, property-control, and related functions, authorized by law, and administered by the Treasury Department in foreign countries and arising out of military operations of the United States; including personal services; printing; maintenance, repair, and operation of a motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle; and reimbursement of any other appropriation or other funds of the United States or any agency, instrumentality, Territory, or possession thereof, including the Philippine Islands, and reimbursement of any Federal Reserve bank for printing and other expenditures; $4,250,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 3, line 15, strike out "$4,250,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because it appears perfectly evident to me from the facts and the approach to it that this organization has deliberately built up its appropriation request because of the fact that we cut them a million dollars last year. They got along all right last year, and they are spending now at a lower rate than the funds that were appropriated last year. There should be a saving even with their taking care of their overtime pay. There is absolutely no excuse for more than $4,000,000 for this item. They are doing away with a large portion of their activities; in other words, large portions of the foreign funds they control have been released, probably better than 50 percent of their funds have been released, and on top of that the number of requests for licenses has been reduced and they have gotten down to the point where only about 14 percent of those requests come to Washington; yet in spite of that they want 711 people in Washington. They have only 628 now. With the funds they had appropriated they were able to have an allotment of 718 positions in Washington, but they have got only 628 employees. Now they want—and this is the only thing in which they could possibly claim that their program had anything to do with the war effort—they want a million and a half dollars for their activities in connection with the liberated areas. That appears on page 105 of the hearings. Suppose we gave them that money, their present rate of expenditure appears on page 112 in the Department's hearings, and at that rate of expenditure $359,000 would come out of the district or departmental setup, so that if you allowed them $1,200,000 for the Department and $1,500,000 in the

liberated areas, and their Federal Reserve payment, including disbursements of all kinds, is $1,120,000, you would get a total of $3,820,000. That is the most they really ought to have. I am giving them $180,000 more than that when I say $4,000,000. There is absolutely no possible excuse for giving them a cent more than $4,000,000.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It occurs to me under the figures the gentleman has given and under the figures shown in the report that if they got $3,450,000 last year, even accepting the gentleman's amendment they would have $550,000 more than they had last year.

Mr. TABER. I am permitting that to stay there so there can be no excuse made by them on the ground that we did not give them the money to go into the liberated areas as they claim they need to. That is the reason I am letting that go in. The most you can possibly figure they could be entitled to under any circumstances is $3,820,000, and that is exceedingly liberal; that is giving them everything that could possibly be justified. Mr. Pehle himself said that he was going to use those people who were on the roll right now in the Department. He does, of course, want to raise their salaries; he has raised them time and time again. There are some of them who have had three and four step-ups—not automatic promotions under the Ramspeck Act, but three and four step-ups from grade to grade.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. It is just about the question as to whether or not this House is going to stand for any semblance of economy or whether we are going to go hog wild. Here is a case where it is absolutely and unqualifiedly unjustified even for the amount I am suggesting. Are we going to take it or are we going to give them $250,000 velvet to let them go out and find somebody to spend it on and let them go out and raise some more of these people four or five grades?

Let me say to you that the average of these professional people, these so-called economic analysts they employ, is $4,788. There is not any excuse for so many of these high-paid personnel. Let me say to you that in their departmental set-up they have 37 lawyers. Let me say to you that there is not the slightest need for any such number.

I do not know whether we want to be realists or whether we want to let things go. We will not have any bottom left in the Treasury if we do not meet the obligations we owe to the people of the United States to keep things in hand, to do away with useless and needless expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE to the amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$3,825,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, it will not be necessary to take 5 minutes to explain this amendment. The appropriation for this item last year was $3,450,000. The necessary amount in addition to that to meet the overtime obligations for the current year raises it to $3,825,000. I see no reason, under any testimony that has been offered, for giving them any more than they are getting this year when you make an allowance for the overtime; consequently, I see no reason for giving them $4,000,000 instead of $3,825,000.

Mr. TABER. I was giving them plenty of margin, but I know that the $3,825,000 is plenty of money and a good margin.

Mr. CASE. Then I hope the gentleman will support my amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House know that for years I have been rather critical of some of the appropriations, that I have supported reductions. I did not support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] a few minutes ago because I think we should not be critical of the Treasury Department. I know of no agency outside of the War and Navy Departments whose activities are more important in connection with this war at the present time. It is, I feel, a real war agency. The Treasury is the financial backer of those in the armed forces. Every Government department that is engaged in helping to prosecute the war I am going to support just as I do the Army and Navy. It is easy to criticize and at times it is justified, but I do not think we should lower an appropriation to reduce the number of messengers at this time. That is why I voted against the gentleman's amendment.

Now as to Foreign Funds Control, I confess I knew nothing of its activities until I read the justification for the appropriation. Let me read from the summary:

Foreign Funds Control is the financial spearhead in this Government's economic attack on the Axis. It is the one agency responsible for seeing that the Axis reaps no benefit from the billions of dollars looted from its victims and for insuring that enemy dollars are not competing with Allied dollars for the war materials money can buy. Foreign Funds Control strikes at Axis activity at its heart depriving the enemy of the money necessary for espionage, sabotage, propaganda, and buying. It strikes at collaborationists and "cloaks" by scrutinizing all transactions which might serve the enemy and by cutting off the rewards for their service to the dictators.

These are not passive operations, limited to immobilizing known dollar assets of the Axis and its victims. Foreign Funds Control carries the attack on all fronts. The really dangerous funds are concealed in the United States itself, in South America, in the neutral nations of Europe, and in the areas from which the enemy has been rolled back. The really dangerous transactions may flow through American channels. Axis assets and Axis agents must be ferreted out by men trained in economic and financial intelligence methods. Transactions involving billions yearly must be controlled by experts.

The job of the Treasury Department in liberated areas as to insure that all the financial facilities there are converted from serving the enemy to aiding the Allied advance. In such areas where banks, factories, and property were under enemy domination it must accomplish a complete change-over. It must set up necessary financial machinery for the use of our forces and the local economy. It must insure that these facilities cannot be used to assist the Axis or its agents. Its operations behind the lines are essential to the establishing of secure bases from which our armies can move forward and to the further tightening of our economic strangle hold upon the enemy powers.

All of these programs of financial and economic control are being carried out currently with a force of approximately 850 Federal employees and 400 Federal Reserve bank employees. It is interesting to note that according to the estimates of one writer the German Government was using several hundred thousand officials in the enforcement of its corresponding controls in 1939. In this country the control program has been especially economical because since the beginning the Government has been able to rely on an unofficial enforcement staff made up of the bankers, the brokers, and other individuals who handle transactions in foreign holdings. For an expenditure of less than $5,000,000 annually the Government keeps billions from the enemy and permits the use of these billions in a manner consistent with our war effort.

It is true, as the gentleman from New York said, that last year they operated for less than the Congress gave them despite the fact that their appropriation was reduced below the Budget estimate in the last bill.

Mr. Chairman, as we go into Italy and other places are liberated so will this Foreign Funds Control outfit go in and they will be compelled to enlarge. To me this work is extremely important and if they can keep billions from the enemy then I say we should support them.

Now getting back to the Secretary of the Treasury.

His Department in all the bond drives to finance this war has made a record that anyone can be proud of. As for me, I want to praise the Secretary of the Treasury and his associates for the grand job they have done, and will continue to do.

I am willing to reduce expenditures, but I am not going to cripple a Department that has made such an excellent record.

No one has any conception of the operation of the Treasury Department who has not read at least the Secretary's statement on the estimates and requirements for next year. Not only does he point out that it is not possible to curtail any of the principal functions but shows that the wartime increase of the operations of other departments and agencies is immediately reflected in the volume of disbursements, procurement, accounting, and other services which the Treasury Department is required to render. Despite the additional burdens that have been placed on the Treasury as a result of the war, the Secretary showed that they have effected economies in

some branches of his Department. After reading the hearings I reached the conclusion that praise rather than criticism is due the Treasury Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr Chairman, I subscribe to everything stated in the speech just made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. If the House deliberately wants to cripple the national effort, about the best way to proceed to do that would be by the adoption of either one of these amendments.

The Foreign Funds Control Committee is retrenching very rapidly in respect to its domestic operations. That is due to the fact that it is bringing most of those operations under general license and is able to effectuate its domestic controls largely through general licenses and by doing away with special licenses.

It has brought down the cost in this phase of its control from $9,000,000 to $4,000,000. The program, however, is expanding with tremendous velocity in all of the liberated areas. As soon as an area is liberated it is necessary for this Government to step in and establish economic controls, create currency systems and otherwise bring economic order out of chaos.

I wish that every Member of the House could read the justification presented to our committee because I am sure if they did so the vote against both of these amendments would be unanimous. I should like to read very briefly from these justifications:

> The liberation of territory which has previously been under enemy domination impcses heavy new responsibilities upon the Treasury. By order of the President, the Department is responsible for comprehensive financial, economic, and property controls in each rewon area. The scope of its operations in this field will be in direct relation to the success of the military advance.
>
> The north African experience has already illustrated on a small scale the necessity for the vigorous application in liberated areas of the controls over finances, property, and exchange. These controls are essential to the maintenance of firm bases for military operations and to the further weakening of the enemy's position.
>
> The pattern of the Treasury's future activities in this field is shown by (1) the problems which its field staff has met in north Africa, and (2) the work which the Washington staff has been called upon to do in preparing programs for territories already liberated or near liberation by the Allied forces.
>
> Compared with the multitude and magnitude of problems which will undoubtedly be met when Germany, France, the Balkans, and the Lowlands are brought under Allied control, the north African program was simplicity itself. Nevertheless, the African experience does suggest the extreme complexity of the problems which must be met.

The estimate presented to us was for $4,500,000 and we reduced it a quarter of a million dollars in the face of great uncertainty as to the obligations which will be imposed as we enter new fields. We must be prepared to take over the economic control in these areas, we must be prepared to establish order out of chaos, and we cannot do that unless this appropriation is granted.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does the gentleman think it is a fair statement to say that if we presume our armies are not going to move into any new countries, then probably this cut might be justified; but if we have any thought during the fiscal year 1945 of our armies being successful enough to invade or move into foreign countries where we are not now located, such a cut might be disastrous to the work that is being done for this country, for the Army, and for the whole world?

Mr. LUDLOW. I am sure the gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. O'NEAL. If we made this cut, we would be presuming that our armies will not progress?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think that is a correct inference.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have only 5 minutes. As the gentleman from Kentucky says if we would be assuming we are not going to win any victories, possibly these cuts might be justified. I am not going to agree to any such defeatist assumption.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. I merely want to ask the gentleman if it would not be possible for the Treasury to proceed in these countries that we may invade using their regular funds and if it develops that they have additional burdens they can come in for a deficiency appropriation?

Mr. LUDLOW. There are no funds available. That is the trouble. That is what we are trying to provide for. We are trying to meet a contingency here which is almost certain to arise. Our armies are moving victoriously forward. We are going to have these great areas on our hands perhaps before we know it and we must be prepared to establish some kind of order when we move into those territories.

The gentleman from New York spoke of a report of our investigators on this activity, but he did not read the report. I am sure he acted wisely in not citing it as evidence because it does not uphold his contention.

I want to tell the Committee what the investigators of the Committee on Appropriations who were sent into this activity reported back to us. They said:

> As has been generally found throughout the Department, the personnel in the Foreign Funds Control Division were all busily engaged in their assigned tasks. It should be pointed out also that all persons interviewed in this activity were very enthusiastic about the program and were extremely interested in turning out good work.

The gentleman referred to the salaries paid to some of the personnel and very accurately stated that they are a pretty highly paid personnel. Let me read to you what Mr. Pehle, the head of this activity, said about that:

> I would like to say something in connection with that; that is, in sending people away from Washington to represent the Treasury and the fiscal interests of the United States, it does not pay to send low-grade personnel. In the first place, it is very expensive to keep people in the field. If you pay for their transportation, it costs $600 to send a person to Europe by Clipper, and they are entitled to a per diem, and it is very expensive to live. In the second place, those people are going to be dealing with the top personnel that the British send to those areas, and with the top financial experts that the French have in the areas. You cannot expect low-grade professional people to deal effectively with the representatives of other world powers. If there was any outstanding criticism of the United States operations that was brought home by the five Senators who recently made a trip around the world, it was that they felt the United States in some cases did not have top-grade people representing our interests and protecting them.

So I think he demonstrated that it was to the advantage of our country to have competent personnel, and to get the competent personnel it is necessary to pay a reasonable salary.

As I say, in regard to the liberated areas program, we have an increase offsetting the decrease on the domestic end of the program, from zero in 1942 to an estimated $1,500,000 for the fiscal year 1945. We are spending $500,000 this year backing up a small staff in north Africa, a staff of 12, dealing with the fiscal, financial, monetary, and property-control program in that section. It is absolutely necessary, as these new areas are taken over and the establishment of an orderly economic system becomes necessary, that we have the full amount of this appropriation. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE) there were—ayes 35, noes 39.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CASE and Mr. LUDLOW.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 57, noes 56.

The CHAIRMAN. On this vote there are 57 ayes and 56 noes. The Acting Chairman votes "No." The amendment is rejected.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly.

Mr. TABER. There are in this set-up 35 messengers running between 6 buildings, the worst set-up you ever saw; 218 out of 267 in the District on administrative services, 20 on budget control, and 20 on administrative planning. It seems to me that that is ridiculous.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone questions the fine work that has been done by the Foreign Funds Control. I should like to read briefly some of the statements made by John Pehle, who is Director of that bureau. At page 73 of the hearings he said:

Foreign Funds Control itself, as you know, is an organization that was set up in April 1940, and expanded to the peak of its activities shortly after Pearl Harbor. Since then, and we will go into it in some detail later, we have spent considerably less.

On page 80 of the hearings, in reply to a question propounded by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], Mr. Pehle said this:

Foreign Funds Control was set up in April 1940 at the time Norway and Denmark were invaded. It was set up principally for the purpose of seeing that the assets of the invaded countries were not seized by Germany—as a protective measure—and as the war went on and Germany invaded other countries, to see that the assets of those countries were also safeguarded.

Is there anyone in this body who can successfully contend that Germany is still invading countries in Europe, thereby expanding the potential work and the program of the Foreign Funds Control?

I continue to quote from page 95 of the hearings. Mr. Pehle stated as follows:

No. This is what I tried to bring out. We have always been in the position with this committee, before which we have appeared 10 or 12 times, of saying that we were giving you our best estimate of what we needed. Sometimes we had more funds than we needed, and we turned back in 1 fiscal year over $460,000 that we did not use; sometimes we had less, and once we had to come up for several deficiencies.

Mr. DWORSHAK. But you were always taken care of in good shape when you presented evidence that justified your demands?

Mr. PEHLE. That is entirely true.

The facts as developed by the hearings are these: That the Foreign Funds Control has been doing excellent work, and we recognize that our armies are not likely to invade more countries. Neither is Germany invading countries over there, necessitating a continued and expanded activity of this particular agency of government; nor is there any indication that we in the months ahead are going to invade so many countries in Europe that at this particular time we must look into the future and provide a lot of money that might be needed by this agency. The War and Navy Departments recently returned unexpended $27,000,000,000. This body has approved all of the funds necessary for carrying on the vital and important activities of these war agencies. The record shows that during the first 4 months of the current fiscal year this agency has been expending its funds at the rate of approximately $4,000,000 annually. In view of that fact, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is entirely proper, and because of that fact I urge its adoption.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. In all fairness to the gentlemen of this committee I would like to state that if there is one item in this bill above all others I would like to see protected, it is the item we are now discussing. Everything else in the bill may be of importance, but if you gentlemen will read the hearings on the important work being done by the Foreign Funds Control, I do not believe there is a man here who would be in favor of the amendment. The Foreign Funds Control has been doing an amazing piece of work for the Army and for the Navy, and for this country in its war effort. If you will read the hearings you will find that the investigators that were sent down there were not critical of the number of employees they have there or elsewhere. In fact, they were complimentary about it, and they made a close and accurate check. Furthermore, you will find that the Army and our officials overseas will tell you that they have done a remarkable piece of work. They will tell you that today they have seized and are handling $8,500,000,000 worth of foreign securities and things of value in the interest of our country. They have voluntarily reduced the amount that they have had before where they found they could. A group of young men, Mr. Pehle and his associates, are extremely intelligent and interested in the job charged to them, and where they could save they did save, and we made a cut of $250,000 in the estimate.

This same group may have to go into 10 or 20 other countries before the fiscal year 1945 is over. Their work overseas may increase 50 percent. They cannot wait to call back here when they are going with the Army into a foreign country and say that they will get the Deficiency Appropriations Committee to make it up. I refer, gentlemen, to the hearings on page 66 and ask you to read of the important jobs that they are doing for the war effort. If you gentlemen will read it, you will agree with me. When this agency was before our committee we agreed on this cut of $250,000, and complimentary things were said about the job they were doing. Nobody in the committee suggested a greater cut, as I recall.

Mr. TABER. I did not agree to this.

Mr. O'NEAL. The gentleman's attitude was very friendly toward the reasonable cut of $250,000. I did not mention the gentleman. We are talking now about war work that is of equal importance to much of what the soldiers and the sailors are doing, and by all means, this cut should not be made. It is one of the most important things in the bill. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes, 56, noes, 60.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. TABER and Mr. LUDLOW to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 63 noes 60.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For salaries in the District of Columbia and all other expenses (except printing and binding) of the Bureau of Accounts, including contract stenographic reporting services, stationery (not to exceed $10,000), supplies and equipment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Bureau of Accounts, $830,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 7, line 13, after the comma, strike out "$830,000" and insert "$800,000."

Mr. TABER. The object of this amendment is to get rid of some of the operations of the Bureau of Accounts, which are duplications. They are, at the present time, trying to state the accounts of the Government in accordance with Executive Order 8512 and it is practically a duplication of the operations of the General Accounting Office. They are keeping three sets of the same records, one for the General Accounting Office, one for the Treasury, and one for the Bureau of the Budget, all based on a different set-up. This particular outfit had an opportunity to effect a $47,000 cut, according to our investigators, if it would install a little better method. The work under Assistant Commissioner Maxwell in connection with the operations of section 8512, gives them 22 Budget positions, which are not needed there, if they are to be had in the Bureau of the Budget. They can cut that item under Commissioner Maxwell from $92,215 down to $50,000. They can easily save $10,000 in the Bureau of Accounts item by a cutting in half of the 10 positions for personnel activity. This is a clear duplication of the personnel office of the Treasury and that was the finding of our representatives who went in there. I feel we could take advantage of this proposition and should cut this down to $800,000 from the $830,000 that was recommended by the Subcommittee on Appropriations. The original Budget estimate was only $857,000 and it is perfectly clear that by doing away with the needless activities they can save the whole of that $57,000.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, before I finish I will try to discuss the amendment, but I want to say a few words in behalf of a group of men that I really feel very sorry for and my sympathy goes out to them; they are the so-called bureaucrats. We hear so much about them. Perhaps a great many of the offices are overmanned; perhaps there are many more people in the jobs today than should be there. But from my contacts with the men down in the offices of the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department and the other Government agencies I can state I know no more patriotic people and no better Americans and no finer men than they are. We up here on the Hill are criticized for many things that we know are unfair, not right and not true. Yet in the same way we are so eager to jump upon some poor fellow down in the bureaus who is doing the best he can where his job has increased tremendously in volume and importance. He is having new problems to face and is forced to effect new organizations to meet those problems. Yet no one says a word for him. We speak of overmanning. Why, one income tax return keeps me busy all day long yet one bureau in the Treasury Department has to know all about 50,000,000 income-tax blanks. It is a pretty good sized job. Think of the number of people required to issue the checks; to account for every man on our pay rolls; and to keep records of the purchasing of materials and the spending of what we here authorize. Think of the number of people that are required.

We have investigators in the Treasury and the Post Office Departments, men who have no interest except to get at the facts. I have looked through the investigations and reports of the Departments under our bill, the Treasury Department and Post Office Department, and almost without exception they have stated that in their opinions there is not any overmanning so far as personnel is concerned; that they are doing a conscientious job; and that there is not, with one or two small exceptions, a statement made by any investigator indicating this great waste of manpower in the bureaus which we hear so often on the floor.

Furthermore, we speak of these people down there as though they had newly come into the Government service and that they have some strange political philosophy which makes them see things differently from sensible people. All that sort of thing goes on day by day. I would like to read to you just briefly, the names of the leading men in the Treasury Department. Whether they are newcomers or not in the Government service will appear from what I read here. We can then see whether they are people who have enjoyed the confidence of the people of America, not only of this administration but of the administrations which have preceded this one. This list is as follows:

Name	Title	Bureau or office	Number of years in Government service
D. W. Bell	Under Secretary	Secretary	33
W. N. Thompson	Administrative assistant to Secretary	do	37
Charles R. Schoeneman	Technical assistant to Secretary	do	37
Charles S. Bell	do	do	18
Wm. T. Hesselfinger	Assistant to Under Secretary	do	26
T. F. Wilson	Director of Personnel	Personnel	28
Elmer L. Irey	Coordinator, Enforcement Agency	Secretary	37
Francis C. Rose	Assistant to Assistant Secretary	do	37
Frank A. Birgfeld	Chief Clerk	Chief Clerk	41
Denzil A. Right	Superintendent of Treasury Buildings	Superintendent	25
Russell R. Reagh	Assistant Director, Research and Statistics	Research and Statistics	18
William S. Broughton	Commissioner of Public Debt	Public Debt	47
Edwin L. Kilby	Assistant Commissioner of Public Debt	do	27
Marvin Wesley	Chief, Loans and Currency	do	42
Melvin R. Loafman	Chief, Public Debt Accounts	do	35
Edward F. Bartelt	Commissioner of Accounts	Accounts	27
Robert W. Maxwell	Assistant Commissioner of Accounts	do	18
Joseph Greenberg	do	do	34
Guy F. Allen	Chief Disbursing Officer	Division of Disbursement	42
Harry R. Schwalm	Chief, Section of Surety Bonds	Accounts	29
Alvin W. Hall	Director, Bureau of Engraving and Printing	Engraving and Printing	26
Clark R. Long	Assistant Director, Bureau of Engraving and Printing.	do	27
Thomas F. Slattery	do	do	21
Harry J. Anslinger	Commissioner of Narcotics	Narcotics	27
Will S. Wood	Deputy Commissioner of Narcotics	do	28
George O. Barnes	Assistant to Treasurer of the United States	Treasurer of the United States.	42
M. E. Slindee	Administrative Assistant, Treasurer of the United States.	do	39
John P. Wenchel	Chief Counsel, Internal Revenue	Internal Revenue	30
Clifton E. Mack	Director of Procurement	Procurement	20
George Landick, Jr.	Assistant to Director of Procurement	do	35
Robert LeFevre	do	do	35
Thomas F. Murphy	Deputy Director of Procurement	do	38
E. B. Van Veen	Attorney for Government	Internal Revenue	25
Harold N. Graves	Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue	do	35
Norman D. Cann	Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue	do	22
D. Spencer Bliss	do	do	46
George J. Schoeneman	do	do	35
W. H. Woolf	Chief, Intelligence Unit, Internal Revenue	do	35
W. R. Johnson	Commissioner of Customs	Customs	26
Frank Dow	Assistant Commissioner of Customs	do	34
Frank J. Wilson	Chief, Secret Service	Secret Service	25

All of them have had from 18 to 20 and 30 years' service. They are not what you gentlemen are prone to call new dealers, Socialists, or what not. Those men have 10, 15, and 30 years of trained service, loyal service, service that has been approved of in these Government agencies for a great length of time. They are responsible for the work that goes on in the Treasury Department. There is a Secretary of the Treasury over them who changes, but the chief work, as you gentlemen know, is done by the staff. These are the men in the key positions. When we criticize a department, I think we must realize that an old Department like the Treasury is in safe, sound, and I might say even conservative hands.

Our investigators investigated this Bureau of Accounts. We made a cut in it, and they stated:

> It is generally true that in the entire Bureau of Accounts there was no idle personnel. All persons were busy at their desks and in many instances it was ascertained that the overtime work had been prevalent during the past several months in order to keep the work up-to-date.

That is the report of our own investigators as to what they are doing.

It will be noted that the total personnel contained in the estimates for 1944–45 is somewhat less than the persons actually on the roll as of 1943. Also, the personnel established by the Bureau of the Budget exceeds these figures.

It was said during the inquiry that there was no contemplated decrease in work in this section and the indications are that the work would increase and in all probability the Bureau of Accounts would be compelled to request supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1944–45.

It is easy to stand here and blast those good people who are doing the best they can. I think we should be fair and just. Let us not be quite so bitter in accusing some of these fine American citizens from your district and mine, in these bureaus of being careless, wasteful, inattentive, and poor executives. They are doing a fine job. Our own investigators said that this very Department for which a cut is being asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is doing more work than it has ever done before. We gave them a cut. They are probably in need of more personnel rather than less.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Since the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offers the report of our investigators as the basis on which he proposes his amendment, I should like, at the expense of being repetitious, to quote to the House what our investigators did say in regard to this office of the Bureau of Accounts. A part of their statement was quoted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. I shall quote the full statement. They say:

> It can be stated generally that all employees were reasonably busy with their assigned tasks, and there was no evidence developed that there was any degree of loafing or idleness within the entire Bureau. It is generally true throughout the entire Bureau that there is no idle personnel. All persons

were busy at their desks and in many instances it was ascertained that the overtime work had been prevalent during the past several months, in order to keep the work up to date.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] referred to a suggestion for consolidation of activities within this Bureau as the basis for the justification for the cut.

Mr. TABER. That was the previous amendment. I did say that they were doing a lot of work that duplicated the work of the General Accounting Office, and this is the same outfit that has been trying to get hold of the General Accounting Office work for the last 10 years.

Mr. LUDLOW. I want to say in that connection that no one has a higher esteem for this staff of investigators than I have. I am sure it is going to be productive of a great deal of good and of many economies in the public service. But this staff has hardly begun to function. It was thrown in there during the last few days, and if you will read its voluminous report, which is about as large as the dictionary, you will find that in many of their statements to Congress they merely say, "This is our offhand impression. We believe we can effectuate economies, but we do not know." That is the substance of it. They throw out these suggestions as a matter of background for future effort on the part of the Committee on Appropriations. I think we should not accept these offhand findings of the investigators without giving the different officials a chance to answer them—a chance to present what they would desire to say in regard to these different suggestions. I do not think we should overthrow the time-honored procedure of a century just on the offhand findings of investigators who state that they have not had time to go into the subject. It is true that in this case the suggestion was made that there might be a consolidation that would effectuate economies. This is what the investigators say:

> These matters were discussed with the Commissioner of the Bureau of Accounts and as a result of the discussion a committee was appointed to consider the possibilities of consolidating the personnel and accounting activities. The following are the concluding comments of this committee.

That is the departmental committee. They say:

> We are in sympathy with the general idea advanced by the investigators and believe it is to be welcomed as a constructive suggestion for possible improvement and savings. In view of what has been said, however, we think the matter is one which justifies most careful consideration and will require a more thorough study than we have been able to make in the past several days. If such a study should be undertaken and any reorganization resulting therefrom is made at the opportune time, we think that some saving in supervisory and clerical force might be accomplished. Only from a more detailed study, however, would it be possible to furnish any reasonable estimate of such saving.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 67, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expenses of loans: The indefinite appropriation "Expenses of loans, act of September 24, 1917, as amended and extended" (31 U. S. C. 760, 761), shall not be used during the fiscal year 1945 to supplement the appropriations otherwise provided for the current work of the Bureau of the Public Debt, and the amount obligated under such indefinite appropriation during such fiscal year shall not exceed $109,500,000 to be expended as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct: *Provided*, That the proviso in the act of June 16, 1921 (31 U. S. C. 761), limiting the availability of this appropriation for expenses of operations on account of any public debt issue to the close of the fiscal year next following the fiscal year in which such issue was made, shall not apply to savings bond transactions handled by the Federal Reserve banks for account of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That regular field employees of the War Finance Division may be reimbursed, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, for travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles while engaged in the promotion of the sale of United States Government securities within the limits of their official stations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning with the words *"Provided further"* in line 5 on page 12 and continuing through the paragraph, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

Salaries: For personal services in the District of Columbia, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, $4,075,000: *Provided*, That with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, there may be transferred to this appropriation and to the appropriations "Printing and binding, Office of the Treasurer of the United States" and "Contingent expenses, Office of the Treasurer of the United States", from funds respectively available for such purposes for the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Home Owners' Loan Corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Federal land banks and other banks and corporations under the supervision of the Farm Credit Administration, Railroad Retirement Board, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, United States Maritime Commission, Food Distribution Administration, Farm Security Administration, Federal Housing Administration, Federal Public Housing Authority, Commodity Credit Corporation, and corporations and banks under the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, such sums as may be necessary to cover the expenses incurred on account of such respective activities in clearing of checks, servicing of bonds, handling of collections, and rendering of accounts therefor.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 12, line 14, strike out "$4,075,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,900,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, on this amendment we will not have to refer to any investigators, we will simply depend upon the hearings and what was developed in the hearings. We have attempted here to cut $175,000 below what the committee marked the bill. The total activity of the Treasurer's office, based upon checks and reductions, it appears, was such that there was a backlog when they started on July 1 this year, but they were given a large addition to their funds to take care of the backlog. As appears on page 358 of the hearings, they claimed they were behind 81,000,000 checks and documents, that that would all be cleaned up. You will note that Mr. Barnes stated on page 358 just below the middle of the page:

> We are working on that now, Mr. TABER, with the supplemental appropriations provided for 1944. We think we can clear up that backlog in this fiscal year so that when we start the 1945 fiscal year we hope to be on a pretty even keel so far as operations in Washington are concerned.

There is no reflection of that backlog in the estimates for 1945 and they are cleaning up that backlog with less help than has been provided for them; in other words, with the funds that are now appropriated they were authorized to have 2,467 employees. To show you how the thing has worked out with the cleaning up of that backlog they had 2,345 employees when they started on the 1st of July. Presently—that is, as of the last date we were able to get in the hearings—they had only 2,293 employees, a reduction of 52 below the former figure and a reduction of 174 below the number they would be able to have. Nevertheless, with that picture they are cleaning up their backlog and getting rid of the 81,000,000 checks. Why? Just because they have put in machines that enable them with the punch-card checks to do more work than they did before with the same help.

What I am proposing here is that we take advantage of those punch-card-check machines and that when that backlog of work they claimed they were behind is cleaned up and those 81,000,000 checks and bonds are taken care of we should take advantage of that situation and provide less money for next year. My idea is that we can make it $3,900,000 without the least trouble. I hope the Members of the House will be in favor of saving money when they come to vote on this and will adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that of all the places in the bill, this is the place where a cut would be least justifiable. The enormous increase of the volume of work in the Treasurer's office is explained on page 8 of the report, where it is said:

> It is contemplated that the volume of checks to be serviced from these funds will increase from 265,000,000 in number in 1944 to 310,000,000 in 1945.

That shows you how this work is growing like a rolling snowball in that office, and, of course, the personnel has to be had to perform this work.

The appropriations we allowed, and which the gentleman from New York proposes to cut still further, are $574,526 below the total amount available for 1944 and $294,000 below the estimate for 1945.

We have cut this appropriation, Mr. Chairman, to the irreducible minimum. It cannot be cut any further now, I am sure.

The gentleman was wise when he said he would not undertake to quote from the report of the investigators in regard to this office. With his indulgence and the indulgence of the Committee, I will quote from the report of the investigators who went into this office to ascertain its condition and its personnel. They say:

The need for additional personnel in the office of the Treasurer was quite acute. Rather serious backlogs have developed, and the caliber of the personnel being obtained at the present time is considerably below what the organization considers normal. It was apparent—

Say these investigators—

that all personnel were busy and that they were being utilized efficiently; in fact, the office is acutely in need—

Bear this in mind—

the office is acutely in need of the additional personnel, but because of the low grade it is almost impossible to get a sufficient number to process the increasing work load.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman does not give any credit to the statement of Mr. Barnes that he is going to get this backlog cleared up in the fiscal year 1944, then? That is what he said on page 358 of the hearings. I figured he was telling the truth.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think when my friend quotes our investigatorial staff in one instance it is only fair to quote them in the other instance. They tell us how acute the need is for additional personnel. Notwithstanding that, we have made a great big slice in the appropriation. It would be very unwise to cut the appropriation any further and I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 79, noes 86.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 86, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Salaries and expenses: For collecting the revenue from customs, for enforcement, as specified in Executive Order No. 9083, of certain navigation laws, for the detection and prevention of frauds upon the customs revenue, and not to exceed $100,000 for the securing of evidence of violations of the customs and navigation laws; for expenses of transportation and transfer of customs receipts from points where there are no Government depositories; not to exceed $84,500 for foreign living allowances; not to exceed $500 for subscriptions to newspapers; not to exceed $85,000 for stationery; not to exceed $12,000 for improving, repairing, maintaining, or preserving buildings, inspection stations, office quarters, including living quarters for officers, sheds, and sites along the Canadian and Mexican borders acquired under authority of the act of June 26, 1930 (19 U. S. C. 68); and for the purchase (not to exceed 150), maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles when necessary for official use in field work; for the payment of extra compensation earned by customs officers or employees for overtime services, at the expense of the parties in interest, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the act approved February 13, 1911, as amended by the act approved February 7, 1920, and section 451 of the Tariff Act, 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 261, 267, and 1451), the receipts from such overtime services to be deposited as a refund to the appropriation from which such overtime compensation is paid, in accordance with the provisions of section 524 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; for the cost of seizure, storage, and disposition of any merchandise, vehicle and team, automobile, boat, air or water craft, or any other conveyance seized under the provisions of the customs laws, for the purchase of arms, ammunition, and accessories; not to exceed $700,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia exclusive of 10 persons from the field force authorized to be detailed under section 525 of the Tariff Act of 1930, and reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, of employees for travel performed by them in privately owned automobiles while engaged in inspecting, guarding, admeasuring, examining, sampling, investigating, and storekeeping duties within the limits of their official station, $25,500,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 14, line 12, after "fifty", insert "at a price not exceeding $1,300 each."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I understand they want to pay $1,500 apiece for these automobiles, which I think is ridiculous.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 15, line 12, after the comma, strike out "$25,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$25,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, these are the facts with reference to Custom's appropriation, as shown on page 390 of the hearings. There are 31 departmental vacancies and 473 vacancies in the field, for all of which the funds are provided for in the committee bill. If the vacancies that now exist were all filled—and they do not seem to be able to get their personnel up, because they do not need them—it would take $1,450,000 more than they will use. In other words, in building up these estimates they have allowed in the Budget for 31 vacancies in the department and 473 vacancies in the field. The committee has cut the vacancies one-third, but there is no occasion for $25,500,000, and we should cut the appropriation somewhat in order to take care of that slack.

I can see no reason in the world for our providing $1,000,000 more than they need. We can just as well save $1,000,000 right here as not, and this amendment gives us an opportunity to cut out a further $500,000. There is an absolute case for it because they do not have the positions filled now and they cannot fill them as long as this war situation continues. They have fewer transactions to take care of, and there would be no occasion for leaving a dollar of this $1,400,000 in here if it were not for some guards they perhaps might want. I am willing to give them $450,000 velvet to provide guards in addition to what they might have justified before the committee, but I do think we should call a halt to just carrying on an appropriation bill empty positions which they have not justified and which they cannot get filled. I hope the committee will support this amendment and give us a chance to save $500,000 for the Treasury.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, may I say that this relates to the Bureau of Customs? I did not say that when I started my remarks.

Mr. O'NEAL. I am glad the gentleman identified the amendment so we may know what we are going to vote on.

Mr. Chairman, we discussed this entire matter very carefully in our committee and came in here in a most harmonious sort of way. The arguments the gentleman from New York made as to the possibility of recruiting further employees were all discussed, and in a very sweet and amicable way we agreed on the cut which has already been effected. We are somewhat surprised now to find that after there was more or less of a meeting of minds, when all the arguments the gentleman now adduces were discussed in detail by the subcommittee, the gentleman should now offer this amendment.

Mr. TABER. I want it understood I agreed on nothing.

Mr. O'NEAL. Of course, the gentleman reserved the right to come on the floor and make further talks, but apparently he agreed on it. Apparently after discussing it and the amount was suggested, all of us said, "All right, that amount is O. K." But on this item and others the gentleman comes in here now using the same arguments which we all used for the cut we estimated would be correct, and then he makes a speech and goes on still further about it, when nothing was said in the committee about further cuts, so far as I know.

I do not know why the gentleman is bringing those additional cuts in when we had a very thorough discussion in the committee and all worked in harmony, but here he is.

I should like to have the Committee understand that the work of the Bureau

of Customs is most important. We reduced this amount $500,000 under the Budget estimate and $132,200 under the total estimated obligations for 1944.

Further, we again had the benefit of our investigators. Their reports contained no statement about the Bureau's being overmanned, but said they probably did not have the number they needed, that the personnel were very active and busy and hard at work. Therefore, the argument we are making is substantiated by the close, accurate investigation made by the men who are employed by our own committee to find out these things.

Mr. Chairman, we again come to the place where offhand, statements can be made, and Members can say, "I think," and "This is the worst that ever happened," and can use all kinds of superlatives, but the fact remains that we made substantial cuts after thorough discussion in our committee, and this action was backed up by the report of the expert investigators we sent out.

It is all right to get up and do something more here in the interest of taking a strong position for economy, but, after all, the bureaus have to operate. We sat down as a committee and in a friendly and open fashion discussed every argument the gentleman has made, and apparently we were all agreed. I think we should stand by the decision made by all of us in presenting this bill. I trust the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, I hope I realize the great Committee on Appropriations has given this measure a great deal of study and consideration, but Mr. Chairman, if we are going to have reduction in expenditures in the management of our Government, we will have to begin somewhere to do it. I am not one who would want to injure or cripple the efficiency of any department of our Government. Here is a chance to save the Treasury and the taxpayers $500,000, without, in my opinion, injuring the efficiency of our Government. Let us try it out. The amount of $500,000 is not a reduction of 10 percent or 5 percent. It is only 2 percent of the $25,500,000 you are allowing for this one service alone.

I notice it has been said that this reduction of $500,000 is regarded as a very large reduction. According to the committee report the committee has increased the appropriation over last year on this item by $3,730,065. If I am in error, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman is mistaken. It is $132,000 below the estimated obligations for 1944.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There may be some reductions in the bill, but this particular item of expenses for salaries and expenses for Customs Service shows $21,769,935 for 1944 appropriation. Your report before us today says "amount recommended in bill for 1945, $25,500,000." It also says, with regard to this item "plus $3,730,065."

The only effective way I know of for you to reduce personnel—and you talk a good deal here on the floor about wanting to reduce the personnel in these departments—is to reduce the amount of the appropriations. I am in favor of having sufficient employees, but not more than we need. I want them to receive fair pay for their services. But, Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that in many, many places, there could be reorganization and simplification, and cutting of plenty of red tape, as well as cutting a lot of inefficiency, so we could save a considerable amount of lost motion, manpower, and money.

Members of the Committee, this is a reduction of only 2 percent, but it is $500,000. Why not save it?

Why not ask this agency to cooperate and make a real effort to show it is willing to reduce the item by 2 percent. It will not mean the reduction of salaries. It will mean getting along with a few less employees that are so much needed in industry and other places.

I know it would be appreciated by the people of the country, and I sincerely feel there need be no reduction whatsoever in the efficiency of this agency. Let us try it out once.

Mr. Chairman, I observe some members of the Committee insist a great amount of additional cost is due to overtime pay. Mr. Chairman, it was understood when the overtime pay was granted that hours of work were likewise increased, and the net result would show a reduction in personnel, with little impairment in amount of services rendered.

Mr. Chairman, it is disappointing, to say the least, to find that increase in pay and in hours of employment, does not seem to show more services rendered on behalf of our Government. Neither the hearings or the report of the committee seem to disclose much benefit by reason of it.

Now I want to insert a copy of that portion of the statement of the committee report showing the increase $3,730,065, that I have mentioned in my discussion with respect to salaries and expenses in Customs Service.

Comparative statement of the appropriations for 1944, the estimates for 1945, and the amounts recommended in the bill for 1945

TITLE I—TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Object	Appropriations for 1944	Budget estimates for 1945	Amount recommended in bill for 1945	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with appropriations for 1944	Increase (+) or decrease (−), bill compared with estimates, 1945
CUSTOMS SERVICE					
Salaries and expenses	$21,769,935	$26,000,000	$25,500,000	+$3,730,065	−$500,000
Printing and binding	85,000	85,000	85,000		
Total, Customs Service	21,854,935	26,085,000	25,585,000	+3,730,065	−500,000

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Like the gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but I have confidence in the committee. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], and the ranking member of that committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], are both endeavoring to bring about economy and a reduction in governmental expenses. Of course, it is very easy for gentlemen on the left to come down here, after they have heard the evidence in committee, and agreed on a sum in a bill, to then urge a further reduction on the floor. Of course, a plea for reduced appropriations sounds well at home, but it is unfair, after the committee has worked hard and has come to a conclusion that this is the amount required for an efficient administration of the agency, to offer an amendment for a further reduction. I repeat it is not fair to come down here and try to cut this provision by $500,000. I myself believe in economy and I want to hold down expenditures, but there are certain things that are necessary, and I have the utmost confidence in the committee. We should rely upon the judgment and the action of the Committee on Appropriations, which we all recognize as one of the outstanding committees of the House, composed of able men who desire to do the right thing by the Government, and at the same time see to it that the different bureaus and departments should not be restricted so that they could not carry out their functions and duties. Of course, if I were on the other side I might also play to the galleries and ask for a reduction when I know that such reduction is impossible if the work is to be efficiently carried on.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, for a question.

Mr. JENSEN. I have been in this House over 5 years now and I ask the gentleman from Illinois if I am mistaken when I make the statement that he has never once voted to cut down any appropriation in the 5 years that I have been here. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is wrong.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman state one place where he ever voted to reduce an appropriation?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot remember the number of times I have advocated a reduction in expenditures.

Mr. JENSEN. Name one place.

Mr. SABATH. That is all that I can yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Name one place.

Mr. SABATH. I will give it to the gentleman. The gentleman has been here for 5 years——

Mr. JENSEN. Name one place.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further. I have been here for 38 years, and I have seen this kind of horseplay year in and year out, and I think it is unfair to attempt to play

to the galleries at the expense of the committee that has performed its duties thoroughly and justly, as they should be performed. As I said, I have the utmost confidence in that committee, and especially do I feel that we should stand by the committee in its recommendations for appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I really ought to have the gentleman's words taken down when he says we are playing to the gallery. The gentleman knows that that is not a proper statement.

Mr. SABATH. I withdraw that statement, and also will refer to the situation as political play instead of horseplay, but I understood that the gentleman agreed to the amount of the appropriation in committee.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman knows better than that.

Mr. SABATH. If I knew better, I would not make that assertion, but I heard the gentleman from Kentucky make that statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and with all due respect to the gentleman from New York, like my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], I was very much surprised when the gentleman from New York offered this amendment. It is the first that I heard of it. It was not offered in the subcommittee.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. HERTER. Does this item include some 37 employees in the wool customs laboratory in the city of Boston? If that is the item, if that is included in this item, I am sure that they could cut it down by a reduction of 20 employees without interfering with its efficiency.

Mr. LUDLOW. I do not know about that; but I say this, that in the face of the rising volume of customs business, we have cut this item $132,200 below what it carried last year. We cut it half a billion dollars below the estimate that was submitted to us, and I want to read from the testimony of the Commissioner of Customs, in which he told about the business and how it is increasing. He said:

> During the first months of this [fiscal] year, 1944—that is in July, August, September, October of this year—our revenues have exceeded those for the corresponding period of the last fiscal year by 54½ percent.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Can the gentleman give us the figures of the amount of customs collected increased over last year?

Mr. LUDLOW. I do not have the figure before me. The gentleman from New York has referred to the report of the investigators, and I will give the report of the investigators in regard to this particular activity. They went into it thoroughly with regard to the manner of operation and the personnel, and as to whether or not the Bureau of Customs was overstaffed. They say:

> Personal observation of the departmental personnel indicates that all employees are reasonably busy on their assigned tasks; total number of personnel in the District of Columbia to supervise activities of the field appears to be conservative, and there is no indication of excess personnel. The department personnel represents less than 3 percent of the total, and their functions are restricted to general supervision and coordination of field activities. This appears to be a conservative number for this purpose. All personnel appears to be busy and have plenty of work to do. There was no evidence of loitering or of inefficent use of personnel or that excess personnel was available.

All the evidence we had in the hearings and the report of the investigators was that this activity is well conducted, economically conducted, and on that basis and the fact of recent volume of business we have cut it half a billion dollars. I submit this additional cut is not justified.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to correct that half-billion-dollar cut. I notice by the report it says plus $3,730,000. Is not that an increase? I am talking about the item for salaries on page 22 and page 23, where last year it was evidently under "increase or decrease as compared with appropriations for 1944," plus $3,730,065.

Mr. LUDLOW. But the gentleman does not consider the overtime that goes into that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to strike $500,000 from this appropriation. I believe that generally the appropriation bill before us presents difficulties involving recruitment, because manpower problems are just as serious when they confront our Federal Government as when they constitute a menace and a threat to private employers today. In this particular bureau of Government, according to the evidence submitted by Commissioner Johnson, he stated there were 31 vacancies in the department and 473 vacancies in the field. That simply means, whether or not they are doing a good job, they are unable to get all of the help for which they are asking appropriations.

A few minutes ago the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] tried to point out that it was unfair and unreasonable for this body to attempt to disagree with any of the justifications submitted in behalf of these appropriations by the various executive bureaus and agencies. I think everyone will agree with me that the Members of this body have a joint responsibility; as the gentleman from Kansas pointed out, "We talk a lot about economy, but what do we do about it?" The only way to effect economy in these bureaus and agencies is to cut down the estimates submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. That is the only way we are going to curtail and limit these activities of the various bureaus.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly.

Mr. ANGELL. I notice the Byrd committee recommended that there be eliminated from the Federal pay roll some 300,000 employees. I would like to ask the gentleman how we are going to do that if we continue to pass every budget as it comes along, making no eliminations and no cuts.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I was going to refer to this report.

The report of the Byrd committee, submitted under date of November 22, 1943, will probably answer your question. It contains the following statement:

> Despite the fact that the first overtime pay act, which increased the working hours of the Government employee, applied to at least 2,180,000 Federal civilian employees, or over 70 percent of the Federal employees, the Bureau of the Budget issued reduction orders only to agencies or parts of agencies representing an aggregate of 735,338 employees, or only one-fourth of the Federal civilian employees.

That simply means that the Bureau of the Budget is not cooperating with the Byrd committee. So far requests have been made to the bureaus affecting only one-quarter of this civilian personnel.

I quote further from the Byrd committee report as follows:

> The committee recommends that the Civil Service Commission, in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget, immediately proceed to institute manpower utilization surveys throughout the entire Federal Government with a view toward reducing and more fully utilizing personnel in all departments and agencies in keeping with the purpose of War Manpower Commission Directive No. 10, and by February 1, 1944, report their findings to the President and to the Congress.

So far as I know, that report requested by the Byrd committee to be submitted to the Congress by February 1, of this year, has not been submitted. I ask you how we can get this essential cooperation when these executive bureaus, including the Bureau of the Budget, refuse to cooperate? May I submit some figures to show how the personnel in the Treasury Department has increased during the past 2 years?

On November 30, 1941, the total civilian personnel in the Treasury Department was 60,949. On November 30, 1943, the total was 85,420, an increase of almost 25,000 or approximately 40 percent in 2 years. How can we curtail civilian employment and restrict this hoarding of manpower when we see this report showing there has been an increase of 40 percent in civilian personnel in the Treasury Department in the 2 years ending November 30, 1943?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho be permitted to proceed 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I was much interested in the comments of the

gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in his conversation with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] as to the voting record of the gentleman from Illinois in all of the reductions. Might I ask further of the gentleman from Idaho if he has seen any Member on that side, with the exception of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], rise at any time in support of any of the reductions which we have tried to put through this afternoon?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I believe the vision of the gentleman from Minnesota is as good as mine. May I add just this other thought? I do not believe anyone is in disagreement with the views submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. We all recognize we have some serious problems to solve. We want better cooperation between the legislative and executive departments. We know that the overtime bill was passed. It might be of interest to point to some of the findings of the investigators which indicate that not only have these civilian employees had this overtime, amounting to as much as $628 annually, but there have been numerous grade promotions and in-grade promotions. For instance, I am referring to a gentleman who has a certain position paying $5,600 per annum, plus overtime, just 2 years ago he was in the grade receiving only between $2,600 and $3,200. He was in that classification. His salary has more than doubled in 2 years. That is typical of the treatment that has been accorded the civilian personnel in our executive departments.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. Does not the gentleman think that in common justice capacity and ability of a man even though in the Government service should be recognized and that if a man distinguishes himself by his ability, it should be recognized by an increase in salary?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I believe that is justifiable.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is one example of that.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not know whether this particular instance is justifiable or not.

May I say in conclusion, the executive department of government should recognize that we must endeavor to solve these problems and utilize to the fullest extent the manpower of our Nation, just as private business is doing today in this wartime emergency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 85, noes 90.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. LUDLOW and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 93, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For the Director, two Assistant Directors, and other personal services in the District of Columbia, including wages of rotary press plate printers at per diem rates and all other plate printers at piece rates to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, not to exceed the rates usually paid for such work; and all other necessary expenses, except printing and binding, including engravers' and printers' materials and other materials, including distinctive and nondistinctive paper, except distinctive paper for United States currency and Federal Reserve bank currency; purchase of tabulating machine-card checks; equipment of, repairs to, and maintenance of buildings and grounds and minor alterations to buildings; periodicals, examples of engraving and printing, including foreign securities and stamps, and books of reference, not to exceed $500; traveling expenses not to exceed $15,000; articles approved by the Secretary of the Treasury as being necessary for the protection of the person of employees, not to exceed $2,200; stationery, not to exceed $5,000; transfer to the Bureau of Standards for scientific investigations in connection with the work of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, not to exceed $15,000; and maintenance and driving of two motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; $10,000,000, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 22, line 10, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$9,650,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to save $350,000 because of the fact that they have in here an estimate for an additional amount of $350,000 for cigarette stamps. This appears on page 5 of the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing will require $350,000 additional next year, as compared with this year's fund. This increase is due largely to estimated requirements of cigarette tobacco stamps, offset to some extent by reductions in the estimated production in currency and checks.

Then in the testimony of Mr. Bell at page 44, the only reference to the Secretary's statement is as follows:

They will require about $350,000 additional next year as compared with this year's funds.

I turn to the Budget and I find this on page A-6: "Tobacco tax: Estimated for 1945, $878,500,000. Estimated for the current fiscal year, $904,000,000," or a reduction of about $26,000,000. The total for tobacco tax, $973,660,000 as against the estimate for the current fiscal year of $988,000,000. How we can be asked to provide $350,000 extra for stamps for cigarette tax, with lower cigarette revenue, is beyond the comprehension of anybody who figures in the ordinary fashion.

Here is a case where you can save $350,000 and there cannot be any dispute about the facts. I hope the House will adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This is another one of those arguments taken out of thin air, I do not know where. We discussed all of those items in the bill in the committee. We reduced them $750,000 under the Budget and $360,000 under the total estimated obligations. Most all of this is personnel and whether they are printing cigarette stamps or something else it is all a question of personnel. We went into the problem of their personnel very carefully and I think we came out pretty well in agreement on these very substantial cuts. We cut them quite sharply on the entire work of the Department. I think the matter has been gone into thoroughly by your subcommittee. The subject matter of all the amendments presented by the gentleman from New York was gone into by the members of our subcommittee. I can see no reason now which would justify any change. We want them to perform, we want the Bureau of Engraving and Printing to continue doing the splendid job they have done. They have an increased load, it is increasing every day. I think the wise thing would be to support the action of the committee and vote against the amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment just briefly supplementing what my friend from Kentucky has said. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] my beloved friend, has discussed only one phase of this matter. The criterion we ought to go by in making appropriations for the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, and the sole criterion, is the work load. The work load is set forth as follows under the item: Appropriations for 1945. The manufacture of 356,655,963 sheets has to be provided for in 1945, compared with 312,284,809 in 1944; and the total amount of the direct and reimbursable work for 1945 is 1,203,056,069 sheets, or an increase of 63,000,000 sheets in round numbers over 1944. We have here, therefore, a very heavy increase in the burden of the work of this Bureau, yet in the face of this increased burden and wanting to save every dollar we can and to practice every retrenchment possible we have cut the estimate $750,000 and we have cut the appropriation $360,800 below the total amount available for 1944. To reduce it still further would simply be a ridiculous and wholly unjustifiable action in my sincere opinion and I hope the Committee will not adopt the amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thought perhaps it might be well to explain to the House the point of view of some of us on the Democratic side on some of these votes in view of some of the remarks that have been made by gentlemen on the other side. This committee has investigated each item in this bill with some care. The bill comes to the House under a unanimous report from the subcommittee.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, it does not come with a unanimous report. That has been thoroughly understood here.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will put it this way, that I have seen no dissenting report. We have not had the

benefit of reading a dissenting report. Now, if there is a dissenting report and I have misstated the facts I am sorry.

Mr. TABER. I stated in the committee that I was going to offer amendments to the bill when it reached the floor. I have said the same thing on the floor as well as in the committee. The subcommittee seldom makes a minority report.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There are no minority views, then, I understand.

Mr. TABER. That means, if the gentleman feels we should have minority views, that we are going to have them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Now I will proceed with what I wanted to say.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman will get them if that is his only excuse for not voting to save money.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I am as anxious to save money as he is, and, further, that my reasons for voting as I have voted is because I have confidence in the deliberations of this committee which have taken place over many weeks of time to a greater extent than I do in discussions of particular items of the bill that take 5 minutes. In other words, I am acquainted with the membership of this subcommittee, I know the gentlemen who compose it. I do not believe they are going to be reckless with the Government's funds, and I believe that we are far more likely to do an efficient job, to save money as we are able to, and to keep the Government going efficiently in these trying days if we follow the reports of the committee than if we try to rewrite the bill on the floor as would be done if all the amendments were adopted. It occurs to me that if there is merit in these amendments they should have been presented in the Appropriations Committee. If turned down there, then of course, they might still be offered on the floor, but there would be far better understanding of them in that case. That is the way I feel about it, and I think it ought to be said in answer to some remarks that have been made from the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 80, noes 88.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. LUDLOW.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 84, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read down to and including line 22, page 22.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4133, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, 1945, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by myself in the American State Highway Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today in connection with the farm-machinery situation, and to include therein an article that appears in today's Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper editorial, and I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee today and to include a part of the committee report on the bill under consideration this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

TWO CONGRESSMEN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, this week the Nation will pause and reverently commemorate the birthday of one of the world's great men who served as a Member of this body. With him served another man who in his section of the country rose to fame and power. It is of those two Members of Congress that I desire to direct my remarks to the House.

In 1847 two men were elected to Congress from widely separated sections of the United States, one from the North, the other from the South. Strangely, they were of the same political faith. Both were Whigs. Both had become members of an exclusive political group called the Young Indians. One was far above average height, the other was a small or diminutive man. Both were intellectual giants. One was opposed to slavery, the other opposed secession. They became warm and intimate friends and remained so until death. One was destined to become the President of the United States, the other Vice President of the Confederacy. One was to be assassinated, the other was to become a political prisoner of the Government he had once served. One was Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, the other Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia.

When they parted in the House of Representatives in 1849, 16 years were to elapse before they met again. It was at night, on board a gunboat in Hampton Roads, Va., February 3, 1865. The occasion was the famous peace conference which accomplished nothing toward ending the Civil War. Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward represented the Union; Stephens was one of the delegates representing the Confederacy.

May I interject here that if it had not been that Abraham Lincoln knew that his former colleague in this House and his warm, intimate friend, Alexander Stephens, of Georgia, was to be one of the Confederate commissioners, in my judgment Lincoln would never have agreed to that conference that night on board the gunboat down in Hampton Roads.

When these talks ended, we can hear the President turning to his old friend and saying, "Alec, is there anything I can do for you personally?" Stephens informed Lincoln that he had a nephew who was a prisoner at Johnsons Island in Lake Erie near Sandusky, Ohio, but his family had heard nothing from him—could Lincoln find out something about him and get word to him that his people at home were well? But Lincoln had his own idea.

Two days later Lt. John Stephens, of the Confederate Army, arose as usual to begin the depressing routine life of a prisoner. He had done so for more than 2 years with no hope of change. He was standing in his bunkhouse near the stove trying to keep warm—the thermometer registered 20° below zero. An orderly appeared at the door informing him to report at once to the commanding officer. His surprise was great. What did the commander want of him? He had known of other prisoners who had been called out and never heard from again. Was he to suffer the same fate? With the orderly he went to the

commander where a still greater surprise was in store for him. He was shown a telegram which read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 4, 1865.*

Officer in command at Johnsons Island, Ohio: Parole Lt. John A. Stephens, prisoner of war, to report to me here in person, and send him to me. It is in pursuance of an arrangement I made yesterday with his uncle, Hon. A. H. Stephens. Acknowledge receipt.

A. LINCOLN.

Wrapped in buffalo robes, placed on board a bobsleigh drawn by two mules across frozen Lake Erie in subzero weather, was an experience undreamed of by this Confederate soldier. To be ordered to report to the President of the United States in person at the Nation's Capital was beyond the imagination of a son of the South in the Confederate service.

Ushered into the presence of Abraham Lincoln, Lieutenant Stephens observed that he was lying full length on a long office table with his elbow on the table and his face resting on his hand, talking to Mr. Seward, who was seated in a chair. He was cordially received and introduced to the Secretary of State. Lincoln suggested that if he had friends in Washington to pay them a visit and then report to him. No guard was necessary; he was under parole to the President of the United States.

Five days later Lieutenant Stephens reported and found Mr. Lincoln alone. Lincoln talked about his uncle, their association in Congress, and their friendship. He handed the young Confederate officer a short letter for his uncle, which read as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 10, 1865.

Hon. A. H. STEPHENS:

According to our agreement, your nephew, Lieutenant Stephens, goes to you bearing this note. Please, in return, to select and send to me that officer of the same rank imprisoned at Richmond whose physical condition most urgently requires his release.

Respectfully,

A. LINCOLN.

Turning to his desk he took from a pigeonhole a small photograph of himself, autographed it, and handing it to Stephens said:

Suppose you take this along with you. I don't expect there are many of them down South.

Young Stephens was carried through the lines, arrived at his Georgia home during the first week in May 1865 and delivered Lincoln's letter to his uncle. By then the war was over. Lincoln was in his grave. Alexander Stephens became a fugitive, was arrested and carried a political prisoner to Fort Warren in Boston harbor.

One of the most touching incidents in all our history is the scene in the cell at Fort Warren on the morning of June 1, 1865. Alexander Stephens, Vice President of the late Confederate States is awaiting his fate. This prisoner who opposed secession and loved his Nation made an entry in his diary that morning. It is the day set apart by President Andrew Johnson decreed as a fast day in memory of Abraham Lincoln. The entry in Stephens' journal for that morning reads:

Rose early. As it is fast day and mourning in memory of Mr. Lincoln, I requested Mr. Geary, the corporal, to bring me from the sutler's nothing but a cup of coffee and rolls.

We can almost hear the spirit of Lincoln whispering "This hath he done in remembrance of me."

The letter relating to the release of Lt. John Stephens and the autographed photograph handed to him by Mr. Lincoln were framed and hung on the wall of the Stephens home in Georgia for over 70 years as a silent reminder of one of the most unusual events in the history of the United States. This little-known, if not unknown, story of the generosity and the kindly impulses of Lincoln has a sequel.

Thirteen years later, on February 12, 1878, the famous oil painting of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, in which Lincoln is the central figure was presented to the Government of the United States by a Mrs. Elizabeth Thompson. This picture now hangs in the old Supreme Court chamber in the Capitol Building in Washington. On this occasion, Alexander H. Stephens who had been relected to Congress from Georgia was chosen to deliver the acceptance speech on the part of the Government. In that address will be found this tribute by Stephens to Lincoln:

He was warm hearted; he was generous; he was magnanimous. Every fountain of his heart was overflowing with the milk of human kindness.

That was the tribute of Alexander H. Stephens, one-time Vice President of the Confederacy, to the President whom even the rancors of Civil War could not turn against an old friend.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I love to hear the gentleman from Michigan discuss Abraham Lincoln. I know he is an authority on him. The gentleman has mentioned that Abraham Lincoln and Alexander Stephens while in Congress belonged to a group called the "Young Indians." I wonder if the gentleman would tell us briefly about that group.

Mr. DONDERO. It was a group of young men in Congress who formed this political group for their own purposes.

May I say as an afterthought that the son of Lieutenant John Stephens, who was pardoned by Abraham Lincoln, died in the State of Georgia within the last 60 days, a member of the Court of Appeals of that State, and that one of the relatives of Alexander Stephens is still in the Capitol of the United States. I believe he is connected with the secretarial staff of Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is true that Judge Alec Stephens just recently died, a member of one of our high courts.

What I rose to say was that as a Georgian I appreciate the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan in reference to Alec Stephens, who I think is certainly one of the greatest men the South ever produced. I can assure the gentleman that there are many people in the South who feel very sincerely that had Lincoln lived the tragic period in the history of this country never would have occurred.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman from Georgia is entirely correct.

COTTON GOES TO WAR

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, The products of the American farmer have gone to war; that is true of all crops but it is particularly true of cotton. It must give the cotton farmer a real feeling of pride and satisfaction to know that his product is playing such a vitally important role in the winning of this war. The cotton farmer's son and the cotton farmer's cotton are preforming a priceless service to our Nation at war.

War has brought many problems to the cotton farmer. The cotton farmer has had to do battle in order to produce in the face of the handicap of machinery shortages and shortages of manpower. Moreover, the prices of agricultural labor—the costs of production—have increased tremendously but the cotton farmer has not relaxed his efforts.

Cotton prices have not advanced in proportion to the advance in the costs of production. The price of cotton is relatively cheap and more encouragement in the way of higher prices is required if our cotton program for 1944 is to produce the maximum result. This is a matter which must not be overlooked by those who are planning the vital program of agriculture for this year.

Mr. Speaker, there is not time to speak at length at this moment but I did want to call attention to the vital importance of cotton production in our war program and to the need for a more adequate price.

The able War Food Administrator, Hon. Marvin Jones, made a radio speech on February 2, 1944, which is very thought provoking. The speech is entitled "Cotton Goes to War," and I have asked permission to insert it in the RECORD at this point.

I am going to talk today about cotton. More American farmers depend on cotton than on any other crop. Nearly one-third of all our farming people live on cotton farms.

But cotton is important not to the South alone. It is the Nation's largest export crop. It is the basis of the largest textile industry in the world. Cottonseed is a basic feed for our livestock and its oils a vital part of our national food supply. It is not only King Cotton in the South but it is a high prince throughout the Nation.

The story of cotton cloth is the story of a Cinderella who came out of the kitchen. For more than a thousand years reports that

drifted into Europe from India and China telling of cotton cloth were doubted and ignored. Alexander the Great wrote about cotton cloth in India, but his stories were thought to be spun, like the cotton they described, only out of the mysteries of the East. Even in 1300 when Marco Polo told about cotton in the East it was still not used in Europe. Cinderella was still in the kitchen.

In England the weavers of Manchester made their fine cloth of linen and high-grade wool. They considered cotton as an upstart substitute and actually passed laws which discriminated against cotton cloth.

But the cloth of the plain people was not to be denied. Artificial restraints cannot keep a strong competitor down. By the end of the sixteenth century England began what was to become the greatest textile industry on earth. Cinderella had come out of the kitchen.

Today cotton clothes more billions of the world's people than any other fabric, and other products of the versatile cotton plant are similarly important in the world today.

Cotton is no new thing in America. The Inca Indians in Peru wove beautiful fabrics in cotton 1,000 years ago. The cotton gin was invented exactly 150 years ago this year. By the time of the War between the States, King Cotton was sitting firmly on his throne.

I have learned first-hand something of the period that followed. When the war was over, the South was crippled, her fields laid waste, and she was broken in finance, in industry, in agriculture—in everything except in spirit. But with that spirit my father, along with his friends and neighbors, began the long task of building back. They plowed their fields and planted cotton; they wore their lives away in its production.

Last Christmas I visited again the combination cotton and wheat farm where I was born, and which my mother still owns. As a boy on that farm, chopping the long rows, I had had time to think a great deal about the problems of cotton—and I have thought a great deal about them since.

World War No. 1 pointed out some of those problems and warned how carefully the Nation must plan and act today. Most of us remember that cotton prices rose—but we all remember when they fell. In April 1920 the cotton price was 38.5 cents. By the very next April it had dropped to 9.5 cents. I do not need to dwell on that. You remember the years that followed—years as long and dreary as the rows of 5- and 8-cent cotton in the fields. Once more, following another war, there was the rebuilding of a wreckage such as had challenged my father 50 years before.

Now another war is upon us. Another post-war problem must be faced again. True, that is in the future—but the future begins now. For one thing, the Congress has wisely protected producers of certain basic commodities, including cotton, against such disastrous price declines by authorizing and directing Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans at 90 percent of parity for the 2-year period following the end of the war. Such forward thinking and planning can help to solve some of the other problems if we are willing to face them. Let's see what some of these problems are.

We have depended on the export market in the past for a third to a half of our crop. That market is now largely gone, for the duration. That means a serious problem. We expect a carry-over of American upland cotton of a little more than 10,000,000 bales next August 1—almost double a normal carry-over. But we have only small working surplus supplies of the particular grades or staples we need. Our excess supplies are in the shorter staples or lower grades.

I urge cotton growers to keep those needs in mind when they plant this spring, and I urge more careful harvesting and ginning so that we may have more of the kinds of cotton we need. Since grades depend greatly on the care used by growers and pickers and ginners, a campaign was undertaken last year by many cotton groups, encouraged by the War Food Administration, to improve the grades. These efforts should be increased this year. In addition, it is hoped that the schedule of grade staple premiums and discounts under the 1944 loan program will further help to get the kinds of cotton that we need for the war effort.

It must be remembered that for every 500-pound bale of cotton lint there are produced 900 pounds of cottonseed. Not a pound of this seed is wasted, not even the hulls. This 900 pounds of cottonseed yields 140 pounds of vegetable oil for food, 400 pounds of meal and cake for livestock feed, about 240 pounds of hulls for feed and chemical uses and, finally, 80 pounds of linters for smokeless powder, plastics, and other things. The linters alone, which are just the fuzz on the cottonseed, are the best natural form of alpha-cellulose, for making smokeless powder. Out of these same hulls they make the transparent nose section of bombing planes and the finest synthetic yarns and fabrics.

About two-thirds of the billions of yards of cotton cloth go to war. They use cotton in self-sealing airplane gasoline tanks. They use it for electrically heated flying suits, for parachute cords and harness, for jungle hammocks, for canteen covers, for rotproof shoes for jungle wear, for tarpaulins, for camouflage netting, for surgical supplies—the list is almost endless. Every soldier requires 250 pounds of cotton, or 10 times what the average civilian uses.

Cotton is our largest single source of vegetable oil, about half of the total supply. Of all fats and oils, both animal and vegetable, cottonseed is second only to lard as a cooking fat and second only to butter as a source of table fat.

Because cotton is a war crop there are now no restrictions on production. The 1944 acreage goal is slightly above last year's planted acreage. We have not had to expand production even to meet the war demands for lint, but we do have great need for its meals, hulls, and oil. The cotton we used to export now supplies our own wartime needs.

But this heavy wartime domestic consumption will not continue after the war. The problem of foreign markets will come again.

For this reason we should begin asking ourselves now some of the fundamental questions about cotton exports. There are probably three big questions. I can only ask them now; not answer them. But since they do exist we must recognize them and give them thought.

First, what is going to be the purchasing power of foreign countries who want our cotton? This will depend basically upon how much of other goods these cotton customers of ours can sell so that they can get money to pay for our cotton. And that depends in turn on our willingness to buy these goods, so that they can buy our cotton.

A second major question involves substitute fibers, especially rayon. During the war Europe, largely cut off from raw cotton, has been using rayon and other synthetics at a rate equal to about half its pre-war consumption of cotton. To what extent will they continue? In the United States rayon consumption has quadrupled and the price has been considerably reduced in the last 10 years. World production of rayon is now the equivalent of around 8,000,000 bales of cotton.

A third major question involves our ability to compete in the world markets with cotton from other countries, with our domestic cotton price higher than the world price. We should find some way to get our share of the world cotton trade, without using cutthroat competition for it and without penalizing our cotton farmers. The solution of these problems calls for the best thought and statesmanship of all who are interested in cotton.

Cotton has had a dramatic history. While silk and linen have frequently been the wearing apparel of the wealthy for many centuries, cotton through the ages has been the clothing of the masses, and it has come to furnish food and feed besides. Those who are interested in its continued service to the people will be wise to work out its development along practical lines. If they do that wisely cotton will always be a source of happiness and a means of livelihood for many people in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is another thought-provoking statement on the subject of cotton which I should like to place in the RECORD. This statement is by the Honorable I. W. Duggan, now Deputy Governor of the Farm Credit Administration and formerly Director of the Southern Division of the A. A. A.

The following is the statement of Mr. Duggan:

AMERICAN COTTON IN THE POST-WAR WORLD

Long-time and recent developments in the cotton situation have implications which the cotton industry cannot long continue to overlook. For the present, high wartime domestic cotton consumption and, even of more effect, the cotton loan are acting as a prop under cotton prices. Otherwise, cotton would be selling for considerably less than present market prices, probably for as low as 10 or 12 cents a pound. For a number of years Brazilian cotton and American cotton sold for about the same price per pound. This year even with the Government supports in Brazil, Brazilian cotton has been selling for about 13 cents a pound. Because of the support that the loan is giving the market, and because of the high level of domestic consumption, during the war, the import of the developments affecting American cotton may not have been fully realized by the South in general. Sometime the war will end and then the effects of the developments that have been taking place with respect to cotton will be felt with full force.

Early in the European war many were fearful that increased surpluses of American cotton would accumulate because of the loss of exports. Some thought that it might therefore become necessary to drastically further reduce acreage and production. Exports dropped to a little more than 1,000,000 bales for the 1940–41 season, but domestic consumption was much higher than anticipated, amounting to more than nine and one-half million bales. Because of the high rate of domestic offtake, world consumption of American cotton was only about 1,000,000 bales below that of the preceding season. Domestic consumption increased to almost 11,000,000 bales for each of the 1941–42 and 1942–43 seasons. It seems, however, that the peak in domestic mill consumption during the war has been passed. The tight labor situation in the cotton-textile industry has been the most important factor in the decline in mill consumption from the record rate of the past 2 seasons to an annual rate of about 10,000,000 bales for this season to date.

The supply of American cotton for the 1943–44 season of almost 23,000,000 bales is smaller than the record 26,000,000-bale supply in the 1932–33 season but is entirely adequate to meet our domestic and export needs and leaves an end-season carry-over of more than 11,000,000 bales.

The carry-over of the shortest cotton and the lower grades was disproportionately large at the end of this past season and will be again at the end of the present season. However, the supplies of practically all grades and all staple lengths of cotton produced in

this country are fully adequate to meet all needs, and we will probably end the season with adequate reserves of all types of American cotton.

Moreover, the mills demonstrated in the 1942–43 season the ability to use shorter staples and lower grades than were used in the preceding season. Nevertheless, the accumulated surplus of low-grade and short-staple cotton will be very difficult to dispose of and could easily be a serious handicap to farmers and others in the cotton industry. The world carry-over of American cotton has been reduced from the record carry-over of 14,000,000 bales on August 1, 1939, to 11,500,000 bales on August 1, 1943. It is not probable that the carry-over will be further reduced by the end of the present season. Eleven million bales is more than twice a normal carry-over as established in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

The estimated production of 11,200,000 bales for the 1943 crop is 500,000 bales lower than average production over the 5 preceding seasons. However, the 1943 production is much below the record 18,000,000-bale crops in 1937 and 1926. Foreign cotton production amounted to 14,000,000 bales in the 1942–43 season, the latest season for which figures are available. In the 1936–37 and 1937–38 seasons, foreign countries produced 18,000,000 bales each season. In the early 1920's foreign countries produced 7,000,000 to 10,000,000 bales of cotton annually.

Almost 22,000,000 acres of cotton were grown in the United States in 1943. With the exception of 1941, this is the smallest acreage since World War No. 1 and is less than half of the record of 45,000,000 acres in 1926. Foreign acreage was down from 52,000,000 acres in 1941–42 to 46,000,000 acres in 1942–43 and considerably below the record of 59,000,000 acres in 1937–38.

However, foreign cotton acreage in the early twenties ranged from thirty to forty million acres. The largest relative reduction in foreign acreage since the war began has taken place in Egypt. Egypt is largely dependent upon exports and has cut cotton acreage to about one-third of the pre-war level to increase its food production.

Foreign acreage has not been reduced under war conditions nearly as much as some people seem to think. The carry-over of foreign cotton has increased each of the last three seasons and at the end of the 1942–43 season was 12,000,000 bales, compared to a pre-war carry-over of seven to eight million bales and a carry-over of four to five million bales in the early 1920's. The world carry-over of all cotton August 1, 1943, was 24,000,000 bales, 2,000,000 larger than the carry-over of the previous year and 1,000,000 bales larger than the previous record carry-over of 1938. The world carry-over of all cotton August 1, 1943, was about equal to a year's world consumption for the previous season of all cotton. After all production records for 1943 are in, the total supply will probably equal about twice the consumption of the previous season.

It is not likely that the years immediately following the cessation of fighting will see a pressure of demand upon available supplies of cotton like that for most food products. Furthermore, unless steps are taken in time to prevent it, American cotton will be at a disadvantage in competing with foreign growths.

The post-war outlook for American cotton will depend to a very large degree upon how well farmers and others in the cotton industry understand all phases of the cotton problem; it will depend on what types of programs they develop and get into operation, with respect to both domestic consumption and exports; it will depend upon whether or not such programs are ready to put into operation as soon as they are needed; it will depend upon the degree of mechanization and other improved production practices that are put into effect to improve the efficiency of cotton production and lower production costs; it will depend on what improvements are made in the packaging, handling, and selling of cotton; it will depend upon what the cotton textile industry does to improve the manufacture and the merchandising of cotton products.

These are only some of the things within the cotton industry that will affect the post-war outlook. Post-war industrial production, consumer incomes, international trade policies, the price of cotton and cotton goods, and competition from synthetic and other fiber products will, among other things, affect the outlook for cotton.

Since the early 1930's much headway has been made by rayon, nylon, spun glass, and other synthetics. The development has been both in the United States and abroad. Rayon consumption in the United States increased from 155,000,000 pounds in 1932 to 622,000,000 pounds in 1942. The price of rayon staple fiber has decreased during the same period from 46 cents per pound in 1932 to 24 cents per pound in 1942. World production of rayon and rayon staple fiber has increased from 534,000,000 pounds in 1932 to 3,472,000,000 pounds in 1942.

World production of rayon yarn and staple fiber was equivalent to 1,250,000 bales of cotton in 1932, and by 1942 production had increased almost sevenfold to the equivalent of more than 8,000,000 bales of cotton. Rapidly increasing production and declining price, together with technological developments in synthetic fiber manufacturing and in utilization are making synthetic fibers formidable competitors of cotton in many lines.

However, it is very probable that the long-time upward trend in world cotton consumption will be resumed after the war. On the other hand, it is not likely that our domestic consumption of cotton will remain after the war at the high level of the war period. However, much can be done to prevent domestic cotton consumption from declining to the low level of the post-World War No. 1 period and of the early 1930's. While industrial production, employment, and consumer incomes will affect cotton consumption and are beyond the control of the cotton industry alone, those in the cotton industry can give their support to policies that will maintain production and employment in the post-war period.

Moreover, those in the cotton industry from producer to manufacturer can take steps to stimulate domestic consumption of cotton. Government programs, such as a mattress program, a cotton-insulating program, a cotton-begging program and programs for other uses not only help the groups being subsidized, but will furnish welcome additions to the normal consumption of cotton. Such programs can be especially beneficial in disposing of the large surpluses of low grades and of short staple cotton.

Not only will it be necessary to have well developed and fully accepted programs to encourage maximum domestic consumption of cotton in the post-war period, but even more important will be the policy or program or lack of program designed to deal specifically with exports.

The trend of exports has been downward for a number of years and unless positive action is taken this trend may be sharply accelerated in the post-war period. Regardless of the highest level at which it may be maintained, domestic consumption cannot make up for the loss of our export markets. Under present conditions, with a relatively small cotton acreage, we are taking into the loan our surplus cotton that ordinarily would be sold abroad. This the Government can do temporarily, if there is a definite hope that our foreign markets will be reopened when the war ends, but if there is no such possibility we must face the fact that we have only one alternative, namely, to reduce further cotton production in the years to come.

It will be very difficult to make a decision to bring about further reductions in cotton acreage. Such a decision cannot be made unless some provision is worked out to sustain the income of cotton producers. If cotton producers are told to stop producing cotton, they naturally will have to produce some other cash crops, and the question of what those crops will be is of interest to the entire country. As yet, no other crop has been developed in the South which will profitably employ the farm population required to produce cotton.

Nearly one-third of all the farm people of the United States live on cotton farms. These cotton farmers are the lowest-income group in the Nation. Many of the factors causing this low income are man-made, such as the tariff, inequitable freight rates, etc., and can be corrected only through the help of the Government. Because of their already inadequate income, cotton farmers cannot be expected to bear the cost of needed adjustments. The South needs all the money it is getting out of cotton now. The income from the 1943 crop did not quite give parity purchasing power to cotton farmers. Cotton farmers could purchase only 99 percent as much goods with the 1943 crop, including Government payments, as they could with the average crops from 1909 to 1914. Excluding Government payments, the purchasing power of the 1943 cotton crop was only 94 percent of the 1909–14 average. If it is humanly possible, the present income from cotton must not only be maintained, it must be increased.

I want to say a word about land values and cotton income. In spite of our experience during and following the last war, land values are on a boom again. It is difficult to visualize what may happen to farms in cotton-producing areas if land values continue to soar. Farmers, agricultural leaders—everyone, in fact—should give sober thought to the outlook for cotton and should be especially cautious about bidding up the values of land if it is expected that cotton income will be sufficient to pay the inflated prices.

After we have taken every possible measure to hold the highest possible level of domestic consumption, aggressive measures must be taken to regain export markets for cotton. This is critical. It will also be very difficult. The textile industry in large areas in Asia and continental Europe may have been destroyed or damaged by military operations. We do not know if these industries will be rebuilt to use cotton or synthetic fibers. The pressure for cash income will cause many foreign cotton countries to increase cotton acreage to pre-war levels, or possibly even expand beyond pre-war levels. The degree of international trade and cooperation will be an important factor in our exports of cotton. Among other factors will be the price of American cotton and of other cottons in the world markets, world industrial development and activity and consumer incomes, what credit arrangements are developed, and possibly most important of all, whether or not we have an international cotton agreement similar to the international wheat agreement.

Farmers and everyone else in the cotton industry should study the memorandum of agreement signed in 1942 by the Governments of the five countries of Argentina, Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Copies of this agreement may be obtained from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

The international wheat agreement together with the international sugar and tin agreements can well serve as a basis for developing an international cotton agreement. The agreement should deal with (1)

expansion of trade in cotton, (2) acreage and production control, (3) stocks, (4) export control, (5) price controls, (6) relief pools, (7) credit arrangements, and (8) an international cotton council or governing body. Farmers and others in the cotton industry should be well represented in the councils that develop and put into operation an international cotton agreement. They will be represented only to the degree that they now begin to take interest in, study, and develop such an agreement.

I have stated some of the facts briefly. I hope they and other factors effecting the general cotton situation will be given the most thorough study and discussion by all groups in the cotton industry and by all thinking men and women in the South. I hope that newspapers of the South present the facts and the discussions. I hope each State in the South organizes a cotton committee and out of these State committees a national cotton committee will develop—one which will bring together and coordinate the work of all the State committees. The problem is too important to the South for any one group or segment of the industry to develop a program for themselves alone. All segments of the cotton industry should be represented on the committees. Only through agreement and whole-hearted cooperation can we hope to meet the changing developments and meet them without further lowering the South's already low cash income. The cotton farmers' cash income, as is the income of all groups of the industry is not from price alone and it is not from volume alone. It is volume times price. This we must never forget.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by Hon. I. W. Duggan, former director of the southern division of the A. A. A., on the subject of cotton.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Port Jervis Union-Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter addressed to the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and the reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LAFOLLETTE, from February 10 to February 16, both dates inclusive, on account of necessary business.

To Mr. LANHAM (at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON), for the rest of this week, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1612. An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence and for other purposes; Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 10, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Thursday, February 10, 1944, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, for the consideration of post-war planning.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 10, 1944, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2652, to amend section 222 (e) of subtitle "Insurance of Title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936," as amended.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The hearings on H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, will be continued on Friday, February 11, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Monday, February 14, 1944, to consider H. R. 1688, a bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, also the companion bill, S. 275, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will have a meeting on Monday, February 14, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., Jesse Jones will testify on the bill H. R. 3873, introduced by Mr. PATMAN.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Thursday, February 10: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 9.

2. Friday, February 11: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, including Salt River, Taylorsville, Ky., the Potomac River and tributaries, the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimack Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, and the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

3. Tuesday, February 15: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Gen. M. C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer, and proponents and opponents of projects along the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Red and Arkansas Rivers, Conway County, Ark., and Purgatoire (Picket Wire) River, Colo., the White, St. Francis, and Yazoo Rivers.

4. Wednesday, February 16: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Col. Miles Reber, former division engineer, Missouri River division, Omaha, Nebr., and proponents and opponents of projects along the Missouri River and tributaries.

5. Thursday, February 17: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 16.

6. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

7. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

8. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1166. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $105,038, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for the War Department for maintenance and operation of the United States Soldiers' Home (H. Doc. No. 408); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1167. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $985,000 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 409); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1168. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $43,185,884.93 (H. Doc. No. 410); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1169. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the legislative establishment for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $282,900, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 411); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1170. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1943, and prior fiscal years, in the amount of $3,930.57, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $396,975.93, in all, $400,906.50, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 412); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 429. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Helen Young Mitchell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1108). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3693. A bill to aid in the stabilization program and the war effort by paid newspaper advertising in connection with the sale of United States bonds, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 202. A bill for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo; with amendments (Rept. No. 1109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCANLON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 439. A bill for the relief of Jack Scarton, or John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski; with amendments (Rept. No. 1110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCANLON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 442. A bill for the relief of John Damacus; with amendments (Rept. No. 1111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LAFOLLETTE:

H. R. 4157. A bill to permit States not guilty of laches to file claims for damages under section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4158. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4159. A bill to amend section 33 of the act of September 7, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 742); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4160. A bill to amend section 2 (a); section 4 (a), (b), (c), (d); section 203 (a); section 204 (a); section 205 (c), (d), (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 4161. A bill to extend to assistant postmasters and supervisory employees of the field service of the Postal Service overtime payments for service performed daily in excess of 8 hours; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. J. Res. 233. Joint Resolution to provide for a streamlined, simplified, and coordinated Federal tax system; to authorize and direct the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make studies and recommendations in connection therewith; and to provide for the creation of a temporary advisory council to said committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be established after the present war an international holiday to be known as "World Peace Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. Res. 431. Resolution to create a special select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct a study and investigation of all news releases, published material, motion pictures, and radio broadcasts pertaining to any Member of Congress and other public officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4772. By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: Petitions of Bowman Miller, DuBois, Pa., and 5,300 other residents of the Twenty-third District of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4773. By Mr. CANFIELD: Joint resolution of the New Jersey Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4774. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Rabbi A. E. Halpern, of the B'Nai Ammona Congregation, Washington and Trinity Avenues, St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of House Resolutions 418 and 419, providing for abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4775. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4776. Also, petition signed by residents of the State of New York, particularly Bronx County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4777. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Malden Senior Hadassah to Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, with reference to the abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4778. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the city of Malden, Mass., relative to the abrogation of the Palestine White Paper issued by the British Government in 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4779. Also, petition of the Congregation B'nai B'rith of Somerville, Mass., relative to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4780. Also, petition of Young Israel, of Malden, Inc., with reference to the abrogation of the British White Paper of 1939, and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4781. Also, resolution of the Malden Zionist district of Massachusetts calling upon the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America to urge the Government of the United States to use its good offices to the end that the persecuted Jews of Europe be admitted freely into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4782. Also, resolution of the Men's Club of Malden, Mass., favoring the immediate abrogation of the so-called British White Paper; of its intents and motives and that the Congress of the United States and the Secretary of State so use their offices in this respect; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4783. Also, petition of the Tifereth Israel Sisterhood with reference to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper and the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish homeland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4784. Also, resolution of the Brotherhood Temple Tifereth Israel, requesting the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America to urge the American Government to use its good offices so that the doors of Palestine may be opened for free entry into that country, and that persecuted European Jewry shall be permitted to find peace, untroubled security, dignity, and political, religious, and cultural equality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4785. Also, resolution of the Talmud Torah Beth Solomon of Malden, relative to the abrogation of the White Paper by the mandatory government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4786. Also, resolution of the Malden Post, No. 74, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, with reference to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4787. Also, petition of the Bikor Cholim Society of Malden, relative to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4788. Also, petition of the Malden Women's Mizrachi Organization, relative to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper and urging the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4789. Also, resolution of the Malden Hebrew Ladies' Aid Society, Inc., to appeal to the American Government to use its good offices with the British Government to keep the doors of Palestine open to the Jews and to give them the right so to order their lives that Palestine may be in fact the Jewish national home; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4790. Also, resolution of the Louis D. Brandeis Lodge, No. 1270, B'nai B'rith, that the United States use its good offices to the end that Britain will keep Palestine open to Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4791. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions containing the signatures of 1,313 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District, State of New York, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4792. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of C. R. Wilson and 805 others protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4793. Also, petition of Anthony Pappon and 4,631 others protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4794. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Martin F. Schilling, secretary, Stegmaier Brewing Co. employees and 6,413 sundry residents of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4795. Also, petition of Neil Fisher, secretary, Bartels Brewing Co. employees and 1,886 sundry residents of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4796. Also, petition of Frank Kopec, secretary, Lion, Inc., employees and 2,719 sundry residents of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4797. Also, petition of John Rice, secretary, Franklin Brewing Co. employees and 1,026 sundry residents of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4798. Also, petition of the Labor News and 1,834 sundry residents of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4799. By Mr. O'LEARY: Petition of James P. Costello and 900 others, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4800. By Mr. Scanlon: Petition of Matthew Turner and 1,220 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4801. Also, petition of A. F. Utzig and 360 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4802. Also, petition of Pete Wasel and 2,000 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4803. Also, petition of John Dietz and 1,579 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4804. Also, petition of Harry F. Butzler and 1,920 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4805. Also, petition of Amelia Wysseier and 360 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4806. By Mrs. NORTON: Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the State of New Jersey, approved February 4, 1944, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4807. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as we come at the zenith of noontide glory lift our eyes from the mists and shadows which shroud the valleys to the hills of strength where Thy clear light illumines the rugged peaks. Cleanse our hearts from secret faults that we may behold the spiritual splendor that only the pure in heart can see, lest our souls shrivel in small views and petty hates. In the eternal struggle of truth and error, tyranny and liberty, give us the assurance that we are not alone, we do not stand alone, we do not fight alone; but that Thy increasing purpose is bound up with all this human struggle toward the goal of man's redemption from ignorance, hunger, suffering, and chains.

Above the din of today's war to the death with forces of darkness, keep our spirits steadfast, our hearts courageous, our motives pure, as riding forth with knightly valor we bear in our hands the commission of ancient days: "He hath sent us to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of prisons to them that are bound; to proclaim the day of justice of our God." We ask it in the Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 9, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 9, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1255. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission, and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939;

S. 1504. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.; and

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 9, 1944, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) requesting the President to proclaim February 11, 1944, as Edison Day in commemoration of the birth of Thomas Alva Edison.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

RESIGNATION OF SENATOR HOLMAN FROM COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER) laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. HOLMAN resigning as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
February 9, 1944.

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee. I have submitted a similar notice of resignation to Senator NYE.

Sincerely yours,

RUFUS C. HOLMAN.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Bailey	Hatch	Reynolds
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smith
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	Overton	Willis
George	Pepper	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is detained on public matters.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on December 31, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONS COMMISSIONED IN THE ARMY FROM CIVIL LIFE

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period December 1, 1943, through January 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the ninth annual report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, together with a statement of certain major developments up to January 1, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

ESTIMATES OF PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, by the National Housing Agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Security Agency covering various constituent organizations under that Agency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for the enactment of pending legislation providing a wartime method of voting by members of the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

The petition of the men's Bible class of the Parnassus Presbyterian Church, New Kensington, Pa., praying for participation by the United States in the establishment of a Christian world order and government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr WALSH of New Jersey:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Board, and other Federal agencies and Federal officials, propose to recommend to the Congress plans that will involve the nationalization of unemployment insurance in the 51 States and jurisdictions of the United States; and

"Whereas transfer of these proper State functions to the Federal Government would eliminate all consideration of local conditions of living and employment; and

"Whereas the balance in the New Jersey fund as of December 31, 1943, is $308,026,821.30; and

"Whereas the proposal to federalize unemployment insurance systems of the various States seriously threatens the availability of this fund for use in the State of New Jersey alone, since the unified national system might involve pooling of all State funds; and

"Whereas the New Jersey Legislature by the enactment of chapter 386, pamphlet laws of 1941, directed that the Employment Service Division of the New Jersey Unemployment Compensation Commission, now loaned to the Federal Government for the emergency, be returned to State service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey considers that post-war problems may be properly administered only under a State employment security system including both unemployment compensation and employment service and, therefore respectfully urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to oppose the enactment of any proposal involving the transfer of the administration of unemployment compensation from the States to the Federal Government.

"2. The secretary of state be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of the joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Federal Social Security Board.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.

"Approved February 4, 1944."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1712. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; and

S. 1713. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1714. A bill to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of James A. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1716. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PEPPER submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CASE OF BENJAMIN E. COOK, ADMINISTRATOR, ETC., AGAINST THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted two amendments both in the nature of substitutes intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1535) to vest jurisdiction of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Oklahoma in the case of Benjamin E. Cook, administrator of the estate of Cam C. Boyd, deceased, against the United States, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

EMPLOYMENT AND READJUSTMENT IN CIVILIAN LIFE OF RETURNING WORLD WAR NO. 2 VETERANS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 1617) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments submitted by the Senator from New York will be received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and printed.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I have just submitted, with the approval of the American Legion, an amendment to Senate bill 1617, the Legion's omnibus bill on Federal Government aid to veterans of the present war. My amendment is a substitute for title V of the bill, relating to veterans' employment service.

During the past few weeks I have had a number of discussions with representatives of the American Legion on this problem and in submitting today a substitute title V, I believe that we have worked out an arrangement which will provide a more effective veterans' employment service. This goes to the heart of the veterans' post-war problem.

The law creating the present United States Employment Service, which I sponsored over 10 years ago, provided for a veterans' employment service. The new provision I have submitted today provides for the establishment of a veterans' placement service board within the United States Employment Service, to consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as chairman, the Director of the National Selective Service System, and the administrative head of the United States Employment Service. This makes it absolutely clear that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs—General Hines—has an official relationship with the employment service. This board, of which General Hines will be chairman, would determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the veterans' employment service.

This arrangement will make it certain not only that the policies of the veterans' employment service are closely coordinated with the policies of the Veterans' Administration but will also make certain that the veterans' employment service will function as an integral part of the United States Employment Service. This is absolutely essential, not only in order to relieve General Hines from

the necessity of day-to-day supervision of administrative details, but also in order to make certain that all of the job-finding facilities of the entire United States Employment Service are made available to every veteran throughout the length and breadth of this land.

It should be recognized that the present United States Employment Service referred to in the bill has been operating on a Federal basis since Pearl Harbor, with employment-service offices in the several States. The new provision for veterans' employment service which I have submitted does not basically alter this wartime set-up. It is so framed as to leave open, for future congressional action, the decision as to whether the permanent United States Employment Service should be operated on a Federal or State-Federal basis. My own views on this issue favor the Federal plan, as written in Senate bill 1161, placing the full weight of the National Government behind the veterans' employment service, under a single chain of command, for maximum effectiveness in getting veterans reemployed on jobs in any part of the country.

HEARINGS BEFORE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE—REGULATION OF RATE BUREAUS

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use a consolidated edition of 1,000 copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the bill (S. 942) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for agreements between common carriers by railroad, between common carriers by pipe line, between common carriers by motor vehicle, between common carriers by water, and between freight forwarders, for the making and filing of rates, fares, charges, or classifications for transportation of passengers and property, and for other purposes.

DELLA M. BENDER—RECONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Tuesday last I reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Senate Resolution 234, to pay a gratuity to Della M. Bender, which was thereupon considered and agreed to. The action was taken under a misapprehension of the law. I ask that the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. Senate Resolution 234 to pay a gratuity to Della M. Bender.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to? The Chair hears none, and the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to is reconsidered and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

RESTORATION OF JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE—EDITORIALS FROM PORTLAND (OREG.) DAILY JOURNAL

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Portland (Oreg.) Daily Journal relative to the restoration of the Jewish homeland in Palestine, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE RUSSIAN ATTITUDE—ARTICLE BY PAUL MALLON

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article under the headline "The Nation's politics," by Paul Mallon, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MOSCOW AGREEMENTS—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the Moscow agreements, written by Constantine Brown and published in the Washington Star of February 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO WOODROW WILSON BY MARTIN AGRONSKY

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to Woodrow Wilson, broadcast over the radio by Martin Agronsky on February 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT'S SPIRIT A LESSON TO WOUNDED SOLDIERS — ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Roosevelt's Spirit Hailed," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of December 17, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD STAMP PLAN—EDITORIAL FROM NEW ORLEANS (LA.) TIMES-PICAYUNE

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Poor Substitute," published in the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune of February 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL HOUSING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, some time before we adjourned at Christmas time an appropriation for housing came before the Senate. I called the attention of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to communications I had received from my State and other States relative to additional housing construction. Those sending the communications felt additional housing was unnecessary, and asked me if the proposed housing legislation then before the Senate was necessary, and whether the appropriations were being made upon the basis of need. The Senator from Tennessee answered they were. Therefore the Senate supported the conference report submitted by the senior Senator from Tennessee as presented to the Senate.

At that time I told the Senator I had received several communications from my State and other States relative to unneeded housing. I wish to put in the RECORD a message I received this morning from the Florence Field Improvement Club, of Omaha, which calls forcefully to the attention of Senators, and especially of the senior Senator from Tennessee, the same situation I brought to his attention on the former occasion when I asked for a congressional investigation. This is the message:

OMAHA, NEBR., *February 8, 1944.*

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The members of the Florence Field Improvement Club respectfully request that Congress investigate the manner in which National Housing funds are being spent in Omaha. It is our belief that the principal gain from several of the projects now under way will be to the contractors, the real estate dealers, the finance companies, and the various agents involved, and that the war effort will benefit but little, and is an unnecessary waste of construction materials and manpower needed to help the war effort. It is our further belief that in the end the Government will have to make good the full 90 percent of the cost which it guarantees and that we, the taxpayers whose property is being damaged by shoddy construction, will finally have to foot the bill. This construction is not prompted by need, but by the desire of certain parties to get their hands into Federal Housing funds.

FLORENCE FIELD IMPROVEMENT CLUB,
A. C. DRACH, *Chairman,*
JOHN I. SMITH, *Secretary.*

I offer this as a constructive suggestion, and ask that the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations most seriously consider it. If housing is not needed, then appropriations should not be made. I should like to have the committee go into the matter in detail, because we in the Senate certainly do not want to be parties to appropriating funds when they are not needed, under the guise of furnishing housing that is unnecessary.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator, when any such matter comes before us, I shall be very glad to have him appear before the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

PHOSPHORUS SCARCITY AND THE MOBILE PLANT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, phosphorus is an essential of modern warfare. It is likewise an essential fertilizer if the land of this country is to continue to produce the foods needed for war and in peace. Due to meager production facilities, there is available for all agriculture purposes this year only one-third as much of this vital mineral as our soil requires. And if military requirements expand, even this wholly inadequate amount will be reduced. Admittedly, combat needs must come first. The protection of smoke screens must not be denied, nor the use of incendiary bombs limited by lack of material. The difficulty of estimating military requirements exactly is understood. But there is no difficulty about estimating agricultural needs, and there can be no dispute that there is a critical shortage of phosphorus for use on the land.

This is a subject about which I have been greatly concerned for the past year. In April of 1943 I addressed the Senate at length, pointing out this astonishing blind spot in our national program to increase the production of war-scarce foods. I reviewed the results obtained by more than 40,000 farmers in 29 States, representing every important

agricultural area of the country. These farmers had voluntarily entered into a program undertaken cooperatively between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the extension services of the land-grant colleges in the States. By adding phosphate to their soil these farmers had been able to alter their farm management so as to increase, not diminish, their land's fertility. And at the same time they had expanded their production of meat and eggs and dairy products, all war-scarce foods, without any additional manpower or machinery. I called it the substitution of land power for manpower. I deplored then, and I now deplore, the fact that among all the measures proposed to assist our farmers to more abundant production of needed foods, there was no recognition of the fundamental fact that the soil of our country is hungry for phosphate.

At that time I pointed out that the failure of the War Production Board to release critical materials to build a plant proposed for erection near Mobile, Ala., was only one indication of official blindness to what may be our major national problem, not only during war years but afterward. That plant was recommended for construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority, which has perfected new methods and new and highly concentrated phosphatic fertilizers at its plant at Muscle Shoals and, pursuant to congressional authorization, has assumed national leadership in demonstrating their use to farmers. Part of the facilities at Muscle Shoals had already been diverted to the production of elemental phosphorus for combat uses. Agriculture's supply was being restricted, and military needs were mounting. To meet the situation, T. V. A. proposed to build a plant at Mobile to produce phosphorus for military purposes during the war and for fertilizer in time of peace. The extensive Florida phosphate-rock deposits would be tapped, and water transportation would guarantee cheap and highly concentrated fertilizers to the farmers of the Midwest as well as to farmers of the South.

The project was approved by the Congress, and money was appropriated 2 years ago. But ever since that date construction has been held up by the War Production Board. Now that it is generally understood that the shortage in materials needed for building has been relieved, there is no further excuse for inaction. Agriculture needs now, if the Army and Navy do not, the 50,000 tons of phosphorus which that plant could produce. Our land needs more phosphate—much more than we have the capacity to produce. The Mobile plant is only a small part of a needed program of expansion. Plants should be built in the West to tap the phosphate reserves lying there. The facilities of private industry should be expanded way beyond the minor increases approved by W. P. B. in recent months. The Mobile plant is an immediate step, however. A site has been acquired; designs are ready. Work can go ahead at once. To increase the fertility of our soil for the future, to save manpower and machinery, while at the same time expanding food production—these are the reasons why our production of phosphorus should be tripled and increasing amounts be made available for use on the land.

We should not tolerate the scarcity any longer or permit this ridiculously scant supply for agriculture to be jeopardized by the uncertainty of future military requirements. That we are beginning the third year of war without any substantial effort to remedy such a critical situation is inexcusable.

Last July I introduced a resolution (S. Res. 172) authorizing an investigation of the problem. Since that time there has been increasing recognition of the importance of phosphate. On October 27, a special committee of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities made a report which has recently become available. The report fully sustains and confirms the facts and conclusions I have given. I am offering it for printing in the RECORD so that all Senators may know what this group of independent and disinterested scientists concluded; and I am going to urge with all my power an immediate investigation by the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, so that it can be determined why the weight of scientific opinion, the practical experience of more than 40,000 individual farms, and the recommendation of a responsible Government agency ratified by approval of the Congress have been disregarded. If failure to release materials for the plant at Mobile is due to indifference, that can be remedied. If it is due to the influence of that segment of the fertilizer industry which would sacrifice the soil's fertility to its own out-worn policies of marketing, that must be remedied. We have been patient too long.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the special committee on the preservation of phosphate resources and their national use printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE PRESERVATION OF PHOSPHATE RESOURCES AND THEIR NATIONAL USE FILED AT ANNUAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, CHICAGO, ILL., OCTOBER 27, 1943

Food, shelter, and clothing are elementary requirements of living. They are products of the soil. Their production represents a continuous drain on the fertility of the soil. Inasmuch as phosphorus is the key element in the conservation of soil fertility, the correct use of an adequate supply of phosphatic fertilizer is fundamental to national welfare. The scope of the problem of supply is broad. Indications are that at least 80 percent of the soils of the United States are now deficient in phosphorus. The problem is particularly critical at this time because of the demands placed upon American farmers to increase wartime food production despite the shortage of farm labor and farm machinery.

The importance of phosphatic fertilizer in increasing crop production, in improving the quality of both human and animal foodstuffs, in controlling soil erosion, and in making better farm practices possible are too well known to need elaboration in this report. Some of the most significant results obtained repeatedly on the 30,000 farms whose operators are participating in the test-demonstration program conducted by the land-grant colleges in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture and the Tennessee Valley Authority merit special attention.

The increases in crop production through the use of concentrated phosphatic fertilizers and adjusted farm management have been spectacular in many cases. Likewise, in the production of livestock, the results obtained through the use of phosphatic fertilizers on pastures have been highly significant. The reduction in growing acreage required per 1,000 pounds of livestock produced has been from 20 to 63 percent. A saving of about 30 percent in farm labor and a 35-percent increase in the production with the same amount of farm machinery has been recorded. Farm standards of living have been raised and farm incomes increased. Taken as a whole, the results obtained on the 30,000 farms participating in the test-demonstration program are of unsurpassed importance in reducing to a quantitative basis the benefits which can come from the intelligent use of phosphatic fertilizers in a system of correct farm management.

The results emphasize the need of a new approach to the whole problem of phosphate supply for agriculture. The situation is only confused by citing statistics of the sales of fertilizers as a measure of the agricultural need of phosphate. The quantity of phosphate necessary to maintain soil fertility, without which permanent agriculture is doomed, cannot be measured by the amount which the farmers have been able to buy under the unfavorable conditions which have prevailed in regard to supply and price.

On the test-demonstration farms mentioned above it has been shown that phosphate equivalent to 17 pounds of P_2O_5 per acre per year, in combination with lime, shall be used advantageously and economically under good farm management. If this rate of application were made on only the farms in the humid areas of the United States, the total requirement would be for 3,400,000 tons of P_2O_5 per year. The fertilizer industry claims to have a production capacity of somewhere between 1,500,000 and 1,700,000 tons per year, although actual production in 1943, when phosphate is so desperately needed, will be only about 1,100,000 tons.

It is obvious that a very great expansion of phosphatic fertilizer production is needed if soil fertility is to be maintained in this country, and if farmers are to have the opportunity to use what they can effectively use. And the expansion should be in the production of the concentrated phosphates which permit economy in packaging and distribution costs. At present less than one-fifth of the phosphatic fertilizer produced in this country is in the form of concentrated phosphate.

The war has created a new situation with respect to both nitrogen and phosphorus supply. Within the past 3 years several large plants have been constructed to produce ammonia and ammonium nitrate for munitions. Agricultural needs for nitrogen were given but scant consideration, and no provision was made for increasing the production of phosphatic fertilizer which agriculture would surely need. The Tennessee Valley Authority, however, obtained from Congress, 2 years ago, permission and funds to build a concentrated fertilizer plant at Mobile, Ala. The Mobile location was chosen because Florida rock phosphate could be used. The Tennessee deposits are very limited in comparison with those of Florida and of the Western States.

The Mobile plant has not been constructed because allotment of construction materials could not be obtained from the War Production Board. There was, so it was said, sufficient phosphorus production capacity available for war, and the fertilizer industry, so it said, had ample capacity for fertilizer needs.

Within the past few months the situation has radically changed again. The need of ammonium nitrate in munitions has decreased greatly and agriculture has fallen heir to a large supply of the material. And the war need for phosphorus for military use is suddenly discovered to be much greater than had been anticipated. New production must be had with all speed. There is now no time to put new phosphate smelting furnaces at Mobile, Ala. They must be put up adjacent to the existing furnaces which draw their raw rock phosphate supply from the Tennessee deposits which are relatively limited. These new furnaces are for war production, and if now needed must be built with all speed. They may be turned to production of fertilizers after the war, but if so will still leave the problem of an adequate supply of concentrated phosphatic fertilizer unsolved. The Mobile plant planned by the Tennessee Valley Authority will still be needed and so will several other plants for the production of concentrated fertilizer. It would be highly desirable that one or more of the new plants needed be built in the West, and a later section of the present report deals specifically with this project.

The problems of a greatly increased supply of phosphatic fertilizer become particularly important in view of the likelihood of a cheaper and more abundant supply of nitrogen for agriculture. Nitrogenous fertilizer is a powerful stimulant of plant growth. And an increased plant growth means an increased uptake of phosphorus and potash from the soil. One of the unfortunate aspects of fertilizer use has long been the fact that a nitrogenous fertilizer accelerates the depletion of the mineral elements of fertility from the soil. If, as a result of the ammonia plants built for war, agriculture is to have cheaper nitrogen, it is certain that this will be a curse rather than a blessing if provision is not made to supply also an abundance of cheap phosphatic fertilizer.

Your committee believes that the need of agriculture for phosphate should be measured by the amount necessary to maintain permanent agriculture, and that it is time to cease measuring need in terms of what the fertilizer industry is prepared to sell.

It appears to your committee that it is high time that the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities took an active part in the development and execution of a comprehensive plan to assure agriculture an abundant supply of phosphatic fertilizer in the all-out effort which must now be made for increased food production, and to assure agriculture in post-war years of a supply adequate to maintain soil fertility.

A PROPOSAL FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A FEDERALLY OWNED FERTILIZER FACTORY USING WESTERN PHOSPHATE AND POTASH

The largest and richest of the deposits of natural rock phosphate in the United States lie in the Western States of Utah, Wyoming, Idaho, and Montana. Most of this phosphate is federally owned, some is held by the individual States, and some by private corporations or individuals.

Most of the phosphatic fertilizer used in agriculture in the United States is applied to lands east of the Mississippi River. The rock phosphate from which this fertilizer is produced is mined in Tennessee and in Florida. The deposits in these two States are the only ones of importance in the United States aside from the western deposits mentioned above. Florida is well located to supply phosphate to States on the Atlantic seaboard and Tennessee is well located to supply phosphate to the adjacent Southeastern States. As the States of the upper Mississippi Valley increase their demand for phosphate, as they must inevitably do, the supply must come either from Tennessee or from the West. The phosphate deposits of Tennessee are very small compared with those of Florida and negligibly small when compared with those of the Western States. An increased demand on the Tennessee deposits will hasten the time, already not far distant, when the Tennessee deposits will be exhausted. In any long-range agricultural program, the western deposits must be called upon to supply the growing phosphate demand of the upper Mississippi Valley, and the sooner this is done the better.

All the commercially exploited potash deposits in the United States are likewise in the western part of the country, some of them on the public domain. At present, potash is being produced commercially at Carlsbad, N. Mex., at Searles Lake, Calif., and at Wendover, Utah. A small plant is being constructed near Salt Lake to utilize the alunite from the Marysvale district of Utah. More than 95 percent of the potash produced in these western operations is shipped to consumers in the eastern and southeastern parts of the United States.

The present proposal is that a federally owned and operated fertilizer plant be constructed in the West at a site somewhere in the region where the States of Wyoming, Utah, and Idaho meet. The construction of such a plant may have to be a post-war undertaking. As such it would fall naturally into the class of projects which the Federal Government is now planning to soften the shock of post-war adjustments in employment.

It does not appear that private industry is likely to undertake such an enterprise as herein proposed, at least not in the near future. The risk to capital would be too great and the opportunity for early profits too small to make the venture attractive. On the other hand, it is vitally important to agriculture that the western phosphate deposits be utilized and that the phosphate be made available to agriculture at a price which is not loaded with a large-profit item.

The products of the plant as now visualized would eventually be three in number, namely, a concentrated superphosphate, calcium metaphosphate, and potassium metaphosphate. All of these are fertilizers of high concentration, such as would lead themselves to shipment over longer distances than are permissible for the ordinary fertilizers now in common use.

The blast-furnace process would be used, inasmuch as cheap hydroelectric power is not at present available near enough to the phosphate fields of the West to permit use of the somewhat simpler electric-furnace process. The Tennessee Valley Authority has been studying means of improving this process for the past 10 years and has operated a small blast furnace over periods of many months. The T. V. A. probably has, today, the best information available in the world on the application of the blast furnace to phosphate smelting and the conversion of the phosphorus to concentrated phosphatic fertilizers of various sorts, including the three mentioned above. The processes for producing calcium metaphosphate and the potassium metaphosphate are T. V. A. developments.

If a blast-furnace plant were constructed, it would probably be prudent to produce only the concentrated superphosphate at first. The supplemental plants for the production of calcium metaphosphate and potassium metaphosphate would be relatively inexpensive additions to the initial plant.

Inasmuch as the T. V. A. has recently made an estimate as to the cost of a blast-furnace plant using western phosphate, a copy of the T. V. A. report[1] is hereto appended with permission from the organization. The cost data used in the appended T. V. A. report are necessarily pre-war cost data. The costs shown in the estimate would be somewhat higher if adjusted to present conditions.

E. G. PETERSON,
Utah, Chairman.
R. M. GREEN,
Colorado.
E. J. IDDINGS,
Idaho.
H. A. CURTIS,
Missouri.
WILMON NEWELL,
Florida.

[1] Report 14, Part II, The Problem of Utilizing Phosphate From Deposits in the Western States: Possibility of Using the Blast Furnace Method. March 1943. Tennessee Valley Authority, Department of Chemical Engineering, Wilson Dam, Ala.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I have at the desk an amendment which has been printed, which I now offer and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 17, after the word "to", it is proposed to insert the following: "domestic wool, sugar beets and sugarcane and."

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho permit action on another matter before he asks for action on his amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Before action is taken on the amendment I wish to say a word.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before we resume the consideration of the pending business there is a matter of privilege which I think ought to be disposed of. On yesterday the House returned to the Senate Senate bill 1285, and in its message insisted upon certain House amendments and asked for a conference. I ask that the message be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
February 9, 1944.

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendments numbered 9, 11, and 12 to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the places of their residence, and for other purposes; and

That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 3 to said bill and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Ordered, That Mr. WORLEY, Mr. RANKIN, Mr. BONNER, Mr. LECOMPTE, and Mr. ELLSWORTH be the managers of the conference on the part of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist upon its disagreement to amendments of the House numbered 9, 11, and

12, that it insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the conference requested by the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object; of course, as all Senators know, the Senate elects conferees, but ordinarily, instead of going through that form, the chairman of a committee submits a list of Senators to be appointed conferees, and they are usually appointed by unanimous consent. The rule of the Senate is found in rule XXIV:

> All other committees shall be appointed by ballot, unless otherwise ordered, and a plurality of votes shall appoint.

Mr. President, I will make a parliamentary inquiry. Under the rules of the Senate do not conferees have to be elected, unless action is taken by unanimous consent?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the opinion of the present occupant of the chair that it is the subject of a proper motion that the Senate in the case presented insist upon its disagreement to the House amendments, and that the Chair appoint conferees. That would be a proper motion. That, in the opinion of the Chair, is subject to amendment——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky did not make that as a motion. He asked unanimous consent, and I am reserving the right to object.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Kentucky still can make the motion.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, he can make the motion, but it has to be passed upon by the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no question about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall state the reason why I take the position I do. We all know that there has been a very active fight over the measure in the Senate. As I understand, under the proposal made by the chairman of the committee, represented as he is at the moment by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], members of the subcommittee which handled the measure would be appointed conferees. The subcommittee is composed of four Senators who favor the Federal ballot plan and one who favors the other plan. The vote in the Senate was exceedingly close. I think the measure was passed by two or three votes—I have forgotten which.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken. The final vote was 45 to 51. The other vote was 46 to 40.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; but when the test vote came the vote was 42 to 44, or 42 to 46, I have forgotten which.

Mr. BARKLEY. Forty-one to forty-five. But be that as it may——

Mr. McKELLAR. But that is an exceedingly small difference.

Mr. President, I think it is utterly unfair and unjust that we should send this bill to a conference with four conferees on one side and one on the other. For that reason it seems to me to be appropriate and proper that the Senate, before doing anything, should vote on the question. Action should not be taken by unanimous consent. I am unwilling to consent to the proposal, and I therefore object to action being taken by unanimous consent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object myself in order to get the floor, I should like to say that we fought for 2 weeks in the Senate on the question of the soldiers' right to vote. The question was decided on a number of significant ballots, not by a large majority, "not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door," but it was enough to indicate the position of the Senate on the question. I should like to suggest to my dear friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee, that the Senate is entitled as a matter of absolute right to have conferees who represent the final action of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us look at the question as a matter of right. Is it possible, after the close vote we had in this body that the Senator thinks the conferees ought to be selected on the basis of four on one side and one on the other side?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I think they ought to represent the ultimate decision of the Senate, and I think that is the only theory of a conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Four to one?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have seen the Senator from Tennessee himself repeatedly recommend the appointment of conferees, not on the ground of seniority, but from among the Senators who have been engaged in the handling of a particular bill. In other words, the Senator always wants his own subcommittee when he is in charge of a bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, of course, and every other chairman wants the same thing.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. But not always.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator wants to have his cake and eat it, too.

Mr. McKELLAR. The three highest ranking members of the Appropriations Committee on the Democratic side and the two highest ranking on the Republican side are usually chosen. That is done by unanimous consent.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why, Mr. President, of course; and that is the decent thing to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. No question is raised about it. But I desire to say that the Senator has never heard me ask unanimous consent that the conferees on a question be in the ratio of 4 to 1, and I challenge him or any other Senator to find any record which would show that I wanted to hog the whole thing. I am perfectly willing to have the 3 to 2 ratio now. I should be willing to grant unanimous consent, so far as I am concerned, if my friends on the other side would be willing to take 3 and give us 2. But when they want 4 to 1, that is going a little too far, and I do not think it is fair; I do not think it is just; I do not think it is in accordance with the sentiment of this body as expressed on numerous votes. For that reason, I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee has objected. Now I wish to enter a motion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Before entering the motion, let me make an observation. It has been the universal custom in the Senate, to which there has been no exception so far as I recall, that in the appointment of conferees on the part of the Senate the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees. In carrying out that authorization it has been the universal custom for the chairman of the committee handling the legislation to suggest to the Chair the names of the conferees. If that is now denied to the chairman of this committee, it will be a denial which has never been registered, so far as I recall, against any chairman of any Senate committee handling legislation.

Furthermore, it has been customary—not invariably the rule, but in nearly all cases it has been the rule—when a subcommittee has been appointed in a committee to deal with the subject of proposed legislation which finally passed the Senate, and upon which a conference is sought and obtained, to suggest to the Chair the appointment as conferees of the members of the subcommittee which handled the legislation and dealt with the subject in the full committee.

I can say to the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Louisiana, and to all other Senators, on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], that it has been and is his purpose to suggest to the Presiding Officer that the members of the subcommittee which were appointed in the full committee be made the conferees on the part of the Senate in connection with this legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment, please. I will give the names of the members of that subcommittee: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

That is not in the ratio of 4 to 1; it is 4 to 2, according to the votes cast in the Senate on the measure. But certainly no one can deny the propriety and the fairness of making the members of the subcommittee which was appointed in the full committee the conferees on this legislation.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield first to the Senator who first rose.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me say a brief word about the situation. I think there are two practices or customs which confront each other and deny each other at this time. I think it has long been the practice, in the appointment of conference committees, to recognize the seniority of members serving upon the legislative committee. I think it is also true, and I think it is proper, that consideration should be given to the views of the Senate upon the legislation, as those views have been expressed by the votes cast in the Senate. Those two positions cannot be reconciled. The practice has been as I have indicated.

Mr. President, I think we should dispose of this matter. I think the conferees should be appointed today. I think the conferees should begin the task for which they are to be chosen. I cannot help pointing out, however, that the votes in the Senate upon the major issues of consequence were not in the ratio of 2 to 1. Those votes in the Senate were close—sometimes with a margin of only 3 or 4 votes between the prevailing side and the losing side.

If a committee of conference is to be appointed, and if the seniority rule is not to be followed in its full application, then I think there should be recognition of the closeness of the votes in this body. A conference committee composed of three Members from the prevailing side and two Members from the minority side, I think, would very much more fairly and completely represent the views of the Senate than to appoint the Senate conferees in the ratio of 4 to 2.

I appeal to the Senator from Kentucky to suggest that the conference committee be made up of a majority of three and a minority of two. If that is done——

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, if the Senator from Maine has concluded.

Mr. WHITE. I think I have said all I regard to be pertinent. I have stated what I consider to be the proper rule, and I have hope that the Senator from Kentucky will feel that a 3-to-2 ratio in the membership of the conference committee will more fairly represent the collective judgment of the Senate than a 2-to-1 or a 4-to-2 ratio. I hope the Senator from Kentucky will agree to have a 3-to-2 ratio on the conference committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to bear with me for a moment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the first place, the question which is really involved here is whether we are to make an exception in this case, and are to adopt a procedure which has not been adopted in any other case before the Senate. We would deny the Chair the right to appoint the members of the conference committee, and thereby would automatically deny to the chairman of the legislative committee which has handled the legislation the right which has been enjoyed from time immemorial by the chairman of every committee handling legislation, namely, the right to suggest the names of the conferees. It would also abrogate the practice of allowing the chairman of a committee to suggest the names of members of subcommittees which have been appointed within the committee. I think I can say, not as a prophet, but merely as a matter of common sense, that if we abrogate the practice in this case, that abrogation will rise to stare the chairman of every Senate committee in the face in the future when we are dealing with the right of a chairman to suggest the names of the conferees on a measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have promised to yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should simply like to remark in connection with what the Senator has said that if we override the right of the chairman to make the recommendation in this case, so far as I am concerned so long as I stay in the Senate no conferees will be appointed by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I agreed to yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I said "4 to 1." I wish to read the proposed conferees included in the unanimous-consent request: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], who is for the Federal voting bill; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is for the Federal voting bill; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], who is for the Federal voting bill; the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is for the Federal voting bill; the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is not here, but has just been married and is on his honeymoon. He will not be here, and there will be five members of the committee, four of whom will be for the Federal voting law, and only one, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], will be against it. That is the truth of the matter, and it cannot be denied. We all know the facts. We all congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on his good luck in getting married, and we are not going to bring him back here, and I am sure the committee and the Senate have no intention of bringing the Senator from New Hampshire back here, away from his honeymoon, to serve on the conference committee. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me, in that regard, of course, we all congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire upon his contemplated wedding, or, if it has already taken place, we congratulate him upon that. At whatever stage it now rests, I congratulate him. So far as I know, he has not indicated any desire to avoid service in the Senate because of his matrimonial venture. If he should indicate such a desire, and should make it officially known, of course the Chair would appoint some other Senator in his place, and the proportion would be the same.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that a day or two ago the Senator from New Hampshire notified me that he would be absent from the Senate for several days, and that he would be unable to serve on the conference committee. He suggested to me that the next ranking Republican member of the committee, who is the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], be named in his place.

Mr. BARKLEY. I had not received such information. However, that would still preserve the status quo, not only as to the committee, but as to the Senator from New Hampshire.

It seemed to me that what is asked is fair and reasonable. It has never been questioned before, even in cases in which all the conferees represented the views of the Senate and there was no Senator among the conferees who had voted against the measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know of any such case as that? I have never heard of it. Of course, I have not been here as long as has the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee came to Congress when I was in knee pants. [Laughter.] He came to the Senate at least 10 years before I became a Member of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator was down in the woods of Kentucky. I do not know what sort of breeches he wore, but he was a big boy then. [Laughter.]

Will the Senator yield to me for something serious?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me call attention to what the effect of this proposal would be. Of course, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] should be named as a member of the conference committee. The next Senator in seniority on the Committee on Privileges and Elections is the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. He has been a Member of the Senate longer than any of us. Why should he be turned down? Why

should the rules be violated to turn down ED SMITH when conferees are appointed?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. The next Senator in order of seniority on the Committee on Privileges and Elections is the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. Why should he be turned down? Why should he not be named as one of the conferees? The practice is uniform. I call on my friend the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who has suffered by that rule time and again in the Appropriations Committee. Time and again he has served on a subcommittee, but has not been named as one of the conferees.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. It seems to me that we ought to be fair. I intend to propose——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not yield for any proposal. I have the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. When the Senator nominates his ticket, I shall nominate another ticket. If the Senator will yield to me, I will read that ticket.

Mr. BARKLEY. Just a moment. I wish to reply to some of the suggestions which have been made before I yield any further.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to correct the statement of the Senator to the effect that he has never known the practice to be questioned that when the chairman of a committee suggested the names of conferees and suggested the members of a subcommittee the members of the subcommittee were appointed conferees. I have a very distinct recollection of that practice being questioned on the floor of the Senate. The order of seniority was always followed until recently. Many years ago, when I first came to the Senate and before the Senator from Kentucky was a Member of the Senate, the question was raised on the floor of the Senate, and the order of seniority was followed. We have not always followed it since then, but it was the almost invariable rule that seniority should be followed unless some Senator did not wish to serve as one of the conferees.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. Let me finish my statement. That rule has been followed in practically all the committees of the Senate. The Senator from Kentucky says that he does not know of an instance of the practice being questioned. It certainly has been questioned in this body since I have been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection let me remind the Senate that some years ago a bill was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who, as I recall, was chairman of the committee. The bill had to do with banking. The then Senator from Florida, Mr. Fletcher, was the ranking Democratic member of that committee. As was customary, the Senator from Virginia submitted a list of suggested conferees to the Chair when the matter of the appointment of conferees was under consideration. The list omitted the senior Senator from Florida, Mr. Fletcher, who was the ranking Democratic member of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He was chairman of the committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. He was not appointed. As I now recall, the reason for that was that the Senator from Florida had not been active in connection with the legislation, and the Senator from Virginia had been very active. I think he was the author of the bill. In suggesting the names of conferees, he named those who had been active in connection with the bill, a majority of whom were in favor of the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator will recall that on that occasion Senator Fletcher, of Florida, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, had not opposed the bill, but he simply had not been active in connection with the bill, and the Senator from Virginia, who is now President pro tempore of the Senate, being in charge of the bill, exercising his right, as he considered it, submitted a suggested list of conferees. He suggested the names of members of the subcommittee, Senators who had been active in connection with the bill, and who had considered it. The Senator from Florida raised no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, I was mistaken in saying that Senator Fletcher of Florida was the ranking Democratic member. He was chairman of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And the Senator from Virginia was chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia, who handled the legislation, was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and when he suggested to the Chair the names of conferees he suggested the names of Senators who had been active in connection with the bill. The list did not include the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator contend that a subcommittee handling legislation ought to be able to name the conferees?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am talking about what happened.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is usually done by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHEELER. If that practice is to be followed in this body, we shall have nothing but chaos in the committees.

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot agree to that.

In the appointment of subcommittees seniority is not always observed within the committee. It is not observed in the Appropriations Committee. It is not observed in any other committee. That is a matter which is subject to rules within the committee. I recall that when the O. P. A. legislation was under consideration former Senator Brown of Michigan was appointed chairman of the subcommittee to handle that bill. When the committee had concluded its work and the bill had been passed by the Senate, in accordance with the custom he suggested as members of the conference committee the members of the subcommittee which had handled the bill, and they were appointed conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the seniority rule has been violated on numerous occasions. When I had been a Member of the Senate for 16 months I was seventh in seniority on the Committee on Education and Labor. I was selected to be a member of the conference committee on the wages-and-hours bill, as my colleague the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] may recall. The reason given for my appointment was because of my activity in respect to the passage of the bill and my knowledge of its contents. I think it a good rule for us to select Senators who have been actively engaged in the passage of a bill and who are thoroughly versed as to the contents of a bill. Aside from that, Mr. President, I am wondering if the Senate is now about to engage in a fight over an issue which has been settled by this body. It strikes me that whether a Senator is in favor of the majority or the minority side, he is duty bound to represent the Senate and to maintain the majority view of the Senate.

I propound this parliamentary inquiry to the Chair: Whether the conferees are for the minority or the majority side, should they not support the majority view of the Senate?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Although the Chair knows of no rule governing the matter, it is the opinion of the present occupant of the Chair that the representatives of the Senate are presumed to represent the views of the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have enough faith in the Members of this body to believe that whoever is appointed to represent the Senate in conference, such representatives or conferees will fight for the majority view of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make one observation in view of what the distinguished acting minority leader [Mr. WHITE] said a moment ago with respect to seniority, and also in reply to what other Senators have said in regard to seniority prevailing.

If five members of the conference committee were appointed according to seniority, there would be appointed the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] from the Democratic side, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] from the Republican side.

If the rule of seniority were followed there would be three members of the committee definitely opposed to the uniform Federal ballot, and two who are in favor of the uniform Federal ballot. It is all very well to say that the Senate conferees will represent the Senate in what the Senate has done. If that is the situation there is no reason for making any fight against the committee suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island. If the conferees are to represent the true sentiments which have been expressed by the majority of the Senate, in line with what my distinguished friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has said, and will enter the conference and do yeoman service for what the majority of the Senate said should be done, there should be absolutely no reason for any controversy on the floor of the Senate at this moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may be permitted to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will any Senator, of any persuasion of thought, say that the Senate is not entitled to have agents—and that is all the conferees are—who will well and truly, so far as they can, represent the opinion of the majority of the Senate as evidenced by its final action on this matter?

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator is absolutely correct. I am making the argument only from the standpoint of seniority, because the question was raised by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. If the rule of seniority is to be strictly followed in appointing conferees, the Senate, which is in favor of the uniform Federal ballot, will be sending to conference a minority of Members who are in favor of the Federal ballot, and a majority of members who are opposed to it. That does not seem to me to be in keeping with our votes in the Senate during the last 2 weeks.

I have the utmost respect for all my colleagues in the Senate. I have great respect for the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. SMITH], who is my chairman. I have great respect and affection for one of the most distinguished Members of this body, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. However, I do not believe it would be correct to say that their hearts are in this measure, and that they would go into the conference and fight for the majority view of the Senate. I do not believe they would. I may be mistaken about it. If I were a minority member of the conference committee I would be fighting for the best interests of the minority. That is what I would be put on the conference committee for.

I wish to cite to the Senator from Kentucky one example of what has happened in the Senate with respect to appointing subcommittees. My good friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] was appointed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, as chairman of a subcommittee having to do with one of the most important measures which has ever been before the Senate, namely, the telegraph merger under the Federal Communications Act of 1934. On that subcommittee, in addition to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], were the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], from the Democratic side of the aisle, and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], from the Republican side of the aisle. We all remember the debates which were had on the bill, and the conferences held later with the House.

From the standpoint of seniority the Senator from Arizona was far down the line. From that angle he would not have been entitled to be on the committee at all; and yet the Senator from Montana, who now talks about seniority, appointed him a member of the subcommittee, and all the members of the subcommittee were appointed conferees to represent the Senate in connection with that important measure. Why did the Senator from Montana appoint those Senators? He did it, Mr. President, because they were familiar with the legislation. They were familiar with what had taken place in the committee, and the Senator from Montana knew it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make a statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not have the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky further yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. Allow me to make a brief statement, and then I shall be through.

I have stated what has been done in the Senate. Members of the subcommittee were all appointed members of the conference committee.

Another very interesting bill, which was reported by the Judiciary Committee, was considered by the Senate during the first session of the present Congress. I refer to the bill providing for the appointment of official court reporters in the United States district courts. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] were appointed members of the subcommittee to consider the bill, and they were all appointed later as members of the conference committee.

The same situation occurred in the first session of the present Congress in connection with another very important measure; namely, the petroleum pipeline bill. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] were members of the subcommittee which handled that very important piece of legislation. The Senate saw fit to appoint those three Senators conferees.

No Senator wishes to be fairer than does the Senator from Illinois. All I want is a fair representation of the Senate on the conference committee. I do not care whether five or seven conferees are appointed. However, if we are to follow the rule of seniority those of us who feel seriously about the uniform Federal ballot—and we all know what an acrimonious struggle we have had here—will be in the minority on the conference. I do not believe any Senator wants to place us in the minority.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. With reference to the legislation to which the Senator from Illinois has referred, I did appoint the subcommittee, and the members of that subcommittee were later appointed members of the conference committee. That action was taken because of the fact that so far as the Senate was concerned, there had been no contest in regard to the measure when it was under consideration. I think the Senate was practically unanimous in its action on that bill. However, I do not appoint conferees in the Interstate Commerce Committee. If objection is raised in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, I follow the seniority rule in suggesting the names of conferees.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the Senator ever have occasion to suggest conferees when there was an objection on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. WHEELER. I have never had a case in which there was objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course not.

Mr. WHEELER. But in the present instance an objection is made in a highly controversial case. It seems to me, regardless of whether seniority is observed, that there can be no justification for the appointment of six members in the ratio of 4 to 2.

The Senator has said that it would be satisfactory to appoint three from one side and two from the other. I have no interest in the matter one way or the other, but I think, in the interest of fairness, that what should be done is to appoint three from one side and two from the other. It is very foolish, in my judgment, to enter into a controversy on the floor of the Senate over this issue. It ought to be settled by appointing three from one side and two from the other. To do otherwise would not be justifiable. It would look rather bad. All the conferees, regardless of which side they represented on the floor of the Senate and which side they voted on, will have to support the Senate view in the conference until such time that they cannot come to an agreement, and bring the matter back to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding. Because of the remark of the Senator from Illinois referring to the Senator from Texas, I feel compelled to make a statement. The Senator from Illinois has done me the favor of interpreting my motives and my intentions about this matter. I do not want to be on the conference committee; I have no desire to be on the conference committee. I assume, however, that any conferee who is an honest man who goes on the conference committee is going to represent, to all reasonable extent, the views of the body that appoints him and the views in this case of the Senate. Any

other situation would be contrary to established parliamentary usage and the highest parliamentary ethics. If I represent a man in court, I represent him; I do not take a hand-out on the side from someone on the other side. But according to the views of the Senator from Illinois, we will never get any bill at all, because, if the Senate conferees are now instructed never to budge and the House conferees are instructed never to budge, certainly no agreement can be reached.

One thing, it seems to me, that Senators have overlooked is the original bill, which is what the conference will be about. The original bill was passed by the Senate when I was not here, and I was not interested in it. The original bill was representative of the views of the Senate at that time, but it is wholly different from what the Senate has done recently. My view, if I were a conferee—and I do not want to be a conferee, and I hope no one will put me on the list, because I do not want to go on the conference committee with the implication on the part of any Senator that I am going to misrepresent the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment; let me finish this statement. I do not want to go on the conference committee and have no desire to serve on it, but if I were a conferee and we reached a point where the difference was fundamental and serious and we could not agree, I would, if I had my way, come back to the Senate, report to the Senate, and ask for instructions from this body as to what I should do in that case.

It seems to me the very theory of conferences is that both sides should not stand out like stone walls, in which event there is no occasion to have a conference. I want to see some sort of soldier's bill enacted and in the committee I voted to report the Federal ballot bill, because I thought at that time it might meet objections that many Senators had to it and that I had to it, but transactions on the floor of the Senate afterward convinced me I could not consistently support it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I want to say this to my very dear friend the Senator from Texas: I am sure that nothing any Senator said was intended or should be interpreted as in any way impugning the legislative integrity of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Illinois said that he assumed that I would go into the conference and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would go into it and would fight for our side.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not think the Senator from Illinois meant that.

Mr. CONNALLY. He said it; I do not know whether he meant it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator from Texas will not insist——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not mad about it. I am speaking of the lack of the Senator from Illinois to appreciate the ethics of the situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope that the Senator from Texas will not insist upon his unwillingness to serve because I think we have got this thing worked out.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should not want to serve under any circumstances unless it was by the practically "uninanimous" action of the Senate. I do not propose to be put up here——

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe it will be "uninanimous" if the Senator will permit me to say so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to serve. To tell the truth, I have some other engagements that I would much prefer to follow than to serve on the conference committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. After conferring with the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Maine—and I am willing to submit the matter to any other Senator who can now be reached—the suggestion has been made that the following be appointed conferees by "uninanimous" consent.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will practice on that word a little he will get it right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will get it right; I always try to practice on any suggestion the Senator from Texas offers me.

As I was saying, the suggestion has been made that the following Senators be appointed conferees: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I think that the Senator from Texas under those circumstances ought to serve, and I am satisfied that such an arrangement will be satisfactory to both sides of the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I express the very earnest hope that the Senator from Texas will serve under those circumstances.

Mr. CONNALLY. What I was about to say to the Senator from Kentucky a moment ago was that I did not propose that my good faith and my conceptions of ethics and my ideas of integrity of view should be tested by a vote. I do not want to serve if a single Senator objects.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would agree with the Senator about that, and if the Senator's good faith and his integrity were put to a vote in the Senate it would be endorsed "uninanimously."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to say to my distinguished friend from Texas that the last thing in the world I even thought of was any implication impugning the motives or integrity of my friend from Texas. I have served with him 5 years in the Senate. I have gone to him frequently for advice and counsel; I have great respect for him; I know, as I said in my opening remarks, that he is one of the most distinguished Members of the Senate; I shall vote for him as a member of the conference committee, and I know the Senator will give real service to both sides in the case.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. On account of the enthusiastic and overwhelming insistence of the Senator from Illinois, I might be prevailed upon. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I now renew——

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I want to say that I am very pleased to know that this controversy has been brought to so happy a termination. The conferees suggested by the Senator from Kentucky meet with my approval.

Mr. BARKLEY. I now renew my unanimous-consent request that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate and that the following conferees be appointed:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection, Mr. President, to that unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Since the conferees operate under the unit rule, I will say that I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Hurry up, Mr. President, before some Senator objects.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kentucky include in his motion the necessary preliminary motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I now make the request that the Senate insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the House of Representatives Numbered 9, 11, and 12. That the Senate insist upon its amendment to the amendment of the House Numbered 3, and agree to the conference requested by the House thereon; and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Presiding Officer.

That, I understand, is the necessary procedure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let the conferees be appointed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the Senate the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to reply to a very remarkable argument made a while ago by the Senator from Kentucky——

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, I think I have the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I understood I had the floor. I yielded to the Senator

from Kentucky only for the purpose of asking unanimous consent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not know that. I thought I had been recognized in my own right. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Some question was raised here about the ages of two Senators, I being one and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] the other. The Senator from Kentucky made the astounding statement that when I was in the House of Representatives a good many years ago, he was a boy in short breeches. I wish to read from the Congressional Directory the biographical sketch of the Senator. He was born in Graves County, Ky., November 24, 1877. I went to the House in 1911. Therefore, when my distinguished friend was wearing short breeches, he was just 34 years of age. I am utterly astounded that, though he came from Graves County, Ky., in the country, he should have been wearing short trousers—short breeches—at that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Short pants.

Mr. McKELLAR. Thirty-four years old, and wearing short breeches! The remarkable thing about it is that the very next year he was elected to the House of Representatives. I wonder whether he was in short breeches when he came to the House of Representatives in 1913.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield in that connection, I have never denied my age. It is in the directory, where everyone can see it. I have searched in vain to find in the directory the age of my very dear friend, the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I received hundreds of letters of congratulations and innumerable telegrams just a few days ago when I celebrated my birthday.

Mr. BARKLEY. How old was the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. Seventy-five years old, and the Senator is 9 years younger than I am.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move, therefore, to insert in the biographical section of the Congressional Directory the date of the birth of the Senator from Tennessee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARKLEY. Getting back to short pants, I merely wish to say that when I came to the House of Representatives in 1913 at the age of 34, I was in long pants, but the Senator from Tennessee has been trying to pull them off me or shorten them ever since. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have enjoyed the exchange of ideas this morning, and I thought perhaps it might be worth while to give the sentiments in relation to the soldiers' vote of a very distinguished citizen of my State, who is now serving on one of the great "battle wagons" of the Navy. He has written about several subjects, but I shall quote his language regarding the vote question, because I think what we have done during 2 weeks of discussion has tended to cause the folks on the home front to become pretty well confused mentally as to the nature of the soldier-vote ballot and the significance of what the soldier thinks on this subject. I quote:

> In the first place, from what I have observed, the men in the armed forces don't seem to care much whether Congress passes a soldier's voting law or not, but on the contrary, think that the furore that it has been causing in political circles is extremely funny. I actually question whether even if a Federal law is enacted the men in the armed forces will utilize the privilege of voting, simply because they have plenty of other important things to think about, and mainly their paramount desire is to get the war finished and get home.

I now quote his second suggestion:

> Secondly, the mustering-out-pay bill is felt to be closely associated with the right of the soldiers to vote, that the impression the boys at the front have is that it is so much pap and a damn high price to pay for votes. The fellows who get out of this deal with a whole hide aren't going to ask for anything, and mainly want to know that those thousands whose lives are going to be ru'ned are taken care of.

Mr. President, I have received many letters along this line. This one came in this morning from this distinguished citizen, who, as I have said, is serving on one of the great "battle wagons" in the fleet.

I think many times we "miss the boat" here, and I think we probably have missed it a great deal during the discussion of the subject of soldiers' voting. Let us get the ballots out to the servicemen. I think there is more confusion on this subject than on any we have discussed in the Senate for months.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I have just a little amendment, which will take only about a minute. It is noncontroversial; and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has to leave the floor, and I want him to hear the amendment explained. Then the Senator may have his own time. Will that be all right?

Mr. WILEY. Certainly.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, the clerk has already reported the amendment, which proposes, on page 10, line 17, after the word "to", to insert the words "domestic wool, sugar beets, sugarcane, and."

Mr. President, it was never the intention of the author of the bill, or of the committee, to bring within the prohibitions of the bill the sugar quotas, and words which we thought provided for that are already incorporated in the Bankhead bill, or, to be more exact, the committee amendment. However, since the bill came out of committee some question has arisen as to whether the words in the committee amendment are sufficient to achieve the result which they were intended to accomplish, and in order to clear up any uncertainty the words provided in my amendment are now proposed.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Alabama, and the amendment is perfectly acceptable to him, and should not be controversial.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What about wool? I have never heard of a wool subsidy. This is the first mention I have heard that one is to be permitted.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. There is very little likelihood that wool comes within the prohibitions of the bill, because there is no wool subsidy. However, the Commodity Credit Corporation has been buying domestic wool, at ceiling prices, less certain handling charges, in order to protect the market. Some slight question was raised as to whether that might not be considered to be within the language of the committee amendment, and, in order to be absolutely certain, I have included wool.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. With regard to wool, may I ask the Senator whether the amendment would protect the large supply of domestic wool which is stored? As the Senator well recalls, in this country we have three categories of wool. We have foreign wool that is owned by the R. F. C., purchased through the War Production Board; we have other wool, which is held here for foreign governments; then we have the third category, a large supply of domestic wool which is being held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Is the Senator satisfied that his language would not compel the domestic wool to be thrown on the market as distress wool?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. The language in the proposed amendment specifically exempts from the provisions of the Bankhead bill the entire wool-purchasing program, and while I do not think it is really essential, if it is necessary, it would enable the Commodity Credit Corporation, when in its judgment it should do so, to continue to purchase domestic wool—not the British wool—at ceiling prices, less handling charges.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Commodity Credit Corporation has not been purchasing foreign wool; it has been purchasing only domestic wool.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. It has been purchasing only domestic wool.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad the Senator from Idaho presented the language of his amendment in order to clarify the situation.

I should like to ask another question in regard to sugar. As the Senator knows, we have two payments made to sugar; one is the so-called benefit payment which is financed by the sugar industry itself at no cost to the Treasury, and then there is the incentive payment. Does the

Senator's amendment make it crystal clear that both these subsidies or payments would be continued?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I am perfectly satisfied that it does. I have discussed the matter with the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. As a matter of fact the language is largely his, and I am perfectly satisfied that it protects the sugar situation in its entirety.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The question asked by the Senator from Colorado was one I also intended to ask, regarding incentive payments. Does the Senator's amendment cover the freight and insurance subsidies on sugar?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Yes; I think so definitely. I took that matter up also with Dr. Hutson and have all the figures respecting it. I am perfectly certain it covers the matter referred to by the Senator. It exempts sugar and sugarcane completely from the prohibitions of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. The language in the Bankhead substitute is:

> That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats—

And so forth. It strikes me that the word "domestic" would also refer to sugar.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. No; because the language of my amendment comes right after the word "to." I propose to insert "domestic wool, sugar beets, and sugarcane and", and the word "competitive" follows immediately. So that it would apply to foreign as well as to domestic sugar.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say that in view of the explanations which the Senator has made to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado, if there were a record vote I should be very happy to vote for the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The statements made by the junior Senator from Idaho deal with matters which are familiar to me. I thought when we placed the provision in the bill authorizing, under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, benefits to the sugar growers, that it covered the entire situation. That was the intention of the author of the provision. My attention was called later to the fact that one of the three benefit payments might not be covered. I then suggested that an amendment be prepared which would wholly and adequately protect sugar in all the payments being made to it, and the Solicitor of the Department has prepared the language of the amendment which the Senator from Idaho has submitted. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama. As I understand, his bill, as reported, would protect all payments on sugar with the possible exception of incentive payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. And the amendment now offered by the Senator from Idaho protects the incentive payments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have been so assured by the Solicitor of the Department who rules on the matter, so I am sure it is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, has the Senator from Idaho concluded his discussion?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Yes. Has the amendment been agreed to?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; action has not yet been taken on the amendment.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to speak to the amendment, Mr. President. I shall not object to it, because I think there should be some subsidies, but I wish to point out the completely illogical nature of this kind of an exception. It is, of course, illogical to make exemptions, as is done by the bill in this language:

> That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and oil-seed meals.

There is no more reason why they should be excepted from the antisubsidy principle than beef or anything else. This exception will permit roll-back subsidies on domestic oil seed, it will permit roll-back subsidies on sugar, it will permit roll-back subsidies on wool when the pending amendment shall be adopted. It will permit any kind of subsidies—consumer subsidies or producer subsidies. The exception being made is simply an exception as to commodity, and certainly no one can oppose subsidies in principle if exceptions are going to be made with respect to oil seed and wool and sugar and anything else that Senators may suggest is of interest to their sections of the country.

The point I wish to make is that if we are going to permit subsidies we ought to permit certain kinds of subsidies in accordance with some kind of logical principle, and not simply by the exception of some particular commodity. I have no objection to the addition of this amendment to the bill, but certainly there is no logical reason that I can see for exempting one commodity if we are not going to permit subsidies in the case of other commodities.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency I had full understanding from the Senator from Alabama that the sugar-beet industry of the West, and also wool, were fully protected under the terms of this bill. I wish to take this opportunity of expressing myself as being in full agreement with the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Idaho, and if there is any question about the language in the Bankhead bill as it was reported, I am very happy at this time that that language has been corrected by the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. May I offer the amendment and have it stated first?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, it is proposed to strike out all of line 23 after the colon, and all of lines 24 and 25, inclusive; also on page 10, lines 1 to 15 to the colon in line 19, and insert:

Provided further, That nothing herein shall apply to payments made to the shippers of commodities or others to cover the increased costs, resulting from the war emergency, in connection with the transportation of such commodities.

In order to secure the maximum necessary production of agricultural commodities in 1944, the Administrator of the War Food Administration shall, as soon as practicable after the passage of this act, list and announce such support prices as he finds necessary pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended. The War Food Administrator may exercise, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, the powers conferred on the Price Administrator by paragraph (e) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to buy and sell agricultural commodities, and if he announces the price at which he will buy such commodities for any specified crop or period of time, such announcement shall be deemed to establish a support price. He may from time to time announce additional support prices, or increase existing support prices. He shall list, and announce the confirmation and approval of, support prices already in effect for 1943 or 1944 production.

Whenever any support price has been announced, the Administrator shall maintain such price or cause such price to be maintained in all producers' markets throughout the United States (unless the support price is limited to particular marketing areas, in which case he shall maintain such price in such areas) either by causing actual purchases to be made by some agency of the United States Government, or by contracts with processors or distributors under which they obligate themselves to pay the support price, or otherwise. All departments and agencies of the Government shall cooperate to secure that result. No maximum price heretofore or hereafter established for any commodity shall be below the support price therefor so announced, or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942. In any case in which a support price for an agricultural commodity is announced and maintained, and a fixed maximum price is prescribed for the sale by processors and distributors of any article processed from such agricultural commodity, the War Food Administrator may direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay to the processor or distributor of any such article an amount per unit of the processed article (without relation to the profits of any particular processor or distributor) for the purpose of making the margin between the producer and the consumer less than it would otherwise be, by the amount of the payments made per unit by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation may accomplish the same purpose, when it purchases any agricultural commodity, by selling such commodity at a

loss to the processor to be used for the purpose of processing, without affecting the general market price at producers' markets for unprocessed commodity. No subsidy shall be paid on liquid milk unless in any particular area a support price is announced and maintained to the producers of milk within that area, in which case payments may be made to the distributors of milk within such area under the authority hereinbefore conferred, provided the margin in the price of milk between the producer and the consumer is thereafter less than it would otherwise be, by the amount per unit of the subsidy.

The total payments made to processors and distributors, plus all losses taken by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the provisions of the preceding paragraph, shall not exceed $950,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, Senators will find copies of my amendment on their desks. They will note that a change has been made in line 3, on page 1, after the word "line", to strike out "15" and insert "19."

I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there are three clarifying amendments which I should like to have acted on at this time. They change no material provision in the bill. I ask that the first amendment be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out "October 13, 1943", and insert in lieu thereof "January 14. 1944."

Mr. BANKHEAD. The date of October 13, 1943, of course, has long since passed, and the amendment would bring the matter down to the current date.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out the words "or maintain."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, which I offer and ask to have stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "but winding up and liquidating such programs shall proceed after the date of enactment of this act, and shall be completed within a reasonable time not later than June 30, 1944," and insert in lieu thereof the following "but such programs shall be completed not later than June 30, 1944."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator explain what difference the amendment would make?

Mr. BANKHEAD. In the original bill it was required that the liquidation should begin January 1, promptly after the completion of the limitation. We propose to strike that out, and to leave the same date for completion that was contained in the original bill, namely, June 30, 1944.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the language which is sought to be stricken, the liquidation would start immediately, and would have to be completed by June 30, 1944.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the proposed amendment, the liquidation will begin just as soon as the bill is enacted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I do not see how the Senator gets that understanding. The amendment proposes a liberalization, rather than a restriction.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was simply endeavoring to find out the difference.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The amendment refers to fixing the date for beginning liquidation. It simply provides that on June 30 it will end. That is all.

Mr. ELLENDER. And as the Senator stated yesterday, all programs which are now in force can be carried out to the same extent as they are now being carried out, until June 30, 1944.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama on page 10, lines 3 to 6.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has an amendment. He is not now in the Chamber at the moment. The amendment lies on the desk. I suppose we shall have an opportunity to take it up later.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I believe my amendment comes next in order.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well, Mr. President; I do not insist on now taking up the Reed amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there has been question raised, and I have finally concluded that, in my amendment, the figure in line 3 should be "15", as it originally was, instead of "19", so as to make the language read: "To the colon in line 15." I therefore wish to delete the previous modification of my amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to do so, and the modification will be deleted.

Mr. TAFT. Therefore, Mr. President, I am offering the amendment to the committee amendment exactly as it is printed and lies on the desks of Senators.

Mr. President, the demand for a billion and a half dollars of subsidies is based on the claim that by that means it will be possible to hold the line, absolutely fix prices, and fix wages. That is the only basis for the proposal. No one wants to pay subsidies. Everyone admits that, in general, subsidies are undesirable unless absolutely necessary; and the only justification for the all-out subsidy program is that by that means it will be possible to hold the line.

I suggest that the whole inflation problem is much more complicated than that, that there are many other ways by which we can hold the line or can hold down prices, and that there are many other things which should be done. This is only one feature of a very extensive program. I suggest that, as a matter of fact, the hold-the-line theory is unsound, unwise, and impossible, and that therefore the whole basis for the general subsidy program is, it seems to me, unsound. I do not need to suggest the other things which bring about inflation.

The first remedy which is necessary is to reduce governmental expenditures as much as possible. Inflation is brought about only by the governmental deficit, and by no other cause. If it were not for the governmental deficit there would not be any difficulty. But there is a deficit. There has been some reduction of expense. The committee of which the able junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman has brought about a reduction of governmental expenses. The War Department has to some extent been scaling down expenses in the war effort itself. But it seems to me to be obvious that expenditures can be further reduced, and that the war can be conducted, without any deterioration in the effort, in a less wasteful manner.

In the second place, we must increase taxes as much as possible. I regret that in the recent tax bill we did not increase them somewhat more; but the question whether taxes are to continue as they are today—$42,000,000,000—or are to be $5,000,000,000 more, after all, is not going to be the fundamental issue; because there is still a deficit of approximately $50,000,000,000.

In the third place, there must be an effort to sell bonds to the people who have real savings, because to the extent that we can take savings which otherwise would be spent and can have them placed in Government bonds and into the hands of the Government, we help to check inflation. We must check as much as possible the sales of bonds to commercial banks, which create purchasing power out of thin air, and we must reduce the tremendous purchasing power which hammers on the walls of the price structure.

In the fourth place, we must control prices to a large extent by rationing. If we artificially cut down, by rationing, the demand for a certain commodity, certainly the demand upon that particular commodity can be removed. The rationing program is just as important a feature as is the subsidy program.

But, finally, with all of this we must have, under these conditions, price and wage control. No matter how we conduct our other policies, I do not believe we can eliminate a certain amount of inflation—that is to say, a certain increase of purchasing power—which will force prices up, particularly in view of the psychology of war, with constant rumors of shortages, even if the shortages do not actually exist.

So, Mr. President, from the beginning I proposed a price-control program and did so before the administration proposed it, and I proposed a wage-control program and did so before the administration proposed it. I think a continuation of those programs is necessary, but I do not think it is necessary to enforce them by a general subsidy program.

On the other hand, I think there are subsidies which are helpful. Subsidies

may be used in various ways. They may be used, as in the case of copper, to subsidize high-cost producers and to save money. I do not think that in the food field or in the agricultural field we can attempt to subsidize particular high-cost producers. The consequences of such a policy, I think, would be much worse than any advantages which could be derived from it.

However, in some instances, by a subsidy on one commodity we can perhaps save consumers a great deal more money than is spent for the subsidy. Take the case of the oil-seed subsidy. If by subsidizing soybeans and peanut oil we raise the prices paid to farmers for those commodities, but do not raise the prices paid for them by consumers, then we are not forced to go on and also raise the price of lard and the price of cottonseed oil and the prices of other fat products which the consumers buy. Consequently, with an expenditure of, let us say, $20,000,000 for those two commodities, we can save consumers approximately $80,000,000 on all oil and fat products. Therefore, I think there are subsidies which can result in some advantage.

We have heard reference to the spiral of prices and wages. Undoubtedly if wages rise somewhat, there is a pressure to raise prices; and if prices rise, there is a pressure to raise wages. But that is a very slow process. After all, wages are increased only once a year, as a rule. If by the use of subsidies we can slow up that process, if by temporary subsidies we can postpone the increase in prices, I think subsidies may very well be used.

It is only when we come to subsidies all across the board that I see no justification for such a policy, for if the Government pays $100,000,000 in order to save the consumers $100,000,000 I believe that is just about as inflationary as to let prices paid by consumers go up, for the reason that the Government has to borrow the $100,000,000 and must borrow it from commercial banks, since we have largely exhausted individual savings, and thus the $100,000,000 will be available to hammer further the line on price control. If we are going to support the subsidy program as a hold-the-line measure, then we shall have to hold the line completely. We shall have to prevent any increases in prices. If we are going to vote to do that, I believe the increase will cost in the neighborhood of $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 during the first year, if we are really going to hold the line, because the natural forces of increase are such that they are bound, I believe, to increase prices 5 or 6 percent in a year. Five or six percent means four or five billion dollars of subsidies which we shall have to pay if we are to try to hold the line.

I think the hold-the-line theory is wrong. It is a popular theory. It is supposedly advocated by the administration. The theory is that we absolutely freeze all prices and all wages where they are. There are two objections to that. In the first place, it freezes injustices, and the American people will not stand for injustices. It attempts to freeze substandard wages. What did we do? We immediately enacted a wage law providing that substandard wages might be raised, because we recognized the justice of it.

The freezing of prices has resulted in many small businessmen being put out of business. Small packers in Cincinnati, and many others, have been forced out of business by price control. They have been forced out of business through an unjust act. The American people feel that those people should have a proper margin, and that it is only fair to give it to them. If we refuse to give it to them, we create an injustice which I think has had much to do with the break-down of morale in the home front, criticism of the Government, and resentment against the Government, because these things are unjust.

We have had brought to our attention on the floor of the Senate one thing after another which strikes the ordinary man as utterly unjust. It is the result of the absolute theory that we must hold the line regardless of what injustices occur. I say that if the hold-the-line theory is unsound because it freezes injustice, the American people will not approve the freezing of injustice.

In the second place, it is very likely to limit production, and has limited production in many fields, because obviously things change; and as we go on, producers shift their production to the thing which is most profitable. If there is an especially low price for a particular commodity, and we freeze it there, we do not get any of that commodity into production. The hold-the-line theory destroys production. The Senate considers that to be unfair. We put in a provision that the farmer should receive not less than parity, and that his prices should not be frozen below parity, because we thought it was unjust that he should receive a price lower, in comparison, than other sections of the American population were receiving.

After all, getting production is even more important than control of inflation. It is most important that we have production. When that conflicts with inflation, the inflation policy is modified. It has been modified. That breaks down the whole theory that we can freeze prices and wages at a given level and keep them there indefinitely.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I construe the Senator's amendment, it differs only in degree from the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], which was rejected yesterday. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut provided for the continuation of the subsidy-to-consumers program, and authorized the appropriation of one and a half billion dollars.

As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, it would continue the subsidy program and authorize an appropriation of $950,000,000. As I understand, that represents a difference only in degree. Both amendments would fix upon the country the system of subsidies to consumers at a time when consumers are in a better position to pay for what they consume than ever before in our history. Does not the Senator believe that we ought not to establish a system of subsidies to consumers as a policy at this time?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is no such thing as a subsidy to consumers. The theory that we can distinguish between producer subsidies and consumer subsidies is a complete fallacy. If we pay the producer a subsidy, why do we pay it to him? We pay it to him because he is entitled to a higher price, and we do not wish to pass the higher price on to the consumer. The only purpose of subsidies is to reduce the margin between the producer and the consumer. The question of where to fix the producer's price or the consumer's price is an entirely different question. We have given the O. P. A. authority to fix prices.

On the question of subsidies, it makes no difference to whom the subsidy is paid, the effect and purpose are the same. The purpose is to increase the farmer's price without increasing the consumer's price. In one case which was brought to our attention the purpose was to reduce the consumer's price without reducing the producer's price. That is the purpose of subsidies. We cannot draft a bill which will distinguish between them. We can distinguish so far as concerns the question of who receives the money; but the purpose of all subsidies is exactly the same, and the effect of all subsidies is exactly the same.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a difference, is there not, between a support price and a consumer subsidy?

Mr. TAFT. The support price is a price promised by the Government to the producer. Every subsidy in the whole list is a consumer subsidy. Every one of them reduces the price to the consumer. That is their only purpose. However, a support price is an entirely different thing. That is a promise. If the Senator will allow me to explain, I will digress from my statement and explain this proposal.

It is more than simply an appropriation of $950,000,000. If the Senator will read the amendment, he will find that, in the first place, it expands the ability of the Government to pay support prices. It provides in so many words that not only may support prices be announced under the Steagall Act, Public Law 147, approved July 1, 1941, but it also provides that—

> The War Food Administrator may exercise, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, the powers conferred on the Price Administrator by paragraph (e) of section 2 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 to buy and sell agricultural commodities, and if he announces the price at which he will buy such commodities for any specified crop or period of time, such announcement shall be deemed to establish a support price.

The Steagall Act did not authorize support prices in the case of basic commodities, corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco. This would authorize a support price in those cases, as well as in the cases covered by the Steagall Act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That is not the answer to my question.

Mr. TAFT. No; but I wish to explain the whole thing.

So, in the first place, this amendment authorizes support prices in every case. It authorizes subsidies only in cases in which support prices are announced and maintained. It provides that if the War Food Administrator announces the price at which he will buy the commodity, the Administrator "shall maintain such price or cause such price to be maintained in all producers' markets throughout the United States (unless the support price is limited to particular marketing areas, in which case he shall maintain such price in such areas) either by causing actual purchases to be made by some agency of the United States Government, or by contracts with processors or distributors under which they obligate themselves to pay the support price, or otherwise."

There has been much loose talk about support prices which have not been maintained, notably in the case of hogs. My amendment provides, first, that if a support price is announced, the Government shall use every means at its disposal to maintain such support price.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the support price have to be for any length of time, or would it be in the discretion of the Administrator?

Mr. TAFT. It would be within the discretion of the Administrator. As a rule he announces a support price for one crop, and agrees to maintain it for that crop. My amendment provides that a subsidy may be paid only when a support price has been announced. If it is desired to continue the beef subsidy, about which there has been much dispute, the Government must announce a support price for beef. I do not know whether it can do so. If it cannot, it cannot pay the beef subsidy. If a support price for beef can be established, a subsidy may be paid to the processor, but the support price must be maintained.

In other words, the effect of this rollback subsidy, according to the producer, was to push down the price to the producer. The O. P. A. said, "That was not intended. We did not do it. Other things caused that." In any event, my amendment provides that the subsidy may not be continued unless a support price is maintained. The beef subsidy could not be paid unless a support price for beef was maintained.

The amendment provides further:

All departments and agencies of the Government shall cooperate to secure that result. No maximum price heretofore or hereafter established for any commodity shall be below the support price therefor so announced.

That is in the Bankhead bill, but, of course, the Bankhead bill relates support prices only to the nonbasic commodities.

My amendment provides further that—

In any case in which a support price for an agricultural commodity is announced and maintained, and a fixed maximum price is prescribed for the sale by processors and distributors of any article processed from such agricultural commodity, the War Food Administrator may direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to pay—

A subsidy. That is the plan. The subsidy can only be paid to reduce the margin between the producer and the consumer. The effort is to make sure that both the producer and the consumer shall receive the benefit of the reduction of the margin. That is the limitation, and that is the only way I can see by which to distinguish between the different kinds of subsidies. If the Government will establish a support price in advance and say to the producer, "If you produce this product you will get this price," then the Government may go further, and in passing the support price on to the consumer it may subsidize the process so that the consumer will not be subjected to the full force of the support price, which is usually an increased price in order to secure greater production. That is the general plan.

The total amount of the subsidy is limited by my amendment to $950,000,000. That is somewhat more than I personally would propose, but the President asked for that amount in his message. He said he wanted 1 percent of the Government's expenditures, which are about $95,000,000,000, and I therefore took that amount, because the actual amount did not seem to me to make a great deal of difference, even if it were possible to limit the type of subsidy.

I have included at the end of my amendment a special provision dealing with milk, although there is some question about whether it is necessary, because it practically repeats what is said elsewhere in the bill with respect to particular areas. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

No subsidy shall be paid on liquid milk unless in any particular area a support price is announced and maintained to the producers of milk within that area, in which case payments may be made to the distributors of milk within such area under the authority hereinbefore conferred, provided the margin in the price of milk between the producer and the consumer is thereafter less than it would otherwise be, by the amount per unit of the subsidy.

In other words, a particular milk area can be taken, and we can assure the farmer that he will receive a certain price for his milk. We can then subsidize that price so that the consumer will obtain the benefit of a slightly lower price than would result from the guaranteed price to the farmer.

Mr. President, I wish to return for a moment to the general question relating to the theory of holding the line, and the reason why the general subsidy policy cannot possibly be justified on that ground. As a matter of fact, the Government has not succeeded in holding the line. The actual figures show that, while the cost of living has gone up from 100 to 124½, say 25 percent in 3 years, and has gone up 5 percent in the last year, the average hourly wage rate paid to labor has gone up from 67.6 cents to 98.9 cents, or an increase of 46 percent.

During the past year, while prices have been held to about 5 percent, the actual cost of labor has gone up 9 percent. The average weekly earnings of labor have gone up from $26.90 to $44.90 in 3 years, or an increase of 67 percent. In the past year they have gone up 12 percent.

The inflationary factor, as I see it, is the average hourly wage cost. It may be due to overtime or it may be due to various other things, but the average cost to the employer of 1 hour of labor is the factor which goes into his costs, and that is the factor which is bound to increase the prices ultimately, if the increase actually occurs.

So, in spite of everything which has been done, it has not been possible to hold the line, and it never will be possible because the control of wages is an infinitely difficult problem. They cannot be controlled by law in the way that prices are controlled. It is impossible to prevent thousands of men from striking if they feel so strongly on the subject that they insist upon striking. We cannot put all of them in jail. We can provide remedies, and I think we ought to provide every remedy possible, but in the last analysis we must recognize that there is a certain pressure, and there is always the element of fairness to be taken into consideration.

Why were the wages of coal miners and railroad workers increased? Because the people thought it was fair to increase their wages, and because the workers, to a large extent, had popular support, for the people have never approved the Little Steel formula which says that, although the cost of living has gone up 25 percent, the workers may have their wages increased only 15 percent. The result is that it has not been possible to maintain the hold-the-line theory, and it never will be possible because the American people put justice and fair treatment of individuals ahead of the arbitrary or the intellectual idea of holding the line on inflation.

The attempt has resulted to a large extent not only in injuring the national morale, but it has put many small businessmen out of business. It has threatened a serious reduction in farm production with regard to many products.

I think the policy should be to hold down prices and wages just as much as we possibly can consistent with justice to the wage earner, consistent with justice to the producer, consistent with justice to the distributor, and that is a hard job. The O. P. A. has my sympathy in its effort to accomplish these objectives. But the more they try to insist on the hold-the-line theory, the more difficulties they will encounter. Particularly would that be true if by subsidies they should increase the purchasing power and increase the natural force which is tending to drive prices upward.

I do not see any need of a full subsidy program, but I do believe that subsidies can be used to slow up the process. I think that the use of subsidies is justified if they are limited strictly to cases

where there cannot be a roll-back on to the producer under the formula I have suggested, so that they can be used only in a limited amount, and so that when the subsidies are chosen the money will be spread in the most useful manner.

Let us consider what happened when the miners were given wage increases. The operators merely increased the price of coal. The Government gave up the idea of "holding the line" on the price of coal. I do not know why. However, a subsidy for coal is just as logical as a subsidy for food products. Inevitably here and there it is necessary to yield to some degree. I think that the increase in the cost of living can be held to 5 or 6 percent a year. If we have subsidies to slow it up more, so that there will be no cumulative effect of increasing prices and wages, we will very successfully control prices, and in the end they will not be higher than they are going to be anyway. In other words, I suggest a defense in depth, which is the modern method of defending, instead of the Maginot line which, when it is cracked, will crack for good and bring complete destruction of the whole economic structure of the country.

Every Senator is familiar with the practical situation. The administration is insisting, apparently, on $1,500,000,000 or nothing. It is insisting on the whole amount. It is insisting that it must "hold the line." I assert that if the Government is to maintain its position, instead of $1,500,000,000 the amount will be $4,000,000,000. I think it ought to be willing to accept $950,000,000 and try to do the best it can with that amount. I think that is a reasonable thing to ask it to do.

On the other hand, those who are insisting on putting through an antisubsidy bill are going to bring about a veto by the President. We know that because he vetoed the last one. The bill will come back to Congress and the veto will be sustained, for there are not sufficient votes to pass it over a veto. Then what will happen? The lid will be off again.

Payments for subsidies have increased. When we first considered this program almost a year ago subsidies were approximately three or four hundred million dollars; then they got up to $500,000,000; when Congress came back in the fall the amount was approximately $850,000,000; before Christmas it was $1,100,000,000; today it is one billion two hundred or three hundred million dollars, and those who are in charge of the program are asking for a billion and a half dollars. If this bill is vetoed and comes back to Congress and dies, the amount paid for subsidies will be two or three or four billion dollars.

Congress enacted a measure containing some loose language. I do not think it justified subsidies but we were not careful enough about our language, and the claimed powers are in the law, and, unless we can pass a bill over the President's veto or unless the President agrees to the bill, those powers are going to stay there, and are going to be exercised, and I do not know how we can prevent their being exercised. The result of passing this bill is simply going to bring about a situation in which Congress has relaxed its control, and cannot recover its control, and perhaps there may be three or four billion dollars a year spent without the slightest vestige of authority from the present Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the Senator any proof from any of the agencies or departments which are interested in the administration of subsidies that if his amendment should be agreed to the bill would not be vetoed?

Mr. TAFT. No, I have no such understanding and no such agreement. I think that if my amendment should be agreed to, that is if those who oppose subsidies should wholeheartedly agree to it, it might be passed over the President's veto. That is my impression of the lineup in the Senate today. I doubt very much if the President would veto a subsidy bill that carries $950,000,000. I think he would put himself in an indefensible position if he should veto it, because the difference is very slight.

The chief subsidy which I think would have to be abandoned would be the milk subsidy, which is being paid individually to 3,000,000 farmers. I do not believe that that is a sound subsidy. It certainly is opposed by the representatives of the milk farmers themselves. It amounts to about $300,000,000. If that were omitted and paid in the way I suggest, I believe it could be done for $100,000,000, and there could be saved about $200,000,000. With the exceptions which have been made in the case of oils, my impression is that the remainder of the subsidy program could be carried out if the administration wished to continue the meat subsidy. I see no reasonable ground on which to veto this bill if my amendment should be adopted.

I might say on the milk subsidy that Mr. Holman, who is head of the dairy farmers, in his testimony before the committee, said:

> The feed subsidy is estimated to be $315,000,000 a year, and I wish to give that one particular attention. This subsidy varies all the way from 30 cents per hundred pounds of fluid milk in the Middle West to as high as 50 cents per hundred pounds in southern New England and in parts of some States such as Tennessee, Kansas, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Mississippi, and it includes also a butterfat subsidy ranging from 4 to 6 cents per pound. That is on separated cream.
>
> Now, there are about 3,000,000 farmers in this country, out of the estimated 6,000,000 who produce milk, that actually sell milk or separate cream or farm butter for commercial purposes. Every one of these farmers has to be found and enrolled, and to do that requires a very large army of either full-time or part-time employees. It is my understanding that the Government is using about 125,000 of these people already, farmers alone, who are being called from their farms at a time when the production is needed, to ride the roads and find these other farmers and help make settlements, and so on.

Letters have been sent out all over the country urging farmers to take advantage of the subsidy. I have one which is found in the record, which says:

> If farmers will bring their records to the Davis County—

That is Davis County, Iowa—

> If the farmers will bring their records to the Davis County Agricultural Adjustment Administration office, their claims will be satisfied and sight drafts drawn on the Commodity Corporation for payment.

In other words, they are restoring the old A. A. A. payments and the amounts are being paid through the A. A. A. to 3,000,000 individual farmers.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. Does the amendment proposed by the Senator provide that subsidies may be paid only on the particular things mentioned in the amendment, or will we face the same proposition we are facing today? In other words, will the Administration, if the Senator's proposal becomes the law, pay subsidies so far as the particular commodities mentioned are concerned to the extent of $950,000,000, and then go ahead and pay the other kind of subsidies from money they may be able to maintain from other sources to any extent they may see fit?

Mr. TAFT. No; that would not be possible, because I do not change the provisions of the Bankhead bill, on page 9, which read as follows:

> SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities—

And so forth.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, if the amendment were adopted and became the law, Congress would take back unto itself the right to say how much shall be spent for subsidies and the manner in which it shall be spent.

Mr. TAFT. Entirely. My proposal is that we do that, and recover all of our power over the public purse, which we have abandoned, or, perhaps I should say, not abandoned but which we have been careless about. My amendment would provide for the year 1944 $950,000,000. That amount, however, would not be provided year after year, but for the year 1945 the Administration would have to come back and ask for what they need for the 1945 program. The amendment simply provides that for the 1944 program we will grant $950,000,000 for use in the payment of subsidies.

I might say that there is another reason why I think it is wise to give some subsidies. I think we could have gotten along without a subsidy program; but if we should abolish them all at once there would ensue a sudden increase in prices which might well stimulate wage increases. The price increases coming all at one time would be particularly noticeable and would be much more likely to start a spiral than if they had occurred gradually during the year. That is another reason why I think that the program should be tapered off, and not completely abandoned.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. A few moments ago the Senator from Ohio referred to the fact that 3,000,000 dairy farmers were eligible for the subsidy under the present program. It is my understanding that only 71 percent of those who have been eligible to receive the milk subsidy have collected such subsidy as has been available to them since the 1st of October. That number represents 80 percent of the milk production which is eligible to receive subsidies. It shows conclusively that it is the small producers, who undoubtedly need it much more than some of the larger ones, who have been deprived of their milk subsidy for one reason or another. In a good many cases it is probably because greater effort and expense were entailed in getting the subsidy than the payment would amount to when it was received.

However, at the present time we are subsidizing milk in the sum of over $300,000,000 a year, and all dairy products to the extent of about $441,000,000 a year. The War Food Administrator evidently recognizes that the subsidy which is being paid at the present time is wholly inadequate.

I have in my hand a release issued on February 2, last week, containing an announcement of the War Food Administration, which reads as follows:

> The War Food Administration today announced the continuation of dairy production payments up to February 17, or the date on which the Commodity Credit Corporation is further extended. The basic rates during such period will be the same as those in effect for January.
>
> While dairy farmers have been affected by increased costs since the program was first announced, Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, pointed out that a commitment had been made with the Congress not to change substantially the subsidy program now in effect prior to February 17.
>
> Subject to action by the Congress continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation without limitations preventing dairy production payments, Mr. Jones stated that thereafter rates for the remainder of February and for March and April would be adjusted to take into account increases in feed and other costs since the original rates were established last October.
>
> The War Food Administrator said he is desirous of recognizing these increased costs in the dairy payments as soon as it is possible to do so, and further expressed the hope that in the interim dairy farmers would continue to produce and market the milk that is so essential for the war effort.
>
> For the spring and summer months, it was indicated that it would be the Administrator's intention to continue the general dairy payments at seasonally lower rates during the time when pastures are more productive. The rates would be seasonally higher next fall and winter. The whole program is contingent, the Administrator emphasized, upon congressional action continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation without limitations preventing such payments. Subject to such contingency, the rates for next summer will be determined and announced before the 1st of May; and for next winter, before the 1st of September.

So, when we are estimating the costs of the dairy subsidy we must not consider it $441,000,000 a year, which is the present rate, but it is my personal opinion that it would have to be about twice that if we are to take care of the milk production by the subsidy method.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. My understanding is that the farmer says, "We want a fair price for milk. We do not want to have to go to the A. A. A. office and get a subsidy. We want the price to which we are entitled paid when we go to the store." That can be done under the amendment I suggest. In the Cincinnati area, for instance, where I live, it can be announced that the price of milk shall be so much a hundred pounds, and the Government will see that it is that. The distributors will pay it, of course, and if we do not want to pass it on to the consumer, we can subsidize it in that area. That is the proposal I make.

I think the farmers are interested in getting their price, but when they say that price must be passed on to the consumer, I think they are going a little further than they are quite entitled to go.

I do not think that is so much their concern. I do not know whether under the proposal I make the beef subsidy can be continued. It cannot be continued without changing the whole set-up.

My own belief as to meat is that the best way to control is to take all the price controls off beef, and impose a very strict rationing on the consumer. I believe that if we do that we can hold the price of beef, and that we will not have the difficulty we have today, trying to fix prices on all the different grades and cuts, and paying the packers tremendous subsidies on beef. I believe that is the best solution of the beef problem, but I do not see how the Congress can decide what shall be done about beef, what shall be done about oil seeds, or what shall be done about wool. We would have to treat peanut oil one way, soybean oil another way, wool another way, sugar another way. I do not see how Congress can believe it can know the way in which these different products should be handled. Yet today we say to the administration, "You can pay subsidies in any way you desire, on vegetable oils, on wool, on sugar, but you cannot pay subsidies on meat."

I think we must have an underlying, logical system, but I think we must leave the actual administration of the system to the War Food Administrator and the O. P. A.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator what the position of the sugar industry will be in case the Senator's proposal becomes law.

Mr. TAFT. I have in the amendment the same provisions as to sugar that are found in the Bankhead bill. There is no difference.

Of course, the original sugar payment was always acceptable. That is regarded as rather a redistribution of the sugar itself than anything else, and it has been paid for years. The other payment, to guarantee the price of beets, so to speak, really establishes a support price for beets, and I think that subsidy could be paid under the general language of my amendment. But I left in the exception that was in the Bankhead bill, to make it perfectly certain that the exception would be in the law, and that there could not be any dispute about the language.

Mr. President, I do not know that we can get away from the irreconcilable difference which arises, but I do not see any reason why the administration should not be glad to settle this matter. I think the idea that they would rather go ahead under unlawful authority, that they would rather go ahead in defiance of the will of Congress, is an utterly unreasonable position to take. It seems to me the Senators who voted for the Maloney amendment should very much prefer voting for my amendment, and put through a measure which, I can assure them, will be practical, which will limit subsidies to an effective and reasonable form of subsidy, which will furnish an amount which can be used to provide for subsidies in reasonable form. On the other hand, I think those who vote to put the bill through knowing that it will be vetoed, simply because they are against subsidies, knowing that it will actually increase the amount of the subsidies rather than decrease them, are also taking an unreasonable position.

I submit to the Senate that if my remedy is not the correct one, then it should be criticized and worked out to a satisfactory form, but it has been evolved after a long series of conferences, even with the Solicitor of the War Food Administration, and with those on both sides of the question, and I feel very confident that it presents a correct solution.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, during these times when subsidies are being so widely discussed it is interesting to turn back the pages of history and read what was said in 1893 by that immortal Governor of Texas, James Stephen Hogg.

Governor Hogg is recognized to this day as being one of the most ardent and outstanding defenders of the rights of the rank and file of the common citizens ever to hold public office in Texas.

His public statement of May 20, 1893, against Federal bounties, which we now call Federal subsidies, is certainly sound logic, in addition to being correct prophecy.

With all the mess we are now in on the domestic front in this Nation on account of subsidies, and the Federal Government trying to dictate how each and every individual must run his own private business, we are certainly getting a generous taste of what Governor Hogg in 1893 called "the polluted fruits of

crime against justice and the Constitution." I believe this statement by Gov. James Stephen Hogg, of Texas, made a half century ago, is one of the strongest and most logical arguments against subsidies that could be made. Coming from that sane age in our American history, it deserves the careful reading and study of some of the would-be statesmen of our present fantastic Government age.

I ask unanimous consent that the full statement of Gov. James Stephen Hogg, of Texas, issued on the subject of bounties on May 20, 1893, be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF TEXAS,
EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
Austin, Tex., May 20, 1893.

To the Public:

By the authority vested in the Governor by the constitution, I hereby give notice and make public proclamation that I disapprove house bill No. 206, passed by the last legislature, which proposed "to authorize, empower, and direct the superintendent of the State penitentiaries to receive from the Treasurer of the United States, for the general revenue of the State, the bounty on sugar raised and manufactured on the State penitentiary convict farms," received in the executive office on the 9th day of this month.

I vetoed such a law as this 2 years ago, and shall never consent to one like it so long as I represent public interests and can read the Constitution of the United States and understand the principles upon which this Government was founded.

It is well for the public to look at this sugar bounty in the light of the Federal law granting it.

In schedule E of the act of Congress approved October 1, 1890, the United States Government directs that until July 1905 there shall be paid from any moneys in the Treasury at Washington not otherwise appropriated, to the producer of sugar, testing not less than 90° by the polariscope, from beets, sorghum, or sugarcane grown within the United States, a bounty of 2 cents per pound, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

To entitle the producer of sugar to this bounty he must file, prior to the 1st day of July each year, with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, a notice of the place of production, with a general description of the machinery and methods to be employed by him, an estimate of the amount of sugar proposed to be produced in the current or next ensuing year, and make an application for license to so produce, accompanied by a bond in a penalty and with sureties, to be approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, conditioned that he will faithfully observe all rules and regulations that shall be prescribed for such manufacture and production.

On receiving the application and bond, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is required by this law to "issue to the applicant a license to produce sugar" at the place, with the machinery, and by the methods described in the application. No one can get the bounty without having first procured the "license" from the United States to produce the sugar, and the law expressly confers the power on the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, to "make all needful rules and regulations for the manufacture of sugar," and to "exercise supervision and inspection thereof." All persons raising less than 500 pounds of the article a year are excluded from the benefits of the bounty. Those who engage in the manufacture of it under this license from the United States are subject to prosecution in the Federal courts and to a fine of not over $500, together with imprisonment for a period of not exceeding 5 years, for certain infractions of the law.

The State of Texas has a plantation of 2,000 acres, worked last year by 165 second-class convicts, by which was produced about 1,000,000 pounds of sugar. The yield this year will be probably at least that amount, with the prospect of a heavy annual increase. So that, under this law of the United States, she would be permitted to receive a bounty of at least $20,000 each year hereafter until 1905 if I permit the act of the legislature under consideration to become a law.

In the first place, I believe that Congress was guilty of a usurpation of power in passing the bounty act, and that to accept money from such source the State government would be an accessory to the crime.

In the second place, I believe the State would debase her dignity, prostitute her honor, and appear before civilization as a humiliated suckling holding onto the breast of the Federal Government if she accepts the bounty.

Such laws are fundamentally wrong, subversive of the powers of Government, undemocratic, paternalistic in the extreme, and no State can be a party to, connive at or ratify them without a surrender of its self-respect.

If the fathers were correct in teaching that the Federal Government is one of strictly limited powers—that its powers are enumerated, specified, and particularized, and that whatever is not delegated to it by the Constitution, nor prohibited by that instrument to the States, is withheld and reserved to them, then I am unable to trace the fight to grant this special benefit to the favored few in the way of the sugar bounty to any source of power except that which lies in the arbitrary will of Congress. It is a forced and unfair construction of the Constitution to hold that Congress possesses the power under the "general welfare" clause to collect money from the masses with which to defray the expenses of and to pay a premium to those engaged in private pursuits. The express purpose of the people in framing and of the States in adopting the Constitution was to form a more perfect union, to establish justice, to insure domestic tranquillity, to provide for the common defense, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to "ourselves and our posterity." The powers of the Congress were limited to the accomplishment of these ends. How can an appropriation out of the General Treasury to be paid to sugar raisers aid in forming a more perfect union? How can it establish justice? How will it insure domestic tranquillity? How can it provide for the common defense? How does it promote the general welfare? How can it secure the blessings of liberty "to ourselves and our posterity"? If it fails to accomplish some of these purposes, then the Congress had not the power to make the appropriation. All observant men see and understand that the excuse for all such usurpation of power by the Congress, exercised invariably at the expense of the great mass of the people for the enrichment of the few who fill the lobbies around the Capitol, finds a cloak under the clause of the Constitution which authorizes that body to "provide for the general welfare of the United States." I cannot understand how it is to the general welfare of the several States, or of the United States, or of the people of the United States, for Texas to be given a bounty by the Federal Government for raising sugar. This product, it is true, is of common use among the people, and its cheapness to them is desirable. So it may be said of cotton, wheat, oats, corn, rice, hay, beef, pork, poultry, potatoes, goobers, melons, pine-rosin, and all other articles of real or apparent necessity among the masses. The State can, with her 3,600 convicts, raise all these products in great abundance at a fine profit, if the general Government grants, and she shall accept, a bounty on them. There is as much authority for Congress to give a bounty on chickens as on sugar. If the purpose is to promote the general welfare, it would appear that articles of necessity, such as bread, meat, and clothing, would be the first on which a bounty should be given. This would reach and help the wheat and corn raiser, the herdsman and the cotton planter, and give cheap food and raiment to the millions. Indeed, it would put millions in the pockets of the great army of producers now struggling under heavy burdens, and add the finishing touch to the ideal government of those who regard the "bounty system" as the catholicon of all economic ills; and, further, it would furnish to civilization an example of the generosity of Congress, displayed in the exercise of its discretionary power, in providing for the general welfare of the United States.

The authority of Texas to take this money from the Federal Government demonstrates the evil of the paternal system into which our General Government is drifting. It strongly supports the suspicion that none but those who are able to help themselves need apply. Texas needs no assistance in farming. Sugar raisers as a rule are the wealthiest planters. There are no poor ones engaged in the business in this State. Most of them are very rich, in every respect beyond the necessity of Government aid. The State's farm of 2,000 acres, on which she makes sugar and cotton, is worth less than many of those nearby belonging to individuals, and it is valued at $245,256. After deducting all expenses of maintenance and operation last year without any bounty the crop on this farm yielded the State, according to the report of the financial agent, a new profit of $61,976. The report of the superintendent of penitentiaries shows that for the period of the past 6 years the crops have yielded her the aggregate net sum of $229,968. When the low prices during this period are considered, with the further fact that the farm is worked by such convicts as are unfit for use within the walls and cannot be hired out, then some idea may be had of the profits of the sugar business operated on a large scale. If Congress was considering the "general welfare of the United States" when it rallied to the aid of the rich planters engaged in this profitable private industry in the bestowal on them of this liberal bounty, it may be pertinently asked, How far does the Government stand committed to this precedent to assist those following less remunerative pursuits when they shall call for help? To the needy alms should go. This is the rule of charity. If followed to its logical result, where will this precedent end? The Government cannot be operated without revenue. Without it all the work in her departments would cease. Government revenue is no more nor less than money collected from the people by taxation in some form or other. After all, it comes out of the production of the soil. To support this bounty all farmers must be taxed. For this and other purposes, with crushing force the Government unceasingly lays its tax-reaping hand on the fruits of labor. From this cause murmurings are heard everywhere. It now takes annually at least 30 percent of the active circulating medium of the United States to pay Federal taxes. The people are tired of this condition, and they ought to be. Departure by the Government from its

legitimate functions is the cause. Favoritism of the few at the expense of the many is the method. These bounty laws are governmental crimes, the culmination of paternalistic iniquity. Those who receive benefits are blinded to the evils lurking in them. Strong resistance will be made to the abrogation of the sugar bounty, but Texas cannot by my act or acquiescence become committed to the movement. The wrong should be wiped out and our State should take part in the work. She cannot with clean hands do so if she accepts the money. Driftwood on a great stream at first seems harmless. Let it alone, and in time the river's current becomes changed by it, submerging the country all round. So with this bounty law. Permit it to stand, and the Government will follow the course already changed from a republic to a centralism, sweeping in its way the liberties of the people. Shall Texas be accessory to this crime? No; not with my consent.

On another point I oppose the State's acceptance of the bounty. In the management of her affairs she is sovereign, supreme, subject only to the control of the people within her dominion. To accept this bounty for sugar she would surrender the supervision and inspection of one of her most important industries to the Federal Government. For spoils she would open the way for the invasion and final destruction of her independent autonomy. For a mess of pottage, seasoned with the sacrifice of principle, boiled in sin, she would surrender her birthright.

To procure this money she must file with the Federal Commissioner of Internal Revenue a notice of the place of production. To him she must give a description of the machinery and methods employed by her in the work. To him she must give an estimate of the amount of sugar she proposes to produce. To him she must make application for a license to follow the pursuit. To him she must look for rules and regulations of the business. To him she must give bond and sureties that she will obey the law. To him she must yield inspection and supervision of her farming operations. To him she must become bound by bond that she will not only obey the law but that she will faithfully observe all rules and regulations that shall be prescribed by him for the manufacture of sugar. For infraction of the law her agents and officers would be subject to prosecution, fine, and imprisonment through the Federal courts. We all know what this means. Spies, informers, and irresponsible deputy marshals would swagger and lurk around the farm worse than the locusts of Egypt. Nothing would please them better than to "rope" the State of Texas into the national court, where they could magnify the power of the Federal judge at the expense of her independence and integrity.

Other potent reasons should move the State to refuse this bounty. She is no pauper or mendicant. She is a sovereign State in the full control of her institutions, capable of repelling with indignation every subtle effort made to destroy her autonomy. When she needs money she will resort to constitutional means and call on Texans to pay it. She would not appeal to Massachusetts, Georgia, or other States to help her; nor will she accept money paid for public purposes by her sisters to the Federal Government simply because the Congress is willing, in the exercise of arbitrary power, in defiance of the Constitution, to let her have it. For the sake of the masses, now taxed beyond endurance through the vicious, insidious tariff system, for the respect due to her own people, for the preservation of her own independence, for the perpetuity of sound principles of government, the State of Texas now, and so long as I am Governor, shall treat this sugar bounty with derisive contempt. She will not handicap her Senators and Congressmen in the performance of their duties to have the law repealed; she will not stultify her statehood; she will not violate democratic pledges to strike down such measures; she will not stain her hands nor dishonor her name by the acceptance of this money—the polluted fruits of crime against justice and the Constitution.

Very respectfully,

J. S. HOGG,
Governor of Texas.

THE SPIRIT OF GUNG HO

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, as the protracted congressional controversy continues with bitterness and rancor to delay a solution of the soldier-vote bill, and as we now discuss the subsidy program after months of delay, our boys—our own sons, and those of our neighbors back home—are facing death, sudden or slow, on the stained and rocky beachheads of Italy. Their loved ones at home wait the news with fear, and pray with agony in their hearts that their boys may somehow escape horrible massacre by powerful and entrenched artillery cruelly commanding the fish-bowl beachhead.

Surely, at this time, with American boys fighting desperately to defend democracy over wide-flung areas, the leaders of democratic government should find the energy and inspiration loyally and efficiently to serve democratic government at home.

Unlike Italy, in the Pacific the tide of victory runs strongly for our forces and there is little need to express on the Senate floor the pride and gratitude of the American people in the magnificent accomplishments of the members of the armed forces fighting today in the Marshall Islands of the central Pacific. No one can now doubt that the American triumph which started here will sweep ultimately across the Pacific to Truk and finally to Tokyo itself. Nonetheless, I cannot refrain from adding to the proud collective voice of America that of the Senate of the United States. Here, Senators, is tangible proof of the ability of America to fight an all-out war. Here is demonstrated her great ability in mass production and technology, translated from peacetime activities into the desperate need of the war effort; here is but another proof of that axiom well known to us all—"The whole is greater than the part." Our boys are, of course, fighting individually for their homes and for their States, but, Senators, on the field of battle there is time only for unity of action toward a common goal. It is the inherent realization of soldiers that unless they stand united, death or surrender will be their fate. We of the Senate might well heed their example and work likewise in harmony with each other lest the pattern of our work be lost by too great an emphasis on the individual parts, by furious and futile controversies discouraging and confusing the Nation.

The story of the assault on Makin Island, in the Gilberts, south of the Marshalls, in August 1942, the prologue of the present fighting in the Marshalls, is one of the finest illustrations of harmonious action—action which indicated that America had finally taken the offensive and had set the stage for later victories to come.

The leader of the group which accomplished this raid, Lt. Col. Evans F. Carlson, had before him a momentous task. His goal, as stated by him, was—

> To create and perfect a cohesive, smooth-functioning team which, by virtue of its harmony of action, unity of purpose, and its invincible determination, would be able to outpoint the enemy on every count.

Most important of all, he found, was the development of the so-called gung ho spirit, the Chinese expression of harmoniously working together, and which is exemplified in the truly great and inspiring film of the same name, Gung Ho, recently released, produced by Walter Wanger, president of the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences, himself a soldier in the First World War. Recently I had the opportunity to view this film and to me it brought a profound realization of the dangers and sacrifices of our fighting men and a renewed determination that we in the United States should subjugate our own passions, prejudices, wants, and needs to a greater and more unified national effort to support the members of the armed forces upon whom principally fall the sacrifice and the burden of the war. Any American seeing this film Gung Ho would resolve thereafter I am sure for more harmonious work in the common and sacred war effort.

On this first anniversary of the Makin raid, Colonel Carlson in an address to the Allied Nations armed forces serving overseas concluded his remarks:

> As a military venture this raid was not of any great import; its significance lay in the fact that America had taken the offensive; that American men had outwitted, outfought, and outmaneuvered the Japanese at their own game. It was significant also because these marine raiders had demonstrated how individual intelligence and initiative and resourcefulness can be applied with benefit to military operations, when they are developed and brought to bear in the democratic way.
>
> There is no limit to the potential power and accomplishment of freemen who unite for common effect in the democratic manner. No dictatorship, no oligarchy can stand against freedom, tolerance, and truth. These are the principles for which the Allied Nations fight.

And, finally, may I quote to the Senate the concluding speech of the film Gung Ho, as made by the leader of the Makin raid:

> Our course is clear. * * * It is for us at this moment to dedicate again our hearts, our minds, and bodies to the great task that lies ahead. We must go further and dedicate ourselves also to the monumental task of assuring that the peace which follows this holocaust will be a just and equitable and conclusive peace. And beyond that lies the mission of making certain that the social order which we bequeath to our sons and daughters is truly based on the freedom for which these men died.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Reed
Andrews	Guffey	Revercomb
Austin	Gurney	Reynolds
Bailey	Hatch	Robertson
Ball	Hawkes	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Shipstead
Barkley	Hill	Smith
Bilbo	Holman	Stewart
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Brooks	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Lucas	Truman
Byrd	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chandler	Maloney	Wagner
Chavez	Maybank	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, N. J.
Connally	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	Wherry
Davis	Murray	White
Downey	Nye	Wiley
Eastland	O'Daniel	Willis
Ellender	Overton	Wilson
Ferguson	Pepper	
George	Radcliffe	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, because of the eloquence of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other Senators who yesterday discussed inflation, I shall not speak about the inflationary problem involved in subsidies. I have before to some extent discussed that phase of the matter.

However, I wish to point out that according to a recent report of the Secretary of the Treasury, nearly $20,000,000,000 of currency is loose around the country. That is nearly four times more currency in circulation than has been in circulation in normal times. On some other occasion I hope to address the Senate on the significance of that situation and its threat to our national economy, but I shall not go into that matter further today.

I have some statistics and figures by way of comparison which I think may be enlightening, if not amazing, as to the cost of subsidies, their effect, who receives their benefits, and by way of comparison between the present price level and the price level existing in 1917 and 1918, because those 2 years have been held out as the top years in which there was a high cost of living, and as the fundamental excuse for paying subsidies now.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, in its Bulletin No. 300, entitled "United States Average Retail Prices," published in 1922, has given the average retail bread prices in 51 leading cities for the years 1917 and 1918, namely, during the 2 years of the First World War, as follows: 9.2 cents for a 16-ounce loaf in 1917, and 9.8 cents in 1918. They were a fraction lower than 1943 prices on all grades of bread. A slightly higher retail price, around 10 cents a loaf, came in 1919 and 1920, after the war was over. But the war price averaged 9.6 cents for a 16-ounce loaf.

What does the O. P. A. threaten to do to the price of bread today if Congress declines to vote for subsidies? The half page of grocery price boosts published in the New York Times of November 17, less than 90 days ago, gives the O. P. A. "roll-back" price at 17 cents for a 17½-ounce loaf of bread, or an equivalent of nearly 16 cents for a 16-ounce loaf which in 1918 sold for 9.8 cents.

In other words, the O. P. A. threatens to boost the retail price of a loaf of bread 6.2 cents, or more than the 60 percent, unless we grant a subsidy of $1,500,000,000, notwithstanding the fact that the farm price of wheat is lower now by 75 cents a bushel than 25 years ago.

The subsidy agencies of the Federal Government base their demand for $1,500,000,000 subsidy to processors to "keep down the price of bread," as they call it, on the ground of the high price of wheat paid to the farmer. When they talk about "the price of bread," I assume they include all the articles necessary for food.

What are the facts?

First, what is the share of the retail grocery price which the wheat grower receives for raising the crop?

On page 20 of the 1944 Agricultural Outlook Charts, just issued by the Department of Agriculture, we read that the wheat grower in August 1943 got the following percentages of the retail price:

Item	Retail price	Farmer's share
White bread	100	24
Whole-wheat bread	100	19
Soda crackers	100	12
Wheat cereal	100	19
Macaroni	100	22
Average	100	19.2

The miller for his flour received 48 percent of the retail price of the finished product—the bakery, cereal manufacturer, wholesaler, and Government taxes getting the remaining 32.8 percent.

That is to say, the Government subsidy cry is based on the assumption that the 19.2 cents which the farmer gets from the retail dollar is so excessive that the Government has to give a $100,000,000 subsidy to the processors in order to keep down the price of bread.

The subsidy agencies of the Government make no complaint against those who collect, in all, 80-odd cents of the retail dollar. The whole complaint is against the farmers' share of 19.2 cents. This less than one-fifth going to the farmer for raising the wheat bears the whole brunt of the subsidy agency indictment. In the eyes of subsidy propagandists, this one-fifth that goes back to the farmer is greater than the four-fifths reaped by the processors and the Government. The subsidy argument reverses Euclid, who began his great mathematical thesis on the proposition that "the whole is greater than any of its parts." It happens that American history, no farther back than the last World War, stands by Euclid, as against the New Deal argument for subsidy.

The average farm price of wheat in the last World War—1917–1918—ranged 75 cents a bushel higher than the price which Government subsidy propagandists complain against now. The farmers in the last World War were getting more than the present 19 cents of the retail dollar of the bread and cereal consumer. Yet the price of bread was stabilized at around 9.5 cents for a 16-ounce loaf—without one dollar of the $100,000,000 subsidy which the Government asks for now.

For the wheat in a pound loaf—0.95 pound wheat—the farmer today gets 2 cents, as compared to a fraction over 3 cents in 1917–1918. Yet the subsidy agencies of the Federal Government say that this 2 cents received by the farmer can no longer be paid unless either the price of bread goes up or the Government pays a $100,000,000 subsidy to the processors and the wheat buyers. This is the story in a nutshell, in comparing the retail price of bread in 1943 with the price in 1917 and 1918.

It will be seen that in the last war, when the United States Government paid no subsidy and had no autocratic O. P. A. bureau, there was no trouble about maintaining a stabilized 9½-cent loaf, although the wheat growers received on the farm at that time an average of $2.05 a bushel.

There are subsidies being paid now to packers, processors, distributors, and retailers. Who are they? The indictment is brought against the farmer for the high cost of living. Companies capitalized in the aggregate for hundreds of millions of dollars and enjoying war contracts of hundreds of millions of dollars, are receiving subsidies. In the October bulletin of the Department of Agriculture, on the Agricultural Situation, page 7, it is shown that the average farm price of wheat has risen from $1.028 in September 1942, to $1.30 in September 1943. It is a little higher now. This is based upon the report of September and October 1943. The parity price for September wheat was $1.46.

In a list of 21 leading farm products, in 1943 wheat and butterfat were below parity. In the meantime the prices of the things which the farmer had to buy had risen 66 percent. The price of farm machinery had risen to the point where a second-hand tractor cost more than it formerly cost new, while wages have about doubled, and in some cases trebled. The farmer receives less profit from his $1.30 in September 1943, or about $1.40 now, than he realized from a price of $1.28 in 1941. On the other hand, finished products put on the retail market by the processors, such as soda crackers and macaroni, have advanced in price not 27 percent, as in the case of wheat, but from 75 to 100 percent. It will be seen that the subsidies do not go to farmers, when prices are below parity, on most products, or were until recently.

Prices of most staples are below parity. But the farmer is indicted. Processing companies which have war contracts and receive war prices for their products receive the Government subsidy. That is a new deal. It follows the Biblical saying, "To him who hath shall be given."

One of the most significant features of the wholesale-retail problem in connection with present food prices is the high margin between the wholesale price of food and the retail price. It was more than twice as high in 1943, under the O. P. A., than it was in 1917, 1918, and 1919, when there was no O. P. A. to "crack down" on grocers and consumers.

The following figures are taken from a recent bulletin of the Department of Agriculture entitled "Marketing and Transportation," comparing retail, wholesale, and farm prices in the United States from 1913 to 1943. In 1917 and 1918 the margin between wholesale and retail prices averaged only 10 percent, as is shown on page 28 of the bulletin. The figures are as follows:

Year	Retail price index	Wholesale prices	Margin
1917 average	112	103	9
1918 average	128	117	11
2-year average	120	110	10

In the 4 months of 1943 ending August, the retail-wholesale margin was:

Months, 1943	Retail prices	Wholesale prices	Margin
May	143	109	34
June	142	108	34
July	136	106	30
August	133	104	29
4-month average	138	107	31

The margin increased more than three times.

I point this out to show that those who are handling farm products are the ones who are to blame. I have a statement of beef prices for 1917. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD for comparison with meat prices at the present time at grocery stores.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Figures for 1917–18 are from Bureau of Labor Statistics		O. P. A. ceiling Washington, Feb. 10, 1944 [1]		
	1917	1918	AA	A	B
Round steak	29	36	47	44	39
Rib roast	25	31	[2] 35	[2] 33	[2] 31
			[3] 39	[3] 36	[3] 34
Pork chops	32	39	[4] 39	------	[5] 35
Bacon, per pound, sliced	41	53	------	------	[6] 42
Sirloin steak	31	34	46	44	36
Leg of lamb	29	35	44	42	38
Chuck roast	21	27	32	30	28

[1] This is 1944 ceiling price.
[2] 10-inch.
[3] 7-inch.
[4] Rib.
[5] End.
[6] Swift Premium.

In 1917–18 beef cattle sold from $15 to $17 a hundred pounds—hogs about the same. Hogs yield the farmer now $8 to $13 on the farm. Look up your hog prices now.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. With respect to the high cost of O. P. A. and subsidies, let me say that some time ago a message from the White House told us that one and a half billion dollars must be paid from the Treasury in subsidies.

We find the price of sirloin steak, if sirloin could be obtained at all last year, running to a 1943 average of approximately 50 cents a pound. When we turn to the food prices listed by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for the year 1918, the last year of World War No. 1, we find that the average price of sirloin steak in American cities in the year 1918 was 38.9 cents a pound. In other words, we were getting our sirloin steak in 1943, under the O. P. A. and subsidies, at an average price 30 percent higher than in 1918 without O. P. A., and without subsidies.

For round steak, in 1943, under O. P. A. and subsidies, the coal miners of Pennsylvania were paying an average price of 45 cents, compared with 36.9 cents in 1918, without O. P. A. and without subsidies, or 22 percent higher than during the last World War.

In 1943 rib roast, under O. P. A. and subsidies, cost from 36 cents to 45 cents a pound, compared with an average price of less than 31 cents for all cities in the United States in 1918, without O. P. A. and roll-back subsidies. In this instance we were paying an average of 20 percent higher than prices of beef during the last war.

In 1918 cheese brought an average United States price of 35.9 cents a pound, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In 1943, in Washington, under O. P. A. and subsidies, the price of cheese hovered around 50 cents a pound most of the time. Sometimes it was less and sometimes it was higher, but always well above th prices of 1918, when there was no O. P. A. and no roll-back subsidy.

Bananas for civilian consumption have been rare in the United States ever since the O. P. A. machine began to work. In 1918 the average price of bananas in American cities was 38.3 cents a dozen, or a trifle more than 3 cents apiece, less than one-half the O. P. A. ceiling for the few people in the United States who have the rare privilege of seeing a banana at this time.

It appears from cost-of-living statistics and from retail grocery advertisements during the period of the two wars that on the average food prices in American cities under the O. P. A. in 1943 are approximately 20 percent above retail prices in 1918.

On a yearly food consumption of $15,000,000,000 for the country at large in 1943, the civilian cost of bureaucratic regulation approximates $3,000,000,000 a year. Part of this $3,000,000,000 cost-of-living charge is chargeable to O. P. A., part to lease-lend, part to priorities, public debt, and mounting taxes.

Significant of the food price upward trend is table I of the Commerce Department survey of current business for November 1943. On page 7 of this report the Secretary of Commerce presents the annual volume of retail sales for various kinds of businesses by years, taking the first 9 months of 1943 as a basis for the estimate. The increase in the price of food sold in retail stores for 1943 over previous years is highly significant. The total for 1929 was $13,092,000,000; for 1940 it was $14,780,000,000; for 1941, $17,372,000,000; and for 1943, the total was $25,000,000,000.

So we find that, based on Commerce Department estimates, the retail cost of food to American consumers in 1943 compared with 1941, when O. P. A. was launched, has risen $4,424,000,000, or 35 percent.

If we add the sales of eating and drinking places to the sales of the retail groceries and chain stores, the increase for 1943 over 1941 in 2 years of O. P. A. is $7,428,000,000, or 42 percent.

Compared with 1929, with its 9-month prosperity boom, the country's retail food bill in 1943 has risen more than $6,000,000,000, or nearly 55 percent.

So much for the widely advertised "economy achievement" of the O. P. A. in its effect on the long-forgotten consumer.

WORLD'S BIGGEST AND MOST COSTLY BUREAU

In the recent tabulation of executive bureaus and departments, laid before the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] in behalf of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Office of Price Administration is given an official personnel of 119,000, including more than 55,000 employees on the civil-service list, and 64,000 on war price and ration boards. This exceeds the total official personnel of any other Federal bureau and even the total for any executive department, except War, Navy, and Post Office.

The 119,000 employees of the O. P. A. exceed by 35,000 the total number of employees of the United States Treasury and its several revenue bureaus. They exceed by 42,000 the total for all branches of the Agriculture Department. The number represents more than three times the total for the Commerce Department and its seven branches. It is more than 12 times the total for the State Department or the Labor Department.

The War Department's peacetime personnel in 1937 was listed at 89,000. The O. P. A.'s 119,000 employees exceeds that figure by 30,000, and the salaried cost of the O. P. A. far exceeds the total cost of the Government of Mexico.

Actual and complete Federal Government costs of the O. P. A. set-up are not easy to arrive at. Appropriations by Congress are followed by deficiency appropriations in rapid sequence, and these again by Executive allocations. The O. P. A. espionage machinery, regulating and prohibiting domestic and interstate sales and distribution of food, requires a totalitarian army 10 to 100 times as large as the Federal machinery employed in prohibition days to check consumption of alcoholic liquors.

The Federal set-up in Washington is supplemented by 9 regional administrations. Attorneys and investigators under Federal direction, whether central or regional, regulate or prohibit food sales on a ration basis in all of the 3,030 counties of the 48 States. Even a farmer, theoretically, is not permitted to eat the chickens, pigs, butter, and eggs he raises, and his wife is not allowed to brown and grind green coffee without authority from Washington, D. C., and its totalitarian democracy.

Under the Federal espionage of food sales and so-called black marketing this so-called centralized planned democracy has a county attorney and a local F. B. I. in every county in the United States—not only to regulate retail and wholesale sales and prices but to regulate the food consumption, the shoes worn, and the gasoline, coal, ice, and clothing of 132,000,000 people. In Germany this might be called local government by the Gestapo, but here it is the New Deal—a new order of things in America.

Mr. President, I do not want Senators to think that I overlook the fact that there are persons—for example, old-age pensioners—who are in trouble and ought to receive aid in some form. However, to grant a subsidy to reduce the price of food to the millions of people, rich and poor alike, a great majority of whom are making more money than they ever made before in their lives, and meet the cost of it by borrowing money to be paid at some time in the future when our national income may not be so great as it is now, and when the chances will be against our having as much money with which to pay for food and pay taxes, is something which I do not think should be done.

If there are articles which we must have, and there is a desire to increase production, instead of paying a subsidy to increase production, all we have to do is to raise and fix the price. I have no objection to ceilings being placed on the prices of agricultural or other products, in order to stop the run-away of prices. People in various communities who are in need should be taken care of so that they will not suffer. It should be done, in my opinion, through the local agencies of the States and counties, who know the individual persons and are familiar with their needs. Certainly no one within reason can object to taking care of such persons.

What does it cost the Treasury and the taxpayer? What is the annual sum total cost of the O. P. A. set-up? A key to an approximate estimate is afforded in the testimony of the second O. P. A. Administrator, Prentiss Brown.

On page 144 of the 810-page volume of hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, he asked for $177,335,000 to meet the salaries and expenses of 68,882 officials and clerical aides of the O. P. A. This would imply a per capita cost of O. P. A. personnel averaging something over $2,500 apiece a year. Applying this unit personnel cost to the entire O. P. A. set-up of 119,000, both civil service and ration boards, calls for a total expenditure of $297,500,000 for the taxpayer to meet.

It carries out and puts into concrete shape two theories of government:

First, the Harry Hopkins theory: "Spend and tax, spend and tax."

Mr. MOORE. And elect and elect.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Yes; and elect and elect.

Second, the Thomas Jefferson indictment of George III:

> He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people and eat out their substance.

It will be noted that the Thomas Jefferson idea was ratified by the signers of the Declaration of Independence, which for 150 years has been accepted as the foundation of the Constitution—indeed, 165 years before the Atlantic Charter.

It did include the "four freedoms," but it was created about 165 years before the Atlantic Charter was signed.

COST OF O. P. A. SET-UP VERSUS COST OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT UNDER THE FIRST 22 PRESIDENTS

If the cost of the O. P. A. set-up were only $177,000,000, as asked for by Administrator Prentiss Brown to support 68,882 bureaucrats, the O. P. A. would cost more than double the entire cost of United States Government in 1861 under Abraham Lincoln, which was only $66,500,000.

If, on the other hand, the O. P. A. set-up costs the $297,000,000 estimated for support of 119,000 in 1944, it exceeds the total United States Government expenditure per annum under President Grover Cleveland, which in 1885–88 averaged $260,000,000 per annum.

Even on a per capita basis, based on population, the O. P. A. set-up establishes a new mark in American "spend-and-taxation."

Under the Jefferson and Jackson administrations, which once were looked upon as democratic, the Government taxes to pay ordinary disbursements from the United States Treasury were less than 1.5 per capita.

The $297,000,000 estimated to cover the salaries and expenses of the O. P. A.'s army of 119,000 employees amounts to a tax of $2.22 per head on a population of 132,000,000 men, women, and children. Is this not too much to pay for the privilege of getting food prices in 1943 at 20 percent higher than in the last World War, in 1918?

The high cost of bureaucracy finds its best example in the high cost of the O. P. A. and subsidy. Yet the O. P. A. is only one among the one-hundred-odd alphabetic bureaus of the New Deal. One bureau is costing more than the entire United States Government under the Cleveland administration, and Grover Cleveland was once looked upon as a Democrat and twice elected as a Democrat. One bureau under the New Deal is costing more than twice the total cost of the United States Government under Lincoln in 1861.

The spend-and-tax theory of government may be good for the 3,000,000 bureaucrats who spend the taxes, and a good foundation for a totalitarian set-up, but does it conduce to democracy in America?

When the Commerce Department, inadvertently, "lets the cat out of the bag," and reveals that instead of a food price roll-back in the Nation's food bill there has been a roll-up-hill from $12,500,000,000 in 1941 to $17,000,000,000 in 1943—a 2-year roll-up of 35 percent—it knocks the last prop from under the world's biggest bureaucracy and this country's biggest bottleneck.

The first step toward post-war recovery and post-war democracy is to put an end to the totalitarian trend by abolishing the O. P. A. set-up and subsidy. Removal of this bureaucratic octopus from the back of American people will be a godsend to producer and consumer, the taxpayer, and free democracy. It may well be worth more for national defense than another victory in Italy or Africa, and it certainly is worth more for the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, I have brought these statistics and comparisons to the attention of the Senate to show the difference in the handling of the food situation in this war and the last war. I do not see any excuse for what has been done in handling this aspect of the domestic economy during the present war. As a matter of fact, the farmer does not get the subsidy. It goes to the processors, the middlemen, the retailers, and to the consumer. The spread in price between the wholesaler and the retailer, who handle the products of the farmer, has doubled if not trebled since the last war. It is they who get the subsidy.

Throughout the farming sections of the country we hear reference made to subsidies paid to the farmer in the triple A soil-conservation payments. But that is not a subsidy. The soil-conservation payments were provided in order to preserve for future generations the soil of the Nation which was being depleted; those payments were made to preserve future assets for the welfare of this country on the assumption that it was not fair for the farmer, because of low prices, to make a living by mining the soil and leave the soil when he was through with it in a depleted condition, and greatly inferior as a national asset.

I shall vote against the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio, with all due respect to him and with all due respect to anyone who does not agree with my point of view. I think subsidies are inflationary. They are putting off the payment of the food bill until after the war is over, and the national income will not be so great as it is now.

We talk a great deal about appreciating the boys who are fighting all over the world and who are scattered in at least 50 various parts of the globe. The trouble is that while we have a war, many of us are afraid that it will cost us something. We talk about the sacrifice of the men who are fighting in the Army and Navy, but there is a feeling that we do not have to sacrifice anything. We want food and we want to obtain it as cheaply as we did in peacetime. We do not want to pay any more taxes than usual, but we want to make some money. I am not referring to any particular class of our pop-

ulation in any sense, but that is the feeling which is prevalent throughout the country.

We know that there are $20,000,000,000 of currency outstanding. I asked a banker in Minnesota what he thought had become of it. He said, "I do not know; perhaps that is why so many people rent safe-deposit boxes, and it may be that they keep it there." Twenty billion dollars, which is about four times more than the average amount in circulation in normal times, is floating around. How did it get there? Is it escaping taxation? Is it money that has been made on the black market? In any event, in addition to our national debt, it is dangerous because of its inflationary possibilities. Sometime in the future I expect to address the Senate on the source of this currency, whence it comes, upon what it is based, and what its potential influence on inflation is. In itself it has inherent dangers, and it is increasing in volume all the time. That, however, is another subject which I shall discuss at another time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. WILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I rise simply to express the fervent hope that we may vote upon the pending amendment, which is the Taft amendment, very soon, and thereafter dispose of the bill today. I frankly say that I hope we can do that and adjourn over till Monday. I think that is the general feeling in the Senate, and I hope we may accomplish that purpose. I do not, of course, want to shut off the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the majority leader if there would be any chance, with the approval of the minority leader, of fixing an hour today when we might vote on the bill, so that we could take the action the Senator from Kentucky suggests?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would be agreeable to that, but I do not know. I think that if we can dispose of the Taft amendment, which is the only hump right now, we can very speedily dispose of other questions having to do with the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me there is another amendment which I propose to call up in behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and myself. It is an amendment which embodies the subject of the food stamp bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I did not know that. I have been told that the Senator was not going to offer that amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. There are a good many Members who desire to have it presented to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. In spite of that, I still hope we may dispose of the bill today.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I feel that the subject of subsidies has been adequately discussed, and that I can make very little contribution to what has already been said. I have, however, a few thoughts on the subject which I consider may tend possibly to bring clarity into a very confused situation.

Yesterday we heard discussed the proposition that a large segment of our population were underpaid. They are generally called the white-collar class. I am satisfied that the settlement of the subsidy question would make little or no contribution to the solution of that problem.

I should like to mention another thing. I feel that in the entire discussion, especially through the columns of the newspapers and over the radio, a large percentage of the workers of America have been given the impression that putting into effect a subsidy such as that we have heard discussed on this floor would afford them great relief. The Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have demonstrated quite clearly that the relief would be infinitesimal. What I am getting at is that, while in the discussions over the radio and in the columns of the press the farmers of the country have been almost damned, they have been misjudged.

I recently received a letter which I shall read into the RECORD. It comes from a farmer of my own State, and presents an almost tragic picture of a condition which I wish all the workers of America could comprehend and understand. Certainly, if prices are high—and they are high in some places—it is not due to the price the farmer is receiving. He is not receiving adequate compensation, as everyone knows, for many of the products he raises.

Let me read this letter:

DEAR SENATOR: As far as we here on the farms are concerned, we cannot understand where these housewives who were down to Washington, hollering about the high cost of living and wanting a subsidy, could be buying, or if their living costs were high, how or where they got that way.

Now listen to this:

Here at the farm we're getting 24 to 28 cents a dozen for eggs, eggs that cost us at least 45 cents a dozen to produce. The hens will bring us only 16 cents a pound. They'll average from 3½ to 4 pounds apiece. We paid 60 cents per chick when we bought them last May.

When we were told to raise more chickens for the country—

Our ears not only turn red, they take on a purple cast, when we think of the feed the chickens ate, to say nothing about the work we put in taking care of them.

The same example can be applied to nearly everything on the farm. So if living costs are high, the high price didn't originate on the farm.

I wish that idea could be broadcast over the radio to the listening public, so there would not be the opportunity by the politicians to create class hatred next fall between city groups and farmers. The way to bring out anything clearly is to throw light on the subject. I think it was a great leader who said, "Give the people light, and they will find the way." But if we bring confusion into the picture, the people will not find the way.

Now I wish to continue reading from the letter:

We—

Meaning the farmers—

take what we get. Not others in America; they get what they ask for. Why, then, is not the farmer entitled to a price instead of a subsidy? And could it be that the high cost of wages has produced the high cost of living?

Just to give you an idea of the duties of a farm wife—

Mr. President, a woman is the writer of this letter. Many times on the floor of the Senate I have referred to the fact that in my State, and in the other States of the Middle West, women, many of whom are past middle age, are performing a great patriotic duty working on the farms. If anyone thinks there is any doubt about that, let him listen to the words this woman has written me on the subject, showing "Her Day" at work. Listen to this:

Just to give you an idea of the duties of a farm wife, due to the scarcity of labor and the price of it, if it were to be had, I'll give you a sketch of My Day.

Where did we hear that phrase before—"My Day"? I quote further:

Up at 5 o'clock. That's 4 by the sun. Milk five cows, get breakfast, do dishes and housework. Then to the woods to cut down 10 trees, pulling one end of a crosscut saw. Home to get dinner and do dishes. To the barn to clean it and haul manure from 21 head of stock. Bed and feed them—

Meaning the stock—

and get them back in. Tend chickens and pigs. I won't elaborate. Back to the house to get supper and do dishes. Milk five cows, do my ironing. Take time to listen to the radio. Hear more about strikes, high cost of living, and wonder how this administration made such a mess of things. Retire at 10:30 real mad. Dumb, aren't I?

Sincerely,

Mrs. ALTIE VICK.

P. S.—Got no time and a half overtime, either. Lucky if I got time.

Mr. President, I shall read another letter, which throws some light on the situation. It is an appeal from an American 69 years of age, and if it does not strike a responsive chord in the heart of any man who listens to it, then I say he must be asleep.

Addressing me personally, the writer says:

DEAR ALEX: I am in a peculiar situation and need advice. You are in a position to know to whom I should write, and feel sure you will tell me.

On January—

I leave the date blank—

the foundrymen went on a strike here because they did not get an 8-cent an hour raise over the $1.20 an hour which is the union scale.

Listen to this:

The machinists, of which I am a member, went out in sympathy, although they had promised not to go on strike until we win the war.

Of course I was thinking about my grandson, Bill. I pondered it over and over.

Something kept coming up in my mind, "Granddaddy, don't strike against me. Granddaddy, don't strike." Well, I refused. I was the only man in the shop for 3 days. Some of the men did not want to go out, but they just didn't have the guts."

Now that they are back some of them refuse to work with me.

The Government needs workers.

We must have men. When I went to work for the company in 1941 I told them I was able and willing to work up to 12 hours a day, 7 days a week, until we win. I have worked 7 days a week since. "I'm only 69." Would be glad to refer anyone to the manager.

I have bought with my earnings 16 $100 bonds. I put my granddaughter through Iowa University. She graduated last January.

I have been a union man over 50 years.

I can't bring myself to strike against my own grandson who is in the service. I can't strike when we are at war. What am I to do. Write me please.

The writer of this letter, Mr. President, who is 69 years of age, who for 50 years was a union man, and whose grandson is in the service finds himself in a position of loyalty perhaps to some union leader, but also of loyalty to the Nation, and he will not strike, but when the men come back from striking they will not work with him. Contrast that with the woman whose letter I just read, who works from 4 in the morning until 8 or 9 at night, and turns on the radio and hears about these strikes.

Alec, what can I do?

Mr. President, how could I answer him? In one paragraph of my letter I wrote:

I have checked with various Government officials here who say they have no jurisdiction. It was, however, suggested that you go to your nearest conciliation service office and present the matter to them.

I told him I admired his attitude. I told him that back in 1939, on the floor of the Senate, I said we needed a definite labor policy. Every day I receive letters from laboring men in Wisconsin who are friends of mine who confirm that they want such a policy. A definite labor policy is needed now more than ever before.

But when it comes to the question of high prices of food attempt is made to induce people to believe that the farmer should be damned, when he works practically around the clock.

Mr. President, the two letters I have read present a situation in America of which we certainly must take cognizance. They are interrelated. The trouble with much of our legislation is that we bring up an idea and we try to handle that idea as if it were the only idea, whereas it is part of a series of ideas. So, Mr. President, I feel that if we are going to handle the subsidy idea properly, it must be done in such a way that that segment of our people that needs help will receive help, and that we should not particularly see to it that folks who do not need aid are assisted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I regret that the senior Senator from Ohio is not in the Senate Chamber at the moment. I should like to ask him a question. He made the statement that there was no difference between producer subsidies and support subsidies or consumer subsidies. I think there is all the difference in the world between a support price to guarantee to the farmer his price for production and a consumer subsidy paid to the consumer for help to buy agricultural products.

The Senator from Ohio said on the floor of the Senate that those who supported the measure of the Senator from Alabama were in a rather embarrassing position because if we supported this proposed measure we would support the general principles of subsidies, while cutting off the consumer subsidy which is prohibited by the bill. We do find ourselves in that position.

I am against a subsidy in lieu of a fair price. It is that type of subsidy that is outlawed in this bill. Last June we attempted to settle the subsidy question once and for all. Since that time a program has been announced whereby the producers of sugar beets and the producers of wool, and the producers of incentive crops will be paid a support price. If we were to vote against the bill because it provides for continuation of support prices, we would absolutely fail to keep faith with the farmer.

Mr. President, I do believe there is a great deal of difference between a support price subsidy and a consumer subsidy. If I understand it correctly, a support price is paid to the farmer to increase agricultural production, and when that production amounts to a surplus, then the Governments steps in and pays the loss in order to pay the farmer the guaranteed price and thereby keep faith with the farmer in the promise made by the Government. Support price subsidy goes to the increase of agricultural production, and the whole theory of support prices has been to increase the production of agricultural products. But if I understand the Senator's amendment, on page 3, beginning where provision is made that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall have the right to buy in the open market, it can buy anything it wants to on which there is a support price, whether it is a surplus product or not, then after it is processed, either by contract or otherwise, the Corporation turns around and sells it to the consumer at a loss, the loss being the difference between the purchase price and the sale price, so to avoid an increased cost to the consumer. I think that is an entirely different thing from a support price, to increase agricultural production.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let us consider the sugar subsidy. What is it? A price for sugar beets was guaranteed, and the processor is paid the difference, in order not to pass the cost of sugar beets on to the consumer. That is exactly the same kind of subsidy as any other. In the matter of increasing production it is not a question of whether a support price is paid; it is a question of the kind of support price that is paid. The higher the support price the greater the increase in production. As long as there is a support price, production is increased. My idea is to pay a subsidy only when it can be based on a support price. First, encourage production, and then determine in the best interest of the country as a whole what shall be done. If it is not desired to pass the increased cost on to the consumer, pay a subsidy.

Mr. WHERRY. My contention, Mr. President, is that instead of having the public pay the increased cost of production, the Government pays the loss as a consumer subsidy to reduce the cost of living.

Mr. TAFT. The farmer is paid, but if there is no subsidy the difference is passed on to the consumer. A support price, of course, is not the same as a subsidy. Senators talk about a support-price subsidy. There is no such thing except in what I have in my amendment. All subsidies have the effect of cutting down the margin between the producer and the consumer. One cannot be classified as a consumer subsidy and another as a producer subsidy. There is no such difference.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my unlerstanding of the amendment, and especially now since the Senator has made his explanation, is that the consumer does not pay the increased cost of processing of agricultural products, but the Government does pay the loss. We are speaking of support prices. We are speaking of the Commodity Credit Corporation buying and selling at a loss. I think the Commodity Credit Corporation should do only one thing, and that is to pay the loss to a farmer if a crop is overproduced and a surplus arises, because the farmer has been guaranteed the support price. I think that is the only proper interpretation of support price.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The kind of subsidy the Senator is condemning is exactly the kind of subsidy we authorize when we put sugar in as an exception. The Government guarantees a certain price for beets, and that price could be allowed to go right on to the consumer in an increased price of sugar if it were desired to do so. Instead of that the Senator has approved and voted for a subsidy, and as a citizen of Nebraska, with his sugar-beet factories he is excepting sugar and saying, "With respect to sugar we will not pass that cost on to the consumer. We will pay the difference to the processor so that we do not have to pass it on to the consumer." He cannot distinguish between what he is doing with sugar and what any one of the other subsidies authorized by my amendment would do.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to say that I think the Senator from Ohio is somewhat wrong in calling the sugar subsidy

a farmer's subsidy. It seems to me it is a subsidy to insure national defense, to keep this country from becoming entirely dependent on overseas sources of sugar; because we know that sugar is absolutely essential in wartime.

I do not believe the subsidy is paid wholly for the benefit of the beet growers of the United States. They necessarily have to receive a higher price for their products because of the seasonal nature of the production.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am always appreciative of the advice and leadership and counsel of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and I wish to thank him for his remarks and comments about my knowledge of the program relative to sugar beets and meat. However, I wish to tell him that I think he has in his amendment exactly what I said; and, to use plain English, I think it is nothing more than a consumers' subsidy. I think it is the first time we have ever been asked legally to authorize a consumers' subsidy in this country. If we do, and if we put up $950,000,000 now for it, they will be back here within 6 months asking for another $950,000,000 to pay the grocery bills of the people. The Senate is now being asked to do it, under the theory that it is a support-price proposition. The only losses we should pay are those necessary to make good on the price guaranties the Government has made to farmers, rather than to pass on the benefit to the consumers, as a consumers' subsidy. The consumers are the ones who are and will be benefited, rather than the farmers.

In the amendment of the Senator from Ohio we have a consumers' subsidy. We do not have it in the bill as reported by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. While it is true—and I made the remarks before the Senator came into the Chamber—that I am called upon to support the sugar price support program, because I want to keep faith with the program that has been announced, I am against the consumers' subsidy.

The amendment of the Senator from Ohio provides for a consumers' subsidy, but such a subsidy is not provided for in the committee bill. That is why I shall support the committee bill and shall oppose the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am not opposing a farmers' subsidy, but the committee bill does propose a consumers' subsidy. The purpose of paying it is to prevent passing on to consumers an increased price of sugar. The Senator from Nebraska has said there must be a support price for sugar beets. That is correct. The reason why a sugar subsidy is particularly defensible is that we do not want to increase the price of all imported sugar. So by subsidizing the sugar grown in this country we save the consumers about three times as much as we pay out. That is the justification for the sugar subsidy; and there is a similar justification for the oil subsidies.

But this would authorize a complete sugar subsidy. If the Government wanted to do so under the provisions of the pending bill it could use $100,000,000 or more to reduce the present price of sugar to consumers throughout the United States. That is what is authorized here. The Government could apply that to all foreign sugar if it chose to do so. I do not say the Government would do so, but the authority to do so is contained in the bill as reported.

Without my amendment, the bill is that broad, and it authorizes consumers' subsidies. It authorizes consumers' subsidies without limit as to those particular commodities; whereas in my amendment I have provided a very definite limit, and require that before that is done a support price to the farmers be put on, so as to protect the farmers. Under the bill as reported by the Senator from Alabama, it is not necessary to put on a support price for sugar or for wool or for vegetable oils. It is possible to subsidize the consumers, if that is desired.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what the Senator is doing by his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, let me inquire whether I correctly understood the Senator from Ohio to change his amendment again, so as to read "in line 15", as it did in the first place?

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I left in the same language that is contained in the bill as reported by the Senator from Alabama. I think there is sufficient authorization without it, but I left that language in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Radcliffe
Andrews	Guffey	Reed
Austin	Gurney	Revercomb
Bailey	Hatch	Reynolds
Ball	Hawkes	Robertson
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Ho man	Smith
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brooks	Kilgore	Taft
Buck	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McClellan	Truman
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Caraway	McKellar	Tydings
Chandler	Maloney	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maybank	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	O'Daniel	Wiley
Ferguson	Overton	Willis
George	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]

Mr. TAFT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REYNOLDS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I do not know how he would vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. TOBEY's name was called). I again announce the absence of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] because of the serious illness of a member of his family.

Mr. WILLIS (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote "nay." As I intend to vote the same way, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Nevada [Mr. [McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote, as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

I am advised that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—16

Ball	Hatch	Vandenberg
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Murray	White
Davis	Pepper	Wiley
Downey	Radcliffe	
Ferguson	Taft	

NAYS—64

Aiken	Bone	Chandler
Andrews	Brooks	Chavez
Austin	Buck	Clark, Idaho
Bailey	Bushfield	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Byrd	Connally
Barkley	Capper	Eastland
Bilbo	Caraway	Ellender

George	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Green	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Millikin	Truman
Hawkes	Moore	Tunnell
Hayden	Murdock	Tydings
Hill	Nye	Wagner
Holman	O'Daniel	Wallgren
Kilgore	Overton	Walsh, N. J.
La Follette	Reed	Wheeler
Langer	Revercomb	Wherry
Lucas	Russell	Willis
McClellan	Shipstead	Wilson
McFarland	Smith	
McKellar	Stewart	

NOT VOTING—15

Brewster	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Jackson	Reynolds
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Gerry	McCarran	Scrugham
Gillette	McNary	Tobey

So Mr. TAFT'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN obtained the floor.

Mr. REED and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator will yield to me so that I may offer a perfecting amendment, which I am sure will take very little time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish to yield for the purpose of the Senator offering an amendment. I wish to offer an amendment myself.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Arkansas will offer an amendment which will involve considerable discussion and debate. I wish to offer an amendment which will take only a moment of the time of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to remind the Senator from Arkansas that he cannot retain the floor while business is being transacted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. For what purpose does the Senator from Kentucky ask me to yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to feel out the situation to see if we could not enter into a unanimous agreement to limit debate on the bill and any further amendments thereto, so that we might bring it to a conclusion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Would yielding to the Senator from Kentucky result in my losing the floor?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would not unless some Senator should make a point of order, and I certainly will not make it myself.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might enter into an agreement for a limitation of debate now, with the idea that we might dispose of the bill today. The present occupant of the chair [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] shakes his head, indicating that he would not agree at this time to a limitation of debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that in his capacity as Senator he would have to object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then I have no purpose in further delaying the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is on the desk an amendment which has been offered by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself. I should like to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 23, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) Within a period of 120 days from the effective date of this act, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942), shall be adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor) feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home grown), and other costs since January 1, 1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war and civilian purposes: *Provided*, That in determining the extent to which maximum prices shall be adjusted as provided herein, due consideration shall be given to historical and normal differentials customarily applied as between markets and regions: *Provided further*, That in no event shall maximum prices on milk and the products thereof be established below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That where minimum prices to producers of milk have been regulated under any agreements or orders pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, the War Food Administrator is hereby directed, within the periods prescribed in this section (relating to the adjustment of maximum prices), to adjust such minimum prices to reflect adjustments in maximum prices determined and ordered pursuant to the provisions of this section. Except as expressly provided herein, nothing contained herein is intended, nor shall be construed to repeal, amend, or supersede the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

(b) In order to effectuate the purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator are hereby directed to hold public hearings on a regional or market basis as the case requires. For such purposes there shall be utilized the hearing procedure and the personnel of the Food Distribution Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture established under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and such other personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration as may be required. As soon as practicable after the completion of the hearing, but in any event within the periods specified in paragraph (a), the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator shall make public their joint findings based only on relevant substantial evidence of record at the hearing and the Price Administrator forthwith shall issue an order adjusting such maximum price or prices on the basis of and in conformance with such findings.

(c) Any person (within the meaning of section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended) who is adversely affected by the order of the Price Administrator may, within 30 days after the action adjusting such maximum price or prices, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the order be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part.

The War Food Administrator shall be made a party to the proceedings and upon service of the summons and complaint, the Price Administrator shall certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record upon which the order adjusting such maximum price or prices was based. The proceedings in such court shall be subject to all applicable provisions of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; except, that wherever the term "Administrator" is used therein, it shall, for the purposes hereof, be construed to mean the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator: *Provided*, That during the pendency of such proceedings the Price Administrator may not modify or rescind his order adjusting such maximum price or prices except upon the basis of additional joint findings on evidence adduced pursuant to the order of the court. The provisions of this section shall terminate coterminous with the expiration of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, this amendment is taken from Senate bill 1418, which was introduced by the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself several months ago. After the bill was introduced the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on it, reported it favorably to the Senate, and it is now on the calendar.

Section 1 of the bill as originally introduced, which provided for an immediate adjustment of milk prices on the basis of 46 cents per hundredweight throughout the Nation, has been eliminated from the amendment now offered.

If the pending bill, which refuses to permit or give sanction to the continuation of the subsidy policy and program, should be enacted, then this amendment would rightfully belong to and would implement the legislation. It would set up the machinery immediately whereby the War Food Administration and the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration are directed within 120 days from the date of the enactment of this law to adjust on a regional or market basis, as the case may require, the prices of milk to the extent necessary to effectuate the following:

(1) Reflect changes in farm-labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or homegrown), and other costs since January 1,

1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war and civilian purposes.

The amendment would further require, Mr. President, that each 6 months thereafter the same process be followed, if necessary, in making an adjustment of milk prices so as to reflect these four goals. After the adjudication is made and the price is fixed, if any affected party is aggrieved or dissatisfied, the amendment then provides for a right of appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals, and pending that time the order, whatever it may be, cannot be changed.

The whole purpose of this amendment is to try to set up machinery so as to make it certain that dairy products shall be given the consideration to which they are entitled and that the producers of dairy products shall have fixed for their products by the Office of Price Administration and by the War Food Administrator a price which will reflect the increased cost of production, taking into account the factors I have already enumerated, covering changes which may have occurred since January 1941.

Mr. President, I think this amendment is important. The truth is that the dairy industry and the milk producers, possibly, have suffered more than any other agricultural interest with respect to the O. P. A. regulations and restrictions and price controls which have been invoked. The industry has been affected to such an extent that today, notwithstanding the increased demand for milk and for dairy products, national production has fallen off; as compared to the average production of other agricultural products for the period from 1935 to 1939, the dairy production has not at all kept pace.

Unless, Mr. President, something is done and done quickly—and in my judgment it will have to be done by the Congress—the shortage of milk products and dairy products will continue to increase. I am sure every Member of the Senate has received letters and information from home, as have I, to the effect that dairy herds are being put on the market, that the cost of producing milk today is equal to or above the O. P. A. price ceiling, and that it can no longer be produced at a profit, even including the subsidy on dairy products which is now paid, amounting in round numbers to $441,000,000.

Certainly, if the subsidy is removed, as is contemplated by the pending bill, then, Mr. President, it is absolutely imperative that immediate steps be taken either through the processes set up by this amendment or by other means to reestablish a fair price for dairy products in order that this industry may survive.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the able Senator if it is not a fact in his State; as it is in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, that the current subsidy being paid is grossly inadequate to give a fair return to the dairy industry for the production of milk?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is wholly inadequate. In my opinion, Mr. President, in order to put the dairy industry on a competitive basis with other agricultural products and also on the basis of other prices, the present subsidy would have to be doubled and possibly trebled. That would be necessary in order to put this industry on a sound economic basis under present circumstances and conditions.

This proposed legislation, if it shall be favorably acted upon by the Senate and shall become a law, will have the effect of stopping the subsidy program, and certainly if that happens, considering the depressed condition of the dairy industry at this time, it is imperative, Mr. President, that action on this order be taken, that some machinery be immediately provided and legislative direction given to the Office of Price Administration and to the War Food Administrator to take action to adjust the prices so that this industry may survive.

Mr. President, I have discussed this amendment only briefly with the very able Senator from Alabama who is in charge of the bill. I hope there will be no objection to it. I hope that the committee can accept it or that the Senator from Alabama can accept the amendment, and that it may be adopted and become a part of the law, if the pending bill is enacted.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that I do not understand that I have the power, either as author of the bill or as the one who was designated to report it to accept in a binding way any amendment to the bill after it is reported. I will simply say that if I had the power to accept it, I would do so very gladly. I think it is consistent with the philosophy I am supporting; it is supported by the milk producers of the country, and it seems to me to be sound in philosophy and theory. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I not only would consent, but I really hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall say just a word, because it is not necessary to say a great deal on the amendment.

I had hoped that we would not unloose the floodgates and bring about an increase in the cost of living in the country, because I think we would thereby cause grave injustice to the major part of our population.

It has always seemed clear to me, and I am sure it has certainly been clear to other Senators, that there is just one of three courses to be followed in respect to the question before the Senate. Producers who are not getting a fair return will have to suffer unless we do one of two things, either give them an increase in the market prices of their products, or give them a subsidy out of the Federal Treasury. To my limited intellect there seems to be no way open except one of those two, if, by hypothesis, producers are not getting enough for what they grow.

Mr. President, that applies particularly to the dairy industry. Those engaged in that industry in my State of Florida are suffering, and I am sure my able colleague here will attest that fact. Hundreds of dairy cattle have been sold by dairymen, some of them for beef. I myself have seen fine Jersey cows, excellent milk cows, sold in the farmer's market, as many as half a dozen or a dozen, when they should have been furnishing milk for the people of my State. But the dairymen were being compelled to sell their cows because, due to the constant increase in the price of labor and in the price of feedstuffs, they could not remain in the dairy business. They have been here repeatedly attempting to obtain relief from the Government.

A few days ago a man came to Washington from Miami and brought with him his accounts with the supply house from which he bought his feedstuffs. He showed by his own books and records that he had $4,000 in the bank the previous year, but when he came here he had not only exhausted his $4,000 in the bank in trying to remain in the dairy business, but in addition he owed $3,800, as I recall the amount, to the wholesale house which supplied him with feedstuffs; and he had the figures establishing that fact. It is not fair to take anyone's private property for public use without just compensation, and that is what we do if we require any person to continue to give his substance to the public good without being compensated for it. That, we must all admit, is not a desirable result.

The only point about which we disagree is as to the best way to help the producer who is not getting a fair return. About that question honest men may honestly differ. I voted in favor of the Maloney amendment. I believe in the subsidy. Other Senators feel equally strongly the other way, and I certainly respect the honesty and integrity of their opinions.

At this time the Senate has already acted in prohibition of the subsidy. So far as I am able to perceive, therefore, if the dairy people in my State and in other Senators' States are not to suffer, we have either to give them a subsidy or give them a greater return in the market place. I recall the time when 37 Senators appeared in the room of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in the presence of Judge VINSON and told him about the plight of their States, and I see many of those Senators sitting in the Chamber at the present time. Yesterday afternoon, however, the Senate denied those engaged in the dairy industry the subsidy, and, therefore, if they are not to suffer I know of no redress

possible for them save to allow them an increase in the market place, and for that reason I shall support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senators from Arkansas and Mississippi.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that this amendment involves the Congress voting in favor of an increase in the price of milk. I do not think we should increase the price of any particular product. Whether we think the prices are wrong or right, if we proceed to pass on the price of milk, on the price of hogs, on the price of corn, and the price of every other product, there will be no end to the legislation in which we will become involved, even though we may agree that the price of milk should be higher. We have enacted a law, we have given to a board power to fix the price. I feel the same about an increase in the price of oil. It may be more than just, but I do not think Congress can undertake to pass on the price of one product after another, under the Price Control Act.

Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TAFT. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Where in the amendment does it say that prices must be raised?

Mr. TAFT. It says:

(a) Within a period of 120 days from the effective date hereof, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942) shall be further adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary—

Adding all costs which occurred since January 1—3 years ago—which probably represents an increase of 50 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senate provided that prices must be adjusted taking into consideration the difference in the cost of production from 1941 until the date it sets out the formula under which the price of milk is to be determined. Certainly the Senator favors an adequate food supply for the American people.

Mr. TAFT. Let me go back. I may misread the amendment. As I read it, this is what it provides:

Within a period of 120 days from the effective date hereof, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk—

That means the prices fixed on milk today by regional agreement or by the price control act. It continues:

and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942) shall be further adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home grown), and other costs since January 1, 1941.

The probable increase in costs in 3 years is somewhere between 25 and 50 percent, and we are taking prices which have been fixed today, not the prices which may have existed in January 1941, and saying we must add 2 or 3 years' increases in costs. It seems to me obvious that it will result in a 25-percent increase in the price of milk.

Mr. EASTLAND. Any business must have increased revenue when its costs increase, and if the cost of the production of milk increases, of course the price of milk must be increased.

We all admit that the dairy industry today is partially living on a subsidy. If we take off the subsidy, as it looks as if the Senate will do, under the bill, we must set up adequate machinery to give the dairy interests cost of production, or we will have a milk famine in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say a word. The purpose of the Eastland-McClellan amendment is to compel compliance with the price-control act of October 2, 1942, and the marketing agreement act of 1937. The Senator from Ohio certainly does not approve letting the executive departments "get by" without complying with those acts, does he?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all, but if those acts are on the statute books and are being disregarded, what is the use of passing another measure which makes the same provision? However, I would not have any particular objection if that were the fact, but as I read the amendment it does something very different. In effect, I think, it says we can take present prices and add to them the increase in costs. I may be mistaken, but that is the way the language reads to me. If the Senator merely wishes to add to the price as it was on January 1, 1941, the increase of cost which has occurred since that time, I have no objection. That is what the price control act provides, but I do not think that is what the amendment provides.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the Senator has no objection to the amendment, if that is what it does. It is too bad that we have to ask any executive agencies to comply with the law; nevertheless, it seems necessary to do so, because they have failed to do it. The purpose of the amendment is to direct them to comply with the two laws I have mentioned, and I believe the Senator from Ohio voted for them, and I assume he stands by them today.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Mississippi will state that in his opinion the provision simply means that the increase over 1941, over what it was 3 years ago, shall be equal to the increase in cost for the same period, I have no further objection to the amendment.

Mr. EASTLAND. Would the Senator please repeat his question?

Mr. TAFT. I think I shall have no objection if the Senator will state that the object is to provide that the price of milk shall be increased as much over what it was 3 years ago, January 1, 1941, as the cost of production of milk has increased during the same years.

Mr. EASTLAND. An increase has already been granted. The purpose is to fix the price of milk according to the formula set out in the amendment, which we think is equitable.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Mississippi. Would the amendment as drafted permit a board which was conducting a public hearing, to place the fair price of the milk as of the date the board was sitting, considering the four items which are to be found on the top of page 2 of the amendment?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly so.

Mr. FERGUSON. If it were found that a reduction in price was justified it could be made under the provisions of the amendment, and if it were found that an increase in price was justified it could be made?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. But under the act of 1937 the price of milk can be set only in interstate commerce. We use that machinery with respect to milk produced and shipped in intrastate commerce.

Mr. TAFT. What confuses the issue, I think, is that the phrase "since January 1, 1941," is contained in the amendment. Why should that not be stricken out? What is wanted is an adjustment to meet the increased cost. When the matter is related to a particular date the cost is related to a particular date, but the change in price is not related to a particular date. The change in price is related to the existing price. I suggest that if the Senator eliminates from his amendment "January 1, 1941," I would have no objection to it.

Mr. EASTLAND. I did not see any point in eliminating that date. We have here the basis to start with. It takes in the whole period. While I cannot speak for the Senator from Arkansas, I for my part do not feel that it should be eliminated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the Senator from Ohio that that date is fixed in the amendment as a basis from which to start. If no date is fixed from which to determine increase in cost, those charged with the determination could go back to 1920 or any other time. There must be some point beyond which they cannot go. In other words, there must be a basis, some date from which to proceed.

Mr. TAFT. This provision suggests the Little Steel formula. What is the Little Steel formula? It is that wages shall not be increased more than 15 percent over what they were on January 1, 1941. This has nothing to do with the price of milk on January 1, 1941. This simply says that in considering the change in the present price the increased cost since January 1, 1941, must be taken into consideration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would carry with it the increase in the cost of producing milk since that time. The increased cost since then would be determined. There has also been an increase in price since then, which would be considered. When the subsidy is taken off, of course, that would result in a decrease in the price which the farmer or the dairyman receives for his product, and that would have to be taken into account. The price would have to be adjusted on that basis.

Mr. EASTLAND. The date, January 1, 1941, is fixed in order to take into account the abnormal cost due to the war, and also increases in prices.

Mr. TAFT. But a part of that cost may have already been taken into account by the increase in price.

Mr. EASTLAND. All the amendment does is to utilize the machinery which has already been set up, to take into consideration in fixing the price of milk the increased cost due to the war emergency since the date fixed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It does not necessarily mean that the price must be increased one cent, but that in adjusting the price to effectuate the purposes as set forth, those charged with the determination of the matter are directed to take into account the increased cost since that time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. In the next few months if the costs decrease, then the price of milk would decrease.

Mr. TAFT. But I understand the Senator thinks the amendment means that in fixing the price, consideration must be taken of what the price of milk was on January 1, 1941.

Mr. EASTLAND. It would take into consideration, in fixing the price, increases since that date.

Mr. TAFT. Is it intended to relate the increase to the increase in the price of milk from that which existed on January 1, 1941?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. If that is the meaning of the proposal, I have no objection to it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I desire to say to the distinguished Senators who have offered the amendment that I think the point being made by the Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. The amendment as it now reads provides that to the maximum price of milk in the last 3 years there shall be added the increase in the cost of production during that period.

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. DOWNEY. The amendment certainly provides that the maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk products shall be taken, and then, beginning with them, adjustment shall be made to reflect the changes in farm-labor costs over the period of time since January 1, 1941.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Adjusting a price does not mean to increase a price. The price is adjusted taking those things into account.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee beginning on page 9, line 11, and extending down to and including line 23, on page 10—being section 3—it is proposed to insert the following:

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS AND AUTHORITY PURPOSES

SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be in the interest of national defense and security and necessary to the effective prosecution of the present war and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the civilian population, and the morale of those members of the armed forces who have dependents among the civilian population, that the limited supplies of food presently available for civilian consumption be equitably distributed among the various sections of the Nation and among persons in the various income groups, and that the means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet be placed so far as possible within the reach of every person in the Nation. It is further declared that the operation of the national food-allotment plan, as provided in this act, is a desirable and effective method of accomplishing the purposes hereinabove set forth.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. As used in this act—

(a) The term "Director" shall mean the Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration charged with the establishment and operation of the food-allotment plan.

(b) The term "household" shall mean one person who alone, or a group of two or more persons who at a common table, customarily consume food prepared by or for him or them in a home or noncommercial nonpenal institution. Households shall be classified for the purposes of this act according to number of members and monthly income. Such income classification shall be according to $10 levels.

(c) The term "basic food allotment" per person, shall mean the following amounts of food per person per week or the equivalent thereof in nutritional value and approximate cost as determined by the Director:

Milk, or its equivalent in cheese, evaporated milk, or dry milk, 5 quarts.

Potatoes and sweetpotatoes, 4 pounds.

Dry beans, peas, and nuts, 8 ounces.

Tomatoes and citrus fruits, 1 pound 8 ounces.

Leafy, green, or yellow vegetables, such as green cabbage, kale, snap beans, and carrots, 1 pound 8 ounces.

Other vegetables and fruits, 2 pounds 5 ounces.

Eggs, 4 (number of eggs).

Meat, poultry, and fish, 1 pound 8 ounces.

Flour and cereals, 4 pounds 7 ounces.

Fats and oils, 14 ounces.

Sugars, sirups, and preserves, 12 ounces.

(d) The term "normal food expenditures" shall mean the amount of money customarily expended for the purchase of food plus the money value of home-produced food consumed by households of a specific size and income classification during a specified period of time.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FOOD-ALLOTMENT PLAN

SEC. 5. The War Food Administrator created by Executive Order No. 9322 is hereby authorized and directed to establish and administer a national food allotment plan in accordance with the provisions of this act under the supervision of a Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration. Such plan shall provide for the issuance to eligible households, according to need and free of charge, of food-allotment coupons of prescribed monetary values and in such form as may be approved by the Director. Coupons so issued shall be transferable by the recipient thereof to mercantile establishments registered in accordance with the provisions of this act in exchange for food or food products of equal value at the prices currently prevailing in the establishment of the transferee and shall be redeemable at face value upon presentation to the Treasury by any authorized transferee thereof. Such coupons may be transferred by such transferee and accepted in payment for food or food products purchased by him, or deposited by such original or subsequent transferee with a banking institution authorized by the Director to receive the same for redemption as hereinafter provided.

ELIGIBILITY OF HOUSEHOLDS

SEC. 6. (a) The determination with respect to the eligibility of households to participate in the national food allotment plan shall be made on the basis of the number of persons who are members thereof and their monthly rate of income. Individual households shall be certified only upon the voluntary application of a member thereof. A household shall be eligible to participate in the national food allotment plan and receive food-allotment coupons: *Provided*, That households of the same size and income classification, considered as a group, are found by the Director, on the basis of factual studies conducted under his supervision, to have normal food expenditures less than the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment of such households.

(b) For the purpose of determining eligibility and the value of coupons issuable, as provided in section 5 of this act, the Director shall determine semiannually in the manner specified in subsection (a) of this section, the normal food expenditures and the reasonable cost, according to the food prices collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, of the basic food allotment for households within each size and income classification. Such normal food expenditures shall be stated in terms of the national average, but the Director may, if he deems it necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act of securing equitable distribution of food supplies, provide for regional differentials with respect to the reasonable cost of the basic food allotments.

VALUE OF FOOD ALLOTMENT COUPONS ISSUABLE

SEC. 7. (a) Each household certified as eligible shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to receive food-allotment coupons of a value which, added to the normal food expenditures for households of the same size and income classification, as determined by the Director, shall equal the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for a household of that size as so determined. The value of coupons to be issued for each period shall be adjusted to the nearest whole dollar.

(b) If the Director finds that the funds available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of this act are insufficient to meet the full amount of the difference between normal food expenditures and the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for all eligible households participating in the

plan, he shall establish a percentage of the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment which can be attained for all participants out of the funds available, and shall cause food-allotment coupons to be issued to each participating household of a value which, added to the normal food expenditures as aforesaid, shall equal the established percentage of the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment of a household of that size.

(c) Except for variations based on regional differentials authorized under section 4 (b) of this act, all households of the same size and income classification shall be entitled to receive food-allotment coupons of the same value. Except for adjustments to the nearest whole dollar as provided in subsection (a) of this section, in no event shall coupons be issued to any household of a value in excess of that which added to the normal food expenditures for a household of the same size and income classification shall equal the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for a household of that size as determined by the Director.

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

SEC. 8. There shall be no discrimination against any household with respect to eligibility, classification, participation, or issuance or utilization of food-allotment coupons under the provisions of this act by reason of race, religious creed, national origin, citizenship, political affiliations or beliefs, occupation, employment, or other tests, except as provided for in this act and as necessary to insure general fairness and equity in the application of this act.

PRESERVATION OF STANDARDS

SEC. 9. No moneys herein or hereafter appropriated for the purposes of this act shall be expended in lieu of Federal, State, or local expenditures customarily made for the direct benefit of households within the income groups found eligible to receive food-allotment coupons. Present standards for the payment, and payments, of social security and other types of assistance shall not be made less favorable to the recipients, or applicants for such assistance, by reason of the operation of the food-allotment plan.

DETERMINATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF ELIGIBLES

SEC. 10. (a) The Director shall designate appropriate State, local, and private agencies and ration boards where feasible to receive applications to participate in the food-allotment plan, to determine the eligibility of such applicants for food-allotment coupons, and to certify to him the names of those found eligible, together with such relevant data concerning the size and income classification of the households so certified as may be necessary to determine the value of the coupons to be issued to the applicant and such other information as may be necessary to the efficient administration of the food-allotment plan. The Director may reimburse such agencies so designated for reasonable expenses incurred in connection with the work performed by them.

(b) When the Director finds upon investigation that appropriate State, local, or private agencies are not available in any State or community, he may establish local offices and employ suitable personnel to receive applications, determine eligibility, and certify eligibles as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Each applicant shall furnish such information with respect to the size and income of the household of which he is a member as may be required by the Director and necessary to the determination of eligibility and of the value of food-allotment coupons to which such household is entitled. In determining the income classification of a household income in cash and in kind shall be considered in accordance with regulations issued by the Director. When two or more adult members, other than husband and wife, contribute to the support of a household, an equitable portion of the income of any such member other than the natural head of the household shall be deemed to constitute income of the household in accordance with regulations issued by the Director.

(d) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures for appealing from the determination as to eligibility and the value of coupons issuable.

(e) The eligibility of each participating household and the value of the coupons to which it is entitled shall be redetermined and certified at least twice in each 12-month period in accordance with rules and regulations issued by the Director.

ISSUANCE

SEC. 11. The unit for issuing food-allotment coupons shall be denominations of 10 cents and increasing denominations thereof. The Director, or his designated issuing agents, shall issue coupons in such manner, and at such times and places, as the Director may determine, taking into consideration efficiency of administration and the convenience of those entitled to receive such coupons.

REDEMPTION OF FOOD-ALLOTMENT COUPONS

SEC. 12. (a) The Director shall provide for redemption of food-allotment coupons exchanged for food and food products through the cooperation of the Treasury Department, Post Office Department, the General Accounting Office, and banking institutions throughout the Nation. He shall designate banking institutions to accept coupons from sellers of food at retail and wholesale. Institutions so designated shall pay at time of presentation in cash or by credit to a demand deposit the full value of all coupons presented to them.

(b) Banking institutions accepting coupons as provided in subsection (a) of this section and other authorized transferees may present such coupons for redemption at audit offices of the War Food Administration, and the General Accounting Office shall arrange to conduct the necessary audits of such claims at such offices, thereupon releasing the coupons to the Director for reissuance. Approved vouchers covering such claims shall then be forwarded to regional disbursing offices of the Treasury Department for payment.

(c) The Director may contract to reimburse banking institutions designated to receive food-allotment coupons for their reasonable expenses incurred in acting as such depository.

REGISTRATION OF FOOD DEALERS

SEC. 13. The Director shall provide by regulation a simple method for the registration of mercantile establishments selling food and food products at wholesale or retail which desire to be authorized to receive food-allotment coupons in exchange for food and food products. Such registration shall constitute authority so to receive food-allotment coupons.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 201. (a) The Director may, subject to the civil-service laws and the approval of the War Food Administrator, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Director may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local and private agencies, and may utilize and establish such regional, local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Director in any case in any court. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

(b) The principal office of the Director shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place.

(c) The Director shall have authority to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; for lawbooks and books of reference; and for paper, printing, and binding) as he may deem necessary for the administration and enforcement of this act. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the purchase of supplies and services by the Director where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $250. Total administrative expenditures of all types shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this act.

(d) The Director may, from time to time, issue such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

INVESTIGATIONS, RECORDS, AND REPORTS

SEC. 202. (a) The Director is authorized to make such studies and investigations and to obtain such information as he deems necessary and proper to assist him in prescribing any rule or regulation under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and the rules and regulations thereunder.

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

SEC. 203. As a part of the food-allotment plan, the Director shall provide, in cooperation with existing agencies of the Federal, State, or local governments, or private persons or groups, for improving the buying habits, food-utilization techniques, and food-preservation methods of the participants in the food-allotment plan.

SUSPENSIONS

SEC. 204. (a) The Director is authorized to suspend from participation in the food-allotment plan any State or area, if he finds after due notice and opportunity for hearing that any agency of such State or area serving as a certifying agent under the provisions of section 8 of this act (1) has knowingly violated any provision of this act or of any rule or regulation issued by him under the provisions of this act or has knowingly certified as eligible households not entitled to such certification or submitted inaccurate data with respect to size or income of households certified and (2) is likely to fail to comply in the future with the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations issued by him or to continue such unauthorized certifications or submission of inaccurate data.

(b) The Director is authorized to suspend from participation in the food-allotment plan any State or area, if he finds after due notice and opportunity for hearing that expenditures customarily made are being withheld, or that standards of payment or payments have been made less favorable, by such State or area, or by agencies thereof, contrary to the provisions of section 7 of this act.

(c) No State or area shall be suspended in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) or (b) of this section except by written order of the Director signed by him.

(d) The Director is authorized and directed to provide by rules and regulations for the suspension from participation in the food-allotment plan of any registered food dealer, participating household, or banking institution found by him, or by any officer or employee designated by him, to hear and determine suspension proceedings, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, to have violated any provision of this act.

COUNTERFEITING OF FOOD-ALLOTMENT COUPONS

SEC. 205. Whoever shall falsely make, alter, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely made, altered, forged, or counterfeited any food-allotment coupon or coupon similar thereto for the purpose of obtaining or receiving, or of enabling any other person to obtain or receive, directly or indirectly, from the United States or any of its officers or agents, any money or other thing of value, and whoever shall transfer or utter as true, or cause to be transferred or uttered as true, any such false, forged, altered, or counterfeited food-allotment coupon or coupon similar thereto, with intent to defraud the United States, or any mercantile establishment, banking institution, or person, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 301. The Director shall render, through the War Food Administrator, semiannual reports to Congress describing the operations of the food-allotment plan, including the following: Number of eligibles and participants, by the various classes of households established; the reasons for nonparticipation of eligibles; effect of the food-allotment plan on the expenditure habits of participants; extent to which the plan increases purchases of foods of various types and other kinds of goods and services, for the various classes of households; benefits derived from the plan for the different types and groups of food sellers, wholesalers, processors, and producers; extent of improper use of food-allotment coupons; changes in relief payments, social-security payments, and other types of income of the various classes of eligibles; the amount and type of administrative expenditures incurred.

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS PROHIBITED

SEC. 302. It being the policy of Congress as provided in title I of this act to provide a national food allotment plan as a means of safeguarding the general welfare against excessive price rises and inflationary tendencies in the existing war emergency, no funds appropriated to, borrowed under congressional authorization by, or in the custody or control of, any governmental agency, including any Government-owned or controlled corporation, shall be used for subsidy or other payments with respect to the production, processing, distribution, or other handling of any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, unless the Congress shall have specifically authorized the use of such funds for such purpose.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 303. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

TERRITORIAL APPLICABILITY

SEC. 304. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

SEPARABILITY PROVISION

SEC. 305. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 306. This act may be cited as the "National Food Allotment Act."

TERMINATION OF ACT

SEC. 307. The provisions of this act, and all rules, regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such rules, regulations, orders, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

SEC. 308. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that I am quite in favor of the Bankhead bill with its limitation on subsidies, but I have felt from the beginning that the Senate would be very vulnerable if it enacted such a bill with its prohibition of subsidies without doing two things, one of which is to adopt an amendment such as we have adopted, which would provide for reimbursing farmers for any loss which they might sustain by reason of the abolition of subsidies and permit them to continue in production. In addition, I cannot vote to deprive the very poor people of our country of even the small amounts they would receive from a general subsidy, without making every effort I can make to provide some means of insuring that they have the food they must have in order to maintain their health.

The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and myself was formerly introduced as Senate bill 1331. Hearings have been held on that bill and have been completed. It is unfortunate that the printing of the hearings has been delayed for some days at the Printing Office. I do not know why the hearings have not as yet been printed and are not available today, but they are not.

However, that bill, as now submitted in the form of an amendment to the pending bill has had several days of hearings. There appeared before us representatives of farm organizations who endorsed the bill, at least in a conservative manner. Among those were representatives of the Federation of Milk Producers, of the Association of Farmer Cooperatives, and of the Grange. There also appeared before the committee, in opposition to the bill, representatives of various labor organizations, including the C. I. O. and the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen. I think one other labor organization also submitted a brief in opposition to the bill.

Opposition was expressed by the American Public Welfare Association, who thought the bill might interfere with its appropriations and might prevent it from obtaining larger appropriations, if the low-income people were temporarily taken care of by some other means. I also think I should say that the Social Security Board opposed the bill on the ground that it should have larger appropriations to enable it to distribute more cash among the people of the country.

Mr. President, in these days of high wages, high prices, and large profits, when money is spent freely and often recklessly, when there is competitive bidding in the black market for insufficient quantities of certain foods, we are likely to get the impression that everyone is well off. I wish this were so. I wish all persons had adequate means to support themselves comfortably; but that is not the case.

Millions of our American citizens do not have an income sufficient to enable them to maintain their health—to say nothing of living in luxury or even in comfort. Among these are 2,200,000 recipients of old-age pensions; 700,000 persons drawing old-age and survivors' insurance under the social-security program; about 1,000,000 disabled veterans drawing pensions or disability compensation, or their widows and dependent children; over 150,000 retired and disabled firemen, policemen, State and municipal employees; dependent children receiving aid through Federal and State welfare funds, to the number of 739,000; blind people to the number of 53,000; and many persons living on a fixed income too low to enable them to buy the food they need.

At the time the food-allotment bill was written, there was an indeterminate number of dependents of the 9,000,000 to 10,000,000 men in our armed forces who would have been eligible under the provisions of this plan. These have since been better provided for by the increase in servicemen's allotment, but no doubt there is still a large number who would be eligible.

I should like to call attention to the average amounts received as pensions or compensation by the veterans of our wars or their dependents:

One hundred and forty thousand veterans of the Spanish-American War average $57.80 a month.

Four hundred and twenty-six thousand veterans of World War No. 1 are drawing $39.02 a month, and we already have over 8,000 veterans of World War No. 2 drawing an average of $40 a month.

The widows and children of deceased veterans of the Civil War average $37.70 a month; of the Spanish-American War, $30.56; of World War No. 1, $44.11; and of World War No. 2, $48.42.

An average of $34.09 per month is being paid to the families of 13,449 men in the armed forces who died from service-connected disability in peacetime.

I would add to these numbers which I have stated several million low-income workers the amounts of whose pay checks have not increased during the years of the present war. These facts and figures will certainly bring home to us the realization that justice, mercy, and income are not being equitably dispensed. Rising costs of living at a rate comparable to the increased costs during other wars make the difficulties of these millions of low-income citizens more serious.

Most of the low-income people today are deserving. A few years ago chiselers and small-time racketeers were to be found in considerable numbers among those requesting assistance from their Government or other sources. Today the chiselers have pretty much disappeared. They would not be interested in the

small-time income which this amendment would provide. I think that is one reason why the group this amendment is intended to help is so silent. They are not organized, and they cannot demand. They are patient, law-abiding, patriotic citizens who deserve earnest consideration, just as much as do the groups which are organized and speak loudly through their spokesmen.

Mr. President, at this time I should like to read excerpts from a few letters I have just received from the kind of people who would receive some assistance from the amendment, if it should be agreed to.

I read first a letter from North Carolina, written by a resident of the home town of the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]:

DEAR SIR: I am one of the group you are trying to help. I have six children, three in school, three at home, too small to go to school. I am receiving $30 a month of A. D. C.

That is Aid to Dependent Children—

My husband lost his mind and is in the State asylum. I am really having a time. I hate to complain about prices, but God knows they are out of sight. I cannot feed and clothe them, and I don't want to give a one of them away. I don't want them to steal and do the wrong thing, to survive. I am praying that God will spare you to get that bill through. I hope it will pass.

We poor people are the hardest hit. I am sure you will make a lot of people feel more like living if that food-stamp bill passes.

I will not state the names of any of the persons who wrote the letters I read at this time.

I read now a letter which comes from Utah, from the home of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Senator AIKEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: We note with some hope your suggestions for relief for those of low-income groups. Prices go up but not our income. I am an ex-physician of 70 years, and had to retire on account of ill health. Our income last year for myself and wife was under $500. How can we live respectably on that? Who says there are no more low-income groups? I think Senators TAFT and BUSHFIELD should look around and figure this out. The plan suggested to help pay our living expenses is the first we have seen to give us any hope. After a life of 45 years of helping the sick and living well, this comes pretty hard, as you must know. They should be told of the many doctors and lawyers and other professional men in this class.

I read now an excerpt from a letter coming from a resident of New York City:

I am a retired United States customs clerk, having performed 26 years and 4 months' service in the United States Appraisers Customs Service, now at No. 201 Varick Street, New York City, first as opener and packer, then clerking for 23 years in the English cloth and manufactured clothing import duties; as to rating under various examiners—until my compulsory retirement by law as to 70 years of age, on July 5, 1939—record "Very good."

I was in the forties at my entry in the Service, and shortly after my entry the pension of Federal employees law came into effect as to $1,200 per year, 70 years of age, 30 years' service, less 2½ percent of salary and later to 3½ percent for same.

Being not able to make the 30 years, my monthly pension chec' is only $86.39 instead of $100. The question is, How are the wife and I to get along on $86.39 per month?

* * * * *

My rent is $43 per month. We allow $45 budget for eats—30 days at $1.50 per day—plus $5 per month gas and electric. These three items equal $93. Plus doctor, medicine, and shoes, and clothing, etc. How to do it, I don't know. Dear Senator if, perhaps, you could amend the $86.39 to the $100 check, we would try and pull out, as my wife is very economical. There are very few who do not leave the service under 30 years' service, and as you can readily see it was no fault of mine. Please try and help us.

Here is a letter from Kodak, Tenn.:

KODAK, TENN., *January 15, 1944.*

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: I have just read in the Knoxville News Sentinal, a Scripps Howard paper, where you have introduced a stamp campaign to increase the living of low-class earners. I am 82 years old and was born on May 23, 1861. My wife—June 18, 1877. We are trying and have raised her granddaughter who is 13 years old, and am keeping her in school every day her health will permit, on the pitiful sum of $23.90 per month we get as an old-age assistance. I have to pay $7.50 per month for a shack that leaks and is open as a barn. I cut wood out of fence rows and carry all the way from 100 to 3,000 yards on my shoulder to keep fires to burn. I feel that it would be a great Godsend if someone would come to our aid, and not be like some of our visitors who try to look after us and tell us we ought to live fine on $23.90 per month. So thanking you again for your effort I beg to remain as ever,

Yours respectfully.

I shall not read anymore of these letters. There are plenty of them, for there are millions of such people all over the United States. I should like to place more such letters in the RECORD.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator an estimate of how many million?

Mr. AIKEN. I will come to that very shortly.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator said there were millions. I wondered how many millions.

Mr. AIKEN. Millions of people in the United States do not have enough to eat, and do not have sufficient means to keep warm.

Mr. TAFT. I am asking if there is an estimate of the number.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall come to that as soon as I can.

It has been said that the distribution of food allotment coupons would be humiliating to some of those who are forced by necessity to request them.

I presume there are those of whom this is true. I am glad that we still have proud people in our country. The fact is, however, that under the old stamp plan between 60 percent and 80 percent of those eligible made application for stamps.

The fact is that pride has not caused some of our higher income persons to decline subsidies. Everywhere all through our land wartime bonuses are being paid and there is no record of broken pride. Even the employees of the United States Government have received bonuses of $300 and up to help out on the cost of wartime living, and I have heard no loud cries of resentment yet—not even from my own office. The people whom this amendment is designed to help are the ones who unfortunately cannot get cash bonuses or increases in salaries. A large part of them are unable to work for one reason or another. Many of them work in civilian industry which has been shut down because of the war. They live in small towns. Their income is cut off. Thousands are borderline cases who may have to call upon their local government for help in the near future. Which will humble them most—to accept a wartime bonus to help out on the cost of living as higher paid groups are being helped, or a listing in the books of public relief and charity, which they do not deserve? During the great depression I saw people living under wretched conditions and doing without proper food to keep from going on relief. Most of them, however, accepted the stamp plan.

It is the purpose of this amendment to provide equitable distribution of food in order to maintain health and productive capacity during wartime among low-income consumers. The amendment has been generally referred to as the stamp plan. It should not, however, be confused with the old stamp plan which was used partly as a relief measure and partly as a means of utilizing surplus farm commodities.

This plan provided for in this amendment attempts to make the best possible use of the experience gained through the application of the old stamp plan and at the same time eliminate the difficulties of that plan.

I wish to make it clear that the amendment would not create any new organization for administering a food allotment plan. It would be under the direct supervision of a deputy director of the food distribution administration, but the actual application will be in the hands of existing State, local, and, in some instances, private agencies.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Under the Senator's amendment, what is the date of expiration of the plan?

Mr. AIKEN. Six months after the war. The bill as drawn carried in the preamble a statement that it could be used after the war for distribution of farm surpluses, which some of us felt would then exist. That part of the preamble, however, has been deleted.

Because of regional variations of conditions, it is advisable to have this plan administered by persons familiar with each locality. For this same reason, provision is also made for regional differences with respect to the reasonable cost of the basic food allotments.

Administrative costs are to be paid by the Federal Government and must not exceed 5 percent of the funds appropriated. The amendment sets no minimum income for determining eligibility be-

cause this amount would vary according to the variation in living costs. It does, however, require a redetermination of such costs every 6 months.

The measure of eligibility is the insufficiency of normal food expenditures of households of various sizes and income classifications to meet the cost of basic food allotment.

A basic food allotment is defined as the amount of various kinds of food per person per week representing a minimum adequate diet. I must confess that the diet as defined in paragraph (c) of section 4 of the amendment is a pretty good diet for a minimum. The diet prescribed has been worked out by the most efficient home economists. It undoubtedly smacks of idealism because it does prescribe what is supposed to be a perfect diet. It is probably a better diet than most persons enjoy today, even though they can amply afford it.

The percentage of this diet which would be given to people in distress would be entirely dependent upon the amount which the Appropriations Committee and the Congress might be willing to appropriate. We have set up in the amendment what is designed to be a perfectly balanced diet. However, I do not think any of us believe that the time will come in the near future when everyone in the United States will be enjoying a perfect diet. However, it is a mark to shoot at. It should be our aim to see that everyone enjoys an ample, well-balanced diet, and we might as well aim for the bull's-eye in hopes that we may run up a better score than we have up to now.

The strength of a nation depends largely upon the health of its people, and health depends upon an adequate amount of the right kind of food.

The War Food Administration, which has approved this food-allotment plan in principle, has estimated that the current average cost of the basic food allotment as outlined in the amendment would be approximately $646 a year for an average family of four persons. It appears that the average family of four, spending $646 a year for food, should be receiving an average income of not less than $2,350 a year.

This would vary according to the section of the country in which the people lived. The amendment is elastic enough to take care of such variations. The $3,000,000,000 figure is the maximum amount that could be spent under this amendment if every person receiving less than $2,500 per year for a family of four received every dollar's worth of coupons to which he might conceivably be entitled. In other words, $3,000,000,000 would not provide a perfect diet for every person in the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There seem to be two conflicting provisions. Section 303 provides as follows:

SEC. 303. The appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act is hereby authorized.

Section 308 provides as follows:

SEC. 308. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say to the Senator from Ohio that this amendment in Senate bill 1331 is made over. I do not doubt that there are some technical errors in it, but I do not doubt the ability of a conference committee to correct them.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What I wanted to ask was whether it is intended to limit the appropriation to $500,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. It is intended to limit the amount of the authorization to $500,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to suggest to the Senator that he modify his amendment by striking out that section.

Mr. TAFT. Section 303.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In writing it over and offering it as an amendment, apparently inadvertently that provision was left in.

Mr. AIKEN. I assure the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Wisconsin that I gladly accept any modifications which will correct any purely technical and unintentional errors in the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to modify his amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified as indicated.

Mr. AIKEN. It is rather startling to learn that there are as many as 60,000,000 people in this country receiving an income at a rate less than $2,500 per year for a family of four.

In some large areas of our country over 99 percent of the people would undoubtedly be eligible for assistance if Congress should choose this criterion. However, they certainly would not be eligible under the $500,000,000 limitation.

It goes without saying that Congress would not, at the present time at least, use these figures as a yardstick in applying the provisions of the act. The amendment provides, however, that if sufficient funds are not appropriated to make up the full difference between normal food expenditures and the cost of the basic food allotment, the food allotment coupons may be used to supplement normal purchases in such a way as to enable participating families to buy a certain percentage of the basic amounts. A reduction in the allowance for food coupons would also mean a decrease in the number of eligible families and persons.

If we should consider that eligibility should be based on a minimum income of $2,500 for a family of 4, we would find that 60,000,000 people would be eligible to receive food-allotment coupons to some degree. If every one of these—both families and single individuals—took advantage of their eligibility and received the fullest amount of coupons that could be allotted, the total cost is estimated to be $3,000,000,000.

Assume that the Congress decides to allow only 90 percent of the full basic diet, which would probably still be as good as or better than that enjoyed by the members of this body. The number of persons eligible would drop from 60,000,000 to 50,000,000, while the cost would drop from $3,000,000,000 down to $2,300,000,000, still assuming there would be 100 percent participation by all eligibles. But it is not likely that, even though authorized, the Congress would even appropriate for 90 percent of a full basic diet. It is more likely that a figure of 60 percent would be chosen, in which case the number of persons eligible would drop to 22,800,000 and the total cost would be about $600,000,000 if everyone eligible participated fully.

However, experience has shown that when the stamp plan was in effect, only 60 to 80 percent of the low-income people took advantage of it.

Assuming that 70 percent of those eligible take advantage of this food-allotment program and receive coupons to enable them to enjoy a 60-percent diet, the total cost would amount to $420,000,000. This amount would substantially raise the living standards of 16,000,000 of our lowest income people and protect them against actual want.

These 16,000,000 people are the ones who are in real need and should have their meager income supplemented in order to maintain their health and efficiency and a reasonable degree of security and happiness. These are the people who average $1,100 a year or less for a family of four.

If we wish to go down still further and subsidize only to the amount of 50 percent of the basic diet, we would find that 19,600,000 persons eligible could be taken care of at a cost of $389,000,000 if all participated or $282,000,000 if 70 percent participated.

It is obvious that the really low income group of our country could be raised from a state of want, though not to a state of luxury, by any means, for approximately $400,000,000 a year.

This amendment is not a relief measure, and it will not relieve States, counties, or municipalities of the duties with which they are now charged.

One of the witnesses before the committee testified that persons of low income should call on their local welfare agencies when they are in need. I advised him that it was the purpose of this bill to keep such persons from having to call on their local welfare agencies because a large percentage of them are not to blame for their present situation and should not be humiliated by being obliged to go "on the town," as we say in New England.

Section 9 of the amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 9. No moneys herein or hereafter appropriated for the purposes of this act shall be expended in lieu of Federal, State, or local expenditures customarily made for the direct benefit of households within the income

groups found eligible to receive food-allotment coupons. Present standards for the payment, and payments, of social-security and other types of assistance shall not be made less favorable to the recipients or applicants for such assistance, by reason of the operation of the food-allotment plan.

The purpose of this section is clearly to prevent local governments from unloading their own responsibilities onto the Federal Government, and to prevent them from cutting down the allowances they are now making to old-age-assistance recipients or others.

Under section 10 the director is charged with designating appropriate State, local, and private agencies and ration boards to carry out the provisions of the act. Only in case that the director finds upon investigation that appropriate State, local, and private agencies are not available he may establish local offices and employ suitable personnel to receive applications, to determine eligibility, and certify eligibles. Provision for the use of private agencies and for the establishment of federally employed personnel in local offices is made to cover the remote contingency that local or State agencies might not be available in some localities.

It is the expectation, Mr. President, that if this program should be adopted, wherever possible the local ration board would be the agency to certify persons for the supplementary income in the form of food-allotment coupons.

It is not expected that setting up the machinery for the administration of the food-allotment plan would be difficult. The actual work of certifying families would rest almost wholly with local boards. The part which the Federal Government played in the administration of the old stamp plan was neither difficult nor expensive. There is no reason to believe that the administration of the plan contemplated by this amendment would be much more so.

Mr. President, I am covering the ground as fast as I can, because I realize that it is growing late. I want to get through with this bill tonight just as much as does any other Senator. However, I do not want to get through with it until I have had a chance to go on record in regard to this amendment, and secure its adoption, if possible.

The Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration would issue coupons on the certification of the local board. These coupons would be used for the purchase of food only through the normal channels of trade.

The reason for that is that we do not want to provide for setting up Government stores for the distribution of food through this amendment or this food-allotment plan. In the amendment itself it is provided—

The Director shall provide by regulation a simple method for the registration of mercantile establishments selling food and food products at wholesale or retail, which desire to be authorized to receive food-allotment coupons in exchange for food and food products. Such registration shall constitute authority so to receive food-allotment coupons.

In other words, all food purchased with these coupons will be purchased through the normal channels of trade.

The Director is authorized to provide for redemption of food-allotment coupons exchanged for food and food products through the cooperation of the Treasury Department, the General Accounting Office, and banking institutions throughout the Nation. He shall designate banking institutions to accept coupons from sellers of food at retail and wholesale. The amendment provides that banking institutions so serving shall be paid reasonable expenses incurred in such capacity.

Section 203 provides for an educational program as a part of the food-allotment plan. Experience has shown that low-income housewives are, for the most part, anxious to make every penny do as much as possible, and welcome any information which will enable them to improve their buying habits, food utilization techniques, and food-preservation methods.

It is not intended that any new agency shall undertake any additional program, but that the Food Distribution Administration shall cooperate with home demonstration agents and other existing agencies in the program.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, if I may take a short cut to the Senator's argument, would about the same technique be employed under his proposal as was employed under the food-stamp operation before?

Mr. AIKEN. The same technique would be employed, and I have had very extensive consultation with those who administered the old food-stamp plan, and they think they have taken the "bugs" out of it, as faults are called in agency parlance.

Mr. BONE. I know that when that plan was in operation before, it proved to be very popular, at least in my section of the country, and very acceptable. I am much interested in the Senator's argument.

Mr. AIKEN. Some faults were developed in the old food-stamp program. I do not think they ever came to the attention of the public, and we have attempted to remove them by the amendment. However, I dare say some will still remain, and others may develop as time goes on.

Section 302 of the amendment, under the subtitle of "Subsidy Payments Prohibited," has stirred objection on the part of some who might favor the rest of it. Perhaps "controlled" would be a better word that "prohibited." Such a change would be perfectly acceptable to me.

However, if one reads this section through, he will find that the only subsidies prohibited are those which have not been authorized by the Congress. The whole subsidy controversy is based upon a difference in the interpretation of the wording of the Price Control Act.

Certainly, no one believing in Government by the people can argue that executive agencies should be permitted to violate acts of the Congress any more than individual citizens should be permitted to. A Government should have an exemplary standing before its people. It is to be presumed that in the near future Congress will definitely specify the subsidies which it deems to have been authorized.

It is clear that in these days, when a large part of our population has adequate, if not excessive, purchasing power, and the Government is asking for more and more taxes in an effort to avoid inflation and finance expenditures, no one can consistently advocate any form of subsidy which adds appreciably to the already excessive purchasing power of at least half of our citizens.

A direct subsidy to those who really need it will, to a large extent, nullify the arguments of those who insist that all persons should have subsidized food. Not a dollar authorized by this amendment would contribute to inflation, because the people eligible would have no excessive purchasing power under its provisions.

We cannot estimate the value received from this food-allotment plan in terms of dollars and cents alone. By assuring millions of our people enough to eat, we will be insuring many of them against the ravages of disease. We will keep an indeterminate number of them from calling upon their civic governments for relief. We will maintain or improve the efficiency of those who through part-time employment or otherwise are contributing materially to the war effort.

We cannot put a dollar-and-cents value upon the eyesight or the health of children now growing up in these borderline families. The money spent under the provisions of this plan might be returned to our country many times over in dividends of health and efficiency.

Mr. President, I have given a general rather than a technical description of the food-allotment plan which the Senator from Wisconsin and I propose. I reiterate what I stated at the beginning, I know it is not a perfect plan. As I said, we have tried to profit from the experience gained in applying the old stamp plan, and even though our plan is not perfect, I believe it is better than any other plan which has yet been presented for taking care of those who actually need assistance. We have taken care of every member of our own office forces, $300 or more being given to each, and they have not been humiliated by it. I do not believe those who receive a little help from their Government during this period are going to be more humiliated than they would be by going to local relief authorities and asking for help.

The amendment provides, in section 307, that the provisions of the proposed law and all rules, regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress. It is proposed as a temporary act, but it is my hope that a year's experience with this plan, during which time I surely expect faults to become apparent, will provide us with such further experience and information that we may well make it the basis of a sound

program which in the future will insure to each and every citizen of our Nation a diet which will enable him to maintain his health and efficiency in such a manner that he will be of the fullest value to society.

Mr. President, it has been said, and I read in the newspaper this morning, that the President would surely veto the Bankhead bill. I presume the assertion, which is credited to our revered majority leader, is probably correct, but vetoing the Bankhead bill as now written and vetoing the Bankhead bill with this amendment in it would be two entirely different things. I have many times disagreed with the President. I have certainly not been one of his advisers; I have sometimes suspected his motives, and I believe him to be a very shrewd politician, at least up to this time, but I do not believe he is cruel enough to veto any bill which we send him which provides that 15,000,000 or 18,000,000 people in need and distress in this country shall have enough to eat.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Vermont takes his seat I should like to have it clear in the RECORD that the amendment now proposed and the bill which we joined in introducing are different in that the amendment provides a very much more restricted operation of the plan, both so far as income levels are concerned, and insofar as the assistance which individuals could receive from it are concerned.

I fear that perhaps from some of the Senator's statements with regard to the original bill, which, frankly, we expected the committee to curtail and pare down, the impression might be left that we were now offering as an amendment the full scope of the original bill. Such is not the case, and I wanted that to appear definitely of record, so that Senators would not be under any misapprehension as to what they would be called upon to vote on, especially those Senators who are not present, and who may read the RECORD. In other words, the pending proposal is limited to $500,000,000, and under a $500,000,000 program, depending of course on the percentage applying for assistance, and assuming an experience under this plan similar to that we had under the last stamp plan, it would not be possible to extend assistance to families who are receiving incomes in excess of $1,200.

I wanted that point to be made clear because I think, perhaps, the impression might have been created by the Senator's statement with regard to the original bill that the amendment applied to families with incomes of $2,350 or less.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct in his statement. The $500,000,000 limitation probably will not permit any extension of the benefits to families of four, having an income of more than $1,200 or probably $1,250 a year. Further than that, before even that assistance could be granted the matter would have to come before the Congress again, be submitted to the Appropriations Committees, and they might cut it down even below that figure, although I should hope they would not, because I think the poor people of the country need $500,000,000 worth of help. But if we are to give 15 percent of our people $500,000,000 in benefits through a general subsidy program, we would have to spend three and a half to four billion dollars to give them the same kind of help we can give them through a food allotment plan for only $500,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had been hoping that we might finish action on the bill today, but in view of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont it is obvious that we cannot do so. I am anxious that we conclude action on the measure as early tomorrow as possible, and to that end I shall propose a unanimous-consent request. I understand the Senator from Wisconsin desires to address the Senate tomorrow on the amendment for a little longer than the time limit I had in mind. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin be recognized at the beginning of tomorrow's session, and that following his address no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on the bill, or any amendment or any motion pertaining thereto until final action is taken.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think the agreement will be satisfactory to me, but I have three amendments which I propose to offer, and have printed and lie on the table. Of course, a Senator can take time on the bill and on amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, but a Senator cannot speak on the bill three times. He can take 20 minutes on any of the amendments, and 20 minutes on the bill. Under the agreement the Senator would not be permitted to speak more than once on the bill. I hope the Senator from Florida will not object to the proposal.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall not object, Mr. President.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I share the desire of the leader of the majority that there may be a conclusion reached with respect to this measure, and I express hope that the unanimous-consent request which the Senator has proffered may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the proper time, before the passage of the pending measure, I intend to move to strike out the subsidies authorized by the so-called Bankhead bill. I am opposed to all subsidies, and intend to move to strike out the favored subsidies authorized and covered by the Bankhead bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ewell K. Jett, of Maryland, to be a member for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1943.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am personally in favor of the confirmation of this nomination, but there are Members on this side who might want to say something about it. I therefore ask that the nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the foreign service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, these are automatic promotions. I ask that the nominations in the foreign service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the foreign-service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs, to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Navy Personnel in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Medical Director Ross T McIntire, to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Civil Engineer Ben Moreell,

to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 11, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., of Douglaston, N. Y., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Robert E. Hannegan, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Admiral Raymond A. Spruance, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 4th day of February 1944.

Rear Admiral Richmond K. Turner, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 4th day of February 1944.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Annie L. Bell, Slocomb, Ala., in place of Walter A. Blount, transferred.

William Harry Tillery, Vinemont, Ala., in place of Maurice W. Holmes, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

George S. Clarke, Grossmont, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alfred S. Rusconi, San Joaquin, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth P. Wilson, Spring Valley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

COLORADO

Maggie Jacobsen, Naturita, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edna A. Kennedy, Peetz, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alice J. Reed, Sanford, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Merrill D. Harshman, Wiggins, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

GEORGIA

Melcena Royal, Ambrose, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Floyd L. Crawford, Appling, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Billy S. Hickman, Colbert, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Cleone M. Fincher, Culloden, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

IOWA

Ambrose J. Leinhauser, Agency, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth Longenecker, Aurora, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Earl T. Van Metre, Clemons, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hannah Nelson, Stratford, Iowa, in place of Hilma L. Peterson. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

KANSAS

Martin A. Basgall, Hays, Kans., in place of Joseph B. Basgall. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

KENTUCKY

Mary M. Stahr, Hickman, Ky., in place of Henry L. Amberg, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Charles R. Dupleix, Youngsville, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MASSACHUSETTS

Josephine M. Welsh, Sudbury, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elizabeth C. Kelley, Thorndike, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Agatha M. Gertken, St. Joseph, Minn., in place of John V. Schroeder, resigned.

MISSOURI

Lloyd Sapp, Ashland, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eugene W. Kurtz, Wyaconda, Mo., in place of Mabel Smulling, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Iona A. Jenness, Rye, N. H. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Irene Bruno Ameele, East Williamson, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Beulah Meier, Holtsville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth P. Bailey, Advance, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lawrence G. Garvin, Avondale, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Manning B. Mahafee, Caroleen, N. C. Office became Presidential April 1, 1943.

Albert K. Dickens, Castalia, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edelweiss Mishoe, Castle Hayne, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thomas G. Long, East Rockingham, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margueritte M. Wells, Henrietta, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Zora Leah Thomas, Hiddenite, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ruth B. Hickey, Hiwassee Dam, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Grace Pugh, Hudson, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Marion H. Current, Leicester, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Margaret L. Rourk, Leland, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lossie S. Campbell, Lucama, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Arthur Lee Nicholson, Macon, N. C., in place of Lula G. Harris, retired.

Annie F. Briscoe, Mill Spring, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Elma B. Harris, Mooresboro, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bessie C. Cox, Newton Grove, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Samuel P. Covington, Pinnacle, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lawrence V. Sigmon, Rosman, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sue C. Worsham, Ruffin, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

McLain L. Furr, Stanfield, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hardee C. Butler, Tuxedo, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Maggie S. Cooley, Wagram, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eva Walker, Walkertown, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH DAKOTA

Noble O. Julson, Plaza, N. Dak., in place of John C. Black, deceased.

OHIO

Ella B. Morgan, Fairpoint, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Neil E. Smith, Noble, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OKLAHOMA

Elijah E. Meggs, Fort Towson, Okla., in place of Carrie M. Wynn, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Albert R. Hinkle, Clearfield, Pa., in place of Seth W. Bloom, deceased.

Hazle Houseberg, East Bangor, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Amelia Teuchert, Milmont Park, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

A. Blanche McClain, Picture Rocks, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George Ed. Reed, Vanderbilt, Pa., in place of George Ed. Reed, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Curtis W. Younger, Atwood, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katie Potts, Bon Aqua, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Glennie K. Harrison, Cosby, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Hollis K. Stephenson, Eagleville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Shafter E. Kidwell, Mohawk, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James T. McCabe, Richard City, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edith D. Hill, Shouns, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Leta McElligott, Bells, Tex., in place of Daniel T. McElligott, deceased

Andrew R. Davis, Brackettville, Tex., in place of Edith M. Bursey, removed.

John A. Leinweber, Ingram, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sislie Curtis, Larue, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sallye Godbold, Leakey, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lura E. Seale, Lolita, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Wayland B. Weatherred, Pampa, Tex., in place of Curry H. Walker, retired.

Albert W. Mosley, Purdon, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Harleigh A. Somers, Barnet, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Jippie S. Yeatts, Hurt, Va. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1943.

WEST VIRGINIA

Jesse C. Garlow, Maidsville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Icie O. Anderson, Watson, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John C. Coleman, Wilcoe, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WYOMING

Andrew Lee Johnson, Jackson, Wyo., in place of Robert B. Landfair, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 10 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

To be a consul of the United States of America

Leslie W. Johnson

PROMOTIONS

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Don C. Bliss, Jr.	Alfred T. Nester
Walter J. Donnelly	Albert F. Nufer
William R. Langdon	

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Donald F. Bigelow	Renwick S. McNiece
David McK. Key	Warwick Perkins
Marcel E. Malige	J. Bartlett Richards

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

H. Merrell Benninghoff	C. Paul Fletcher
	Winthrop S. Greene
Gilson G. Blake	William M. Gwynn
Joseph F. Burt	Eugene M. Hinkle
Reginald S. Castleman	Clarence E. Macy
Vinton Chapin	E. Talbot Smith
Prescott Childs	Francis H. Styles
Charles H. Derry	

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Sidney A. Belovsky	Cloyce K. Huston
Cavendish W. Cannon	Perry N. Jester
Augustus S. Chase	Kenneth C. Krentz
William P. Cochran, Jr.	J. Hall Paxton
	Guy W. Ray
Gerald A. Drew	Walter N. Walmsley, Jr.
Monroe B. Hall	Robert S. Ward

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Walworth Barbour	Patrick Mallon
Jacob D. Beam	Robert Mills McClintock
Barry T. Benson	
Max Waldo Bishop	Edward D. McLaughlin
William E. Flournoy, Jr.	Troy L. Perkins
	Kennett F. Potter
Morris N. Hughes	Joseph P. Ragland
Miss Elizabeth Humes	John F. Stone
C. Grant Isaacs	Tyler Thompson
Robert Janz	Joseph I. Touchette
Charles F. Knox, Jr.	William C. Trimble
Henry P. Leverich	Whitney Young
Raymond P. Ludden	
Thomas J. Maleady	

To be Foreign Service officers of class 7 of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

John L. Bankhead	Andrew G. Lynch
M. Williams Blake	Robert B. Memminger
Carl Breuer	Charles S. Millet
William F. Busser	Bolard More
Thomas S. Campen	Brewster H. Morris
David M. Clark	Jack B. Neathery
Harry M. Donaldson	Miss Katherine E. O'Connor
Jay Dixon Edwards	
Perry Ellis	John Ordway
James Espy	Charles O. Thompson
Richard D. Gatewood	S. Roger Tyler, Jr.
John L. Goshie	Woodruff Wallner
John D. Jernegan	Philip P. Williams
Hartwell Johnson	Robert E. Wilson
Easton T. Kelsey	

To be Foreign Service Officers of class 8 of the United States of America, effective November 16, 1943

Roland K. Beyer	George D. Henderson
Niles W. Bond	John P. Hoover
Robert P. Chalker	Donald W. Lamm
Wimberley DeR. Coerr	Frederick J. Mann
V. Lansing Collins, Jr.	Delano McKelvey
Adrian B. Colquitt	Miss Minedee McLean
Thomas J. Cory	Julian L. Nugent, Jr.
Edward A. Dow, Jr.	Joseph Palmer 2d
Nicholas Feld	Richard H. Post
William N. Fraleigh	M. Robert Rutherford
John C. Fuess	Robert C. Strong
Boies C. Hart, Jr.	J. Kittredge Vinson
Richard H. Hawkins, Jr.	Alfred T. Wellborn
	Charles H. Whitaker

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Medical Director Ross T McIntire to rank as vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Surgeon General and Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Civil Engineer Ben Moreell to rank as vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy, to rank from February 1, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

TENNESSEE

George T. Cunningham, Dukedom.
James O. Massey, Finger.
Eugene N. Miller, Vanleer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause His face to shine upon us, that Thy way may be known on earth, Thy saving health among all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. Let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations upon earth. Let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; then God, even our own God, shall bless us. God shall bless us and all the ends of the earth shall fear Him.

Our Father, who art in heaven: Hallowed be Thy name, Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread, and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 10, 1944.*
Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives:

I wish to present my resignation as a member of the House Pensions Committee, to take effect immediately.

Respectfully,

P. W. GRIFFITHS,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 432), which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, as follows:

Committee on Insular Affairs: LEON H. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania; P. W. GRIFFITHS, of Ohio.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Committee on Enrolled Bills: SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, Jr., of Pennsylvania.

Committee on the Territories: JOSEPH M. PRATT, of Pennsylvania.

Committee on War Claims: JOSEPH M. PRATT, of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SOCIALISTIC FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, those who have been fearful that America will be remade along communistic lines will be reassured by yesterday's statement of the Vice President. It is so important that I shall trespass upon the time of the House to read it. Quoting the Vice President:

> We are not going to use the whole Russian political and economic system here.

CONDITIONS AT CAMP SHANKS, N. Y.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the New York Daily News, after an investigation of the deplorable conditions existing at Camp Shanks, Orangeburg, Rockland County, N. Y., in my new congressional district, made a number of exceedingly serious charges about a month ago of the corruption, malpractices, and irregularities concerning one of the largest military camps in the Nation. The charges were so shocking in regard to the construction of the camp and the conduct of the military personnel there that the public interest requires immediate action, to turn the searchlight of pitiless investigation upon all those responsible for the prevailing conditions which are a disgrace and an insult to hundreds of thousands of soldiers who have been quartered in this embarkation camp.

I have visited many Army camps, but, have seen none constructed on such a flimsy basis as Camp Shanks. The barracks are unfit for winter use, without a steam-heating system and totally inadequate to afford protection against the winter storms and rain and snow. In justice to our soldiers who use these leaky and wind-blown barracks, while awaiting transportation overseas, there should be no further delay in ascertaining the facts and holding those responsible for the conditions there strictly accountable.

The charges made by the New York Daily News are of such a serious nature

that there should be an immediate investigation by Congress, the War Department, and the Department of Justice to get to the bottom of a disgraceful situation that can only undermine the morale of these soldiers who are quartered there and reflect on the Army officials responsible.

I hope the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], will expedite action through the War Frauds Section of the F. B. I., and that his committee will also take proper steps to have the barracks renovated and to improve the living conditions of the servicemen at at Camp Shanks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Eaton (Ohio) Register-Herald, of January 26, 1944, which quotes from an address by our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOOD CONDITIONS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, during recent months I have come into the well of the House, each time urging the people to save food, and the people have conserved food. Yet in Philadelphia today, according to headlines in the newspapers, produce rots by the carload. Tons of the food is left on the city dumps, while 427 carloads of fruit and vegetables cannot be unloaded, and 92 carloads of potatoes and fruits are sent to the city dumps. No one to haul them away, they say, while 75 carloads of potatoes, 45,000 pounds to the car, are rotting, blaming it on the high prices—prices quoted are just the same as before the war. For instance, celery retailing at 10 cents per stalk; beets, two bunches for 15 cents; spinach, 2 pounds for 23 cents; lettuce, 12 cents per head. These vegetables retailed at prices higher than this many times during the past 10 years.

Among the items of perishable food were 41 carloads of cabbage, 51 carloads of celery, 35 carloads of carrots, 17 carloads of spinach, and 44 cars of mixed and less popular vegetables.

Things of this kind were unheard of in the days when farm produce flowed through the ordinary channels of trade.

Just a year ago, Philadelphia had a famine in virtually every line of fresh fruit and produce. I am wondering just how soon they will have the next famine. Someone is losing a tremendous lot of money, either the farmers or the shippers, and the consumer also shares in the loss. Think of the cost of the freight alone and the fact that these cars could have been used to haul war materials instead. The Office of Price Administration revealed yesterday that the price of eggs must be reduced from 5 to 9 cents per dozen before the end of the week. Producers on the Atlantic seaboard are now receiving from 20 to 30 cents per dozen for fresh eggs, while the cost of production is above 40 cents per dozen. The Government is asking to have less pork, less poultry, and fewer eggs produced during 1944. One thing is sure, they are going to get less and at the same time they are promising to supply the whole world with these commodities.

Unless this House supplies sufficient funds for the O. P. A. to carry on they will automatically have to fold up July 1. In the light of their past record and their immediate performance I am wondering what kind of an argument they are going to present to justify the needed appropriation.

INCOME-TAX RETURNS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEISS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS SYSTEMS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, on February 3 I made an address and inserted some of my remarks in the RECORD pertaining to Juan Trippe and the Pan American Airlines and included in that speech comments pertaining to the directorships occupied by Mr. Leo T. Crowley. The information that I had was secured from a directory which is utilized by the banks and business people of this Nation, which gives the record of the men on the boards of directors of corporations throughout the United States.

I received a communication from Mr. Crowley under date of February 4, which I feel, in all fairness to him, should be presented to the House. I read it accordingly:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 4, 1944.*

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Confirming our telephone conversation of this morning with respect to your speech on the floor of the House yesterday, and so that you may be fully informed of my association with the Lehman Corporation and Pan American Airways System, I was elected to the board of directors of the Lehman Corporation on October 16, 1941. I never attended a directors' meeting, and I resigned from the board December 12, 1941. I was elected a director of the Pan American Airways System in May 1941. I attended one directors' meeting, at which time I indicated my desire to resign. Thereafter I never attended a directors' meeting, and I resigned on August 7, 1943.

I appreciate your giving me the opportunity to submit to you the facts in respect to the foregoing.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

LEO CROWLEY.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Cleveland Press relative to the strange problems brought up by the complex tax methods.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMERICAN OIL PIPE LINE IN PERSIA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution asking for a survey of the proposed Ickes Persian pipe line and also a survey of the entire oil petroleum situation as regards this country both at home and abroad. New England has suffered more than any section as the result of the lack of planning regarding petroleum and petroleum products. New York has suffered much, following New England in the extent of its suffering, and the entire east coast also has suffered. I contend that there has been no excuse for that suffering. We should certainly have the entire picture before the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

ALIEN LABOR LEADERS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article on tax simplification.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE RAYMOND CLAPPER

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that on Sunday next, at the Press Club in Washington, a memorial ceremony will be held for Raymond Clapper, a man who devoted his entire life to bringing real news from the spot to the reading public and who lost his life

on February 3 in an airplane crash in the Marshall Islands. Mr. Clapper is the sixteenth war correspondent who has lost his life in this war bringing news to the American public from the spot.

On April 9, 1943, I introduced H. R. 2445—to provide for the issuance of a medal in recognition of the services of war correspondents. I again ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to give consideration to the matter of providing a medal for war correspondents who are doing such an admirable job.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to the coal shortage.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRACHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial with reference to the Northeast Airport.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in the first to include a letter from an Army private, and in the second instance to include an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WAR LABOR BOARD AND UNION MEMBERSHIP RAIDING

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, without in any way disagreeing with anything that was stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] about Mr. Smith, the secretary of the M. E. S. A. union, who has called out some 53,000 skilled workers in strikes throughout Ohio and Michigan, there is something else that should be borne in mind. That union is striking because they have been denied an election to determine a bargaining unit and because on these various Government boards and agencies, like the N. L. R. B. and the War Labor Board, the independent unions do not have representatives. The C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. and the employers all have representatives on these various boards, but the independent unions do not have a representative there. So when either the A. F. of L. or the C. I. O. start to raid a union's membership, the independents are helpless and their union can be destroyed by these boards and the other unions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what about this soldier-vote business that you were in such a hurry about last week?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is reserving the right to object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, worthier hands have taken it over. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves the right to object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us the legislative program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to do so.

On Monday, District day, I understand there are four or five bills, the numbers of which I do not have readily available, but I understand from the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia the District day calendar might take about an hour.

I shall get the numbers of the bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is not expected that they will be controversial?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding. I will see that the whips on both sides are advised as to the numbers of those bills.

Then a resolution has been reported out of the Rules Committee today, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], House Resolution 346, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate a program for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber. I intend to call that up on Monday. Of course, if the bill in relation to the additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior is not disposed of today, I will call that up Monday, after the District of Columbia business is disposed of. In any event, I shall place in order the resolution by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] after the District business and after the Assistant Secretary of the Interior bill is out of the way.

If any matter comes up on Monday where there is a roll call on the passage, I will be glad to have the roll call taken on Tuesday, if that is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then on Tuesday there will be the call of individual bills on the Private Calendar; not the omnibus bills.

I understand the resolution offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] will take only 1 hour. I think it is a fine resolution, and I do not think there is any controversy about it. I know of no opposition, but naturally the Rules Committee had to act on it. Whether the full hour will be taken or not, I do not know, but I do not think there is any controversy in that bill.

Then on Tuesday, H. R. 3209, authorizing construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substitutes to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, 2 hours of general debate have been provided. That will be the next order of business after the Anderson resolution, but not before Tuesday, and after the call of the individual bills on the Private Calendar. I doubt if anything else will be taken up that day.

I am putting down for Wednesday another bill on which a rule was reported out today, H. R. 4103, on which 1 hour of debate is provided. That is a bill to provide for the loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances. It is from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

I am informed that the Committee on Appropriations will report two appropriation bills on Wednesday, one, the civil functions bill, and the other, the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments appropriation bill. Both of those will be reported out. I am informed there is no difficulty or controversy about the civil functions bill. It may not take very long on its passage.

Acting upon that information I have asked that the other bill should be ready to be reported out on Wednesday and it is my understanding that it will be reported. I spoke to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], chairman of that subcommittee and I have spoken to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman of the subcommittee, handling the civil functions bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania informs me it will not take more than half an hour, or probably an hour to finish that bill. Assuming it requires longer, then the other appropriation bill will come up on Thursday and Friday. I think it is important to get through the appropriations bills as quickly as possible.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is anxious to know, if the conferees should happen to make a report on the soldiers' voting bill, whether a place would be provided for that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, absolutely. I am sure it is understood that any program I announce is always subject to the understanding that when conference reports come in they will be brought up as quickly as possible. Certainly if the conferees should agree on that bill, it will be brought up as quickly as possible after it is reported in.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman can help me a little. Am I right in assuming that the Senate has sent three bills here?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I do not know that I can help the gentleman out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You being the leader, I went to the highest source. I am just coming to you now.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman asks the question seriously.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Surely, about this soldiers' voting bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that there is one completed bill with differences between the two branches; that is in conference. There is another bill that has been passed by the Senate. That is my understanding.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can you tell us which one they really want?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman from Michigan is again asking a very serious question and that is a matter for the majority of both branches of the Congress to deal with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am a little disturbed about the program with reference to the appropriation bills, because the program as suggested would bring the reading of the bill right into Washington's Birthday, which I imagine would be a bad time. That is the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments' bill. There is likely to be quite a little excitement over that bill. In view of that fact, I am a little disturbed about the program which brings the reading of the bill right into Washington's birthday. It does not make any difference to me. I have to be here anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose we let the program, as I have announced it, stand for the time being. Of course, the gentleman from New York knows that I like to make the program as nearly as possible satisfactory to all the Members. I suggest that we leave the program stand and then we can discuss that later.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from New York that Washington's Birthday does not come next week.

Mr. TABER. But it comes the week after. If these bills are reported out on Wednesday, and general debate disposed of on Thursday and Friday, and perhaps Monday, we would have the reading of the bill on Washington's Birthday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that the conferees on the soldiers' voting bill have not been selected in the Senate. When they are selected it is our intention to move forward as rapidly as possible.

I think it would be a wholesome thing if it could go over Sunday and Lincoln's Birthday. I almost wish we could move Washington's Birthday up to get it in too. Then we might have a complete revival of righteousness here and at the other end of the Capitol, and might get them to adopt the constitutional States' rights bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must interpose. Comity between the two bedies has always been zealously guarded by all of us.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I did not violate the rules of the House. I did not refer to a Senator. I said the other body.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was objecting to the adjective the gentleman used.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, a revival of righteousness will not hurt them; nor would it hurt here.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

SAM HARDY

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee of the House is very fortunate in having as its messenger an outstanding character, Sam Hardy, who yesterday completed 36 years of faithful service with this great committee. In honor of the occasion the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] offered the following resolution:

On motion of Mr. COOPER, the Committee on Ways and Means—

"*Resolved*, That the committee go on record, on this thirty-sixth anniversary of Sam Hardy's employment with the committee, expressing its gratitude and appreciation for the loyal, faithful, courteous, and efficient services rendered by him during those years.

"*Resolved, further*, That this resolution be spread on the minutes of the committee and a copy delivered to the said Sam Hardy."

R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman.

Attest:

C. MALCOLM HEVENOR, *Clerk*.

May I not take sufficient time of the House to read Sam Hardy's remarks in reply. They are as follows:

FEBRUARY 10, 1944.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Ways and Means Committee, on the 9th day of February 1908, I was employed by the Ways and Means Committee as assistant messenger. During my 36 years under the 8 chairmen that I have had the honor of serving, I have witnessed some wonderful experiences. Those chairmen are, namely, the Honorables Serena E. Payne, Oscar W. Underwood, Claude Kitchin, Joseph W. Fordney, William R. Green, James W. Collier, Willis C. Hawley, and Robert L. Doughton. Today, Representative ADOLPH SABATH, of Illinois, is the only Member of the House who was here when I came. I have seen them come and go. I have seen 23 tax bills placed on the statute books, 7 tariff bills, 3 trade agreement bills, and 8 bonus bills, as well as various other pieces of legislation placed on the statute books. I have been with this committee all day, all night, holidays, and Sundays, and am still feeling fine. I have enjoyed the work and found it very interesting. On February 9 I also celebrated my thirty-first wedding anniversary. I want to thank the chairman and members and appreciate all they have said about me.

Again I thank you,

SAM HARDY.

I might mention in connection with Mr. Hardy's remarks that the committee saw fit to present him with a substantial purse in recognition of the fine, loyal, efficient service he has given to us in the past. I am sure I voice the sentiment of the members of the great Committee on Ways and Means when I say we all hope that Sam Hardy will continue to serve as faithfully, as loyally, and as efficiently in the next 36 years as he has in the period past.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short quotation from President Woodrow Wilson on the question of soldiers' voting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUNDSTROM] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RANK OF CHIEF OF CHAPLAINS OF UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1023) to establish a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy, introduced by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what this bill does?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I intend to offer an amendment to the committee amendment which I will explain at that time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thought the gentleman might explain the bill briefly to the membership now.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. It will establish the office of chief of chaplains in the Navy and provide for the rank of captain as permanent rank and the rank of rear admiral as temporary rank during the period of the war.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This comes with a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes; it does.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That one chaplain on the active list in the Corps of Chaplains of rank not below that of lieutenant commander may be appointed by the President and with the advice and consent of the Senate to be chief of chaplains of the United States Navy.

He shall serve as such for 4 years, and shall have the rank, pay, and allowance of captain while so serving. His duties shall include investigation into the qualifications of candidates for appointment as acting chaplains and chaplains and general coordination and supervision of the work of chaplains: *Provided*, That until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may fix, the chief of chaplains shall be entitled to hold the temporary rank of rear admiral, and shall receive the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half while serving in such grade.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged by proclamation of the President or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may fix, there shall be in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy one officer who shall be entitled to hold the temporary rank of rear admiral, and shall receive the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half while serving in such grade."

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: On page 2, strike out lines 8 to 14, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That one chaplain on the active list in the Corps of Chaplains of rank not below that of lieutenant commander shall be designated by the Secretary of the Navy to be chief of chaplains of the United States Navy. He shall serve as such for 4 years, and shall have the rank, pay, and allowances of captain while so serving: *Provided*, That until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may fix, the chief of chaplains shall have the temporary rank of rear admiral, and shall receive the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half while serving in such grade."

Amend the committee amendment to the title by striking out "A bill to authorize one officer in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy with the temporary rank of rear admiral." and insert in lieu thereof the following: "A bill to establish a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of having the RECORD definitely and clearly show what this bill does. It is a very fine bill and a similar bill should have been passed long ago. I should like for my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make a short statement so there will be no misunderstanding so far as the RECORD is concerned as to what the bill accomplishes and what it does; and for that purpose I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there are at the present time serving in the United States Navy 1,809 chaplains. The authorized strength of the Chaplain Corps is 2,100. During the war the number has increased from 104 to the present strength of 1,809.

The organized religious bodies of the country who have jurisdiction over the passing on applications for chaplains feel this is a propitious time to accord the same dignity to the Chaplain Corps of the Navy that has been accorded to other corps of the Navy. In the Dental Corps the chief is a rear admiral. This bill, even with my amendment, does not meet entirely the desires and wishes of the organized religious bodies of the country but it is a step in the right direction, inasmuch as it establishes for the first time a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy which heretofore has merely been a courtesy title. The chief of chaplains by this bill is given the permament rank of captain and during the period of the war the temporary rank of rear admiral with the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the lower half.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman is making a good presentation. I am heartily in accord with the principles of the bill and hope it is speedily adopted. It certainly is most meritorious.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. The Bureau of Personnel of the Navy has approved this step. I want to compliment my good friend from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] for introducing this measure and thank him for the cooperation I have received from him in handling this bill before the committee. I hope the House will agree to it unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just want to say to the gentleman that my purpose in moving to strike out the last word was to get him to explain the bill. I appreciate his very fine explanation. I think the bill is a splendid one, for there is no place where the morale of the men in the armed forces is more greatly influenced than the Chaplain's Corps of these forces. Recognizing the Chaplain Corps of the Navy in this manner is bound to have a very stimulating and beneficial effect.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I thank the majority leader for his statement.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman spoke of the fact that there had been some investigation by religious denominations in respect to this act.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Yes. The organized Protestant denominations, numbering 22, officially recognized by the Navy, the National Catholic Welfare Conference acting for the conference, and the Board of Jewish Rabbis, acting for the Jews, have been consulted, approve and agree to this.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it in order to ask for recognition under the 5-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman rises in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not. I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman desires recognition?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; to strike out the last word, but not in opposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has an amendment pending to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, then I move to strike out two of them.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to this bill. All I want to know from the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who I understand introduced this bill, is something of the history of the legislation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, for a year and a half the religious bodies of this country importuned me to introduce a bill which would provide for that which this day has been accomplished. The religious bodies were not satisfied with the bill as reported by the committee. They said through Dr. S. Arthur Devan, director of the general religious commission, that the bill as reported does not create a chief of chaplains of the United States Navy whose duties shall include investigation into the qualifications of candidates for appointment as acting chaplains and chaplains and general coordination and supervision of the work of the chaplains. It leaves unchanged the administration of matters pertaining to naval chaplains and thereby fails to designate for the supervision of those entrusted with the moral and spiritual welfare of the Navy personnel, a man who by training, experience, and interest in religious work would be specially qualified for such office.

According to Dr. Devan, the original bill constituted a big step toward placing the Navy chaplains on a par, administratively, with the Army Chaplains Corps. The Navy chaplaincy now is a part of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and the original bill would officially make the head of the Navy chaplains a chief of chaplains, nominated by the President and Senate, with a definite term of office and powers under the law.

So in conjunction with my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], and I am assured with no objection from my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, we worked out an amendment which has been adopted. This bill, if it becomes a law, will satisfy, and I am of the opinion that it will comply with, the requests and the demands and the interests of the religious organizations expressed throughout the country with respect to the contribution which the Navy might well make toward the religious education and the care and comfort of the men in the armed forces represented in the Navy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman. I was advised this was a bill introduced by him and only wished to be

sure. He has rendered a worthy service to the clergymen.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to amend the title of the bill. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the amended title that he proposes is exactly like the one in the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the committee amendment contained an amendment striking out the title.

The committee amendment to amend the title was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Arnold	Fulmer	McConnell
Barden	Gale	Magnuson
Bell	Gallagher	May
Bennett, Mich.	Gamble	Morrison, La.
Bonner	Gavin	Morrison, N. C.
Buckley	Gifford	Murray, Tenn.
Buffett	Gorski	O'Leary
Burchill, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	Ploeser
Byrne	Hare	Powers
Cannon, Fla.	Harness, Ind.	Price
Carson, Ohio	Hart	Rabaut
Chapman	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Cole, Mo.	Hess	Rowe
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Schiffler
Cullen	Jackson	Schuetz
Curley	Jennings	Schwabe
Davis	Johnson, Anton J.	Scott
Dawson	Jonkman	Shafer
Dirksen	Judd	Short
Domengeaux	Keefe	Smith, Va.
Dondero	King	Smith, Wis.
Douglas	Kleberg	Stearns, N. H.
Eaton	Klein	Stockman
Ellis	LaFollette	Sumners, Tex.
Elmer	Lanham	Vinson, Ga.
Engel, Mich.	Lea	Wadsworth
Fay	Luce	Willey
Feighan	Lynch	Winter
Fuller		

The SPEAKER. On this call 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Chair designates the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] to read Washington's Farewell Address, Tuesday, February 22, 1944.

There was no objection.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4133, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: For the Chief of the Division and other personal services in the District of Columbia, $85,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is, at best, rather dry reading. And it probably receives less attention from the average reader in proportion to its importance than any other publication of the day. That is particularly true of that part of the RECORD reporting the debates on the annual appropriation bills. They deal with statistics. They are largely concerned with technical and financial matters and have little reader appeal. But I am going to ask the Members of the House to make an exception and read in detail yesterday's debate on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill as reported in this morning's RECORD. You will find it of more than ordinary interest—and it is of more than passing importance, because the amendments offered yesterday are typical of the amendments which will be offered to all the supply bills for the remainder of the session. Regardless of the amounts carried in the general appropriation bills this session—whether high or low, whether adequate or inadequate, however reasonable and however well justified—amendments to cut the appropriations in comparatively small amounts will be offered and the time of the House will be taken up in specious debate in support of them as on yesterday.

The reason is obvious. Our system of government is the most perfect form of government yet devised by the mind of man. But no product of the human brain is perfect. And one inevitable and unavoidable concomitant of our democratic system of government is the necessity of submitting to the electorate every 2 years political issues on which to base campaigns for the biannual elections. If there are no particularly pertinent issues, they must be developed, and magnified and emphasized. The supply bills, although essentially nonpolitical, offer exceptional opportunities for the incubation of such issues. And for 6 or 8 months preceding the national campaign the thousands of items in the annual appropriation bills are vehicles for the never-failing and ever-popular amendments to cut expenditure.

But no one need be misled. You can always recognize the hack political amendment. It cannot be disguised; it cannot be camouflaged; no amount of smoke screen however adroitly maneuvered can conceal it.

A political amendment can always be identified by two indelible earmarks. In the first place, whenever a member of the committee reporting the bill submits here on the floor an amendment which has not been submitted or suggested in the hearings, in the subcommittee or the committee—which has never been offered at any stage of the long consideration which preceeds the report to the House—that amendment is a political amendment, offered for political purposes, and there is no possibility of any other construction.

In the second place, when a vote is taken here in the House on——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether or not he intends to consume the additional 5 minutes in making a political speech instead of talking on the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will leave that to the Congress and the country to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is a further method by which you can determine beyond the peradventure of a doubt whether an amendment is a political amendment. Whenever on a standing vote, every Member on one side of the House rises in support of an amendment and every Member on the other side rises in opposition, its identity as a political amendment is indubitably fixed. On all questions coming before the House in which a real issue is involved, the House divides—not along political lines—but according to geographical, economic, industrial, or sectional interests. On all such questions, Members from both parties will be found voting for and against. It is only on patently partisan questions that the House unanimously divides on party lines. That was the situation yesterday when we voted on the several amendments offered to the Treasury and Post Office bill by members of the subcommittee which drafted it.

There was a single exception. When we voted on one of the amendments a lone Democrat rose on this side of the aisle to vote with our Republican brethren standing solidly on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In just 1 minute, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Your 5 minutes will be up in about 1 minute.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I trust I can have time enough to answer the gentleman.

Here was a Member who had not read the bill; who has not heard the amendment; who had had no opportunity to listen to the debate. All he knew was that the vote was on a motion to cut. It is easy to understand that kind of political philosophy. A vote to cut appropriations is an easy vote to defend before an uninformed audience. The boast that a Member has voted to cut expenditures at every opportunity offered during his service in the House will meet with applause from an unthinking electorate. But it is the mark of utter incompetence. There are times when reduction of expenditures is highly desirable. And there are times when a vote to cut an item in an appropriation bill is just as highly reprehensible. There are items in these annual supply bills on which a vote to reduce is a vote to cripple an essential activity. And in a majority of instances, in the consideration of such a bill as this a Member of the House can render no greater disservice to the country than by voting to cut items of appropriation.

That is particularly true of the pending measure. It is perhaps the most important of the annual appropriation bills. It deals with national finance. It has a tremendous responsibility in providing funds to carry on the war. The collection of taxes, the sale and servicing of the War bonds, the accounting in connection with $100,000,000,000 a year of expenditures is the largest fiscal task ever undertaken by the treasury department of any government in the history of the world. This bill, as it came from the committee, is a carefully considered and a meticulously prepared measure. It has been cut and trimmed by the committee after exhaustive hearings and in the light of investigations by specially trained accountants and inspectors. To increase or reduce the carefully estimated figures in any item of the bill is to throw it out of adjustment. And yet Members here are willing to take that risk and divide on party lines on matters of such ominous responsibility in times like these.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifteen Members are present; a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I make the further point of order that the gentleman from Missouri is talking on a political matter and the gentleman, therefore, is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri will proceed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, let me again earnestly urge the Members of the House to read carefully the proceedings and debate on this bill as reported in this morning's RECORD. The bill has been prepared by the ablest and most experienced Members of the House, men who have served on this committee and this subcommittee for many years. It is the most carefully drawn and painstakingly prepared bill, in my opinion, ever reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The debate yesterday by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] indicate a comprehensive knowledge of the bill and evinces the highest order of constructive statesmanship. I suggest that Members clip these pages from the RECORD and file them for ready reference.

Mr. Chairman, no one can charge this committee with countenancing unwarranted expenditures. On all nonwar appropriations we have cut to the irreducible minimum. It is to be noted that this committee in the last 2 years has reduced expenditures by a greater percentage than in any like period in the fiscal history of the Nation.

And I have no protest to make against the submission of political amendments. I am not complaining on that score. I am not objecting. I am not criticizing. Politics is the order of the day. We practice it on both sides of the aisle—on this side as well as on that side. But I am calling attention to the obvious character of the amendments offered to this bill yesterday and to the fact that we may expect on all the supply bills for the remainder of the session similar amendments and the attempt to develop similar spurious issues. The House should take note of it, and the country should be apprised of it. It will explain many things which the unsuspecting layman sees in the papers and hears from time to time over the air. We have cut the appropriations. We have cut drastically. But we refuse to cut the jugular vein.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I again make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order. He is making a political speech. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With pleasure.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. The gentleman is a distinguished parliamentarian. I want to ask him this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute in order to yield to my friend from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I want to propound this question to the gentleman. In view of the fact that the gentleman is probably one of the most distinguished parliamentarians in the House, does he mean to say that every time an amendment is presented here, which has not been presented to the subcommittee, or presented to the main committee, it is a political amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly not; but I do say this, that when an amendment of this character is presented on the floor by members of the subcommittee reporting the bill who have gone through the hearings, have been afforded every opportunity to offer amendments and suggestions both in the subcommittee and the main committee, and have never before suggested such amendments, and then when they are presented here on the floor we divide on purely political lines, there is no escaping the conviction that it is a political amendment, offered for purely political purposes. There can be no other conclusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the leader of unlicensed governmental spending has spoken. For 10 long years I have been trying to prevent the wild spending of the people's money on bills that have been brought in here and that have been supported by the Roosevelt administration.

Yesterday it was my privilege to offer seven or eight amendments to this bill. When the bill was in the committee I announced that I would be bound by no agreement as to any item; that I reserved the right to offer amendments to bring the bill in line with the testimony and the reports of the investigators of the Committee on Appropriations. I have offered some of those amendments. Not once has there been an intelligent, analyzable answer to the statements that I made yesterday in support of those amendments. Irrelevant statements were made, but not a direct, positive answer which was intelligible and which would hold water.

Yes, it is true that that action of the committee yesterday was a division, insofar as the membership voting on partisan lines was concerned.

I have never been so surprised in my life as I have been these last 2 days at the tight, close, keen, discipline under which the majority Members in this House have been held. One Member from Arkansas, yes, did go through with us once, but he did not go through again, and no other Member of the majority went through again notwithstanding that continuously and repeatedly no justifiable argument was made against the amendments I offered to cut items.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. In a moment. Let me say that if it is a political issue, economy and honesty and efficiency and putting the bureaucrats in order, it is a good political issue and on that I am ready to go to the public.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'NEAL. I just wondered how many on the other side voted against some of the amendments.

Mr. TABER. Oh, I do not know any.

Mr. O'NEAL. That is what I thought.

Mr. TABER. But I do not believe that on a roll call the Members on the majority side would want to vote to support the position the committee took in favor of the increased expenditures.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to say to the gentleman that one reason many of us, if not most of us, vote for his amendments is because we trust the gentleman from New York. We think he studies these amendments. We are all anxious to grasp at any straw to cut expenses, and we know that the gentleman from experience tries to lead us along the right path toward economy.

Mr. TABER. I am going to give one illustration of the type of amendments that were offered. I could go into every one just as thoroughly.

In the Office of Customs there were 437 vacancies in the field as against a proposed employment of 8,400, and that included the vacancy set-up; there were 31 vacancies in the Department. They did not expect to fill any of those vacancies. The committee cut $500,000. The total salaries of that group of vacancies figured $1,450,000, and I offered to cut only another $500,000. If I was wrong, the wrong consisted in not adding another $450,000 to the proposed cut; I was not wrong because I asked for too great a cut.

Never in my long service here in this House have I seen such an attempt to becloud the issue as that which was made by my friend the gentleman from Missouri. He would like to have it go out to the country that one votes to save a dollar only for political effect. If that kind of statement is to be the excuse of the spenders, God help the country if they follow that kind of reasoning.

I appeal to the membership of this House. We are up against a serious proposition in this country with an ever-mounting debt, with tremendous appropriation bills before us. The first bill we had called for $11,450,000,000; the second, the one now under consideration, carries directly and indirectly $11,985,000,000. Are not these figures of sufficient moment that they call for the earnest and devoted consideration of the membership of this House? If it is a political issue, if the gauntlet is down I accept it. I stand for the taxpayers and the people of the United States, and I hope the House of Representatives will stand for the people of the United States and not for profligate spending.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I would regret very deeply if anything were said on this floor that would reflect on the high character and fine service rendered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I have been here for 10 years sitting with the gentleman from New York on this and other committees. I know he is deeply and conscientiously interested in the welfare of this country, in economy, and in doing a fine job; and I would not want anyone to think that our committee feels for 1 minute that the gentleman from New York is not of the highest type.

Let us just be frank with each other. The gentleman from New York is also human. He has responsibilities here as a member of his own party. No man here is so guileless as not to recognize that we are all elected by parties and have party responsibilities. The facts in this case are very simple. In the past we have sat as appropriation subcommittees through long hearings. We talked things over usually in a very friendly way and agreed and then we came on the floor and stood by the action of the committee. Even when we are criticized when others want to cut down the appropriation we have stood together on both sides of the aisle. I do not know whether it is a coincidence or not that the situation is different in this year 1944. We had amicable sessions on this bill. The gentleman from New York was just as agreeable as he could be, as in the past, and we were all agreeable. Much to my surprise and to the surprise of the subcommittee, when we came on the floor certain items which we had discussed and agreed upon in the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York proposed to cut further by amendments offered here on the floor. In the past our experience has been that when we agreed on items in committee we practically stood by them.

The gentleman from New York will have to answer to his own conscience at least as to why there seems to be, at least to the committee on this side of the aisle, a little change of attitude in 1944. Common sense and experience can interpret why the gentleman offers on the floor amendments to cut further the amounts agreed upon.

The gentleman is not only an excellent Member of Congress but he is a fine Republican. I am not criticizing him for anything that he may do that he thinks may be advantageous to his party. I should like to say just this one thing further: When the gentleman from New York made the first speech on this bill he stated it carried $12,000,000,000. The total cuts proposed by the gentleman from New York up to the present time amount to one ten-thousandth—that is all he has proposed—one ten-thousandth of the total amount of this bill, one one-hundredth of 1 percent. That is what has happened here. The total of all cuts proposed by the gentleman from New York is one one-hundredth of 1 percent or one ten-thousandth of the total carried in this bill. It seems to me that possibly the effect of these cuts is being overemphasized, the effect they may have on the whole world economy and the economy of this country.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman tell the House how much this bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations was below the Budget estimate?

Mr. O'NEAL. I would have to refer to the figures. They are in our report.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is below the Budget estimate?

Mr. O'NEAL. I think it was $13,000,000 for the Postal Department and——

Mr. COCHRAN. That $13,000,000 was not cut by the Republicans, it was cut by the Democrats and the Republicans, the entire committee? The gentleman from Indiana says it was cut $23,000,000 below the Budget estimate. Therefore those of us who support the committee vote for a saving of $23,000,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. That would seem to be an agreeable report to both sides of the aisle.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. It was cut some $23,000,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. The total cut. And of the amount which we are appropriating here, there are many millions that are not subject to any cut whatsoever.

Mr. LUDLOW. There are 116 items in the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. In the permanent appropriation there is the sinking fund refunds and such items which are fixed and cannot be pared.

Mr. LUDLOW. Here are the appropriations that should not be touched at all. There is one here of $405,170,000. For permanent appropriations there are $5,300,000,000.

Mr. O'NEAL. Something over $5,000,000,000 is subject to possible reduction by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other act shall be used during the fiscal year 1945 for the purchase, within the continental limits of the United States, of any standard typewriting machines (except bookkeeping, billing, and electric machines) at a price in excess of the following for models with carriages which will accommodate paper of the following widths to wit: Ten inches (correspondence models), $70; 12 inches, $75; 14 inches, $77.50; 16 inches, $82.50; 18 inches, $87.50; 20 inches, $94; 22 inches, $95; 24 inches, $97.50; 26 inches, $103.50; 28 inches, $104; 30 inches, $105; 32 inches, $107.50; or, for standard typewriting machines distinctively quiet in operation, the maximum prices shall be as follows for models with carriages which will accommodate paper of the following widths, to wit: Ten inches, $80; 12 inches, $85; 14 inches, $90; 18 inches, $95.

Mr. TABER. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Procurement Division I am not going to offer an amendment to cut this, but there is a situation there that I feel should be called to the attention of the House and the country, and a tremendously serious situation, too. The Army, the Navy, the War Food Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Lease-Lend set-up, and all sorts of units of the Government are developing surplus property. It is not being handled properly or efficiently; it is not being handled so that the goods that are created as surplus property either get quickly into other

Government agencies where they may be used or back into the regular channels of trade. On the other hand, they are getting into the hands of brokers who bid them in at quick sales and the whole thing is not handled in the interest of the Government and the Government's interests are not protected. We are not following up our stock piles and keeping them clean as we should.

In the New York Herald Tribune this morning there is a write-up concerning 216,000 pounds of butter that have deteriorated to such an extent that it is no longer fit for table use. It is being dumped into cooking channels.

My understanding is that in the lease-lend set-up the War Food Administration and other agencies have some 20,000,000 pounds nearly in the same shape. That butter, according to the information that I receive from people who understand the business, should be placed where it can be of use to the civilian population and where it may be salvaged before it gets to the point where it has to be used for something other than that for which it was made.

It does not do any good to pile up those kind of surpluses and let them spoil. And, on the other hand, it places a burden on our civilian population which is not justified.

I hold in my hand a photographic reproduction of an advertisement taken from the New York Journal of Commerce of date January 11, 1944, by the Surplus & Salvage Sales Co., Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., which indicates that they have currently for sale a lot of dehydrated pea soup, 25,000 gallons, 1943 crop orange juice, and 75,100 bags No. 3 Indiana pea beans, no priorities, no points.

Instead of that material being in the hands of some salvage outfit, it ought to be handled in such a way that it gets into the usual channels of trade and so that the people of the country may have it to eat.

There is also a further advertisement by the same organization advertising billions in merchandise, machinery, textiles, food, and plants to be liquidated after the war. It states:

> Millions in merchandise available now. Vast potentialities make it imperative that I meet with principals who have knowledge of merchandising and are financially responsible. For the last 6 months we have been ascertaining possibilities, and are now ready and qualified to meet with proper associates for the establishment of New York offices.

That is an advertisement by the same salvage company.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that there are some funds carried in the pending bill for the handling of transferred property by the Procurement Division. I call attention also to the fact that these people undoubtedly are not equipped with the kind of legislation they ought to have or the kind of people they ought to have to handle the situation. It is crying out loud for immediate attention.

There is a bill pending before the Banking and Currency Committee and I am in hopes that the House of Representatives, through its proper committee, will take some action that will get these goods back into the regular channels of trade and put an end to these peculiar operations by certain salvage sales companies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, relative to what the gentleman has just said about the bill pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency (H. R. 3873) providing for a central agency to dispose of surplus war material, may I state to the gentleman for his information that we have had hearings lasting over 1 week, almost 2 weeks, on that particular bill. The committee, as its chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] announced yesterday, will resume hearings again next Monday. Mr. Jesse Jones will be the first witness next Monday.

I am in hearty accord with what I heard the gentleman say—I did not hear all of his speech but I heard part of it—to the effect that he is in favor of those goods going through the normal channels of trade and distribution. We have some minor scandals in the country now by reason of the way these surplus goods are being disposed of, and we shall have some major ones if it is not stopped. It should be stopped. There should be one central agency.

Our committee, the House Committee on Small Business, disclosed that in one section of the United States procurement agencies would be disposing of the same kind of materials at a very low price, in fact, a give-away price, whereas on the other side of the United States they would be buying new the same kind of materials. That just does not make sense and should be stopped. We should have a bill enacted into law at an early date which will cause this vast store of surplus war materials to be disposed of through the normal channels of trade and distribution.

Many people do not realize how much these goods will amount to. It is our prediction, based upon the amount we had during the last war, that when this war is over, if over within the next 12 months—if it is longer the amount will increase—we shall have between fifty and seventy-five billion dollars worth of plants, machinery, materials, goods, and supplies of all kinds, types, and characters.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. When the gentleman estimates there will be fifty to seventy-five billion dollars worth of goods to be disposed of, does the gentleman include in that the 20,000,000 acres of land which have been taken over?

Mr. PATMAN. Without agreeing as to the amount, for I am not acquainted with the exact amount of acreage, I may say it is included. In the case of defense plants, of course, the real estate is included.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman includes land also?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman heard our colleague from New York say something about 216,000 pounds of butter that had spoiled in New York and would have to be sold on the market as cooking butter. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. PATMAN. No; but I would not be surprised at it.

Mr. STEFAN. How is that to be disposed of?

Mr. PATMAN. In any huge program things like that will happen. They will happen to any big corporation, and they will happen to the Government, too.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman does not have any details on that?

Mr. PATMAN. No; in fact, I am not surprised at things like that happening. In a program as large as this you naturally expect some things like that to happen.

Mr. STEFAN. Has the gentleman's committee written a bill the objective of which is to have one organization?

Mr. PATMAN. One central agency.

Mr. STEFAN. Have you introduced a bill to that effect?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. It is H. R. 3873. It is the House Committee on Small Business bill. All the members of this committee helped to formulate it. I introduced it as chairman.

Mr. STEFAN. What is the status of it?

Mr. PATMAN. The status of it is that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], announced yesterday that we would resume hearings commencing next Monday, and Mr. Jesse Jones, the Federal Loan Agency Administrator, will be the first witness.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman's bill make any provision for the final sale and disposition of real property which has been acquired by the Government in the expanded war program?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the bill would include it, but it is my opinion that the committee is going to leave that out. I do not think we will deal or attempt to deal in this particular bill with that at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. It deals only with personal property and not real estate?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; that is what is contemplated in this particular bill right now.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think it would be well for the committee to give some consideration to the method of disposing of these large areas of land which have been acquired in camps and cantonments throughout the country?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; the only reason we are inclined to put that aside for the present is that this other is urgent. There is more of a necessity for immediate attention being paid to the movable materials than there is to the real property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am as it is at present.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendments:

"Reduce Bureau of Customs $500,000, making the amount carried $25,000,000.

"Reduce Treasurer's Office $175,000, making the amount carried, $3,900,000.

"Reduce Bureau of Engraving and Printing $350,000, making the amount carried, $9,650,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 52, noes 75.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present, and make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. This is an automatic call. The Doorkeeper will close the doors and the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 162, nays 164, not voting 103, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—162

Allen, Ill.	Angell	Beall
Andersen, H. Carl	Arends	Bender
Anderson, Calif.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bishop
Andresen, August H.	Barrett	Blackney
	Bates, Mass.	Bolton
Bradley, Mich.	Hill	Mundt
Brehm	Hinshaw	Murray, Wis.
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Norman
Brumbaugh	Hoffman	O'Brien, N. Y.
Busbey	Holmes, Mass.	O'Hara
Butler	Holmes, Wash.	O'Konski
Canfield	Hope	Phillips
Carlson, Kans.	Horan	Pittenger
Carrier	Howell	Poulson
Carson, Ohio	Hull	Powers
Case	Jeffrey	Pracht,
Chenoweth	Jenkins	C. Frederick
Chiperfield	Jensen	Pratt,
Church	Johnson,	Joseph M.
Clason	Anton J.	Ramey
Clevenger	Johnson,	Reed, Ill.
Compton	Calvin D.	Reed, N. Y.
Crawford	Johnson, Ind.	Rees, Kans.
Cunningham	Johnson,	Rizley
Curtis	J. Leroy	Robsion, Ky.
Day	Johnson, Ward	Rockwell
Dewey	Jones	Rodgers, Pa.
Dworshak	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Ellison, Md.	Kearney	Rohrbough
Elmer	Kilburn	Sauthoff
Elston, Ohio	Kinzer	Scrivner
Fellows	Kunkel	Simpson, Ill.
Fish	Lambertson	Simpson, Pa.
Gathings	Landis	Smith, Maine
Gavin	LeCompte	Smith, Ohio
Gearhart	LeFevre	Springer
Gerlach	Lemke	Stanley
Gilchrist	Lewis	Stefan
Gillette	McConnell	Stevenson
Gillie	McCowen	Sumner, Ill.
Goodwin	McGregor	Taber
Graham	McLean	Talbot
Griffiths	McWilliams	Talle
Gross	Maas	Taylor
Gwynne	Martin, Iowa	Thomas, N. J.
Hagen	Martin, Mass.	Tibbott
Hale	Mason	Towe
Hall,	Merrow	Troutman
Edwin Arthur	Michener	Vorys, Ohio
Hall,	Miller, Conn.	Vursell
Leonard W.	Miller, Mo.	Weichel, Ohio
Halleck	Miller, Nebr.	Welch
Hancock	Miller, Pa.	Wigglesworth
Harness, Ind.	Monkiewicz	Wilson
Heidinger	Mott	Wolcott
Herter	Mruk	Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—164

Abernethy	Ford	Monroney
Allen, La.	Fulbright	Murdock
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gibson	Murphy
	Gordon	Myers
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Newsome
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Norrell
Beckworth	Granger	Norton
Bland	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bloom	Green	O'Connor
Boren	Gregory	O'Neal
Boykin	Harless, Ariz.	O'Toole
Brooks	Harris, Ark.	Outland
Brown, Ga.	Harris, Va.	Patman
Bryson	Hart	Patton
Bulwinkle	Hays	Peterson, Fla.
Burch, Va.	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Burgin	Hendricks	Philbin
Camp	Hoch	Poage
Cannon, Fla.	Holifield	Priest
Cannon, Mo.	Izac	Ramspeck
Capozzoli	Jarman	Randolph
Celler	Johnson,	Rankin
Clark	Luther A.	Robertson
Cochran	Johnson,	Robinson, Utah
Colmer	Lyndon B.	Rogers, Calif.
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Rowan
Cooper	Kee	Russell
Costello	Kefauver	Sabath
Cox	Kelley	Sadowski
Cravens	Kerr	Sasscer
Crosser	Kilday	Satterfield
D'Alesandro	King	Scanlon
Delaney	Kirwan	Sheppard
Dickstein	Kleberg	Sheridan
Dies	Lane	Sikes
Dilweg	Larcade	Slaughter
Dingell	Lesinski	Smith, W. Va.
Disney	Ludlow	Snyder
Doughton	McCord	Somers, N. Y.
Drewry	McCormack	Sparkman
Durham	McGehee	Spence
Eberharter	McKenzie	Starnes, Ala.
Elliott	Madden	Stewart
Engle, Calif.	Mahon	Sullivan
Fernandez	Maloney	Tarver
Fisher	Manasco	Thomas, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	Mansfield,	Thomason
Flannagan	Mont.	Tolan
Fogarty	Mansfield, Tex.	Vincent, Ky.
Folger	Marcantonio	Voorhis, Calif.
Forand	Mills	Walter
Ward	West	Wickersham
Wasielewski	Whelchel, Ga.	Winstead
Weaver	White	Worley
Weiss	Whitten	Wright
Wene	Whittington	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—103

Andrews	Fulmer	O'Brien, Mich.
Auchincloss	Furlong	O'Leary
Barden	Gale	Pace
Barry	Gallagher	Pfeifer
Bell	Gamble	Ploeser
Bennett, Mich.	Gifford	Plumley
Bonner	Gorski	Price
Bradley, Pa.	Grant, Ind.	Rabaut
Buckley	Hare	Reece, Tenn.
Buffett	Hartley	Richards
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Rivers
Burdick	Hess	Rolph
Byrne	Hobbs	Rowe
Carter	Jackson	Schiffler
Chapman	Jennings	Schuetz
Coffee	Jonkman	Schwabe
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Scott
Cole, N. Y.	Keefe	Shafer
Courtney	Kennedy	Short
Cullen	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Curley	Klein	Smith, Wis.
Davis	Knutson	Stearns, N. H.
Dawson	LaFollette	Stockman
Dirksen	Lanham	Sumners, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lea	Sundstrom
Dondero	Luce	Treadway
Douglas	Lynch	Vinson, Ga.
Eaton	McMillan	Wadsworth
Ellis	McMurray	Willey
Ellsworth	Magnuson	Winter
Engel, Mich.	May	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fay	Merritt	Wolverton, N. J.
Feighan	Morrison, La.	Woodrum, Va.
Fenton	Morrison, N. C.	
Fuller	Murray, Tenn.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Curley against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Kennedy against.

Mr. Sundstrom for, with Mr. Rabaut against.

Mr. Cole of Missouri for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. LaFollette for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. McMurray against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. O'Leary against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Gamble for, with Mr. Bonner against.

Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Grant of Indiana for, with Mr. Byrne against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Furlong against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Klein against.

Mr. Schwabe for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Andrews for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Jennings for, with Mr. Burchill against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Price with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. May with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Willey.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Stearns.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Schiffler.
Mr. Gorski with Mr. Ellis.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Coffee with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Davis with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Rolph.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Rowe.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Winter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct an error: That on page 36, line 15, the words "seventy-five" be changed to "ninety-five."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 321, nays 6, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—321

Abernethy	Clevenger	Grant, Ala.
Allen, Ill.	Cochran	Green
Allen, La.	Coffee	Gregory
Andersen, H. Carl	Colmer	Griffiths
Anderson, Calif.	Compton	Gross
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cooley	Gwynne
Andresen, August H.	Cooper	Hagen
Angell	Costello	Hale
Arends	Cox	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Arnold	Cravens	Hall, Leonard W.
Baldwin, Md.	Crawford	Halleck
Baldwin, N. Y.	Crosser	Hancock
Barrett	Cunningham	Harless, Ariz.
Bates, Ky.	Curtis	Harness, Ind.
Bates, Mass.	D'Alesandro	Harris, Ark.
Beall	Day	Harris, Va.
Beckworth	Delaney	Hart
Bender	Dies	Hartley
Bennett, Mo.	Dilweg	Hays
Bishop	Dingell	Heffernan
Blackney	Disney	Heidinger
Bland	Drewry	Hendricks
Bolton	Durham	Herter
Boren	Dworshak	Hill
Boykin	Eberharter	Hinshaw
Bradley, Mich.	Elliott	Hoch
Brehm	Ellison, Md.	Hoeven
Brooks	Elmer	Hoffman
Brown, Ga.	Elston, Ohio	Holifield
Brown, Ohio	Fellows	Holmes, Mass.
Brumbaugh	Fernandez	Holmes, Wash.
Bryson	Fish	Hope
Bulwinkle	Fisher	Horan
Burch, Va.	Fitzpatrick	Howell
Burdick	Flannagan	Hull
Burgin	Fogarty	Izac
Busbey	Folger	Jarman
Butler	Forand	Jeffrey
Camp	Ford	Jenkins
Canfield	Fulbright	Jensen
Cannon, Fla.	Gathings	Johnson, Anton J.
Cannon, Mo.	Gavin	Johnson, Calvin D.
Capozzoli	Gearhart	Johnson, Ind.
Carlson, Kans.	Gerlach	Johnson, Luther A.
Carrier	Gibson	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Carson, Ohio	Gilchrist	Johnson, Ward
Celler	Gillette	Jones
Chenoweth	Gillie	Kearney
Chiperfield	Goodwin	Kee
Church	Gordon	Kefauver
Clark	Gore	Kelley
Clason	Gossett	Kerr
	Graham	Kilday
	Granger	King
		Kinzer
		Kirwan
		Kleberg
		Kunkel
		Lambertson
		Landis
		Lane
		Larcade
		LeCompte
		LeFevre
		Lemke
		Lesinski
		Lewis
		Ludlow
		McConnell
		McCord
		McCormack
		McCowen
		McGehee
		McGregor
		McKenzie
		McLean
		McMillan
		McWilliams
		Maas
		Madden
		Mahon
		Maloney
		Manasco
		Mansfield, Mont.
		Mansfield, Tex.
		Marcantonio
		Martin, Iowa
		Martin, Mass.
		Mason
		Merrow
		Michener
		Miller, Conn.
		Miller, Mo.
		Miller, Nebr.
		Miller, Pa.
		Mills
		Monkiewicz
		Monroney
		Mott
		Mruk
		Mundt
		Murdock
		Murphy
		Murray, Wis.
		Myers
		Newsome
		Norman
		Norrell
		Norton
		O'Brien, Ill.
		O'Brien, Mich.
		O'Brien, N. Y.
		O'Connor
		O'Hara
		O'Neal
		O'Toole
		Outland
		Pace
		Patman
		Patton
		Peterson, Fla.
		Philbin
		Pittenger
		Plumley
		Poage
		Powers
		Pracht, C. Frederick
		Pratt, Joseph M.
		Priest
		Ramey
		Ramspeck
		Randolph
		Rankin
		Reed, Ill.
		Reed, N. Y.
		Rees, Kans.
		Richards
		Rivers
		Rizley
		Robertson
		Robinson, Utah
		Robsion, Ky.
		Rockwell
		Rodgers, Pa.
		Rogers, Calif.
		Rogers, Mass.
		Rohrbough
		Rolph
		Rowan
		Russell
		Sabath
		Sadowski
		Sasscer
		Satterfield
		Sauthoff
		Scanlon
		Scrivner
		Sheppard
		Sheridan
		Sikes
		Simpson, Ill.
		Simpson, Pa.
		Slaughter
		Smith, Maine
		Smith, Ohio
		Smith, W. Va.
		Snyder
		Somers, N. Y.
		Sparkman
		Spence
		Springer
		Stanley
		Starnes, Ala.
		Stefan
		Stevenson
		Stewart
		Sullivan
		Sumner, Ill.
		Talbot
		Talle
		Tarver
		Taylor
		Thomas, Tex.
		Thomason
		Tibbott
		Tolan
		Towe
		Troutman
		Vincent, Ky.
		Voorhis, Calif.
		Vorys, Ohio
		Vursell
		Walter
		Ward
		Wasielewski
		Weaver
		Welchel, Ohio
		Weiss
		Welch
		Wene
		West
		Whelchel, Ga.
		White
		Whitten
		Whittington
		Wickersham
		Wigglesworth
		Winstead
		Wolcott
		Wolverton, N. J.
		Woodruff, Mich.
		Worley
		Wright
		Zimmerman

NAYS—6

Case	Kilburn	Taber
Kean	O'Konski	Thomas, N. J.

NOT VOTING—102

Andrews	Fenton	Morrison, La.
Auchincloss	Fuller	Morrison, N. C.
Barden	Fulmer	Murray, Tenn.
Barry	Furlong	O'Leary
Bell	Gale	Peterson, Ga.
Bennett, Mich.	Gallagher	Pfeifer
Bloom	Gamble	Phillips
Bonner	Gifford	Ploeser
Bradley, Pa.	Gorski	Poulson
Buckley	Grant, Ind.	Price
Buffett	Hare	Rabaut
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Byrne	Hess	Rowe
Carter	Hobbs	Schiffler
Chapman	Jackson	Schuetz
Cole, Mo.	Jennings	Schwabe
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, J. Leroy	Scott
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Cullen	Jonkman	Short
Curley	Judd	Smith, Va.
Davis	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Dawson	Kennedy	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Keogh	Stockman
Dirksen	Klein	Sumners, Tex.
Domengeaux	Knutson	Sundstrom
Dondero	LaFollette	Treadway
Doughton	Lanham	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	Lea	Wadsworth
Eaton	Luce	Willey
Ellis	Lynch	Wilson
Ellsworth	McMurray	Winter
Engel, Mich.	Magnuson	Wolfenden, Pa.
Engle, Calif.	May	Woodrum, Va.
Fay	Merritt	
Feighan	Morrison, La.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Ellis.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Cole of Missouri.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Short.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Schwabe.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Price with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Jonkman.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. May with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Willey.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Schiffler.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Stockman
Mr. Lea with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Davis with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Rowe.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Morrison of North Carolina with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Murray of Tennessee with Mr. Carter.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed and that that motion lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gathing, one of its clerks, announced disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 9, 11, and 12 to the bill (S. 1285) entitled "An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces

absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the amendment of the House numbered 3, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GREEN, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BUTLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that that special order be transferred to Monday, and at that time I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars and include certain excerpts. That is, two insertions in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two articles, one by John O'Donnell and one by Frank C. Waldrop.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolutions, which were referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

PROGRAM FOR PLANTING GUAYULE

House Resolution 346

(Rept. No. 1113)

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the progress of the program provided for in the act of March 5, 1942, for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward in a manner calculated to achieve such a domestic source in the shortest possible time.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, investigators, and other assistants, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as he may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

LOSS OF UNITED STATES NATIONALITY

House Resolution 433

(Rept. No. 1114)

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4103) to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PLANTS TO PRODUCE SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUEL

House Resolution 434

(Rept. No. 1115)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3209) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ADDITIONAL SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 381, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which is made in order by this resolution, provides for an Assistant Secretary to the Secretary of the Interior. As we all know, many additional responsibilities and duties have been given to the Secretary of the Interior, and I am informed by the committee that has held hearings on the bill that it is absolutely necessary he be given this additional help. I appreciate that years ago, before gentlemen on this side and some on the other side knew the qualifications and ability and courage of the Secretary of the Interior, there was much unjustifiable criticism of him, but today, after performing the duties that have been entrusted to him so well, so intelligently and courageously, I feel that we all recognize and appreciate that he is deserving of the aid that is provided in the bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman think the breaking of the Little Steel formula by the Secretary of the Interior is to his credit?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether he has broken it or not. It is not broken yet. I know he has striven to serve the country to the best of his ability. The position of an additional Secretary of the Interior is only for the duration and 6 months thereafter and is restricted to a compensation of $9,000 a year.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. RIZLEY. I have not heard the gentleman state the purpose of the resolution; that is, the need for the additional Secretary. What has brought about the need for the additional help?

Mr. SABATH. The need for this additional office is the burden that has been imposed upon the Secretary of the Interior by additional duties, such as problems relating to coal, oil, fisheries, geological surveys, and efforts to procure many materials for war purposes, duties which have been assigned to him by Congress, as well as by Executive orders of the President, and which duties I feel the Secretary of the Interior has tried to perform to the satisfaction of nearly all of the well-meaning American citizens having the best interests of the country at heart. I do not know of any man in the Government service who has worked harder, more intelligently, and courageously than the Secretary of the Interior. Of course, some people think that he has a little too much courage and too much intelligence. Personally I admire a man who is not afraid to say what is in his heart. If someone hits him below the belt he goes right after him. Regardless of how influential a person or a press antagonist may be, he is not afraid; and I admire him for it. I wish we had more such men in the public service as the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] 30 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has already re-

quested that I speak out of order. I do not know that my remarks will necessarily be out of order. Apparently there is not a great deal of opposition to this bill in the Committee of the Whole or in the Committee on Rules. It has been kicking around for a long while. Even the distinguished gentleman who presides over the destinies of the Committee on Rules, I think, has had the rule for some months before he, in his judgment and great wisdom, decided to bring it out on the floor of the House. Apparently there is no rush for this highly important legislation. But I might say that I am entirely open-minded. If this is needed, of course, it should be granted by the House after discussion by the Committee of the Whole. There are some points in connection with this bill that I would like to discuss. All this bill does is to create an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. There is already an Under Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries. This creates just one more, just one more at $9,000 a year, for some deserving Democrat. But not believing in any kind of partisanship or politics at any time, I am very glad, of course, in the desperation of the chairman, to help out the Democratic Party, to vote another $9,000 job, for which, I am sure, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] will be very grateful. I note that he is getting up to thank me. I appreciate it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has so expressed himself. I know my friend would have no objection to a Democrat being appointed. If your party was in power I would expect a Republican to be appointed. I want to make this observation in all sincerity; I hope it is a Democrat.

Mr. FISH. I want to agree with you. I hope a Democrat is appointed. I much prefer to see Democrats appointed under your administration than pseudo-Republicans. We do not want to be blamed for these pseudo-Republicans that you have. You can keep them. You have them now and you can keep them.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a brief question.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This bill provides for more than an additional Assistant Secretary for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Ohio has discovered something in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This is also a pay-raise bill; and I shall speak on that point later.

Mr. FISH. I am sure the gentleman from Ohio will get time under the rule of the committee to do that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman from Michigan want to contribute something? I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to ask if your generosity is a sort of a going-away present. I did not expect that to happen.

Mr. FISH. I know that they are on the way out, but I do not like to rub it in.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit a question on the bill?

Mr. FISH. I yield for a question on the bill, if it is not too serious a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In reading the Secretary of the Interior's letter addressed to the Speaker he apparently primarily justifies the passage of this bill based on Executive orders which have created additional work in his department.

Mr. FISH. That does not surprise the gentleman from Michigan, does it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; but I would like to have the comments of the gentleman from New York on this question. If the President continually creates vast Government operations under Executive orders and we continually supplement that by creating official jobs, such as is here proposed, wherein does the responsibility of Congress begin and end?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss at some greater length the matter I originally rose to discuss here today. The Secretary of the Interior has announced to the press—I do not know if he has taken the Congress into his confidence or not, or whether he has appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House or the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—that he proposes to build in Arabia, from Persia, over the sands of Arabia, for 1,250 miles, a pipe line to the Mediterranean. Now, just where he gets the authority, or whether he proposes, after he has constructed it and paid for it, to ask for our permission, I do not know. But I desire to discuss that matter at the present time, which discussion, I think, is in order, for which reason I did not think it necessary to ask to speak out of order.

Certainly Members of Congress are entitled to the facts to find out whether this is a part of a new global planning or global and world-wide W. P. A. policy, or whether it is merely secret diplomacy, or whether it is just Ickes diplomacy. Possibly it is dollar diplomacy; we do not know on either side, I am sure, whether we may not be embarking on a program of imperialism or dollar diplomacy.

So I rise simply for a question of information to ask—of course, it is a little bit selfish on my part; I come from the great State of New York, and our people there totaling tens of millions in that section—New Jersey, New England, and New York—want more oil, more fuel oil, and more gasoline; we would like a pipe line, a pipe line, I might suggest to the gentleman from Illinois, which might run from the southern part of Texas to Chicago and then on to New York to supply the needs of over 40,000,000 Americans. I do not know how many Arabs they are going to take care of nor how many Arabs they are going to put to work on this Arabian W. P. A. project. I do know, however, that it certainly is not a military project. It will probably take 2 or 3 years to build, and some of us hope the war in Europe will be over in 6 months or a year. This is nothing more than a project to spend the taxpayers' money to build a pipe line in a foreign land.

This sounds like an Arabian night's dream or more like a pipe dream than a reality. That is what the new dealers have told us they are planning to do. They are planning to spend our money when we cannot get enough to have another pipe line built from Texas to the East to take care of the actual needs of the people of that section of our own country.

Now, they will tell you there is no more oil in America. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and other Members from that State have heard this same old story for 25 years. They have said, "There will be no more oil in 14 years." They told us that 14 years ago. Now, they tell us the same thing. They then drill a little deeper and go down a few more thousand feet and they find a few more oil sands. They are now down to 10,000 and later on they will go down to 20,000 and they have and will continue to find oil sands. We cannot get the pipe to build another pipe line in America, although it is needed immediately, from Texas to New York, even if it does not go by way of Chicago. We can waive that. I only suggested that for the purpose of getting the chairman on our side, but they already have a little oil in Illinois.

Let us go back and see what this proposal really covers. Is this a commitment from the Teheran Conference or from the Cairo Conference? We heard a lot of ballyhoo about these wonderful conferences, but what do they amount to? What about the Atlantic Charter; that has disappeared now into thin air? You cannot find the Atlantic Charter any more. The Teheran Conference may turn out to be of even less importance than the Atlantic Charter. It may be just another of the administration's commitments that we know nothing about. We are trying to find out. They merely inform the Congress that they are going to spend millions of dollars. As is the New Deal custom they bandy millions around like they were nothing. This project alone may total $400,000,000 before they get through.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The big oil companies have got the American people on the hip on this Iran pipe line, have they not? It has been said by the Senate committee which made an investigation, that 70 percent of the oil was being furnished by this country. They tell us now that if we want them to furnish the oil there we will have to finance the pipe line.

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. If we do not furnish the pipe line we will have to furnish the oil. They have got us either way it goes.

Mr. FISH. We have never lost a war and we have never won a conference.

That is what has always happened to us. This is not English oil, or Arabian oil, or foreign oil. It is the oil produced by three American companies, the Standard Oil Co., the Gulf Oil Co. and the Texas Co. in Arabia. The Government, as usual, is being free with our taxpayers' money and will pay for the pipe line. The American taxpayers will pay for it. If those big oil companies want to build their own pipe line there is nothing to stop them, but they want the Government to underwrite it. This is nothing but national socialism or fascism.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York, Mr. FISH, has expired.

Mr. FISH. I will yield myself 5 additional minutes.

This is just the beginning of a world-wide plan for national socialism or fascism; the Government is using the taxpayers' money for the benefit of private enterprise, to build a pipe line that will be of no value to the American people after a couple of years.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. I commend the gentleman for criticizing the new pipe line that is proposed to be established by the Secretary of the Interior. I might venture the suggestion that if the Secretary of War were alert to the taxpayers' interests he would not want to befriend the Standard Oil of California, the executive vice president of which is Petroleum Administrator of War.

Mr. FISH. That is very interesting. I did not know that. The gentleman knows a great deal about it and I want to commend the gentleman publicly for what he is trying to do in this House, particularly for his efforts in trying to keep our own aluminum factories, in which we have invested over a billion dollars, in operation instead of spending about $150,000,000 more to buy aluminum from Canada. This is the same principle involved as in the Canol pipe-line project in Alaska—another $150,000,000. They can always find $150,000,000 for any foreign nation, but we cannot find it for the benefit of our own people. For 2 days the House has been sitting here arguing and rearguing about the spending of $20,000,000, and then Mr. Ickes pulls a rabbit out of his hat to the tune of $150,000,000 to spend in some foreign land.

The distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], who has just been appointed chairman of what I believe to be the most important committee in the House, a committee that has to do with post-war economic planning and policy, designed to devise a program for the future which will provide employment for 11,000,000 Americans who will come back from the war, and another 11,000,000 who will be demobilized from our factories. Certainly building this pipe line in Arabia will not put any soldiers back to work in America. If you are going to build pipe lines let us build them here in America for the benefit of the American people and provide employment to those who may be unemployed within the next 6 months or a year.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does not the gentleman think that the history of the South Pacific would have been much better if we had sent $150,000,000 worth of planes, food, ammunition, and quinine to the boys on Bataan and Corregidor?

Mr. FISH. Yes, and 50 of our destroyers, too. But I cannot cover that now. I am supposed to be talking about one assistant secretary at $9,000 a year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have in my hand a resolution that I am introducing, a resolution of inquiry asking what benefits, if any, are to be derived from the pipe line in Persia, what our supply is, what will be needed in the post-war period regarding oil.

Mr. FISH. Why does not the gentlewoman introduce it and make one of her able speeches on it?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is going into the hopper right now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement with reference to the expenditure of this money by the Secretary of the Interior. Does he not agree with me that the least that could be done is to bring this matter before the House and before the Congress and have it considered; at least have it given some consideration before we have an agency of the Government going out and agreeing to make a contract to spend this money?

Mr. FISH. I am glad the gentleman in his wisdom understands what I am trying to do. That is all I am attempting to do. I am merely trying to bring this matter out into the open, to expose this secret diplomacy before the House, and have it referred to the proper committees, and have it considered in the House and Senate before they give away $150,000,000 and make these unauthorized commitments and turn us into an international Santa Claus. There is one thing the people do not want, and that is a world-wide W. P. A. with our money wasted in foreign nations thousands and thousands of miles away from home. Go home to your districts and you will not find any of your constituents who are for things like that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the gentleman this question. I think he is entirely in order in discussing the pipe line, because this letter cites four executive orders which have been issued in the Department of Interior and presented here in justification of this bill. Did not the Secretary of the Interior have some rather caustic remarks to make about the oil expedition that was made up in Canada?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under the direction of the Army?

Mr. FISH. Yes. You will find that this report covers the whole question of oil, solid fuels, and all of that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Canadian oil situation developed through secret negotiations?

Mr. FISH. Yes. Although we spent a large amount of money there they now find the war has moved 3,000 miles away.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Secretary of the Interior proceeds to do the very thing he condemned the War Department for doing.

Mr. FISH. And the Standard Oil Co. is behind both—both Canada and the new Arabian pipe line. It is a great thing to have the Government of the United States put up the money for the Standard Oil Co. to extend its pipe lines all over the world.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The independent oil producers out my way are discouraged trying to get an increase of 35 cents a barrel for crude oil, yet they can go over there and spend $150,000,000.

Mr. FISH. Oh, yes; they are not going to give anything for research or for the purpose of finding new oil here; that would benefit no one but our own people.

Mr. RIZLEY. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, since he has brought it into this discussion, the purpose of this bill probably was connected up with this new policy that my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, who knows all about the oil business, together with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma have a resolution pending over in the other body to have this whole thing investigated by the Congress.

Mr. FISH. May I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma, as a Member who comes from an oil district, that he introduce an identical resolution in the House, that he associate with him also the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. These two Members come from oil-producing districts. I suggest that they introduce the same resolution in the House.

Mr. RIZLEY. Why did the Rules Committee let this thing come out?

Mr. FISH. This proposed pipe line is not in this resolution and it would not have come up except we were just using it as a vehicle to develop and discuss the issue. As long as we are trying to find out the facts, perhaps we might also find out something about the Teheran Conference when we delve into this oil project. We may even find there was such a commitment made at that Conference. I wish to read a few extracts from an article by Raymond Clapper on the Teheran Conference, so it can be recorded in the RECORD:

> There must be a thrill for such powerful Allied leaders as they go into seclusion behind the secret portals to settle the affairs of the world, but they are slipping into a state of oriental arrogance regarding the interests of democratic peoples.

This is a most arrogant act on the part of Secretary Ickes, taking American money, the people's money, without the advice and consent of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Here is a statement by Dorothy Thompson, whom everyone will admit is a New Deal partisan. She wrote:

> We received reiterations of noble phrases but not a single positive principle. Our Government is in extreme danger of boring the American people to excruciation, if it does not irritate them into blind opposition, because they do not take the American people into their confidence.

Not only 130,000,000 Americans, but the Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike, are not taken into the confidence of the administration when they go out and make these commitments. Was this one of the commitments? Have we not a right to know?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Usually the gentleman is 100-percent right, but I am wondering if he is in this instance. Why should we discriminate against Teheran when we are building a pipe line up in Canada for the Canadians?

Mr. FISH. I suppose what the gentleman means to ask is, Why should we discriminate against one nation while we are so lavish with all the others?

Mr. KNUTSON. I think if we are going to be Santa Claus to one nation, we should not discriminate against another.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman suggests that instead of spending just millions on these boondoggling projects it ought to be billions—I know the gentleman does not really think that, but at least that expresses the fallacious New Deal idea, that we have unlimited money, that we can continue to drain the lifeblood and resources of America for all these foreign transactions, whether they call for $150,000,000 or $150,000,000,000.

Let us put an end to this; let us insist on being furnished with the facts. Let the Congress demand that Mr. Ickes come before it and give us the facts and prove his case before he is permitted to spend one single dollar for a foreign oil line for the benefit of private companies having sufficient resources of their own to build the same pipe line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REOPEN MAIL FACILITIES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND AREAS IN ITALY OCCUPIED BY THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to call the attention of the Congress to a very serious problem that faces Americans of Italian origin in the United States. Since Pearl Harbor they have not been permitted to communicate with their relatives in Italy or receive mail from them. There are very few of us of Italian origin who do not have close relatives in Italy; many of us have mothers, fathers, and brothers, not speaking of cousins, aunts, and uncles. We have learned through the news of the terrific destruction of towns and lives, particularly in the southern part of Italy. We have also learned of the terrible suffering of the civilian population in Italy. We are all anxious to know what has happened to our people there. We are not permitted to send or receive mail in any form or manner. It seems to me it would be not only humane but also a tremendous contribution to the morale of the people here, as well as the Italian people in Italy whose sympathies are thoroughly with the United Nations, if we would be permitted to receive news from our relatives and to send them news about ourselves. All that we ask is permission to receive from and send mail to people in the areas in Italy now occupied by the armed forces of the United Nations. We all know that there is a strict censorship on mail going to and from the United States. This would guarantee against the sending of any information that would be detrimental to the military interests of the United Nations. Consequently I have written to the President the following letter under date of January 31, 1944:

JANUARY 31, 1944.

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You, I know, would be the first to give testimony to the unquestioned loyalty of Americans of Italian descent. Their contribution to our armed forces and to the battle for freedom on the home front match in every detail the records of other Americans. It is for this reason that I am addressing this letter to you to urge that through your good offices a way be found to facilitate the interchange of mail between American citizens and their relatives, who are Italians residing in Sicily and those parts of Italy now occupied by United Nations forces.

I represent a congressional district largely populated by Americans of Italian origin. Among my constituents there is a great and understandable anxiety concerning the fate of their blood kin in Italy. They cannot see, now that our forces have gained control of a substantial area of Italy why it is not possible for them to communicate with their relatives in this area, to ascertain their present status and their needs. If such exchange of mail were possible, I firmly believe that it would be a great contribution toward easing the worry of our people and would at the same time serve to strengthen the ties of friendship between Italians in this area and our troops now present in the area.

My suggestion is made, with full appreciation of the need to limit such an arrangement so as not in any way to create problems of security or inconvenience to our forces now fighting in Italy. Such a limitation, I believe, is possible and would prevent any difficulties that otherwise might arise.

You will appreciate, I am confident, the great joy that would be engendered among Americans of Italian descent and among Italians in Italy by such wise and friendly action on your part, I most earnestly urge you to act favorably upon this suggestion at your earliest possible moment.

Sincerely,

VITO MARCANTONIO,
Member of Congress.

I do hope that Members of Congress who are interested in this situation will also send letters to the President along similar lines urging that this humanitarian act be performed. It will be of immeasurable aid to the morale of our people here, to the Italian people in Italy, and it will be of considerable aid to our troops now fighting in Italy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SOMETHING WRONG

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, with millions of men and women in the armed forces, with the lives of hundreds of thousands of men engaged in mortal combat and the issue of success or failure depending upon the production and transportation to them of sufficient munitions of war and food, the facts demonstrate that something is radically wrong with the administration's labor policy.

THE PRESIDENT'S LABOR POLICY

In recent days, more than one editorial has been written, charging that the President has no labor policy. That conclusion is erroneous. Since 1935, the record shows that the President has a definite labor policy. Stated briefly, it was, and it is, a policy designed to placate labor leaders, to grant labor organizations special privileges. In return, the President has received the political support of all but one of the outstanding labor politicians.

HAS FAILED

That policy has failed to end strikes, slow-downs, work stoppages, or to bring peace between employees and employers. The failure has been due to the administration's refusal to adopt, state, and adhere to fundamental principles which have guided our people, and to the further refusal to recognize the fact that the bosses, the labor politicians, neither think nor act as do the average, the overwhelming majority of American workers, who have sons, brothers, and husbands with the armed forces.

NO-STRIKE PROMISE

Not so long ago, President Murray of the C. I. O. and President Green of the A. F. L. and many another labor leader gave his solemn promise as did the unions by the action of their executive boards, that there would be no strikes in wartime.

HAS NOT BEEN KEPT

Whether that promise has been violated is not a matter for argument. It is

a matter of record in the office of the United States Secretary of Labor. That record shows that, in 1942, there were 2,968 strikes which caused a loss of 4,-182,500 man-days; while, in the first 11 months of 1943, while our Army and our Navy were fighting abroad, we had 3,425 strikes and that the man-days lost were more than three times as many, and totaled 12,785,000.

Now, it is no answer to say that the time lost was only a fraction of the actual time worked. Nor is it an answer to point to the wonderful record of production.

NO EXCUSE FOR STRIKES

It was on Monday last, speaking at Kansas City, Mo., that A. F. L.'s president, William Green, said:

No matter how unjust conditions may become, no matter how sharp the aggravation may be, the members of the American Federation of Labor should realize that they must stay on the job and keep producing to the limit of their ability until final victory is won.

When the lives of our sons and brothers and loved ones are at stake, when victory in this war against hatred, tyranny, hangs in the balance, there cannot be any justification or excuse for any strike or stoppage of work.

BREAK IN SUPPLY LINE DANGEROUS

Industrial plants might be likened to ammunition dumps near the battlefield. Transportation might be compared to the lines of communication between the ammunition dump and the man in the fox hole at the front. We all know what would happen to the men at the fighting front if the ammunition dump is blown up or if the lines of communication are cut. The battle is lost and men lose their lives or are taken prisoner.

The same result—exactly the same thing—happens if industrial plants here at home are closed; if transportation lines are down.

THREATS WHICH DISCOURAGE

Yet it was only last December when the railway brotherhoods, for some reason unknown to the general public, threatened that, unless their demands were met by December 31, our national transportation system would be tied up.

That may have been an idle threat, but it was unfortunate and it resulted in the President, figuratively speaking, putting the Army for a few days in charge of the railroads.

CAUSES OF STRIKES

And strikes have continued—some of them due to delay and the conflicting action of Government agencies charged with the settlement of labor disputes; some of them due to factions in labor organizations and to jurisdictional disputes between unions, and some due to the actions of the union officials themselves.

WORKERS NOT DISLOYAL

It cannot with truth be charged that recent strikes and those which exist at the present time are due to the disloyalty of the workers themselves. The American worker—and I refer now to the industrial employees—is just as selfish, just as unselfish, just as patriotic as is the average citizen. He has at the fighting front—on land, on sea, under the sea, and in the air—his own flesh and blood—sons, brothers, and husbands—and it is absurd to think for one moment that the overwhelming majority of those engaged in production and transportation do not want to win the war as quickly as possible, with the least possible loss of life, and that all are not hoping for the safe return of the loved ones.

STRIKES AS ENEMY PROPAGANDA

Nevertheless, we have had, and we have now, strikes which interfere with production. We have strikes out of which our enemies are making propaganda. Yesterday's press carried this caption: "Tokyo radio reports United States labor unrest"; then the statement that the Domei News Agency broadcast:

A dispatch from Fall River, Mass., said the United States Army took over operation of seven textile plants last night at the direction of Roosevelt, owing to a strike by independent unions.

LACK OF FAIR LABOR POLICY CAUSE OF STRIKES

One of the causes for strikes is laid squarely on the White House doorstep by John P. Frey, head of the metal-trades department of the A. F. of L., who recently urged the creation of a central clearing house to dispose of industrial disputes.

Frey made no attempt to defend or condone strikes. On the contrary, he stated that they were indefensible and intolerable. But he made it clear that, in his opinion at least, the end of strikes was not in sight. He said that labor had been forced to meet "an almost impossible administrative condition" in the Government.

He also said:

Those of us charged with labor responsibility frequently find it difficult to know which way to turn or to whom to go. Problems which should be settled accumulate and become enmeshed in the multiplicity of Government agencies and their conflicting policies and decisions.

COMMUNISTS CAUSE STRIKES

Another cause for trouble is the power which the Communists have acquired in the C. I. O. organization. It was on February 3 that here in Washington, Philip Pearl, A. F. of L. director of public relations and official spokesman, commenting upon certain action of the C. I. O., described it as "one of the most despicable betrayals" of organized labor "in the staggering record of treachery perpetrated by the Communist Party in America."

In his column, Facing the Facts, Pearl referred to Bridges and Curran as Communist leaders, and he added:

For the events of the last few weeks have proved even to the most broad-minded that several C. I. O. unions are infested with a type of verminous leadership that is dangerous to the health and safety of the workers of America.

Without conscience, without scruple, without the least vestige of principle, these so-called union leaders have betrayed the basic freedoms of the American labor movement in a major crisis.

* * * * *

A "united front" was presented on this issue—the draft-labor proposal—until the "Communist lice" spoke up.

First we heard from the illustrious Joe Curran, of the National Maritime Union, who has been hailed far and wide as one of the great heroes in this war because of his successful fight to evade the draft. Mr. Curran announced that the patriotic thing for labor to do was to consent to enslave itself under the terms of the National Service Act.

This might have been considered merely an individual aberration, but then we heard from Harry Bridges, the supremely loyal leader of the C. I. O. longshoremen's union, who also has assumed heroic proportions in American life for his long and successful fight to evade deportation. Mr. Bridges also endorsed the draft-labor law.

* * * * *

And the C. I. O. can do without the counterparts of Russian trade unions. Unless it rids itself of the Currans and the Bridges, they will stab the C. I. O. in the back at every opportunity. And until the C. I. O. succeeds in delousing these unions, there is little hope of a united labor movement in America.

Read again the foregoing, and, as you read, remember those are not my words; those are the words of the A. F. of L. director of public relations and official spokesman for the A. F. of L.

NO EXCUSE FOR JURISDICTIONAL STRIKES

There is no need to cite illustrations of jurisdictional disputes, for all are familiar with many strikes growing out of such disputes, occurring sometimes between affiliates of the same union, sometimes between affiliates of the C. I. O. and the unions affiliated with the A. F. of L.

NEW STRIKES

The morning paper carries the news that 700 day-shift workers engaged in war work at the Bendix Aviation Corporation in New York walked out yesterday without, according to the press, giving any reason for the walk-out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to have the RECORD show at this point that the January 15 issue of the Nation carries a long article by Victor Johnson, who is a very important labor official in two of the big shipyards, and he makes the same complaint, that they will threaten to strike and they will continue to strike largely because of these delays in the departments down here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, and we get the same thing from the hearings before the Smith committee.

Yesterday's paper carried the headline, "United States takes over strike-bound textile plants," and the news story tells us that the strike began on December 13, when independent craft unions of skilled workers called their members out of 12 plants in protest against their inability to win bargaining points, notwithstanding an order of the W. L. B. that the men go back to work.

The strike grew out of the fact that a Government agency refused to permit the independent unions to bargain for their own members. Now the Government takes over.

RAIDING OF ONE UNION BY ANOTHER CAUSES STRIKES

According to the press, late last week approximately 50,000 skilled workers belonging to the Mechanics Education Society of America, an independent union,

went on strike and crippled war production in some 44 plants in Michigan and Ohio. This strike is due to the refusal of a Government agency to give the independent union an election to determine bargaining agents. It claims it is being raided by the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. and that its very existence depends upon an immediate secret election. It charges the N. L. R. B. with stalling and aiding rival organizations.

The independent union also complains because, while the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L., and industrialists have members representing them on the War Labor Board, they have none.

FAILURE OF W. L. B. TO ACT CAUSES STRIKE

Another press dispatch of February 7 is captioned "3,000 foundry workers strike."

They are out in 40 factories. They passed a resolution stating:

> We are striking in protest against passing the buck. Our wage-increase request has been approved by the employers but has been turned down by the Government and we can't get any satisfaction.

The strike may halt production of castings for landing barges.

The dispatch carries the further statement that Chester A. Sample, vice president of that particular union, said that the international will sanction the strike, although union officials have asked the workers to heed a W. L. B. appeal that they remain on the job.

The wage increase, although agreed to by the employers and the employees, was denied by a regional W. L. B. panel.

UNIONS CONDONE SLOW-DOWN

An illustration that the unions themselves are not free from blame but sanction slow-downs is found in the account given Monday, January 24, of trouble at the Edgewater, N. J., plant of the Ford Motor Co., where the C. I. O. has a bargaining contract.

Very few Members of Congress have not received from eye-witnesses written or verbal accounts of slow-downs in factories in their own or adjoining districts. Many such complaints from individuals I know personally have come to me.

In this instant case, two truck testers were involved in the dispute. Neil Smith and John Elvin are veteran employees. Nevertheless, because they turned out too much work, they were expelled from the union and, under the union's contract with the company, if properly expelled, would be discharged.

A letter from Bennett of the company to R. J. Thomas, president of the union, explains the situation. It reads as follows:

> The ability of these men to do their operation speedily and efficiently in one-third of the time it has formerly taken aroused resentment among their coworkers and officials of Local 906 of your union at the Edgewater plant. Some of the officials and a number of other members of Local 906 approached these two men and told them that they must take 45 minutes to perform the operation.

When Smith and Elvin continued to perform the job in 15 minutes, the letter stated, members of the local "attempted to intimidate them with threats of bodily harm and expulsion from the union."

The union did expel them and demanded that the company dismiss them. Company officials reported that the 2 were each able to test between 22 and 24 trucks per day, while other drivers were able to test but 10 or 12 daily.

The union officials deny that the men were expelled because they worked too fast and charge that they had not been doing their work properly. Inasmuch as the company inspector made no complaints of the work, it may be that the union's charge of incompetency is merely a subterfuge.

Elvin has appealed to the President. He is the father of seven children, with a son in the Army. It will be interesting to see whether these men are protected in their effort to give their utmost to the defeat of our enemies.

CAUSE OF LABOR DISPUTES

In addition to the foregoing instances, hundreds—yes, perhaps thousands—can be cited. Now there must be some basic cause for all this labor trouble. Certainly it is not due to low wages, for wages today in industrial war plants are comparatively high.

It cannot be due to disloyalty or a lack of patriotism, for our workers are not only patriotic, but their own flesh and blood is on the fighting front and the lives of those who are near and dear to them are dependent upon production and transportation.

The cause goes further back than the beginning of the present war. It is deeper than dissatisfaction with either wages or working conditions. It cannot be wholly accounted for on the ground that the Communists are boring from within, although their methods, their procedure, is responsible for a large part of the trouble between employees and employers.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL TRADING

Much of the present trouble is due to the policy of the President of trading special privileges in return for political support. That is a serious charge. Unfortunately, the facts support it.

PRESIDENT'S POLITICAL BARGAIN

The C. I. O. has officially endorsed the President for a fourth term. Both the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. supported him in his third-term drive. Both have contributed time, effort, speakers, writers, and money to the effort to defeat anti-New Deal Senators and Congressmen. Both have called for the defeat of two-thirds of the Members of the House and the Senate who voted for the Connally-Smith bill. Both have recently been engaged in a Nation-wide effort to prevent the reelection of Members of Congress who have opposed the President politically.

We all recall how even John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers contributed some $700,000 to the campaign fund of the President, for his election and for the election of new dealers.

That end of the bargain is being carried out. Let us turn then to the other side of the picture and take a look at what the administration has done to further the interests of the three great labor organizations.

Prior to 1935 there was a practice among certain employers of requiring all employees to enter into a contract under which they agreed that they would not remain or become members of a union during the term of their employment. That was known as the yellow-dog contract and it was outlawed by the enactment of the Norris-LaGuardia legislation, which prohibited the making of such contracts and which gave to labor immunity from the operation of injunctions except under certain special circumstances.

THE ADMINISTRATION LAID FOUNDATION FOR LABOR TROUBLE

Then, in 1935, came the Wagner law, or the N. L. R. A. It was hailed by organized labor leaders as their Magna Carta. A National Labor Relations Board was created to interpret and administer it.

The A. F. of L. of that day, which boasted that it was the father of the law, evidently thought that by it independent unions would be put out of business. But unexpectedly, on labor's doorstep was found a new baby, the C. I. O. Wet-nursed by the Senate Civil Liberties Committee; cared for and nurtured by the N. L. R. B., the C. I. O. experienced a phenomenal growth.

Without effective protest from Michigan's Governor or the Nation's President, the little C. I. O. baby had grown so strong that, on the 31st day of December 1936, with armed goon squads from without the State it was able to march into Michigan, violate the law with impunity, defy the peace officers and the National Guard of the State, and set at naught the orders of the courts.

Provisioned and armed, by force and through the exercise of violence it took possession of private property, of the streets of some of Michigan's cities, and from the 31st day of December 1936, to the 10th day of June 1937, it forcibly imposed its will upon hundreds of thousands of citizens of Michigan.

Spreading across the country like a pestilence, it brought disorder, violence, the denial of the protection of the Constitution, to the workers and the citizens of Niles, Canton, Massillon, Akron, and other Ohio and Michigan cities. Only the Governor of Indiana turned back the armed and marching forces when they sought to invade his State, until finally, after a reign of violence and bloodshed, Governor Davey, of Ohio, asserted that the State was supreme.

From that day to this; yes, down to the present moment, massed picket lines, with the protection of the Federal courts and the Federal administration, have prevented patriotic citizens serving their country, aiding in the defeat of our enemies, by performing their usual tasks in factory, mill, and mine.

The National Labor Relations law was unfair and was lopsided when it was enacted. It has been misinterpreted and maladministered. That is a charge which has been made against it by both the president of the A. F. of L. and of the C. I. O., as well as by hundreds of thousands of employers and employees who have been deprived of their just rights through its administration.

THE REMEDY

There is a remedy. It will be found in the enactment and enforcement of a just, fair labor law, which not only protects the rights of unions, of organized workers, but of the unorganized worker, of employers, and of the citizens generally.

The present law should be amended in at least five particulars:

First. It should be amended so that an employee has the right to join or not to join a union.

Second. It should provide that employees shall be free from coercion from any source—coercion by union officials and unions as well as by employers.

Third. It should provide for secret elections, conducted by impartial public officials who do not belong to the unions, who are not employers.

Fourth. It should provide for an appeal to a court and jury from all decisions of fact by the Board.

Fifth. It should contain provisions which, while protecting the right of collective bargaining and the right to peaceful picketing and to strike, should prohibit violence, sympathetic and jurisdictional strikes, and make unions, union officials, and union members responsible for and liable for damage growing out of violence or the violation of contracts.

There are many other secondary improvements which can be placed in the law. Inasmuch as the law and its administration has been condemned, not only by the public generally, by employers, but by the labor organizations themselves, it is long past time when the law should be rewritten.

As long ago as March 13, 1939, after weeks of study, I rewrote the N. L. R. A. and introduced a bill to repeal it and substitute the new version. Ever since, that bill, although reintroduced in succeeding Congresses, has reposed in committee, and action on it—even a hearing on it—is denied by the administration forces.

The labor disputes have grown in number; strikes have increased. Here we are at war, and the Congress of the United States lacks either the inclination or the courage to put on the books an over-all labor statute which would be at least an effort to end or lessen labor disputes; lessen the interference with our attempt here on the home front to give all-out support to our fighting forces.

Not only must the N. L. R. A. be drastically amended so as to give employees—nonunion as well as union—employers, and the public equal justice under law, but the administrative agency which interprets and applies it must be impartial, wholly divorced from the control of either the unions or employers.

THE AUSTIN-WADSWORTH BILL IS NOT THE REMEDY

The President's recent demand for the universal draft of manpower, if and when certain other conditions named by him had been brought about, to me lacks sincerity. Strikes, slow-downs, work stoppages, will not be prevented by the drafting of America's men and women, putting them under the control of a dictator.

Great Britain has a sweeping national service law. It has stringent rules for dealing with absenteeism and tardiness. Workers may not change jobs without the Government's permission. Every man and woman up to 40 years of age is subject to the labor draft and the Minister of Labor has authority to direct any person of any age to perform "any service that person is capable of performing at the prevailing rate of pay for the job."

Yet, last year, Great Britain had 1,775 strikes and the strikes in 1943 caused a loss of 1,800,000 man-days.

Everything that the English have is not necessarily good for us.

This administration is already exercising altogether too much arbitrary power. Our whole theory of government is based upon the principle that a free man will render greater service to his State than will the regimented individual.

That theory has demonstrated its soundness and simply because other peoples ruled by dictators are engaged in a bloody war is no reason why we should abandon the system which has placed us as a people above all other nations.

All our people need, all our people want, is the opportunity to guide their own destinies, to work out their own salvation. They have the ability, the courage, and the determination to win this war and to restore constitutional government in this land.

Once they can be assured that their Government will treat them fairly, that they will have equal justice under law, labor disputes, dissension, disunity, will be reduced to a minimum and we will go forward, united, and wholeheartedly make the defeat of our enemies, the reestablishment of American traditions, our first, our only objective.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make and the remarks I have made today, and include therein certain statements and excerpts, not including charts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PRICE CONTROL HAS SAVED UNITED STATES $65,000,000,000 ALREADY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently, upon the floor of this House and in the Senate, statements have been made that there is little danger of inflation; that fears expressed by Government officials over the danger of rising prices have been greatly exaggerated. The truth is that never in the history of this Nation has such a cloudburst of dollars rained down upon this country as is deluging it at present, and never has so large a proportion of the Nation's output gone off to war. Never have such powerful inflationary pressures developed, and week by week they are piling up more and more powerfully behind the price-control dam erected by order of this Congress.

These facts I intend to prove, but first let us see what happened to the buying power of the dollar in the three other major wars in which this Nation engaged. In the War of the Revolution the buying power of the dollar shrank to 33 cents, in the Civil War to 44 cents, in World War No. 1 to 40 cents.

As a result, the value of investments shrank, fixed incomes were cut in half or less, war costs were vastly increased, war debts were needlessly expanded, and post-war price collapse created even greater hardships than wartime inflation.

This time, for the first time, Congress and the President decided that the Nation should not be subjected to the terrible ravages of wartime inflation. We erected for the first time a price-control dam.

In World War No. 1, as we have seen, the purchasing value of the dollar declined to 40 cents. This is how it happened:

In 1914 war orders were placed in this country, but few deliveries were made. Inflationary pressures had not begun to pile up and living costs increased only seven-tenths of 1 percent. In the next year, orders placed by our future allies began to inflate buying power, while taking away for war the extra goods produced. Living costs advanced to 7.8 percent, above the 1914 base. In 1917 we entered the war. Living costs rose to 28 percent above the 1914 base. In 1918 inflationary forces were powerfully at work. Now, living cost was over 50 percent above the 1914 level. By the end of 1919, living costs were 73 percent above the 1914 base. In 1920, inflationary forces engendered by the war finally carried living costs to a peak 108 percent above their 1914 beginning.

Now, $2,000 is a little above an average income in the United States; but it is a good foundation for judging the effect of such an inflationary price rise upon fixed incomes. What was a fixed income of $2,000 in 1914 shrank during this 6-year period, until at the 1920 peak it had a purchasing value of only $960. It lost $1,040 of its buying power. And do not think, Mr. Speaker, there were no heartbreaks in such a decline. Persons who had worked hard all their lives to build up annuities for their old age, stood helpless and saw them melt away. First, they cut down in their food, but soon that did not suffice. Then they cut their rent, by moving to poorer quarters. Their clothes grew shabby, but they could not be replaced. That is the tragedy which inflation brings in its wake.

But that was only a fraction of the damage done. War demanded iron, steel, copper, zinc, lead, coal, petroleum, and other materials in greatly increased quantities. Nowhere near the quantities demanded in this war, but great nonetheless. And without a price-control dam to hold inflationary forces in check, prices

began to soar. This chart shows some of the increases from 1914, when the war began, to the end of 1918.

Price increases first 52 months, World War No. 1

	Percent
Steel plates	181
Pig iron	145
Copper	93
Zinc	80
Anthracite coal	43
Bituminous coal	135
Lumber	71
Tin	156
Coke	171
Cement	75
Petroleum	200
Lead	106

These increases, of course, added largely to the cost of the war. In fact, the total cost of World War No. 1 was $32,000,000,000. Of this, $17,000,000,000 was a necessary cost; $15,000,000,000 a price-increase cost. We still are paying interest on debts created by this price-increase cost.

Whatever goes up artificially, however, must come down. It took 6 years for prices to rise to the peak. It took less than 2 years for them to collapse. In the first year they dropped 32 percent. At the end of the second year they were 45 percent below the peak. And the results were tragic.

Factory workers' average take-home pay dropped 25 percent; from $27.50 to $20.70. Factory employment declined 31 percent and the total weekly factory pay rolls dropped from $244,000,000 to $136,000,000, a decline of 44 percent.

Farmers were hit hardest of all. Farm prices went all to pieces. These were the 2 years' declines:

	Percent
Wheat	65
Corn	78
Oats	71
Cotton	76
Potatoes	85
Rice	79
Peanuts	73
Lambs	61
Hogs	66
Beef cattle	57
Butter	53
Milk (wholesale)	32
Eggs	73
Hens	39
Oranges	75

Recently, in a radio address, a distinguished Member of the House said, and I quote:

> There was a general increase in the price level during the last World War that was much greater than anything that has taken place during a corresponding period in this war, but there was no inflation.

If there was no inflation in the last war, I wonder from just what heights did these prices decline?

In those 2 fateful years per capita farm income in the United States dropped from $1,430 to $554 and total farm income dropped from $9,249,000,000 to $3,603,000,000. And in the next 5 years 453,000 farmers lost their farms through mortgage foreclosures.

Just imagine what that meant in human worry and suffering. Four hundred and fifty-three thousand farmers who started out with high hopes to build homes and safe incomes for themselves and their families losing their all. How many sleepless nights, how many hidden tears, how many suicides were wrapped up in those cold figures—four, five, three, zero, zero, zero. I for one want no repetition of such a catastrophe.

Business dreams, too, collapsed. Not for the most part dreams of big businessmen, but dreams of ordinary men, owners of little factories erected with high hopes, of little stores swept out, painted and opened to the public with dreams of growing big, of little repair shops, and tiny service stations. All the hopes wrapped up in them vanished in thin air, not due to failures of their owners but because of economic conditions over which they as individuals had no control. Post-war deflation did it to them. In the 5 years following the price collapse, 106,196 businesses went into bankruptcy, an increase of 47 percent over the average number before the war. The fact that business failures continued high during the last five speculative years of the 1920's brought not one of them back to business life.

Perhaps there are other Members who think there was no dangerous and damaging inflation during the last war. If so, I suggest they go back to their districts and talk to some of the farmers who lost their farms in those 2 fateful deflationary years, who have not forgotten the bitter experience of trying to repay with $1.06 wheat mortgages placed when land values were based on $2.98 wheat. Unfortunately, a new crop of farmers own those 453,000 farms now, or we would not have so many of them crying again for inflationary farm prices.

Fixed incomes cut in half, war costs multiplied, war debts piled up, post-war deflation wrecking dreams and creating paupers throughout the land—that is the price we paid for the last war's inflation.

This time, for the first time, the Congress and the President decided that the people need not be helpless victims of inflationary pressures. They decided to hold the waters from the economic cloudburst of this war in check. This time, for the first time, we erected a price-control dam.

It was well that we did so; for this time the economic cloudburst far exceeds that of the last war. In the last war, in the first 52 months, $32,000,000,000 rained down upon the country. You have seen the result. This time, however, in the first 52 months, $142,000,000,000 has rained down upon the country and it still is raining hard. The rain in 1944 will total some $90,000,000,000. Public buying power after taxes was $58,000,000,000 in the fourth year of the last war. This time it is $124,000,000,000.

Unfortunately, only a fraction of the water is being drained off by taxes and the sale of bonds to the public. So month by month water is piling higher and still higher behind the dam. In the first three-quarters of 1943 alone, war expenditures exceeded taxes and bond sales to the public by more than $40,000,000,000.

Another measure of inflationary pressure is money in circulation. In the last war it increased from $3,400,000,000 to $5,900,000,000. In this war it has increased from $7,200,000,000 to $19,900,000,000, and it is climbing month by month.

Demand deposits, subject to check withdrawals, also rose far more than in World War No. 1. In the First World War they rose from $10,082,000,000 on June 30, 1914, to $14,843,000,000 in June 30, 1918. In the present war they rose from $27,355,000,000 on June 30, 1939, to $56,039,000,000 on June 30, 1943, and still they are rising.

At the peak of the war effort in 1918 only about 25 percent of all goods produced went to war. A considerably larger share was left for civilian purchase. In this war nearly one-half of all goods produced is going to war.

Evidence might be multiplied, but by now it should be evident to everyone that in comparison with those of any previous war the inflationary pressures of this war are gigantic. Had it not been for the price-control dam which the Congress and the President so wisely erected there is every reason to believe that the inflationary waters would have swept over our fair countryside, lifting prices above all previous flood-stage markers. Thank God, I say, for our price-control dam.

It was 19 months after the war broke out in Europe before the President, by Executive order, set up the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply. By that time the cost of living had risen 3.7 percent. It was 29 months after the war broke out in Europe before we passed the Price Control Act. By then living costs had risen 13.6 percent. It was 38 months after war broke out in Europe before we passed the Stabilization Act. By then living costs had risen 19.5 percent. Since then they have risen only 5.6 percent, and since April 1943, for the last 9 difficult months, the cost-of-living index has stayed practically stable, having risen only three-tenths of 1 percent.

With war expenditures in those 9 months exceeding the sums collected by taxes and the sale of War bonds to the public by $27,400,000,000, and with currency in circulation increasing from $16,250,000,000 to $20,500,000,000, I consider that fact the most remarkable economic accomplishment in our Nation's history, if not in world history. For never in history did any nation build up such great inflationary pressures in so short a period of time, yet holding living costs in line.

But an even more remarkable job has been done in controlling the prices of basic materials entering largely into the cost of this war. Let me give you some figures. In this column you see percentage increases during the first 52 months of the First World War. In this column you see comparable percentage increases during a like period in this war. And in this column you see the peak increase

due to World War No. 1 inflation. Let me read the figures:

War materials price increases

	Percentage increases		
	World War No. 1 (51 months)	World War No. 2 (51 months)	World War No. 1 (inflation peak)
Steel plates	187	0	695
Pig iron	145	14	304
Copper	93	15	165
Zinc	80	70	345
Anthracite coal	43	26	65
Bituminous coal	135	22	264
Lumber	71	59	72
Tin	156	0	228
Cement	76	0	276
Coke	171	19	268
Glass (plate)	81	0	81
Petroleum	200	13	215
Lead	106	29	195
Wool (wholesale)	203	62	264
Cotton (wholesale)	137	106	222

And here is an astonishing, almost unbelievable fact: If prices had risen in this war in the same proportion that they rose in the last war, this war instead of costing $136,000,000,000 would have cost $201,000,000,000. The net difference is $65,000,000,000. And if we continue to hold the line this figure will by the end of 1944 rise to $120,000,000,000.

And some people talk about the cost of O. P. A. and subsidies and the stabilization program. Why, gentlemen, the money this Congress has invested in O. P. A. is the best investment this Government or any other government ever made. In fact, 1 year's interest on the $65,000,000,000 saved approximates the total cost of O. P. A. to date with the total cost of subsidies added. The return to the Government on its investment is about 3,000 percent.

There is a lot of foolish talk about subsidies. In fact, I cannot remember when such specious reasoning ever was presented to this Congress as has been going the rounds about subsidies.

Subsidies, my friends, are one stone, but an essential one, in the price-control dam. They are costing $1,200,000,000 a year. Chester Bowles tells us that to hold food prices firmly in 1944 will cost $1,500,000,000 in subsidies.

Now we are told that every cent spent for subsidies has to be borrowed and that therefore subsidies are inflationary. It is very true, of course, that every cent spent for subsidies has to be borrowed, just as every cent spent to build the levee through Portsmouth, Ohio, cost the taxpayers money. But to say that for that reason subsidies tend to send prices up is as false a conclusion as to say that the levee at Portsmouth represents a net loss to the people of that city. If the money spent on that levee had not been spent, Portsmouth last summer would have been inundated to its second-story windows at a cost of millions of dollars. And if the United States Government removes the subsidy stone from its price-control dam and lets loose the impounded flood it may very well increase the cost of this war by billions. Roughly every 1-percent increase in prices increases the cost of this war by a billion dollars.

One billion five hundred million dollars added to the pressures above the dam is an insignificant sum compared with the pressures already held in check. It can have no influence in increasing prices so long as the dam holds. But $1,500,000,000 removed from the dam and eliminating the subsidy stone can have disastrous results. It may very well prove to be the most expensive billion and a half dollars Congress ever saved.

I hear it said occasionally that by keeping prices down subsidies increase people's buying power and so widen the gap between purchasing power and available goods. For this reason, it is claimed they are inflationary. The only conclusion one can draw from this is that if we want to hold prices down the way to do it is to let them go up, or if we want prices to go up we should hold them down. No more specious argument was ever offered to the Congress or the public. Pressures added above the dam do not send prices up, so long as the dam holds. And subsidies are one vital stone in the dam.

I hear, too, a great deal about the boys on the fighting front having to pay the grocery bills of those of us who stay home and prosper. The trouble with this argument is that what subsidies really buy are not groceries, but a stable living cost or an essential stone in the price-control dam. Remove the stone, set loose the flood, and the sum the boys will pay will not be $1,500,000,000. It can well be measured in terms of $50,000,000,000 or $100,000,000,000 before the war is over.

Remember the story of the little Dutch boy, with his finger in the break in the dike? The danger was not from the small trickle that would have come through, had his finger been removed. The danger was that that trickle would become a stream, and that stream a flood. The price-control dam is like that. It is holding back a lot of water.

Let the Congress be warned. The inflationary pressures of this war are too dangerous for political bickering and group pressures. This, if ever, is a time for economic statesmanship. Whether we be Republicans or Democrats, let us first be Americans and protect the people of this Nation from a far greater disaster than was visited upon the Nation by the last war.

Of course, the stabilizers have made mistakes. The operation of price control and rationing is more vast in its ramifications and more complex in its problems than those of any 50 or 100 of our greatest corporations. Techniques have had to be developed from the test-tube stage. And the job has had to be done with a staff hastily assembled, with three bosses in its short life and with a complete change in price policy executives in the past 6 months, ordered by Congress. The wonder is not that they have made mistakes; the wonder is that they have been so few.

The mistakes and delays are trying, of course. But when I view the over-all result, I am amazed. It is the greatest economic accomplishment since the Continental Congress went into action. In worry and suffering saved it is one of the greatest humane accomplishments of all time.

When this war is over 11,000,000 brave boys from the fighting forces, many of them crippled, will come back to be reabsorbed into jobs. It will be tragic in its consequences if we have to face that job, with prices collapsing about our ears. For the sake of the boys on New Britain, in Italy, and about to lead the great invasion of the Continent; for the sake of the boys bombing Berlin and about to bomb Tokyo, we must hold the line.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that those who have listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and who have followed the charts that he has presented realize that he has rendered a valuable service to us and to the country. I hope that everyone will find time to examine closely the information that he has given us as it will appear in the RECORD tomorrow, because it will be of great help.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I am sorry I cannot yield, as I have another matter that I desire to call attention to. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who at my request was permitted to speak out of order, utilized the time to assail the Secretary of the Interior because he contemplates a pipe line, but the gentleman did not say that it would be in the interest of the United States and would save us from shipping our oil out of the country. He heard this morning before the Committee on Rules that we have no surplus oil which we should send to other parts of the world. When the Secretary of the Interior advocated a pipe line to be built to supply New York and the East, from Texas to New York, to assist this section of the country, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] did not complain, and I believe that if we had acted in time on Secretary Ickes' recommendation many of the oil restrictions could have been avoided in the East and in New England. I believe he has used good judgment, and I know that he is not going to do anything which will be detrimental to the best interests of our country. As I said earlier in the day, I feel that he has rendered extremely valuable service to our country, and it can be relied upon that whatever he does or attempts to do is in the best interest of our Nation. Therefore, I feel that the resolution before us should be agreed to, and the bill it makes in order should be passed by the unanimous vote of the House.

I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2801, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior. At the present time there are two Assistants and this would make a third Assistant. The bill was carefully considered by the Committee on the Public Lands and had the vote of members on both sides. In fact, our committee went into the matter rather carefully. I realize from the debate upon the rule that many extraneous matters have come into the discussion. I realize that oftentimes many of us, including myself, have been critical of the acts of the Secretary of the Interior; and in presenting this bill today I make no brief for his acts. I am not here to defend him and I am not here to indict him. But upon the basis of the facts and a careful consideration of the facts I am thoroughly convinced he is entitled to this additional assistance. During his tenure of office as Secretary of the Interior, there have been many additional duties placed upon him. Some of those duties have been placed upon him by Executive order and some have been placed upon him by the Congress itself. Some of the duties have been placed upon him by Executive order after congressional committees had acted and were in the process of imposing those duties upon him. I might mention a few of the problems, the problem of solid fuels, of oil, and of the fisheries. The question of fisheries is a big problem. I happen to know of that by reason of my service on the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Then there is the problem of the administration of the Explosives Act. I happen to know something about that because I handled the legislation which amended the present Explosives Act. I will give you some idea of the volume of that in a few minutes.

Then he has had to handle the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and other matters in connection with war work. Those are some of the things in connection with the war effort that we have placed upon him.

Bear in mind that a mere clerk or person with no statutory responsibility cannot sign any of these orders. As you know, as a Member of this House I have not been one of those who rush to a decision. I have tried to consider things carefully before I act. I think the Committee on Public Lands have the confidence of the House because they do carefully consider matters. I asked for some facts as to what has been happening and for information as to the volume of work that has been placed upon the Secretary of the Interior. I mentioned many of the agencies that have been heaped on him. I find that in the task of administering the Federal Explosives Act alone there are more than 200,000 licenses which have been issued to persons manufacturing, selling, and using explosives. That is new work which has come in by reason of the war conditions under regulations and laws passed by the House itself. In the 6-month period from July 1 to December 31, 1942, the Secretary acted upon and approved over 2,210 cases and items of correspondence; the Under Secretary, 3,900; and the Assistant Secretary, 9,900.

In the previous 6-month period the First Assistant Secretary acted upon and approved almost 4,800 cases and matters. In the same months of 1942 the items amounted to about 500 per month for the Secretary, 700 per month for the Under Secretary, and 800 per month for the First Assistant Secretary, and over 2,000 per month for the Assistant Secretary.

Now, regardless of whether or not you agree with the Secretary of the Interior or whether or not you like him, the situation is that we have actually placed this work on him, and he is entitled to this Assistant's help. I am thoroughly convinced of that.

The Members of the House know I have not been one of those to defend many of his acts. You probably recall I was able, on occasion, to get certain limitations put on his appropriations. At times I have disagreed with him. But as a matter of fairness and decency when we give him the work to do, we should see that he gets adequate assistance to do it.

Although this bill creates one new Assistant Secretary, making three in all, there is a provision in it which places them without numerical distinction. That is, frankly speaking, so that a man who comes all the way to Washington will not have to see the "Third Assistant Secretary." It is a matter of psychology. They will all be "Assistant Secretaries" instead of "First," "Second," and "Third Assistant."

There is a provision with reference to salary. Frankly, that is the only objection I have heard. I understand some of the gentlemen on the other side will discuss that particular item. Under the Classification Act at the present time, I am informed, the present Assistant Secretaries get $9,000. I will not go into that detail now. I will make a short statement later, because I understand one of our good friends and colleagues on the other side will make a statement with reference to that. That is roughly the situation. I could give you more of the details, but I think I have covered the situation.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true, then, that the question is not whether we approve of the Secretary of the Interior or not, but rather, Do we need this Assistant Secretary? Is it not also true that small-business groups have written to members of the Committee on Public Lands, or at least they have written me, requesting that this appointment be made, as they feel it will immeasurably assist them in the problems facing small business today?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; the gentleman is eminently correct. We should not let our like or dislike of the Secretary color our views.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The chairman of the Committee on Public Lands has called attention to the importance of this particular bill. I recall several weeks ago that that same committee reported out a far more important bill so far as the people of the country are concerned, which was introduced by the gentleman from Wyoming, and which would have sought to nullify the creation of the Teton National Monument. Can the gentleman tell us when there is some likelihood of that very important bill being submitted to the House for action?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not know at the present time, but I will be glad to confer with the gentleman from Wyoming. The report has not been written in that particular case. It was ordered reported, however.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us in brief what are going to be the duties of this new Assistant Secretary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. He will have a variety of duties, of course. At the present time there are many matters relating to fisheries and matters relating to oil, public lands, coal, and so forth, which go to a different one.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. When the gentleman mentions fisheries, I am particularly interested in that.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. The gentleman from Massachusetts knows some of the problems we have had regarding fisheries and the Fish and Wildlife Service. They have had an immense amount of work, and some of these orders finally have to go on up to the Secretary's office.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I know what fine work the gentleman from Florida has done in regard to the problem of fisheries. But he also knows no division within the Department of the Interior has been subjected to more justified criticism than the Fish and Wildlife and Fisheries Division. I would like to know whether or not we are going to get some relief and whether some real work will be done in behalf of commercial fisheries in the Department of the Interior if this bill becomes law.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I am hopeful of that. Whether rightfully so or not, the Fish and Wildlife Division was a combination from other departments. It was placed in the Department of the Interior, part coming from the Department of Commerce and part coming from the Department of Agriculture. The Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries were combined.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Florida think it is a good thing to separate them once more? Let us have a Commercial Bureau of Fisheries instead

of combining that operation with a lot of insect investigations.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It has been considered. There may be merit to the suggestion, but I would rather not go deeply into that discussion at the present time.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, evidently the people who have in mind creating this new office of Assistant Secretary of the Interior must have some individual in mind whom they want to place in that position. Can the gentleman from Florida tell us whom they expect to appoint?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No; I cannot. I have no idea whom they intend to appoint. I am proceeding on the basis of whether they do have a need for the office or not. I do not know whom they intend to appoint.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thought perhaps the committee might have gone into that matter. I have no justification for the rumor, but several Members have asked me today if I had any idea that either Mr. Dodd, Mr. Watson, or Mr. Lovett were going to be appointed to that position.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Certainly I would oppose any one of those gentlemen.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will yield to me I think I can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. All I can say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is that he will find the answer in the bill. The Assistant Secretary is to be appointed by the President. The last time we had legislation of this kind before the House it was expected that Mr. Berlew would be the recipient but it did not turn out that way at all, and the thing is entirely in the hands of the President.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] but I still say I thought perhaps it was brought out in committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. No, sir; it was not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] raised a question about the fisheries. One of the Executive orders deals with fishery coordination. Since the fishery coordination on July 21, 1942, have the people of the United States been supplied with a greater quantity of fish or a less quantity of fish?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not have the complete figures here, but I will say that a greater portion of the blame lies with O. P. A. and not entirely on the Department of the Interior, as a result of certain information which O. P. A. had, but the fishery matter will be made the subject of an intense study. I started an investigation of the fishery situation and in a few days there will be a resolution before the House on that question. I found the Interior Department, through its Fish and Wildlife Service, very cooperative.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would it be fair to assume by that reply that the fishery coordination scheme has not been a success up to date?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I would not say that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then why investigate?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The investigation is the result of certain facts and a need for a complete picture of fishing problems, and before we complete the investigation I would not want to prejudge.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The facts are there have been actually hundreds of thousands of pounds less fish landed within the last month than at the same period a year ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is my understanding.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Much of that was due to the fact that the Government had taken over the boats.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. Part of that was due to that, and part was due to the O. P. A. regulations.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. As I understand, this new Assistant Secretary is going to devote part of his time to the development of these problems and the solution of problems pertaining to the commercial fisheries of the country. They have been given but very little attention.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes. I will make that request of the Secretary, as chairman of the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. As I remember, during the last session of Congress we passed a bill giving an additional staff to Dr. Gabrielson, who is in charge of the fisheries, to handle the problems of the fisheries and to coordinate with the military officials relative to that matter. I am wondering if that staff has not been able to work out the problems that the Interior Department said they had last year.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The staff has been working on it but many new problems have arisen.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the history of this proposed legislation is, in my opinion, rather unsavory. As I recall, it was first introduced in the House last July as H. R. 2801.

Also, as I remember, a long letter from the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, accompanied the report on that measure, wherein it was contended that another Assistant Secretary was essential to that Department. The bill provided for the elimination of grades or ranks of the Assistant Secretaries of the Interior Department and further for a uniform salary of $9,000 for each Assistant. On going into the matter I found that the initial salary of the lowest grade Assistant was $8,500. Thus it became apparent that Mr. Ickes' request as embodied in the bill was for more than an additional Assistant. It was also a pay-raise measure.

I objected to the bill at that time because I felt it lacked forthrightness. I think heads of departments when they make requests of Congress should be honest and lay their cards on the table face up. The present bill is in all respects similar to H. R. 2081 heretofore mentioned.

Having paid some attention to the enormous bureaucratic growth and cost of operating the Interior Department, I am reluctant to granting this request for an additional Assistant. The Secretary of the Interior refuses to make any savings where he could. He could eliminate costs amounting to millions of dollars annually without harming in the least the Interior Department. I should not wish, of course, to be responsible in any degree for withholding needed help to any of the Departments at this time. But it has been stated by competent men, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] that other departments such as the War and Navy Departments, are getting along without such additional assistance as the Secretary of the Interior requests here, though their work is just as heavy.

There is absolutely no regard, so far as I can see, by any of the bureaus for costs or manpower. The Congress just must take these matters in hand if there is to be any hope whatever of bringing Government costs and operations within the limits of reason and real need.

You will recall that it was the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] who objected to the unanimous-consent request that was made for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not a fact that since the beginning of the war and on account of the war, both the Army and the Navy have been given a number of Assistant Secretaries?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I have not looked into the matter myself. I am stating from memory what the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] said, which I think you will find in the RECORD.

Mr. MOTT. I will say for the information of the gentleman that the answer to my question is in the affirmative.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Now, complaint has been made on the floor that Mr. Ickes has embarked on the construction of a pipe line for carrying oil 1,200 miles in Arabia, and that possibly he is undertaking this project without any legal authority. Furthermore that this might be a part of a global W. P. A. program. Almost every Member of this House goes back to his district and complains of the bureaucracy in Washington and of its

arbitrary exercise of power; complains also that the departments of Government have grown to a size that is wholly out of line with what is really needed.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I recall when they built a new 20-inch pipe line and a 24-inch line that the cost was about $90,000,000 for about 1,600 miles of pipe line in this country.

I read an article in the paper stating that this new Arabian pipe line would be about 1,200 miles long and would cost $116,000,000. I do not know what authority he has to build that line but it seems to me it would be better to develop our own oil resources in this country, to move it to the eastern seaboard where we so badly need gasoline, kerosene, and fuel oil.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no question at all that the people throughout this country want this bureaucratic growth stopped. They not only want the growth of bureaucracy stopped but they would like to see its size greatly reduced. There is only one way to accomplish these wishes of our people and that is by withholding from the heads of our governmental departments funds and personnel. Of all the forces now operating to make the United States into a socialistic, communistic, or fascistic state, I consider Mr. Harold Ickes one of the worst. I think it is Mr. Ickes' intention to nationalize the whole oil industry. I do not propose to vote for any measure which has the least prospect of making it possible for him to accomplish that purpose, and I therefore plead with this House that we stop and seriously consider this proposal. Our duty now I think is to respond in a degree to the wishes of the people throughout this country and do something to stop the further socialization of our economy that is proceeding apace.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I should just like to say to the gentleman that I am in no way attempting to defend the 1,250-mile pipe line, but I do feel in all fairness that it should be said that the money spent for it will in time come back to the Government. It is my understanding that this is more of a subsidy to get the oil with the understanding that in time it will be returned to this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he knows where any records can be found supporting the contention that this money will come back to the United States?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman is speaking of the pipe line?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am speaking of the pipe line or any of these other advances we are making wherein we are not satisfied with having the Government take over the ownership, operation, and management of all industry in this country but we have to extend our financial arms into every spot on the face of the earth and try to take over their operations too. That is what I am opposed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I of course do not know where any such records may be found.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would not take the time of the House today if it were not for the fact that during the last session of Congress the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee denied Mr. Ickes money to build a transportation line from Shasta substation to Oroville in California. An amendment was offered to the bill when it came to the floor of the House by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to place that back in the bill. The House took a clean vote and we defeated the amendment. It was taken up in the Senate and finally the Senate decided to let the conferees handle the matter. We did and agreed to leave it out of the bill entirely. But regardless of that, regardless of the action of Congress in denying funds to build that transmission line, Mr. Ickes went ahead and built it. I am a little surprised that he should ask us to give him an additional Assistant Secretary. I am sorry more members of the subcommittee are not here for I am sure they would bear me out in what I have to say. I am surprised that he should ask for another Assistant Secretary because he has paid so little attention to the will of Congress. He asked for nine-hundred-and-some deferments in his Department. The subcommittee and the Congress saw fit to reduce his request to such a point that a number of those he had asked be deferred were naturally taken off the pay roll and many of them are now in the service. His former Under Secretary, Abe Fortas, a very able man, went into the service but I understand was rejected because of physical disabilities and will be back with Mr. Ickes. Just why we should give Mr. Ickes an additional Assistant Secretary now is beyond me, because I think if he would spend his time looking after the affairs Congress has directed him to look after instead of going out and building a transmission line for which Congress denied him money, and building or getting ready to build pipe lines all over the world he would not need an additional Assistant Secretary.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I well recall the vote about a year ago in the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee recommending against the building of the transmission line from Shasta power plant. The House very decisively turned that matter down. The Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations have since held hearings. What has Mr. Ickes or his Department had to say with regard to going ahead in the meantime notwithstanding the previous action of Congress in denying funds for building that transmission line? What is his answer to it?

Mr. JENSEN. I may say that the committee has not held hearings since that time, but we are going to ask Mr. Ickes some very pointed questions when we sit again the latter part of this month.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, among the other duties of the Secretary of the Interior comes the administrative work in connection with irrigation and reclamation projects. Those of us from California, and particularly those connected with the metropolitan water district, have felt the heavy hand of the Department in practically forcing us to give up certain of our rights in order to obtain equity and justice in our rates, but for the time being I will talk about some other things.

On last Friday there appeared in the Washington papers the report that a new treaty had been signed between the United States and the Republic of Mexico concerning the disposition of the waters of the Colorado River and the Rio Grande. That was the first intimation that nearly all of us here in this body from California had that there was to be any special disposition to Mexico of the waters of the Colorado River. It was understood by us in the Boulder Dam Act and the Colorado River compact, which was approved by this Congress, that the rights to use of the waters of the Colorado River basin were for the use exclusively within the limits of Colorado River basin States.

It was provided in section 3 (c) of the compact, however, that if any agreements were made for the disposition of any of the waters to the Republic of Mexico in international comity they were to be assigned from the surplus waters if such were available, otherwise any deficiency would be made up proportionately by the various States. Historically the Republic of Mexico has used in the delta region of the Colorado River something in the neighborhood of six to seven hundred thousand acre-feet of water per annum. It is my understanding, although I have not seen the treaty, that in the treaty it is provided that 1,500,000 acre-feet of water be given of what we call firm water to the Colorado Delta region within the Republic of Mexico, in Baja California, and Sonora.

Mr. Chairman, we can talk all we like about the good-neighbor program, but, Mr. Chairman, water to the West is more valuable than gold. A million and a half acre-feet of "firm" water is worth at least $200,000,000. But you cannot buy water with gold unless the water is available. You cannot make it rain upon those mountains any more than it does and the precious fluid that comes down waters the fertile valleys and enables us out there in the far West to grow the early winter fruit and vegetables that you people in the East enjoy so much, and the people need it for domestic purposes. We depend on it. I could give you a summary and I would like to have

the time to give you a summary of the disposition of the waters of the Colorado River, under the terms of our compact, but suffice it to say in summation that as the State of Arizona last night signed the Colorado River Compact—the Governor of that State was here and I understand left this morning—it completes the compact, all seven States having signed it.

If this further disposition of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water is to be made to the Republic of Mexico as "firm" water prior to the various rights of the other States, it will be a terrific loss to my own congressional district, to the metropolitan water district of California, and to the city of San Diego, to the Imperial Valley, the Coachella Valley, the Gila Valley of Arizona, and all of those other fertile valleys, as well as to the upper basin States. We cannot get along without it. Without water our country is a forbidding desert.

I wonder what the Secretary of the Interior is doing to protect the rights of these States in this exceedingly important water question. I wish that I might have more time in which to discuss it. However, permit me to say that on Tuesday of this week I introduced House Joint Resolution 232, calling upon the Secretary of State to conduct negotiations toward the purchase of Lower California and a small part of Sonora from Mexico. If that were accomplished, this question could be settled and great benefits bestowed upon all parties. That is, in my judgment, the right solution to that issue as well as to our need for Magdalena Bay for national-defense purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, during this hour of debate on the bill and during the preceding hour of debate on the rule, we have listened to some very interesting speeches. With the exception of the remarks of the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the committee, however, there has been very little discussion, if any, which has been directed to the bill under consideration.

Now, it seems to me that in the consideration of the simple matter which is presently before the House it makes not the slightest difference whether one happens to like the Secretary of the Interior or not, or whether one happens to agree with certain of his policies. I have been a member of the Public Lands Committee for 11 years. As my colleagues know, I have disagreed vigorously with many of the Secretary's proposals, with most of his philosophy and with many of the measures which he has suggested during that time. When I have opposed such measures I have done so because I thought they were wrong. On the other hand, I have agreed with some of his proposals and with some of the measures which he has advocated, because I thought they were right, and when I have thought they were right I have supported them as vigorously as I could.

This bill certainly has nothing whatever to do with the philosophy of the Department of the Interior or of its Secretary. It has nothing to do with the building of pipe lines, with foreign policy, or with anything else which has been discussed here, except the question whether the Secretary of the Interior at present need in his Department an additional Assistant Secretary. That was not a very difficult question for the committee to decide. With the committee's report before you it should not be a very difficult matter for the House to decide.

The Public Lands Committee is composed of men interested in the question of public lands and in the other matters within the normal jurisdiction of the Interior Department. It is about as nonpolitical a legislative committee as can be imagined. The membership of the committee along political lines is almost equally divided. No one has ever heard any discussion in that committee of anything having to do with party politics.

This matter was fully presented to the committee on its merits. It was examined thoroughly, and after full hearings the committee reported this bill out favorably by a unanimous vote. So I say, Mr. Chairman, especially to those on this side of the aisle, I hope no one will consider it from a political angle and I hope no one will be intrigued by anything that has been said here which was not directed to the merits of the bill itself.

If you will refer to the committee report on the bill you will find a very concise statement as to why, in the opinion of the committee, an additional Assistant Secretary is needed in the Interior Department at this time. Most of those reasons, I should say, require no argument, because they are apparent on their face.

When the war started there were two Assistant Secretaries in the Department of the Interior. Since that time the work of the Department of the Interior has been very greatly increased. You will find a list of the new duties and activities that have been given to the Department of the Interior since the war started. One of the most important of those new activities is the Solid Fuels Administration for War; then there is the Office of Fisheries Coordination; there is the Federal Explosives Act; and there are many other activities which have been vested in this Department solely by reason of the war. In addition to that, some of the old agencies of the Department have had to assume a great deal of additional work on account of the war. The Mining Bureau is a case in point, and there are a great many others.

There is at present an Under Secretary of the Interior and two Assistant Secretaries of the Interior. The testimony before the committee is that the increased volume and the expanded scope of the work which the Department is required to transact now by reason of the war cannot be properly conducted by these two Assistant Secretaries alone.

The testimony also shows that much of the work which is now being done, the new work, is work which properly should be done on a secretarial level, and you will find a very clear statement on that point in the report. For these reasons it is the opinion of the committee that it would be to the betterment of the Department and to the advantage of the country, during wartime, if the Secretary of the Interior were permitted, for the duration of the war only, to have an additional Assistant Secretary, who would draw the same pay as the present Assistant Secretaries draw now. And in this connection I direct your attention to the fact that the bill specifically provides that the additional office provided in this bill shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities.

So far as salary is concerned, and there has been some reference to it in the debate, if there is any objection to the amount I am sure the chairman of the committee and the committee itself would be very glad to accept an amendment which would strike out all reference to salary, because the salaries of these Assistant Secretaries are determined under the Classification Act any way. They are all, I understand, getting $9,000, the amount named in this bill; but the bill could just as well provide that the salary should be fixed in accordance with the provisions of the Classification Act. It would be the same in either case. That is a matter of minor importance. The only important issue here is whether, under all the circumstances, as disclosed at the hearings and concisely outlined in the committee's report, an additional Assistant Secretary is needed at this time in the Interior Department. It is the unanimous opinion of the committee which heard the evidence that an additional one is needed. We trust that the House may concur in this opinion and pass the bill, and we believe it will.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not considered that Mr. Ickes has administered his Department efficiently, whether or not you agree with his views?

Mr. MOTT. Compared with other Administrators in the executive agencies of this Government at the present time, I should say yes. And I might go even further and say that now, after 10 years of experience with the alphabetical agencies and the men who make and administer their policies, most people would be inclined to consider Mr. Ickes, by comparison, as almost a conservative.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Regardless of what we think of Ickes, what does the gentleman think Ickes thinks of the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MOTT. I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina, what Mr. Ickes may think of the Congress of the United States has no more to do with the issue involved in this bill than what the Congress of the United States, including the gentleman from South Carolina, may think of Mr. Ickes. The only question involved here is whether the

Department of the Interior needs an additional Assistant Secretary during the war period.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The United States Code, Annotated, page 483, provides in the Department of the Interior a First Assistant Secretary of the Interior and an Assistant Secretary of the Interior. Is the gentleman prepared to state to the House that the salaries of these underofficials are $9,000 at the present time?

Mr. MOTT. The salaries of the two Assistant Secretaries are $9,000. The Third Assistant, if this office is created, will receive $9,000 also.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Will not the gentleman agree that regardless of how many Under Secretaries Mr. Ickes would have he would still be absolutely 100 percent in authority, and would do exactly as he thought should be done regardless of what any Under Secretary said?

Mr. MOTT. I am sure the gentleman understands that that is the policy which all department heads under the present administration try to follow. Sometimes they do not succeed, but they all try.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. By the establishment of this salary by law are we not taking it out of the purview of the Classification Act, to which the gentleman referred?

Mr. MOTT. It is possible the language of the bill could be so construed. It seems to me also that it might possibly be construed as a limitation upon the salary which could be fixed under the Classification Act. I understand the Civil Service Commission under the Classification Act is not presently limited in the amount of salary it may fix. However, if that is considered by anyone to be really an important point, as I said a moment ago, I am sure the committee would be perfectly willing to accept an amendment striking out all reference to the amount of salary, and providing that the salary should be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. This bill seems to carry a mandatory provision that the Assistant Secretaries shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of $9,000 per annum. If that is not a mandatory provision of law, then I do not know what is.

Mr. MOTT. They are receiving $9,000 now.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Under the Classification Act?

Mr. MOTT. That is right, but the Classification Act alone, I understand, the salaries could go higher. Under this bill they could not. The provision, as the gentleman says, is mandatory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, under the Classification Act the Assistant Secretary now gets $9,000, but if there is any question in the mind of any Member of the House about that and an amendment is introduced to strike that provision from the bill, I may say as chairman of the committee that I will not oppose it.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GIBSON. Does not the gentleman believe that if we pass this bill Mr. Ickes would hold it to be unconstitutional, just as he did our action regarding Dodd, Lovett, and Watson?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate during this hour with great interest and solicitude. Some of the debate was by permission "out of order" and some of it did not even pertain directly to the bill. I was greatly impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I was very much informed by the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. Part of what the gentleman from California had to say is as new to me as it had been to him regarding the treaty arrangements with Mexico and its provisions concerning the waters of the Colorado River. I have not yet seen that treaty but I assure my friends in California that I am as much interested in it as anyone in the Colorado River Basin can possibly be.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I want to strengthen the hand of the Secretary of the Interior, for his work within our domain, and not that he may go abroad and build pipe lines all around the world. That is something else and not related to this bill. The Interior Department is one of the great Departments of this Government loaded with responsibility and rich in possibilities. It needs good management and able administration. I have often quarreled with the Secretary on both policy and practice, but I do believe he needs additional help to carry properly his present load.

Now, I cannot be too emphatic about the tremendous importance of an adequate and well-trained staff for this great Department. It would take hours of time even to begin to enumerate what a storehouse of wealth the public land States contain for the benefit of the Nation and which are held in trust, so to speak, by the Secretary of the Interior as the servant of us all. Ours is a young nation, and even so we have had a marvelous history. Our economic history is as amazing to the world as is our political history. Certainly the development of our Nation economically presents to the world some wonderful object lessons, many of which are worthy of imitation elsewhere. Of course, some of them are warning of what not to do. However, the western part of this country comprising that portion under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department is only slightly developed, relatively, considering its possibilities. Upon its full and proper development hinges the prosperity of this country. That proper development depends largely upon the brains, the statesmanship, and the patriotic businesslike management of high officials in the Department of the Interior. No business corporation has the assets and the resources comparable to our Government in that great Department over which Secretary Ickes presides. When will America realize this potential wealth?

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] spoke out of order a few minutes ago and made a comparison of war costs between the Frst World War and the present war, and also compared the volumes of money and national debts in similar periods of the two wars, he caused me to do a lot of thinking. We have all been thinking seriously. How can this present astronomical debt ever be paid? I have heard pessimistic souls declare that it cannot be paid. On the other hand, I have heard level-headed businessmen declare that it can be paid—if. Now, that "if" is a long story but it presupposes some mighty efficient handling of America's resources. These same optimistic souls tell us that the business genius of the American people, if given free rein and unhampered except by the minimum of police regulation, will create new wealth quickly and absorb the debt with ease. I want to believe that such is true, and I feel that I may believe it—if. Now, my "if" involves a proper emphasis upon our national storehouse of natural resources lying untouched or barely scratched in the West. Let me give an illustration.

An unusually well-informed gentleman told me just yesterday that since Thomas Jefferson gave us the West with only a very small investment and since Theodore Roosevelt started one phase of western development with a similar very small investment, we have converted 20,000,000 acres of desert land into a highly productive domain under irrigation. Remember, this 20,000,000 acres includes 226,000 acres within an hour's automobile ride of my home which, during the last 12 months, produced $30,000,000 worth of food and fiber. Think of an average yield of $129 per acre in 12 months. This same thoughtful gentleman declared that within the lifetime of most of us now living we could and should double the acreage of irrigated land in the West and make it 40,000,000 with similar results. Even then we would not have as many irrigated acres as there are unirrigated but cultivated acres in the State of Iowa. Just think of that. I have mentioned but one of a dozen aspects of economic development of which the great West is capable under private American enterprise and good administration.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard complaints about the Secretary and complaints about the salary of this proposed new member at $9,000 a year. Let us pay no further attention to what Ickes may be doing abroad while considering this bill, for there is no relationship between them. Let us overlook our petty differences of opinion with regard to internal management of affairs in the Department of the Interior, unless they be vital. I do not agree wtih the present Secretary in some of his policies of so-called conservation, and yet I believe in conservation and he believes in conservation. I can kick as hard as anybody if and when he becomes too autocratic and overdoes even a good thing, such as national parks and monuments, and on that issue I have had it 'round and 'round with him. But let us not quarrel now over a matter of $1,000 in salary for an important administrative official. The Secretary himself is not getting one-tenth as much annual salary as is paid to most business executives handling concerns with far less value and importance. Let us pass this bill and give the Secretary this help.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I am for this bill on its merits. I am particularly glad to support legislation that contains this provision:

That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law.

If there is anything we need in any of these departments to bring about better cooperation between the Congress and the departments it is to have men appointed subject to confirmation by that branch of the Congress which has that power under the Constitution of the United States. I wish more of the policy-forming positions in the departments could be filled under that provision. If there is anything that in my 10 years of experience and trying to represent the people of the great western part of the country—and 72 percent of my State is Federally owned—I have found needed it is men who are responsive to and under the control of the Congress. I have found that where we have men in the departments who are appointed subject to confirmation by the Senate, they are far more cooperative and have far more respect for the Congress and the wishes of the people than where the men are appointed not subject to such confirmation.

We are talking here about $9,000 a year. It would be very easy for the Secretary of the Interior to appoint two men at $4,500 a year who would flout the Congress and be independent and arrogant, as so many of them are in the departments.

If there is anything from which the people of the United States are suffering, anything they want to get out from under, it is bureaucratic control. I am glad that this position is to be filled along constitutional lines, the appointment being subject to confirmation by the Senate. For that reason, I am for the bill 100 percent.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law. The Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of $9,000 per annum. The additional position created by this act shall exist only during the present war and for 6 months thereafter.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of the bill after the period in line 10 on page 1 and insert the following: "The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution."

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for 15 minutes.

AMERICA'S WAR EFFORT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have watched America's war machine grow into a powerful striking force, prepared to meet our enemies on any ground. Today the war is being carried to our foes, and on many fronts the flag goes proudly forward. Our people are confident and rightfully so. There is good cause for confidence.

America is fulfilling its promise of production. It has become truly the arsenal and the granary of the United Nations. Farm production in 1943 topped even the great record of 1942 by 5 percent. Both years were far above pre-war averages and 50 percent above World War No. 1 production a superhuman accomplishment despite shortages of farm labor, machinery, and fertilizer.

There is much satisfaction in the fact that 8,798 planes were produced in January 1944. It means that a new plane came down the assembly lines every 5 minutes.

American shipyards delivered to the merchant marine 208 ships in December 1943. There were only 99 in the entire year of 1941. In 1942 the number of ships delivered was 746, but in 1943, deliveries totaled 1,896 ships which grossed over 19,000,000 dead-weight tons. I take pride in the fact that Wainwright yard at Panama City in my district has probably the outstanding production record in the Southeast and that the Pensacola shipyard is forging rapidly to the front with its facilities in full production.

On the military side of the picture, we find that the United States Army is 60 times as large as in pre-war days, and that increased fire power and mobility give it a striking power 100 times greater. We have thrown everything into a race to complete this Army in time to strike hardest in the decisive stage of the war. Now, that race is won. The Army is close to its planned strength of 7,700,000. One-third of it is overseas, another third is going over this year. With increased shipping and more trained replacements, many battle-weary veterans will get deserved furloughs back home during this year.

The Navy's growth has been even more spectacular. In 1941, the Navy had 2,136 ships of all types. In 1942, this number grew to 6,759. But in 1943 the number of Navy ships increased to 26,326, and the number estimated for the end of 1944 is 41,179. No wonder Tojo does not sleep well any more.

It is encouraging to us in the Third District to realize that we have contributed greatly to both the Army and Navy training programs. One base in particular enjoys a Nation-wide reputation and strategic importance second to none. It is the great Naval Air Training Center at Pensacola. With a personnel of approximately 20,000, it brings into the area more than $50,000,000 annually.

Yet in the national picture the great production records of our people and our war plants and the success of our fighting men have led to a let-down in effort, to a little premature celebrating. And the fact that there is cause for celebration makes it natural that some of our people should become overconfident and complacent.

Very recently, responsible officials have warned that some Americans are forgetting there is a war on. But they are not only warning against overconfidence and complacency. They see something more sinister. They are noting that groups and individuals—an industrial minority, some farm-bloc leaders, a few union-labor chieftains, and some politicians—are beginning to pull out of the war effort and to advance their own special interests, heedless of the Nation's interests.

Tarawa and the Anzio-Nettuno beachhead—the miles that separate our forces from Tokyo and the uncracked might of Hitler's European fortress—should carry their own warning against overconfidence, complacency, selfishness, and politics as usual. The war is not yet won. It will be won, but the toughest fighting still lies ahead. Many, many thousands of American boys are yet to die in bitterest combat. How many of them must die will depend in part upon the job that each of us does on the home front.

I cannot say too much for the glorious achievements of America's fighting men. I am proud to point to the records of men like Maj. Gen. Roy Geiger, who is leading our victorious marines in the South Pacific. I think of lovable, hard-working Commander Jack Shoemaker, of gallant Maj. Walter Beckham, who with 18 Nazi planes shot down, is ace of aces among American airmen over Europe; of Corp. Charles Dawson, who was at Guadalcanal and who followed the magnificent Carlson at Makin Island; of Lt. Johnny Courtney, who made 66 successful fighter missions against the Nazis; of Capt. Albert M. Lewis, who refused to quit when his feet were crushed by a land mine in north Africa. These brave Floridians are but six of thousands whose achievements I could list. And I could turn to the scroll of sorrow, to the rolls of our heroic dead, for the names of other Floridians whose great sacrifice we must be doubly sure has not been made in vain. Those they left behind already know the full tragedy of war.

The little sacrifices, the minor discomforts that we are called on to bear at home are of small consequence indeed compared to theirs. That is why I have watched with concern the signs of dissatisfaction and disunity—the emphasis which some are placing on personal rather than national interest.

There are a few, and thank God they are few, who feel that we should be able to engage in the greatest war of all time, equip and prepare ten to twelve million fighting men, and send most of them abroad without serious dislocations at home. They expect great profits, high wages, low prices, no shortages, and the minimum of suffering and hardship. There are those among us who expect to wipe away a tear with one hand for those who have gone down in glory and grab for everything they can with the other. Fortunately the great number of our people know that democracy means a willingness to share what privation the war brings. To them we must look for a renewed determination to maintain a successful home front.

There are legitimate home-front differences. There are home-front weaknesses which can and should be connected by our Government. This I have argued time and again. I have frequently been concerned by official muddling which is completely out of place in war. There are too many complicated regulations. Funds are being expended unnecessarily. There are too many Government employees. I resent interference in the constitutional rights of my State by Federal officials. And I resent activity by any person which leads to racial and class discord. But, like most people, I do not object to sacrifices, and I am glad to pull in harness with our leadership to help win the war at the earliest possible moment. I know that lack of faith in our democratic government and lack of confidence in its world leadership cause disunity, and disunity can lead only to distress, suffering, and hardship. It can make the war last longer, and by making the war last longer, disunity kills American boys who otherwise would live to come back.

The President has correctly said:

In our military planning, in our production planning, and in our financial planning we cannot rely with safety on hopes of early victory.

We must realize that, as the world becomes war weary, our tasks and our burdens will become heavier. But a successful home front will be no less essential to victory. We must steel ourselves not to lose sight of the real objectives. Knowing that hard work and cooperation can solve every home-front problem, knowing that we cannot afford to fail, the men on the fighting fronts, let us all—farmers, ship workers, bankers, grocers, and all the others—rededicate ourselves to an untiring effort to win the war and then to win the peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. ROBERTSON), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and a bill of the House of the following titles:

On February 9, 1944:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944.

On February 10, 1944:

H. R. 3687. An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The hearings on H. R. 2596, to protect Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, will be continued on Friday, February 11, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands at 10:30 a. m., Monday, February 14, 1944, to consider H. R. 1688, a bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, also the companion bill, S. 275, and such other matters as may properly come before the committee.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The Committee on Banking and Currency will have a meeting on Monday, February 14, 1944, at 10:30 a. m. Jesse Jones will testify on the bill H. R. 3873, introduced by Mr. PATMAN.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume public hearings on House Resolution 418 and House Resolution 419, relative to the Jewish national home in Palestine, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 15, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Friday, February 11: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in the upper and lower Ohio River and tributaries, including Salt River, Taylorsville, Ky., the Potomac River and tributaries, the New England region, including the Connecticut and Merrimack Rivers, and the Middle Atlantic region, including New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, and the South Atlantic region, including rivers flowing into the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River.

2. Tuesday, February 15: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Gen. M. C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer, and proponents and opponents of projects along the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Red and Arkansas Rivers, Conway County, Ark., and Purgatoire (Picket Wire) River, Colo., the White, St. Francis, and Yazoo Rivers.

3. Wednesday, February 16: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Col. Miles Reber, former division engineer, Missouri River division, Omaha, Nebr., and proponents and opponents of projects along the Missouri River and tributaries.

4. Thursday, February 17: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 16.

5. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

6. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

7. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1171. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated August 21, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1172. A letter from Mr. C. WAYLAND BROOKS, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate, transmitting the Annual Report of the Navy Club of the United States of America, for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1173. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Thirty-first Annual Report of the Secretary of Labor for fiscal year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Labor.

1174. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the ninth annual report, which covers the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and certain major developments up to January 1, 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1175. A letter from the Director, Office of War Information, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Information covering the third quarter of the fiscal year 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1176. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting copies of the information furnished the Director of the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of making a determination of the Veterans' Administration personnel requirements for the third quarter of the 1944 fiscal year; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1177. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

1178. A letter from the Administrator, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, United States Department of Labor, transmitting the report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor for the year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Labor.

1179. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $150,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 413); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1180. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, relating to travel allowances; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1181. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize Army officers designated by the Secretary of War to take final action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property," approved October 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 758); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1182. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $34,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, for the War Department for cemeterial expenses (H. Doc. No. 414); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1183. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation of the Foreign Economic Administration, designed to authorize expenditures necessary to return dependents of employees of the Foreign Economic Administration and the State Department who were moved to foreign posts of duty at Government expense (H. Doc. No. 415); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1184. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 in the sum of $172,146,860, together with proposed provisions, in the form of amendments to the Budget for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944 affecting appropriations for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 416); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1185. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, for various constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency, also quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the same period for Office of the Administrator; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1186. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned in the Army of the United States without prior commissioned military service, for the period December 1, 1943, through January 31, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1187. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting copies of the requests for personnel needs during the third quarter of fiscal 1944 as placed before the Bureau of the Budget on January 1; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1188. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a supplement to the report entitled "Distribution Methods and Costs, Part I—Important Food Products," submitted on November 11, 1943; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1189. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the financial statement of the Bonneville administrator for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, made under the provisions of section 9 (c) of the Bonneville Act (Public, No. 329, 75th Cong., approved August 20, 1937); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 346. Resolution providing for an investigation of the program for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1113). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 433. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4103, a bill to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances; without amendment (Rept. No. 1114). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 434. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3209, a bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1115). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 230. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 203 of the Criminal Code, and sections 306, 314, and 315 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; with amendment (Rept. No. 1117). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage townsite; without amendment (Rept. No. 1116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4162. A bill to provide for emergency disability compensation for members of the land, naval, or air forces separated from service, pending settlement of their claims by veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4163. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 4164. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4165. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional cadets at the United States Military Academy and additional midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy from among the sons of officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4166. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4167. A bill to provide for a 20-percent increase for the duration of the war in the amount of the Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance and in the amount of Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4168. A bill to provide for the payment to certain Government employees for accumulated or accrued annual leave due upon their separation from Government service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4169. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 4170. A bill to supplement the Federal-aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to provide for the establishment of an interregional system of highways, and to authorize appropriations for the post-war construction of greatly needed highway facilities in the locations where such facilities are most urgently required and where the conversion from war to peacetime activities will require the cushioning effects of public-works construction; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. Res. 435. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Fourth Intermediate Report (H. Rept. No. 1024) of the Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies for the use of the committee; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 436. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to furnish the House of Representatives with information relative to the benefits to be derived by the United States from the construction of the proposed Persian pipe line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the deportation of alien and inimical Japanese at the conclusion of the present war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4171. A bill for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4172. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T. H.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4173. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4174. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4808. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Passaic County Central Labor Union (American Federation of Labor), Paterson, N. J., protesting against the enactment of a national service law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4809. By Mr. CLASON: Resolution adopted by members of the Springfield (Mass.) Zionist District and affiliated organizations on January 31, 1944, favoring the adoption by the Congress of House Resolution 419, and urging the State Department to use its influence with the British Government to take such steps as are necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the aforesaid resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4810. By Mr. CROSSER: Petition of the National Committee of Americans of Polish Descent of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the Russian invasion and her claims to half of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4811. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of the Brockway Orient Club and other citizens of Brockway, Pa., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 or similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4812. Also, petition of G. T. Doyle and 5,000 other residents of the Twentieth Pennsylvania District and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4813. Also, petition of 2,360 residents of the Twentieth Pennsylvania District and vicinity, protesting against passage of House bill 2082 or similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4814. Also, petition of 1,140 citizens of Twentieth Pennsylvania District and vicinity, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 or similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4815. By Mr. GILLETTE: Petition of residents of the Fifteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4816. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 9,880 residents of the Twenty-sixth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4817. By Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON: Petition of Fillmore C. Marks and others, urging the abrogation of Great Britain's White Paper to allow the persecuted Jews of Europe to go to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4818. By Mr. MERROW: Petition signed by 21 residents of Berlin, N. H., appealing for appropriate action to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939, and urging that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration, and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth, to the end that the Jewish people may be enabled to take its rightful place in the progressive order of mankind; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4819. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Russell J. Baumann and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4820. Also, petition of William P. Birtley and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4821. Also, petition of H. H. Danglos and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4822. Also, petition of Clara C. Lieber and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4823. Also, petition of Evan J. Van Hook and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4824. Also, petition of Fred J. Hahn and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4825. Also, petition of Ira L. Bretzfelder and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4826. Also, petition of J. M. Alvey and 11 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4827. Also, petition of Thomas E. Creley and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4828. Also, petition of Oliver C. Ludwig and 20 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4829. Also, petition of Angelo C. Mamati and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against enactmet of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4830. Also, petition of John Sknski and 19 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4831. By Mr. PRATT: Petition of 691 citizens of Philadelphia, opposing the Bryson prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4832. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Pile Drivers, Bridge, Wharf, and Dock Builders, Local Union, No. 34, opposing the House bill 3477; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4833. Also, resolution of the International Association of Machinists, Lodge 68, San Francisco, Calif., relative to a Federal ballot for all those in the armed forces; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4834. Also, resolution of the Pile Drivers, Bridge, Wharf and Dock Builders, Local Union No. 34, San Francisco, Calif., relative to memorializing Congress on the soldiers' vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4835. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of John Jasinski, president, Circuit 36 of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, representing a membership of 2,500, comprising Brooke, Hancock, Marshall, and Ohio Counties, W. Va., urging the State Department to favor and foster the cause of a righteous adjustment of the integrity of the former pre-war boundaries of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4836. By Mr. WEISS: Petition of 2,140 petitioners of the Thirtieth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4837. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the acting city manager, city of Gladstone, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a veterans' hospital and rehabilitation center in the city of Gladstone; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4838. Also, petition of the executive director, the Philadelphia Council of the American Jewish Congress, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging enactment of House Resolutions 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God in whom alone we live, we turn in all our desperate need to Thee, the fountain of life. Without Thee all is vanity and vexation of spirit. Ere our days pass like futile dreams away reveal to us the deceptions which rob us of durable satisfactions and the delusions which spoil the music and mar the pattern of Thy plan for our lives. Save us from mistaking shadows for substance and from spending our labor for bread that perisheth and for treasures that fade.

Forbid that professions of brotherhood and love should be on our lips while hatred and prejudice possess our hearts and poison our minds. Make us builders of the road of world concord which shall make the rough places smooth and the deep ruts level and which shall span the chasms which separate man from man with bridges of understanding, over which the glad and eager feet of brothers shall pass to and fro in a world of peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, February 10, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting several nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1023. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains of the United States Navy; and

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. PEPPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ball	Bone
Andrews	Bankhead	Burton
Austin	Barkley	Bushfield
Bailey	Bilbo	Butler
Byrd	Holman	Reynolds
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Caraway	Kilgore	Shipstead
Chandler	La Follette	Smith
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McKellar	Truman
Downey	Maloney	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
Ellender	Mead	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Moore	Wagner
George	Murdock	Wallgren
Gerry	Murray	Walsh, Mass.
Gillette	Nye	Walsh, N. J.
Green	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Guffey	Overton	Wherry
Gurney	Pepper	White
Hatch	Radcliffe	Wiley
Hayden	Reed	Wilson
Hill	Revercomb	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is detained on public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NATIONAL HOME FOR JEWS IN PALESTINE—RESOLUTION BY MOUNT VERNON (N. Y.) COMMON COUNCIL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Common Council, and approved by the mayor, of the City of Mount Vernon, N. Y., endorsing resolutions pending in Congress which approve the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MISHANDLING OF PERSONS AT SPRINGFIELD (MO.) PRISON

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago Norman Thomas published an article in the Scripps-Howard papers charging certain mishandling of the prison at Springfield, Mo. I have before me and ask unanimous consent to present a telegram from the secretary of Local No. 229, United Federal Workers of America, on behalf of custodial officers and others in charge of that institution, which really is a veterans' hospital for the criminally insane. It is being used for the imprisonment of conscientious objectors.

I ask unanimous consent that the telegram be referred to the Committee on Finance for consideration by the subcommittee of that committee which handles veterans' legislation and affairs.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRINGFIELD, MO., *February 10, 1944.*

HARRY S. TRUMAN,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

In view of the accusations of Norman Thomas, as carried in the press today, the officers of Local No. 229, United Federal Workers of America, comprising over 90 percent of the custodial officers at the medical center for Federal prisoners here, have instructed me to request your support of such a congressional investigation.

We feel that such an investigation would bring before the public the true facts of just the kind of treatment being received by conscientious objector law violators in answer to Norman Thomas, Socialist leader.

The recent issues of the Absolutionist, official conscientious objector publication and which they claim to mail to all Senators and Congressmen, will disclose some of the unreasonable demands of this and other anti-war and peace-now groups.

We strongly urge that you take steps to become a member of this investigatory committee, also would suggest that the American Legion be authorized to investigate.

E. M. BEAZLEY,
Secretary.

RETURN TO STANDARD TIME

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mrs. G. W. Brown, of Beloit, Kans., which urges a return to standard time. She calls my attention to the fact that the Legislature of the State of California has already gone on record in favor of the change. I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Brown's letter be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BELOIT, KANS., *February 4, 1944.*

Mr. CAPPER,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR SIR: Just a few lines to ask you if you will use your influence to have our time put back to standard time? (The correct time.) Really, it is of no saving to anyone in our country, just makes our light and heat bills higher, and we are asked to conserve in every way. I cannot see but what it is just another bungle to have the time as it is now. We are sick and tired of getting up and blundering around in the dark to get to school or work, according to the new time. Why cause the whole United States to use this crazy time; if those few in the East like it let them go to work an hour early; we do not care. Poor little children go to school before it is daylight and when they do get to the school house it is so dark they cannot see to read in their books. People do not attend Sunday school because they have to blunder around in the dark to do the chores. So, if you can use your influence in this matter to have the time put back as it should be many of us will appreciate your efforts. Am enclosing a clipping of which I would like to second the motion.

Thanking you,
Very respectfully,

Mrs. G. W. BROWN.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1717. A bill for the relief of Luella F. Stewart; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. GEORGE) introduced Senate bill 1718, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey:

S. 1719. A bill for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella; to the Committee on Claims.

TERMINATION OF WAR CONTRACTS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, an omnibus contract termination bill. This bill is the result of many months' study by the Post-War Economic Policy and Planning Committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and also by the war contracts subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee of which subcommittee I am chairman.

In our opinion the enactment of this measure by the Congress will not only aid in the war-production effort but will also provide a strong foundation for achieving full employment in the post-war period. Properly administered, the bill, if enacted, will guarantee speedy settlement of all termination claims, adequate working capital during the period between termination and final settlement, quick removal of war materials from war plants after contract termination, and proper advance notice before termination.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD at this point together with a brief statement or summary which I herewith submit.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement or summary presented by the Senator from Montana, together with the bill, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1718) to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. GEORGE), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are—

(a) to facilitate maximum war production during the war, and to expedite reconversion from war production to civilian production as war conditions permit;

(b) to insure to prime contractors and subcontractors, small and large, speedy and equitable final settlement of claims under terminated war contracts, and adequate interim financing until such final settlement;

(c) to insure uniformity among Government agencies in basic policies and administration with respect to such termination settlements and interim financing;

(d) to use all practicable methods compatible with the foregoing objectives to prevent improper payments and to detect and prosecute fraud.

SURVEILLANCE BY CONGRESS

SEC. 2. (a) To assist the Congress in appraising the administration of this act and in developing such amendments or related legislation as may further be necessary to accomplish the objectives of the act, the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall study each report submitted to the Congress under this act and shall otherwise maintain continuous surveillance of the operations of the Government agencies under the act.

(b) In January, April, July, and October of each year, the Director shall submit to the Senate and House of Representatives a quarterly report on the exercise of his duties and authority under this act, the status of contract termination. Termination settlements, and interim financing and such other pertinent information on the administration of the act as will enable the Congress to evaluate its administration and the need for amendments and related legislation.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this act—

(a) The term "prime contract" means any contract, agreement, or purchase order entered into by a contracting agency and connected with or related to the prosecution of the war; and the term "prime contractor" means any holder of one or more prime contracts.

(b) The term "subcontract" means any contract, agreement, or purchase order connected with or related to the performance of any prime contract or of any other subcontract; and the term "subcontractor" means any holder of one or more subcontracts.

(c) The term "war contract" means a prime contract or a subcontract or both; and the term "war contractor" means any holder of one or more war contracts.

(d) The terms "termination," "terminate," and "terminated" mean the termination or cancelation, in whole or in part, of work under a prime contract for the convenience or at the option of the Government (except for default of the prime contractor) or of work under a subcontract for any reason except the default of the subcontractor.

(e) The term "material" includes any article, commodity, equipment, accessory, part, assembly, or product of any kind.

(f) The term "Government agency" means any executive department of the Government, or any administrative unit or subdivision thereof, any independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, and any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, and includes any contracting agency.

(g) The term "contracting agency" means any Government agency which has been or hereinafter may be authorized to make contracts pursuant to section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, and the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

(h) The term "termination claim" means any claim by a war contractor under a terminated war contract.

(i) The term "interim financing" includes advance or partial payments, loans, discounts, or advances or commitments in connection therewith, and guarantees of loans, discounts, or advances or commitments in connection therewith and any other type of financing related to termination settlements.

(j) The term "Director" means the Director of Contract Settlement.

(k) The term "person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, or other entity.

DIRECTOR OF CONTRACT TERMINATION SETTLEMENT

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established the Office of Contract Settlement which shall be headed by the Director of Contract Settlement. The Director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, and shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per year.

(b) The Director shall perform his functions to the fullest extent feasible through the personnel and facilities of the contracting agencies and other established Government agencies.

(c) The Director may prescribe regulations to carry out any of the provisions of this act, and such regulations shall be binding on any Government agency to the extent that it is subject to this act. Each such agency shall carry out such regulations expeditiously and may make such further regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this act or any regulations of the Director.

(d) The Director may, within the limits of funds which may be made available, employ necessary personnel without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923 and make expenditures for supplies, facilities, and services necessary for the performance of his functions under this act.

CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ADVISORY BOARD

SEC. 5. There is hereby created a Contract Settlement Advisory Board, with which the Director shall advise and consult. The Board shall be composed of the Director, who shall act as its Chairman, and the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, the Chairman of the Board of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the Board of Smaller War Plants Corporation, and the Attorney General, or any alternate or representative designated by any of them. The Director shall request other Government agencies to participate in the deliberations of the Board whenever matters specially affecting them are under consideration.

SETTLEMENT OF TERMINATION CLAIMS

SEC. 6. (a) It is the policy of the Government to insure to every war contractor fair compensation for the termination of any war contract, including reasonable expenses incident to termination and settlement, reasonable expenses of removing and storing materials, and such allowance for profit on the work done on the uncompleted part of the contract as is reasonable under the circumstances, plus interest on the termination claim in accordance with subsection (c) of this section. Where any war contract does not provide for such fair compensation at the time of its termination, the contracting agency, subject to regulations of the Director, shall amend such war contract by agreement with the war contractor, or shall authorize, approve, or ratify an amendment of such war contract by the parties thereto, to provide for such fair compensation.

(b) Subject to regulations of the Director, any contracting agency may settle any termination claim under any war contract by agreement with the war contractor or by determination of the amount due on the claim without such agreement, or by any combination of these methods. Where any such settlement is made by agreement, it shall be final and conclusive and shall not be reopened, annulled, modified, set aside, or disregarded by any officer, employee, or agent of the United States, or in any suit, action, or proceeding, except (1) to the extent otherwise provided by the terms of the settlement; (2) for fraud; (3) upon renegotiation to eliminate excessive profits under

the Renegotiation Act, unless exempt or exempted thereunder; or (4) by mutual agreement. Where any such settlement is made by determination without agreement, it shall likewise be final and conclusive to the same extent, unless the war contractor appeals, submits to arbitration, or brings suit in accordance with section 13 of this act.

(c) Each contracting agency shall allow and pay interest on the unpaid balance of any termination claim under a prime contract at the rate of 3 percent per annum for the period beginning 60 days after the date of filing of the claim, in substantially the form prescribed under this act, and ending with the date of final payment, except that (1) if the contractor unreasonably delays the settlement of his claim, payment of interest shall be suspended for the period of such delay, and (2) if interest on any advance payment or loan, made or guaranteed by the Government, has been waived for the benefit of the contractor during the period after termination, the amount of interest so waived shall be deducted from the interest otherwise payable hereunder. In approving, ratifying, authorizing, or making termination settlements with subcontractors, each contracting agency shall allow interest on the termination claim of the subcontractor on the same basis applicable to a prime contractor. The Director may prescribe regulations to govern the computation of interest under this subsection.

SEC. 7. (a) The Director, by regulation, shall prescribe policies to govern the settlement of termination claims. Subject to regulations of the Director, each contracting agency shall establish methods, suitable to the conditions of various classes of war contractors, for determining fair compensation for the termination of war contracts on the basis of actual, standard, average, or estimated costs, or of a percentage of the contract price based on the percentage of completion of work under the terminated contract, or on any other basis, as it deems appropriate.

(b) Where, in connection with the settlement of his termination claim by a contracting agency, any war contractor makes settlements of the termination claims of his subcontractors, the contracting agency shall limit its review of such settlements with subcontractors to the minimum amount compatible with the public interest. Subject to regulations of the Director, any contracting agency (1) may approve, ratify, and authorize such settlements with subcontractors upon such evidence, terms, and conditions as it deems proper; (2) shall vary the scope and intensity of its review of such settlements according to the reliability of the war contractor, the size, number, and complexity of such claims, and other relevant factors; and (3) shall authorize war contractors to make such settlements with subcontractors without review by the contracting agency, whenever the reliability of the war contractor, the amount or nature of the claims, or other reasons appear to justify such action. The Director shall prescribe policies and standards to govern the contracting agencies in approving, ratifying, and authorizing such settlements in order to insure that their review of such settlements for these purposes is limited or omitted to the maximum extent compatible with the public interest. Any such settlement of a subcontract approved, ratified, or authorized by a contracting agency shall be conclusive and binding upon the United States to the same extent as a settlement under subsection (b) of section 7 of this act, and the war contractor making it shall not be liable thereon except for his own fraud.

(c) Subject to regulations of the Director, any contracting agency shall exercise supervision or control over payments to prime contractors on account of termination claims of subcontractors to such extent and in such manner as it deems necessary or desirable to insure the receipt of the benefit of such payments by the subcontractors.

(d) The Director, by regulations, shall prescribe policies and methods for the settlement by any contracting agency of some or all of the termination claims of a war contractor under contracts with one or more (1) bureaus or divisions within a contracting agency, (2) contracting agencies, or (3) prime contractors and subcontractors, to the extent he deems such action necessary or desirable for expeditious and equitable settlements of such claims. The Director may assign any war contractor to a contracting agency for such settlement.

(e) Subject to regulations of the Director, any contracting agency may settle directly termination claims of subcontractors to the extent that it deems such action necessary or desirable for the expeditious and equitable settlement of such claims. In making such termination settlements any contracting agency may discharge the claim of the subcontractor by payment or may purchase such claim, and may agree to assume, or indemnify the subcontractor against, any claims by any person in connection with such claim or the termination settlement.

(f) Whenever the insolvency or bankruptcy of a war contractor, or termination of his war contract for default deprives his subcontractor of fair compensation for the termination of a subcontract, the contracting agency concerned may make such additional payment to such subcontractor as is necessary to provide such fair compensation. The Director shall prescribe standards, terms, and conditions to govern the exercise of this authority, and may direct such payments in such classes of cases as he deems proper.

INTERIM FINANCING

SEC. 8. (a) It is the policy of the Government to insure adequate interim financing, within 30 days after application therefor, to every war contractor having a termination claim or claims, pending their settlement.

(b) In order to carry out this policy, the Director, by regulations, shall prescribe methods for providing to any war contractor during the period between termination and settlement of one or more war contracts—

(1) interim financing under this act representing not less than 90 percent of the amount of his termination claim or claims, after deducting all liabilities to subcontractors and such advances, partial payments, and loans, previously made or guaranteed by the Government, as are available to such war contractor upon substantially the same terms and conditions as interim financing under this section;

(2) such additional interim financing as the Director deems necessary or desirable.

(c) The Director, by regulations, shall prescribe (1) the types of estimates, certificates, or other evidence to be required to support such interim financing; (2) the terms and conditions upon which such interim financing shall be made; (3) the classes of cases in which such interim financing shall be refused; and (4) such methods of supervision and control over such interim financing as he deems necessary or desirable to assure adequate and speedy interim financing to subcontractors of the war contractor.

(d) Whenever the amount of the termination claim or claims as stated by any war contractor for the purpose of obtaining interim financing under this section exceeds the amount finally determined to be due on such claim or claims, and the war contractor thereby obtains interim financing in excess of the amount he would otherwise have obtained, the war contractor shall be liable to the United States for a penalty on such excess interim financing. The contracting agency shall determine the amount of such excess interim financing, subject to regulations of the Director. The penalty shall be computed at the rate of 12 percent per annum and for the period from the date such excess interim financing is received to the date on which such excess is repaid or extinguished. The obligation to pay such penalty and to repay any interim financing under this section shall constitute a debt due to the United States within the meaning of Revised Statutes, section 3466 (31 U. S. C., sec. 191).

(e) Subject to regulations of the Director, each contracting agency shall allow advance payments, previously authorized in connection with the performance of a war contract, to be used for expenses related to the termination settlement of such contract, to such extent and upon such terms as it deems appropriate

(f) Subject to regulations of the Director, no interim financing made by any contracting agency under this act shall extend beyond the settlement of the termination claim or claims of the war contractor involved, and such period thereafter as the contracting agency deems necessary for the liquidation of such interim financing in an orderly manner.

SEC. 9. (a) Subject to regulations of the Director, any contracting agency may make partial payments to any war contractor on account of any termination claim or claims, and may authorize, approve, or ratify any such partial payments by any war contractor to his subcontractors.

(b) Where any partial payment is made to any war contractor by any contracting agency or by another war contractor under this section, the provisions of subsection (d) of section 8 shall apply to such payment. Any excess payment shall be treated as a loan from the Government to the war contractor receiving it, and shall be payable upon demand. Where the partial payment was made by a war contractor and authorized, approved, or ratified by the Government, the war contractor making it shall not be liable for any excess payment in the absence of fraud on his part and shall receive payment or credit from the Government for the amount of such excess payment.

SEC. 10 (a) Subject to regulations of the Director, any contracting agency is authorized—

(1) to enter into contracts with any Federal Reserve bank, or other public or private financing institution, guaranteeing such financing institution against loss of principal or interest on loans, discounts, or advances or on commitments in connection therewith, which such financing institution may make to any war contractor or to any person who is or has been engaged in performing any operation deemed by such contracting agency to be connected with or related to war production, for the purpose of financing such war contractor or other person in connection with the termination of one or more such war contracts or operations;

(2) to make, enter into contracts to make, or to participate with any Government agency, any Federal Reserve bank or private financing institution in making loans, discounts, or advances, or commitments in connection therewith, for the purpose of financing any such war contractor or other person in connection with the termination of such war contracts or operations.

(b) Subject to regulations of the Director, any such loan, discount, advance, guaranty, or commitment in connection therewith shall be secured, if the contracting agency concerned deems it reasonably practicable, by either assignment of, or covenants to assign, the rights of such war contractor or other person in connection with the termination of such war contracts or operations,

or in such other manner as the contracting agency may prescribe.

(c) Subject to such regulations as the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System may prescribe with the approval of the Director, any Federal Reserve bank is authorized to act, on behalf of the contracting agencies, as fiscal agent of the United States in carrying out the purposes of this act.

(d) This section shall not limit or affect any authority of any contracting agency, under any other statute, to make loans, discounts, or advances, or commitments in connection therewith, or guarantees thereof.

ADVANCE NOTICE

SEC. 11. (a) In order to facilitate the efficient use of materials, manpower, and facilities for war and civilian purposes, it is the policy of the Government to provide war contractors with notice of termination of their war contracts as far in advance of the cessation of work thereunder as is feasible and consistent with the national security.

(b) To carry out this policy, subject to regulations of the Director, each contracting agency shall—

(1) provide war contractors, to the fullest extent feasible, with notice of termination of any war contract at least 30 days in advance of the cessation of work thereunder;

(2) permit the completion of work in process under a terminated contract wherever such completion will result in a saving to the Government;

(3) permit the continuation of work under a terminated contract for the purpose of avoiding injury to plant and material; and

(4) protect war contractors against any additional costs and expenses resulting from any failure of the contracting agency to give notice of termination at least 30 days in advance of the cessation of work under the terminated contract.

(c) The Director shall have no authority under this act to regulate or control the classes of contracts to be terminated by the contracting agencies.

REMOVAL AND STORAGE OF MATERIALS

SEC. 12. (a) It is the policy of the Government, upon the termination of any war contract, to insure the expeditious removal from the plant of the war contractor of all materials which relate to such terminated war contract and for which the Government is responsible.

(b) To carry out this policy, subject to regulations of the Director, each contracting agency shall provide—

(1) for the submission by the war contractor to the contracting agency of statements, in such form and detail as it may prescribe, showing the materials related to a terminated war contract for which the Government is responsible;

(2) for the removal of such materials by the contracting agency within 30 days after the submission of such statements or within such longer period as the war contractor may agree;

(3) for the removal and storage of such materials by the war contractor at the risk and expense of the Government upon the failure of the contracting agency so to remove them.

(c) The Director shall have no authority under this act to regulate or control in any way the sale or other disposition of any materials by a contracting agency or by any war contractor.

APPEAL

SEC. 13. (a) Whenever any war contractor has submitted a termination claim, in substantially the form prescribed under this act, to the contracting agency responsible for settling it, and such claim has not been settled by agreement with the contracting agency, or only a part of such claim has been so settled, the contracting agency shall prepare written findings of the amount due on such claim or the unsettled part thereof, and shall deliver a copy of the findings to the war contractor within 60 days from the date of a demand for such findings by the war contractor.

(b) Whenever any war contractor is aggrieved by the findings of a contracting agency or by its failure to make such findings in accordance with subsection (a) of this section, he may, at his election—

(1) appeal to the Appeal Board or an umpire in accordance with subsection (d) of this section; or

(2) submit such claim or such part thereof, to arbitration in accordance with subsection (e) of this section; or

(3) bring suit against the United States for such claim or such part thereof, in the Court of Claims or in a United States district court, in accordance with subsection (20) of section 24 of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. 41 (20)).

(c) Any proceeding under subsection (b) of this section shall be governed by the following conditions:

(1) A war contractor shall not be required to appeal from such findings within the contracting agency concerned before proceeding under subsection (b) of this section, but may do so in his discretion.

(2) If a war contractor does not initiate proceedings in accordance with subsection (b) of this section within 90 days after delivery to him of the findings by the contracting agency, or in case of failure to deliver such findings, within 1 year after his demand therefor, he shall be precluded thereafter from initiating any proceedings in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, and the findings of the contracting agency shall be final and conclusive, or if no findings were made, he shall be deemed to have waived such termination claim.

(3) Notwithstanding any contrary provision in any war contract, the Appeal Board, umpire, arbitrators, or court shall not be bound by the findings of the contracting agency, but shall treat such findings as prima facie correct, and the burden shall be on the war contractor to establish that the amount due on his claim exceeds the amount allowed by the contracting agency. The Appeal Board, umpire, arbitrators, or court may increase or decrease the amount allowed by the contracting agency.

(4) When a war contractor has initiated such proceedings by one method under subsection (b) of this section, he shall be precluded from initiating proceedings by any other method thereunder.

(5) Any such proceedings shall not affect the authority of the contracting agency concerned to make a settlement of the termination claim or any part thereof, by agreement with the war contractor at any time before such proceedings are concluded.

(d) (1) The Director shall appoint an Appeal Board composed of not less than three and not more than nine members, to sit in the city of Washington, and one or more umpires to sit in each judicial district, to hear appeals under this section. The Board may sit in sections of not less than three members. The Director shall designate the members of the Appeal Board and the umpires, and shall fix their term of office and compensation.

(2) The Director shall prescribe the practice and procedure to govern proceedings before the Appeal Board and the umpires, or may authorize the Appeal Board to prescribe such practice and procedure. The Appeal Board and any umpire shall have power to compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence in accordance with regulations of the Director. Subject to the direction of the Director, the Appeal Board shall supervise the proceedings of the umpires, but shall have no power to review their decisions. The decision of the Appeal Board or of any section of the Board, or of an umpire, shall be final and shall not be subject to review by any court or other agency.

(e) When a termination claim is submitted to arbitration in accordance with this section, the arbitration proceeding shall be governed by the United States Arbitration Act to the same extent as if authorized by an effective agreement in writing between the Government and the war contractor for such arbitration upon the conditions specified in subsection (c) of this section.

(f) Whenever any dispute exists between any war contractor and a subcontractor regarding any termination claim, either of them by agreement with the other, may submit the dispute—

(1) to the Appeal Board or an umpire in accordance with subsection (d) of this section;

(2) to a contracting agency for mediation or arbitration in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed by the Director.

(g) The Director shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of this section.

COURT OF CLAIMS

SEC. 14. (a) For the purpose of expediting the adjudication of termination claims, the Court of Claims is authorized to appoint not more than twenty commissioners in addition to those provided for by the act of February 24, 1925 (ch. 301, 43 Stat. 964), as amended by the act of June 23, 1930 (ch. 573, 46 Stat. 799), and the provisions of said acts shall apply to such additional commissioners in all respects as if they had been appointed thereunder without limitation as to nature of duties which they may be called upon to perform.

(b) The Attorney General, under such rules as the Court of Claims shall prescribe, may cause any and all persons with legal capacity to sue and be sued, wherever located, actually to be notified, or on specific order of the court, to be notified by publication, and if within the jurisdiction of the United States, at the discretion of the Attorney General, to be served with subpena, to appear as a party or parties in any suit or proceeding of any nature whatsoever pending in said court and to assert and defend their interests, if any, in such suits or proceedings, within such period of time prior to judgment as the Court of Claims shall prescribe. Upon failure so to appear, any and all claims or interests in claims of any such person against the United States, in respect of the subject matter of such suit or proceeding, shall forever be barred and the court shall have jurisdiction to enter judgment pro confesso upon any claim or contingent claim asserted on behalf of the United States against any party who, having been duly served with subpena, fails to respond thereto, to the same extent and with like effect as if such party had appeared and had admitted the truth of all allegations made on behalf of the United States. Upon appearance by any party pursuant to any such notice or subpena, the case as to such party shall, for all purposes, be treated as if an independent proceeding had been instituted by such party pursuant to section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended, and as if such independent proceeding had then consolidated, for purposes of trial and determination, with the case in respect of which the notice or subpena was issued, except that the United States shall not be heard upon any counterclaims, claims for damages, or other demands whatsoever against such party, other than claims and contingent claims for the recovery of money hereafter paid by the United States in respect of the transaction or matter which constitutes the subject matter of such case, unless and until

such party shall assert a claim, or an interest in a claim, against the United States, and the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction to adjudicate, as between any and all adverse claimants, their respective several interests in any matter in suit and to award several judgments in accordance therewith.

(c) The jurisdiction of the Court of Claims shall not be affected by this act except to the extent necessary to give effect to this section, and no party shall recover judgment on any claim, or on any interest in any claim, in said court which such party would not have had a right to assert if this section had not been enacted.

PERSONAL FINANCIAL LIABILITY

SEC. 15. (a) Whenever any payment is made from Government funds to any war contractor or other person as a partial or final payment of the amount due on any termination claim or pursuant to any loan, guaranty, or agreement for the purchase of any loan entered into by the Government, no officer or other Government agent authorizing or approving such payment or settlement, or certifying the voucher for such payment, or making the payment in accordance with a duly certified voucher, shall be personally liable for such payment in the absence of fraud or bad faith on his part. In settling the accounts of any disbursing officer the General Accounting Office shall allow any such disbursements made by him notwithstanding any other provisions of law.

(b) For the purpose of making termination settlements or interim financing any Government agency is authorized, subject to any regulations prescribed by the Director, to rely upon such certificates of war contractors as it deems proper and to permit war contractors and other persons to rely upon such certificates without financial liability in the absence of fraud on their part.

THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SEC. 16. The General Accounting Office is authorized to examine all records of any contracting agency relating to the settlement of any termination claim after the final settlement of such claim. Any other provision of law notwithstanding, the function of the General Accounting Office with respect to any termination settlement made, authorized, ratified, or approved by a contracting agency shall be confined to an examination of the records of the contracting agency for the purpose of determining (1) whether the settlement payments to the war contractor were made in accordance with the terms of settlement, and (2) whether such records or other information warrant a reasonable belief that the settlement was induced by fraud. Whenever the General Accounting Office believes that any settlement was induced by fraud, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report all of the facts relating thereto to the Congress, to the Director, to the Department of Justice, and to the contracting agency concerned, but shall not suspend or withhold, or direct or require any contracting agency to suspend or withhold, by set-off or otherwise, any amounts owing to the war contractor by the United States under such settlement or otherwise and shall not suspend credit to any disbursing officer for any disbursements made by him under such settlement. In any such case the contracting agency on its own initiative may, or upon order of the Director shall, take such action as it deems appropriate to recover or withhold payments to such war contractor.

DEFECTIVE, INFORMAL, AND QUASI CONTRACTS

SEC. 17. (a) Where any person has arranged to furnish or furnished to a contracting agency or to a war contractor any materials, services, or facilities related to the prosecution of the war, relying in good faith upon the apparent authority of an officer or agent of a contracting agency, a letter of intent, written or oral instructions, or any other request to proceed from a contracting agency, the contracting agency shall pay such person fair compensation therefor subject to regulations of the Director.

(b) Subject to regulations of the Director, whenever any formal or technical defect or omission in any prime contract, or in any grant of authority to an officer or agent of a contracting agency who ordered any materials, services, and facilities might invalidate the contract or commitment, the contracting agency (1) shall not take advantage of such defect or omission; (2) shall amend, confirm, or ratify such contract or commitment without consideration in order to cure such defect or omission; and (3) shall make a fair settlement of any obligation thereby created or incurred by such agency whether expressed or implied, in fact or in law, or in the nature of an implied or quasi contract.

(c) Where a contracting agency fails to agree on a settlement of any claim asserted under this section, the dispute shall be subject to the provisions of section 13 of this act.

(d) The Director shall require each contracting agency to formalize all such obligations and commitments within such period as the Director deems appropriate.

RECORDS, FORMS AND REPORTS

SEC. 18. (a) The Director shall establish policies for such supervision and review within the contracting agencies of termination settlements and interim financing as he deems necessary and appropriate to prevent and detect fraud and to insure uniformity in administration. For this purpose he shall prescribe the records to be prepared by the contracting agencies and by war contractors in connection with such settlements and interim financing. He shall seek to reduce the amount of record keeping, reporting, and accounting in connection with the settlement of termination claims and interim financing to the minimum compatible with the reasonable protection of the public interest. Subject to regulations of the Director, each contracting agency shall prescribe forms for use by war contractors in connection with termination settlements and interim financing to the extent it deems necessary and feasible.

(b) The Director shall require the Government agencies performing functions under this act to prepare such information and reports regarding terminations of war contracts, settlements of termination claims, and interim financing, as he deems necessary to assist him in appraising their operations or to assist him or other Government agencies in performing their functions under this act, and may prescribe the terms and conditions upon which such information and reports shall be made available to other Government agencies. The Director may require any Government agency to furnish such information under its control as he deems necessary for the performance of his functions under this act.

(c) The Director, by regulations, shall provide for making available to the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and any other interested Government agency, such advance notice and other information on cut-backs in war production resulting from terminations or failures to renew or extend war contracts, as he deems necessary and appropriate.

(d) The Director shall report to the Department of Justice any information received by him indicating any fraudulent practices in connection with termination settlements and interim financing, and may require the Departmet of Justice or any other Government agency to make such investigations as he deems necessary or desirable to detect fraud in connection with termination settlements and interim financing.

PRESERVATION OF RECORDS; PROSECUTION OF FRAUD

SEC. 19. (a) Until 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, or 5 years after the final settlement of a war contract involving $5,000 or more, whichever is the later, except to the extent authorized by the Director, (1) no natural person shall willfully secrete, mutilate, obliterate, or destroy, or cause to be secreted, mutilated, obliterated, or destroyed, any records of a war contractor which relate to the negotiation, award, performance, payment for, renegotiation, interim financing, or cancelation or other termination, of such war contract, and (2) no corporation shall fail to preserve all such records within its possession, but a corporation shall not be liable for the accidental nonnegligent loss or destruction of records. The Director may prescribe regulations for the destruction of any such records upon such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate. Any war contractor shall allow any officer or agent of any interested Government agency, the General Accounting Office, or any committee of Congress reasonable access to such records. As used in this subsection, the term "records" includes (but is not limited to) books, ledgers, checks and check stubs, pay-roll data, vouchers, memoranda, correspondence, inspection reports and certificates, and interoffice reports and communications. Upon conviction for violation of any of the provisions of this subsection, any corporation shall be fined not more than $50,000 and any natural person not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

(b) The first section of the act of August 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 747; title 18, U. S. C., Supp. II, sec. 590a), is amended to read as follows:

"The running of any existing statute of limitations applicable to any offense against the laws of the United States (1) involving defrauding or attempts to defraud the United States or any agency thereof whether by conspiracy or not, and in any manner, or (2) committed in connection with the negotiation, procurement, award, performance, payment for, renegotiation, interim financing, or cancelation or other termination, of any contract, subcontract, or purchase order which is connected with or related to the prosecution of the present war, shall be suspended until 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, or 5 years after the final settlement of such contract, subcontract, or purchase order, whichever is the later. This section shall apply to acts, offenses, or transactions where the existing statute of limitations has not yet fully run, but it shall not apply to acts, offenses, or transactions which are already barred by provisions of existing law."

(c) (1) Every person who makes or causes to be made, or presents or causes to be presented to any officer, agent, or employee of any Government agency any claim, bill, receipt, voucher, statement, account, certificate, affidavit, or deposition, knowing the same to be false, fraudulent, or fictitious, or knowing the same to contain or to be based on any false, fraudulent, or fictitious statement or entry, or who shall cover up or conceal any material fact, or who shall use or engage in any other fraudulent trick, scheme, or device, for the purpose of securing or obtaining, or aiding to secure or obtain, for any person any benefit, payment, compensation, allowance, loan, advance, or emolument from the United States or any Government agency in connection with the termination, cancelation, settlement, payment, negotiation, renegotiation, performance, procurement, or award of a contract with the United States or with any other person, and every person

who enters into an agreement, combination, or conspiracy so to do, shall forfeit and refund any such benefit, payment, compensation, allowance, loan, advance, and emolument received as a result thereof and shall in addition pay to the United States the sum of $2,000 for each such act, and double the amount of any damage which the United States may have sustained by reason thereof, together with the costs of suit.

(2) The several district courts of the United States, the District of Columbia, the several district courts of the Territories of the United States, within whose jurisdictional limits the person, or persons, doing or committing such act, or any one of them, resides or shall be found, shall, wheresoever such act may have been done or committed, have full power and jurisdiction to hear, try, and determine such suit, and such person or persons as are not inhabitants of or found within the district in which suit is brought may be brought in by order of the court to be served personally or by publication or in such other reasonable manner as the court may direct.

(d) The provisions of section 35–A of the Criminal Code (18 U. S. C., sec. 80) shall apply to any statement, representation, bill, receipt, voucher, roll, account, claim, certificate, affidavit, or deposition made or used or caused to be made or used for any purpose under this act or under any regulations pursuant to this act.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 20. (a) Subject to regulations of the Director, each contracting agency shall have authority (1) to make any contract necessary and appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act, (2) to amend by agreement any existing contract, either before or after notice of its termination, on such terms and to such extent as it deems proper; and (3) in settling any termination claim, to agree to assume, or indemnify the war contractor against, any claims by any person in connection with such termination claims or settlement. This subsection shall not limit or affect in any way any authority of any contracting agency under the First War Powers Act, 1941, or under any other statute.

(b) The Director, by regulations, shall prescribe the amount and kind of evidence required to identify any person as a war contractor, or any contract, agreement, or purchase order as a war contract for any of the purposes of this act. To the extent provided in such regulations, any determination, made in accordance with such regulations, that any person is a war contractor, or that any contract, agreement, or purchase order is a war contract, shall be final and conclusive for any of the purposes of this act.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for administering the provisions of this act.

(d) All policies and procedures relating to termination of war contracts, termination settlements, and interim financing, prescribed by the Director of War Mobilization or any contracting agency, and in effect upon the effective date of this act, shall remain in full force and effect unless and until superseded by regulations prescribed by the Director in accordance with this act, or by the contracting agency with the approval of the Director.

(e) Nothing in this act shall be deemed to impair or modify any war contract or any term or provision of any war contract, which is otherwise valid, without the consent of the war contractor involved.

OTHER FUNCTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR

SEC. 21. In addition to his other functions under this act, the Director shall—

(a) promote the training of personnel for termination settlement and interim financing by contracting agencies, war contractors, and financing institutions;

(b) collaborate with the Smaller War Plants Corporation in protecting the interests of smaller war contractors in obtaining fair and expeditious termination settlements and interim financing;

(c) promote decentralization of the administration of termination settlements and interim financing by fostering delegation of authority within contracting agencies and to war contractors, to the extent he deems necessary and feasible;

(d) consult with war contractors through advisory committees or such other methods as he deems appropriate.

USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

SEC. 22. Any contracting agency is authorized—

(a) to use for the purposes authorized in this act any funds which have heretofore been appropriated or allocated or which may hereafter be appropriated or allocated to it, or which are or may become available to it, for such purposes or for the purpose of war production or war procurement;

(b) to use any such funds appropriated, allocated, or available to it for expenditures for or in behalf of any other contracting agency or corporation for the purposes authorized in this act;

(c) to determine by agreement, joint estimate, or any other method authorized by the Director, the part of any expenditure made pursuant to subsection (b) hereof to be paid by each contracting agency concerned and to make transfers of funds between such contratcing agencies accordingly. Transfers of funds between appropriations carried upon the books of the Treasury shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with joint requests of the contracting agencies involved.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 23. (a) The Director may delegate any authority and discretion conferred by this act to the head of any Government agency, and may authorize successive redelegations of such authority and discretion, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe.

(b) Subject to any limitations imposed by the Director, the head of any Government agency may delegate any authority and discretion conferred upon him or his agency by or pursuant to this act to any officer or employee of such agency or to any other Government agency, and may authorize successive redelegations of such authority and discretion.

(c) Any two or more Government agencies may exercise jointly any authority and discretion conferred upon them individually by or pursuant to this act.

(d) Nothing in this act shall prevent the Director from exercising any authority conferred upon him by any other statute or Executive order.

SHORT TITLE

SEC. 24. This act may be cited as the "Contract Settlement Act of 1944."

The statement or summary presented by Mr. MURRAY in connection with the bill is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CONTRACT TERMINATION BILL

OBJECTIVES OF THE ACT

The objectives of the act are to help both the war effort and the reconversion from war to civilian production by insuring to "prime contractors and subcontractors, small and large, speedy and equitable final settlement claims under terminated war contracts and adequate interim financing until such final settlement." It recognizes the need for uniformity among Government agencies with respect to the administration of the act and calls for the use of all practicable methods compatible with the necessary speed to prevent improper payments and to detect fraud.

The act establishes the principle that Congress, through its appropriate committees, shall maintain continuous surveillance of the operations of the activities of the Government agencies under the proposed act.

OFFICE OF CONTRACT TERMINATION SETTLEMENT

The act establishes the Office of Contract Termination Settlement to be headed by the Director of Contract Termination Settlement. The Director of Contract Termination Settlement is directed to use to the fullest extent feasible the personnel and facilities of existing agencies.

CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ADVISORY BOARD

A Contract Settlement Advisory Board is created, consisting of the heads of the principal procurement agencies, to advise the Director in connection with settlement and interim financing.

FAIR COMPENSATION FOR TERMINATED CONTRACTS

The proposed act establishes the policy of the Government to insure to every war contractor fair compensation for the termination of any war contract. Such compensation shall include reasonable expenses incident to termination settlement, reasonable expenses of removing and storing materials, and an allowance for profit on the work done on the uncompleted part of the contract, plus interest on the termination claim at the rate of 3 percent.

FINALITY OF SETTLEMENTS

Subject to the regulations of the Director, the contracting agencies may settle termination claims by agreement which shall be final, except for fraud, but shall be subject to renegotiation for excessive profits under the Renegotiation Act. Where no agreement is reached, the contracting agencies shall make findings as to the amount due; such findings are subject to appeal by the contractor to an appeal board or court or may be submitted to umpires or arbitrators.

BASES FOR SETTLEMENTS

The Director is called upon to prescribe policies to govern the settlement of termination claims and to establish methods suitable to the conditions of various classes of war contractors for determining fair compensation. It permits settlements on the basis of actual, standard, average, or estimated costs, or of a percentage of the contract price based on the percentage of completion of work under the terminated contract, or of other methods which he deems appropriate.

SETTLEMENTS WITH SUBCONTRACTORS

The contracting agencies, subject to regulations of the Director, may approve settlements by war contractors, and the review of such settlements shall depend upon the reliability of the war contractors, the amount or nature of the claim, and other circumstances.

Wherever prime contractors are paid after settlement, the contracting agencies shall exercise control over such payments to insure to subcontractors the benefit of such payments.

COMPANY-WIDE AND DIRECT SETTLEMENTS

The act further provides for company-wide settlements of termination claims of war contractors or for the direct settlement of subcontractors' claims to the extent that the Director deems this necessary.

Where a subcontractor fails to receive fair compensation because of insolvency or bankruptcy of an intermediate contractor, the contracting agency may make additional payments in order to protect the subcontractor.

INTERIM FINANCING

The act establishes the Government policy to insure adequate interim financing within 30 days to every war contractor pending settlement of not less than 90 percent of the amount of his termination claim after deducting liabilities to subcontractors and advances, partial payments or loans to the war contractor. This may be done through partial payments or direct or guaranteed loans from the procurement agencies, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Additional interim financing may be provided by the contracting agencies. Any war contractor who overstates his claim and thereby secures excessive interim financing must pay a penalty of 12 percent per annum on such excess.

ADVANCE NOTICE

The act makes it the policy of the Government to provide war contractors with advance notice of termination. The Director is called upon to prescribe regulations to permit the completion of work in process under certain circumstances.

REMOVAL AND STORAGE OF MATERIALS

It is declared to be the policy of the Government to insure the expeditious removal from plants of all materials for which the Government is responsible. If such removal does not take place within 30 days the contractor may store the material at the risk and expense of the Government.

PERSONAL FINANCIAL LIABILITY

The act proposes to eliminate the personal financial liability of Government officers in connection with settlements and interim financing, except for fraud.

THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The General Accounting Office is authorized to examine all records of the contracting agencies relating to settlements in order to establish whether settlement payments were made in accordance with the termination settlement or whether the settlement was induced by fraud. In case any fraud is found by the Comptroller General, he is directed to report to the Congress, the Director and the Department of Justice, but he may not suspend or withhold any payments. The responsibility for withholding any payments in case of fraud is placed squarely upon the contracting agencies and the Director.

DETECTION AND PROSECUTION OF FRAUD

The Director is to establish policies for the review by the contracting agencies of termination settlements in order to insure uniformity and to prevent fraud. He is further directed to reduce the amount of record keeping and accounting in connection with termination claims and interim financing to the minimum.

Heavy penalties are imposed for the destruction of records, and double damages may be recovered in a civil suit from any war contractor who has received payments on the basis of fraudulent statements.

INFORMAL, DEFECTIVE, AND QUASI CONTRACTS

The section on informal, defective, and quasi contracts, like the Dent Act after the last war, permits contractors to recover in spite of formal defects in their contracts, or in the absence of any contract where the contractor has delivered materials or rendered services.

MISCELLANEOUS

The Director is called upon to promote the training of personnel for termination settlement and interim financing by contracting agencies, war contractors and financial institutions and to collaborate with the Smaller War Plants Corporation in the protection of the interests of small war contractors. The administration of the act by the contracting agencies is to be on a decentralized basis subject to the regulations of the Director.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1023. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH INVESTIGATION OF CAR SHORTAGE FOR GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 254), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 185, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to October 21, 1943, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

BOEUF AND TENSAS RIVERS AND BAYOU MACON, ARK. AND LA. (S. DOC. NO. 151)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, by resolution adopted February 20, 1942, requested the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to review the report on the Ouachita River published in House Document Numbered 196, Seventy-third Congress, second session, with a view to determining whether improvements for flood control on the Boeuf and Tensas Rivers and Bayou Macon, Ark. and La., are advisable at this time.

Under date of December 16, 1943, the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army submitted a report, with accompanying papers, and an illustration. Under date of February 3, 1944, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, has forwarded the report to the chairman of the Commerce Committee of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report, with the accompanying papers, and an illustration, be printed as a Senate document.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPANSION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MURRAY before the C. I. O. Committee for Political Action, in New York, January 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SETTLEMENT OF TERMINATED WAR CONTRACTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator MURRAY at the annual meeting of the National Screw Machine Products Industry, at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, January 28, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAR WITH JAPAN—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Britons Oppose All-Out Jap War" published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

A POETIC VERSION OF THE GETTYSBURG ADDRESS—BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "A Poetic Version of the Gettysburg Address," by Horace C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

LACK OF GRATITUDE OF REPUBLICS—EDITORIAL FROM THE LOS ANGELES EXAMINER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner of January 30, 1944, relating to ungratefulness of republics, which appears in the Appendix.]

LOUIS BROMFIELD'S PREDICTION OF A FAMINE IN FEBRUARY—ARTICLE FROM YORK GAZETTE AND DAILY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating of Louis Bromfield's prediction of a famine in February, from the York Gazette and Daily, which appears in the Appendix.]

TREATMENT OF WOUNDED VETERANS—ARTICLE FROM LOS ANGELES EXAMINER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Hands Gone, Blind, Deaf, Boy Left To Shift for Himself by Army," published in the Los Angeles Examiner of January 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOICE OF SALERNO—COMPOSITION BY E. BEESON MICHEL

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a composition entitled "Voice of Salerno," by E. Beeson Michel, reprinted from the magazine Exchangite, which appears in the Appendix.]

VOTES FOR SOLDIERS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "I Refuse," from the Washington Post of February 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CABARET TAX—LETTER FROM EDWARD FLORE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter regarding the cabaret tax, written by Edward Flore, general president of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRAZILIAN RUBBER—ARTICLE FROM OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Pact on Rubber 'Failure,'" from the Omaha World-Herald of February 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA CAN GET IT—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address entitled "America Can Get It," delivered by Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, at Seattle, Wednesday evening, February 9.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There once was a man by the name of Job. Job had a lot of hard luck, and worst of all had to listen to the false consolations of three so-called friends. After it was all over, the Lord was pleased with Job and gave him twice what he had had before.

The United States in some ways is like Job. We are now going through great adversity, but after it is all over we can have nearly twice what we had before. At any rate, we can have the things I described at San Francisco last Monday and most of the things I described at Los Angeles last week. Curiously enough, the problem with us, as with Job, will be largely a spiritual one. Once we get our minds clear and our hearts pure with regard to certain fundamentals, we shall make extraordinary progress. I am not talking about human perfection; I am talking about a little more vision in our own long-range self-interest. Heretofore we have never been permitted to use our reserve of natural resources, manpower, and technological skill to the limit. Now we have no choice. There is no halfway point. It is Pike's Peak or bust. Curiously enough, the full utilization of our resources, manpower, and skill is the formula both for our necessity and our blessing. Its application will require a great spiritual strength and in the process of developing that strength in a practical way we shall bless ourselves and the world. The problem of full utilization of all resources is first economic and second political.

The economic explanation of how civilized nations drifted into practices of scarcity goes back to the rise of factory mass production, the great corporation, vast investment and banker control in behalf of investment security. Modern factory civilization has become highly geared up and there is always danger of tremendous overproduction unless mass purchasing power is geared up to match it. This fear can vanish only if as much imagination is put into the art of distribution as into the science of production. Many who have tried to finance a business in Wall Street have found that scarcity economics is the very heart of the system. The Wall Street financing house will demand control of the most important type of stock issue, and then will want to make sure that a loan to the new concern will not imperil, because of competition and new methods, the loans to older concerns. Wall Street calls this system "businesslike." I deny that it is businesslike, and say that it is the dead hand of the past trying to make a profit by blocking the progress of business. The day has now come when we must release the business system to act through increased production for the benefit of all the people. Many businessmen now understand this as they couldn't have understood it in 1929.

I have asked several friends who have visited Russia during the past 18 months what we could learn from Russia to make our system work better. Invariably the answer has come back, "Give our workers more incentive, more free enterprise, more initiative. Hold the profit motive out to them in the same way as the Russians." Don Nelson tells me that he visited a number of towns in eastern Russia and western Siberia, which, 3 years ago, contained less than 200,000 people, but which today number from 600,000 to a million. There he saw steel furnaces as large and well equipped as any we have in the United States. There he saw production goals scientifically set for different groups of workers. There he saw large cash prizes given to the men who went furthest beyond their quotas. The Russians can't understand how we can get along in the United States without giving our workers incentives of this kind. Nearly everyone in Russia feels he is directly working for the welfare of the whole nation. He has no fear whatever that he is being exploited for the sole profit of the management or stockholders.

Another friend, a Latin American who is living in Russia at the present time, wrote me under the date of last November: "What you in the United States preach on Sunday the Russians do here every day."

That the Russians could go so far in the past 20 years and evoke such an extraordinary response from the people in time of stress is the greatest indictment I know of the scarcity economics as practiced by those who believe that profit and free enterprise are only for the few.

We are not going to use the whole Russian political and economic system here in the United States. It was made for Russia, and not for us. But the system of rewarding men for inventing improvements in their own jobs is already well established in some progressive American industries. Once the management and the workers learn to trust each other and to work together, it is proved that they can get a spectacular increase of output. Both Russia and America are showing the advantages of good engineering. Under free competition we may hope that the less progressive companies in America will be obliged to catch up to the best practice. The problem is whether we can modernize the backward areas in our present system so as to make it stand from top to bottom for full use of resources, full use of skills, full use of inventions, without the bottlenecks created by cartels, unfair banking control, unwise labor restrictions, or unenlightened farm leadership. As we face the future the leaders of the great pressure groups must ask themselves continually, "Is my pressure group in its demands helping the general good? Is my corporation in its program doing what it can to bring about full employment? Or are we just trying to get a rake-off by obstructing full activity? Are we fighting for the biggest piece of the pie as it is, or are we also trying to increase the present size of the whole pie?"

One aspect of modern scarcity economics is the belief that men will work only when they are hungry and that they will stop work when they have enough money to keep their bellies full for 3 or 4 days. This cynical attitude of exploitation of the many for the benefit of the few has no place in modern civilization. The moment the many are taught to read and write, to build better homes, to eat better food, to see an occasional movie, to listen to the radio, desire is created and markets are enlarged. People want more and are willing to work to get what they want. This increased longing of the people for light and abundance is going on at an increased tempo all over the world.

The modern Russians, as well as enlightened employers everywhere, have never believed in the keep-them-hungry, keep-them-in-darkness system of economics. When they evacuated workers by the hundreds of thousands from Leningrad, Kiev, Kharkov, and Stalingrad to escape the advance of Hitler's armies, they evacuated the artists along with the workers. As a result you find today the finest Russian drama and concerts in towns with names which not one of us in a hundred in the United States can pronounce or locate on the map. The Russian art is for the people, not merely for those who can afford to pay $5. The Russians know, and we know, the "man cannot live by bread alone." We have been accustomed to think that it was the United States that was prepared to give all men food, education, and an opportunity to work and live in freedom. Let us live up to our own national ideal. Once all of us wholeheartedly adopt the doctrine of economic abundance instead of economic scarcity, we can have nearly twice as many of the good things of life as we had before. Incidentally, it's the only way in which those who have can hang on to what they've got. We must pull together for a glorious future. We must not pull at cross purpose until a time of dark despair is upon us and archangels rather than ordinary men will be needed to get us out of our mess.

One serious danger of unemployment, for example, is in those industries producing machine tools and machinery for big construction jobs. These industries did a marvelous job preparing us for a magnificent war effort. Their services will be needed all over the world—in China, Russia, India, all Latin America, and Africa, and in the United States, building flood control, irrigation and power projects, building roads, and equipping factories. At the end of the war we shall have a tremendous surplus of these goods and services. The whole world has a great hunger for them. The question is to discover some sound method by which the world can pay for them. Our young men shall open undreamed-of frontiers which will unleash tremendous purchasing power to keep the world economy revolving for a half a century. But these dreams will not come true unless the world can discover some practical method of paying the United States. The basic method of payment is, of course, through goods. If we keep our people fully employed, we shall require fully twice as much in the way of imports in 1949 as in 1929 in order to keep our factories running. Furthermore, from the standpoint of national security we must purchase certain strategic materials. The United States must build up large permanent stock piles of those materials of which this country has been proved to be short in time of war, and which can be preserved without loss. Mr. William Batt, of the War Production Board developed this idea in a very interesting way in a recent speech of his in Chicago. Such stock piling as outlined by Mr. Batt need not concern domestic producers of these materials because Congress would hold the key until it had declared an acute emergency.

Russia wants machine tools. All right, let Russia pay in terms of manganese and platinum, of which she has a surplus. China wants an irrigation system. She has more tungsten than she needs for her own use. Let her pay in terms of tungsten. Persia wants a power project. She can pay in terms of oil, which we can store in underground reservoirs. Chile wants to build some airports. Let her send us copper and nitrates. There are at least 20 strategic materials of which we are seriously short in the United States as a result of our tremendous war effort. One of the best ways to make sure that there will not be another war is to build up in all the peaceful countries of the world such large supplies of the materials of which each is short that no friendly nation anywhere in the world will ever be caught helpless by sudden attack. The manganese, the copper, tungsten, platinum, oil, etc., will be of great value to us in terms of security and real wealth. The export of these machine tools, equipment, and construction services will greatly increase the wealth and production power of friendly nations all over the world. If this is properly done, the result will be in 15 years to draw the world together by highway and airway so that every man in truth will be the brother of every other man. We shall appreciate economic interdependence as we never have before. We shall know that a prosperous Asia helps to make America prosperous. We shall know that the prosperity of the poorest is of great significance to the most well-to-do. It has to be that way in an economy of abundance. It is only in an economy of scarcity that the few can sit on top and scorn the misery of those below.

After the last war, several groups of hardheaded businessmen decided that they would make profits for themselves without regard to harmonizing their individual activities with the needs of our foreign economic policy. One group did its best to expand its sales of goods and services to the world. They made money. Another group loaned money to foreigners and sold bonds to the Americans. They made money. The bonds sold by the second group furnished the money which paid for the goods sold by the first group. Europe got the goods and the services without paying us what she should have paid for the simple reason that we made it impossible for Europe to pay in the only way she could pay. Because Europe couldn't pay,

the unsuspecting investor in the United States got bonds that often turned out to be worthless. The hard-headed businessmen made their profit but they helped destroy the general welfare not only of the United States but of the entire world.

The same type of so-called hard-headed businessmen will exist after this World War as after the First World War. Some of them will have the same kind of unsound finance to sell. We must not let them lead the world astray again. We must not let such men lead us headlong toward another world-wide depression and World War No. 3. The best brake on such men will come from other businessmen who see the world picture more clearly. Such men will help this country to rise to abundant prosperity and in that way will give other countries a greater chance to sell their goods to us. The trading of the United States goods and services for huge stock piles which can be unlocked in times of national emergency is one way of making sure that we get paid for our exports. Another way is to encourage tourist travel.

The furnishing of our goods, services, and engineers for the building of great construction jobs all over the world is only a small part of our task of making full employment here in the United States. The big job is to supply a standard of living to the 135 million people in the United States which is at least 40 percent higher than it ever was prior to the war. That's the greatest single contribution we can make to greater foreign trade. We must have no business booms, no business busts.

We want efficient planning but without regimentation. Our chief need is the green and red light kind of regulation. We want carefully designed rules of the road which will not block traffic but release it.

In order to get full employment, together with the maximum of free enterprise and profits for the many instead of the few, it will be necessary after the war to use our taxation system for economic objectives much more skillfully than we have in the past. There is just one basis for judgment of our taxation in the post-war period and that is, "Will this system of taxation over a period of years give us the full employment of people producing the kinds of things which the people of the United States most need and want?"

Undoubtedly we shall have to continue with heavy, steeply graduated taxes on personal incomes after the war. But in the case of corporations it would seem to be wise policy to tax in such a way as to force corporate reserves either into the building of plant and equipment or into distribution as dividends. Huge corporate reserves, beyond legitimate business needs, which are held out of use are subtracted from the purchasing power of the Nation. In a time of unemployment each billion dollars stored up as savings means at least half a million men unemployed for a year. Unemployed men mean less goods produced and a smaller market. By our taxation system we must encourage the small and rapidly growing enterprise because such enterprises are the seedbed of the employment of the future. But corporations which have lived far beyond the life of the founding father and which have huge corporate reserves and which no longer expand, represent the dead hand of the past. They should be prodded awake by the right kind of taxation system so that they will find incentive for putting their money to work instead of letting it lie idle.

To get full utilization of all resources for the benefit of all the people the most important single economic readjustment is to do away with internal trade barriers. I am referring to those monopolistic practices on the part of some manufacturers, bankers, labor unions, doctors, and farm organizations which serve their own welfare without regard to the welfare of the unorganized. I don't say that each member of each of these groups deliberately practices scarcity economics. But enough of them do it so there is continually sand in the bearings of the economic machine. There is enough sand so that 10,000,000 families are continually living in poorhouses with inadequate clothing, without enough to eat. Except in time of war, 10,000,000 families, whether living on the land or in the city, are given an opportunity to produce only about one-tenth as much as their more fortunate fellows. The war has demonstrated what they can do for themselves, and for the entire Nation, provided only these families are given an opportunity to work without the continuous imposition of bottlenecking controls.

It is not necessary to break up the big organizations which have deliberately produced bottlenecks. But it is necessary that in time of peace there be created a moral climate, backed up by a big stick in the Department of Justice, to convince every monopoly group that in the future its welfare can be served only by that all-out production which serves the welfare of all.

Everyone must recognize that it is sound government policy, even in terms of the large monopolistic groups themselves, for government to stimulate the economic activity of the weak on behalf of abundance economics while restraining the economic freedom of the strong to practice scarcity for temporary self profit. There is a growing and vigorous support for this position within industry itself.

The experience of Russia during the past 10 years and in the United States during the past 2 years has demonstrated what a tremendous job of production can be done once the monopolistic bottlenecks are effectively broken. In the investment of money, in determining volume of output, in setting prices, in bargaining for wages and hours of labor, the decision made must be the one which best promotes full employment, full production, and full consumption.

The leaders of the respective groups must become experts in determining how the activities of any particular group are affected by the public good and how they affect the public good. When the respective pressure groups are led by men who know that the size of the whole pie is more important than the size of the slice they want for themselves, our fear of bread lines and soup kitchens will be largely over. Then every worker in the United States will have the creative satisfaction of doing his part in helping the common cause.

In many other parts of the world there is a small land-owning military clique composing 1 percent of the population sitting on top of the pile, exploiting the rest of the population, part of whom are workers and part farmers. The task of the century of the common man is to bring these oppressed people into the market. As their productivity and consumptive power are gradually increased, they will within a few years create for the post-war world new frontiers of unimagined richness—new frontiers of peaceful abundance. It is up to us in the United States to demonstrate by our own example the tremendous productivity and happiness of a general welfare economy. Latin-America will follow our example faster than we think, and as she follows it her economy will benefit ours and our economy will benefit hers. Our good neighbor policy should make it possible for Latin-American countries to get the good points in our experience and to avoid such mistakes as we have made. Speaking here in Seattle, I may say the same applies to our relations with China and Siberia. Here at the port which is the closest of all American ports to the Far East, it is important to mention that general welfare economics and modern technology will make the Far East a market of such vast proportions that eventually there will be more trade across the Pacific Ocean than there once was across the Atlantic. Private enterprise is dependent upon these broadening markets for its very survival.

The political aspect of getting full utilization of all our powers is more important in some ways even than the economic. By politics I mean the mechanism whereby the people, themselves, thinking in terms of the needs and the welfare of all of the people, make clear their will to the State legislatures and to Congress so that the lawmakers will serve the people more than they do the high-pressure groups which are continually selling the people down the river. The people, standing for just one thing, namely, "the maximum use of all our resources in the service of the general welfare," must guide Congress to stand for that objective at all times and to resist all pressure groups except the one big pressure group—the general welfarepressure group. In action this means that constituents will have the good sense to reelect Congressmen more for their national statesmanship than for their service to their local groups which are a minority even in the particular congressional district.

The general welfare pressure group must believe in democratic planning and must engage in it at the precinct level, the county level, the state level, the regional level. Wall Street and the Wall Street stooges say that such planning is un-American. I say that it is only by such planning that we can preserve and further develop the American way of life. It is only by such planning that we can prevent American fascists from taking us over. When I refer to American fascists I mean those who believe that Wall Street comes first and the country second and who are willing to go to any length through press, radio, and demagog to keep Wall Street safely sitting on top of the country. American fascists at this very moment are desperately striving to control the delegates to the county conventions so that they may in turn control the delegates to the State and National conventions of both parties.

Operating on the precinct level, the people thoroughly aroused can at any time they wish throw the American fascists out of control. They can put the man above the dollar and march straight up from the precinct to the county to the State and to the National convention. They can see that the right men are nominated for Congress and the Senate. They can see that the Congressmen and Senators after they reach Washington are kept informed and eager to respond to Main Street instead of to Wall Street. Dollar principles are all right insofar as they serve human principles, but when they fail in such service they have no meaning except to American fascists.

The issue is very simple. The question is whether the people, keeping themselves fully informed, can operate through democratic government to keep the National interest above the interest of Wall Street. Or will the old-line politicians, financed from Wall Street, again succeed in making Washington the servant of Wall Street. What we need in this country is a new partnership in which Main Street and Wall Street, as well as Washington, will put nothing ahead of all-out production in our America of tomorrow.

The people can come out on top provided they remain continually awake and really believe they can have a higher standard of security and a higher standard of living and if they will not let up in their fight until they get what they want and must have. They must hold their Congressman responsible for getting that higher standard of living. They

must make him feel responsible at all times to the general welfare and above everything to the principle of complete utilization of all resources, all manpower, all skills, in the service of the common man in his search for jobs for all. In this fight of the people it is quite possible for those who control the big corporations to gum up our system so that it cannot work. It is possible for an incipient American fascism to precipitate a depression which will defeat all the desires of labor and government and most of business. Personally, I think they are too enlightened today to do a thing of that kind. Statements by the presidents of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers indicate that they realize there has been a great change in the moral as well as the business climate. Thousands of businessmen subscribe wholeheartedly to the principle of full utilization. And so I am sure that the managers controlling our great corporations will not deliberately produce a situation where there are 20,000,000 men unemployed. Nevertheless, the people will smash their system unless they are willing to furnish such active leadership in wholehearted cooperation with labor and government as will prevent serious unemployment.

We are in for a profound revolution, partly as a result of the aftermath of two great wars and partly as a result of 150 years of modern technology and democratic thinking about the rights and duties of man. Those of us who realize the inevitability of revolution are anxious that it be gradual and bloodless instead of sudden and bloody. We believe it can be gradual and bloodless if the makers of public opinion, if the politicians, if the pressure group leaders will only influence their millions of followers on behalf of the public good instead of regional and class prejudices. It would be simple if light could come down from heaven, but we all know that God helps those who help themselves. The people themselves will have to educate their leaders on behalf of the general welfare, measuring every article in the press, every statement over the radio, every act of Congress by the one yardstick: "Does this help use all our resources, employ all our men, develop all our skills?" If the people everywhere hold these judgments up as a measure, we shall gradually find this principle of "goodness" permeating our national life like a leaven. In no other climate can there be profits for our private enterprise economy. We must fight with all our might to do this thing. Otherwise, we shall have a bloody revolution and slavery. Time is pressing. Victory will bring problems on us so thick and fast that we must be prepared to make instant and correct decisions.

Today we can take the necessary steps. Tomorrow will be too late. We have the resources, both material and human. We have the machines, the tools, and the skills. We have evidence of new attitudes with greater vision. We have $100,000,000,000 of savings. All we need to do is to press forward in confidence, believing in the complete use of all our resources. That confidence must come first; once we have it, the many specific actions on many specific fronts will all add up to a total picture that makes sense.

But if we do not press forward toward total peace in the same complete spirit as we have pressed toward total war, the $100,000,000,000 will melt like snow in April and the machines and skills will become a mockery. I can't overemphasize the time factor. We must have the full employment, total-use peacetime system ready to begin its march the moment the wartime system slackens. Halfway measures will produce chaos and a democracy which is afflicted with pressure-group sickness does not have the vitality to stand that chaos. There is one yardstick by which we can judge those who would lead us in the future. Are they or are they not in favor of using our resources to the utmost? When they oppose this or that specific program, are they ready with a concrete alternative to achieve the same end? It is the job of the common man to ask these questions again and again in the years ahead.

Job, before he could enter into his period of abundance when he was to be twice as rich, had to go through his time of misery and then have a change of heart toward God. We are not yet through our misery but I have faith that we will have sufficient change of heart in all sections of the country and among all groups of our people to correct our pressure-group sickness. We are eager to save ourselves. It was never easier, and it was never more urgent. If all groups know how vitally important is a complete, full-use peace system, if we put the same energy into the peace effort as the war effort, all the rest will be easy. We are the hope of the world. We must set our own house in order so that our light may shine as a comfort and a beacon to the whole world.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to announce that a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into yesterday by the Senate under which, at the conclusion of the remarks of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who it was agreed should have the floor, and who is now recognized, debate would be limited, each Senator being allowed 20 minutes on each amendment and on the bill.

The amendment pending is the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], for himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], to the committee amendment to House bill 3477.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Yesterday, in discussing the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and myself, I mentioned the fact that certain representatives of labor unions had appeared before the committee in opposition to the provisions of the amendment as they were embodied to Senate bill 1331. This morning, however, I have received a copy of the Labor News, New England journal of labor, which is edited by Freeman M. Saltus. Mr. Saltus has in this issue an extremely fair editorial under the heading "Subsidize those who need it most." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBSIDIZE THOSE WHO NEED IT MOST

The War Food Administration, one of the hinges to the jammed door of price control, has belatedly endorsed a plan for selective subsidies first introduced last summer by Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, and Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont. Under this plan the Government, through food stamps, would subsidize the grocery bills of low-income-group families. The cost of this program, estimated at $3,000,000,000, would assure an adequate diet to over 18,000,000 eligible persons.

Fair-minded persons cannot object to this program, although it does not entirely meet the administration's announced purpose of stabilizing food prices at the September 1942 level. The farmers loudly contend that they, and not the food producers and meat packers, who have been piling up fantastic profits, were entitled to the subsidy, and there is merit to this claim. On the other hand, there are certain middle-class groups having fixed salaries and incomes whose living standards have been seriously affected by inflated living costs. These people also have a reasonable claim upon a subsidization program which would rescue them from the horns of the dilemma on which they are pinioned.

Organized labor, too, rightly protested that the cost of living had so far outstripped wage increases that the average worker today, in effect, has taken a substantial pay cut when compared with his purchasing power of September 1942. Labor argued that it did not favor subsidies in principle, but that apparently they were the lesser of two unfavorable conditions which must be alleviated.

Senator AIKEN, in advocating his food-stamp program, said that it would "subsidize the 20 percent of the population hardest hit by the inflated living costs, without the Government attempting to subsidize the 80 percent who don't need it."

What the Senator apparently meant was that the 80 percent is better equipped to make sacrifices without suffering dire want. With this we agree; and since we must subsidize, let's favor those who need it the most.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the amendment which the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and I have offered to the bill is a sincere effort to find a constructive solution for the problem which confronts the Congress, the Executive, and the country as a result of the increased cost of living due to our participation in this global war. I should like to say at the outset that I believe most unfortunate and most extravagant statements have been made outside this Chamber in connection with the public discussion involving the problems of price regulation, control, and stabilization, and the relationship of subsidies to those problems. The advocates outside this Chamber, of subsidies have been creating an opinion in the public mind that failure to continue the subsidy program would result in a run-away inflation, and relaxation or a failure of all governmental efforts to stabilize, control, and regulate the wartime price structure of our economy.

On the other hand those outside this Chamber who have opposed subsidies have drawn extravagant conclusions unjustified, in my opinion, by the facts, as to the effect of their continuance and enlargement.

However, Mr. President, every thoughtful American citizen must realize that this problem of control and stabilization of prices is one of vital moment, not only in the conduct and the cost of the war, but also in its effect upon the problems which this Nation will confront during the post-war period.

Subsidies in their present form and as now applied are only a minor factor in the governmental program for the stabilization and control of the price structure. The great and more important instrumentalities now in possession of the

executive arm of the Government are the establishment of price ceilings and the power to ration those articles essential to human life of which there is an insufficient amount to meet consumer demand. They are the great pincers, if I may use that phrase, which can and have greatly succeeded in controlling and regulating the price structure. Subsidies, on the other hand, have been only a minor factor, taking into consideration the over-all magnitude of this question, and they have, as I said before, in my opinion, been greatly exaggerated insofar as their importance is concerned in obtaining the objective which every thoughtful person desires to obtain, namely the prevention of an uncontrolled and a run-away rise in the price structure of this Nation.

There are, however, Mr. President, two distinct problems which have become involved in this controversy over subsidies. The first one is the need of securing the agricultural production essential to our armed forces and to the civilian population of this Nation, to our associates and allies in this war through lend-lease. The other is the stabilization of the cost of living.

We overlook the vast magnitude of the problem with which we are confronted, insofar as the obtaining of the essential food production of this Nation is concerned. As in too many aspects of the war effort, there has been a tendency to believe that we could draw upon our food resources without limit, just as I believe there was an attitude that we could draw upon our resources of industrial production without limit, and too often the agencies in control of our war program have acted as if they could write unlimited blank checks upon the industrial and agricultural capacity of the Nation without the danger of overdrawing the account.

We must provide, Mr. President, adequate, nourishing food for the largest armed force any nation in the history of the world has ever mobilized for war. The demands of our associates in this war are likewise tremendous. The Foreign Relations Committee at this moment has under consideration a measure providing for Congressional action to implement the organization which took place at Atlantic City of U. N. R. R. A., and no doubt as the enemy is rolled back, as territories which have been under his domination and control come under the domination and control of this and other nations associated with us in this war, the demands for food will rise over and beyond the huge requirements with which we are now confronted.

Food production in the United States in 1943 was 32 percent above the 1935–39 average. It was a phenomenal achievement, and yet it is not enough. Already there are shortages in important foods here at home. The goals for 1944 call for the planting of 16,000,000 additional acres in the United States.

I quote briefly from a release from the War Food Administration dated January 15, 1944:

1943 PRODUCTION

In 1943 the Nation's record output of food was 32 percent above the 1935–39 average. It was 5 percent above the previous all-time record in 1942. It was 50 percent above any year's production during the other World War. The 10 percent increase above 1942 in livestock production more than offset the 10 percent decrease in food-crop production which resulted from smaller yields due to drought conditions, notwithstanding a larger acreage. Record production of oil crops and direct-food crops included soybean production at 380 percent, peanuts at 211 percent, flaxseed 366 percent, dry peas 415 percent, beans 152 percent, and potatoes 128 percent of the 10-year pre-war 1932–41 average.

* * * * *

Because of their record purchasing power, civilians, unchecked, would have bought all the food we produced last year. Similarly, to have met the full wants of our armed forces and Allies would have endangered our civilians' nutritional status, endangering our war production and home-front morale. Allocation enabled the middle course. In 1943 it provided 75 percent of our food production for civilians, the rest going for direct war purposes—13 percent to our military services, 12 percent to our allies and other friendly nations.

Mr. President, I quote from a release of the Office of War Information under date of November 11, 1943:

In setting the goals for 1944 farmers made it clear that they would need adequate machinery, fertilizers, and labor, and that it would be necessary to have a continuation of the present price supports, and in some cases increased price supports.

Mr. President, it is my view that adequate prices covering the cost of production are absolutely essential if we are to meet or to approximate meeting the enormous goals which have been set for food production in 1944. Congress has recognized the effect of price upon the obtaining of increased production. In the act of July 1, 1941, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, we promised the farmer a support-price program at 85 percent of parity, where expanded production was demanded. In the Economic Stabilization Act of 1942 we raised the support-price program to 90 percent of parity. It is clear, therefore, that Congress has conceded parity to be a necessary level for farm prices, and we provided in that act that no price ceilings were to cut farm prices below the parity level.

Senators familiar with what has been going on in the agricultural regions of this Nation must be alarmed by recent developments. I mention only a few of them. One was the recent dumping of hogs on the market—thousands upon thousands of them, under prime weights, which represented a net loss in meat, caused by the inability of farmers to feed them and to hold them at prevailing costs. I mention as another example the havoc which has been wrought among poultry farmers because the Government did not support egg prices in December and January. Laying flocks have been reduced at an alarming rate because farmers could not meet the cost of production, with eggs selling at from 24 to 28 cents a dozen; and I am advised that egg prices on the farms are down again.

Mr. President, I recognize that there are certain types of subsidies which are necessary as a part of our program to increase food production. They may be needed from time to time to implement the price-support program for the farmer. I also grant that subsidies on marginal production are, where administratively feasible, without too much red tape, useful in stimulating added production.

The general types of subsidies, however, to meet the levels prevailing throughout the entire group of producers have no bearing on stimulating production. They are, in fact, subsidies in lieu of a fair and necessary price. Such subsidies, to pay the difference between the necessary support price and some arbitrary O. P. A. ceiling fixed below that point, are related instead to the problem of stabilizing the cost of living.

The roll-back type of subsidy is an indefensible device conceived in a misconstruction of the Economic Stabilization Act and the clear intent of the Congress when it passed it.

The subsidy program was based on many false assumptions. It was based on the assumption that prices were to be frozen at levels prevailing on September 15, 1942. Congress specifically provided that farm commodity prices would be allowed to rise to parity if they had not already reached a higher level. I wish to emphasize the point that it was the deliberate decision of the Congress that, in order to secure adequate production to meet the absolute needs of the armed services, the civilian population, and our allies, prices had to be allowed to rise to parity. The President was, moreover, authorized to allow such other increases as were found necessary for the successful prosecution of the war; and stabilization at September 15, 1942, levels was directed only insofar as practicable.

Mr. President, the necessity of subsidies in stabilizing the cost of living has been grossly exaggerated, as I have already said. It has been contended that subsidies are the keystone of the stabilization program. Subsidies have been dangled before the eyes of the public as a chain that would bind labor to the Little Steel formula and would prevent further wage increases. It has been contended that they are the only alternative to a runaway inflation.

I deny those assumptions. I deny those conclusions with every emphasis at my command. However, Mr. President, there is a serious cost-of-living problem which affects most seriously the low-income groups and the fixed-income groups in this country. It affects tragically those who have been disadvantaged by our participation in this war. They are the ones who are usually put forward as the persons for whom the subsidy is designed. They are the widows and orphans of this argument, who are constantly mentioned when the question of subsidies arises. That they present a very serious problem, not only so far as immediate human suffering is concerned, but also insofar as the condition, the health, and the welfare of the oncoming generation are concerned, I would be the first to emphasize and to acknowledge.

The basic low-cost adequate diet outlined by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics for a family of four costs $646 a year. There are 18,000,000

families in the United States, in this year of 1944, whose incomes are insufficient to provide that diet without robbing other essential needs of the normal family budget.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has just indicated that the normal diet costs $646 a year for a family of four. What does that consist of? Does the Senator have that information available?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not have that statement here.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the $646 include only food?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; only food. In 1942 41 percent of the spending units, so-called, which include families and single persons as well, received incomes of less than $1,500. Those receiving $1,000 or less represented 24.6 percent of the population, including all families and single consumers.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a table entitled "Distribution of Families and Single Consumers by Money Income Level, 1942."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the table may be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, these groups represent a substantial slice of the population of this Nation, and with the increased cost which has come in food and other items involved in the standard of living, they are the groups which are being most greatly disadvantaged by the effects of war. They are the groups in which malnutrition and the tragic consequences which it brings in its wake will manifest themselves in the oncoming generation.

On page 196 of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency will be found a table, No. 21, entitled "Recipients of Fixed Income by Type of Payment." There are 2,170,000 persons receiving old-age assistance. There are 310,000 receiving aid to dependent children. There are 80,000 receiving aid to the blind. There are 380,000 receiving general relief. In this category are 2,940,000 persons; and every Senator familiar with the assistance provided to those persons will appreciate that the increase in the cost of living has been a tragic and horrible consequence of war so far as they are concerned.

There are 1,340,000 persons in the Federal Government, excluding the military, receiving fixed incomes. There are 1,920,000 persons in State and local governments, excluding the public education systems. There are 1,320,000 persons on fixed income in the public educational institutions of the United States. There are 4,750,000 persons receiving military allotments. There are 860,000 persons receiving veterans' pensions. There are 10,000 receiving lump-sum old-age and survivors' insurance, and 680,000 receiving monthly payments under that category. There are 160,000 persons on fixed income under the Railroad Retirement Act, and 70,000 under civil service pensions. This makes a total of 14,050,000 persons in the United States who are on fixed incomes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same table to which the Senator is referring was placed in the RECORD by me in a speech which I delivered in the Senate on November 29, 1943. I am wondering if the Senator will be good enough to tell us how many families he contemplates taking care of with the $500,000,000 which is sought to be appropriated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was intending to come to that a little later in my discussion, but I shall be glad to refer to it briefly at this point.

The amendment as now drafted would provide 60 percent of the basic food allotment set out in the amendment to 22,800,000 persons, or, as I estimate it, at 3½ persons to a family, to 6,500,000 families.

Mr. ELLENDER. What would be the income received by the persons sought to be helped?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is a little difficult to give an exact figure. The Senator will recall that at the time when we had experience with relief during the period of unemployment—and I wish to make it clear that I do not regard this as a relief measure in that sense, because this is war assistance for disadvantaged groups—our experience during that time was that whatever money the Congress appropriated had to be spread over those who were eligible, to the best of the ability of the administrators.

In other words, during the depression we never at any time appropriated a sufficient amount of money to the W. P. A., or any other organization, to take care of all those who were eligible to receive assistance. The best estimate which I can give the Senator is that this amendment, limited to $500,000,000, would furnish assistance to 6,500,000 families, or 22,800,000 persons, and that it would not affect those at the family income level above approximately $1,100. For a single person, 60 percent of the basic allotment would not provide in all probability, assistance if his income exceeded $350.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, families receiving $1,100 and more, would not be entitled to receive any of these funds.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to make it clear that there is no absolute ceiling in the amendment; but applying 60 percent, as would have to be done under the amendment as now drawn, and providing a fund of $500,000,000, it would be necessary to afford war assistance at the level at which there was the greatest need. The effect of it, generally speaking, would be to limit it to families with incomes of $1,100 and below, and to single persons with incomes of less than $350. However, that would not be an absolute limit which would prevent a family with more dependents than the average from receiving assistance if its income happened to be greater than $1,100.

Mr. ELLENDER. In the speech to which I referred, which I delivered on November 29, I placed in the RECORD a table showing the income of typical farmers all over the country, including farmers from Georgia, Mississippi, and several other Southern States. The typical Georgia two-mule farmer, let us say, has an income of $648. Would a farmer of that type be eligible to receive assistance under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. He would be if he was head of a family.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Some of the rural people in this country are in a worse economic condition than those who live in the large metropolitan areas.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator's amendment make any difference between the allowance to be given to persons living on the farm and that given to those living in cities?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It would not The amendment has this provision in it, however, which I wish to emphasize: It provides for regional differentials in order that the other factors in the cost of living may be taken into consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is along the same line that was followed under the W. P. A., I presume. For example, a workman in New York received $58 a month, and a workman in Louisiana received only $19 a month. Is that the Senator's idea?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My idea is that so long as we are unable to take care of this entire problem we should provide for regional differences in the total cost of living. Obviously, if a person does not have any fuel bill, if he lives in an area of the country where fuel is not required, that fact reduces the ordinary family budget. But, as I see it, this measure would be administered through existing agencies in the States, and they would have to take into consideration the entire cost-of-living budget of a family, and thereafter supplement the food budget to make it equalize with that of any other person similarly situated as to income, in the United States, regardless of where he lived.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, if it were proposed to give wartime assistance to disadvantaged persons for all the factors in the cost of living, the situation would be different. But this amendment is a solution of the problem to which it is contended by many advocates of subsidies that the subsidy program is directed. I certainly do not think there would be any dietary discrimination in the net result, region by region.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the point about which I desire to ask the Senator further questions. I understood the Senator to say a while ago that $646 per family is the amount which is usually spent by the average family for food which would constitute a good diet, and that a certain percentage of that amount would be given to families in need whose incomes are, say, less than $1,100. If that is the situation, why should there be a regional differential? Is it not necessary to give the same diet to a person in the South as is given one in the North?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; and I do not think there would be any discrimination in the diet so far as regions of the country are concerned. The diet would be similar. The only difference would be as to the other factors, which may make more of the family's income available for food.

Mr. ELLENDER. But since the Senator has limited the application of the amendment to food, there is very little difference in the cost of food as between the East, the North, and the South. That is why I am wondering why the Senator has established zones in his amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Simply to take care of the situation which I have already tried to explain to the Senator. If in a particular region there is more of the family's income available for food under normal conditions because of the fact that the family does not have to spend part of its income for other purposes, it was felt in drafting the amendment that there should be some flexibility, but no discrimination between regions is intended.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have listened to the address of the Senator from Wisconsin, and the questions propounded by the Senator from Louisiana, in which he stated that there was a difference between the W. P. A. rate paid in New York, I believe, of $54 as against $19, or approximately that amount, in the South. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin feels that there should be no such differential between various sections of the country as prevailed under W. P. A.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course not.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it should be pointed out that the differential, if any, would be small.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And there would be no differential in diet. That is the point. This amendment is directed toward meeting the problem which low income and fixed income groups face in view of the increase in the cost of food. The amendment does not involve any question of wage scales or wage levels, but is simply designed to provide families who could be benefited by this program with a food assistance which would have the result of producing the same effect on the recipient's table whether he lived in Florida, or whether he lived in New York, or whether he lived in Maine, or whether he lived in California.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. To take a concrete case, a family of four in New York City and a family of four in Maryland or Alabama, for example; if they were in a relative economic status, under the Senator's plan, would eat exactly the same kinds of food if they availed themselves of the stamps, and if it were possible to obtain the same foods?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. So whether they live North or South would not be a primary factor. The primary factor would be what is needed to establish the family in New York and the family in Maryland and the family in Alabama on the same general subsistence level, their economic status being relatively the same. Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator states it better than I have.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I understood him, the Senator stated that there would be no difference in the diet. Does he mean by that statement that there would be the same kind of a diet?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No. I meant there would be no difference in the ability of the individual who received the stamps to obtain if he so desired, the same kind or an equivalent amount in money value that may be obtained by someone else in a different region.

One of the advantages of the stamp plan, as Senators will remember, was that there was no supervision of their expenditure; the stamps were issued, and then the individual was in the position to go to his normal place of trade and spend the stamps for the commodities which were designated to be available under them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator referred to the quality of diet. Is the amendment intended to cover both the quality of the diet and the quantity of the diet?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, quality would be something which would depend on what was available in the community. It is not the design of the amendment to have those who administer it buy food and import or ship it into communities. They would simply provide the recipient with the stamps, and he would be at liberty to go to any of the usual places where he normally obtains his food and there utilize the stamps as if they were money.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to ask another question if the Senator will permit me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Who will fix the differential between the different areas or zones?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That will be fixed by the administrator of the act, who would be a Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Deputy Director, then, would fix the quantity that the client in Alabama may get and also the quantity the client in Wisconsin may get, and so on throughout the different zones.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. He would have the power to set up regional areas, and between those regional areas he would have the power to make adjustments, but he would not be able to say what the individual recipient should receive.

Mr. BANKHEAD. As I understood the Senator, it would be permissible under the amendment, as it was in practice under W. P. A., to provide for one area a quantity different from that provided for another area. I want to find out who settles that, who decides how much Alabama will have, and how much New York will have. What will be the difference, if there is to be a difference between them? There was a difference under W. P. A.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration would have the say. The agencies of the Government have data showing the percentage of income spent for food by people in each section of the country. Of course, people who live in warm sections probably spend a larger percentage for food than they do for other things because they do not have to spend so much for clothing and fuel.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the differentials be based upon the quantity of food heretofore used together with its cost?

Mr. AIKEN. This amendment is designed to make up the difference between what they have to spend for food out of their income and what it would be necessary for them to spend for food in order properly to maintain their health.

There is an elasticity in the amendment. The $1,100 or $1,200 which we take as the line above which the $500,000,000 would not be available is the national average. I presume the people living in cities where rents are high—and we know where rents are high—cannot get by on the same amount of income as people who live on the farm. However, in figuring the income of people on the farm allowance is made for rent, for what they raise on the farm for themselves, and for other noncash income which they might have but which the people in the cities do not have. But, in the final analysis, the amendment provides on page 5, subsection (b):

(b) For the purpose of determining eligibility and the value of coupons issuable, as provided in section 5 of this act, the Director—

That is the Director of the Food Distribution Administration—

shall determine semiannually in the manner specified in subsection (a) of this section, the normal food expenditures and the reasonable cost, according to the food prices collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, of the basic food allotment for households within each size and income classification. Such normal food expenditures shall be stated in terms of the national average, but the Director may, if he deems it necessary in order to effectuate the purposes of this act of securing equitable distribution of food supplies, provide for regional differentials with respect to the reasonable cost of the basic food allotments.

The amendment is so drawn that the people living in one section of the country would be entitled to exactly as good a diet as those living in any other section.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not critical of the idea, but I want to call the attention of the two Senators who are the authors

of the amendment to the fact that, as I am sure they will recall, one of the most controversial questions which arose each year in connection with appropriations for W. P. A. was the formula under which the money was distributed, and the differences in the various sections of the country in the amount of the money expended from the relief fund of the W. P. A. There was a controversy every time the bill came before the Congress for consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize the point that the regional flexibility feature of the amendment is not designed to bring about such a result. It is solely designed to make certain that there can be taken into account the fact that if more of a person's income is available for food because he does not spend it for other essentials in the cost of living, there may be a reduction in the amount of stamps, but there can be no discrimination between regions so far as the actual supplementation of the diet of persons is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on that point will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has stated very clearly that, as he understands the amendment, everyone will be treated equally, as it were, in the matter of diet. That being true, I cannot for the life of me see why it is necessary to establish zones.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If Senators object to that provision, so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing to eliminate it, but it was emphasized by those with whom we consulted in drafting the bill that there are certain drains, so to speak, on the family income in one region which do not exist in another. I feel certain that the Senator from Vermont and I had only that in mind, and if the provision disturbs any Senator, so far as I am personally concerned, I should be glad to modify the amendment and eliminate the provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to suggest to the Senator a specific example. For instance, we allow to dependents a given sum, let us say, depending on how many children the soldier leaves behind. Suppose there is a farm boy, let us say, from Tennessee, who might be in zone 1, whose wife would be entitled to $60, let us assume. Then there may be a soldier who lives in New York, or in Vermont, and whose wife receives $60. Why should not these families receive the same amount, under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So far as I am concerned, I repeat what I said before, the sole objective of giving the power to establish the regional differentials was for the purpose of permitting the Administration to take into account the fact that the persons living in one region might have a greater proportion of their income available for food than those living in another, because the person in the latter region might have other essential demands, so far as the standard of living was concerned, which cut down the amount available for food. But, as I have said, if the Senator is concerned about that feature, I am perfectly willing to take out of the amendment the provision giving discretion, because it certainly was never intended to have any such result as the Senator's questions indicate he is worried about.

Mr. ELLENDER. It strikes me that since the Senator begins with the premise that all the persons he intends to take care of are not able to take care of themselves because of lack of funds, he assumes at once that with their present revenues, no matter where they are located, they cannot maintain their families decently. It is for that reason that he is now desirous of making this money available. Since that is true, it strikes me that whether a family should receive 60 percent of the amount to be allowed, or 20 percent, or 30 percent, should depend on the family's ability to obtain the diet which the Senator desires the family to have.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield, we have already stated that it is the intention of the amendment to allow exactly the same adequate diet to persons, regardless of where they live.

Mr. ELLENDER. That should settle it, then.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is any discrimination, however, it would be in favor of those who live in a section of the country where food constitutes a major part of the expense. There should be some elasticity, so that there could be some difference between those who lived in high-cost areas and those who lived in lower-cost areas within the same State. But I state absolutely that it is the intention and purpose to give exactly the same adequate diet to everyone eligible, regardless of where he or she may live.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the Senator from Vermont that he eliminate the discretionary provision, because I do not think it is vital to the amendment. It was inserted solely to take care of the situation which we have outlined. If any Senators have apprehension about it, I am perfectly willing to modify the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. I am willing to modify it to that extent.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as I am concerned, I think the provision should be deleted. I do not believe there should be a discrimination, since the object of the Senators is to give to each beneficiary a like diet.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator from Wisconsin has stated, we consulted freely with those who know most about food distribution in the United States and those who had the most experience under the old stamp act. I wonder if there is some particular reason why those lines should be in the amendment, and if the amendment should go to conference, if the conference committee would have the right to reinsert them. So far as I am concerned now, the amendment may be modified.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest that the Senator modify his amendment by inserting a period after the word "average" in line 17, page 5, and strike out the balance of the sentence, and on page 6, line 20, after the parenthesis (c), strike out the words "except for variations based on regional differentials authorized under section 4 (b) of this act," and begin the word "all" with a capital letter.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am wondering whether the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Wisconsin has been referred to the present War Food Administrator for his opinion and judgment on it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; we have a letter, which is in the record of the hearings, signed by the Acting War Food Administrator, expressing his approval of the measure, with the usual and customary statement that it does not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, but that they were at liberty to file the statement with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think I have the letter right here, and I shall be glad either to read it, or to show it to the Senator, if he is interested.

Mr. MURDOCK. Would the Senator say that the attitude of the War Food Administration is favorable to the proposed amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. The War Food Administration, in a letter signed by Acting Administrator Grover B. Hill, stated that in their opinion such a plan was very desirable. They said that the Bureau of the Budget told them that section 302, forbidding certain subsidies, was not in accord with the President's program, but that they had no objection to the report being sent up by the War Food Administrator.

I may also say that one of the most earnest advocates of the bill, which is now the amendment, appearing before the committee, was Dr. H. R. Tolley, of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. I forgot to mention him yesterday in recounting those who advocated the amendment. A consumers' organization, known as the Peoples' Lobby, also spoke in favor of the amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wonder if it would be asking too much to request the Senator from Wisconsin to make the letter received from the War Food Administration a part of his remarks and insert it immediately following his remarks.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have the letter here, and shall read it now. It is dated December 20, 1943, and reads as follows:

Hon. ELLISON D. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Your letter of July 12 asked for our views concerning S. 1331, a bill "to assist in the effective prosecution of the war; to improve the health, efficiency, and morale of the civilian population and armed forces; to provide for a more equitable distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment plan; to prohibit the payment of subsidies for the production, processing, distribution, or other handling of agricultural commodities except as specifically authorized by the Congress; and for other purposes."

That is a quotation from the title of the measure which the Senator from Vermont and I introduced in the form of a bill. Now this measure has been modified to strike out from it the authorization for a sum sufficient to carry out the program, and it now contains an authorization for $500,000,000, which cuts down both the percentage of the basic food allotment which can be provided under it and also the number of persons who would be enabled to receive benefits from it.

The food-allotment plan outlined in the bill is intended to supplement the diets of all families now getting less than minimum amounts needed for good health and nutrition. The War Food Administration recognizes that many families are not getting adequate amounts of food. Those who are employed at good wages probably can well afford to pay the increased costs of food in recent years. However, there are many groups of workers, such as school teachers, for example, whose salaries have always been rather low, and who in most cases have not received increases in pay sufficient to cover higher living costs. The program provided by this bill would be of substantial assistance to groups of this kind, as well as to many unemployable groups, such as aged people and those with physical handicaps. We believe a program of this general character would be very desirable.

The War Food Administration has studied some of the administrative problems in connection with this program.

Mr. President, I ask to insert in the RECORD the remainder of the letter, if the Senator from Utah so desires.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it would be beneficial to have it in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The remainder of the letter is as follows:

It is probably unnecessary to comment on these problems in detail at the present time, but we would like to point out that the current average cost of the basic food allotment as outlined in this bill is approximately $646 a year for an average family of four persons. Reviewing available statistics on food expenditures, it appears that families with income below $2,350 a year are spending less than this amount for food. From this and other available data it appears that about 18,000,000 families and single individuals might be eligible to participate.

If all eligible families did participate and if the Government provided food stamps to make up the full difference between normal expenditures and $646 a year, the annual cost would be approximately $3,000,000,000. This, of course, is a maximum figure. Only 60 percent to 80 percent of the eligible families participated in the former food-stamp program, and perhaps no larger percentage would participate in the proposed food-allotment plan. Also, of course, Congress might decide to appropriate smaller amounts of money, in which case the allotments would be set below the $646 which would be required to bring diets fully up to the standards set in the bill.

We note that the bill does not require normal cash expenditures for food to be maintained. For example, a family spending $450 a year for food might be given $200 worth of food coupons. This would not mean, of course, that the family would get an additional $200 worth of food. As a matter of fact, such a family could, if it chose, decrease cash expenditures by $200, saving $200 to spend on other things and getting no more food. Our experience with the food-stamp program suggests that about one-half of the dollar value of a food coupon would represent increased purchases of food unless some way could be found either to induce or to require participating families to maintain their cash food expenditures.

We believe it is clear that the program authorized by this bill would not prevent increases in food prices. On the other hand, it would at least partly compensate low-income families for recent or prospective price increases.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, while the enactment of section 302 of the bill (prohibiting the payment of subsidies) would not be in accord with the program of the President, it has no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely,

GROVER B. HILL,
Acting Administrator.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand the amendment, a primary purpose is to bolster the income of low-income groups so as to give them more money with which to go into the market and purchase food.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. To supplement the income.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes; and that the authorization is $500,000,000. Is that over any period of time?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is for the program.

Mr. MURDOCK. Today, because of the food shortage we are rationing food, and we are operating, or attempting to operate at least on a price-ceiling basis. Will the amendment of the Senators result in increasing the competition between consumers for the available food supplies?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What it will do will be to make effective some of the ration stamps which have been given to individuals because they were entitled to them, but who have been unable to utilize them because they have not had sufficient income to use the stamps.

Mr. MURDOCK. Well, but it results, does it not——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It does not result in any cut-back of the estimates made at the time the rations have been issued. The Senator very well knows that there are many persons in the low-income groups and in fixed-income groups who cannot utilize their stamps, and who make them available to other persons to use, because they do not have purchasing power. But when these foods are rationed, if the O. P. A. is capable of conducting the rationing program, it will not issue more stamps than can be used for the foods which are to be rationed. The amendment would only serve to see to it that the foods which are rationed are equitably distributed, and that some individuals do not secure more food than they are entitled to, or in many cases can use on an economical basis.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to congratulate the Senator on the very laudable objectives of his amendment. My only purpose is to obtain his judgment as to whether it will furnish a further impetus to inflation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think on the contrary that it cannot have an inflationary effect, assuming that the rationing program is predicated upon any sound basis whatsoever, because the O. P. A. must calculate, when it issues its rationing stamps and when it makes quantities of food available thereunder, that the privileges of purchase thereunder are going to be exercised. But what happens is, as I have said before, that many persons in the disadvantaged group, due to the war, do not have buying power with which to use their stamps, so they either give them away or sell them or otherwise make them available to someone who has the purchasing power.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, notwithstanding the fact that the amendment authorizes within one fiscal year the pouring into the circulatory monetary stream of an additional $500,000,000, it is the Senator's best judgment that that will not be conducive to uncontrolled inflation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am assuming that the rationing program is predicated upon sound estimates. If that is wrong, of course, there is no way of making any calculations whatsoever. But assuming it has been done with any care and intelligence, the value of the coupons, and the amount which they are available to purchase have been based upon the assumption that they would all be utilized. Therefore, it cannot cause any shortage so far as the rest of the consuming public is concerned. It may prevent many persons who today are getting ration points which they have no right to, from those who are underprivileged and unable to buy, from securing the excessive amounts of rationed foods which they have been obtaining.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator let me ask another question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. I do not wish the Senator to think that the vigor with which I am answering his question is any indication that his question is received in a hostile manner. I appreciate the fact that he is bringing out a very important point.

Mr. MURDOCK. I always like the the vigorous approach of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I do not take any offense at it to myself.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I have followed the Senator, he says that points are issued to families today in the lower income group which cannot be used because of an inadequate purchasing power.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. But that the stamps which are issued to those families find their way into the hands of the higher income groups, who are obtaining more than their share of the available food supply?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I could not say that all of them do, but I do know of enough instances of my own personal knowledge to lead me to believe that it is a very widespread practice of people to obtain ration stamps either for money or by gift from persons who do not have the ability to buy the allotment of food which has been given to them under the rationing program.

Mr. MURDOCK. So that if the Senator's theory is correct, the mere fact that there is placed in the available money supply an additional $500,000,000 in a fiscal year should not necessarily increase the competition for the available food supply?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; but on the contrary I contend that the subsidizing the cost of food to persons in the higher income groups has the effect of releasing purchasing power to add to the inflationary pressure.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'DANIEL in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have in my hand a statement giving the results of surveys by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture. The statement was presented to the committee by Dr. Tolley. It is quite pertinent to the questions which have been asked by the Senator from Utah. I read as follows:

Interviews of urban and rural people during the past year give an indication of how the wartime food consumption of consumers has been modified, especially what problems low-income groups are experiencing in attempting to satisfy their food needs in face of rising prices. The situation is well summarized in a statement from a housewife in one of the Southeastern States: "Us gits just as hungry as before the war, but we cooks and eats less because of the cost."

Surveys in the Southeastern States lead to the following conclusions:

1. About 40 percent of the families of low economic status have an excess of red-brown ration points while only about 20 percent of this group state they have insufficient points. This situation was entirely reversed for the higher income groups.

2. The low-income families having excess stamps generally report they buy less lard, butter, and other rationed foods because of their high cost.

3. The cost and availability of non-rationed foods is likewise a problem to many low-income families. A Birmingham housewife complained: "I bake less because cornmeal is hard to get and the things you have to buy cost so much these days. I buy less lard. We don't really get enough, but we make it last." Another said: "I was raised on cornmeal and I most starve for it now." Flour and shortening were most often said to be too prohibitive in price for the housewife to maintain her baking habits. More low-income families complained about the shortage, poor quality, and high price of cornmeal than about any other food except sugar.

4. In Richmond, Va., 60 percent of the families earning $15 or less per week and 40 percent of those earning between $15 and $25 weekly reported that they cannot live up to their former nutrition standards because of high prices and occasional local food shortages.

5. In the same city two-thirds of the families with weekly incomes under $15 have made extensive changes in their food consumption patterns.

In the United States generally the problems reported by Southeast consumers are characteristic of other sections except for certain regional differences associated with industrial employment and proximity to food industrial employment and proximity to food-producing areas.

Dr. Tolley emphasized very strongly the fact that today the low-income consumers cannot use up their ration stamps, because they do not have enough money to match the stamps.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, with reference to the amount which is provided in the amendment, I should like to read a little further from Dr. Tolley's testimony:

Just in general it seems to me that something like $500,000,000 a year would be the absolute minimum under which a program of this kind could be spread all over the country; and even if a program of that size were put into effect better results might be obtained if funds were limited and at the beginning it were made available only to certain groups within these income classes that are already laid out.

For instance, we know that there are many families of soldiers and sailors and veterans who are in these income classes whose income now is lower than it was before the soldier or sailor went to war.

Mr. President, the plight of persons in the fixed-income and low-income groups is one which I believe we are inclined to underestimate and to fail to understand. They are not an organized group. They have no great Nation-wide organizations. They have no persons whom they can send to Washington by the trainload to see Senators and Members of the House of Representatives and to press upon the Congress and the executive branch of the Government the dire straits in which they find themselves.

Likewise, Mr. President, there are the problems of the war workers jammed into a city beset with food shortages, inadequate housing facilities, overtaxed restaurants, and so forth. There are the working women who must provide for their children at home.

The general consumer subsidy program to which the administration has clung with such undying tenacity does not begin to touch these problems I have been discussing. So far, only food subsidies have been discussed; but food, Mr. President, is only 41 percent of the cost of living. Clothing is considered, by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, to be 12 percent of the cost of living. From December 1942 clothing prices have risen 6.9 percent, more than double the increase in the cost of food. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table from the January 31, 1944, Monthly Digest to Members of Congress from the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor, with reference to the percentage changes in the cost of living.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage changes in cost of living

Group	December 1942 to December 1943	December 1941 to December 1942	December 1940 to December 1941	August 1939 to December 1943
All items	+3.3	+9.0	+9.7	+26.2
Food	+3.3	+17.3	+16.2	+46.6
Clothing	+6.9	+9.7	+13.0	+34.2
Rent	+.1	−.2	+3.1	+3.6
Fuel, electricity, and ice	+3.0	+2.1	+3.4	+12.3
Housefurnishings	+3.4	+5.9	+16.3	+27.1
Miscellaneous	+4.7	+4.7	+5.8	+17.6

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. A brief perusal of this table will show, Mr. President, that the present subsidy program is directed at only a part of the total family budget which goes into the cost of living. We are at the crossroads in the decision we are about to make. If we are going farther down the road of subsidies, then there is no place to stop until we get to the end of that road, until we reach the point where every important item in the cost of living has been subsidized. How will we deny to those who are contending for relief from this situation, the right to subsidies on rents, on clothing, on fuel, on house furnishings, and on the other items which go into the cost of living? Mr. President, food, as we all know, is not the only thing required for living in a modern society, although it is the primary consideration. These other items are of almost equal importance. How will we deny the appeal to extend the subsidy program outside of the food field? How will we turn back the demand that more and more of the items in the food budget shall be subsidized, unless we find some constructive alternative to this subsidy program?

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is my contention that the subsidy program has utterly failed so far as the persons who are in most dire need of assistance are concerned, namely, those in the low-income groups and in the fixed-income groups. The total consumer saving claimed for the present subsidy program is $1,151,000,000, and that is to permit those who are ardent advocates of the subsidy program, and who appeared before the Senate committee in an effort to put it over on the Congress again, to take credit for every dollar they claim as a saving, both direct and indirect. Taking their own figures, some of which I think are justified, and some of which I think are exaggerated, but giving them the benefit of every possible doubt and of all the exaggeration which they may have in their claims, the sum of $1,151,000,000 is only 3.5 percent of the 1943 national food bill. It is 1 percent of total consumer expenditures in 1943. How much of the saving claimed is a saving in mark-ups, and not necessarily due to subsidies? The actual direct aid afforded by food subsidies is only 2.6 percent of the national food bill. This subsidy aid is infinitesimal when translated into terms of specific income food budgets. Taking their 3½ percent, and giving them all they have claimed for their program, let us see what has been accomplished in helping the people who are put forward as the primary justification for subsidies. For a family at an income level below $500, the savings from the food-subsidy program amount to $5.57 a year.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. That is assuming that they buy the same amount of subsidized foods per capita as other people buy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is applying the 3½-percent saving to their food expenditure.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator knows that my argument in favor of the continuation of the program was not based upon that premise.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I realize that; but I also realize that the fixed-income groups and the low-income groups have been utilized by many others who have advocated the continuation of the subsidy program. They are the ones who should have our first consideration, because they are the ones who have been disadvantaged by the war. They are the people who have had an already cruelly low standard of living further pushed down toward the near-starvation level by the war. They are not benefiting either directly or indirectly. They are not only being asked to sacrifice a tragically low standard of living which should bring a blush of shame to every statesman in America, but they are also giving up their flesh and blood on the battlefields and on the seven seas of this global war.

Mr. MALONEY. Does not the Senator believe that the proper way to take care of that distressed class of people is by providing proper wage scales for them?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The fact is that many of such persons are not employable. Many of them have very meager incomes, and are receiving such incomes under wartime conditions.

Mr. MALONEY. I refer to those who are employable.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If I could provide a higher standard of living for those people, which they, themselves, could earn and work for, I should be very glad to bring it about; but the fact remains that many persons, despite the stimulation of war, have not had an increase in their income, and many of them have had a decrease in their income because of the effect of war.

A family at the income level of $500 to $1,000, under the subsidy program, giving the O. P. A. all that it claims, has a saving of $10.96 a year. In the group from $1,000 to $1,500 the saving is $16.84; in the group from $1,500 to $2,000 the saving is $20.54; in the group from $2,000 to $2,500 the saving is $23.80; in the group from $2,500 to $3,000 the saving is $26.85; from $3,000 to $4,000 the saving is $30.29; from $4,000 to $5,000 the saving is $34.44; from $5,000 to $7,500 the saving is $39.62; from $7,500 to $10,000 the saving is $43.54. At the $10,000 level it would amount to $60.24.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Would the Senator agree that if there were no price control and if it should become necessary, as a result of the loss of the subsidy program, to increase prices, the figures which he has just given would be multiplied many times because of the increase in prices?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not concede—I deny with every fiber of my being that subsidies are the keystone of the arch of the price-control and stabilization program. Subsidies have been exaggerated out of all proportion to their relatively insignificant importance in this situation. The important factors in the control of prices are, first of all, the power to fix prices; secondly, the power to ration articles for which there is greater consumer demand than supply; and, third, the fiscal and taxation policy of the Nation. The role of subsidies has been blown up out of all proportion, until many persons in the United States have obtained the impression that if subsidies are abandoned there will be a runaway inflation in this country, the kind about which the Senator from Georgia spoke, in which there will be a flight from the dollar into tangible goods. I say, "Stuff and nonsense."

Mr. MALONEY. The Senator knows, however, that the War Labor Board, the Office of Price Administration, and others charged with the management of the program, say that this is the keystone.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; and I deny it. I say that there is no evidence to prove it. There is nothing but their exaggerated assertions. I say that if we had never adopted a subsidy program they would have been able to control prices and they would have been able to control the economy. I say that subsidies have been exaggerated out of all proportion. They have been tied up with the Little Steel formula, which has been broken; and it is about time the American people got the truth about this matter, because if they do not, they are going to have a false impression if in the end Congress should win over the Executive in this fight. That is why I am joining with the Senator from Vermont in trying to offer a constructive solution for the most crying need insofar as the increased cost of living is concerned.

I do not think it is the responsibility of Government to say to every person who stays at home, in the safety of the continent of the United States, separated by thousands of miles from the conflict, that he shall not suffer any hardship as a result of the war. I do not think that every person who has been advantaged by the war, who is receiving more income today, from whatever source it may be derived, than he ever received before, is entitled to have the cost of living rolled back for him.

However, in war the Government has a responsibility. It has a duty to see that the effects of war shall not produce more malnutrition, more disease, and more of the unconscionable conditions which exist in the rural and urban slums of this Nation. We have a responsibility to do that, Mr. President, not only because of our sympathy, but because today those people are producing children who will be a part of the adult generation of tomorrow, upon which the future stability of this Republic will rest.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Referring to the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], we are all familiar with the testimony of the Price Administrator to the effect that if roll-back subsidies were removed the cost of food would increase 7 percent. The fact remains that when roll-back subsidies were put on, the cost of food did not decrease 7 percent, in spite of the fact that subsidies resulted in a demoralized condition in the livestock market.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not only that, Mr. President, but I think it can be shown from their own charts that the leveling off in the cost of living came as a result of the establishment of price ceilings, more than as a result of the establishment of subsidies. The leveling off started when price ceilings were established. There has been much loose talk and loose thinking on this subject. Of course, Congress provided that under the Stabilization Act farm prices should not have ceilings placed upon them until they reached parity, or the price on a certain date prior to the enactment of the act, whichever was the higher. Naturally such prices rose until they reached that point. But the O. P. O. placed ceilings on the prices after they had crossed that line, and I think it can be shown that it was then that the cost-of-living index began to level off. Subsidies came later. I shall discuss that question a little further as I proceed. I have already taken more time than I intended.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question for my information?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is there an income tax, under the existing rates, on any of the classifications which would be reached by the Senator's amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Before the Senator came into the Chamber I tried to explain that it is difficult to say there are no specific levels of income set in this amendment. But when we appropriate $500,000,000 we shall know approximately where the level will be. It will be at about $1,100 for a family, and at about $350 for a single person.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So there would be income taxes to be paid by some of the beneficiaries under the Senator's amendment; would there not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but it would all depend on how many dependents there were in the family.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. We are dealing with averages here, but certainly not, so far as any single person is concerned. Since many of the families in this group tend on the average to be greater in size than those of the higher-income levels, I doubt that what the Senator from Michigan has referred to would be the case, but there might be such cases.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was wondering whether the problem the Senator poses could be reached through the income-tax law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, a 5-percent roll-back on a pound of butter will not solve the problem of the war worker who must pack up his belongings and move across the country to a strange city, pay outrageous prices for a room or some makeshift of a home for his family, where transportation is difficult and expensive, and where doctors' bills are high because of sickness and disease in crowded communities. A 3-cent roll-back on meat is no compensation for the

disappearance of the inexpensive grades of work clothes from the store.

A roll-back on peanut butter does not compensate the working mother for the cost of providing care for her child at home, or the railroad man who is spending practically all his time on the road away from home, sleeping and eating away from home in order to do his part in this Nation's war emergency, or the coal miner who may be at the mercy of the company commissary.

Mr. President, it is neither possible nor necessary to attempt a general subsidy program to guarantee to everyone the same standard of living which he may have enjoyed on any given date, whether it be January 1941 or September 1942. War, as I suggested a moment ago, will cut into the Nation's standard of living. That fact will be inevitable. It is a part of the cost of war to the individuals of a nation which participates in the war. Dislocations in the economy resulting from a war are bound to bring the need for adjustments in prices and wages.

I emphasize that, Mr. President, especially in view of the fact that we have launched on a course of deficit financing for this war on a scale never known before in the written history of the world. That is where the inflationary potential lies. It is our great problem. We can subsidize until we are black in the face and we shall never either solve the problem of holding the line, nor solve the problem of dealing with the persons who have been cruelly disadvantaged by the war.

Do not forget that the President has been the victor in the subsidy battle up to date. To hear some of the officials from the O. P. A. and elsewhere talk one would think that Congress had cramped and crippled their style in administering subsidies. As a matter of fact, the President won the battle on subsidies. The administration has been given every dollar it asked for, and it has not been able to hold the line. I cite that fact as additional proof that subsidies are not the crux of this matter, and that a proper, a vigorous, and a courageous enforcement of the powers now within the hands of the O. P. A. would be effective in controlling prices, and in regulating the economy of the United States during the war.

The saddest day for America on the home front was when someone sold the administration a bill of goods, namely, the idea that it could freeze the economy of this country, with all its complexities, and engage in a global war, in which it is now pouring out the resources and substance of the Nation, and which it has largely financed out of deficits, and still could hold the line. The officials of the Government had to give way. They are faking when they say they have held the line, if they do say that. They have not held the line. They have not held the Little Steel formula, subsidies to the contrary notwithstanding, and they have received every dollar for subsidies for which they asked. Yet they try to tell the people that subsidies are the keystone of the price-control and price-stabilization arch in America. If that be true we had better get someone else to administer the act.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The Administration received more than it asked for; did it not? It spent the money on small roll-back subsidies which were not legally authorized. Is that not true?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not enter into a legal argument as to whether the Congress was slipshod in the way it framed the Price Stabilization Act. The Administration officials claim, and the Attorney General has given them opinions to that effect, that Congress gave them the authority to do what they did. I do not think Congress ever intended to give them such authority, but that is beside the point. I am trying as best I can in my feeble way to concentrate the argument on the question of high national policy.

A moment ago I made the statement that we should get someone else to administer the act. I am a great admirer of Mr. Bowles. I count him as one of my personal friends. But I assert that if he has decided to pin the hopes of America on subsidies in order to prevent a runaway inflation, in which there will be a flight of money into goods, he should get out and let someone handle the situation who can successfully prevent inflation. I assert here and now that subsidies will fail if they are relied upon as the major instrumentality for accomplishing the objective which every thinking American knows must be accomplished.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. So that there may be no misunderstanding, I should like to point out now—and in doing so I express my own feeling as well—that Mr. Bowles has said time and time again that his feeling toward subsidies was one of accepting the lesser of two evils. That is how many of us feel about it. We do not like subsidies. We deplore them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I assert that a reading of Mr. Bowles' testimony indicates that he regards subsidies as one of the major factors in the price-control program. I state also that if that be true, his administration will go the way of all flesh like every other administration which has been in the Office of Price Administration. It is doomed to failure, Mr. President; first, because, as I have already said, if we go down the road of subsidies we must go down to the end, and that means the subsidization of the entire economy insofar as it relates to the cost of living.

They are not going down that road; they cannot get there; because they will have a fight with Congress every time they try it; even if they won the fight as a result of a veto and our inability to pass the bill over the President's veto, and even if they should get what they are asking for now, $1,500,000,000, it would not be a drop in the bucket; it would not do the job.

The line has already been broken. It was broken as a result of the coal strike; it was broken as a result of the railroad strike, which was, so far as the Government is concerned, one of the worst bungled jobs in my entire experience in public life. But when it was over the line was broken. Now, what is the use of trying to fool the American people any longer?

I do not say the administration broke the line because they wanted to. They broke the line because it is impossible to hold a hard and fast line in a wartime economy where huge expenditures are being made by Government and a large percentage of them through the medium of deficit financing.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. Time and again in this debate and in other debates we have heard the statement made that we have not held the line. I cannot quite understand the purpose of the constant iteration of that statement. Could it possibly mean that someone believes that we should disband our forces and should not try to repair the line?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That would be just as ridiculous as to continue to say the line is being held when it is not. The alternative to holding the line is not a runaway inflation; it is not an uncontrolled price structure; and the very law itself gives power, which, if properly, vigorously, and courageously exercised, will prevent that very thing.

But I will say that by yelling until they were black in the face about holding the line, by exaggerating the importance of subsidies they have created an ominous psychology in the public mind.

Mr. MALONEY. Does not the Senator think that the psychological situation with which we are confronted is important? I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes, but I do not believe that the way to cure a psychological condition is to let it continue and do nothing to stop it. If some people would be more frank, and if they would be more honest in evaluating the relative insignificance of the subsidy program, that psychology would disappear. But the administration wants to cure it by pumping another small hypodermic of subsidies into the economic system. That will not cure the thing the people are now worried about; it will not help the disadvantaged groups, and in the end it will not help the psychology of the American people.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator from Wisconsin and myself are in entire agreement in the expressions I have heretofore made on this floor, that there is very small, if any, connection between subsidies and holding the line, and that, after all is said and done, the big factor in controlling prices is the power already given to establish maximum prices and to ration an inadequate supply of

a commodity as between consumers. I think the Senator from Wisconsin agrees with that, does he not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I agree in general with that statement. Now I wish to hasten along.

Mr. President, I think organized labor has made one of the most tragic mistakes in its history in tying its hope for the alleviation of distress among its membership to the subsidy program. Labor is doomed to tragic disappointment in this respect. They now entertain the hope that they can get subsidies and break the Little Steel formula completely at the same time. In the long run, Mr. President, I do not believe that the Congress will ever accept such a proposition or consent that they shall have their cake and eat it too. As I have already demonstrated, the effect of the subsidy program is so negligible in assisting the consumer in meeting the increased cost of food that labor will be pulverized as a result of its blind advocacy of the subsidy program.

Mr. President, I repeat, the resort to subsidies proves that the line cannot be held with regard to prices, and the breaches of the Little Steel formula which have been made whenever the pressure became sufficiently strong completely demonstrate that the wage line cannot be held.

The moment anyone says the wage line cannot be held he is accused, by misrepresentation, of advocating wild and uncontrolled inflation. Mr. President, I deny that. I say that today the power is in the hands of the O. P. A. and the administration to control the price structure of this Nation. I say, furthermore, that it is not desirable nor should it be a concern of Government to subsidize consumers who are not in the low-income group and who are able to pay a reasonable and a fair price for their food. The subsidy program works in inverse ratio to the sound policy of income taxation. The subsidy program benefits least those who are in the lowest income groups and it benefits most those who are in the higher income groups.

The keystone of economic stabilization is and must be in the future compounded of the elements of price control through maximum price ceilings, rationing, a sound, over-all tax and fiscal policy, and more effective administration and enforcement of these controls.

Stabilization of food prices is traceable to such developments as the establishment of specific dollars-and-cents ceiling prices, the first of which became effective May 10, 1943. I am sorry I cannot show the graph which appears on page 98 of the hearings, but if Senators will draw a line on May 10, 1943, when the specific ceilings on food prices went into effect, they will find that it is the point at which the cost-of-food index in the United States began to level off. The advance of food prices slowed down, as indicated on this graph, as farm commodities reached parity-price levels and became subject to ceilings.

The chief cause of increase in the food index last winter and spring was the uncontrolled rise in the prices of fresh fruits and vegetables. To show this, I wish to call attention to the fact that on January 15, 1941, the cost-of-living index stood at 100.8; on May 15, 1942, at 116; September 15, 1942, at 117.8; April 15, 1943, at 124.1; May 15, 1943, at 125.1; December 15, 1943, at 124.4.

Now, consider the food index for 1943. In January all foods stood at 133; fresh fruits and vegetables at 147.1.

In February all foods stood at 133.6; fresh fruits and vegetables at 152.8.

In March all foods stood at 137.4; fresh fruits and vegetables had gone to 172.9.

In April all foods stood at 140.6; fresh fruits and vegetables went to 191.1.

In May all foods stood at 143; fresh fruits and vegetables were up to 205.8.

In June 1943 all foods had dropped back to 141.9; fresh fruits and vegetables to 202.

In July all foods stood at 139; fresh fruits and vegetables at 192.9.

In August all foods stood at 137.2; fresh fruits and vegetables at 179.4.

In September all foods stood at 137.4; fresh fruits and vegetables at 175.8.

In October all foods stood at 138.2; fresh fruits and vegetables at 174.9.

In November all foods stood at 137.3; fresh fruits and vegetables at 170.

In December all foods stood at 137.1; fresh fruits and vegetables at 171.5.

Mr. WILEY. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I digress long enough to say, however, that this rise in the prices of fresh fruits and vegetables was not because of any failure of Congress to provide the O. P. A. with power to put price ceilings upon these commodities. It was not the fault of Congress that that particular branch of the food line climbed out of all relation and proportion to the rest of foods.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. WILEY. My colleague has anticipated my question. He has taken the position, which I think is the correct one, that O. P. A. has had ample power to control prices, but has fallen down on the job. As I understand the table he has just read, it demonstrates to anyone who is impartial in trying to get at the facts that it is correct to say that O. P. A. had the power, Congress gave it the power, but O. P. A. fell down on the job in exercising the power. Am I correct in that conclusion?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not care to make any sweeping denunciation of O. P. A. I think that on the whole the O. P. A. has been quite successful in holding prices within control. I do think, however, that they have made a great mistake in pinning their faith on subsidies, and I think any continuation of that policy is doomed to tragic failure.

We should not overlook the fact that their failure to exercise power for one reason or another with regard to fruits and vegetables had the effect of distorting the cost-of-living index to the extent which its weighted value has in that relationship.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I make no complaint about what the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin has just said, but I think, in view of the conclusions attempted to be drawn by the junior Senator from Wisconsin, a statement from me is in order.

A very large proportion of the foods produced in the United States come from California and the Pacific coast. A substantial amount of vegetables comes from California and the Pacific coast. Due to the very extreme demand for labor on the Pacific coast in war work, the farmers were compelled to double and treble the wages they had been paying to the farm workers. Farm wages in California almost reached equality with the wages of industrial workers, and were two or three times as much as the average elsewhere in the United States.

The distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin himself has carefully and exhaustively reported upon conditions in California when very low wages were paid to farm workers. Now, very high wages are being paid. It was clearly due to that fact that the O. P. A. was compelled to allow very high prices for fruits, and to a lesser extent for vegetables.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. But the figures which I have cited will show that they permitted them to get away out of line before they ever imposed the restrictions, and Mr. Carroll, from Mr. Bowles' office, if my memory serves me correctly, indicated that he acknowledged that to be true.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me also state that the high prices which the consumer had to pay for fruits and vegetables during that period were in a large measure due not only to the fact that the farmers of California had to pay higher wages to labor, but there was also a terrific and almost uncontrolled middleman's profit for a long time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that brings me to another point which I wish to make; namely, that the farmer has been very unfairly treated, so far as the public discussion over the radio and in the press is concerned in this controversy. All too often there is not any recognition in such discussion of the fact that the spread between the price which the farmer receives for his product and that which the consumer has to pay is one of tremendous magnitude. Instead of the consumer's attention being directed by these high-powered information gentlemen who are on the Administration's pay roll to this great spread between the price which the farmer receives and the price which the consumer has to pay, the consumer's attention has been directed at the farmer, as if he were responsible for the fact that we have to pay 70 cents a dozen for eggs in Washington, whereas they have been selling on the farms in Wisconsin for 24 cents.

Mr. President, I do not make this charge, but I ask the question, Have not subsidies been the road of least resistance so far as the O. P. A. is concerned? Is it not easier to subsidize the product than it is to squeeze out exorbitant and

extortionate profits which may be made between the time the goods leave the hands of the farmer and arrive in the hands of the consumer?

I have some studies here. I am not at liberty to give the source of this information, but I wish to read briefly a summary of the profits of meat packers, 1936 to 1942.

Compared with average earnings in the years 1936–39, profits before income taxes have risen more for meat packers than for most other food groups. Aggregate profits in 1942 of 53 companies were over 4 times the pre-war level on only 83 percent higher sales. Gains over the base period were greater for packers with 1942 volume ranging from five to fifty million dollars than for larger concerns, and were smallest for companies reporting sales of less than $5,000,000 each.

For all 53 companies, the profit per dollar of sales rose from 1 cent in the pre-war period to 2.4 cents in 1942. The return more than doubled for the large and tripled for the medium size, but declined for the small packers. In the base years, however, the small concerns had averaged 2 to 4 times as much on sales as the others.

On each dollar of capital invested in the 53 companies, the return in 1942 was three and one-half times the 1936–39 average. In the base period almost half of the companies averaged less than 5 percent on invested capital, while in 1942 more than half realized at least 10 percent. In this instance, all groups participated in the rise, although not to the same extent. The small packers averaged three times as much as the medium size in the base years, but less than two-thirds as much in 1942. The large companies did only half as well as the small in the prewar period, but over one and one-half times as well in 1942. The greatest changes occurred from 1941 to 1942.

Seven out of every 10 packers earned more in 1942 than in the years 1936–39, and 6 out of 10 reported gains over 1941.

* * * * *

Wholesale food grocers realized twice as much on every dollar of sales in 1942 as in 1939. Sales were up 43 percent, but profits before income taxes rose over 200 percent. The larger companies showed the greater increase in sales, but the smaller concerns reported the greater increase in profits. From 1939 to 1942, profits before taxes of companies with sales under $5,000,000 rose 250 percent, compared with less than 200 percent for companies with sales of $5,000,000 and over.

* * * * *

Profits before income taxes of fruit and vegetable canners were five times as great in 1942 as in the years 1936–39, on less than twice the pre-war volume of sales. Their increase in profits exceeded that of any other food group, and of all nondurable manufacturing industries except textiles.

Profits expanded 5 times as rapidly for small as for large canners, although the gain in sales was about the same for both. Companies with individual volume under $5,000,000 realized 16 times greater profits in 1942 than in the base years, while larger concerns reported only a threefold gain. More than half of the small canners had profits in 1924 10 or more times the pre-war average, and two-thirds reported increases in excess of 500 percent. Among the larger concerns, only one realized a gain of more than 500 percent.

Mr. President, of course, I am not opposed to the processors and the distributors realizing a reasonable profit, and I do not have the figures for 1943 which are comparable, but I simply raise the question as to whether subsidies are not the easier way, so far as the administration is concerned, rather than exercising its power to shrink down the margins to where they will produce a reasonable profit? Congress did provide that the O. P. A. should not disturb normal business practices, or words to that general effect, but it never intended to permit the realization of unconscionable profits.

Within the frameworks of a stabilization policy based upon the factors which I have outlined there would be means of price adjustments where necessary to meet production costs, wage controversies could be settled on their merits, labor would not have the Little Steel formula hanging around its neck. I say that because in my opinion the Little Steel formula has lost all validity and reality, and the fact that the administration itself has had to breach it proves my point.

Whatever financial aid the Government can afford in relieving the cost of living could be concentrated and should be concentrated on the low-income groups where it is needed most and could accomplish some tangible results. So far as the people who are injured most seriously by this rise in the cost of living are concerned, the subsidy program is a total and a complete failure. The fire, Mr. President, if I may use a poor analogy, is in the basement, but we are squirting a feeble stream of water on the roof of the building.

I am not interested, as I indicated at the outset, in the barrage of statistics which are thrown up first by one side and then the other in an effort to show how much better labor has fared in the war economy as compared with the farmer, or vice versa. Labor and the farmer in the long run will prosper together or go down to ruin together.

Our wartime experience should drive that point home. It is the fact, as stated by the War Food Administration, that under present wage scales in this country every pound of our tremendously accelerated food production would have been absorbed here at home as the result of increased buying power. The one thing I do regret, Mr. President, is that individuals on both sides of this controversy have sought to drive a wedge, to create hostility between labor and the farmer, whereas, as every student of this economy knows, they must ultimately go up together or go down together.

The events of the last 3 years have proved that if the workingman is getting a good wage he can buy all the food the farmer can produce. The per capita consumption of agricultural food products in 1941 was 11 percent higher than the 1935–39 average for the civilian population only. In 1942 it was 8 percent higher, and in 1943 it was 4 percent higher.

To labor, the consumer subsidy program of the administration will prove a sham and a delusion. It is being used to tie labor to a lifeless and outmoded Little Steel formula, and it is giving no significant aid in return.

To the farmer it is an unbearable fraud, for it seeks to avoid public recognition of fair and necessary prices, something that is bound to rise to plague the farmer in later years when the statisticians go to work to belittle his distress by comparing 30-cent butter with 41-cent butter, instead of 46- or 50-cent butter, which is the real price in these times.

Mr. President, we will have to extend this subsidy program, in all fairness and justness, unless some other alternative is found; and I say it will rise to plague every industry, including agriculture, to which it is applied, in the difficult period of the post-war adjustment.

As an alternative, I believe all patriotic Americans can unite on a program of fair treatment for all producers, and of Government assistance to those who need it most, to avert severe hardship among the low-income and fixed-income groups.

Mr. President, I say that in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, we have a constructive, workable program. It was tried in part for several years, and proved its value. I think it is essential that we make some constructive answer to this problem. I fear more than I dare to phrase in words the growing chasm which exists on the eve of our most supreme war effort, between Congress and the Executive. I say it is time for both sides to give some ground. I saw the ridiculous spectacle here yesterday when those who had voted for $1,500,000,000 of subsidies refused to vote for $980,000,000. I know what is afoot, Mr. President. I know that it is intended to make this a political issue, just as the administration intends to make a political issue of all the differences which exist between the Congress and the Executive on other great questions confronting the people today. Congress should not contribute to this political purpose of the administration. Congress should propose a constructive alternative, a majority of both Houses having determined on abandonment of the subsidy program. Embodied in the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont and myself is a workable, tried solution for the most crying phases of the problem created by the cost-of-living increase.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Vermont, the authorization is $500,000,000. That represents the maximum amount which the Congress could appropriate under the amendment. The exact amount which will be appropriated remains to be determined and recommended by the Appropriations Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. President, let me say that we have reached a point in this war where it is of vital necessity for the effective continuation of the war that when we reach these impasses between the position of the Executive and that of the Congress, we should work out some constructive solution which both can accept. We should not permit the problems to

go unsolved solely for the purpose of making them issues in the Presidential campaign of 1944. Even if the Executive does not desire to see this country united and held together, even if his policy tends to tear groups in this Nation asunder on the eve of the greatest military effort in all history, I say that does not relieve the Congress of its responsibility.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have joined with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in presenting the program embodied in this amendment, because I believe it represents an opportunity for a constructive solution of the most pressing aspects of the present problem.

To follow any other course will produce chaos in the price-stabilization program with inadequate food production on one hand and grave consumer unrest on the other. We need constructive leadership instead of jockeying for political position at the expense of the welfare of the American people.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply desire to clarify one thing about the amendment. One Senator has asked me in regard to section 303 and section 308, which apparently are in conflict. I wish to say for the benefit of Senators present that section 303 was stricken from the amendment yesterday. That was one which had no restrictions on the amount to be authorized. Section 308 remains in the amendment, and authorizes a limit of $500,000,000.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT A

TABLE 5.—*Distribution of families and single consumers by money income level, 1942*

Income level	All families and single consumers		Families		Single consumers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under $500	3,488,000	8.5	2,319,000	6.9	1,169,000	14.9
$500–$1,000	6,652,000	16.1	4,604,000	13.8	2,048,000	26.1
$1,000–$1,500	6,601,000	16.0	4,837,000	14.5	1,764,000	22.5
$1,500–$2,000	6,008,000	14.5	4,920,000	14.7	1,088,000	13.8
$2,000–$2,500	4,618,000	11.3	3,953,000	11.9	665,000	8.5
$2,500–$3,000	3,272,000	8.0	2,852,000	8.5	420,000	5.4
$3,000–$4,000	4,620,000	11.2	4,236,000	12.7	384,000	4.9
$4,000–$5,000	2,633,000	6.4	2,486,000	7.5	147,000	1.8
$5,000–$7,500	1,901,000	4.6	1,805,000	5.4	96,000	1.2
$7,500–$10,000	628,000	1.5	597,000	1.8	31,000	.4
$10,000 and over	789,000	1.9	751,000	2.3	38,000	.5
All levels	41,210,000	100.0	33,360,000	100.0	7,850,000	100.0

Office of Price Administration, Division of Research.

THE COAL SHORTAGE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement relative to the coal situation.

The Special Committee Investigating Fuel Shortages, of which I am chairman, has for some time been following the coal situation. During last fall we held hearings at which it was developed that the coal situation would be extremely serious this winter, but that we could expect to come through all right if there were no further labor difficulties, and if consumers tightened their belts just a little. At that time the Solid Fuels Administrator stated that rationing would not be necessary this winter.

Since then the Government has again taken over the operation of the coal mines and the labor situation has not materially improved. The committee determined to suspend hearings in order to enable the Administrator to work out his problems without undue interference. But we followed developments carefully and continued to keep advised of the facts.

At the present time the committee is convinced that it is necessary to reexplore the entire subject in detail. The Office of Price Administration has announced that it is working on a rationing plan for solid fuels, although no determination has yet been made to ration coal. Even this year many consumers have had to submit to informal rationing under orders of the Solid Fuels Administrator limiting deliveries.

The production of coal has not kept pace with steadily increasing consumption. It is usual for production to fall below consumption during the heating season but in past years stocks have been replenished during the summer and fall. This year, however, stocks have steadily declined due to a number of factors, of which the most serious is a shortage of manpower. The decline in coal stocks is expected to continue during 1944.

It should be pointed out that this situation exists despite a slight increase in total production of coal for 1943 over the total production for 1942. But there has been an over-all decline in anthracite production. This decline is serious because there has been a trend to production of anthracite for industrial use at the expense of domestic consumers. In the bituminous fields increased demands have outstripped the increased production.

This committee has shared the reluctance of the Solid Fuels Administrator and of the greater part of the industry to see any coupon rationing of solid fuels. As in the case of fuel oil, a rationing system would probably have the effect of placing limits on deliveries. This in turn would greatly burden transportation facilities and increase the load on available manpower. It would probably discourage adequate stock piling during the summer months. Rationing would also be unwieldy and cumbersome to administer. The many different sizes and types of solid fuels would have to be treated separately, and the resultant regulations would probably be complex and burdensome. Nevertheless, a preliminary study made by the committee raises a serious question that the solid-fuel supply for the next heating season will be considerably less than the demand.

The committee will continue hearings for the purpose of exploring further every possible means of increasing production and averting the necessity for rationing. We will consider the manpower question, the possibilities of mechanization, the transportation situation, the administration set up, and other relevant problems. In the event that we must have rationing, the committee intends to explore fully the difficulties so that the Congress will be well advised before hand of the problems which are likely to arise in the future.

In one most serious respect the committee has suffered a serious setback. In the future it will be severely handicapped by the loss of Senator W. Warren Barbour. Senator Barbour, in his work with our committee, as in his other senatorial functions, made an irreplaceable contribution. There cannot be any substitute for his energy, and his judgment, and his interest in our problems. Perhaps our need, and therefore our loss, is not as great as that of the important standing committees to which Senator Barbour so greatly contributed. But we will miss him as much as any.

I hope the President of the Senate will be able to appoint another Member to carry on for Senator Barbour as soon as possible so that the committee can enter into its important work on the coal situation with a full membership.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield for that purpose?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Langer
Andrews	Danaher	Lucas
Austin	Downey	McClellan
Bailey	Eastland	McFarland
Ball	Ellender	McKellar
Bankhead	Ferguson	Maloney
Barkley	George	Maybank
Bilbo	Gerry	Mead
Bone	Gillette	Moore
Burton	Green	Murdock
Bushfield	Guffey	Murray
Butler	Gurney	Nye
Byrd	Hatch	O'Daniel
Capper	Hayden	Overton
Caraway	Hill	Pepper
Chandler	Holman	Radcliffe
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Clark, Idaho	Kilgore	Revercomb
Clark, Mo.	La Follette	Reynolds

Russell	Truman	Walsh, N. J.
Shipstead	Tunnell	Wheeler
Smith	Tydings	Wherry
Stewart	Vandenberg	White
Thomas, Idaho	Wagner	Wiley
Thomas, Okla.	Wallgren	Wilson
Thomas, Utah	Walsh, Mass.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] has the floor.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, for a number of years I have known both sponsors of this amendment. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is one of my dearest friends. I regard him most highly because I know of the type of work which he has done, not only in this body but before he came here as a Senator. The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] made a marvelous speech today in presenting his cause. For the most part I concur completely with him in everything which he said except his conclusions.

Mr. President, if this amendment, which, much to my regret, I am forced to oppose, were not so sinister in its implications it would be fantastic. If we control the people's food we control the people themselves. In my opinion that is exactly what the effect of the pending amendment would be. It would result in complete control and regimentation of the people of the country.

I recall all too distinctly what a sigh of relief went up throughout the country when we finally heard from Washington that the W. P. A. had been abolished. The people themselves were relieved, because the larger percentage of those who had benefited by the W. P. A. never believed in it, and longed for the day when it would cease to exist.

The proposal of the Senator from Vermont and of the Senator from Wisconsin can be interpreted in no other way, Mr. President, than to reestablish a glorified W. P. A. That is what it means, no matter what fancy language it may be dressed in to take care of the occasion.

It is proposed to appropriate $500,000,000 in order to buy food stamps to distribute throughout the country to a group which has been called the low-income group.

Within the past 2 days, by overwhelming majorities, the Senate has voted down proposals of a similar nature. This amendment provides for nothing more nor less than a subsidy under another name. Are we to reverse ourselves and approve a subsidy because it has been given a fancy name and a fancy description?

Mr. President, I regret that I have had to say these things about the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, but I am forced to do so because a few years ago I lived through an era similar to the one which would result from the adoption of this amendment, and I do not wish to experience it again.

I do not like Santa Claus in politics, no matter whether such a situation existed during the past 10 years or will exist during the next 10 years, because Santa Claus has too many friends.

Let us consider this amendment briefly and a few of the provisions it contains.

For the first time in our history it is proposed not only to regulate but to define the kind and quantity of food we shall eat. It reminds me of Karl Marx, who made the sage comment years ago, "When you control the people's food, you can control the people." The provision to which I have referred in the amendment would prescribe the amount of food to be allotted to us, the kind of food we shall have, and there would be a course of education given throughout the country, if you please, on improving our eating habits. That is what the amendment calls for; that is what it provides.

I invite attention to another provision on page 11. I do not know whether Senators have noticed it, as it is apparently an innocuous provision which might be passed over lightly at first. I refer to the section at the top of page 11, which reads:

> The Director shall provide by regulation a simple method for the registration of mercantile establishments selling food and food products.

Do Senators realize what that means? It means that every merchant in this country, every little cross-roads grocery store, or food store, will be registered and licensed by the Federal Government, and if we ever turn over the food distribution——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I shall not yield now.

Mr. AIKEN. I was about to tell the Senator that food distribution is absolutely not to be turned over to anyone, and he knows it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It is provided for in the amendment. If it is desired to turn the distribution of food over to some bureau in the Federal Government it can be done under this amendment containing, as it does, a provision that every food dealer shall be licensed by the Federal Government. It is provided that only those dealers who take in stamps shall be licensed or regulated. The Senator comes from a State similar to mine. Both States are filled with small towns and small communities. The merchants of those small towns and communities almost fight each other in order to get hold of the food stamps because they cannot exist unless they have that kind of business.

There is another section to which I wish to call attention. I refer to section 201 (a) under title II. We are assured by Senators that no new Federal employees will be added to the pay roll to administer this amendment. I recall very distinctly that within 6 months after the O. P. A. had been created it had 55,000 employees on the public pay roll. However, under the provisions of this amendment, even though we use existing committees throughout the States and counties, "the Director may appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act and shall fix their compensation." Every one of those employees will be on this new pay roll, and the new bureau, of course, will be under the control of the Director.

In title II, section 201, at the bottom of page 11, we find this interesting qualification:

> In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration.

In that connection I wish to call attention also to the provision in section 8, on page 7, which reads:

> DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED
>
> SEC. 8. There shall be no discrimination against any household with respect to eligibility, classification, participation, or issuance or utilization of food-allotment coupons under the provisions of this act by reason of race, religious creed, national origin, citizenship, political affiliations or beliefs—

And so forth. I do not believe that the American people or the Members of this body are so naive as to believe that sort of a provision will be observed and that there will be no discrimination. I lived through one era of this sort of political relief. I saw it operate, and I know what it does to the recipients. I know how the administrators themselves operate. I do not want to see return to this country such a condition as prevailed in that era. It may be said, "Oh, well, the people proposed to be benefited are entitled to relief and to receive a few food stamps and go to the grocery store and get the groceries they need." Senators, listen: In the West a few years ago there was a prolonged and serious drought; thousands upon thousands of people were on relief, and the relief afforded at that time was supposed to be absolutely nonpartisan; there was to be no politics in it. Yet what happened? With half the population of some of the prairie States on relief, the great humanitarian sat here in the White House and uttered his platitudes about what he was doing for the poor, but his henchmen in my section of the country traveled, from door to door, if you please, and from road camp to road camp, from work camp to work camp, carrying pockets full of buttons of the administration which was then running for office, pinned the buttons on the workers and left them with the very definite impression that their relief would not be continued unless they saw the light on election day.

In the midst of that drought no crops were raised, the farmers had no feed for their livestock, and men with families were working in road gangs or relief crews. I have no objection to taking care of those whom the Government should take care of; but I do object most emphatically to the manner in which relief was administered. I will give an example of what was done. As I have said, the relief agents traveled around from house to house, and when they met a woman, perhaps with a half a dozen children around her skirts, they left her with the feeling, whether justified or not—and she thought it was—that if her husband and she did not vote the ticket the agent represented, the relief check would fail to come to their door the next month. I do not want to see that kind of thing again happen in this country, whether in the East or in the West.

Gentlemen may utter all the platitudes they care to about there being no discrimination, but unfortunately things are not operated in just that way in this country when politics is at stake. Every Senator on this floor has been through that sort of thing and knows what it is.

My State is primarily a farming State. It is the home of Hereford cattle in the Northwest. Our Hereford herds all over the State had been built up for years; they were magnificent cattle, with splendid sires; but when the drought hit us what did the Federal Government do to impress upon our cattle growers and farmers its power, its influence, and "what have you?" They offered the owners of the Hereford herds from $7 to $21 a head for purebred and almost purebred cattle, and then to impress our people they brought herds of Hereford cattle and milch cows into almost every little town in the State, drove them to the edge of the town, shot them, and rolled them into a ditch—and that at the time when people all over the country were crying for meat and food! That is the type of thing that went on. I am not saying that any other party would not do the same thing if it had a chance, but I do not want to see such things again made possible in this country.

One day into the town where I live a herd of fine white-faced cattle had been driven, which had been bought for $7 a head. A bunch of W. P. A. workers had dug a huge pit on the edge of the town. A man came to my office and said, "Do you know they are killing cattie here?" I said, "No; I am going out to see about it." They slaughtered 200 head of those cattle that day, and rolled them into the pit, when the people of this country were crying for meat and for food. That is on a parallel with the fantastic story about the slaughter of millions of little pigs, but I saw what I have described with my own eyes. I protested and said, "Those cows are milk cows; there are people who could use that milk." The udders of the cows were filled with milk—the man in charge said, "This is none of your business; I am following orders." So the cattle were slaughtered and rolled into the pit. I, as one Member of this body, do not want ever to see such an incident repeated. I do not want any party or any administration to be tempted to use that kind of method to influence the voters of the various States.

Mr. President, the pending amendment also provides that the Director or Administrator shall make report to Congress. One of the fantastic provisions is that the Director must show to the Congress why all the eligibles did not use the food stamps. What business is it of the Director or anyone else in this country if I, John Smith, Bill Smith, or someone else does not want to use the stamps? I do not know; but that is in the amendment, if you please, Senators. It looks very much to me as if food stamps were going to be forced upon people whether they wanted them or not.

It is provided in the amendment that $500,000,000 may be used to operate the food-stamp plan. Let me call attention to what the Department of Agriculture, at the other end of the Avenue, says about it.

Grover B. Hill, First Assistant War Food Administrator, of the Department, estimated in a letter to the Senate Agriculture Committee that the cost of a stamp program as outlined in a bill introduced by Senator AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, would be around $3,000,000,000 annually if all eligible families took advantage of it.

He explained the estimate did not mean the War Food Administration was recommending the appropriation of any specific amount, but was based on statistics showing 18,000,000 families are receiving less than $2,500 a year in income.

Mr. President, I do not know where the Department of Agriculture or the statistician or anybody else got the fantastic notion that anyone in this country who does not earn $2,500 a year is in the low-income group. Good Lord, half the people of the States of the Middle West, indeed almost 90 percent of them, do not earn $2,500 a year. Are we going to say under this amendment that everybody living in South Dakota and North Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa are in the low-income groups, and that we ought to pay their grocery bills out of the Federal Treasury?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I can speak on the bill, can I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 20 minutes on the bill.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am almost through, and I prefer not to yield for the present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment or two more. I do not want to be misunderstood in what I have said today. If there is anyone in this country who is entitled to assistance, I want to see him helped; but I want to meet that issue face to face. I do not want to have it tacked into the tail of a justifiable bill which we are trying to pass in this body. I want to meet the issue of need if and when and where it arises, and allow the necessary supplies to go to the groups which may need them.

It will be said, "Oh, you do not understand the situation." Let me say that I do understand the situation, and that is why I am so intense about this matter. My father and mother went into Dakota when it was still a Territory. There were thousands and thousands like them who went into that section on foot, on horseback, in covered wagons, who took up homesteads on the prairies of our State. My father and mother built a board shack for their homestead claim, and covered it with tar paper. That is the kind of house in which their babies and many other babies were born on the prairies in that section of our country.

Those men and women, who came from all parts of the Union to the prairies in those days, faced savage monsters of weather, hardship, and privation, which are hard for us of today to understand. But I say that those who came to the prairies and built their homestead shacks and raised their babies there, who made roads, built churches and schools and towns, and made a great State out of my State and all the other prairie States, neither asked nor expected the Federal Treasury to pay their grocery bills. I say that in all solemnity and earnestness.

Mr. President, before I leave that subject, I wish to add that the West was not settled or built by food stamps at the cost of the Federal Treasury. I want to face the issue of relief squarely when it comes before us, and if the proponents of the amendment are able to satisfy this body that any particular group needs help, I shall be for extending assistance as quickly as will any other Member of this body. But I oppose placing 20,000,000 American citizens under obligations to a director of a Federal bureau who would dish out food stamps to them every month. Inevitably, I care not whether my party or the other party were in control of the Government, the man who handed out the stamps would leave the impression with the recipients of the stamps that he would like to have them vote his way when election time came.

Mr. President, I have heretofore made some remarks on this subject on the floor of the Senate, which were also broadcast by me over the hook-up of the National Broadcasting Co. a few weeks ago, and I ask unanimous consent to incorporate those remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, "if food and other necessaries of life are adequate in quality and variety, and if men are free, there will be industry. If savings are secure from confiscation and debasement, there will be thrift; and an industrious, thrifty people make a prosperous and rich nation."

On Labor Day 1942, the President delivered a message to Congress—perhaps the most amazing message ever delivered by a President.

On the same date, the President delivered a radio speech to the American people commenting upon his message to Congress. In that speech, he said:

"Today I sent a message to the Congress pointing out the overwhelming urgency of the serious domestic economic crisis with which we are threatened. Some call it inflation, which is a vague sort of term, and others call it a rise in the cost of living.

"Last January the Congress passed a law forbidding ceilings on farm prices below 110 percent of parity on some commodities. On other commodities the ceiling was even higher so that the average possible ceiling is now about 116 percent of parity for agricultural products as a whole.

"This act of favoritism for one particular group or commodity increased the cost of food to everybody, not only to the workers of the city or in the munitions plants and their families but also the families of the farmers themselves.

"Since last May ceilings have been set on nearly all commodities except the exempted farm products.

"Wages in certain key industries have been stabilized on the basis of the present cost of living."

Obviously, the President intended to and did tell the Nation in that speech that the American farmer was getting too much money in spite of the fact that since January 1939 industrial wages have risen 94 percent while the cost of living, including all items, has risen only 24.1 percent.

The President severely criticized the Congress for passing the law of January 1942, whereby he was prohibited from fixing ceiling prices below 110 percent of parity on many foods and farm products, and left the impression that the advance in the price of farm products has far outrun that parity limitation.

In the statistical summary issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture, under date of October 30, 1943, we find that wheat, corn, cotton, and eggs are still within or below the parity limits and have not advanced to 110 percent as suggested by the President.

We further find that none of the food products mentioned in that report of the Department of Agriculture, which includes oats, potatoes, hogs, beef, veal, lambs, butterfat, and milk, have exceeded the 110 percent of parity named in the law of January 1942, except in one or two cases, and then only slightly.

But the President went further than that. He demanded immediate action by the Congress giving him vast additional powers and specified a time limit within which the Congress must act, namely, October 1, 1942. He said:

"I have told the Congress that inaction on their part by that date will leave me with an inescapable responsibility to the people of this country to see to it that the war effort is no longer imperiled by the threat of economic chaos."

Only one conclusion can be drawn from this statement. Since he claims he had stabilized everything except farm prices and that we were threatened with economic chaos on that account, then we much conclude that because of soaring prices of farm products we have chaos.

Reluctant as I am to differ with the President, I must call attention to the fact that the President was mistaken in both statements. There have been no soaring prices in farm and food products and there has been no economic chaos.

The President, continuing, said:

"In the event that Congress shall fail to act, and act adequately, I shall accept the responsibility, and I will act.

"The President has the powers, under the Constitution and under congressional acts, to take measures necessary to avert a disaster which would interfere with the winning of the war."

The Congress not only acceded to the demand of the President, but very promptly, on October 2, 1942, passed the Emergency Price Stabilization Act, giving him all the power he demanded.

In the spring of 1943 I introduced S. 1143, which had for its purpose the prohibition of the payment of subsidies by the executive branch of the Government unless specifically authorized by the Congress. I offered this bill because the subsidy program then proposed was in violation of the law and was definitely inflationary, as I will point out hereafter.

This bill was later merged with the Commodity Credit Corporation bill and, in the rush of the closing days of the session before the summer recess, was passed with a limited authority granted for the payment of certain subsidies.

The bill expired on the 31st day of December and was continued until February 17, 1944.

H. R. 3477, which was recently passed by the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority, is now before the Committee on Banking and Currency for consideration. It extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to June 30, 1945. In that bill is the following provision, known as section 3:

"No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which subsidy programs or support prices have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out and such support prices may continue to be maintained to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but not beyond December 31, 1943."

Years ago in the county fair circuits of the Middle West there was always to be found a pitchman with his little table, three walnut shells and a little pea. The pitchman was an adept at his business. After getting a crowd around his little table, he would deliberately, slowly, and with complete honesty, show his audience the pea. He then covered the pea with one of the walnut shells and permitted some member of his audience to tell him under which shell the pea was located.

With confidence thus established in his customers, he offered to bet a sum of money that no one in the audience could tell him under which shell the pea was located. One or more of the suckers were certain they could do so and thereupon bet their hard-earned money upon their judgment.

Of course, the pea was not under the shell designated. In the end the suckers, if they remained long enough, lost their shirts.

Today we have a shell game going on in our National Government. We are shown the pea and told exactly under which shell it will be and what will result if we lift the shell. The pitchman is a clever operator, else he could not survive.

The American people in this particular shell game are the suckers. They are being told that if we remove the shell from the pea, a terrible, destructive, and cataclysmic inflation will sweep this country.

The pea is not under the shell we think it is. The disastrous inflation predicted will not occur, but if we bet our money and follow the advice given us, we will lose our shirts in the expenditure of public money for unneeded and unwanted subsidies.

An unprecedented campaign of misrepresentation and even downright falsehood has been waged by those high in authority for the purpose of instilling fear in the minds of the people. The President, James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization, Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, Chester Bowles, Director of the Office of Price Administration, and other governmental officials have, by written and spoken word, endeavored to instill in the minds of the American people a fear that catastrophe will result if this bill is passed.

In recent weeks many statements have been issued to the press suggesting a compromise. A compromise means surrender to those asking a continuation of subsidies and this is no time for surrender.

Throughout the country organized groups have been inspired from Washington to bombard Congress with telegrams and letters. News writers and radio commentators have engaged in this pressure campaign of fear, either because they do not understand or are inspired from the same source, and we are witnessing today a concerted and studied attempt to pass legislation by pressure. One leading official of this administration has stated publicly that if this bill is passed, it will cost the American people $8,000,000,000. According to the January 10 issue of Newsweek, Mr. Bowles has now boosted that figure to $17,500,000,000. That claim is so fantastic that it is not worthy of an answer. It is not founded upon any known facts and is nothing more than pure misrepresentation. From the reverse viewpoint, I agree that this program, if carried on for 2 or 3 years, will cost the American people far more than $8,000,000,000, but not in the way the administration means. Those billions will come out of the Federal Treasury and will come from taxes paid by the American people to pay subsidies.

The President said in his recent message to Congress that the continued payment of subsidies to consumers was vital to the war-food program. Subsidies have nothing whatever to do with the war-food program, because the payments proposed to be continued are being made to consumers for the alleged purpose of cutting down their grocery bills and not to produce food. The farmer is getting no part of these subsidies except a few unwanted pennies on milk checks.

Not only is the farmer not getting any of these subsidies under this present program, but the farmer's share of the consumer's dollar, as disclosed by the Department of Agriculture in its report of August 1943, amounts to only 58 cents out of each dollar. The President made no mention of the 42 cents going into other pockets, but left the impression that the farmer was the sole beneficiary in whatever increase in prices has occurred.

The President says that "Government funds have been used in various ways to enable the farmer to get a fair price for his crops—a price high enough to encourage him to raise more crops—without raising the price to the consumer." The President's statement is not in accord with the facts. The law passed by Congress in 1942 authorized the payment of subsidies for the sole purpose of increasing production. The experience of the last 6 months has proven that this proposed subsidy program has actually reduced production. Cattle production has declined and thousands are being rushed to market before ready for slaughter. Hog production in 1944 will be down 20 percent.

Milk and butter production both show a monthly decline. These subsidies have not benefited the producers. They have not increased production, but have caused confusion, annoyance, and financial loss.

The President says that he is sure "that Congress and the people feel that this expenditure of $800,000,000 per year is a moderate sum to pay in order to help accomplish the objectives which we have in mind—greater production and lower consumer prices." These payments have not gained the objective sought. Neither the people nor Congress favor it.

Last summer Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones testified before the Agriculture Committee of the Senate that he estimated the cost of the roll-back program to be $450,000,000 a year. The President now has it up to $800,000,000. Chester Bowles, Director of the Office of Price Administration, says it will cost a billion and a half. C. I. O. demands $2,000,000,000 for this purpose. Whatever the price, are we willing to pay the grocery bills of labor at a time when it is receiving the highest wage in history?

The Department of Labor figures on the percentage increase in average wages of workers in all manufacturing industries and in the cost of living since January 1939 are

as follows: Wages, 94 percent; living costs, 24.1 percent.

The President said that the payment of subsidies will "stimulate production, prevent price increases, encourage distribution." Experience has shown that it will not stimulate production. It will not prevent price increases, because the payment of subsidies has nothing whatsoever to do with prices. It will not encourage distribution, but does encourage hoarding.

There are 40,000,000 farmers in this country. Our national income has increased since 1939 by at least $40,000,000,000, but only 14 percent of that $40,000,000,000 goes to the farmer. The other 86 percent to nonfarm groups.

Last winter the hog producers of America were urged by the administration to increase hog production. Now, in the face of falling prices, it refuses to support prices for hogs. In the face of a black market in every city in this country, in the face of a threatened scarcity of meat the administration is discouraging meat production. Hog raisers are being punished. The cattle industry, through ill advised regulations, is being wrecked. There are more cattle in the country today than ever before, but those cattle are being pushed upon the market, weighing not more than two-thirds, and in many cases not more than one-half, of a matured animal. The producer is losing that extra production. The American people are deprived of the extra meat, and O. P. A. is on its way to better and bigger pay rolls.

Food is being hoarded and wasted by the War Food Administration. On January 4 the Office of Defense Transportation officially charged, and I quote:

"1. W. F. A. has bought and hoarded such tremendous stocks of butter, meats, and frozen commodities that the nation's storage facilities are filled to capacity, with no space available for storing spring and summer crops which should be processed to prevent spoilage.

"2. W. F. A. has continued buying and hoarding despite this apparent condition.

"3. W. F. A. does not even know how much it has bought, so frenzied has been the purchase spree

"4. W. F. A. does not know where all this food is stored.

"5. W. F. A. does not know what percentage of food stored is held by commercial operators and what percentage by their agency

"6. W. F. A., as a result of this shortsighted policy, has been responsible, indirectly at least, for tremendous losses in meat, eggs, and canned milk."

The President says, "There are some who advocate taking off all restrictions on food because of the vast food production which the American farmers have raised. But with the great excess of purchasing power now in the pockets of the American people, the supply would never last. We might have a feast for a few months, but then there would be a real shortage."

Does the President think that the American people are children or savages, who would glut their stomachs with an excess of food for a short time and then end in famine? We have managed to get along without Executive direction in this country for 150 years and no famines have resulted. We have not overfed ourselves. We have not destroyed our resources. We have taken care of ourselves without Government paternalism, and we can continue to do so.

There is only one solution to this confusion and threatened famine, and that is to remove all regulations on food production. Let the age-old law of supply and demand take its course. Hoarding will cease. Black markets will disappear. We will get rid of an unwanted and an unnecessary army of Government employees, and our supply of food will be ample for all purposes.

The President says "Some people say 'a little inflation will not hurt anyone.' They are like the man who takes the first shot of opium for the sensation he thinks it will give him. He likes it, although he swears that he will not make it a habit. Soon he is taking two—and then more and more—and then he loses all control of himself."

May I paraphrase that statement by saying there are a few people in this country who say that a little subsidy will not hurt anyone; that it will be extremely helpful and acceptable to those who receive the subsidy; that they like it, but they swear it is only for the moment and that they will do without it a little later on. But soon we will lose all control of ourselves and will be subsidizing everything out of the Federal Treasury to take care of pressure groups who think they want Government assistance.

Under the present law the Government is paying subsidies on cheese, 3¾ cents, amounting to $28,000,000; on butter, 4½ cents, amounting to $100,000,000; on milk and cream, amounting to $350,000,000; on meat, amounting to $350,000,000; and on bread, $108,000,000. Where will it end? What will be the next item the pressure groups will insist should be included in this subsidy opium?

Many officials and others who are talking vociferously in favor of subsidies are confused in their thinking. They either do not understand the problem, or they have been inspired by the idea of getting something for nothing, or they are looking with longing eyes to the 1944 election.

There are two kinds of subsidies—production and consumers' subsidies—a fact which most of the commentators seem to overlook completely.

Congress authorized subsidies to increase production. No one is complaining of that kind of a subsidy. The other kind of a subsidy is a consumers' subsidy which is a different breed of cats. It is a raid on the Federal Treasury or, more directly, into the taxpayer's pocket, to help out a pressure group with its grocery bill.

No one is objecting to producers' subsidies if used for the purpose specified in the law. That is the kind of subsidy they are paying to the producers of copper, because the Government needs copper in its war effort.

We are told over and over and over again, with a repetition that has grown monotonous, that if we do not pay subsidies we will have inflation, and that inflation is a terrible bugaboo which we must avoid under all circumstances. Some of those who talk so glibly about inflation do not know what inflation means. But inflation is easily defined. It means that there is more money in the pockets of the people than there are goods to purchase. Doing this or that legislatively will not cause inflation. Neither is all inflation harmful. We have inflation in some degree nearly all the time, but there is nothing harmful about it. When a farmer buys a work horse in the fall for $100 when no one wants a horse and sells it in the spring for $125 when everyone wants horses that is inflation. But no one is harmed by it. If I buy 1,000 bushels of corn in October for a dollar and sell it the following May for $1.25, that is inflation, but no one is harmed. There is only one correction to inflation and that is increased production. Production of civilian goods cannot be increased materially at the present time, but there are two other solutions, and only two, increased taxes or enforced saving, but neither are needed. We have in this country vast stock piles of commodities for war use. Those stock piles are a continuing brake upon the threat of inflation. As long as they exist no inflation can occur, because the market can be completely controlled. We have heard a lot about holding the line under the President's order, but the President himself does not hold the line. He did not hold the line of John L. Lewis' coal miners. He did not hold the line on the railways, or with Government employees, or with the steelworkers, and the whole mess was created in the first instance by the ill-advised policy of Government paying outrageous prices for war work. For the first time in the history of America, pick-and-shovel laborers were paid out of Government funds, wages ranging as high as $100 a week. No man living can earn that much money with his hands, but our entire economic structure was wrecked by the payment or approval of such wages.

Congress passed what is known as the Stabilization Price Act. Under it the Government has complete authority to fix prices of commodities. Because of its failure to do so we are now threatened with inflation, and they are attempting the futile, unnecessary expedient of paying subsidies to consumers. The payment of 5 cents a pound to me for butter that I buy and use in my home has nothing whatsoever to do with holding the price of butter. All the administration had to do at any time was to fix prices, both on labor and commodities, and hold them there. No subsidies were needed to accomplish that, nor will subsidies accomplish it. I say to you that there is no reason, either moral, legal, or economic, why the money in the Federal Treasury should be used to pay the grocery bills of every Tom, Dick, and Harry in this country at a time when 9,000,000 American boys are working for their Government for $50 a month. It is the job of O. P. A. to hold the line, but not with the payment of subsidies.

Through timidity or vacillation the administration refused to use the one certain method provided by Congress. Instead of picking out an item here and there upon which a ceiling price was ordered, why did it not issue one horizontal order straight across the board, fixing prices upon retail merchandise and upon labor? That was the obvious course if it did anything, but it was not taken.

Last summer they established what was called a roll-back price on butter, meat, and coffee of 10 percent. To thousands of processors of these commodities the administration proposed to and is paying a subsidy out of the United States Treasury.

During those weeks while that policy was under discussion, Secretary of Commerce Jesse H. Jones appeared before the Agriculture Committee of the United States Senate and stated, in substance, that the proposed roll-back subsidy would cost $450,000,000 a year; that he had the money in his R. F. C. funds; and that he proposed to pay these subsidies upon the order of the President, whether the Congress approved it or not, and without the necessity of an appropriation from Congress.

Further testifying, Secretary Jones said, in disapproval of the subsidy program: "If you let the law of supply and demand take its course, no subsidies are needed. The subsidy plan will reduce production instead of increasing it."

Chester C. Davis, then War Food Administrator, and since sent back to the obscurity of nonofficialdom because he did not agree with his chief, said, in testifying before our committee: "I believe that a general dependence upon a broad subsidy program as the chief instrument in holding prices in line, or in expanding production, would be dangerous and would not accomplish the things we seek."

T. G. Stitts, Chief of the Dairy and Poultry Branch of the Agricultural Marketing Administration, stated at the same time: "The proposal to roll back the price of butter has had an unfortunate effect. Prices—for the producer—have gone down. There is no provision to indicate that the subsidy would be passed on to the farmer."

Albert Goss, national president of the Grange, one of the large farm organizations, testified before our committee. He said: "We are opposed to the use of subsidies for such purpose, because they will not work. They are inflationary and will defeat the purpose sought to be accomplished. Subsidies in lieu of fair prices will lead to post-war chaos. Subsidies pass on to future generations costs which this generation should bear. Subsidies lead to the dangerous doctrine of expecting the state to support its people. Subsidies lead to political control, and when once used they are almost impossible to get rid of."

Under this subsidy program on butter and meat, the benefit to the consumer is so negligible as to be almost laughable. Under the rationing now in effect each consumer can obtain a quarter of a pound of butter a week, or 12 pounds a year. The 5 cents additional cost paid by the consumer without a roll-back amounts to just 65 cents for the whole year. On meat it amounts to $2 for the entire year. The entire cost to the consumer without the roll-back and subsidy is less than 1 cent a day.

The worker has plenty of money. He is receiving the highest wage ever paid. Is it not better that he, the consumer, pay this small additional cost than to take it out of the taxpayer?

Comparison of the wages of industrial workers with the pre-war average

Year and month	Wage income for employed industrial workers	Cost of living
1935–39 average	100.0	100.0
1941: January	118.7	100.8
1942:		
January	145.6	112.0
September	167.3	117.8
1943:		
January	173.4	120.7
February	177.2	121.0
March	181.1	122.8
April	184.1	124.1
May	186.2	125.1
June	185.5	124.8
July	186.8	123.8
August [1]	190.8	123.2

[1] Preliminary.

NOTE.—Data compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. Cost-of-living index compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Another thing, whatever the amount paid for subsidies, whether it be $800,000,000 or $2,000,000,000, the Government does not have the money. It must borrow it from the American people. To borrow money you must pay interest and to administer this subsidy program we must hire an army of new job holders. We then have the original cost of the subsidy, whatever it is, plus the interest on borrowed money, plus the cost of administration. You and I know that when the Government handles it, the cost will be two or three time the total amount of the subsidies. And who pays this bill? The taxpayer pays it.

The administration is determined upon this policy of subsidy payments and, by hook or crook, unless this Congress emphatically says "No," they are going through with it.

As an illustration of what I mean, let me tell you of a conference held in the committee room of the Committee on Agriculture some weeks ago. Hon. Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, appeared before a conference of 31 Senators in connection with the payment of milk subsidies. The chairman of the meeting asked for an expression from the Senators as to their feelings about the payment of subsidies. Mr. Vinson insisted that no expression of opinion be given. Nevertheless it was given, one by one. Every Senator present, and it was not a partisan group, stated emphatically that they were opposed to subsidies. Mr. Vinson said: "We are going to pay this subsidy nevertheless."

So I repeat that unless this Congress emphatically prohibits the continuance of this policy by the passage of this bill, the wishes of a large majority of the Members of the Congress is going to be disregarded. Certain labor leaders have stuck a gun against the ribs of this administration, demanding higher wages and, in lieu of wages, subsidies on their food bill. The administration has attempted to press the same gun against the head of Congress, but Congress knows that the gun is not loaded and we have no fear of it. Subsidies have been tried over and over again in the history of the world and have always resulted in confusion, disaster, and chaos, and that is what is going to happen in this country if the administration is permitted to carry out its ill-advised policy.

The claim of the proponents of subsidies that we are faced with a disastrous inflation is not true. One of the leading officials of the present administration, Dr. Richard V. Gilbert, Economic Consultant in the Office of Price Administration, agrees with that statement. He says, in his book An Economic Program for American Democracy:

"The supposed danger of inflation can be disposed of briefly. The instances of runaway inflation usually cited—for example, the post-war experience in many European countries—all occurred in countries exhausted by long wars and straining their depleted resources to the breaking point. There is no danger of a rapid rise of prices. Furthermore, the instruments of monetary control already at the disposal of the Federal Government—for example, control over reserve requirements, taxation, and debt repayment—assure us that there need be not the slightest fear of inability to control any general price rise which might be regarded as excessive."

Professors Harper and Curtiss, of Cornell University, two of the foremost economists of this country, just recently issued a statement upon this same subject. This is what they have to say:

"A rising price level, no matter how slight, is inflation. The popular concept of inflation is a rapid rise, perhaps like that of World War No. 1, where wholesale prices rose from 100 to 244, or possibly an uncontrolled type like that which occurred in Germany in the twenties. A more modest rise than either of these is inflation, but is not commonly thought of as such.

"In the history of countries, inflation (rising prices) has been occurring about half the time. Rarerly has it been of the extreme type. Conspicuous instances in the world in modern times were those of France in the 1790's, and Germany in the 1920's; both were in defeated countries following major wars. Violent inflation now theatens China, following large governmental deficits and a long war. Violent inflation in the United States is unlikely."

Continuing they say:

"Inflation cannot be controlled by law or regulation of prices. Theoretically, it seems possible, but in practice it is not because it does not get at the root of the trouble and so enforcement breaks down. 'Legislatures are as powerless to abrogate moral and economic laws as they are to abrogate physical laws. They cannot divorce effect from cause, either by parliamentary majorities, or by unity of supporting public opinion.'

"As an aid to the solution of the inflation problem, subsidies fail for two reasons: First, the subsidy payments to producers and to their spending power, which is as inflationary as an equal number of dollars received directly in price. Second, consumers' prices are held down (or possibly reduced by a roll-back) which increases their excess-spending power and exerts that much more inflation pressure on black-market operations or elsewhere.

"Subsidies also add to later inflationary tendencies. This is because they add to the Federal debt. The fact that the Government pays the subsidy does not in the least prevent its being an inflationary force.

"Subsidies are an excellent device by which to maneuver producers and distribution agencies—and even consumers—into position where they are much more subject to governmental control; but as a means of controlling inflation they are a delusion, and for this purpose they yield nothing in recompense for the loss of individual freedom that goes with the plan.

"Subsidies, in effect, are a means of shifting some of the cost of living from the consumers of the product subsidized to the national debt, and thus to the taxpayers. This really amounts to a shift in the cost of living from those who used the product to some who did not, rather than a reduction in the cost of living for the Nation."

Dr. John Lee Coulter, economist of national reputation, has this to say in regard to H. R. 3477, which we are now considering:

"We have shown that the indexes for wholesale prices on costs of living and retail prices on goods in large cities throughout the Nation have returned to normal. There is no possible justification for widespread payment of subsidies in order to make it possible for the consumers to purchase commodities at Government expense.

"Roll-back subsidies now in operation certainly are inflationary in character, and should be eliminated.

"Moderate wage and salary adjustments, some long overdue, should not be used as a basis for hysterical cries of inflation."

The truth of the matter is that there is not going to be any inflation. The cry of "Wolf, wolf" is wholly unjustified. Remove all regulations on the production of food, and the problem will solve itself. The record shows wages have risen twice as fast as food and three times as fast as living costs during the last 4 years.

It is said by some who do not favor subsidies that if we do not pass a bill continuing them the administration will use our refusal to start an inflation of its own for political purposes. I do not subscribe to that fear. There have been few of the acts of the Roosevelt New Deal administration with which I have agreed. I do not wonder that he has finally seen the handwriting on the wall and requests that we drop the name "New Deal," but I do not believe that Mr. Roosevelt or any other man holding the office of President of the United States would under any circumstances purposely bring on a disastrous panic of uncontrolled inflation.

If we are going to roll back prices of commodities and farm products to the 1939 level, let's roll back the wages of the laboring man to a comparable price with the farmer's income.

In 1939 farm prices were only 92 percent of the 1910–14 average. The weekly factory worker's wages are 208 percent of the wages of that same period. The Bureau of Economic Statistics shows that in August 1943, as compared to September 1942, the weekly wages of the factory worker could purchase 52 pounds more of bread, 28 quarts more of milk, 11 pounds more of butter, 19 pounds more of steak, 28 pounds more of pork chops, or 91 pounds more sugar than in 1942.

Dr. Wilford I. King, professor of economics of New York University, said the other day:

"According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the cost of living in February 1943 was 21.5 percent higher than the average

for 1939. But what happened during this interval to the average weekly earnings of employed factory workers? According to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, these earnings rose from $24.58 to $41.12. These figures refer solely to those employed, taking no account of the large additional gains in income brought about by rising employment. The best available evidence, therefore, indicates that in the last 4 years the contents of the pay envelope of the average factory worker have expanded at least three times as much as the rise in the cost of living. Obviously, unless conditions change very decidedly from those existing at present, Mr. Green's worry lest the growing cost of living outstrip wage advances is quite superfluous.

"Whether they know it or not, the poor as well as the rich pay the hidden tax inflicted by inflation. They pay it not only in higher prices but in shortages of automobiles, gasoline, household equipment, farm machinery, meat, canned goods, etc. Had our leaders dared to tell the people the truth and put the war on a pay-as-you-go basis, the marvelous price system—an automatic control mechanism far surpassing in efficiency anything which the mind of man can devise—would have silently and effectively taken care of both war and civilian needs, obviating all necessity of rationing except perhaps in the case of rubber. Had inflation been avoided, the O. P. A. would have been entirely unnecessary and the army of men and women now engaged in regimenting the populace could have been busy helping to win the war. Only an absolute ruthless dictatorship, oblivious of the wishes of the public, can interfere with the free price system and not produce by its operations shortages of necessities and widespread black markets."

The expenditures of consumers for food as a percentage of his total income, in the following table prepared by the Department of Labor, shows that the percentage of incomes paid for food has declined steadily instead of increasing:

Food expenditures as a percent of total income

Year:	
1929	23
1930	24
1931	24
1932	25
1933	25
1934	24
1935	23
1936	21
1937	21
1938	22
1939	21
1940	21
1941	20
1942	21
1943	20

Senators have been talking of compromise. If the payment of subsidies out of the Federal Treasury to specific groups is wrong, a compromise does not right the wrong, and no benefit will be derived by anyone.

There will be no inflation if the administration uses the tools now in its hands for holding this so-called line.

Dr. John Lee Coulter, the economist from whom I have heretofore quoted in a recent statement issued by him, said:

"Over a considerable period of years, the basic price-reporting agency set up by the United States Government, Department of Labor, reported regularly all details with reference to the price structure. Prices are quoted on many hundred commodities. In order to make comparisons as between price movements of different commodities and as between dates, these data have been reduced to the form of index numbers. For this purpose, the calendar year 1926 has long been accepted as the base period representing normal price levels in the United States. These statistical price index numbers have been calculated extending back over a period substantially of a hundred years.

"Using price levels during the normal base or representative year 1926 as equal to 100, the Bureau shows that, in October 1942 (1 year ago), the index number of wholesale prices for all commodities likewise stood at exactly 100. In other words, wholesale-price levels in October 1942 had finally recovered from the low or depression levels of the depression period and had again returned to the exact level of the base period.

"During the year October 1942 to October 1943 the wholesale price index number for all commodities has ranged between 100 and 104. At the very most, therefore, it may be said that wholesale prices for all commodities have ranged within the margin of probable error in collecting, calculating, and computing index numbers. There is only one conclusion which can be properly drawn and that is we do not have any price inflation in the United States at the present time as measured by index numbers of wholesale prices."

The payment of subsidies has no effect whatsoever upon the price of commodities, and I urge the Senators to approve this bill by such an overwhelming vote that those proponents of subsidies will understand that there is no compromise. Karl Marx said: "If you control the people's food, you control the people themselves." There are those in this Government who want to control the people's food. It is within our power to prevent that control of our food. It is within our power to restore to the people of this country the handling of their own affairs, if we have the courage to take that step.

For 11 years the President has met every problem presented to him during his administration with one unfailing formula: "Spend more money." That is his answer to every problem. That is his answer today. Instead of holding the line with the power that Congress has placed in his control, he evades the issue by pleading for authority to spend more money.

This bill is more than just another piece of legislation. It goes to the very foundation of our Government and our way of life. I urge the Senators to consider it as such. I urge them to take control away from the Executive and prevent his proposed spending of more public money. I urge that Government control of food be removed and that the law of supply and demand be permitted to settle this problem.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, it will not take me long to give my reasons for opposing the consumer food-subsidy program. It is another of those "psychic" programs; I do not like to use the word "fraud" in describing any legislation, because that would be impugning the motives of those supporting it, and I have the highest respect for the motives of every one of my colleagues.

We are told it is necessary to pay billions from the Treasury in food subsidies in order to halt or retard or prevent inflation. Mr. President, every dollar paid from the Treasury in subsidies adds that much to the spending power of the country. The basic factor in price rises is increased purchasing power going into a market where there is not a corresponding increase in things that can be bought. Increasing the purchasing power increases the inflation factor.

Subsidies to increase production can be justified. Subsidies to increase spending power cannot be justified as a hedge against inflation.

We are told also that consumer food subsidies are necessary because people cannot afford to pay their own grocery bills in these times. Mr. President, the incomes of the people of the United States are almost double what they were when the war started. The national income has gone from somewhere in the seventy billions to an estimated one hundred and fifty billions plus in 1944. The cost of living has gone up 25 percent. National income has gone up almost 100 percent. And the bulk of the increase in national income has not gone to those who clip coupons. It has gone to those who work for wages. Statistics show this. What anyone can see on the streets, in the stores, at any place where large numbers of people go to spend money, bears out this statement.

Some comparisons have been made with the subsidy paid to high-cost copper producers in order to get increased production of copper. The copper subsidy can be legitimately used as a reason for paying a subsidy on soybean production in order to get increased and much-needed increased soybean production. But the copper subsidy is not at all analagous to the proposed consumer food subsidy; it is just the opposite. In the case of copper the Government did not pay a subsidy to all producers of copper; it went just to high-cost producers. The consumer food subsidy proposed here would not go just to those of whom it is said—and with justice, so far as several million fixed-income and white-collar workers are concerned—that they need relief. On the contrary, the proposed food subsidy would go clear across the board, to every consumer.

Mr. President, I want to nail another one right at this point. Some have called this a subsidy to farmers. It is not. The administration has not claimed that farmers will get increased income from the subsidies here proposed; the subsidy is to make up generally only in part for less farm income due to lower prices to be paid for farm products in the market under the subsidy program.

No, Mr. President, what is proposed is most emphatically not a subsidy to the farmer. It is a subsidy to the consumer. This is a proposition that the Federal Treasury shall help pay the grocery bill of the consumer—at a time when consumer income is the largest in all our history; perhaps the largest in the history of the world.

I will dwell only briefly on what to me is a most untenable position to take, that is, the proposal that the Government borrow money to help pay the grocery bills of our civilians at home, and have those additional billions of public debt saddled upon the generation of men and women who are fighting our battles for us overseas. The bill to be presented the fighting generation when this war is over promises to be at least $3,000 per capita, as it is. Would it not be fine, when the boys and girls came home, to say to them:

"Look here, my children. While you were away seeing the world, times were so hard back here at home, wages were so low, that we just found it necessary to charge part of our grocery bills to you

We knew you would understand it, and be glad to saddle the extra load."

Mr. President, there are just one or two more points I wish to make.

Suppose we give this shot of dope, this consumer food subsidy on some foods. Why not then on some other foods? Why not on rents, on clothing? Mr. President, are we not in danger of encouraging an appetite for subsidies? Of becoming a nation of subsidy addicts?

Why, Mr. President, the consumer subsidies are not new. Long before Julius Caesar refused the crown a third time, there was a Roman official—Gaius Gracchus—who wanted to be reelected to office, although the Roman laws prohibited his reelection. But he was a very generous man—with public funds. So he started food subsidies for voters of Rome and was reelected. The plan worked. Also the appetite of the Roman voters for subsidies grew. Food subsidies were followed by lodging subsidies; then wine; then free tickets to the games. The treasury was called upon to furnish food, lodging, drinks, tickets to theaters and arenas. The Romans became subsidy addicts.

This is a dangerous road to follow, Mr. President.

Now just one more point.

Suppose, while incomes are high, while wages are up, while there is full employment, the Treasury is called upon to borrow money to subsidize food for consumers—to help pay the grocery bills of all our people; not just the poor and needy, but subsidies for all? Can we believe that when incomes drop, when wages are lowered, when unemployment replaces overtime, that the people then will be willing to give up the food subsidies they were given as necessary when times were good, wages were high, unemployment was almost nil?

Mr. President, that runs contrary to human nature. I cannot support this consumer food subsidy program, and I hope the Senate will refuse by a huge majority, to approve it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement in connection with the pending amendment, and I should like to have the time charged to me.

The question has been raised as to whether the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and myself would not have the effect of deleting the amendment dealing with wool and sugar subsidies, which has already been accepted by the Senate. It is not the intention of the Senator from Wisconsin nor myself to affect any of the subsidies which have already been accepted by the Senate.

Therefore we will modify our amendment in this manner. Our amendment now proposes: "In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the committee beginning on page 9, line 11," and so on; we modify that to say: "On page 11, after line 7, insert the following." Then we go over to page 16 of our amendment and eliminate section 302. Of course, section 303 was eliminated yesterday. And then renumber the sections in the proper manner.

By doing this the amendment is simply offered in addition to the bill of the Senator from Alabama, and this presents the stamp plan, so-called erroneously, for the consideration of the Senate, and would also place it before the conference committee for consideration if it should be adopted by the Senate.

There has been no intention to upset any of the subsidies which have been legally and properly authorized by the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to emphasize what the Senator from Vermont has stated. It never was his intention nor mine to interfere with the amendments which have been adopted, or with the text of the bill in charge of the Senator from Alabama, but on the evening that we decided to have this amendment printed, we had hastily to take the bill and draw it as an amendment to the pending bill, and erroneously we hooked it on at the wrong place.

I want it clear to every Senator that this amendment as it is now offered as a separate title, does not affect the text of the bill in charge of the Senator from Alabama, or any amendment that has been agreed to, and comes up as a separate title to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified as indicated by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am quite sure that the statements made by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Wisconsin are accurate and that their action was taken in good spirit and not with an intention at all to develop a conflict between their amendment and the so-called Bankhead amendment. Unfortunately it had that effect, as many of us thought, and when the matter was called to the Senators' attention they readily and in good spirit agreed to correct it, and the modification of the amendment does correct it.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Alabama for the remarks he has made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the amendment still retain the language in section 302 as is?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No, that has been stricken out.

Mr. AIKEN. That was stricken out yesterday.

Mr. WHERRY. I am talking about section 302.

Mr. AIKEN. No, that has been stricken out, and the language of the Bankhead bill is left in its place.

Mr. WHERRY. The language of section 302 goes out and the language of the section contained in the Bankhead bill is retained.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. We believed that section 302 did exactly the same thing that the section in the Bankhead bill did. But in order that there may be no misunderstanding we now modify the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I have listened to one of the most powerful speeches I have heard in my 5 years in the Senate. I compliment the Senate and congratulate the country upon having a Senator of the caliber of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. He discussed this matter so thoroughly, so logically, so completely, that his speech, together with the few remarks I shall make and the logic I shall offer to both sides of the aisle for support of the amendment, ought to secure a unanimous vote in its favor.

Mr. President, before I enter upon a discussion of the amendment I wish to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin and to the Senator from Vermont that they are not entitled to have a copyright upon their proposal.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly, I will be the first to concede that, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. I happen to have been one of the vocal and vigorous opponents of the subsidy policy which is being followed and so greatly abused by the administration. Always have I recognized the fact that in these abnormal times there was a class of people entitled to whatever relief could reasonably be afforded. I began calling attention to this situation in June of last year on this floor. On December 17, 1943, I discussed the so-called low-income class of people. I conferred with the Bureau of Labor Statistics in an endeavor to find out about how numerous that class was. I could not obtain exact information. The best they could do was to tell me that there were between 30,000,000 and 40,000,000 families in this country, and the Bureau thought that probably 5,000,000 families fell in the class of people with rigid incomes who were actually and seriously injured by the present abnormal prices.

Mr. President, I also wish to agree with the Senator from Wisconsin to the extent that it is an outrage upon the people of the country that the President of the United States, that Mr. James F. Byrnes, now stabilization czar, that Judge Vinson, that Marvin Jones, that Mr. Bowles of the O. P. A. should always insist in every public utterance that subsidies are necessary in order to prevent uncontrolled inflation. That is not so. The relation between subsidies and the control of prices is relatively unimportant.

I have been one of those who have rather freely criticized the O. P. A. It has made a great many ghastly blunders. It has made a great many mistakes. However, I wish to say for the O. P. A. that, over all, it has done a reasonably good job in holding prices from running away in uncontrolled inflation. The administration now has the power, through ceiling prices or maximum prices, plus the rationing of commodities as between consumers, to control prices; and it does not

need the subsidy policy, to prevent inflation. I charge these high officials responsible for this agitation in the country with bad faith, with exaggeration, with overstatement of the facts, with unnecessarily alarming the people.

Mr. President, I wish to give three good and sufficient reasons for every Member of this body, on both sides of the aisle, to vote for this amendment. In the first place, we are now spending at the rate of $1,300,000,000 a year for subsidies, without any possible distinction between the low-income class of people, who I think are entitled to it, and the folks who have no need for relief at all. Back Bay, in Boston, Park Avenue, in New York, the Gold Coast, in Chicago, Euclid Avenue, in Cleveland, and the other aristocratic districts in every city of this land receive more benefit from these subsidies and the policy that is being followed than do the stockyard districts or the districts "across the tracks." That is the first indictment I bring against the administration of this policy.

The amendment would reduce the $1,300,000,000 presently being spent, or the $1,500,000,000 as provided for in the Maloney amendment, to a maximum of $500,000,000. Five hundred million dollars is not an inconsequential sum, even in these days; but, after all, it is approximately one-third of what we are presently spending for subsidies, and it will go into the hands of the class of people who need it.

I am informed by the authors of the amendment that no family having an income of more than $1,150 per annum could participate in the benefits under the amendment. That is reason No. 1, or perhaps reasons 1 and 2.

Next, Mr. President, I know that every Senator on the other side of the aisle will vote for the amendment. Has not their chief time after time called attention to the great injustice that so-called price inflation has done to this class of people? The President of the United States has emphasized that upon every possible occasion. Surely his faithful leaders in the Senate, such as the Senator from Kentucky, the Senator from Missouri, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the Senator from Illinois, who follow him so faithfully, whose sole guide necessary is the voice of the master, are not going to vote to deprive this class of people, so vividly described as needing help, from being allowed to receive help through this amendment. Surely my friends on the other side of the aisle would not let their chief down by voting against the amendment.

Mr. President, to my friends on this side of the aisle I call attention to the fact that during the debate on this question the spokesman in this body for the White House has warned us that if the bill is passed it will be vetoed. If we, with the help of the Senators on the other side of the aisle, are prepared to put in the bill so meritorious an amendment giving relief to the class of people with whom the President of the United States has such deep sympathy, surely they would not refuse by their votes to amend the bill so as to afford the relief.

Then, Mr. President, to my friends on this side of the aisle I should like to make another suggestion. I am one of those mild, open, and naive people who believe almost everything they hear, except a few things. One of the things I have always wanted to test has been the extent of the sympathy of the President of the United States for the class of people he uses so frequently to drive home his points to the people at large.

Mr. WHERRY. The forgotten man.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, one of my colleagues suggests that he is the forgotten man. The President does not forget him—for public purposes, at least.

My own theory is that the President of the United States emphasizes this, not because of the low-income class, but because he is more concerned with the most vociferous supporter of the public subsidy program, the most vociferous opponent of the Bankhead bill—the C. I. O. I receive more letters and telegrams from the C. I. O.—and I think all other Senators and Members of the House of Representatives do, too—demanding that I oppose the Bankhead bill than I do from anyone else. If the President is going to veto this bill, as the Senator from Kentucky has suggested he will——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] suggested that long before I ventured any such assertion; so it seems to be entirely nonpartisan. I hope the Senator from Kansas will realize that the amendment involves an economic problem, and I hope he will eschew the very natural desire to chastise the President because of any possibilities that may lie ahead, and will devote himself to the economic discussion of this very economic problem in an economic way so that we may get an economic vote on this bill if it is economically possible. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Mr. President, not even under the persuasion of the Senator from Kentucky does the Senator from Kansas ever permit himself to wander from the broad, nonpartisan pathway of economics.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not sure that the Senator from Kansas permits himself, but there seems to be some driving force which now and then shifts him away from that narrow path. It may be something beyond his control.

Mr. REED. Then, it is when the Senator from Kentucky starts working on him. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I shall vote for this amendment because of its intrinsic merits. I discussed this matter on the floor of the Senate before either the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Vermont discussed it. I wish to test the sincerity of the President of the United States in his repeatedly expressed sympathy for the low-income group. I wish to write this amendment into the bill, first, because I believe in it, because I think it has merit; and, secondly, because I want to see whether the President of the United States will veto a bill which contains the only relief offered to the class of people which he so frequently and forcibly used as an example of those needing relief from price conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] for himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. AIKEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hayden	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hill	Smith
Bone	Holman	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chandler	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	Mead	Walsh, N. J.
Danaher	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Murdock	Wherry
Eastland	Murray	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wilson
George	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their name. A quorum is present.

Mr. NYE obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is very desirable that we conclude the consideration of this bill today if possible, even if we must stay in session a little later than the usual hour of 5 o'clock. I hope we may dispose of the bill today, and that to that end Senators will be as economical as possible in the use of time, except as to matters upon which they feel the urgency to speak.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to detain the Senate. I have not the slightest objection to the subsidy issue being settled by the Senate this afternoon; but there are things which it seems to me I am called upon to say in explanation of my vote on the pending amendment and on the Bankhead bill itself.

To me the challenge presented by the bill simmers down to a lone question, which is in the minds of most of the people today. It is a question of too much government—too many cooks with their "mitts" in the broth, who must not be disturbed, or whose manpower status as Government employees must not be changed.

Too much government! One hears it on every hand. Look at the numbers who are employed by the O. P. A. today in Washington, and in every State and county in the Union. All those employees are maintained primarily be-

cause there is no will on the part of the Government to trust the people, while at the same time the Government demands the confidence of the people.

Too much government! The Government is playing with the farm manpower problem. "Playing" is the proper word, Mr. President. Here is Col. Lewis Sanders, who seems to be one of the No. 1 boys of the new economy plan who are at work experimenting, even during this perilous time of emergency. Colonel Sanders appears before committee after committee of Congress, giving testimony—as an expert, mind you—which must strike the average farmer as being asinine.

Colonel Sanders said, "Place in operation a farm-consolidation plan," while other governmental agencies urge Congress to give more help to the small farmers, who are responsible for the largest increase in wartime agricultural production.

Colonel Sanders urged: "Plan the planting of whole counties as one farm." What a kick the farmer will get out of such a proposal. But this is by no means the extent of Colonel Sanders' thought on the subject of how Americans should farm and conduct themselves in winning the war. There is not a farmer who is not sorely concerned about how he is to bring about added production with less farm help, for much of his help has gone into high-paying defense industry, or has been drafted into the military services. Along comes Colonel Sanders with this wisdom. He poohpoohs the idea that agriculture is an essential industry in winning the war, and says, critically, "There has been a persistent effort on the part of a large number of our people to elevate agriculture to the position of No. 1 weapon in winning the war," and then goes on in detail to explain how erroneous is the conclusion that the American farmer is playing a vital part in the winning of this war.

It was Colonel Sanders' opinion that agriculture must be placed on a planned basis. In all seriousness this so-called expert testified that in his opinion it was entirely proper to release from agriculture the 2,200,000 workers required for the armed forces and for war production and stated that all that would be required would be the application of—I quote his own language—"a few simple and elementary principles of industrial engineering."

Then, Colonel Sanders, in continuing his testimony before the congressional committee, said that agriculture, instead of being harmed by such a course, would actually benefit by the steps taken.

Anyone at all conversant with agriculture knows how essential farm labor is, unless, of course, we are to adopt a program of regimentation and communization of agriculture—which would seem to be the very thing Colonel Sanders was advocating—and are to put agriculture on a basis entirely different from that which has prevailed in past ages during which agriculture has contributed so much to the sum total of the happiness, comfort, welfare, and balanced economy in the United States. Obviously, so long as there are so-called experts, recognized as such by responsible officials and agencies of our Government, experts who are ready to advance such asininity as Colonel Sanders has advanced, one cannot be too sure of what may come next.

Mr. President, of course it is easy to stand back and see that this kind of an expert, paid for by the Government, and in constant attendance at committees of the Congress, is representing the cause of regimentation or the cause of communism, or that he and his coworkers are necessarily planning for the Russian way of agriculture in the United States. However, if anyone thinks that strange, I would refer him to the newspapers of yesterday morning and to a reading of that part of the speech of our eminent and genial Vice President delivered at Seattle night before last. In that speech we find our Vice President declaring, not in effect, but quite directly, that—and I quote him as he was quoted yesterday morning in the Washington Post—

> We are not going to use the whole Russian political and economic system here in the United States.

What grand assurance! We are not going to use the whole Russian system! It follows that we are going to use it in part, I believe it is fair to say.

Mr. President, we are reaching the point where the patience of American farmers with this sort of goings on will not absorb more of this playing around by experimenters. The time has already arrived when the farmers are saying, quite clearly, "Enough," and are asking for freedom from all the red tape which has them floored at every turn of the road, in the performance of every part of their daily work.

I wish to return, Mr. President, for a moment to the Seattle speech made by the Vice President. His speech, delivered on the 9th day of this month, has cleared up something for me. I have been the target of the Communist Daily Worker and the C. I. O. political-action group as being an advocate of fascism. I have wanted to know what they meant. The fascism which I knew about—the theory of government as it was being practiced in Germany and Italy, for example—was a thing I have condemned time and again, a thing I have detested. Now comes Mr. WALLACE with a definition. In his Seattle speech he said:

> When I refer to American Fascists, I mean those who believe that Wall Street comes first and the country second.

Well, that lets me out.

If only Mr. WALLACE would tell the C. I. O. and the Communist Daily Worker boys that, according to Mr. WALLACE'S definition, NYE is not a Fascist, I would appreciate it; because I am sure those boys are very close to the Vice President, who now declares just how far we shall go and just how far we shall not go in adopting the Russian way of government.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NYE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have no disposition to quarrel with the Senator from North Dakota in using the Vice President as a whipping boy. I simply should like to suggest to him that he might equally well employ his talents in discussing some of the discourses of Mr. Wendell Willkie, the last Republican nominee for the Presidency, who no longer ago than yesterday announced from the grandstand that he would again be nominated for the Presidency on the Republican ticket. Why does the Senator select Mr. WALLACE and ignore Mr. Willkie? Let him take a few cracks at Mr. Willkie, too.

Mr. NYE. I am not in the least unmindful of Mr. Willkie's ambition; but, having him in mind, and not having changed in the least my ideas about him, as compared with the views I expressed when I last spoke of him, I think the more we leave Mr. Willkie alone for the moment, the further he will be from becoming a candidate for the Presidency, either on the Republican or the Democratic ticket, either one of which is possible.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wendell Willkie announced no longer ago than yesterday that he was certain to be the Republican nominee for President, and it seems to me the Senator from North Dakota has gone quite far afield in attacking the Vice President and ignoring the pretentions of the barefoot boy from Wall Street.

Mr. NYE. Well, if my remarks are to be construed as taking more of a "kick" at one individual than at another, I am sorry. But, having gone thus far as best I can, I think I may proceed with my discussion of the pending matter without involving too much argument.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me interrupt once more, Mr. President, to inquire whether the Senator would support Wendell Willkie if he were nominated for President on the Republican ticket?

Mr. NYE. Oh, Mr. President, I have said more than once that if the choice were between the present leader of the United States and Mr. Wendell Willkie, I would support Mr. Willkie.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator would have to swallow everything he has heretofore said.

Mr. NYE. Oh, how hard I would have to swallow. How true that is. [Laughter.] And if I am not mistaken, the Senator from Missouri might have to do some swallowing, if certain things come to pass in November of this year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that when the issue was drawn I was opposed to the third term; but when the issue was drawn between President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Wendell Willkie I never had a moment's hesitation.

Mr. NYE. Then the Senator will understand my position as to the choice which might be mine to make this year.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I never had the slightest hesitation, because I never could possibly vote for a common adventurer like Wendell Willkie.

Mr. NYE. I may suggest to the Senator from Missouri that we are both in the whale of a fix. [Laugter.]

Mr. MOORE. In answer to the question of the Senator from Missouri whether the Senator from North Dakota would support Wendell Willkie if he were nominated on his ticket, I believe the Senator from North Dakota said he would. I presume the Senator's answer was predicated probably on the idea that Willkie might be a better manager for the New Deal philosophy of government than the one we now have.

Mr. NYE. I shall not go into that for the moment. I have gone as far as I will let myself go today.

Mr. President, there is now a time limitation upon us, and if I may proceed without interruption until I shall have completed my remarks, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. President, I was addressing myself to the subject of too much government. The American farmer is feeling this more and more every day. There is not a farmer who has not experienced in greater or lesser degree the embarrassment and the retarding effect on his efforts and daily operations which have been caused by government. The farmer's experiences are many; but I imagine there has been no more interesting one than that of my friend at Carrington, N. Dak., a farmer named Joseph A. Kreps. Up to last fall he and his family had looked longingly at bathtubs displayed in store windows. They had developed a great yearning for a bathtub in their own home. They saw bathtubs in the window for sale. There came a day last October, after the harvest and the prospect was such as to afford him ability to buy when, following his desire, he went into the store to buy the bathtub. I have before me the file that accumulated in this particular case. Mr. Kreps found out, to his regret, when he was ready to purchase the bathtub, that he could not have it unless he secured a priority order. Then started a tussle, lasting months and not settled yet, to get a priority order so that he could purchase a bathtub which he and his family had wanted for so long.

I and my office force went to work as best we could for Mr. Kreps, and tried to break down the W. P. B. bottleneck. We thought we were making progress until there came to Mr. Joseph Kreps this letter from the War Production Board written by the acting district manager:

> Referring to your recent application that was denied calling for a bathtub, after giving same further consideration we have come to the conclusion that if your doctor will furnish you with a statement stating that on account of your age this bathtub is absolutely necessary and essential for the good of your health, we will be glad to consider your application further.

[Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Who signed the letter?

Mr. NYE. It was signed by the acting district manager. Think of an agent of the Government enforcing such an asinine requirement as that, at a time, too, when another department of the same Government was advocating that American farmers retain Japanese workers on their farms so that the Japs might teach them cleanliness. Is it any wonder that Mr. Farmer sits back in his place today wondering what in the world he will have to endure next?

Mr. President, there is not time to discuss all the farmer's problems as they relate to the number of representatives of various farm credit agencies that visit him during the year. There is no time to discuss the farmer's problems in connection with tire rationing and oil rationing and the mileage required of him to travel to the place where he may get mere consent to buy tires and to buy oil. There is no time now to discuss the burden that is his with the new income-tax returns. There is no time now to discuss his machinery problem and his farm-labor problem. There is only time, perhaps, Mr. President, to make reference to a very recent experience of farmers who last year, responding to the pleading of their Government, went "all out" in an effort to bring about a tremendous hog production, so as to provide meats and fats which were so necessary. Last fall the farmer came forth with an abundant hog production, only to find within recent weeks that he could not sell the hogs he had raised. Ceilings had been fixed on prices; ceilings had been fixed on weights and the Government had said to the farmer that the best hog, the most marketable hog, would be one weighing between 200 and 300 pounds. Then started the race of the commission firms and the packers to buy hogs which were just as good and which could be purchased for less money if they weighed less than 200 pounds or more than 300 pounds. My files are filled with stories by farmers of the number of pounds of hogs they sold, hogs weighing over 300 pounds, which brought them less money than would have been theirs if their hogs had weighed only 299 pounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator on the amendment has expired.

Mr. NYE. I shall take my additional time on the bill.

The farmers, waiting for the Food Administrator or someone else to afford them relief from that condition, which found them unable to sell hogs that weighed between 200 and 300 pounds, presumably the premium hogs, have fed to those hogs every bit of feed they could accumulate; the farmer who was trying to and expecting to save some corn for next year has fed all that corn, and today there are farmers who are going to go broke because they have raised the thing the Government pleaded with them last year to raise. One hog raiser telephoned me one evening within the last 3 weeks and told me of his problem. He had three or four hundred hogs, which would make approximately 25,000 pounds of pork. He had at West Fargo storage capacity for 25,000 pounds of meat. It had been his custom through the winter to use that storage space for fish, which he disposed of at wholesale; but not this winter. That storage capacity was idle. He could not butcher his three or four hundred hogs and put them in that storage capacity to be held there until they were needed, nor could he find a butcher who would butcher that stock for him. Why? Because the butchers were under regulation by the Government which forbade butchering for any farmer or any individual a greater amount of pork than such individual and his family themselves would consume.

I was told 10 days ago that there would be issued a regulation which would permit this man to butcher or have butchered his hogs for storage in the storage space which was his and that I would be sent a copy of the order. I have not yet received a copy of the order. I have been awaiting word from this particular farmer to know whether or not he had been given consent to go ahead and have his stock butchered.

Mr. President, there comes a time in the life of every man, and it is as true of the farmer as it is of anyone else, when the breaking point is reached. There are in America today farmers by the thousands who are wondering whether they shall gamble another year as they gambled this year, with the Government pleading for production, but unable to take care of it after the farmers have abundantly responded to the plea.

In my own State tens of thousands of bushels of this year's production of wheat, are out on the prairies, without protection, because there is not elevator space, and the farmers cannot obtain priorities to enable them to buy lumber with which to build the protection the wheat should have. There is no transportation, there are no boxcars, in which to carry the wheat out of the country.

Let me say to my colleagues that we are coming dangerously close to a real break-down of American agriculture. Instead of encouragement, when he responds with the things which the Government wants, the farmer encounters repeated discouragement, and then more of discouragement.

The reactions of the farmer to these subsidy plays grow more desperate every day. A week or 10 days ago 700 farmers responded to a call to a meeting at a little community called Kindred, where they gathered to protest the bottleneck that has developed in the hog market. The resolutions they adopted leave no question as to what will happen with respect to hog production next year in that community. There will not be any.

Wednesday night of last week there was another meeting to protest the hog bottleneck, at Wahpeton, N. Dak., and there some three or four hundred farmers gathered. There appeared at that meeting the very eminent and very able head of the Farmers Union Livestock Association, who went there because these were the people who were supplying the stocks with which he dealt in his business. This very able man, when it came his turn to speak at this meeting of these farmers, asked for a show of hands of farmers who favored the subsidy programs. I have before me the report afforded by the Wahpeton Farmer-Globe in which it is stated:

When Charles Egley, Farmers Union Livestock man from South St. Paul, asked more than 300 farmers here Friday evening just how many favored subsidy payments for livestock, not a single hand was raised.

I found the same result in the first 2 weeks in January, when in eight separate gatherings in my State I put that question. I found some division, but an overwhelming mind dictating against continuation of subsidies.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter written me concerning the experience of cooperative creameries and individuals with the so-called butter subsidy. It is from William J. Murphy, the dairy commissioner of North Dakota. I have not time to read it now; I can only ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE AND LABOR,
Bismarck, October 20, 1943.

Hon. GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NYE: This is referring to your letter of October 14, wherein you ask for more information on the results of our compilation on prices paid for butterfat during June as compared with the first 5 months of the year.

I would like to explain that each cream buyer in the State must file a report with the State dairy department as to butterfat purchased and amount paid for same. The creameries report semiannually as of June 30 and December 31. Figures so obtained are compiled in the department so that we know what prices are being paid for butterfat at any given point in North Dakota.

As stated in my previous letter, the compilation of these reports show that the price paid for butterfat during the month of June during 1943 was 3.4 cents per pound less than the average price paid for the previous 5 months, namely, January through May. This, in spite of the fact that a stabilized price for butter was maintained in the markets through the ceiling set by the O. P. A. When the roll-back subsidy was put into effect in June the O. P. A. ordered the price of butter reduced on the market 5 cents per pound, with a subsidy of a like amount to be paid to all processors of butter upon the presentation of claims for payment. However, we find that the price of butterfat was reduced considerably, and while some plants made a supplementary payment to the farmers, of which we have a record and which amount was added to their June payment, the average price for the State showed a reduction of 3.4 cents under the previous 5 months.

There were only two ways in which the creameries could comply with the roll-back price of 5 cents, and that was either to pay the full price to the farmer and finance it themselves until subsidy payment was received or to lower the price and make a supplementary payment when they received the funds from the Government. Many plants, especially the smaller creameries, did not have sufficient capital to underwrite the 5 cents per pound in payment to the farmers and were forced to lower their price and make a supplementary payment later on when funds were received. This put these plants in an unfavorable competitive situation as against plants who had plenty of funds to maintain the higher price and underwrite the subsidy payment.

As an example, I would like to give you the record of one cooperative creamery in North Dakota. This plant had some surplus funds on hand and decided to pay the full price to the farmer. For the month of June alone this creamery had invested $15,740 in maintaining the price, and as they did not receive their June subsidy payment until after the middle of July, they had another $7,000 invested which meant this cooperative creamery was using funds belonging to the farmers to finance the roll-back price of 5 cents to the consumer.

It is my belief that unless the food problem which is so critical at this time is clarified and put into control of someone in Washington who knows what he is doing we will find drastic curtailment in production during the next year. Our farmers are getting pretty badly discouraged and what we must have and must have quickly is the establishment of a long-ranged, definite policy so that our farmers can be given assurance that they can go ahead and plan their operations without having some bureaucrat in Washington issuing a new order before they really get started on a production program. I do not believe that any subsidy either paid to the farmers direct or through the processor will get the required increase or the maintenance of production that we must have. The plan now in effect whereby the Government pays the farmer a subsidy of from 30 to 50 cents a hundred on milk or from 4 to 6 cents a pound on butterfat through the Triple A offices will not work out except in instances where large commercial dairies are operating. The average farmer in North Dakota producing a small amount of butterfat individually cannot afford to drive to the county seat at stated intervals to present his claims for payment as the amount he would receive would be more than offset by the expense involved in making the trips. And we would also be losing thousands of valuable man-hours in wasted effort.

The one thing our farmers would like to have above anything else is to be left alone and that 90 percent of the red tape and restrictions they are now operating under be removed so they could go ahead and do their work and be assured a sufficient amount of machinery and equipment to produce as they would like to do.

* * * * *

Yours very truly,
WM. J. MURPHY,
Dairy Commissioner.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, that brings me to the amendment now before the Senate, the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], an amendment which I feel makes the Bankhead anti-subsidy bill very much what I want to see in the way of correction of a program which the administration is using to fasten upon the Nation more and ever more of subsidy.

Stability of wages and prices is much to be desired. To attempt to avoid runaway prices and undue wage increases is commendable. To seek to avoid a price and wage spiral of inflation is but to seek avoidance of economic suicide. But why must those who advocate subsidy and ever more subsidy for the benefit of the consumer strive always to sell it as the only simon pure way of avoiding a suicidal inflation? Is it only because this administration, having set out on one program, will not countenance any other approach, or is it because they do not wish to upset the cumbersome pay roll which has been established to carry on the order which prevails?

Adjustment of prices and wages, Mr. President, to meet constantly changing conditions and demands upon consumers, is not of itself going to bring dangerous inflation, certainly not if the adjustment is to be intelligently administered. On the other hand, a freezing and rolling back of prices cannot possibly fit our economy, especially at a time when larger production and increased production costs is in demand. Indeed, these freezing and roll-back programs are contributing to the creation of a spiral which can only bury producers in deep graves of failure, and at the same time deny consumers what they must have and can better afford to pay for than ever before in their lives.

Leon Henderson, at a time when there was complete bewilderment and a will to "let George do it," chose the freeze, the subsidy, and the roll-back method of fighting inflation in preference to a wise price-control program. Does it follow that we must hold to this program? What is so wrong about admitting the impossible conditions the policy is causing and returning to a sane basis in our dealing with prices and with wages?

It is said that poor people are going to have to face distress and undernourishment if we do not continue the consumer subsidies. Give those who are not enjoying the increased wages which the times have brought the advantage of the Aiken-La Follette amendment to the Bankhead bill, which seeks to do away with consumer subsidies, give the food-stamp help to those who must live on low incomes, and there will be no more suffering than there is now, and the Government will save itself from the necessity of saddling billions upon billions of dollars more of debt upon all the people by reason of continuing subsidies, subsidies which buy the same advantage for the rich they buy for the poor. Congress and the executive branch of our Government will do well to heed what the roll-back, the subsidy, and the freezing programs are doing to jeopardize agricultural production. While there must be a control over prices and wages, it does not follow that everything must be frozen right where it is in order to avoid a killer inflation. If the freezing must continue for the farm producers, for heaven's sake give the farmer a break to the extent of putting him on a cost-plus footing, or do away with the cost-plus basis for others. Fair play would dictate that.

Mr. President in conclusion, let me say that I look upon the consumer subsidy as being just about the most preposterous thing our Government has ever undertaken. It is preposterous because we are subsidizing the consumer at a time when the consumer is better able than he has ever been before, better able than he will ever be again, to pay reasonably decent prices for his agricultural needs. Yet we provide consumer subsidies, we go into debt in order to pay them, resulting finally in a debt which will be paid some day by the very same consumers, at a time when they are far less able to meet such obligations than they are able to meet them now.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to say that the amendment now be-

fore the Senate, if it is based upon the fact upon which it is represented to be based, that in this day of the Nation's history, when the Nation's people are enjoying the greatest income in the history of the country, there are 20,000,000 people without sufficient income to sustain reasonable existence—if that is a fact, I consider it the most damning indictment of our system of handling prices and our system of distribution of wealth.

One would be inclined to believe the great depression is still with us. I do not know where these figures come from, or who compiled them, but I say that if true they furnish a most damning indictment at a time when nearly $20,000,000,000 of currency are floating around the country, when wages are the highest in the history of the Nation, when war profits have soared beyond what they were in the last war, and our pulp mills are busy all the time making paper to be used in printing money and bonds representing future debts.

Mr. President, this system of price fixing and handling food is a curse to the farmer and to the consumer. Those who favor it say, "We do not want to go back to the dangerous condition of the last World War when prices ran away." I am not in favor of run-away prices. I am willing to put a price ceiling high enough to insure production. But let me repeat some of the statistics I gave yesterday and some new ones I have obtained with respect to what is called the horrible condition of the consumer in the last World War which the present system of handling food prices is to remedy, in order to save the consumer.

The 9½ cents a 16-ounce loaf in last World War is based on United States Labor yearly summary, showing 9.2 cents for 12 months of 1917 and 9.8 cents for 1918—average 9½ cents. For 1943, under O. P. A., the bread price average is 10 cents, while the farm price of wheat averaged $1.25 compared with $2 per bushel in 1918—a farm price disadvantage of 60 percent. And this notwithstanding O. P. A. and subsidies.

Mr. President, I was too conservative in a statement I made yesterday. I had figures which were 3 months old. This morning I learned from the Bureau of Labor Statistics that cattle sold in 1917 for from $17 to $17.35, and in 1918 they went as high as $19.45. It is only for the top steers that the farmers now receive $13 or $14. Most of the very best cattle are sold from $8 to $14.

Hogs sold in 1917 at about the same price as cattle. The price of both is now from 30 to 50 percent lower than in 1917.

The Senator from Arkansas told me this morning that he had received letters from men in his State who had sold hogs in the Memphis, Tenn., market recently, and the price was from 5 to 12 cents a pound, the average price being 8 cents a pound.

The Senator from Georgia showed me letters he had received from Georgia this morning showing that the market at Atlanta on hogs ranged from 6 to 9 cents; the price for top hogs being from 8 and 9 cents. Senators, note the prices received by the farmer in 1917 and 1918 compared with the prices received by him today under the regimented management of farm prices and markets.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The figures the Senator has given for cattle and hogs as of the present period are considerably lower than they were on September 15, 1942, when the prices were supposed to be stabilized between the farmer and labor.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is true. But the O. P. A. forgot about the stabilization price.

Mr. President, the prices of meats to the consumer are approximately 35 to 50 percent higher than they were during the last war, while the prices of hogs and cattle are from 30 to 50 percent below the prices paid for hogs and cattle in 1917 and 1918.

Average meat prices in 1917 and 1918 were as follows, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics:

The price of round steak in 1917 was 29 cents, and in 1918 was 36 cents. In Washington yesterday round steak was selling at 47 cents for the best cuts, compared with 36 cents in 1918 and 29 cents in 1917. The price for second-best cuts was 44 cents.

According to the figures I received yesterday from the Bureau of Labor Statistics the price of rib roast in 1917 was 25 cents and in 1918 was 33 cents. Yesterday the ceiling price in Washington was 35 cents.

The price of pork chops in 1917 was 32 cents and in 1918 was 39 cents. Yesterday the price for end pork chops in Washington was 35 cents, and for AA cuts 39 cents. So Senators will see that there is very little difference in the price of pork only in Washington in the two periods, although hogs are 40 percent cheaper than in 1918.

The price of pork on the hoof has gone down from about 15½ and 16 cents to from 5 cents to a top of 9 cents in Memphis and Atlanta. I have an idea that possibly in Chicago the price is a little higher. But, Mr. President, the question is, What does the farmer on the farm get for his animals when he ships them to market? He receives from 30 to 50 percent less than he received in 1917 and 1918. Still we find that under the so-called protection price policy of O. P. A. to the consumer meat prices average from 30 to 50 percent higher than they were in 1917 and 1918.

In 1918 cheese brought an average United States price of 36 cents. In 1943 the price of cheese hovered around 50 cents a pound, or an increase of 35 percent over the 1918 price. Now, we see what the consumers are getting and what the farmers are getting. The consumers are paying entirely too much, as compared to what the farmers are receiving. Let me again call attention to the fact that the spread between wholesale prices and retail prices is 300 percent greater today, under the O. P. A. than it was in 1917 and 1918.

In 1943 the average food prices generally to consumers, according to Government statistics, were approximately 20 percent above retail prices in 1918, when we had the highest price level that has existed from the Civil War until 1943.

Mr. President, certainly the farmers are suffering, and the consumers are suffering, too. The consumers are now paying for their food much more than they paid during the last war, and the farmers are receiving a great deal less. Some evil, palsied hand is steering this price program. I have only the highest regard for Judge Vinson. I am sure he must understand this program, and from what I know of him I am sure he cannot like it. But what is the evil hand that is ruining the farmers and is putting burdens on the consumers, so that we are met with requests for billions of dollars of subsidies from the taxpayer, to further increase the public debt, and to threaten inflation and the very foundations of the economy of the country in time of war?

The safety of the country depends more upon the economics of our national life than upon anything else, if we are to preserve the American system of government. If we regulate prices in such a way as to bring on inflation and ruin production, the result may be an after-the-war economy which will result in national bankruptcy, confusion, unemployment, underproduction, and real starvation for many of the 130,000,000 people of the United States. Is it planned that way?

At a time when so much money is being printed, and when our people are being asked to buy War bonds, we are told that 20,000,000 of our people do not have enough income to sustain a reasonable standard of living. I said in the beginning that is the most damning indictment of the regimented, price-fixing food program that could be made to the people of this country. The most evil genius could not have put us on a more dangerous road than the one we are now on—not only as regards food, but in respect to the wasting of money and the printing of unlimited quantities of bonds, with resultant inflation and the creation of a tremendous debt which must be paid off in the future when our productive capacity may decrease to one-third of what it is today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] [for himself and the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. LA FOLLETTE] as modified.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bushfield	Connally
Andrews	Butler	Danaher
Austin	Byrd	Downey
Bailey	Capper	Eastland
Bankhead	Caraway	Ellender
Barkley	Chandler	Ferguson
Bilbo	Chavez	George
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Gerry
Burton	Clark, Mo.	Gillette

Green	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	Moore	Thomas, Utah
Gurney	Murdock	Truman
Hatch	Murray	Tunnell
Hayden	Nye	Tydings
Hill	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Holman	Overton	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Wallgren
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Walsh, Mass.
La Follette	Reed	Walsh, N. J.
Langer	Revercomb	Wheeler
Lucas	Reynolds	Wherry
McClellan	Russell	White
McFarland	Shipstead	Wiley
McKellar	Smith	Wilson
Maloney	Stewart	
Maybank	Thomas, Idaho	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a moment. Before the yea-and-nay vote is taken, I think Senators should know of the modifications which have been made in the amendment, inasmuch as some Senators may have been detained because of other business, and may not have been present at the time when the modifications were made.

First of all, I wish to make it clear that the amendment, as now drawn, will, if agreed to, appear as title II of the pending bill. It therefore would not in any wise affect the language of the bill in the charge of the Senator from Alabama, nor any of the amendments which have been adopted thereto.

Secondly, I wish to point out that the discretionary power given on page 5 to the Director to provide for regional differentials in the application of this plan has been eliminated.

I also wish to point out that on page 16, section 302, which provided for a prohibition of subsidies, has been eliminated.

So, the plan now stands solely as a program designed to meet the needs of those in the fixed-income and low-income groups. It does not in anywise affect the action of the Senate with regard to the bill in the charge of the Senator from Alabama, and does not in anywise affect the issue of subsidies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have had numerous inquiries as to how I feel about this amendment. Generally speaking I am sympathetic with efforts to aid those who need help, as was done under the stamp plan; but I do not think this is the time or place to enter into that broad field, so I will vote against the pending amendment, and I hope it will not be added to the bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, as modified, printed in the RECORD prior to the roll call thereon.

There being no objection, the amendment, as modified, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. AIKEN (for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE) to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, viz: On page 11 after line 7 insert the following:

"TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS AND AUTHORITY

"PURPOSES

"SEC. 3. It is hereby declared to be in the interest of national defense and security and necessary to the effective prosecution of the present war and the maintenance of the health, efficiency, and morale of the civilian population, and the morale of those members of the armed forces who have dependents among the civilian population, that the limited supplies of food presently available for civilian consumption be equitably distributed among the various sections of the Nation and among persons in the various income groups, and that the means of obtaining sufficient food for an adequate diet be placed so far as possible within the reach of every person in the Nation. It is further declared that the operation of the national food-allotment plan, as provided in this act, is a desirable and effective method of accomplishing the purposes hereinabove set forth.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 4. As used in this act—

"(a) The term 'Director' shall mean the Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration charged with the establishment and operation of the food-allotment plan.

"(b) The term 'household' shall mean one person who alone, or a group of two or more persons who at a common table, customarily consume food prepared by or for him or them in a home or noncommercial nonpenal institution. Households shall be classified for the purposes of this act according to number of members and monthly income. Such income classification shall be according to $10 levels.

"(c) The term 'basic food allotment' per person, shall mean the following amounts of food per person per week or the equivalent thereof in nutritional value and approximate cost as determined by the Director:

"Milk, or its equivalent in cheese, evaporated milk, or dry milk, 5 quarts.

"Potatoes and sweetpotatoes, 4 pounds.

"Dry beans, peas, and nuts, 8 ounces.

"Tomatoes and citrus fruits, 1 pound 8 ounces.

"Leafy, green, or yellow vegetables, such as green cabbage, kale, snap beans, and carrots, 1 pound 8 ounces.

"Other vegetables and fruit, 2 pounds 5 ounces.

"Eggs, four (number of eggs).

"Meat, poultry, and fish, 1 pound 8 ounces.

"Flour and cereals, 4 pounds 7 ounces.

"Fats and oils, 14 ounces.

"Sugars, sirups, and preserves, 12 ounces.

"(d) The term 'normal food expenditures' shall mean the amount of money customarily expended for the purchase of food plus the money value of home-produced food consumed by households of a specific size and income classification during a specified period of time.

"ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FOOD-ALLOTMENT PLAN

"SEC. 5. The War Food Administrator created by Executive Order No. 9322 is hereby authorized and directed to establish and administer a national food allotment plan in accordance with the provisions of this act under the supervision of a Deputy Director of the Food Distribution Administration. Such plan shall provide for the issuance to eligible households, according to need and free of charge, of food-allotment coupons of prescribed monetary values and in such form as may be approved by the Director. Coupons so issued shall be transferable by the recipient thereof to mercantile establishments registered in accordance with the provisions of this act in exchange for food or food products of equal value at the prices currently prevailing in the establishment of the transferee and shall be redeemable at face value upon presentation to the Treasury by any authorized transferee thereof. Such coupons may be transferred by such transferee and accepted in payment for food or food products purchased by him, or deposited by such original or subsequent transferee with a banking institution authorized by the Director to receive the same for redemption as hereinafter provided.

"ELIGIBILITY OF HOUSEHOLDS

"SEC. 6. (a) The determination with respect to the eligibility of households to participate in the national food allotment plan shall be made on the basis of the number of persons who are members thereof and their monthly rate of income. Individual households shall be certified only upon the voluntary application of a member thereof. A household shall be eligible to participate in the national food allotment plan and receive food-allotment coupons: *Provided*, That households of the same size and income classification, considered as a group, are found by the Director, on the basis of factual studies conducted under his supervision, to have normal food expenditures less than the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment of such households.

"(b) For the purpose of determining eligibility and the value of coupons issuable, as provided in section 5 of this act, the director shall determine semiannually in the manner specified in subsection (a) of this section, the normal food expenditures and the reasonable cost, according to the food prices collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, of the basic food allotment for households within each size and income classification. Such normal food expenditures shall be stated in terms of the national average.

"VALUE OF FOOD ALLOTMENT COUPONS ISSUABLE

"SEC. 7. (a) Each household certified as eligible shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, to receive food-allotment coupons of a value which, added to the normal food expenditures for households of the same size and income classification, as determined by the Director, shall equal the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for a household of that size as so determined. The value of coupons to be issued for each period shall be adjusted to the nearest whole dollar.

"(b) If the Director finds that the funds available for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of this act are insufficient to meet the full amount of the difference between normal food expenditures and the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for all eligible households participating in the plan, he shall establish a percentage of the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment which can be attained for all participants out of the funds available, and shall cause food-allotment coupons to be issued to each participating household of a value which, added to the normal food expenditures as aforesaid, shall equal the established percentage of the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment of a household of that size.

"(c) Except for variations based on regional differentials authorized under section 4 (b) of this act, all households of the same size and income classification shall be entitled to receive food-allotment coupons of the same value. Except for adjustments to the nearest whole dollar as provided in subsection (a) of this section, in no event shall coupons be issued to any household of a value in excess of that which added to the normal food expenditures for a household of the same size and income classification shall equal the reasonable cost of the basic food allotment for a household of that size as determined by the Director.

"DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED

"SEC. 8. There shall be no discrimination against any household with respect to eligibility, classification, participation, or issuance or utilization of food-allotment coupons under the provisions of this act by reason of race, religious creed, national origin, citizenship, political affiliations or beliefs, occupation, employment, or other tests, except as provided for in this act and as necessary to insure general fairness and equity in the application of this act.

"PRESERVATION OF STANDARDS

"SEC. 9. No moneys herein or hereafter appropriated for the purposes of this act shall be expended in lieu of Federal, State, or local expenditures customarily made for the direct benefit of households within the income groups found eligible to receive food-allotment coupons. Present standards for the payment, and payments, of social security and other types of assistance shall not be made less favorable to the recipients, or applicants for such assistance, by reason of the operation of the food-allotment plan.

"DETERMINATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF ELIGIBLES

"SEC. 10. (a) The Director shall designate appropriate State, local, and private agencies and ration boards where feasible to receive applications to participate in the food-allotment plan, to determine the eligibility of such applicants for food-allotment coupons, and to certify to him the names of those found eligible, together with such relevant data concerning the size and income classification of the households so certified as may be necessary to determine the value of the coupons to be issued to the applicant and such other information as may be necessary to the efficient administration of the food-allotment plan. The Director may reimburse such agencies so designated for reasonable expenses incurred in connection with the work performed by them.

"(b) When the Director finds upon investigation that appropriate State, local, or private agencies are not available in any State or community, he may establish local offices and employ suitable personnel to receive applications, determine eligibility, and certify eligibles as provided in subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Each applicant shall furnish such information with respect to the size and income of the household of which he is a member as may be required by the Director and necessary to the determination of eligibility and of the value of food-allotment coupons to which such household is entitled. In determining the income classification of a household income in cash and in kind shall be considered in accordance with regulations issued by the Director. When two or more adult members, other than husband and wife, contribute to the support of a household, an equitable portion of the income of any such member other than the natural head of the household shall be deemed to constitute income of the household in accordance with regulations issued by the Director.

"(d) The Director shall establish appropriate procedures for appealing from the determination as to eligibility and the value of coupons issuable.

"(e) The eligibility of each participating household and the value of the coupons to which it is entitled shall be redetermined and certified at least twice in each 12-month period in accordance with rules and regulations issued by the Director.

"ISSUANCE

"SEC. 11. The unit for issuing food-allotment coupons shall be denominations of 10 cents and increasing denominations thereof. The Director, or his designated issuing agents, shall issue coupons in such manner, and at such times and places, as the Director may determine, taking into consideration efficiency of administration and the convenience of those entitled to receive such coupons.

"REDEMPTION OF FOOD-ALLOTMENT COUPONS

"SEC. 12. (a) The Director shall provide for redemption of food-allotment coupons exchanged for food and food products through the cooperation of the Treasury Department, Post Office Department, the General Accounting Office, and banking institutions throughout the Nation. He shall designate banking institutions to accept coupons from sellers of food at retail and wholesale. Institutions so designated shall pay at time of presentation in cash or by credit to a demand deposit the full value of all coupons presented to them.

"(b) Banking institutions accepting coupons as provided in subsection (a) of this section and other authorized transferees may present such coupons for redemption at audit offices of the War Food Administration, and the General Accounting Office shall arrange to conduct the necessary audits of such claims at such offices, thereupon releasing the coupons to the Director for reissuance. Approved vouchers covering such claims shall then be forwarded to regional disbursing offices of the Treasury Department for payment.

"(c) The Director may contract to reimburse banking institutions designated to receive food-allotment coupons for their reasonable expenses incurred in acting as such depository.

"REGISTRATION OF FOOD DEALERS

"SEC. 13. The Director shall provide by regulation a simple method for the registration of mercantile establishments selling food and food products at wholesale or retail which desire to be authorized to receive food-allotment coupons in exchange for food and food products. Such registration shall constitute authority so to receive food-allotment coupons.

"TITLE III—ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT

"ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 201. (a) The Director may, subject to the civil-service laws and the approval of the War Food Administrator, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Director may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local, and private agencies, and may utilize and establish such regional, local, or other agencies and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. Attorneys appointed under this section may appear for and represent the Director in any case in any court. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

"(b) The principal officer of the Director shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place.

"(c) The Director shall have authority to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere; for lawbooks and books of reference; and for paper, printing, and binding) as he may deem necessary for the administration and enforcement of this act. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to the purchase of supplies and services by the Director where the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $250. Total administrative expenditures of all types shall not exceed 5 percent of the funds appropriated for the purposes of this act.

"(d) The Director may, from time to time, issue such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper in order to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

"INVESTIGATIONS, RECORDS, AND REPORTS

"SEC. 202. (a) The Director is authorized to make such studies and investigations and to obtain such information as he deems necessary and proper to assist him in prescribing any rule or regulation under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and the rules and regulations thereunder.

"EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

"SEC. 203. As a part of the food-allotment plan, the Director shall provide, in cooperation with existing agencies of the Federal, State, or local governments, or private persons or groups, for improving the buying habits, food-utilization techniques, and food-preservation methods of the participants in the food-allotment plan.

"SUSPENSIONS

"SEC. 204. (a) The Director is authorized to suspend from participation in the food-allotment plan any State or area, if he finds after due notice and opportunity for hearing that any agency of such State or area serving as a certifying agent under the provisions of section 8 of this act (1) has knowingly violated any provision of this act or of any rule or regulation issued by him under the provisions of this act or has knowingly certified as eligible households not entitled to such certification or submitted inaccurate data with respect to size or income of households certified and (2) is likely to fail to comply in the future with the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations issued by him or to continue such unauthorized certifications or submission of inaccurate data.

"(b) The Director is authorized to suspend from participation in the food-allotment plan any State or area, if he finds after due notice and opportunity for hearing that expenditures customarily made are being withheld, or that standards of payment or payments have been made less favorable, by such State or area, or by agencies thereof, contrary to the provisions of section 7 of this act.

"(c) No State or area shall be suspended in accordance with the provisions of subsections (a) or (b) of this section except by written order of the Director signed by him.

"(d) The Director is authorized and directed to provide by rules and regulations for the suspension from participation in the food-allotment plan of any registered food dealer, participating household, or banking institution found by him, or by any officer or employee designated by him, to hear and determine suspension proceedings, after due notice and opportunity for hearing, to have violated any provision of this act.

"COUNTERFEITING OF FOOD-ALLOTMENT COUPONS

"SEC. 205. Whoever shall falsely make, alter, forge, or counterfeit, or cause or procure to be falsely made, altered, forged, or counterfeited any food-allotment coupon or coupon similar thereto for the purpose of obtaining or receiving, or of enabling any other person to obtain or receive, directly or indirectly, from the United States or any of its officers or agents, any money or other thing of value, and whoever shall transfer or utter as true, or cause to be transferred or uttered as true, any such false, forged, altered, or counterfeited food-allotment coupon or coupon similar thereto, with intent to defraud the United States, or any mercantile establishment, banking institution, or person, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 301. The Director shall render, through the War Food Administrator, semi-annual reports to Congress describing the operations of the food-allotment plan, including the following: Number of eligibles and participants, by the various classes of households established; the reasons for non-participation of eligibles; effect of the food-allotment plan on the expenditure habits of participants; extent to which the plan increases purchases of foods of various types and other kinds of goods and services, for the various classes of households; benefits derived from the plan for the different types and groups of food sellers, wholesalers, processors, and producers; extent of improper use of food-allotment coupons; changes in relief payments, social-security payments, and other types of income of the various classes of eligibles; the amount and type of administrative expenditures incurred.

"TERRITORIAL APPLICABILITY

"SEC. 302. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the United States, its Territories and possessions, and the District of Columbia.

"SEPARABILITY PROVISION

"SEC. 303. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 304. This title may be cited as the 'National Food Allotment Act.'

"TERMINATION OF ACT

"SEC. 305. The provisions of this title, and all rules, regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this title and such rules, regulations, orders, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense.

"SEC. 306. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BALL's name was called). The Senator from Minnesota is unavoidably absent. He asked me to announce that if he were present and voting he would vote "nay."

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (when his name was called). On this question I have a nontransferable pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. I understand that if he were present and voting he would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I do not know how the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Nevada would vote. Therefore I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] who is absent from the city on important official business. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. I have endeavored to ascertain from his secretary his attitude toward the pending amendment, but his secretary was unaware of what the Senator's vote would be on this question, so I withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is detained on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are necessarily absent. Both of these Senators would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON].

The junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 46, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Holman	Revercomb
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Shipstead
Capper	La Follette	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Murdock	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Murray	Wallgren
Downey	Nye	Wheeler
George	Pepper	Wiley
Guffey	Reed	

NAYS—46

Andrews	Connally	Hill
Austin	Danaher	Lucas
Bailey	Eastland	McClellan
Bankhead	Ellender	McFarland
Barkley	Ferguson	McKellar
Bilbo	Gerry	Maloney
Burton	Gillette	Maybank
Bushfield	Green	Mead
Byrd	Gurney	Moore
Chandler	Hatch	O'Daniel
Clark, Mo.	Hayden	Overton
Radcliffe	Tunnell	Wherry
Smith	Vandenberg	White
Stewart	Wagner	Wilson
Thomas, Okla.	Walsh, Mass.	
Truman	Walsh, N. J.	

NOT VOTING—20

Ball	Hawkes	Reynolds
Brewster	Jackson	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Brooks	McCarran	Taft
Buck	McNary	Tobey
Davis	Millikin	Willis
Glass	O'Mahoney	

So the modified amendment offered by Mr. AIKEN on behalf of himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. REED. I send to the desk and ask to have stated a perfecting amendment which is acceptable to the Senator from Alabama, the disposition of which should not take more than a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 19, it is proposed to strike out the colon and insert the following: "and wheat flour for export."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to urge Senators, while they are present, to remain in the Chamber, because I believe there are only two or three more amendments, which will be briefly discussed. We may be able to dispose of this bill today and then take a recess until Monday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I had intended to submit an amendment to the Senate for the continuation of subsidies along the lines suggested in the amendment introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. However, his amendment was so badly beaten that I believe I know when I am licked and I am not disposed to further encroach on the time of Senators at this late hour.

I have concluded that the majority of the Senate is definitely and decidedly opposed to subsidies. I am truly sorry of that. There is no doubt in my mind that the only alternative to subsidies is higher prices of consumer goods. Higher prices of consumer goods will mean a higher cost of living, and a higher cost of living no doubt will beget higher wages, and higher wages will again mean higher prices for consumer goods, and soon our economy will become enmeshed in a spiral of inflation that will not only wipe out the savings of millions of our people but will curtail our productivity now, and almost destroy it in post-war years.

In a speech which I delivered in the Senate on November 29, 1943, I pointed out some of the reasons why I thought we should continue subsidies. At this time I shall not go into the various arguments advanced by me in that speech, but I wish to discuss a few pertinent issues that were referred to in the debate on the pending bill.

Much has been said on the floor of the Senate in the last 2 or 3 days about the

income of the farmers during this war in contrast to World War No. 1 and how the income of farmers has been adversely affected by subsidies. Senators, I am satisfied that the record does not bear out that latter contention, that is, that subsidies have adversely affected the income of farmers.

In my speech of November 29, 1943, I submitted to Senators for their consideration a table showing the net cash income above expenses of typical commercial family-operated farms throughout the country, for the average period of 1935 to 1939, for 1940, for 1942, and for 1943, the latter year being estimated as to a few types of farms. It is very illuminating and it should invite the attention of Senators who have made the charge to which I have referred.

The increased income represented in dollars in 1942 for wheat farms, over the average farm income for 1935 to 1939, was $3,700, and for 1943 it was $4,800. The dollars increased income, 1942 over the average for 1935 to 1939 on a wheat, grain, sorghum, livestock farm was $3,264, and for 1943 it was $4,539. For a cash grain farm the increase was $3,205; for a hog-beef breeding, fattening farm it was $2,626; for dairy farmers in New York it was $1,040; for Wisconsin dairy farmers it was $1,078. Let us shift to the South. The dollars increased income, 1942 over the average 1935–39, on flue-cured tobacco farms—Virginia—was $656; on Texas black waxy prairie farms, cotton area, it was $400; on Georgia two-mule cotton farms it was $348; and on Mississippi Delta two-mule farms it was $306.

Senators, I desire at this time to bring to your attention figures relating to my own farms in Louisiana which, in a measure, corroborates the incomes to which I have just referred. I operate two farms, one with 64 acres and the other with 125 acres in cultivation.

I have before me copies of my farm statements which I furnished to the Income Tax Division when I made my income-tax return for the years 1939 to 1942, both inclusive. In 1939, being away from home and trying to farm by remote control, my net loss was $3,063.99. In 1940, again trying to farm by remote control, my net income was $2,560.47. In 1941, it was $46.53. In 1942, it was $1,830.16.

Last year, 1943, my net income before deducting bonuses I gave to my helpers, was in excess of $10,000. Bear in mind that the incomes from the years indicated came from the same farms, with practically the same crops which I had planted in prior years, as to quantity and kind. Why, last year, my net income was more than the gross income received by me in all years mentioned except the year 1942. I venture to say that results almost similar to my own experience can be found on virtually every farm in this Nation. When I say farm, I mean a farm that produces crops of the same kind as I am cultivating. I, of course, realize that dairy farms, cotton farms, and probably many others, will not show as high a percentage of income, but there has been a decided improvement in income in the last 2 years as to all farms over prior years. The net farm income for last year was more than $12,000,000,000. The average annual farm income for the 5 years, 1935 to 1939, inclusive, was $4,668,000,000.

Those figures reflect net incomes of the farms, as I have just indicated. I thought I should again bring those figures to the attention of the Senate to show that the farmers' income, after all, has not been affected by the subsidy programs now in effect, as has been charged in the course of the debate on the pending measure. I believe that the vast majority of our farmers are well satisfied with the subsidy program. It is my honest and studied opinion that if we do away with subsidies, we are bound to have an increase in the cost of living which will reflect itself, as true as I am talking, in the returns of the farmer. Let us take the figures for the last World War, as I pointed out in my speech on November 29, 1943. The prices received by farmers for what they produced increased during World War No. 1, 78 percent. During World War No. 2 they increased 116 percent.

On the other hand, the things which the farmer buys in order to produce his crop increased during World War No. 1 71 percent in contrast to only 34 percent during the present World War. During World War No. 1 my father, a farmer, paid as much as $100 a ton for nitrate of soda. I bought some nitrate of soda last month for $37 a ton. My father bought some cane knives to harvest sugarcane during World War No. 1 which cost him $1.90 apiece. I bought some of the same kind of knives during the past winter which cost me only 60 cents apiece.

No, Mr. President, I dread inflation. We have come a long way in our attempt to stabilize the cost of living. We have done a good job and I am not going to cast my vote for a measure that will almost destroy all we have accomplished in the last 18 months, in our battle against inflation.

Mr. President, much has been said about the problems of our cattle feeders. Despite what some opponents of subsidy have claimed, we know that these problems are not ones of prices and returns on beef or dairy products but mainly one of securing adequate feedstuffs at reasonable prices. Prices of finished beef-cattle products are way above parity and far exceed pre-war prices. If the feedstuffs can be supplied at reasonable levels this important branch of American agriculture will share fully in the unparalleled prosperity now enjoyed by American agriculture as a whole, which so largely results from the stabilization of prices of the things the farmer buys.

Our feed problems arise from the immense growth in the number of animals we have to feed rather than from any absolute shortage of either low-protein feeds or high-protein concentrates. The number of live cattle we have to feed has increased by about 16,000,000 head, or approximately 25 percent, over the last 3 years. Our hog population has grown by 40,000,000 or about 50 percent over normal levels. Poultry production has increased by about 50 percent since prewar years, and dairy production has increased by 10 percent. Total production of meat animals, by weight, has risen 45 percent since before the war. On the other hand, total feed, grain, and hay production have increased only about 5 to 10 percent during these years.

Some agricultural experts, and even ex-President Hoover, had argued that the best solution to this problem is radical reduction in the number of animals and a consequent shift in our eating habits toward grain products, such as bread. The administration has rejected this proposal. The need of a high-protein diet for wartime work and for our armed forces and our allies requires meat, dairy, and poultry production, and demands, therefore, that we stretch our feed supplies as far as possible to get maximum possible amounts of these foods. The Government also realizes that hog raisers and cattlemen have cooperated splendidly with its program for expansion of production and that they must be protected against unfair loss.

I should like to outline, briefly and only partially, what is being done by the Government to make sure that dairymen and cattle feeders will not bear the brunt of this feed shortage.

Until fairly recently, everyone knows, hogs had been getting the lion's share of our scarce feeds. The national need for fats and the fact that using feeds to produce human foods through hogs is generally more efficient than feeding cattle for beef or producing milk and other dairy products, led to steps to expand hog production. An attractive support price of $13.75 was placed under fat hogs weighing from 240 to 270 pounds to get the vital fats and meats for our civilian and military needs. This made it very profitable to produce more hogs and to feed them to very high weights. Now, in order to save feeds, the support price for 1944 production has been reduced to $12.50 and confined to lighter-weight hogs weighing from 200 to 240 pounds. It is estimated that this step alone will save about 10 percent of the immense amount of corn fed to hogs—for other users. In addition the goal for hog production has been sharply cut back for next year. The number of hogs at present is about 125,000,000. The 1944 goal announced by the War Food Administration recently is only 105,000,000, or 17 percent lower. This should save another 15 percent of feed. It is safe to say that within the next year the amount of our corn which goes to hogs will be reduced by almost one-fourth. This will be a great help to cattle feeders and dairymen. At the same time it will cut out the wasteful feeding which the production of very heavy hogs entails.

Cattle raisers as well as hog producers will have to economize on feeds for the duration. As the Iowa State College Agricultural Experiment Station has recently said, in a bulletin entitled "Better Weather Ahead for Cattle Feeders," cattle feeding prospects are looking up, but only for feeders ready to go on a sound wartime feeding basis: "Good red meat is what is wanted, carrying enough fat to give the meat a good flavor, but without the tallow that ends up in the pail of waste fat." Feeding should be

up to "good" grade, not up to the triple-A grade which was called forth by the abnormally high prices and more plentiful feed supplies of some time ago.

The same bulletin also points out vividly what some of us may have forgotten, namely, that the profit from cattle feeding depends very much on the cost of the feeding, which depends in turn on the prices of feeds and feeding practices. The Government can do and has done a great deal to keep these feed prices down, as indicated below, but only the feeder can control his feeding practices. As for feed prices, in 1918–19 during the last war, for example, a "standard" feeding ration cost $27.20 per 100 pounds of gain in animal weight, whereas in this war, in 1942–43, this cost was only $13.30. This is but one tangible reflection of the many benefits the stabilization program has brought to American agriculture, and warns us that rising prices are not the answer to the farmer's welfare. As for what the feeder himself can do, a less fancy wartime ration, Iowa State College points out, will cost only $10.50 per 100 pounds added to weight. If cattle growers will do their part in conserving our scarce feed supplies, they can benefit the entire country at the same time as benefiting themselves.

Efforts to expand our feed supplies are not being neglected, especially production of high-protein feed concentrates so badly needed for dairy production. Liberal support prices and incentive payments have been used to expand production of peanuts, soybeans, and flaxseed. Our production of these three products combined has almost tripled since before the war. Part of this production goes for vital oils, but they also greatly increase available supplies of high-protein feeds.

The lifting of all planting restrictions of corn has helped all feeders by contributing to record corn crops. In 1942 our corn crop was 3,300,000,000 bushels and despite less favorable weather it was 3,100,000,000 bushels last year, as against a pre-war crop of about 2,500,000,000 bushels. As everyone knows, corn is the foremost high-potency feed for beef cattle, dairy cows, and poultry, as well as hogs.

The cut-back of the hog program will do much to make feed more available to cattlemen, dairymen, and poultrymen, but the other steps have been taken to insure that feedstuffs get to these users and at reasonable prices. To supplement domestic feed supplies, over 40,000,000 bushels of feed wheat have been brought in from Canada under Government auspices during 1943, and it is hoped that seventy-five to one hundred million bushels can be got from Canada this year. In addition, the Commodity Credit Corporation has sold about 490,000,000 bushels of feed wheat at the parity price of corn to all types of feeders during 1943. Since the wheat has to be bought at higher prices the Government is taking a loss of almost $70,000,000 a year on this program. The Commodity Credit Corporation is also making a payment of 5 cents per bushel on all corn shipped from the Middle West into the feed-shortage area along the Atlantic Seaboard. These Government-subsidized shipments have on recent occasions been running at the rate of almost 100,000,000 bushels a year, at an annual cost of about $5,000,000 to the Government.

I would like to point out that these are some of the subsidies which the opponents of stabilization would blindly eliminate. There was recently started a program by which the Commodity Credit Corporation brings hay into certain drought areas for dairy use and sells this hay at low prices. Between September 15 and the end of November 66,000 tons of hay have thus been provided to hard-pressed dairymen. This is another of the subsidies some would want to cast out.

Mr. President, I discussed this subject quite fully in my speech of November 29, 1943, but since the subject of the ill effects of subsidies on cattle feeders was again called to our attention I felt duty bound to make answer.

Mr. President, another point discussed by subsidy opponents say food subsidies mean saddling our grocery bills upon "the boys in the fox holes overseas."

The fact, of course, is just the opposite, so completely the opposite that it would be ludicrous if the true situation were not so tragic. The fact is that if the subsidies are not paid, if this tool of inflation control is struck from our hands, the boys who come back from the fox holes will be paying taxes for years to help pay interest on the Government bonds issued to pay inflated prices for their implements of war and the food they eat. If subsidies are removed, the prices of foods will go up. Other prices will then go up. Workers will ask for higher wages, and those represented by strong labor organizations will get them. In many cases the increases will more than offset rising living costs, since the demand for labor is very keen. This will raise prices further, and the spiral will continue. The foodstuffs, and the textiles, and the military equipment used by the boys in the fox holes will rise in price, and the Government will have to borrow more billions to pay the bill.

From whom can it borrow? Obviously from those here at home who are fortunate enough to have money to lend. It is they who will hold the bonds when the boys come home, either directly in War bonds or indirectly in the form of bank deposits and other financial obligations created out of the huge sale of bonds to the banks.

And who will these fortunate people be? They will be those who profit from the inflation—the war contractors; those lucky farmers who happen to salt away their paper profits from uncontrolled food prices; those workers in war plants whose organizations are strong enough to keep their wages advancing faster than living costs. These will be the war profiteers. Ironically the profits, and the swollen-farm income, and the high wages earned on the food and equipment for the boys in the fox holes will be earned in part out of the decline in the value of fixed incomes, pensions, and allotments, leaving many of those same boys' parents and dependents destitute.

If ever crocodile tears were shed, it is the tears of those who cry that we must not saddle a part of the grocery bill on our fighting men by paying subsidies to hold prices down. These subsidy opponents really want higher prices now—they are always forced eventually to admit it. They do not cry out that the boys fighting for $55 a month cannot afford to pay higher prices for the things they need. They show no concern for the seven and one-half to eight million dependents of fighting men who have to pay their grocery bills out of fixed and meager allotments. Yet the soldiers and their wives and children will be paying their grocery bills right now—if they can—and paying higher and higher prices for groceries and everything else as inflation proceeds. And they will pay through the nose later on as well.

For when the boys come back home from their fox holes they will have the privilege of paying taxes to help pay the interest on the inflated national debt incurred to fight a high-price war. And to make the irony complete, they will be paying this interest into the hands of those very war profiteers, many of whom are now demanding removal of the Nation's protection against rising prices and a soaring national debt on the foolish plea that the boys in the fox holes should not help pay our grocery bills.

Mr. President, I could make answer to other charges that were preferred by subsidy opponents, but I feel that it will all be in vain. Senators have already made up their minds on this issue and arguments seem to fall on deaf ears.

Mr. President, I contend that if the line is broken and inflation sets in, the farmers of our Nation will be the losers. I think I have demonstrated that in my speech of November 29, 1943, and I ask Senators to take time out and read that speech. We have used subsidies in order to hold the line. That method has worked well up to this moment, and I think it would be a grave mistake for the Senate at this time to abolish subsidies.

Mr. President, it is late, and I do not care to detain my colleagues any longer, but I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a debate between myself, Representative Louis E. Miller, of Missouri, Mrs. Esther Cole Franklin, of the American Association of University Women, and Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association, on the American Forum of the Air.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Announcer HAROLD STEPLER. This evening the American Forum of the Air has invited two Members of Congress, a consumer and a farm representative, to discuss Subsidies and the Cost of Living. They are: Senator Allen J. Ellender, Democrat, of Louisiana; Representative Louis E. Miller, Republican, of Missouri; Mrs. Esther Cole Franklin, of the American Association of University Women; and Charles W. Holman, Secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation.

Each has a brief prepared statement. Then all will join in an extemporaneous round-table discussion of "Subsidies and the Cost of Living."

First, then, Senator ELLENDER.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER

Mr. Granik, ladies and gentlemen, payment of subsidies is not new. Our Government has been very liberal in giving aid and rendering assistance so as to protect and sustain our economy. A familiar method of assistance is through the imposition of taxes on imports, known as tariffs. By imposing such taxes our industries are able to hold their own against foreign competition and our high standards of living are thereby maintained. Our people must pay for this protection and their cost of living is substantially increased.

A common method of giving aid is to make grants of funds or property to persons or corporations to assist in the establishment or support of an enterprise deemed advantageous to the public such as in aid of transportation, as to ship, canal, air-transport, or railroad companies. Except for this form of aid we may not possess the unparalleled system of air, water, and rail transportation that we now enjoy. Such aid is commonly known as subsidies.

A more recent application of Government aid is in the form of payments made from our Public Treasury in order to bridge the gap which inevitably arises in wartime between rising costs of production of essential commodities and stable prices to consumers, so as to prevent inflation. Such payments are also called subsidies. Oh! But what a sinister word "subsidies" has grown to be in the past few months, and yet tariffs, grants, subsidies, incentive payments, and the like have been successfully used in the past, and at the present to sustain our economy.

The opponents of subsidies have no plan except higher prices for consumer goods. They are in reality advocating that the consumers pay after January 1, 1 to 2 cents more for each loaf of bread, 5 to 10 cents more for each pound of butter, 1 to 2 cents more for each quart of milk, 2 to 3 cents more for each pound of sugar, 3 to 4 cents more for each pound of potatoes, 10 to 15 percent more for each pound of meat, 10 percent more for canned vegetables, and the Lord only knows how much more for fresh vegetables.

Can you not see the wage earners come in for increases, and in a short time our Nation will be confronted with a tug-of-war between the producers and distributors of commodities on one side and the wage earners on the other. Why, under such conditions our economy will soon become engulfed in a spiral of inflation that will not only wipe out the savings of millions of our people, but will curtail our productivity now, and impair it in post-war years.

For everyone of us, as taxpayer, consumer, worker, businessman, or farmer, subsidies mean simply an insurance policy—a small payment made to avert an infinitely greater one which would have to be made if we should be forced to pay inflated prices for our staggering war program. It has been conservatively estimated that our war cost would have been increased by $68,000,000,000 had we paid for material at World War No. 1 inflated prices. It is amounts of this magnitude or larger with which we are dealing when we question whether it is wise to spend a few hundred millions to hold back the tremendous forces which are now pent up in our economy.

In order to appraise the value of our present program we need but compare the cost of living for the first 4 years of World War No. 1, when we had very limited controls and no subsidies, with the first 4 years of World War No. 2, and we find that in terms of the total cost of living, World War No. 2 is 25.4 percent less than World War No. 1.

Subsidies should by all means be supported because they are an essential tool to do the stabilization job which must be done if we are to win the war and win the peace.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Senator ELLENDER. Next, Representative LOUIS E. MILLER of Missouri. Congressman MILLER.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS E. MILLER

The purchase of next year's election is under way. That is what the subsidy program is intended to do. So let's call things by their right names. The proposed subsidy is in fact a subterfuge to hide the inflation that is already here. The loose fiscal policies of this administration over a period of 10 years have sown the seeds of inflation deep in our economic soil. A stable currency was devalued; extravagance extolled and frugality frowned upon.

The deadly poison of deficit financing, coupled with its philosophy of scarcity has brought us face to face with its fallacies. Let us get a few fundamentals firmly fixed in our minds. Rising prices are not the cause of inflation—they are the result of inflation—caused by the bungling of our fiscal and economic affairs.

It is claimed that there is too much purchasing power for the amount of commodities available and that subsidies are the cure for this condition. I deny this. On the contrary, subsidies would only aggravate the situation, because, if the Government pays a part of everyone's grocery bill, it leaves everyone with that much more money with which to buy the things for sale. In short, subsidies create more inflation. This is only the beginning, because you are saved but $3.92 on your 1943 grocery bill and you must pay back in interest and cost of administration $9.15 at some future date.

The Government has no money of its own and you must be taxed to pay this back. Is it fair, is it patriotic to ask the boys who fight and die for $50 a month to pay a part of your, my, or Rockefeller's grocery bill? Do you want to put everyone partly upon relief, when people are earning the highest wages in history?

The solution to this question is not subsidies, which means more taxes, more debt which you must pay, more bureaucrats, and more bungling and waste. The only solution, aside from changing administrations, is more production of foodstuffs. (1) Give the farmer the manpower and the mechanical means to do the job, and give him a price which will be an incentive to produce. (2) Reduce excessive Government spending, hoarding, and waste. (3) Siphon off through enforced savings or taxes any excess-purchasing power above what is needed to purchase necessary, available goods at a reasonable price; but put this in trust as a nest egg for the post-war period.

Subsidies have been tried and have failed. More than a year ago Congress passed a Price Control Act, but there has been no all-out attempt to enforce it. No one then asked for consumer subsidies to control prices. The New Deal waited until a year before election and attempted to seize upon this device to bail itself out of a mess created by its own inefficiency, lack of courage and action.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Congressman MILLER. We now hear the consumer's point of view. Mrs. Esther Cole Franklin, of the American Association of University Women. Mrs. Franklin.

ADDRESS BY MRS. ESTHER COLE FRANKLIN

As an unofficial spokesman for American consumers, I should like first to say that neither the smoke screen of special-interest propaganda nor the barrage of political bickering can entirely conceal the elementary facts about subsidies and the cost of living

To prevent inflation in a war economy, it is essential that the Nation use every effective and reasonable tool.

Because we have failed to use some of the more important tools at hand, the burden of stemming the inflationary tide has fallen more and more on the price control machinery. To make price control work and secure maximum production, when we cannot fix prices at the source, it is obviously necessary to use incentive payments to producers or processors.

Clearly, the only alternative to this use of subsidies is to start adjusting prices upward to cover increases in costs in various parts of our economy—thereby giving rise again to the inflationary spiral. The proposed ban on subsidies would open the gates to an immediate rise of approximately 10 percent in living costs, would stimulate wage increases, and result in serious dislocation on the home front.

The extra expenditures from the National Treasury for equipping and supplying the fighting forces would amount to far more than the subsidy payments.

Why should we not profit from the successful experience of Great Britain and Canada? Both countries have found the food subsidy an effective instrument in stabilizing the cost of living. But we need not look abroad. Food prices have been held down—even decreased—here at home since subsidies were instituted.

On a recent trip through seven States I had opportunity to talk with hundreds of consumers whose major concern was with the continued flow of basic necessities, and the prevention of further price rises. They favored the use of subsidies where necessary to achieve these purposes. They do not support the indiscriminate use of subsidies; they know that subsidies alone will not check inflation. But the limited and careful use of subsidies is an almost universal plank in the consumer's platform.

When the benefits of subsidies are so apparent, I confess I have been at a loss to understand the vehemence of the opposition. Gradually, however, the reason has emerged from the confusion of argument. Amazingly enough, the opponents of subsidies are opposed to price control itself. They actually want inflation. Apparently forgetting the role of responsible citizens in a nation at war, they want any and every chance for immediate profits for the few. What we need today is a broader view of our national interest based on a knowledge of economic facts.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mrs. Franklin. And now, Mr. Charles W. Holman, Secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation. Mr. Holman.

ADDRESS BY CHARLES H. HOLMAN

Farmers do not want subsidies payment forced upon them, and I do not believe that consumers would if they knew the facts. Subsidies reduce food production and lead to food scarcity. Subsidies are wasteful. Subsidies are inflationary. Wartime subsidies mean postponing food payments until the boys and girls in our military forces return to assume the payment of these debts.

But for us left at home, subsidies will increase our present taxes, and the food subsidy bill now totaling $1,272,000,000 annually will increase and increase and increase as the months go by. As subsidies increase, taxes will have to increase.

Since the beginning of our organization, the N. C. M. P. F., before the last World War, our people have given organized expression to their objection. Since at least 1935 we have been resisting in every way we could the determined efforts of the present administration to fasten some kind of subsidy upon the individual dairy farmer. As early as that year an effort was made to make individual payments to dairy farmers for reducing their individual milk production. Due to our resistance the Government temporarily abandoned this quasi-political move but evidently has kept it in mind all the time; for the last subsidy—miscalled a feed subsidy—is now to be administered by the A. A. A. county committees, thus maintaining an army of about 125,000 part-time employees for such

time as the subsidy may be allowed by Congress to continue.

Today the dairy farmer is the most regimented of all farmers. Today every producer of any kind of dairy product is the unwilling recipient of a subsidy hinged around with regulations.

Since the enactment of the price-control legislation the administration has continually thwarted the desires and will of the Congress with respect to flexible price ceilings. We believe the time has now come when the Congress, in addition to prohibiting any further grants of food subsidies except in isolated instances, should require the administration to guarantee minimum prices to producers of dairy products and to make the price ceilings flexibly conform to the guaranteed prices. We are confident that the vast body of consumers can easily pay the slight increases in prices of milk and its products to maintain and even increase production. For those who can't, I think we should frankly recognize the fact that there may be many types of persons who for lack of income or for lack of skill cannot earn sufficient to maintain themselves according to decent standards of living. The right of persons of this kind of a supplement to their income should be recognized and provided for by Government.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Mr. Holman.

The American Forum of the Air continues with its round-table discussion of Subsidies and the Cost of Living.

Suppose subsidies are scrapped, as the House has voted, Congressman MILLER, do you favor the removal of all price limitations on farm products?

Congressman MILLER. Indeed, I do not. I favor not only the retention of whatever limitations we have at present on farm products—the price of farm products—but I favor more rigid enforcement of the controls of the Price Control Act. One of the reasons for the present plight is the fact that there has not been any honest-to-goodness attempt to enforce the provisions of the Price Control Act which was enacted by the Congress more than a year ago. The break in the dam occurred when the President insisted upon the right to control wages, and you know the score there. All you need to do is to ask John L. Lewis.

Senator ELLENDER. I do not quite agree with Congressman MILLER in that respect. Considering that price control meant a virtual change overnight of our normal and customary way of doing business, I do believe a good job has been done. A lot has been said about John L. Lewis and his lot in helping the miners, but I believe that if the facts are investigated in respect to this pay increase, it will be found that the miners of the Nation must work 13 hours more per week for the increase that has been given to them in recent months. Their basic hourly wage has not been increased.

Mr. HOLMAN. Senator ELLENDER, let me interpose here. Is it not true that the President's hold-the-line order was really an Executive order which paralyzed the operation of the O. P. A., W. F. A., and the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act?

Senator ELLENDER. I cannot agree with you, Mr. Holman. On October 2, 1942, the Congress passed a law whereby we ordered the President to stabilize prices and wages at their September 15, 1942, levels. There was some flexibility whereby certain prices and also certain wages were adjusted. You must realize that the problem was a difficult one. Contrary to the belief that was expressed by Congressman MILLER, a few moments ago, I am of the firm opinion that this administration has done a wonderful job in stabilizing prices and keeping the cost of living at the figure that is now prevailing.

Congressman MILLER. Senator, do you realize that if the proposed subsidies which you favor are retained and, for example, if additional subsidies are given from time to time, instead of keeping down the cost of living you will actually contribute to the cost of living?

Senator ELLENDER. No; I do not agree with the Congressman. You stated in your opening remarks that the amount saved is only $3.53 per person. Now, that is in the nature of a small insurance premium that the taxpayers are called upon to pay in order to keep the price of commodities down. When I say commodities, I mean not only those subsidized, but all others. By subsidizing some, others are prevented from rising. Just as surely as I am addressing you tonight, unless we can keep the prices down through the payment of these small amounts, there is not any question that if the dam is once broken the cost of living will skyrocket.

Congressman MILLER. Do you not recognize that the cost of living has increased just one-third to the extent that wages have risen in the last 4 years? For example, the cost of living, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, has risen 25.1 percent, I believe, and the weekly rate of pay of all employed people in industry has risen to 67 percent, approximately three times the cost of living.

Senator ELLENDER. We can prove almost anything with statistics, depending on how they are manipulated. The basic rate of pay has not been very much increased if at all since September 15, 1942. The increase that the distinguished Congressman refers to applies to a very small segment of our millions of employees. The increase applies principally to the millions employed in shipbuilding and the like—mostly new industries.

Congressman MILLER. How about the fact that we have fifteen to twenty billion dollars excess in purchasing power each year?

Mrs. FRANKLIN. Congressman MILLER, what authorization has been granted by Congress that has not been picked up and put into effect on the anti-inflation front? Is it not true that it was the wishy-washy action of Congress in not granting these controls that caused us to fail, in some points, in the inflation machinery?

Congressman MILLER. I was not in the Congress at that time, but I can say that from information given to me by both Democratic and Republican colleagues, the Congress passed the Price Control Act as was requested by the President more than a year ago. He himself has had the control of that. He has had the superintendence over its functions. He has selected those who have attempted to administer it, but one of the faults lies in the fact that we have eight or nine separate and independent agencies attempting to control prices in this country.

Mr. HOLMAN. I agree with Congressman MILLER to some extent, but I want to pick up the question about whether the President did not freeze the operation of the Price Control Act. Now, I speak with some degree of experience in this matter. Ever since the Executive order was issued there has been practically no change in milk prices. On the other hand, the dam which you speak of has been broken and overflowed, also, through the spillway, with respect to the continuous rise in wages, going far beyond the 15 percent Little Steel formula.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Holman, that point has been argued to a considerable extent, but I have discussed the matter with members of the War Labor Board and all of them to whom I spoke tell me that the Little Steel formula has not been breached. It is my honest opinion that so long as we are able to maintain the Little Steel formula we ought to do so, and the moment that the prices of commodities rise, then I can see labor come in and justly ask for an increase of their basic wages. When that occurs, God pity us. The flood will be so great that we will be unable to prevent inflation from engulfishing us.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. I want to ask Mr. Holman one question. Is it not true that there are other groups that have profited by the war? Is it not true that farm prices averaged, in 1943, 175 percent of the 1935–39 average? Is it not true that cash income from farm sales will this year average 240 percent of that period and that the actual, realized, net income for farm operators will average 266 percent of that period? I happen to represent the fixed-income group. I want to keep prices down.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not know that I can answer all of those questions in the short time I have here, Mrs. Franklin, but it is true that farms prices in relation to the 1935–39 index are 181 percent. It is true, also, that nonagricultural income payments, which means the wages of industrial workers, as compared to 1913, are 359 percent, as compared with 1929 are 73 percent higher. I think that we could go a long way, as Senator ELLENDER says, in shooting statistics at each other, but the facts are that today the American people, with the exception of a few, are in a far better position to pay these moderate food prices than they have been at any time since the last World War.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Holman, I need not ask you the question, but as I understand, you contend that the alternative to subsidies is higher prices.

Mr. HOLMAN. Moderate prices.

Senator ELLENDER. How can you hold commodities to moderate prices? How can that be brought about? If you take the lid off the price of butter or milk and let people who have the money buy all the butter and milk they desire, what do you think will be the increase in the price of butter and milk, say, in the next 6 months?

Mr. HOLMAN. Senator, I have answered that question to you two or three times before committees. My answer is this: That, by and large, milk will take a cent to a cent and a half rise a quart in the cities. In some communities in the South it will run from 2 to 2½ cents. On the Pacific coast it will run about the same, and in the East it will run about 2 cents a quart.

Senator ELLENDER. And that, of course, will make wages go up, which necessarily again will affect the price of milk production and before the 6 months are up, you will be back again for higher prices.

Mr. HOLMAN. Senator, there is a fallacy in the argument on the subsidy action. It is based upon the assumption that the present relationship of purchasing power to prices is what it ought to be when, as a matter of fact, the income of the cities is so far out of line in comparison to the income of the country districts that you cannot follow through on that basis. Of course, labor will try to hold its advantage. Of course, labor will insist upon more but the question is, Should labor have more?

Mrs. FRANKLIN. Mr. Holman, I should like to ask whether parity as now defined was not considered quite adequate from 1933 through 1942? What I really want to know is why you should object today to a subsidy in which both farmers and consumers share when you have fought so hard for subsidies for farmers in the past.

Mr. HOLMAN. Parity is one of those figures we created in 1933 purely as a legislative yardstick to help the farmers a little, and nobody thought it would be in existence for more than 2 or 3 years.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. You did not expect to reach it, in other words.

Mr. HOLMAN. It was so moderate that we expected it to be superseded by more adequate prices within a short length of time.

Congressman MILLER. The Senator raised an interesting question a moment ago. He mentioned butter and predicted it would go up 5 or 10 cents a pound. That recalls that through lend-lease operations in north Africa we have a 100 percent subsidy program. That is, we are sending the Arabs there everything from diapers to butter. We recently shipped

them a quantity of diapers—100,000 ready-made diapers and material for 600,000 more, and the Arabs, not knowing exactly what to do with them, made turbans out of them. They used a shipment of butter as a body ointment. If we continue to send butter to Africa, and if we attempt to grease all the Arabs in Africa, Lord only knows what the price of butter will be.

Senator ELLENDER. You are evidently just trying to be facetious, I'm sure, but the fact remains, Congressman MILLER, that there is no question that if such important foods as butter, milk, and bread go up, the prices of all commodities will be upped with them, and with that, the cost of living is going to rise, and rise quickly. After it starts, there will be no way to stop it, because wages will be raised which will again affect commodity prices and the spiral of inflation will be set in motion.

Congressman MILLER. That is pure speculation, in my judgment. You have no figures and neither has any so-called economist any figures to prove that.

Senator ELLENDER. But listen——

Congressman MILLER (interposing). Just a moment. In World War No. 1 wheat went to two-dollars-and-something a bushel; today it is one-dollar-and-thirty-odd cents a bushel. The price of bread is not 1 cent different per pound.

Senator ELLENDER. I disagree with that. Bread is selling now for 9 cents, and as I recall it after World War No. 1 it went up to as much as 15 cents when inflation began to take hold of our economy.

Mr. HOLMAN. In 1918 the retail price of white bread was 10 cents a pound; in November 1943 it was 9 cents a pound, a national average. In 1918 the price paid to farmers for wheat was $2.06 a bushel and now it is $1.37 a bushel. I want to ask Mrs. Franklin whether she will pay 10 cents more a pound for butter if her 16 points are reduced so that she can get a pound of butter a week instead of the present fifth of a pound?

Mrs. FRANKLIN. No, Mr. Holman; I will use oleomargarine.

Senator ELLENDER. Let's get down to cases.

Congressman MILLER. I pity you, Mrs. Franklin. Did you know, for example, that if we pay the subsidies that have been in vogue here and which are asked to be continued, that the average family will be saved approximately 30 cents a week? That is all.

Senator ELLENDER. But this 30 cents, as I have indicated, will keep other commodities from rising by keeping the lid down. You are familiar with the stock market in New York. You may not gamble on it but you know that if the price of oil goes up it affects the stocks in and the price of aluminum, steel, and everything else. By the same token, any time that you permit the price of any staple commodity to go up the price of almost every other commodity is lifted with it.

Congressman MILLER. When the Government starts paying a part of your grocery bill and my grocery bill and Rockefeller's grocery bill, we have just that much more money to buy beer with, to buy stocks, or something else. Is it not reasonable to assume that then we are going to become more competitive with each other and boost the price of things?

Mrs. FRANKLIN. Have you considered what the people want?

Congressman MILLER. Yes; the people want first of all, and I think they will answer that next year, to change the administration.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. If subsidies are thrown out, they will—at least in Congress.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let's see what happened to milk and other dairy products in the last year. The production of creamery butter has declined 13 percent, cheese 4 percent, evaporated milk 7 percent, dried skim milk for human food 35 percent, and the total decline in milk products is 2.4 percent.

Senator ELLENDER. Mr. Holman, you know yourself that that is due principally to the fact that our animal production has increased so much that the feed that is now produced is not sufficient to take care of all of them adequately. Just stop and think of this: The hog population has increased over 50 percent, cattle 25 percent, and poultry 50 percent, and all those are consumers of feed such as corn, oats, and other grains and hay. The production of feed has increased only 5 to 10 percent over our pre-war figures.

Congressman MILLER. We have no shortage——

Mr. HOLMAN (interposing). Just a moment.

Congressman MILLER. May I say that we have no shortage of essential commodities at all. We have a shortage of efficiency in the administration of the Price Control Act and in the getting to market of the things that we need. For example, today Government warehouses are bulging with food of all sorts. Just a week ago a trade journal announced that they proposed to sell 1,000,000 cases of canned peas, 1,000,000 cases of peaches, 27 carloads of catsup, and 2,700,000 cases of grape juice.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. It is quite true that in wartime it is impossible to see ahead exactly in the military theaters. You know that quite well, and yet it is necessary today to produce all we can produce. It is my belief that subsidies will have about the same effect on production as an incerase in prices in the open market. I notice that the United States Department of Agriculture Crop Report of December 10 indicates that there was an abnormally sharp decline of milk production from August through October which appears to have slackened, and that during November the production decreased less than usual for that month. Evidently subsidies have had their effect.

Mr. HOLMAN. Many times I disagree with the Department of Agriculture and usually our figures come out right. I say that it is a 2.4 percent decrease in the past year, and let me tell the Senator something. Since January 1941, and that is the test we are putting on this thing, farm wages have gone up 112 percent.

Senator ELLENDER. That is not the basic wage. Quite a lot of overtime work has been added to the weekly pay envelope.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is what the farmer is having to pay the farm hand. Prices paid for feed are up 68 percent. Those are some of the things we have to deal with. The present subsidy program, even if it is to continue (and I fear it will) will not stop this inevitable trend toward scarcity in dairy products.

Senator ELLENDER. I notice, Mr. HOLMAN, that your cooperatives have advocated that ceilings should be removed from corn. How can you argue that that will help out any if, as you know, the removal of ceilings from corn, will make the price skyrocket?

Mr. HOLMAN. Our people are in competition with hogs and beef cattle. The ceilings on corn were designed primarily for protecting the hog man. If the price of $1.07 were raised to $1.16 that would leave an adequate profit to the hog man for feeding.

Senator ELLENDER. How could you force him to sell his corn?

Mr. HOLMAN. By raising the ceilings up to a competitive point so that we can enter the market and buy it in competition with the hog man. We would like to do it.

Senator ELLENDER. And with that price of milk and all dairy products will skyrocket, and I am certain that higher prices for hogs will certainly result should corn go up.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. You would really like to see inflation, would you not, Mr. HOLMAN?

Mr. HOLMAN. No, but let us say something about the buying power of your town people. In August of this year, real wages were 154 percent as compared to the cost of living.

Congressman MILLER. Let me ask you a question. If you think it is proper and right, for example, to pay a nickel on the dollar of everyone's grocery bill, why is it not equally right to pay 50 cents on the dollar or pay the entire grocery bill?

Mrs. FRANKLIN. I would like to throw the question back to you by saying that there is evidently a misconception about the use of subsidies. There seem to be good subsidies and bad subsidies in your mind. You want the kind of subsidy whereby a few people make the profit; we want the kind of subsidy which will help the entire Nation at war

Congressman MILLER. I do not want the kind of subsidy—the unpatriotic kind—which pushes off on the boys who are fighting the battles for us today a debt that we should pay. Do you want the Government to pay your entire grocery bill?

Mrs. FRANKLIN. The debt will be much greater to the Government.

Congressman MILLER. In what sense of the word? It simply could not be.

Senator ELLENDER. Congressman MILLER, just a moment. If the subsidies are removed the 1st of January, it will mean that the cost of living will rise 8 or 10 percent.

Congressman MILLER. I deny that. There is nothing on which to base that.

Senator ELLENDER. I said in my opening statement what will happen. Since September 15, 1942, the cost of living has risen 5 percent. If subsidies are removed the cost of living will rise another 3 or 4 percent. Certain commodities will go up, and with the rise in cost of those commodities, other commodities will go up and you will have a tug of war, as it were, between producers and distributors of commodities on one side and wage earners on the other.

Congressman MILLER. You did state that, but that almost ruptured my credulity when I tried to believe it.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. But it is true, Mr. MILLER, is it not, that actually today the subsidies in force are holding down the cost of living about 7 percent on food costs and at least 3 percent, and somewhat more, on the overall cost of living?

Congressman MILLER. I do not believe that the present small subsidies have any effect whatsoever on the cost of living. For example, what effect would $450,000,000 have in trying to hold back a yearly purchasing power of $25,000,000,000 in the market? If you are correct in your assumption, we will say that $1,000,000,000 a year paid in subsidies would roll back prices 10 percent. Why not pay $10,000,000,000 and roll back prices all the way?

Mrs. FRANKLIN. On one thing I am quite in agreement with you, and that is that we need other, stronger measures besides price control with subsidies to keep down the cost of living, but I do say that in the absence of those measures, certainly you have got to use subsidies or prices will rise rapidly.

Congressman MILLER. The most striking example of the extended use of subsidies was in Rome in the days of Gracchus. He started out giving them small quantities of corn, and increased it until he gave them all they needed—free circuses and free baths—and the Roman Empire was destroyed.

Mr. HOLMAN. Senator ELLENDER, with respect to your statement that the cost of living will go up 10 percent, here is what actually happened between 1929 and September 1943. The wholesale prices of food (and that will be the farmer's relation to price) went up 6 percent, and the retail prices of foods went up only 4 percent. Between January 1941 and September 1943 the wholesale prices went up 43 percent and the retail prices 40 percent. Between September 1942 and September 1943 wholesale prices went up 2 percent and the retail prices 8 percent.

Senator ELLENDER. Do you not think that the stabilization program had something to do with that good showing of the small rise since September 1942?

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not think that the shift between the farmer and the consumer will have such great pyramiding as you seem to fear. I think that those rates, those spreads as we call them, particularly in the milk business, are pretty well fixed.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. According to your logic, subsidies have no effect at all, and the economic stabilization has no effect at all. Why are you arguing about it?

Mr. HOLMAN. They have the effect of increasing the public debt, and the big reason why our farmers do not like subsidies (especially our 3,000,000 dairy farmers) is that we do not like the yoke of Government regulation, with implied favors given to us to make us try to stay in line under a program of New Deal regimentation.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. But, after all, gentlemen, we are in a war and we would like to win that war. We would like to do it without ruinous inflation.

Congressman MILLER. And the fact that we are in that war should give us the spirit of sacrifice among us. We should not ask a future generation to pay part of our grocery bills when we are making more money than we ever made before.

Senator ELLENDER. The amount you are asked to pay, as Mrs. Franklin pointed out, compared to what it will be if you let the lid off, will be far less. You challenge these figures. Will you challenge this? The total cost of living during the first 4 years of World War No. 1 rose 50.3 percent, and during the first 4 years of this war it rose only 24.9 percent.

Mrs. FRANKLIN. Economic stabilization has been effective, and that is what is the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I should like to have reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) In the administration of the Stabilization Act, approved October 2, 1942, the President shall issue a general order with respect to wages and salaries, permitting any increase in straight-time hourly earnings which does not result in increasing such earnings to a point more than 18 percent above the level of January 1, 1941.

(b) The provisions of this section shall apply with respect to increases in wages or salaries occurring on or after July 1, 1944, the date as of which the prohibition in section 3 of this act against the making of certain payments to aid in reducing or preventing increases in maximum prices becomes effective.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate for a moment, I have three amendments on the desk. I am aware of the lateness of the hour, and the fatigue of Senators, so I shall just make a brief explanation of the amendments.

On the first amendment I shall ask for the yeas and nays, but I shall not make any protracted remarks about it, because I think all the amendments are very clear, and I believe it would be fair to the Senate if I did not take time at this hour, but I think the Senate will be willing to be fair to me, and give me a yea-and-nay vote on the first amendment, when Senators appreciate the significance of the proposal.

Mr. President, the Little Steel formula was based upon the concept that at the time it was put into effect the cost of living had increased 15 percent since January 1, 1941. The Bureau of Labor Statistics now admits—and it is a conservative estimate that the cost of living has increased 23.4 percent, or, as the Bureau of Labor Statistics prefers to say, 23 percent plus or minus. That is already 8 percent more than the Little Steel formula. Yet day before yesterday afternoon the Senate knocked out the subsidy, which action, according to the statement of the able Senator from Alabama, had the inevitable effect of increasing the cost of living 3 percent more. It increased the cost of food 7 percent and the cost of living 3 percent.

Mr. President, we took 3 percent out of the wage and salary of every worker in the United States day before yesterday afternoon, if what we did shall become law. Already, under the Little Steel formula prohibitions, they were receiving 8 percent less than the increase in the cost of living.

What I propose is only fair, in my humble opinion. Let us direct the President, as the amendment would do, to allow the War Labor Board to increase the Little Steel formula 3 percent, so that the employer may compensate his employees for the 3 percent we added to the cost of living here in the Senate this week when we adopted the committee amendment.

Mr. President, that is a clear-cut, simple proposal. We either want to take 3 percent of their wages and salaries away from the working men and women of the United States, or we do not. That is a simple decision for a Senator to make.

I think the language of the amendment is clear, and I shall indulge myself in reading it, and conclude:

In the administration of the Stabilization Act, approved October 2, 1942, the President shall issue a general order with respect to wages and salaries, permitting any increase in straight-time hourly earnings which does not result in increasing such earnings to a point more than 18 percent above the level of January 1, 1941.

That, of course, adds 3 percent to the Little Steel formula of 15 percent.

The amendment provides in the second part that this increase shall not go into effect until the prohibition against the subsidy provided for in the pending bill shall go into effect.

Mr. President, I do not believe Senators wish to diminish the wages and salaries of the working men of America by governmental order, yet unless we compensate, permissively, at least, for the inevitable effect of what we did this week, we shall do exactly that.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the Senator's amendment would order the President, direct him, to have issued, through the various agencies, increases up to 18 percent, instead of 15 percent.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the President already have authority to do that through his agencies?

Mr. PEPPER. The President may have authority to do it, but we did not leave it up to the discretion of the President to increase the cost of living or not. When the Maloney amendment was defeated, the Senate, by its own vote, raised the cost of living 3 percent upon every household table in America. This amendment proposes compensation for that. It directs the President to move the lid of the Little Steel formula up 3 percent more. It does not make it imperative that the employer give the increase, but at least we make the President, by the Senate decree and the Congress' direction, lift the lid 3 percent higher, which is the inevitable effect of what we did here on the cost of living when we prohibited the subsidy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, no one knows what is going to happen about the question of subsidy, notwithstanding the passage of the pending bill through the Senate. Does not the Senator think we really should wait, if we desire to legislate on wages, to see what the final determination is to be?

Mr. PEPPER. That is taken care of in the second part of the amendment, which I shall read to the able Senator:

(b) The provisions of this section shall apply with respect to increases in wages or salaries occurring on or after July 1, 1944, the date as of which the prohibition in section 3 of this act against the making of certain payments to aid in reducing or preventing increases in maximum prices becomes effective.

In other words, when the amendment becomes effective, this increase in wages will become effective.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is assuming that the amendment to which he refers as a part of the bill is to become effective, and that the bill itself will become effective. The point I make is that I do not think we know about that yet. Personally, I have grave doubt about whether the bill will become effective. But most Senators still think we might well wait and find out what the outcome will be.

Mr. PEPPER. No, Mr. President; because the increase of 3 percent does not become effective unless the subsidy provision which has been stricken out becomes effective. In other words, unless subsidies are abolished and the cost of living is increased 3 percent, this lift of 3 percent in the War Labor Board's directive, called the Little Steel formula, does not become effective. I think that is clear.

Mr. President, I shall not impose further upon the Senate, but I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHANDLER (when his name was called). Concerning my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], I repeat the announcement I made on the previous roll call, and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. RADCLIFFE'S name was called). My colleague the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is necessarily detained on important business. If present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM]. I do not know how either the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Nevada would vote if present. I have made the transfer so I may vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I do not know what his attitude would be respecting the pending amendment. If I were at liberty to vote I should vote "Nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent on public business. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "Nay."

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON].

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 57, as follows:

YEAS—12

Aiken	Guffey	Pepper
Bone	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	La Follette	Wagner
Downey	Murray	Wallgren

NAYS—57

Andrews	Bilbo	Chandler
Austin	Burton	Chavez
Bailey	Bushfield	Clark, Idaho
Bankhead	Butler	Clark, Mo.
Barkley	Capper	Connally
Danaher	Lucas	Stewart
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Ellender	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	McKellar	Truman
George	Maloney	Tunnell
Gerry	Maybank	Tydings
Gillette	Moore	Vandenberg
Green	Murdock	Walsh, Mass.
Gurney	Nye	Walsh, N. J.
Hatch	O'Daniel	Wheeler
Hayden	Reed	Wherry
Hill	Russell	White
Holman	Shipstead	Wiley
Johnson, Colo.	Smith	Wilson

NOT VOTING—26

Ball	Jackson	Radcliffe
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb
Bridges	Langer	Reynolds
Brooks	McCarran	Robertson
Buck	McNary	Scrugham
Byrd	Mead	Taft
Davis	Millikin	Tobey
Glass	O'Mahoney	Willis
Hawkes	Overton	

So Mr. PEPPER'S amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. I offer another amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) In the administration of the Stabilization Act, approved October 2, 1942, the President shall issue a general order permitting any increase in wages or salaries which will not result in increasing such wages or salaries to a point above the subsistence level, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Such Bureau is authorized to determine the subsistence level for the purposes of this section.

(b) The provisions of this section shall apply with respect to increases in wages or salaries occurring on or after July 1, 1944, the date as of which the prohibition in section 3 of this act against the making of certain payments to aid in reducing or preventing increases in maximum prices becomes effective.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, to save the time of the Senate I shall not ask for the yeas and nays, and shall simply offer a word of explanation concerning the amendment.

As Senators know, Mr. Davis, of the War Labor Board, and his Board have promulgated a rule that an employer cannot increase the salary or the wage, or, to put it in another way, the employer must apply specifically through the War Labor Board if he desires to increase the salary or wage of a worker above 40 cents an hour. What my amendment provides is that respecting those persons in the country who receive wages or salaries less than a subsistence level, as defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the employer may raise their wages or salaries without having to obtain the express permission of the War Labor Board so to do.

In other words, they are the people upon whom what we have done is going to bear most heavily. They are already impoverished, and we have added 3 percent more to their poverty by diminishing the subsidy power of the Government. It seems to me, therefore, that we might be willing to make the War Labor Board remove any prohibition against any willing employer increasing the wages or salaries of workers who are below the subsistence level, if the employer chooses to do so. My amendment directs the President to permit that to be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. I have still another amendment which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. (a) All pensions, disability, or death compensation, and retirement pay, payable by any department or agency of the Government, are hereby increased to an amount 18 percent in excess of the amount provided by the law in effect on January 1, 1941, with respect thereto, except in cases where an equal or greater increase has already been made.

(b) The amounts of the allowances for quarters, subsistence, and dependents, payable to or with respect to members of the armed forces of the United States or their dependents, are hereby increased by 3 percent.

(c) The amount of any payment of old-age and survivor's insurance payable to any individual under title II of the Social Security Act is hereby increased by 18 percent.

(d) Every individual entitled to overtime compensation or additional compensation under the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943 shall, in addition thereto, be paid additional compensation at a rate of 3 percent of so much of his earned basic compensation as is not in excess of $2,900 per annum.

(e) In determining the amount to be paid to any State with respect to old-age assistance under title I of the Social Security Act for any quarter which begins while the increases provided for by the foregoing provisions of this section are in effect, the maximum amount of the expenditure with respect to any individual which may be counted for any month is hereby increased by 18 percent.

(f) In any case in which the increased payments provided for by this section are paid out of any trust fund or retirement fund, the Government shall pay into such fund an amount sufficient to reimburse it for the increase in payments provided by this section; and such appropriations as may be necessary for that purpose are hereby authorized.

(g) The increases in payments provided by sections (a) to (d) of this section shall be paid for the period beginning with July 1, 1944 (the date as of which the prohibition in section 3 of this act against the making of certain payments to aid in reducing or preventing increases in maximum prices becomes effective), and ending with June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not take more than a moment of the time of the Senate on this amendment. Generally speaking, it would do two things. First, it would give the benefit of the Little Steel formula to the recipients of Federal payments—for example, to veterans of the Spanish-American War, veterans of World War No. 1, and persons receiving retirement benefits, if they have not already received a 15-percent increase; veterans of the Spanish-American War and veterans of the World War have not. The House has passed a bill providing for such increases, and I believe a similar bill has been favorably reported by the Senate Finance Committee, but the Senate

has not thus far acted favorably upon that measure. If such persons have received the 15 percent, they would receive an additional 3 percent, to take care of the increase in the cost of living as the result of the amendment prohibiting the subsidy.

The second category of beneficiaries of the amendment would be the dependent families of members of the armed forces. They would receive an increase of 3 percent in their allowances, because 3 percent has been added by the Senate to the cost of living of those persons. An officer in the Army or an officer in the Navy or an officer in the Marine Corps who receives a subsistence allowance from the Government would have it increased by 3 percent, because when we prohibited the subsidy we increased the cost of living 3 percent. The beneficiaries of old-age and survivors' insurance would receive the 15 percent, if they had not already received it, and 3 percent in addition, even if they already had received the 15 percent. Government workers who have been receiving a 15-percent increase on the first $2,900 of their salary, in accordance with the provisions of the bill Congress passed last year, would by the provisions of the amendment receive an additional 3 percent to take care of the increase in the cost of living entailed by the prohibition of the subsidy.

Those who are the beneficiaries of the old-age assistance provisions made by State and Federal Governments would receive their 18 percent or such portion thereof as they had not already received. Those who are the recipients of benefits under the Railway Retirement Act would receive the same increase which others would receive because of the increase in the cost of living.

Mr. President, of course the Senate has a perfect right to determine which of several courses it will pursue. It has a right to increase the cost of living if it chooses to do so. But the Senate should not be deceived about what it has done. The Senate has added 3 percent to the cost of living of every American family. Senators are presumed to realize the inevitable effects of their every act. Therefore, the Senate must decide the secondary question, "Will we reduce the wages and salaries of all workers in the United States, or will we provide some compensation for the increase in the cost of living which we have brought about by our prohibition of the subsidy?"

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not impose on the Senate; I shall take only a moment or two more. I am sure Senators would not want to deprive me of that. Otherwise, of course, I shall insist upon my rights as a Senator.

I merely wish to say that Senators who do not believe in the subsidy have a perfect right to say they prefer some alternative. But I have not heard any Senator say he opening advocates an increase in the cost of living of the American people, without any compensation for it. Let us be honest with our people, Mr. President. If we do not like the subsidy, then let us either tell the American people honestly and frankly that we are willing to increase their cost of living without any compensation, or let us find some redress for our prohibition of the subsidy. Such a decision would seem to me to be a fair one. Yet all we have done, and, of course, all we shall do today, is to increase the cost of living 3 percent, but not even giving the poor the benefit of the stamp plan proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], or giving them any increase in the compensation they receive from their employers, if they are privately employed, or in their public benefits, if they work for a public agency. That is what we have done and that is what we shall have done when this day is concluded and when we shall have finally voted on the pending bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, the Senator from Florida knows that the O. P. A. can roll back any price it wishes to roll back, without any subsidy.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator from Maryland is absolutely correct about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean if the price is higher than wages are, it should be rolled back. That is provided by the law we passed. Why are not the prices rolled back?

Mr. PEPPER. Very well, Mr. President; I desire to propound the following rhetorical question: Does the Senator mean to tell the American producer that we cut by 3 percent the price of his commodity, under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the American producer is receiving 3 percent above the line fixed to keep wages and prices in line, his price should be rolled back, just the same as wages have been held in line. There is no reason in the world to go into the subsidy business in order to keep prices and wages in line.

When Mr. Byrnes appeared before the Appropriations Committee, I asked him the exact question:

> Is it not true that you have all the authority now to keep prices and wages in line, without any subsidy?
>
> Mr. BYRNES. We have.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct; and, as usual, he puts the matter clearly. I simply want the public to know that when we vote this afternoon to prohibit the subsidy, we are doing one of two things: Either we are keeping down the prices that producers receive for their commodities, or we are making the consumers pay more for them. That is a perfectly proper choice; but I want us to be aware of the consequences of what we do, and to be sufficiently courageous to let the people know that we choose one or the other, instead of a subsidy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. My position is that if any price rises so that it is above its proper relationship to wages, it should be reduced. Whether this, that, or the other price is higher or lower, I am not in a position to say. But if it is higher, certainly it is not fair to give the producer a 3-percent increase if he is receiving 3 percent more than he should receive, any more than we should give labor an additional 3 percent, if it should not get it in relation to the cost of living. It is just as unfair one way as it is the other.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, Mr. President; but every Senator on this floor knows that with respect to a commodity which was the subject of a subsidy, we must either lower the price of the commodity to the producer or raise the price of the commodity to the consumer. We proved it by what we did yesterday with the Eastland amendment, when we took the 40-cent to 50-cent per hundredweight subsidy away from the price of milk. By the Eastland amendment we turned around and provided an increase in the price at the market place, which will have the effect of displacing the substitute for the subsidy prohibited. I voted for it; but that is what we did.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct about that, except he should point out that the price-fixing authorities said the milk producers were entitled to that price, and that they wanted to make up a part of the price with the subsidy. If they are entitled to it, in relation to wages, they should get it without any subsidy.

Mr. PEPPER. That is all right; but the effect of what the Senator from Maryland has been saying is to tell the wage earners and the salary earners of America that henceforth they will have to pay more for milk. It is perfectly proper for Congress to tell them that; but let us be fully aware that that is the effect of what we are doing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I offer two amendments and ask unanimous consent that they be considered together, because they are really one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 18, after the word "payments", it is proposed to insert the words "for any purpose whatever"; and on page 10, line 6, after the figures "1944", it is proposed to strike out the proviso, down to and including the words "by existing law" in line 23.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out the provisions in the pending bill making a differentiation between good subsidies and bad subsidies. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] says that most subsidies are bad subsidies, but that there are certain subsidies which ought to be encouraged and

perpetuated, and he exempts them from the operation of the bill.

Mr. President, all my life I have been opposed to subsidies. I was raised in a very hard school of Democratic politics, when the Democratic Party was opposed to all subsidies of every kind, character, and description. I am in sympathy with the general purposes of the measure introduced by the Senator from Alabama, but I am not willing to say that certain subsidies which happen to affect people in Alabama, or in some of the other Southern States, or even in Missouri—much as I love Missouri—are to be perpetuated, but that all other subsidies are to be barred.

My amendment, briefly stated, is to eliminate the favored subsidies sought to be perpetuated by the bill of the Senator from Alabama. A vote of "yea" on my amendment would eliminate all subsidies. I am perfectly frank and open about that. I have been in that position all my life. If a Senator believes, as I believe, that we ought not to have subsidies, he ought to vote "yea" on my amendment. If any Senator believes that we ought to have certain little coddled, pet subsidies, having to do with particular territories, which subsidies are to be perpetuated by the passage of this bill, he ought to vote "nay" on my amendment.

On my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield for a question. Let us first ascertain whether or not we are to have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I am favorably disposed toward the Senator's amendment, but I wish to be informed. Would it eliminate the payment of subsidies in connection with soil-conservation payments, sugar payments, and other such payments?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It would strike out every subsidy I can find in the bill.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Before the vote is taken, I should like to inqure of the Senator from Missouri whether his amendment is restricted merely to the subsidies contained in the bill, or how deeply into the subsidy question his amendment goes. It intrigues me very much. I have in mind ship subsidies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My intention is to go to the heart of the subsidy question. I am opposed to all subsidies.

Mr. BONE. I understand. The Senator and I have discussed the subsidy question on the floor of the Senate for many years. If his amendment went to the entire subsidy field it would be most intriguing. I wonder whether it is confined merely to the operations under the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am catching all the subsidy provisions I can find in the bill.

Mr. BONE. But that does not touch the whole subsidy field.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In all frankness the Senator ought to say that his amendment is an amendment to this bill, which itself does not affect soil-conservation payments and parity payments. His amendment would eliminate the subsidies allowed in this bill, which include subsidies on cottonseed oil and soybean oil.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is precisely what I am trying to do. I am trying to eliminate the subsidies distinctly authorized in this bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Missouri has not forgotten that old couplet:

'Tis sweet to hear the watchdog's honest bark
Bay deep-mouthed welcome as we draw near home.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the Senator from Kansas that I have always voted against subsidies, whether for Missouri or for any other section of the country.

Mr. REED. I did not mean to infer in any way that the Senator from Missouri had done otherwise, but I should like to ask another question of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say to the Senator from Kansas that the remark of my father during his lifetime which made me feel prouder of him than anything he ever said was on the subject of a tariff on zinc. He said that he would never knowingly help by means of a tariff rate any living human being merely because he happened to live in Missouri.

Mr. REED. The Senator has referred to the old school of genuine democracy, so well exemplified by his distinguished father. Does the Senator from Missouri have any belief, in the faintest degree, that that old kind of democracy is the democracy of the Democratic Party of today?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As opposed to a man like Wendell Willkie, I certainly think it is.

Mr. REED. Why evade the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, may the amendment be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, line 18, after the word "payment", it is proposed to insert "for any purpose whatever"; and on page 10, line 6, after the figures "1944", it is proposed to strike out the proviso, down to and including the words "by existing law" in line 23.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REYNOLDS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who is detained on public business, has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON].

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—17

Bushfield	Gurney	Truman
Byrd	Kilgore	Tydings
Capper	McKellar	Wallgren
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson
Guffey	Smith	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Gerry	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hayden	Shipstead
Barkley	Hill	Stewart
Bilbo	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McClellan	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Wagner
Connally	Maloney	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh, N. J.
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
George	Nye	

NOT VOTING—25

Ball	Chandler	Langer
Bone	Davis	McCarran
Brewster	Glass	McNary
Bridges	Hawkes	Millikin
Brooks	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe

Revercomb	Scrugham	Willis
Reynolds	Taft	
Robertson	Tobey	

So the amendment of Mr. CLARK of Missouri was rejected.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in order to conserve the time of the Senate, but also in order to present my own position on this bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief memorandum.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I wish briefly to state my position on this highly controversial issue of consumer subsidies. In no other way can I answer 50,000 Michigan letters and petitions that have come to me upon this subject—half of them violently opposing all consumer subsidies down to the last nickel, the other half violently demanding total consumer subsidies on the apparent theory that nothing else stands between our people and their inflationary doom.

In my considered view, the correct answer at the moment to this problem necessarily lies somewhere between these extreme views.

If I could deal with "consumer subsidies" by themselves, unrelated to any other inflationary factors, I should be completely opposed to them. I believe they are themselves potentially inflationary if not held in strictest control. I believe they have been historically dangerous to democratic institutions ever since the Gracchi days in ancient Rome.

But, in the present instance, I cannot deal with "consumer subsidies" by themselves because this administration has almost inextricably interwoven them into its anti-inflationary strategy. Whether I like it or not—and I do not—I cannot run away from this reality so far as the immediate situation is concerned.

If I could deal with farm prices by themselves, unrelated to any other inflationary factors, I should say emphatically that American agriculture is always entitled to its fair price, its cost of production, and its fair profit, in the market place and not at the back door of the Treasury. I believe this must be basic in our stabilized economy. This truth has been too long overlooked. But I cannot, at the moment, deal with farm prices by themselves because this administration has created a situation in which it uses the farm-price argument as the basis for what it does in respect to wage control. Wages are just as important an inflationary factor as are prices—often more so. Unfortunately the administration has not put wages and prices in gear and kept them in gear—as must be done, before it is too late, if we are to permanently hold the anti-inflation line. But so long as the President and his administrators pretend to relate their wage decisions to our price decisions, although too often they fail to do so, I cannot ignore this reality, whether I like it or not, and I cannot run away from this cold, hard fact in our current economy. The President and his administrators are an unescapable part of our governmental machinery.

Transcending every other consideration in this matter is the necessity to do everything within our power to hold the line against inflation and to use every available weapon against inflation—particularly in behalf of our white-collar workers, our citizens on fixed income, and the millions of our people who have had no increased income whatever from the war effort. They are the ones upon whom inflation bears down with heaviest and cruelest force. In a broader sense, of course, uncontrolled inflation can ruin all of us—farmers and wage earners included. Any temporary gain by any special group, at the expense of ultimate inflation, is a purely transient and utterly costly advantage. My first consultation, in a situation such as now confronts the Senate, must be the total overall battle against inflation for the sake of the total welfare of our whole people.

The President and his administrators virtually tell us that they cannot and will not hold the wage line if they are prohibited the use of any consumer subsidies whatever. Whether we like it or not, it seems to me that this puts us on notice that the total prohibition of consumer subsidies will result in inevitable inflation on the wage front. I refuse to take any part of the responsibility for any such calamity or to be any part of such an alibi. I shall vote against the proposed general ban on all consumer subsidies. There are occasions when they legitimately may be the best available temporary expedient.

On the other hand, my fear of the hazard in uncontrolled consumer subsidies is such that I must also vote for adequate limitations and legitimate controls over the use of these subsidies. The idea that subsidies are a total answer to inflation is simply fantastic. Therefore I have voted for the so-called Taft amendment which would clothe these subsidies with appropriate standards and effective limitations for the emergency period that lies ahead.

Here is another consideration. I am eager to continue to join in fighting present maladministration in many directions. But for the sake of the American people, we cannot afford a complete deadlock between the executive and the legislative branches of the government upon this inflation proposition. Our system of government can be reduced to almost complete futility in this regard when the President and Congress are at odds. Under such circumstances, it does not function; it just bogs down; and, as the New York Times recently said, "it is not surprising that thoughtful men are disturbed over the prospect." I believe that inflation is inevitable if the President and Congress entrench upon this issue at opposite ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. So long as we have this administration, and so long as it fails to develop an appropriate coordination in dealing with all inflationary factors, we are left with no alternative except to seek a composition of our difficulties until 1945 in a matter like the one now pending. I must vote for that viewpoint. I commend a similar consideration of the realities on the part of the President and his administrators.

I repeat that none of these inflationary factors can be safely settled by themselves. What we do in respect to subsidies will be followed by what O. P. A. does in respect to ceilings and particularly what the President and the War Labor Board and Mr. Justice Byrnes and Judge Vinson do in respect to wages. Again we are at the mercy of lack of unified attack upon inflation. If the agricultural producer gets no subsidies (and too often they do not reach him anyway), as the result of the passage of this bill, and then subsequently gets no higher price ceilings, as the result of continued O. P. A. and W. F. A. opposition, agriculture will simply continue to lack adequate compensation for its production costs and production may dry up. On the other hand, if there are no subsidies whatever, as the result of the passage of this bill, and O. P. A. thereupon tilts the food ceilings, and then the President and his administrators further take the lid off wages—as they have plainly prophesied—we are off in the mad dance of inflationary death. Meanwhile, if agriculture gets unrestricted subsidies, as a result of the defeat of this pending prohibition, and every subsequent wage demand from labor—of which the air is full today—is met by more subsidies pursuant to this formula and precedent, we shall get run-away inflation from this pyramiding process and from the resultant run-away public debt. If consumer subsidies are stabilized as our first line of defense against inflation, the ultimate demands for the use of this easy equalizer will come from agriculture, industry, and labor in such an irresistable flood-tide that we shall face a veritable surf of inflation. Subsidies can never be our chief reliance against inflation in fact. But we cannot wholly escape the authority of those who erroneously think so.

Under all these circumstances, I cannot answer the pending question with a simple "yes" or "no." Either such answer, in my view, is fraught, with inflationary danger. I must face what I believe to be the practical realities. Basically, I shall continue to strive for a new rule of action which gears prices and wages together and then undertakes to keep them in automatic gear. That would require no subsidies at all. Basically, I shall never consciously cast an inflationary vote. Meanwhile, I shall reluctantly vote for limited and controlled subsidies for the reasons I have indicated, with all emphasis upon the limitations and controls, and I am forced to vote against a total prohibition of all subsidies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BALL's name was called). I renew my announcement with regard to the unavoidable absence of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. He has authorized me to say that if present and voting he would vote "Yea."

Mr. REYNOLDS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I understand that on this question my colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], has a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. If the Senator from New Jersey were present and at liberty to vote I am advised that he would vote "yea." If the Senator from Maryland were present and at liberty to vote, I understand that he would vote "nay."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], who is absent on official business, and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] is detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who is detained on public business, has a general pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS]. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], who would vote "nay," has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON]. Mr. WILLIS would vote "yea," and I am advised that Mr. JACKSON would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired on this question with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. Mr. TAFT would vote "yea," and Mr. LANGER would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Mr. ROBERTSON would vote "yea," and Mr. O'MAHONEY would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. Mr. HAWKES would vote "yea," and Mr. RADCLIFFE would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 28, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Eastland	Reed
Andrews	George	Russell
Austin	Gerry	Shipstead
Bailey	Gillette	Smith
Bankhead	Gurney	Stewart
Bilbo	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	La Follette	Tydings
Butler	McClellan	Wheeler
Byrd	McKellar	Wherry
Capper	Maybank	White
Caraway	Moore	Wiley
Chavez	Nye	Wilson
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	
Connally	Overton	

NAYS—28

Barkley	Green	McFarland
Bone	Guffey	Maloney
Clark, Mo.	Hatch	Mead
Danaher	Hayden	Murdock
Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Ellender	Kilgore	Pepper
Ferguson	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Truman	Wagner	Walsh, N. J.
Tunnell	Wallgren	
Vandenberg	Walsh, Mass.	

NOT VOTING—24

Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Brewster	Jackson	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Brooks	Langer	Robertson
Buck	McCarran	Scrugham
Chandler	McNary	Taft
Davis	Millikin	Tobey
Glass	O'Mahoney	Willis

So the bill, H. R. 3477, as amended, was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term "31st of March" where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term "30th of June," and by deleting from the second sentence thereof 'on the basis of the cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of 12 months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on the basis of the cost, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower.' The first appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis established by this amendment shall be made as of June 30, 1944.

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); by striking out in the first sentence of such section 'February 17, 1944' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945'; and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided, however*, That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of 1 fiscal year: *Provided further*, That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That any such advances of reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further*, That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions.'

SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which programs involving such payments or losses have been announced on or before January 14, 1944, such programs may be carried out to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but such programs shall be completed not later than June 30, 1944: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be maintained and announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to domestic wool, sugar beets, and sugarcane, and competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and oil seed meals and wheat flour for export: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law.

SEC. 4. (a) Within a period of 120 days from the effective date of this act, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942), shall be adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes

in farm-labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home-grown), and other costs since January 1, 1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war and civilian purposes: *Provided*, That in determining the extent to which maximum prices shall be adjusted as provided herein, due consideration shall be given to historical and normal differentials customarily applied as between markets and regions: *Provided further*, That in no event shall maximum prices on milk and the products thereof be established below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That where minimum prices to producers of milk have been regulated under any agreements or orders pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, the War Food Administrator is hereby directed, within the periods prescribed in this section (relating to the adjustment of maximum prices), to adjust such minimum prices to reflect adjustments in maximum prices determined and ordered pursuant to the provisions of this section. Except as expressly provided herein, nothing contained herein is intended, nor shall be construed to repeal, amend, or supersede the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

(b) In order to effectuate the purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator are hereby directed to hold public hearings on a regional or market basis as the case requires. For such purposes there shall be utilized the hearing procedure and the personnel of the Food Distribution Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture established under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and such other personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration as may be required. As soon as practicable after the completion of the hearing, but in any event within the periods specified in paragraph (a), the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator shall make public their joint findings based only on relevant substantial evidence of record at the hearing and the Price Administrator forthwith shall issue an order adjusting such maximum price or prices on the basis of and in conformance with such findings.

(c) Any person (within the meaning of section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended) who is adversely affected by the order of the Price Administrator may, within 30 days after the action adjusting such maximum price or prices, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the order be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part.

The War Food Administrator shall be made a party to the proceedings and upon service of the summons and complaint, the Price Administrator shall certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record upon which the order adjusting such maximum price or prices was based. The proceedings in such court shall be subject to all applicable provisions of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; except, that wherever the term 'Administrator' is used therein, it shall, for the purposes hereof, be construed to mean the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator: *Provided*, That during the pendency of such proceedings the Price Administrator may not modify or rescind his order adjusting such maximum price or prices except upon the basis of additional joint findings on evidence adduced pursuant to the order of the court. The provisions of this section shall terminate coterminous with the expiration of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

SEC. 5. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at a loss perishable fruits or vegetables, owned or controlled by it, the increased production of which has been requested by the War Food Administrator, if there is danger of substantial loss through deterioration by spoilage.

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out '$3,000,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof $3,250,000,000.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement to the Senate regarding the prospect of business for next week.

It is my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess until Tuesday next, and on that day to have the calendar called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection. Outside of that, the only definite legislative business I foresee for next week is the so-called U. N. R. R. A. joint resolution, now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations, upon which action will be taken in that committee on Monday, I assume, and it is desired to take it up next week and dispose of it in the Senate. Except for those matters, I do not see any immediate legislation in prospect.

I make this statement for the benefit of Senators who will be interested in knowing what is to occur next week, so far as we can now foresee.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may file during the recess of the Senate, minority views on Senate bill 1509, to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an article from one of the local papers entitled "Lend-Lease Started War." The article reads as follows:

LEND-LEASE STARTED WAR

NEW YORK, January 31.—The United States entered the war, not at Pearl Harbor but when we participated in the lend-lease operations with Allied Nations, Arthur Hays Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times and member of the central committee, American Red Cross, declared today.

"I happen to be among those who believe that we did not go to war because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor," Sulzberger told a Red Cross meeting. "I hold rather that we were attacked at Pearl Harbor because we had gone to war when we made the lend-lease declaration.

"And we took the fateful step because we knew that all we hold dear in the world was under attack and that we could not let it perish. That declaration was an affirmative act on our part and a warlike act."

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on Monday, the Committee on Foreign Relations will consider House Joint Resolution 192, to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, the so-called U. N. R. R. A. resolution. I ask unanimous consent that in the event the committee shall act on the resolution on Monday, it may have permission to file a report up to midnight Monday, so that the matter may be before the Senate on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement by me as to the law relating to appointments and promotions of officers in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Inquiries have been made by members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and others with reference to the existing laws regarding appointment and promotion of officers in the Navy.

In reply to these inquiries I now call attention to the following: Prior to July 24, 1941, 5 months before Pearl Harbor and at a time when the Navy was beginning to expand in order to become fully prepared in case we got involved in the World War No. 2, the appointments and promotions of the Navy were fixed by law and based upon a selective system of promotion which met with general approval and had been in operation for some years.

The law, approved July 24, 1941, dealt with two essential phases of this problem: It authorized the President in time of war or national emergency to temporarily appoint commissioned warrant officers, warrant officers, chief and first-class petty officers in the Navy and Naval Reserve, and similar ratings in the Marine Corps, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard, and Coast Guard Reserve, to commissioned rank in these services. It is to be noted that these appointments and promotions were temporary, and that the appointments could be made from the enlisted personnel. The law also authorized the President to temporarily promote officers in the naval service to higher ranks. This authority, given to the President, was limited in the case of promotions of officers above the rank of captain in the Navy and colonel in the Marine Corps in that such promotions required the advice and consent of the Senate. It is to be noted that following this law there were two systems of promotions in effect: The temporary promotions referred to above and the law providing for permanent promotions in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps. It should be added that the temporary appointments were subject to the period which the President might determine, but not longer than 6 months after the termination of the war.

On June 30, 1942, another law was passed suspending certain provisions of the prior

laws which provided for permanent promotions in the Navy by providing that such promotions should be suspended during the period of the war and for 6 months thereafter and that promotions thereafter should be of a temporary character. There were certain minor exceptions under this law. The present situation, therefore, is that with only a few exceptions all appointments and promotions in the Navy are of a temporary nature.

Prior to the act of 1941 the President was limited in the number of admirals and vice admirals and other officers he could name. Under the act of 1941 he was given the power to make temporary promotions and name as many admirals, vice admirals, and other officers in the Navy as he deemed necessary.

At present the number of flag officers in the Navy on the active list is as follows: Admirals, 5; vice admirals, 21; rear admirals, 159 active of the line and 35 of the staff; and commodores, 26.

SPEECHES BY SENATOR MEAD AND SENATOR BREWSTER REGARDING TOUR OF BATTLEFRONTS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements relating to the world tour of 5 Senators, made by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], at a special open meeting of the Senate Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, may be printed as a Senate document. They are now being edited.

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, before we have a ruling on the request of the Senator from Missouri, I wish to be heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have reserved the right to object.

Mr. DANAHER. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. When were the statements submitted to the full committee?

Mr. TRUMAN. It was some time ago. The Senator from Texas was not in town at the time the committee had the meeting. It was an open, public meeting.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the full committee taken any action on the matter?

Mr. TRUMAN. The full committee has heard both speeches, and one of them has already been printed as a Senate document.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think this matter, on which I understand the report is made——

Mr. TRUMAN. It is not a report; it is a couple of speeches the two Senators made at the meeting I have mentioned. It is not a report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is bad practice to print as a Senate document, which goes out with the authentication of the Senate, speeches made by Senators. If they are to be printed in the RECORD, that is one thing, but I do not think they should be sent out as a Senate document. We got into trouble recently from printing as a Senate document a Senator's speech, which was merely his opinion.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thought I would save a little money.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's desire to save money, but as a matter of policy I doubt the wisdom of printing as a Senate document ex parte statements of Senators on any subject.

Mr. TRUMAN. Then I change the request and ask to have them printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is different.

Mr. TRUMAN. Would that satisfy the Senator?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to their being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. Were they made in public?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; at a public meeting.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not suppose I would object to the request now made.

Mr. TRUMAN. I was just trying to save a little money.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is very doubtful whether the matters touched upon are within the legitimate scope of the so-called Truman committee, but if the Senators made the statements in open meeting, I do not suppose there is any question about the matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri withdraw the request?

Mr. TRUMAN. No, I ask that the statements be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri to print in the Appendix of the RECORD the speeches of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] at a public meeting of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Legislative Clerk read the nomination of Ewell K. Jett to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Legislative Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the executive calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, February 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 11 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Henry J. Healy to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of October 1943.

Harry D. Reed, Jr., to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 3d day of October 1943.

Francis X. Popper to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 3d day of October 1943.

Marvin T. Paulson to be aide with rank of ensign in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 11 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Ewell K. Jett to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the term of 7 years from July 1, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

KANSAS

Theodore F. Stuckman, Kirwin.

OKLAHOMA

James E. Ward, Camargo.
Frank James, Hartshorne.
G. Phillips Hines, Watts.

PENNSYLVANIA

Florence M. Armstrong, Allenwood.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAMSPECK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1944.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chaplain will offer prayer.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of the ages, everywhere present to uphold and guide Thy children, through humility, forgiveness, and power, we pray that we may build ourselves into our country, rather than our country into ourselves. Clothe us with more zeal to labor, more courage to be true, more patience to bear and forebear, and greater strength to carry the crosses of life. We praise Thee that amid toil, tears, and death that our Republic still lives in the fiber of our national life and about the firesides of our homes of peace and plenty.

In these days of mass irrationality, grant, dear Lord, that our influence and example may become Nation-wide in vision and in absolute personal integrity; forbid that we should ever prove recreant to the great trust which our fellow countrymen have bestowed upon us. May we turn dismal pictures to the wall and talk not of gloom and despair; infuse our minds with the will of our Lord linked to ailing humanity with the lights of the ultimate sky above us. Woe to him who has bread in time of famine and allows men to starve; woe to him who has medicine in time of plague and allows men to perish; woe to the country which is guarded and blest with rich abundance, fails to throw the torch and breaks faith with those who die: "Lord God of hosts be with us yet, lest we forget."

We pause in mortal silence as our memory of one strong and true is on the throne of our being. The roll is called and no response is made; he has passed to that home from which no traveler returns, a land of union, undisturbed peace and everlasting joy, all through the merits of an atoning Saviour.

He leads us in no darker room
Than He Himself went through,
And in our path is laid no stone
He would not carry, too.

In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 4, 1944:

H. R. 636. An act for the relief of C. J. Toole.

On February 6, 1944:

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of Paul W. Busbey, Mrs. Paul W. Busbey, Paula Busbey, and Mrs. Louisa Busbey.

On February 7, 1944:

H. R. 1875. An act for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Shaner, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

EXTENDING LIFE OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to provide a basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SPENCE, FORD, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, WOLCOTT, CRAWFORD, and KEAN.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until 12 o'clock midnight to file their report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—ANNUAL REPORT OF THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN (H. DOC. NO. 417)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Annual Report of the Alien Property Custodian on proceedings had under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, for the period beginning March 11, 1942 (the date on which the Office of Alien Property Custodian was established), and ending June 30, 1943.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to call District of Columbia bills.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE LEONARD W. SCHUETZ

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I announce the sudden and unexpected death of the Honorable LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, of the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, while sleeping in his apartment in the city of Washington last night.

Mr. SCHUETZ was born in Posen, Poland, of that sturdy Polish stock that has contributed so much to the upbuilding of great America and has always loyally given so freely to our fervent, patriotic endeavors, and came to Chicago when 1 year old. Mr. SCHUETZ' father died when Mr. SCHUETZ was only 10 years old, and it was necessary that he go to work and at the same time educate himself. By hard and persistently intelligent efforts he became, successively, a stenographer, an executive, a building contractor, and a very useful Representative in Congress.

Our deceased friend is another contradiction of the allegation that unfavorable circumstances are necessarily a deterrent to elevation to high place in the affection of his friends and in the councils of state.

Mr. SCHUETZ met two severe judgments, namely, he was a successful businessman in a highly competitive field, he met pay rolls, and the verdict of this honorable body on his important work here is transcendently in his favor.

Entering the House at the beginning of the Seventy-second Congress our friend soon concentrated all his efforts to build a great Navy and Naval Establishment. I shall leave to others, better acquainted with that great work, an assessment of our deceased colleague's labors in that direction.

The deceased was the ranking majority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, a member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, an assistant majority whip, a member of the Democratic Congressional Committee and ranked high in his own city and here in party councils. He was an extremely modest, self-effacive gentleman, always willing to be last when his talents dictated that he should be among the first.

You know there are various ways in which men rise to power, prominence, and eminence. Some men rise to high positions of leadership from the employment of armies and force; others reach that position because of great wealth; and still others reach the position of leadership because of the natural qualiful influences; but our departed colleague, whose shocking and untimely death—13 years short of three score and ten—we now mourn, rose to a position of leadership because of great and powerties he possessed; because of the heart that was his; because of the decency of his manner; because of his sense of understanding and justice.

To me his entire life is a message to the living, a message of being ever ready and willing, and anxious to contribute more to society than one could possibly hope to receive from it; to work conscientiously and industriously and selflessly.

Our colleague, Mr. SCHUETZ, leaves to mourn, with us, his untimely passing a widow and one daughter, both of whom

have our deepest compassion in their hour of greatest trial.

I know I voice the sentiment of everybody here when I say that our country has lost a fearless champion of the people, our State has lost a very able Representative, our city has lost one of its most beloved citizens, and we all have lost a friend who achieved real and permanent honors where the standards were high.

Mr. Speaker, at a future date I shall further express my deep appreciation of the worth and work of this eminent friend, legislator, and benefactor.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the chairman of the committee on which Mr. SCHUETZ was ranking member, namely, the great Committee on Naval Affairs. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the second time within a few short weeks the Naval Affairs Committee has lost another member, the Honorable LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, of Illinois. Once again the State of Illinois has lost one of her distinguished sons.

Mr. SCHUETZ has served in the House for the past 13 years. He was elected in 1930 to the Seventy-second Congress and has served continuously ever since. He was immediately appointed to a place on the Naval Affairs Committee, and throughout the important years which followed he has served on that committee conscientiously and well. Mr. SCHUETZ was quiet and unassuming in his manner. He was devoted to the work of the committee; was constant in his attendance; and rendered his country loyal and outstanding service. He had an appreciation and understanding of the many important matters which came before the committee, and a capacity to absorb facts and acquaint himself with the most intricate problems.

We shall miss his friendly counsel and genial manner. Our sympathy goes out to his bereaved wife and daughter.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked and deeply grieved to learn of the sudden death of our colleague and my personal friend, the Honorable LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, of Chicago. For many years he has rendered distinguished service to the district he had the honor to represent and to the Nation. In his passing his district and the country has lost one of their finest citizens.

Before entering Congress he was one of Chicago's outstanding contractors and to his memory there now stands many churches, schools, and other edifices, which pay a silent tribute to his many accomplishments.

He has served in this House continuously from the Seventy-second Congress and attained an enviable position on our Naval Affairs Committee. He was also a member of the Select Committee on the Conservation and Wildlife Resources.

He was a kindly gentleman, a devoted husband, and father.

May the Lord deal with him as one who has gained the palm, and may his place in the world beyond the grave be ever higher and more glorious than which he won for himself among men.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unutterably shocked as I came to the Capitol this morning to learn that the flag was flying over the House of Representatives at half staff, again, today, because of the death of my long-time friend, LEONARD SCHUETZ, the distinguished gentleman from the State of Illinois, who represented one of the largest districts in the United States for seven consecutive terms. That is the measure of the man.

He was my friend of long standing. To paraphrase William Cullen Bryant I know that "Sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust," he approached his grave "Like one that wraps the drapery of his couch about him and lies down to pleasant dreams." His reward is found in the satisfaction he found in duty well done.

His district which I know so well, one of the most cosmopolitan districts in a great metropolis has a very large population of 100-percent Americans of Polish descent, than whom there are, nor can be, any more enthusiastic lovers of liberty, or better judges of men than they. They sent LEONARD SCHUETZ to represent them in the Congress of the United States, and he served them faithfully and well: more than that, with great credit and recognized distinction over the years.

They, as we, have lost a great and good friend. We in Congress, and the country at large mourn the passing of one of our most substantial citizens, who gave all he had, which was not inconsiderable, to the country which offered him the opportunity to be and to become what he was, a statesman, and one of God's noblemen.

I join with all of you in expressing my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Schuetz and daughter in their bereavement, which is our loss, as theirs.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of our dearly beloved late friend and colleague, LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, of Illinois, is a great loss not only to the Nation but to the State of Illinois. We all sympathize with his widow and daughter in their great loss and sorrow.

His passing is also a distinct loss to his many thousands of friends, among whom I was proud to include myself. As our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] well said—and no one is better qualified to say it than he—our late friend was "quiet and unassuming." As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] so well stated, he was "loyal and sincere." He was quiet, he was unassuming, he was loyal, he was sincere. I thoroughly agree with those observations with reference to our late friend.

During the 13 years he served in this body it was my pleasure to become well acquainted with LEONARD SCHUETZ, and I valued very much the strong feeling of friendship that existed between us. When any Member of this body takes the journey into the Great Beyond, we are all saddened; it leaves a gap in our ranks. To me, the passing of LEONARD SCHUETZ is particularly so. We are all serving here under trying conditions with our country at war and the world faced with the greatest tragedy that the history of man records. This is a time when we need leadership in this body. In his quiet, unassuming but loyal and sincere way, LEONARD SCHUETZ gave to his country a leadership that fitted into the picture which exists today, a leadership which will leave its imprint upon the pages of our history.

During the trying days of this conflict, and in the years preceding, when men of vision and courage were looking into the future and saw the troubled situation that in all probability would face us, and which culminated at Pearl Harbor, LEONARD W. SCHUETZ was one of those men who saw the danger and he possessed the courage to vote for those legislative acts which enabled us to be prepared, and to sustain the shock, the impact, and the disaster that occurred at Pearl Harbor. He worked hard. He made his contribution in the preparation of our country, a contribution which as we look back we realize was necessary in order to preserve this country of ours and, in addition, to make for a decent world in the future in which men and women of good will might live.

His work on the Naval Affairs Committee, under the leadership of the great chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] will always live in the history of the United States. That committee has made a great name and a great reputation for itself. We have members of that committee on both sides of the aisle who are deserving of credit, and we have been fortunate to have as its chairman a man of years of experience, a man of unusual capacity, great vision, and unlimited courage. The help that our late friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, LEONARD SCHUETZ, gave the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, will long live, and the work of the chairman of that committee would have been in vain had it not been for the able efforts of men like our late colleague.

Mr. Speaker, on occasions of this kind it is rather difficult to express adequately in words our feelings, or the thoughts that run through our minds. May I say, however, that our late beloved friend was a great American, he died in the line of duty just the same as young Americans abroad are giving up their lives in this conflict that our country might be preserved.

Our late colleague lived an exemplary life. His soul is with God. May God have mercy upon his soul, and I know that he can face his Maker with a clear conscience and with the knowledge that he will be judged in accordance with the splendid life he lived.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I learned just a few hours ago of the passing of my friend and our

colleague. I join the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK, and the chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, Mr. VINSON, in the many good things they have just said about him. Having served with LEONARD SCHUETZ on that committee for 6 years, and having known him here in Congress as well as in the Chicago area where he and his family reside, I join in extending my sympathies to his good wife and daughter. That great metropolitan district he represented so faithfully and ably—Chicago and its suburbs—has lost a statesman and a good man.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, only a few short days ago our colleague, Hon. LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, in company with others of us in the Illinois delegation, returned to Illinois as part of the official party in connection with the death of our colleague, Hon. William H. Wheat. Little did he or any of us dream that one of our number would be the next to receive the call among those who serve in the House of Representatives. I join those in the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, as well as all those in the House of Representatives, in mourning the passing of Mr. SCHUETZ. His district, his friends, and all those who knew him well have lost a good friend and an able Representative.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN].

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, Congress and the Nation mourn the untimely passing of a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Illinois, the Honorable LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, of the Seventh District—Chicago. In his death the Congress has lost a conscientious, industrious, intelligent, and patriotic Member who has made a notable contribution to his Nation in this critical hour. As one of the high-ranking members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, he brought to that position a broad knowledge of business which he obtained through years of service in the executive department of one of the largest packing companies in Chicago, and as a builder who specialized in the construction of churches, schools, and religious edifices, not only in Chicago but throughout the Nation. His business and construction experience were especially valuable to the Naval Affairs Committee during the time that it was engaged in the greatest program of naval building in the history of this or any other nation. As an assistant whip of his party in the House of Representatives, LEONARD SCHUETZ was ever vigilant and ready for service at all times.

We, from his native city, who have been privileged to know LEONARD SCHUETZ over a long period of years recognized and admired him for his fine civic contribution to the city of Chicago. He was a champion of the underprivileged and understood the perplexing problems of the heterogeneous population of that great hub of midwest America.

LEONARD W. SCHUETZ had a very unique distinction in the Congress of the United States due to the fact that he represented more people than any other Member of that body. The last available statistics indicate that the Seventh Congressional District of Illinois had a population of 914,000. The construction of many large war plants on the periphery of his district, and the influx of war-workers brought about such an increase in population that it is estimated that in round numbers, in the last year or two, he represented approximately 1,000,000 people. In a word, he was the Representative of almost one-third of the population of the second largest city in America. Not all of these people are in Chicago, however, but the majority of his constituency resided within the confines of that city. That he represented his people faithfully and well is demonstrated by the fact that he was elected to the Seventy-second Congress and was re-elected each successive 2 years for six terms. On his recent trip to Chicago I understand he filed his petition for his eighth consecutive term in the House of Representatives.

One month ago, almost to the day, another distinguished Member from the State of Illinois, sitting across the aisle, the Honorable William Howard Wheat, was called to his reward again verifying the oft repeated statement that death is no respecter of persons. As the war progresses and the problems multiply the strain upon all those in public service is intensified. There is no question that the added worries and the devotion to duty have hastened the death of some of the Members of this body. The Honorable LEONARD W. SCHUETZ and the Honorable William Howard Wheat are two of those who are undoubtedly on that roll of honor.

The city of Chicago mourns the death of its illustrious citizen, a man who has given nearly 14 years of his life to the service of his country in the Congress of the United States.

I join my colleagues in extending to Mrs. Schuetz and his daughter our condolences, and assure them that his memory will ever be held in our hearts here in Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, as I approached the Capitol this morning I saw the flag flying at half mast and, of course, knew that once more one of our beloved colleagues had passed on. I was shocked, however, when I found that it was LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, of Illinois, because I had had no intimation that he was not in good health.

He was one of the men who have assisted me in my work as Democratic whip. He was a faithful worker in the ranks, as he was always faithful to any trust imposed upon him.

As I think back over the years I have served with him, my mind runs to an occasion in August of 1939 when, after Congress had adjourned, I went to Portland, Oreg., to attend the convention of the Rural Letter Carriers Association. Following that I took a few days' rest on the beach of the Pacific Ocean at Seaside, Oreg. While I was there, a subcommittee of the Committee on Naval Affairs, headed by our colleague who has just passed away, Mr. SCHUETZ, came to Tongue Point, Oreg., on an occasion celebrating the commencement of work upon the naval base at that point. How well that committee looked into the future when they authorized the establishment of that naval base, which has been such a source of strength to us in the emergency which has come since that date.

He was always faithful, he was always doing his part of the job. We are going to miss him very, very much.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning, when I learned that our colleague, LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, of Chicago, Ill., passed away suddenly last night with a heart attack, I was touched with sorrow, for during the nearly 14 years that he served as a Member of this House, it had been my privilege to know him, and I have observed the fine record that he has made.

He was not the flamboyant type. He was quiet, unassuming, a hard worker, faithful in his attendance on the sessions of the House, he knew what was being done, and he conscientiously cast his vote on every measure for his country's best welfare.

With reference to our foreign policy and legislation affecting it, I have had occasion to observe that he, without exception, on all measures considered in the House, both before and after Pearl Harbor, cooperated with our Government and supported all legislation recommended by the State Department and reported favorably by our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

He was a man of vision, understanding, sympathy, and courage, and the country can ill afford to lose one of his type at this time.

He was my friend, and I had an effectionate regard for him, and I shall miss him, and so will his district and the Nation.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words in paying tribute to the memory of our former colleague and my dear friend, LEONARD SCHUETZ.

Leonard was my friend and companion, and it was my privilege to have enjoyed his friendship since I became a Member of this body at the beginning of the Seventy-third Congress. It has indeed been my good fortune to have had a close personal acquaintance with him.

It is always difficult to speak of a departed friend, and especially of one for whom you have had the deepest respect and admiration. We mourn his death as a distinct loss to this body, to his State, and to the Nation.

His was a useful life, full of friendship and love for his fellowmen that made for him a constantly increasing circle of friends.

LEONARD SCHUETZ was a self-made man. He was born in the city of Posen, which was then under German rule, and after the last war became a part of Poland. His parents were Poles, and he was proud of his Polish ancestry. He came to this country with his father when he was 1 year of age and when he was a lad of only 10 his father died, leaving him an

orphan. From that time on Leonard was on his own. Many have been the times when he told me of his early struggles—how he went to work, attended the public schools, graduated from high school, and attended business college. At an early age he became a stenographer and secretary in the office of Swift & Co., of Chicago, and later became an executive in that organization. He resigned to enter into business for himself and was president of the Schuetz Construction Co., of Chicago.

His entire life is an example of the opportunities that our great Nation affords to those who come to our shores.

A poet once wrote, "If I would have my name endure, I'll write it on the hearts of men." LEONARD SCHUETZ wrote his name indelibly upon the hearts of his fellowmen, and his name will endure in the memory of those who were privileged to know him until their time is no more.

LEONARD SCHUETZ was a man of deep convictions, intensely devoted to his congressional work, and especially his work as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. During his service in Congress, he tried at all times to represent the best interests of the people of his district, State, and Nation.

In the passing of LEONARD SCHUETZ, I have lost a dear friend and companion, and it has been my good fortune to have lived long enough to know that there comes a time in all our lives when we must part with loved ones who have been near and dear to us. The Divine Maker in His Wisdom has seen fit to call our former colleague from the busy life of turmoil and strife to rest in peace.

No word of mine can bring him back again, nor can I bring much comfort to the sorrowing loved ones left behind.

It has been said that, "Memory is the only friend that grief can call her own."

Through the death of our colleague and friend, a good and upright man has passed into the Great Beyond.

We miss him, and we shall continue to miss him, and in sadness I quote:

As life runs on the way grows strange,
With faces new,
And near its end
The milestones into headstones change,
'Neath everyone, a friend.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the life and services of our late colleague, Mr. SCHUETZ.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 437).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of eight Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee Messrs. SABATH, REED of Illinois, DEWEY, O'BRIEN of Illinois, GORDON, ROWAN, GORSKI, and DAWSON.

The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume public hearings on House Resolution 418 and House Resolution 419, relative to the Jewish national home in Palestine, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 15, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, February 15, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 2328 and House Joint Resolution 49 (to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable), and the report of the subcommittee thereon. Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be meetings of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 16, and Thursday, February 17, 1944, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, for the consideration of postwar planning.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Tuesday, February 15: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Gen. M. C. Tyler, president of the Mississippi River Commission and division engineer, and proponents and opponents of projects along the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including the Red and Arkansas Rivers, Conway County, Ark., and Purgatoire (Picket Wire) River, Colo., the White, St. Francis, and Yazoo Rivers.

2. Wednesday, February 16: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, Col. Miles Keber, former division engineer, Missouri River division, Omaha, Nebr., and proponents and opponents of projects along the Missouri River and tributaries.

3. Thursday, February 17: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 16.

4. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

5. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

6. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1190. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to $3,493,500, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 418); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1191. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 and prior fiscal years, for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $1,908,220, together with proposed authorization for the expenditure of $4,500 from Indian tribal funds (H. Doc. No. 419); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1192. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $49,700 for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 420); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1193. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated October 13, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal, Wisconsin, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on November 5, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 421); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1194. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 13, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of report on the Mississippi River at Minneapolis, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4175. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Social Security Act to employees employed in connection with commercial processing and packaging of dried fruits and raisins; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 4176. A bill authorizing acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of certain forest lands within the Mount Hood National Forest in Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4177. A bill authorizing appropriations to reimburse the States for certain portions of the amounts expended by the States for equipping, operating, and maintaining rest homes for veterans of the present war; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 4178. A bill to extend to April 15, 1944, the time for filing certain tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 4179. A bill to repeal the provision of law authorizing the Secretary of War to carry out flood-control projects without the prior consent and cooperation of the States affected by such projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 4180. A bill to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4181. A bill to extend the period of operation of the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4182. A bill authorizing appropriations to reimburse the States for certain portions of the amounts expended by the States for equipping, operating, and maintaining rest homes for veterans of the present war; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and offered as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass a law enabling the ceiling prices on crude petroleum to be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4839. By Mr. EBERHARTER: Petition of James Donovan and others, containing 1,440 signatures of residents of the Thirty-first Congressional District of Pennsylvania and vicinity, protesting against prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4840. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolutions of the board of directors of the United Jewish Fund of Buffalo, Inc.; the Congregation Beth Abraham, of Buffalo, N. Y.; the Buffalo Zionist executive committee; the board of governors of the Wilmont Town and Country Club, Buffalo, N. Y.; and the Young Men's and Young Women's Hebrew Association of Buffalo, N. Y., urging favorable consideration of House Resolutions 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4841. By Mr. ELLIS: Petitions of the Parkersburg Elks Club, Parkersburg, W. Va., containing the signatures of 37 citizens; Johnny's Tap Room, Parkersburg, W. Va., containing 39 signatures; Coram's Confectionery, Parkersburg, W. Va., containing 36 signatures; and Tei's Confectionery, Parkersburg, W. Va., containing 20 signatures, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4842. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the Common Council of the city of Mount Vernon, N. Y., urging the speedy adoption of House Resolutions 418 and 419 for the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4843. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Brandies District Zionist Organization of America, N. N. Yalem, of St. Louis, Mo., president, urging the passage of House Resolutions 418 and 419, providing for the abrogation of the British White Paper and establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

4844. Also, petition of the congregation Havavath Achim of America, Louis M. Cohen, of St. Louis, Mo., secretary, urging the passage of House Resolutions 418 and 419, providing for abrogation of the British White Paper and establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4845. Also, petition of the ladies' auxiliary of the Achad Ha'am Hebrew School of St. Louis, Mo., Pearl Cohen, president, urging the passage of House Resolutions 418 and 419 providing for abrogation of the British White Paper and establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4846. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4847. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4848. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4849. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4850. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester and Bronx Counties, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4851. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of the Raymond Elks Club, Raymond, Wash., and signed by 27 members, protesting against the passage of legislation designed to bring about prohibition under the guise of a war measure or otherwise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4852. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Knickerbocker Lodge, No. 510, Knights of Pythias, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging adoption of House bill 2328 and House Joint Resolution 49; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

4853. Also, petition of the city clerk of the Common Council of the city of Mount Vernon, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging adoption of House Resolutions 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4854. Also, petition of Edith Gorrelick, of New York, N. Y., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1285; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President and Representatives in Congress.

4855. Also, petition of the chairman of the executive board, Denver committee for the right to vote, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging support of legislation for a Federal ballot to permit every service man and woman, as well as everyone in the auxiliary services, to vote, and urging support of passage of House bill 7; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4856. Also, petition of the Italian-American Labor Council, Inc., New York City, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the right of the Italian people to establish their own form of democratic government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, Thou art the shining presence at the altar of our hearts. For this hallowed moment closing the doors of a noisy world so full of terror and alarms, we come into this place of quietness and peace to meet with Thee, Thou who hast made us for Thyself. As before Thee we search our own hearts, we are shamed by what we are and, yet, lifted up by what it is still within us to become. We confess the fickleness and folly which have disappointed us and Thee. Forgive us for smug satisfaction with ourselves and for cynical contempt of others. May the mire and misery of our moral failures prove but stepping stones to our better selves. Purge our minds of the prejudices which separate us from others. Cleanse our hearts of the uncleanness which blinds our eyes. So may we be more worthy to belong to the one great family of Thy children and to take our place at the common table of humanity where the bread of fellowship is broken and the wine of sacrifice is shared.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1944.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. McKELLAR thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, February 11, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Leonard W. Schuetz, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. KEAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Andrews	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Pepper
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Ball	Green	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Gurney	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hatch	Smith
Bone	Hayden	Stewart
Buck	Holman	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wallgren
Connally	Maybank	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Mead	Wheeler
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Eastland	Murray	Wiley
Ellender	Nye	Wilson

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of serious illness in his family.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented the credentials of SINCLAIR WEEKS, of Massachusetts, appointed a Senator from that State for the unexpired term of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., resigned, which were read, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I, Leverett Saltonstall, the Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint SINCLAIR WEEKS a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the resignation of Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and the great seal of the Commonwealth hereto affixed at Boston, this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1944.

By the Governor:

[SEAL] LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
Governor.

F. W. COOK,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Hon. SINCLAIR WEEKS, the Senator-designate from Massachusetts, is present in the Chamber, and I ask that the oath be administered to him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. WEEKS, escorted by Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, advanced to the Vice President's desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law having been administered to him by the Acting President pro tempore, he took his seat in the Senate.

REPORT OF THE ALIEN PROPERTY CUSTODIAN

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Alien Property Custodian on proceedings had under the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, for the period beginning March 11, 1942 (the date on which the Office of Alien Property Custodian was established), and ending June 30, 1943.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1944.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FINANCIAL STATEMENT, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, submitting, pursuant to law, a statement by the Bonneville Administrator relating to the financial operations of the Bonneville Power Administration (Oregon and Washington), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (6), Justice, and Commerce which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 78

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing mustering-out pay for veterans discharged from the armed forces and to provide a master plan for veterans' welfare and unification and coordination of agencies and services administering veterans' benefits

"Whereas in rapidly increasing numbers men are being released from our armed forces on medical discharges; and

"Whereas these men, handicapped with maladies and varying degrees of physical disability and many without jobs or sources of income, are without means to tide them over until able to find their places in civil life; and

"Whereas unless the Congress promptly enacts laws providing such means for our returning war heroes, who gallantly fought and silently suffered to preserve the American way of life, this Nation, and its people will not only shamefully fail to properly recognize the great debt owed to its veterans of World War No. 2, but will be guilty of a travesty against human decency which may adversely reflect upon the moral and political life of this country for generations to come; and

"Whereas, while in the past veterans' laws have for the most part been enacted without

regard to a master plan and administered by various uncoordinated Federal agencies and services, demand for uniformity of benefits to veterans, more intelligent and comprehensive legislation, economy of administration, and other paramount matters pertaining to welfare of veterans requiring legislative consideration, such as hospitalization, medical care, pensions, education, make-work projects, unemployment compensation, and farm and home loans, now require an expert study of all veterans' problems, study and codification of existing veterans' laws, unification and coordination of all Federal services now administering veterans' laws and assisting veterans, and adoption of a master plan for veterans' welfare: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin memorializes the Congress of the United States to promptly enact legislation providing for mustering-out pay, clothing and hospitalization facilities for discharged servicemen immediately upon their return to civilian life, and to take necessary steps (1) to cause to be made an expert study of all veterans' problems; (2) to cause to be made a study and codification of existing veterans' laws; (3) to unify and coordinate all Federal services now administering veterans' laws and assisting veterans; and (4) to adopt a master plan for veterans' welfare; and be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to both Houses of Congress, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 83

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States as to the responsibilities and prerogatives of the States and the Federal Government in providing for absentee soldier voting in time of war

"Whereas the Federal Government enjoys limited grants of powers under the Constitution of the United States to regulate elections, such grants being in article I, section 4, relating to election of Senators and Representatives and in article II, section 1, relating to the time of choosing electors; and

"Whereas the only prohibitions against the States on the subject of electors or elections are contained in article XV and XIX of the amendments which provide that the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, previous condition of servitude, or sex; and

"Whereas the reservation to the States of all powers not delegated by the Constitution to the United States nor prohibited by it to the States includes the reservation of power in the State to prescribe the qualifications of its electors and the time, place, and manner of holding its elections; and

"Whereas the State of Wisconsin, in recognition and fulfillment of its responsibility to provide voting opportunities for all of its electors has enacted a law facilitating voting in the 1944 elections by electors who are absent by reason of serving in the armed forces of the United States; and

"Whereas the Wisconsin enactment has simplified its absent voting procedure as far as possible, avoiding the necessity of making applications for ballots, requiring local clerks to compile and maintain an up-to-date list of absent electors in their respective localities who are serving in the armed forces, with their latest known military addresses, and requiring such clerks to forward ballots to all electors on such list, and advancing all dates to conform to the minimum mailing requirements announced by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy; and

"Whereas the effectiveness of the law of this or any other State is dependent upon the prompt transportation of ballots to and from absent electors serving in the armed forces, particularly those serving outside of the United States; and

"Whereas the transportation of ballots through the mails is exclusively the responsibility of the Federal Government which can and should be implemented by appropriate legislation by the Congress; and

"Whereas the several bills now pending in the Congress on the subject of absentee soldier voting clearly invade the constitutional responsibility and jurisdiction of the States and should be limited in scope to the constitutional authority of the Federal Government to provide only for the transportation of ballots and applications therefor furnished under State-enacted legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States: (1) to refrain from enacting legislation on the subject of absentee soldier voting which invades the exclusive jurisdiction of the States under the tenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and (2) to take positive action under its exclusive constitutional authority by enacting legislation providing for the prompt and speedy transportation of ballots and applications to and from members of the armed forces, furnished under and pursuant to State legislation; be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to each House of the Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

Petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and vicinity, in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of pending legislation providing a wartime method of voting by members of the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Mississippi; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to give to the original owners of the lands acquired by the United States Government for war purposes during the present war, or to the legal heirs of said owners, the priority right or first preference, to purchase from the Government these lands after the end of the war, when the Government shall decide to dispose of said lands

"Whereas during the present World War the United States Government has acquired title to many thousands of acres of land in Mississippi and elsewhere in the United States, the ownership of said lands by the Government being necessary for the successful prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas after the United States and our heroic allies have won the war and secured the peace, the Congress of the United States will probably decide that a wise public policy would require the sale and disposal of a large portion of these lands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the State Senate concurring therein), That we do hereby petition the President and the Congress of the United States to give to the original owners or their legal heirs, at the time of the Government's acquisition of said lands preferential consideration and priority right to purchase the said lands they formerly owned, at a fair and equitable valuation; and we respectfully make this request because of the personal and financial sacrifices many of these patriotic Americans made for their country in giving up their ancestral homes for the purposes of war; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives be instructed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each of our Mississippi Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

"Assembly Joint Resolution 108

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress and the Office of Price Administration to relax the stringent rationing of butter

"Whereas from authoritative sources the Government has already bought and stored sufficient butter to meet essential military, lend-lease, and other noncivilian requirements for several months to come; and

"Whereas W. F. A. officials estimate domestic production of creamery butter alone will average between 110,000,000 to 130,000,000 pounds for the months of January, February, and March 1944, all of which supposedly shall be available for our civilian use, while according to statistics the average civilian consumption of butter in the United States during the past 9 months was approximately only 100,000,000 pounds per month; and

"Whereas notwithstanding an adequate production and supply of butter for civilian use and strenuous protests by the Nation's dairy industry and myriads of housewives and butter-consuming civilians the country over who find it impossible to purchase 16-point butter along with their meat needs, the Office of Price Administration has wholly failed and refused to relax the prevailing 16-point-per-pound butter cost; and

"Whereas the Office of Price Administration having failed to satisfactorily explain why the ration-point value of butter has been raised to and maintained at 16 points per pound or why the ration-point value of oleomargarine, a butter substitute, has been maintained at the comparative low level of 6 points per pound, it must be interpreted as a clear federalized attempt to beat down the barriers which the great dairy State of Wisconsin and other dairy States have maintained against butter substitutes and to destroy our domestic market for butter: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That this legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress and the Office of Price Administration to immediately take steps to reduce the ration-point value of butter to enable our civilians to purchase that share of the Nation's production and supply of butter available for their use and in order to safeguard the health of our workers and their families and to protect the Nation's dairy industry against the encroachment of inferior substitutes; and to adjust the rationing point value of oleomargarine so as to be on a parity with that of butter; be it further

"Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the Office of Price Administration and to each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 111

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation reimbursing municipalities for loss of personal property tax upon federally owned personal property used in war production and exempt from taxation

"Whereas municipalities wherein are located industries engaged in war production recognize their obligation to curtail expenses during the war in order to render their full support to the national financing of the war, but where the municipal burdens are increased and its sources of local revenue are reduced, the municipalities are compelled to ask that the Federal Government assist in preserving the tax base for local purposes, not as a subsidy, but to preserve the ad valorem tax or its equivalent on all taxable

property both real and personal within the municipalities' limits; and

"Whereas these municipalities suffer a large annual loss in tax revenues by reason of the nontaxability of those items of machinery, equipment, and buildings owned by the Federal Government and which are leased to local industries in war production; and

"Whereas the demands upon municipal services for fire, police, and health protection, as well as street and sewer maintenance and improvement is just the same if not greater with respect to such Federal-owned property; and

"Whereas the municipality is not reimbursed for the additional costs occasioned by such services; and

"Whereas the cost of manufactured products represented by local municipal taxes are but a fraction of the total cost of such products and should, in all fairness and reason, be borne by the Federal Government instead of making the taxpayer of these municipalities bear what is an unjust burden; and

"Whereas it is legally impossible to tax those items upon which the Federal Government asserts its immunity from local taxation and claims such exemptions; and

"Whereas it is only fair and proper that as to such items the Federal Government should pay to the municipalities a sum equivalent to what the tax upon such property would yield if subject to tax: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Senators and Representatives of the State of Wisconsin be urged to support legislation in Congress designed to reimburse industrial municipalities an amount which would equal the yield as if subject to tax, from all such property, real or personal, upon which the Federal Government presently holds title, and which is exempt from taxation by reason of such immunity; be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President, to each House of Congress of the United States, and to each Wisconsin Member thereof."

By Mr. DANAHER:

A resolution adopted by Oscar H. Cowan Post, No. 3, American Legion, of Stamford, Conn., favoring a reduction in long-distance telephone rates to members of the armed forces in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

RESTORATION OF PRE-WAR POLISH BOUNDARIES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a letter which I have received from the Central Committee of the United Polish Societies of Bridgeport, Conn., containing a resolution adopted at the annual meeting of that society held on January 25, 1944, urging the restoration to Poland of its pre-war boundaries.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE
UNITED POLISH SOCIETIES,
Bridgeport, Conn., February 10, 1944.

Senator FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: At its annual meeting held on January 25, 1944, the Central Committee of the United Polish Societies of Bridgeport, Conn., unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas a serious situation and question has arisen between two allies of the United States of America, namely, Russia and Poland, in regard to pre-war boundaries in the post-war plan of the future; and

"Whereas in the Atlantic Charter, our great President and Commander in Chief, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, forcefully condemned all acts of aggression by any nation or nations and promised to maintain the territorial integrity of invaded nations; and

"Whereas it is absolutely necessary that all seeds of suspicion and distrust should be wiped out so as not to lay a foundation in the near future for another world war; and

"Whereas, the sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers of American citizens of Polish descent are enrolled, by the thousands, in the armed forces of the United States and sacrificing their lives and blood to put an end once and for all to aggression: It is hereby

"Resolved, That the Central Committee of the United Polish Societies, of Bridgeport, Conn., on behalf of and representing 10,000 Americans of Polish descent, respectfully requests the President of the United States, the State Department, and the Congress of the United States of America to do every act and deed within its limits and ability to restore to Poland its pre-war boundaries; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Senators Maloney and Danaher and to Representatives Monkiewicz and Luce."

Dr. B. L. SUIYKOWSKI,
President.
Dr. F. P. TYLEURSKI,
Secretary.

REDUCTION TO MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES OF LONG-DISTANCE TELEPHONE RATES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Oscar H. Cowan Post, No. 3, American Legion, of Stamford, Conn., urging a reduction in the long-distance telephone rates "to men in the military service of the United States and its Allies in Army camps and naval stations and hospitals in the United States."

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the men in the military forces of the United States and its allies because of their service to our country and our cause and of their limited resources; and

Whereas long-distance telephone communication by said men with their families, wives, and children, and sweethearts is a vital source of morale to them and the home front: Now, therefore, be it unanimously

Resolved, By the Oscar H. Cowan Post, No. 3, American Legion, of Stamford, Conn., that the long-distance telephone rates to men in the military service of the United States and its Allies in Army camps and naval stations and hospitals in the United States be reduced, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to the following, with a view that immediate action be taken to carry said objects into effect.

Francis T. Maloney, Senator from Connecticut; John A. Danaher, Senator from Connecticut; Boleslaus J. Monkiewicz, Congressman at Large, Connecticut; Clare Boothe Luce, Congresswoman, Fourth District, Connecticut; Warren Atherton, national commander, American Legion; Louis Balchik, department commander, American Legion; George Stafford, district commander, American Legion; Bell Telephone Co., New York; Stamford Advocate, Stamford Shopper.

JAMES H. WILD,
JOHN J. GOLDEN,
SAMUEL BROWN,
Past Commanders.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — REPORT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, reported it on February 14, 1944, with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 688) thereon.

EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH INVESTIGATION OF CAR SHORTAGE FOR GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 254, and ask that it be read and that the Senate then consider it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 254) submitted by Mr. WHEELER on February 11, 1944, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 185, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to October 21, 1943, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 10, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1447) to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1720. A bill to vest title to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (ex *Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original U. S. S. Michigan, Inc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 1721. A bill to provide for the maintenance, expansion, and operation of school lunch and milk programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NYE:

S. 1722. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. ELLENDER introduced Senate bill 1723, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

TEMPORARY OPERATION BY MUNICIPALITIES OF ABANDONED AIRPORTS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide temporarily for the operation by municipalities and other governmental units of airports abandoned or placed in a stand-by condition by the Army or Navy Air Forces.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Louisiana will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1723) to provide temporarily for the operation by municipalities and other governmental units of airports abandoned or placed in a stand-by condition by the Army or Navy air forces was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the necessity for this bill arises out of the fact that the Air Forces have abandoned or are proposing to abandon many of the airports which they have been using in the United States. While using these airports, the Air Forces have installed technical equipment which is essential to the proper and efficient operation of the airports. Because of the regulations of the armed forces relating to accountability and responsibility for property entrusted to the care of officers, which require that when property is no longer needed for the purposes for which it was so entrusted to them it must be turned in as surplus material, the equipment which has been installed at these airports must be dismantled and turned in to warehouses when the airports are abandoned. Much of this equipment is very valuable and useful when installed at airports, but the same equipment when dismantled is of little value and is not needed for any other use. The removal of this equipment from these airports when it is not needed elsewhere is an economic waste which should not be permitted.

The purpose of this bill is to provide that when the Air Forces abandon an airport or place it in a stand-by condition, they should not be required to remove all of the equipment installed at the airport, but shall remove only such of the equipment as is needed elsewhere. The Air Forces would be authorized to enter into agreements with interested municipalities or other governmental agencies providing that such municipalities or agencies may operate such airports and use the equipment left there by the Air Forces until the Congress determines what permanent disposition is to be made of such airports and equipment.

CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC WORKS DURING POST-WAR PERIOD—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) requesting information concerning the construction of needed public works in the various States during the post-war period, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INFORMATION RELATING TO FLOOD CONTROL—AMENDMENT

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) directing the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army to furnish the Congress with certain information relating to flood control; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, most public men, myself included, at times must hear the truth we have spoken "twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools." In this connection I sometimes think I must be pretty good, because I am seldom criticized for what I say or do, but almost invariably censure of me arises from what some vicious, irresponsible, or fictitious person asserts that I have said, or done, or intend, which is contrary to the fact.

I have a file of correspondence supporting this observation which I request be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks. In presenting this correspondence for the RECORD, I charge specifically that Paul Dunham, the name appearing on a syndicated news column distributed to a number of newspapers in the Northwest, is a fictitious character. His name is not listed in the Congressional Directory index of Washington newspaper writers, nor is he known to any of the members of the Oregon delegation in the Congress. It would appear that the column is, in fact, prepared in Portland, Oreg., but distributed under a Washington, D. C., date line. My attention has been called to a number of false news articles appearing in this column and in the Oregon Voter, which the correspondence I am about to place in the RECORD will demonstrate.

In bringing this subject to the attention of the Congress I have the further purpose of making the record so that the Federal postal authorities can take cognizance of this matter, to ascertain if there has been a violation of postal regulations which prohibit the use of the mails to defraud.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAUL DUNHAM COLUMN

The Oregon Voter of January 8, 1944, page 4, contains the following article:

"Wayne Morse had advance urging by 'some among the high command of the Republican Party in Oregon' as the man who could beat Senator HOLMAN at the primaries, Paul Dunham reports from Washington. He also reports that 'inside dope has it that Morse will be offered the presidency of University of Oregon.' Senator HOLMAN 'does not relish the idea of having Morse as his opponent' and 'is figuring out how to sidetrack him into some other job.'"

On January 13, 1944, Senator HOLMAN sent the following telegram to C. C. Chapman of the Oregon Voter:

"I notice you quote Paul Dunham from Washington frequently. I suggest you produce him in person or expose him as a fictitious character. No such person has ever appeared before me and has no right or authority to express my ideas on any subject or about any person.

"RUFUS C. HOLMAN."

No response was received from Mr. Chapman but the following article appeared in the January 22, 1944, issue of the Oregon Voter, pages 8-10:

"FIND PAUL DUNHAM—HE'S IN THE ARMY NOW

"Senator RUFUS HOLMAN sent the following telegram to us: 'I note you quote Paul Dunham from Washington frequently. I suggest you produce him in person or expose him as a fictitious character. No such person has ever appeared before me and has no right or authority to express my ideas on any subject or about any person.'

"Our conjecture is that the following paragraph, which we condensed from a Paul Dunham letter published last week in up-State papers, is what stirred the sensitive Senator into the repudiation in the latter half of the last sentence in his telegram:

"'Senator RUFUS HOLMAN is more than anxious to learn whether Wayne Morse will run. (Paul Dunham.)'

"This sentence presumes to express the Senator's state of anxiety and to some extent his idea of concern as to Wayne Morse. We conjecture that no one 'appeared before' the Senator in order to interpret his state of anxiety or his ideas as to Morse. On both the Senator is likely to speak for himself; so far we have not heard that he has spoken clearly; he probably will say something original when and if Morse runs.

"As to Paul Dunham—we cannot produce him, for he is in the Army now, beyond our editorial jurisdiction.

"As to the Paul Dunham column, which appears in a considerable number of Washington and Oregon dailies and weeklies and is one of the most informative of any that deals with Pacific Northwest affairs, it is the successor to the John W. Kelly column. Kelly, as Senator HOLMAN may have known, or may not have known, had a staff of reporters and writers who aided in gathering information and writing for his celebrated column. Likewise, most of the noted columnists have staffs of writers, reporters, and secretaries whose work goes into the respective columns which are published under the name of the responsible columnist. Some of these columnists have as many as 8 or 10 aides. That is one reason why their columns are as good as they are.

"When Kelly left Washington to accept appointment by Governor Snell as head of Oregon's post-war bureau in the Governor's office, Paul Dunham succeeded Kelly as the name of the head of the column. We are authoritatively informed that when Dunham went into the Army he did not feel like sacrificing what this column could mean to him when the war would be over: By permitting his name to be continued over material prepared by the same staff, he retained whatever value there is in the prestige of his name over the column.

"As a columnist is a composite person, and as Paul Dunham's column is published under his name in some 50 daily and weekly newspapers with a numerous following, the Paul Dunham column continues to exist in fact even though Senator HOLMAN implies that Dunham is a fictional person. So long as Paul Dunham's name is carried at the head of the column, we shall continue to quote from it, giving proper credit—to Paul Dunham. That is, we will continue to quote so long as it contains material which we feel our readers will find interesting even though it has not been published in news-crowded Portland dailies. That is one of the functions assumed by the Oregon Voter, to supply readers with material which otherwise they would have no opportunity to note."

January 25, 1944, Senator HOLMAN sent the following telegram to C. C. Chapman:

"Have been unable to identify Paul Dunham as member of armed forces. Please airmail to me his rank, organization, date he entered the Army, and if possible his Army serial number. Also period of time when he in person functioned as claimed with brief biographical sketch of him.

"RUFUS C. HOLMAN."

In response C. C. Chapman wrote the following letter to Senator HOLMAN on January 26, 1944:

"For information concerning Paul Dunham we respectfully refer you to any of the newspapers which publish his column as a regular feature. A few of these are Oregon City Enterprise, Albany Democrat Herald, Grants Pass Courier, Sherman County Journal; there are many others.

"We do not subscribe for the Paul Dunham column and do not receive it direct, though we do not hesitate to quote from it, as from other material, if we note anything that we think we ought to quote.

"Yours cordially,

"C. C. CHAPMAN."

In reply Senator HOLMAN has addressed the following letter to C. C. Chapman:

"I have your letter of January 26 concerning the Paul Dunnam column and regret to note that it does not contain any of the information requested in my wire to you of January 25.

"I have made a diligent effort to identify Paul Dunham through newspapermen here in Washington and have been unable to locate anyone who ever knew him or could say that there ever was such a Washington, D. C., newspaper correspondent or columnist.

"Of course, I know John Kelly and was familiar with his column. He called at my office practically every day when he was here but since his departure no one has represented himself to me as being 'Paul Dunham' or as representing 'Paul Dunham' and I am constrained to the belief that he is a fictitious character and that the 'Paul Dunham' column is not written by anyone on the scene here in Washington or by anyone having regular or responsible representation here.

"I am not suggesting that it is not your privilege to quote from this column nor am I endeavoring to hold you responsible for such direct quotations. However, your article appearing on pages 8 and 10 of the January 22, 1944 issue Oregon Voter contains statements which are not quoted from other articles and I presume therefore, that you are prepared to accept responsibility for them. I again request that you demonstrate the accuracy of your statement that 'Paul Dunham' is in the Army and that the articles written under that name emanate from Washington, D. C.

"Sincerely yours,

"RUFUS C. HOLMAN."

On February 7, Senator HOLMAN addressed the following letter to Mr. C. C. Chapman:

"Since writing to you on February 1, I have received the following report from a representative of the Associated Press here in Washington:

" 'The gallery attendants who keep the records of correspondents accredited to the Senate and House Press Gallery say they have never known of a Paul Dunham working in Washington. If he did he was not accredited to the Press Galleries and did not come up to the Capitol enough for them to know him.'

"Another newspaperman here ventured the statement that there is no such person as Paul Dunham and that the publicity articles attributed to him and given Washington date lines are, in truth and in fact, written in Portland, Oreg., by one Vern Williams.

"Very truly yours,

"RUFUS C. HOLMAN."

C. C. Chapman addressed a letter to Senator HOLMAN, on February 4, as follows:

"Thanks for your courteous letter.

"You will hear from John Kelly direct concerning Paul Dunham. If the information he sends is not adequate, kindly advise.

"Cordially yours,

"(Signed) C. C. CHAPMAN,
"Editor."

On February 15 Senator HOLMAN addressed the following letter to C. C. Chapman:

"Not having received from Mr. John Kelly, whom we greatly respect, the letter which you led us to believe in yours of the 4th instant we would receive in explanation of the Paul Dunham mystery, I shall now consider the historic, or factual, period of this correspondence terminated and shall proceed on the facts as they are now established.

"Permit me to observe in this connection that it is as base to knowingly circulate a lie as it is reprehensible to fabricate it originally.

"Very truly yours,

"RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
"United States Senator."

The following article appeared in the Centralia (Wash.) Daily News on May 6, 1943, as well as in other newspapers which subscribed to the John Kelly column:

"KELLY TO TAKE NEW POSITION

"On May 16 John W. Kelly will assume his new duties as executive secretary to the Oregon Post-War Planning Commission, and the Washington column that appears daily on the editorial page of the Chronicle will be written by Paul Dunham, who has been in the Northwestern News Service's Washington, D. C., office the past 4 years. He is no stranger to Chronicle readers, having worked with Mr. Kelly and written the column on many occasions, especially during the latter's annual vacations.

"Knowing the Northwest and the news in which its people and publishers are interested, Mr. Dunham is well qualified to maintain the high standard in newspaper reporting set by the Northwestern News Service's staff, and the editors of Washington and Oregon are assured there will be no lessening of the value of material furnished by it.

"As in the past, the Washington column will be written particularly for Northwest readers, giving first attention at all times to matters of local interest and the actions of members of the congressional delegations of the two Northwest States. This is a special coverage not provided by any other columnist in the National Capital and affords intimate contact between residents of Washington and Oregon with the legislative happenings and official rulings of their National Government.

"Mr. Kelly has served at Washington about 10 years, and his value grew steadily as an interpreter of events of State and National significance. In his new post as a member of Governor Snell's staff, he will be in charge of organizing Oregon's activities in preparation for meeting the problems that will face the Commonwealth after the war is won."

The following letter was addressed to Members of the Congress in May 1943, by Vernon Williams, of the Northwestern News Service, Inc., of Portland, Oreg.:

NORTHWESTERN NEWS SERVICE, INC.,
Portland, Oreg., May 11, 1943.

DEAR SIR: As you know, Mr. John W. Kelly, who has been in charge of our Washington, D. C., office of the Northwestern News Service for the past 4 years, resigned his position to accept the post of executive director of the Oregon Post-War Planning Commission, effective as of May 15.

During the past 4 years we have been syndicating a column entitled "At the National Capital," to approximately 150 daily and weekly newspapers in the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. It is our intention to continue this column, to be written under the name of Paul Dunham, regardless of whom in our Washington bureau may furnish the material. This arrangement, you will, of course, realize, should be held in strict confidence. This procedure is necessitated by the fact that we have found it difficult, under existing circumstances, to secure a trustworthy man in the National Capital who is sufficiently acquainted with conditions in the Pacific Northwest to write informatively of matters which are of intimate interest to readers of this column.

Therefore, for the next few weeks, it will be necessary, in the main, for us to obtain our news from members of the Northwest delegations, and we would sincerely appreciate your cooperation in providing us with any news, via air mail or wire, which can be incorporated into this daily and weekly column for the newspaper readers of your district. This should not be, of course, "spot news" which is covered by the Associated Press, or other news-gathering agencies; but, rather, relating to such matters as are to be taken up, proposed or otherwise suggested looking to the welfare of Northwest citizens and industries. To be most effective in your district, this information should be received in our Portland office 3 to 6 days prior to any announcement or action which is to be taken in Washington, and which we may release for publication at a later date.

That there should be no interruption in the service to our newspaper clients, it is advisable that we should be informed at once as to your willingness to cooperate in this matter.

Thanking you for many past courtesies, and trusting we may be of further service to you in the dissemination of news to your constituents, we are,

Cordially yours,

NORTHWESTERN NEWS SERVICE,
VERNON WILLIAMS.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE OCCASION OF THE TRANSFER OF THE DESTROYER ESCORT "SENEGALAIS" TO THE FRENCH PEOPLE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD remarks made by the President of the United States at the Washington Navy Yard on the occasion of the transfer of the destroyer escort *Senegalais* to the French people, on February 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FULL EMPLOYMENT IN POST-WAR WORLD—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Vice President of the United States at Milwaukee, Wis., on February 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETERANS' LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on veterans' legislation, delivered by him in Washington, D. C., February 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on Abraham Lincoln delivered by him over Wisconsin radio stations, February 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

LIBERALIZATION OF SERVICE PENSION LAWS — STATEMENT BY SENATOR BILBO

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator Bilbo relative to House bill 2350, relating to pensions of veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and

the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILL WE KEEP THE FAITH?—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Will We Keep the Faith?" delivered by the former Governor of Kansas, Hon. Alf M. Landon, at Knoxville, Tenn., February 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JEWISH IMMIGRATION INTO PALESTINE—THE BRITISH WHITE PAPER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The White Paper," from the New York Times of February 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR BRICKER'S POSITION—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO SUN

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bricker Gives Fair Warning," published in the Chicago Sun of Saturday, February 12, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PHYSICIANS LEFT IN LOUISIANA

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of physicians left in Louisiana, submitted to him by Dr. C. Grenes Cole, State medical chairman, Procurement and Assignment Service, War Manpower Commission, New Orleans, La., which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR BENEFITS TO VETERANS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAGNER

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, because of the interest of all Senators in previous legislation on the subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made by me on February 11, 1944, before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Legislation of the Committee on Finance, concerning Senate bill 1617, providing post-war benefits to veterans of the armed forces.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator WAGNER. Mr. Chairman, in presenting my comments and suggestions on the pending legislation providing post-war benefits to veterans of the armed forces, I shall not go over the ground already covered by this committee, including the comprehensive testimony already presented to this committee by Commander Atherton of the American Legion, fully explaining the objectives and provisions of S. 1617—the so-called omnibus bill sponsored by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee for himself, Senator GEORGE and a number of other Senators, and which was introduced on January 11 of this year. As the subcommittee knows, there is also pending here the armed forces social security bill introduced in November of 1943 by Senator GEORGE, Senator CLARK, and myself, following the President's message.

All of us are agreed on the main objective—to deal justly and equitably with the demobilized veteran and his family, to care for the wounded, and to provide for the survivors of those who gave their lives at the call of their country.

The omnibus bill pending before the committee draws upon the background and broad experience of the American Legion. It goes without saying that I heartily concur in its objectives. Representatives of the Legion have conferred with me and with the chairman of the subcommittee on those phases of this bill which overlapped S. 1545; namely, the protection of the social security rights—S. 1545 being the bill that I introduced together with the other Members.

OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' INSURANCE

It should be observed that S. 1545 provides comprehensive protection for the old-age and survivors' insurance rights of all members of the armed forces under the Social Security Act. Payments would be made out of the Federal Treasury to provide credits in the old-age insurance fund for every month of military service since the Selective Service Act was adopted in 1940. The amount of the payment would be at the regular rate of old-age insurance tax for employers and employees, on a uniform wage base of $160 per month. The protection is afforded to those millions of servicemen who are covered by the Social Security Act, who otherwise would lose benefit rights, for themselves in their old age or for their widow or orphans if they die. The bill also provides the same paid-up benefit rights for the millions of other servicemen who are not already under the old-age and survivors' insurance system. This is done in order not to discriminate in providing a Federal benefit and in the hope and expectation that those now excluded may be brought into the permanent social security system by future amendment of the act; such as, for instance, farmers and domestic servants who are not now in the act.

The sponsors of S. 1545 are very pleased to have the hearty and official endorsement of this provision on this title of their bill by the American Legion. As the subcommittee is probably aware, this title on old-age and survivors' insurance protection is not embodied in the omnibus bill. It is our hope that it may be considered and reported promptly, perhaps simultaneously with the omnibus bill.

EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

I introduced yesterday, with the approval of the Legion—that is, representatives of the Legion with whom I have conferred—an amendment to S. 1617, which is in the nature of a substitute for title V of that bill relating to the Veterans' Employment Service.

Title V in its original form provides for the transfer of the Veterans' Administration of the employment-service functions of the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service System. General Hines, however, has questioned whether the Veterans' Administration should be weighed down with this additional responsibility, which in any case, to be really effective, must be coordinated with the employment-service functions for the entire civilian population.

Several of the representatives of various veteran organizations have made exactly the same point. During the past few weeks, therefore, I have discussed this problem with representatives of the Legion, and, in submitting a substitute for title V, I believe that we have worked out an arrangement which will provide a more effective veterans' employment service than at the present time. A vitally effective veterans' employment service goes to the heart of the veterans' post-war reemployment problem.

The law creating the present United States Employment Service, which I sponsored over 10 years ago, specifically provided for a Veterans' Employment Service. The new provision which I introduced provides for the establishment of a Veterans' Service Placement Board within the United States Employment Service to consist of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as chairman, Director of the National Selective Service System and the administrative head of the United States Employment Service. This makes it absolutely clear that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs—General Hines—has a definite and official relationship with the Employment Service. This Board, of which General Hines will be Chairman, would determine all matters of policy relating to the administration of the Veterans' Employment Service.

This arrangement will make it absolutely certain that the policies of the Veterans' Employment Service are closely coordinated with the policies of the Veterans' Administration and moreover will also make certain that the Veterans' Employment Service will function as an integral part of the United States Employment Service. This is essential, not only to relieve General Hines from the necessity of day-to-day supervision over the many administrative details involved in employment-service responsibilities, but also in order to make certain that all of the job-finding facilities of the entire United States Employment Service are made available to every veteran throughout the length and breadth of this land.

My amendment specifically provides that it shall be the duty of the Veterans' Employment Service to carry out the following five responsibilities:

(a) Supervise the registration of veterans in local employment offices for suitable types of employment.

(b) Secure and maintain current information as to the various types of available employment in public works and private industry or business.

(c) Promote the interest of employers in employing veterans.

(d) Maintain regular contact with employers and veterans' organizations with a view of keeping employers advised of veterans available for employment and veterans advised of opportunities for employment.

(e) Assist in every possible way in improving working conditions and the advancement of employment of veterans.

It should be recognized that the present United States Employment Service referred to in my amendment has been operating on a Federal basis since Pearl Harbor with employment-service offices in the several States and localities. This new provision for the Veterans' Employment Service which I introduced, does not basically alter this wartime set-up. It is so framed as to leave open for future congressional action the decision as to whether the United States Employment Service should be operated permanently on an exclusively Federal basis or on a State-Federal basis. My own views on this issue favor an exclusively Federal plan as written into S. 1161, which is pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and which places full weight of the entire National Government behind the Veterans' Employment Service under a single chain of command for maximum effectiveness in getting veterans reemployed on all jobs in any part of the country.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Title VI of the Legion's omnibus bill provides for a uniform national system of unemployment allowances for former members of the armed forces. This title follows practically verbatim the main benefit provisions of the unemployment insurance provisions of my bill, S. 1545; that is, a maximum of 52 weeks of unemployment-insurance benefits, varying from $15 to $25 per week, according to the number of dependents. I heartily endorse title VI of the Legion's omnibus bill, which provides for unemployment-insurance benefits on a uniform national basis. The arguments advanced by National Commander Atherton for such a uniform national system seemed to me absolutely sound and were exactly the same reasons which impelled the sponsors of S. 1545 to formulate the unemployment-insurance provisions in that bill.

When I speak of S. 1545, I am speaking of the bill that I introduced with the two other Senators.

I should like to quote Commander Atherton's statement on this matter, because I think the reasons and conclusions which he gives are 100 percent correct. Commander

Atherton in his testimony before this committee said as follows:

"Pending the period between discharge and placement in proper employment, we consider it to be the obligation of the Federal Government to make a financial provision for the veteran.

"We believe that these veterans should not be required to resort to the State unemployment compensation acts for several reasons:

"1. Their services were rendered the Federal Government and the period of readjustment is a Federal responsibility.

2. Uniform treatment should be accorded all veterans, which is not possible under the existing State acts due to the variation in the waiting periods, payment, and duration.

"3. Many, possibly 50 percent or more, do not come under the existing State acts and therefore are ineligible for benefits.

"4. This financial obligation, if placed on the respective State unemployment-compensation funds, might endanger the whole structure erected in the States for all citizens.

"We therefore propose that a reasonable allowance be made to all veterans during a reasonable period of unemployment. When returned to work, this allowance would cease and they could then be eligible under the respective State acts."

While the Legion bill has adopted all of the main unemployment-benefit provisions of S. 1545, there are certain differences in the two bills upon which I have strong views. These differences are as follows:

1. The omnibus bill provides for a maximum of 52 weeks unemployment insurance during the 24-month period following final mustering-out payment, instead of a 15-month period as provided in my bill. This is a good change and I am in complete agreement with the modification.

2. The portion of S. 1617 to which I take chief exception deals with disqualifications of ex-servicemen in situations where their unemployment is not involuntary. I have introduced an amendment on page 23 to strike out the phrase "of paragraph (1)" in line 14 and to strike out all after the period on line 18, down to and including line 11, page 24. I have discussed the amendment with representatives of the Legion, and I believe they have no objection to it.

Of course, provisions which prevent the payments of benefits to individuals whose unemployment is due to conditions within their own control are a necessary part of any unemployment compensation plan; and S. 1545 contains such provisions. All State and Federal unemployment compensation laws, and those of foreign countries, guard against the payment of benefits to individuals who are out of work because they have refused, without good cause, to accept a reasonable offer of suitable work, or have left their jobs of their own will, or have been discharged for misconduct. Such provisions, however, should not be so harsh and restrictive as to subvert completely the purpose of the legislation, and to limit the rights and freedom which the veterans of this war have fought to protect.

The language of the labor dispute disqualification given on pages 22-23 of S. 1617 and the definition of "good cause" and "suitable work" on page 24 are substantially the same as those provided in S. 1545. However, the provisions regarding the period of disqualification given on pages 23-24 of S. 1617 are so severe and restrictive as to require substantial modification, in my opinion. These provisions are more restrictive than the present unemployment insurance laws of most States. They are inconsistent with the purpose of the bill, which is to assure protection to veterans whose unemployment is involuntary. They would undoubtedly create ill feeling and resentment when veterans find themselves denied the protection they have been expecting to get.

S. 1545 follows the sound principle of disqualification; that is, in proper cases, veterans are denied unemployment benefits only temporarily, through postponement of their rights for a certain period, say 4 weeks. In such cases, he suffers the consequences of his act in the form of a temporary loss of benefits immediately following his voluntary act but retains his full benefit rights which he may exercise at a later date. Disqualification provisions of this kind existed in nearly all the original State unemployment compensation laws in this country and are found in the present British and Canadian unemployment compensation laws.

VOLUNTARY LEAVING

Under S. 1617, a veteran who voluntarily leaves his job without good cause may be denied benefits for the week of his leaving and for up to 4 additional weeks immediately thereafter. In addition to postponing his benefits for this period, the total amount of benefits to which he is entitled is actually reduced by the number of weeks of disqualification. To illustrate the unfortunate effects of this latter provision, let us consider the situation of a veteran, perhaps a young man whom any of us may know, who is entitled to only 4 remaining weeks to draw benefits, because of long previous unemployment covered by allowances. Let us also assume that he left his job for what you or I might think is a trivial reason, but apparently important to him, for otherwise he would not have quit. If some official or clerk found that the veteran did not have good cause for leaving, he could be disqualified under S. 1617 for a 4-week period, and, on top of that, would be denied any further benefit rights, because the remaining 4 weeks of his eligibility period had been canceled.

The unemployment compensation laws of 32 States contain no provisions for such cancelation of benefit rights. Moreover, the District of Columbia unemployment compensation law and the railroad law, enacted by Congress, contain no precedent for such a double penalty provision.

This provision really raises the vital question whether veterans should be encourged, rather than penalized, when they seek that job which will enable them to make a greater contribution to our national output, or which offers an opportunity for the better life all of us are encouraged to strive for. This provision really limits unduly the cherished American right to leave one job in order to take a better one—better for the veteran, for the community, and for the Nation.

S. 1617 contains an additional penalty for the veteran who leaves his job voluntarily, by providing, in cases of repeated disqualification, that no benefits whatsoever shall be payable to him until he shall have had 2 weeks of substantially full-time work or for such greater period of employment, without limitation, as the Administrator may prescribe (p. 24, par. (3)). However, if he is unable to obtain such employment, because no jobs are available in his occupation or his community he can obtain no further benefits under this program.

No such penalties as the requirement of reemployment, in cases of voluntary quitting, are found in 44 of the existing 51 State laws. That is, it includes Hawaii, the District of Columbia, and Alaska.

On the surface it may appear entirely proper to assign a heavier disqualification to a veteran who quits several jobs in succession, without good cause. Yet, we must face the question whether such an individual, who may have undergone the hardships of military life for 4 or 5 years, should be denied the fair protection of this program if he finds it difficult to settle down on the first job or jobs he happens to accept after returning to civilian life. Such a penalty may have the effect of eliminating veterans from all protection under the law if after the war there are several unemployed men for each available job.

We are all aware that many veterans, by reason of their military service, with its risks, and mental, physical, and emotional strains, will have great difficulty in adjusting themselves to civilian life and quickly settling down to regular jobs. After the hardships of 2, 3, or even 5 years of military life, in surroundings completely different from those of their former civilian existence, they may well require some time to adjust to permanent employment. In my opinion, they should not be discouraged if they wish to try their hands at several types of jobs, either jobs similar to their previous civilian work, or jobs which will use the skills and experience gained while in the armed forces, or something completely different from either. The seriousness of the problems of personal readjustment is recognized by the War Manpower Commission, which has exempted veterans of the present war from all existing restrictions imposed on civilians as to the type of jobs they may take, and as to their freedom in making job changes during the first 60 days following their discharge from the armed forces.

Another ground for disqualification in this and other unemployment-compensation laws, is discharge for misconduct. This disqualification is commonly applied to individuals who have been dismissed from their jobs for violations of company rules regarding such things as tardiness or absence without excuse, smoking on the job, quarreling with a supervisor or fellow worker, and the like. The same heavy disqualification penalties are applicable in such cases as are applied in cases of voluntary leaving work without good cause. While the reasons I have already outlined apply in general to the disqualification for misconduct, there are additional cousiderations which require attention.

Twenty-seven State laws, including that of the District of Columbia, have no provision for cancelation of benefit rights in cases of discharge for misconduct. In addition, not a single State law requires that a claimant, so discharged, must remain disqualified until he has been reemployed.

Such disqualification provisions are especially undesirable in the case of veterans. We know that the ex-serviceman will not find it easy to adjust himself to the variety of rules, regulations, and working practices of civilian commercial and industrial establishments. Every new worker, whether he is a civilian or a veteran, has some difficulty in learning to live under the rules which govern his conduct in a modern department store or factory, although many such rules are intended for his own safety and protection. Relieved from the severe discipline of the armed forces, many veterans will not accept at once the host of company rules which they are expected to follow in their first civilian jobs. It is obvious that a veteran who is discharged for violation of rules governing smoking on the job, for example, will suffer a severe penalty in the fact of the discharge itself, since it will leave him without a job and require him to seek other employment. It seems to me that disqualification for a period of 4 weeks will prevent abuse of the unemployment allowance system. To go further and cancel the veteran's benefit rights would impose a penalty out of all proportion to his offense.

There is one more disqualification that deserves attention here—the penalty for refusal of suitable work or refusal to attend a training course to which a veteran is referred under regulations of the administrator (p. 22, lines 8 to 14). Under S. 1617, this offense results in 4-week disqualification, plus further loss of benefit rights until the veteran has worked 2 weeks or longer, as prescribed by the administrator. The severity of this latter requirement is matched

by only 3 of the 51 State unemployment compensation laws.

I firmly believe that we should not pay benefits to individuals who are out of work because they have refused to accept suitable work without a good and justifiable reason. This is a genuine employment allowance, not a haven for the shiftless or the "goldbricker." At the same time, however, the penalty should be adapted to the problems at hand. Members of the committee will agree, after consideration, that the problems of determining what is suitable work for a veteran of Tarawa or the Italian campaign, possibly discharged with a slight physical disability, and what is good cause for refusing such work, might try the wisdom of a Solomon. Is work in the veteran's pre-war occupation suitable for him today, although he may have learned new skills while in military service? Many a former retail clerk will come out of the war a skilled machinist, radio or television mechanic, airplane pilot or truck driver; he may have picked up some practical engineering experience, or developed qualities of leadership which would fit him for administrative or executive responsibilities.

Would a messenger boy's job be suitable for an ex-messenger who comes out of the war a captain in a paratroop battalion (to cite an actual illustration)? Would he have good cause for refusing his former employer's offer of his old job back? A former architect or lawyer might have spent his military career as a stock clerk in an Army warehouse: Would a job as a stock clerk be suitable for him, and if so, would he have good cause for refusing it, even though no work at his former occupation might be available in his locality?

Many veterans may refuse to accept jobs for reasons which may not appear entirely reasonable to the administrative agency but yet these reasons may be compelling to the veterans as a result of military experience. Disqualification for a stated—4 weeks—period provides adequate protection against abuse. We should not add the further penalty in S. 1617, that benefit rights are suspended until the veteran obtains 2 weeks' work or more, with no limit on the Administrator's discretion. This may mean the complete denial of protection under the program to a veteran who refuses an offer of work in a period when jobs are hard to find.

I am satisfied that these added penalties were inadvertently transposed into this bill from a few of the State unemployment insurance laws, which are not typical of the main body of laws on the subject, and have no proper relation to a Federal plan of unemployment allowances for veterans. As I said earlier, representatives of the Legion were sympathetic toward my amendment once we had discussed the full implications of the penalty clauses.

DURATION OF BENEFITS

I understand that it has been suggested to the committee that the duration of unemployment benefits in the bill be changed from a uniform maximum duration of 52 weeks to a variable duration of from 12 to 52 weeks depending upon the length of time the serviceman has been in the armed forces. I hope the committee will not accept any such change in the bill.

I am of the firm conviction that every serviceman should be entitled to receive the same amount of benefits, for the same maximum period of time if he is unemployed. When a serviceman goes into the armed forces—whether for a day, or a week, or a month, or a year—he severs his ties with his family, his community, and his employer. If when he returns he cannot find a suitable job, in the light of both his past experience and his experience in the service, I think he should be entitled to unemployment compensation for at least 1 year if he is unemployed. It must be kept in mind that if he isn't unemployed he does not get the benefits. But if he is unemployed I think the serviceman and his family are entitled to adequate protection irrespective of the length of his military service. We know that the length of a person's service in the armed forces is in most cases a factor over which the individual has little or no control. For instance, in this war a man may serve a short period of time in some special or technical capacity in a particular campaign and become injured. Although his injury may be physically minor and he may recover very quickly it may alter his entire employment opportunities. In such a case he may remain unemployed for a considerable period of time and I think he should be entitled to the maximum duration of the benefits provided in the bill. He served his country to the best of his ability—that is the important fact—and he is unemployed because of his service.

ADMINISTRATION

I would like to make one more observation before concluding my remarks. In the preparation of the unemployment provisions of my bill I tried to frame every single detail so that the benefits could be paid quickly and simply—without delay. It was my intention that all the veteran would have to do would be to go into one of the 1,500 full-time local offices of the U. S. E. S., or one of the additional 2,000 part-time offices with his discharge certificate, and that the local office could determine the amount of his benefits right on the spot without the necessary papers having to go through any other intermediate State, regional, or Federal office. Only if this is done can the veteran get his benefits promptly and without red tape. I urge the committee to see that the administrative provisions of any bill which is reported out give the administrative agency complete authority to decentralize the administration at the local level and through the use of simplified procedures and forms without tying the hands of the Federal administrative agency to have to use some particular kind of machinery which may be cumbersome and time-consuming.

I wish to thank the committee for this opportunity to discuss these problems with you. I know that you will give consideration to all these various matters and if I can be of any further help to the committee I shall be glad to do so.

MEN AND DOLLARS—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States, before the Mid-Day Luncheon Club, at Springfield, Ill., on Saturday, February 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Until the end of time men will come here to pay tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln. He who speaks here should speak from the heart, and briefly.

Every schoolboy, every American, and all lovers of freedom everywhere know the Lincoln story. He was born poor, he united a nation torn asunder, and he freed men. Lincoln was a man of faith who looked beyond private sorrow and public woe. His name and his deeds will live forever.

Within a few months after Abraham Lincoln became President we were engaged in a terrible war which was not won until a few days before his tragic death. It was not an easy war to win. The opposing armies in the field were strong. Those who gave lip service to the United States but who found fault with everything Lincoln said and did were powerful. Influential newspapers continually and severely criticized him. At one time, and only a few months before he was renominated for President, he had only one supporter in Congress. This great man who spoke truly when he said, "I have never willingly planted a thorn in any man's bosom," was misrepresented and maligned by swarms of little men. Lincoln, nevertheless, bent his great energies to winning the war and planning for the peace. He was struck down while the people of the United States, North and South, were celebrating the return of peace.

We meet tonight in the midst of another great war. Ten million American fighting men are engaged in work as important as any which has ever been done on this earth. As soon as this war has been won the soldiers and the workers in war plants will be ready to make peacetime goods. There must be jobs for all willing workers. We have come out of the dark cellars of unemployment and doles, and we must never go back. The people have a right to ask, "Why can we not work and get enough to eat and wear in peace as we have in war?" The answer is, "We can and we must." With full employment the people of the United States can have the things they have always wanted—better homes, better schools, better household furnishings, and more time to spend with their children.

Those who are blinded by fear say that we must go back to the old days—the days of hunger and despair. We must not heed them. They are not of the stature to which Lincoln grew.

The future calls for faith and work—faith and intelligent planning. Peace, good will, jobs, health and family security are possible and obtainable, and should become the tools of man's march toward the fuller and richer life. If Lincoln were here today he would concern himself with striving for a better tomorrow.

Short-sighted, fearful people in Lincoln's day said that we could never recover from the wreckage of the Civil War. Lincoln himself looked ahead with hope and confidence. He planned for new frontiers—for the West that was to be. The American enterprise and the American Government of 1864 knew that the men who returned to civilian life needed work to do. The jobs that were provided by the building of the West saved us from chaos after the Civil War.

This experience of our grandfathers is a lamp for our feet.

Who does not wish to see swamps drained, harbors deepened, dams built, soil saved, inventions encouraged and new and better goods for use and comfort provided for men everywhere? The man who cannot see, the man who fears and waits is not of the stuff of which Lincoln was made. Rather he is like the Copperheads whom Lincoln fought—those who wanted peace at the price of a divided Nation. Those who seek a people's peace have the right to see through Lincoln's eyes, and our duty is continually to work with vigilance always against the national and international carpetbaggers who would starve and enslave the world.

Lincoln said, "Trust the common people." He believed in their common sense and in their ultimate unselfishness. Today, while democracy is menaced abroad and while American Fascists are trying to enslave us here, the words and deeds and inspiration of Lincoln give strength to those who battle in the people's cause.

So long as there is human need in the United States it is criminal for men to be idle, whether they be the idle poor or the idle rich. It is bad business and bad morals to allow believers in scarcity to hold down production while people need goods and men are out of

work. The people of America are our most precious possession. The poorest people of America are our most valuable, untapped market. Men are more important than dollars. Abraham Lincoln believed this. Shortly before he became President he said that he was both for the man and for the dollar, but in case of conflict he was for the man before the dollar. He believed and died believing that the rights of man were more precious than the rights of private property.

Those who fight for us in this war belong to many parties, many creeds, and many races. This is a people's war. The peace must be a people's peace. Lincoln would have it so. We will fight unceasingly against anyone who puts the dollar above the man. We will win the people's peace.

LATIN AMERICA—ARTICLE BY MARY HERSCHFELD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted immediately following my brief remarks at this point in the RECORD an article written by a staff writer of the Cleveland Plain Dealer under date of February 8, the title of the article being "Latin America."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA

The prospective revolution in Costa Rica which is hitting the front pages was in the making when I was there less than 3 weeks ago. The nation, noted for its democratic procedures, was approaching its Presidential election next week in a seething frame of mind. Tempers were boiling, police were preparing for trouble, and people talked of nothing else but the coming event.

The opposition charges that the party in office is trying to prolong its regime by putting its own candidate into power even though it is going through the motions of an election. The opposition charges that its man, one-time President, Don Leon Cortes, is not going to get a fair deal and it is determined not to put up with it.

"Costa Ricans know how to fight for their liberty," one of them said to me, and I heard echoes of that statement throughout the neighboring countries, for there is an underground movement in Central America as lively as you will find in occupied Europe.

Four of the Central American Presidents are in office because they have changed their nations' constitutions to lengthen their terms, and the opposition has been forced underground.

DEMAND CHANGE IN EL SALVADOR

The day before Christmas I sat in a darkened office and listened to two well-informed men talk about the situation in their country, El Salvador. An electric street sign threw a little light into the room. Next door someone played a phonograph record over and over. It was White Christmas.

"We are going to have a change here. We must have it; and if you aren't going to help us, we will go it alone. Our trouble is that we don't have a leader, but one will come, only he will need a thousand-year plan to straighten us out," the spokesman added sardonically.

Driving along a country road I listened to an American businessman who had lived in the country for years. He said:

"I am sure if President Roosevelt would consider for a moment what is going on here he would stop it. There ought to be an election here for the prestige of the Allies. In heaven's name, what is this war all about if it isn't for that?

"The United States appears to be operating under the sign of the double cross. We propagandize for democracy and foster dictatorship. We don't even ask these countries to stand by the commitments they have made. Why don't we say: You are a signatory to the Atlantic Charter. If you don't uphold your own constitution how can you uphold the Atlantic Charter?

"The good-neighbor policy is a principle that existed before the time of Jesus. I have no quarrel with it, but we must be realistic. This sort of thing has gone on long enough. My friends are as helpless as if they were in the middle of France."

CARRY ROOSEVELT'S PICTURE, JAILED

"Why, a number of persons were thrown into jail because they marched down the street carrying American flags and a picture of Roosevelt. That's why these people laugh at us. From Washington they keep getting free souvenirs about democracy, but they don't get a chance to practice it.

"We say that we don't want to mix internally in these countries. Well, what do you call sending lend-lease guns and bullets to the party that is in power unconstitutionally?

"Sure we are opposed to sending in marines, but there are other ways of handling the situation. For instance, we could indicate that we wouldn't buy any more coffee until the political picture was cleared up. That would be enough, for without our coffee purchases their economy would break down."

At a small town in Honduras I attended a dance. Long after midnight, one of my partners, speaking under the cover of the music, said:

"Not long ago I was in New York. I watched your mothers looking at the statue of the 'four freedoms' and drying their tears of pride and sorrow. I felt sorry for them, for I knew the folly of the whole thing. Why the 'four freedoms' is a myth. We have presidents in Central America who shoot their opponents, jail those who disagree with them and hold innocent relatives as hostages. Your good-neighbor policy has brought us the worst dictatorship we've ever had.

"I grew up in your country. You taught me freedom of speech, freedom from want and fear, and then you send me back to this. Sure, dictatorship in Latin America isn't your business, but you have made it yours with your lend-lease gifts. You are just dealing at the top.

"Don't ask us why we don't do something about conditions down here. You might just as well put that question to people under Hitler's heel.

"We know how precious freedom is. We've fought and died for it, even as you have, and we will do it again."

REFUSAL OF REPRINT AGREEMENT WITH THE READER'S DIGEST

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "New Yorker Refuses Stories to the Digest. Won't Renew Its Contract, Says Magazine No Longer Is a Reprint Periodical," published in the New York Herald Tribune of Saturday, February 12, 1944.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORKER REFUSES STORIES TO THE DIGEST—WON'T RENEW ITS CONTRACT, SAYS MAGAZINE NO LONGER IS A REPRINT PERIODICAL

The New Yorker magazine has refused to renew an agreement with the Reader's Digest permitting the reprinting of the New Yorker text or pictures because the New Yorker says, the Reader's Digest has ceased to be essentially a reprint magazine and is beginning to generate a considerable fraction of the contents of American magazines.

This gives us the creeps, as does any centralization of Genius (the capital "G" is the New Yorker's), the editors of the New Yorker explained in form letters sent out February 9 to its contributors.

Publication of the New Yorker letter brought to a head a situation that has been agitating the magazine publication field for a considerable period as the Reader's Digest circulation, earnings, and influence have been expanding at a rate unparalleled in American publishing history.

THE NEW YORKER LETTER

The text of the New Yorker letter follows:

"To Our Contributors:

"The New Yorker has not renewed its agreement with the Reader's Digest this year and has decided that no permission will be given the Digest to reprint our text or pictures. Since you, as a contributor, have a stake in this we presume you will want to know our reasons. They are roughly as follows:

"The Digest started out as a reprint magazine but grew into something quite different. Nowadays a large proportion of its contents is frankly original with the Digest, and not presented as reprint material; and, of the stuff that is presented as reprint material, much actually originates in the office of the Digest and then gets farmed out to some other magazine for first publication.

"THIS GIVES US THE CREEPS

"The effect of this (apart from spreading a lot of money around) is that the Digest is beginning to generate a considerable fraction of the contents of American magazines. This gives us the creeps, as does any centralization of Genius. The fact seems to be that some publications are already as good as subsidized by the Digest. Our feeling is that if the Digest wants to publish a magazine of original material, it should do so in a direct manner.

"We believe it should not operate through other publications to keep alive the reprint myth. We don't want to be in the position of receiving for consideration a manuscript that has already been bought and paid for by someone else, for we regard such a situation as unhealthy. We were willing to be digested, but we are not willing to be first supplied, then digested.

"The New Yorker, furthermore, has never been particularly impressed with the Digest's capsule theory of life and its assumption that any piece of writing can be improved by extracting every seventh word, like a tooth. We have occasionally been embarrassed to see our stuff after it has undergone alterations at Pleasantville. [Pleasantville, N. Y., where the Digest is published.]

"Mostly, however, we object to the Digest's indirect creative function, which is a threat to the free flow of ideas and to the independent spirit. We trust that you will see our point and approve.

"THE EDITORS."

DeWitt Wallace and his wife, Lila Acheson Wallace, cofounders and coowners of the Reader's Digest, could not be reached for comment last night.

Although the number and types of agreements made between the Digest and other magazines are closely guarded trade secrets, it is said that in general they involve an annual guarantee at a stated rate for reprint rights. These vary for different magazines.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as this is the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of the birth of Susan Brownell Anthony, a great pioneer, a great leader, and a revered fighter for the rights of women, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the Senate for not more than 10 minutes on that subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, within the past few days we have commemorated the birth and the life of Abraham Lincoln. In a few days we will commemorate the birth and life and influence of the Father of His Country, George Washington. Today, as I have stated, we commemorate the one hundred and twenty-fourth anniversary of the birth of Susan Brownell Anthony, a great pioneer, a great leader, and a revered fighter for the rights of women.

Perhaps there never was a time in world history when the established status of women was so seriously threatened as it has been in recent years in the lands of the dictators.

Susan B. Anthony once said of her work:

> I go in the strength of right, to make the right triumphant on the earth; I go in the name of the undone right to make it real; I go in the name of the forgotten justice to make it remembered in high places and in low; I go in the name of the silent and the silenced ones to give them voices.

Mr. President, that statement by a great leader stands today not only as a charter of rights for women; it is virtually a statement of what the United Nations fight for today.

This is not strange because, of course, the ideals which Susan Anthony sought to secure for women are also the ideals which the United Nations now seek to secure for all free people.

The rights of women and the treatment of women and the affection and respect which are accorded to women in any particular land are a peculiar index to the character of that land.

In the lands of the dictators, the sanctity of the home has been ruthlessly ravaged and the lessons of family love learned at a devoted mother's knee have been rudely displaced by a blind worship of the state and its leaders.

The chastity of women has been made a mockery and the noble function of propagation has been distorted to serve the grim purposes of the state.

The women of conquered lands have been herded into the slimy degradation of Nazi brothels.

All the love, all the respect, all the veneration which civilization had painstakingly builded into an altar for womankind has been ruthlessly razed by dictators who in their bloodlust know no respect for womankind or the ideals she represents.

Mr. President, the years in which we live are a grim proving ground for the rights not only of freedom but also for the hard-won rights of free women everywhere in the world.

In every great period of crisis in American history, women have made their contribution. They have made it in the strengthening of our moral vigor; they have made it in the vitality of our family life; they have made it in their perpetual call for right and for justice and decency.

We fight for that decency today—free men and free women everywhere.

In this war, as in the wars of our pioneer days, women are giving not merely of their moral courage and their spiritual strength, but also of their time and of the products of their hands and their minds.

Today women are in every phase of our war work, and each branch of our armed services has its component women's group.

Women work side by side with men in almost every great war industry in America. I say without hesitation that this war could not be won if it were not for the support of women in the United States and women elsewhere in the United Nations.

In my own State of Wisconsin, which has pioneered in legislation to safeguard the rights of women, women today are working in the fields so that there may be food, and women are working in the factories so that there may be weapons for our boys overseas.

It is unnecessary for me to say that the wealth of a nation and the strength of a nation lie not merely in its buildings or its ships or its guns, but that the last bulwark of our strength must be the strength of a united people—of men and women working together for a great cause.

Today we honor the memory of a great woman. We honor her memory not merely because she was a great woman in herself, but because of the principles of women's rights for which she stood.

Susan Anthony came from a distinguished pioneer family. Her two brothers, George T. Anthony and Col. Daniel R. Anthony, participated in the struggle which made Kansas a free State. George T. Anthony became Governor of the State, and Col. D. R. Anthony, through his newspaper, became a powerful civic force.

Susan Anthony was born on a farm near Adams, Mass., on February 15, 1820. She was of Quaker parentage and early in life was inculcated with the sound doctrines of right thinking, right living, diligence, thrift, and industry—all doctrines which I fervently hope will be reinstated in our national consciousness during this period of crisis.

Susan Anthony's father operated a mill at Battenville, N. Y., where he hoped to set up a model industrial community with good wages, good working conditions, good schools, and good employer-employee relationships.

This was undoubtedly a factor in Susan Anthony's later concern with securing the best possible working conditions for men and women.

After her school education, she became a teacher and determined to give her life to championing the cause of women's rights. For the remainder of her life until her death at the age of 87, she worked unremittingly and unsparingly for women's rights. Despite persecution, she pioneered for a half century for the emancipation of women. She crusaded for suffrage and, as everyone knows, her beliefs were written into the law of the land some half century later. She was more than a pioneer for the suffrage movement, however, because she fought for justice for both men and women and for all races.

She possessed an incredible courage and a rare determination. She persisted in her battle even when the fight seemed to be lost. She made an indelible mark on the history of our Nation and our people. She dedicated her life to service and she succeeded in shifting the thought of an entire Nation. She altered the fabric of our entire civilization. She played a heroic role in improving the status of women, politically, economically, and socially.

She did not begin the struggle for woman's equality, nor did she end it, but she lent it the vigor and fire of a great personality.

Mr. President, if we in this land have great fighting forces today, it is because we have great homes—great mothers, great wives, and great sweethearts behind the men of those forces.

Out of the homes of this land has emerged the sturdy character of the people of our land. Out of these homes have emerged the freedoms for which we fight today. Out of these homes have emerged the rights and freedoms for which women have fought.

In paying tribute to Susan B. Anthony we pay tribute to all womankind.

In these troubled days we can recall Susan B. Anthony's words: "Principle, not policy; justice, not favor." They might well be a yardstick which we could apply in writing the peace which must follow this war.

Nothing which we can say here today would ennoble or enrich the heritage which this woman has left to America and to the world. What does ennoble and enrich that heritage, however, is the fact that today free men and free women everywhere are fighting to safeguard all freedoms and all rights—and certainly to enshrine the freedoms and the rights which women have won.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with the first bill on the calendar, Calendar No. 12.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 40) to provide that the term of the Governor of Puerto Rico shall expire upon the enactment of this act and at the end of each 2-year period thereafter was announced as first in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 403) for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as a result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 675) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to amend the act of July 3, 1926, entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the Crow Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the joint resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 168) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 409) authorizing the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians or any band thereof to submit their claims against the United States to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 670) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of the Prairie Band or Tribe of Pottawatomie Indians of Kansas and Wisconsin against the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 445) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 23) authorizing the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES RESULTING FROM IMPROVEMENT OF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY

The bill (H. R. 205) conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREPARATION OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS FOR WARTIME SERVICE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 875) to provide for the preparation of high-school students for wartime service was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator defer for a moment his request that the bill be passed over?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The bill was reported to the Senate last May, and has been passed over since that time, on the assumption that the States would perform the services for which Federal appropriations would be authorized under the bill.

In the meantime the situation has grown very much more aggravated. The bill would appropriate some money from the Federal Treasury to enable public schools to prepare high-school students for military service. In the United States there are approximately 1,300,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 17 years who are certain to get into this war before we finish fighting with Japan. The bill would provide for the appropriation of funds in order to make them better soldiers, and to qualify them physically and mentally by giving them physical training and teaching them aeronautics, mathematics, and science.

The proposed legislation is necessary. I could continue with a recital of representations made by educational institutions throughout the entire United States about the importance of the proposed program.

I suggest to Senators that conditions have changed in the past 9 months. Why not pass this bill and send it to the House of Representatives, where there is a perfectly good Committee on Education to hold hearings on it? The facts can be developed there. I am sure it will be shown that there is greater need for the bill today than there was at the time when it was reported to the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the bill proposes that the Federal Government appropriate approximately $8,500,000 a year in order to provide the States with a number of additional school officials for the State boards of education. That is the principal purpose of the bill. It provides for—

> a State plan * * * for in-service training of high-school teachers to meet war needs in mathematics, science, preflight aeronautics, and physical fitness through intensive short-term institutes—

And so forth. Of course, practically every State has a normal school where teachers can learn all that if they desire to do so.

The bill also provides for a State director of a High School Victory Corps, to be paid for by the Federal Government; a supervisor of physical fitness, to be paid for by the Federal Government; a supervisor of aeronautics, mathematics, physics, and chemistry, to be paid for by the Federal Government; a supervisor of occupational information and war-service counseling; clerical and stenographic services for and necessary expenses for travel of such personnel.

The bill also provides for the payment of not to exceed $1.25 for physical examinations, which, of course, in most States, as in Ohio, are already made at the expense of the States.

This bill has been pending since May of last year. So far as I can see, the war has gone very well. We have got along so far without the bill. If conditions have changed since last May, when the bill was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, it seems to me that the bill ought to go back to the Committee on Education and Labor for determination as to what the changed conditions are. I do not see any reason for our passing the bill and sending it to the House to let the House determine the conditions. I therefore object to the present consideration of the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 26) authorizing the President to proclaim the Sunday before Memorial Day as a day for memorial services for deceased firemen was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the joint resolution. In the absence of the author of the joint resolution, I ask that it go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 249) providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1106) to prohibit the allowance of credit in computation of lumpsum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting equal rights to men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the joint resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1120) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the posthumous appointment to commissioned or noncommissioned grade of certain enlisted men and the posthumous promotion of certain commissioned officers and enlisted men" approved July 28, 1942, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1088) to amend the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the sale of cotton held by or on behalf of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of air-mail service was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Let the joint resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1046) to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 683) to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal was announced as next in order.

Mr. GILLETTE. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1257) authorizing wartime construction and operation and maintenance of reclamation projects was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, was Senate 1257, Calendar 375, passed over?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill was passed over.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, is the Senator from Virginia inquiring about Calendar 375, Senate bill 1257?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. As I understood, the Chair announced that that bill had been passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it was passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] the bill was passed over.

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY LABOR OR MANAGEMENT ORGANIZATIONS

The bill (S. 1272) to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, sec. 251), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 313. It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution in connection with any election to any political office, or for any corporation whatever, any labor organization, or any management organization to make a contribution in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for, or for any candidate, political committee, or other person to accept or receive any contribution prohibited by this section. Every corporation, labor organization, or management organization which makes any contribution in violation of this section shall be fined not more than 5,000; and every officer or director of any corporation, or officer of any labor organization or management organization, who consents to any contribution by the corporation, labor organization, or management organization, as the case may be, in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year or both. For the purposes of this section the term 'labor organization' shall have the same meaning as such term has when used in the National Labor Relations Act, and the term 'management organization' shall mean any business league, chamber of commerce, board of trade, employers' organization, trade association, manufacturers' association, or any other committee, association, organization, or group representing or designed to further the interests of any group of persons (as defined in section 302 of this act) engaged in the operation or management of one or more types of business enterprises."

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 54) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1943, General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the joint resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) to create the War Shipping Field Service was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the joint resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 865) suspending for the duration of the war the limitations upon the compensation of certain retired personnel employed by the Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that bill probably should go over. I do not see its author present.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 7) making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other elections for national offices was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERTON. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 195) requesting an investigation concerning Government property and materials no longer needed for war purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Let the resolution go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

MRS. MARGARET M. ROSS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1323) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross, of Tacoma, Wash., for damages arising out of the patenting to another person of lands in Pacific County, Wash., which had been selected or entered by said Mrs. Margaret M. Ross, under the homestead laws, and for damages arising out of the subsequent cutting of timber from such lands.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which said court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SCENIC PARKWAY—GREAT SMOKY MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 1388) to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from

the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3428) to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska" was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, I do not know what Senator objected to consideration of Calendar No. 559, House bill 3428, providing for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, but I hope the Senator who made the objection will remain in the Chamber. When we shall have completed the call of the calendar I will ask for consideration of the bill, and will make an explanation of its provisions. I believe that when they are fully understood no objection will be made.

COMPENSATION FOR SUGGESTIONS BY PERSONNEL OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The bill (S. 1232) to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the bill provides for payment of awards to employees in the Department of the Interior for making useful suggestions or inventions of which the Government receives the benefit. The same identical measure now applies to the Army and Navy. It is in the interest of obtaining advice, suggestions, and help from the employees.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. From what source or fund would such payments be made?

Mr. HATCH. They would be made from Government funds. There is a limitation in the bill as to the amount.

Mr. GILLETTE. Would payments be made from the funds appropriated for the particular department for its budgetary requirements?

Mr. HATCH. There would have to be an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. GILLETTE. A special appropriation?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

COMPENSATION OF REGISTERS OF DISTRICT LAND OFFICES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 866) to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, after line 6, to insert "*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the basic annual compensation of any register below the amount paid to such officer, exclusive of overtime pay, during the fiscal year immediately preceding the enactment of this act," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That commencing 60 days after the approval of this act the positions of registers of the district land offices shall become subject to the Classification Act of 1923 (42 Stat. 1488; 5 U. S. C., sec. 661, and the following), as amended: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall operate to reduce the basic annual compensation of any register below the amount paid to such officer, exclusive of overtime pay, during the fiscal year immediately preceding the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Any moneys heretofore appropriated for the salaries and commissions of registers shall be available for the payment of the compensation of the registers under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts as may be necessary for that purpose.

SEC. 3. No provision of this act shall relieve any public-land applicant or claimant from the necessity of making payment of fees, commissions, or other moneys required by law or regulation. Commencing 60 days after the approval of this act, the registers shall not receive any compensation based on fees, commissions, or other receipts and all amounts collected by them shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States.

SEC. 4. Sections 2237 and 2240 of the Revised Statutes and the act of May 21, 1928 (45 Stat. 684; 43 U. S. C., sec. 80), as amended, are hereby repealed, and all other provisions of law inconsistent with this act are repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

SEC. 5. The provisions of this act shall not extend to the Territory of Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MINING OF COAL, PHOSPHATES, OIL, ETC., ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1335) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202), are hereby amended to read as follows: "*And provided further*, That no company or corporation operating a common-carrier railroad shall be given or hold a permit or lease under the provisions of this act for any coal deposits except for its own use for railroad purposes; and such limitations of use shall be expressed in all permits and leases issued to such companies or corporations; and no such company or corporation shall receive or hold under permit or lease more than 10,240 acres in the aggregate nor more than one permit or lease for each 200 miles of its railroad lines served or to be served from such coal deposits exclusive of spurs or switches and exclusive of branch lines built to connect the leased coal with the railroad, and also exclusive of parts of the railroad operated mainly by power produced otherwise than by steam: *And provided further*, That nothing in this section shall preclude such a railroad of less than 200 miles in length from securing one permit or lease thereunder, but no railroad shall hold a permit or lease for lands in any State in which it does not operate main or branch lines."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain,' approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202)."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1418) to provide for the adjustment of maximum prices on milk, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

CHARLES A. STRAKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1326) for the relief of Charles A. Straka, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, in line 4, after the words "accounts of", to insert "the late", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the accounts of the late Charles A. Straka, former postmaster at Milledgeville, Ill., with the sum of $1,149.35, representing the total of the amounts claimed by him in his quarterly reports as compensation for the period May 1, 1940, to December 5, 1940, but disallowed by the General Accounting Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka."

FRANK KNOWLES

The bill (S. 1399) for the relief of Frank Knowles was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank Knowles, of Montgomery, Ala., the sum of $110, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of three typewriters owned by him which were destroyed by fire while on loan to the Work Projects Administration, at Opelika, Ala., on November 21, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

THOMAS LEWIS

The bill (H. R. 3189) for the relief of Thomas Lewis was considered, ordered

to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. RENZIE GRAHAM

The bill (H. R. 550) for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARY VULLO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 616) for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,177.50," and insert "$2,000"; and in line 8 after the word "sustained", to strike out "on August 8, 1941" and insert "by her and for medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000 to Mrs. Mary Vullo, of Independence, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her and for medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 51, near Hammond, La., on August 8, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARENCE A. GIDDENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1433) for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to insert "$4,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence A. Giddens, of Orlando, Fla., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States (1) for compensation for the death of his daughter, Betty Lou Giddens, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by her when an Army airplane crashed into the apartment of the said Clarence A. Giddens on June 5, 1943; (2) for compensation for personal injuries sustained by his daughter, Carol March Giddens, as a result of such accident; (3) for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and funeral expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries and death; and (4) for compensation for loss and damage to his personal property as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER EUGENE HAYES

The bill (S. 1484) for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walter Eugene Hayes, the sum of $4,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the Government for damages sustained by the said Walter Eugene Hayes on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when a truck owned and operated by him was struck by a United States Army airplane attempting to make an emergency landing on United States Highway No. 101, near Arroyo Grande, Calif., on May 6, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

TAYLOR W. TONGE

The bill (S. 1112) for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Taylor W. Tonge, of Bremerton, Wash., the sum of $499.50, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for loss of wages and for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of personal injuries sustained by him and his minor children, Danny Tonge and Larry Tonge, when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck on June 11, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH-CABLE CO.

The bill (H. R. 2340) for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ARTHUR J. MARTIN, JR.

The bill (H. R. 3076) for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAN CROTTS

The bill (H. R. 1311) for the relief of Dan Crotts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCESCO P. MASTRILLI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 480) for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration, with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "shall", to insert "upon being charged to the Italian quota."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HENRY ANGELL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2131) for the relief of Henry Angell, which had been reported from the Committee on Immigration, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "shall", to insert "upon being charged to the quota of the country in which he was born."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PEDRO JOSE ARRECOECHEA

The bill (S. 556) for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the case of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea, of Shoshone, Idaho, legally admitted as a seaman but who has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of $10 and head tax of $8. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

GEORGE M. LOUIE

The bill (H. R. 850) for the relief of George M. Louie was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REV. JULIUS PAAL

The bill (H. R. 1467) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEDAL OF HONOR TO WILLIAM MITCHELL

The bill (S. 429) authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for

a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to award posthumously, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to the late William Lendrum Mitchell, formerly a colonel, United States Army, in recognition of his outstanding pioneer service and foresight in the field of American military aviation. The President may present such Medal of Honor to Mrs. Martin Fladoes, of Milwaukee, Wis., sister of the said William Lendrum Mitchell.

SANITARY CODE FOR RESTAURANTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1340) to establish a sanitary code governing the operation of restaurants in the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the following definitions shall apply in the interpretation and enforcement of this act:

(a) Restaurant: The term "restaurant" shall mean restaurant, coffee shop, cafeteria, short-order cafe, luncheonette, tavern, sandwich stand, soda fountain, and any other eating or drinking establishments, within the District of Columbia, excepting itinerant restaurants, Government restaurants, and railroad dining cars, and shall also include kitchens or other places within the District of Columbia in which food or drink is prepared for sale on other premises: *Provided*, That this definition shall not be interpreted to include boarding houses and private homes.

(b) Itinerant restaurant: The term "itinerant restaurant" shall mean an eating or drinking establishment operating for a temporary period in connection with a fair, carnival, circus, public exhibition, or other similar gathering.

(c) Government restaurant: The term "Government restaurant" shall mean any restaurant, coffee shop, cafeteria, short-order cafe, luncheonette, soda fountain, or other eating or drinking establishment operated within the District of Columbia, not primarily for purposes of private gain, on premises owned or held under lease by the Government of the United States or any Federal department or agency.

(d) Health Officer: The term "Health Officer" shall mean the Health Officer of the District of Columbia or his authorized representative.

(e) Person: The term "person" shall mean person, copartnership, firm, corporation, or association.

SEC. 2. From and after 3 months from the date on which this act takes effect, it shall be unlawful for any person to operate a restaurant or itinerant restaurant within the District of Columbia who does not possess an unsuspended or an unrevoked permit from the Health Officer. Such permit shall be posted in a conspicuous place. Only a person in full compliance with the requirements of this act and all rules and regulations promulgated hereunder shall be entitled to receive and retain such a permit.

Permits as provided in this section may be temporarily suspended by the Health Officer, in his discretion, upon violation by the holder of any of the provisions of this act or the rules and regulations duly promulgated hereunder. A permit may be revoked by the Health Officer, in his discretion, for serious or repeated violation, after the holder thereof has been given an opportunity to answer and be heard upon the charges against him.

In case of suspension or revocation of a permit as provided in this section, the holder thereof shall have the right to a hearing before the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, following which the Board of Commissioners may order that the suspension be lifted, or that the revoked license be reinstated, with or without regard to the provisions of section 8 of this act.

Issuance or possession of a permit, pursuant to this section, shall not affect any requirement prescribed by law with regard to the licensing of restaurants.

SEC. 3. Every restaurant shall display at all times in a prominent place, to be approved by the Health Officer, a notice approved by the Health Officer, stating the grade of the establishment. Similar notice shall be written or printed prominently on all restaurant menus or price lists.

SEC. 4. Samples of food, drink, and other substances from any restaurant may be taken and examined by the Health Officer as often as he may deem necessary. The Health Officer may condemn and forbid the sale of, or cause to be removed or destroyed, any restaurant food or drink which he finds to be unwholesome.

SEC. 5. Every restaurant shall be inspected by the Health Officer at least once every 6 months. In case the Health Officer discovers, upon inspection, the violation of any item of sanitation required for the grade then held, he shall make a follow-up inspection after the lapse of such time as he deems a reasonable period within which to remedy the defect; and such follow-up inspection shall be determining as to compliance with the grade requirements prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under section 6 of this act. Any violation of the same item of sanitation on both an original inspection and the successive follow-up inspection shall call for immediate degrading or suspension of permit: *Provided*, That the permit of a restaurant shall not be suspended, under this section, for violation of an item of sanitation not required for restaurants of lower grade.

One copy of each inspection report shall be posted by the Health Officer upon an inside wall of the restaurant, and said inspection report shall not be defaced or removed by any person except the Health Officer. Another copy of each inspection report shall be filed with the Health Department.

Any person operating a restaurant shall upon request of the Health Officer permit access by the Health Officer to all parts of the establishment and shall permit copying any or all records of food purchased.

SEC. 6. The grading of all restaurants shall be based upon such standards as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall by ordinance prescribe. Standards for the grading of restaurants shall be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia within 1 month after the date of approval of this act, and may thereafter be amended by such Commissioners at their discretion. A copy of the regulations prescribed under this section, and of any amendments thereto, shall be mailed by the Commissioners to each licensed restaurant operator in the District of Columbia, within 10 days after promulgation; but failure to receive a copy of such regulations or amendments thereto shall not excuse violation of any provision of this act or of the regulations prescribed hereunder.

SEC. 7. From and after the date on which this act takes effect, no restaurant shall be operated unless it conforms with the minimum standards prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia pursuant to section 6 of this act: *Provided*, That when any restaurant fails to conform to such minimum standards the Health Officer is authorized in his discretion either to suspend the permit of such restaurant or in lieu thereof to degrade the restaurant and permit its operation during a temporary period not exceeding 6 months.

SEC. 8. Any restaurant the grade of which has been lowered and all grade displays changed accordingly, or the permit of which has been suspended, may at any time thereafter make application for regrading or reinstatement of its permit.

Within 1 week after the receipt of such an application, accompanied by a statement signed by the applicant to the effect that the previously violated provision or provisions of this act have been and are being conformed with, the Health Officer shall make a reinspection, and thereafter as many additional reinspections as he may deem necessary to assure himself whether the applicant is again complying with the applicable grade requirements, and, in case the findings indicate compliance, shall award the higher grade or reinstate the permit.

SEC. 9. Itinerant restaurants shall be constructed and operated in a manner approved by the Health Officer, and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Regulations governing itinerant restaurants shall be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia within 1 month after the date of approval of this act, and may thereafter be amended by such Commissioners at their discretion.

Upon failure of any person maintaining or operating an itinerant restaurant, after warning, to comply with any requirements of this section or the regulations prescribed hereunder, it shall be the duty of the Health Officer summarily to forbid the further sale or serving of food or drink therein. Any person continuing to sell or serve food or drink in such a restaurant, after being so forbidden, shall be subject to the maximum penalty provided for violation of this act.

SEC. 10. From and after the date on which this act takes effect, no Government restaurant shall be operated unless it conforms with the minimum standards prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia pursuant to section 6 of this act. It shall be the duty of the United States Public Health Service to make appropriate inspections to assure compliance with this section, and to report violation of this act by Government restaurants to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia. Prosecutions for violations of this act by Government restaurants shall be on information filed by the United States attorney for the District of Columbia or his assistants in the criminal branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 11. Penalties: Any person who violates any provision of this act or of any ordinance or regulation promulgated hereunder shall upon conviction be punished by a fine of not more than $500, or imprisonment for not more than 90 days, or both. Each and every violation of any such provision shall constitute a separate offense.

SEC. 12. This act shall be effective 3 months after the date of its approval, except as otherwise herein provided.

SEC. 13. This act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Restaurant Grading Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the grading of restaurants in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN MATERIALS ON PUBLIC LANDS UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2697) to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of

the Secretary of the Interior, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, on page 1, line 4, after the words "dispose of", to strike out "materials or resources, including"; in line 8, after the word "materials", to strike out "or resources"; and on page 2, line 1, after "materials", to strike out "or resources."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, line 12, before the word "under" to strike out "or resources."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 2, line 15, after "materials", to strike out "or resources"; in line 21, after "materials" where it appears each time, to strike out "or resources"; in line 23, after "by", to strike out "valid"; on page 3, line 3, after "materials", to strike out "or resources", and in the same line after "by" to strike out "valid."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the report filed by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys explains the bill as well as it can be explained. The report states:

With limited exceptions, sand, gravel, earth, common rock, timber, and other natural materials and resources on the public domain have not been made subject to disposal by law. Although these products are relatively less valuable than mineral deposits now subject to disposal under the mining and mineral leasing laws, the demand for them is increasing and many of them are needed in connection with the prosecution of the war. The purpose of this bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of such materials and resources where such disposal is not detrimental to the public interest. These materials and resources would be disposed of for an adequate price after public notice, to be given in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary. The committee has been assured by representatives of the Department that the ample public notice to be given will be by publication and will conform to the general practice of the Department.

This bill has also been approved by the Director of the Budget.

The bill was recommended by the Department of the Interior in a letter addressed to the House of Representatives, and was passed by the House.

There have been many cases in which contracts were let when the only available source of gravel and material of that kind was on public lands. Under existing law the Secretary had no right whatever to make any disposal of those deposits. The purpose of the bill is to reach conditions of that kind.

Mr. TAFT. I was wondering at the rather extensive power provided in the bill to dispose of timber on national lands. I understand about materials lying loose, but this bill would seem to give authority to the Secretary of the Interior at his discretion to dispose of timber, which, I presume, means the cutting of timber.

Mr. HATCH. The bill would give to the Department of the Interior authority to dispose of timber. The bill originally went further than that by including other resources. We struck out "or resources" because we wanted the language limited to those matters which might be necessary for the war effort. The bill is limited to the duration of the war.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not consider that the language of the bill includes oil; does he?

Mr. HATCH. No. We were afraid of minerals of that type being included by the use of the words "or resources," and we eliminated those words from the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ANNUAL SALARY BASIS FOR FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis, and fix their rate of pay, and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

The first amendment was on page 2, after line 3, to strike out:

Less than $50	$72
$50 but less than $100	144
$100 but less than $150	216
$150 but less than $200	288
$200 but less than $250	360
$250 but less than $300	432
$300 but less than $350	492
$350 but less than $400	532
$400 but less than $450	572
$450 but less than $500	608
$500 but less than $600	684
$600 but less than $700	760
$700 but less than $800	836
$800 but less than $900	904
$900 but less than $1,000	972
$1,000 but less than $1,100	1,040
$1,100 but less than $1,500	1,100

And insert:

Less than $50	$60
$50 but less than $100	132
$100 but less than $150	204
$150 but less than $200	276
$200 but less than $250	348
$250 but less than $300	420
$300 but less than $350	468
$350 but less than $400	508
$400 but less than $450	548
$450 but less than $500	584
$500 but less than $600	660
$600 but less than $700	724
$700 but less than $800	800
$800 but less than $900	868
$900 but less than $1,000	926
$1,000 but less than $1,100	1,004
$1,100 but less than $1,500	1,100

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 3, after "July 1" to strike out "1943" and insert "1944".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INCREASED COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, on page 2, line 15, after "for" to insert "not exceeding 3 years of".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 3, at the beginning of line 6 to insert "3 years of"; and in the same line after "service" to insert "immediately prior to the approval of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The bill (S. 1546) to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the incorporation of Providence Hospital, of Washington, D. C., under an act of Congress approved April 8, 1864, be, and the same hereby is, approved and continued in force except as herein specifically altered:

The corporate name of the said corporation shall be "Providence Hospital" instead of "The Directors of Providence Hospital."

SEC. 2. The corporation is authorized to conduct not only a hospital, clinic, and all the departments, staffs, and services usually connected therewith, but also a school for the education and training of nurses and interns with full power to examine the said nurses and interns and to issue suitable certificates evidencing the completion of their courses of training.

SEC. 3. The provision contained in the act incorporating Providence Hospital approved April 8, 1864, limiting the value of the real estate which may be held by the corporation is hereby repealed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO CHANGE NAME OF CONDUIT ROAD IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1554) to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say a brief word in explanation of the bill.

The road, which begins in the District of Columbia and extends into Maryland, is owned exclusively by the Federal Government. It was originally called Conduit Road because it was built over a conduit. A number of citizens living alongside the road asked that it be called MacArthur Boulevard, and as a

result of such request an act of Congress was passed to name the road "MacArthur Boulevard" for its entire length in the District of Columbia. The name of the road applied only as far as the District limits because it was assumed that the State of Maryland owned the road outside the District.

The State roads commission has written a letter to me stating that it has nothing to do with the road, that the State does not own it in any respect whatever, and does not keep it in repair. Therefore, inasmuch as a part of the road is already named "MacArthur Boulevard," the citizens of Maryland have asked that all that part of the road belonging to the District of Columbia and extending into the State of Maryland be given the name "MacArthur Boulevard" for identification and for other purposes. That is all there is to the bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I withdraw my request that the bill be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the highway now known as Conduit Road extending from Foxhall Road in the District of Columbia to Great Falls in the State of Maryland shall hereafter be designated MacArthur Boulevard in honor of the gallant defense of the Philippines by Gen. Douglas MacArthur."

TAX SALES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 2199) to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDIANS OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA

The bill (S. 1579) to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933 (47 Stat. 777), is amended by adding at the end thereof new sections 9, 10, and 11, as follows:

"SEC. 9. That the following words in section 8 of this act: 'any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir' shall not be construed to include any interest in land which was not restricted in the person from whom such full-blood Indian heir inherited the same.

"SEC. 10. In the case of any interest in land acquired by purchase with restricted funds after the date of enactment of this section, such interest shall not be deemed a restricted interest unless the deed conveying such interest shows upon its face that such purchase was made with restricted funds.

"SEC. 11. No conveyance, subsequent to January 27, 1933, and prior to the date of enactment of this act, of any interest in land of any full-blood Indian heir, which was not restricted in the person from whom such full-blood Indian heir inherited the same, shall be invalid because such conveyance was not presented for approval in open court as provided in section 8 of this act."

FERTILIZERS, FEEDS, NURSERY STOCK, OR SEEDS DISTRIBUTED BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1421) making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "laws" and the colon, to insert *"Provided,* That all costs of any such inspection shall be added to the costs of such distribution by such officers, employees, or agents by whom distribution is made, and any amounts so collected as costs of inspection shall be paid by such officers, employees, and agents to the proper authority of such State: *And provided further"*; and on the same page, line 14, after the word "any" to strike out "valid", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That when the Department of Agriculture or any other agency of the United States Government shall distribute seeds, livestock and poultry feed, nursery stock, fertilizer, or soil-conditioning or fertilizer material to farmers, it shall be the duty of the officers or employees or agents distributing same to comply with and be subject to the inspection laws of the State within which such seeds, livestock and poultry feed, nursery stock, fertilizer, or soil-conditioning or fertilizer material is distributed with reference to any such seeds, livestock and poultry feed, nursery stock, fertilizer, or soil-conditioning or fertilizer material, and such officers, employees, or agents are hereby authorized and directed to comply with such inspection laws: *Provided*, That all costs of any such inspection shall be added to the costs of such distribution by such officers, employees, or agents by whom distribution is made, and any amounts so collected as costs of inspection shall be paid by such officers, employees, and agents to the proper authority of such State: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to fertilizer manufactured and distributed by the Tennessee Valley Authority under and by virtue of any law of the United States which may be passed authorizing any such manufacture and distribution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELENE MURPHY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1102) for the relief of Helene Murphy, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$1,103.47" and insert "$133.25"; on the same page, in line 7, after the words "compensation for" to strike out "time spent by her and"; and on page 2, line 1, after the word "and" to strike out "March 15, 1932" and insert "June 30, 1930", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Helene Murphy, of Sioux City, Iowa, the sum of $133.25, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for carfare paid by her in traveling between stations in the course of her employment as an employee of the United States post office at Sioux City, Iowa, during the period between July 1, 1923, and June 30, 1930: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RETURN TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN VESSELS

The bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. RADCLIFFE subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day, when the measures on the Calendar were being considered, objection was made to the consideration of Calendar No. 616, House bill 3261. Since that time I have been in numerous discussions with the Senator who raised objection to the consideration of the bill, and he has withdrawn his objection to its consideration.

Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up for consideration and action Calendar No. 616, House bill 3261.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3261) to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have the Senator from Maryland make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I shall gladly do so. Mr. President, the necessities of the war not only have required that the Government build ships, but also secure, from private owners, many types of vessels—for instance, yachts, barges, and other types. These have been obtained by charter, purchase, and requisition of either title or use, to the number of approximately 2,500. Of course, it has always been desired that at the earliest possible moment those boats be returned to their owners. Recently Congress enacted legislation providing for the return of fishing vessels under certain conditions.

Mr. WHITE. The bill applies only to vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less; does it?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The description in the calendar is somewhat misleading. The bill applies to vessels of any size on the Great Lakes. There are only 14 of those so secured. Then it applies also to all boats of 1,000 gross tons or less wherever they were located.

Mr. WHITE. There are only 14 vessels on the Great Lakes to which the bill applies; is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes; in its first provision the bill applies to only 14 vessels on the Great Lakes irrespective of their size.

Mr. WHITE. And the other vessels, aside from those on the Great Lakes, are of 1,000 gross tons or less; is that correct?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Yes. The bill would also permit vessels of 1,000 gross tons or less, wherever they were obtained, to be returned to their owners. Whenever in each case the department using the vessel believes it can dispense with it, or its ownership at least.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. As I stated the bill would permit vessels on the Great Lakes, whether over or under 1,000 gross tons, to be returned to their owners.

Mr. WHITE. How many such vessels are there?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Fourteen. Nine of them were transferred for use along the Atlantic coast line for the carrying of coal. These have subsequently been brought back to the Great Lakes, and it is now desired that they be returned to private ownership as soon as possible and before the ice breaks up on the Great Lakes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Maryland has talked to the Senator who objected to the consideration of the bill during the call of the calendar.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I have; I have talked at very considerable length to the Senator from Vermont, who objected to consideration of the bill during the call of the calendar. He has withdrawn entirely his objections to its passage.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have no objection.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The bill gives authorization for the return of the vessels and creates certain machinery for carrying out such a purpose. The former owner would be given the first opportunity to purchase, using as a basis for his price what he had received or was to receive, modified by allowances for wear and tear, use or rental, and costs of reconditioning. If no agreement is reached with the former owner the Government can dispose of the vessels by getting sealed bids which are satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 3, in line 2, after the figure "(2)" and the word "to", to strike out "compensate", and insert "pay just compensation to"; in line 5, after the word "prescribe", to insert a colon and the words *"Provided,* That the amount of just compensation may be agreed upon between the parties and upon failure to agree shall be arbitrated; in such arbitration one arbitrator to be appointed by the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, one by owner, and if these two arbitrators cannot agree within a reasonable time they shall select a third arbitrator and the decision of the majority of these three arbitrators shall be final.", and in line 12 to strike out: "The determination of such allowances by the Administrator shall be final notwithstanding any other provision of law."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CASH AWARDS TO PERSONNEL OF MARITIME COMMISSION AND WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments on page 1, line 5, after the word "employees", to insert "including officers and members of crews employed on United States or foreign-flag vessels as employees of the United States and the War Shipping Administration," and on page 2, after line 12, to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That any such cash awards shall be ascertained and reported to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives for approval or disapproval or modification prior to payment," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to pay cash awards for suggestions submitted to it by any of its officers or employees, including officers and members of crews employed on United States or foreign-flag vessels as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration, in cases where the suggestion, in the opinion of the Commission or of a committee designated by it, would, if adopted, make for substantially increased efficiency, economy, or general improvement in carrying out the duties, powers, or functions of the Commission. Such suggestions shall be submitted and such awards shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, including provision for transfer to the United States of all rights or interests of the officer or employee in the suggestion. The provisions of this section shall apply in like manner to the War Shipping Administration and its officers and employees, and for the purpose of this sentence the terms "United States Maritime Commission" and "Commission" shall be deemed to refer to the War Shipping Administration: *Provided,* That any such cash awards shall be ascertained and reported to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives for approval or disapproval or modification prior to payment.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE RATES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1029) to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments in section 1, page 2, after line 4, to insert "(54 Stat. 1064; D. C. Code, 1940 edition, title 35, sec. 1903)"; in section 3 on page 3, line 21, after "Stat." to strike out "1063" and insert "1082; D. C. Code, 1940 edition, title 35, secs. 1348 and 1349"; and in section 9, page 6, line 18, after "Stat.", to strike out "1063" and insert "1066 and 1079; D. C. Code, 1940 edition, title 35, secs. 1306 and 1340", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in this act, unless the context otherwise requires—

"District" means the District of Columbia;

"Superintendent" means the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia;

"Company" means any insurer, whether stock, mutual, reciprocal, interinsurer, Lloyd's, or any other form or group of insurers;

"Agent" means and shall include any individual, copartnership, or corporation acting in the capacity of or licensed as a "policy-writing agent", "soliciting agent", or "salaried company employee", as defined under section 3, chapter I, of the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1064; D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 35, sec. 1303); and

"Broker" means any person who for a consideration acts or aids in any manner in the solicitation or negotiation on behalf of the assured of contracts of insurance.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall apply to insurance in the District of Columbia against loss of or damage to property or any valuable interest therein by or as a consequence of fire, lightning, tornado, and windstorm, or any one or more of such hazards, including all supplemental, additional, or extended forms of coverage written in connection with fire insurance, and including any policy which insures property, while it is at a permanent location, against the hazard of fire, lightning, tornado, or windstorm; but this act shall not apply to ocean marine, transportation, or motor vehicle insurance, nor to insurance covering the property of interstate common carriers, nor to any form of insurance designated by the Superintendent as inland marine insurance.

SEC. 3. The Superintendent is empowered to investigate the necessity for an adjustment of the rates on any or all insurance risks within the scope of this act, and to order an adjustment of such rates whenever he determines, after investigation, that the profit derived therefrom for a period of time not less than 5 years immediately preceding such investigation is excessive, inadequate, unjust, or unreasonable. In determining the necessity for an adjustment of rates, the Superintendent shall give consideration to the conflagration hazard, both within and without the District. The Superintendent is also empowered, after investigation, to order removed, at such time and in such manner as he shall specify, any discrimination existing between individual risks or classes of risks.

Any person, firm, or corporation aggrieved by any order, ruling, proceeding, or action of

the Superintendent, or any person acting in his behalf and at his instance, may appeal to the Commissioners of the District, or contest the validity of such order, ruling, proceeding, or action in any court of competent jurisdiction by appeal or through any other appropriate proceedings, as provided under sections 44 and 45, chapter II, Public, No. 824, Seventy-sixth Congress, known as the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1082; D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 35, secs. 1348 and 1349).

SEC. 4. Within 120 days after the approval of this act and under the supervision of the Superintendent, the insurance companies authorized to effect insurance in the District against the risk of loss or damage by hazards within the scope of this act shall organize a rating bureau for the purpose of administering rates for such insurance, and all such companies now or hereafter authorized to transact such business in the District shall be members of such bureau. The government of the rating bureau shall be vested in its members and it shall not be subject to the direction or control of any other bureau, association, corporation, company, individual, or group of individuals. The rating bureau shall have power to establish reasonable agreements and bylaws for its governance, and shall be permitted to adopt reasonable rules and regulations necessary to carry out its functions, but such agreements, bylaws, rules, and regulations shall not be inconsistent with the provisions of this act, and the same and amendments thereto shall be approved by the Superintendent before becoming effective. The rating bureau, subject to the approval of the Superintendent, shall apportion the expenses of its operation among its members in proportion to the premium income on risks in the District.

SEC. 5. No company, agent, or broker shall issue or deliver, or offer to issue or deliver, or knowingly permit the issuance or delivery of, any policy of insurance in the District which does not conform to the requirements approved by the Superintendent: *Provided, however*, That a company may deviate from such requirements if the company has filed with the rating bureau and with the Superintendent the deviation to be applied, and provided such deviation is approved by the Superintendent. If approved, the deviation shall remain in force for a period of 1 year from the date of approval by the Superintendent, unless such approval is withdrawn by the Superintendent for cause after notice to the insurer, or withdrawn by the insurer with the approval of the Superintendent.

It is further provided that a rate in excess of that promulgated by the rating bureau may be charged, provided such higher rate is charged with the knowledge and written consent of the insured and the Superintendent.

SEC. 6. The rating bureau shall keep a record of all rates, schedules, and proceedings. Every agent shall keep a record of every policy contract issued by or through his agency.

SEC. 7. The Superintendent, his deputy, or duly authorized examiner, is authorized and empowered to examine all records of the rating bureau, companies, and agents, and to require every company to furnish promptly accurate written information from such records as will disclose their loss or profit from any class of risk in the District.

SEC. 8. No rate, premium, schedule, rating method, rule, bylaw, agreement, or regulation shall become effective or be charged, applied, or enforced in the District by the rating bureau, or by any company, agent, or broker governed by the provisions of this act, until it shall have been first filed with and approved by the Superintendent: *Provided*, That a rate or premium used or charged in accordance with a schedule, rating method, or rule previously approved by the Superintendent need not be specifically approved by the Superintendent. No company, agent, or broker shall issue any form of policy, clause, warranty, rider, or endorsement until such form shall have been filed with and approved by the Superintendent.

SEC. 9. Any company or any agent or broker guilty of violating any of the provisions of this act shall be subject to the provisions of sections 3 and 36, respectively, and as may be amended, of chapter II, Public, No. 824, Seventy-sixth Congress, known as the Fire and Casualty Act, approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1066 and 1079, D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 35, secs. 1306 and 1340).

SEC. 10. All laws or parts of laws, insofar as they relate to business affected hereby and in conflict with any of the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 11. Should any section or provision of this act be decided by the courts to be unconstitutional or invalid, the validity of the act as a whole, or of any part thereof, other than the part decided to be unconstitutional, shall not be affected.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF FIRE AND CASUALTY ACT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1028) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments in section 1, page 1, line 5, after the word "Congress", to strike out "54 Stat. 1063" and insert "54 Stat. 1066"; on page 2, line 6, after the word "company", to strike out "only by check or money order drawn to the order of" and insert "through the Office of the Superintendent to the"; in section 2, page 2, line 9, after the word "Act", to insert "54 Stat. 1079"; in line 21, after the word "person", to strike out "only by check or money order drawn to the order of", and insert "through the Office of the Superintendent to the"; in section 4, page 3, line 11, after the word "Act", to insert "54 Stat. 1080"; and in line 17, after the word "authorized" to strike out "company," and insert "company", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3, chapter II, of the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia (Public, No. 824, 76th Cong.; 54 Stat. 1066; title 35, sec. 1306, D. C. Code, 1940), be amended by deleting the period at the end of said section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and by adding thereto the following: "*Provided further*, That, in lieu of revoking or suspending the certificate of authority of any company for causes enumerated in this section after hearing as herein provided, the Superintendent may subject such company to a penalty of not more than $200 when in his judgment he finds that public interest would be best served by the continued operation of the company. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by the company through the office of the Superintendent to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia."

SEC. 2. That section 36, chapter II, of such act (54 Stat. 1079, title 35, sec. 1340, D. C. Code, 1940), be amended by deleting the period at the end of the said section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon, and by adding thereto the following: "*Provided*, That, in lieu of revoking or suspending the license of any policy-writing agent, soliciting agent, broker, or salaried company employee for causes enumerated in this section after hearing as herein provided, the Superintendent may subject such person to a penalty of not more than $200 when in his judgment he finds that public interest would be best served by the continued operation of such person. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by such person through the office of the Superintendent to the collector of taxes, District of Columbia."

SEC. 3. That section 32, chapter II, of such act (54 Stat. 1078, title 35, sec. 1336, D. C. Code, 1940), be amended by deleting therefrom the figures "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000", so that the first sentence of the second paragraph of the said section as so amended shall read as follows:

"Resident and nonresident brokers shall, as a prerequisite to the issuance of a license, file with the Superintendent a corporate surety bond in an amount not less than $1,000 for the benefit of any person who may suffer loss resulting from fraud or dishonesty on the part of said resident or nonresident broker."

SEC. 4. That section 40, chapter II, of such act (54 Stat. 1080, title 35, sec. 1344, D. C. Code, 1940), be amended by deleting the period at the end of the said section and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and by adding thereto the following: "or if the agent or broker has placed with any unauthorized company any risk which could be placed with an authorized company except for abnormal provisions of the policy, or if the agent or broker has procured from an unauthorized company any policy which covers a risk of a class generally covered in the District by authorized companies and which authorized companies would cover at a rate not higher than that charged by authorized companies on other District risks of the same class."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF DEATH GRATUITIES

The bill (S. 1428) to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision contained in the act approved June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824), as amended (45 Stat. 710; 56 Stat. 146; 34 U. S. C., Supp. 943), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "Immediately upon official notification of the death from wounds or disease, not the result of his or her own misconduct, of any officer, enlisted man, or nurse on the active list of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps, or on the retired list when on active duty, the Paymaster General of the Navy shall cause to be paid to the widow, and if there be no widow, to the child or children, and if there be no widow or child, to any other dependent relative of such officer, enlisted man or nurse previously designated by him or her, an amount equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received by such officer, enlisted man, or nurse at the date of his or her death. The Secretary of the Navy shall establish regulations requiring each officer and enlisted man or nurse having no wife or child to designate the proper dependent relative to whom this amount shall be paid in case of his or her death. Said amount shall be paid from funds appropriated for the pay of the Navy and pay of the Marine Corps, respectively: *Provided*, That if there be no widow, child, or previously designated dependent relative, the Secretary of the Navy shall cause the amount herein provided to be paid to any grandchild, parent, brother or sis-

ter, or grandparent shown to have been dependent upon such officer, enlisted man, or nurse prior to his or her death, and the determination of such fact by the Secretary of the Navy shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *Provided further,* That nothing in this section or in other existing legislation shall be construed as making the provisions of this section applicable to officers, enlisted men, or nurses of any forces of the Navy of the United States other than those of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and nothing in this section shall be construed to apply in commissioned grades to any officers except those holding permanent or probationary appointments in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps: *Provided further,* That the provisions of this section shall apply to the officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and the Secretary of the Treasury will cause payment to be made accordingly: *And provided further,* That in the event of the death of any beneficiary before payment to and collection by such beneficary of the amount authorized herein, such amount shall be paid to the next living beneficary in the order of succession above stated."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in section 1 of this act shall be construed to invalidate or in any manner affect any payments of the 6 months' death gratuity made prior to the date of approval of this act, but no payment of such gratuity shall hereafter be made to the representative of the estate of a beneficiary who died prior to such approval.

SEC. 3. The act approved March 17, 1941, entitled "An act extending the provisions of the act approved August 27, 1940, entitled 'An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes'" (55 Stat. 43; 34 U. S. C., Supp 855c–2), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end of section 1 thereof the following words: "or as hereafter amended."

SEC. 4. The act approved January 19, 1942, entitled "An act to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes" (56 Stat. 6; 33 U. S. C., Supp. 870), is hereby amended by inserting after the words "Marine Corps" in the sixth line of section 9 thereof, the words "or as hereafter amended."

STAFF SGT. MARION JOHNSON AND SGT. GEORGE B. KRESS

The bill (S. 1517) for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, the sum of $283.50, and to Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve, the sum of $214, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for the value of their personal camera equipment lost in a fire in the Marine Corps Recruiting Station, 76 Forsyth Street Northwest, Atlanta, Ga., on August 25, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

XC——105

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR LOSS CAUSED BY FIRE AT DAVISVILLE, R. I.

The bill (S. 1542) to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in Building B. O. Q. O–3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, have we not general legislation providing for reimbursement of losses of this kind?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No. There is general legislation applying to losses of this character when they occur at sea, but there is no general legislation which provides for reimbursement for losses on shore in Navy and Marine barracks and stations. It has been suggested that such legislation be enacted, but I think perhaps it is a good idea to have the Navy Department come to the Congress for permission to pay the losses, to explain their investigation of the cause of fires and also their inquiry into the amount of damage. I think that is helpful in the long run.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $4,797.15, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy, to reimburse under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire in building B. O. Q O–3, at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

C. GUY EVANS

The bill (S. 1589) for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,527.79 to C. Guy Evans, of Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the destruction by fire of his recreation hall at Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash., November 17, 1942, which was being used by personnel of the United States Coast Guard who failed to exercise reasonable care in the protection of the premises: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MILITARY RANK FOR CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE NAVY NURSE CORPS

The bill (H. R. 2976) to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR LOSSES SUSTAINED BY FIRE IN ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 3605) to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1942, respectively was considered ordered to a third reading read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR LOSSES BY FIRE AT PORTSMOUTH, VA.

The bill (H. R. 3606) to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Virginia, on December 4, 1942, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR LOSSES BY FIRE AT CAMP BRADFORD, NORFOLK, VA.

The bill (H. R. 3607) to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L–76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943, was considered, ordered to a third reading read the third time, and passed.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL FOR LT. GEN. THOMAS HOLCOMB, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The bill (H. R. 3760) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF DRY-MILK SOLIDS

The bill (H. R. 149) to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am sufficiently familiar with the attitude of the Senator from Louisiana to know that no good purpose would be served by asking him to withhold the objection at this time. I am aware of the bitter opposition of the Senator from Louisiana to this bill. I simply desire to give notice that at the earliest practicable opportunity, at the conclusion of the call of the calendar, I shall move to take up the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me say, Mr. President, I do not know that my opposition to the bill should be characterized as being bitter. It is nevertheless very firm and, I think, well grounded. I shall be very glad to cooperate with the Senator and agree with him upon a time——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that we have discussed the matter at length in the committee. I have read the Senator's minority views on the bill. I think it is an extremely meritorious measure, and I still say that the Senator's attitude has been characterized by bitter opposition to this particular measure.

Mr. OVERTON. I certainly should like to absolve myself of that charge, because I have not been bitter in my opposition, but I am relentless in my opposition. I was about to say that I shall be very glad to cooperate with the Senator to take the matter up at any time that will suit the convenience of the Senate, but I should like to have a day or two notice so that I may be present at the time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The only opportunity to which I am entitled under the rules to move to take up the bill is at the conclusion of the call of the calendar, and I intend to move to take it up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar today, provided it is concluded in a reasonable time. I think that is the only opportunity I will have to make the motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill will be passed over.

RELIEF FOR THE PEOPLE OF STRICKEN AND HUNGRY COUNTRIES

The resolution (S. Res. 100) submitted by Mr. GILLETTE (for himself and Mr. TAFT) on February 11, 1943, and reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations on December 18, 1943, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Whereas the small democratic countries of Belgium, Norway, Poland, the Netherlands, Greece, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and others have been invaded and occupied; and

Whereas these small countries which are allied with us in the cause of democracy resisted to the limit of their strength the onrush of invading forces; and

Whereas the usual economic processes of these small countries have been completely dislocated as a result of being occupied by invading forces; and

Whereas the food supplies of all these nations are dangerously exhausted due to requisition of native food supplies by the Germans, and inability to secure their usual imports through the blockade; and

Whereas no relief can be brought to them unless there be international action through which their native supplies can be protected and imports be made through the blockade; and

Whereas starvation has already begun; and

Whereas a plan for feeding the people of Greece has been in effect for several months in Greece under supervision of the Swedish and Swiss Governments and the International Red Cross; and

Whereas after 6 months' trial this relief has been certified by the State Department as working satisfactorily and without benefit to the Germans; and

Whereas the Governments of Belgium, Norway, Poland have requested that their people be given relief; and

Whereas there are food surpluses available in the United States and in South America; and

Whereas many of the small invaded countries have money with which to purchase the food needed to keep their people alive and have signified their desire to use funds for that purpose; and

Whereas the Swedish Government has ships not available to the Allies which could be used for transportation; and

Whereas the specter of mass starvation among friendly and noncombatant women and children is a tragedy that the compassionate heart of America wants to avert; and

Whereas Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Poland, Greece, Yugoslavia, and the Netherlands and others have lived in friendship with the United States during our entire national existence, and have sent us millions of our most useful and helpful American citizens, and now have no means whatever of securing the necessary agreements by which this disaster can be averted: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States does express the conviction that immediate steps should be taken to extend the Greek experiment and thereby prevent this impending tragedy of mass starvation heretofore named; and be it further.

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States respectfully urges that the Government of the United States, through the Secretary of State, endeavor as quickly as possible to work out, in cooperation with the British Government and the Governments of Sweden, Switzerland, and the accredited representatives of the other governments concerned, the setting up of systematic and definite relief for all stricken and hungry countries where the need is now the most acute; this relief to be based on agreements by the belligerents for the protection of the native and imported food supplies, with rigid safeguarding of such relief so that no military advantage whatever may accrue to the civil populations or armed forces of the invading nations.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a statement which will consume about 5 minutes.

The Senate today passed Senate resolution 100, and I ask that the remarks which I am about to make be inserted in the RECORD following the adoption of the resolution.

This resolution was submitted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and myself in order to initiate and give the sanction of the Senate to the feeding of children in the occupied democracies of Europe, especially Belgium, Holland, and Norway. Since the resolution was submitted, the French situation has become such that feeding is also possible there.

While the general language of the resolution does not specifically mention France, I think it can be said that it is intended that the resolution does cover France, and that it is intended by the authors that any country in a situation similar to that of the countries mentioned will also be dealt with.

The evidence given to the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee showed beyond question that the children in these occupied areas are receiving only from one-third to one-half the food which is considered necessary for the proper health of children in this country and elsewhere. The inevitable result is hardship, starvation, and death for millions, and stunted bodies for many millions more. Furthermore, the mental state of men and women who have been starved in their childhood, when they could have been fed, is no contribution to the future peace of the world.

The resolution requests the State Department to negotiate with England and with Germany to arrange for the shipment through the blockade of special foods for children, just as was done in the First World War by the Commission for Relief in Belgium. Only one objection is made, namely, that in some way the shipment of this food may benefit the Germans. The answers to that are conclusive. No shipments are to be made until guaranties are obtained from the German Government that the food will only reach the children for whom it is intended, that no food will be shipped out of the country for German use, and that the same quantity of food shall be supplied to the country by the Germans, if they have been supplying food, as they have in the case of Belgium. If this guaranty cannot be obtained, the food will not be shipped. If it is broken at any time, shipments will cease, and the amount which could possibly be seized by the Germans at any one time would be infinitesimal. The food will be distributed by the nationals of the country concerned, under the supervision of the International Red Cross, officered by Swiss and Swedish representatives. This method has been pursued in Greece with regard to supplies for the entire population, and it has been entirely successful. In fact, the Greek experiment, forced upon the United Nations by the insistence of the Turkish Government, is a conclusive argument for similar action in other countries. Swedish shipping is available to carry the necessary food stuffs, the volume of which is not great.

There is an extensive movement in England, headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and many members of the Parliament, to promote the plan. They realize the tremendous importance to the United Nations of preserving the health and morale of the people in the occupied countries, and creating the good will which would result from this action. They see no sense in fighting for the freedom of many innocent nations if the people of those nations are to die or be stunted for life before they can be freed. The project cannot possibly interfere with the war effort of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted at this point as a part of my re-

marks a statement containing quotations from three or four members of the British Parliament dealing with the subject:

There being no objection, the quotations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On November 10, 1943, Mr. Stokes said:

"I have given notice, on behalf of a considerable number of members of all parties in the house that we want to take this opportunity of raising what to many of us is a very vital question of famine relief in Europe. We approach this matter in a spirit of intense persuasiveness.

"We do not believe that the assistance for which we ask would be assistance of any kind whatever to the enemy.

"Where adults are used to further the efforts of the German war machine, the Germans see that they are well fed. The people we are seeking to assist are those who are not helped by the Germans, those we hope to rely on in the future, whatever the date may be.

"To follow the policy that we are recommending is obviously good business. When the war comes to an end, unless we now do something about it all our friendly populations are going to be down and out, and starving, and they will hate us and be quite unable to govern Europe. I can imagine the awful bitterness which will prevail in the hearts of the parents of children as a result of suffering, and in many cases death."

Mr. T. Edmund Harvey said, "We have concluded that at least one-third of the young persons in Belgium are suffering from tuberculosis.

"Are we to do nothing to help this tragic situation? The Minister who was seated on that bench an hour or two ago said, in dealing with the problem of tuberculosis in our country, that it requires a full standard of living to combat the disease. Do my honorable friends who listened to that debate see the irony of our saying that of the tuberculosis sufferers in our own country and, at the same time refusing not to give ourselves, but to allow others the opportunity of giving for the benefit of the women and children of Belgium."

Mr. Harold Nicholson said:

"I believe the only way we can get total victory is by total war. I do not wish to embarrass in any way the Government of which I am a most ardent supporter.

"I was a few days ago in Sweden, and I had occasion to speak to and interview a great many earnest and intelligent men who since the beginning of the war have devoted their experience and their energies to a study of the nutrition problem in occupied Europe and to the means by which malnutrition could be at least alleviated. I found it difficult to meet the arguments they put to me * * *. I racked my brains to think of the arguments ministers have in the past given me, hoping that I should find in them some armor-piercing javelins which would confound and utterly rout my Swedish critics. I searched, and what did I find in the palm of my hand? Not a javelin, not even a pointed dart, but just a handful of dust. They said to me:

"'Do your Government, do the House of Commons, know the conditions of Belgium and Greece? Do they see the vital statistics? Do they know the tuberculosis figures? Have they had the facts about child welfare?' 'Yes,' I said, 'I think they have all the information.' Then they said, 'Is it that they mistrust the Swedish Red Cross or the Swiss Red Cross? Is it that they have no confidence in the international arrangements that we have made?' 'No,' I said, 'the Swedish Red Cross and the Swiss Red Cross are regarded in England with the deepest respect and admiration.' They then said, * * * 'Is the House of Commons aware of what a tiny little scheme we have? Do they not realize that we can provide the ships, and the money, and the foodstuff, and that it is only the navicerts that are spoiling what we wish to do?' 'Yes,' I said, 'the House of Commons knows that.' Then they said, 'What is the reason?' I said, 'There may be reasons of which I am unaware,' and they replied, 'Well, they must be very strange reasons since, to us, the attitude of your Government in this matter is not in harmony with the high repute which Great Britain in these years has won.'

"There is a German policy. It is a deliberate policy, * * * with the most consummate strategy, with incomparable efficiency. It is the policy of so debilitating the populations of occupied countries that they will be unable to resist. It is even more fiendish than that. It is the policy of so debilitating those populations that even the generations yet to be born will be incapable of resisting the future encroachments of the herrenvolk.

"If he—the Minister of Economic Warfare—accepts our scheme, then surely he will be giving life, and the hope of life, not only to the present population but, as I have said, to the children yet unborn in those countries. If he does not do that, then I say he will be disregarding what I hope is the conscience of this House. He is disregarding what I imagine is the conscience of the people of this country. And he is disregarding what I know to be the conscience of the neutral world."

Note a few significant sentences from the speech of Sir Peter Bennett:

"I have had to try and explain the attitude of our Government first of all to some good friends of this country in America, and I, frankly, found it impossible. Then I have had to try to explain it to my own constituents. I have had interviews with the ministers, and I have tried to go back and reassure my constituents with what I have been told in answer to their questions, but I found it quite impossible to convince them that those reasons were really sound."

Here are some excerpts from the address of Mr. William Brown:

"Germany is not going to be defeated by starving the children of our allies * * * the whole strategy of Germany was devised either for victory now, or the certainty of victory next time, by so defeating, not merely the military, but the civilian strength, that what they cannot do today, they might hope to do some years hence * * * to have an eye to the future because, believe me, if Europe is to be rebuilt on a basis that will endure, one of the first things we have to inject into Europe is the spirit of humanity and common goodness, the lack of which is our chief charge against the enemy whom we are now fighting."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the action of the Senate on Calendar No. 633, Senate Resolution 100, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD an article which I wrote, Starving Europe and the Next World War, which appears in the December 27 issue of the Progressive.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STARVING EUROPE AND THE NEXT WORLD WAR

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.)

Four grim winters have already taken their awful toll among the ravaged peoples of occupied Europe since this war began, and now a fifth, probably the grimmest of them all, is upon them.

Disease and malnutrition are on the march, and like invisible claws of a giant pincers movement they are moving in to destroy the helpless civilians, women, and children who are imprisoned in Hitler's European fortress.

It is estimated by Belgian officials that 20 percent of the Belgian population will perish by the end of next year. It is estimated that in Poland the war will destroy 50 percent of the population.

In Belgium the most reliable estimates to be had indicate that tuberculosis has increased 800 percent since May 1940.

Thirty-five percent of Belgium's 2,300,000 children are reported tubercular now, and 40 percent threatened.

The alarming increase of contagious disease in Holland is reported to have resulted in a German order to members of its armed forces instructing them to keep away from theaters and other public gathering places.

BREAD ALONE ISN'T ENOUGH

The reason for these horrible conditions is not hard to find. There is unquestionably a lack of medical care and supplies to combat disease, but it is the lack of proper food that has made the peoples of occupied Europe helpless to resist the inroads of disease.

Generally speaking, the children in occupied Europe have been forced to get along on about a third of the food we consider necessary for American children. In other words, what our children eat for breakfast is equivalent to the ration that is allowed to children in the occupied countries for the entire day.

In some countries it is worse than in others. Growing children need fats, minerals, and other food elements which adults can do without temporarily, at least, if necessary. It is these fats and other critical food elements that are scarcest. Bread alone is not enough.

In Poland the daily ration of adults last January was composed of 210 grams of flour and bread, 350 grams of potatoes, 15 grams of sugar, 20 grams of meat, and 5 grams of fat. A gram is approximately one-thirtieth of an ounce.

Compare that with the normal American diet which includes on the average 243 grams of bread and cereals, 217 grams of meat, fish, and eggs, 340 grams of milk and cream, 134 grams of butter, cheese, and other fats, 376 grams of vegetables and potatoes, 276 grams of fruit, and 142 grams of sugar and sirup.

THE SEEDS OF REVENGE

The situation in France, Norway, and some of the other occupied countries is slightly better than in Poland, but it is desperate in all of them. In Norway the daily ration of meat has been only 7 grams although it provides for approximately 50 grams of fats. This is a better fats ration than the Polish people have but it is still less than half the amount in the normal American diet.

The medical service of the Red Cross reports that the legal rations of fats in Belgium are from 20 to 85 percent deficient as compared with average needs of the different age groups. The deficiencies are less in the case of younger children because an effort has been made to take the fats away from the adult diet and give them to the children, but nevertheless the ration is 60 percent deficient in the 6–14 age group and 85 percent deficient in the 14–18 age group.

The consequences of malnutrition cannot be adequately measured in terms of deaths alone. The dangers of broken bodies and twisted minds among those that live are just as horrible to contemplate, and more far reaching in their effect.

Let it not be forgotten that the seeds of revenge that finally bore the bitter fruit of nazi-ism were planted in the hearts of the German people during the years of blockade, despair, and devastation following the last war, culminating in the inflationary debacle of 1923.

EXAMPLE OF GREECE

In the name of common humanity and common sense America and the other United

Nations must offer its help to these innocent victims, the women and children of those occupied countries under the Nazi heel.

For 3 years we have been talking about it, but little has been accomplished except in Greece. Britain has taken the position that to send food to these starving people would defeat the military effectiveness of the blockade, and our State Department has in the past weakly acquiesced.

The success of the relief program in Greece, however, has demonstrated that it can be done in other occupied countries without aiding the enemy one iota. The National Committee on Food for the Small Democracies, under the leadership of former President Hoover, undertook in 1940 and 1941 to work out a plan to provide relief for the people of Belgium, but the British refused to approve it.

The efforts of various other groups in the occupied countries have been almost negligible, and the result is that the Allies are still withholding any effective help from these men, women, and children.

The military argument that is used against the proposals to send food to these helpless victims of the war overlooks the admitted facts of the success achieved in handling the relief shipments to Greece. It overlooks also the admitted fact that 7,000 tons of food per month are going to prisoners of war in Germany itself with no appreciable loss to the enemy.

IT CAN BE DONE

If methods can be worked out whereby the delivery of food can be made to prisoners of war in Germany without aiding the German war effort, and if the Swiss and Swedish commission handling Greek relief can deliver from 18,000 to 20,000 tons of foodstuffs to the people of Greece without aiding the Nazis, it can be done in the other countries.

Greek relief is supervised by a joint Swiss-Swedish neutral commisison of 30, and aided by 3,000 local Greek committees in Greece itself. The food is shipped in Swedish ships, and passage is arranged for the ships through the Allied blockade through advance understandings.

To prevent Germany from gaining any advantage from the importation of food into Greece, the neutral governments of Switzerland and Sweden first obtained guaranties that Germany would take no foodstuffs out of Greece.

Thus since the relief authorities can make sure that the imported food goes to the Greeks for whom it is intended, and by agreement closely watched there is no opportunity for Germany to remove whatever other food might be available in the country, it does not break the blockade on Germany's war effort.

It does, however, extend to the children of war-torn Europe a helping hand which may be able to stifle the otherwise inevitable flames of bitterness and hate that may again break out in another world conflagration 20 years from now when Europe's children of today become its leaders of tomorrow.

PROVISIONAL FUR SEAL AGREEMENT OF 1942

The bill (H. R. 2924) to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada, to protect the first seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—INCREASE OF EXPENDITURE LIMIT

The resolution (S. Res. 136) submitted by Mr. Van Nuys on April 14, 1943, and reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate on the calendar day December 21, 1943, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the amount authorized to be expended by the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, pursuant to Senate Resolution 35, agreed to January 14, 1943, is hereby increased by $3,000, such additional amount to be used for paying expenses of said committee or subcommittees thereof, in connection with hearings and investigations with respect to judicial nominations referred to said committee.

PROTECTION OF THE COINS OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (H. R. 3403) to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold the objection?

Mr. DANAHER. I am glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the title of the bill is not very illuminating and therefore I should like to have the RECORD show what the amendment of chapter 7 of the Criminal Code means.

This is a bill to extend the protection of legislation over the coins of the United States. Some protection is afforded at the present time, but it is inadequate. This bill would make it a crime to "manufacture, sell, offer, or advertise for sale, or expose or keep with intent to furnish or sell, or shall cause or procure to be manufactured, furnished, sold, offered, or advertised for sale, any token, slug, disk, or other device similar in size and shape to any of the lawful coins of the United States, with knowledge or reason to believe that such tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices may be used unlawfully or fraudulently to procure anything of value, or use or enjoyment of any property or service from any automatic merchandise vending machine, postage-stamp machine, turnstile, fare box, coin-box telephone, parking meter, or other receptacle, depository, or contrivance, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States."

I do not intend to make a speech on this bill, but I call attention to the fact that the evidence shows that very large damage is being suffered currently.

According to the report of the House committee, which was corroborated by the evidence given at the hearing of the subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

> A recent survey conducted by the National Automatic Merchandising Association reveals that the losses by use of slugs and tokens in service and merchandise machines amounts to approximately $5,000,000 annually.

There is more in the report showing the need for the legislation. I do not know what the objection of the Senator from Connecticut may be, but, in any event, I do want this explanation to appear in the RECORD at this time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I concur in the objectives stated by the Senator from Vermont and understand that the evidence sustains the plain need for the legislation. I was present in the Judiciary Committee when the bill was under consideration and I am entirely cognizant of the factual background which has been explained by the Senator from Vermont.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that there are two particulars which will necessitate our further attention to this bill. One is that since we had it under consideration the Office of Price Administration has prepared a form of token which is to be used in lieu of ration stamps under certain given circumstances, and there are millions upon millions of them in process of distribution at this time. Consequently the impact of the proposed legislation upon the legitimate production of tokens for use by another agency of the United States, and which will have the widest possible distribution among all our citizenry, is a phase of this matter which we must consider, for we have not gone into it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator may not be familiar with the fact that in the preparation of the bill the Office of Price Administration was consulted. I was informed by a witness that a letter was written to him with respect to the type of slugs which were to be used, by which it appeared that the diameter and thickness of the token would be such as probably not to cause any damage.

I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction of the bill, and when I saw the notice in the press that the Office of Price Administration intended to use coins, of which they published a picture, I immediately called the Director on the telephone and talked with him about it. He said he thought that their device would not offend the law. I told him definitely that it probably would, and I suspended decision in this matter. The committee withheld its action so as to give the Office of Price Administration an opportunity to come forward and make any case they desired to make as to why they should be permitted to manufacture a spurious coin which would operate in telephone boxes and some of the other devices, such as parking meters; but they never came near, and never asked for a hearing.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I yielded too soon to my distinguished colleague from Vermont, for had I continued I would have pointed out that the tokens of the O. P. A. are entitled to at least as much protection as the coins, in view of the intended use to which the tokens are to be put; and, in view of the fact that these tokens are to be made simply of fiber, and not of the type of metal alloy which goes into coins, the possibility of their fabrication by counterfeiters is something to be reckoned with.

Therefore, Mr. President, in the direction of perfecting the bill, and extending its protections to the fiber coins or tokens of the O. P. A., further consideration can and it seems to me should be had of this matter, to the end, for example, that in line 11 on page 1, after the reference to a device "similar in size and shape to any of the lawful coins of the United States," there should be

added "or any device or token utilized by an agency of the United States Government in the protection of the distribution of foodstuffs." Therefore, Mr. President, we would extend rather than narrow the bill, in the contemplation to which I have reference.

The Senator from Vermont and I are not apart at all in what we want to have done. It is merely a case of making the bill sufficiently inclusive. I rather fancy that we can very properly amend the bill, and that the Senator will concur with me in the need for the amendment; and that we can join, with the permission of the majority leader, in taking the matter up in due course.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was about to suggest that if the bill is to go over, it might as well go over now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

PUNISHMENT FOR KILLING OR ASSAULTING FEDERAL OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1227) to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting of Federal officers, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the name "Coast Guard," to strike out "any member of the auxiliary military police of the Army of the United States," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of May 18, 1934 (ch. 299, 48 Stat. 780), as amended by the act of June 13, 1940 (ch. 359, 54 Stat. 391; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 253), be, and it is hereby, further amended by omitting the words "man of the Coast Guard," following the word "enlisted," and inserting in place thereof the words "person of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1658) to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia government and the White House Police force," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of Public Law 22, approved April 1, 1943, be amended to read as follows:

"This act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe."

SALE OF FISH IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1641) to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 898 of the District of Columbia Code, approved March 3, 1901, be amended to read as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person to have in possession or expose for sale in the District of Columbia, between the 10th day of June and the 30th day of November, both inclusive, in any year, any fresh fish of the shad or herring species."

AUTHORITY TO COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONVEY LAND

The bill (S. 1657) to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land," approved April 28, 1922, be, and it is hereby, amended by striking out the period and adding the following words: "to the credit of the District of Columbia."

PNEUMATIC TUBE TRANSMISSION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3916) to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic-tube transmission in the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments in section 1, page 2, line 2, before the word "side", to strike out "north" and insert "south"; in line 5, after the word "successors", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; in section 2, page 2, line 21, after the word "successors", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; on page 3, line 1, after "successors", to strike out "and" and insert "or"; and in section 3, page 3, after line 6, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WADE BROS.

The bill (H. R. 3504) for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G W., and Ovid Wade, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOWARD L. PEMBERTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1409) for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of" to strike out "$2,387.20" and insert "$1,959.20", and at the end of the bill to insert a proviso, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard L. Pemberton, Kalamazoo, Mich., the sum of $1,959.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Howard L. Pemberton against the United States because of damage to his airplane which was struck on June 14, 1943, while parked at Lambert Field, St. Louis, Mo., by a United States Navy airplane taxiing across such field: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAFAYETTE GIBSON

The bill (H. R. 1442) for the relief of Lafayette Gibson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NELS J. PEDERSEN

The bill (S. 1358) for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nels J. Pedersen, of Vancouver, Wash., a sum equal to the amount which would have been paid to him as compensation for services rendered as an employee of the Bonneville Power Administration from July 16 to July 28, 1942, and for accumulated annual leave from July 28 to August 17, 1942, if such payment had not been prohibited because of his not being a citizen of the United States, the said Nels J. Pedersen having obtained such employment and rendered such services while under the bona fide but erroneous impression that he had become a naturalized citizen by taking an oath of allegiance to the United States before an officer of the United States Army while serving with the military forces of the United States during the First World War: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ESTATE OF JENNIE I. WESTON

The bill (H. R. 3153) for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER A. GAWALIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1594) for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "injuries," to insert the words "and property damage."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

OSWALD L. SAWYER

The bill (H. R. 2690) for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD H. SMITH

The bill (H. R. 213) for the relief of Edward H. Smith, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED HUNTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1637), for the relief of Fred Hunter, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,000" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ETHEL COHEN

The bill (H. R. 1854) for the relief of Ethel Cohen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. E. McCOY AND SON

The bill (H. R. 1872) for the relief of J. E. McCoy and Son, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN SIMS

The bill (H. R. 600) for the relief of John Sims was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The bill (S. 2075) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. C. AND VASSIE LEE DAVIDSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1334) for the relief of J. C. and Vassie Lee Davidson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of" to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,760.60", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. C. Davidson and his wife, Vassie Lee Davidson, of Ozark, Ala., the sum of $3,760.60, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their daughter, Verlie Lee Davidson, a minor, who, upon alighting from a school bus, was fatally injured when struck by a United States Army truck on the Enterprise-Dothan Highway, about 1½ miles from the Providence Church, Clayhatchee, Dale County, Ala., on May 13, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriatec in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF THE STATE OF OREGON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 2, line 9, after the name "Polk County Forest Protective Association", to insert "Northwest Oregon Forest Fire Association."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PENSIONS FOR HELPLESS CHILDREN

The bill (S. 662) to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, under the general pension law and service pensions law, pension to or in behalf of a child terminates when the child attains the age of 16. The law provides, however, that the payment of pension may be continued after the age of 16 to a child who was pensioned or entitled to pension in its own right or with the mother if such child was insane, idiotic, or otherwise physically or mentally helpless at the date of attaining the age of 16. Payments of pension continue during the period of helplessness. Unless a helpless child was pensioned or entitled to pension in its own right or with the mother before attaining the age of 16, pension may not be authorized under a ruling holding that there is no provision of law by which a pension may be continued to a child who did not have a pensionable status prior to attaining the age of 16.

The purpose of the bill is to secure that right.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill does not change the basis on which pensions are paid?

Mr. TUNNELL. No. It makes it possible for those who were not pensionable at the time in question to obtain the benefit of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 662) to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter pension under the general and service pension laws pertaining to service prior to April 21, 1898, and under the laws reenacted by Public Law No. 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, shall be allowed to or for any person otherwise entitled as a physically or mentally helpless child regardless of his or her age at the time of death of the veteran or date of filing claim: *Provided*, That such person was insane, idiotic, or otherwise physically or mentally helpless at the date of attaining the age of 16 years and the helpless condition exists at the date of filing claim. Payments of pension shall continue during the period of helplessness, except that payments shall be discontinued as of the date preceding the marriage of a helpless child, and when pension is properly discontinued by reason of marriage it shall not thereafter be recommenced. This act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private.

AMENDMENT OF PART II OF VETERANS' REGULATION NO. 1 (A)

The bill (S. 698) to amend part II of the veterans regulation No. 1 (a) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part II, be amended by adding thereto a new paragraph, numbered paragraph IV, to read as follows:

"IV. For the purposes of paragraph I hereof, as amended, any person who, on or after August 27 1940, and prior to termination of the present hostilities, has applied or shall hereafter apply for enlistment or enrollment in the active military or naval forces and who was or shall be provisionally accepted and directed or ordered to report to a place for final acceptance into such military or naval service, or who was or is selected for service and after reporting pursuant to the call of his local board and prior to rejection, or who after being called in the Federal service as a member of the National Guard but before being enrolled for the Federal service suffered or shall suffer an injury or a disease in line of duty and not the result of his own misconduct, will be considered to have incurred such disability in active military or naval service: *Provided*, That payments of pension under the terms of this paragraph shall not be effective prior to the date of enactment of this amendment."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of Senate bill 698, Calendar 665.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill has been passed.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the votes by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, in order that we may have an explanation of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes are reconsidered, and the Chair understands that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] will make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to provide a pensionable status for persons and the dependents of persons who incurred disability or death in line of duty prior to final induction or acceptance for active military or naval service. The proposed legislation is similar to existing law applicable to those who incurred disability or death prior to the completion of entry into active service during World War No. 1. The bill would cover claims for disability or death occurring during the period from August 27, 1940, and prior to termination of hostilities in the present war. August 27, 1940, is the date of approval of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, authorizing the President to order members and units of reserve components and retired personnel of the Regular Army into active military service. While the bill would be effective from August 27, 1940, payments of

pension could not be made for any period prior to the date of enactment of this measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 698) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VETERANS OF THE WAR WITH SPAIN AND CERTAIN OTHER WARS

The bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the Senator who was formerly chairman of the Committee on Pensions tells me he had prepared a speech dealing with the measure, but he says he cannot deliver it, so I will try to make an explanation of the measure.

The bill amends existing law, and its purpose is to increase the rates of service pension payable to certain veterans and the widows of veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition, so as to make them correspond with the rate of pension payable to veterans and the widows of veterans of the Civil War. The bill would also extend the marriage limitation date from September 1, 1922, to January 1, 1938.

The existing law provides a service pension of $60 a month for a veteran of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or China Relief Expedition who has attained the age of 65, or, regardless of age, if he is totally disabled. Such pension is payable to veterans who served 90 days or more from April 21, 1898, to July 4, 1902, and who have been honorably discharged, or who, having served less than 90 days, were discharged for disability incurred in the service in line of duty. Section 1 of this bill would increase the rate of service pension payable for age 65 or total disability from $60 to $75 a month. The average age of these veterans is 69 years. Civil War veterans were granted a service pension of $75 a month regardless of age by the act of June 9, 1930. Both Civil War and Spanish War veterans now receive $100 a month if their physical condition is such as to require the aid and attendance of another person.

To be entitled to a service pension under the act of May 1, 1926, a widow or a former widow must have married the veteran prior to September 1, 1922. Section 2 of H. R. 2350 amends such law by striking out the date "September 1, 1922" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "January 1, 1938."

Under the existing law, the widows and former widows of such veterans receive a service pension of $30 a month regardless of age. Section 3 of the pending bill would increase such pension to $40 a month at age 65, and would provide a pension of $50 a month to a widow or former widow who was the wife of the veteran during the period of his service. Civil War widows receive a service pension of $30 a month—the same as now granted to the widows provided for under the pending bill—which is increased to $40 at age 70. The widow or former widow who was the wife of the veteran during his Civil War service receives $50 a month, which rate was granted by the act of July 3, 1926. The increase from $30 to $40 a month was granted to Civil War widows by the act of June 9, 1930.

The purpose of the pending measure is to place them on practically the same basis.

Mr. BYRD. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the bill puts the pension paid with respect to the Spanish War on the same basis as the Civil War?

Mr. TUNNELL. On the same basis as the Civil War, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment at the end of the bill to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 4 The act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382–384; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 364–364f), is hereby amended by adding a new section thereto numbered nine, to read as follows:

"SEC. 9 No pension or increase in pension shall hereafter be allowed to the widow of a veteran of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, under any law, unless there was continuous cohabitation from the date of marriage to the date of death with the person who served except where there was a separation which was due to the misconduct of or procured by the person who served, without the fault of the widow: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed so as to discontinue any pension granted prior to the enactment of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PENSIONS TO SOLDIERS WHO SERVED IN THE INDIAN WARS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 85) to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes," which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions, with amendments, on page 3, line 11, after the word "month" to strike out the colon and the words "*And provided further*, That no one while an inmate of the United States Soldiers' Home or of any National or State soldiers' home, and while the Government of the United States contributes toward defraying the expense incurred in providing such inmate with domiciliary care shall be paid more than $50 per month under this act;" and on page 6, after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 5. Section 5 of the act of March 3, 1927 (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 381d, 44 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. No agent, attorney, or other person shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for preparing or assisting in the preparation of the necessary papers in the application to the Veterans' Administration for benefits under this act. Any person who shall, directly or indirectly, solicit, contract for, charge, or receive any fee or compensation for such preparation or assistance shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and each and every offense shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment at hard labor for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Let the bill go over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this bill calendar No. 668?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. WHITE. At the instance of a Senator temporarily absent, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF PUERTO RICO CIVIL GOVERNMENT ACT — BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1407) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let the bill be passed over.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senators who requested that the bill be passed over will defer their request long enough to enable me to make an explanation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. BYRD. I withhold my objection.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Senate bill 1407 is the result of the appointment by the President, last spring, of a civilian committee or commission composed of officials of the Federal Government and citizens of Puerto Rico, for the purpose of making suggestions for the reorganization of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico. The committee or commission, as perhaps it is better termed, worked diligently in the city of Washington and in Puerto Rico.

As a result of its work, Senate bill 1407 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. From that committee a subcommittee of five Senators was appointed. I happened to be selected as chairman of the subcommittee. With me also worked the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. We held long hearings. We listened to many witnesses. Eventually, after a great deal of hard work, the subcommittee unanimously reported to the full committee the bill which has now been reached on the calendar. The bill was then again explained to the entire Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and the full committee in turn reported the bill to the Senate.

I feel that there are no particular reasons why the bill should not be considered at this time. Its purposes are simple.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection whatever to having the Senate consider the bill, except I do not think it should be considered under the 5-minute rule. The bill proposes very important legislation. I do not know that I am at all opposed to it, but I cannot believe it can be adequately discussed and considered under the 5-minute rule which applies to the reading of measures on the consent calendar. That is the only reason why I made the objection.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Is it in order for me, as a member of the committee, to move that the 5-minute rule be suspended so that more time may be available to Senators who desire to inquire about the bill?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not think that can be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That cannot be done under the unanimous-consent agreement for consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the consideration of the measures on the calendar. However, I think the calendar will be concluded in a short time. So perhaps it would be better to let the bill go over until the conclusion of the consideration of measures on the calendar. Then I shall move to have the bill made the pending business. I think we can dispose of it today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

W. E. DOWDELL AND JUNE DOWDELL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1563) for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,125.03", and insert "$1,700", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,700 to W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell, of 722 West Thirty-eighth Street, Houston, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damages sustained as a result of a United States Army airplane, bearing No. 41-16175 on the tail structure, crashed into their residence at 722 West Thirty-eighth Street, Garden Oaks, Houston, Tex., on February 7, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LLOYD L. JOHNSON AND P. B. HUME

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3157) for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REBECCA COLLINS AND W. W. COLLINS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 891) for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,000"; and in line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rebecca Collins, of Wise, Va., the sum of $1,000, and to W. W. Collins, of Wise, Va., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by them as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a truck used by the Work Projects Administration in Norton, Va., on February 9, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. DONALD B. JOHNSTON

The bill (H. R. 1934) for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOM S. STEED

The bill (H. R. 2691) for the relief of Tom S. Steed was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SPENCER MEEKS

The bill (H. R. 3332) for the relief of Spencer Meeks was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDERICK LEE LITTLEFIELD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1835) for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "appropriated, to", to insert "the estate of"; in line 6, after the word "Littlefield", to strike out "of Hyannis, Massachusetts"; and in line 8, after the words "sustained by", to strike out "him", and insert "Frederick Lee Littlefield, of Hyannis, Massachusetts."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Frederick Lee Littlefield."

VERN M. STANCHFIELD

The bill (S. 1549) for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vern M. Stanchfield, of Wise River, Mont., the sum of $75, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of his horse, which was destroyed because of injuries received by it while under rental to an employee of the Department of the Interior for use in the performance of his official duties: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

KERNAN R. CUNNINGHAM

The bill (H. R. 547) for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUTH E. P. PHILLIPS, ETC.

The bill (H. R. 2804) for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM M. TUCKER AND NELDA M. TUCKER

The bill (H. R. 2639) for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker

was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. COL. CHARLES H. MORHOUSE

The bill (H. R. 3329) for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PACIFIC DRYDOCK & REPAIR CO., INC.

The bill (H. R. 610) for the relief of Pacific Drydock & Repair Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES T. ROGERS

The bill (H. R. 3001) for the relief of James T. Rogers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPACT OR AGREEMENT FOR DIVISION OF WATERS OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER

The bill (S. 1387) to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River", approved August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 551), as amended and extended by the act entitled "An Act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River", approved June 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 399), is further amended by striking out "June 1, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1947."

CAPT. S. E. McCARTY

The bill (S. 1632) for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $388.25 to reimburse Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a storm on August 17, 1942, which flooded Government quarters occupied by him at the United States Naval Air Station, Quonset Point, R. I.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

TITLES FOR HEADS OF STAFF DEPARTMENTS OF UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The bill (S. 1653) to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter officers serving as heads of the Paymaster's Department and the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Marine Corps shall have the title of "The Paymaster General of the Marine Corps" and "The Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps," respectively.

SEC. 2. All laws or parts of laws now in force relating to the staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, except as provided in section 1 of this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SGT. MAJ. RICHARD SHAKER

The bill (S. 1676) for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sergeant Major Shaker, United States Marine Corps, the sum of $85, which sum represents the value of a radio lost while in the custody of the Marine Corps authorities at Quantico, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

LT. (JR. GR.) NEWT A. SMITH

The bill (S. 1677) for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a thid reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $272.50 to reimburse Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of the Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR LOSS OF PROPERTY

The bill (S. 1681) to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,483.36, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged in a fire that destroyed quarters assigned to certain officers of Marine Utility Squadron 152 on February 9, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

RENEWAL OF CORPORATE SURETY BONDS FOR OFFICERS AND MEN OF ARMED FORCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1647) to amend the act of March 2, 1895, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the words "enlisted men of the", to insert "Army," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 807), as amended by an act approved March 8, 1928 (45 Stat. 247), is further amended by inserting in the third line of the proviso as it appears on page 247 of volume 45 of the United States Statutes at Large, after the word "employees" the following: "and bonded officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL SHIP-REPAIR FACILITIES FOR THE NAVY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1668) authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy from time to time, but not less frequently than every 60 days, shall transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land, by lease or otherwise, effected under the authority of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $130,000,000 for essential equipment and facilities at either private or public plants for repairing, altering, or converting any vessel operated by the Navy or the War Shipping Administration or being prepared for the use of either.

SEC. 2. The authority herein granted shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy may deem best suited to the purpose of the authority herein contained, erect or extend

buildings, acquire the necessary machinery and equipment, and shall be in addition to all authority heretofore granted for these purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy from time to time, but not less frequently than every 60 days, shall transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisititons of land, by lease or otherwise, effected under the authority of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND BEQUESTS FOR UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The bill (S. 1640) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized in his discretion to accept, receive, hold, administer, and expend gifts and bequests of personal property, from individuals or others, for the benefit of, or for use in connection with, the United States Naval Academy.

SEC. 2. Gifts or bequests of money or the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States under the title "United States Naval Academy general gift fund," and any funds so deposited shall be subject to disbursement by the Secretary of the Navy for the benefit or use of the United States Naval Academy subject to the terms and conditions of the acceptance of any particular gift or bequest.

SEC. 3. Gifts and bequests accepted by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this act shall be exempt from all Federal taxes.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, to invest, reinvest, or retain investments of the money or securities composing the United States Naval Academy general gift fund, or any part thereof, deposited in the Treasury pursuant to section 2 of this act, in securities of the United States Government or in securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States Government. The interest and profits accruing from such securities may be deposited to the credit of the United States Naval Academy general gift fund, and will be available for disbursement as provided in section 2 of this act.

COMPACT RELATING TO WATERS OF THE BELLE FOURCHE RIVER BASIN

The bill (H. R. 2580) to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARRYING OF CIVIL-WAR BATTLE STREAMERS WITH REGIMENTAL COLORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1539) to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the word "colors", to insert a comma and the words "upon verification in the War Department that such streamers were carried by the regiment in the Civil War", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, each regiment of the Army of the United States is hereby authorized to carry its Civil War battle streamers with its regimental colors, upon verification in the War Department that such streamers were carried by the regiment in the Civil War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLOWANCES FOR MILEAGE OF MILITARY ACADEMY GRADUATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1669) to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment, on page 3, line 5, after the word "abode", to insert "or home, school, or Army station", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers graduated from the United States Military Academy when traveling under competent orders to the first station to which they are permanently assigned for duty shall receive the mileage allowance authorized by law for officers of the Army traveling under competent orders without troops, for the distance actually traveled under such orders, not to exceed the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from their homes or from West Point, N. Y., as may be designated in their orders, to such first duty stations. The orders mentioned in the first sentence of this section shall be deemed to involve a "permanent change of station" as those words are used in the fifth paragraph of section 12, Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (act of June 16, 1942; 56 Stat. 365), and the rights of the officers concerned shall be governed by the provisions of that paragraph with respect to the transportation of their dependents and household effects. That portion of the act of August 9, 1912 (37 Stat. 252; 10 U. S. C. 744), which reads as follows: "*Provided further*, That hereafter a graduate of the Military Academy shall receive mileage as authorized by law for officers of the Army from his home to the station which he first joins for duty," is hereby repealed. The provisions of this section shall be effective as of January 19, 1943: *Provided*, That no person shall suffer, by reason of the enactment of this act, any reduction in any allowance or compensation which he has been paid or to which he was entitled immediately prior thereto.

SEC. 2. A person entering the United States Military Academy as a cadet shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for all travel which he actully performs, and which he certifies he has actually performed while proceeding to the United States Military Academy for admission as a cadet, not in excess of the distance by the shortest usually traveled route between the place which he certifies was his actual permanent place of abode or home, school, or Army station at the time such travel was commenced and the United States Military Academy. All payments to such persons for travel to the United States Military Academy made on or after June 1, 1940, to the extent that they involve questions as to the place from which payment of mileage was authorized, are hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIMINATION OF PAY DISCRIMINATION AGAINST TEACHER OF MUSIC, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The bill (S. 1635) to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to make better provision for the teacher of music, the leader of the Military Academy Band," approved May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), is amended by striking out the words "third pay period", wherever they occur in such act, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "grade of captain."

BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1509) to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is a very important bill. I ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 234) to pay a gratuity to Della M. Bender was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ORGANIZATION—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the joint resolution is scheduled to come up tomorrow. Later in the day I may ask to have it made the unfinished business, with the understanding that it will not be taken up today.

I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

That concludes the calendar.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on yesterday, Monday, February 14, Frank C. Waldrop, a so-called columnist, had this to say in his column in the Times-Herald in speaking of the Latin American expenditures matter:

> The smear artist shot the hypo to Senator K. D. McKELLAR (Democrat) of Tennessee and handed him a speech to make at Senator BUTLER.

This statement is a willful, deliberate, and malicious lie out of whole cloth and shows Waldrop to be an assassin of

character. Not only did I not make a speech that somebody else wrote in this particular matter, but never in my 27 years' service in the Senate have I made a speech that anyone else wrote. Waldrop is a miserable and ignorant liar. I am quite sure that the other 95 Senators who have served with me and the many others who served with me and who have left the Senate, will all bear witness with me that I prepare and make my own speeches, and that I do not make speeches on the floor of the Senate that other persons prepare for me. If any Senator feels that he knows of an instance to the contrary, I ask him to rise and say so.

POST-WAR COMMITMENTS BY UNITED NATIONS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. For what purpose?

Mr. HATCH. A little while ago I gave notice that as soon as the calendar was concluded I wished to return to a certain measure on the calendar, to which I should like to refer before other business is taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota desires to address the Senate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I do not yield.

Mr. President, on November 5, 1943, I urged the Senate not to rush into an uninformed endorsement of what was reported to have been agreed to at Moscow. An overwhelming majority of the Senate felt it better, however, to endorse at once the general principles communicated to us by the press as the solemn conclusion of the representatives, respectively, of the President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the King of England and Emperor of India, and the President of the United States.

The Declaration of Moscow was approved by the Senate even before the Secretary of State had come before any of its committees, or had addressed a joint session of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Less than 14 weeks later, on February 15, we find that two great regional federations are fast emerging as trustees for the future peace, sovereignty, and freedom of thought and belief, from want and fear, of a large part of the world. The U. S. S. R. has taken steps to decentralize its public administration, even to the extent of splitting up collective representation in foreign affairs among all its component parts.

The Soviet Federation has provided a formal basis for the incorporation within its membership of any or all Slavonic, Magyar, Finnish, Iranian, and Mongol states. Conceivably Germanic and Scandinavian states, or Latin and Greek states, would in time be admitted.

Surely the Foreign Secretaries of Great Britain and the United States were told of this step by the Foreign Secretary of the Soviet Union.

No action of such tremendous implications could have been intended by the Soviet Union's President, Prime Minister, and Cabinet without realizing that the most elementary good faith between military allies would require frank disclosure of a plan to liquidate virtually all central responsibility for foreign commitments of the Union, by delegating to the individual collectivist states the sovereign conduct of international relations.

Two weeks ago, there appeared a dispatch informing us that Australia and New Zealand had concluded a treaty to reserve to themselves a decisive part in the disposition of the islands of the Pacific Ocean, including some important islands, such as the Marshalls, not formerly subject to their sovereignty.

Even islands not yet recovered from the Japanese appear to be within the scope of this treaty. I have sent to the Secretary of State a letter in which I asked him for the text of this agreement.

It would appear to be proper for the Senate to know something about such an agreement, as long as the United States is committed to the divesting of the Japanese Empire of its conquests of the last half century and committed without qualification as to cost.

Perhaps the formal declaration of an Australasian Monroe Doctrine is quite in order; but might not the Senate be justified in withholding endorsements of blanket generalities until it knows just what our manhood is being sent to fight for and die for in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the Pacific Ocean?

Is it really for the socialization of much of Europe? Or is it really for the creation of some hybrid Australasian-European sovereignty over the entire western and southern Pacific Oceans?

I ask to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks an editorial from the New York Times of today, dealing with a new phase in Poland. I should like to quote the last paragraph of the editorial and have it printed in the RECORD, in full:

> Three months ago the foreign secretaries of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, meeting in Moscow, made this declaration: "The conference agreed to set up machinery for insuring the closest cooperation between the three governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops." There was no exemption here of Eastern Europe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

A NEW PHASE IN POLAND

With the establishment on pre-war Polish soil of a Polish national council sponsored by the Russian Government, the problem of Poland has now moved well beyond the old question of frontiers. It has become a more fundamental question of who is to speak for the Polish people in any revision of the frontiers. The Russian action clearly implies an early recognition of the new council as the authentic government of Poland. For, simultaneously with a fresh attack by Pravda on the Polish Government-in-Exile in London as being "backed by no one in Poland except pro-Fascist agents who are helping the Germans," the Russian Ministry of Information hails the new agency as "a step forward in the consolidation of all national elements inside Poland."

There cannot be any doubt that the Russian Government is acting independently in this matter. Britain and the United States are not parties to this procedure. Both recognize the London government in exile as the Government of Poland. The adherence of that government to the Atlantic Charter made Poland one of our allies in the war and one of the United Nations. The new national council on the other hand, was organized in Moscow. Its head is Wanda Wasilewska, wife of a Russian Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs who has now become Foreign Commissar of the Russian Ukraine. The Russian Ministry of Information announces that the new council "includes representatives of the Polish Peasants' party, Polish Socialists, the Polish Workers' party and other democratic national groupings"; but if this is a coalition it is a coalition organized on the initiative of the Kremlin and without consultation with Russia's allies.

It is natural and inevitable that Russia should be deeply interested in the future of a nation which is its bulwark against Germany and deeply concerned about having that nation governed by friendly leaders. But the whole series of steps in recent weeks, from Russia's choice of the Curzon line to the establishment of the national council, consists quite clearly of unilateral decisions on the part of Russia.

Three months ago the foreign secretaries of the United States, Great Britain, and Russia, meeting in Moscow, made this declaration: "The conference agreed to set up machinery for insuring the closest cooperation between the three governments in the examination of European questions arising as the war develops." There was no exemption here of eastern Europe.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article written by George Weller and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 6, 1944, dealing with the reported treaties with respect to control of islands of the Pacific by Australia and New Zealand. The headline of the article is based upon its contents. It is:

> Agreements would bar future United States bases in area considered defense arc.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANZACS CLAIM PACIFIC ISLES—AGREEMENTS WOULD BAR FUTURE UNITED STATES BASES IN AREA CONSIDERED DEFENSE ARC

(By George Weller)

Australia and New Zealand, the two antipodean members of the British Empire, have agreed to a pact which would sharply limit American rights in these areas and which would attempt to establish an Anzac-oriented pattern for territorial adjustments after Japan has been defeated in the Pacific.

This move comes after 26 months of United States participation in the Pacific war zone, during which American forces helped to defend Australia and New Zealand. If this agreement remains in force, America's future political and strategical security in this area will be seriously impaired.

Comment on this document coming from New Zealand and Australia is naturally meager because in General MacArthur's area there is a categorical ban on outgoing cables discussing controversial political matters. Correspondents there are strictly limited by American military, as well as Australian civil authorities, to war news, and routine political announcements. Free political clarification thus being barred—the reason given that American commentators interpret censored

pieces as conforming to headquarters views—little enlightenment can be expected from down under.

Although impact of the pact will doubtless be softened by follow-up statements intended to mollify feelings already ruffled in Washington by the Anzac assumption of political initiative, it is clear already that the chief, if not the only, purpose of the pact was to launch a strong bid for Pacific control before the United States should invoke its strategic needs.

The two members of the Empire agree to stand shoulder to shoulder barring any bid for semi-American sovereignty over the bases in Australia and New Zealand now used by American forces and in many cases constructed by them.

CLAIMS TERMED "ABSURD"

Claims for bases from which American submarines now leave for harassing raids against Japanese shipping and where thousands of troops, aircraft supplies, and lease-lend material have been unloaded in defense of the two members of the Empire are called in a direct statement by Herbert V. Evatt, Australia's Minister of External Affairs, absurd.

"Such practice does not in itself afford any basis whatsoever for territorial claims after hostilities have been concluded," Evatt declared.

Nothing was revealed about what provision the Anzacs plan to offer in answer to the many American official and unofficial announcements, ranging from Secretary Knox's repeated statements that permanent bases were needed to the statement by Representative MAGNUSON, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, that continuance of American naval bases on the Indian Ocean coast of western Australia, as well as on the eastern Pacific coast of Australia, were indispensable.

In great detail the document also excludes any American participation in those former German mandated territories which remain to be captured.

Thus the Anzacs dispose of any American hopes of acquiring Rabaul or Kavieng, Jap bases which have been for 2 years under steady American air attack.

The mandates were first earmarked for Australian and New Zealand possession by the secret Anglo-Japanese treaty of 1915. President Wilson remained ignorant of the existence of this treaty of spoils until after the armistice. Brenckinridge Long, now Assistant Secretary of State, made an ineffectual fight during the peace conference to obtain western Samoa and, also, have the Japanese mandated islands come under American title as naval bases, but combined opposition by the Anzacs and Japanese defeated this move.

The Anzac pact, in continuously expanding concentric rings of asserted political rights, says that the two members of the Empire reserve the right to be represented in any transfer of title or even of administration of the enemy territories, which would include the Marshalls, Marianas, Carolines, and Pelews, Japanese possession of which doomed the defenders of Bataan to torture and death.

The next ring of external assertion states that the Anzacs agree to oppose unitedly any change of sovereignty or system of control in any of the islands of the Pacific which lacks their consent.

The last assertion is world-wide in scope. Here the statesmen, representing Australia's 7,000,000 and New Zealand's one and a half millions, assert their right to be associated not only in the membership, but also on the planning and establishment of the general international organization referred to in the Moscow declaration.

The Anzac pact further asserts that the arc of islands from Portuguese Timor to American Samoa is a "regional zone of defense based on Australia and New Zealand." This arc includes the independent kingdom of the Tongan Islands, which has been an important American naval base. The British are represented there by a consul. The United States never has had a consul nor made an effort to represent its strategic interests in this fully independent South Seas democracy.

FIFTY BASES IN ARC

At least 50 American Army and Navy bases now in use as jump-offs for prongs of the drive northward are included in the projected area and about an equal number of airbases exclusive of those in American use on the Australian and New Zealand mainlands.

The Anzacs also agreed to promote the establishment of a "South Seas regional commission with England and France and the United States as members, thus in effect giving America an opportunity to join a pact directed against the American strategic holdings.

The most interesting characteristics of the pact are:

1. It ignores the fact that the United States never has recognized the Anzac titles to the mandated former German territories and still reserves full rights therein under the Versailles Treaty.

2. The assumption is made that the United States would be willing to treat with Australia and New Zealand in a Pacific agreement as though the British statute of Westminster affected such agreements, giving them two votes plus another vote for the United Kingdom.

3. The pact is based strictly on Anzac views and makes no concessions of any kind to the present dependence of the two members of the Empire on the American Air Forces and Navy for their present defense and to America's future security.

4. The pact has been negotiated, signed, and announced, without, so far as is known, any invitation of American participation and without any notice that it was under contemplation.

FEAR YANKS MAY REMAIN

Possibly in line with fears expressed by an Australian judge recently that the Yankees might remain in Australia—an intention which this correspondent was unable to discern in more than 1 percent of the home-hungry Americans—the thirty-second of the pact's 44 articles also asserts a right to "control immigration and emigration in all territories within their jurisdiction."

The purpose here, while unclear, may be to attempt to put a formal lock on the ex-German mandates, which, according to their League of Nations authorizations, are open to all nations.

The Anzacs, moreover, assert their right to dispose at will of all airfields on both their own and mandated territory, without particularizing any American interest in the scores of fields—14 in a cluster at a single place in New Guinea—which have been built by American engineers and are now being used by the American Air Forces. Furthermore, the Anzacs assert that their nationals must be fully represented among the personnel of any international airlines which they permit to cross their territory.

What formal treatment this pact will receive in Washington, once the surprise over its unilateral announcement subsides, is difficult to predict. The Anzacs have confronted the State Department with a fait accompli. But the technical conflicts with known American diplomatic attitudes are so numerous therein that American adherence to the pact would be virtually excluded even if American strategic interests and her position as paramount Pacific power and Anzacs' defender were recognized therein—as they are not.

COMPENSATION FOR USEFUL SUGGESTIONS BY PERSONNEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] objected to the consideration of Calendar 560, Senate bill 1232. He has since told me that he has no objection to it. For that reason I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1232) to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "case", to insert: "For the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to set up in the Department a Board of Awards, the proceedings of which shall be available to the public", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to pay cash rewards, subject to such regulations as he shall prescribe, to officers and employees of the Department of the Interior, who, in the course of their employment, and subsequent to November 17, 1942, make suggestions or inventions which are of such a nature that their adoption would result in improved technological or scientific processes or methods, or in improvements in the administration or operations of the Department of the Interior. The amount expended for the payment of such rewards during any 1 fiscal year shall not exceed $20,000 in the aggregate and shall not exceed $1,000 to any one person, unless a greater amount is specifically appropriated for a named person in an exceptionally meritorious case. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to set up in the Department a Board of Awards, the proceedings of which shall be available to the public.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEASING OF COAL LANDS IN ALASKA

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, during the call of the calendar, House bill 3428, Calendar 559, was passed over. The bill relates to the leasing of coal lands in Alaska. I stated that I did not know what Senator objected to it, but I wished to explain it. I hope the Senator who objected is present. I do not like to have the bill taken up in the absence of the Senator who objected, but I did give notice that I should like to return to the bill.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 3428, Calendar 559, in order that I may make a brief explanation of the bill and see if there is objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3428) to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of

Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442).

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as indicated by the title, the bill relates only to the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska. Under existing law any person, corporation, or association may acquire a lease upon as much as 2,560 acres of the public domain for the mining of coal. That is the maximum area that can be leased under a single lease.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the objection to this bill had been withdrawn?

Mr. HATCH. No.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is merely explaining the bill?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I said that I did not know what Senator made the objection, but I hoped the Senator who made the objection would remain in the Chamber. I wish to explain the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I made the objection because I was not familiar with the bill, and I wanted an opportunity to examine it before it was considered. Perhaps if I have such an opportunity, or if an explanation is made of it, I may withdraw the objection.

Mr. HATCH. I am very glad the Senator is present because I wanted to make an explanation of the bill. If the Senator will give me his attention, after I shall have explained it, I do not believe he will object to it. That is why I wanted to make an explanation.

Mr. AIKEN. I made the objection because I believe we cannot be too careful in giving anyone the right to lease or give away public resources.

Mr. HATCH. I appreciate the Senator's attitude. All I wish to do is to explain what the bill provides. After having done that, if the Senator wishes to object, he may do so.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to listen to any explanation which the Senator wishes to make.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, under existing law, any person, association, or corporation may lease as much as 2,560 acres of the public domain. That is the maximum amount which any person, association, or corporation may lease of the public domain. Moreover, the present law also provides that if a person has a lease on any amount of the public domain as, for example, say 40 acres, he cannot acquire an interest in any other lease of public land whatever. He is limited to the 40 acres. That is all any person, firm, or association may hold. If a person happens to have an interest in 40, 80, or 160 acres, that is all he may have, while his neighbor may have a lease on 2,560 acres.

This bill would remove the restriction, so that a person who has a lease on less than 2,560 acres may acquire an interest up to 2,560 acres, but no more, even though it be in different leases. The limitation now is to one lease which may be for 40 acres, or 2,560 acres, but no more. Under the bill he would be permitted to have more than one interest in different leases so long as his total acreage did not exceed the maximum of 2,560 acres.

The bill was recommended by the Secretary of the Interior for the reason, as he has advised us, that the existing law with its limitations is hindering the development of coal properties in Alaska. So long as the maximum amount of 2,560 acres is not exceeded—and this bill would not change the law in that respect at all—our committee felt that the measure was a good one and should be passed.

That is the explanation of the bill which I wished to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3428) to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLARK of Missouri obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator permit me to make an announcement with regard to the business which we wish to conclude?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I gave notice during the consideration of the calendar that I intended to make a motion to take up under the rule Calendar No. 632, House bill 149. I do not desire to lose any rights in that regard, but the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is the chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill in the Commerce Committee, and who also submitted minority views, advised me that he wanted to prepare himself a day or two before the bill was to be taken up.

Having consulted the majority leader, I understand that the U. N. R. R. A. legislation is to be made the unfinished business.

In view of the request of the Senator from Louisiana I should like to ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 632, House bill 149, be made the unfinished business at the conclusion of consideration of the U. N. R. R. A. measure. I simply wished to make that explanation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was about to ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 699, House Joint Resolution 192, with the understanding that it will not be taken up today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the joint resolution by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider the joint resolution. It is understood that the joint resolution will not be taken up today, except to be made the unfinished business and considered tomorrow.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, in the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], he has concurred in that arrangement?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, it is satisfactory to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I do not want to be a voice of discord, but I think we ought to make some effort to dispose of the Puerto Rican bill today. It certainly should not take very many minutes to act upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that it is not my purpose to take up the U. N. R. R. A. joint resolution today. If the Senator desires to have it temporarily laid aside and ask that some other bill be considered, I should have no objection——

Mr. BONE. If there should be any controversy over the Puerto Rican bill, I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and I would abandon any effort to dispose of it, but I thought, with a full explanation by the Senator from New Mexico, we could dispose of it in a little while.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no objection to that being done. I am willing to have the other bill laid aside temporarily so that the measure referred to by the Senator from Washington may be considered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the motion of the Senator from Kentucky been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 699, House Joint Resolution 192.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the consideration of the unfinished business which is Calendar No. 699, House Joint Resolution 192, Calendar No. 632, House bill 149, to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILEY. I have in front of me what I thought was the U. N. R. R. A. bill, which is marked Calendar No. 698. Senators have been referring to Calendar No. 699. Is not Calendar No. 698 the unfinished business for tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proper calendar number is 699. The calendar number was erroneously printed as 698.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the presiding officer.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. BONE. I move that the bills which have been made the pending order

of business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may consider Calendar No. 669, Senate bill 1407, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico" and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Washington that unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the so-called Puerto Rican bill, Senate bill 1407?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1407) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs was, on page 2, line 2, after the word "objectives", to strike out:

It is further declared to be the intention of Congress that no further changes in the organic act shall be made except with the concurrence of the people of Puerto Rico or their duly elected representatives.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 3 of the Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 741a) is hereby amended by adding to the second paragraph, after the words "or brought into the island," the following words: "but any such excise or sales taxes heretofore or hereafter levied on articles, goods, wares, or merchandise imported for exportation purposes shall be refunded if such articles, goods, wares, or merchandise are reexported."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 20, after the words "salary of", to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$10,000"; and in line 24, after the word "for", to strike out "maintenance, servants, automobiles, and social functions incident to the office of Governor" and insert "such other services and emoluments as may be provided by act of the Legislature of Puerto Rico."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$6,000"; in line 16, after the word "to", to strike out "that" and insert "the", and in the same line, after the word "of", to insert "Governor for the remainder of that term."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think there ought to be a complete explanation made of this bill before we act on the amendments. The Senate has not received any explanation as yet.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall be delighted to explain the bill as best I can to the Senate.

As I stated in my brief remarks when the bill was reached on the calendar, it is the result of the efforts of the commission appointed by the President of the United States that had for its purpose the effectuation of the policy declared on page 1 of the bill itself, which reads:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to reinforce the machinery of self-government in Puerto Rico and, to this end, to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Puerto Rico, and to provide for the necessary adjustments of relations between the Government of the United States and that of Puerto Rico in accordance with the foregoing objectives.

That is all there is to the bill. It appeared that it was the desire of the Executive of the Nation that the Organic Act of Puerto Rico be so amended that the people of Puerto Rico would be allowed to elect certain of their own governmental officials. With that in view, the President appointed a Commission headed by the Secretary of the Interior and having as members the Under Secretary of the Interior, Governor Tugwell of Puerto Rico, one citizen of this country, and about four or five citizens of Puerto Rico, including the man who was confirmed by the Senate as Chief Justice of Puerto Rico within the week. That Commission met in Washington; they had long deliberations; they listened to testimony; and as a result of their efforts Senate bill 1407 was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. That committee in turn referred the bill to a subcommittee of five members of this body, composed of myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. We took up the bill; we read and considered all the data which had been gathered, including all the information available to the Commission that had been appointed by the President. We listened to the testimony of the Secretary of the Interior and a number of others, including many governmental officials and many citizens of Puerto Rico, and, after working on this bill for 4 or 5 months, the subcommittee unanimously reported it to the full committee. Of course the bill probably does not include all that each individual member of the subcommittee would like to have it include, but it is the result of the unanimous opinion of the entire subcommittee. In turn the subcommittee made its report of the bill to the full Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, and, after the bill was explained, that committee, without a dissenting vote, reported it in the form in which it is now before the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The much older Territories of Hawaii and Alaska are not yet permitted to elect their own Governors. On what theory is Puerto Rico to be given an elected Governor when similar privilege is not extended to the other Territories?

Mr. CHAVEZ. On the theory of doing justice. The fact that we are not doing justice to Alaska and Hawaii should not keep us from doing justice to Puerto Rico at this instant.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to point out to the Senator from Michigan another essential difference in the case of Puerto Rico. Practically all the Governors of Puerto Rico have not been Puerto Ricans, or residents of Puerto Rico; they have been residents of the United States. Practically all the Governors of Hawaii, on the other hand, have been life-long residents of Hawaii, and many of them have been natives. For that reason there has not been the agitation in Hawaii for the election of a Governor in comparison with the agitation in Puerto Rico. Puerto Ricans have rarely, if ever, had the privilege of electing the Governor of that Territory.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am familiar with the Hawaiian situation. It is either provided in the statute, or it is definitely fixed in the procedure, that while the Governor is appointed by the President, he has to be a resident of Hawaii for a certain number of years.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would seem to me that was a perfectly logical intermediate step in the development of greater local autonomy.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, I think there is no way of denying the inference of the Senator's question, and if the Hawaiians wanted the privilege of electing their Governors, I think the Senate would look with great sympathy upon their request, but since I have been chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I do not recall a single request of any nature looking to that result. On the other hand, there has been much solicitation from Puerto Rico.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the requirement regarding qualifications of candidates for governor, under the text of the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The qualification regarding residence required of any candidate for governor, if he is a native Puerto Rican, is that he must have lived on the island for at least 1 year. The idea is that many Puerto Ricans come to cities in the United States—Washington, Miami, New York, and others—and remain here for years. We decided that even in the case of native-born residents, they should have to go back to Puerto Rico and live at least 1 year. If they are not native-born, if they are continental born, they must have lived in Puerto Rico for 5 years. The original bill recommended by the President's commission required a residence of 2 years, and the committee felt that 5 years' residence was better than 2 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand, then, that an American citizen from the States who has lived 5 years in Puerto Rico would be eligible to run for governor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How long has Dr. Tugwell lived in Puerto Rico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. When the Senator interrupted me, I was thinking of Calendar No. 12, Senate bill 40, a bill introduced, I think, by the Senator from Michigan. I believe that the 5-year limitation would take care of the situation the Senator asks about.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator pretty sure of that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am positive. In the first place, Dr. Tugwell has not been in Puerto Rico 5 years. In the second place, he is not a resident of Puerto Rico. I understand from the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] that he has been in Puerto Rico about 3 years. But irrespective of that, he is there on a temporary basis, because he is an appointee of the President as Governor of Puerto Rico.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, in addition to the other advantages of the bill, when the Senator lists the advantages, I suggest he include the emancipation of Puerto Rico from Dr. Tugwell, which I think is exhibit A in the advantages.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The subcommittee considered very carefully the question of a 2-year term or a 5-year term, and I am satisfied in my own mind that all the objectives of Senate bill 40 are taken care of by the residence qualification in the pending bill.

Mr. President, when I was appointed chairman of the subcommittee I was very happy when I learned who the other members were to be. They all devoted their time and energy toward perfecting a measure which, in my opinion, is extremely American. The subcommittee visited the island, and we feel that Puerto Rico is entitled to have a simple bill which will provide for the people of the island a certain amount of self-government, which will prevent someone from the States, someone who might have been unsuccessful in a campaign, becoming Governor of Puerto Rico, and which will enable the people of Puerto Rico to select their own Governor.

This committee, without any personal interest whatsoever, without any feeling that what they were doing would be of any particular benefit to them, so far as they were concerned, devoted their time and brought forth what we consider a simple bill, one designed to carry out the purposes of the first part of the bill, which I read again:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to reinforce the machinery of self-government in Puerto Rico and, to this end, to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Puerto Rico, and to provide for the necessary adjustments of relations between the Government of the United States and that of Puerto Rico in accordance with the foregoing objectives.

Mr. President, of course, the Commission which drafted the original bill was extremely ambitious. Our committee had made a trip to Puerto Rico, and we realized the economic limitations of the people and tried to provide in the bill arrangements which would result in the least expense possible to the government. We cut down bureaus and agencies to the limit. We amended the original act to such an extent that, whereas originally the act provided for the creation of a commission of 12, to be appointed by the President, with authority to employ many hundreds of people, we did not think that Puerto Rico or the United States could stand for that. The committee feels that we have reported to the Senate a bill in keeping with the ideas of the President. We considered it to be necessary to explain the bill to the full committee, which we did, and this is the one bill on which there is a unanimous report from the committee.

If there are any questions with reference to the amendments, I shall be very glad to explain them.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico about the language at the bottom of page 5, section 12c, which reads:

> No person shall be eligible to election as Governor, or Government Secretary.

"Government Secretary" is an office similar to the Vice Presidency in the United States; is it not? That is, if anything happens to the Governor, the Government Secretary fills the unexpired term?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is an innovation in legislation. It appears that what they had in mind was electing a Government Secretary who would carry out the duties of the Secretary of State in the United States, as we understand them, and who would be Lieutenant Governor at the same time.

Mr. BYRD. Then it says "or attorney general." They shall be citizens of the United States, at least 30 years of age, able to read and write the English language, and no person shall be eligible unless he "either is native-born and has been residing in Puerto Rico for at least 1 year immediately preceding the election," and so forth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is if he is native-born.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; or has been a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico during the immediately preceding 5 years. Would that be applicable to the present Governor of Puerto Rico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I answered that question in reply to the Senator from Michigan a moment ago, but I will again state the view of the committee. The Governor of Puerto Rico of the present moment is a temporary resident of Puerto Rico. He is there by virtue of the fact that he was appointed Governor by the President of the United States. But if he were a legitimate resident of Puerto Rico he could not qualify as a candidate for Governor because he has not been there 5 years.

Mr. BYRD. That would eliminate the present Governor of Puerto Rico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That would eliminate the present Governor of Puerto Rico for running for the office.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it could be said without any fear of successful contradiction that the present Governor would not be elected Governor. I think the Puerto Rican people would not elect him if he were to run. I do not think Governor Tugwell would run, and if he did run I do not think the people would elect him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 4, line 6, after the words "salary of", to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$6,000"; in line 16, after the word "to", to strike out "that" and insert "the"; and in the same line after the words "office of" to insert "Governor for the remainder of that term."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 13, to insert:

> (3) The Attorney General shall receive as compensation for his services an annual salary of $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 17, after the word "Governor", to strike out "of Puerto Rico, and"; in line 18, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "of Puerto Rico" and insert "and the Attorney General of Puerto Rico"; in line 24, before the word "Government", to strike out "or"; in the same line, after the word "Secretary", to insert "or Attorney General"; on page 6, line 2, after the word "and" where it occurs the first time, to insert "either is native born and has been residing in Puerto Rico for at least 1 year immediately preceding the election, or"; and in line 5, after the word "preceding", to strike out "two" and insert "five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 8, after the word "Secretary", insert "Attorney General, Auditor."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 19, before the word "Government", to strike out "or"; and in line 20, after the word "Secretary", to insert "Auditor, or Attorney General."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 5, to change the section number from 5 to 6; in line 10, after the word "Agriculture", to insert "a Department of Industries", and in line 12, after the word "Health", to insert "and Welfare."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 19, after the word "to", to strike out "create such additional departments and executive agencies as may be necessary and to" and in line 21, after the word "departments" to strike out "or agencies" and insert "herein provided for: *Provided, however*, That all executive agencies now existing or hereafter created shall be placed within one of such departments."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 25, after the word "heads", to strike out "and assistant heads"; on page 8, line 1, after the word "departments" to strike out "and agencies" and insert "except the Attorney General,", and in line 3, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out the period and "Each shall hold office during the term of office of the Governor by whom he is appointed and until his successor is qualified, unless sooner removed by the Governor"

and insert "for the term provided by act of the Legislature of Puerto Rico."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 8, after the word "Council", to strike out "is hereby" and insert "may"; in line 10, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "are" and insert "may be"; in line 11, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "until" and insert "by act of", and in line 12, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "shall otherwise provide."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 13, to change the section number from 6 to 7.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 16, after the word "That", to strike out "there" and insert "an Auditor"; in line 18, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "an auditor and assistant auditor"; in line 19, before the word "shall", to strike out "Each" and insert "He"; in line 20, after the word "of", to strike out "eight" and insert "nine"; in line 21, after the word "qualified", to strike out "unless sooner removed by the Governor. In the case of absence from duty, from any cause, of the auditor, the" and insert "The auditor may appoint an"; in line 24, after the word "auditor", to insert "who"; and, in line 25, after the word "during", to strike out "such" and insert "his."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 15, after the word "branches", to insert "and shall prescribe and promulgate general rules and regulations governing the exercise of the authority and duties of his office herein provided for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 21, after the word "final", to strike out "except that appeal therefrom may be taken in the manner prescribed in section 21 of this act. The auditor is authorized to communicate directly with any person having claims before him for settlement, or with any department, officer, or person having official relation with his office," and insert "subject to such right of action and review in the courts as may be provided by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 5, to change the section number from 7 to 8; in line 6, after the word "hereby", to strike out "amended to read as follows" and insert "repealed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 6, to strike out:

That any person aggrieved by the action or decision of the auditor in the settlement of his account or claim, or any official of the Government who believes that a decision of the auditor adversely affects a matter within his official jurisdiction, may, within 1 year, take an appeal in writing to the Governor, which appeal shall specifically set forth the particular action of the auditor to which exception is taken, with the reason and authorities relied on for reversing such decision. The decision of the Governor in such case shall be final, subject to such right of action as may be otherwise provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, after line 17, to strike out:

SEC. 8. Section 31 of the organic act (48 U. S. C., sec. 820) is hereby amended by adding at the end of the section the following: "*And provided further*, That the Legislature of Puerto Rico is empowered to alter the per diem rate of pay and travel expenses provided in this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 13, after the word "meet", to strike out "annually"; in line 15, after the word "January", to insert "1945, and biennially thereafter and shall"; in line 16, before the word "in", to strike out "remaining" and insert "remain"; in the same line, after the word "than", to strike out "one hundred" and insert "ninety"; in line 20, after the word "than", to strike out "fourteen" and insert "twenty-one", and in line 22, after the word "therefor", to strike out "or in any special message by the Governor to the legislature while in such session."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 8, after the word "unless", to strike out "disapproved" and insert "annulled"; in line 9, before the words "of the", to strike out "President" and insert "Congress"; in the same line, after the name "United States", to strike out "as hereafter provided"; in line 14, after the word "the", to strike out "Commissioner General for transmission through the Secretary of the Interior to the President of the United States. If in the judgment of the President such bill would (1) threaten the security of the United States, or (2) impair the international relations of the United States, or (3) impair its relations with Puerto Rico under the provisions of this act, the President may, if the bill has not yet become law, disapprove the same, in which event it shall not become law, or he may, if it has already become law, disapprove it within 60 days after it has become law, in which event it shall cease to have force and effect. This power of disapproval is not intended to be used to regulate the internal affairs of Puerto Rico nor to limit the power of the Puerto Rican people to legislate for themselves", and insert "and the Congress of the United States"; on page 13, line 5, after the word "may", to strike out "object to" and insert "veto"; in the same line, after the word "items", to strike out "or any part or parts, portion, or portions thereof,"; in line 7, after the word "approving", to strike out "of", and in the same line, after the word "the" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "other portion" and insert "remainder."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 12, after the name "Puerto Rico", to insert "to not more than seven"; in line 15, after the word "the", to strike out "Governor" and insert "President"; in line 17, after the word "of" where it occurs the first time, to strike out "Puerto Rico" and insert "the United States for a term of 7 years"; in line 18 to strike out "all justices of the Supreme Court shall hold office during good behavior"; in line 20, before the word "the", to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$10,500", and in the same line, after the word "justices", to strike out "$11,500" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 23, after the word "an", to insert "administrative"; in line 24, after the word "The", to strike out "United States Commissioner General" and insert "Coordinator of Federal Agencies"; on page 15, line 3, after the name "President", to insert "for the purpose of coordinating the administration of all Federal civilian functions and activities in Puerto Rico", and in line 7, after the words "salary of", to strike out:

$12,000 In addition thereto, he shall be entitled to the occupancy of such buildings as the President may assign or which may be built for the Commissioner General for both his residence and office with furniture and effects, free of rental, and to funds for maintenance, automobiles, servants, and social functions incident to the office of Commissioner General. The President shall designate a member of the staff of the Commissioner General who shall act as Commissioner General in the case of a vacancy, temporary disability, or absence of the Commissioner General. The Commissioner General shall have power to appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Office. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

(2) The Commissioner General shall, except as provided in section 12 of this act, be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws of the United States applicable in Puerto Rico. He may grant respites for all offenses against the laws of the United States until the decision of the President can be ascertained. Whenever it becomes necessary he may call upon the commanders of the military and naval forces of the United States in the island to prevent or suppress invasion, insurrection, rebellion, or (upon the request of the Governor) lawless violence. He shall annually, and at such other times as he may be required, make official report of the transactions of his office through the Secretary of the Interior to the President of the United States, and his annual report shall be transmitted to Congress. He shall perform such additional duties and functions as may in pursuance of law be delegated to him by the President.

And insert "$7,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 14, after the word "The", to strike out "Commissioner General" and insert "Coordinator of Federal Agencies"; in line 18, after the word "the", to strike out "Commissioner General" and insert "Coordinator of Federal Agencies"; in line 24, after the word "the", to strike out "Commissioner General" and insert "Coordinator of Federal Agencies", and on page 17, line 1, before the word "shall", to strike out "Commissioner General" and insert "Coordinator of Federal Agencies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 21, after the word "time", to insert "after hearing"; in line 25, after the word "The", to strike out "Commissioner General" and insert "Coordinator of Federal Agencies", and at the end of the

same line, before the word "from", to strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 5, after the word "The", to strike out "Commissioner General" and insert "Coordinator of Federal Agencies"; and in line 10, after the word "the", to strike out "Commissioner General" and insert "Coordinator of Federal Agencies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 16, to strike out:

SEC. 49c. (1) There is hereby created a Joint Advisory Council for Puerto Rico. It shall study and report to the President and the Congress of the United States on necessary or desirable changes in this act. The council shall also study and report on proposals with respect to the basic relationships between the United States and Puerto Rico, which proposals shall, when and as approved by Congress, be submitted to the people of Puerto Rico for their decision. The council shall also study and recommend a comprehensive economic program to be made operative over a period of years, the purpose of which shall be the economic rehabilitation of the island. The council shall report from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 2 years, beginning January 1, 1946. The reports of the council shall be made available to the Governor and the Legislature of Puerto Rico.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 7, to strike out:

(2) The council shall consist of the Secretary of the Interior, who shall be its Chairman, the Governor of Puerto Rico, and the Commissioner General, who shall serve as members ex officio, and, in addition, of four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, and five persons to be appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 13, to strike out:

(3) The council is authorized to employ such experts, technicians, and such other persons as may be necessary from time to time, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923. The expenses of the council are to be defrayed from appropriations made for this purpose by the Congress of the United States or by the Legislature of Puerto Rico. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary to defray the expenses of the council.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 5, after the word "by", to strike out "the Legislature of Puerto Rico and approved by the Governor; and if the legislature shall fail to make an appropriation for such salaries, the salaries theretofore fixed shall be paid without the necessity of further appropriations therefor," and insert "law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1407) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

XC——106

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I merely wish to call to the attention of my brethren that so far as I am able to determine, no one in Puerto Rico is happy over the bill just passed, or any other similar proposal which has appeared before the Senate during my term of service in this body. Judging from what I have heard and what I have read, I suspect that it would be impossible to formulate any political proposal affecting the life of that island which would meet the approval of any respectable minority of its people.

Mr. President, I desire to pay a tribute to the able chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who has certainly poured an enormous amount of energy into the accomplishment of the work that has been consummated by the Senate today. I also wish to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who despite his opposition to some of the proposals of this bill, was generous in seeing that it had a fair hearing before the entire committee.

It seems to me that one of the difficulties we confront is the fact that there is a terrifying finality about the views expressed in Puerto Rico. There are no neutral tints or neutral shades. Everything is either black or white. Puerto Ricans either want statehood or independence, and nothing in between. When we are wrestling with that sort of viewpoint it is impossible for this or any other body to formulate a political principle wrapped up in a bill which would satisfy them. I have a vast amount of literature in my office which has come to me through the mails. It was sent by earnest and well-meaning friends of the islands, and emphasizes one aspect of the Puerto Rican viewpoint: that they want to decide for themselves whether they shall have statehood, and thereby remove from Congress the duty of passing upon that question. So it seems by the arguments presented.

I do not know whether we are giving Puerto Rico something in this bill that its people do or do not want. As an earnest seeker after truth I have assiduously combed the literature of Puerto Rico which comes to my office, and I cannot find anybody who is happy about it. They rise with one accord and call down the mildew of God Almighty's wrath on its every proposal.

This committee did a great amount of work. The Chavez subcommittee went to Puerto Rico and examined earnestly and carefully the economic problems of that island. It seems to me that this bill is certainly a first step in the direction of ultimately achieving statehood, but that final decision, of course, must rest with the Congress.

If the people of Puerto Rico oppose this formula, and they are able to induce our brethren in the other House to repel it and throw it into the wastebasket, it can accomplish but one thing, Mr. President, and that is to force us to a very realistic contemplation of the independence formula presented to this body by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in a pending bill. I am quite certain that if the Puerto Ricans are unwilling to accept the mild suggestions made in the bill, which does not represent the full views of any member of the subcommittee or any member of the entire committee, but, rather a necessary merging of ideas, a blending of ideas, a relinquishment of some pet notions, and a compromise of views, which is very prevalent in legislative bodies, and if the Puerto Ricans fight it in the House and destroy it over there, they will face the stark realism of proposals which have been pending in this body for the disposition of Puerto Rican problems. I refer to the independence bill.

I hold in my hand several statements or editorials which represent some of the viewpoints of Puerto Ricans—for instance, statements coming from the business classes of Puerto Ricans. They are much opposed to the bill because they do not want their Governor elected locally. They would prefer to have a Presidentially appointed Governor. One of the leading journals in the island has this to say:

Our true position is the quiet but firm claim of our right to determine our own political destiny and to live under the blessings of sovereignty and liberty, which, under democracy, the United States is not denying to other peoples, more fortunate than ours.

In other words, to remove Puerto Rico forever from the realm of congressional activity, so far as legislating on very material matters.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that there be better order in the Chamber. The Senator from Washington has made quite a study of the Puerto Rican problem. He has corresponded with many persons in Puerto Rico, and I think his contribution to this debate should be assimilated by all of us. I ask that there be better order in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland. Perhaps I cannot add anything to what the Members of this body already know. I am not objecting to the bill. I merely believe that Members of the Senate should know a little more about the reactions of Puerto Ricans, as revealed by publicity reaching us.

When our committee went down there, hands were raised in holy horror at the suggestion that Puerto Rican children be taught in English. I confess, Mr. President, that it was staggering to us to find that people living under the American flag violently objected to having their children taught in English. An editorial in El Imparcial emphasizes what I have just said about general island reactions.

The editor has this to say, in addition:

The reforms bill as now recommended; that is, with the amendments introduced by the Chavez subcommittee, is not worth anything, is good for nothing, does not settle anything, does not establish any political assurance to the people of Puerto Rico.

The same newspaper has another suggestion to make in a recent editorial in

which the editor says, among other things:

There is no place for Puerto Rico within the American Union. * * *

No Puerto Rican worthy of the name will ever want to cease to be a Puerto Rican.

Another editorial from the same journal reads in part as follows:

The mortifying attitude of the Chavez subcommittee, reducing to a simple proposition—

Let me interpolate here the words "the election of a Governor, is a procedure which"—

lacked respect, was insolent; was a mockery for the Puerto Rican people and especially for those of our fellow citizens who were called by President Roosevelt to Washington to carry out a measure which he considered very important for our people.

In reference to our committee, I read further:

They also ignored in the most ignominious manner the demand of our legislative assembly contained in a unanimously adopted resolution claiming the right of Puerto Rico to end as soon as possible the colonial regime. The attitude of the Chavez subcommittee is offensive, irritating, and injurious to all the people of Puerto Rico, who seem to be condemned to continue with the burden of the chains of political servitude under which they have lived.

* * * * *

As we stated in a recent editorial, there is only one opportunity to state the views of Puerto Rico in Congress, and that is when the bill goes to the House, the Committee on Insular Affairs whereof has great interest in holding it up and to make it the victim of sabotage for reasons which we have already stated.

Mr. President, I call attention to these matters because they will give the Senate some idea of the difficulty under which the subcommittee and the full committee had to labor in attempting to formulate some change in the law. I confess that I cannot understand the attitude of mind of persons who say, "This is the end." The Congress which will meet next year will be able to change every line of the legislation affecting Puerto Rico, including the entire organic act. But to listen to the protests of Puerto Ricans, one would think that this pronouncement was as the law of the Medes and the Persians, that it was immutable, and never could be changed.

Before I leave the floor Mr. President—and I am about to conclude—I wish to pay a tribute to all the members of the subcommittee—the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the chairman of our subcommittee; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]; because they gave loyal and undivided attention to this work. The bill represents the best they could do for Puerto Rico at this time, with any hope of getting it through the United States Senate without a fight.

The bill does not represent my viewpoint. I would have stripped the harness off Puerto Rico, and would have let Puerto Ricans elect everyone, from Governor down to dog catcher, in that island. I would have given them democracy clear to the hilt. But some of my able brethren felt we should proceed more cautiously. The bill certainly represents a great step beyond what now exists in the political set-up of that island and it paves the way for other salutary and desirable changes. If Congress appears to be feeling its way along, it is due to a desire not to make mistakes, and also to the vigorous island opposition to all proposals so far advanced.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a few words relative to the effect of the bill. In my opinion, the bill is only a step toward later self-government on the part of Puerto Rico. It is not final. I do not think we can, during the war, while the war continues, determine the ultimate status of Puerto Rico. A bill providing for statehood for Puerto Rico has been introduced. Another bill, providing for her complete independence, has been introduced. I have been opposed to both bills because it has seemed to me that until the war is over, until we know the naval and military situation in particular, we can not decide what shall be the ultimate status of Puerto Rico.

This bill simply moves in the direction of greater independence. As a practical matter, what it would do would be to permit Puerto Ricans to elect their own Governor. That is the principal provision of the bill.

The reason for the protests which are made in Puerto Rico is that the committee appointed by the President recommended somewhat wider powers. For instance, it suggested that the organic act could not again be amended without the consent of Puerto Rico—a suggestion to which we thought we could not agree, even if we wished to do so. The committee appointed by the President recommended much more power for the Governor than the present bill as amended would provide. For instance, it recommended that the Governor should appoint the judges of the supreme court for life, and that the legislature might indefinitely increase the number of judges on the supreme court. As the bill is modified, it provides that the court cannot be increased to more than seven members, and that they are to be appointed for 7 years by the President of the United States, substantially under the present conditions.

We tried to envisage a situation comparable to that of the States of this Union. There are a few States which provide for the appointment of judges. Most of them provide for the election of judges. We did not feel that we finally had reached the point where we knew whether in Puerto Rico the election process would work well enough with respect to judges. So we decided to leave the court as it is. That is what we did. I think the President of the United States for the present would appoint a better court than could be chosen in any other way.

We also provide for a coordinator of federal affairs. One thing we found is that in Puerto Rico there are some 20 or 30 Federal agencies, each operating independently, without relation to the other, without reporting to the Governor of Puerto Rico, but each reporting to an office in Washington. We felt there should be a coordinator of Federal affairs reporting to the Secretary of the Interior. In the bill we have provided for the establishment of such a coordinator.

The committee appointed by the President recommended a bill providing for a commissioner general, and for him to have a very handsome residence and to have all sorts of expense money which would have to be provided by the United States Government. All of us felt there should not be such an official in Puerto Rico. We provided instead simply for a coordinator of Federal affairs at $7,500. I am perfectly confident that we must go further.

In my opinion Puerto Rico cannot be compared to Hawaii, Alaska, or even the Philippines, because it is a nation of 2,000,000 people which was subject to Spain, but which for many purposes had practical independence. We cannot assert that they are unable to govern themselves. They are just as able to govern themselves as are many other free nations. If they desire to govern themselves subject to certain military qualifications, I do not think in the end we can in any way refuse their desire.

The Puerto Rican people have a long history. While they are friendly to America, I do not know whether they will finally wish to be part of America. I do not know whether we will wish to admit them as a State into the Union. I do think that they are entitled to approximately the same independence which each State has, to the extent of choosing their own governor, and ultimately choosing their own judges and other officers who may be necessary for the conduct of their affairs.

There is one thing that is entirely omitted from this bill, which should also be called to the attention of the Senate. I think there should be a complete revision of the provisions of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, relating to finances. We have not attempted to deal with economic questions in this bill. The bill deals solely with political questions; but the present situation is being considered in the House of Representatives. The House is considering the arrangement under which Puerto Rico would return all the internal-revenue taxes collected in Puerto Rico. Under the present conditions of increased manufacture of rum they are receiving a tremendous revenue which, strictly speaking, comes out of the taxes on the people of the United States. I think that subject should be given further consideration, and some measure should be devised to deal with that situation.

I think this is a step—not a very long step, but an important step—in the direction of giving the people of Puerto Rico the right of self-government.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the chairman and members of the subcommittee for the very diligent work they have done in familiarizing themselves with the conditions pertaining to Puerto Rico, and for formulating this bill to carry the widest measure of local self-government, to Puerto Rico that the present circumstances, in my

opinion, will permit. I think it is a good bill so far as it goes; but I should not want to assume that even a mild solution of the Puerto Rican problem has been accomplished by this bill.

In my judgment, there is only one solution for the Puerto Rican problem, and that is complete, absolute, and unconditional independence for that island.

We obtained Puerto Rico by conquest as a result of our war with Spain. Conditions in Puerto Rico today are not at all healthy. They are not healthy economically, and they are not healthy politically. Many attempts have been made to salve the wounds caused by the economic and political conditions obtaining in Puerto Rico. The usual way is to appropriate a large sum for relief; and year after year sick Puerto Rico—sick both politically and economically—has been kept alive by the injection of relief money, without which, in my opinion, there would be real hardship in the island and a great deal of disease, which in some respects is already much above the average rate obtaining in other parts of the United States.

Why should not the Puerto Ricans have independence? While they are loyal to our country, of course, they are essentially alien to our language, for, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] has said, very few Puerto Ricans speak English fluently. Spanish is the prevailing language, and although they have been under the American flag since 1898, the Puerto Ricans want to retain their Spanish language. If they want to retain it, that is their privilege. But the line of cleavage in culture, speech, and thought is wide as between the Latin on the one hand and the predominant Anglo-Saxon, characterized by the United States, on the other.

Furthermore, there is a one-crop economy in Puerto Rico. There is nothing but sugar, a seasonal crop. The density of population in Puerto Rico is greater than anywhere else in the Western Hemisphere. More people live in a square mile of space in Puerto Rico than anywhere else in this hemisphere from the North Pole to the South Pole. They are all dependent on one crop, an economy of one kind only. Puerto Rico has possibilities for economic variation, for economic diffusion, and for economic seasonal production, which its present economy will not permit it to enjoy or achieve.

There can never be any solution of the Puerto Rican problem under our system of government except that of pure expediency. I make this assertion, and I make it with measured words: If the Puerto Rican people are given the opportunity by ballot to say whether or not they want complete independence, they will vote overwhelmingly for it. Then why do we not give it to them? Every Senator who has spoken on this subject concedes that we have not begun to settle the problem. It is said that at most the step we have taken is but a short one. It has not changed anything fundamentally. Then what are we waiting for?

The question of bases in Puerto Rico is not the reason for deferring action in this matter. The independence bill provides that we may keep all the military, naval, and air bases we want. There is no quarrel on that score. We could take such facilities as we might desire, and the Puerto Ricans would accept that situation, because obviously Puerto Rico is too small a country to defend itself, and it would be glad to have us there.

Then what is the reason? Money, selfishness, the greed of a few persons. That is all there is to it. While we are fighting this war for democracy—God save the name—we are willing to keep these people in economic slavery because of a few investments there by persons in this country who are reaping handsome dividends as a result.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think that is an extraordinary statement to make.

Mr. TYDINGS. Wherein is it incorrect?

Mr. TAFT. My reason for opposing independence is that if today we should give independence to the Puerto Ricans, in my opinion, there would be the direst poverty and the most tragic collapse of their economic life. That is the reason why I am opposed to the Senator's bill for independence, unless it is proposed to accompany it with some economic treaty. I suggest that instead of granting independence to Puerto Rico we might ultimately make Puerto Rico a sort of autonomous dependency in which we retain our diplomatic and military status, under an arrangement by which we would give certain definite contracts to the Puerto Ricans with respect to tariff and economic relations, which would insure their prosperity. But certainly the opposition to independence in the Senate arises entirely from the standpoint of the interests of the Puerto Ricans themselves. If they had independence today, in the first place their sugar could not compete in the American market with the sugar of other countries. In the second place, we would immediately deprive them of $50,000,000 of revenue which they are receiving from the rum tax and other internal revenue taxes which we are levying.

Mr. TYDINGS. No one should assume for a moment that we are going to give them independence in 24 hours. The bill which I have introduced provides for giving them independence, but also for giving them economic preferences in this market on a declining scale for a period of 20 years.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Of course, if we were to cut off all the economic preferences which the people of Puerto Rico today enjoy, such action would bring on revolution and strife. But the independence bill proposes that, starting with 100 percent of the preferences which they now enjoy, they shall be decreased each year by 5 percent, over a period of 20 years, to permit their economic readjustment.

It is as plain as the nose on one's face that the great masses of the people of Puerto Rico can never earn a livelihood in that single island with all their future welfare tied up to just one crop, and that a seasonal crop. What will they do between the periods of harvest? They will do exactly what they have been doing—namely, hunt for work which does not exist—while the American Congress pours out millions upon millions of dollars of relief money to keep them from starving to death.

In the old days in Puerto Rico, prior to 15 or 20 years ago, and from the time we obtained Puerto Rico as a result of our treaty with Spain, she produced most of her own meat. She produced a large part of her vegetables and other food. Today cattle are gone from Puerto Rico. All her fertile lands are employed in the production of sugar only. Meat is imported. Nearly everything the people there need to eat comes in from the outside. The economic system established there has furnished no solution. We are keeping 2,000,000 people in economic slavery while we are fighting for so-called democracy. We are feeding the world. In the midst of a tremendous internal prosperity we are forced to feed our own population as it is represented in Puerto Rico every single year by the use of relief money. Make no mistake about it, the political leaders in Puerto Rico dare not let the people pass on this question. I challenge them to do so. If they do, the vote will be like a landslide.

Puerto Ricans are basically a proud people. They are basically of the Latin or Spanish culture. They cling to the heritage of their fathers and mothers. I do not mean to say that they are not loyal Americans, for they are. However, by long centuries of thought, philosophy, training, and culture, their roots are in a different environment from those of the people of the United States.

No one from Puerto Rico has at any time come before our committee and said that the bill to give them independence is unfair. They cannot say it, for although we would quickly give them independence, they would have, even after independence, 20 years of preference in the American market which would enable them gradually to change from an economy of one crop to a diversified economy which would provide them with a balanced diet.

Puerto Rico is bound by the coastal shipping laws of this country. That fact acts as an economic ball and chain on a little island such as Puerto Rico. If it were not for those laws she could have ships plying the sea reviving her coffee trade, reviving her cattle trade, and reviving her vegetable trade, enlarging the potential economic possibilities of Puerto Rico.

There is no reason to wait for the settlement of this question until after the war is over. It will be the same question then as it is now. For all we have done, lo, these many years, has been annually to feed the masses of Puerto Rico, because we have not had the will to look this question in the face, and because the so-called leaders of Puerto Rico are more anxious concerning political preferences, in many cases, than they are

concerned with the real welfare of the Puerto Rican people.

The bill which I have introduced provides that we shall keep such naval, air, and military bases as our authorities believe to be necessary, with the right to acquire all that we wish to acquire there. It provides that immediately after independence Puerto Rico shall enjoy 20 years of special economic advantages in our domestic market. That would give the American investors in Puerto Rico time to adjust their affairs and withdraw without loss to their property.

Mr. President, in what way is this question being handled internally in Puerto Rico? I will tell you. Mr. Luis Muñoz Marín, the president of the senate and the so-called leader, I believe, of the popular party of Puerto Rico, proposed that a new economic set-up be launched in the island. Governor Tugwell, who is the Presidentially appointed Governor, proposed that an old law of Congress be enforced. What is that old law? In simple words, it provided in effect that the sugar estates should not be so large, and it proposed, through Government action, to buy up some of those estates and devote them to the production of cattle and vegetables so that Puerto Rico could produce her own food. That is not the way to go at the problem. It is almost like a condemnation of the whole of the island from its present situation to its past situation. Let the Puerto Ricans settle this matter, under proper safeguards, which are already written into the independence bill. I do not wish to discuss the Puerto Rican question at this time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. How much money would the United States save annually if Puerto Rico were given her independence?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not the figure available, but I can get it for the Senator. Perhaps the Senator from New Mexico may be in position to give me the figure.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not have the figures at hand, but I can get them. The committee has the information. But I do not wish to have assertions made in the Senate that because some money has been sent to Puerto Rico for relief it in any way compares with the amount of money which has been sent to my State, to the State of the Senator from Maryland, or to the State of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; that is correct. However, the impression seems to prevail that the Puerto Rican people are the only ones who are being given any of this charity money. Compared with the money which has been received throughout the United States in the last 10 years that which has been received by Puerto Rico makes her a mere "piker."

Mr. TYDINGS. Allow me to say to the Senator from Arizona that under the present law, while all the Territories and all the States turn their Federal internal revenues into the National Treasury, we allow Puerto Rico to keep hers for her own uses. We have certain tariff laws which provide that in the case of Puerto Rico her import revenues shall remain in Puerto Rico instead of going into the National Treasury. Not only that, but we have appropriated annually for years special funds for Puerto Rican relief. So, when we put all these revenues together, the cost to the American Government, from a strictly financial consideration, is greater than that of any other territory under the American flag. I believe I have answered in general terms the question of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. President, I do not wish to debate the Puerto Rican independence bill at this time. That is a subject about which I should wish to talk at a later time, and at greater length. However, I make the statement now that the bill the Senate has been considering this afternoon is only a political sop, although it is a partial aid to the people of Puerto Rico. It settles nothing. It condemns the people of Puerto Rico to live in economic slavery. There is no economic solution in it. There can be only one solution, namely, to give those people what they are entitled to receive—the right under God's sun to govern themselves.

Let me for a moment before I sit down draw a parallel with the Philippine Islands. There was a time when we would not appropriate money to fortify the Philippine Islands. It was not possible to get a nickel out of Congress to fortify them. More than that, we were bound by treaty with Japan that we would only keep up our fortifications there, without building any new ones.

When the Philippine independence question was before the Senate, I pointed out on this floor that we had the responsibility of defending a land which was thousands of miles from America, in which lived 15,000,000 people, and that we were without the means to discharge that responsibility. The independence bill was delayed. When it was finally passed, we were at war with Japan, before we had divested ourselves of our responsibility, and were unable to fortify the islands so that we could discharge the responsibility which we had assumed. Now we are reading accounts of what our short-sighted policy inflicted on our very people.

I want to tell you, Mr. President and Senators, that the question of Puerto Rican independence will not down, because it is essentially just and humane and fundamentally American that these people should have the right to be the masters of their own destiny in any way they want to. They lived before they were under the American flag, and, on the whole, in my opinion, they lived better than they have been living recently. So they can live again. We will not hear the last echo of this debate; we will never end the Puerto Rican problem until we give to the people of the island the democracy that is their birthright, until they have what we have, the right under God's sun to be the masters of their own fate, to be their own rulers. That is what they want, and what, in God's name, is wrong in submitting to them this proposition so that they can say "Yes" or "No" to it? Politics, greed, and selfishness intervene while two and a half million people are chained to an impossible economic set-up, and the American Congress condones it by annual appropriations to keep them from starving to death, while disease permeates many of the poorer classes of that unfortunate island.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I inquire what is the status of Senate bill 1407? It has been passed, has it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been passed.

REPUBLICAN CAMPAIGN ACTIVITIES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is a limit to the credulity of the people even in a campaign year. The birthday of the noble Lincoln has been made the occasion for an anvil chorus which has echoed from one end of the land to the other. Many speeches have been made giving counsel to the American people about the course they should pursue. I have before me, Mr. President, an excerpt from a great speaker:

He—

Referring to the President—

stands for a theory of administration and government which is not American. His methods, his constant if indirect assaults upon the Constitution, upon all the traditions of free government, strike at the very life of the American principles upon which our Government has always rested. The return of the Democrats to power with [him] or one of his disciples still the leader and master of a great party, which before his advent possessed both traditions and principles, would be a long step in the direction of the autocracy for which [he] yearns and a heavy blow to the continuance of free representative government as we have always conceived and venerated it.

The peril inseparable from [him] and his system goes far beyond all party divisions, for it involves the fundamental question of whether the Government of the United States shall be a government of laws and not of men, whether it shall be a free representative government or that of a dictatorship resting on a plebiscite carried by repellent methods. [He] and the autocracy he represents and all those who believe in his doctrines and share his spirit represent must be put aside and conclusively excluded from any future control.

We must be now and ever for Americanism and nationalism, and against internationalism. There is no safety for us, no hope that we can be of service to the world, if we do otherwise.

Mr. President, those were the remarks of a great Republican Senator, but they were not delivered on Lincoln's birthday; they were not delivered by a sitting Senator. I have read an extract from an address delivered by Senator Henry Cabot Lodge before the Republican National Convention in 1920. Yet, Mr. President, you would have thought it was not Woodrow Wilson against whom Mr. Lodge directed his references but Franklin D. Roosevelt. I deleted the name Wilson and inserted the pronoun "he" and "him" in order that Senators might see that the Republican Party and its leadership in the campaign of 1920 used the same slogan, made the same appeal to misrepresentation and prejudice and made the same sort of claims they are

making today. The analogy is so accurate that the American people will not ignore it in their choice of one party or the other to govern this Nation and through it the destiny of mankind.

Yet, Mr. President, the heir apparent to the Republican throne, that gilded, public-relations-advised candidate, the Governor of New York, in his best and most studied pose of the coy maiden who is so diligently sought, the one who says "no" with a lisping lip, but with the dark lashes of her inviting eyes says "come on"—that coy Candidate Dewey tells the American people, pretending to give to his utterance the probity of his great office, that the American people dare not face the confusion of the future with the Democratic Party in power; that the people, if they wish a permanent peace, must resort to the Grand Old Party.

Mr. President, if the shade and shadow of the Republican Party of the past does not hover over those utterances to belie them, the people are of short memory. For that is the party, Mr. President, which destroyed the hope of mankind for permanent peace when it destroyed the League of Nations and its author and founder and prophet, the man whom Lodge hated, Woodrow Wilson.

Mr. President, beyond the citadel of the skies where an omniscient eye and mind record all incidents of man's activity, if there be a moral court, that coterie of Republican leaders bear upon their souls the penalty of a war which has consumed another guiltless generation of men. Yet, Mr. President, the party which repudiated the League of Nations, the party which prevented the World Court, the party which has opposed international collaboration and cooperation even to the very verge of this war, has the temerity to appeal to the American people for a vote of confidence upon their policy for the future.

Whom do they offer, and what? Does any American know what the view of the coy candidate of New York is on foreign policy? I believe someone has said that Governor Dewey came out against isolation only when it was ridiculous any longer to embrace it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It might be interesting to interject in the debate a statement with respect to the foreign policy of the coy candidate from New York. At the Mackinac conference, the Senator will recall, Dewey came forth with the only foreign policy statement I have ever heard of him making, when he advocated a military alliance between England and the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as I recall, that is about the only thing he has ever said in connection with foreign policy. It is interesting to observe in connection with what I am saying, that the Chicago Tribune immediately read Dewey out of the party, called him a deserter, and said that he had no place in the Republican Party, as a result of that statement. I have the editorial, and some day before we finish this campaign I shall read the editorial into the RECORD in full, because what the Chicago Tribune said about Mr. Dewey is a good deal along the line of what the Senator from North Dakota has said constantly about Mr. Willkie. Yet they both will probably swallow either one or the other, in the event he becomes a candidate.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, as the able Senator from Illinois has said, Governor Dewey has gotten no further in his thinking about international organization than to propose an alliance between Britain and the United States. I wonder how long he will adhere to that declaration, how quickly, when he is brought out of his cloistered retirement, when finally he puts on his Cinderella slipper and goes to the ball, he will continue to embrace, in the presence of an opposing portion of the population, the suggestion of a British-American alliance as security for the post-war world.

Mr. President, at the time of the recent visit of the "modern Harding," the gentleman who has had so much difficulty in dissociating himself in the public mind from his predecessor from Ohio—and I refer, of course, to Governor Bricker—it seems to me a great effort was made to dissociate him in the public mind from an offensive declaration of isolationism. But his publicity build-up has removed those obstructions from his candidacy, and now he comes out for a declaration of foreign policy which I challenge any proponent to show is a word stronger than the utterances of his predecessor and prototype, President Harding, of Ohio.

Yet, Mr. President, in spite of the fact that a great assembly of prominent Republicans, such as Elihu Root, William Howard Taft, Nicholas Murray Butler, and many others, assured the American people that Harding was all right on the League of Nations—and he was all right until after the election—after the election he said, "As far as I am concerned, the League is dead," and it was dead, destroyed with the dagger of his election.

Does any American whose son is fighting for democracy, any American who saw the Republican Party stifle the hope of peace, after World War No. 1, and betray one generation of soldier-citizens, does any father who has only the memory of a dead son to honor, think that he would repose trust for world peace in either Governor Dewey or Governor Bricker, upon their public record of international collaboration and cooperation?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I presume the Senator is familiar with what the great William Allen White said about the famous Governor from Ohio, Mr. Bricker, who was in Washington on Lincoln's birthday.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to be reminded of it.

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, he said, in substance, that surely the Republican Party would not sink so low as to offer "Bricker and a bellyache"—I think those were the words—as campaign arguments to win a national election in 1944, that Bricker was a second "honest Harding, thumbs down." That is what was said by the late William Allen White, a man whom I consider one of the great men and great Republicans of this country.

Mr. PEPPER. William Allen White had a penetrating understanding of human nature, and when the coin of character did not ring true, William Allen White inevitably discovered it.

Mr. President, the American people are not going to be deluded. The outstanding fact is that the one great leader in the Republican Party has probably made himself unacceptable to the Old Guard, which still is, as it always has been, the Republican Party, because he is known to have courageous convictions about international collaboration after the war. I refer to Wendell Willkie. I do not expect ever to vote for Mr. Wendell Willkie, Mr. President, but I will say that as a fellow American I honor the courage of a man who sees through the complexity and the difficulty ahead, and courageously proposes to accept the challenge of a dangerous future. Compare him with these retreating, shifting, vacillating, word-mouthing candidates. It is like a pygmy by a giant. At least he has the courage of a conviction.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Before we leave Mr. Bricker, who was in Washington on Lincoln's Birthday, let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that he also made the statement that the Republicans could win in the 1944 election with any candidate, and he said they had a lot of good men in the Republican Party.

I desire to make the observation in the Senator's time, that it is going to take more than a good man to run this weary old world during the next 4 years. It is going to take a great man, and I undertake to say that the great men in the Republican Party cannot be found.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask any Senator to compare the utterances so far made by any of the Republican candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency, except Mr. Willkie, with the following declaration made by a great Democrat before the election in 1920. This is what he said:

> In our world problems we must either shut our eyes, sell our newly built merchant marine to more far-seeing foreign powers, crush utterly by embargo and harassing legislation our foreign trade, close our ports, and build an impregnable wall of costly armaments and live, as the Orient used to live—a hermit nation—dreaming of the past; or we must open our eyes and see that modern civilization has become so complex and the lives of civilized men so interwoven with the lives of other men in other countries as to make it impossible to be in this world and not of it. We must see that it is impossible to avoid, except by monastic seclusion, those honorable and intimate foreign relations which the fearful-hearted shudderingly miscall by that devil's catchword "international complications."
>
> Even as the Nation entered the war for an ideal, so it has emerged from the war with the determination that the ideal shall not die. It is idle to pretend that the war declaration of April 6, 1917, was a mere act of

self-defense, or that the object of our participation was solely to defeat the military power of the central nations of Europe. We knew then, as a Nation, even as we know today, that success on land and sea could be but half a victory. The other half is not won yet. To the cry of the French at Verdun: "They shall not pass," the cheer of our own men in the Argonne: "We shall go through," we must add this: "It shall not occur again."

Mr. President, would any Senator be surprised that those were the words of a young man of conviction, a candidate for Vice President in 1920, named Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York? That is not an equivocal vote-getting statement, Mr. President. That is a dedication of purpose.

A few days ago I had the privilege to sit and talk with another great Governor of Ohio, Gov. James M. Cox, an honored citizen and publisher of my State. I heard him tell the story of the time when he and his Vice Presidential candidate went into the White House to talk about the League of Nations and the campaign of 1920 with Woodrow Wilson, which is being included in a book soon to be published by Governor Cox, of Ohio. There was no equivocation in the declaration of the Democratic platform, Mr. President. There was no equivocation in the declaration of the Democratic candidates. No, they did not pussyfoot with the destiny of the earth.

What I am saying, Mr. President, is only this, that the analogy is so accurate as to become frightening between what happened in 1919 and 1920 and what may happen in 1944. We read a moment ago what the leader of the Republican Party in the Senate said at the Republican convention in 1920; the shibboleth of praise and pretense which he used is being repeated upon every Republican platform and wherever they speak in all the land, complaining against this, complaining against that, talking about dictatorship and tyranny, using the old jargon of States' rights, and wrapping around them the folds of a falsely used Constitution.

O Mr. President! let the people remember what they did in 1920 and beware! Their sons today die because they were not aware in 1920. I do not care what the name of the Presidential candidate is, but in the name of God and the dead, Mr. President, let us not have a man who lies about his convictions for the profit of office when he betrays the rolling rivers of the blood of destroyed boys.

Mr. President, the "party of gloom" says to the American people that they dare not risk the confusion of the Democrats in power in the distressing days which lie ahead of us economically. The effrontery, the temerity—as I have heard it said, the unmitigated gall—of a party that sat with its arms folded and its thumbs twiddling while the Nation burned in despair and distress, now asking confidence from the American people upon their leadership in a period of economic crisis.

In 1933, on the 4th of March, between one hour and another America became a different Nation, not, Mr. President, because it had a different people, not because it had more money, more men, more resources. No, it has a new President and a new party in power. And when this Nation heard the words of that new President breathing the inspiration and the strength of new hope and courage, it was a new Nation rejuvenated from within.

Mr. President, I wonder when the candidate from New York gave that assurance how much it impressed the soldiery who may come here for succor in the future.

Mr. President, I will say one thing with pride and satisfaction: No Democratic Commander in Chief and President has ever at the point of the bayonet and the sword driven the faithful veterans of America's wars when they came clamoring for the justice they deserved from the Nation's Capital. They did not offer them jobs. They gave them a sword and a bayonet; by the personal command of the President and the Secretary of War they drove them out into painful oblivion, and if soldiers coming back from another war want that kind of treatment, Mr. President, the record of that party sustains with confidence, maybe, what they shall get in the future.

So I wonder whether or not also the people want to entrust the greatest plum a political party has ever sought—the power to effect and control the economy of this Nation, which will be within the grasp of the party in power when this war is over—I wonder whether the American people wish to entrust that immeasurable power to a party whose name has been associated with privilege from the beginning of its political history.

Does anyone believe, Mr. President, that the Government, which owns 54 percent of the aluminum plants of this country, will make pots and pans cheaper to the housewife if the Republican Party, carrying out its tradition of past privilege, has the power of distribution of that 54 percent of the aluminum production facilities of this country? Do the people in the West believe, Mr. President, that those great steel mills will run and smelt the ore out of their own soil to build a greater country if the party of privilege, whose coffers for campaign purposes shall be filled by men associated with those protected and dominant industries, is the party in power?

Are all the machine tools, Mr. President, going to be employed in making goods more plentiful and cheaper for the American people, or will they be retrenched and discarded, and an economy of scarcity be put back into effect, so high prices and high profits may become the dominant policy of the dominant industry of the Nation?

Mr. President, do they think social-security benefits will be extended and expanded? Do they think we will have national employment, Mr. President, by the party which, to take it at its best, is the party of laissez faire, where he may take who has the power, and he may keep who can?

So, Mr. President, this is the responsibility of the people. It is they who suffer; it is their country about which we are talking; it is their destiny of which we speak. The pawns in the game are their jobs, their wages, their homes, their recreation, and their sons. It is they who are to determine, as they will determine before the end of this year, what shall happen to them. Shall they die following gloriously the pursuits of peace, or shall they die in some muddy and bloody ditch in some foreign clime because their elders did not have the courage and the vision and the foresight to make better provision to secure their future safety in an honorable peace?

CANADIAN FARM EQUIPMENT AND MACHINERY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], who has been compelled to leave the Chamber, has asked me in his behalf to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to him from the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., which is accompanied by a memorandum delivered to the State Department by the counselor of the Canadian Legation with reference to Canadian farm equipment and machinery. I ask unanimous consent that these two communications be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 11, 1944.

The Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: The counselor of the Canadian Legation called at the Department on February 4 and referred to your statement in regard to Canadian farm equipment and machinery which appears on page 860 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1944. He brought with him a memorandum, giving certain information with regard to this situation and suggested that you might be glad to know of these additional facts. I am, therefore, enclosing a copy of the memorandum.

You will note that the situation is said to be quite different from that implied in the Canadian Trade Commissioner's letter, which is quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In view of this, the Canadian Embassy suggests the possibility that in order to correct the impression which has been given, the contents of the memorandum might be made public. The Department, of course, would have no objection to publication of the memorandum.

In view of the statements made regarding coordination with the War Production Board, I am also sending a copy of the memorandum to Mr. Donald Nelson.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

The attention of the Embassy has been drawn to a statement under the heading "Canadian farm equipment and machinery," which appears at page 860 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1944. The statement includes a copy of a letter addressed to Senator WHEELER by an implement company in Montana, together with a copy of a letter addressed to the implement company by the acting Canadian trade commissioner at Chicago. Since the contents of the acting trade commissioner's letter appear to be somewhat too concise and might, and apparently did, leave the impression that Canada was in a position to supply all kinds of farm implements to the United States, it is considered that Senator WHEELER would welcome further information on the matter.

The situation was, in fact, quite different from that implied in the acting Canadian trade commissioner's letter; therefore, in the interests of good understanding between the two countries it is considered desirable that the misapprehension should be cleared up. In this connection the Embassy desires to emphasize that there was in fact no surplus of farm machinery in Canada. Production in Canada for domestic use is at least as restricted as in the United States, if not more so, and production for export is restricted in almost exactly the same terms as apply to United States manufacturers. Since 1941 the Canadian production and distribution of farm machinery have been coordinated with production and distribution in the United States. The orders issued by the Wartime Prices and Trade Board of Canada and the War Production Board of the United States controlling production and distribution in the two countries have been brought into closest harmony. However, Canada and the United States have always exchanged certain implements and equipment in normal commercial transactions. There is, and there has been for many years, trade between Canada and the United States of various types of farm machinery. Certain types are made in the United States and not in Canada, and these types are exported from the United States to Canada. Other types are made in Canada and not in the United States, and these are exported to the United States. The presently existing regulations in each country recognize the mutual advantage accruing from such trade by permitting its continuance in a volume reduced commensurately with existing shortages.

The Wartime Prices and Trade Board of Canada and the War Production Board of the United States have cooperated to determine the types and quantities to make up this trade, and indeed have worked closely together in allocating all of the available exports among dependent markets according to need; there is no intention to depart from the practice.

In addition to the cooperation which has existed between these authorities since 1941, a new organization for cooperation has recently been established. It is the Agricultural Machinery Committee set up about 2 months ago jointly by the Combined Production and Resources Board, and the Combined Food Board; both Canada and the United States are members of both Boards. This committee surveys world production and requirements of farm machinery and it provides an additional protection against trade in farm machinery between Canada and the United States (and between those two countries and other countries) which is not in the interests of the common war effort.

Mr. Spencer's letter to the Montana company undoubtedly arose from a circular letter sent to the Canadian trade commissioners requesting advice as to the requirements in their territories for Canadian farm implements to be manufactured in the 1945 production year, the information to be given to the administrator of farm machinery for his use in formulating an export program. This letter was sent to Canadian officials in the United States, though it was not primarily intended for them, as the Administrator himself will negotiate with the War Production Board and other officials on exports to that country. The request was not related to market expansion, but was simply to obtain information on basic requirements of Canadian foreign customers in order to coordinate such requirements with restricted Canadian wartime production. While Canada has not given precise consideration to a post-war export program for agricultural implements, Foreign Commerce Weekly, an official publication of the United States Department of Commerce, in its January 22 issue, devotes its leading article to post-war foreign markets for farm machinery, including a study of the potential Canadian market for United States implements.

The Embassy ventures to express the hope that the foregoing information will serve to correct any earlier impression derived from the acting trade commissioner's letter and to suggest that, in view of the publicity given to the matter, the contents of this memorandum be made public as well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a treaty, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

REMOVAL OF SECRECY BAN FROM TREATY WITH MEXICO—UTILIZATION OF WATERS OF THE COLORADO AND TIJUANA RIVERS AND THE RIO GRANDE

Mr. CONNALLY. Earlier today the President sent to the Senate a treaty—Executive A, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—with the United Mexican States dealing with the apportionment of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and the Rio Grande, boundary waters, from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico. The treaty is on file with the Secretary of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the ban of secrecy be now removed from the treaty so that it may be made available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Col. Omar T. Pfeiffer to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 5th day of October 1942; and

Vice Admiral Raymond A. Spruance, United States Navy, to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 4th day of February 1944.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SCHUETZ, OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate resolutions of the House of Representatives (H. Res. 437), which were read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
February 14, 1944.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of eight Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 255) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of three Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BROOKS, and Mr. CHAVEZ the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 16, 1944, as 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 15 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George W. Renchard, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Joseph T. Sylvester, of Portland, Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine. (Reappointment.)

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Augustine H. Gray, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander service squadron 8.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lonnie D. McCurry, a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1943.

Platoon Sgt. William C. Doty, Jr., a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 5th day of May 1943.

Roy H. Elrod, a citizen of Texas, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943:

Billie S. Adams, a citizen of Alabama.

Edwin G. Middleton, a citizen of Kentucky.

James F. Mayenschein, a citizen of West Virginia.

Platoon Sgt. Otis R. Waldrop, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of December 1943.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 12th day of January 1944:

Platoon Sgt. Nicholas M. Seminoff.

Platoon Sgt. Robert J. Craig.

Staff Sgt. Arthur W. Ecklund.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 15 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

ALASKA

Maude H. Boyle, Fairbanks.
Sidney Arlington Banks, Yakutat.

ARKANSAS

Elizabeth F. Godfrey, Sweet Home.
Claiborne A. Worthington, Tinsman.
Jesse C. Bogy, Wabbaseka.
Mattye E. Hendrix, Ward.

KANSAS

William Benjamin Burrows, Lakin.
Beth Constance, Shawnee.
Horace D. MacCloughan, Solomon.
Henry M. Otis, Wilsey.

KENTUCKY

Mary E. Stiles, Cecilia.

OREGON

Harriet F. House, Grand Ronde.

VIRGINIA

Ira B. Forrest, Messick.
Thomas S. Hawkes, Wellville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Bow down Thine ear, O God, for we are poor and needy, this day may our lips be pure and our hearts clean. Love is Thy glory, strengthening the weak is Thy glory, and standing as the defender of those who have been wronged is Thy glory. We pray to be kept free of self-laudation and from the perverted thought that one has the right to do as he wills with his own; Thou dost recompense those who suffer and strive. At the time discipline seems to be a matter not for joy, but for grief; yet it yields to those who have passed through its training the peace of a righteous life.

We praise Thee for that deep and abiding faith which through the turmoils of the nations, has held us close to Thee and for the star of hope which has illuminated our way on to better endeavor. We thank Thee for that subtle, pure, mysterious something we name "love," which binds us together in families and friendships and which neither time nor space can sever. Touch our souls that they shall feel Thine emotion; touch our understanding that it shall have poise and our decisions Thy wisdom. Thou who art above all to whom the rich and the poor, the bad and the good may look up and call Thee Father, help us to rid ourselves of all selfishness that we may become fit temples wherein dwelleth that righteousness which finds a path through the sad heart of this world. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business, and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Also, Mr. Speaker, that on Friday next, I have similar permission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] tomorrow, after special orders and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD, and include a recent address delivered by Governor Dewey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4183, Rept. No. 1118) making appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and together with the report thereon, referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

EMPLOYMENT OF PRIVATE COUNSEL BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 230, to limit the operations of sections 109 and 203 of the Criminal Code, and sections 306, 314, and 315 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman from North Carolina explain the purpose of the joint resolution?

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, as is well known, Messrs. Dodd, Watson, and Lovett, in consequence of congressional action in a recent deficiency appropriation bill, have brought suit against the United States to recover their alleged salaries due them. They raise the question of the constitutionality of the action of the Congress of the United States, in the passage of this amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill. The purpose of this resolution is to allow the Congress, through a joint resolution, to employ counsel, which authority has been given by this House, and to suspend certain statutes, which would embarrass any counsel and prohibit those who had a claim against the Government, or who are employees of the Government from appearing in behalf of the United States in the aforesaid cases, the sections referred to are sections 109 of the Criminal Code and 113 of the Criminal Code.

The other three statutes to be suspended are sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes. By the suspension and abridgment of these statutes and the consent of the Attorney General the attorneys for Congress so employed will have an opportunity to present the contentions of the Congress fully in the Court of Claims in which these cases are now pending as well as in the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The subcommittee is unanimous in favor of this resolution?

Mr. KERR. Yes; and we have a precedent for it in the case of the Teapot Dome investigation and prosecution. Mr. Roberts, now a Supreme Court justice, was employed in that matter, and a similar resolution was passed in order to protect him when so employed. This was by special resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 54 of the Sixty-eighth Congress, so that he might make his appearance for

the United States Government. A comprehensive report, No. 1117, has been filed with this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, 365, or 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel serving under the provisions of House Resolution 105, Seventy-eighth Congress, adopted February 9, 1943, or House Resolution 386, Seventy-eighth Congress, adopted December 18, 1943.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law."

CONTESTED ELECTION CASE, CLARK AGAINST NICHOLS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 3, together with a resolution dismissing the election contest of E. O. Clark, contestant, against Jack Nichols, contestee, Second Congressional District of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. The report and resolution is referred to House Calendar, and ordered printed.

Without objection, this matter will be temporarily laid aside.

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF GUAYULE PLANTING

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, House Resolution 346.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the resolution which the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] spoke to me about on several occasions?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; and it is the resolution which I announced was on the program for yesterday?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very fine resolution and unless anybody wants to ask any questions, I hope it will be passed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thought it had better be explained for the benefit of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I am going to ask the gentleman to explain it, but so far as I am concerned, I think it is a very fine resolution. After the explanation by the gentleman from California, I hope unanimous consent will be granted for its immediate consideration and that it will be passed.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I appreciate the attitude of the majority leader and also the attitude of the minority leader.

This resolution simply provides for an investigation without delay of the entire guayule production program in the United States. We have appropriated some $45,000,000 and have planted some 30,000 acres. I think it is high time we conducted a thorough investigation, because the program has bogged down under the present management. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture are in accord with the resolution. I understand that both the majority leader and the minority leader are also in accord with the provisions of this resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am for the resolution. The gentleman said it has bogged down. What does he mean by that?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That would take a long time to explain. A properly conducted investigation will bring out all of the facts. It has bogged down. It is time it was investigated, so we will find out exactly where we are in this program.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the following report to Governor Warren, of California, as made by the California State Guayule Committee. I am still convinced that guayule has a great future in the United States if it is properly handled. It is my hope that the chairman of the committee will speedily appoint a subcommittee to investigate the present status of the guayule emergency rubber project and that this committee will report its findings to Congress so that we will know how best to proceed in the future. Such a subcommittee might also look into the work that is being done with Russian dandelion, cryptostegia, and other rubber-producing plants.

The report referred to above is as follows:

JANUARY 10, 1944.

The Honorable EARL WARREN,
Governor of the State of California,
Sacramento, Calif.

DEAR GOVERNOR WARREN: At the last session of the California State Legislature, the assembly passed a resolution authorizing the appointment by you of a California State guayule committee to consist of one man from each of the five guayule districts.

Pursuant to that resolution you appointed the following committee: Fred J. Hart, chairman, Salinas, Calif.; Lloyd W. Frick, Bakersfield, Calif.; Rudolph W. Lindeman, Sr., Los Banos, Calif.; E. Stanton Daley, Woodland, Calif.; Lee Anderson, Coachella, Calif.

At the first meeting of the committee they elected as vice chairman Rudolph W. Lindemann, and as secretary Fred S. McCargar, secretary of the Salinas Chamber of Commerce. At that meeting the committee also requested the department of agriculture, the food and fiber authority, the agricultural extension service of the University of California, the United States Rubber Director's office, and the emergency rubber project to designate an official representative who could meet with the committee in an advisory capacity. Each of these departments acceded to that request, and the committee acknowledges the wholehearted cooperation of the representatives.

In order to properly evaluate actions taken by the committee, it is necessary to have the following information in mind.

The emergency rubber project was authorized by action of Congress in 1942, making possible the planting of some 75,000 acres of guayule. The responsibility for development was delegated to the United States Department of Agriculture, which in turn delegated it to the United States Forest Service. Personnel, plans, and equipment were immediately organized for the planting of some 35,000 acres of guayule on nonirrigated lands in California formerly largely used in growing cereals. Shortly thereafter, Congress authorized expansion of the project to 500,000 acres. To meet this mandate, the United States Forest Service expanded its facilities and personnel in preparation for planting some 200,000 acres. To hasten the time of maturity this increased planting was to be made on irrigated lands, these lands formerly being utilized for production of field crops.

In the spring of 1942 the general rubber program in the United States was such that the emergency need for rubber produced from guayule was thought to have been lessened to the extent that it was more important that the better grade of irrigated lands be used for growing food crops rather than guayule. To meet this condition all irrigated lands that had been acquired for planting of guayule and which were not actually planted were returned to the original owner upon request, or subleased when possible.

It is obvious that the project has been subject to an expansion and contraction program which has made operation difficult with any degree of efficiency in use of management, equipment, personnel, and other facilities.

At the present time, there are approximately 30,000 acres planted to guayule in California with no further expansion of acreage being contemplated.

The activities and expenditures for capital and operating costs of the project fall into three categories, namely, (1) research and experimental, (2) seeding, growing, and harvesting, and (3) extracting or processing of the mature shrub. These activities have been evaluated on the basis of three possible purposes they may serve, namely, (a) making rubber available in the present emergency, (b) value in making rubber available in future emergencies of a similar kind, (c) possibility of establishing domestic rubber production by private enterprise on a limited scale as an addition to the agricultural use of lands of secondary value in certain areas of suitable climatic conditions, and as an insurance against excessive future raw rubber prices caused by foreign cartels.

After careful consideration of the project in its present status, your committee desires to recommend for your consideration and for the consideration of the people of California and the United States the following program:

1. That as early as is practical the activities of government in this project be limited to determining methods for the production and processing of rubber from guayule on a practical and economic basis; and to the conducting of such research and experimental work as is necessary in the present emergency for future emergencies

and for aiding in establishing a new peacetime agricultural industry of this nature, if such proves to be economically necessary or feasible.

2. That the Government continue to carry on the present project in as economical and orderly manner as possible and that during such continuation, as rapidly as is practical the growing of shrub be turned over to individual farmers, and the processing be turned over to private or cooperative enterprise.

As it is now estimated that by the fall of 1944 there will be more acreage of matured guayule ready for harvesting than present facilities can process, it is the committee's recommendation that the emergency rubber project immediately establish contact with one or more of the leading rubber users in an endeavor to contract with them for the processing of shrub now being grown. This contract to be entered into with the understanding that such company will use every effort to develop and maintain the domestic production of guayule rubber in the future. Such contract not to be entered into with any corporation not domestically owned and controlled.

3. That since all land leases now held by the Department of Agriculture for the growing of guayule were negotiated under conditions and economic circumstances very different than exist at the present time, or may exist in the future, it is recommended by the committee that owners of such land be given option to renegotiate such leases at the date of harvest of the guayule shrub now growing on land covered by said leases.

4. That in order to obtain more definite and practical information on cultural practices and costs of growing guayule by individual farmers the Congress of the United States appropriate or earmark sufficient funds for the establishment of not less than 15 50-acre farms scattered properly over the guayule-growing area of the State, on which farmers shall be encouraged to grow guayule at a stated, guaranteed payment for their efforts, based on ultimate rubber produced. It is estimated that the amount of rubber produced on these experimental farms, if paid for at the present price being paid by the Government for Mexican guayule rubber delivered at the border, would require a sum of approximately $500,000. The committee desires to point out in this connection that this is not a request for the Government to give the farmers any money, but is primarily a request that funds be earmarked in such a manner as to enable the Government to contract for the purchase of rubber when and if it is produced. The committee feels that if the Government is willing to pay Mexican producers 34 cents per pound, it certainly should be more than willing to purchase rubber from American producers at the same price. The committee believes experience to date has definitely proved that California climatic and soil conditions are extremely favorable to the culture of the guayule shrub.

Number 4 recommendation listed above is a very important one. It is the committee's feeling that only through such a system can actual costs of growing under normal farm conditions be obtained. It is planned that these farm costs shall be handled as agricultural extension projects are handled, thus insuring that within a 12 months' period from the beginning of such experimental operations, actual costs will be available on which a farmer can determine whether he can or cannot produce guayule rubber in competition with synthetic or foreign importation.

The committee wishes to express its appreciation of the very friendly and valuable cooperation afforded it by those connected with the emergency rubber project in California and the office of the United States Department of Agriculture, and the office of the Emergency Rubber Director, in Washington, D. C.

The committee also expresses its appreciation for the cooperation and assistance rendered the emergency rubber project and the committee by growers and individuals of various districts of California where guayule has been planted.

It is the belief of the committee that the best interests of California agriculture will be served by the continuance of the present or a similar State committee. The present members of the committee have served at their own expense and it is their opinion that should you desire them to continue in office, or appoint a new committee, that some provision should be made for reimbursing committee members for their out-of-pocket expense occasioned by attendance at meetings, or when engaged in activities of an official nature as members of the committee.

Very truly yours,

FRED J. HART,
Chairman, State Guayule Committee.

The above report has been approved by each of the five members of the committee with the exception of Mr. E. Stanton Daley, who is ill, and we believe that it meets with his approval.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the progress of the program provided for in the act of March 5, 1942, for the planting of guayule to serve as a domestic source of crude rubber, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward in a manner calculated to achieve such a domestic source in the shortest possible time.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress, at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony, to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, investigators, and other assistants, and to have such printing and binding done, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as he may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 439), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 408 of the Seventy-eighth Congress incurred by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $100,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. That the official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—DISCHARGE PETITION

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have today caused to be placed on the Speaker's desk a discharge petition on the so-called equal rights amendment to the Constitution. On this, the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of the birth of the late Susan B. Anthony, I believe it proper and fitting that this petition be instituted.

It is somewhat bizarre that the women of our country, or in many parts of our country, have been denied the right of equal citizenship. It is even more bizarre that the Congress of the United States has made no provision for the legislative authority to the several States to provide actual equality and the right to control their own economic destiny, and the destiny of their children.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress has provided to women of this country the opportunity to serve in and with the armed forces on land, on the sea, and in the air This Congress has distinguished women as a part of its membership who have contributed much to the welfare of our country. This Congress can, in my opinion, do no less than authorize the machinery for a constitutional amendment declaring that women shall have equal rights with men throughout the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I invite the membership of the House to sign the petition to which I have referred.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, any right-thinking and fair-minded person, observing the various activities in which women are patriotically engaged in these wartimes, must agree that women are entitled to equal consideration with men and that the laws of the States which unjustly discriminate against women should be repealed. In almost every imaginable occupation women are serving our country conscientiously and devotedly and are nobly doing their part in order that America may live as a free Nation. If women are good enough to operate the vehicles of transportation, to forge the tools of victory in the defense plants of our country, to serve as WAC's and WAVES and in a thousand other capacities vital to the prosecution of the war, it seems to me that it would be a very low and miserable conception of justice that would deny to them the

enjoyment of equal rights with men under the laws of the land. The refusal of many States to grant them that equality can only be corrected by the adoption of the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution. I hope that Members of the House in overwhelming numbers will sign the discharge petition which will bring this righteous proposal out of committee and before the House for debate and a record vote in the true American way.

As a Hoosier I am glad that the forelooking Governor of our State has assumed a role of leadership in advancing this great human cause, and I call attention to a letter he wrote a few days ago to Miss Mary C. Kennedy, president of the Indiana Society for the Equal Rights Amendment, in which he said:

> I am pleased to tell you that I share your convictions on the proposed equal-rights amendment to the Federal Constitution. I have no doubt that our party will incorporate a supporting plank in both the State and the National platforms this year.

Those are the words of a wise and farseeing statesman and I hope that Members of Congress will weigh them carefully.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Governor Schricker, of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON] has today placed the equal-rights-amendment petition on the Speaker's desk, and I shall be honored in being one of its early signers.

In this period of great emergency when so many of our men are away from their homes and so many of the young women have also donned the uniform in defense of their country, I feel that their mothers and wives, in fact all of the fine women of our great country should undertake an additional responsibility—namely, to be trustee of those precious American ideals for which their sons and daughters are valiantly fighting.

Perhaps I simplify my impression of these ideals, but to me they are expressed through our Constitution containing its splendid Bill of Rights. That wise document and those 10 brief paragraphs forming its first 10 amendments have permitted our country to grow great and permitted the American home to be one of its symbols.

I believe the women of America appreciate this more poignantly than do we men and will always be willing to rise in defense of our Constitution and our American way of life. This ever-ready willingness should give them the equal rights in our Government which they deserve.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, as one who comes from a State where men and women have been, under the law, treated as individuals, as community copartners when married to each other, each member an individual in his and her own right, for many, many years, and especially in view of the war, wherein men and women are serving on an equal basis, it is difficult for me to understand why there should be any opposition to writing the equal rights amendment into the Constitution of the United States. I will support the proposed amendment. Furthermore, I will be one of the very first to sign the order on the Speaker's desk which, when 217 others have also signed, will require the consideration of the resolution in which the amendment is contained, this because I believe it should be a part of the Constitution of the United States at the earliest possible moment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, coming, as I do, from the great Southwest and neighboring California, I can say for Arizona as the gentleman has just said, we on two accounts recognize the splendid influence of women in civic and political as well as in social matters. We have the law of community property in Arizona. It may be that we inherited that from the Spaniards. But Anglo-American Arizona early gave women the ballot.

On her one hundred and twenty-fourth birthday, I want to point out that Arizona owes a great deal to Susan B. Anthony. One of her best personal friends and disciples, Mrs. Josephine Brawley Hughes, came to Tucson, Ariz., in 1874, when there were not more than a dozen Anglo-American citizens in that old pueblo, and this Mrs. Hughes laid the basis for women's rights in our State. Mrs. Hughes not only fought the saloon, but she eventually brought woman suffrage to that new community.

This was done indirectly through the son of Mrs. Hughes. The Arizona woman leader on one occasion about 50 years ago attended a national woman suffrage convention in the East bringing her little son, John, with her. Susan B. Anthony carried the little boy from Arizona up on a platform and conferred upon him the title "Suffrage Knight of Arizona" in the presence of the whole convention. The little fellow probably did not understand then but his mother taught him to understand through later years. John Hughes grew up to be a lawyer, was a member of the senate in the first legislature of the new State of Arizona and he introduced the amendment granting Arizona women the right to vote in 1912—several years before the nineteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution was adopted.

On behalf of many women in Arizona I wish to remember Susan B. Anthony on this her birthday, to recognize our debt to her and her personal friend, Mrs. Josephine Brawley Hughes, and to say that we in Arizona have found it wise to share with women the heavy civic responsibilities. From our experience I think it wise to go further than we have gone in the direction of equal rights for women.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have been one to sign the discharge petition on the equal-rights amendment, placed on the Speaker's desk today by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON].

There has been a long, long struggle down through the ages to give equality of opportunity and of right to women as well as to men. My State of Oregon has been one of the forward-looking States in that respect. The late Abigail Scott Dunniway, of my State, a woman of noble character and great power, was one of the prime movers in the suffrage movement. Our State granted that right long before the National Government did so.

I have an excerpt which appeared in the Star of our Capital City 50 years ago which is of interest to us today. May I read it:

> WOMAN SUFFRAGE CONVENTION
>
> Woman suffragists descended upon the Capital to discuss ways and means of accomplishing their object. As described in the Star of February 13, 1894: "The twenty-sixth annual convention of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, which is to commence at Metzerott Hall next Thursday morning, February 15, 1894, to last for a week, promises to be the most successful and interesting ever held by the association in this city. Every indication points to a large attendance of delegates and others interested in the work from all parts of the country. Miss Susan B. Anthony is already here, but goes over to Baltimore this afternoon to be present at the State convention there. Others of the advance guard began to arrive today."

Mr. Speaker, the women of our Nation are joining the ranks of men today not only in civil life but are making an outstanding contribution to the war effort as well. The time has arrived when we should by the equal-rights amendment to the Constitution place both sexes on an equality before the law. I trust that you my fellow colleagues will join us in signing the discharge petition on the Speaker's desk permitting the resolution on the equal-rights amendment to be called up for passage.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLISON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the independent spirit of the Free State of Maryland asserted itself far back in history. Two hundred years before the historic convention at Seneca Falls, N. Y., when Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott inaugurated the organized woman movement—200 years before that year, 1848—a woman of free spirit made her declaration of rights in Maryland. In 1648 Mistress Brent demanded place and voice in the assembly as the executrix and representative of her kinsman, Lord Baltimore. Her petition was denied, of course, just as related petitions have been denied women ever since; just as Mrs. Mott and Mrs. Stanton two centuries later were denied seats as delegates in the Antislavery Convention of London; just as Susan B. Anthony whose birthday we honor today was denied the right to vote though she appeared at every session of Congress from 1869 to 1906 to plead the suffrage cause; just as women today are being denied their plea for full equality with men under the law, for which they ask in the equal-rights amendment.

Mistress Brent and Miss Anthony were defeated in their immediate objectives, but their crusading spirits lived on. The women who have so long been struggling for equality and justice are not defeated, though they have sustained a temporary set-back in committee. They will continue their fight and they will win. Their bill of rights will take its place in our Constitution and I, for one, hope that the Seventy-eighth Congress will have the distinguished privilege of opening the way to place it there. I welcome this opportunity to sign the discharge petition which my honorable colleague from Florida has presented. I believe it eminently just that the Members of this House should be given opportunity to discuss and vote on this important amendment so vital to the women of our country.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON] announced a few minutes ago that he had put a petition in the well of the House for the discharge of the committee from further consideration of what is known as the equal-rights amendment. As soon as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON] announced that he had put this petition in the well, I immediately signed it. In this day, when all races, creeds, and groups are contending for their rights, I can see no reason why we should fail to hear those who feel that their rights have been denied them.

We could pay great tribute today to Susan B. Anthony and to those great women who have followed her. But I am concerned more now with the women of the present. They are the women under present circumstances who are the guardians of our democracy. The men of this Nation are at war to defend this great democratic country. In addition to assisting at home, the women are also going to do the greater share of the voting. Therefore, the responsibility for the defense of democracy in this country depends upon the women and the candidates whom they will choose during the elections this year. Since we have placed greater and greater responsibility upon the women of this Nation, we should certainly not hesitate to hear them when they say that certain rights have been denied them.

I have heard there is some difference of opinion among the women who are concerned with this amendment, but there could be no harm done to those who are either for or against it by permitting those who favor it to be heard. I hope that this House will give this amendment its most careful consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the Members of Congress today in commemorating the great work and leadership of Susan B. Anthony.

In the long struggle for the advancement of our civilization and the upbuilding of our country, we have come to recognize and have been helped by the refining influence of the womanhood of our Nation. One of the outstanding pioneers in the great movement for the recognition of women's claim to equal rights was Susan B. Anthony, and it is to the success of her efforts that the refining influence of women has extended not only throughout this country but throughout the world. The women of every nation are indebted for the recognition they have achieved to the pioneering spirit and leadership of the great American woman, Susan B. Anthony.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a telegram and a resolution adopted by the Oregon Dairymen's Association on February 11, bearing on price control and the dairy industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AFTER THE WAR

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, in a political speech Saturday night, Governor Dewey, of New York, said that the people of the United States are "desperately anxious that we shall build well and strongly in international cooperation after the war."

With that statement we can all agree.

It was not many months ago however, that Governor Dewey, in trying to jump the gun on other Republican presidential candidates at the Mackinac Conference, made the somewhat amazing statement that he favored an alliance with Great Britain.

Certainly, the people of this Nation want us to take our place as a leader among the nations of the world in a cooperative effort for permanent peace. They are not interested in entangling alliances, and are not likely this early to forget the proposal advanced by Mr. Dewey at Mackinac, even though he now attempts to abandon that position in favor of the position taken by President Roosevelt and Secretary Hull.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial that appeared in the Boston Post on Tuesday, February 8, on the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from the Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, regarding the operation of that law in the Territory of Hawaii.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article by the Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii on the destiny of the Nation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE CANNING INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an article from the Wisconsin Medical Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address made by my colleague, the minority leader of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], at Wheeling, W. Va., on Saturday evening, February 12

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GOSSETT was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.)

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix on the income-tax form.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Bureau of Reclamation and the Hungry Horse, together with a report by William E. Warren, before the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on February 5, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address on the oil-shortage problem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FORM OF BALLOT FOR SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous-consent requests: First, to extend in the RECORD a speech delivered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] on Lincoln Day; and, second, to extend my own remarks and include therein a letter appearing in the columns of the Kennebunk Star, published in Kennebunk, Maine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and to include therein an editorial; and I ask unanimous consent that in revising the remarks I made on House Resolution 346 I may be permitted to include certain data.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Governor Edge, of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include two letters received from C. S. Herr, chief forester, Brown Co., Berlin, N. H., and John H. Foster, State forester, Concord, N. H., respectively, in regard to spruce budworm.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] may have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address he made in Kansas City last Friday evening.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THROTTLING GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a sweeping strangle order recently issued by the General Accounting Office which forbids all employees of that agency, numbering approximately 11,000, from making any independent contacts with congressional committees or individual Members of Congress without first securing permission from the Comptroller General or his special assistant.

The order reads as follows:

In order to accomplish better coordination and prevent duplication of effort in connection with appearances before the contacts with committees of the Congress and individual Members of either House thereof, by representatives of the General Accounting Office, respecting pending or proposed legislation and matters affecting the work of the office, all such appearances and contacts shall be made under the direction of Mr. A. Banks Thomas, Special Assistant to the Comptroller General, to whom all officers and employees of the office proposing to make any such appearances or contacts shall present the purposes thereof for my consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have always had high respect for the Comptroller General. But, Mr. Speaker, when the head of an agency of our Government isues an edict which says that employees under his direction are not permitted to make any appearances or any contacts with Members of Congress without consulting him or his assistant, he is carrying things too far. Why, tell me, should a Government employee not have a right to discuss matters affecting his employment and his Government with committees or Members of Congress? Can there be anything so secretive or confidential except matters pertaining to the war effort that civil-service employees should not discuss with a Member of the House or Senate? Has it become necessary to provide a censorship in our own departments of Government and require that anything said to a Member of Congress by Government employees must first be scrutinized by the heads of our agencies?

Mr. Speaker, a rule of this kind, in my judgment, is harsh. It is severe. It conflicts with the right of civil-service employees under the law to petition Members of Congress with respect to matters affecting their employment or their Government.

Mr. Speaker, such rule, if rigidly enforced, could mean a further step of regimentation within the departments of our own Government. It is undemocratic and ought to be rescinded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have three requests to submit: One, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD; two, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including an article written by a distinguished newspaper columnist; and, three, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing an article written by Mr. Hutchison.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news article from the Citizen Herald of Arkadelphia, Ark.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two particulars, in one extension to include a letter from an overseas officer and in the other an address by Brig. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a book review from the New York Herald Tribune; also I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Senator Robert L. Owen.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a news item from the Post with my own comments thereon; also to extend my

own remarks and include a resolution from the American Legion post of Vermillion, La.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial taken from the New York Times of Sunday, February 13, entitled "Parsons in Uniform."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter which I have received.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUSAN B. ANTHONY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and in that connection to extend my remarks, and that my remarks may appear in the RECORD at the place where the Speaker called my name recently.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may address the House for 1 minute only at this time.

Mr. WHITE. For 1 minute only, Mr. Speaker, but I ask that my remarks may appear at that point in the RECORD where the Speaker called my name.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STRIKES AND WORK STOPPAGES

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GATHINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks I wish to print a speech delivered by Judge Francis Rivers of New York at a Lincoln Day banquet last Saturday. Judge Rivers is a native of Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning on amendments to the renegotiation statute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein some law notes concerning H. R. 4103.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by Governor Bricker of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a release I received from the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THREE HUNDRED AND FOURTEENTH TROOP-CARRIER GROUP CONTRIBUTION TO INFANTILE PARALYSIS FUND

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter transmitted to me to be presented to the President, to include also a copy of a letter, and a copy of a letter transmitted to me requesting that I make the presentation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BONNER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MR. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement of our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, protesting to Hirohito, that little shriveled-up ape in Tokyo, against the brutal, cruel, and inhuman treatment that has been meted out to our men in Japanese prisons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some time ago, those two smear campaigners of the radio, Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson, trained their guns on Gen. George Patton, one of the greatest soldiers of this war. They were joined by PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker. Their slimy attacks did more to injure the morale of the men in our armed forces, and to disturb the people at home, than anything else that has yet occurred.

General Patton is not popular with Hitler, he is not popular with Hirohito, but he is popular with the brave men who are fighting under him.

I was proud of an old ex-doughboy of the First World War down in my home town when a fellow walked up to him and asked: "Don't you think they ought to court martial General Patton and punish him for slapping that soldier?" The old boy looked at him and said, "Hell, no! you're looking at a man who got slapped in the last war. What do you think this war is, a petting party? You have to have discipline in an army in time of war." He said, "We need more men like Patton."

Today our boys are paying with their lives for the attacks made by Drew Pearson, Walter Winchell and PM on General Patton, the only man who ever whipped Rommel, the German leader, in north Africa, and kept him whipped.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Shamrock, Tex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Maj. Gen. Edwin M. Watson and from Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

AMENDMENT TO ACT EMPOWERING THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMISSIONERS TO CONVEY LAND

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 4059) to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922), and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman has several bills relative to the District of Columbia which he will call up today. I presume he will follow the usual practice and explain each bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The distinguished minority leader is correct. There will be four bills called up and I will make an explanation in each case as they are called up.

Mr. MARTIN of Masachusetts. Will the gentleman run through them briefly?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The purpose of this legislation (H. R. 4059) is to transfer certain funds that have been placed in the general Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia. These funds were inadvertently transferred to the United States, which properly belonged to the District of Columbia, in connection with the sale of land.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land", approved April 28, 1922, be, and it is hereby, amended by striking out the period and adding the following words: "to the credit of the District of Columbia."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO APPOINT NOTARIES PUBLIC

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3720) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint notaries public, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 558 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 1, sec. 501), be further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 558. Notaries: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have power to appoint such number of notaries public, residents of said District, or whose sole place of business or employment is located within said District, as in their discretion, the business of the District may require: *Provided*, That the appointment of any person as such notary public, or the acceptance of his commission as such, or the performance of the duties thereunder, shall not disqualify or prevent such person from representing clients before any of the departments of the United States Government in the District of Columbia or elsewhere: *Provided further*, That such person so appointed as a notary public who appears to practice or represent clients before any such department is not otherwise engaged in Government employ, and shall be admitted by the heads of such departments to practice therein in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed for other persons or attorneys who are admitted to practice therein: *And provided further*, That no notary public shall be authorized to take acknowledgments, administer oaths, certify papers, or perform any official acts in connection with matters in which he is employed as counsel, attorney, or agent, or in which he may be in any way interested before any of the departments aforesaid.

"Each notary public before obtaining his commission, and for each renewal thereof, shall pay to the collector of taxes of the District of Columbia a license fee of $10: *Provided*, That no license fee shall be collected from any notary public in the service of the United States Government or the District of Columbia government whose notarial duties are confined solely to Government official business: *And provided further*, That no notary fee shall be collected at any time by a notary public who is exempted from the payment of the license fee. The Commissioners are hereby authorized to refund, in the manner prescribed by law for the refunding of erroneously paid taxes, the amount of any fee erroneously paid or collected under this section.

"The Commissioners are hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as they may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act."

SEC. 2. Section 561 of the said act approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., title 1, sec. 504), is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 561. Oath and bond: Each notary public, before entering upon the duties of his office, shall take the oath prescribed for civil officers in the District of Columbia, and shall give bond to the District of Columbia in the sum of $2,000, with security, to be approved by the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia or a justice thereof, for the faithful discharge of the duties of his office."

SEC. 3. A notary public appointed before the passage of this act may continue in such capacity until the expiration date of his commission.

SEC. 4. Certificates issued by the Commissioners may be signed by the secretary, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. Appropriation is hereby authorized to be made to carry out the provisions of this act, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to include in their annual estimates provision for all expenses incident to such purposes, including the purchase of equipment and supplies and the payment of salaries to personnel, subject to the limitations of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal (H. R. 3720) would simply provide for the appointment of notaries public in the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of the District rather than through the Department of Justice as they are now appointed. We think this is a power that should properly be lodged in the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE CODE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PROVIDING FOR THE SALE OF FISH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3997) to amend the code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 898 of the District of Columbia Code, approved March 3, 1901, be amended to read as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any person to have in possession or expose for sale in the District of Columbia, between the 10th day of June and the 30th day of November, both inclusive, in any year, any fresh fish of the shad or herring species."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill (H. R. 3997) would permit the sale of fresh fish of the shad or herring species in the District of Columbia during the month of December. Originally it was believed that December was included in the spawning season. At the present time the sale of fish of the shad or herring species is prohibited by law between the 10th day of June and the 30th day of December, both inclusive. This was a protective measure. It has been determined by the Bureau of Fisheries that the legislation as formerly enacted is not necessary for the month of December and for that reason we ask that this bill be passed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT OF ADDITIONAL POWERS TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up H. R. 2644, to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered within their discretion—

(a) In accordance with such regulations as they may make, to provide for the waiver of payment by any person in the military service of the United States of any annual or other periodic fee required by law to be paid to the District of Columbia or to any District of Columbia board or commission as a condition to retaining or renewing any license or permit to engage in any business or calling or to practice any profession in the District of Columbia.

(b) To make, adopt, and enforce regulations requiring persons, firms, and corporations, other than utility companies, engaged within the District of Columbia in the business of plumbing or gas fitting, or of installing, maintaining, or repairing heating, ventilating, air-conditioning, or mechanical refrigerating apparatus, equipment, appliances, systems, or parts thereof, or of installing, maintaining, or repairing apparatus, equipment, fixtures, appliances, or wiring, using, or conducting electric current, to furnish and keep in force, a bond running to the District of Columbia with corporate surety authorized by the United States Treasury Department, and by the Insurance Department of the District of Columbia to do business in the District of Columbia in an amount not exceeding $5,000, conditioned upon the performance in accordance with law and regulations in force in the District of Columbia of all such work undertaken by such person,

firm, or corporation, and to keep the District of Columbia harmless from the consequences of any and all acts performed by said person, firm, or corporation in connection with such business during the period covered by the said bond.

The surety on any such bond may terminate its liability under such bond by giving 30 days' written notice thereof, served either personally or by registered mail, to the principal and to the Commissioners; and upon giving such notice the surety shall be discharged from all liability under such bond for any act or omission of the principal occurring after the expiration of 30 days from the date of service of such notice. Unless on or before the expiration of such period the principal shall duly file a new bond in like amount and conditioned as the original in substitution of the bond so terminated, the license of the principal to engage in such business shall likewise terminate upon the expiration of such period. Upon making any payment on account of its bond, the surety shall immediately notify the Commissioners.

In the event the surety becomes insolvent or a bankrupt, or ceases to be authorized by the United States Treasury Department, or by the Insurance Department of the District of Columbia to do business in the District of Columbia, the principal shall, within 10 days after notice thereof, given by the Commissioners, duly file a new bond in like amount and conditioned as the original and if the principal shall fail to do so the license of such principal shall terminate. If a recovery be had on any bond the principal shall restore the bond to its original amount.

Any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation in force in the District of Columbia relating to such business shall have, in addition to his right of action against said person, firm, or corporation, a right to bring suit against the surety on said bond, either alone or jointly with the principal thereon, and to recover in an amount not exceeding the penalty of the bond any damages sustained by reason of any act, transaction, or conduct of the principal which may be in violation of law or regulation in force in the District of Columbia relating to such business.

The Commissioners shall furnish to anyone applying therefor a certified copy of any such bond filed with them upon the payment of a fee to be fixed by the Commissioners therefor, and such certified copy shall be prima facie evidence in any court that such bond was duly executed and delivered by the person, firm, or corporation whose name appears therein.

(c) To rent any building or land belonging to the District of Columbia or under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, or any available space therein, whenever such building or land, or space therein, is not then required for the purpose for which it was acquired, and to rent any used personal property belonging to the District of Columbia which is not then needed for the purpose for which it was acquired: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this paragraph shall have the effect of changing in any manner Public Law No. 732, Seventy-fourth Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936.

(d) To grant revocable permits upon such terms, conditions, bonds, and rentals as the Commissioners may impose for the construction of tunnels, and the laying of conduits and pipes in the alleys, streets, and avenues in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

(e) To suspend, with or without pay, any officer or employee appointed by them and, under such rules or regulations as they may prescribe, to delegate this power to any officers or employees of the District of Columbia.

(f) After public hearing to name and change the name of any highway, bridge, building, or other public place or property in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

(g) To fix, assess, and collect fees for copies of orders, regulations, permits, certificates, and transcripts of records furnished by the District of Columbia such fees to be paid to the collector of taxes and deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

(h) Where not otherwise specifically provided, to prescribe a penalty upon conviction of a violation of any rule or regulation authorized by this act by a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment of not more than 90 days.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to appoint such number of employees of the District of Columbia as they shall consider advisable as contracting officers, who under the direction of the said Commissioners, may exercise any powers with respect to making and entering into contracts on behalf of said District of Columbia and administering said contracts that are now vested by law in the said Commissioners, except as herein otherwise provided; but no contract of $1,000 or more entered into on behalf of said District of Columbia by any contracting officer appointed pursuant to this act shall be binding upon said District of Columbia, or give rise to any claim or demand against said District of Columbia, until approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or a majority of them, sitting as a Board.

All contracts entered into by any contracting officer in which such contracting officer or any of the Commissioners shall be personally interested shall be void, and no payment shall be made on any of such contracts by the District of Columbia or by any officer thereof.

That with respect to all contracts of the District of Columbia which contain stipulations for liquidated damages for delay the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to remit the whole or any part of such damages as in their discretion may be just and equitable.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioners may transfer to, impose upon, and vest in the Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia all or any of the duties imposed upon, and all or any of the powers, rights, and authority vested in, the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia, the Inspector of Plumbing of the District of Columbia, and the Electrical Engineer of the District of Columbia, by any law, and the Commissioners may authorize the said Director of Inspection to delegate any or all of such powers to the Chief Engineer of the Department of Inspection of the District of Columbia and to the Chief of Inspection of the Department of Inspection of the District of Columbia and to their respective deputies when acting for them.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations provided for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, so far as possible, shall purchase material, supplies, including food supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, in accordance with the regulations and schedules of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department or from various services of the Government of the United States possessing materials, supplies, passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles, and equipment no longer required. Surplus articles purchased from the Government, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price, not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. The various services of the Government of the United States are authorized to sell such surplus articles to the District under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office materials, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners may, in their discretion and when they deem such action to be in the public interest, effect settlement with owners of real estate authorized to be acquired by purchase or condemnation for District of Columbia purposes, through such title company or companies in the District of Columbia as may be designated by the Commissioners, and to pay from appropriations available for the acquisition of such real estate reasonable fees to cover the cost of the services rendered by such title company or companies.

SEC. 6. The power and authorities conferred by this act are to be construed as in addition to and not by way of limitation of the powers now vested by law in the Commissioners.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was presented by our colleague from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. He did this with the approval of the Commissioners and had the assistance of those officials in the preparation of the provisions of the bill. It has been generally recognized that we have brought to the House floor from the District Committee legislation which could properly be handled by giving certain additional powers to the District Commissioners rather than to have them come in here so frequently.

Under this bill we would grant additional powers authorizing the Commissioners to waive the annual payment of license fees to members of the armed forces; we would authorize the Commissioners to require companies in the District of Columbia to furnish appropriate bonds; we would allow them to rent buildings and property belonging to the District of Columbia; we would allow them to suspend, with or without pay, employees appointed by them, and we would allow them also to change the names of highways and to take care of the laying of pipe lines in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. What was that item in connection with the appointment of employees?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It just simply allows the District Commissioners to suspend, without pay, certain employees of the District of Columbia who have been appointed by them, and who for one reason or another they want to investigate or terminate their services. There have been some cases where they felt that should be done.

Mr. STEFAN. Would it affect in any way the appropriation for the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; it would not. It will allow the Commissioners also to fix the fees for copies of orders and it would allow them to purchase material and

supplies under the regulations and schedules of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department.

Mr. STEFAN. To what amount?

Mr. RANDOLPH. We have no amount stated. We just say, "In accordance with regulations and schedules of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department."

Mr. STEFAN. Would that not in some way reflect itself upon the appropriations for the various functions of the District?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; we believe not.

Mr. STEFAN. What would they purchase?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It would affect the settlements of land or, perhaps I should say, the purchase of material.

Mr. STEFAN. We from time to time meet here and hold hearings on appropriations having to do with the District of Columbia in connection with which at times land is purchased, where uniforms for the police and where fire-department equipment is purchased. Would this mean that the Commissioners would no longer have to come before the Appropriations Committee to justify these appropriations?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Oh, no. The Commissioners would have to come before the District of Columbia Committee on Appropriations to justify the purchase of any of these materials. We would simply allow the District Commissioners to effect the settlement of land purchased under condemnation proceedings through title companies. These are certain grants of power which the District of Columbia Committee felt would not infringe, of course, on the Appropriations Committee and the various subcommittees thereof.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much worried about this bill. I think it ought to go over without prejudice. I feel that this is giving the Commissioners a little more power than even the legislative committee would like to give them. For instance, we have a testing laboratory in the District which the Commissioners endeavored to use again. Congress in its wisdom decided to have all material in the District tested by the Bureau of Standards. The chairman of our Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], is very much interested in that item. I wonder if this would affect that. Could the Commissioners now go ahead and put this laboratory into operation? There is written into the appropriation bill a provision that no part of the funds will be used for the operation of this particular laboratory.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I believe I may say that it is the purpose always, as it has been in the past, for the legislative committee to cooperate with the Subcommittee on Appropriations. In view of the suggestion of the gentleman that this measure go over without prejudice, I should be very glad to withdraw it. We have cooperated fully in the past and we want to do so in the future.

Mr. STEFAN. Until I have a conference with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I hope the gentleman will agree to let this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should be very glad to agree to that suggestion. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be withdrawn.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 3618, to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the War Food Administrator be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to sell and convey by quitclaim deed to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, for the sum of $100, a certain tract of land, owned by the United States of America and situated in the northwest quarter of section 3, township 4 north, range 5 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, county of San Joaquin, State of California, described with more particularity as follows: "Commencing at the southeast corner of the twenty-third and forty one-hundredths acre parcel conveyed to the United States of America by deed recorded in Book of Official Records, volume 599, page 180; thence south one degree twenty-two minutes twenty seconds east one hundred and twenty-eight feet, which is the beginning point; thence from said beginning point south one degree twenty-two minutes twenty seconds east fifty-five feet; thence south eighty-eight degrees thirty-seven minutes forty-five seconds west sixty-four and eighty-two one-hundredths feet to a point on the eastern boundary of the land of the Western Pacific Railroad Co.; thence north twenty-three degrees fifty minutes thirty seconds west along said boundary thirty-four and ninety-one one-hundredths feet; thence leaving said boundary line and running north seventy-two degrees twenty-four minutes twenty seconds east eighty-one and forty one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning, containing seventy-three one-thousandths acre, more or less."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK DURANTE AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 768, to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Frank Durante and wife, Maria Durante, and five children, namely, Paul Durante, Alfred Durante, Anthony Durante, Henry Durante, and Patsy Durante.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the outstanding order and warrant of deportation issued pursuant to sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156), in the case of Frank Durante, Maria Durante, Paul Durante, Alfred Durante, Anthony Durante, Henry Durante, and Patsy Durante, any provision of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of the approval of this act, Frank Durante, Maria Durante, Paul Durante, Alfred Durante, Anthony Durante, Henry Durante, and Patsy Durante shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same fact upon which the outstanding proceedings rest.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 4, after "outstanding", strike out the remainder of line 4 and all of lines 5, 6, and 7, and insert "deportation proceedings under the immigration laws."

On page 2, at the end of line 8 insert the following: "Upon the enactment of this act the Attorney General shall cause to be made a record of permanent admission in respect to these aliens as of April 9, 1925, the date on which they claim to have entered the United States. The Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to make appropriate deductions in the cases of Frank Durante, Maria Durante, and Paul Durante."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY LOVIS ELLIOTT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1643, for the relief of Mary Lovis Elliott.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. SPARKMAN]. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PHYLLIS LEE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2787, for the relief of Phyllis Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provisions of the immigration laws the temporary admission to the United States of Phyllis Lee is hereby declared a record of permanent admission as of the date she last temporarily entered Hawaii, to wit: December 8, 1937.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER HENRY BUCK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2789, to permit the naturalization of Peter Henry Buck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the racial limitations contained in section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 8, sec. 703), Peter Henry Buck, Honolulu, T. H., if found otherwise admissible to citizenship, may become a naturalized citizen of the United States upon compliance with the requirements of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, except that—

(a) No declaration of intention shall be required;

(b) No certificate of arrival shall be required; and

(c) The petition for naturalization shall be filed prior to the expiration of 1 year immediately following the date of enactment of this act.

The said Peter Henry Buck, the son of a distinguished Irish citizen of New Zealand and a Maori chiefess, is an eminent scientist and author, and has been an honored resident of Honolulu for many years.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRESIDENT TO APPOINT FRANK T. HINES A BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 872, to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States, and immediately thereafter place him on the retired list of the Army with the rank, pay, and allowances of that grade: *Provided*, That during the period that he is occupying civil office under the Federal Government as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or otherwise, he shall not be entitled to other pay or compensation than the salary attached to such civil office.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to appoint any former officer of the Regular Army, who has resigned his commission and subsequently served for a period of more than 15 years either as Director of the Veterans' Bureau or as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or both, an officer on the active list of the Regular Army in the grade held by him at the time of such resignation and thereafter immediately place him on the retired list of the Army in that grade and with the retired pay thereof: *Provided*, That such pay shall not be chargeable to appropriations for the Military Establishment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide retirement benefits for certain persons who serve as Administrator of Veterans Affairs."

WALTER ERVIN AND CORA ERVIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1216, for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $16,009.40 to Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin, of San Jose, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the loss of silver foxes, which were killed or injured as a result of Army planes from Moffett Field, Calif., flying low over the fox ranch, during the year 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$16,009.40" and insert "$4,940."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

G. H. GARNER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1963, for the relief of G. H. Garner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and empowered to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to G. H. Garner the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for the loss of the sight of one eye; the said G. H. Garner having lost sight in one eye by reason of an injury in an automobile accident on November 10, 1941, while riding in the car of C. E. Bedsole; the Bedsole car being hit by a War Department truck and the said injuries being sustained in the resultant collision; the accident occurring on Madison Avenue at its intersection with the Wetumpka Highway, Montgomery, Ala: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNADINE SALMONS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2438, for the relief of Bernadine Salmons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000 to Miss Bernadine Salmons, of Sedalia, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her as the result of an accident in which the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army Air Corps tractor, on United States Highway No. 50, near Tipton, Mo., on August 10, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$2,000" and insert "$500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHASE, PARKER & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2660, for the relief of Chase, Parker & Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana and Mr. MOTT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JOHN W. BOOTH II

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2993, for the relief of John W. Booth II.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John W. Booth II, of Mansfield, La., the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by his son, John W. Booth III, when an automobile driven by the said John W. Booth III was involved in a collision with a United States Army truck near Mansfield, La., on or about August 13, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered or to received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after "Booth", strike out "II" and insert "III."

Line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

Line 7, strike out "for" and insert "as."

Line 8, strike out "by his son, John W. Booth III."

Line 9, strike out "driven by the said John W. Booth III." and insert "in which he was driving."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of John W. Booth III."

PAUL H. WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3125) for the relief of Paul H. White.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul H. White,

Frank, W. Va., the sum of $799.65. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims, except a claim for medical expenses which has been released, of the said Paul H. White, against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him on May 26, 1942, as the result of a collision near Arbovale, W. Va., between the car in which he was riding and a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, after the figures "$799.65" strike out the period and the following: "The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims, except a claim for medical expenses which has been released, of the said Paul H. White." Insert in lieu thereof, "in full settlement of all claims."

At the end of the bill strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof, "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY GROSSI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3139) for the relief of Henry Grossi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Henry Grossi the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for loss sustained by said Henry Grossi on account of the complete destruction of his automobile and the death of his wife incurred as a result of a collision with a United States Army truck, which collision occurred in the city of Lompoc, Calif., on January 21, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,029.49."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. C. DAVIDSON AND VASSIE LEE DAVIDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. C. Davidson and his wife, Vassie Lee Davidson, of Ozark, Ala., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their daughter, Verlie Lee Davidson, a minor, who, upon alighting from a school bus, was fatally injured when struck by a United States Army truck on the Enterprise-Dothan Highway, about 1½ miles from the Providence Church, Clayhatchee, Dale County, Ala., on May 13, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,260.60."

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GRANT of Indiana to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 7, strike out "$5,260.60" and insert "$3,766.60."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAVIS NORRINE COTHRON, AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and for the three minor children of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the late William Edward Cothron, namely, Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mavis Norrine Cothron and her minor children, namely, Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, the sum of $15,000 in full settlement of their claims against the United States for the death of William Edward Cothron, the husband of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the father of the said Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, minors, the said William Edward Cothron having been killed on May 21, 1943, when a land plane of the United States Naval Air Station, Sanford, Fla., struck the said William Edward Cothron on a fishing launch in Mosquito Lagoon, Brevard County, Fla: *Provided*, That $1,500 of the amount appropriated be paid the said Mavis Norrine Cothron and $13,500 be paid to a guardian of the said minors appointed by a court having jurisdiction of funds belonging to the said minors to be held by such guardian and expended for the support and maintenance of the said minors under the supervision and direction of such court: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", insert "the sum of $1,500."

On page 1, line 6, after the name "Cothron", strike out the bill down to the "colon" in line 14, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof, ", of Allenhurst, Fla.; to pay the sum of $6,000 to the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, each child receiving equal share, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of William Edward Cothron as a result of being struck by a United States Navy plane while on a fishing launch in Mosquito Lagoon, Brevard County, Fla., on May 21, 1943."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norman Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLINTON A. CLAUSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3701) for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of Clinton A. Clauson, collector of internal revenue for the district of Maine, in the sum of $417, representing the value of certain 1944 motor-vehicle use tax stamps which have been lost by fire by his office.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM SANDLASS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4074) for the relief of the estate of William Sandlass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William Sandlass the amount, not in excess of $6,278.82, determined by him to be the actual expense to such estate of moving certain buildings owned by it from the

right-of-way required by the Government in connection with the widening of the road leading to the military reservation at Sandy Hook, N. J. In determining such expense the Secretary shall include the cost of all demolition, moving of buildings, excavation, construction, reinforcing, wiring, plumbing, and painting necessary to put such buildings as nearly as possible in as good condition in their new location as they were prior to such moving.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the figures "$6,278.72", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for actual expense to such estate of moving certain buildings owned by it from the right-of-way required by the Government in connection with the widening of the road leading to the military reservation at Sandy Hook, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. ANDERSON F. PITTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3679) for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anderson F. Pitts, colonel, Field Artillery, the sum of $2,648, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount paid by him from personal funds in the settlement of the accounts of the Service Club, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Field Artillery, Battle Creek, Mich., which was established with the approval and liquidated by direction of his commanding officer on or about March 14, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, a similar Senate bill is on the Speaker's desk. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill, S. 1528, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anderson F. Pitts, colonel, Field Artillery, the sum of $2,648, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for a like amount paid by him from personal funds in the settlement of the accounts of the Service Club, One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Field Artillery, Battle Creek, Mich., which was established with the approval and liquidated by direction of his commanding officer.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the Senate bill, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: At the end of the bill add the following:

"*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3679) was laid on the table.

ROBERT NORHEIM

The Clerk called the bill (S. 199) for the relief of Robert Norheim.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Norheim, of Dickinson, N. Dak., the sum of $202.68, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for accrued sick leave earned while employed by the United States Department of Agriculture, his request for substitution of sick leave for annual leave, during an illness which was contracted after his resignation had been submitted but before the effective date thereof, having been denied because the Department of Agriculture had not approved the revocation of such resignation prior to its effective date: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPHINE M. MELCHIOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 255) for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Josephine M. Melchior, of Mount Angel, Oreg., the sum of $807.92, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of certain timber owned by her in Tillamook County, Oreg., such timber having been cut without her consent by a survey party of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHOENIX-TEMPE STONE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 375) for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for damages arising out of the rental by the Civil Works Administration in Arizona of a paving-mixing plant, owned by said company, under a contract numbered CWA-234 dated January 5, 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE A. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 817) for the relief of George A. Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George A. Rogers, of Bellingham, Wash., the sum of $278.90, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for expenses incurred as the result of an accident involving a Government truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, at the intersection of Maple and Jersey Streets, Bellingham, Wash., on March 27, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or re-

ceived by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. NEOLA CECILE TUCKER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 921, for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $5,000 to Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker, of Houma, La., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Dr. William Lee Tucker, a first lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Army who was killed by a train at De Quincy, La., while under Army escort to a psychiatric hospital: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was land on the table.

MRS. ANNA RUNNEBAUM

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 949, for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $4,000, to Mrs. Anna Runnebaum, of Axtell, Kans., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Ralph Joseph Runnebaum, who was killed in an automobile accident while in the employ of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any amount not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM A. HAAG

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1077, for the relief of William A. Haag.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in the case of William A. Haag, of Leavenworth, Kans.; and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized and directed to consider and act upon any claim filed with the Commission, within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, by or on behalf of the said William A. Haag for compensation or other benefits under the provisions of such act of September 7, 1916, as amended, for disability due to an injury alleged to have been sustained by him on December 8, 1939, while pulling down an overhead fire door on an elevator shaft, in the performance of his duties as a storekeeper at the United States Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans.: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUTHER THOMAS EDENS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1288, for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Luther Thomas Edens the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of his claim against the United States arising out of the death of his minor daughter, Clara Edens, and personal injury to his minor daughter, Bettie Edens, resulting from an accident involving a United States Army truck on Highway No. 17, at Scotts Hill, N. C., on April 22, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC POWER CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1324, for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Wisconsin Electric Power Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., the sum of $5,433.75, in full satisfaction of its claims against the United States for compensation for damage to its property which resulted when an employee of the Works Progress Administration drove an automatic air-driven tool into an underground cable, owned by the said company, near the intersection of North Sixth and West Canal Streets in Milwaukee, Wis., on September 23, 1937: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH MORET

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1325, for the relief of Joseph Moret.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph Moret, of Palm City, Calif., the sum of $5,845.16, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation (1) for the death of his wife, Ella Moret, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by her when a United States Navy airplane crashed into the private residence of the said Joseph Moret in Palm City, Calif., on February 17, 1943; and (2) for damage to his grounds, residence, and personal property as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN HIRSCH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1628, for the relief of John Hirsch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Hirsch, Spokane, Wash., the sum of $2,107. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John Hirsch against the United States for damage to certain real and personal property owned by him, such damage being caused by the crash of a United States Army pursuit plane on April 23, 1942.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$2,107" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,887."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH SCARPELLA AND DOROTHY SCARPELLA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2390, for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph Scarpella and to Dorothy Scarpella, his wife, both of rural free delivery No. 1, Woodbine, N. J., the sum of $5,793.90. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of (1) personal injuries sustained by the said Dorothy Scarpella and (2) damage to and loss of real and personal property owned by the said Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella when their dwelling on State Highway No. 49, rural free delivery No. 1, Woodbine, N. J., was demolished on July 9, 1942, by a United States Navy truck.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$2,134.10" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,500."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, tc strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk reported the next committee amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 7, after the word "truck", insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MILDRED MAAG

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2711, for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maag.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mildred Maag, Kent, Ohio, the sum of $3,857.03. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Mildred Maag against the United States on account of personal injuries, sustained by her on October 4, 1942, in Delaware, Ohio, when the automobile which she was driving was struck by a United States Government truck engaged in hauling supplies for the Three Hundred and Thirty-third Engineer Regiment, United States Army, stationed at the Quartermaster Depot, Marion, Ohio.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, strike out "of the said Mrs. Mildred Maag."

Line 8, after the word "injuries", insert ", medical, hospital, nursing, and incidental expenses."

At the end of bill strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE GEILER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2743, to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Marie Geiler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, the claim of Mrs. Marie Geiler, of New York, N. Y., against the United States for damages on account of the death of her husband, William Geiler, who lost his life in an accident involving a United States Army truck on January 28, 1943, in the city of New York, N. Y. Such suit shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of enactment of this act, and the liability of the United States in such suit shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, after the enacting clause, strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof: "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,577.75 to Mrs. Marie Geiler, of New York City, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of her husband, William Geiler, who lost his life as a result of being struck by a United States Army truck in New York City, N. Y., on January 28, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler."

RUTH L. CLAPP

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3137, for the relief of Ruth L. Clapp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth L. Clapp, of Ogden, Utah, the sum of $322.82, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained by her as a result of an accident in which she was burned by steam in the dormitories at the Ogden Arsenal, Ogden, Utah, on April 30, 1943.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill strike out the period, and insert in lieu thereof: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOWARD L. PEMBERTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3351, for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Howard L. Pemberton, Kalamazoo, Mich., the sum of $2,387.20. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Howard L. Pemberton against the United States because of damage to his airplane which was struck on June 14, 1943, while parked at Lambert Field, St. Louis, Mo., by a United States Navy airplane taxiing across such field.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,387.20" and insert "$1,718.12."

On page 2, line 1, after the word "field" insert: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. JASON McVAY AUSTIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3387, for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby au-

thorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin in the amount of $1,688.84 and any and all amounts of per-diem allowances and transportation at Government expense, arising out of the fact that for the period from November 21, 1941, to May 31, 1942, he was paid for services rendered by him as an associate production and inventory analyst, War Production Board, and for per-diem allowances and was furnished transportation at Government expense, whereas he was a retired officer in the United States Army, the payment of such compensation for civilian employment being in contravention of section 2 of the act of July 31, 1894 (28 Stat. 205), as amended by the act of May 31, 1924 (43 Stat. 245), the act of July 30, 1937 (50 Stat. 549), and the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1194; 5 U. S. C. 62), prohibiting the appointing of officers of the Army retired for the causes stated therein, to an office, the salary rate or annual compensation of which is in excess of $2,500 per annum.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,200, the salary for employment as aforesaid, for the period June 1, 1942, to October 15, 1942, inclusive, withheld and unpaid: *Provided*, That he shall not receive retirement pay for the period November 21, 1941, to October 15, 1942, inclusive, and any retirement pay heretofore received by him for such period shall be deducted from the said $1,200.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAE EKVALL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3649, for the relief of Mae Ekvall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mae Ekvall, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $358.48. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mae Ekvall against the United States for personal injuries and personal property damage sustained by her on July 15, 1942, when she slipped and fell upon a freshly painted area of sidewalk in front of the United States Army engineer's office, located on the southwest corner of Seventh and Figueroa Streets, Los Angeles, Calif. This section of the sidewalk had been covered with paint by a member of the United States Army engineer's office who had failed to barricade the painted area.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "area", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BYRON ENNIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3654, for the relief of Byron Ennis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Byron Ennis, of Newark Valley, N. Y., the sum of $600, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the cost of damages to an automobile owned by him when struck by a United States Army jeep, on December 11, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

On page 1, line 9, after the word "jeep", insert "near Lyons, N. Y."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT BARRETT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3840, for the relief of Albert Barrett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Albert Barrett, as of August 1924, the date on which he entered the United States, if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 875, U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), requiring the exclusion of aliens who have been convicted of or who admit the commission of a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ISABELLA TUCKER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3075, for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii is authorized and directed to consider and act upon an application by Mrs. Isabella Tucker for the reamortization of her indebtedness to the Territory of Hawaii on account of a special homestead agreement under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled 'An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii', approved April 30, 1900, as amended", approved June 12, 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 48, sec. 677a and b), if the said Mrs. Isabella Tucker files such application with the Commissioner not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act. The said Mrs. Isabella Tucker filed an application January 24, 1941, which was after the termination of the 6 months' limitation for filing such applications specified in such act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE S. BRADSHAW

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 933, for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lee S. Bradshaw, of Grovetown, Ga., the sum of $789.60, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him, and medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the truck which he was driving was struck by a United States Army truck near Augusta, Ga., on November 14, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCILLE SLEET

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1164, for the relief of Lucille Sleet.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem in favor of Lucille Sleet, of Cincinnati, Ohio, certain War Savings stamps, series of 1918, issued to her but later destroyed by fire, such redemption to be in the amount of $100.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. R. JORDAN AND MABEL JORDAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1391, for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan, of Luverne, N. Dak., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation

for the death of their son, John Jordan, who died of injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a truck used for and under the control of the Work Projects Administration near Edinburg, N. Dak., on August 14, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. BURNS INTERNATIONAL DETECTIVE AGENCY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1494, for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the William J. Burns International Detective Agency, the sum of $1,402.50, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for services rendered the War Relocation Authority, from June 22 to July 26, 1942, in providing guards for the protection of alien and evacuee property stored in warehouses at various points in the State of California, the payment of such claim being prohibited by the provisions of the act of March 3, 1893 (27 Stat. 591; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 53): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK E. WILMOT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1269, for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frank E. Wilmot, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $340.30. Such sum represents the cost of a resurvey by Frank E. Wilmot of section 32, township 11 north, range 7 west, San Bernardino meridian, California, made necessary when original survey data and plats made under his direction proved inaccurate, without fault of his own, because they had been based on certain corner monuments reestablished erroneously through the negligence of an employee of the Glendale, Calif., office of the United States General Land Office of the Department of the Interior.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, after the figures, strike out the period and the following words "Such sum represents" and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of."

On page 2, line 6, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDDIE T. STEWART

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1411, for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Eddie T. Stewart, the sum of $5,167, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damages received in a collision with a United States Army truck, near the town of Many, in the Parish of Sabine, State of Louisiana, on August 20, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,167" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL B. LINGLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1421, for the relief of Paul B. Lingle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul B. Lingle, 1302 Fifth Street, Statesville, N. C., the sum of $2,864, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when struck by a United States Army truck on Eastern Avenue, Baltimore, Md., on March 17, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. G. BYARS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1891, for the relief of W. G. Byars.

Mr. MOTT and Mr. GRANT of Indiana objected, and under the rule the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

REIMBURSEMENT OF GRAND VIEW HOSPITAL ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2013, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Grand View Hospital; W. J. Pinkerton, medical doctor and surgeon; Ina Antilla, registered nurse; and Leone Gresiak, nurse; for services rendered and medical attention for Edwin Beckman, deceased, a former Civilian Conservation Corps enrollee of Camp Gogebic, Marenisco, Mich.

Mr. PRIEST and Mr. MADDEN objected and under the rule the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

PERIQUE GOMEZ AND MRS. PERIQUE GOMEZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2147, for the relief of Perique Gomez and Mrs. Perique Gomez.

There being no objecttion, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That nowithstanding any other provision of law, the national service life insurance applied for on February 1, 1942, by Perique Gomez, Jr., apprentice seaman, United States Navy, who died in the service of his country on February 18, 1942, shall be held and considered to have been in effect at the time of his death, and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay such insurance in equal shares to Perique Gomez and Mrs. Perique Gomez, parents of the said Perique Gomez, Jr., and designated as beneficiaries in the application for such insurance.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE WAVERLY MORGAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2212, for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Clarence Waverly Morgan, of Rollins Fork, Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses and injuries sustained as the result of a collision on February 7, 1942, at the intersection of Constitution Avenue and Delaware Ave-

nue, in Washington, D. C., between a United States Army truck and an automobile driven by Clarence Waverly Morgan: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, strike out "expenses and injuries sustained" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "property damage, personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses and loss of wages sustained by him."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHRISTINE HANSEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2234, for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Christine Hansen, Holstein, Nebr., the sum of $2,394.95. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Christine Hansen against the United States on account of the death of her daughter, Miss Martha Hansen, who died on August 28, 1942, as the result of personal injuries sustained on or about August 23, 1942, when she was attacked by a bear in Yellowstone National Park.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the dollar mark, insert "2,394.95."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Strike out "$2,394.95" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,894.95."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk reported the next committee amendment, as follows:

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. C. FUDGE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2273, for the relief of E. C. Fudge.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement of all claims against the United States, the sum of $1,000.05, to E. C. Fudge, of Atlanta, Ga., for loss of time from employment, hospital, and medical expenses resulting from personal injuries caused by an attack by a group of soldiers at Monroe, N. C., on the night of December 2, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof "*: Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTIAN WENZ

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2332, for the relief of Christian Wenz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Christian Wenz, of New York City, the sum of $2,541.88, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained, and reimbursement of expenses incurred, as the result of being struck by a United States Coast Guard truck, in the service of the Coast Guard, and operated by a unit of the Coast Guard, on September 28, 1942, in New York City: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,541.88" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,627."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JONAS MULLENS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2472, for the relief of Jonas Mullens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jonas Mullens, of Charleston, Kanawha County, W. Va., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for the untimely death of Gertrude Mullens, deceased, the wife of said Jonas Mullens, on August 15, 1940, through negligence on the part of the employees of the Works Projects Administration, while engaged in the construction of a road in the vicinity of Kanawha Two Mile Creek, in Elk District, Kanawha County, W. Va., said Work Projects Administration employees having negligently felled an overhanging tree in such a manner that the tree in falling snapped a high-tension electric line, causing the loose end of the wire to strike and electrocute the said Gertrude Mullens, while she was in her own yard hanging clothes, where she had every right to be: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after "to" strike out "Jonas Mullens" and insert in lieu thereof "the estate of Gertrude Mullins."

On page 1, line 8, strike out "untimely."

On page 1, line 8, strike out "Mullens" and insert in lieu thereof "Mullins."

On page 2, line 3, beginning with "having" strike out remainder of line and strike out lines 4, 5, 6, 7, and line 8 through the word "be," and insert in lieu thereof "while cutting a limb from a tree, negligently permitted the limb to fall across the high tension electric line, which contacted service wires leading to the home of Gertrude Mullins, resulting in the transmission of electric current through the metal siding of the house, and causing the electrocution of Gertrude Mullins who was hanging clothes on the wire clothesline at the time."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Gertrude Mullins."

EDWARD E. HELD AND MARY JANE HELD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2625, for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held, both of Pasadena, Calif., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Edward E. Held and Mary

Jane Held, his wife, as the result of personal injuries suffered by the said Mary Jane Held on September 3, 1942, when the automobile in which she was riding east on Florence Boulevard, in Southeast Los Angeles, Calif., was struck by a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 8, strike out line 8 beginning with the word "damages" lines 9, 10, 11, and lines 1 and through the word "truck" on page 2. Insert in lieu thereof "property damage and personal injuries sustained on September 3, 1942, by the said Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held, his wife, and expenses incident thereto, when the automobile in which they were riding on Florence Boulevard, in Southeast Los Angeles, Calif., was struck by a United States Army truck."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET HAMILTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2757, for the relief of Margaret Hamilton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Margaret Hamilton, Revere, Mass., the sum of $2,613.75. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said Margaret Hamilton on February 21, 1942, when the streetcar in which she was riding was struck near the city hall, Revere, Mass., by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out all after the words "sum of" and insert the following: "$771.75; to pay the sum of $396 to Mrs. Catherine Higgins, of Chelsea, Mass.; to pay the sum of $15.67 to Mrs. Rebecca Sallop; to pay the sum of $50.67 to Mrs. Dora Projansky, both of Revere, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as a result of the streetcar in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck, near the city hall, Revere, Mass., on February 21, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallop, and Mrs. Dora Projansky."

CHARLES J. GOFF

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2925, for the relief of Charles J. Goff.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles J. Goff, Salmon, Idaho, the sum of $596.77. Such sum represents the actual expenses incurred by the said Charles J. Goff on account of the death of his brother, Judson E. Goff, who died on September 19, 1942, as the result of a gunshot wound received on September 7, 1942, at Pendleton, Oreg., when he was accidentally shot by a member of the military forces of the United States. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Judson E. Goff.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "such sum represents the" and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

On page 2, line 10, strike out "the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Judson E. Goff."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NELS J. PEDERSEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3298, for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nels J. Pedersen, of Vancouver, Wash., a sum equal to the amount which would have been paid to him as compensation for services rendered as an employee of the Bonneville Power Administration from July 16 to July 28, 1942, and for accumulated annual leave from July 28 to August 17, 1942, if such payment had not been prohibited because of his not being a citizen of the United States, the said Nels J. Pedersen having obtained such employment and rendered such services while under the bona fide but erroneous impression that he had become a naturalized citizen by taking an oath of allegiance to the United States before an officer of the United States Army while serving with the military forces of the United States during the First World War: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH-CABLE CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3324, for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co., of New York, N. Y., the sum of $3,090.94, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred in rebuilding and restoring a thirty-wire crossing over the Delaware River between Raven Rock, N. J., and Lumberville, Pa., which was demolished and knocked into the Delaware River by a United States Navy aircraft, model SBD–4, No. 10615, on April 3, 1943, while engaged in a routine scheduled flight over the Delaware River: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agent, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAUGER CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3466, for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Mauger Construction Co., Columbus, Ohio, the sum of $7,323.83. Such sum represents reimbursement for the amount of gross sales tax paid by such company to the State of West Virginia in connection with work performed under a Government contract dated May 14, 1941, in the construction of the Cumberland (Md.) Municipal Airport near Wiley Ford, W. Va. Due to a misunderstanding of Government instructions, the bid submitted by such company failed to state that if any tax should be levied, the amount of the bid would be increased by the amount of the tax, and, therefore, such company has not received compensation from the United States to cover the amount of such gross sales tax.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "such sum represents" and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

On page 2, line 2, after the word "Virginia", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall

be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

On page 2, strike out in line 10 the words "due to a misunderstanding" and all of lines 11 to 16, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. JAMES T. DENIGAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3538, for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to the Reverend James T. Denigan, of Long Island City, N. Y., the sum of $50,000. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of injuries sustained by the said Reverend James T. Denigan, and damage to his automobile, on July 27, 1942, when such automobile was struck by an Army truck at the intersection of Rockaway Boulevard and Burnside Avenue in Far Rockaway, N. Y.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$50,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000."

On page 2, line 1, after the word "York" strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "New York: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL F. R. WILSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3547, for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 765–770), the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of Carl F. R. Wilson for disability due to tuberculosis alleged to have been proximately caused by his employment in the service of the United States between May 5, 1937, and January 29, 1941, and to determine said claim upon its merits under the provisions of said act: *Provided*, That said claim shall be filed with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRANT of Indiana: On page 1, line 11, after the word "Wilson", insert a comma and the following words: "a former employee of the Patent Office."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HALL FARRIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3781, for the relief of Hall Farris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hall Farris, Murray, Ky., the sum of $2,605. Such sum represents reimbursement for the loss sustained by the said Hall Farris on account of the forfeiture to the United States on May 18, 1936, in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Indiana, Indianapolis Division, of a bond conditioned upon the delivery in court of one William H. Lemons. The said William H. Lemons failed to appear on the date set for his trial, but he was apprehended 8 days later, pleaded guilty to the indictment, and was duly sentenced.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,605. Such sum represents" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for".

On page 2, line 5, after the word "sentenced", strike the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the committee amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof: "$2,005."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendments as amended were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MICHAEL SOLDO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 202, for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Michael Soldo, of West Palm Beach, Fla., whose wife and minor child are citizens and residents of the United States, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted, at Detroit, Mich., on February 11, 1942, to the United States for permanent residence. The Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith the bond filed by the said Michael Soldo at the time of his admission to the United States on a temporary basis, and conditioned upon his return to the Dominion of Canada.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "February 11, 1942" and insert in lieu thereof "October 15, 1936."

On page 1, strike out lines 9 to 12, inclusive.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK SCARTON OR JOHN SKARTON, FORMERLY SIMON JAN SKARZENSKI

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 439, for the relief of Jack Scarton or John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Jack Scarton, alias John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski, heretofore issued on the grounds that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained, and that he shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of March 6, 1910.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "and the order of deportation."

On page 1, line 9, after the word "gained" insert the following: "and that he has been convicted of or admits having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude prior to entry into the United States, to wit: Carnal abuse and perjury."

On page 2, line 4, strike out "March 6, 1910" and insert the following: "July 1, 1939. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota of the first year that the said Polish quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN DAMACUS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 442, for the relief of John Damacus.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant

of arrest and the order of deportation against John Damacus heretofore issued on the ground that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained, and that he shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence in April 1927.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, strike out "in" and insert the word "on"; and after line 10 insert the following: "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Rumanian quota of the first year that the said Rumanian quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF BUILDING TO AMERICAN LEGION POST, ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1417, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized to donate and convey, on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, that certain wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on land owned by said Jack Henry Post, No. 1, designated as lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site, Alaska.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTORATION OF BILL TO PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 776) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States, be restored to the Private Calendar. I may say by way of explanation that this request has been submitted to the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK] and to the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] and both have given their approval.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Judge Joe G. Montague, general attorney for the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers' Association, before the Central Cooperative Association, at St. Paul, Minn., on the night of February 8.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent address I delivered in St. Louis, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein an article from the National Press Club publication which speaks splendidly of our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2801, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose at the time this bill was last under consideration the bill had been read and the committee amendment had been reported. The committee amendment is now pending.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 10, strike out "The additional position created by this act shall exist only during the present war and for 6 months thereafter." And insert the following: "The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution."

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the committee amendment is to limit this authority to the duration of this emergency and 6 months thereafter. We had a somewhat similar provision in the House bill, but inasmuch as the Senate passed a companion bill we placed the same verbiage in this bill that the Senate had in its bill.

While I am on my feet explaining the amendment, may I say that I heard rumors to the effect that some Members thought the Secretary might appoint one of the three men concerning whom Congress has heretofore taken action. I am thoroughly convinced in my mind that there is nothing to that rumor. I discussed the matter with the Secretary. Whoever is appointed must be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. I asked the Secretary to write me about this matter and he sent me the following:

I shall try to recommend to the President, if the bill passes, a man who will have the ability and the vigor to do the important work with which he will be entrusted and whose character and personality will be such as to commend him to the Members of Congress. It should be borne in mind that my power with respect to this appointment goes no further than that of recommendation to the President. He will make the appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

I am thoroughly convinced that there is no intent on the part of the Secretary to circumvent the views of the Congress with reference to those three men. As I said before, I am not trying to defend various acts of the Secretary for which he might be criticized. Sometimes when I have disagreed with him I have been free to criticize him. However, this matter was carefully considered by our committee, considered by a committee on both sides of the table, and reported out of the committee after careful consideration. We are thoroughly convinced that we have given the Secretary extra work to do and, as was very wisely pointed out by the gentleman from Idaho, it is much better to have an Assistant Secretary whose appointment is confirmed by the Senate than to have some appointment made over which the Congress would have no control. This appointment would have to be confirmed by the Senate.

I am thoroughly convinced that the Secretary is entitled to have this extra help. Regardless of our likes or dislikes, I feel that we should rise to the occasion and not let our prejudices govern our vote. We should be governed by the merits of the situation and the needs of the hour.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I say to the gentleman from Florida that inasmuch as I am the one who raised the question regarding the rumor, I wish to compliment the gentleman on his writing to the Secretary of the Interior and ascertaining if there was anything to it. The gentleman's statement clarifies the situation.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I thank the gentleman. He is most kind.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is not merely a question of giving to or withholding from the Secretary of the Interior an additional assistant. It is something much more than that. It is a question of whether the Members of the House are really sincere in their protests against the evil growth of bureaucracy and are willing to make a start and do

something concrete about it or whether we shall continue merely to give lip service to being opposed to it.

I want to see the Secretary of the Interior stopped in his mad grab for more and more power, just as I want to see the other Department and Bureau heads stopped from doing the same thing.

Mr. Ickes is one of the leading spirits that is making for the destruction of the Constitution and free enterprise and the substitution therefor of a totalitarian regime. He is leading in the movement for the creation of labor armies and giving our returning soldiers slavery. See his 1943 annual report, page 76, where he tells us of a 3-year public-works program he has planned for some half million returning servicemen.

That is what Mr. Ickes has to offer our returning soldiers politically made work, in reality forced labor. I say forced labor advisedly. The political planners first destroy private enterprise and the jobs which go with it. Then the worker is forced to accept politically made work.

In this connection we should recall what the great Frederic Bastiat had to say. In speaking of public works as a means of providing employment he said:

> Let us then study the question in its two-fold bearing. While we mark the destination which the state gives to the millions voted, let us not neglect to mark the destination which the taxpayers would have given—and can no longer give—to these same millions. You will then understand that a public enterprise is a medal with two sides. On the one appears a workman employed, with this device, what is seen; on the other a workman unemployed, with this device—what is not seen.
>
> Public works as a permanent, general, systematic measure for providing employment—

He said—

> is nothing but a ruinous mystification, an impossibility, a contradiction, which shows a little stimulated labor which is seen and hides much prevented labor which is not seen.

For every dollar earned in the last 12 years in politically made work, such as W. P. A., several dollars were prevented from being earned in private industry because of political aggression upon it. It is political exploitation which is the curse of America, not free private industry. The danger has not been competition, but the stifling of it by the political group.

I think it is Mr. Ickes' intention to destroy competition in the oil industry, to in fact nationalize, or fascistize it on the pretext of conserving this valuable resource.

Stop men like Ickes, or they will destroy our Nation completely. If he has more work than he can handle with his present force then let him reduce some of the nonessential nonwar activities of his Department and utilize the services of personnel which would thus be made free for his use.

If we mean to stop the bureaucracy we will deny Mr. Ickes' request for this additional assistant secretary.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no one has more respect than I for the sincerity and the ability of the gentleman from Ohio. No one is more in accord than I with his sentiments when he denounces the trend toward bureaucracy as evidenced by the executive agencies; and I want further to say that the Department of the Interior is by no means free from blame in that regard. Nevertheless, granting, for the sake of argument, the truth which everything the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] has said, still it has nothing to do with the simple question at issue here, which is whether, on account of the tremendous extra work and activities placed in the Interior Department, new work placed there entirely by reason of the war, another Assistant Secretary should be afforded that Department. If the gentlemen will look over the report of the committee, they will see that the reasons why this additional Assistant Secretary is necessary during wartime are, briefly, concisely, and very definitely set out. In the minds of those who heard the testimony on the committee, both the majority and the minority members of the committee, there can be no doubt that, for the duration of the war, this Assistant Secretary is necessary, and to indicate to you how carefully the committee has been to see that this new office shall be for the duration of the war, only, I call your attention to the following language which we have written into the bill as a committee amendment:

> The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation, or by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

This is purely a war measure, and I do not think that anyone, simply by reason of his dislike of Mr. Ickes, or by reason of his opposition to many of his philosophies and policies, should refuse to place in the Department of the Interior an additional secretary, when the evidence before the committee clearly demonstrates that an additional secretary is necessary to have supervision of the war work now carried on by that Department.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. Yes.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman tell us now the specific duties that require another Assistant Secretary?

Mr. MOTT. Yes. As set out in the report, it is on account of the heavy increase in work which the Interior Department has assumed due to various war programs delegated to the Department by Executive orders of the President. Among those new war programs are these: The Solid Fuel Administration, which has charge of all coal production activities, including the taking over and operation of the mines in certain instances with which the gentleman is familiar; also the Office of Fisheries Coordination, which is very important, particularly to the coastal areas and to the fisheries areas of Alaska. There are the problems, also, of the Territories and the island possessions which have been greatly extended on account of the war. Then there are the increased activities of the Bureau of Mines in the last 2 or 3 years, to which Bureau has been obliged to devote a great deal of its time in a field which it has never before been obliged to undertake, such as the discovery, exploitation, and production of new critical war minerals. Also there is the administration by that Bureau of the Explosives Act, under which some 200,000 licenses have been issued.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I also call the gentleman's attention to the increased work of the Geological Survey, carried on now almost entirely for the benefit of the Army; and many times more work is being done in that field now than has ever been done in the past. There is also the rescheduling of the power program of the Interior Department, and that includes all of those hydroelectric facilities now engaged in producing power for the production of aluminum and other critical war materials. There has been a great extension of the work of the Interior Department; work it has never been obliged to do before. The committee believes that on account of that fact another Assistant Secretary is needed there to take care of a part of that work, for the duration of the war.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I am very strongly opposed to the provisions of this resolution. I have a very high regard and respect for the gentleman from Florida who is sponsoring the resolution, and were it not for my sincere opposition to the measure I would, of course, support my friend.

I am not alone in my opposition to this resolution. There is strong sentiment against it. To begin with, the Department of the Interior has exercised too much authority now and if an effort were made to restrain at least some of the acts of the Secretary, which, in my opinion are far beyond the scope of his authority, you would have my very hearty approval of such action.

That Department has been getting into far too many matters of no concern to it with the help it has. With more power and more help you may expect more mischief. If this body should authorize another Assistant Secretary for this Department what assurance do you have that Robert Morss Lovett will not be appointed to fill it? What assurance do you have that we will not have another David Ginsburg melodrama?

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Is the gentleman aware that most of these new activities which have been taken on by the Interior Department were delegated to that Department by the Executive order and not by legislation or anything, because the President said that is where he wanted it?

Mr. GIBSON. Yes. I cannot yield further.

Every Member of this House knows the utter disrespect shown to the Congress as an institution by the Secretary of the Interior. I would not, and I am sure no Member would, let this fact cause him to vote against a worthy resolution affecting this Department. But when we know it is not worthy but just an effort to satisfy another whim of the Secretary and to add to his inflated opinion of his importance, I think it a fine opportunity to teach him some manners, that no man stands supreme.

It is well known that to provide another Assistant Secretary will not divide the responsibility, as the Secretary is not going to yield any authority to anyone in his Department; that he even attempts to direct the course of Congress and all citizens. Is it proper to create this position at $9,000 per annum, when a $3,000 clerk will do the same work? This will mean wasting $6,000 annually, which I concede is a small item in Government expenditures, but still it is better saved than thrown away. Furthermore, when bureaus are falling over each other here in Washington and trying to set up within themselves powers to control the destiny of all the people, I refuse to cast a vote to expand one of them.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Usually I do not take any stock in matter of this kind, but if ever I have been convinced that a Cabinet officer needed an assistant, I am convinced that this bill is justified. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT], it appears to me, gave reason on top of reason why this office should be created. This is not a question of Harold Ickes going out and grasping for authority. It is a question of these duties and these obligations being placed upon him, as has been so well said by the gentleman from Oregon.

It may be that somebody does not like Mr. Ickes personally or may not like some action that he has taken with reference to some of the manifold duties that he has had to perform. But I do believe in the interest of good administration and in the interest of having things done speedily and expeditiously that this bill should pass, because I know something about the duties that are to be imposed upon the assistant and I know something about the many, many additional duties that have been imposed upon the Secretary of the Interior in the administration of the office he originally administered. I think we should give him this assistance for the duration of the war especially in view of the conditions and duties of his office.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I most thoroughly disagree with our distinguished Speaker concerning these great duties that have been imposed upon the Secretary of the Interior. I happen to be one who examines the appropriation of the Department of the Interior and have done so for several years. To be sure, some additional duties have been given to the Secretary of the Interior. But I want to tell the House that right now a great deal of the work of the Department of the Interior has been reduced rather than increased. I notice the Secretary of the Interior, in his communication, refers to work in the National Parks Service. The figures that his own Department submit to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, show that the attendance at the national parks is now about 40 percent of what the attendance is in normal times. Their organization has been scaled down; but by no means in proportion to the decrease in attendance.

The Bureau of Reclamation work is practically at a standstill. A little work will be carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation, but the great construction program for most of them have "stop orders" against them by the Government itself.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield briefly for a question.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman said that in the Secretary's letter it was stated additional work was required in reclamation and in the national parks by reason of the war. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Secretary did not say that at all. This is the language of the Secretary of the Interior in this letter. He says:

This additional work—

That is, after describing war work—

has been superimposed upon the regular activities of the Department administered through such agencies as the Bureau of Reclamation, the Office of Indian Affairs, the National Parks Service—

And so on. All he said is that this additional work which I mentioned a few moments ago has been superimposed upon the regular activities.

Mr. CARTER. All right. Then I desire to say that a number of the bureaus and departments have very decidedly decreased. I am willing to accept the statement of the gentleman from Oregon as to the statement of the Secretary. But I do know that many activities have decreased. As has been suggested here, how do we know but what the House is going to find placed, as was suggested a few moments ago by the previous speaker, in this position Dr. Lovett, an individual that the House has gone on record as saying this man—Dr. Lovett—should not be working for the Government of the United States.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the gentleman from California ought to be in the RECORD as making an incorrect statement. The gentleman from California says that the work in the Reclamation Division and other departments has been reduced.

Mr. CARTER. I say that; and it has.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Ickes maintains it is the regular work; and that is not true.

Mr. CARTER. No. He says it has been superimposed upon the regular Bureau of Reclamation and Park Service work. It has been superimposed upon a greatly reduced national parks work and a greatly reduced Bureau of Reclamation work. If the Secretary desired to make an accurate statement that is what he would have said instead of the statement that he makes in this communication.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The gentleman, of course, realizes the Senate would have to confirm any appointee and that it would be far better to have an appointee that the Senate confirmed rather than a subordinate employee.

Mr. CARTER. I realize that the bill provides for that. If I thought the additional work justified the appointment of a man down there I would be for the bill. Knowing intimately the work of the Department of the Interior and having canvassed that budget for a number of years, and being about to do so again, I do not believe that the work there justifies the appointment of a $9,000-a-year man.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I wish to ask the committee members some questions on this bill, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], this question: What is the base salary of the present Under Secretary of the Interior and the two Assistant Secretaries at the present time?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. At the present time the two Assistant Secretaries are getting $9,000 a year under the Classification Act.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What was their base salary, if you please?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. They started either at $8,000 or $8,500.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When did this increase take effect to bring them up to $9,000 a year?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I do not recall the exact date. It was after a certain length of service and was handled entirely under the Classification Act. But I will say this, as I have stated repeatedly, if any Member of the House wants to strike out the salary clause of this bill I would have no objection to an amendment to strike it out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the object of putting the $9,000 as a beginning salary of the new Assistant Secretary?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is the salary at the present time that they are getting. Heretofore they have been designated as First Assistant and Second Assistant, and if we had followed that practice then this Assistant would have been a Third Assistant Secretary. We were trying to get away from the idea of a First Assistant and a Second Assistant and a Third Assistant and trying to make them all Assistants, because folks who come here from thousands of miles away feel as if they are being put off when they are asked to see a Second Assistant or a Third Assistant. Then, if we just name

them all Assistants we keep down any dispute as to who is getting more salary. It only involves a matter of $500, and we thought it best that they be put on the same basis.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Florida may feel that an increase of $500 for these Assistants in this particular case is immaterial to his district. But in my opinion there is about 95 percent of politics in this bill and about 5 percent of good common sense.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further on this particular point. In the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to the Speaker of the House, he points out four Executive orders that have been issued. Then the Secretary of the Interior goes on to say, "The problems of territorial and island possessions have multiplied both in number and in magnitude, because of the impact of the war." If the Members of the House wish to take the time—we certainly cannot cover it here this afternoon—I urge them to read the 13 or 14 volumes which set forth in detail the testimony taken by the Insular Affairs Committee of the House in Puerto Rico on the very activities which the Secretary here points out. I think you will be sufficiently convinced, so far as the additional duties imposed upon the Department of the Interior and the Island possessions are concerned, that the Secretary of the Interior's assistants have gone far afield there, not only to obtain additional work for themselves, but also to drive those people engaged in the private-enterprise system in Puerto Rico entirely out of business. I will let the record that has been placed in the committee hearings stand on its own feet and I direct your attention to that. I am not going to support an increase in salary for these men down here in the Department of the Interior, because, in my opinion, they are not entitled to it. I do not think the Members of Congress are entitled to an increase in their salary at the present time.

I do not think we should come in here with increases in the salaries on those various duties for the mere purpose of making it a little more comfortable, from an association standpoint, down in the Department of Interior. I cannot understand why the committee would come in here with such a recommendation at the present time.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What is the date of the letter to which the gentleman is referring?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The date of this letter is May 18, 1943.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is approximately 8 or 9 months ago?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, sir. I believe in good administration also, but I wish this House had the time and the means to go down and investigate these departments and ascertain the evidence of the wasted time, wasted manpower and womanpower in those departments. If you want to go out to dinner with me—and I will pay for the dinner, and let you listen to what the employees say themselves about how time is wasted by these under secretaries and these minor officials, and employees. I do not think we have to have an investigating committee to find out these things. Have lunch with the people themselves. I do not believe God Almighty would ever forgive this Congress for the waste that we are permitting and which we know is going on. I do not propose to vote for this kind of bill or any other kind of bill. It does not make any difference who advocates it, where I am as much convinced that there is waste, as I am in the Department of the Interior. I am not making any remarks against the Secretary of the Interior. I am making remarks about what actually goes on in that Department, letting the accusations rest on the facts.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. What good would come out of going down there and investigating the different departments when the President of the United States orders these men not to testify? Here comes an order from the Comptroller General's office, dated February 2, prohibiting these men from coming down to testify before any committee of Congress until they are cleared through a certain individual.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the reason I made the remark the way I did, in the form of a question, if there was any way we could get this information. So I do not expect it to come through any investigating committee. You have got to make your own investigation as best you can, and stand on your own convictions in these matters. But this is not any time for us to start raising salaries in the executive branches of Government. The people out on the farms in my district know much better than that about running the Government at this time. Why should we raise salaries and then in the next 2 or 3 days come along and give them a roll-back subsidy to pay their grocery bills, as has been advocated by Judge Vinson and some of the others?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that this Congress still has the right of subpena, and can still bring those members, the personnel of those departments in here, whether they want to come or not?

Mr. CRAWFORD. And we should exercise it if we feel that time is being wasted in those departments.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Is it not a fact that they have been brought in by subpena and refused to testify?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know about that.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman has been referring to this bill as a salary raise bill. It is not a salary raise bill. It creates a new office.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, it creates a new office and makes the Under Secretaries, or whatever you call them, all uniform, which is conclusive evidence that they are fighting among themselves down there with respect to the title they carry. What difference does it make whether I am assistant secretary of a corporation or secretary of a corporation? Why do we not listen to what Christ told His disciples on the Sea of Galilee, when one of them said in substance, "Now, that is all right, Christ, but what is John going to do?" Christ replied to him in substance in saying, "Listen, you have got your different assignments. Go ahead and carry out your assignment and do not worry about John. He has got his job, too."

Mr. MOTT. That may all be, but this is not a pay raise bill. It creates a new office.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It sets the price at $9,000 instead of $8,500 or $8,000 to begin with.

Mr. MOTT. The chairman of the committee stated that if anyone wanted to offer an amendment striking out all reference to the salary, the committee would be glad to accept it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then what would be the situation? What would the salary be to begin with?

Mr. MOTT. The salary would be set at whatever the Classification Act provided.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is that $8,500 or $8,000?

Mr. MOTT. I think it is $8,500.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then I will certainly offer an amendment to strike out $9,000. If it is agreeable to the committee why should not the chairman of the committee offer it?

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman should then offer his amendment if that is his point and the committee will accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MAHON. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. GEARHART. Would that reduce the 5 minutes I am about to receive?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I will amend the request if you make it 20 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida, as amended?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened in amazement to the storm of opposition which has arisen against this simple proposition. I cannot understand why anybody might think for a moment that the responsibilities of the Department of the Interior has not been increased. The very reading of the list of new assignments which have been imposed upon the Secretary should convince any reasonable

individual that the Secretary does require an additional assistant. Responsibility after responsibility has been placed upon his shoulders—responsibilities which have not been sought but which have been thrust upon him by Executive order.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. If a careful search of the statutes were made I am sure that it would be revealed that many additional responsibilities have been imposed upon him by acts of Congress itself.

Now, we are fighting a war. We are putting into that war everything we can possibly accumulate to make the victory as certain and as soon as possible. One of our responsible executives says he requires additional assistants, and, strange to behold, we hear opposition—petty opposition, opposition based upon the absurdity that somebody of pinkish hue might be appointed to the job.

Such arguments are beneath the dignity of those who compose the membership of so high a deliberative body as is the Congress of the United States. When a high Government official finds himself in need of assistance in the performance of his official duties, duties which relate directly to the winning of the war, he will look for men of efficiency not for the dreamers of dreams, not for one who would make of this a beautiful world. If I know Secretary Ickes and if I have any appreciation of the great responsibilities that are his, it will be sterner stuff he will be looking for. Let us have no more such arguments.

Must we, Mr. Chairman, turn our attention to the picayunish, to debate, wax angry, if you please, over pettyisms when the fate of the world hangs in the balance? I simply cannot go for that. There are too many issues of great importance, my colleagues, matters which have to do with the bypassing of the Constitution of the United States; matters which have to do with setting up totalitarian schemes, that should engage the attention of statesmen at this fateful hour. Ours is the business of winning this war, yet some would turn aside to vent their spleen upon one who deserves only their kindliest consideration. Must I, need anyone, speak in his defense?

Chance has afforded me unusual opportunities to appraise the character and capabilities of Secretary Harold Ickes. Close association with him has increased my respect for his great abilities, convinced me the more of his deep devotion to the causes which are just. Despite the controversies in which he has been involved, the bitterness which some of his stern decisions have aroused, let me assure you that withal he is as conscientious a public official as has ever been called to high service. He is a fearless, a courageous, double-fisted fighting man, the kind of man I admire, the kind of man who, in his public relations, thinks only of the public good. I wish I could say as much for others, of some concerning whom I have had occasion to speak on this floor, to criticize and, at times, to bitterly denounce.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say that while he is a hard fighter he is an honorable and clean fighter.

Mr. GEARHART. I have never known him to be otherwise. If I did not so believe, I would not be in the well today. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Members will consider the great objective we have in view, the winning of the war, and give to this conscientious public official the aid and assistance he assures us he needs. To withhold it is unthinkable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, someone has said that this bill is about 95 percent politics. I have no information as to whether there is any politics in this bill. I have no charges to make against the Secretary of Interior or anyone else; I shall not undertake to criticize or defend, as it has been my observation that the Secretary is amply able to take care of himself. I do recognize, however, that we have several million employees on the Federal pay roll, that if we create new executive heads they must have their assistants, their clerks, and others. I am thinking now of one of the agencies of the Department of the Interior which started at the time of the war with 2 people but now has 145. They are doing some important work, but the great hue and cry throughout this country is not for more Federal employees but for fewer Federal employees. It is a matter which should give every American serious concern that the general public has such a contemptuous attitude toward the employees in the bureaus of this Government. It does no country any good for the people to look with contempt upon those who work in the bureaus of Government. I think it is far more important and essential that Congress direct its efforts not to creating more positions but to streamlining this Government in such a way that we will fully utilize the employees now on the Federal pay roll, making reductions wherever possible. I would like to see the time come when working for the Government would be recognized by all our people as a highly honorable occupation. The need is for higher standards of service and greater efficiency and economy of money and manpower. If that end is achieved, then Government employment will be looked upon with respect and not with the wholesale condemnation that is prevalent at this time. There is considerable justification for the contempt on the part of the people. There are those who deserve the stigma we apply to the word "bureaucrat."

On the other hand there are plenty of able, efficient, hard-working people in the Government service.

I say to you that when it comes to creating a new executive job which may lead to the employment of additional hundreds of people, it is a serious step to take. It is true that the Interior Department has more work to do of a certain type than it did before the war, but I think we should pay some heed to the urgent situation confronting the country and to the voice of public opinion which has spoken to the effect that we should eliminate all these unnecessary things for the duration of the war and concentrate only on the war.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I have no time to yield; I am sorry.

That seems to me to be the thing here. I believe the 40,000 people more or less, who are now working in the Interior Department are enough to carry on the work of that Department. Let us eliminate unnecessary activities until the boys come marching, sailing, or flying home.

As I say, I have not studied this bill as much as have the members of the committee. I have no attack to make upon anybody. I have no political ideas with respect to just who may be appointed, in fact, I have not the slightest idea who may be appointed to the proposed new job, but I do hesitate to vote to increase bureaucracy at a time when there is such widespread shortage of manpower and the demands for efficiency and economy are so great. I feel that we should devote our time to working out a better utilization of the 40,000 people now employed in this Department rather than to the proposition of creating a new job. Let us cut out everything in the Department of the Interior that safely can be eliminated for the duration of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the proforma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman that time has been fixed and the gentleman's name is not on the list of those seeking recognition.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather unusual position as I arise in defense of a so-called bureaucrat. Let me say, however, that I had occasion, even before I became a Member of Congress, to work with various officials of the Federal Government, and I want to say for Mr. Ickes that he is one individual I found who is willing to say yes or no to a question. He is a man who has the courage of his convictions and I admire him for it. We quibble about the salary the proposed Assistant Secretary of the Interior will receive. I am amused. Before I became a Member of Congress I was superintendent of construction on defense plant projects, under supervision of the Army. No objection is made to the Army appropriations, yet I had men under my supervision operating LeTourneau scoops who received wages in the amount of $1,000 per month. Carpenters were paid $600 per month and bricklayers $600 to $650 per month.

I have had as many as 93 changes made by the War Department during the construction of one building. I have had forms built equal in area to one-fourth of a city block, reinforcing steel in place, electric conduits installed, screeds fitted, runways assembled, and everything ready to pour concrete, when someone from the main office would come rushing down, shouting: "Hold

everything. We have received an order to place a wood block floor finish on this section instead of concrete." Workers who had been willing to go all out, driving to get a job finished, would then see the results of their labors for several days destroyed, as it would be necessary to wreck the entire structure and drop the framework several inches.

I had charge of the removal of 17,000 cubic yards of dirt in making an excavation for four open-hearth furnaces and, after driving piling on 30-inch centers, building forms for footings, setting bolts for reinforcing steel, and pouring the concrete for the complete foundation, I received orders that only three furnaces were to be built and that it would be necessary to fill up one-fourth of the excavation.

I have had to go like a burglar in the night and steal a mile of railroad rails in order to complete tracks on a defense plant, because priorities did not come through.

It is because of experiences such as these that I take the floor in defense of an individual whom I feel to be one of the most competent and conscientious officials in Washington.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Was the gentleman here a year ago when Congress recommended against the building of a transmission line from Shasta Dam down to Oroville, when the House sustained that proposition and voted down an amendment which would have permitted it? And does the gentleman know that since then Mr. Ickes has built the power transmission line notwithstanding the sentiments expressed by the Members of the House in that vote?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I have no information about that project.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. If that was not contemptuous disregard for Congress I do not know what is.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I do know this, that the people of the United States today are facing a fuel shortage and thousands of homes throughout the country are cold because the administration refused to listen to Mr. Ickes during the coal strikes. Had his advice been heeded, there would be between 50 and 60 million additional tons of coal above ground and in the fuel bins of our citizens.

I contend that if Mr. Ickes had been permitted to exercise his prerogative and good judgment, the coal strikes would have been avoided and the miners would never have left their work.

It is for these reasons that I speak in his defense, and ask the Congress to grant his request for an assistant, as I firmly believe Mr. Ickes is honestly trying to do a good job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I believe every Member of this House and every Member of Congress will agree with me that if there is anything needed in these departments it is personnel, and an administrative personnel that is responsive to the will of Congress itself. The will of the Congress is the thing that the Court tries to interpret in what is intended by the passage of legislation.

We are confronted with a personnel in the departments of the executive branch of the Government that is not under the control of the Congress. They are arrogant in dealing with the Members of Congress and I think we should see to it in the appointment of this personnel, particularly the policy-forming executives, that they respond to the will of the Congress. This bill provides that an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Every policy-making position in these United States should come under the terms of that provision of this legislation.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I would like to make the observation that my stand in opposition to the encroachment of various bureaus upon the rights of the people is very well known to the Members of this Congress. It appears to me that we are to a large degree defeating our own purpose of weeding out these various bureaus by not allowing to the old-line agencies of the Government the the help that they need. It is well recognized that during the last several years the functions of the Federal Government have expanded tremendously. Those additional duties of the Government have got to be taken care of by someone. The Department of the Interior is one of the old-established agencies of the Government, which I feel should be taking care of these things rather than to create new bureaus and new offices and appointing a lot of theorists to do all of these jobs. Why do we not channel all these efforts through the old agencies and give them enough help to do the job? That is one of the ways, as I see it, of destroying and weeding out the new agencies that are constantly cropping up to annoy and harass the people and destroying government in this country.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Why does not the Department of the Interior through its Secretary fill the vacancies that are there now?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. That is what we are attempting to do here now.

Mr. ROWE. You are creating another vacancy.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. This is to provide enough administrative talent and enough officials down there to do the job through the old agencies rather than go out here and create all kinds of new alphabetical agencies that work in a deep and mysterious way. Why do we not give the old agencies what they need, then demand of them that they perform the duty?

Mr. ROWE. You are creating a new agency against the will of the people.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. We are not creating a new agency. The Department of the Interior is one of the old agencies that has been functioning very efficiently. Why do we not give to them the personnel they need and then demand of them that they perform the duties?

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman want to ask that as a question?

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will suspend a minute, I would like to answer the question myself. That is the very point at issue in this legislation. The gentleman wants these people appointed and, as the gentleman who spoke ahead of him, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] said, "Transfer somebody else over there." We want people in these Departments responsible to the will of the Congress and this is the way to do it. Make them subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States. This is a move in the right direction, according to the gentleman's theory. It is all right to appoint two or more people for this money who are not responsive to the Congress, but what the Government needs is executives who are responsive to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is very easy to criticize the purpose of this bill. Had any of you attended the meeting of the Committee on Rules and heard the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], testify as to the merits of the bill, I know you would agree with the Committee on Rules that the rule should have been granted and that the bill should pass.

Our committee was informed that the bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Mines and Mining after a great deal of time had been given to the consideration of the question of the need for an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior. In view of the unanimous action of the gentlemen on that committee, representing both sides of the House, in favorably reporting the bill out of that committee and recommending its passage, I think the House should pass the bill without question. I regard as unjustified the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and several others on that side of the aisle that the bill savors of politics. It would appear to me that if politics were being played in connection with this legislation it would be on the part of those who are opposing the bill, especially since it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Mines and Mining, and carried the vote of members of their own party serving on that committee. I say to them that such is not the case, and they have no real reasons in offering such

criticism, as we all know that this regular old-line Department has been obliged since the beginning of the war to assume many additional duties and responsibilities in connection with legislation we have passed and which has been decreed by Executive order. I, therefore, feel that the criticism on the part of some of these gentlemen who have not considered nor realized the increase in the functions of this Department and the responsibilities imposed upon Secretary Ickes is most unfair. However, I want to compliment some of the Republican members of the committee, especially the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] and the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], who have recognized not only the real need for the services of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior but the efficient and economical administration of the Department under the direction of Secretary Ickes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another reason for the need of an additional Assistant Secretary for this Department. As soon as this bill is disposed of, I shall call up H. R. 3209, authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes. The bill provides for the development of commercial processes for making oil from coal and shale and will be a means of our country keeping abreast of its future requirements for gasoline and fuel oil without seeking sources in other countries or importing it from abroad. This is vital legislation for our future welfare and the important program will be initiated under Secretary Ickes, who is the Petroleum Administrator for War, and the Bureau of Mines will be the agency to carry it through to a successful conclusion. I feel that this new legislation alone warrants the taking on of an additional Assistant Secretary.

Replying to the gentleman—I believe it was the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER]—that vacancies have not been filled in the Department of the Interior, may I say that it is not the policy of Secretary Ickes to have a vacancy in his Department remain unfilled. He is quite particular and exacting in obtaining personnel of proper ability and caliber and thoroughly investigates character and qualifications of an applicant before effecting an appointment. During his long service some vacancies have, perchance, remained unfilled for a short time. However, on the other hand, I know that the Secretary of the Interior will not fill any vacancy if the needs of the service do not require it because, as I have stated, his administration of the duties of his Department has not only been efficient but economical as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2801) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to House Resolution 381, reported the same back to the House with an amendment agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PETERSON of Georgia) there were—ayes 73, noes 60.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 186, nays 159, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—186

Allen, Ill.	Flannagan	McMurray
Allen, La.	Fogarty	Madden
Anderson, N. Mex.	Folger	Maloney
	Forand	Manasco
Angell	Ford	Mansfield, Mont.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fulbright	Marcantonio
Barden	Furlong	Merritt
Barrett	Gearhart	Michener
Barry	Gordon	Monroney
Bates, Ky.	Gore	Morrison, N. C.
Beall	Granger	Mott
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Mruk
Bland	Green	Murdock
Bloom	Gregory	Murphy
Bonner	Hale	Myers
Bradley, Pa.	Harless, Ariz.	Norman
Brehm	Harris, Ark.	O'Brien, Ill.
Brooks	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Brown, Ga.	Hendricks	O'Hara
Bulwinkle	Herter	O'Neal
Burchill, N. Y.	Hill	Outland
Burgin	Hinshaw	Pace
Byrne	Hoch	Patman
Camp	Holifield	Patton
Cannon, Mo.	Holmes, Wash.	Peterson, Fla.
Capozzoli	Howell	Peterson, Ga.
Carrier	Izac	Pfeifer
Chapman	Jackson	Philbin
Chenoweth	Jarman	Plumley
Church	Jenkins	Priest
Clark	Johnson, Calvin D.	Ramey
Clason	Johnson, J. Leroy	Randolph
Cochran	Johnson, Luther A.	Rankin
Coffee	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Reece, Tenn.
Colmer	Judd	Reed, Ill.
Cooper	Kean	Richards
Cox	Kefauver	Robertson
Crosser	Kerr	Robinson, Utah
D'Alesandro	Kilburn	Rockwell
Davis	Kilday	Rogers, Mass.
Delaney	King	Rowan
Dewey	Kirwan	Sabath
Dickstein	Klein	Sadowski
Dilweg	Lane	Sasscer
Dingell	Larcade	Sauthoff
Doughton	Lea	Sheppard
Durham	LeCompte	Sheridan
Eberharter	Lemke	Sikes
Ellison, Md.	Lesinski	Simpson, Ill.
Ellsworth	Luce	Slaughter
Engle, Calif.	McCormack	Smith, Maine
Fay	McGranery	Snyder
Feighan	McGrath	Somers, N. Y.
Fernandez	McKeough	Sparkman
Fitzpatrick	McLaughlin	Spence
Flaherty	McMillan	Stanley
Flannery	McMillen	Stewart
Flood	McMorris	Stockman
Flynn	McNutt	Sullivan
Fogarty	Mahon	Sumners, Tex.
Folger	Mansfield, Mont.	Tarver
Forand	Marcantonio	Thomas, Tex.
Ford	Merritt	Thomason
Fulbright	Michener	Tolan
Furlong	Monroney	Vinson, Ga.
Gearhart	Morrison, N. C.	Voorhis, Calif.
Gordon	Mott	Wadsworth
Gore	Mruk	Ward
Granger	Murdock	Wasielewski
Grant, Ala.	Murphy	Weiss
Green	Myers	Welch
Gregory	Norman	Wene
Hale	O'Brien, Ill.	White
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.	Whittington
Harris, Ark.	O'Hara	Willey
Hart	O'Neal	Winstead
Hendricks	Outland	Wolverton, N. J.
Herter	Pace	Woodrum, Va.
Hill	Patman	Worley
Hinshaw	Patton	Wright
Hoch	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman
Holifield	Peterson, Ga.	
Holmes, Wash.	Pfeifer	
Howell	Philbin	
Izac	Plumley	
Jackson	Priest	
Jarman	Ramey	
Jenkins	Randolph	
Johnson, Calvin D.	Rankin	
Johnson, J. Leroy	Reece, Tenn.	
Johnson, Luther A.	Reed, Ill.	
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Richards	
Judd	Robertson	
Kean	Robinson, Utah	
Kefauver	Rockwell	
Kerr	Rogers, Mass.	
Kilburn	Rowan	
Kilday	Sabath	
King	Sadowski	
Kirwan	Sasscer	
Klein	Sauthoff	
Lane	Sheppard	
Larcade	Sheridan	
Lea	Sikes	
LeCompte	Simpson, Ill.	
Lemke	Slaughter	
Lesinski	Smith, Maine	
Luce	Snyder	
McCormack	Somers, N. Y.	
McGranery	Sparkman	
McGrath	Spence	
McKeough	Stanley	
McLaughlin	Stewart	
McMillan	Stockman	
McMillen	Sullivan	
McMorris	Sumners, Tex.	
McNutt	Tarver	
Mahon	Thomas, Tex.	
Mansfield, Mont.	Thomason	

NAYS—159

Abernethy	Gilchrist	Miller, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	Gillette	Mills
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillie	Murray, Tenn.
	Goodwin	Murray, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Gossett	Norrell
	Graham	O'Brien, N. Y.
Andrews	Grant, Ind.	O'Konski
Arends	Griffiths	Phillips
Arnold	Gwynne	Pittenger
Auchincloss	Hagen	Poage
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Poulson
Bender		Powers
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Leonard W.	Pratt, Joseph M.
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Harness, Ind.	Rees, Kans.
Blackney	Hays	Rivers
Bolton	Hoeven	Rizley
Boren	Hope	Rolph
Bradley, Mich.	Hull	Rowe
Brown, Ohio	Jeffrey	Russell
Brumbaugh	Jennings	Satterfield
Bryson	Jensen	Schiffler
Buffett	Johnson, Anton J.	Schwabe
Busbey		Scott
Butler	Johnson, Ind.	Scrivner
Canfield	Johnson, Okla.	Shafer
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, Ward	Short
Carson, Ohio	Jones	Simpson, Pa.
Carter	Jonkman	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield	Kearney	Smith, Wis.
Clevenger	Keefe	Springer
Compton	Kinzer	Starnes, Ala.
Costello	Knutson	Stearns, N. H.
Courtney	Kunkel	Stefan
Cravens	Lambertson	Stevenson
Crawford	Lanham	Sumner, Ill.
Cunningham	LeFevre	Sundstrom
Curtis	Lewis	Taber
Day	Ludlow	Talbot
Dies	McConnell	Talle
Disney	McCowen	Tibbott
Dondero	McGehee	Towe
Elliott	McGregor	Treadway
Ellis	McKenzie	Troutman
Elmer	McMillan	Vincent, Ky.
Engel, Mich.	McWilliams	Vursell
Fellows	Maas	West
Fisher	Mahon	Whelchel, Ga.
Fuller	Martin, Iowa	Whitten
Gale	Mason	Wickersham
Gallagher	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Gathings	Miller, Conn.	Wolcott
Gavin	Miller, Mo.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach	Miller, Nebr.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gibson		

NOT VOTING—83

Baldwin, Md.	Gross	Morrison, La.
Bell	Halleck	Mundt
Boykin	Hare	Newsome
Buckley	Harris, Va.	Norton
Burch, Va.	Hartley	O'Connor
Burdick	Hébert	O'Leary
Cannon, Fla.	Heffernan	O'Toole
Case	Heidinger	Ploeser
Celler	Hess	Pracht, C. Frederick
Cole, Mo.	Hobbs	
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	Price
Cooley	Holmes, Mass.	Rabaut
Cullen	Horan	Ramspeck
Curley	Kee	Robsion, Ky.
Dawson	Kelley	Rodgers, Pa.
Dirksen	Kennedy	Rogers, Calif.
Domengeaux	Keogh	Rohrbough
Douglas	Kleberg	Scanlon
Drewry	LaFollette	Smith, Va.
Dworshak	Landis	Smith, W. Va.
Eaton	Lynch	Taylor
Elston, Ohio	McCord	Thomas, N. J.
Fenton	McLean	Vorys, Ohio
Fish	Magnuson	Walter
Fulmer	Mansfield, Tex.	Weaver
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Weichel, Ohio
Gifford	May	Wilson
Gorski	Monkiewicz	Winter

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. C. Frederick Pracht against.

Mr. Drewry for, with Mr. Fenton against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Hartley against.
Mr. Curley for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Elston of Ohio against.
Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Ploeser against.
Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Weichel of Ohio against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania against.
Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. Hess against.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana for, with Mr. McLean against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Gross against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Price with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Monkiewicz.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Rohrbough.
Mr. Newsome with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Winter.
Mr. May with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. McCord with Mr. Case.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. LaFollette.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Cole of Missouri.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Dworshak.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table, the bill, S. 1140, and strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the House bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law. The Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of $9,000 per annum. The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 2801 as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and insert the provisions of H. R. 2801 as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill H. R. 2801 was passed were vacated and the bill was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JEWS IN PALESTINE

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PFEIFER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from New York [Mr. LYNCH] may extend his own remarks by inserting a small article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a Reuters news dispatch, dealing with international air route operation by surface shipping companies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article prepared by my colleague the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a former Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article based on a radio address by former Ambassador Bullitt in relation to the Polish question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYS was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Chicago Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after any other special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS FROM COAL AND OTHER SUBSTANCES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 434, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3209) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Mines and Mining, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ALLEN], minority member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is again an open rule. It provides for 2 hours' general debate and then the bill will be taken up under the 5-minute rule as usual.

This is an important measure that the resolution makes in order. I understand that for 2 or 3 years a Senate committee has given a great deal of thought and consideration to this proposition. The House Committee on Mines and Mining has also made a study of the need for this legislation, and the Committee on Rules, upon being informed that that committee reported the bill unanimously, granted a rule by unanimous vote.

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical material available, to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, with all facilities and accessories

for the manufacture, processing, and testing of such fuel.

Only a few minutes ago my attention was called to an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star, showing that the Truman committee in a report stresses the need for additional fuel. That committee is fearful, and other reports indicate, that we really have only 5 or 6 years' supply of oil. I hope that report is not correct. I do feel that we have a greater supply than has been reported, because otherwise we really would be in danger.

This proposal aims to utilize the cheapest possible coal for the purpose of producing this fuel. Now, this is nothing new. In Germany, almost one-half of the fuel and gasoline has been produced in this manner.

The Department here under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, for years has been investigating and developing this process, and I am informed they have improved materially upon the German method. If this be so, we are indeed in a splendid position, because we have enough coal to last us for a thousand years. The cheap coal that will be used for this purpose is available in nearly every section of the country. Some have chided me that there was a lot of cheap coal in Illinois, but in reply I say there is cheap coal not only in Illinois and Indiana but in almost all sections of the country. Experimentation at the small laboratory of the Bureau of Mines operating at Pittsburgh has demonstrated that the methods used in Europe could be applied to American coals and lignite, and yields have been determined for coals from 14 States and Alaska, one from Illinois showing a yield of 122 gallons of gasoline to the ton.

It is contemplated to build one, two, or three plants and make such improvements in the process as will reduce the cost. I think it is absolutely necessary that we not delay any longer the development of these plants. This is one time that I cannot be charged with delay in reporting a rule, because the Committee on Mines and Mining only reported the bill on the 10th of this month. The rule was granted a few days afterward, and here on the 15th we have the bill before us for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that some Members are desirous of leaving early, so I am not going to take any more of your time. I believe the bill has such merit that we will all feel it should be passed without any delay. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]. I know he will direct attention to the recommendations that have been made by the heads of certain bureaus that made a thorough study of this subject and also to the hearings that were held on this important measure.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks, the remarks I made earlier in the day and the remarks I am just concluding.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee has so splendidly outlined the points of this resolution that I will take no more time on this side than to say there is no objection to the rule. The only thing is that some Members on the minority side feel that private industry should undertake most of these experiments in regard to oil.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of what I said that many Members desire to leave early I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3209) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3209) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is a very far-sighted measure. The Committee on Mines and Mining gave very thorough study to the subject and this bill under the very splendid leadership of the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. They conducted extensive hearings of their own and also in conjunction with the Senate committee. The dates and facts of the hearings will be developed by the gentleman from West Virginia. The hearings show that the committee gave long and continued study to the subject and has presented a very far-sighted solution of a problem we should meet now, must meet in the immediate future, and which we should have met, if I may speak as an observer, long ago, for I believe that had we taken this step some years ago we would not have been caught short as we were at the beginning of the war.

As I say, this study was conducted by a subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and then acted upon by the full Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there anything in this program that deals with the question of synthetic rubber as a by-product from coal?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The gentleman from West Virginia will develop the whole situation during the course of his statement. He has made a complete technical investigation of the subject as chairman of the subcommittee and I had intended for him to handle the debate on our side.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, who deserves such a large share of credit for this far-sighted measure, 20 minutes, and whose hard work, untiring energy, and close attention to this important subject deserves the praise of the whole Nation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the legislation which comes before us this afternoon for consideration by the committee, and which we trust will receive the unanimous approval of the House, is the result of approximately 1 year and 9 months of study by the House Committee on Mines and Mining.

In April 1942 the distinguished chairman of that committee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH], appointed a subcommittee to study the necessity and feasibility of developing in this country a synthetic fuel industry to take care of the impact of war and the needs which would come in the mechanized era in which we would find ourselves at the conclusion of the conflict. The initial hearings were held in June of 1942.

In August 1943 the subcommittee of the House Committee on Mines and Mining joined a subcommittee of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate in exhaustive hearings. The Senate subcommittee was under the very splendid leadership of the legislator from Wyoming, Senator O'MAHONEY. He had introduced S. 1243 to cope with this growing problem. We held hearings in Washington for a period of days, then journeyed to Pittsburgh for hearings and an investigation of the laboratory at the United States Bureau of Mines experimental station, and from there we went to Salt Lake City, Utah. There ended very fruitful discussions and exhaustive consideration of this legislation at Cheyenne, Wyo., on August 11, 1943. More than 450 pages of informative testimony was assembled and has been printed.

At this point I wish to express my genuine appreciation for the unfailing courtesy which Senator O'MAHONEY extended. I desire also to thank the members of the House Mines and Mining Committee for the cooperation displayed in solidly supporting the provisions of H. R. 3209.

I am deeply appreciative of the attention which the House is giving to a

proposal of this kind, and if I may be allowed without interruption, I shall present, step by step, what I believe to be the facts which will guide you in your action on this measure. If I could not stand in the well of the House this afternoon and approach the necessity for this legislation, built on fact alone, I would not care to participate in the debate on this bill.

What is the present rate of crude-oil production in the United States?

We find that in 1943 it was about 1,500,000,000 barrels. This was an all-time record. But the estimated demand for 1944 is even greater, or over 1,600,000,000 barrels.

Will oil consumption decrease or increase after the war?

Certainly the country could reduce its demand to almost any level by sufficient restrictive legislation, but the people of the United States do not want that and I am sure Members of Congress would not desire it. In time of peace it would be unnecessary. It would restrict our development, lower our standard of living, and create unemployment.

During 1941, which was a reasonably prosperous year and before we were at war, for at least 11 months, our consumption was over 1,250,000,000 barrels annually. After the war it is believed we will have one-third more automobiles, private aviation will increase tenfold, commercial air transport to perhaps an even greater extent, and our system of highways will be vastly extended. This House received a report only a few weeks ago in which a program was advanced to build 34,000 miles of express roads in this country. Of course, we know there will be economies in engine performance and we know that it will tax the ingenuity of our engineers to make these balance new and increased uses. It is reasonable to believe that our vast war demands will fall off, but when they do they will be replaced and perhaps extended by a civilian demand.

I wish to call your attention to a report recently made by General Arnold, in charge of our Army Air Forces. He points out that since Pearl Harbor the Army Air Force alone has consumed more than 2,000,000,000 gallons of high-octane gasoline. Breaking this down, we realize that is more than 200,000 railroad tank cars. This is but one drastic drain on the domestic petroleum pools of this country under the mechanization of this global conflict.

If we believe in the future of our country, if we plan for a full level of employment, we should equally as well lay our plans to provide the oil and gasoline that such conditions will certainly demand.

Let us go into the matter of how much oil is being discovered in new fields in the United States each year. Since 1937 the oil discovered in new fields has been less than our consumption. This deficiency occurs year by year. In 1937 we produced three-quarters of our annual consumption by the discovery of new fields, yet that gradually came down year by year, until in 1943 we discovered only one-fourth of the oil which we were consuming.

Oil in new fields as a fraction of annual consumption

Year:	
1937	¾
1938	⅔
1939	⅓
1940	¼
1941	⅓
1942	¼
1943	¼

In the last 4 years we have discovered in new fields only about one-fourth of the oil we have used.

In this connection I believe it is interesting to direct your thinking to this fact: Even taking into account an annual upward revision of oil reserves in known fields, production has exceeded discoveries for the past 5 years. During 1942 and continuing into 1943, the total discoveries of reserve oil from new pools and from revaluation of old fields were near the lowest level in the history of the oil industry since 1918. This is in the face of the highest consumption of oil products on record.

It might be asked, Does this failure to discover new oil result from a lack of exploratory drilling and wildcatting, owing to the shortage of materials and manpower? I answer emphatically no; it does not. In 1942 we drilled exploratory wells to the number of 3,300 and in 1943 we had approximately 3,400 wells that were of an exploratory nature. These years represent, contrary to popular belief, the highest number of wildcat wells drilled in the United States, but these wells did not discover oil at the rate the United States was consuming it. While it is comforting to think that an even greater exploratory effort may increase our discoveries, there is no assurance that that is true. In fact, the very intensity of this effort makes each new field more difficult to discover. These circumstances make for a future decrease in discoveries fully as likely as an increase. The effect of each new field discovered means one less to discover.

Someone might ask, Is the low rate of discovery of these new oil reserves due to failure to locate new pools? I would reply that it is not. As a result of our great exploratory effort, the number of new fields has increased, but each one is small compared with the great fields that had previously been discovered.

I have a table which discloses clearly that the drilling of more wildcat wells to find new pools of petroleum does not solve the problem because the shortage continues, due to the fact that the amounts found are relatively small.

Year	Number of new fields	Average volume of petroleum reserves per field
		Barrels
1936	162	14,771,000
1937	221	9,399,000
1938	256	8,980,000
1939	254	3,215,000
1940	304	4,815,000
1941	341	2,863,000
1942	348	1,458,000
1943	[1]500	[2]

[1] Estimate.
[2] Volume of petroleum reserves per field not yet determined. Preliminary estimates indicate that it will be almost the same as for 1942.

Those figures indicate the seriousness of the situation. No thinking American, anxious for his country's well-being, can hesitate in aiding a sensible program for synthetic fuel production to aid in keeping this Nation the No. 1 transportation country of the world. Also, we must be ready to meet an emergency which can arise, greater than that we now face. No one can with certainty indicate what day this terrible war will end. But we do know now, not later, that we have explored for new fields, we have done intensive drilling, yet the results from discoveries show a very drastic decrease in the reserves which have been found.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to my friend that I think his statement should be amplified to this effect: One reason there has not been a greater discovery has been because the price of crude oil has been so low that those interested in the oil industry have not been willing to undergo the expense of drilling to the deeper pools and a great many of the oil experts in this country are of the opinion that 90 percent of our available petroleum through such drilling is still untapped. We passed in this House, as the gentleman knows, a bill seeking to raise the price of crude oil in order that we might increase our production of petroleum. That bill is now pending in another body. In view of the acuteness of our petroleum situation and in view of our desire to foster private industry, I hope insofar as it is possible that that bill will soon pass and be approved.

May I ask the gentleman this question while I am on my feet: As I understand, it is the purpose of this measure not to get the Government into the oil business but through experimentation to seek other sources of oil in order that such business of this character as may be available could be turned over to private operation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman from Texas makes two observations which are correct. The first is that we need to raise the price of oil to stimulate wildcatting. I voted for that measure, and trust the Senate will act affirmatively on it. I believe it to be a necessary stimulant.

I am glad also that the gentleman has gone into the subject of private business and Government cooperation. Under the provisions of this bill the Government of the United States is not entering into business in competition with private industry. We have placed restrictive language in the measure to cover that point. We know that in our hearings the oil industry, through the independents and the organized companies, were enthusiastic for this type of legislation, because they believed that the Government could lay down a pattern which they, very quickly perhaps, could follow and take over as a private enterprise. This is highly desirable. We want only to lead the way at a time when congressional foresight is needed.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that the plants contemplated are to be very small, the maximum production to be not more than 1,000 barrels a day, and that the entire proposal is for experimentation to make this available to the operation of private industry.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct when he mentioned 1,000 barrels a day. Really, that is the top. Perhaps 500 barrels would more nearly coincide with the thinking of the research experts of the Bureau of Mines.

This decrease which I have read in reserves per field to one-tenth of the value found in 1936, over a period of the last 6 or 7 years, we believe to be alarming. That is why the committee brings this measure here today. The oil industry, we know, are drilling now where they think the prospects for finding oil are best. If they do not find oil, it can only mean that their scientists, their geologists, are approaching perhaps an end of the resources, and it is likely that they are seeking something that is not there.

There are some who will tell you that we cannot sit in Washington and find oil, and that it is only necessary to explore and it will be found. We say to those persons that the oil companies themselves are spending millions of dollars annually on this effort, that they have hired the country's best brains, and all of this has failed to keep discovery equal or even close to consumption. We ask the question, What are the present resources of the United States in known reserves of petroleum? These are estimated at the present time to be 21,000,000,000 barrels.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Why cannot this be left to private industry?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Private industry has felt, as the hearings over many, many months indicate, that it did not feel that it could spend the amount of money necessary in learning the know-how to do this job. It felt, as was said by all the witnesses without exception, that the Government could do what has been done in Great Britain, that is, lead the way in a matter of this kind. We know that Great Britain controls provinces possessing great oil reserves, yet today 3,500 barrels of synthetic fuel are being produced in Great Britain in one plant which was established by the Government in cooperation with private industry, just as we hope to do it under this measure.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell me why this is not another Federal bureaucracy?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think my voting record in Congress has been an independent one. I believe that if the gentleman from Ohio would scan it he would find that I have stood shoulder to shoulder with many others in attempting to do away with the overstaffing and the unnecessary agencies in our Federal system. However, I cannot understand how the gentleman would ascribe to the Congress of the United States a desire to continue bureaucracy when, in the face of a drastically dwindling petroleum supply, we attempt on a sound and sensible basis to lay a foundation which will enable us to produce domestically the liquid fuels and gasoline which we shall need in the years immediately ahead.

In further reply, may I say—advisedly—that prior to our entrance into the World War we were receiving our crude rubber supply from the Dutch and the British. I am not attempting now to criticize them, but I am saying to you that we paid the price they wanted us to pay, because we were under a monopoly to those sources of our supply of crude rubber. But when the war came and we found ourselves without any planning here at home for a synthetic rubber industry, this Congress, of which the gentleman is a hard-working Member, appropriated $750,000,000 to build approximately 59 plants to produce synthetic rubber in this country. We had to do that. It was under the impact of an emergency. But it is safe to say that we spent perhaps $100,000,000 unnecessarily because we had to throw the program into high gear so quickly. We do not want that to happen again. That is why we bring here today a bill, unanimously reported, which we believe will set up a demonstration plant or plants and will lead the way to synthetic fuel development so that private industry, in a sense shaking hands with sound government, can give a basis for the products we must have in the future if we are to remain a first-rate power. We must have here, not abroad, the petroleum resources with which to fuel this era of wheels and wings in which America must be supreme.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has touched on the question I asked the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] a few minutes ago, that the backbone of Germany's war machine is the making of synthetic rubber out of coal or coal by-products.

The other question I wanted to ask is this. If we have 21,000,000,000 barrels of oil in reserve, I think it is fair to say to the House and to the country that it takes 25 or 30 years or more to get that amount of oil out of the ground. It cannot be done all in 1 year. I wish the gentleman would explain that fully to the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall say in reply to the gentleman from Michigan that what he has said about Germany is correct. It took Germany approximately 20 years or a little more to develop a synthetic fuel industry. The same was true with its synthetic rubber research which led to such extensive development. Today more than 50 percent of the gasoline being used by the Germans in their war effort is coming from synthetic sources. We do not need to take that long in this country. We can do it perhaps in 3 or 4 or 5 years. But we do believe that now is the time to do it, when we see our resources being drained off very rapidly—to a danger point.

One bombing plane uses 1,000 gallons of high-octane gasoline on a mission, and a thousand of those bombing planes converge over an enemy target using 1,000,000 gallons of high-octane gasoline in a period of perhaps only 1 or 2 hours. It takes 4 gallons of crude oil to produce 1 gallon of 100-octane gasoline. So we can visualize the tremendous drain on, and the even greater demand for, petroleum products, which will come as we go into the more crucial stages of this war.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for his very excellent statement on this subject.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Has this bill been approved by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Bureau of the Budget has written a letter to the Secretary of the Interior under date of November 8, 1943, which incidentally was the day prior to the unanimous passage of similar legislation in the Senate. He set forth that it would not be desirable to take away critical materials from the war effort just at this time. No blanket approval of doing the job exactly now was given. This committee does not ask for that. In this bill we say "within the limits of critical materials available."

Mr. CARTER. As I understand it, it has not the approval of the Bureau of the Budget or of the President at the present time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Not as an immediate construction program, but as a necessary full program to supplement known reserves it does have approval.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman has a letter approving it from the Bureau of the Budget I ask him to please put it into the RECORD.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I shall also include letters from the Petroleum Administrator for War, the Acting Secretary of the Interior, and the First Assistant Secretary, which I shall place in the RECORD.

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1943.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: I am gratified to learn from your letter of October 25 that the Mines and Mining Committee of the House of Representatives has unanimously reported H. R. 3209 with amendments, which bill provides for the establishment and operation of demonstration plants for the production of gasoline and liquid fuels from coal and other substances. This brings us one step nearer the enactment of legislation which I consider essential to the fuel economy of the Nation. You are, of course, familiar with my endorsement of S. 1243, a Senate bill which is similar to H. R. 3209. I desire to repeat again my endorsement of this legislation.

It is quite true that we are faced with a shortage of crude oil supply. The discovery and development of new crude oil reserves has not kept pace with the mounting demands of the armed forces and essential civilian requirements for petroleum products. The cold hard facts indicate that by the end of 1944 we shall require the importation from foreign sources of approximately 300,000 barrels of crude oil daily to meet the projected demand for petroleum products at that time. Obviously, in the face of these facts, all possible steps should be taken to augment the Nation's petroleum supply. H. R. 3209 is a desirable step in that direction.

I am having an analysis made of the statements published by Mr. Leon Henderson in his broadcast of September 25 which you forwarded with your letter. You will hear further from me with respect to that matter.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH K. DAVIES,
Acting Petroleum Administrator for War.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., October 27, 1943.

Hon. JOE L. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Mines and Mining, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: You have asked my views on the provisions of H. R. 3209, a bill authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

I am wholeheartedly in favor of the legislation proposed in the bill. It is high time that the country embarked in earnest upon the program of research and development work necessary to determine the processes and equipment required for the establishment of an industry which can help to supply the continuing needs of the country for liquid fuels which have heretofore been available from the ample but now waning domestic petroleum reserves.

The total demand for liquid fuel in 1941 and 1942 reached about 1,500,000,000 barrels annually. The rate of discovery of petroleum has decreased sharply since 1937. In the 3 years 1937–39, about 5,400,000,000 barrels were added to the Nation's proved oil reserves, whereas in the 3 years 1940–42 the increment was only 1,600,000,000 barrels. In 1942, the new reserves discovered, including extensions and new horizons in old fields, were at a low of 317,000,000 barrels or only about one-fifth of our annual rate of consumption. This failure to find adequate quantities of new oil was not due to lack of prospect drilling, as 3,264 wildcat wells were drilled in 1941 and 3,029 in 1942. The decline in the rate at which new discoveries are being made is causing serious concern as to a sufficient supply of crude petroleum in the event of a long war. The ominous implications of the progressive effect of this decline upon the peacetime economy of the post-war years are easily foreseen and can be effectively forestalled by timely action. The answer to the problem clearly lies in the utilization of other materials than petroleum as sources of the liquid fuels required to supply the Nation's needs.

It is apparent that this country can no longer delay in embarking upon a synthetic liquid-fuel program. Our study of petroleum reserves and the rate of their depletion indicates clearly that unless we take action, the end of the age of abundant oil is in sight. This development—and I fix no date for it—will inevitably bring major repercussions throughout our entire economy in peace as well as in war.

Fortunately, the Department of the Interior has been aware of these trends and has initiated the study of means which may still be taken to prevent the Nation from feeling the full force of future natural petroleum deficiencies. In particular, the Bureau of Mines has developed processes that actually have produced petroleum products and liquid fuels from coals, oil shale, gases, and other substances. We have also studied similar developments in other countries.

However, the time has come when we must get out of the test-tube stage into actual production. Past experiments have given us the scientific knowledge of the basic processes involved but the way must be blazed for American industry to enter this synthetic-fuel field, which inevitably will be one of the major industrial developments of the near future.

It is, in my opinion, the responsibility of an alert government to meet such a situation forthrightly. Therefore, I propose that the Government harness its facilities to the business of blazing this path so that industry and private initiative may take up the work. Under present conditions we cannot rely upon industry to make the initial, unremunerative expenditure necessary to solve the technical and economic problems of synthetic-fuel production. Therefore, I propose that the Government fulfill its duty on a demonstration basis, making its findings and experience available to industry so that private enterprise can take up the task of providing synthetic fuels on the scale necessary to safeguard the Nation's future.

In order to clarify the scope of the operations intended to be authorized by H. R. 3209, I recommend that the following language be inserted after the word "products" at page 2, line 2, of the bill:

"The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic-liquid-fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products."

The Department has not as yet been informed by the Bureau of the Budget concerning the relationship of this proposed legislation to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

ABE FORTAS,
Acting Secretary of the Interior.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOE L. SMITH,
Chairman, Committee on Mines and Mining, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: In response to a request for immediate notification of any report by the Bureau of the Budget as to whether H. R. 3209 is within the President's program, I attach herewith a letter received today on that subject from the Director of the Budget. You will note that the Director concludes "that there would be no objection to the enactment of legislation authorizing this undertaking as a post-war project" and precedes this conclusion with the statement that "the construction of these plants during the present war should not be considered in accord with the program of the President."

H. R. 3209, as you recall, stipulates no time schedule in relationship with the war. The testimony of the Department, industry, and other officials was to the effect that any interference with the President's war program would be avoided, following passage of this authorization bill, by submission of priority requirements on material to the War Production Board, labor requirements to the War Manpower Commission, financial items to the Bureau of the Budget, and any other items to appropriate Federal agencies. This procedure would insure compliance with the changing requirements of the war program. Therefore, the concept of the Department, and the bill as written, would seem to be in accord with the stipulation of the Bureau of the Budget. The Department would not feel free to proceed with the essential preliminary work prerequisite to this large undertaking, unless definitive House action is taken on H. R. 3209.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
First Assistant Secretary.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1943.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to prior correspondence concerning proposed legislation to authorize the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war and conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation.

Your letter of October 25, 1943, indicates that you would contemplate the construction, under this legislation, of three plants, with a total investment cost of $50,000,000, and with annual operating costs of $7,810,000. In this connection, it is to be noted that the House bill, as reported to the House, fixes a total appropriation authorization of $30,000,000.

Expert testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Senate indicated the contemplated program could not be looked upon as an important aid to the prosecution of the present war, or even to meeting the immediate post-war petroleum requirements. Moreover, the present construction of these plants would make considerable demand upon our supply of manpower and critical materials.

In view of these considerations, you are advised that legislation contemplating the construction of these plants during the present war should not be considered in accord with the program of the President, but that there would be no objection to the enactment of legislation authorizing this undertaking as a post-war project.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director.

Mr. CARTER. There is another question that I want to ask the gentleman. The gentleman asks in this bill that there be authorized an appropriation of $30,000,000. How was that figure arrived at?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The men who have spent much time in an exhaustive study of this program, that is, experts of the United States Bureau of Mines, say that $30,000,000 in their opinion will be sufficient to develop the methods by which we can do a good job in this country; perhaps it would allow for the construction of three plants. They will vary in cost, but they would cost in the neighborhood of $30,000,000. One of those plants for demonstration purposes, of course, would be used in shale, possibly coal, and perhaps another substance. This is the figure arrived at by the men from the Bureau of Mines. We did not want to be excessive in our request. Just a few moments ago on the floor the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr.

VINSON], said to me that he hoped he would be able to come here and speak in favor of this legislation. He felt we should have at least $100,000,000. I said to him that the experts felt that we could lay down a sound and workable pattern with this amount of money, and that is all your committee wanted to ask, and not a cent in excess of it.

Mr. CARTER. Did the gentleman have testimony before the committee as to where the $30,000,000 was to be spent?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The testimony from the Bureau of Mines experts, which takes up page after page in our hearings, and in the joint hearings of the Senate and House, which go into the cost of the matter——

Mr. CARTER. How many experimental plants can be built with the $30,000,000?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Approximately three.

Mr. CARTER. And that means approximately $10,000,000 for each plant. Where are they to be located?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Bureau of Mines would make the decision, and Dr. Sayers has suggested frankly to the committee that he and his associates would develop the facts before he located the actual site, or sites, after the most careful study of the best places for the demonstration purposes.

Mr. CARTER. Dr. Sayers and his staff carry on experimental work at the present time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Dr. Sayers and his staff, due to a small appropriation made by this Congress, which was fought 2 years ago, had the sum of approximately $60,000, which they have used in a tiny, toy plant, a sort of laboratory, in Pittsburgh, at the experimental station of the United States Bureau of Mines. In August 1943, when the joint committee held hearings in Pittsburgh, we saw that pygmy plant in operation and we felt that the results of their work indicated the need for demonstration plants of the size indicated in the legislation requested here today.

Mr. CARTER. Have they reached any conclusion as to the result of that experiment work in Pittsburgh?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They have reached some conclusions, and they urge plants of a larger size to develop these processes by which the cost of production of the synthetic liquid fuels can be reduced, and improved.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that the Bureau of Mines enjoys a splendid reputation for efficiency and high character in developments?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think so. The United States Bureau of Mines over a period of many years, through different administrations, has been composed of men, alert, scientific research men, who really are attacking this problem in a proper way.

Mr. JENKINS. One of the things about this bill that recommended it to me very highly—and I could not have supported it unless they did—was the provision that the Bureau of Mines should have supervision over these things. My interest is this: This matter is not a matter of just new experimentation. Many plants have been built in Europe and other places, and even in the United States there are some struggling along trying to work out this problem, but the purpose of this program is to have the Government spend some money and in that way save private industry from wastefulness in trying to make experiments, which they cannot do without loss of time and money, and in this way if this experimentation is made under the Bureau of Mines, it will be complete in every detail; and that it is not the intention that the Government should go into this business of producing oil from coal—the Government does not want to do that and does not intend to do that, and there is no purpose to that—but it must be looked at something as the Congressional Library may be looked at. No city or State could afford a library such as the Library of Congress, but the Government in the interest of education can afford it, and the Government, therefore, in the interest of education in this case can afford to experiment and bring this matter up to a point where it is possible for private industry to take hold of it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. VURSELL. I am for the principle of the bill. I think the legislation is proper, but one of the things that bothers me is that when we get into this synthetic rubber problem, and I believe the gentleman said there were something like 52 plants already constructed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Fifty-nine.

Mr. VURSELL. At an expense of something like $700,000,000, because we had to go at it rapidly. Perhaps I am wrong, but as I read the statements in the newspapers at the present time, the President and Mr. WALLACE do not want to continue making synthetic rubber from these plants, for fear they might have to charge a little higher, or that there might have to be a little subsidy granted. Are we getting into something here when we talk about synthetic rubber where we have an equipment already built, where perhaps we may find that under our good-neighbor policy we cannot afford to make synthetic rubber, but that we must keep ourselves bound to pay the unconscionable prices charged us by Britain, as the gentleman suggested? Just where are we in this synthetic rubber situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I wish to reply to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]. I do not believe in the philosophy which would ditch these synthetic plants after the war just because we can purchase from outside. I believe that we are protecting domestic methods which are going to bring costs down to a considerable degree, and that the product will be good. In connection with synthetic fuel, we find, today, that from crude oil we are making gasoline at a cost of 5 cents a gallon; and from shale, which would be in the exploratory program, under the demonstration plants in this legislation, we find that we can produce it for from 7 to 12 cents a gallon; from tar-sands, at about 5 to 12 cents; from natural gas from 8 to 10 cents, under the Fischer process; and from coal under the Fischer process from 15 to 17 cents, and from coal under hydrogenation, at from 13 to 18 cents a gallon.

That shows us that the costs are now higher than the gasoline produced from petroleum. But we believe that by this type of sensible program we can produce the methods by which we can reduce the cost and bring into being in this country a domestic fuel program that can keep us from ever becoming an importing Nation from the standpoint of bringing in petroleum from other parts of the world.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to compliment the gentleman on his splendid presentation. That is precisely the reason why this bill will not put the Government in competition with private industry. It costs so much more to extract gasoline from shale and from coal than it does from petroleum that no private concern could possibly initiate experiments along this line. It is not the intention at all to compete with private industry, but solely to carry on these experiments and later on let private industry take hold and operate these plants after the policy has been well established.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman is correct. In section I of the bill we set forth:

> The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I supported the gentleman's bill a few weeks ago and I am very happy to yield to him at this time, because he is a student of the subject of petroleum.

Mr. DISNEY. I was sure that I would be reminded of that when I rose to ask a question about the bill. The gentleman says that this $30,000,000 is for the pattern. What will the complete picture consist of?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not think anyone can say, I reply to the gentleman from Oklahoma. Certainly we are not going to put the Government into this program except on the basis of coming through the Committee on Appropriations and making its case of not to exceed $30,000,000. The United States Bureau

of Mines says it will take that amount to place in operation the necessary plants to prove the practicability of construction and operation of a synthetic fuel industry in this country.

Mr. DISNEY. Is this a war measure?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not say you can exactly tie it into the war situation, although I will say this: I recall a speech last night by an official of the Government, a physician, to be exact, Dr. Ross McIntire. He said we were thinking in terms of fighting another 3 years, at least, in the Japanese war. So I would hesitate, and I think any man is wrong in prophesying the war will end in a few months, or at any certain date. We do believe now, and not later, is the time to start on such a development as this. The petroleum industry, through those witnesses who came before us, believe that today and not later when we run into an acute emergency, not later when we have drained our petroleum pools, is the time to start on this program.

Mr. DISNEY. Were those witnesses in favor of this type of legislation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They were. We had no opposition in all of the House or the joint Senate and House hearings. The petroleum industry, the independents, and the organized companies, were unanimously in favor of the bill.

HOW LONG WILL THE OIL IN THE UNITED STATES LAST, BASED ON OUR PRESENT RATES OF DISCOVERY AND CONSUMPTION?

Contrary to popular belief, the country has an oil shortage right now. With our oil wells producing at rates which will avoid excessive loss of oil in the ground, we cannot secure enough oil to satisfy military and civilian demand. This is shown by the fact that our civilian restrictions are no longer attributed only to transportation or rubber shortages, but simply to the fact that we cannot safely withdraw oil faster from the wells.

Unless we can double or triple our present rate of discoveries, and there is no indication that we can, the shortage will grow worse year by year. The flush, high production of a well occurs in the first few years of its life and then falls off rapidly until finally only a few barrels a day can be withdrawn. At a low rate a well may continue to produce a little oil for 50 years. If an attempt is made to withdraw oil at a much higher rate the gas pressure driving the oil to the surface is lost rapidly and oil is lost in the sand in such a manner that it can never be recovered. With low discoveries the number of wells in flush production is growing smaller. Almost all of our production is coming from older fields whose production is decreasing rapidly. If we allow this situation to continue without taking vigorous and forthright steps to meet it, the country is facing a petroleum shortage of the most serious proportions by 1950.

OIL SHORTAGES HAVE BEEN PREDICTED BEFORE ON AT LEAST TWO OCCASIONS AND HAVE NOT MATERIALIZED. WHY IS THIS ONE ANY MORE LIKELY TO OCCUR THAN THE OTHERS?

From 1907 to 1910 there was a period in which unguided drilling of wells failed to locate very much oil and in a few quarters fear was expressed that the country was short of oil. This apprehension quickly subsided with the introduction of the simple surface geological methods which served to guide wildcat drilling and to increase discoveries. In 1923, 1924, and 1925, as shown in figure 1, total discoveries and consumption were about the same, and consumption actually exceeded discoveries slightly during 1924. This was followed by the application of new geophysical prospecting methods and from 1926 through 1931 tremendous reserves were discovered which abated fears of shortage. In 1932 and 1933 consumption exceeded discoveries but this was in a considerable measure a result of the depression as well as little apparent need for new oil because of the large reserves found in the immediately preceding years. Discoveries again greatly exceeded consumption from 1934 through 1938. There are two important things to note in these cases. First, there was no extended period in which production exceeded consumption and, second, during each apparent shortage new prospecting methods were developed that helped to solve the problem.

In contrast, the current shortage represents a period from 1939 through 1943 with total discoveries less than consumption for every one of these years. This is a much longer period than ever encountered heretofore where this highly adverse situation existed. Not only have discoveries fallen at an extraordinary rate, but this has been coupled with sharply increased consumption. No material improvement in prospecting methods has appeared during the last few years nor is any now in sight. Oil geologists are approaching the end of their resources so far as finding good prospects by present methods is concerned. In the past, fears of shortage have been based on what might happen; now they are based on what has happened since 1939.

Another interesting point brought out by figure 1 is the tremendously high discovery level that would have to be maintained to supply our economy at the rate oil was used for the pre-war year, 1941. For the 25 years, 1918 through 1942, there were only 9 in which discoveries exceeded this level of consumption and 16 in which they were less. To keep even, large fields must be discovered at periodic intervals such as represented by the years 1926 and 1930. The chances for doing this become less and less each year as the country exhausts its brightest prospects.

CAN AN OIL SHORTAGE BE MET BY OPENING UP THE WELLS AND LETTING THE OIL COME OUT FASTER?

Yes, for a short time, but this would cut our ultimate recovery of oil drastically for much of it remains trapped in the ground if withdrawal is too rapid. Such a policy could exhaust our entire reserve in 2 or 3 years. It must not be followed except in the most dire emergency.

Even with the high rates of withdrawal now in use, we are losing ground. In a report from the Interstate Oil Compact Commission (October 1943, p. 17) appeared the following statement:

It is alarming to note that after every available barrel of oil is produced from the presently known and developed oil fields of America, including the 246,000 additional barrels (per day) that can come from Texas, we still will be 500,000 barrels per day short of the anticipated demands at the peak of the 1944 estimates of crude-oil requirements.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO MEET AN OIL SHORTAGE?

There are four ways to meet the oil shortage. The bill before us considers only one, but I want it understood that I favor the vigorous and active pursuit of all four.

The first way is to increase to the greatest possible extent our exploratory program and wildcat drilling. This can certainly be expected to help meet the shortage but will not solve it.

The second way is to import oil. In this case, we do not know how much the oil will cost, the amount we can secure, or whether it will be available to us through the vicissitudes of peace and war. Difficulties that may arise with oil from foreign sources is exemplified by problems presented in the production of oil in Mexico just before the present war started. Certainly no Member of Congress wants to entangle this country in controversy with foreign countries over oil supplies. If we do get in such an entanglement, we will need our own assured sources of supply to support our economy and our Army and Navy.

The third way is to reduce consumption. So far as this involves more effective use of oil and more efficient motors, this is a sound program. I oppose the restriction of consumption, if it creates unemployment, retards our progress and development, and lowers our living standards.

The fourth way is one that will assure the oil supplies we need, will help meet post-war employment problems, and in which the great majority of our States can participate. This is to make oil and gasoline from oil shale, coal, and lignite.

ARE THE PROCESSES FOR MAKING OIL FROM OIL SHALE, COAL, AND LIGNITE NEW LABORATORY SCHEMES THAT HAVE NEVER BEEN USED ON A LARGE SCALE?

No, they are not. Germany produces almost one-half the gasoline for this war from coal. England has one plant making 3,500 barrels a day from coal and coal tar.

DOES ANYONE IN THE UNITED STATES HAVE INFORMATION ON THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THESE PLANTS?

Yes; in spite of the fact that the Germans have kept the processes a military secret and have never released full information. The Bureau of Mines has sent engineers to Europe to obtain information and keep abreast of developments. Their last mission on this work was to England in June of 1943. They have also operated a small laboratory at Pittsburgh in which they have explored the secrets of the processes since 1936.

WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE TO DEVELOP THESE PROCESSES TO COMMERCIAL USE?

These processes are in the laboratory stage in this country. They are in almost the same state as processes for making synthetic rubber before Pearl Harbor. To avoid a hectic, costly, and as yet unsatisfactory development, such as we are now witnessing for rubber, this bill, H. R.

3209, proposes that methods for making oil and gasoline should be brought to commercial usefulness before the country is caught in a damaging oil shortage. To do this, it is necessary to build a limited number of demonstration plants in which the chemical and engineering problems can be fully and carefully solved. The data from this work will allow industry to build plants of the most modern design, to secure the most efficient operation, and to produce gasoline at the lowest possible cost.

HOW MUCH WILL IT COST TO PRODUCE GASOLINE OR OIL BY THESE PROCESSES?

Raw materials that may be used to produce synthetic gasoline include natural gas, oil shale, bituminous coal, subbituminous coal, and lignite. The testimony offered at the hearings of Senate and House last summer on the companion bill (S. 1243) indicated costs ranging from 8.8 to 23 cents a gallon. This compares with about 6 cents a gallon from petroleum. The lowest price estimate was made by a vice president of the Standard Oil Development Co. and was based on the use of natural gas as a raw material.

The experts from the Bureau of Mines estimate that, in large plants comparable to those used in the petroleum industry, gasoline can be produced from coal for about 15 or 16 cents a gallon. These are conservative estimates based on present known plant designs. Improvements in the processes as a result of the work under this bill can reduce these costs materially.

Crude oil from oil shale is estimated to cost from $1.75 to $2.50 per barrel. Petroleum varies greatly in price covering a range from around $1 to nearly $2. Oil from shale would be about 50 cents to $1 more per barrel or from 1 to 2½ cents more per gallon.

CAN AVIATION GASOLINE BE PRODUCED BY THESE PROCESSES?

Yes, aviation gasoline is being produced from coal which in every respect is equal to gasoline from petroleum.

DOES THE UNITED STATES HAVE LARGE RESERVES OF OIL SHALE AND COAL?

Yes. There is sufficient oil shale to furnish all oil and gasoline at the present rate of use for 65 years. Oil shale is used for no other purpose, is now going to waste, but it can be made a valuable domestic raw material by enactment of this legislation.

There is sufficient coal to furnish all that is needed for heating and for all our synthetic liquid fuel for over 1,000 years.

IN WHAT STATES ARE THESE RAW MATERIALS LOCATED?

The majority of States have one or more of the raw materials, oil shale, coal, or lignite, and can participate in the program planned under this bill.

HAS PUBLIC TESTIMONY SUPPORTED THIS LEGISLATION?

Hearings on the Senate bill were held last August in Washington, Pittsburgh, Salt Lake City, and Sheridan, Wyo. Testimony was presented by 77 witnesses. This legislation was actively supported by oil companies, coal companies, and their engineering and research organizations. A representative from the Army testified to the need for the work. State officials and representatives from State universities pointed out that the program was of national interest. Industrial organizations and Government officials offered testimony supporting the program. These hearings revealed strong sentiment favoring the proposal in all regions of the country.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN TO PATENTS DEVELOPED AS A RESULT OF THIS WORK?

They will be assigned to the Government and will not be the property of individuals.

WILL THIS LEGISLATION HELP TO SOLVE OUR POSTWAR EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS?

It will—by opening a whole new chemical field for development by industry. It will furnish work for our construction companies, our steel companies, and will employ many miners.

WILL FUNDS WHICH ARE PROVIDED BY SUBSEQUENT ACT OF CONGRESS IN CONNECTION WITH THIS LEGISLATION BE SPENT IN THE UNITED STATES?

Yes, they will. This money will be used for our benefit in our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the subcommittee making this study. I feel that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia, has done a very good job dealing with the scientific phase of this, even going into details. So I will deal with quite another matter. I sat here earlier in the day and listened to a conversation between my chairman and the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Georgia, who declared that in his judgment this is one of the most significant bills presented to this Congress for many years. And although I am naturally interested in it I think I see why this is so vital.

Now I take from my pocket a coin on which there is inscribed a Latin phrase, a very significant phrase in American history, E pluribus unum. I tell you, gentlemen, that historically is a significant phrase; when we consider that out of many States and communities we now have one united nation. Who was it that wrote E pluribus unum across our seal, across our coins, and across the course of our history? Of course, you gentlemen of the bar would say at once it was a group of men back yonder in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787 who wrote the Constitution of the United States, who provided thus for a more perfect union, and who consolidated these States into one nation. I agree largely with you in that, but I recall that on a summer day in 1787 a shabbily dressed man appeared before the old philosopher, Dr. Benjamin Franklin, and said, "Dr. Franklin, will you come down to the river this afternoon to watch my experiment?" And old Dr. Franklin, being in advanced years and suffering somewhat with an ailment, said, "Well, I am afraid I cannot get down to the river to watch your experiment. I wish you well." Franklin was himself both a solon and a scientist.

I want to say to you that the gentlemen who met in that famous Convention in 1787 did adjourn from Independence Hall and from their labors, and they went down to the bank of the river to watch an experiment. They saw something which was destined to play a great part in the unification of America. That experiment was the application of steam to the propulsion of a steamboat. I want to tell you gentlemen, as a student of American history, it is difficult to determine who had most to do in writing E pluribus unum from the Atlantic to the Pacific in the creation of these United States of America; whether the men who wrote the Constitution or whether the men who made possible rapid transportation by steam on land and water.

On November 6 last I went out to the Washington Airport to see my friend the gentleman from West Virginia arrive on a plane. I think a lot of my good friend from West Virginia, the chairman of this subcommittee, but I would not ordinarily have gone out there that day, what with the bad weather, just to see him fly in. This was no ordinary occasion. The point was that the gentleman from West Virginia, from a place 175 miles distant, flew a plane into Washington for the first time with fuel made from coal. I tell you that was a very significant thing. That was history in the making.

All of us have had pointed out how our dwindling reserves of petroleum are leaving us in great straits. I feel if we are going to conduct a long war on a global scale and later on carry on commerce throughout the world on a global scale, and are not to ditch all our internal combustion engines, we are going to have to get another source of fuel for power. It is the exploratory work which this bill makes possible. I will not take the time from other gentlemen who have these details more at hand, but I want to point out that this measure tops new sources of fuel, not only for internal combustion engines needed for rapid travel, but also for commerce. It means smokeless fuel for homes and factories. I think if we create three great laboratories we will be able to do this exploratory work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 more minute to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I feel, after listening to all of the testimony that has gone into these hearings and seeing what they have done in Germany and Russia, as well as in England and other countries, that we can make use of some of these formulas which are now in our possession, or at least German formulas in the possession of the Alien Property Custodian, and that we can get the know-how very soon so that American business, having found out the best that the scientific minds of this country can determine, will furnish this power.

The gentleman from Oklahoma asked, "How much is it going to cost?" Well, $30,000,000 will be what the Government

will put up in developing the processes and then the cost of ten or twenty times that much will be put up by private individuals and private companies to exploit this process or these processes to the full.

I am in favor of this bill and hope it passes unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt that there is anything I can add to the splendid presentation made by the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has made a very, very careful study of this entire and most important matter.

I do want to point out, however, with respect to the matter of cost, this fact: At the time our committee was meeting jointly with a committee of the Senate it was thought on the other side of the Capitol that perhaps Congress would be fully justified in appropriating $100,000,000 to conduct these very important studies, to put us in better position to safeguard our future against possible complete dwindling of our known reserves of oil. The committee on this side of the Capitol insisted upon a reduction to $30,000,000 for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other Members on this side who are anxious to discuss this matter because it is a matter that is very important to their districts, being coal-producing areas. I shall yield my time to them. However, I do want to point out that this bill specifically provides that this experimental work will be conducted by the Bureau of Mines. The Bureau of Mines, as has been aptly said by the chairman of the subcommittee, is highly regarded by the coal industry. I have talked to representatives of the coal industry and they are thoroughly in accord with the purposes of this bill. They sincerely hope and expect that this legislation will be passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. There are 28 States in the Union that have coal deposits and there are about 12 States that have shale deposits. We want it clearly understood that there is nothing sectional in this type of legislation. It is an over-all planning for the country. We can make approximately 125 gallons of gasoline from 1 ton of coal. That varies with the type of coal used. We can make approximately 35 gallons of gasoline from a ton of shale, although we can go up as high as 75 or 80 gallons in certain parts of the country.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Depending upon the oil content of the shale.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HOWELL. Not only as a new source of fuel, but as possible relief for unemployment, this bill seems to have particular significance. In my particular district in Illinois and throughout other sections of the State when the demand for coal slackens those mines are forced to close, and unemployment ensues. It seems to me that this bill is particularly significant as possible relief from unemployment which will necessarily follow a decrease or slackening of the demand for coal, due to the war.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Of course, the purposes of this bill are purely exploratory, but I agree with the gentleman that after the know-how has been developed, should private industry then take up and capitalize on the results of these studies, it should have a very stabilizing influence on the entire coal industry and tend to stabilize employment in the industry, because certainly in the post-war world we are going to have an increased demand for petroleum products or for liquid fuel.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, first I should like to ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who has this bill in charge, whether I understood him correctly. Did the gentleman say that this program could not be of value to the war effort?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I might answer in this way: If the war continues for a period of years, we think it definitely will be needed as a further supply for petroleum products. If the war should cease in 1 or 2 or 3 years, we would have had during that period of time such terrific drains upon our petroleum pools that this program contemplated would give us one further method in our own country—not in the Mediterranean, not in the Persian Gulf, but here at home, where we would have sensibly laid down a foundation that we could carry on through private industry in the development of the synthetic-fuel industry. I have not answered the gentleman perhaps. I can only say that no one can say when the war will end. The gentleman would not hazard a guess, nor would I. But we have stated in the bill that the program would go forward within the limits of critical materials available.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I understood the gentleman also to say that it would take about 4 years to put this program through the experimental stage where the results would be evident. Is that correct?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; 3 to 4 years are the best estimates of the Bureau of Mines and other research men from private industry who appeared at the hearings.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Now, I have tried in every instance to support legislation which was necessary to carry on the war. I have two sons in this war. I think I have as much interest in winning it as quickly as possible as any Member in this House. But so many of these propositions come before this Congress as war measures which appear to me not to be such.

We are making a great fuss about bureaucracy. We want to see private industry saved in this country. We are starting another bureaucracy here. There is no question in my mind about that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in future wars, which we certainly must look out for and hope against, it will be necessary again to use large supplies of fuel oil for battleships. It might become necessary for us to set aside certain of our reserves and hold them against that time. It might be that by the conclusion of this war we would have very little expendable reserves for civilian uses.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Now, I agree with all that the gentleman has said, but I want to call the attention of this House to this fact, that this war is being fought with the fruits of private endeavor and industry. This war is going to be won with those fruits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The difference between our views on this question is this: I have faith in free enterprise. I still have faith in human liberty. If private enterprise is able to do this war job as it is certainly doing, I am willing to continue to put my faith and trust in private industry.

Let me say this in conclusion, that these political machines—and that is all this is—once set up never operate the way we intend them to operate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words in regard to the statement made by my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]. At the outset let me say that there is no man on this floor who is more zealous, more studious, more sincere in his efforts than the gentleman from Ohio. If I had the same views he has concerning some aspects of this bill I think I would oppose it. If I could not agree with any of its purposes at all I would, of course, be against the bill. But I want to assure the gentleman that private industry appeared before the committee that has charge of the passage of the measure, and private industry has indicated that they want this legislation because as I said in some remarks that I have heretofore made that these experiments cannot be carried on by private industry alone by themselves. They want and need the encouragement they know they can get by the great

departments of the Government cooperating together and with them. I want to say to him further that this legislation we are trying to pass here today has been given a tremendous impetus by reason of the war. Some of us for years have been in favor of this legislation but we have not made much headway at times, other things would intervene; but since the war this bill has been almost unanimously favored. The coal people are favoring it and the oil people are not opposing it, and the scientific people are not opposing it. They are for it because they appreciate what will happen to us if we should have such a terrific drain on our oil reserves as we have had during the last 5 years. We could not stand it.

I am going to place in the RECORD after the committee rise and I can get permission in the House, a very comprehensive study made by Dr. MacQuigg, dean of the Engineering College of Ohio State University. He is one of the best posted men on this subject in America.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. May I say to my distinguished colleague from Ohio that our subcommittee and the full committee also are unanimously for this bill. We think it is very much needed and very timely legislation.

Mr. JENKINS. It has no politics in it and it has no sectionalism in it. Personally I am not sure that three plants will be built; in fact I doubt if they build more than one at first; I do not think they will spend the entire $30,000,000. My guess is that they will not spend more than $10,000,000 at first. My judgment is that they may not conduct their experiments in the big coal fields that are well developed now but may go into States like Wyoming where they have a grade of coal they cannot ship, that will not stand the weather, that will not stick together in freezing weather; they cannot ship it because it jars to pieces. I do not say that all Wyoming coal is of that grade, but some of it is, and some of that kind is high in qualities desirable for this work. I see my distinguished friend from Wyoming ready to rise in defense of his State. I know that his State contains a great quantity of fine coal. But naturally I could not concede to him that his coal stands in the same class as coal in my State. Possibly they may put one of these plants out there in his State, if that will satisfy him, and his coal might be found the ideal coal for this purpose. But leaving facetiousness aside, there are many large deposits of cheap coal all over the country that can be used.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will remind him that we have coal in Colorado, too.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman speaks of there being coal in Colorado. Yes; the great State of Colorado also has some excellent shales that may be desirable for this purpose.

I am supporting this measure and ask you to support this because it is meritorious. I want it understood, Mr. Chairman, by my colleagues, that this is not a measure that will benefit any one section especially and is not promoted by anyone who comes from the big coal districts. This is a tremendously important measure. If it is successful, who knows how far-reaching it will be. We have an inexhaustible supply of coal available. Alaska, which is practically untouched, has great coal fields. If this will be successful it is time we find it out. If it is not successful it is likewise time we find it out.

Another reason why I support this legislation is because the general process of making oil from coal has been approved scientifically at many different places. What is needed is that all these previous experimentations be studied carefully and an effort be made to give to our people the facts. If these facts justify our further pressing the matter we should do so. If not we shall have put at rest all this agitation and thereby save many expensive experiments by private capital. As far as the expense is concerned it is a very small item compared to what we are spending in other directions on matters that are of no comparable consequence. I want the House to understand that in my opinion this whole program has passed what we might term the experimental stage. It is not a new field at all. It is an effort to capitalize on the experimentations of Germany, Great Britain, and other countries so that when we go into this business we will not pay for mistakes; we will know what mistakes have been made and we can start at an advanced stage, but those engaged in private industry in this business will of course continue these experiments.

Mr. Chairman, I have already referred to Dr. Ellison MacQuigg, the dean of the school of engineering at the Ohio State University. He has made many exhaustive studies of this subject. Under his direction the school of engineering at Ohio State University has made many scientific demonstrations. He is one of America's great chemical engineers. And besides being a great scientist he has the distinction of having been born and brought up in my home town of Ironton, Ohio, where we are proud of his achievements.

I am glad to insert at this point a very scholarly and lucid statement made by Dr. MacQuigg on this subject. I commend this statement to the membership of the House. It is written in plain understandable language and free from technical terms.

STATEMENT BY C. E. MACQUIGG, DEAN OF THE COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING OF THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OHIO

The following reasons may be cited for the enactment of bill S. 1243:

1. IMPENDING SHORTAGES OF LIQUID AND GASEOUS FUELS

Enough reliable information has been accumulated to indicate that the known reserves of petroleum and natural gas in the United States are so limited in extent when compared with our present consumption that in the not distant future our consumption will be of such relation to the reserves as to require other sources of supply much sooner than has heretofore been the general belief.[1] Some authorities have placed this time of the catching up of rate of current use versus developing reserves, as low as 13 to 15 years; others decline to name a definite time, but admit its relative nearness. Still other persons decline to admit an impending scarcity of petroleum and natural gas and hopefully postpone shortages to an indefinite, long future; the latter group of experts are undoubtedly in the minority. It is not necessary for the present consideration to know definitely what the exact life of the reserves will be. One of the latest statements on this subject is that made by Dr. B. T. Brooks in the New York Times of Sunday, July 18. The gist of Dr. Brooks' statement is that the United States will become an oil-importing nation before long. Suffice it to say that whether the period be 10 years, or 50, the validity of the argument developed here is unaffected.

It might appear from the indefiniteness of the life of the reserves that this question is not of immediate concern and at the very worst many years of plenty remain to us respecting our supplies of petroleum and gas. Be this as it may, the arguments presented herein are based entirely upon the fact that the reserves of coal are many hundreds of times greater than the reserves of liquid and gaseous fuels and that sooner or later we must proceed to replace the latter fuels by the former. Proceeding with the picture of the inevitability of eventually deriving our liquid and gaseous fuels from coal, we can justify an experimental plant for research purposes alone. It will be shown, however, that such a plant in certain areas, can reasonably be expected to have utilitarian purposes of wide consequence to its surrounding communities. Admitting at once the lack of commercial feasibility for the products of the plant at present prices for hydrocarbons, nevertheless, we shall try to demonstrate that no time should be permitted to elapse before large scale research is started on our American coals.

Our economic life is definitely built, to a great extent, on the internal combustion engine, and it is, therefore, trite to point out the increasing dependence of Diesel-driven marine and land transportation on gasoline and the heavier liquid fuels; also motor-driven equipment is a sine qua non of military matériel, while the necessary control of the air is dependent upon an ample supply of high octane gasoline.

Turning to the post-war economy, it is not any longer a matter of speculation as to what our fuels will be. Much of the mechanical energy needed for our national life will be derived from liquid and gaseous fuels. If in a relatively few years our liquid and gaseous fuels supplies give us increasing concern, it is logical that we must not longer delay planning to use our scientific knowledge for the solution of our problems. It seems self-evident then that we can follow one of very few courses We can continue to deplete our natural supplies yet remaining in the earth and, in the case of natural gas, continue to regard it only as a fuel instead of a God-given chemical agent, and do nothing to develop technology along clearly indicated lines. Such a course will hasten the day when we must perforce import fuels. On the other hand, we may produce substitutes for natural gas and petroleum. Happily coal can be transformed to liquid and gaseous fuels and for an indefinite future we must rely upon coal.

2. RESEARCH MUST BE DONE NOW

The processes contemplated for further development under sponsorship of this bill—such as coal hydrogenation or gasification through the "water gas" types of reactions are not in controversy as to their technical feasibility. Vast plants are beng operated abroad at this moment for the production of gasoline and other valuable hydrocarbons. What is being proposed for the United States

[1] Coals' New Horizons, Coal Age, April 1943, p. 57.

is a concrete study of the applications of the established technology to our own engineering economics and study of further refinements. By constructing the proposed experimental facilities we will, as a Nation, be in a better position to cope with the shortage of certain kinds of fuels, notably petroleum and gas, through the conversion or substitution of our most plentiful form of energy, namely, coal. This substitution, even at increased cost, sooner or later is going to be necessary and justifiable on the basis of our economic situation in which we are already fixed.

As the matter stands today our technicians are somewhat familiar with the details of foreign practices in this art. They do not, however, know the necessary facts relative to the behavior of our numerous types of American coals and the many factors necessary for commercial development by these methods.

3. THIS PROJECT MUST BE GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED

Ordinarily, industrial research gambles with some process which is as yet only envisioned or, at best, merely discovered and not at the time fully commercialized. In the present situation the uncertainties attendant upon the usual pattern of industrial research are largely removed because large-scale operations abroad have already demonstrated the entire practicability of the processes; one plant alone in England is producing thousands of barrels of gasoline per day. Therefore, with the removal of the hazards accompanying the average industrial research, this is not a research gamble but a problem in the application of known methods to the solution of questions in our national fuel economy. Moreover, the establishment of this plant would differ from the customary type of industrial development where the element of gain is quite properly present in the financial return to the company or section of industry. The proposed project concerns the welfare of the Nation and is not in the same category as the development of a process whereby a single interest may benefit.

It might be argued that an experimental plant of the type mentioned should be the concern of one of the large American industrial organizations—say a coal association, or a large producer of petroleum products, or a manufacturer of organic chemicals, or some similar industrial interest or group of interests. Such is not the case, because of several factors applying to this specific situation. In the first place, it may well be argued that the cost is too great for any single commercial interest in view of the diffuse nature of the rewards to be reaped in the future by any one interest alone. Since no basic patent protection could be enjoyed, the monetary reward for development by a single company would not be attractive enough in the immediate future to justify the required large expenditure of stockholders' money. Moreover, since the matters to be investigated are so fundamental to the well-being of our national life, it would seem that automatically the problem goes into the domain of the General Government.

If it should be argued that the time element does not press for the immediate development of this plant, such argument may be answered by stating that an experimental plant can be justified as a military necessity. Already we are vexed by the very problems touching the heart of these researches, namely, gas and oil shortage. With a short war the temporary dislocation of civilian life with attendant problems of morale can be postponed for a period; with a long war not only is the civilian situation aggravated, but matters of military necessity become infinitely sharper. Chiefly due to transportation difficulties, we are now tasting a situation which, in the not distant future, may well be due to an entirely different cause, namely, scarcity of supply.

4. COLLATERAL ADVANTAGES OF A RESEARCH PLANT

Compelling reasons in related realms of national welfare justify the immediate conduct of the proposed researches. Among these are the wide social implications beyond the obtaining of technical data on the processes. For example, in certain areas of the Appalachian coal fields, the local deposits suffer in competition with the coals of adjoining regions because of characteristics of composition. This results in the unemployment of the miners with attendant lowering of the economic standards in the whole district. (No problem exists in marketing the high-class coals which should be used as they are; the beneficiation of the less marketable fuel is needed.)

These coal deposits are merely awaiting the touch of processes which will make them available and at the same time capitalize on the acute needs for the more desirable types of fuel. As an example of what is meant: We have a certain combination of factors in our area which have been of concern to the Ohio State Engineering Experiment Station. The western fringe of the Appalachian area presents a unique combination of problems; because of the importance of this area from the standpoint of population, war production, tax-paying capacity, and other physical and economic factors, it is almost the solar plexus of the Nation. Some of the reasons why this research is timely for this area are, very briefly: (a) the availability in Ohio alone of some 5,430,000,000 tons of coal reserves [2] with an already developed producing capacity of thirty to forty million tons of coal per annum. Details of the location and composition of this coal are presented in the accompanying report.[3] (b) This area, being the first to develop natural gas, has come to depend heavily on that source of energy for both industrial and domestic use.

Because it is such a large consumer of natural gas, exceptional facilities for distribution of this fuel have been set up. Threatened now with shortages, this area becomes strategically most important in connection with the proposed treatment of coals. Numerous benefits can be visualized by switching from coal to derived products; one among them is combating the smoke nuisance in the exceptionally large number of cities over 100,000 population in this zone. Another is the presence of unique geological forms in the Clinton sandstones permitting subterranean storage of gas produced by this technique.

The Clinton sand in Ohio is unlike the gas-producing sands found elsewhere in the Appalachian area, in that whereas in the States of New York, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee where natural gas is found, the producing sands are practically continuous. In Ohio the Clinton sand is what the geologists call lenticular in nature. The productive areas are extremely spotty, varying in size from a few acres supporting a single well to large areas covering several townships. While the spotty area of production is a headache to the wildcatter and the geologist, it has one very definite advantage in that it makes possible the repressuring of the near-depleted wells and the storage of large quantities of gas underground.

Several such areas in two groups have been so used for several years by the Ohio Fuel Gas Co., and no doubt many other such areas are available among the many spots of Clinton and in Ohio. The pipe lines operated in conjunction with these storage areas cross the coal-producing areas of Ohio at many points, loc. cit. A unique advantage claimed is that there is practically no loss of gas.

The gas-distribution lines, already mentioned, may be seen on the map and one authority has likened Ohio to the gas granary of the Appalachian area. As far as discernible at this moment, future demands for fuel energy are going to capitalize the convenience factor of gas and liquid fuels. A price differential is gladly paid by the consumer in recognition of this convenience factor which comes from the form of the fuel.

Mr. T. H. Kerr has pointed out that using certain designs for the process contemplated, this plant could make an appreciable contribution to the gas supply of this whole area by reason of the already existing storage and distribution facilities and the already established demand. This has an immediate bearing on present recognized deficiencies in the general gas supply for this area. Already much of our economic technology is dependent upon the hydrocarbons derived from gas and petroleum. One might almost predict, therefore, that the establishment of this research in a highly industrialized area would many times justify the expenditure by virtue of the contributions made to fundamental industries running the whole gamut from synthetic rubber to vitamins.

5. Looking finally to the post-war picture, researches of the type contemplated will place this country on an equal footing with foreign competition.

[2] Geological Survey of Ohio, fourth series bull. 34.

[3] "Report of the facilities in Ohio favorable to the location of proposed plant for the hydrogenation and liquefaction of coal."—T. H. Kerr, Ohio State Engineering Experiment Station, July 1943.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we all realize the gravity of the petroleum situation and it is a subject in which we must be vitally interested. We tried to be helpful in its solution in this body some time ago by passing a bill which would encourage private industry to produce more oil for our country. The testimony of experts has shown that there is a great deal more petroleum available in deeper pools but that exploration is not feasible without some increase in the price of crude oil.

We have been told that the supply now in sight will last us only about 14 years. When we stop to contemplate the importance of petroleum and its products, not only in time of war but in all the civilian operations of peace, it is a most urgent matter for our deliberation, consideration, and action.

I wish at this time, however, to call attention to another feature of this bill concerning which it is my purpose to offer two amendments.

Provision is made in the bill for the acquisition of patents and patent rights by the Government. One section provides that these patent rights of individuals may be acquired by purchase, by donation, by lease—or otherwise—I call attention to that last proviso. We certainly do not want any governmental condemnation of rights under a patent which the Government itself has granted. American initiative, American inventive genius, must necessarily depend upon the Government keeping this contract, which in its essence has been a part of our system ever since the adoption of the American Constitution.

I have discussed this matter with the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia who sponsors this bill and with those in the Bureau of Mines who would control the operation of this measure if enacted. They are entirely agreeable to the adoption of these amendments. I think they will be helpful and clarifying in preventing friction and preventing any effort at governmental abrogation of patents or deprivation of patent rights to those entitled to them. I understand, furthermore, that the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia has received a letter from the Secretary of the Interior quite in accord with the purpose of the amendments I am offering. I am sure, therefore, that they will be in no way controversial, but I desire at this time to call attention to them in order that this bill when and if enacted may be administered in accordance with its primary purpose and function, that of seeking to implement our petroleum supply without the friction that would necessarily follow if we should have these unwarranted interruptions and interferences with rights under patents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, at the expense of being accused of provincialism, I would like to say that no measure has been before the Congress which if enacted into law will do more to aid my section of Ohio, both from an economic and social standpoint, than this resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, at which time I will go into the various phases of the economic and social features regarding this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

The remarks referred to will appear in the Appendix of the RECORD within the next 5 legislative days as agreed to by the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I congratulate the subcommittee on Mines and Mining, appointed to investigate the possibility of utilizing our vast natural coal and oil shale resources, with a view to their further development, upon the efficient manner in which the investigations have been made. I hope, as a result of their efforts, the people of our country, yes, and the peoples of the world might be greatly benefited therefrom. Special commendation should be given to the chairman of this Committee [Mr. RANDOLPH], the gentleman from West Virginia, who has so energetically and fairly conducted the hearings and investigations, without the slightest degree of partisanship or sectional interest. Although he comes from the great coal-producing State of West Virginia, he has been entirely fair to all coal-producing sections of this country. Yet the fairness and impartiality that he has shown, has in nowise lessened his enthusiastic efforts in behalf of and in the interest of his own people of West Virginia.

Coal, strictly speaking, is our greatest natural resource. This being true, it seems strange indeed that so little public money has been spent in research to determine the best utilization of this great natural resource. In spite of the lack of interest that the Federal Government might have shown in a financial way, it has, through the Bureau of Mines and in cooperation with private enterprise, entered the field of research to the degree that many uses for coal have been discovered. If it could be proved, through research and demonstration, that the many uses are economically feasible, it would add to the wealth and well-being of our people.

The average man thinks of coal as fuel to burn to keep himself warm or as something to be used to generate steam for the propelling of locomotives in the field of transportation, or perhaps for the development of power to generate electricity. These are all beneficial uses to be sure, but we have learned from our research that there are many other uses for this most valuable product, uses that are now limited either because of lack of knowledge or because of the economic factor curtailing its use. In addition to the foregoing uses of coal, there are other potential uses from its by-products, such as gasoline, crude oil, petroleum products, city gas, cokes, smokeless fuels, chemicals for synthetic rubbers, plastics, and fertilizers.

When we take into consideration that the extent of our coal as a natural resource is some 3,200,000,000,000 tons, I doubt that anyone is in a position to say that we are utilizing this natural resource to the limit of its usefulness or that we have even discovered its most economical value.

As I understand it, the purpose of the legislation we are here discussing is to promote research and experimentation, not in any way to take the place of or interfere with private enterprise, but rather to furnish laboratory facilities to assist private enterprise in this instance, the same as has been done in many other fields of endeavor.

The hearings held by the committee disclosed that they were primarily concerned with the question of the feasibility of producing oil, gasoline, and rubber from coal and oil shale. These commodities were especially emphasized because of their need in the prosecution of this global war, which in a large measure is being fought on rubber and with oil. Therefore, my remarks will emphasize the possible use of coal and oil shales in their production for fuel.

I do not care to enter into the argument as to whether there is now or will be in the very near future a shortage of crude oil hiding in the depths of the earth, inasmuch as we cannot see it or measure it. Statements that there are great quantities or small quantities of oil, while based on some geological knowledge, are more or less speculative. On the other hand, coal and oil shales, while subject to some calculation, are more visible and therefore permit of more accurate estimation.

The Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Mines, estimates our assets in natural resources as follows:

	Valuation	Percent national income
Coal, all grades	$9,980,000,000,000	0.9
Iron ore, all other minerals	1,645,000,000,000	.5
Petroleum, oil shale, natural gas	75,000,000,000	.6
Water power	5,000,000,000	1.4
Forests, farms, fisheries	65,000,000,000	
All industries and manufacturing	113,000,000,000	30.6
Public and private building	140,000,000,000	

These figures show the value of our coal resources is more than four times as much as all the other resources combined, yet the national income from coal for the year 1942 was less than 1 percent.

From actual tests that have been made, it seems to have been generally established that our bituminous coal contains gasoline, ranging all the way from 136 to 58.2 gallons of gas per ton of coal in the Sunnyside coal beds of Utah, to 27.2 gallons of gas per ton of coal at the Beulah coal beds in North Dakota. As these figures indicate, a ton of Sunnyside coal will average 18.2 percent potential gasoline.

As I have just said, you will note the 58.2 gallons of potential gasoline multiplied by the number of estimated tons of coal in this area would add up to a lot of gasoline. It is estimated that there are about 200,000,000,000 tons of coal underlying the 13,000 square miles in Utah, the veins varying in thickness up to 35 feet, enough coal I am told at the normal consumption to last the United States 250 years. The amount of oil existent in this Utah coal and the figure 58.2 gallons per ton that I have given you have been determined through experiment known as the hydrogenation process. As I understand it, when this process is completed, you have 58.2 gallons of gasoline and the coal, as coal, has vanished. Therefore, the question to be determined is whether that 58.2 gallons of gasoline is worth more as gasoline and other by-products, or as a ton of coal. Some people will definitely say it is worth more as coal, while others will say there are other processes that have been tried and others yet to be tried by which byproducts are worth more than the coal itself. As a matter of fact, there have been other experiments carried on by which we may have some valuable byproducts left. By the process of distillation, the same process as applied to shales, coal will yield as much or more oil than the shales and at the same time semicoke will be a by-product which is superior to the raw coal itself for all purposes.

As an example of what can be produced from these remarkable coals, it has been shown by the cooperative researches of the State of Utah and the Federal Government that from a ton of average coal—from the Mesa Verde formation—there is obtainable from 30 to as high as 44 gallons of crude oil, heavy fuel oil, and critical chemicals for war needs,

also 2,000 to 3,000 cubic feet of gas of the same heating value as natural gas, and 1,200 to 1,400 pounds of semicoke, which these large-scale researches proved to be superior to raw coal for all domestic and industrial heating purposes, for metallurgical uses, and for production of hydrogen for the Fischer-Tropsch hydrogenation process.

Before I conclude, I want to call attention to the oil shales' part of the committee's investigation. Again, I have some startling figures in connection with oil sands and shales lying directly over the coals in Utah. In the Uintah Basin in eastern Utah, we have the largest oil-bearing sands and shale deposits in the entire country. There are mountains of it standing before your very eyes waiting for someone to give it the magic touch. It is estimated there are 2,500,000 acres that would yield 30 to 40 gallons of gasoline per ton. A person casually driving through these parts may thinks of it as a desert of wide-open spaces surrounded by mountains, while in reality these valleys and mountains hold these treasures, the potential value of which cannot be equalled in any other similar area in the entire world. Therefore, it is easy to understand why I am so interested in this legislation, and I hope it will be passed. It is my understanding if this proposal becomes law, it will be the duty of the Bureau of Mines to determine the type of plants and where they will be located. I am quite sure the people of my State will cooperate in every way with the Bureau of Mines in furnishing data proving these startling figures and will press their claims for a plant to be placed in Utah.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that this legislation will make it possible that all processes and patents may be used to explore and further utilize our coal and oil shales. As I previously said, we have no definite knowledge of the extent of our oil reserves and by the same token we do not know what our needs will be in 10, 20, or 50 years from now. The events of the world today should impress upon us the vital necessity, purely as a means of national security, of preparing ourselves for any eventuality.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, fear has been expressed that an experimental industry such as this might conflict with private enterprise. Frankly, I have no such apprehension. My reason for this opinion is because of the experience of the mining industry in my own State.

In checking into its history we find that our most productive year was 1923. The mines of Illinois during that year produced 80,000,000 tons of coal. From that time on, our production declined until the year 1941, when only 46,000,000 tons were produced. During the same period employment dropped from 100,000 to 45,000. The reason for this drop in production was the enactment by several cities of smoke ordinances which barred high volatile Illinois coal. When production declined an investigation was made by the Illinois General Assembly. Following this investigation an appropriation of $180,000 was made to develop a smokeless fuel from Illinois coal. The investigation developed that only 30 percent of the coal used in the city of Chicago was mined in the State of Illinois. We found that 50 mines out of 60 had closed in the Belleville area because Illinois coal would not meet the requirements of the St. Louis smoke ordinance. Even now we are making frantic efforts to improve our product, but it appears that we are locking the barn after the horse is stolen.

We have lost our markets to higher grades of fuel from the East, and although the fuel beds of Illinois contain approximately 200,000,000,000 tons, it is useless unless it can be mined and sold.

I see a direct parallel between the oil industry and the coal industry. They both produce fuel. The mining industry did not realize the problem that faced it and, as a result, did not prepare. It faced the emergency virtually bankrupt and Illinois felt justified in assisting that industry to meet its problem.

I feel that it is the duty of government to conduct these experiments and develop an economical process of hydrogenation of coal for the production of gasoline and fuel oil. Known resources of crude petroleum will be exhausted within 14 years at the present rate of consumption. If hydrogenation processes are developed, there is a sufficient supply of coal in the Nation to meet the needs for both gasoline and fuel for 1,000 years. The Government should pay for these experiments as the entire Nation will benefit from this great natural resource.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COMPTON. The trouble in connection with this legislation is this: If this process is so commercially possible and would be commercially profitable, why is it that private industry has not gone ahead with this experimentation?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. The reason private industry has not gone ahead with it is this. Gasoline can be produced from petroleum for approximately 5 cents per gallon. It will probably cost 15 cents per gallon to produce it from coal. As long as there is oil available, no industry is going into competition with another industry and spend 10 cents more per gallon for the production of a fuel than its competitor can produce it for. I predict that unless the Government conducts these experiments and develops this system, the oil industries of the Nation will work down to the last barrel or until they were forced to swing to the hydrogenation process. I believe that through Government assistance a system can be worked out where gasoline can be produced from coal at no greater expense than it can be produced from petroleum.

Mr. COMPTON. Why should the Federal Government in the meantime interfere in this situation? When the time comes that it is necessary for us to produce gasoline from coal, at that time private industry can take care of it well enough, without taking out of the Treasury this $30,000,000 that is proposed to be appropriated here for that purpose.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I regret to disagree with the gentleman, but I feel that we approach that time in the same position we were in as to producing synthetic rubber. We spent $700,000,000 in the construction of synthetic rubber plants and probably $100,000,000 of that amount has been wasted and as yet we have no synthetic rubber available in any quantity. I am sure the gentleman and I would both like to have a new set of tires right now but we cannot get them because of lack of foresight. I am fearful that unless we go into a program of this kind that the time will come when we shall both want gasoline and find ourselves unable to obtain it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I will probably support this measure, but I am going to state very frankly that I share the views of some of the other gentlemen who have raised the point that private enterprise should have been allowed to take hold of this thing itself and start the ball rolling.

I wonder if many of you have read the rubber report No. 4 which was issued about a month and a half ago, in which the whole subject of the manufacture of synthetic rubber was discussed at length. I remember it was pointed out that only two new plants for the manufacture of synthetic rubber had been contemplated in the whole war program.

Frankly, I was very much disturbed over this matter and I looked into it further. I found that although there were various firms in private industry who were just crying to get into the synthetic rubber business, they had been prevented from doing so by rules, regulations, and technicalities. To me it seems a crime that the manufacture of synthetic rubber has been curtailed because of these reasons.

I am introducing today a resolution which deals with this whole subject. At the same time, while I want to say I expect to support this measure, I regret that a like sum is not being appropriated for the further manufacture of synthetic rubber and rubber products. My resolution reads as follows:

Whereas a recent Government report on rubber shows that only two new plants have been opened for manufacturing synthetic rubber; and

Whereas the present natural rubber stocks and remaining stock pile of tires are rapidly diminishing; and

Whereas it is estimated that 2,000,000 private automobiles were scrapped during 1943 and another 2,500,000 will be discarded in 1944 because of lack of tires; and

Whereas both the military and the civilian population need automobile transportation to win the war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress direct those in authority to find ways and means of establishing more facilities for the building of additional synthetic rubber for military and civilian use.

May I emphasize with the introduction of this resolution that 2,000,000 automobiles left the road in 1943, and the main reason, as mentioned in this rubber report, was that they did not have enough tires to go around. The report also prognosticated that 2,500,000 more automobiles would be off the road by the end of 1944. I know you agree with me that we are all interested in seeing civilian automobile ownership encouraged and continued, because I am sure we all feel that if we are to win the war the public must be kept on wheels, for efficiency's sake more than anything else.

So I feel that this resolution should be adopted. If we can spend thirty millions to experiment, we can afford to put a lot more money into something tangible. I am surprised that more action has not been taken along these lines. I sincerely hope that in the future we shall be able to remedy this problem along with the one we are now considering. We must do more to meet the demands of military and civilian needs in synthetic rubber and we will have to act as soon as possible to save what private automobiles are left.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of this resolution. As has been mentioned by my colleague and friend from Ohio, the State of Wyoming is a great coal-producing State. We have 23 counties, and all but three of our counties are underlaid with coal. The State of Wyoming has 600,000,000,000 tons of coal within its confines.

I am not interested in this measure because we are a big coal-producing State, but some mention has been made of the question whether or not this is a war measure. If it were not for the fact that Germany about 20 years ago made an exhaustive study and carried on this sort of a policy in that country, we would not have today this war we are experiencing. They are carrying on this war with synthetic oil that they have been able to produce.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In the States of Wyoming, Utah, and Colorado are found 85 percent of all the oil-shale deposits of this country, as well as the great amounts of coal the gentleman has mentioned as being in the deposits in his own State. I think the gentleman is correct when he calls attention to the war-measure features of this bill. We know that the terrific drain on our petroleum supplies by the prosecution of the war has brought us nearer to the time when we scrape the bottom of the barrel. This is why we bring this legislation today to get ready now, not when it is too late to do this job.

Mr. BARRETT. I thank the gentleman very much.

May I say further that I do not believe this resolution will in any manner interfere with the right of private enterprise to carry on this work. It has been shown here that we can produce a gallon of gasoline from crude oil for 5 or 6 cents, but it takes about 17 cents to produce a gallon of gasoline from coal. No private enterprise can carry on this sort of a program, because there is no likelihood that it can produce gasoline from coal and get a return within 10 or 20 years. Therefore, this experiment has to be carried on by the United States, and we have to lead the way.

Mr. Chairman, I think this measure should pass.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much in recent months concerning the shortage of oil in the United States. The present consumption of oil due to the constantly increasing requirements for our Army and Navy is reducing our reserves every day. It has been pretty well demonstrated that regardless of the amount of new development before and after the war, the United States will never again be able to supply its own needs from the underground wells within our own borders. The consensus seems to be that at the present rate of consumption our present oil resources, were it possible to procure them as needed, which cannot be done, would last from 7 to 14 years. What then?

Our economic life has been built around the mobile engine. It would make us very vulnerable were we to become dependent upon the resources of foreign countries for our supplies of gasoline and oil. Therefore, it seems time to discover and develop synthetic supplies of liquid fuel to take the place of the pools of oil that are steadily becoming less adequate for our constantly greater needs.

It has been known for many years that oil could be extracted from oil shale, oil sands, coal, and natural gas. As long as there was an ample supply of cheap underground oil, it was not profitable to develop them as resources of liquid fuel. Other countries, not so fortunate as we, have made great advances along this line. Germany, Britain, and Russia each have studied the refinement of gasoline and oil from shale and coal. Germany spent 13 years learning to produce synthetic fuels commercially. Much of the transportation in Germany during the war has been on fuel developed from these materials. If the United States shall continue to be self-supporting, she, too, must begin to find ways and means of producing fuel from these materials in commercial quantities.

There are two great sources of natural oil left in the world today. One is in the Carribean Basin from Texas and Louisiana down through Venezuela. The other is the Middle East Basin, including Iran, Iraq, Arabia, and Russia. It would be impossible for us to carry on another major war with the known resources of underground oil within the United States. Modern warfare is built on the mobile engine. Sixty-five percent of the tonnage of all supplies for our Army overseas has been petroleum products.

Our geologists and the Bureau of Mines tell us that there is sufficient oil shale in the United States to produce 92,000,000,000 barrels of oil, 75,000,000,000 from shales in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming, and 17,000,000,000 from Kentucky and Indiana, a supply to last 65 years. The total quantity of petroleum produced in the United States from 1859 to 1941 was only 25,000,000,000 barrels. They further state there are 3,000,000,000,000 tons of coal in this country, which would supply our needs for petroleum products for 1,000 years. While Germany, Great Britain, and Russia have through necessity carried on extensive experiments and have for years successfully extracted gasoline and oil from coal and oil shale, our Bureau of Mines has conducted two limited experiments in this country, one in Pennsylvania with coal and one in Colorado with oil shale.

In the early 1920's the president of the Colorado School of Mines and two of his assistants came to Congress with a complete laboratory oil-shale retorting plant. It was set up in one of the committee rooms and demonstrated to the Senators and Representatives that oil and gas could be produced from oil shale. Shortly thereafter, Senator Phipps, then Senator from Colorado, sponsored a bill to appropriated $50,000 for oil-shale research that resulted in the location of a small experiment plant at Rulison, Colo., the heart of these great oil shale reserves. The plant was brought from Scotland and was of the type they used there. This experiment showed that certain areas in Colorado yielded 185,000 barrels of oil per acre, or 25 to 40 gallons of oil to the ton, with an estimated average of 75,000 barrels an acre for all of Colorado's shale territory. In round figures, the products of oil shale are 10 to 20 percent oil, 25 to 30 percent water vapor and gas and 50 to 65 percent shale. As the result of this Rulison experiment, the Government set aside 45,000 acres of the adjoining land as a naval reserve. There are 900,000 acres of these oil shale lands in western Colorado alone.

Mr. William S. Farish, late president of Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, 2 years ago testified before the Mines and Mining Committee that he believed synthetic gasoline would cost 18 cents a gallon. Other estimates run as low as 7 cents from modern methods. Gasoline from petroleum costs 6 cents. This makes synthetic gasoline much higher but those who have investigated believe these costs can be greatly cut by modern methods and machinery. The Bureau of Mines reports that as the result of their experiments 13 years ago in Colorado shales, a high yield of oil can be obtained. However, little is known regarding the application of any improvements in oil-shale retorting methods. Application of modern methods would give results much improved over those obtained 13 years ago. One of the professors at the Colorado School of Mines told me that he felt that research would show that oil shale could be produced economically in competition with liquid oil if the present price were raised 35 to 50 cents a barrel.

This is too big a task for the oil companies to undertake. Also, the knowledge gained should be for the benefit of all the American people and not for any one oil company.

We have before us a bill to appropriate $30,000,000 to be used to carry on research and experiments toward the commercial production of gasoline and oil from coal, oil shale, oil sands, and natural gas. Its passage will be a guaranty that the United States will never be dependent upon outside sources for its gasoline and oil supply either at peace or in war.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I approve this measure, although I have the most profound respect for my colleague from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, whose sincerity is beyond question, and with whom I for the most part am agreed, especially in his attitude with respect to the expenditure of public funds. However, in my opinion the expenditure of the $30,000,000 authorized by this bill is only an infinitesimal amount as compared with the benefits likely to flow from the expenditure. Our oil resources, as has been so fully detailed, are being rapidly exhausted. We are coming to the point where we will have to curtail the use of the internal combustion engine unless we find other resources of liquid fuel, and the hydrocarbon deposits represented in the coals of this country furnish the most available source of liquid fuel for the future. The variety of chemical combinations obtainable from the constituent parts of coal is perfectly marvelous. From coal we get dyes, flavoring extracts, rubber, and all sorts of materials that would ordinarily not be thought of as contained in the hydrocarbon of coal.

This proposal to construct Government owned and operated research laboratories is in no sense in conflict with private industry. If it were I would be opposed to it. It is not. It is a supplement to private industry and is akin to Government owned and operated experiment stations for farmers, and it will provide for the entire people of the country something not possible for private industry to furnish because private industry must depend for its continuance upon continuing profits, which manifestly cannot be derived from a research laboratory.

I realize that we are approaching the day when these natural resources of petroleum will be exhausted and we cannot afford to wait until that day is upon us. We must take advantage of the opportunity that time now affords and make the investigations and discover the cheap and efficient means of transforming the latent energy, stored up by sunshine pouring upon ancient forests, long since turned to coal, into fuel for the future. It can be done, as has been demonstrated over and over again, but we need this research laboratory to find the way it can be done most cheaply and effectively. I am sure that if we take time by the forelock and set up this sort of research laboratory now before the petroleum scarcity is upon us, we will find we shall have pushed back into the future by many, many years the day when America will be without liquid fuel for the internal-combustion engines upon which so much of the economy and civilization of this era is based.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP], a very able member of the committee.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this bill, having been active as a member of the whole committee and a member of the subcommittee, there is no new bureau to be set up. This is to be carried out by the department which has been in operation in the past. It says in section 2, subsection (d) "to cooperate with any other Federal or State department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, educational institution, or corporation in effectuating the purposes of this act."

I am bringing that to your attention because many of the educational institutions throughout the country have been making this experiment on a minor scale. Exhibits shown by those who have made this experiment on a small scale showed the committee that the synthetic rubber tires were made at that time to run 10,000 miles. They also demonstrated other rubber products from coal. Coming from a mining district which has the largest bituminous mines in the world, I can realize without being selfish on our own part, having the raw materials, we are anxious to mine that coal and also bring to the top the oil. In doing this we are supplying other parts of the country with much needed gas and byproducts from bituminous coal that may be found by means of these experiments. I am sure that the thousands and thousands of workers who may be benefited by this bill will more than pay the $30,000,000 which is asked to make this experiment. You have been told here by other Members of the great shortage of oil and the great supply of coal, so you can see just how important it is that you make possible this experiment. As we go along in this program, and we hope this war ends tomorrow, we are only fortifying ourselves for that which may happen in years to come. Many of them have been accepted and many have been rejected. But after 3 years of this committee's actions, taking into consideration every factor that we knew how, it came out with the full endorsement of the entire committee. Men on this committee from territories of the United States that have no oil or coal, but who are very much interested that their people get the much needed gas and byproducts that may be found in either oil or coal, are in favor of it. So I urge you to support this bill that you, too, may enjoy the possibilities of the byproducts of this coal or oil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] 1 minute to ask a question.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, we have developed in this Nation a great synthetic rubber industry and in so doing have made ourselves independent of rubber monopolies controlled by overseas countries. However, if we do not develop a new source of gasoline, we may find ourselves dependent upon overseas shipment when our present supply is exhausted. Will the chairman express an opinion on this subject?

Mr. RANDOLPH. As the gentleman from Illinois remembers, in my address to the committee I stated that if we did not go forward at this time with this type of program we might very well find ourselves in a few years an importing Nation from the standpoint of bringing into this country huge petroleum supplies from other parts of the earth. No, I think the gentleman agrees with me, we have the resources to do a sensible job on the synthetic program now and should not wait until we are face to face with the fact of actual depletion of our supplies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, our wartime demands for aviation fuels are so tremendous that our petroleum resources are taxed to the utmost. Since there is such a drain on petroleum resources now, the question arises as to peacetime use of this very important commodity. It is a matter of such serious importance that now is the time for Congress to become vitally interested in giving aid to our civilian requirements for the future. Taking into consideration that we will be faced with importation of oil from foreign countries unless we have our own sources for gasoline and oil in time of peace, we cannot escape the provisions of the present bill providing for supplying our country with this most essential necessity. Coming from the bituminous coal region in my section of the State of Pennsylvania, I know we are sufficiently supplied with the materials for the producing of oil and gasoline. I am most heartily in favor of the pending legislation and sincerely trust it will pass without delay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of the pending bill. In southern Colorado we have large deposits of bituminous coal which has proven excellent for coking purposes. This coal is high in its content of byproducts.

In Pueblo, Colo., is located the Minnequa steel plant of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Corporation. For some years this company has been operating a byproducts plant. Coke is available in large quantities and is used in this plant. Mr. Chairman, the production of gasoline from coal has been going on at this plant for some time. No attempt has been made to produce gasoline in commercial

quantities. However, in talking to officials and employees of the company at this plant I am informed that they use this gasoline in their own cars and it has proven as satisfactory as any other gasoline purchased at regular filling stations.

My purpose in mentioning this is to impress upon the House the fact that the production of synthetic liquid fuels from coal, as proposed in this bill, is nothing new or novel. It is now being done with success. As I understand this bill, it provides that experimental plants shall be established to explore the possibilities of commercial production of gasoline from coal and other substances. In view of our dwindling oil supplies, it is highly important that we determine just what can be accomplished by this process.

The bill specifically provides that these experimental plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry. After this information has been made available it will then be up to private industry, and particularly those engaged in the production of coal, to decide whether this suggestion is feasible. All that the Government will do is to make the experiment and submit the facts. Coal operators in my district have already indicated their interest in this proposal. I am sure the Bureau of Mines can be depended upon to conduct this research and development work honestly and efficiently. Their efforts will be closely followed and the results awaited with great anticipation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, that is all the requests I have for time on this side. I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the Committee on Mines and Mining and I do not assume to speak with too much authority on the measure now before us. I am very happy, however, that this afternoon several Members of the Congress during the debate on this measure gave recognition to the wonderful work that has been done by the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior, which is located in my home city of Pittsburgh, where the feasibility of the development and obtaining of gasoline from coal has been proven. I am also happy, Mr. Chairman, that this afternoon or early tomorrow, by passage of this act, the Congress will be doing something of a constructive nature for private enterprise. I am glad indeed that so many of my Republican colleagues give recognition to that fact. Of course, we all know, and it has been demonstrated in my home city, that gasoline produced from coal will operate automobiles and aeroplanes, but we do not know at this stage whether or not it is possible or practicable to produce gasoline from coal in such a manner that it will be worth while in the economy of this country. And so we have the necessity of the Government giving its aid and assistance in this manner to private industry. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that there will be no votes against the passage of this progressive piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield back all time that has not been used on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to conduct laboratory research and development work necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation;

(b) to acquire, by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, donation, or otherwise, land, and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interests; options on real or personal property; plants and their facilities; secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation; to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property;

(c) to engage, by contract or otherwise, engineers, architects, and any private industrial organization he deems suitable, to do all or any part of the work of designing, constructing, or operating the plants, the operation to be under his supervision, and through leases or otherwise as he believes advisable;

(d) to cooperate with any other Federal or State department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, or corporation, in effectuating the purposes of this act. Sections 321 and 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 412), as amended, shall not apply to any leases under this section; and such leases may be made for a term of years notwithstanding Revised Statutes, section 3679, as amended, or any other provision of law.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell the products of the plants at not more than actual cost, including amortization of capital expenses, as determined by him, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal or any State Government, but priority shall be given to orders placed by the War or Navy Departments. Any remaining products may be sold at going prices to any purchaser through regular commercial channels. The Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, shall also have authority to dispose of any lands or other real or personal property acquired, but in his opinion no longer useful, for the purposes of this act, and to grant, on such terms as he may consider appropriate, licenses under patent rights acquired under this act.

SEC. 4. All moneys received under this act for products of the plants and royalties shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Interior shall render to Congress on or before the 1st day of January of each year a report of all operations under this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act. The authority and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be exercised through the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It is my intention to move shortly that the Committee rise, and it will be in order to offer amendments when we resume later.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 2, after the period, insert "The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products."

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3209, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular business on tomorrow, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] may address the House for 20 minutes, and that his request for permission to speak today may be waived.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therewith an article written by Dr. MacQuigg, with reference to the subject under discussion this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. FENTON] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an article on converting coal into gasoline and oil.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the subject matter under discussion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LINCOLN AND THE MANPOWER DRAFT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln spoke two fundamental truths, which might be spoken today, with an application to our affairs as close as their application to the affairs of that past day in which Lincoln spoke. He said:

As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my idea of democracy. Whatever differs from this, to the extent of the difference, is no democracy.

He uttered another profound truth when he said:

Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subject of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you.

The American people have been familiarizing themselves with the chains of bondage in the form of bureaucratic regulations; rationing of foods; point stamps; literally a new system of currency; repeated trips to ration boards, and generally onerous regulations, prescribed by men never elected by the people, who never submit their policies to public discussion, who never permit the debate and compromise where their regulations are concerned, all of which characterize the proceedings in the legislative branch of the Government.

It is true, of course, that these regulations have, to a very great degree, been made necessary by the desperate struggle in which we are engaged. It was inevitable that, in event of war, a great deal of administrative law, which means bureaucratic regulations having the force of law, would be necessary to coordinate the operations of American industry, American agriculture, and American labor. Nobody objects to any necessary regulations; but it has become increasingly apparent that a great mass of these regulations represent the whims of bureaucrats grown arrogant, and seeking more firmly to entrench themselves in their positions of power, both for the duration of the war and for a long time after, rather than necessary regulations required to coordinate the operations of industry, agriculture, and labor.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Is it not true that in recent years there has been a constant decrease in the number of laws made by Congress which regulate the lives of the people, and a tremendously alarming increase in the number of directives that daily affect our lives.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Unquestionably.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. So much so that last year there were about 200 acts of Congress that affected the lives of people and about 20,000 bureaucratic directives.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Unfortunately, what the gentleman from Michigan states is correct. Many of these regulatory measures are conflicting, contradictory, obviously unnecessary, and greatly confused. They are, therefore, losing all character of necessary administrative measures and are beginning to look suspiciously like the links with which the chains of bondage could be forged.

What a wise man the immortal Lincoln was, how well he knew the habits of mankind, when he said:

Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them.

The most wholesome, the most healthy, the most encouraging sign in America today, that sign which tells us that the American people will never submit to wearing the chains of political bondage or bureaucratic government, is the fact that they are not only grumbling, they are rising in righteous wrath and aggressive indignation against these bureaucratic regulations which are unnecessary, contradictory, and confused. The people have become familiar with these bureaucratic regulations, but they have not become accustomed to them, and they most emphatically are not reconciled to them.

Abraham Lincoln, when the necessities of a desperate situation required him to take measures which were declared in his day unconstitutional, and which the legislative branch of the Government later validated by special acts, exercised the powers which he assumed only so long as it was necessary for him to do so, and then, voluntarily and with great eagerness, returned those powers to the people through their Congress. No American today believes for a moment that if the great Lincoln had not been assassinated he would have sought a third term or a fourth term in violation of the honored tradition established by George Washington, and observed by every President since then, except the present incumbent of the White House.

There has been a different attitude for the last 12 years in this country on the part of the Executives concerning the possession and exercise of power. We all know that the present occupant of the White House has constantly sought more and more power, under the claim of endless crises and emergencies, so-called. I know of not a single instance in which he has voluntarily returned any of these powers to the Congress.

I want to warn this House that the proposed Manpower Draft Act, concealed under a more euphonious name, is the most dangerous measure ever proposed to the Congress. Known by the name of its sponsors, the Austin-Wadsworth bill, it is a proposal sponsored by and backed up by the executive department to put every man, woman, and child in the service of the Government under a military dictatorship. The administration would have you believe, and the administration propagandists are striving to make you believe, that this measure has been necessitated and that it was conceived by reason of the necessities of the present war. As a matter of fact, the present bill was written into the industrial mobilization plan in 1936 by the present administration, and the specimen act was printed therein. The industrial mobilization plan was a plan by which the General Staffs of the Army and Navy would coordinate the operations of industry, agriculture, and labor. So then, this plan to put everybody under a military dictatorship, so people could be torn from their homes, so families could be separated, and the members sent anywhere the Commander in Chief should decide to send them, to do whatever kind of work they would be directed to do, regardless of their age, physical or financial condition, was conceived by this administration prior to 1936, and not after we entered the present World War.

Again, in another revision of the industrial mobilization plan in 1939, this administration wrote in a provision looking to the continuance of all of the war powers and regulations over the civilian population, for an indeterminate period after the war should end, and until the Commander in Chief—the President—should decide that a satisfactory readjustment to a peace-time basis had been achieved. Now, mark you, that plan was conceived prior to 1939 and was not the outgrowth of this war. The administration sought to conceal this change in the industrial mobilization plan and refused to let the press have copies of the 1939 revision. It was Michigan's own Senator, ARTHUR VANDENBERG, who secured a copy of it and had it published as a Senate document in order that the people might know what was being prepared for them, what chains of bondage, military regulations, bureaucratic orders, trials by court martial, were being prepared for them.

Now, my friends, no amount of argument, no amount of dissembling, no amount of political fog or propagandized mirages can obscure or distort the plain fact that prior to 1936 this administration was planning on enslaving the people under a manpower draft act, if a war should come along. No sort of mental gymnastics or literacy smoke-screen can obscure or distort the fact that this administration planned, prior to 1939, to hold onto its war powers, and to keep its clutch on the liberties of the people, to keep those chains of bondage, those fetters of bureaucratic control fastened securely upon the limbs of the American people for a long time after any war should end.

This Manpower Draft Act is not needed. This statement has recently been confirmed by no less a personage than Paul McNutt, chairman of the War Manpower Commission, than whom there is a no more faithful, no more subservient Presidential "me too" in Washington. He is quoted by the press as saying that the manpower draft bill is not necessary to meet manpower needs, but he would support the drive to force such a measure through the Congress.

The fact that the American Legion for 20 years has advocated a universal draft act does not remove the fact that we are dealing with an administration, which in every hour of its existence has sought to gain more and more control over the lives, the liberties, the property, and the activities of the American people. That administration has never hesitated to break a solemn promise. It has never

hesitated to try to override the Constitution when the Constitution stood in the way of its rapacious appetite for power and still more power. It has not been content, this administration, with seeking to assist industry and agriculture and labor and society in general to achieve adaptation to new world conditions. Instead, this administration has sought by violent hands literally to remake the whole economic structure of the United States.

So, then, my friends, just as Abraham Lincoln said at Gettysburg in 1863:

We are now engaged in a great * * * war, testing whether any nation conceived and dedicated in liberty and to the proposition that all men are created equal can long endure.

In that same wonderful speech he said:

We are testing whether or not this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

I say to you that this iniquitous proposal contained in the Austin-Wadsworth manpower draft bill is a step directly away from a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is a step designed to lead to exactly a situation which Abraham Lincoln himself foresaw when he said:

At what point then is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reached us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide.

If the time ever comes in America when a minority can frustrate the will of the majority, the result will be monocracy upon the one hand or tyranny on the other.

This dangerous measure which is proposed to the Congress would lead exactly in the direction of a danger which Mr. Lincoln clearly foresaw when he said:

It is to deny what the history of the world tells us is true, to suppose that men of ambition and talents will not continue to spring up amongst us. And when they do, they will as naturally seek the gratification of their ruling passion as others have done before them. The question then is, Can that gratification be found in supporting and maintaining an edifice that has been erected by others? Most certainly it cannot.

Many great and good men, sufficiently qualified for any task they should undertake, may ever be found whose ambition would aspire to nothing beyond a seat in Congress, a gubernatorial or a Presidential chair; but such belong not to the family of the lion, or the tribe of the eagle. What, think you, these places would satisfy an Alexander, a Caesar, or a Napoleon? Never! Towering genius disdains a beaten path. It seeks regions hitherto unexplored. It sees no distinction in adding story to story upon monuments of fame erected to the memory of others. It denies that it is glory enough to serve under any chief. It scorns to tread in the footsteps of any predecessor, however illustrious. It thirsts and burns for distinction; and if possible, it will have it, whether at the expense of emancipating slaves or enslaving free men.

Is it unreasonable, then, to expect that some man possessed of the loftiest genius, coupled with ambition sufficient to push it to its utmost stretch, will at some time spring up among us? And when such an one does, it will require the people to be united with each other, attached to the Government and laws, and generally intelligent, to successfully frustrate his designs.

Our heroic men and women are fighting and bleeding and dying on the far-flung battle lines of this globe in order to assure that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall endure in their own beloved country, and not perish from the earth.

You do not want your sons and daughters in the fighting lines betrayed behind their backs. You, too, want to do your part to see to it that vigilant guard is kept on the home front.

This dangerous manpower draft bill must be defeated. Free government must continue in this Nation. Eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty in America, and it is our vigilance and the vigilance of our fellow citizens, alone, which can save it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KNUTSON, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. DREWRY (at the request of Mr. FLANNAGAN), for the balance of the week, on account of the death of a relative.

To Mr. FENTON (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

To Mr. HOLMES (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. BURCHILL of New York), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. NEWSOME, for the balance of the week, on account of official business in district.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 16, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will resume public hearings on House Resolution 418 and House Resolution 419, relative to the Jewish national home in Palestine, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, February 15, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, February 15, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 2328 and House Joint Resolution 49 (to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable), and the report of the subcommittee thereon. Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be meetings of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 16, and Thursday, February 17, 1944, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, for the consideration of post-war planning.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backing of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Wednesday, February 16: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers. Col Miles Reber, former division engineer, Missouri River division, Omaha, Nebr., and proponents and opponents of projects along the Missouri River and tributaries.

2. Thursday, February 17: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 16.

3. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

4. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

5. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1195. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, Architect of the Capitol, fiscal year 1945, involving an increase of $2,500, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 422), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4183. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 439. Resolution to provide for expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 408; without amendment (Rept. No. 1119). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on Elections No. 3. House Resolution 440. Resolution to dismiss election contest of E. O. Clark, contestant, against Jack Nichols, contestee, Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1120). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANGELL: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 3403. A bill to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1121). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2650. A bill to add certain lands to the Upper Mississippi River wildlife and fish refuge; with amendment (Rept. No. 1122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2651. A bill to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 1123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2654. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust debts of individual Indians, associations of Indians, or Indian tribes, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2655. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Kanosh Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3956. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits; without amendment (Rept. No. 1126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEFAUVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4166. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3763. A bill to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 272. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda; with amendment (Rept. No. 1128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 552. A bill for the relief of Winfred Alexander; with amendment (Rept. No. 1129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1755. A bill for the relief of Broadus D. Boland; with amendment (Rept. No. 1130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2006. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hagar Simpson, Mrs. Nat Price, Jr., and Griffin Brothers Clinic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2008. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel; with amendment (Rept. No. 1132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2303. A bill for the relief of O. W. James; with amendment (Rept. No. 1133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2453. A bill for the relief of Margaret J. Pow; with amendment (Rept. No. 1134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2497. A bill for the relief of Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2648. A bill for the relief of Avid Evers; with amendment (Rept. No. 1136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2689. A bill for the relief of Pete Paluck; with amendment (Rept. No. 1137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of E. Sullivan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian W. Timmerman, mother of Ann Timmerman, a minor, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 1139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2855. A bill for the relief of the estate of John Buby; with amendment (Rept. No. 1140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3102. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle; with amendment (Rept. No. 1141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3126. A bill for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ROWAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3190. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; with amendment (Rept. No. 1143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3496. A bill for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke; with amendment (Rept. No. 1144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3596. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3674 A bill for the relief of William E. Widby; without amendment (Rept. No. 1146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3737. A bill for the relief of M. H. Harris; without amendment (Rept. No. 1147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 4184. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4185. A bill to facilitate the various Federal agricultural programs by providing for the consolidation of their local offices; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4186. A bill to authorize the sale and conveyance of certain property of the estate of Jackson Barnett, deceased Creek Indian; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 4187. A bill for the relief of the Eastern and Western Cherokee Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4188. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act to provide annuities for individuals who are totally and permanently disabled and have completed 15 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4189. A bill to carry out obligations of the United States under article 27 of the Geneva Convention relating to compensation for certain injuries to interned workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 4190. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 4191. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4192. A bill establishing a naval oil-shale development board and authorizing the construction, maintenance, and operation of a plant to produce oil for naval use from the naval oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 4193. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 379, current session, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the National Interregional Highway Committee outlining and recommending a national system of interregional highways; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:
H. Res. 441. Resolution directing Congress to find ways and means of establishing more facilities for the building of synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing mustering-out pay for veterans discharged from the armed forces and to provide a master plan for veterans' welfare and unification and coordination of agencies and services administering veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States as to the responsibilities and prerogatives of the States and the Federal Government in providing for absentee soldier voting in time of war; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:
H. R. 4194. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence V. Magee; to the Committee on Claims.
H. R. 4195. A bill for the relief of John W. Magee; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. DWORSHAK:
H. R. 4196. A bill for the relief of George Williams; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. FULMER:
H. R. 4197. A bill For the relief of Mrs. Ada Mae Cushman; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. GERLACH:
H. R. 4198. A bill for the relief of the Allentown Airport Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. MAY:
H. R. 4199. A bill granting a pension to Lillie Patrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions
By Mr. SOMERS of New York:
H. R. 4200. A bill for the relief of William Weber; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:
H. R. 4201. A bill for the relief of Conrad Newman; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. VURSELL:
H. R. 4202. A bill for the relief of Lawson Land; to the Committee on Claims.
By Mr. WENE:
H. R. 4203. A bill for the relief of Herschel W. Carlisle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4857. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by 33 organizations of Paterson, N. J., urging that appropriate action be taken to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine white paper of 1939 and establish a Jewish national home in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4858. Also, petition of the Carpenters' Local Union 1939 of Clifton, N. J., protesting against the enactment of the proposed national service law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4859. By Mr. FORAND: Petition appealing to the Government of the United States to take all appropriate actions to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine white paper of May 1939 with its unjustifiable restrictions on immigration and land settlement, and urging that the gates of Palestine be opened wide to Jewish immigration, and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth, to the end that the Jewish people may be enabled to take their rightful place in the progressive order of mankind, which they pray may issue from this struggle; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4860. Also, petition appealing to the Government of the United States to take all appropriate actions to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine white paper of May 1939 with its unjustifiable restrictions on immigration and land settlement, and urging that the gates of Palestine be opened wide to Jewish immigration, and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth, to the end that the Jewish people may be enabled to take their rightful place in the progressive order of mankind, which they pray may issue from this struggle; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4861. Also, petition appealing to the Government of the United States to take all appropriate actions to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine white paper of May 1939 with its unjustifiable restrictions on immigration and land settlement, and urging that the gates of Palestine be opened wide to Jewish immigration, and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth, to the end that the Jewish people may be enabled to take their rightful place in the progressive order of mankind, which they pray may issue from this struggle; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4862. Also, petition of Temple Beth El of Providence, R. I., appealing to the Government of the United States to take all appropriate actions to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine white paper of May 1939 with its unjustifiable restrictions on immigration and land settlement, and urging that the gates of Palestine be opened wide to Jewish immigration, and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth, to the end that the Jewish people may be enabled to take their rightful place in the progressive order of mankind, which they pray may ensue from this struggle; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4863. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of sundry citizens of the Thirty-third Congressional District of New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4864. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of Bernard M. Mallison and other residents of St. Marys, Pa., protesting against enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4865. Also, petition of L. B. Weis and 1,160 residents of the Twentieth Pennsylvania District, protesting against enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4866. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Mrs. L. Niemeyer and 44 other residents of Grand Rapids, Mich., recommending House Resolution No. 117; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4867. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions containing the signatures of 151 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District, New York State, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4868. By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of 763 residents of the Twenty-eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4869. Also, petition of 2,300 residents of the Twenty-eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4870. Also, petition of 1,780 residents of the Twenty-eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4871. Also, petition of 140 residents of the Twenty-eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4872. Also, petition of John Beck and others of Monessen, Pa., opposing passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4873. Also, petition of Stanley Szczepanski and others of Monessen, Pa., opposing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4874. Also, petition of the Columbian Federation (Gaetano Pilati Lodge, No. 176) of Arnold, Pa., proposing free transportation for members of the armed forces on certified furloughs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4875. Also, petition of 2,901 residents of the Twenty-eighth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, opposing the Bryson bill (H. R 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4876. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition protecting against the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4877. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petitions of Anna Zor and Joseph Poppeti, of Hudson, N. Y., also Harry M. Diedling, of Catskill, N. Y., and signed by 100 residents of these communities, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4878. By Mr. MERROW: Petition signed by 15 residents of Berlin, N. H., appealing for appropriate action to insure the withdrawal in its entirety of the Palestine white paper of May 1939, and urging that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration, and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth, to the end that the Jewish people may be enabled to take its rightful place in the progressive order of mankind; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4879. By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of Carl Heim and 762 other residents of Luzerne County, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4880. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4881. By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of Charlotte Orner, of Lewistown, Pa., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4882. Also, petition of Oscar C. Tyler, of Millerstown, Pa., favoring the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4883. Also, petition of Sara T. Howanstine, secretary, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Newport, Pa., favoring the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4884. Also, petition of Rev. Carl C. Helt, minister of the Methodist Church of New Bloomfield, Pa., and signed by members of his congregation, favoring the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4885. Also, petition of S. M. McKeehan, of New Bloomfield, Pa., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary

4886. Also, petition of L. O. Thompson, of Liverpool, Pa., favoring the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4887. Also, petition of Margaretha Cupp, and others, of Thompsontown, Pa., urging the enactment of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4888. Also, petition of N. Paul Taylor, and others, numbering 660 signatures, opposing

the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4889. Also, petition of Charles E. Cain, of Duncannon, Pa., opposing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4890. Also, petition of Harry E. Brownawell, of Newport, Pa., opposing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4891. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, opposing the Bryson prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4892. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Resolution of the Maine Dairymen's Association, Inc., representing 980 dairy farmers in Maine, urging that the market price of milk be raised in proportion to the cost of production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4893. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of Emil Karsten and 18 residents of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; also petition of R. T. Corbett and 7 residents of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; and a petition of Sol Richman and 22 residents of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4894. Also, petition of Irving S. Goodwin and 10 residents of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; and a petition of H. J. Datson and 12 residents of the Ninth Congressional District of New Jersey, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4895. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Petition of the Mississippi Legislature, session 1944, asking Congress to enact legislation to give the original owners of lands acquired by the United States for war purposes, and their heirs, preference to purchase said lands, after the war, when the Government disposes of said lands; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

4896. By Mr. WILLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4897. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation whose ear is always open to the cry of contrite hearts, our voice shalt Thou hear in the morning, O Lord; in the morning will we direct our prayer unto Thee and will look up. Grant to our groping hearts the grace of receptivity, of reverence and humility, and a will to take in our hands, for the redemption of human life, the red cup of suffering and of sacrifice, knowing that only thus can be found the climbing road to truth and goodness. Consecrate with Thy presence the way our feet may go, and the humblest work will shine and the roughest places be made plain.

Touch with live coals from off the altar of devotion the lips of these Thy servants who speak for so many and whose words are freighted with the power of love or of hate, of life or of death. May the healing winds of heaven blow across all the areas of their minds and hearts, cleansing their ruling passions and ambitions and desires of the dross of narrow partisanship and making them prophets of the new dawn of righteousness which even now reddens the eastern sky, when the severed kingdoms of man's allegiance shall become the one and radiant kingdom of Thine all-embracing love. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, February 15, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 12, 1944:

S. 1255. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act creating the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said Commission; and authorizing said Commission and its successors and assigns to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Friar Point, Miss., and Helena, Ark., and for other purposes," approved May 17, 1939; and

S. 1504. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

On February 14, 1944:

S. 1447. An act to remit claims of the United States on account of overpayments to part-time charwomen in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Pepper
Andrews	Gerry	Radcliffe
Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Bailey	Green	Shipstead
Ball	Guffey	Smith
Bankhead	Gurney	Stewart
Barkley	Hatch	Taft
Bilbo	Hayden	Thomas, Idaho
Bone	Holman	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Jackson	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Bushfield	La Follette	Tydings
Butler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Byrd	McFarland	Wagner
Capper	McKellar	Wallgren
Caraway	Maloney	Walsh, Mass.
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Weeks
Connally	Moore	Wheeler
Danaher	Murdock	Wherry
Davis	Murray	White
Downey	Nye	Wiley
Eastland	O'Daniel	Willis
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Ferguson	Overton	

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent in the performance of duty as a member of the committee to attend the funeral of the late Representative Schuetz, of Illinois.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of serious illness in his family.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is unavoidably absent on business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw;

S. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site; and

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of

the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.;

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo;

H. R. 439. An act for the relief of Jack Scarton or John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski;

H. R. 442. An act for the relief of John Damascus;

H. R. 768. An act to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Frank Durante and wife, Maria Durante, and five children, namely: Paul Durante, Alfred Durante, Anthony Durante, Henry Durante, and Patsy Durante;

H. R. 1216. An act for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin;

H. R. 1269. An act for the relief of Frank E. Wilmot;

H. R. 1411. An act for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Paul B. Lingle;

H. R. 1628. An act for the relief of John Hirsch;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of G. H. Garner;

H. R. 2147. An act for the relief of Perique Gomez and Mrs. Perique Gomez;

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan;

H. R. 2234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen;

H. R. 2273. An act for the relief of E. C. Fudge;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Christian Wenz;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2438. An act for the relief of Bernadine Salmons;

H. R. 2472. An act for the relief of the estate of Gertrude Mullins;

H. R. 2625. An act for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held;

H. R. 2711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maag;

H. R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler;

H. R. 2757. An act for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallop, and Mrs. Dora Projansky;

H. R. 2787. An act for the relief of Phyllis Lee;

H. R. 2789. An act to permit the naturalization of Peter Henry Buck;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker;

H. R. 3125. An act for the relief of Paul H. White;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of Ruth L. Clapp;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;

H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen;

H. R. 3324. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron;

H. R. 3466. An act for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co;

H. R. 3538. An act for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson;

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3649. An act for the relief of Mae Ekvall;

H. R. 3654. An act for the relief of Byron Ennis;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson;

H. R. 3720. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint notaries public;

H. R. 3781. An act for the relief of Hall Farris;

H. R. 3840. An act for the relief of Albert Barrett;

H. R. 3997. An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4059. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922);

H. R. 4074. An act for the relief of the estate of William Sandlass; and

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

REGULATION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE RATES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MOTION TO RECONSIDER ENTERED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar yesterday there was passed by unanimous consent Senate bill 1029, a bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. I desire to enter a motion for the reconsideration of the votes by which the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

Mr. BURTON subsequently said: Mr. President, I tried to get the attention of the Chair while the Senator from Wyoming was entering a motion to reconsider the votes by which Senate bill 1029 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and passed.

I merely wish to say, on behalf of the Committee on the District of Columbia, that the bill was carefully considered in committee, and the report states the conclusions of the committee. However, I understand the Senator from Wyoming wishes to confer with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who was chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia at the time the bill was reported, and with me, as I made the report. I shall be happy to confer with the Senator, but I am sure he will find that the matter was fully considered, and that the bill does represent the considered judgment of the committee. The bill follows the Virginia statute relating to the subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Ohio. I feel that the bill deals with a subject of most far-reaching importance, and, as the Senator from Ohio has stated, I desire very much to discuss it further with him, and with the author of the bill, probably with a view to suggesting an amendment or two.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR AMENDATORY CONTRACTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAMS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist the States to establish and maintain school lunch programs (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH PROGRAMS

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for employee health programs in the various agencies and independent establishments of the United States Government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

STATISTICS OF NATURAL GAS COMPANIES, 1942

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting copy of a newly issued report of the Commission, entitled "Statistics of Natural Gas Companies, 1942," presenting detailed financial and operating information on a majority of the Nation's principal natural gas pipe-line companies (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PAYEES UNDER THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT AND OTHER AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

A letter from the First Assistant Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report containing the names and addresses of payees who received $1,000 or more and showing the amount of payment to each for participation in the 1942 programs administered under the provisions of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 303 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; also a supplemental list of payees who received $1,000 or more under such programs for 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializing Congress and the Office of Price Administration to relax the stringent rationing of butter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILEY on the 15th instant, p. 1633, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin memorializing Congress to enact legislation to reimburse municipalities for loss of personal property tax upon federally owned personal property used in war production and exempt from taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILEY on the 15th instant, p. 1633, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Colorado; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Whereas the persecution and attempted extermination of the Jews in occupied Europe by Nazi Germany have outraged the conscience of the civilized world; and

"Whereas, on the basis of authentic information in the hands of the United States Department of State, at least 2,000,000 Jews have been ruthlessly annihilated, and the remainder of the Jewish communities in Europe stand in immediate danger of similar extermination unless prompt action is taken by the United Nations to provide havens of refuge for them; and

"Whereas tens of thousands of Jews are stranded in European ports desperately seeking rescue; and

"Whereas the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, guaranteeing the establishment of a Jewish National Homeland in Palestine was approved by 52 nations, including the United States, and incorporated into the treaties of peace terminating the First World War; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, and approved by the President on September 21, 1922, and implemented by the Anglo-American treaty of December 3, 1924: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the thirty-fourth general assembly, in first extraordinary session convened (the senate concurring herein), That we express our most profound sympathy toward the victims of Nazi religious persecution and racial hatred; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United Nations be urged to take steps to find even temporary havens of refuge, through an international rescue agency, for those homeless and hounded Jews who can be rescued immediately; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge that all barriers on Jewish immigration into Palestine be now removed so that those Jews who can find escape from Axis-dominated Europe have permanent haven in the Land of Israel in their urgent need; and we view with favor the absorption of all Jews into Palestine after the war who need or desire to go there, not only as an act of justice to the Jewish people, but as an integral part of a new democratic world order in which every people shall have the right of self-government and self-determination in accordance with the principles for which we now fight; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States; to Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State; to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States; and to the British Embassy in Washington, D. C., for transmission to the proper authorities in London."

Resolutions adopted by a meeting of the national board of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, at Detroit, Mich., referring to discrimination in employment practices on account of race, creed, national origin or ancestry, and favoring the enactment of House bill 3986, prohibiting such discrimination and establishing a fair employment practice commission; protesting against the enactment of the so-called Austin-Wadsworth national war service bill, or similar proposed legislation, and endorsing the principles embodied in House Joint Resolution 192, to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

An act of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"H. 624

"An act authorizing the Governor to offer to convey State property to the United States Government for the purpose of erecting a veterans' hospital

"Whereas the erection of a United States veterans' hospital in the State of Rhode Island would be a logical move in the proper direction for the development of such a hospital, since the huge expanse of Narragansett Bay provides ample facility for a large part of the Naval Fleet and the many Army and Navy installations in this State have now brought to Rhode Island an Army and Navy population of great impact in this area; and

"Whereas the increasing casualties in all theaters of operation and the inevitable injury in training pursuits and field maneuvers are taxing resources of the present hospital accommodations and the number of disabled veterans from World War No. 2, added to those of previous wars in which the United States has been engaged, is a fact which should be faced in anticipation with entirely adequate plan for development of proper facilities: Now, therefore,

"It is enacted by the general assembly as follows:

"SECTION 1. The Governor is hereby authorized and empowered to offer to convey to the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, without payment therefor, title to unimproved land now belonging to the State of Rhode Island, for the purpose of constructing thereon a veterans' hospital, provided that the United States Government, or any of its departments or agencies would agree to accept such land and to use the same for the establishment and building upon said property of a modern veterans' hospital.

"In the event that the United States Government, or any of its departments or agencies, advises the Governor of the unsuitability or unadaptability of any available land for the purposes aforesaid, the Governor is hereby authorized and empowered to offer to pay to the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, out of the funds appropriated for the payment of contingencies, such sum as may be required, not exceeding the sum of $50,000, for the purchase by the United States Government, or any department or agency thereof, of land within the State of Rhode Island, provided that the United States Government, or any of its departments or agencies, would agree to purchase such land and to use the same for the establishment and building upon said property of a modern veterans' hospital.

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect upon its passage."

RESOLUTIONS BY MEETING OF KANSAS OILMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred the resolutions adopted by the Kansas Oil Men's Association, at its annual meeting in Wichita, Kans., January 24, 1944. These resolutions state the position of men actually engaged in business, as affected by regulations under which they are working, and I suggest that their recommendations are entitled to careful consideration at the hands of their Government and its agencies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Whereas there is a shortage in district 2 amounting to approximately 200,000 barrels per day of crude oil, arising principally from the diversion of crude to other areas to meet war demands; and

Whereas the only feasible immediate method of making up this deficiency is to move crude oil into district 2 from Texas, Wyoming, and other areas; and

Whereas the only practical accomplishment of this is by tank car until adequate pipe-line facilities can be completed, and since hauling by tank car is more expensive than by pipe line, some practical means of compensation for the excess cost must be worked out: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Oil Men's Association go on record as favoring a plan which will compensate all refiners finding it necessary to import crude oil from various areas outside district 2.

Whereas it appears that some form of allocation of refined-petroleum products may become necessary in the territory covered by district 2 of the Petroleum Administration for War, including the State of Kansas; and

Whereas the products distribution subcommittee in district 2 is studying plans for an equitable basis to be used in the distribution of the available supplies to the petroleum jobber, dealer, and consumer; and

Whereas 1941 is generally considered to be the last normal year in petroleum marketing, 1942 is considered to be the first year in the full transition from peacetime operations to the emergencies of war, and 1943 is considered to reflect peacetime-wartime shifts in population with the consequent fluctuation in demand for refined petroleum products; and

Whereas it is recognized in the State of Kansas that an adequate supply of petroleum products for farm operations must be maintained in order to assure the production of essential food products: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Kansas Oil Men's Association go on record with the products distribution subcommittee favoring allocation based on the averaged purchases of the jobber, dealer, or consumer for the years 1941, 1942, and 1943, with a horizontal cut affecting all alike if such a cut becomes necessary.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas a substantial part of the off-the-highway gasoline sold in Kansas is sold through service stations; and

Whereas many dealers and jobbers of petroleum products in the State of Kansas have predicted their business and have made investments in their businesses on the theory that the farmer and other off-the-highway users of motor fuels will come to their service stations to purchase them; and

Whereas a change in the rationing of gasoline regulations providing that service stations may not take R, off-the-highway, coupons in exchange for gasoline is unjust and discriminatory; and

Whereas a system wherein the off-the-highway user of gasoline would be given a check book to cover his rationed needs, providing his ration is 100 gallons or more in any rationed period; and

Whereas a ration holder whose ration requirements are less than 100 gallons of gasoline in any one rationed period would be furnished with E coupons; and

Whereas a method has been proposed that the checks issued by the nonhighway consumer of gasoline would flow from the consumer to the dealer, to the primary supplier, to the bank, and in turn to the district office of the O. P. A., that they might then be checked against the tax-exemption records of the State of Kansas, thus giving an adequate check as to the purchases and use of any nonhighway gasoline by any consumer in the State of Kansas, and also removing the possibility of illegal traffic in R, off-the-highway gasoline coupons, for the simple reason that they would no longer exist: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Oil Men's Association go on record as opposing the plan which will be tried in Georgia and Florida after February 1, for the reason that it would be discriminatory and unfair should it be instituted in Kansas, and go on record as favoring the check-book plan, outlined above, for the reason that it would be workable and practical in Kansas.

Whereas due to the necessity of producing additional quantities of higher grade octane gasoline which may create such a shortage of tetraethyl lead that we will no longer be able to produce premium gasoline for civilian consumption; and

Whereas premium gasoline has always been sold by the dealer and jobber at a higher margin than other grades of gasoline; and

Whereas should the manufacture of premium gasoline be discontinued because of the shortage of tetraethyl lead fluid, the marketer will lose his longer margin item of merchandise: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Oil Men's Association request the Office of Price Administration and the Petroleum Administration for War to arrange adequate and suitable marginal spread on the gasoline that the dealers and jobbers have left to sell, should the manufacture of the premium gasoline be discontinued to compensate the dealer and jobber for the loss of the higher margin item.

Whereas gasoline, fuel oil, and tire rationing has been necessary due to the critical shortage of these materials; and

Whereas rationing of these items has worked an extreme hardship on all those engaged in marketing of these rationed products; and

Whereas there is a normal desire in the heart of every businessman to return to the days of normal unregimented business: Be it

Resolved, That immediately when the cause and need for the rationing of these items is removed, that gasoline, fuel oil, and tires be removed from rationing.

Whereas the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States reads in part, "Nor (shall he) be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law"; and

Whereas the rules and regulations under which the Office of Price Administration is now operating wherein a hearing commissioner, a paid employee of such Office, sits as both judge and jury at the trial of alleged violators of rationing regulations, does not constitute due process of law; and

Whereas gasoline rationing regulations as they now exist are impossible for the dealer and jobber to comply with for the simple reason that adequate and competent manpower is not available; and

Whereas a careless or dishonest employee can violate the gasoline rationing regulations against the instructions of his employer and without the knowledge of his employer; and

Whereas it has been the policy and contention of the O. P. A. that the employer is responsible for the acts of his employee even though he is not in a position to exercise control over them, and even though the employee acts against the instructions of his employer; and

Whereas such conditions place the property and the right to do business of the petroleum dealer and jobber in a position of dire jeopardy, in which the property and the right to do business of the individual is subject to the whim and caprice of one paid employee of the agency charging the violation: Be it

Resolved, That the Office of Price Administration take cognizance of the peculiar position in which the petroleum jobber and dealer today finds himself in respect to his potential right to property and the free use thereof, and cease the unconstitutional holding that the employee, contrary to specific instructions of his employer, and despite the due diligence of his employer, binds said employer by the employee's personal illegal acts in violation of rationing regulations, and that the Office abide by the wording of the congressional action which spawned its creation, which enjoins the Office of Price Administration to call upon the duly organized and institutionalized law enforcing agencies and the regular courts of the land for the policing and enforcing of its regulations.

Whereas the Office of Price Administration has started to issue serially numbered T gasoline coupons and plans in the future to issue all A, B, C, and T gasoline coupons with serial numbers, with an identification card showing the serially numbered coupons which each coupon holder is entitled to hold and use, thus identifying each serially numbered coupon to be a part of the ration of the person to whom it is issued; and

Whereas the procedure for the sale of gasoline as set out by the Office of Price Administration entailing the following procedures:

1. Checking license number of the car.

2. Canceling the coupon if it is not already canceled. (Well over 50 percent of the coupons now presented at the stations are not now canceled.)

3. Detaching the coupon from the holder's book and checking the license number on the coupon identification slip.

These are so cumbersome and time consuming that they are impossible and impractical for the operator to be able to follow and comply with, and as a result, the procedure as outlined is not being followed in a great majority of cases where gasoline is sold, for the simple reason that adequate and competent manpower is not available; and

Whereas the issuing of serially numbered coupons removes the necessity for identification purposes of canceling coupons with license numbers, and State of registration of vehicle, and the requirement that the seller of gasoline take only canceled coupons: It is

Resolved, That when A, B, C, and T gasoline coupons have been issued on a serially numbered basis that rationing regulations be changed so that coupon holders no longer have the responsibility to cancel their coupons, and that the person accepting coupons in exchange for gasoline no longer be charged with the responsibility of seeing that such coupons are canceled.

Whereas district 2 of the P. A. W. (the Middle West area) faces a shortage of crude oil now amounting to 200,000 barrels per day, to meet the military and rationed civilian demand for petroleum products; and

Whereas the only tried and proved method of increasing crude oil production is the price incentive; and

Whereas an increase in the price of crude oil and refined products is minute and inconsequential to the consumer and not inflationary; and

Whereas all branches of the industry have had to meet wage and salary increases, increased cost of material, pyramiding of taxes, shortages of manpower, with no increase in the price of crude oil or refined products to this time; and

Whereas, because of the increasing demand for petroleum products, it is necessary that every refinery run to its maximum capacity, and more crude oil can be run to refinery stills in this area than is now available; and

Whereas an adequate supply of petroleum products for the military and essential civilian activities is necessary to a successful prosecution of the war effort; and

Whereas, unless immediate steps are taken to secure additional crude production, it appears that we, as a Nation, will find ourselves in a position of "too little, too late" as respects our supply of petroleum products: Be it

Resolved, That the price of crude oil be substantially advanced with an equivalent and concurrent advance in the price of refined products. This increase in the price of products to be in effect all down the line, from the refinery, through the marketer to the consumer.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1682. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, T. H., without amendment (Rept. No. 689).

HEARINGS BEFORE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE—REGULATION OF RATE BUREAUS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Printing I report two resolutions which I should like to have considered and acted upon. First, I report Senate Concurrent Resolution 34 and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) submitted by Mr. WHEELER on February 10, 1944, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use a consolidated edition of 1,000 copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the bill (S. 942) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for agreements between common carriers by railroad, between common carriers by pipe line, between common carriers by motor vehicle, between common carriers by water, and between freight forwarders, for the making and filing of rates, fares, charges, or classifications for transportation of passengers and property, and for other purposes.

MANUAL EXPLANATORY OF THE PRIVILEGES, RIGHTS, AND BENEFITS OF AND FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee on Printing I also report Senate Resolution 251, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 251) submitted by Mr. BONE on February 7, 1944, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided for All Persons Who Are or Have Been Members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and of Those Dependent Upon Them" be printed as a Senate document; and that 5,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—MINORITY VIEWS (PT 2 OF REPT. NO. 687)

Mr. PEPPER, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the views of the minority of that committee on the bill (S. 1509) to provide for the education and training of members of the armed forces and the merchant marine after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes (reported from the Committee on Education and Labor on the 9th instant, with an amendment), which views were ordered to be printed.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1724. A bill proposing that no reduction be made in service-connected permanent and total disability compensation and/or insurance ratings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Sunday, March 12, 1914, as Sun Yat-sen Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and a joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo;

H. R. 439. An act for the relief of Jack Scarton or John Skarton, formerly Simon Jan Skarzenski;

H. R. 442. An act for the relief of John Damascus;

H. R. 768. An act to authorize the cancelation of deportation proceedings in the case of Frank Durante and wife, Maria Durante, and five children, namely: Paul Durante, Alfred Durante, Anthony Durante, Henry Durante, and Patsy Durante;

H. R. 2787. An act for the relief of Phyllis Lee;

H. R. 2789. An act to permit the naturalization of Peter Henry Buck; and

H. R. 3840. An act for the relief of Albert Barrett; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1216. An act for the relief of Walter Ervin and Cora Ervin;

H. R. 1269. An act for the relief of Frank E Wilmot;

H. R. 1411. An act for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart;

H. R. 1421. An act for the relief of Paul B. Lingle;

H. R. 1628. An act for the relief of John Hirsch;

H. R. 1963. An act for the relief of G. H. Garner;

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan;

H. R. 2234. An act for the relief of Mrs. Christine Hansen;

H. R. 2273. An act for the relief of E. C. Fudge;

H. R. 2332. An act for the relief of Christian Wenz;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Joseph Scarpella and Dorothy Scarpella;

H. R. 2438. An act for the relief of Bernadine Salmons;

H. R. 2472. An act for the relief of the estate of Gertrude Mullins;

H. R. 2625. An act for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held;

H. R. 2711. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Maag;

H. R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler;

H. R. 2757. An act for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallop, and Mrs. Dora Projansky;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 3125. An act for the relief of Paul H. White;

H. R. 3137. An act for the relief of Ruth L. Clapp;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi;

H. R. 3324. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron;

H. R. 3466. An act for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.;

H. R. 3538. An act for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson;

H. R. 3649. An act for the relief of Mae Ekvall;

H. R. 3654. An act for the relief of Byron Ennis;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson;

H. R. 3781. An act for the relief of Hall Farris; and

H. R. 4074. An act for the relief of the estate of William Sandlass; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2147. An act for the relief of Perique Gomez and Mrs. Perique Gomez; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3075. An act for the relief of Mrs. Isabella Tucker; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 3720. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint notaries public; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DIVISION OF FLORIDA INTO TWO JUDICIAL DISTRICTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 454) dividing the State of Florida into two judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT and Mr. O'MAHONEY each submitted an amendment, and Mr. McKELLAR submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TWENTY-SIXTH MONTHLY MESSAGE TO JAPAN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the twenty-sixth monthly message broadcast by him to the people of Japan, which appears in the Appendix.]

IN POST-WAR AMERICA—ADDRESSES BY SENATORS MEAD AND MURRAY

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the introductory remarks and addresses on the subject of post-war America delivered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] at the National Radio Forum on February 8, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

BENEFITS OF OPERATIONS OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPCRATION

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to the operations of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, published in the Washington Post of February 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICS IN CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY FRANK KINGDON

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address by Frank Kingdon on February 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR FOR VICTORY—ADDRESS BY JOHN P. FREY

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Labor for Victory," delivered by John P. Frey, president of the metal-trades department of the American Federation of Labor, on February 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BLOT ON HISTORY—EDITORIAL FROM SAN ANTONIO LIGHT

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial

entitled "Blot on History," published in the San Antonio Light of February 11, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

IRRIGATION, RECLAMATION, AND POWER PROGRAM IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN AREA

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I made before the House Committee on Flood Control relative to the development of an irrigation, reclamation, and power program in the Missouri River Basin area.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, the development of the Missouri River Basin is a program of the most vital importance to the people of the West. What is done in the next few months with respect to three important reports dealing with this matter will set patterns in that basin that will govern for all time the growth and development of a very considerable and important part of the United States.

One of these reports is that of the corps of engineers known as the Pick Report, setting up a flood-control project from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River. This is the subject of your meeting today.

Another report relating to the development program recommends a navigation project calling for a nine-foot channel in the lower Missouri. This project is proposed in H. R. 3961, recently reported by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee.

The third report is now in process of completion by the Bureau of Reclamation. This latter report will deal particularly with the development through irrigation, the restoration of surface and ground water levels, and the production of hydroelectric power of that vast and relatively undeveloped empire comprised in the upper Missouri Basin.

The Missouri River rising in the Rocky Mountain flows through the semiarid high plains, through the subhumid zone that lies roughly parallel with and along the 100th meridian and continues well into the humid agricultural Midwest before it joins the Mississippi River.

In the semiarid and subhumid zones, the Mississippi River drains large parts of the States of Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado and Kansas. Except for the watershed of the Platte River, which is a tributary of the Missouri River, agricultural development by irrigation of lands in the semiarid and subhumid sections of the basin is still in its infancy. The importance, therefore, to the western region of the planned use of the waters of the Missouri River cannot be overemphasized. I am sure it is not necessary at this late date to dwell on the catastrophic droughts of 1934 and 1936 and their economic consequences, in order to convey to this committee the importance of an intelligently planned expansion of irrigation through the utilization of the waters of the Missouri and its tributaries. This program is essential to the future welfare of the Plains and the Nation as a whole.

I understand that preliminary figures obtained by the Bureau of Reclamation indicate that perhaps as much as 4,400,000 acres of good, arable land that is now dry can be irrigated and made useful in the Missouri River Basin.

To give you an impression of the importance of 4,400,000 acres of irrigated land to the Western States and to the Nation, I should say that this is more than one-fifth of the total of all irrigated lands in the 17 Western States today. There are roughly 20,000,000 acres of land now being irrigated in the West, and these 20,000,000 acres provide the sustaining agricultural base of one-third of the area of the entire United States. The irrigation of 4,400,000 acres of dry land means stable homes on good farms for hundreds of thousands of people. It will mean stability on that scale for our States. It will mean a great increase in population of these sparsely settled States and stabilization of the economy of vital importance to the whole country.

These 4,400,000 acres that can be watered from the Missouri River and its tributaries have a special significance in our States. As you know, the high plains are in that zone which sometime gets enough rain to make crops, but which often does not. Settlement has been unstable there. Great droughts, less than 10 years ago, drove 300,000 people from their homes in the Plains forcing them to make jalopy migrations farther west. These droughts required expenditures by the Federal Government of $600,000,000 for simple relief in the Missouri River Basin in the States affected. Those expenditures, large as they were, did little to correct the conditions which made the droughts catastrophic in their consequences. They simply alleviated some of the misery that followed in the wake of the weather. The economic loss sustained by the region because of these droughts cannot be calculated. Farmers were driven from their homes and into bankruptcy and the damages in dollars and cents suffered in the affected areas greatly exceeded the relief expenditures of the Government. Now again a serious drought menaces the same region. Snowfall reports as of February 1, 1944, by the Department of Agriculture reveal an alarming scarcity of moisture in the Missouri, Platte, and Arkansas River watersheds. This entire area has received approximately from one-half to one-fourth less snowfall this winter than the average for the past 9 years, which included the severe droughts I have described. Compared with last year, precipitation is from one-fourth to two-thirds short.

The stabilization of the areas in my State of Montana, and in Wyoming, South Dakota, North Dakota, and other States of the Plains that are subjected periodically to these droughts is one of the great problems before this Nation. Irrigation of accessible bodies of good farm lands with waters taken from the Missouri and its tributary streams must form the basis of any permanent solution to drought problems in the Northern Plains States.

Please keep in mind, if you will, what I have said about the importance of irrigation to the future of this area, while I discuss other phases of the development of the river itself. I am fully cognizant of the need of flood control, especially to protect the area along the Missouri River below Sioux City. I am sympathetic with attempts to gain such control of this river as will provide the protection desired. I am interested, as well, in the control of floods and in alleviating flood conditions in other sections of the basin. A sound flood control program must be a part of our basin developments.

As I said earlier, the Missouri River is relatively undeveloped. By proper planning now I am convinced we can obtain for the Nation and for the States of the Missouri River Basin the navigable channel needed in the lower river, the protection from floods needed in the lower basin and at the points that are threatened elsewhere, and we can also have the development by irrigation that is essential to the welfare of the vast plains and valleys of the upper reaches of the Missouri River and its tributaries. I base my statement that I believe it is possible, by proper planning, to obtain all of these ends on facts gained from those who are making the plans. It will be necessary, however, to coordinate the work and the plans of the Bureau of Reclamation for irrigation, and surface and ground water restoration, and for power, with plans of the Corps of Engineers for flood control and navigation, in order to achieve this desired end. The use of waters beneficially in the upper basin States for irrigation must be clearly protected against the perfection of rights of riparian character. Any program that would repudiate a proper reclamation program and cause this water to flow wastefully forever in the future downstream to float barges would be a major national mistake. The channels needed for the waterway effectively can be maintained in the future as development proceeds upstream through additional protective works and locks in the lower river. We, therefore, must guard against the pledging forever of the full flow of the Missouri River to the negative use of maintenance of a channel depth, because the channel can be maintained in other ways when that time is reached in which the water will be needed for consumptive uses upstream.

That is why, as I understand it, the President has recommended an amendment to the rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 3961, as follows:

"Page 21, line 13. After the word 'Congress' substitute a colon for the semicolon and insert the words: *'Provided*, That the use of waters of the Missouri River for municipal, domestic, and livestock water supply, for irrigation of arid and semiarid lands, and for mining and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby.'"

I believe all the advocates of the navigation project contend that the 9-foot channel will not interfere with future irrigation upstream. I am sure, then, that they can have no legitimate objection to such a statement in the bill as that worded by the President.

If proper principles are applied in the design, construction, and operation of the flood-control project, I am also sure that it too can be made a coordinated part with irrigation and navigation of the logical ultimate development of the basin. I understand that a great deal of thought has been given to this matter by the Bureau of Reclamation, as well as by others. I am sorry that the Reclamation report and that the comment of the Reclamation Service on the Corps of Engineers' report is not before the Congress at this time. I do not believe it would be safe to dispose of the flood-control project on the Missouri River until, at least, these comments have been received and considered.

The Bureau of Reclamation, like the Corps of Engineers, is an agency with a deserved, fine reputation and a long history of constructive, useful public work. The views of this agency and of the Department of the Interior, of which it is a part, will be relied upon by the representatives of the States in the arid and semiarid zones for a large measure of guidance.

Just as we of the underdeveloped upper basin are interested in irrigation, so we are interested as well in the development and use of the low-cost hydroelectric power that will be a byproduct of the improvement of the river. The Corps of Engineers is not a power-marketing agency. For the most part, that function has been made the responsibility of the Department of the Interior, which has developed and applied the policies that assist in western growth. Bonneville and Fort Peck Dams are examples of Army construction and operation for the major purposes and of marketing power by the Department of the Interior. The arrangement works to the satisfaction of the Western States. The President took cognizance of these facts and of the dominant interest of the Bureau of Reclamation in irrigation when he proposed to the Rivers and Harbors Committee the following amendment to its bill:

I quote: "Page 29, line 12. Add the following new paragraphs at the end of section 1:

"'Electric power and energy generated at projects authorized by this act and not re-

quired in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers, and preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives. At dams or works authorized by this act which are suitable for the production of electric power and energy, the Secretary of War shall provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such structures, machinery, equipment, facilities, and supplies as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to develop power and energy for existing and potential markets and for the proper reception, handling, and dispatch of electric power and energy; and operations of all such machinery and facilities shall be scheduled in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior so far as consistent with requirements for the use of water for the other purposes of said projects. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire such transmission lines and facilities and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements as he deems necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities herein conferred upon him.

" 'In connection with dams or works authorized by this act which the Secretary of the Interior determines, with the concurrence of the Secretary of War, may be utilized for irrigation purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), such additional works as he may deem necessary for irrigation purposes. Such irrigation works may be undertaken only after a report and findings thereon have been made by the Secretary of the Interior as provided in said Federal reclamation laws; and, within the limits of the water users' repayment ability, such report may be predicated on the allocation to irrigation of an appropriate portion of the cost of structures and facilities used for irrigation and other purposes. Dam and works authorized by this act may be utilized for irrigation purposes only in conformity with the provisions of said Federal reclamation laws and this paragraph.' "

This amendment is equally pertinent to the bill you are preparing. I recommend it to you.

The interests of the West demand that conflicts between Federal agencies be avoided in the development of our western streams. Irrigation and power marketing are recognized functions of the Department of the Interior. Flood control and navigation are recognized responsibilities of the Corps of Engineers.

The rule of the thumb laid down by the President in a recent letter to your chairman that the agency with the dominant interest in the project should build that project strikes me as very sensible. But beyond that construction, we must have single administration of benefits. The functions of a multiple-purpose dam should be administered, no matter which agency builds the dam, by that agency with the principal responsibility for the function.

You will recall that the President said in his letter of February 7, 1944, to your chairman:

"In my letter of May 5, 1941, I suggested that a sound policy in connection with these water projects would consist of selecting the construction agency by determining the dominant interest. Projects in which navigation or flood control clearly dominate are those in which the interest of the Corps of Engineers is superior and should be so recognized. On the other hand, projects in which irrigation and related conservation dominate are those in which the interest of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior is paramount and should be so recognized. No matter which agency builds a multiple-purpose structure involving in even a minor way the interests of the other, the agency with the responsibility for that particular interest should administer it in accordance with its authorizing legislation and general policies. For example, the Bureau of Reclamation in the Department of the Interior should administer, under the reclamation laws and its general policies, those irrigation benefits and phases of projects built by the Corps of Engineers. These suggestions are, to my mind, even more pertinent today. For today we gird for peace. Confusion over jurisdiction ought not to be allowed to disrupt the great preparations now being made for post-war construction of vital public works."

I am of the opinion that we need three things with respect to the development of the Missouri River: First, we need a coordination of the plans. The Congress cannot escape its responsibility in connection with this coordination. We have provided no agency to do it for us. The President has asked the Bureau of the Budget to attempt the task, but the Budget is imperfectly equipped for the arduous job and, furthermore, in our impatience we, in the Congress, do not give the Budget time to get the work done. The Congress, therefore, has the major responsibility for coordinating the plans That is why I have talked to this Flood Control Committee about irrigation, power, and navigation as well as about flood control.

The second thing we need in the development of the Missouri River is the adoption of a proper standard by which we can determine which Federal agency shall build each particular project of the grand plan. The President has proposed a good method, the dominant interest standard.

The third thing we need is a clear enunciation of basic policy that will assure everyone that the benefits of multiple-purpose projects will be administered by the agency with the responsibility for the particular benefit under consideration—irrigation by Reclamation, power by the Department of the Interior, flood control by the Corps of Engineers, and navigation by the Army. In connection with this program, we need a clear protection of the rights of the upper basin States for irrigation and domestic water.

Let me say again, the Missouri River Basin today is relatively undeveloped. The Great Plains section of the basin is subject to catastrophic, recurring droughts with one now in the offing. Intelligent and well-planned use through irrigation of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries hold the basic promise for the ultimate stabilization of this region. Navigation improvement, the control of floods and irrigation and hydroelectric power development in the basin are all desirable. With proper coordination of the work of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, there is no reason why the development of the Missouri River Basin cannot go forward now without injury to any part of the basin in the future. The report of the Bureau of Reclamation has not yet been completed. I will not feel safe in acting upon any of the reports and plans now before the Congress until the comments of the Bureau of Reclamation have been received and considered, and until the future development of the semiarid and subhumid zones of the basin is adequately protected and safeguarded.

These western arid and semiarid areas wisely developed can be made a great national asset but neglected can become a dangerous national liability.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 5, page 16, line 2, after the word "expire", it is proposed to strike out "at the conclusion of 2 years following the termination of hostilities on all fronts unless specifically extended by an act of Congress," and to insert "on June 30, 1946", so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. The authorization contained in this joint resolution shall expire on June 30, 1946.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish briefly to explain to the Members of the Senate the nature and purpose of the joint resolution now pending. It is commonly referred to as U. N. R. R. A. I dislike very much the initial abbreviation, but it means United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

In the main, the joint resolution authorizes cooperation by the United States Government with the other nations of the United Nations in an international relief organization having for its purpose the extension of temporary relief in the liberated areas, after our armed forces shall move on and out, or after the conquerors who may occupy these lands are thrown out, or may voluntarily retreat from the areas.

The joint resolution is not, according to our conception, a treaty. When it was first advanced it was proposed that it take the form of an executive agreement, an agreement by the executive department with other nations, without any reference whatever to congressional or senatorial action. When the matter came to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that conception was combatted, and the committee appointed a subcommittee to take up with the State Department the consideration of the proposal in an effort to work out some common ground upon which the Congress and the State Department could cooperate. The Senator from Texas, as chairman of the committee, was chairman of the subcommittee. On that committee were the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

I do not wish to claim any great share of the credit for what was accomplished. Some of us were out of the city at the time. But I desire especially to thank the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], members of the subcommittee, who devoted a great deal of time and secured very valuable results with the State Department. The agreement subsequently entered into by the 41 nations was materially altered as a result of the conferences between the subcommittee and the State Department, and in consequence the joint resolution in nowise assumes any obligation on the part of the United States, unless the obligation is indicated through the action of the constitutional authorities, in this case the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives

through their appropriate power. In other words, under the terms of the joint resolution the United States does not obligate itself to pay any amounts except such amounts as the Congress may from time to time hereafter authorize by appropriation.

The amounts tentatively allocated under the agreements were based upon a formula providing that the contributing nations would contribute 1 percent of their national income, not annually, but for the entire period. In the case of the United States our national income, as Senators know, has been very greatly enhanced by war expenditures, until it is extremely high, whereas in many of the other countries, because of exchange conditions and disruption of their economy, their incomes are relatively low. So it may appear to some Senators that the proportion of the total expenditures which the United States may provide, if Congress so wills, is a very large percentage of the entire amount. That is true; there can be no dispute about it. The contributing share of the United States, if it is ultimately provided by the Congress, would total about two-thirds of the entire amount to be expended.

The organization of this international body consists of the membership, of course, of each nation. Then there is provision made for the establishment of an executive council, and when the executive council is not in session or available, a special select executive committee is in charge of operations as to policy and matters of that kind. It is headed by a Director General, and the recent conference held at Atlantic City elected Governor Lehman, theretofore the American relief representative, as the Executive Director of the organization known as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Mr. President, I am glad the word "rehabilitation" was introduced into the discussion. So far as the United States is concerned, as we have tried to make plain in the joint resolution, in the report of the committee, and in the hearings, our purpose is to assure that our activities, and whatever contributions the Congress may make and appropriate, shall be limited to relief and such rehabilitation only as is tied in with and connected with the necessity for extending temporary relief. As a rough illustration of what I mean, I may say that if relief were being extended to a particular area, and there was lack of transportation because a roadway had been destroyed, and therefore the transportation of relief supplies could not be accomplished without the rebuilding of the road, such work would probably be held to be within the terms of the joint resolution, because it would be tied in with the relief which could be extended; but it is not contemplated, it is not provided, and it is not authorized by the joint resolution, that any extensive rehabilitation of devastated areas shall be undertaken. It does not authorize anywhere any reconstruction of utilities, or public activities, or private property, except, as I have indicated, that which is incidental to and necessary to carry on the temporary relief which the joint resolution does authorize.

Mr. President, we had before the committee the representatives of the War Department. We did not want any conflict between the military and the relief organization under Governor Lehman. It was there developed that of course when the Army is in charge of an area, when it moves in and takes possession, nothing must interfere with the authority of the commanding general over the military operations in the area occupied. To interfere with them would, of course, provoke chaos and disruption of military activities. But it is proposed that when the necessity arises for the extension of such temporary relief as may be necessary from a military standpoint, when military activities cease and the Army moves on, the organization is then authorized to move in and take up where the Army left off. It was made clear in the hearings held by the committee that we expected—and Governor Lehman was before the committee and testified—that there must be the utmost cooperation between the Army and the authorities acting under the joint resolution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In what way would the allied military governments be related to the relief activities and how would this particular operation be affected thereby?

Mr. CONNALLY. There would be really only the incidental relationship that might exist between the military and the government that might be in control of the particular territory occupied. Allow me to say to the Senator from Maine that as I understand, when the Army goes in and takes charge of territory, either of enemy or of liberated areas, and establishes a military government, the military government which is established wherever possible utilizes the existing government of the country if it is cooperative. If it is not, it will be removed, and in its stead will be placed some functionary who will cooperate. The functions are to be limited in the main to the normal and general authority exercised by the particular governmental authorities or functionaries. In such a case, when the necessity for relief arose, this organization would be supposed, of course, to cooperate insofar as possible with the military government which was set up, and through the subordinates, on down, through the channels which might carry the proper amount of relief.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's statement, unless it will be helpful to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad to have the interruption.

Mr. BREWSTER. The New York Times carried what apparently was a rather authoritative report from the London Times this last week, saying there was 6 months' supply of grains in Italy, but that it could not be made available for use for relief, so we had to ship food there. Apparently both the British and the Americans were rather dubious about that procedure. My question is addressed to exactly how, if that statement be correct, the local government in that territory could be required to make supplies such as those available.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that it is made clear in the pending joint resolution, in the reports, and in the hearings, that wherever it is possible for the local authorities or the local population to purchase supplies from their own resources or from their own gold reserves, or from whatever sources may be available to them, this agency will not extend relief to them, but will aid in the allocation and distribution and the funneling out to the proper areas of such relief supplies. Furthermore, it is contemplated by this measure that while those administering it will not have any facilities for wholesale buying and selling, in every instance the feeding out of even the relief supplies will be encouraged through normal commercial and other channels, so as not to become an international Santa Claus or an international W. P. A. I think it is highly important that in the operations and administration of this measure the people whom we aid and to whom we extend relief should be made to know and to feel that we expect them to exert themselves to the utmost to rehabilitate themselves and to revive their drooping agriculture and commerce and industry to the limit of their ability.

Mr. President, the justification for this proposed legislation in the main is that it is one of the war costs. The committee took that view in relation to the long-range picture of the great enterprise upon which we have embarked. Some may say we should not have embarked upon it; but, be that as it may, we have embarked upon it; we have in our hands the sword, and we must go on until the issue is determined in victory, and then, after victory, in a peace that I hope will be just and equitable, and in the establishment of machinery which will assure that never again shall the mad malaise of aggression and conquest plunge the whole world into seas of blood. The committee also took the view that after the Army moves on, leaving the liberated areas without proper leadership, perhaps swept by epidemics of illness, perhaps short of food and clothing and all the other necessities of life, such fields would be fruitful ones for the development of bolshevism and chaos and disease which might spread all over the areas, multiplying many times the necessities for relief, and bringing about an intolerable situation in our modern world. We regarded the measure as a part not only of the winning of the war but of undertaking to do something for the conservation of the forces of law and order and humanitarianism in a world lacerated and torn and bleeding from the outrageous injustices of military despots.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee desire that I yield to him?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be glad to have the Senator yield to me, provided I do not interrupt the development of his presentation.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; not at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wondered what proportion of the entire costs the United States will bear. I suppose the Senator has already stated that, but I have just entered the Chamber.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have already adverted to that, but I am glad to repeat. I explained that our contributions, if allowed by the Appropriations Committee, would constitute a very large proportion, approximately two-thirds of the entire cost, as it is now projected in the resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. What proportion will Great Britain and Russia bear?

Mr. CONNALLY. Russia is not a party to the agreement; because under its terms the agreement does not apply to countries which have themselves been invaded. Great Britain has already appropriated, through the House of Commons, £80,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. The equivalent of $300,000,000, in round numbers?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, approximately.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me? I happen to have those figures available.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan, and shall be very glad to have the information.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The British Parliament has already acted to the extent of £80,000,000, which is $320,000,000 at present rates of exchange. Australia's share is $40,000,000; Canada's, $75,000,000; New Zealand's $15,000,000. In other words, the total British contribution, other than the contribution from India, which is still undetermined, is between $450,000,000 and $500,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask another question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to have the Senator ask a further question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are we to contribute our share in money, or will we furnish food, such as flour or wheat or meal or corn or other articles of food, and also clothing? Are we to furnish relief in money, or is the money to be turned over to the Commission and used by it in buying whatever it wishes to purchase? Are there to be any rules, for instance, about the expenditure of certain proportions of the money in our own country, or will the Commission be able to buy the supplies whenever and wherever it wishes to do so?

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that, of course, so far as the Treasury is concerned, it will mean a cash outlay. But under the joint resolution and under the policies which were developed through the hearings, it will be the duty and function of the Director General and his associates on the council to endeavor to keep in mind the whole picture and to procure supplies where they are most readily available at the best prices. Our own representatives could, if approved by the Director General, furnish from our own sources here at home the supplies to which the Senator has adverted. Let me say a further word. For example, Mr. Leo Crowley, who is now in charge of all the foreign economic agencies of the Government, who took over the functions formerly exercised by the Vice President and the Board of Economic Warfare, and who has assumed all the functions of those various organizations, will be the American Administrator or representative dealing with this organization. Mr. Crowley came before the committee and gave assurance that in the administration of the act he would exercise his best judgment in the procurement of supplies in areas where they are most available at the most attractive prices, and that wherever they could be procured in the United States they would be so procured. Some other countries might have a surplus of certain supplies and a shortage of others. We should require countries with surpluses of supplies beyond their own needs to furnish such surpluses for employment in other areas where they might be needed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Generally speaking, if we are to contribute two-thirds of the entire sum, manifestly it would seem fair, just, and proper that, in the same general way, two-thirds of the supplies should be bought in America. According to my way of thinking, that would be only fair and just.

Mr. CONNALLY. While there is no requirement in the joint resolution that it shall be done in that proportion, I have no doubt that the preponderant volume of supplies will inevitably have to come from this country. Let me say to the Senator, who is an eminent and distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, and acting chairman of that committee, that if the joint resolution shall be enacted into law, it will be squarely up to the Appropriations Committee as to whether or not a dime shall be appropriated. I realize the pressure which will be upon the Senator. I am not minimizing that. It was in an endeavor to protect the authority of the Congress that certain provisions were inserted in the agreement. We speak of congressional power, and we speak of executive power; but if the Congress has any power, it is chiefly in the appropriating power. We wish to preserve that power. The appropriating power includes the control of the purse and of the sword. We felt that Congress should reserve the control of the fund. That is about the only way by which we can control any executive branch of the Government. If we do not give it the money to carry on its activities it cannot operate.

Furthermore, the committee adopted an amendment to the House joint resolution limiting the authority to act under it to the 30th of June 1946. That does not necessarily mean that we might not continue it, as we frequently continue such organizations; but that provision would give the Congress another opportunity to examine into the activities of the administration, interrogate Mr. Lehman and others, and review its operations. If the administration does something which we do not want done, we can put provisions in a future act eliminating such activities and delimiting the power under the joint resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In accordance with the figures of the able Senator from Michigan, the various other nations have appropriated about $450,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. There are some others in addition to the ones he mentioned.

Mr. McKELLAR. The joint resolution authorizes an appropriation of $1,350,000,000. I should like to have the Senator's idea as to how much the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses should recommend at this time. In line with the suggestion which I made a few moments ago, it seems to me that at this time we certainly ought not to appropriate more than our proportion. In other words, if we are to bear two-thirds of the entire expense, and the other nations have appropriated, or will have appropriated, say, $450,000,000, manifestly it seems that we ought not to appropriate more than $900,000,000. I should like to have the view of the distinguished Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the committee, and of the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who is the ranking minority member of the committee. They are both present, and I should like to have an expression of their views.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator that it is contemplated by the committee and those having to do with this matter that if the joint resolution is enacted, it will then be the duty of those in charge of the administration to come before the committee of the Senator from Tennessee and make their presentation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that; and I have no doubt they will do so. But what I should like to have is the view of the Senator——

Mr. CONNALLY. I will give the Senator the view of one Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the view of the Senator as to how much should be appropriated at this time, when our associates have appropriated $450,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that they have made that much available. Let me say to the Senator that it is not contemplated by the joint resolution that we shall dump out all the money at one time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that. The joint resolution so provides.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is up to the Committee on Appropriations to say how much of this activity will be necessary between now and the 1st of July and how much will be necessary for the ensuing fiscal year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. To begin with, the Senator from Tennessee should not be misled by the figures which I cited. The figure of $450,000,000 is the share of the British Empire only. In addition,

all the other signatories to the compact are facing their assessments. For example, Brazil's assessment is $35,000,000. Little Iceland sent in her check for $50,000 the other day. There is a total budgetary contemplation of about $2,000,000,000. That is the over-all estimate, respecting the entire enterprise, until it is finished. The appropriations to be sought from time to time will be based on accurate estimates submitted to the committee over which the able Senator from Tennessee presides. The estimate which I have heard as to the probable requirement for the remainder of this fiscal year is between $250,000,000 and $400,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to have that information. I should like to ask another question, if the Senator from Texas will yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much have the other nations actually appropriated at this time? I think we should have that information, and I have no doubt it will be given when the time comes; but I should like to know, if the Senator can give the figures, how much has been actually appropriated by other nations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me to reply to the question of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In practically all instances the same time element is involved in the legislative process elsewhere as is involved here. We have not as yet completed the legislative process to establish our contribution. I very much doubt whether the process has been concluded in very many other countries, although it has been concluded in the British Parliament, and a commitment of £80,000,000 has been made.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is about $325,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has that amount been appropriated, or does it represent only a commitment, such as we would make if the joint resolution were to be enacted? The joint resolution would commit us to a contribution of $1,350,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My impression is that it is much more of a commitment than we make when we merely enact an authorization.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is more of a commitment than that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I intend later to discuss this matter at some length because I feel a very deep responsibility in connection with it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as to the authorized appropriation of $1,350,000,000, over what period is that amount to be expended?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Over the total period of the enterprise, whatever it may happen to be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Until the cessation of the war?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. However, under the committee amendment it would be limited to June 30, 1946.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Absolutely.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have in my hand an article from the Christian Science Monitor, dated at London, January 28, 1944, relating to the action of the House of Commons with regard to this particular matter. It reads as follows:

> The House of Commons has made a good start in grasping the significance of the enormous task of relief and rehabilitation which lies ahead of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.
>
> In voting two new votes of credit for war purposes of £750,000,000 and £1,000,000,000, Commons also agreed to the British contribution to U. N. R. R. A. of £80,000,000.
>
> Britain today claims to be first country specifically to vote its U. N. R. R. A. contribution. But this contribution is seen as a solemn duty and not occasion for any particular expressions of gratitude from outside Britain.

It would seem from this report that the appropriation has already been made by the House of Commons.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can ascertain that later.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make sure that I am perfectly frank with the Senator from Tennessee about this matter. I do not desire to anticipate, on the time of the Senator from Texas, what I expect to say later. Unless the limitations which we have scrupulously sought to write into the proposed legislation were emphatically observed, this adventure might run into an expenditure of uncounted billions of dollars. There is no doubt in the world about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no doubt whatever.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The sole objective to which the subcommittee referred to by the Senator from Texas addressed itself for 6 months in dealing with the State Department on this problem was to make sure that limitations, insofar as it is possible to write limitations into the legislation, should absolutely confine this enterprise to specific war relief, only such rehabilitation as is inherent in relief and essential to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. And as a result of the war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Exclusively as a result of the war, and absolutely divorced from the problem of post-war reconstruction. Except as those limitations are effective, the answer to the Senator's question would be that the sky is the limit. However, I am supporting the joint resolution on the theory, as I shall subsequently detail from the record, that we have tied down Dean Acheson, who speaks for us in U. N. R. R. A., and that we have tied down Director General Lehman. Both have frankly conceded that they are tied down, and have accepted their obligations within the limits which we have sought to provide.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Texas if that is his understanding of the situation?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is exactly my understanding.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall prove that from the record. There can be no question about it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. On the very point referred to by the Senator from Michigan, I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether it is not a fact that even with the limitations imposed by the subcommittee the United States will still get an awful trimming in the matter of its contributions to this enterprise. I understand that the formula which has been adopted is, roughly, 1 percent of the national income. Our national income has been figured on a basis on which our people have been taxed to the point of inflation to supply lend-lease and to supply our armed forces to an extent never dreamed of before in the history of the world. Of course, that made our cash position and, in turn, our exchange position very excellent. So it seems to me that a formula of a flat percentage of the national income puts the United States in a very unfortunate position when it comes to making contributions for U. N. R. R. A. I believe that both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan will be forced to agree with that statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Missouri does not need to try to force me to agree with the statement which he has made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not trying to force the Senator to do anything. I merely thought that that statement should be added to what the Senator has already said.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The accuracy of the statement is perfectly obvious on its face. If this were to be taken as a precedent——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We would all have to vote against it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If this were to be taken as a precedent for America's general contributions in the post-war reconstruction period it would be equivalent to committing hara-kiri in public, on the floor of the Senate. It would be impossible.

Mr. President, I respectfully submit to the able Senator from Missouri that, since this project has been tied down exclusively to war relief, and since it will expire within what is unfortunately probably still the life of the war itself, we must choose between two alternatives. I rather suspect that if we did not have U. N. R. R. A., even though it costs us, say, 65 percent of the total expenditure to sustain it, we probably would find ourselves paying 100 percent of the bill. I think this is a bargain under existing circumstances.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has stated the only ground on which I can find it possible in my own mind to vote for the joint resolution. I am still not in entire agreement with the Senator's suggestion that it is a bargain.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Relatively speaking, it is a bargain.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very relatively.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am daily, almost hourly in receipt of communications asking for the relief of some particular part of some particular country, some of which I never before heard, asking me to serve on committees, to attend banquets, or send a check. It may be that the over-all picture presented by the Senator's statement is correct, but I think it should be very clear that this is not to be a precedent, and that no Member of the Senate who votes for this resolution is to consider it in any degree as a precedent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will indulge me for a further remark, the only reason in the world why I intend to intrude on the time of the Senate for perhaps half an hour a little later is to present for the RECORD the factual proof that what I am saying is true so far as it is humanly possible for Congress to put it into words and to commit the officials of this Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for a moment in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am wondering if the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan could not advise the Appropriations Committee that in their judgment, as the sponsors of the proposed legislation, our general rule should be to ascertain the actual appropriations made by other countries and then double them, in accordance with the rule suggested.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the Senator asking me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like first to ask the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas and, I presume, also the Senator from Michigan, will be available, and we shall be very glad to be consulted by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know they will come before the committee, but I wanted to have the Senator's opinion.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think it is quite fair for the Senator from Tennessee to press us now as to what we will do when the matter is later considered by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Texas is asking us to vote for this joint resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am not asking the Senator to do anything unless his judgment approves of it. However, I may say to the Senator that the members of our committee will be here, and I personally shall not shirk any responsibility.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure of that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. I did not mean to throw any bouquets at myself; but in presenting such a serious matter, I shall not hesitate. Let me say to the Senator that in the hearings the Senator from Michigan asked this question—and I want the attention of the Senator from Tennessee as I expect to have his attention when I go before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will have it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am flattered to be invited, but I do not want to be brushed off in advance. I want the matter to be considered as, if, and when we appear, with the facts and circumstances then surrounding it.

In the hearings the Senator from Michigan asked Assistant Secretary Acheson the following question:

> What immediate appropriations will be requested?

That is what the Senator from Tennessee has been talking about.

> Mr. ACHESON. That is a matter which does not fall immediately under me. Mr. Crowley, at the hearings before the House, stated that he believed that the immediate request that would be made would be for $500,000,000, to go until the end of this fiscal year. I think that that view has got to be revised. That statement was made in December—

And so on. I merely cite that to show that the committee had before it and that the State Department knows that we do not expect the Appropriations Committee to make the whole appropriation in a lump sum. We expect the Appropriations Committee and the Congress to hold the reins as it were, over this whole operation, and if it does not function in the way we have set it up, if it does not perform the high duties and responsibilities with which we have invested it I should be willing to stop it tomorrow. Does that answer the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. That answers me to that extent, anyway. I thank the Senator very much. Now I should like to hear from the Senator from Michigan as to his judgment about it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in the first place, I hope that the Appropriations Committee of which the Senator is acting chairman will use a microscope on every penny that is sought under this operation. If there is the slightest disposition in the subsequent administration of this instrumentality to depart in any degree from the prospectus which was presented today by the able Senator from Texas and which I shall presently supplement, I hope he will pull the string.

Mr. McKELLAR. That does not quite cover my question if the Senator will permit me.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Perhaps the Senator wants to know where the string is.

Mr. McKELLAR. As a general rule, the Appropriations Committees of the Congress and the Congress itself should not go beyond doubling the combined appropriations of other countries.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would agree to that as a general proposition, but I want to say something else to the Senator from Tennessee if the Senator from Texas will permit me.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Tennessee, as Acting Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has had a great deal of experience with the rather loose license which the administrative agencies of the Government give to themselves in the use of blank check appropriations, and the Senator knows that there are a good many blank check war appropriations which are available for almost any purpose for which the executive agencies of the Government wish to draw upon them. I think perhaps one of the finest proofs of the good faith with which the State Department has approached this particular undertaking is the fact that it has not put 1 penny of American money into the original administrative budget of U. N. R. R. A. even though there are in the control of executive agencies funds which probably could be drawn upon for that purpose. The administrative section of the U. N. R. R. A. has been set up so far solely on contributions made by other governments, because the State Department has set for itself a precedent, in this particular regard at least, that it will not proceed 1 inch without congressional approval. I should like to repeat that if that attitude continues on the part of the State Department and the administrators of this fund, I think we shall have a rather refreshing experience and I do not believe we have much to worry about.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Tennessee, and I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I inquire who compose the council as provided for in the pending legislation?

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will turn to the terms of the agreement itself, which is contained in the joint resolution, that matter will be easily apparent.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I find here provision for the composition of the council.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is on page 5.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Section 3, article III, provides that—

> The central committee of the Council shall consist of the representatives of China, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

That is four. It is my understanding from a statement made a few moments ago by the Senator from Michigan, as I recall, that Russia is to make no contribution, is not a signatory to this agreement, and is not expected to make a contribution under the U. N. R. R. A. agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I made that statement, but I did not go quite so far as the Senator indicates. I did not say Russia was not expected to contribute, but I said that since the organization does not apply to countries which themselves have been invaded Russia was thereby excluded. It is true as the Senator suggests that in article III, section 3, the central committee of the Council shall consist of the representatives indicated. The Council itself, though, is a wider body; it represents all the countries; but when it is not in session, when it is not able to perform or function, the central committee does act in its stead.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And it has the power, when the Council is not in ses-

sion, to promulgate and formulate any policies.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas permit me?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But it cannot increase the obligations of any signatory government without the consent of that government.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand; and that is the point I am coming to. While the authorization does not necessarily and absolutely bind the Congress to follow through with appropriations to the limit of the authorization, still it does carry with it, and will in this instance and all others, a moral obligation to provide every dollar authorized if in the judgment and wisdom of the governing body of U. N. R. R. A. it is found necessary to make the expenditure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas permit me to interrupt at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to disagree completely with that interpretation. I think it is important that we should lay down today the fundamental rule to which we propose to adhere; and the chief contribution that I want subsequently to make to this debate is to prove that the record justifies me in saying that every dollar of subsequent appropriation under this authorization can be tested by the limitations which we have written into the joint resolution itself, and any time there is any failure on the part of the administration of U. N. R. R. A., any time there is any possibility of it overstepping the general lines of policy to which we are clearly committing ourselves, then Congress is an absolutely free agent to stop appropriating one single cent. That is my conception of the situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I suggest to the Senator that, aside from the joint resolution, in the agreement establishing the organization it is provided in article V, section 2:

> The supplies and resources made available for the member governments shall be kept in review in relation to prospective requirements by the Director General, who shall initiate action with the member governments with a view to assuring such additional supplies and resources as may be required.

I now call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that I am about to quote from article 5, section 1, of the agreement itself, which provides:

> The amount and character of the contributions of each member Government under this provision will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies.

That is in the agreement setting up this organization. In the proposed act itself it is made clear that that is our purpose.

I realize, as I indicated a moment ago to the Senator from Tennessee, that of course when there is an authorization there is always pressure to go the limit, but we have committees capable of standing up under pressure when there is proposed something which is not right.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator that the Congress still will have control of the purse strings, but in the authorization we are proposing to take action on an over-all job, undertaking to contemplate the full amount necessary to do the entire job, and we are making all the authorization at one time. In the course of the operation and administration of the U. N. R. R. A., the Council, as the governing body, will have the authority, as I interpret the language, to make such committals from time to time as in its judgment may be wise, expedient, and advisable. Having that authority, and having made a committal that would require us to make our part of the contribution to meet the over-all plan and objective, I think we would be under heavy moral obligation to make the appropriation, if we vested the council with the authority I have indicated.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should be the last to assert that we were entering upon this dreadfully important experiment in anything except good faith and a purpose to carry it out, and I should want nothing I have said to indicate any lack of good faith. On the other hand, there is just as much good faith required on the part of those to whom we are applying our limitations, and I want to read one question and one answer from the hearing bearing specifically upon the proposition which the able Senator has submitted.

Governor Lehman is testifying. He is the Director General. He is the man who has had all the contacts in the creation of the original instrumentality. I asked him this question:

> I assume that the implications of article V of the agreement—

Which is the one the able Senator from Texas just read—

> I assume that the implications of article V of the agreement are clearly understood by all the signatory powers to indicate that there is no commitment of this Government except as measured by subsequent appropriations of the Congress of the United States, and if they understand that they will avoid some of their misunderstandings.
>
> Governor LEHMAN. I think there is a full realization of that on the part of the governments.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I ask the Senator one other question in this connection? Either Senator may answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am seeking information and enlightenment in regard to the pending measure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest to the Senator that that is about as far as we in the Senate can go.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The point I wish to have made clear in my mind is this, Does the Council, the governing body, or the Director General, have authority to make committals beyond the appropriations already made? Can they make committals within the authorization, or must they make their committals from time to time within the appropriations made by the different governments?

Mr. CONNALLY. It depends on what the Senator means by "committal." Anyone can make a tentative decision that when and if we get the money we will do so and so, but it does not bind anyone. It does not bind this Government, it does not bind anybody.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the very point I am trying to determine. If we make this authorization to the full limit of the amount that is regarded as our equitable part of the contribution, as determined by the Council, if we are actually going to hold the purse strings, and hold control of them, then certainly the governing body of U. N. R. R. A. should not be vested with authority to make committals or incur obligations beyond the amount of the appropriations available.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think there is any question that that is not the case.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to ask one other question. I do not want to take too much time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is perfectly clear that, so far as it is legislatively possible, we have prevented what the Senator apprehends, by covering it in the agreement all the nations sign, and then putting it in the act itself. How we could go further, I do not know.

So far as committals are concerned, I may make a committal to give someone a deed to the White House, but that would not bind anyone; the President would not move out, and the Government would continue on its course. I have not authority to make such a committal, and I do not think the council to be set up would have authority to make a committal that would be binding. Of course, they might tell someone what they would like to do when and if they obtained the funds, but they will not secure funds, under the proposed action, except within the limitations of the authorization.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Just one other point, and I shall be through. According to my calculations—and the Senator has suggested it in general terms—our proportionate part of the entire obligation will be 67½ percent. In article 3, section 1, of the agreement, I find the statement "unless otherwise provided by the agreement or by action of the Council, the Council shall vote by simple majority."

What I am trying to determine is, if we have but one representative on the Council, Great Britain has one representative, and every other country has one representative, will they have equal voting authority, individually, in their representative capacity?

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume, under the clause cited by the Senator, that would be true.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is my interpretation of it. While we are providing 67½ percent of the money in this enter-

prise, other governments providing much less will have equal authority in the direction of the expenditure of the money after it is once appropriated.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume the Senator is correct about that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I make just one comment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should say that if this were a peacetime adventure, if the authority under the act were anything except exclusively war authority, the point raised by the able Senator from Arkansas would be completely fatal. I think it must always be borne in mind that this thing we are now doing is definitely, indispensably, a part of the war, and, so far as the conclusion of war obligations, the winning of the war, is concerned, we cannot apply percentages and we cannot talk about how many votes who's got where. It is a common enterprise, to which we have to make a common dedication of our resources and our purposes, and when we come to the question of permanent relationships under a peace—and I assert this again and again and again—there must be absolutely nothing in the action we take today which will be a precedent of any sort or character.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a brief statement?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say, both to the Senator from Texas, who has been kind in yielding to me, and also to the Senator from Michigan, that my purpose in making these interrogations is not with a view of being critical. I am endeavoring to satisfy myself that what is being done here and being authorized I can support within my conscience and under my duty to my constituents. I have observed some things in connection with expenditures of the Government which are not at all pleasing or gratifying to me, and I am trying to determine from those of my colleagues who have given the matter close study and are in a position to know what the facts are and what the consequences will be, so that I can satisfy myself in supporting the pending proposal.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that I think I voice the sentiments of most members of the committee when I say this is no "joy ride" to us. None of us are anxious to spend the money of the people of the United States, and if this were not, according to our view, really an essential part of the war we would not be for it at all. But in this war, of course, we are generous. Of course we are spending probably more than all the other nations combined. Of course we are generous with lend-lease. But I would rather send dollars abroad than to have to send more soldiers abroad. We are making contributions in our blood and in our sacrifices larger than those of any other nation. We are pouring out our treasure in larger measure than any other nation. The proposed enterprise, as I see it, is not only a military adjunct and necessity to follow up the armies after countries have been liberated, but it provides some assurance with respect to the post-war period. We do not want bolshevism in the countries affected; we do not want chaos; we do not want epidemics and pestilence sweeping through them.

Some may say, "Oh, well, it is simply a gratuity." Well, it is a gratuity. But the leadership of the United States, not only in the war but in the peace, is of the highest importance not alone to the rest of the world but to us. We do not want another war. If there is another war, or if any post-war arrangements are made, we want to feel that we are going to have influence among the nations of the earth, that our leadership will be respected.

Mr. President, it seems to be the fate of America in this tragic hour of the world's history, either to step out and be a leader to help mold the future of the world, or else to take a cold and selfish attitude I do not relish the idea of providing two-thirds of the amount of money necessary for the entire enterprise, but when we contemplate the possible reactions, even if some of this money is spent foolishly, which I hope will not be the case, we cannot afford to wreck a great enterprise through the timidity and the fear that we may improvidently spend some of this money.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut, and thank him for his indulgence and patience.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Texas. We are adopting a most interesting device in the accomplishment of objectives which I think all of us wish to see attained. It will be helpful for the record if the Senator will bear with me while I ask him a question or two. As I examine the joint resolution, commencing at the top of page 2 and running down through page 14 in line 23, there is embodied an agreement which was entered into by representatives of the United Nations and associated governments on November 9, 1943; is that not so?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. So that section 1, insofar as it is printed in lines 1 to 12 on page 1, and sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 actually cover the joint resolution which we are passing upon as a matter of legislation; is that not so?

Mr. CONNALLY. Except insofar as the reproduction in the joint resolution of the agreement has legal effect.

Mr. DANAHER. So that sections 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 as matters of legislation are open to possible amendment, but the agreement itself is not; is that not correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is correct in that statement.

Mr. DANAHER. If the Senator will now please turn to the top of page 15, and he will find that reference is made to resolution numbered 12, the reference being in line 8. Has the Senator placed that resolution numbered 12 into the record?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. It is available. I do not think it is in the record, but all the resolutions and the transactions of the conference held at Atlantic City are available, and I hold in my hand resolution numbered 12, which I shall be glad to exhibit to the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. In what document does it appear, will the Senator please tell me? It is not in the Senate hearings?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it is in an independent volume. Some of the resolutions were inserted.

Mr. DANAHER. It has been handed to me in a document entitled, "First Session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Selected Documents."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point resolution numbered 12 be inserted in full in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Resolution No. 12 is as follows:

Whereas the preamble of the agreement states that preparations and arrangements shall be made for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed industrial production and the restoration of essential services; it is therefore

Resolved, That, subject to the provisions of Resolutions Nos. 1 and 17 of this session, the Council approves the following statement as a guide to activities with respect to the rehabilitation of such industries, transport, and other services as are essential to relief:

1. Rehabilitation supplies are to consist of materials, such as raw materials, machinery, and spare parts needed to enable a recipient country to produce and transport relief supplies for its own and other liberated territories; and, within the scope of the administration, the rehabilitation of public utilities and services, so far as they can be repaired and restored to meet immediate, basic needs, such essentials as light and water, power, transportation, and communication. These needs include rehabilitation of essential relief industries, such as those which provide food, shelter, clothing, medical supplies.

2. Raw materials may be supplied by (a) the liberated country in which the industry is situated and in which the materials are to be used, (b) another liberated country, or (c) any other country. The task of the Administration in cases (a) and (b) should be the rehabilitation of the raw material producing industries such as coal mines, mineral mines, construction-materials industries, etc.

3. If the raw materials required must be imported from overseas, it should be the responsibility of the Administration, through the appropriate national or intergovernmental agencies, to arrange for necessary allocation and procurement of supplies, so that there may be created as promptly as possible, reserves to be available at the request of the Director General when and wherever the need arises.

4. It is recommended that pools be created of materials such as processing materials, machine tools, mobile power units, maintenance equipment, industrial machinery of both standard and special types, and spare parts.

5. It is recommended that in cases where home production exceeds home consumption, the government or recognized national authority concerned should take all steps necessary to enable the excess of production available in a country to be put at the disposal of other liberated areas which may need such supplies to cover their deficits.

6. It should be the policy of the Administration to help those countries whose industries can be rehabilitated for production of relief and rehabilitation goods urgently required in other liberated areas. It is recommended that in attainment of these objectives the following be considered: Special allocations of raw materials, machinery, and spare parts, by placing at the disposal of those countries, at the request of their governments, an experienced staff, and by providing special priorities for the return of skilled personnel awaiting repatriation.

7. It is recommended that the governments or recognized national authorities having administrative authority in a liberated area will keep the Director General and the appropriate regional committee fully informed as to any surplus of supplies from time to time available in such area, to meet, when circumstances permit, relief and rehabilitation import requirements of other liberated areas.

8. It is recommended that the Administration should, in consultation with the governments or recognized national authorities concerned and the appropriate international coordinating authority, assist liberated areas in restoring the transport and communications system to satisfactory working condition; it should also help to restore equipment, repair shops, workshops, shipyards, etc. It is recommended that a pool of transportation equipment both fixed and mobile should be created either from stocks manufactured overseas or in Allied or in neutral countries Equipment which has been the property of the enemy may also form part of the pool.

9. It should be the task of the Administration to participate in conjunction with military and other appropriate authorities in the organization and coordination of the transportation of relief and rehabilitation supplies during the relief and rehabilitation period.

10. It is recommended that the requirements for raw materials, machinery, spare parts, and processing materials should be established within each country and that a definite order of priority be established taking into consideration: (a) Technical factors, such as, on the one hand, the necessity of restoring the public services (gas, water, electricity), and, on the other, the needs of various types of consumer goods; (b) social factors, such as the necessity of providing reemployment; (c) temporary economic factors, such as scarcity of certain raw materials and shipping.

11. The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief. No new construction or reconstruction work is contemplated, but only rehabilitation as defined in the preamble of the agreement. Problems, such as unemployment, are important, but not determining factors. They are consequences and, at the same time, motives of action. The Administration cannot be called upon to help restore continuous employment in the world.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I should now like to ask the Senator from Texas further then, if we have not in effect, through the representatives of the United Nations, adopted the device of those who would associate themselves in articles of corporation, the corporation to partake of the character of an international corporation for the accomplishment of the purposes which the agreement itself states; is that not so?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would not necessarily imply it is a corporation. It is an association or a corporate body.

Mr. DANAHER. I say it is of the nature of a corporation, no doubt; and it does in this agreement state the purposes it seeks to attain.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. And in section 3 we undertake by legislation to affirm the purposes insofar as Resolution No. 12 states some of them?

Mr. CONNALLY. Section 3 reads:

In the adoption of this joint resolution the Congress expresses its approval of and reliance upon the policy adopted by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration at the first session of the Council, summarized in paragraph 11 of Resolution No. 12, and reading as follows—

Then the language is quoted.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator bear with me further?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Obviously paragraph 11 of Resolution No. 12 is stated to be summarized, and it is important, it seems to me, that we understand this thoroughly, for in the summary we discover that—

The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief. No new construction or reconstruction work is contemplated, but only rehabilitation as defined in the preamble of the agreement.

Now then, if we wish to know what rehabilitation is, I assume that we turn back to page 2, and read lines 7 to 16 as constituting a part of the preamble of the agreement; is that so?

Mr. CONNALLY. On page 2 or page 1?

Mr. DANAHER. On page 2.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Page 2 of the print.

Mr. DANAHER. Page 2 of the joint resolution as printed. Is that not so?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Now, if we read the definition of "rehabilitation" as it there appears, we find in lines 14 to 16, inclusive, that among the items of policy to be accomplished are those necessary—

For assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production.

Has there been any testimony offered by representatives of the State Department as to policy, the State Department's policy, on the subject of industrial production?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that insofar as the hearings went into those matters it was suggested in the case—if the Senator will permit me, before he goes to the matter of industrial production—in the case of agricultural rehabilitation that in many of the stricken areas the cheapest and the best way to afford relief would be to furnish the seed and the fertilizers whereby the local population could reembark upon agriculture and produce needed food.

Mr. DANAHER. A course with which I agree.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly. The language is, "urgently needed agricultural and industrial production." Throughout the whole hearings the understanding was made evident that industrial production was to be limited purely to temporary relief and not to the rehabilitation of a factory or an organization, or to the reconstruction of a destroyed one. It is a very difficult thing, I will say to the Senator, who is a lawyer of many years' experience and ability, for us to draw a line and say, "Relief stops right here; this other matter is rehabilitation." But it is the purpose of the committee and the purpose of the joint resolution only to permit that degree of rehabilitation which is necessary to make effective immediate relief.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, that definition of rehabilitation in respect to industrial production is subject, I assume, to possible amendment, in view of article VIII, clause c, on page 14. Please notice that clause a states that—

Amendments involving new obligations for member governments shall require the approval of the council by a two-thirds vote and shall take effect for each member government on acceptance by it.

The same limitation applies with reference to amendments of article III or article IV, as is stated in clause b. But when we come to clause c, we find that whoever drew the agreement has removed the limitation, so that proposed amendments, defined as "other amendments," need not require the approval of a member government. In other words, the Council itself may make such other amendments to the declaration of purposes and policy as the Council may agree upon. Therefore, it becomes important, I submit to the Senator from Texas, that we know for certain whether the evidence discloses any outline of the policy of the State Department with reference to industrial production in the affected countries. That is my question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that the representatives of the State Department agreed heartily with the objectives as we outlined them in the committee. Let me further say that this whole agreement would never have had any congressional action had it not been for the insistence of the Committee on Foreign Relations, last summer, beginning in July and continuing for 6 months. Through our insistence, the agreement was wholly rewritten and revamped, and the limitations and assurances which are now contained in the agreement were inserted in it by the committee. The State Department understands our conception of the matter.

Of course, the only iron-bound guaranty is with respect to our refusal to give them funds. I would not favor the appropriation at the moment of all this money, but I would only allow it from time to time, as the necessities may arise. If this enterprise should deviate in any material respect from the purposes for which we intend the money to be employed, I would say we should cut off the appropriation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me make plain that the course of inquiry I pursued with the Senator from Texas is not to be taken as an indication of any opposition to the objectives mentioned or as a suggestion for cutting off the appropriations later. Not a bit. But if we pass

the joint resolution, including clause C of article VIII, we shall be giving, through the joint resolution, approval of action by the council with reference to whatever objectives it shall seek to attain, whether now stated in the agreement or later incorporated in it by amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with the Senator as far as he goes. The statement in the measure itself is that we agree as to the policy and the general objective outlined. We do not swallow it all, entirely.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Connecticut has made reference to Resolution No. 12, of which paragraph 11 is stated in the text of the joint resolution. Resolution No. 12 gave me some concern, I recall, in the committee meeting, because it authorizes, in the paragraphs which precede No. 11, various works, such as the restoration of destroyed public utilities, the rebuilding of warehouses, the repairing of ships, and whatnot. I was fearful that it was going beyond the terms of relief and into the field of reconstruction. But Mr. Acheson very definitely stated, in answer to questions, that the things which could be done under Resolution No. 12 were limited to works directly connected with and making direct contribution to relief, and that they were not undertaking things which could be done or continued separate and apart from their relief contributions.

I think I am correct in that statement; am I not?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the fact that Resolution No. 12 is really tied to Resolution No. 1. The Senator from Maine will note on page 40 of the pamphlet entitled "First Session of the Council of the United Nations' Relief and Rehabilitation Administration," the statement:

> Whereas the preamble of the Agreement states that preparations and arrangements shall be made for assistance in the resumption of urgently needed industrial production and the restoration of essential services: It is therefore
>
> *Resolved*, That, subject to the provisions of Resolutions Nos. 1 and 17 of this session, the Council approves the following statement as a guide to activities with respect to the rehabilitation of such industries, transport and other services as are essential to relief—

Therefore, all the paragraphs numbered from 1 to 11, which appear in Resolution No. 12, are subject to Resolution No. 1, and cannot be interpreted as an enlargement of the declarations contained in Resolution No. 1.

I shared the same feeling which was expressed in the committee by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and at first felt that Resolution No. 12 was an extension, an enlargement, and a broadening of the interpretations and declarations contained in Resolution No. 1. But after further study, I think that the fact that it is made subject to the provisions of Resolution No. 1, cannot in any way be considered to be an extension or a broadening of the definitions and mat- Resolution No. 12 by Mr. Acheson,

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I take it that the Senator from Wisconsin will agree that that was the final construction placed on resolution No. 12 by Mr. Acheson, speaking for the State Department.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was. If the Senator from Texas will further yield——

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to say that I submit that the examination of both Mr. Acheson and Governor Lehman, conducted largely by the Senator from Michigan, with some feeble assistance on my part, will indicate that they definitely, and insofar as any two men could do so, stated emphatically that they had no intention of giving a broad interpretation to these resolutions, and that in making the decisions which must be made as to the relationship between temporary rehabilitation and relief they would give the strictest possible and the most limited possible interpretation to them.

I am sorry the hearings are not available; but I feel certain that the Senator from Michigan, when he takes the floor to discuss this matter, will point out very definitely the specific commitments which were made on behalf of the State Department and the executive branch of the Government by Assistant Secretary of State Acheson and by Governor Lehman, who is now the Administrator of U. N. R. R. A., having been selected at the Atlantic City conference.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to supplement the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin, by saying that I intend to do exactly what has been indicated. I intend to make a part of the RECORD today the seriatim quotations from the statements of the men who will be responsible for the operations of this organization.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me say to the Senator from Texas and to other Senators that I very greatly appreciate the assistance which this colloquy has afforded. So long as they are convinced that by this statement of policy there is not to be afforded an opportunity for enlargement through the amendment provisions of the agreement itself, it is reassuring.

Let me add that I am not by any means to be understood as opposing necessary industrial rehabilitation in countries in which U. N. R. R. A will operate; but my query in the first place stemmed from my desire to know whether or not the State Department had outlined what its policy with reference to industrial rehabilitation will be. I understand that the Senator from Michigan and other Senators will dwell upon that subject in due course.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am interested in the following provision of article VIII, with reference to amendments:

> Amendments involving new obligations for member governments shall require the approval of the Council by a two-thirds vote and shall take effect for each member government on acceptance by it.

My conclusion is that such an amendment might be made, imposing additional obligations on the United States, by agreement of the President of the United States, without further action by Congress. If so, this agreement could be indefinitely enlarged, to include additional obligations, financial or otherwise, without approval by Congress. I wonder whether the Senator feels that the language "shall take effect for each member government on acceptance by it" means acceptance by the Executive or acceptance by the Executive and Congress. In what way is acceptance to be indicated?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the whole spirit of this resolution is that the United States is not assuming any compulsory obligations whatever. Its obligations are contingent upon the appropriations which Congress may make. With respect to the Senator's question as to the amendment involving new obligations for member governments requiring the approval of the Council, and so forth, I do not think that under this resolution the President would have constitutional authority to make commitments to foreign governments which the Congress would have to respect.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite understand why. We are not asked to approve this agreement. In fact, we disown any obligation to approve it by putting it in the joint resolution without approving it. So it seems clear to me that it is an Executive agreement made by the President, and I should suppose that any amendment of it would be made by the President.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me ask the Senator a question. He has been asking us questions. Does the Senator conceive that the President of the United States could make an Executive agreement obligating the United States to pay certain sums of money, and force the Congress to make appropriations?

Mr. TAFT. No; but I think that if he does not make the reservation which is now made in this agreement, he will impose a moral obligation on Congress under those circumstances to appropriate that amount of money. In other words, if he has power to make an Executive agreement, then it is an agreement by the United States of America, which is binding on the United States. Congress can repudiate it and refuse to appropriate; but in order that that situation might not arise in this particular agreement, it is

now provided that insofar as its appropriate constitutional body shall authorize, it will contribute; but under the amendment section that protection may be entirely removed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think so.

Mr. TAFT. I do not see why not.

Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. DANAHER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I totally dissent from the construction which the able Senator from Ohio places upon what we are doing here in respect to this agreement. When the agreement was originally proposed last June it was intended to be exclusively an Executive agreement. It was at that point that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee intervened, as the result of the resolution which I submitted; and as a further result we had our subsequent conferences with the State Department and produced what we both understand is to be not merely an Executive agreement, but an agreement approved by Congress.

Mr. President, I believe that the agreement embodied in the joint resolution is subject to the same kind of reservations, if Congress desires to attach them, as would be the case if this were a treaty pending for our consideration. I think the Congress can attach any reservations it wishes to attach to this agreement, because the theory upon which the agreement now comes to Congress is that it has ceased to be an Executive agreement alone, which in our opinion would have been a gross violation of the proprieties as well as of the law. It has been submitted to Congress for congressional approval and not merely for congressional information. If the Senator from Ohio wishes any reservations to the agreement, so far as I am concerned he is just as free to offer reservations to this agreement as he would be to offer reservations to a treaty if we were considering it as a treaty.

As to the meaning of the language to which reference has been made, in view of that history of the situation, I submit that when the agreement says that amendments shall take effect for each member government only on acceptances by it, in the face of the clear record, and in the face of the equally clear understanding which exists between the State Department and at least the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "it" means the same legislative process by which the agreement is approved in the first instance. That is my interpretation of the word "it." If there is any doubt about it, I refer further to the letter which Assistant Secretary of State Sayre wrote to the able Senator from Rhode Island in response to a question which I submitted to him as to what is meant by the escape clause, and whether the President or the Congress could invoke the escape clause. The Assistant Secretary clearly says that the Congress, as well as the President, can invoke the escape clause. I do not believe that in the face of the record there can be any doubt on earth as to what "it" means in this instance.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am very much interested in the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, because I think he introduces a new suggestion in constitutional law, which I hope may be the fact. The Senator says that the agreement has ceased to be an Executive agreement. Obviously, however, it has not become a treaty, because a treaty would require a two-thirds vote of the Senate. So what is it? Apparently the Senator suggests that it is a new kind of thing, an Executive-congressional agreement, which may be entered into with foreign nations. I think it is a rather good suggestion, but it is a novel suggestion, one which I have never before heard made. I find here no express approval of this agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. There is an implied approval by appropriating the money to carry it out, but I doubt whether there is an express approval.

My suggestion was not that there be a reservation to the agreement——

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. Just a moment. I wish to finish this thought.

I thought an amendment of this sort might be added:

> No amendments involving new obligations for the United States shall be made to the agreement for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration without approval by joint resolution of Congress.

Such an amendment would make it perfectly clear that this is an agreement which depends upon the approval of Congress, and that any amendment of it depends upon the approval of Congress. I think the suggestion made by the Senator from Michigan, that this is no longer merely an Executive agreement, but a joint Executive-congressional agreement, would be strengthened by such an amendment. I will submit it later to the chairman of the committee, in the hope that it may be accepted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Ohio says that this is a novel process. I think he is mistaken in that statement. I think there has been a middle course between exclusively Executive agreements upon the one hand and treaties on the other. I think the Senator will find that we have entered into such agreements on several occasions. I have one or two in mind which I shall be very glad to look up. I do not wish to refer to them at this time without assurance; but I think the Senator will find that there are such things, and that this is standard practice.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. Let me first suggest that I understand that the Pan American Union—I cannot refer at the moment to its exact legislative history—was first established by what might be termed an Executive agreement, and subsequently Congress in effect adopted it by making annual appropriations for our share of its maintenance.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, this document involves something more. It involves the implication that there are certain things which the President cannot do by Executive agreement, but which he can do by executive agreement approved by Congress. I never have seen such a field defined, and I think it will be difficult to define it. It is very difficult to define the field in which the President may operate by Executive agreement as opposed to what he may do only by treaty. But if we are now to have a third field in which he may operate by Executive agreement approved by Congress, the whole matter will be quite confused. I think it is a good idea, but it ought to be defined. I think we should, so far as possible, indicate that is what we mean in this agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator from Ohio that I am, of course, interested in his suggestions. However, as he indicated sometime ago, the line between what is a treaty and what is an Executive agreement is not clear-cut and well defined. I have in mind, when and if we can get around to it, that the Foreign Relations Committee shall have some research work done in connection with the question in order to ascertain if we cannot in a general sort of way mark the boundaries of what are treaties and what are not treaties.

However, what I wish to suggest to the Senator from Ohio is that any government—the United States or any other government—possesses certain powers, and certain authority to act with foreign governments. The allocation of those powers, of course, depends upon our fundamental constitutional law. The law is that a treaty—whatever that may be—must be ratified by the Senate.

That, however, does not exhaust all governmental power. Under the distribution of these powers there might be some functions not necessarily subject to a treaty, and yet require the action of the Congress and the action of the Executive.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to point out that the Senators who earlier were finding that Congress would impliedly be approving this agreement, because we would authorize an appropriation for it, apparently have overlooked the very definite language in section 4 on page 15, which reads as follows:

> In expressing its approval of this joint resolution it is the recommendation of Congress that, insofar as funds and facilities permit—

And so forth. So it is perfectly clear that the Congress is being asked to express its approval of this joint resolution. I think there need be no mistake about that. There is no guess about it. It is expressly stated. Allow me to ask the Senator from Texas if that is not true.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not the exact text before me.

Mr. DANAHER. It will be found on page 15, beginning in line 19.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I believe that what the Senator from Connecticut has said is true.

Mr. CONNALLY. Section 4 of the joint resolution states, as quoted by the Senator from Connecticut—

In expressing its approval of this joint resolution—

That means, of course, the resolution——

Mr. DANAHER. Embodying the agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. When we vote for the resolution we express our approval of it. The language in section 4 reads:

In expressing its approval of this joint resolution it is the recommendation of Congress that, insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

I presume the Senator from Connecticut knows why that language was put into the joint resolution. It was inserted to take care of a certain area on the earth which technically, perhaps, has not been invaded by military forces and yet is quite important from a military standpoint, and in which there might be famine or need for relief. That was the House amendment known as the Mundt amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. It is the first line of section 4 which is important to the present discussion, because it makes it perfectly clear that we are being asked to express approval of the joint resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, if we pass the joint resolution we shall be expressing our approval of it.

Mr. DANAHER. There is nothing implied in it.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is the joint resolution which we shall vote on.

Mr. President, I thank the Senators who have contributed so intellectually and informatively to the debate. This matter is one to which not only the full Committee on Foreign Relations but the subcommittee as well, gave a great deal of time and study, during which it was confronted by these intricate questions involving Executive agreements, treaty-making powers, and limitations on all the Government agencies.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not know whether the Senator has mentioned the subject to which I shall refer, but it was impressed on me. I think it was the military witness who appeared before the committee who made the suggestion that there is an obligation under international law on the part of nations which participate in bringing about what he called an uncovering of civilians. There is an international obligation to look after them to a certain extent. Has the Senator mentioned that matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator from Texas has not mentioned it. I may say that what the Senator from Delaware has referred to was dealt with in the testimony of General Hilldring. Under international law, as well as the Geneva and other conventions, responsibility is placed upon the military authorities in any area which is taken possession of either by conquest or by driving out the enemy. There are certain obligations which rest upon the military with respect to the civilian population. I am not prepared to give all the details concerning the obligations. However, it is certainly very clear that the purpose is to protect the civilian population as much as possible in its possessions, its properties, in its activities, and in the normal functions of life. It is an obligation of the military to respect those matters. General Hilldring suggested that under those provisions the army, after taking possession, would exercise military control because of the obligations to which I have referred, but that when it moved on into a new area the U. N. R. R. A. organization would take over. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand the situation, a contribution for relief is not entirely a matter of charity, but is something which the United States, for example, is under obligation under international law.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

I will state further that as to administrative expenses, not only those governments which are named but those which will receive any benefit from the relief, are expected to contribute. In the case of Russia, which is not a member of the organization, her portion of the administrative expenses has already been estimated at a million and a half dollars, which she has agreed to supply.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator add at that point, because it is pertinent, that our share of the administrative expense is only 40 percent and not two-thirds?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; I am glad the Senator has called attention to that fact. In the matter of administrative expense the proportion of our outlay is very considerably smaller than the proportion with regard to operations. There are in the organization two funds, one, a fund available for operations, and the other, a fund available for administrative expenses.

In the case of administrative expenses all the governments have in fact agreed to make those contributions, whether or not under the technical terms of the agreement they themselves are eligible for relief or operation expenses.

Mr. President, I am anxious to conclude my remarks because the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and other Senators will discuss these matters rather fully.

I wish to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations in presenting this joint resolution to the Senate do so in the belief that it is a necessary portion of the far-flung war effort which the United States is making. We feel that it is also a part of the necessary plan looking forward to the post-war period. We cannot be indifferent to the woes of a great civilized world. Our own future is inextricably involved with the peace of all the other nations on the globe. We have seen that, however much we desire to live our own life and to abstain from being embroiled in the controversies and quarrels of other continents and other lands, the trend of events has gradually and inexorably brought us within the scope of world-wide wars, two of them, in less than a generation.

It is to the highest interest of the United States and its people that this present war against the savage and treacherous enemies that confront us shall be brought to a triumphant conclusion by a complete and crushing victory and that the countries that have been overrun and overpowered and devastated shall be preserved in some form, so that when the peacetime comes they can again embrace their activities, reestablish their governments, and join with us and other peace-loving nations in the establishment of peace machinery which shall prevent the bloody monsters who now seek to crush us, and to destroy freedom and liberty in the world from ever again plunging the nations into misery and horror and devastation and ruin. We offer this resolution as a part of the great obligation which we have assumed, an obligation not simply to ourselves, an obligation not conceived in cold and selfish ambition but in an ambition to serve not only ourselves but to serve a torn and stricken and war-broken world in an endeavor to lead it back to ways of peace and to establish assurances that its peace and safety shall not again be ruthlessly overrun and destroyed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is a very important matter; in my view it is a matter of major importance, not only because of the obligations we assume under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation agreement, but also because of the implications involved in the event that the action we take should hereafter ever be brought up as a precedent for our obligations in the post-war world.

The pending joint resolution is the first of what inevitably will be numerous other acts dealing with international relationships between America and the other members of the United Nations. Therefore, enlarging upon the debate as it has already progressed and emphasizing the things the able Senator from Texas has already said, I think it is vitally important that the RECORD should clearly show precisely what is being undertaken and, of even greater import, what is precisely not being undertaken.

We have already had too many glittering generalities in respect to this war's prospectus. They have too often invited transcendent hopes which may end in disappointment if not in bitter disillusionment. A better and happier world can only be builded upon the basis of candor and realism between the United Nations, particularly in such a matter as now impends for Senate action. Since we must be the chief almoners in this vast international relief responsibility, America must take vigilant care that we leave no groundless implications, that we

invite no unrequited aspirations which will later "Keep the word of promise to the ear, but break it to the hope."

We owe it to our own people as well as to our Allied partners to make wholly clear the limitations which surround this pending congressional action. They do not reflect, Mr. President, limitations upon our national good will, nor upon our American anxiety to do our wholehearted part in every phase of this war and in its triumphant aftermath of ordered peace and organized security and justice; but they do reflect the unavoidable cold, hard fact that there are limitations upon the resources which we can commit to these objectives; that there are limitations upon the obligations which America can and shall assume in the post-war world.

Because I have been a member of the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee that has had this pending agreement under constant scrutiny, in cooperation with the State Department, for the last 8 months, I feel a particular responsibility to make the record completely clear in respect to my interpretation of what I believe we have done and what we now propose to do. Therefore, I shall discuss the limitations in some detail in a moment.

First, I want to speak affirmatively in behalf of the pending joint resolution itself. I believe it offers us the wisest possible course which we can take in respect to international relief in the liberated areas in the wake of this war. Let it be plainly understood that the pending resolution creating and implementing the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation agreement deals with a situation which is inextricably a part of the war itself. This is not the dreamy launching of a philanthropic spree; this is not boondoggling on a global scale; this is not even a Vice Presidential milk route. That is where the limitations come in. This is not the lengthened shadow of some slap-happy aspiration to support the earth at our expense. This is the inevitable and unavoidable obligation to follow up our victorious armed forces and, in common effort with our allies, to bring indispensable subsistence to the liberated areas behind our lines. That is all it is. Entirely aside from the humane aspects of the case, this is the creation of ways and means to relieve the Army from this responsibility, and release it to its fighting fronts. It is just a part of the war.

The Army necessarily assumes the first and immediate responsibility in this regard, just as it has done, for example, in north Africa, Sicily, and southern Italy. Speaking generally, the Army acts in this capacity for about 6 months. U. N. R. R. A. as the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is colloquially known—will move in as the Army moves on.

In no other way can there be safety behind our lines. In no other way can we take care of the elementary human needs of the victims of Axis tyranny as they pass to our control. In no other way can we provide the preliminary proofs of the greater values in our way of life. It is a great adventure in friendliness and helpful aid. It is a preview of better days to come. But, I repeat, it is primarily a task indispensable to and tied in with the successful conduct of the war itself, and it must be so considered.

As a matter of dollars and cents, under U. N. R. R. A. we share this expense with all our uninvaded allies. It is also true at the moment that we bear the major load of the expense—in the proportion of about 65 percent—the allocations being roughly made on the basis of relative 1943 national incomes, but I am inclined to believe that the cost to us is less than it would be without U. N. R. R. A. because, otherwise, an even greater proportion of the load would probably stare us in the face, and there could be no such patterned and coordinated and, therefore, economical action.

So I repeat, Mr. President, I believe that there is no escaping the functions of U. N. R. R. A. as one more incident of war; and I believe that U. N. R. R. A. may well prove to be the most expeditious and the most economical way for America to join in implementing this vital function.

The method of organization and action is self-explanatory in the U. N. R. R. A. agreement and in the supporting documents. It is needless for me to take the time of the Senate in any repetitions upon this score. I hope the limitations are equally clear. I return now to that subject. I put my major emphasis upon it because I think it is so desperately important that there should be no misunderstanding about the scope and purport of this adventure.

An understanding of these limitations is necessary here at home, Mr. President, so that those well-meaning planners who have ambitious schemes in contemplation with respect to the post-war world will not look upon this particular vehicle as an omnibus upon which they can take a ride. It is not that kind of a vehicle, and I think it is very necessary that that be understood. This is a pattern exclusively for relief and not for reform. This limitation is written in the bond. The power to enforce the limitation is also written in the bond. In my judgment, U. N. R. R. A. will be held to strict accountability by Congress in respect to this limitation. I repeat that, first of all, an undestanding of this limitation to which I shall further advert in a moment, is necessary here at home.

Then, too, Mr. President, it is very, very necessary abroad. For the sake of the mutual understandings and good faiths which must be at the base of our post-war relationships with our comrades in arms, if we shall succeed in our hopes and prayers for post-war solidarity in the maintenance of security and justice and peace, we and our allies must be frank with each other. We must say what we mean and mean what we say. By every human means we must strive to avoid even the semblance of broken pledges. International disillusionment is not the road to amity; and there is no telling how far, in its subsequent fatality, the effect of disillusionment may go.

The highly accurate Henry J. Taylor, in his great book Men in Motion—by the way, one of the very great books which has come out of the literature of this war—has this to say:

> The danger to the peace settlements is in the quality of wartime promises. Nations, especially small nations, do not forget promises made to them during wars. They make memorandums. They have the memorandums in their pockets at the first sign of peace.

Mr. President, I feel so keenly about this particular point and the utter necessity that the pending agreement, particularly, shall not be misunderstood in its implications abroad, that I linger upon Mr. Taylor's theme, because in the final analysis it is of such dreadful impact upon what is subsequently to happen. I wish to quote very briefly from him at page 218:

> The tragic failure of the League of Nations did not center in the League as a conciliatory body. It centered in the peace settlements which the League was obligated to enforce. No body, sitting in relation to those settlements and bound to them, could have succeeded. And the settlements originated in wartime promises.
>
> This will be true again.
>
> The danger is already rampant, and an honest recognition of such danger and a mending of our ways are the most productive things that Americans could do at this time toward a better peace in the future.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The problems abroad are astronomical. They are far more confusing than the conditions symbolized by Hitler, Stalin, or the British Empire. They are the sum total of these conditions, and much more. Unless we adjust our actions and moderate our voice to fit the facts, and unless our leaders have modesty enough to admit they may not be reelected and, further, to display to foreign friends that there are limits to both American resources and world wisdom, we shall only meddle. We shall not serve. For a policy of exaggerated internationalism is as dangerous, foolhardy, and destructive as narrow isolationism.

I read one other paragraph, Mr. President. I commend this book most earnestly to anyone who wants a first-hand view of a thoroughly authentic American student's investigation of European conditions on the ground. I read:

> I come fresh from the impact of American words—

"The impact of American words." That is what I am talking about—promises, pledges, just what I want to be sure is not read into the pending U. N. R. R. A. agreement.

> I come fresh from the impact of American words on European and Middle Eastern minds. Therefore I am perplexed by what our leaders are saying. They talk as though the people over there were Americans and lived in America. They are not Americans, and they do not live in America.
>
> In our deep anxiety to be helpful to the world, and to ourselves, we are making promises now and assuming superior attitudes which America and the world will deeply regret.

Mr. President, I want to be sure, at least so far as I am concerned, that in the subsequent development of U. N. R. R. A. there shall be nothing to regret as the result of words which are misunderstood abroad. That is why I repeat and reiterate the importance of

the limitations upon the thing which we are here doing.

The words I have quoted, Mr. President, do not come as the voice of narrow provincialism. This is the warning of the last American permitted in and out of Germany before Hitler declared war on us. This is the opinion of an intimately informed American who is dreadfully anxious that a post-war world of sound international order, justice, and security shall be the full fruit of this cataclysm.

I have lingered on his words, Mr. President, because of their very great importance with respect to every phase of our international contacts, and more particularly because U. N. R. R. A. could so easily be misunderstood in its implications. Therefore it is the course of candor, and hence of wisdom, that the limitations shall be fully understood.

Now I want to talk about these limitations, and I want to make perfectly sure that no one can misunderstand this record when it is read in respect to limitations.

The first limitation, Mr. President, arises as the result of the form in which this legislation comes to the Senate. I remind the Senate that the U. N. R. R. A. agreement originally appeared on June 10, 1943, in the form of a release from the State Department, in which it was announced that the entire enterprise was to be launched exclusively by Executive agreement. I remind the Senate that in the original plan of June 10, 1943, there was never a purpose to consult either the Senate in respect to treaty obligations or the Congress in respect to appropriation responsibility.

When the agreement became public, when that intention became apparent, I submitted a resolution in the Senate calling upon the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to inquire into the pending agreement and to determine whether it did not amount to the dignity of a treaty and require treatment as a treaty. The resolution went to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the committee promptly contacted the State Department. I am very happy to say that the State Department not only immediately conceded that there should be total congressional consultation, but from that point on the State Department worked in closest and most sympathetic cooperation with the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in rewriting the entire agreement.

I cannot too heartily commend the attitude of the State Department in this aspect. We were given total access to all essential information. We were given sympathetic consideration for the congressional viewpoint, and the net result is that we have an instrument here submitted to the Senate which I can stand and defend and recommend to my colleagues, whereas if the original program of June 10 had been pursued, the dignity of the Senate, the integrity of constitutional process, and the rights of the United States would have recommended total disagreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, would it discommode the Senator if I were to ask him a question?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee never discommodes me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I find on page 2 of the joint resolution, in lines 21, 22, and 23 the following:

The Administration—

Meaning the U. N. R. R. A.—

shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property—

I do not know how broad that provision is, but that is not what I have in mind at the moment. The next words are—

to enter into contracts and undertake obligations.

Apparently that is an unlimited power granted to this organization by Congress. If it had been limited to the appropriations made or even to the appropriations authorized, that might not work a hardship, but it seems to me there ought to be a limitation, so when the Senator was discussing limitations I thought I would ask him what that language meant.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I shall come specifically to that a little later.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator was not in the Chamber all the time I was speaking. I was trying to outline at the moment the basic limitations with which we have undertaken to surround this entire adventure, and I should like to conclude that framework before attempting to go into detail. I say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have been asserting to the Senate that the limitations involved in the pending joint resolution, from my point of view, are far more important than the grants contained in the pending legislation, because it is so dreadfully vital that no one in this world, either our do-gooders here at home or our friends abroad, should ever mistake this particular formula as a precedent for anything that we are ever going to undertake in the post-war world.

I repeat, the limitation must be understood, and that is what I am trying to outline at the moment.

The first limitation, then, is the limitation which we built around this action through the change in its procedural character. In the form in which it was originally proposed it was sought to impose this obligation upon America exclusively by Executive agreement. In the form in which it was originally proposed the obligations of the United States were so illimitable that I do not believe a successful argument could be made against the proposition that the original agreement was a treaty in every aspect.

As a result of this interim of cooperative, sympathetic activity between the State Department and the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, the entire agreement was rewritten in its fundamental character. It was stripped of every general obligation and responsibility. It was brought back to a simple authorization of appropriations for an international purpose, and it was written in a form which textually undertakes to limit our obligation without any question whatsoever to the specific appropriations that are made under the authorization from time to time by the Congress. I repeat, we entirely changed the character of the document, and obviously I think it ceased to be a treaty. That was the first limitation.

In rewriting the agreement we rewrote the preamble. We deleted from the preamble all the words which might have been construed in their generality into a blanket commitment to the welfare of mankind throughout the universe. The preamble therefore in its present impact is to be interpreted in respect to not only what is in it, but what is not in it, and I think the things we deleted are particularly significant.

That is not all we did. As I have said, we tied down literally the nature and extent of our obligation to the appropriations subsequently made.

That is not all. There was no escape clause in the original agreement. We inserted an escape clause, and it is in the pending agreement.

Not only that; the language in those sections of the agreement which deal particularly with appropriations were rewritten to improve, if possible, any last, lingering doubt regarding the appropriate interpretation; and although this language has already been read into the RECORD several times, the language cannot be read too often, Mr. President, because it is the crux of the pledge we are making and it is also the crux of the pledge we are not making. I read from article V on page 12:

Insofar as its appropriate constitutional bodies shall authorize, each member government will contribute—

And so forth—

The amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies.

No one can misunderstand what that means in the United States. The only appropriate constitutional body under our system of government which can appropriate one nickel is the Congress of the United States. No one can now or hereafter misread the purpose of article V, which is to say that there is no obligation upon the United States under this agreement unless and until and except as the appropriations committees of the House and the Senate shall make the necessary recommendations and the House and the Senate themselves shall subsequently approve. And that language is repeated in article VI, in respect to the provision for administrative expenses of the instrumentality. Just for the cumulative effect of it, I wish the RECORD again to show the language in article VI, from which I quote:

Upon approval of a budget by the Council the total amount approved shall be allocated to the member governments in proportions to be determined by the Council. Each member government undertakes—

Undertakes what?—

subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the Administration promptly its share of the administrative expenses so determined.

There can be no question, here or abroad, as to what the phrase "requirements of its constitutional procedure" means in the United States of America.

Mr. McKELLAR rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike to interrupt the Senator, because he is making a most excellent presentation of the matter; but I am wondering if the money could not be borrowed from the R. F. C. since under our laws and Constitution that body has been authorized to lend money for a great many purposes, probably including this one. I am merely wondering whether this language is sufficient to confine it to appropriations made by the Congress.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator is asking me to guarantee to him that this administration cannot find ways to get money and to spend it, regardless of Congress, I cannot give him the assurance, because the administration has been doing it for 10 years, and I suppose it will continue doing it so long as it is in power. But insofar as lies within our poor congressional authority, I submit to the Senator that we have already put down the limits, beyond peradventure, where they cannot be transgressed except in bad faith. The Senator has a right to interrogate us on this subject, because he carries the chief responsibility of the great Senate Appropriations Committee.

I now shall read to him the language of the men in this Government upon whom we have to depend to implement these limitations. First, I quote from the testimony of Dean Acheson. I should say by way of further explanation that Dean Acheson is the official representative of the Government of the United States on the U. N. R. R. A. Council. He speaks for the United States in that aspect. In the course of Dean Acheson's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, answering a question of mine, he said:

Now, that is the agreement, and as I say, that agreement was worked out after thorough discussion with the subcommittee of this committee, which led it to be believe that all commitments on the part of this country are in the hands of Congress, that no one had undertaken to commit the United States to any act, and that therefore the issue as to whether this was a treaty had been removed from discussion.

Is that enough? I read further:

Senator VANDENBERG. Mr. Acheson, at that point I would like to have the record show the language in article V, because I think it is very important. The only actual obligation which we accept in a financial sense is set out in article V, is it not?

Mr. ACHESON. Article V and article VI, which has to do with the administrative expenses; yes, sir.

Senator VANDENBERG. And, in each instance, quoting from the text—

"The amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies."

I am still asking this question of Dean Acheson:

In other words, we are accepting no fiscal obligation under this agreemnt except as the obligation is specifically accepted by acts of appropriation by the Congress; is that correct?

We certainly could not put it any plainer than that.

Mr. ACHESON. That is correct, Senator VANDENBERG.

I turn to another point in the record. Now we are come to the question of administrative expense, which might be a very fertile field, as we know by experience, for some experimental nonsense. Again I was interrogating Dean Acheson, the very able Assistant Secretary of State:

Senator VANDENBERG. If Congress became critical at any time of the administrative setup and thought it was extravagant or improvident, I assume that under the terms of article VI, since each member government undertakes to make its contribution only "subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure," the administrative problem would also be entirely within congressional control insofar as our share of sustaining it is concerned.

We could not put that down in plainer language.

Here is the reply:

Mr. ACHESON. That is correct. Congress would have complete power at any time to stop its contributions or to lay down the conditions as to their uses.

Senator VANDENBERG. I constantly emphasize that point, Mr. Chairman, because it was one upon which our subcommittee put major emphasis in indicating the change in the character of the document.

The CHAIRMAN. I think the committee is pretty well advised as to the policy that underlay the action of the subcommittee, and that was to make it clear that at all times it was under the control of the Congress so far as funds were concerned. Is that right?

Mr. ACHESON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Am I correct in stating that Assistant Secretary of State Acheson testified that, in addition to our being able to control appropriations, we would also have the power to impose conditions and limitations upon their expenditure?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall read the language again to the Senator. The words speak for themselves. I do not have the printed hearings, so I cannot give the printed page reference; but the language appears on page 30 in the first volume of the stenographic report:

Mr. ACHESON. That is correct.

Referring to his agreement with me that Congress had total and plenary control over the funds of U. N. R. R. A.

Continuing the quotation:

Congress would have complete power at any time to stop its contributions or to lay down the conditions as to their uses.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. That is perhaps as important a piece of testimony as has been contributed in this entire debate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Does the Senator understand that we at this time, as we now act on this joint resolution, have the power to amend the agreement itself, without further action by the other signatories to the agreement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, no. I think the Congress has precisely the same latitude in connection with the U. N. R. R. A. agreement contained in the joint resolution that the Senate would have in respect to a treaty if the matter had been submitted in treaty form. We have a perfect right to attach any reservation we may wish. That would be a totally different thing, of course, from amending the text of the agreement itself.

Mr. DANAHER. But any such reservations, or any counterproposal, or any amendment to the agreement itself as set forth in the joint resolution, would nonetheless require confirmatory action by the other signatories?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not clear that I caught the Senator's full question. We require no consent from any other government on earth to exercise our total internal veto power under this legislation upon the granting of appropriations to implement the agreement.

Mr. DANAHER. Up to that point I think I am in complete accord with the Senator; but if we have the power ultimately—say in December 1945—to place such terms and conditions upon the expenditure of an appropriation intended for U. N. R. R. A. as would vary the terms of the agreement which we now undertake to approve, it seems to me that there is a reservation at the outset which would tend to negate the purported agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I disagree with the Senator, for this reason: There is absolutely nothing in the pending agreement which negates—to use his word, which is a good one—the power of Congress to control its own appropriations. Therefore if any subsequent Congress were to attach limitations to an appropriation, it would not be negating the agreement itself.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall be glad to yield when I have finished my reply to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I invite the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that article X provides that—

Any member government may give notice of withdrawal from the Administration at any time after the expiration of 6 months from the entry into force of the agreement for that government.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. It also provides that the notice shall take effect 12 months after the date of the communication of the intention to withdraw.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's understanding that if we had, in fact, undertaken some commitments through the council of U. N. R. R. A., and under the terms of the agreement had provided our contribution for the execution of that commitment, we could somehow or other, earlier than the date of complete liquidation of that commitment, terminate our participation simply by placing a rider on an appropriation bill?

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is my opinion—and I repeat it for the hundredth time; I do not object to repeating it, because I think it is so important—that under this agreement no fiscal obligation is involved in respect to the United States except as it is identified and validated by subsequent definite and specific acts of appropriation by the Congress itself.

If that answer be read as suggesting any lack of good faith in our commitment to U. N. R. R. A. itself, it is just too bad. I assume that we are signing this agreement in good faith; that we will proceed in good faith; that we will not resort to any fictitious, improper, or inappropriate excuses or reasons for limiting our cooperation; and that we will proceed in the same spirit of international fraternity in respect to this war effort—because it is part of the war effort—that we do in all other aspects. But, as a matter of legislative obligation, I come back to the fact that we have written into this agreement precisely what Dean Acheson says we have written into it, namely, a situation in which Congress has "complete power at any time to stop its contributions or to lay down the conditions as to their uses."

That is not my language. That is the language of the Assistant Secretary of State who helped to draft the agreement. That is the language of the Assistant Secretary of State who sits on U. N. R. R. A.'s Council representing the United States of America. I submit that it is conclusive.

Mr. DANAHER. I very greatly appreciate the views of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. If the other forty-odd members of the Council should place a different interpretation upon some decision than our own representative or our Congress places upon it——

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would be just too bad. That is the reason I am making this speech today in such extension, because I want, if humanly possible, at the threshold of this great adventure, to have everyone related to it know exactly what the facts are, so that no one can possibly be misled.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate that very much; and the Senator has stated his views most clearly. However, as I understand the Senator's explanation, we are in this position: While we have the legalistic right to do thus and so, as the Senator has so clearly pointed out, is there not a moral obligation to go along with the agreement and fulfill all its terms, regardless of what Congress may decide to do in the future?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not think so; and when I have concluded my schedule of limitations, I think the Senator will agree with me that the situation is fairly clear. I have only started to outline the limitations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Article IV, subparagraph 5 of the agreement, set forth on page 11 of the joint resolution, provides as follows:

> The Director General shall make periodic reports to the central committee and to the Council covering the progress of the Administration's activities. The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the central committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential.

Is the Congress of the United States to have no report made to it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, yes. The joint resolution itself requires the President to report quarterly to Congress respecting the entire enterprise.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am going to discommode the Senator to the extent of returning to page 2. I know it is out of place; but a while ago he stated that we had a right to put reservations on this agreement, which statement attracted my attention very much, because there ought to be a reservation to the language in lines 21, 22, and 23 on page 2. This language, in article I, reads as follows:

> The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations—

And so forth. If we give the Administration such broad power, in my judgment we shall not be limited to an obligation of $1,350,000,000. Whatever contracts or agreements the Administration might make, we should be obliged to execute. If the Administration should incur obligations for $5,000,000,000, in honor we should be obliged to fulfill such obligations, under the terms of this agreement. I am wondering if the placing of a reservation in the joint resolution limiting the right to make contracts and to undertake obligations to the amount of $1,350,000,000 would not be a very excellent restraint or safeguard.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will answer the Senator. So far as I am concerned, I would attach no reservations to the agreement. My reasons are as follows: In the first place, it cannot too often be said that the operations of U. N. R. R. A. are just as much a part of the war as the operations of the War Department itself. U. N. R. R. A. is to step in as the Army moves on, and except as U. N. R. R. A. should be available to step in, the Army could not move on, and the entire military strategy would be disrupted.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot agree with the Senator that far.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In what particular does the Senator disagree with what I have said?

Mr. McKELLAR. For example, we are now in the act of taking over Italy. I think we will do so. However, I think it is immensely more important at this stage of the game, or at any stage of the game, for us to take over Italy than it is to govern it after we have taken it over.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the first place, what the Senator says, of course, is literally true. The first step is to win. His subsequent observation suggests that he might have the idea that this instrumentality has something to do with the government of Italy. It has nothing whatever to do with any governmental function whatsoever.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is to feed the people of the occupied territories.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is something else. The Senator referred to government, and this has nothing to do with the governments of the liberated areas. It has to do solely with the function which the Army itself exercises up to the point where the Army itself asks to be relieved. When the Army itself asks to be relieved it must have somebody to whom to address the appeal, and there must be somebody available. That is U. N. R. R. A., and that is all U. N. R. R. A. is. It cannot be dissociated from the specific activity of the war itself in the war area.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can see the importance of it, but of greater importance is first winning control of the area. However, in this respect I invite the attention of the Senator to section 4, on page 15, in line 19. I wish to read it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Wait a moment, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him. Up to this point I have been discussing solely the appropriating power. We are now coming to the subject of relief and rehabilitation, and I suggest that the Senator allow me to deal with the subject and see if I do not cover his point.

Mr. McKELLAR. The section to which I refer applies to the very question we have been discussing, namely, that of unlimited power.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What unlimited power?

Mr. McKELLAR. The unlimited power to make contracts.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is no unlimited power to make contracts. All the power contained in the joint resolution is related to the remainder of the language of the agreement. That is not an unlimited power.

Mr. McKELLAR. The agreement itself states, "To enter into contracts and undertake obligations," without limitation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator does not mean that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I will read it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator would not say that the language in the limitations of the joint resolution itself

does not restrict the functions to which the instrumentality may address itself.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have a very grave doubt about it. I think it is an unlimited power. However, allow me to invite attention to section 4, which reads as follows:

> In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations, which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The territory which is more important to the military operations of the United Nations than any other territory in the world is that of Germany. Under section 4 the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration would have a perfect right to go to the relief of the Germans, or the Austrians, or the people of any nation controlled by Germany, if famine should overtake them at any time during the war.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And if it could reach Mars it would involve the Martians.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would do almost that, because the language is "any area important to the military operations of the United Nations." I think that language goes entirely too far, and that it should be stricken out.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Allow me to say to the Senator, in respect to the particular language to which he just referred, that I have no responsibility whatever for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. However, it is in the joint resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am telling the Senator where it came from and what it is about.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to know about it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language was inserted on the floor of the House of Representatives. It has just one purpose, so far as I know, and that is to include India within the area which, if necessary, can receive consideration from the instrumentality to be set up. However, it can do that only upon the request of the military authorities who consider the relief to be essential to the military effort.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps so. However, if putting India into the pot requires us to put in Germany, Austria, and all the others, the language should be changed.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the statement of the Senator is perfectly fantastic.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is our purpose to include India, we should include India, and not provide for our enemy countries. They are the most important areas in the world so far as the winning of the war is concerned, and they should be excluded from receiving benefits under the proposed legislation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator from Tennessee will not misunderstand me if I say that his latest observations are totally fantastic.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am merely interpreting the language contained in the joint resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The idea that any instrumentality of war, such as the one under consideration, will be used by any responsible American administrator to lend aid and comfort of any nature to any of the enemies of the United Nations, I repeat, is fantastic beyond words.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The question which I should like to have cleared up in my mind is this: I understand from the Senator from Michigan that U. N. R. R. A. is actually a part of the war effort. After a government has been reestablished in a country which is presently occupied, does U. N. R. R. A. then step out, or does it continue to work in that area in cooperation with the government which has been established and which is in control of the country?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not believe there is any testimony bearing on the direct question which the Senator has asked. My assumption is that U. N. R. R. A. would continue to cooperate with the local authorities, whatever they may be, so long as the primary relief requirement continued, and so long as the instrumentality itself was in existence. Of course, the Senator will understand that we have definitely limited our participation in U. N. R. R. A. to June 30, 1946.

Mr. AIKEN. But it would not be continued into the rehabilitation program of the area.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Oh, I am coming to that, because I agree with the Senator that it is extremely important that there shall be no misunderstanding on that point, and I shall reach it as soon as I am allowed to. I think I perhaps could save a little time if I were permitted to conclude my statement of the record which I am trying to make, because I might anticipate many questions which Senators desire to ask, and yet I do not wish to foreclose any questions.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to beg the Senator's pardon. I know I have imposed on him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not want the Senator from Tennessee ever to apologize to me for anything. The country is indebted sufficiently to him so that he may annoy me the rest of his life, and still be on the credit side of the ledger.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is very kind of the Senator to yield. I have to leave the Chamber, but there is one point about which I should like to obtain information, and I ask the Senator to refer to article III of the agreement. According to my understanding earlier in the discussion today it was stated that the Soviet Union is not a party to this agreement; that it is not one of the signatories to the agreement. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator was out of the Chamber at the time, but it was pointed out that there is a clause in the agreement that invites the governments that are not contributors to the operating expenses to contribute to administrative expenses, and Russia has expressed her agreement to the assessment of a million and a half dollars to help defray administrative expenses.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Does Russia put up any money to run the organization?

Mr. CONNALLY. Russia puts up a million and a half dollars for administrative expenses.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Does Russia put up any money for the relief of those who are in need in the stricken countries?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. REYNOLDS. How much does the head of the organization, Governor Lehman, get a year?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am still yielding to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Excuse me. I did not know the Senator was still yielding to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But I will say to the Senator from North Carolina that I have not the slightest idea what Governor Lehman gets, and I care less.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand Russia, the Soviet Government, is not a member of the U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should be able to answer the question authoritatively, but I cannot do so. My own impression is that Russia is a member, but I have not the papers with me.

Mr. McCLELLAN. This morning when I was interrogating either the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from Texas I was advised, as I recall, that Russia is not one of the signers of the agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to reserve an answer to the question, I will find the answer.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will follow it through because I want to get the information. Assuming that Russia is not a member of the U. N. R. R. A., then I want to ask whether U. N. R. R. A. funds, a part of which, indeed the major part of which, we are obligating ourselves to provide, may be used by the Council or the governing agency, or authority of the U. N. R. R. A. for relief in that part of Russia which has been devastated by war?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am not an authority on this subject, but my own answer would be that the funds could not be so used, because the purpose is to use the funds exclusively in liberated areas from which the military authorities of the United Nations have moved on and have invited U. N. R. R. A. to move in. I do not see how that could happen in Russia, though perhaps it could.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course, the area of Russia that has been invaded and occupied by Germany is like the area of any other country that has been invaded and occupied. I find nothing in the agreement or in the joint resolution that

would not permit the use of the relief money in Russia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator is entitled to a conclusive answer to his question. I cannot give it. I do not know what the answer is, but I will say to him that if, under the rigid necessity which must exist before relief is extended under U. N. R. R. A., if the Russian Soviets in any portion of their domain could qualify for relief, in spite of my well-known feeling about communism for the past 40 years, I should hope Russia would get the relief, because of all the countries on this globe for which I have complete reverential respect as regards the sacrifices they are willing to make in their own national defense, my hat is off to Russia.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will permit a further observation, I can agree with him with respect to the heroic and sacrificial efforts Russia has made in her own defense, but in the matter of making these appropriations and spending our money the point I am making is that if Russia is not a signatory to this agreement and is not a part of the U. N. R. R. A., then I do not think Russia ought to have membership either on the Council or on the central committee and be able to tell us how we shall spend our money.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator will find that Russia is a member. I do not see how she could be a member of the Council without being a member of the U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the very reason I asked the question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has found the reference I was looking for. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a member. It is not a contributing member in respect to the relief fund, because, under the rule, only uninvaded countries are required to make contributions, but it is a contributor to the administrative expense.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Russia contributes only to to the administrative expense, but could be a beneficiary of relief under this agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And could ultimately become a contributor to the general fund.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a moment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. May I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that, with all the care the committee has expended on this resolution which the Senator from Michigan is now explaining, it is possible for anybody to chart in detail every contingency and every conceivable situation which may arise. We must, after all, trust to the good sense, the patriotism, and the wisdom of those who are to administer it, having in mind the over-all checks which the Congress is going to exercise over them. If they do not do what is required of them, Congress will refuse to appropriate any more money for their activities. I say it is inevitable that we cannot look out and see every little angle and every side issue and every little fellow who is hungry and every little fellow who is cold, and where he is, to what country he belongs, what his religion is, and what governmental theories he upholds. We cannot do those things. We have got to trust to the good sense and wisdom of the administrators.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for one further observation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, of course, I agree with the observations of the Senator from Texas. I think, if Members of the Senate had sat with the subcommittee during the hot summer and the early fall when they were busy taking the "bugs" out of this agreement, they would consider that a substantially effective job had been done upon the original document. I have no doubt that the completed document can be attacked in some particulars in respect to its structure and its net result, but I do not know of anything in connection with this war effort which is quizproof, and I submit to the Senate, in view of the over-all limitations which we have succeeded in putting into this measure—and the over-all limitations are far more important than any specific detail of text that could possibly be involved in any part of this agreement—in view of the over-all limitations that we have written into this agreement, unless there is total lack of faith in American administrators, our share in this engagement will proceed on a basis which will be wholly in keeping with the best welfare of the United States of America and the United Nations' war effort.

I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I want to make an observation. It is not my purpose to appear to pick flaws in the agreement, but I do not regard it as a small or indifferent matter. If we are to spend 67½ percent of the money, and have a country such as Russia help administer it, yet make no contribution to the general purpose itself, I do not think that is a small matter, or one of such insignificance that we should be entirely indifferent to it. Now is the time to determine what course we are charting, and try to understand it. That is my only purpose in asking these questions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I welcome the opportunity to discuss the matter with the able Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. There was one answer which the Senator from Michigan made to a question propounded by the Senator from Vermont which it seems to me the Senator from Michigan will not wish to have stand. The implication of his reply, at least, was that the pending joint resolution will be effective only until June 30, 1946. I say, that was the implication. I feel certain that that is not the fact, and that the Senator would not wish it so to appear. Section 5 states that "The authorization contained in this joint resolution shall expire on June 30, 1946." But the word "authorization" refers to the appropriation which is described in section 1 of the joint resolution. So far as the joint resolution itself is concerned, it is permanent legislation, is it not, subject to the right of our Nation or any member government to withdraw in accordance with the provisions of article X? Is not that so?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly; what the Senator is saying is that we might become a nonpaying member. I answered the Senator from Vermont in terms of realism.

Mr. DANAHER. I point to article I, of the agreement itself, on page 2, where it is provided in line 22:

> The Administration shall have the power * * * to enter into contracts and undertake obligations.

Surely, the Senator does not expect that our representative in U. N. R. R. A. and the Council itself, will be authorized to make contracts for 5 years, for 10 years, for any number of years, subject only to the authorization with reference to the appropriations, which will expire on June 30, 1946. Surely, the Senator will expect that our own good faith and credit will be pledged to the execution of any contract whose execution we authorize. Is not that so?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I could read to the Senator again the statement of Assistant Secretary of State Acheson, which is final, conclusive, and utterly determinative. I cannot go beyond that. No one could put it down in plainer language. Our obligation is limited to the appropriations which we make.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to proceed with what I undertook in the beginning; what I intended to be a disclosure of what I think are the essential safeguarding limitations in this agreement. I hope the Administration greatly appreciates the fact that I seem to be projected as the defender of its engagements. I had not risen for that purpose, although I think it has done an excellent piece of work in this instance.

Mr. President, I wish to finish, if I can—and I see the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] entering the Chamber—what I was saying about what I believe to be the effectiveness of the limitation which we have written into the proposed agreement in respect to the congressional appropriating power as the over-all limitation upon every obligation involved.

I have already quoted Dean Acheson, the Assistant Secretary of State, and the American representative in U. N. R. R. A., and his consent to the concept that I have submitted is clear and distinct. There is only one other person who could speak with equivalent authority, and that is Governor Lehman, who now, though he does not represent the Government of the United States, is the executive director of the international organization itself. He did live with the representatives of these signatories at Atlantic City when the agreement was being put together, and he should know better than any other man on earth what occurred and what the net result was, and whether or not our American

situation is understood by the other signatories.

I took pains to submit that question to Governor Lehman when he was appearing before the committee, and I read again just one question and answer:

Senator VANDENBERG. I assume that the implications of article V of the agreement are clearly understood by all the signatory powers to indicate that there is no commitment of this Government—

"No commitment of this Government"—

except as measured by subsequent appropriations of the Congress of the United States.

Governor LEHMAN. I think there is a full realization of that on the part of the governments.

Mr. President, it is impossible to tie a limitation down any more than that is tied down.

There is one other phase of the matter involved in the limitations, and I shall dismiss it as briefly as possible, although so far as I am concerned this report is going to be complete as respects the limitations upon the thing which we think we are doing.

The second limitation is in the earnest and repeated efforts in the text of the agreement and in the subsequent testimony to make sure that the agreement applies solely to war relief, and not to world-wide post-war reconstruction in any phase whatsoever.

This brings up the question of the implementing resolutions adopted by U. N. R. R. A. itself when it organized at Atlantic City. There was some fear that these implementing resolutions, in turn, might have collaterally broadened the nature of our responsibility under this joint resolution. In order to leave no room for doubt upon this score, Assistant Secretary Acheson and Governor Lehman were specifically quizzed by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is important to introduce some of this testimony for the RECORD.

Now I wish to read from Assistant Secretary Acheson with respect to what the word "rehabilitation" means in this connection, because rehabilitation seems to be the twilight zone word.

Senator TUNNELL. How far does the word "rehabilitation" go? Just what is the meaning of it in your opinion?

Mr. ACHESON. Senator TUNNELL, that was the subject of resolutions at Atlantic City, one of the most important of which has been set forth in this House amendment to the bill itself. That is found on page 15.

Senator TUNNELL. Yes. What I was looking at was—

"The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief."

I was just wondering whether "rehabilitation" has reference there entirely to relief of sections, or just what is meant by that.

Mr. ACHESON. There are two fairly clear places, one in the agreement and one in the resolution, where that is dealt with. If you turn to the bill, on page 3, section 2, of the agreement, under article I, it says:

"Subject to the provisions of article VII, the purposes and functions of the Administration shall be as follows:

"(a) To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and other basic necessities, medical, and other essential services"—

That is generally what is regarded as "relief." Then it goes on: "and to facilitate in such areas, so far as necessary to the adequate provision of relief, the production and transportation of these articles and the furnishing of these services."

That is what has been regarded as "rehabilitation." In other words, if it is wiser and better and more efficient to produce the relief articles and services in the country rather than to import them, the organization has the authority to do that.

I think that is an answer to the question submitted much earlier in the day by the Senator from Connecticut, and the question which has repeatedly intervened in the course of subsequent debate.

Senator TUNNELL—

Continuing the cross-examination.

What is your idea, then, of the word "reconstruction"? Does that mean the reconstruction of buildings?

Mr. ACHESON. That is something which is altogether beyond the scope of this organization. That is a rebuilding of the devastation of the war, and with that this organization has nothing to do.

Mr. President, he could not be any franker about it, and he could not make it any plainer. The official spokesman for the United States, first, in the authorship of this agreement; and, second, in the organization of U. N. R. R. A. itself, says that this organization has nothing to do with post-war reconstruction or with the rebuilding of the devastation of the war.

I proceed a little further in the same record.

Senator VANDENBERG. On the question asked by Senator TUNNELL, might it not also be stated for the record, Mr. Secretary, that in the preamble the language was rewritten and changed from the original form in a further effort to restrict the scope and to be sure that we were dealing solely with relief?

Mr. ACHESON. That is quite correct.

Senator VANDENBERG. Yes; but I want to observe that some things that are not in the draft are just as important as some of the things that are, in its interpretation.

Mr. ACHESON. Yes, sir.

Senator VANDENBERG. We took out some language which might have been misleading in its enthusiasm.

Mr. ACHESON. That is entirely correct.

Now I want to read one further excerpt from Mr. Acheson's testimony. The able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] became somewhat disturbed, as Senators have become here upon the floor, about the implications or possible rehabilitation which might extend on into the area of reconstruction.

Senator WHITE. I think that comes very close to the definition which appears in paragraph 11, but when you go down to 8, I do not just see how "restoration" of transport and communications facilities and helping to restore workshops and repair shops and shipyards of one sort and another can be deemed to be contributing to relief, except as it offers an opportunity for work; and if that is to be your test, "opportunity for work," why of course there is no limit.

Mr. ACHESON. It certainly was not the intention, and this reference here to shipyards, work shops, repair shops, and that sort of thing was in the minds of those who wrote it for the purpose of fixing up the equipment with which these people could go ahead and fish or transport or do what they had to do in the relief field. * * * But, as I say, we had this same discussion in the House as to whether the language of all of these paragraphs comported entirely with my interpretation of them, and the House committee put in this section 3 of the joint resolution. They picked out section 11 of resolution 12 of the U. N. R. R. A. Council as summing up in the way which they thought was most desirable the policy to be followed, so they wished that to be put in the joint resolution in order to serve notice on U. N. R. R. A. that they interpreted all these resolutions in the way in which section 11 states it and the way I had stated it at the hearings, which would be a pretty fair indication that we would trust that our contribution would be used along those lines and not along the broader lines which I had disclaimed and which the U. N. R. R. A. Council has attempted to disclaim; so I think the purpose was to emphasize what you have emphasized, Senator WHITE, and to indicate to U. N. R. R. A. that that is the way this Government would expect it to perform.

Mr. President, no man could be franker than that, and no commitment could be more conclusive. I remind the Senate that the House wrote into the joint resolution the language of section 11. I wish to read the language of section 11, because it is the final and conclusive statement on the subject. I read from page 15 of the bill, section 3:

SEC. 3. In the adoption of this joint resolution the Congress expresses its approval of and reliance upon the policy adopted by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration at the first session of the Council, summarized in paragraph 11 of resolution No. 12, and reading as follows—

And this is the telltale section:

The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction.

Mr. President, I emphasize that language. It is not even the beginning of reconstruction.

The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief.

And nothing else.

No new construction or reconstruction work is contemplated, but only rehabilitation as defined in the preamble of the agreement.

Which means rehabilitation that is indispensable to relief itself, and nothing else.

Problems, such as unemployment, are important, but not determining factors. They are consequences and, at the same time, motives of action. The Administration cannot be called upon to help restore continuous employment in the world.

Then I repeat the first sentence again:

The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as [even] the beginning of reconstruction.

If we will keep that firmly in mind we shall certainly keep in mind an all-over restraint and limitation upon this authority, which will hold it intimately within the realms in which we are willing to go.

Mr. President, I dislike to burden the RECORD upon this subject, but as I said in the beginning, I know of nothing quite so important, when we are here embarking upon this international agreement,

as that there shall be no possibility of misunderstanding either at home or abroad. I feel that so keenly that I will impose upon the Senate just long enough, in addition, to indicate that Governor Lehman, when testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, was equally frank and equally specific in arriving at precisely the same net result in respect to the differentiation between relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction, which I have already indicated. I read from Governor Lehman's testimony:

Senator VANDENBERG. Governor Lehman, it seems to be quite clear in the text of the agreement that there is a very clear purpose to draw a sharp line of distinction between "relief" and "rehabilitation" as such in this operation, and that you are intending to confine yourself, and U. N. R. R. A. is intending to confine itself, exclusively to relief except insofar as contingent rehabilitation contributes to relief, is that correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

It cannot be said more plainly. It cannot be made any more specific. The Director General could not more emphatically be confined by a question and an answer.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct. I believe there is an absolute prohibition adopted by the Council with regard to the undertaking of what might be described as "permanent reconstruction" activities. That was certainly the intention.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall yield in a moment. I wish to finish the record with respect to Governor Lehman. I do not mean that I am more interested in Governor Lehman than I am in the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; that is all right. I can ask the question later.

Mr. VANDENBERG. At a later point in the hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee the able Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] particularly catechized Governor Lehman regarding what might have seemed to be some discrepancy between the basic commitments in the agreement itself and in the subsequent resolutions adopted at Atlantic City, but as he himself said earlier in the day, the result of that colloquy was to make it perfectly clear that there is no commitment whatever beyond the commitment to relieve a contingent rehabilitation along the line which I have indicated in the previous exhibits which I have submitted, and I think perhaps that statement will suffice for that portion of the record.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has had a great deal to say, and very properly, about the opinion of Governor Lehman and Dr. Acheson. I have no doubt that so far as they themselves are concerned in the administration of this measure they will continue to feel as they testified. But the trouble is that the organization will be controlled, at least in numbers, by others, and if they choose to differ with Dean Acheson or if they choose to differ with Governor Lehman, and if they outvote him, we would be committed just the same. In other words, suppose the U. N. R. R. A. organization by vote determined that relief carried rehabilitation along with it, and a little help in addition to that, perhaps in the way of better housing or better relief of other kinds.

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; let us wonder what would happen if they went beyond our conception of the agreement. That is what the Senator wants to know, as I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. If they did that, with this unlimited statement at the very beginning that this Board has the power to enter into contracts and to undertake obligations, there is no telling where it would lead, in my judgment. That is why I was so insistent in asking the distinguished Senator if he did not think we had better put in a reservation limiting it to the appropriations made.

I agree in the main with all the Senator has so well said this afternoon, but I think we should be exceedingly careful in the language to be used, because our representatives' construction of the language will not be final. The final construction of the language will be made by the U. N. R. R. A. organization or administration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there is nothing I can say to the Senator beyond what I have repeatedly said in response to the same question put in a different form 15 or 20 times this afternoon. That is not said in derogation of the questions, because I think they are important.

All I can once more say, and to sum up with finality, is that if the Senator from Tennessee, as acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, ever confronts a situation under U. N. R. R. A. where the concept of it as presented to us by our own American authorities is violated, I hope he will see to it that every penny of appropriation is withdrawn; because it is the specific understanding that we shall have no obligations except such obligations as are written into our specific appropriation acts from time to time.

Mr. President, I now desire to conclude. If I have put my major emphasis upon the limitations in this pending commitment, it has not been intended in any way to be in derogation of the affirmative advantages which can flow from U. N. R. R. A. I believe that U. N. R. R. A. is an inevitable, unavoidable concomitant of this war. I believe that relief and contingent rehabilitation in the liberated areas are an inseverable part of the war effort itself and, therefore, that these functions should be the partnership responsibility of the United Nations. I know of no better way in which to serve these functions than through this cooperative, international organization up to the point where war relief leaves off and post-war reconstruction begins. I favor the passage of this joint resolution. But I have wanted to make it wholly plain that I favor its passage, not only because of the positive reasons which are convincingly urged in its behalf, but also because the purposes to be served are restrained within the limitations upon which I have lingered.

America will do her full part and will carry her full share of the load in the responsibilities of post-war peace and justice and security. Enlightened selfishness, if nothing else, will require of us that we join wholeheartedly in these cooperations. But, in my humble opinion, we must ever take counsel of the fact that our own resources are not illimitable; and we must never neglect to vigilantly guard the internal necessities of our own country. In the peace problems of post-war world-wide reconstruction—whether economic or social—it would be fabulous improvidence for America to take U. N. R. R. A. as a pattern and to contemplate underwriting anything remotely like the share of world responsibility which we here temporarily accept as an unavoidable incident of war. So far as I am concerned, I accept it only because it is the unavoidable incident of war. I accept it in the overwhelming form in which we are required to underwrite it, only for that reason.

Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield the whole shooting match with great joy and pleasure. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETE obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wished to ask a question of the chairman of the committee, if he is willing to submit himself to a question. Will the Senator look on page 2, lines 21, 22, and 23, at the language:

The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations.

That is an unlimited power.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I do not agree with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me explain for a moment, please. In my judgment, that is an unlimited power. If the U. N. R. R. A. were to make a contract to dispense $5,000,000,000, instead of $1,350,000,000, it could do so. Why not put in, after the word "obligations", an amendment, by way of reservation, something to this effect:

Within the limitations of the appropriations made for this purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that there are several reasons why that is not practicable. In the first place, the Senator is offering that language as an amendment or reservation to the agreement already signed.

Mr. McKELLAR. It could be done only by way of reservation, as I understand the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. The Senator would have to place it at the end, by way of reservation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that I do not agree at all with his hypothesis. I do not believe that language gives the Administration any power to make a contract or to convey

property or to undertake obligations beyond the limitations of this joint resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, why not say so?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do say so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why not have the language of the joint resolution say so?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not object to making it clearer. If we made an authorization for someone to spend a million dollars for a certain purpose, in order to spend it he would have to make contracts and assume obligations. Of course, this organization will have to do that. Every time it buys supplies it will make a contract; will it not? Every time it promises to pay someone at a future date for those supplies it will be assuming an obligation. But those things are contained within the limits.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is an all-inclusive power.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not grant the Senator that.

Mr. McKELLAR. And there is no limitation at all on that power.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; there is.

Mr. McKELLAR. I want to make this matter clear. I ask the Senator to turn to page 12, and I call his attention to the following language:

> The amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no doubt that the writers of that provision expected, for instance, so far as the Congress of the United States is concerned, that the money would be appropriated by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is right.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under our system we have already given the power to the R. F. C. to make loans, and the money could be used for that purpose. Would the Senator be willing to accept an amendment, in the form of a reservation, after the words "appropriate constitutional bodies," to insert "in the case of the United States, the Congress of the United States"?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have great respect for the Senator's views, but I think that would be wholly unnecessary. I hold in my hand an amendment suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] which, if adopted, might obviate the difficulty which the Senator faces.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator please read it?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Ohio would add, at the bottom of page 15, the following:

> No amendment involving any new obligation for the United States shall be made to the agreement for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration without approval by joint resolution of Congress.

Personally I have no objection to that amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I doubt if that would cure the difficulty of which I have spoken.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the general language "appropriate constitutional bodies" is broad enough. I do not see any occasion for saying, "by the House of Representatives, by the Senate, and by the signature of the President of the United States." They are the constitutional authorities.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is putting a tremendous obligation upon the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses. When representatives of the Administration come before us and say, "We have an authorization for an appropriation of $1,350,000,000, and we want to have the money appropriated," the Senator says that we can use our discretion. That puts the Appropriations Committees in a very awkward situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. It does not unless the Appropriations Committee is to be a printing office.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not be a printing office.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Appropriations Committee discharge the functions which we are placing in its hands.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not the question. The question is, Should not this joint resolution be made so specific that there will be no trouble over the amount of money we appropriate? That would help tremendously.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have tried to aid the Senator all I could in that respect by indicating what was shown in the testimony of the witnesses.

Mr. McKELLAR. That does not commit them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly it does not commit them; but what is the use of having an Appropriations Committee with such powers if the authorization must go into all the details? We might as well appropriate the money in the beginning.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have great respect for the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I do not wish to encroach further on the time of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Tennessee will conclude reasonably soon.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am ready to conclude whenever the Senator from Tennessee reaches his terminal facilities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Paragraph 11 of Resolution No. 12, set forth on page 15 of the joint resolution, contains the following language:

> The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief.

In the first place, I do not know what "coterminous with relief" means, and I doubt if anyone else does. Waiving that question for the moment, the joint resolution applies to relief; does it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Why not say so?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what we are trying to say.

Mr. McKELLAR. Paragraph 11 of Resolution No. 12 says:

> The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction.

The joint resolution applies only to relief.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a quotation from the agreement which has been signed by the 44 nations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it is. That is exactly what I think we ought to correct at this time.

Mr. CONNALLY. We cannot rewrite the agreement unless we submit it to the 44 nations again.

Mr. McKELLAR. We can attach reservations. As an illustration of an appropriate place to attach a reservation, I read section 4, on page 15:

> SEC. 4. In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

I understood from the Senator from Texas and also from the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that it was intended to include India. That language would include every nation in the world. I think it ought to be limited to what the committee intended.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let the Senator offer an amendment, and the Senate will vote on it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly shall do so.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Tennessee that his contribution is very helpful.

It is with considerable reluctance that I find myself unable to support the pending proposal. There are various reasons why I am reluctant. One of the principal reasons is that I am on the short end of the classic ratio of 16 to 1, which was the vote by which the joint resolution was reported to the Senate. Members of the Foreign Relations Committee whose erudition and legal learning are far superior to mine reached a judgment other than the one which I reached. I wish very briefly to give the reasons for the conclusion to which I was forced in announcing my opposition to the pending measure.

In the first place, if I had listened to my heart instead of my head, I would be enthusiastically supporting the proposal. If it were a matter of the allocation of my personal funds to a purpose of this kind, I would not hesitate for a fraction of a second. But, Mr. President, when I am acting as a Member of the Senate, and when I am asked to authorize an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 of the resources of the people of the United States, I think I should try, I think I must try, and I know I have tried, to think the matter through so as to bring myself into a frame of mind represented by what the Highest Authority tells us—"That thou mightest be justified when thou speakest and be clear when thou judgest."

Reduced to its simplest terms, Mr. President, the question before us is this: Are we justified in passing a measure which authorizes the expenditure of $1,350,000,000 of the people's money by an agency over which we have no control as to policy? That is the question. After careful thought I have reached the

conclusion that there is only one answer to it.

What is this proposal? It is a proposal to implement, by making available funds. To implement what? Is it to implement the activities of a bureau set up by Congress, to which we have delegated certain powers of administration? No. What is it? Is it to implement an act which has been placed upon the statute books by the Congress of the United States? No. What is it? Is it a proposal to implement by authorization a treaty entered into by the United States, which has gone through its various stages and has been approved and become a fixed thing, instead of a fluid thing? No. No such proposal is before this body.

The proposal is to implement an organization. What organization? An organization set up by a group of governments, including our own. The organization is called the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Who set it up? Who initiated it? Who motivated it, and what is it?

The agreement was signed—by 44 nations? No. It was signed by 44 governments or authorities—something new in our conception of international relations. A group of 44 governments or authorities have met and drafted a proposal, and signed it by their representatives.

Does it come to us as a finished thing? No, it is not a finished thing. We are asked to furnish the money to put it into effect. As I have said, if it were a treaty and were an established thing, we could study and understand its provisions. We could make reservations, as suggested by the Senator from Tennessee. We could make suggestions. We could refuse to confirm it. But we have no such authority. This is a fluid thing. It is not a static thing. Why is it fluid? Because by its very provisions it sets up a Council composed of one representative of each of the signatories, a Council charged with the duty of formulating policies for carrying into effect the purposes of the act. Just the moment we approve that, we approve that authority; we say, in effect, "All right; we are going to implement this with the people's money, and you may go ahead and change those policies you have provided in the provisions, because by this measure we are approving the provisions."

There has been much discussion this afternoon with regard to paragraph 11. I shall refer to it in a moment. It has been said that we are protecting ourselves. I am sorry the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is not present. I love him and admire him, and frequently I follow him. However, the number of times this afternoon that he has assured himself there is no occasion for doubt or misunderstanding, the number of times he interrogated witnesses appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee in order to assure himself, show that in his mind there was that doubt, and that there is that doubt today.

I wish to interpolate here, while I am referring to that matter, that the Senator from Michigan has quoted two of the finest men in public life, namely, Mr. Dean Acheson, of the State Department, who has been chosen the American member of this Council, and Governor Lehman. The Senator has quoted their statements of their viewpoints and of their ideas about what this policy should be.

I am glad to observe that the Senator from Michigan has now come into the Chamber. I was saying that he has quoted over and over again the two men to whom I have referred. I did myself the honor of referring to the Senator from Michigan. I am glad he has returned. As I have said, he has quoted Dean Acheson and Governor Lehman, two eminent gentlemen. But who are they? Governor Lehman at this instant does not represent the Government of the United States in this organization in any way, shape, or manner.

No longer than 24 hours ago a representative of the State Department said it was necessary to have someone to represent the United States. Governor Lehman is the international agent of this international organization. That is what Governor Lehman is. I do not impugn his statements. I do not question his sincerity. On the contrary, as I have already stated, I admire him as much as I admire any man in public life. But he would have nothing to say about it. He is to be the administrator of the policies formulated by the Council. He will not have a vote. By the express provision of this instrument, he will not even have a vote.

Mr. Dean Acheson is our representative—yes—and we are interested in his views, just as we are interested in the views of Governor Lehman. But Mr. Dean Acheson will have one vote in the Council. The Council is to be composed of 44 members representing governments or authorities—the new concept. Twenty-two or 23 of them will constitute a quorum under the procedure which has been adopted. A majority of that quorum could formulate policies. The United Kingdom or, rather, the British Association of Commonwealths, will have seven votes. I do not care anything about that, because their interests and ours will go along parallel, I hope, continuously. But the fact remains that we are to have one vote; and whatever may be the interpretation by Mr. Acheson as to what the provisions of this agreement are, it will be the interpretation of one man having one vote; that is all. He will be bound, and we will be bound, by the policies adopted under the provisions of the instrument which we are now asked to approve, which provides that they may make the policies to carry into effect what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has very cogently called attention to. At this point I stop my discussion of that phase of the matter.

Mr. President, what is the purpose of the organization? I read:

> The Administration shall have power—

I ask Senators to listen to the reading of the provision. It is not a question of what is thought by Governor Lehman, the man who now is the international agent—not the United States agent—the man who will have no vote, the man who will merely be carrying out the wishes or the purposes of the policy-making body. It is not a question of what his viewpoint may be. He will be an international agent. What will be their power? I read from article I:

> The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property—

We shall be approving that article if we pass the joint resolution—

> to enter into contracts and undertake obligations—

We would approve that authority on their part—

> to designate or create agencies and to review the activity of agencies so created, to manage undertakings—

We would give them that authority.

Now I return to paragraph 11 of Resolution No. 12, to which I wish to refer.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the agreement provides wholly unlimited power to enter into contracts and undertake obligations.

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly it does.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No restriction or limitation is placed on it. If they were to undertake to contract to furnish $10,000,000,000 or $50,000,000,000 for relief purposes, our Government would be honor bound to carry out the contract.

Mr. GILLETTE. Our Government would be morally bound, if not legally bound.

Over on the House side, in order to reassure themselves, as I am sure our distinguished colleague the Senator from Michigan has tried so many times to reassure himself, section 3 of article X was written so as to quote a portion of the oft-quoted paragraph 11 of Resolution No. 12 of the Council. If the joint resolution containing that portion of Resolution No. 12 were passed by the Congress, Congress would thus approve of the conception that we will not engage in a program of reconstruction, but that we will be limited to a program of rehabilitation, as provided in the preamble to this United Nations agreement.

What is said in the preamble? Among other things it says:

> Assistance in the resumption of urgently needed agricultural and industrial production * * *.

Rehabilitation is within that concept, within that phraseology. If Senators do not believe that is what is meant, I call their attention to the various paragraphs of resolution No. 12. I may say in this connection that the council which we are asked to approve, which we would clothe with the power to exercise that authority, and which we would implement within these limitations as to amount, has already adopted 41 interpretive resolutions for the purpose of stating what they intend to do under that proposal. Do Senators know what they are?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. What, if anything, will we have to say about it?

Mr. GILLETTE. In a little while we will be asked to give it our blessing, I am quite sure.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. And our money.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; the cash to implement it.

But what do we find?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator state what the 41 provisions are?

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will excuse me. The provisions cover approximately 35 or 38 pages.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall excuse the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Forty-one were adopted at the first meeting. The Council can meet at any time. They must meet twice a year. They can meet at any time, on call, after 3 weeks' notice has been given, and they can adopt 41 more resolutions changing the policy. They can adopt a resolution eliminating paragraph 11 which has been quoted, and on which we express reliance. They can wipe it out tomorrow; and when we have recognized that authority we have recognized their right to do so. But what did they do in Resolution No. 12? I now have it before me. Following the preamble, it reads:

Resolved, That, subject to the provisions of Resolutions Nos. 1 and 17—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator cite the page from which he is reading?

Mr. GILLETTE. I read from page 40 of the first group of resolutions which has been adopted implementing the agreement which is now before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. If there is a Senator in this Chamber who knows what those resolutions are, I should like to have him stand up now and be counted. If any Senator knows what is contained in the resolutions which, in effect, the Senate will approve if it passes the joint resolution, I wish he would stand. But listen. I read from paragraph 1 of Resolution No. 12:

Rehabilitation supplies are to consist of materials, such as raw materials, machinery, and spare parts needed to enable a recipient country to produce and transport relief supplies for its own and other liberated territories; and, within the scope of the Administration, the rehabilitation of public utility and services, so far as they can be repaired and restored to meet immediate basic needs, such essentials as light and water, power, transportation, and communication. These needs include rehabilitation of essential relief industries, such as those which provide food, shelter, clothing, medical supplies.

I shall now quote from section 5 on page 40 of this volume. I invite attention to this statement as bearing on the assertion which is made that the relief organization is to operate in a transition period, taking over, after the Army has gone in, in order to relieve distressed and suffering people as a military necessity. Now listen. What does the Council we are approving say?

5. It is recommended that in cases where home production exceeds home consumption—

That has no reference to poor starving people—

the government or recognized national authority concerned should take all steps necessary to enable the excess of production available in a country to be put at the disposal of other liberated areas, which may need such supplies to cover their deficits.

6. It should be the policy of the administration to help those countries whose industries can be rehabilitated for production of relief and rehabilitation goods urgently required in other liberated areas.

Not as a matter of military necessity to feed starving people, but to enable a country to reestablish their industries and resume production so that they can start the flow of goods into other liberated areas. I am not quarreling with that if that is the purpose. What I am quarreling with is the suggestion that as representatives of the American people we should implement a proposal of that kind, an agreement of that kind over which we will exercise no control.

It is said it is merely an authorization, and that it will be necessary for the administrators to come to Congress and get the money. I have heard that assertion until I am sick at heart. I have not served in Congress so long as has the Senator from Tennessee and many other Senators, but I have been here 12 years, and I have heard a hundred times a year the statement: "This is only an authorization; do not worry about it; it is merely an authorization and they will have to come before the Appropriations Committee and justify their request for the money." Congress passes an act providing an authorization and then those interested in obtaining the money come to the Appropriations Committee and say, "You are not a legislative committee; this matter has been carefully considered by a legislative committee; they have gone into it, approved it, and reported it to the two Houses of Congress. Congress has approved it and acted on it. Your function is to make funds available when and as they are needed. It is not a question of a legislative proposal which Congress has passed on."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Iowa knows that he always impresses the Senator from Wyoming when he rises to speak, and I am listening with the greatest of interest to his remarks upon this most important subject.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not having the responsibility of serving on the Foreign Relations Committee——

Mr. GILLETTE. I assure the Senator that is the loss of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind. I have only had the present opportunity to examine the language. So I ask the Senator if he will be good enough to turn to page 12 of the joint resolution which is before the Senate, where I find the first paragraph under the heading of "Supplies and resources," reading as follows:

1. Insofar as its appropriate constitutional bodies shall authorize, each member government will contribute to the support of the Administration in order to accomplish the purposes of article I, paragraph 2 (a).

That provision, paragraph 2 (a) of article I, is the paragraph which authorizes the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration—

To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and other basic necessities, medical and other essential services.

I take it, therefore, that that deals with the very heart and soul of the agreement.

Then referring again to paragraph 1 on page 12:

The amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies.

So I ask the Senator, since that is specifically stated in words of almost one syllable in the agreement itself and appears to be a requirement that there should be a continuing supervision of the activities by the constitutional authorities of the member governments, if it is not, by that very language, clearly within the power and scope of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House to review every expenditure and to place limitations upon the expenditures whenever in the judgment of the Appropriations Committees it seems desirable to recommend such limitations.

Mr. GILLETTE. In answering the Senator from Wyoming I should say that I sincerely hope that the committees will take that viewpoint, but I call attention to the language which the Senator just read in connection with the language on page 13. There are two funds provided. One is for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of article I; the other is the administrative fund, and there are two separate provisions dealing with it. The first, to which the eminent Senator has just alluded, reads:

Insofar as its appropriate constitutional bodies shall authorize, each member government will contribute.

Now we are authorizing $1,350,000,000, and insofar as we will authorize we will, of course, contribute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; if the Senator will permit me, that does not follow because——

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall be glad to hear the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should say that the joint resolution is an authorization for the appropriation of $1,350,000,000. Sentence one which the Senator has just quoted says:

Insofar as its appropriate constitutional bodies shall authorize each government will contribute—

Now we are making the authorization; but observe the next sentence:

The amount and character of the contributions of each member government will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies.

That extends, it seems to me—I certainly hope it does—into the future, and it is a clear declaration that, so far as this authorization of $1,350,000,000 is concerned, the character of the contribution may be determined from time to time by the appropriate constitutional body of this Government, which means the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GILLETTE. Which immediately brings up the question before the Appropriations Committee of a legal obligation or a moral obligation. If I said to the Senator from Wyoming, "When you are next in Cheyenne, where fine clothes are obtainable, buy me a suit of clothes for a hundred dollars"—I have not a hundred dollars, but suppose I made that request of the Senator——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would buy the suit, if the Senator just told me.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator would say, "What kind do you want?" I would reply, "I don't care—any color, any shade. You are authorized to buy that suit of clothes." The Senator buys it and brings it to me and says, "I bought your suit of clothes." I reply, "I don't like it. I don't want it." The Senator is "stuck with it." He paid for it.

Mr. President, what Appropriations Committee is going to take any such viewpoint? That is not done in our committees. They scrutinize, of course, but again and again and again question is raised as to the legislative authority.

Mr. O'MAHONEY rose.

Mr. GILLETTE. I want to give the Senator a chance to get the suit of clothes. I yield to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator means he is giving me a chance to give him some Wyoming clothes, and they are very excellent; and I may say they would be very well worn by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator withhold his interruption for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The point I have in mind, and on which I should like to have the comment of the Senator, is whether he does not believe that the inclusion in the agreement, and the presence in the joint resolution, of this particular language, is not notice to every member government, and to every government which may be seeking relief, and, more important than that, notice to those who administer the relief, that they are constantly under the supervision of the constitutional body?

Mr. GILLETTE. Let me interrupt the Senator. I should hope that would be the conclusion, but I remind the Senator that in the same instant we recognize the authority of this organization to do these various and sundry things.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Within these limits.

Mr. GILLETTE. The limits I have just read, "to acquire, hold and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings * * *." I do not know what they will conclude. We are recognizing their right to make any conclusion they desire.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe that, with the presence of this particular language in the joint resolution, the administration handling this relief would have the authority to go beyond the amount and character approved by the constitutional body, the Congress of the United States?

Mr. GILLETTE. I certainly do. It would be a question whether they could hold us beyond the authorization, but they certainly have the right to attempt it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It seems to me it would be easily possible to make a legislative record here which would make it clear that they had no such authority to go beyond it. Personally, it is my opinion that this language is so clear, so explicit, so incapable of misunderstanding, that all who read it, including the administrators, must know that they are bound by the determination of the Congress of the United States as to the amount and the character of the contributions which they may make.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is a consummation devoutly to be wished, and it was a matter which was referred to by the Senator from Tennessee, when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming was out of the Chamber. The Senator from Tennessee suggested that we make it clear by amendment. Amendment to what? Amendment to an international agreement by action of the Congress, attempting to bind 43 other signatories? Of course not. We cannot do it. I wish we could do it. If so, we could clear up some of these questions.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will yield, we can only amend by inserting a provision which would have to be agreed to by the other signatories.

I wish to call to the Senator's attention, and to the attention of the Senate, and especially of the Senator from Wyoming, that the language here is very peculiar. The provision is:

The amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision will be determined from time to time by its appropriate constitutional bodies.

Offhand, one would think that meant the Congress of the United States, in the case of this country. I do not know whether it means Congress or not. It may mean Congress, but there is the R. F. C., which is a perfectly constitutional body. That body was created by the Congress under our Constitution, and it is one of the constitutional bodies of this Government. Suppose the Congress, through its Appropriations Committees, or without regard to the Appropriations Committees, should turn down an appropriation. Under this language there would be no reason in the world why an order could not be issued, under our law, to the R. F. C. to furnish the money, in such amount as Mr. Jones' organization, the R. F. C., might chose to put up.

If it means Congress, then the language should be changed to read, "by the appropriate action of the Congress of the United States." That is the only way to make it mean exactly what it is said it means.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in that connection, I wish to refer to another matter in this very anomalous and amorphous thing we have before us for approval. It is that the funds which we make available must be accounted for. To whom? There is not a word as to that. They must be accounted for. There is only one thing which sheds a little light on it. On page 11, in section 5, it is provided that the Director General, Mr. Lehman, "shall make periodic reports." To whom? To the United States of America, which furnishes $1,300,000,000? He shall furnish periodic reports both "to the Central Committee and to the Council covering the progress of the administration's activities."

For whom is he the agent? Mr. President, he is the agent of your people and my people, but he makes a report to the agency which he is representing, an international agency which is created, and we are asked to approve word for word what he says.

Let me state one or two relatively minor matters, and then I shall take my seat.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield to me before he concludes?

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall yield to the Senator before I conclude.

The preamble, which is of course explanatory, says that the purpose of the joint resolution is to furnish the services enumerated to liberated areas. But what does the joint resolution itself provide? On page 3, section 2, subsection (a), is this language:

To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations.

Does that mean liberated areas? Here is the joint resolution, my fellow Senators, authorizing the furnishing of this type of relief to the "victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations."

Is it merely for liberated areas, as a war measure? Does that sound as though it were a limited measure, a restricted measure, for liberated areas, when we clothe this amorphous thing with that authority, to spend that money, and negotiate those contracts, to rebuild those industries "in any area under the control of the United Nations"?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. GILLETTE. I promised to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it his interpretation that subdivision (a) of section 1, article V, on page 12, in the words "the amount and character of the contributions of each member government under this provision

will be determined by its appropriate constitutional bodies" is a restriction on the language in article I, paragraph 1, which provides that the Council by a majority vote can enter into international contracts?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. So that this language on page 12 applies only to contributions which are made, but in the final analysis the corporation of nations, as I call it, or organization, if the majority of its members decide to enter into contracts, is not restricted in any respect by the provisions of this measure. Is that the Senator's interpretation?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is true. I wish to say that during the colloquy which took place immediately after noon today, in response to the interrogations by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the esteemed acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the eminent Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], said, "Why, they will have to come back to you and justify the expenditure of the money. They will come back to you." Who are "they"? Mr. President, who are "they"? An international organization governed by a council composed of 44 members, nations, and authorities. Who are they? Whom are they going to send who will have a right to appear before an appropriations committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives and ask to be heard and justify expenditures? Who are they? We will have one member, the Honorable Dean Acheson; one vote, that of the Honorable Dean Acheson, and no more.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to remark first that it is my belief that paragraph 1 on page 12 is a clear and specific limitation on paragraph 1 on page 2. That is to say, I believe that article V modifies, confines, and restricts article I. But I wish to ask the Senator if it would not be clearly so if on page 1 of the measure we should provide an amendment by inserting in line 5, after the word "Congress", the words "as provided by article V of the agreement hereinafter referred to", so that it would read:

> That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums, not to exceed $1,350,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress, as provided by article V of the agreement hereinafter referred to, may determine from time to time to be appropriated for participation by the United States—

And so forth.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think such language would be very helpful. It might go quite a way toward reassuring the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Michigan has done yeoman work on this proposal for the last 7 months. But every day or two he wants to be reassured as to the doubts which the Senator is now raising and which he is trying to clarify, because he does not believe it himself. The doubts still remain in his mind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Iowa does not say that I am raising any doubts.

Mr. GILLETTE. No.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am trying to clear away the doubt from the Senator's mind.

Mr. GILLETTE. But even if the language the Senator has suggested should be adopted, it would still leave the proposal open to the limitation, or attempted limitation, of an organization whose policies we authorize other people to formulate without any reference to us.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I impose upon the Senator's time long enough to say that it seems to me to be clear that article V in the agreement was intended clearly to preserve to the constitutional authorities of the United States the power of determining from time to time what the policy should be, because it states in so many words that the contributions shall be made subject to those conditions.

The amendment which I suggest is such that it would clearly tie to the congressional authority the power of determining the character of the contribution. I believe that was intended, and if the Senator from Texas does not find any serious defect in the amendment which I propose, I think perhaps I shall offer it later. I think it merely states what is implicit in the resolution.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator's suggestions are always interesting, and usually helpful.

Mr. President, I should like to refer to another matter while it is in my mind. The contribution which the Senator from Wyoming has just been discussing is the proportionate contribution by the signatories to the instrument on the basis of 1 percent of their national income. I do not care to go into the question of the injustice of that proposal. It has been referred to in the Senate. At any rate that proposal has been made. But on page 13 there is a separate provision that—

> Each member government undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the administration promptly its share of the administrative expenses.

Under the first proposal we are to contribute about 60 percent, $1,350,000,000, or $10 for every man, woman, and child. It is rather significant that $1,350,000,000 is $10 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. That is about 60 percent. The Senator from Texas says it is 66 percent. I think he is a little in error in his computation. I think it is about 60 percent. But our share in the proposed contribution to the administrative expenses is 40 percent. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that his repeated reference to the $50,000 to be contributed by Iceland dealt with the contribution to the administrative expenses and not to the contributive share for relief and rehabilitation. Iceland's share is five-tenths of 1 percent. Our share in that matter is 40 percent, $4,000,000, and I would vote to make it available tomorrow.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator from Iowa wholeheartedly. Senators may talk about limitations being placed by Congress on authorizations for appropriations, but when a department of our Government spends more money than we authorize to be appropriated for the department and comes before the committees and asks Congress to appropriate money in a deficiency measure to make up the difference, what can we do about it? Senators rise in the Senate and perhaps criticize the department, but we say there is nothing else we can do except to appropriate the money, because it has already been spent.

Mr. President, just so sure as Senators are now sitting in their chairs, if we grant the proposed authority not only for relief, but for the building of manufacturing plants in any country, not only in countries which are retaken from our enemies, but in any country that the proposed organization may designate, whether it be India or in South America or in whatever country, the organization can vote on the question and say that a dam should be built here, and an electric power site here, a manufacturing plant here, and a railroad, or anything else, and we in Congress will have nothing to do about it.

Mr. GILLETTE. And we will not know anything about it until they come to us and ask for the money.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; we will not know anything about it until it is done. The money is spent, and those who spend it will come to us and say, "In accordance with the authority granted us we have spent this money. We have contracted for the expenditure of so much money." Mr. President, are we not morally bound then to appropriate the money?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him at that point?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The appropriation laws dealing with relief matters which have been passed by the Congress in the past 10 years at all times have been full of limitations which were imposed by Congress. There were huge blanket appropriations made for purposes of relief. Frequently when relief organizations adopted programs which the Congress did not think should be carried on, the Congress wrote limitations in the laws and prohibited such types of programs. Our appropriation laws, I may say to the Senator, are full of such limitations.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not questioning that, but I say, on the other hand, that to my personal knowledge Congress has repeatedly in the last 20 years passed deficiency appropriation measures to provide money which has been spent or contracted to be spent by various departments of our own Government over and above the amounts appropriated for them.

It is now proposed to establish an organization which is not under the control of the United States Government, on which we have only one vote, which can set up all sorts of manufacturing establishments and come to Congress and say, "You are not going to run out on what you have already authorized this organization to do; are you?"

Who in this body will stand up at the time when there is this group of nations all over the world and say, "We are going to run out on the promises we have

made"? We have been accused time and time again of running out on agreements. Before we enter into the proposed agreement we should safeguard it so that other nations cannot say, after we have agreed to it, that we are "running out" on something.

As the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, what is there to prevent the R. F. C. from loaning money to this organization, without ever coming to the Congress of the United States? Is there anything in this measure to prevent that? The R. F. C. is a constitutional body. It has the power to lend money. What is there in the pending measure to prevent the R. F. C. from lending the U. N. R. R. A. a billion dollars or any other amount of money? Mr. President, you and I know that the R. F. C. has loaned money to organizations and to foreign governments, and has never come to the Congress of the United States to request of it authority to do so, except for the general authority which has been given it; and we did not know anything about the loans that were made.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I very much appreciate what the Senator has had to say about this matter. I can well understand that basically he is interested in the United States first, and is interested in saving whatever money we can save. We are told that 44 countries are going to contribute to this fund. I have before me a list of the countries. I should like to know whether the Senator has seen the list of the 44 nations which are supposed to contribute.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; I have seen the list.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, does the Senator know how many of the nations which are supposed to contribute to the fund are receiving lend-lease funds from us?

Mr. GILLETTE. I cannot answer that question. It was estimated that the combined contribution of the group of nations would be approximately $2,000,000,000, and that our share would be approximately $1,350,000,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I was wondering whether some of those nations, or all of them, expect to contribute to this fund from the lend-lease money we are giving them. If so, that would make us pay almost all, if not all, of the fund.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in addition to that, I would say to the Senator that some of the so-called nations are not nations. They are authorities. They can be added by action of the Council, not by action by us. Who will be added to represent Poland? Will it be the Government in exile in Europe, or the new Polish Government to be set up under the approval of Russia? Who will represent Yugoslavia—the Tito regime or the regime of King Peter? They are authorities. How could they contribute? The governments in exile have no money—to a degree, at least—except what the Senator suggested we have been furnishing them. But we are expecting them to contribute; we are agreeing that they shall have an equal voice and an equal vote in the formulation of policies.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator. I shall not enter into the debate with respect to whether the language of the measure is sufficient to limit the power. I merely wish to ask the distinguished Senator two questions. Suppose we disregard the joint resolution entirely; I should like to have the distinguished Senator's reaction to this question: Would not the President, and, under him, the military, have the power to accomplish as a military measure what is provided for in the pending measure, thus making the charge almost entirely a charge upon this Nation?

The second question is this: Has not the Congress already given the President the power, under lend-lease, to provide funds to accomplish the purposes set forth in the pending measure?

Those are the two questions.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, in answer to the first question of the Senator from Wisconsin, let me say I do not agree that the military authority could properly and successfully administer relief and rehabilitation. After the military authorities have taken over an area, after they have driven out the enemy, there must be an interim period during which they must of necessity furnish relief to the destitute. But they are not set up and organized to do that for any length of time.

In answer to the second question as to whether the President, under lend-lease authority, could make use of lend-lease funds in order to accomplish the purposes set out in the pending measure, let me say that if the Senator will recall the language of the Lend-Lease Act, he will remember that the President has the right, under the Lend-Lease Act, to give away, transfer, and so on, any war materials which would be of any benefit, direct or indirect, to any nation, and which he thought would be of military value to the United States. The power under lend-lease and the President's discretionary judgment under it would be limited, of course, by that language.

Mr. WILEY and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the answer he has made to my questions; but it seems to me the Senator is taking too limited a view. For instance, in any nation such as Italy or France or any of the other occupied countries, after we shall be successful, as we hope, in driving out the enemy, we shall find chaos, we shall find the people depleted not only economically, but spiritually and mentally. It seems to me we cannot, from a military standpoint, disregard the threat of volcanic consequences from such situations. If there is no other agency, would not the military or some agency under it have to handle such situations? It seems to me that follows as a natural consequence.

Second, it seems to me that under the very language of the Lend-Lease Act quoted by the Senator, the Congress has given the President adequate power to meet that situation. In my opinion, the scope of the Lend-Lease Act is that broad. I am sorry I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations which heard all the evidence and the facts; but I have listened to the arguments presented on both sides. It seems to me that what we are doing is simply saying, "We will bring in an additional group of nations to undertake this tremendous job, or we will do it alone."

I should like to have the Senator speak on that phase of the matter, because it seems to me that is the final issue.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am very anxious to take my seat. I have felt better than I do now. I should like very much to conclude.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I call the Senator's attention to paragraph 3 of article V, page 12, which reads as follows:

> 3. All purchases by any of the member governments, to be made outside their own territories during the war for relief or rehabilitation purposes, shall be made only after consultation with the Director General, and shall, so far as practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations agency.

I ask the Senator from Iowa whether that means that if we should have a severe drought in this country next year, and if we should have to buy grain from Canada, even as we are buying it now, virtually for relief purposes, would the United States have to obtain the consent of this organization before buying Canadian or South American grain, and would the purchase have to be made through the U. N. R. R. A.? According to this paragraph, it seems to me it would. If it would, it seems to me the Members of this body should know it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I hesitate to think that that construction would be put on that paragraph; but under the proposal we are considering, it is impossible to know what construction could be placed on it, because it is impossible to know from one month to another what policy may be adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not speaking of the construction. I am simply reading the language. It says that—

> All purchases by any of the member governments to be made outside their own territories during the war for relief or rehabilitation purposes, shall be made only after consultation with the Director General, and shall, so far as practicable, be carried out through the appropriate United Nations agency.

We are now buying grain for relief in this country.

Mr. GILLETTE. I will admit that that language might raise a doubt. I know it has raised a doubt in the Senator's mind, and it would in mine. However, to repeat, I am very reluctant to believe

that any such construction would be placed upon it.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope no such construction will be placed upon it; but nevertheless, the wording is there.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we all realize that we must do something in the way of relief under the circumstances we are discussing today. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question. He is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. Was any proposal made to the committee that we organize relief under that splendid organization which is so popular in this country, and which has done such a wonderful work not only in the United States but all over the world? I refer to the American Red Cross. Was there any proposal before the committee that we furnish the money to the Red Cross, and delegate to the American Red Cross the duty of furnishing relief to other countries? It seems to me that that would be a very proper way to administer relief. I wonder if any such proposal was made.

Mr. GILLETTE. No such proposal was made at any time when I was present at meetings of the committee.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I should like to ask the Senator a question with reference to article I, which is set out in the joint resolution beginning on page 2. The language in line 21 is as follows:

> The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations—

And so forth.

Does not the Senator consider that the language "undertake obligations" would give U. N. R. R. A. the right to borrow money? That is undertaking an obligation.

Mr. GILLETTE. It would certainly authorize the Administration to enter into a contract for the payment of money.

Mr. O'DANIEL. The language is "undertake obligations." And borrowing money is certainly "undertaking obligations."

Mr. GILLETTE. Whether the authority would be extended to actually borrowing money, I do not know.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Even if this language does not specifically give the organization authority to borrow money, U. N. R. R. A. certainly has the authority to change article I at some later date so that it will specifically have the power and authority to borrow money and it can do so without even asking our Government for our consent to change article I, or any other articles in their constitution. But it appears to me that article I undoubtedly already gives them power and authority to borrow money.

Mr. GILLETTE. The language is broad enough so that, within the general purposes of the proposal, it could certainly enter into any kind of a contract, even for the purchase of real estate.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If we should become a party to this organization, U. N. R. R. A., which deals in money by the billions, and it has authority to borrow money, it is quite likely that it might become involved in a substantial debt. In that case, we, being a party to the organization, would naturally feel a moral obligation at least to see that its debts were paid. If it borrowed the money from an agency of the United States Government, such as the R. F. C., and then later came to Congress asking for an appropriation to pay our share of the debt, the Congress could not well afford to deny the appropriation of our share of 65 or 70 percent of the debt, when a department of our own Government, R. F. C., for instance, would get paid the full 100 percent of the debt. Certainly, Mr. President, we are treading on treacherous ground if we become a major contributing member of an organization such as U. N. R. R. A., which has unlimited power and authority to borrow money.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand, the agreement set out in the joint resolution has already been signed by 44 nations.

Mr. GILLETTE. By 44 governments or authorities.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understood the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] something was added or attempted to be added, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GILLETTE. Not to the United Nations agreement. The only additions were the paragraphs on page 15, at the bottom of the page, beginning with section 4. As I recall, the House added that provision, which was an attempt to bring within the purview of the authority the right to furnish relief to the India area.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it the Senator's opinion that section 4 now becomes a part of the agreement of the 44 nations?

Mr. GILLETTE. Not at all. On the contrary, the express language of the joint resolution is as follows:

> In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United States which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

We recommend it, but there is no obligation on the part of the United Nations to accept the recommendation.

Mr. MURDOCK. The agreement ends in line 18, on page 15, does it not?

Mr. GILLETTE. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. Where does the agreement end?

Mr. GILLETTE. It is a little difficult to find it in the print. The end of the agreement is near the bottom of page 14, at the end of line 23, ending with the words "undertaken by it."

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, so far as that agreement is concerned, Congress can do absolutely nothing about it.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Because if it was signed authoritatively by whoever signed it for the United States, we are bound by it.

Mr. GILLETTE. We are bound by it if we accept it by the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. MURDOCK. How does the Senator distinguish—if he does distinguish—between what is brought to us now and referred to as an agreement, and a treaty?

Mr. GILLETTE. If this international agreement had been presented to the Senate as a treaty for confirmation, it would have been subject to debate. It would have been subject to suggested amendment or change. As this is presented, it comes before us, not for the purpose of making any change, but in a situation in which we have no authority to make changes. It is simply introduced by reference in a joint resolution which provides for the implementation of the instrument which has been signed.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the opinion of the Senator, is the subject matter of the agreement which is now brought to us by way of reference a proper subject matter for a treaty?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the opinion of the Senator, should it not have been handled as a treaty rather than as an executive agreement?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is absolutely correct. If it had been brought here as a treaty, and the Senate, in the consideration of the treaty, had suggested an amendment, it would have gone back to the executive department, which would have consulted the treaty signatories and asked them whether they would accept the changes; but it was not so presented. Any change which we might make in the agreement would be ineffectual, because there are 43 signatories who are not consulted, and there is no opportunity for consulting them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me ask the Senator a further question, and then I shall be satisfied.

Turning to page 12, we find this language, which was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Michigan:

> Insofar as its appropriate constitutional bodies shall authorize, each member government will contribute to the support of the administration in order to accomplish the purposes of article I, paragraph 2 (a).

Now we find that in the joint resolution it is proposed to authorize, by our constitutional authority—which, of course, consists of the Congress and the President—an appropriation of $1,350,000,000.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under what subterfuge, excuse, or pretense could the Congress of the United States later say that we were not obligated for the $1,350,000,000?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not know.

Mr. MURDOCK. Neither do I.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Was it explained why the voting power was not set up in accordance with the amounts contributed by the various nations?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. What explanation was given?

Mr. GILLETTE. Regardless of the contribution of 60 percent by us, the fact is that some of the signatories are merely "authorities," without any national existence. Under the definition of our Supreme Court they could not be parties to a treaty. We recognize them as "authorities." Under the Supreme Court decision they could not become parties to a treaty; and yet they are to have an equal vote with Mr. Acheson, who represents us on that policy-making organization.

Mr. McFARLAND. Will the Senator explain why the voting power was not made to conform to the amount contributed by each nation? Why was not the voting power set up in that way?

Mr. GILLETTE. I wish I knew. The proposal comes to us in this form.

I hope Senators will allow me to conclude.

In closing, let me say that I regret the position I must take on this measure. Since I have been a Member of Congress I have stayed awake many nights considering the necessity which I felt incumbent upon me as a Senator to vote to implement plenary authority by blank checks, delegating to the various agencies, bureaus, commissions, and departments of the Government the right to spend money, under restrictions, of course, which we laid down in the delegated authority. I have worried about that. I have worried because I had given my approval to that type of legislation, which to me is repugnant to every instinct of democratic administration of a people's affairs.

I cannot bring myself to support a proposal to authorize the expenditure of $1,350,000,000 of the American people's money by an organization which we did not create, an organization in which we would have but only one vote, an organization for the machinery of which we would give approval, an organization which is a policy-making organization with power to determine and change in the future its policies under which the money is to be expended and over which we would have no control except the negative control over appropriations when it asks us for additional money. The Almighty knows that it will be back here asking for additional money, because we are the ones who control the purse strings.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BANKHEAD submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 1 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term '31st of March' where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term '30th of June', and by deleting from the second sentence thereof 'on the basis of the cost, including not more than one year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of twelve months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on the basis of the cost, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower'. The first appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis established by this amendment shall be made as of June 30, 1944.

"SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); by striking out in the first sentence of such section 'February 17, 1944' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945' (this amendment to be effective as of February 17, 1944); and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *'Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"'(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further,* That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal year: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the Act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"'(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"'(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions.'

"SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided,* That with respect to any such commodities for which programs involving such payments or losses have been announced on or before January 14, 1944, such programs may be carried out to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but such programs shall be completed not later than June 30, 1944: *Provided further,* That support prices shall continue to be maintained and announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further,* That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to domestic sugar beets and sugarcane and competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and oil seed meals: *And provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments or soil-conservation payments authorized under existing law, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law.

"SEC. 4. (a) Within a period of one hundred and twenty days from the effective date of this Act, and within each six-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942), shall be adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs, feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home grown), and other costs since January 1, 1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products

thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war and civilian purposes: *Provided*, That in determining the extent to which maximum prices shall be adjusted as provided herein, due consideration shall be given to historical and normal differentials customarily applied as between markets and regions: *Provided further*, That in no event shall maximum prices on milk and the products thereof be established below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That where minimum prices to producers of milk have been regulated under any agreements or orders pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, the War Food Administrator is hereby directed, within the periods prescribed in this section (relating to the adjustment of maximum prices), to adjust such minimum prices to reflect adjustments in maximum prices determined and ordered pursuant to the provisions of this section. Except as expressly provided herein, nothing contained in this section is intended, nor shall be construed to repeal, amend, or supersede the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

"(b) In order to effectuate the purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator are hereby directed to hold public hearings on a regional or market basis as the case requires. For such purposes there shall be utilized the hearing procedure and the personnel of the Food Distribution Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture established under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and such other personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration as may be required. As soon as practicable after the completion of the hearing, but in any event within the periods specified in paragraph (a), the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator shall make public their joint findings based only on relevant substantial evidence of record at the hearing and the Price Administrator forthwith shall issue an order adjusting such maximum price or prices on the basis of and in conformance with such findings.

"(c) Any person (within the meaning of section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended) who is adversely affected by the order of the Price Administrator may, within thirty days after the action adjusting such maximum price or prices, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the order be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part.

"The War Food Administrator shall be made a party to the proceedings and upon service of the summons and complaint, the Price Administrator shall certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record upon which the order adjusting such maximum price or prices was based. The proceedings in and the determinations, orders, and decrees of such court shall be subject to all applicable provisions of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; except, that wherever the term "Administrator" is used therein, it shall, for the purposes hereof, be construed to mean the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator: *Provided*, That during the pendency of such proceedings the Price Administrator may not modify or rescind his order adjusting such maximum price or prices except upon the basis of additional joint findings on evidence adduced pursuant to the order of the court. The provisions of this section shall terminate coterminous with the expiration of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

"SEC. 5. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at a loss perishable fruits or vegetables, owned or controlled by it, the increased production of which has been requested by the War Food Administrator, if there is danger of substantial loss through deterioration by spoilage."

And the Senate agree to the same.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
D. WORTH CLARK,
JNO. THOMAS,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
ROBT. W. KEAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the Senator's purpose to request action on the conference report this afternoon?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes. I ask for the present consideration of the report. There are a number of reasons for my desire to do so. The conference report is unanimous, and in substance it conforms to the attitude of the Senate. Only two things have been eliminated, and nothing has been added.

Mr. WHITE. It occurs to me that inasmuch as there are only a few Members of the Senate present it might be better to postpone consideration of the report. However, the Senator has said that it is a unanimous report.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It is a unanimous report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the pending joint resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the bottom of page 15 it is proposed to insert the following:

No amendment involving any new obligation for the United States shall be made to the agreement for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation without approval by joint resolution of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at what point is the amendment to appear in the joint resolution?

Mr. TAFT. At the bottom of page 15 of the joint resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The amendment is not intended to be offered to the agreement?

Mr. TAFT. No; it is intended to be offered as an amendment to the joint resolution itself.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit certain reservations and amendments and ask that they lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments and reservations will lie on the table and be printed.

PETROLEUM REPORT—INVESTIGATIONS OVERSEAS IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM (PT. 15 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an additional report from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, pursuant to Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, and Senate Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, authorizing and directing an investigation of the national defense program, being the report of a subcommittee of the Special Committee Concerning Investigations Overseas: Section 1—Petroleum Matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, because of the lateness of the hour I shall not read the report, but I wish to invite the attention of the Senators to the fact that there is a copy of the report on their desks. This is the first report submitted by the committee following the return of the subcommittee which made the trip around the world.

The report contains the findings of our committee including the hearings which our subcommittee held in the various theaters of activity, particularly in the Middle East and in the Persian Gulf area. It also includes considerable material taken from the hearings which the subcommittee held both before we left this country and after our return.

It also includes, Mr. President, a study of this problem made by our full committee, together with the individual reports made to the Senate by the five members of the subcommittee who made the trip around the world.

The primary purpose of this report is to present to the public the essential basic facts with respect to the supply and demand in the United States for petroleum production and the reserves of petroleum that have been proved in the United States. These figures indicate that although no catastrophe faces the United States, petroleum is very important to the future prosperity of the United States and our present demand for petroleum is so great, compared to the supply and the proved reserves, that prudence requires us to give now serious attention to formulating a national policy with respect to petroleum.

In its report the committee does not attempt to formulate such a policy but instead attempts to outline some of the major problems that will have to be considered before such a policy can properly

be formulated. The committee further recommends that such a policy should not be evolved as a result of separate action taken by the various agencies, each of which has authority with respect to some limited phase of petroleum activities. Such a policy should be determined by the Congress. The appropriate legislative committees of the Senate, such as the Foreign Affairs, Commerce, and Interstate Commerce, can consult all informed opinion, public and private, and formulate the policy to be followed on petroleum matters.

Mr. President, this is probably one of the most important problems which the Senate will be called upon to consider. It is important for the reason that we are living in a petroleum age. Not very long ago Mr. Ickes made the rather shocking pronouncement that at the present rate of consumption we would not be able to oil another war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I invite attention to the fact that the House of Representatives today passed the synthetic liquid-fuel bill which was passed by this body on the 9th of November last. That measure authorizes and directs the Bureau of Mines to construct demonstration plants for the manufacture of synthetic liquid fuel from coal, oil shale, and other substances. As was shown in the debate which took place in this body when the measure was under consideration here, and as was shown again yesterday and today in the House, and by the reports and hearings of the committees which considered the measure, there is great opportunity in the United States for the manufacture of unlimited amounts of oil from coal, oil shale, and other materials which are available in the United States.

There is no reason why the United States should at any time suffer under the slightest restriction for liquid fuel. The Mines and Mining Committee of the House, through a subcommittee which was headed by Representative JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, and the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, conducted joint hearings during the past year upon this measure, and I think it can be said without any reservation that the natural resources of the United States are such that we need not be dependent upon any foreign source for the liquid fuel with which to operate our gas engines.

Let me add that Representative RANDOLPH, whose interest in the development of synthetic fuels has been responsible for the speedy action by the House of Representatives on this measure, personally demonstrated the efficiency of gasoline made from coal by flying from his district in West Virginia to Washington in an airplane fueled by synthetic gasoline made from coal.

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to have that statement from the able Senator, and I commend the House for their action today and the Senator from Wyoming and the Senate for their initiative.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall yield in a moment. I hope that the processes which the Senator from Wyoming has just explained will prove highly successful, for if they do, it certainly will allay the apprehensions which many of the experts who have studied this question have manifested.

I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I invite the attention of the Senator from Wyoming, and inquire whether or not he has an estimate as to what the mass production of liquid fuel from such a source as he has indicated would, under present processes, cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the object of the bill of course is to provide for the construction of demonstration plants, and it is hoped that the cost can be reduced. As I recall, estimates were made by the late W. S. Farish, president of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, that under the processes available a year or so ago gasoline could be made for from 12 to 20 cents a gallon, which of course is much more expensive than under present processes.

Mr. BREWSTER. What would be the comparable figure for the production of gasoline from petroleum at the same point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It can be produced from petroleum for from 4 to 5 cents a gallon.

Mr. BREWSTER. So it would be three to four times as expensive as under present processes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the conditions which existed some years ago, but the evidence before our committee showed that great progress had been made, both in England and in Germany, as a result of the war.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a fact, is it not, that Germany is producing about half her gasoline from such a source?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is my information.

Mr. BREWSTER. But it would mean a very considerable burden, under present conditions, upon the consumers, if we should be compelled to turn to other sources than petroleum for our liquid fuel?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Provided the art could not be improved, but the experience in this country in almost every field has been such that I think we can look confidently forward to a very great reduction in the cost of producing liquid fuel.

I may say, if the Senator from New York will permit, one may refer, as an example, to the production of what is known as wood sugar. The process of making sugar from wood was known in Germany and in this country for many years. It was commercialized in Germany before the rise of the Hitler regime. That regime confiscated the plants of the commercial operator; in fact, that operator was placed in a concentration camp and compelled to purchase his liberty by turning over his property to the designees of the Nazi regime. He came to this country, and has been cooperating with the Department of Agriculture and with the Forest Products Laboratory, and already the Forest Products Laboratory in the United States is capable of producing a very much better quality of wood sugar, at a much lower price, than the Germans had been able to produce.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator does not know, does he, as to the expense of obtaining gasoline by the German process?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not have the figures in mind at the moment, but there is a wealth of information in the hearings which were held by the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate, and which were printed. I may say to the Senator, and to any who may happen to read the RECORD, that there was so much public interest in the matter that the Superintendent of Documents printed an extra edition of the hearings.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I can see that experimenting with the process which has just been explained by my distinguished colleague from Wyoming will have a very helpful effect upon our future security. In the petroleum age of tomorrow, I believe that for the benefit of our internal economy we should have access to the most economical petroleum available, and if we do not, it will of course adversely affect our economy in our competition with the world.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I should like to make comment on what the Senator from Wyoming has said.

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I understood the Senator from Wyoming to say that we probably could produce enough oil from shale—synthetic oil, if we may so call it—without resorting to foreign sources. That probably would not be economical.

If we found ourselves running out of oil in this country, I think we probably could avail ourselves of foreign sources which our nationals now own.

Mr. MEAD. From present indications that is a fairly conservative statement. Mr. President, the study of the petroleum problem may be divided into three sections:

First. The effect of the war on the United States and the world petroleum supply.

Second. The future of the United States in the world petroleum economy.

Third. The formulation of national policy on petroleum and petroleum administration.

Mr. President, the conclusions which our committee reached, and which I trust will be read by all Members of the Senate as they read the complete report, are as follows:

> The committee is very strongly and unanimously of the opinion that the Senate should give immediate consideration through the appropriate legislative committees to the determination of a petroleum policy for the United States that shall take properly into account both the domestic and foreign field and critical importance of petroleum in our national defense as well as our national well-being.

Mr. President, our committee is not finding fault with the Congress, or with

the agencies of the Government, or the Executive of the Government. We have gone along very satisfactorily since the very beginning of the country's history without the need of a foreign petroleum supply, but by reason of our reaching the age of aviation, and the age of oil, and because of the exigencies of the emergency in which we find ourselves, because of the fact that we have 25 percent of the reserves of the world, and are furnishing from 60 to 90 percent of the petroleum needs of the United Nations, because of the fact that we are consuming more rapidly than we are producing, we believe that the time is now ripe for the consideration of a national policy, and the consideration of that policy rightfully belongs in the Congress.

Mr. President, the second conclusion is as follows:

The security of the United States today is dependent upon adequate supplies of petroleum. The economy of the United States is also to a large extent dependent upon petroleum.

And will be more so as time goes on. The conclusions continue:

Failure to make proper provision for adequate petroleum supplies for the United States during the next few decades will vitally affect both our security and our development.

The critical importance of petroleum in the world economy is emphasized in the current emergency. There have been suggestions that international arrangements may be considered, assuring the access of all nations to petroleum reserves for their peacetime economy upon an equitable basis.

Such a possibility accentuates the imperative necessity of an early determination of a national policy on petroleum by the Congress.

Mr. President, I wish to note in the RECORD that on Thursday, February 3, 1944, the Petroleum Administrator for War submitted a statement which was made public on that day and from which I read the following:

Petroleum Administrator for War Harold L. Ickes announced today that the Arabian-American Oil Co. will undertake immediately in Saudi Arabia the construction of a privately owned and financed refinery to make petroleum war products for the United Nations.

The project will be financed entirely by the company, which is jointly owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co.

Administrator Ickes also revealed for the first time that expansion programs have been under way a number of months at the Bahrein Petroleum Co.'s refinery on Bahrein Island in the Persian Gulf, at the Abadan, Iran, refinery of the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Co., and at the Haifa refinery of Consolidated Refineries, Ltd. Capacity of the Bahrein plant, which also is jointly owned by the same two American companies, is being substantially increased.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is a fact, is it not, as shown in our report, that the product of the refineries in the Middle East, as numerated in the report, as estimated by the Petroleum Administrator on December 1, 1943, amounts to 375,000 barrels a day, as compared with 4,100,000 barrels a day in the United States, and 700,000 barrels in the Caribbean; so that when we speak of the increase in their output we begin from a very moderate basis? Is it not also a fact that all the increases concerning which we have so far had definite information have been extremely moderate in extent?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct, and I believe the figures are accurate.

I have in my report the following observation which I believe verifies the figures the Senator has just given:

Certain projects are now under way, and with their completion the present maximum production capacity of 350,000 barrels per day for all the Middle East refineries will be stepped up to approximately 525,000 barrels a day.

Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. I continue to read:

There is a small refinery located in Egypt. Last year this plant operated only on 85 percent of its capacity.

I assume that may be included in the 525,000 barrels a day.

Mr. BREWSTER. That would indicate, assuming that increase were accomplished, that the output of the Middle East area, which has enormous reserves, as the Senator has shown, more than equal to our own, would still be only 10 percent of the production in the United States.

Mr. MEAD. I believe that is also an accurate figure.

Mr. President, on February 6, 1944, the Department of the Interior Information Service made public a statement, a part of which I shall also read for the RECORD, as follows:

The United States Government will construct a pipe line for transportation of petroleum products from the Persian Gulf area to a point on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, and will obtain in that area reserves of 1,000,000,000,000 barrels of oil, Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes announced today on behalf of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, of which he is president. The Directors of Petroleum Reserves Corporation are the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior, and the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration.

This project is covered under an agreement in principle between the United States Government and the Arabian American Oil Co. and the Gulf Exploration Co. That the public may be fully informed concerning the agreement in principle, copies are being made available for public inspection.

Secretary Ickes issued the following statement in connection with this undertaking—

Mr. President, because of its enlightening qualities I should like to have Secretary Ickes' statement made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The directors of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, with the approval of the President of the United States and the State Department, and acting upon the recommendation of the War Department, and Navy Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, have authorized me to enter into an agreement in principle with the Arabian-American Oil Co., operating in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and the Gulf Exploration Co., operating in the Shaikdom of Kuwait. The Arabian-American Oil Co. is owned by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co., and the Gulf Exploration Co. is owned by the Gulf Oil Corporation.

The agreement is conditioned, of course, upon obtaining the sanction of the rulers of Saudi Arabia and Kuwait.

The Petroleum Reserves Corporation does not propose to compete with the private oil industry of this country. On the contrary, its purpose is to promote the private oil industry of this Nation, and to further the interests of the people of the United States. In addition to assisting these private American companies in the development of their oil interests in the areas covered by this agreement, the project will promote the interests of the governments and of the peoples of such areas.

The purpose of this agreement is to make provision for a pipe line which will be constructed from the Persian Gulf area to a point on the eastern Mediterranean, and to provide a reserve of 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil for the naval and military forces of the United States. The terms of the agreement guarantee to the Government complete repayment of its investment and costs.

The principles agreed to, which are subject to the working out of a definitive contract, provide that the Petroleum Reserves Corporation will construct, own, and maintain a trunk pipe-line system to transport crude petroleum from the Persian Gulf area to the Mediterranean. The Government will determine the most feasible plan for operation of the facilities, and will retain supervision thereof. The entire cost of construction plus interest will be returned to the Government within a period of 25 years, together with such net profit to the Government as may be agreed upon in the definitive contract. This is guaranteed by the companies. In other words, the pipe line will eventually cost the Government of the United States nothing. It is estimated that the cost will be between $130,000,000 and $165,000,000, depending on the details of plans to be worked out. The companies agree to perform at actual cost any work or services which the Government may request in connection with this project.

The pipe-line facilities will be made available to other oil producers and shippers, in addition to the companies which are now parties to the agreement. Provision is made for other companies to utilize the facilities, provided that they fulfill certain stipulated obligations.

The agreement of the companies to maintain a crude oil petroleum reserve for the account of the United States, of 1,000,000,000 barrels or 20 percent of the total crude reserves if they are less than 5,000,000,000 barrels, will greatly help to assure an adequate supply of petroleum for the military and naval needs of the United States in view of the obligations which this country must assume for the maintenance of collective security in the post-war world. It will make the oil in this reserve available for Government purchase, at any time for military or naval use at 25 percent below the market price in the Persian Gulf region, or of similar crude oil in the United States, whichever price is lower. The Government is not obligated to take this oil or any part of it, but it has the right to do so at any time, for a period of 50 years. In addition, in times of war or other national emergency, the Government has the option to purchase all of the crude petroleum produced by the companies and all products thereof, to be paid for at such price as may be agreed upon at the time of taking.

The agreement in principle further provides that the companies will not sell petroleum or products to any government or the nationals of any government when, in the opinion of the Department of State, such

sales would be unwise in the light of United States foreign policy and the requirements of collective security. The companies also agree that before they negotiate with the governments of any foreign countries with respect to the sale of petroleum and petroleum products from their concessions in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait they will give notice to the Department of State and the Petroleum Reserves Corporation.

In order that the public may be fully informed concerning this agreement in principle, copies are being made available for inspection.

The action which we have taken in cooperation with the American oil companies which have rights to oil in Saudi Arabia and Kuwait is designed to offset, in measure, the dwindling oil reserves in the United States. The known reserves in this country are estimated to be adequate for this Nation's needs for only a relatively few years. It is true that there may be inventions or improvements in technology which will result in the discovery of new reserves, or, indeed, in the development of new sources of energy. But it would be imprudent to gamble the future of the Nation in such a speculation. The construction of the pipe line will assure that huge quantities of oil in the Persian Gulf region will be available to this country when and if needed. And the setting aside of 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil for military and naval use assures to our armed forces, on very favorable terms, a supply of oil which amounts to several years' requirements at their present unprecedented rate of consumption.

I hope that the announcement and publication of this agreement in principle will eliminate once and for all the apprehensions which have been caused by the organization and activities of Petroleum Reserves Corporation. We are making this announcement of our plans and program as soon as possible in view of the complicated negotiations affecting many agencies of our own and other nations. Premature publicity in this situation might well have made it possible to conclude the arrangements.

The policy of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation is to aid the private oil business of this country by seeing to it that so far as the foreign oil situation is concerned, the interests of the United States and its military forces are protected, and to do what can be done consistently with the foreign policy of this Government as administered by the Department of State, to aid the private oil industry of this country to secure against future contingencies an adequate supply of foreign oil.

The pipe line which will be built pursuant to this agreement will serve an essential military purpose and it will also be of lasting benefit to the people of this Nation.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in conclusion let me say in submitting the report from the Truman committee that it is the initial report of the subcommittee concerning this investigation overseas, and I trust it will be well received and well read by Senators, and that the several committees which have to do with the matter will not only find the report interesting, but find us available whenever they deem it necessary to invite us.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, supplementing what my colleague from New York has said in connection with the presentation of the report on petroleum, I think it brings very definitely into focus the tremendous importance of petroleum. We are engaged not only in a petroleum war but we live in a petroleum economy. The recent announcement by the Secretary of the Interior, as Petroleum Administrator for War, of the $125,000,000 pipe line in the Middle East, seems to me to precipitate very definitely the necessity for congressional consideration of this matter, as urged by the Truman committee in its report.

The one conclusion to which we very definitely arrived as the result of our studies of this question extending over the period of the past 8 months was that the United States is entering a period when we must consider a petroleum policy; that it is not proper that that policy should be determined by Executive action alone, although if we do not now consider it, if the matter proceeds along the present lines, we shall be practically committed to a policy which has some very extensive ramifications.

I may say that Secretary Ickes in his appearance before the Truman committee stated that he entirely agreed with us that policies of this character should be considered by the Congress before action was taken. I am informed that originally it was proposed to acquire the entire concession in Arabia owned by American oil concerns, where many billions of barrels are located. But subsequently it was considered whether or not a third interest should be acquired at a price of perhaps $40,000,000. That, too, was brushed aside, and finally the proposal for a pipe line emerged. I am here expressing no opinion as to whether or not it is prudent for the pipe line to be constructed, but I am very clear that before the United States is committed to a policy of this character congressional consideration should be afforded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; I am very happy to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to anticipate what the Senator intends to say, but has he any definite conclusion as to whether or not the Government itself should undertake the securing of concessions or reserves in other quarters of the globe, in view of the very heavy demands which are being made upon our own resources and oil reserves, and the imperative necessity for war and for peace economy that we acquire somewhere, somehow, for some of our people, these oil reserves?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am very glad the Senator asked the question, and I appreciate it. In the formulation of an idea I am always very grateful to the bridge that carries me over. It so happens that we are proceeding victoriously in this war simply and solely because the American petroleum industry, under the initiative of private enterprise, has made the production of petroleum possible. Russia has an entirely totalitarian petroleum economy, as well as everything else. Britain has a 50–50 petroleum economy. She has 51 percent in the great Iran reserves. Yet 80 percent of all the petroleum essential to our victory has come from American reserves.

In view of that fact, I feel that the American petroleum industry is entitled to a little consideration. Before we embark upon either governmental exploitation of reserves or even Government ownership or operation of reserves, I think we should give the American petroleum industry an opportunity to show what it can continue to do. In the last 20 years it has acquired concessions outside the United States to the extent of 20,000,000,000 barrels of oil—an amount equal to our own reserves in Texas and elsewhere—with practically no Government aid. As our report shows, the diplomatic support has been very negligible. Very little has been done. After our industry has performed that amazing task, before Mr. Ickes or anyone else in authority abruptly adopts a plan of Government operation, I believe consideration should be given by Congress to the question whether this problem can be worked out along traditional lines. If it cannot be so worked out, I think the matter is so vital to our national security that serious consideration should be given to the following approaches—and there may well be others—to our solution of the petroleum problem: First, with the present condition of very nominal diplomatic support; second, with very vigorous diplomatic support of the action of private companies abroad; third, with partial Government operation; fourth, with complete Government ownership and operation.

Let me say in regard to the matter of vigorous diplomatic action in support of private companies abroad, that I think that might help us a great deal.

Furthermore, we urge very strongly that a competent committee of this body be created, representing the committee of which the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is chairman, because of the foreign relations involved, and that the other legislative committees concerned create a competent committee to consider this whole situation and to make recommendations.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Does not the subcommittee in its report also bring out the fact that it may be that, through the settlement of lend-lease obligations, some allocation of petroleum more equitable than that which now exists may come about?

Mr. BREWSTER. The report does, in that respect, make the definite recommendation that, in view of the enormously disproportionate supplies of petroleum which the United States has contributed to the war effort, consideration should be given to the transfer to the United States of some portion of the reserves held by other countries, particularly by Great Britain, which it was not possible to use in this war because of lack of refining and transportation facilities. Again, that will be a matter which will come under the purview of any committee which is created. In fact, Mr. Ickes, in his report to the committee in the letter to which the Senator from New York has referred, very definitely said that was the objective. That was one thing which disturbed me about the action which has been reported regarding the pipe line. Mr. Ickes in the letter which is a part of the report said:

With more tankers available today, we are able to use more oil from these foreign sources—British oil and American oil, as well—though not as much as both we and the British would like to see supplied from these sources. As materials can be made available, it is hoped that the necessary pipe line and refinery capacity can be installed, so that the British oil reserves may be drawn upon to a greater degree. Plans to this end are now under way and it will be a matter of great satisfaction to me when the time comes that the heavy drain upon American reserves may be offset by correspondingly greater withdrawals from British resources.

One thing which disturbed me in that connection—and I have repeatedly discussed it with the Secretary—is that the $125,000,000 pipe line which is proposed is to be built to the American reserves in the Persian Gulf. It will tap Saudi Arabia and Kuwait where the Gulf, the Standard Oil of California, and the Texas companies have great concessions. The pipe line is to draw on those great reserves.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is true, though, that the pipe line is ultimately to be paid for by those companies; is it not?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is to be some amortization over a period of years; is there not?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes, indeed. I am not raising here any question whether it is a good business policy. The point I make is that again we are tapping American reserves, instead of tapping British reserves. In the same area, within a few hundred miles of where the pipe line is to be located, are probably 15,000,000,000 barrels of oil of reserves of other companies—foreign companies. It was my understanding from Mr. Ickes' letter, as plainly stated, that we would look forward to tapping those reserves. I read in the newspaper that there are projects looking in that direction; that we are going to build a pipe line tapping the British reserves; that we are to furnish the steel and the money, and are later to be repaid. That may well be. But I feel that the matter is of such importance that, in the first place, it must be borne in mind that this project is a post-war project. No one contemplates that it will be of any immediate aid in winning the war. Where the $125,000,000 is coming from, I am not clear. I do not know whether Mr. Jones has $125,000,000 lying around loose so that he can put it into such a project. The only official advance he made was $30,000,000. As shown in our report, he told Mr. Ickes, when he formed this Corporation with a capital of $1,000,000, that he could have $30,000,000. Now the ante seems to have been raised to $130,000,000. If this is to impinge upon our war appropriations, again it is a matter of concern. If, on the other hand, it is to come from some other source, I think that must be considered in connection with the matter of the entire economy we shall face following the war, not only in relation to petroleum but in relation to financial economy, remembering that this is only a beginning.

In addition to the money which is involved, which, in the vernacular, "is not hay," there is also the matter of the obligations which come under the jurisdiction of the committee headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, because under this project we will be moving into one of the most tempestuous areas to be found in the world, one where many wars have originated. Whether the Mediterranean is to be an Italian lake, a British lake, a Russian lake, or an American lake following this war has to be determined. We are building a pipe line to the Mediterranean. The Dardanelles are of great interest to Russia. I think that before embarking upon so radical a reorientation of our foreign policy as is involved in the proposed project, complete consideration should be given.

In addition, at present the authority is very much diffused, as we show in our report. Agencies dealing with foreign petroleum matters include the Petroleum Administrator for War, the State Department, the Foreign Economic Administration, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Secretary of Commerce. Under such conditions it is difficult to have the coordination of policy which is essential.

Furthermore, the President, as well, is vitally interested in this situation, and, I believe, is responsible for the fact that Mr. Ickes has not come to the Congress, although he assured us he would; for I assume that the higher authority of the President superseded the pledge of Mr. Ickes that this matter would be discussed with the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House before final action was taken.

For these reasons, I feel very strongly that at the present time action should be deferred until we have further consideration of the matter.

Mr. MOORE subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the report of the Truman subcommittee concerning its study of our national oil problem, I take this occasion to say that it is a splendid, detailed, and accurate review of our petroleum situation, and the committee is to be congratulated upon its keen insight into the problems that confront us. The committee has taken a firm stand against the ownership by this country of foreign oil reserves, with which I heartily agree. The committee suggests that probably participation by our Government with the efforts of our nationals in the development of their foreign reserves should be given careful consideration, but strongly recommends that our Government take no steps in this direction without the Congress being thoroughly advised and being afforded full opportunity to investigate such proposals.

It is my own view that there are no reasons sufficiently compelling to cause our Government to enter the oil business, or any other business, in competition with our own citizens at home or abroad, either directly or indirectly; and most certainly the administrative officers of our Government should not take any further steps to this end until the Congress has been fully advised and given full opportunity to approve or reject such policy.

The report offers, as one of its suggestions, a policy of full diplomatic backing for American enterprise in exploring and developing foreign petroleum reserves. This, to my mind, is a sound policy, and is in keeping with the principles and traditions of this Government. It is perfectly true that since 1932 our nationals have been wholly without substantial diplomatic support in their efforts to develop foreign oil reserves. The expropriation of the property of our nationals in Mexico and the inadequate settlements that followed are examples of our failure in this respect. I should like to point out, however, that this has not always been the case. The large stake in the oil reserves of the Middle East, now owned by American nationals, except the concessions of Cal-Tex and the Gulf Oil Development Co., is due to the strong diplomatic support of the State Department under the administration of Mr. Bainbridge Colby in 1921 and the continuation of his policies by his successor in office, the Honorable Charles Evans Hughes. At some appropriate time in the future, I hope to detail the history of the activities of our State Department in this connection. The report could well conclude that the real solution to our petroleum problem is again to return to the policy of Colby and Hughes—namely, the active and firm diplomatic support to the commercial efforts of our own nationals abroad, rather than the policy of imperialism that is being proposed by some of our executive and administrative officials.

COL. ANDERSON F. PITTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1528) for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts, which was, in line 12, after the word "officer", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

Mr. WHITE. May we have an explanation of the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. It simply provides the usual 10-percent limitation on attorneys' fees.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

NELS J. PEDERSEN

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday, during the call of the calendar, the Senate passed Senate bills 1358, 1409, and 1334. I understand that those bills are now on the desk, and have not yet been sent to the House. In the meantime, I am informed by the clerk that the House has passed bills identical to the ones mentioned by me. I think the bills could well be disposed of at this time by having the Senate consider the House measures and pass them, rather than refer them to committees.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider House bill 3298, for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen. If unanimous consent to that end is obtained, I shall thereafter ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the corresponding Senate bill was agreed to, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me inquire whether the Senator proposes to ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the House bills corresponding to the Senate bills passed yesterday by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. The House bills are identical to the Senate bills referred to; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Parliamentarian that it will be necessary that the House bills be passed first.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3298) for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1358 was passed is reconsidered, and the Senate bill is indefinitely postponed.

HOWARD L. PEMBERTON

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 3351.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this bill in the identical situation with the previous bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is in the identical situation. The only difference between the two bills is that the House bill represents the amount recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3351) for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1409 was passed is reconsidered, and the Senate bill is indefinitely postponed.

J. C. DAVIDSON AND VASSIE LEE DAVIDSON

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 3193.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I take it this bill is in the same situation as the other two bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. The same situation, except that there is a difference of $6 in the amount.

Mr. WHITE. We will not quarrel over a difference of $6.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3193) for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson was read twice by its title, considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1334 was passed is reconsidered, and the Senate bill is indefinitely postponed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations in the Marine Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Martin Travieso, of Puerto Rico, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico, vice Emilio del Toro Cuevas, resigned; and

John P. McMahon, of the District of Columbia, to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia. (Judge McMahon is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired December 15, 1943.)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond A. Spruance to be admiral in the Navy for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Omar T. Pfeiffer to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 17, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 16 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE MARINE CORPS

Brig. Gen. James T. Moore to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of February 1944.

Brig. Gen. Francis P. Mulcahy to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of February 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 16 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Raymond A. Spruance to be an admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from February 1, 1944.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Omar T. Pfeiffer to be brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from October 15, 1942.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Sallie C. Athey, Grady.
James T. Mabrey, Horton.
Zada Davis, Magazine.
Beekman L. Youngblood, Minter.
Bessie M. Forman, Odenville.
John Ellis, Ohatchee.
Robert M. Craft, Owens Cross Roads.
Addie G. Oliver, Panola.
Nevada Tuggle, Quinton.
Elsie Mae Fowler, Sumiton.
Sarah E. Harding, Theodore.
Rufus C. Johnson, Trafford.
Danny D. Coleman, Whatley.

CALIFORNIA

Marie G. Turner, Chatsworth.
Joe Z. Silva, Sharp Park.

CONNECTICUT

Evelyn P. Estabrooks, Hampton.
Lewis M. Cromwell, Poquonock Bridge.

FLORIDA

Maggie L. Vaughan, Dinsmore.
Joseph D. Coburn, Eagle Lake.

Anna B. Chapman, Florida City.
Olga L. Ward, Malone.
Roy S. Troutman, Palm Harbor.
Angus W. Pledger, Panama City Beach.
Cornelia P. Deas, Perrine.
Otis M. Ashmore, Sopchoppy.
Kathleen Pullen, Wabasso.
Inez G. Arnold, Westville.

GEORGIA

Anna L. Hinton, Dacula.
William C. Spires, Doraville.
Ethel Nash, Dunwoody.
Robert J. Walsh, Garfield.
Mark C. Balkcom, Georgetown.
Willie H. Massey, Hahira.
Willie Pate Phillips, Harlem.
Alva D. Lindsay, Hephzibah.
Mary Elizabeth Reeves, Luthersville.
Annie C. Hays, Mansfield.

ILLINOIS

Mabel J. Spires, Kempton.
Edward J. Duffy, La Salle.

LOUISIANA

Modiste C. Lavoilette, Mermentau.

MARYLAND

Russell M. Buck, Upper Marlboro.

MISSOURI

Josie Monan, Braggadocio.
Florence C. Clifton, Gasconade.
Oliver William Branneky, Pattonville.
Herbert S. Bond, Sheridan.
Elizabeth C. Merrell, Vandalia.

NEW MEXICO

Hezekiah Hall, Magdalena.

NEW YORK

Marion E. Kerr, Glenfield.
Grace A. Barker, Industry.
Dorothy W. Andersen, Mastic.
Mary I. McKernan, Olcott.
Frank J. Alianell, Retsof.
Charles De LaVergne, Salt Point.
William J. Griffin, Jr., Starlake.
Alice V. D. Laskoski, Tomkins Cove.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lillian H. Rice, Durton.
Foster M. Lynch, Coward.
Robert A. Dobson, Fairforest.
Joseph W. Holliday, Galivants Ferry.
James A. Montgomery, Lane.
Joseph G. Brabham, Olar.
Inez M. McCollough, Salters Depot.
Boyce B. Myers, Scranton.
Oscar Tuck, Westminster.

TEXAS

Ruth N. Floyd, Batson.
Mabel F. Selkirk, Blessing.
Mary A. Herrington, Caddo.
Fordyce C. Sims, Cedar Hill.
Viola L. Harris, Christoval.
Eva L. Parker, Garden City.
Frank E. Staudt, Harper.
Annie Thomas, Hawley.
Albert W. Mosley, Purdon.
Verna Gregory, Rice.
Arthur N. Brown, Jr., Richland.
Ida L. Cowan, Roanoke.

WEST VIRGINIA

Thomas R. Moore, Jr., Charles Town.
Winnona P. Kahl, Triadelphia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, the world gives its peace to reward toil and its rest from labor, but Thy peace passeth all understanding: "My peace, give I unto you; not as the world giveth, give I unto you." We pray for the inspiration of Thy presence to prepare us for earnest work and to stimulate us to wise action. Let us go forward to cast up a highway for those rhythmic feet of freedom; from the loins of those embattled hosts are destined to spring democracies and republics yet unborn.

Thou who art the Light of the world and the Vine of mystery, we pray that, tempered with knowledge, our acts may be the fruitage of being true to one's self through Thy unerring voice. Let us feel the determination of this throbbing purpose, to live for fixed moral principles, to engage in nothing that conflicts with the sovereignty of duty; following Him who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross and glorified the mark of a slave. We pray for Thy counsel that we may keep Thy commandments, continue to deepen our respect for truth, for honor, and for our neighbor's good name. Send the impure darkness back from whence it came and let Thy pure light shine everywhere. Bestow upon our President, our Speaker, and the Congress the blessings of wisdom and the ease of the untroubled heart. We pray in the name of Saint Mary's holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 550. For the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;

H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended;

H. R. 2340. For the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2639 An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2691 An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes;

H. R. 2976 An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3001 An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076 An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3189 An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3329 An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H Morhouse;

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 3428 An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442);

H. R. 3504 An act for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade;

H. R. 3605 An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606 An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607 An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943; and

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes";

H. R. 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide

allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof;

H. R. 480. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Fred Hunter;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield;

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Henry Angell;

H. R. 2350. An act to liberalize the service-pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents;

H. R. 2697. An act to provide for the disposal of materials or resources on the public lands of the United States which are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior;

H. R. 2836. An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3157. An act for the relief of Lloyd L. Johnson and P. B. Hume;

H. R. 3261. An act to amend the act of April 29, 1943, to authorize the return to private ownership of Great Lakes vessels and vessels of 1,000-gross tons or less, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3916. An act to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3477) entitled "An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 255):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of three Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that the Acting President pro tempore had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Departments:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of War.

ELECTION CONTEST OF E. O. CLARK AGAINST JACK NICHOLS

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 440, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of E. O. Clark, contestant, against Jack Nichols, contestee, Second Congressional District of the State of Oklahoma, be dismissed.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the granting of my request to extend my remarks in connection with the report submitted by the Committee on Elections No. 3, in respect to the contest filed by the Honorable E. O. Clark, of Stigler, Okla., against the Honorable Jack Nichols, in connection with the election held in the second district of Oklahoma in the general election in 1942, I desire to briefly call attention to some of the matters suggested by the report, and particularly call attention to some of the testimony submitted in the case which the committee had before it for consideration in the determination of the contest.

The record discloses that the contest was filed by the contestant on December 5, 1942, after the State election board of the State of Oklahoma had refused to take jurisdiction and authority, and had refused to permit the contestant to recount the ballots and make an investigation of the election proceedings in the various counties in the second congressional district.

Apparently the State election board attempted to justify its action in dismissing the contest that was filed before that board, and refused to take jurisdiction under the assumption that the House of Representatives, being the judge of the qualifications of its Members, has sole and exclusive jurisdiction in contest matters pertaining to the office of a Representative for Congress, and entirely overlooked or disregarded the general rule with reference to such matters which is pointed out by the committee in its opinion in this case, to the effect—

It has been said again and again by the House, by the courts, by every tribunal that has this duty of passing upon contested elections, that the returns which are made by the inspectors appointed by the laws of the State where the election is held are presumed to be correct until they are impeached by proof of irregularity and fraud, and that the House will not erect itself nor will it erect its committees as mere boards of recount.

Be that as it may, I think it can be fairly stated from a full examination of the report that the House committee bases its order of dismissal largely upon the proposition that the evidence in the case is insufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the committee that fraud per se was perpetrated on the contestant by the election officials and that in the absence of a recount the evidence as a whole is insufficient to override and overturn the presumption of validity carried in the election certificate issued by the State election board to the contestee.

The case is interesting from the standpoint that no evidence whatever was submitted by the contestee. All of the evidence which the committee had before it for consideration was evidence offered by the contestant and was uncontradicted; and it is interesting to note from the committee's report that although, as suggested, it made disposition of the case largely on the failure of the contestant to establish fraud, that some consideration was given to the acts and conduct of the election officials who held and conducted the election.

Commencing at the bottom of page 3 of the committee's report will be found this very interesting language:

It is charged by the contestant that the election was held and conducted in disregard of the election laws of Oklahoma, in that no registration book as is prescribed by law, was had or kept in certain precincts in the election districts. Other irregularities of a similar nature with regard to certain requirements were referred to. That there were such irregularities, which this committee does not condone, was fairly proven. It is not the business nor the province of this committee, however, to attempt indirectly to compel the State of Oklahoma to enforce its laws with respect to certain provisions therein which patently were not complied with, but grossly disregarded.

Section 6, of article III, of the Constitution of Oklahoma, provides:

In all elections by the people the vote shall be by ballot and the legislature shall provide * * *; and may, when necessary, provide by law for the registration of electors throughout the State or in any incorporated city or town thereof, and when it is so provided, no person shall vote at any election unless he shall have registered according to law.

Pursuant to the authority granted by its constitution and to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and to preserve the purity of the ballot in the State, the Legislature of Oklahoma enacted a registration law which became effective February 26, 1916, which law was in full force and effect at the time of the election in controversy, November 3, 1942. The legislative provision reads as follows:

It shall be the duty of every qualified elector in this State to register as an elector under the provisions of this act, and no elector shall be permitted to vote at any election unless he shall register as herein provided. (Okla. Stat. 1941, title 26, sec. 72.)

This law requires that the county registrar furnish the precinct registrar of each election precinct in his county with necessary registration certificate books, every alternate sheet of which is to be perforated so it may be detached, the perforated sheet to be for the purpose of writing the original registration

certificate of the elector on, immediately underneath to be a carbon sheet, and immediately underneath the carbon sheet to be an exact unperforated duplicate of the original, the original to be numbered consecutively, beginning with the number one, and the duplicates to bear the same number as the originals; that the county registrar take receipts therefor from the precinct registrar showing the number of the precinct, and the county, and the number of certificates contained in the registration certificate book, the receipts to be filed by, and retained in the office of the county registrar—idem, section 75; that an applicant for registration appear personally before the precinct registrar and take an oath that the statements contained in the registration certificate are true and correct, and the certificate to be then and there filled out in indelible pencil, and signed, by the precinct registrar, and thereupon, if the precinct registrar be satisfied that the applicant is a qualified elector in the precinct at the time, to deliver the original registration certificate filled in to the applicant and to retain the duplicate original—idem, sections 76, 77.

Frank Connelley, the county registrar of Sequoyah County, admitted his disregard of the law authorizing him to deliver these registration certificate books only to precinct registrars, and requiring him to take receipts therefor when issued by him, and admitted his violation of the law in delivering these registration certificate books to others than the official precinct registrars and even to candidates and that he took no receipts for any of the registration certificate books issued by him—record 150, 151.

Obviously, the law requiring an applicant for registration to appear personally before the official precinct registrar, make representations under oath to that official as to his eligibility for registration and otherwise satisfy him that he was a qualified elector, was disregarded and flagrantly violated in Sequoyah County.

The law provides a definite period of registration before each primary, special, and general election, commencing 20 days before and ending 10 days before any such election, and that the precinct registrar shall have no authority to register electors at any other time, and that no registration certificates issued by any precinct registrar at any other time shall be valid—idem, 79—except in the case of registration of newly created precincts—idem, 83; but the law makes no provision for the precinct registrars to be at any particular place at any particular time during that period for the purpose of receiving applications for registration, and the lack of such a provision makes it necessary for a person wishing to register to locate, find, and personally appear before, the official precinct registrar.

The unavailability of the precinct registrars in Sequoyah County to applicants of the minority—Republican—party for registration during the periods of registration, and the partisan performance of their duty to receive and consider the application of all persons desiring to register, is strongly indicated by testimony adduced by contestant. Earl Floyd Winsel, a candidate on the minority—Republican—party ticket for representative from Sequoyah County in the State legislature in 1936 and for county commissioner in that county in 1942, testified that he not only could not get a registration certificate book, but could not locate the precinct registrar or any person who had a book and was never able to secure the registration of any Republican—record 201–203.

The disregard and violation of the law prohibiting registration of applicants except within the registration period, and providing that certificates of registration issued at any other time shall be invalid, is shown by the testimony of Wheeler Mastuson, an official precinct registrar. He testified he made out certificates to persons up to the day of the election—record 148.

This law created the offices of county registrar and precinct registrar, provided for their appointment by the secretary of the State senate and the county registrar, respectively, their respective tenures of office to be during the pleasure of the appointing officers—idem, section 73. The administration of this registration law and the application of the election machinery in the State of Oklahoma and in Sequoyah County have been in the hands of the majority—Democratic—party since 1907. The witness, Edgar Blackard, testified that the majority—Democratic—party has had charge of the election machinery since 1907—record 151. We find no contradiction of this statement in the record.

This law requires one general registration book, called the county registration book, for each county, to be substantially bound and to be a permanent record, to be made up by the secretary of the county election board, by his entering therein the name of each elector registered in alphabetical order by the election precinct, the school district in which such elector resides, dates of registration, his age, residence, occupation, race, color, politics, and the number of registration certificate as shown by the duplicate registration certificate of each precinct, and when completed to be filed with the county clerk to be a public record and the county clerk to be the custodian of it—idem, 77. This law further provides, however, that the secretary of the county election board shall keep the county registration book current by entering upon it the names of all persons registered during any registration period after the closing of such registration—Oklahoma Statutes, 1941, title 26, section 79.

It appears from this law—idem, section 81—that the purpose of this county registration book was to afford a public record or list of the names of all persons who had been registered prior to any election, readily available to all interested persons, so that illegal registrations, if any, might be purged in the manner therein provided; and without such a book it appears that there is no way provided for purging the poll lists of illegal registrations.

The record discloses that no county registration book has ever been completed for Sequoyah County. Tom Hale, the county clerk, the county official whom the law provides shall be custodian of this book, produced a book entitled "County Register of Electors" and testified that it was the only book of its nature in his custody; that it was incomplete, contained only a partial list of the precincts of the county, and was never regarded or considered as a complete list of the registered voters of the county; that no effort had been made for a number of years to complete it or bring it up to date as to the various precincts, and that he had no book in his office from which a list of the qualified voters of Sequoyah County could be obtained—record 147, 148.

Under the Oklahoma law the secretary of the respective county election boards is required to retain possession of the duplicate registration certificates of the respective election precincts in the county at all times, and to deliver them to the inspector of such precincts, on or before the day before any election, for use at the polling places—Oklahoma Statutes 1941, title 21, sections 80, 89.

Guy L. Thompson, the Secretary of the County Election Board in Sequoyah County, whose duty it was to deliver these duplicate registration certificates, testified that he delivered no duplicate registration certificates to any of the inspectors of the 36 election precincts in Sequoyah County before election day, November 3, 1942; and further testified, in substance, that he had none of the duplicates, that they had not been preserved, and were not in existence.

Obviously, the purpose of the registration law and the procedure required of the election officials is for the purpose of providing a means of ascertaining and determining the qualified electors who may vote in any given precinct. Sequoyah County is one of the counties comprising the Second Congressional District. The number of votes cast in that county in the election in controversy was sufficient to determine the result of the election in the whole of the congressional district.

The record is undisputed that in all of the election precincts, so far as Sequoyah County is concerned, in the election held on November 3, 1942, the provisions of the registration law of the State of Oklahoma were entirely disregarded. I point this out not for the purpose of criticizing the committee in its refusal to eliminate all of the votes from Sequoyah County, because undoubtedly a vast majority of the votes cast in the county were cast by citizens who were entitled to vote and not be disfranchised, even though the registration laws had not been complied with. Rather, I bring this to the attention of the House in support of the committee's finding that the election officials in Sequoyah grossly disregarded the provisions of the Oklahoma election laws.

The Election Committee takes the position that the provisions of the Constitution and the statute with respect to registration and compliance with the registration laws is merely directory and should always be treated as directory, unless the law either expressly or in effect makes them essential to the validity of the election. There is respectable authority to this effect. On the other hand,

there is much respectable authority to the contrary.

McCrary on Elections, fourth edition, section 135, states as follows:

> It being conceded that the power to enact a registry law is within the power to regulate the exercise of the elective franchise and preserve the purity of the ballot, it follows that an election held in disregard of the provisions of a registry law must be held void.

In the Florida election case of *Bisbee, Jr.*, v. *Finley* (2 Hinds' Precs., sec. 980, p. 322, Congress) it appears that the registration law of Florida was almost identical with the registration law of Oklahoma. There, as here, a county registration book and a precinct registration book were required to be made and kept and were not, and the facts of that case were otherwise strikingly similar to the facts in the instant case. Because the registration law was disregarded in Brevard County all of the elections in that county were held void and the return of that county was rejected and not included in the count. Insofar as Brevard County was concerned, the claim for the rejection of the poll of that county was based solely on the ground of the failure of the authorities in that county to comply with the registration law. The factual basis of the decision in that case as it relates to Brevard County is identical with the facts in the instant case, as they relate to Sequoyah County. In that case, the committee says:

> To sustain this as a legal registration would do violence to the provision of the constitution and laws of Florida, would destroy all the safeguards against the frauds at elections which the registration laws are intended to prevent, and would, we think, furnish greater facilities for fraud than the absence of any registration at all.
>
> Your committee therefore hold that the election in this county must be set aside as illegal and void.
>
> The principle is so well settled that an election held without registration, under laws requiring registration, is illegal, that the citation of authorities is deemed unnecessary.

In *Benoit* v. *Boatner* (1 Hinds' Precs., sec. 340, p. 230), the majority of the committee rejected the entire vote of a precinct and says:

> In the absence of the poll list it was of course impossible to hold a fair and honest election, for the reason that it could not be definitely known who was entitled to vote.

With reference to other gross irregularities which the committee perhaps had in mind, and caused it to find that the election laws of Oklahoma had been grossly disregarded, was the wholesale distribution and use of absentee ballots in various counties and precincts in the congressional district, by election officials, contrary to the express provisions of the Oklahoma statutes.

The absentee-ballot law in the State of Oklahoma permits the secretaries of the election precincts to issue absentee ballots only upon application made in person or by mail by the absentee elector to the secretary of the county election board, the ballots and supplies to be forwarded to said absentee elector—Oklahoma Statutes 1941, title 26, section 324.

The record discloses in Adair County, as well as in other counties in the congressional district, that without application in writing or in person by the absentee voter, himself, or anyone for him, the secretaries admitted mailing ballots and supplies to absent Democrat voters; and after the ballots were returned, either voted them themselves or caused them to be voted.

The record further shows that one, H. T. Williams, who was the Democratic county attorney of Adair County, received from a secretary in one of the election precincts somewhere between 25 and 100 of these absentee ballots, and that in one of the polling places during the noon hour and while everyone except the election inspector was out for lunch, this Democratic county attorney entered the polling place with a large bundle of absentee ballots and sat down with the inspector, A. C. Ray, and in the absence of the judge of the election and without checking the ballots with the stubs, as provided by law, or any other registry, that he and the inspector opened envelopes purporting to contain the ballots and placed the ballots in the ballot box.

The record is replete with circumstances of similar nature, and while it may be that all of these patent, gross irregularities are insufficient to invalidate the election and insufficient as a matter of law to impeach the presumption of validity vested in the election certificate issued to the contestee, certainly they are sufficient to warrant the investigation of an election in which the contestee as the candidate of the political party which had control and charge of the election, claims to have been elected in a congressional district by only approximately 385 votes. This would seem especially true where a State election board dominated by the same political party denied itself jurisdiction and by so doing suggested that the House should set itself up as a recount committee.

There are various other interesting circumstances appearing in the record which are too numerous to mention, but in passing we should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that in one precinct in the town of Coweta, Okla., where admittedly in the race for Governor a total of 426 votes were cast, and in the race for United States Senator 427 votes were cast; while in the congressional race the returns show that only 318 votes were cast. The record is undisputed that the Republican candidate for Governor received 272 votes in this precinct, the Republican nominee for United States Senator 290 votes, and even a deputy mine inspector—with not a coal mine in the county—received 240 votes. The contestant, the Republican nominee for Congress, is credited with receiving only 164 votes.

In the same precinct the Democratic candidate for Governor had 154 votes, the Democratic candidate for United States Senator 137 votes, and contestee, the Democratic nominee for Congress, 154 votes.

If the official return from this precinct is to be accepted as correct, it shows that 109 voters did not vote for either the contestant or contestee, and that they were all Republicans.

Undoubtedly, the only honest conclusion that can be reached is that whoever certified the vote erred to the tune of 100 votes, to the detriment of the contestant. This would seem especially true in view of the fact that the unofficial reports on the night of the election credited the contestant with having received 264 votes in this precinct, which is in keeping with the total vote cast for other Republican nominees.

The State election board, with this type of evidence before it, said that it was without jurisdiction and could afford no remedy for the contestant, presumably on the theory, as heretofore suggested, that the House was itself the proper tribunal to make the investigation.

The House says that it cannot erect itself as a recount board, and so the contestant finds himself in the peculiar position of being denied by his own State election board the right of a recount or review; and when he brings himself to the United States House of Representatives its committee says that there were "gross irregularities" and flagrant violations of the election laws, "fairly proven" by the contestant, which "the committee does not condone," but is without authority to intervene because "it is not the business nor the province of the committee to attempt indirectly to compel the State of Oklahoma to enforce its laws * * * which patently were not complied with, but grossly disregarded."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1945

Mr. RABAUT, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1149), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I ask the gentleman from Michigan if the members of the Committee on Appropriations have made any agreement as to the time to be allowed for general debate on the bill he has just reported?

Mr. RABAUT. They have not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman advise the House what time is likely to be allowed for general debate, for the information of the Members?

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that the

ranking minority member of the committee has just left the floor, and I cannot inform the gentleman at this time concerning that matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman from Michigan confer with the minority members and see if you can agree on the time for general debate, and let the gentleman from Massachusetts and me know what agreement has been reached so that I may advise the House about it later?

Mr. RABAUT. I will do that. I thank the gentleman.

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered in my district by our colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] on February 10.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to provide a basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, have until midnight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press, and further to extend my own remarks and include therein an article by Dorothy Thompson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

SIMPLIFIED EXPLANATION AND ANALYSIS OF INCOME-TAX FORM 1040

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I call to your attention a simplified explanation and analysis of income-tax Form 1040 which I am placing in the RECORD at the suggestion of several Members who have been as much at sea as I have as to how to make out that form. I think this will be helpful not only to the Members of the House but to some 40,000,000 taxpayers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOSEPH J. O'BRIEN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PETROLEUM RESERVES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, for some weeks I have been working on a comprehensive speech on the subject of oil and I hope to have it ready for delivery within the next few days. Since, however, announcement of the proposed construction of a pipe line across Arabia has brought oil very much to public attention, there are a couple of things I want to say right now.

The first is that whereas some Members of Congress seem to be worried about the Government "getting into" the oil business in competition with the private major oil company monopoly, I am worried on the other hand about the oil companies invading the Government in competition with the American people. And second, I now read in the press once again statements that "petroleum reserves will last only 14 years." I am not prepared to say that this may not be accurate, but I do wish to warn the House that I first read that our petroleum reserves would last only 14 years when I was a small boy of about 10 years and I have been reading the same thing continuously at 5- or 10-year intervals ever since.

What is needed is a determination of the facts in this matter by a truly independent governmental agency which will get its information from sources other than the controlled findings of the major oil companies themselves. Accordingly, I am introducing a resolution today calling for a complete investigation of this whole petroleum matter by a committee of the House consisting of three members of the Committee on Public Lands, three members of the Committee on Naval Affairs, three members of the Committee on Military Affairs, three members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, three members of the Committee on Agriculture, and three members of the Committee on Mines and Mining. I should have preferred to place this matter in the hands of one of the standing committees of the House but in view of the fact that several committees are directly interested and jurisdiction therefore uncertain, I felt the resolution in its present form was the best I could do. The important thing is for the job to be done and to be done at once, for the American people are entitled to accurate and complete information on this all-important subject.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an article by Mark Sullivan, and further to extend my remarks in two instances and include in each an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an article by Mr. Merlo Pusey, entitled "Short Cuts to Roll-back Subsidies," appearing in the Washington Post of February 15, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD relative to a letter I have received from a soldier in the South Pacific.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own re-

marks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., minority leader of the House of Representatives, at the Lincoln Day Banquet held in Washington, D. C., on Thursday, February 10, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand one of these calendars that are printed by the Government, I suppose, and are hanging all over America. I observe that every national holiday is set out in red on this calendar except Lincoln's Birthday, which receives no recognition. This is the first time I have ever noticed this or that it has been called to my attention. Whoever is responsible should be censured severely. If it is an oversight, he should make the proper public apology.

I include in my remarks a letter from a patriotic constituent of mine who says:

YORK, PA., *February 10, 1944.*

Hon. CHESTER H. GROSS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHESTER: I suppose you have seen some of the calendars the United States Government is distributing to the different offices in the United States. It has a picture of the Capitol at Washington, but the thing that took my attention most was the fact that February 12, which, of course, is Lincoln's Birthday, is printed in black type, whereas all the calendars that I have seen have this particular date printed in red type.

I am sure this was done deliberately by some New Dealer in Washington, and I, as an American citizen and a good Republican, highly resent this slur on one of our great Presidents.

There is one of these calendars hanging in the office of city draft board No. 2, and I suppose they are in all similar offices in the United States.

Kindly verify this condition and if you find it correct, think you should give them a "blast" on the floor of Congress.

I am writing this letter in a hurry and also in anger, and hope it reaches you before you leave Washington for the week end.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN F. HIVELY, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the State Legislature of Mississippi.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter appearing in this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LINCOLN DAY SPEECHES

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I have read all these Lincoln Day speeches and I observe that my friends on the Republican side are engaged at the present time in two battles. One is that they seem to be fighting Mr. Willkie, and the other is that they seem to be fighting Mr. Roosevelt. I can understand how they might fight Mr. Roosevelt, but after what I heard 4 years ago from Republican Members of this House on the floor and from newspaper reports of speeches in the way of praise of Mr. Willkie, I cannot see why they are treating him in such a manner now.

DESECRATION OF LINCOLN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to both gentlemen who have just spoken, let me call attention to the fact that the nearest thing to a desecration of Lincoln's Birthday that I know of was a party thrown by Marshall Field 3d, the playboy millionaire from Chicago, here in Washington on Sunday last.

I am told that he threw a party that would make Belshazzar's feast look like a Chinese soup kitchen. They had everything from cocktails to caviar. I understand that he spent more than $7,500 on that wasteful revelry at a time when every American is being called on to save and buy bonds in order to fight this war.

He is the same Marshall Field who last September received a fortune of $70,000,000 that has entirely escaped taxation, and is now being used to finance PM, a Communist publication that is being used to malign the white people of the South, stir up race trouble, promote communism, and discredit the Congress of the United States.

I hope the Commissioner of Internal Revenue attended that party as an observer, for I am trying to get him to bring suit to collect the taxes on that vast fortune before Mr. Field squanders it all in riotous living or in financing subversive publications.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PIPE LINES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3916, to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic-tube transmission in the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 1, strike out "north" and insert "south."

On page 2, line 4, strike out "and" where it occurs the first time and insert "or."

On page 2, line 20, strike out "and" and insert "or."

On page 3, line 1, strike out "and" and insert "or."

On page 3, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman kindly tell us what the amendments are?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this legislation has to do with the laying of certain pipe lines in the District of Columbia. The House passed this bill several weeks ago. The Senate took action on it yesterday, and the amendments added by the Senate are simply corrective.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They do not change the text?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No. The body of the bill is as we passed it in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on concurring in the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. Martin F. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by John L. Boyd, on the League of Nations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS FROM COAL AND OTHER SUBSTANCES

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3209) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3209, with Mr. DELANEY in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose last evening the first committee amendment was pending. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 9, after the word "firm", insert "educational institutions."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 4, after line 14, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed the sum of $30,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments to offer. They relate to the same matter, although appearing at different places in the bill. I discussed them yesterday. It seems that they are in no way controversial. I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments be considered together in view of the fact that they relate to exactly the same matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: On page 2 strike out all of subsection (b), lines 15 to 25, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(b) to acquire by purchase, license, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation; and to acquire by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, donation, or otherwise, land, and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interests; options on real or personal property; plants and their facilities; to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property."

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: On page 4, line 4, after the word "act", change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That such licenses are consistent with the terms of the agreements by which such patent rights are acquired."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] in charge of this bill where he is going to get the money to finance this program. Is the gentleman going to get it from taxation or by the sale of bonds to private investors, or is he going to get it via the Government printing press? Will the gentleman please answer that question?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Oh, I did not know that the gentleman was asking a question for information. I thought his question was merely rhetorical.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not asking a rhetorical question, but a factual one. Where are you going to get the money to finance this program? Are you going to get it from taxation, or the sale of bonds to private investors, or through the Government printing press?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Answering the gentleman, I might say that this program will make many millions of dollars for the Federal Government, and create an asset of great importance. If the gentleman will read the bill——

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The bill provides——

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield. I submit to the gentleman that the only way this money can be raised is by the Government printing it. We are not selling enough bonds to private investors and by taxation to pay the cost of government.

I ask, Is that good financing? The gentleman in charge of this measure has frankly and forthrightly stated that this proposed program cannot be expected to achieve results before the expiration of 4 years. This measure therefore can by no stretch of the imagination be considered as a war measure. On the contrary, it is an anti-war-effort measure.

The very means by which it must be financed should make clear to us that it cannot be anything other. The process of Government financing through the banks—that is, creating new money by simply printing it—is undermining our whole financial structure. The longer the war lasts, the more will the evils of this procedure manifest themselves.

From the standpoint of the war effort I consider this a dangerous and inimical measure. Thirty million dollars of additional Government printing-press money would have its effect in further undermining the financial structure of the country and hinder our war effort. But worst of all it would serve the purposes of other nonessential and nonwar proposals. If you can print thirty million new dollars for this project which has no prospect of being helpful to the war effort, why is it not reasonable to suppose that you can print additional millions or even billions of dollars for other similar paternalistic undertakings?

This Congress has no right to authorize or to appropriate one single penny that is not absolutely essential to the prosecution of the war and the maintenance of minimum essential Government functions.

I sincerely believe that a vote for this measure is a vote to undermine our war effort and to prolong the war and add to our losses. I beg of you to respond to the crying need of our soldiers and the Nation to save every dollar possible for the war effort by voting down this proposal.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I know that the distinguished Member from Ohio, in speaking of communistic procedures in government and bureaucracy, as he did yesterday, would not want to imply that the members of his own party on the Committee on Mines and Mining—Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky; Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan; Mr. LANDIS of Indiana; Mr. BISHOP of Illinois; Mr. ROCKWELL of Colorado; Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois; Mr. ELMER of Missouri; Mr. BREHM of Ohio; and Mr. ELLSWORTH of Oregon—would have approved this measure and reported it unanimously with the Democratic members of the Committee on Mines and Mining if they thought for a single moment there was any intention or effort to be communistic in proposing that the United States build demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances to protect our domestic needs, even if it was proposed in the cloudy days of war and not in a recognized era of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute to answer the question of the gentleman from West Virginia.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In answer to your question, I should like to say that the Eighth Ohio Congressional District elected me to the office which I am now holding. When I was elected and took my oath of office I went on the assumption that it was my duty to examine all the measures that might come before Congress and judge them on their merits and give no heed or consideration to partisan politics whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON: On page 1, line 7, after the word "coal", insert the following: "And one or more demonstration plants to produce liquid fuel from agricultural and forestry products."

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no personal interest in this thing, no interest affecting my district, that is, in the immediate future; and none expected. I am only interested in the general welfare of our Nation and agriculture. I am for the bill. We have heard so much about the potential exhaustion of our petroleum, and I think it is well founded. I know from experience. I have had a little oil interest myself back in my own State. Recently it has come to my attention that there is

a proposed request for another $300,000,000 to be spent to manufacture synthetic alcohol from petroleum. I have that on pretty reliable information. Therefore I introduced H R. 4096 on January 31, of this year, which would prevent the use of any further Federal funds for the manufacture of synthetic alcohol from petroleum.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I would like to state to the gentleman that I am very much in favor of his amendment. Our committee worked carefully on the question of the production of rubber and synthetic gasoline or fuel by the use of alcohol. We are very much in favor of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I want to give you a little more background on this. Almost 2 years ago it was my great privilege to sit for a few months on the Senate side with the Gillette committee, which was investigating the further industrial uses of agriculture and forestry products in industry. One day I was quite impressed with Dr. Rosten, a Polish scientist, who had done much work in Poland in the manufacture of alcohol, which was used in the manufacture of rubber. We also had there another scientist who was in this country at the same time. Dr. Rosten read from the record of the report of the Petroleum Institute that had been held the year before in California that there was only a visible or potential supply of petroleum to last this country for 13 or 14 years. He told us many things that were new to us in this country. He had just recently come from Poland and he said we are wasting in the United States and Canada over 700,000 tons annually of fermentable sugar in waste sulfite liquor which is going down our streams and polluting our streams.

When I first came to Congress in January 1939, I had been interested up to that time in motor-vehicle alcohol fuel blends. I had been using it in my own cars. I became familiar with the advantages of it. I took up the study of what foreign countries had done in that respect.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. I want to compliment the gentleman on what he said about making alcohol out of waste sulfite liquors, and Dr. Rosten's fine work, which has resulted in the granting, by the War Production Board, of first priorities for a plant for the manufacture of alcohol out of sulfite liquors in the United States. That is in my own State.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I want to go into that a little more in detail. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. Alcohol is synonymous in our thinking today with blended motor fuels and also rubber. They are vitally needed and perhaps we are going to need them not only in our war effort, before this war is over with the Japanese, but for some years to come, we do not know whether we can get any foreign rubber. Other countries have been using alcohol motor fuel blends. I do not care whether it comes from grain or from waste sulfite liquor or sawdust, which they can make, and I know it. I am speaking now of the great Northwest, where you do not have a lot of petroleum, but where you can make alcohol motor fuel and where you get economy of operation when such products are produced where the raw materials are available. England has been using it for many years. They have been using an alcohol blend and the Standard Oil Co. has.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes. I would also like to ask him if he will yield at this time for some questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman knows that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL] has a very similar amendment that he would like to add to your amendment. He would include the words "oil shale" to your amendment.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I will accept that.

Not only has England been using it, but the Standard Oil Co. in England has been producing it over at its plant and they advertised it as "at last, the perfect motor fuel"; a blended alcohol. Yet we cannot get it here.

Cuba, our good neighbor to the south of us, has been using it. This is not hearsay because I checked with the Cuban Embassy this morning. On October 13, 1942, the O. R. P. A., which is comparable with our O. P. A., passed a resolution on motor fuel blends; Alcohol 65 percent, gasoline and naphtha 30 percent, 5 percent other petroleum oils, and so forth. They are getting along wonderfully with it. Yet we are suffering from a lack of those things.

I want to say to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who is so deeply interested in this, that he told us a great story about a plane landing here, powered with synthetic gasoline made from coal. There was quite a story in the paper and I was greatly interested in it. I was proud of the progress that had been made. I was glad we were not going to be dependent upon foreign oils but were going to be self-sufficient with our own raw materials.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I yield briefly.

Mr. MAY. Coal is mined in marketable quantities in 37 of the 48 States of the United States. We have been producing coal for perhaps 100 years. Up to this time we have shipped it all in bulk without determining how many by-products might be extracted by chemical methods. With the oil industry estimated by Mr. Ickes to be exhausted within 13 or 14 years, why is it not important that we take some step now?

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Well, we should. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Along that line, we get our styrene largely from coal in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. About 25 percent of the ultimate raw material that goes into synthetic rubber comes from coal products.

With reference to that plane coming here, not long ago there was an automobile driven up on the Capitol Grounds, equipped with synthetic-rubber tires made from waste sulfite liquors. They first extracted the fermentable sugars, then converted the sugars into alcohol, then into Buna S rubber, all done by private capital up in Canada, and these cars are running all over the country on demonstration.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is aware of the fact that Dr. William Hale, an eminent scientist, estimated that for $100,000,000 we could set up 100 farm grain-alcohol plants and produce more synthetic rubber than has been produced by the $700,000,000 spent on synthetic rubber.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. There is no question about it whatever. I regard Dr. Hale not only as one of my personal friends but a great scientist and a leader in motor-fuel alcohol blends. If we had followed his teachings on this a little more we would be a great deal better off today.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. I am sorry. My time has about expired.

Now, reference has been made to $720,000,000 that has been spent in setting up synthetic rubber plants. There were only 200,000 tons set aside to be made from grain alcohol, and that was because of the fight put up on the other side of the Capitol, as well as on this side, to make rubber from agricultural products. Otherwise we would not have had any from grain alcohol. I do not care whether the alcohol comes from grain, sawdust, or waste liquors, but there is only one plant today making butadiene from alcohol operated on private capital and it is not in full operation yet. That is only a small plant of 15,000 tons that is privately owned. All the rest are Government owned and they might we wiped out after the war is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON] has again expired.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if my amendment adding "oil shale" was accepted?

The CHAIRMAN. We will first dispose of the amendments offered by the gentleman from Illinois. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Was my amendment accepted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROCKWELL: On page 1, line 7, after the word "coal", insert a comma and the words "oil shale."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: On page 3, line 2, after the words "any industrial organization", insert "or any educational institution."

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, New Mexico is vitally interested in this bill. It is an oil-producing State, but it has also large deposits of coal. Unfortunately, because of lack of demand for coal, the coal miners have up until this war been able to operate only 1, 2, or 3 days a week.

The New Mexico School of Mines, I understand, has been giving some thought to this problem, and it is at their suggestion that I offer this amendment. It merely adds educational institutions to the enumerated list of persons and agencies which the Secretary of the Interior may utilize, if he deems it desirable, in carrying out the purposes of the bill.

I appreciate, of course, that the Committee on Mines and Mining approved and the committee has accepted an amendment permitting cooperation with such institutions. This additional amendment is broader, however, in that it would permit the Secretary to engage the services of the institution or its facilities, if he finds such an arrangement desirable and mutually advantageous.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment. We have "educational institution" used in another subsection of the bill. This amendment is perfectly in order, and if agreeable to the gentleman we will accept it at this time.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I appreciate there has been an amendment made in the second paragraph, but I was not sure whether it covered the field I wanted to cover.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The committee certainly wants the measure to cover educational institutions as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: On page 3, line 23, after the word "channels", strike out down to and including all the language in line 4 on page 4.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, here is an amendment to which I assume there will be a great deal of opposition, but I see no reason why we should go out today and tax the taxpayers or sell bonds to raise $30,000,000 to do a job that private industry stands ready to do, and at the same time give the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, authority to dispose of lands, real and personal property, at any time he desires to do so.

Going through the report on this bill which is signed by Abe Fortas, Acting Secretary of the Interior, I find some very interesting language. Only a few weeks ago this House had before it a proposition which had to do with the oil industry. A showing was made, and the bill was passed on the proposition that new oil fields were not being discovered and development work was slowing down because of certain irregularities incident to the price ceilings on oil. This House acted on the showing there made. Now, Mr. Fortas comes along and in this report makes a dissimilar presentation to that used on oil which shows exactly how that kind of fellow operates in applying the same argument for different purposes. A proposition of this kind gives another reason why I opposed the bill yesterday afternoon. If you give a man enough rope he finally hangs himself if his mind runs along certain channels. Then he makes this fallacious argument:

Under present conditions we cannot rely upon industry to make the initial, unremunerative expenditure necessary to solve the technical and economic problems of synthetic fuel production.

I deny that statement and challenge Mr. Fortas to show that the people of this country are unwilling to provide risk capital to do this kind of job or any other kind of job that is necessary to be done in this country. Historically, we have done the necessary until the Government began to compete and drive out private enterprise.

I was amazed by the argument of my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON] awhile ago when he demonstrated that certain types of equipment had appeared on these Capitol Grounds which had been financed and the bugs taken out of their performance as a result of the enterprise of private citizens. Why in the world do we at this time come in here and propose another $30,000,000 gouge of the people of this country to carry out an undertaking when we know full well that the people of this country have over $100,000,000,000 standing ready to put into the private-enterprise system of this country if these Government bureaus and if the Congress would just for a few minutes let private industry alone and stop promoting these Government projects. I do not propose to support this bill now. I can understand why Members from coal districts—and, incidentally, I have a coal district myself—will come in here and support this kind of operation. Why do you want more than one pilot plant? If you have got to spend Government funds for this purpose, why not build one pilot plant, let the bugs be taken out of the process in that plant, and the process then turned over to private industry? Why go out here with a "pork barrel" proposition and put these plants all over the United States during wartime? You cannot answer that question satisfactorily to the people of the United States.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I should like to say that I agree somewhat with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why, of course, the gentleman agrees with a lot of it.

Mr. MAY. Not necessarily with what the gentleman has said but with his motion to strike out those lines. The purpose of the gentleman undoubtedly is to prohibit the Secretary from disposing of real estate at his will.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I think the better way to reach that would be to amend that provision in the bill by inserting after the word "shall" in line 24 the words "subject to the approval of the Congress." Then he could sell land only if the Congress approved of it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That certainly would be satisfactory to me. In other words, let the Congress of the United States control their own affairs instead of delegating the powers to these bureau heads and the departmental heads.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman just asked why more than one plant may be necessary. This bill is not confined strictly to the study of coal and coal derivatives.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand that, but this bill has a certain objective. If you will bring your scientific data and raw materials, and so forth, to a concentrated point you will get better results out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is certainly in order and your Committee on Mines and Mining would be agreeable to an amendment of that type. We do know that a program of this kind must have certain lodgment of authority within a Federal department of the Government. I do not think of this development of a synthetic fuel industry of the Nation as being solely in the hands of Secretary Ickes, John Smith, or any other man. I think of it, as I know the Members of this House think of it, as being under the direction of those experts of the United States Bureau of Mines who throughout the Democratic and Republican administrations have continued vital research programs. They have fostered developments which have been of great value and assistance to this country.

I believe, and I do not want to be misunderstood, that we too easily and too lightly bounce the ball of bureaucracy against the sounding board of prejudice and public opinion. I say that from my heart. I do not agree with the insidious phases of bureaucracy any more than my colleague from Ohio [Mr. SMITH],

but it is factual that in Government departments there are those conscientious, skilled, and able men who have been of great assistance to the development of America. I cannot allow to go unchallenged certain criticisms which have been spoken, when we take into consideration what has been accomplished in this country in research.

Let us consider one example very briefly, the National Advisory Council for Aeronautics. Think of its record for a moment. Its work was created by Congress 29 years ago to deal with research and development problems of flight. It placed America definitely ahead of any other nation in the world from the standpoint of technical development of the airplane. In 1933 there was an aeronautical congress held in this country. The experts from the other countries were unanimous in saying that because of the research we had done in aeronautics we were 10 years in front of any other country. That was the testimony given by the representatives of other nations. What happened? We found later, to our dismay, that Germany had not gone along in the regular and slow routine of small research. Hitler had multiplied facilities for air research. Perhaps five times as much advancement had been made in 5 or 6 years under his prodding as we had in the United States. We realize however that the fine developments carried on at Langley Field, Va., were not enough, and this Congress in its wisdom went out to Sunnyvale, Calif., and established another great laboratory, and a third one at Cleveland, Ohio. It should not be difficult to convince anyone that the money this Government has put into this aeronautical research, some $70,000,000 being invested, has given to this Nation a continuing return on the money spent and has proved of economic value. We know that its work served America as a safety measure for air transport and general flying in time of peace and that it gives to us a superior performance in time of war. Our existence as a country can well depend on the latter consideration.

Mr. Chairman, the dollars we spend on research and carefully conceived development of the programs which are for the well-being of our people and the advancement of America will pay dividends far in excess of the funds which are spent on the resources which are consumed. My colleagues, let us act with wisdom worthy of our leadership. Let us be far-visioned. Let us proceed in America, not far away from home, in the fact-finding development of a synthetic-fuels program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this legislation is enacted. It will eventually assure the Nation of an adequate petroleum reserve for any emergency. The lesson taught us by the failure to provide a reserve of rubber should be sufficient to drive us immediately to a farsighted, sound business policy of assuring adequate reserves of all basic material.

The known petroleum reserves of the Nation are about 20,000,000,000 barrels. The annual consumption in 1943 was about one and a half billion barrels. If no further reserves are discovered, the entire 20,000,000,000 barrels would be consumed in 13 years. The program outlined by H. R. 3209 might well take 15 to 20 years before the work is completed to assure us the proper liquid fuels at satisfactory production costs. The program is a good insurance policy against a dearth of liquid fuel. We hope additional reserves sufficient for our needs will be discovered, but that still should not stop us from providing against a failure of these reserve discoveries at any time in the future.

A significant statement was made by Mr. Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator for War, in the course of an address at the annual meeting of the American Petroleum Institute in Chicago, November 1943. I quote:

> Our experience over the past 5 years and the outlook for the future, as far as we can see it, suggests that whatever the reserves yet to be discovered, they will be found more slowly, with greater difficulty, and at greater expense than reserves have been found in the past. Current studies show that it is four or five times as difficult and costly to find a barrel of new reserves today as it was in the pre-1938 period.

All evidence gathered from authorities shows that with present discovery rate, the present production rate, and the prospects of consumption continuing because of the war to be heavy, leave us with reason to believe that we shall be feeling the pinch within 8 years, and that we shall have reached the end of our supply of petroleum in 13 years. We cannot afford to be indifferent to a sound, businesslike policy such as is being offered today.

There need be no fear that Government will enter into competition with private business. This is neither the purpose nor intent of this program. The Government function is to develop and perfect the best-known processes for acquiring liquid fuel from coal and shale. Private industry can take it then. My experience leads me to believe that the present oil companies would be willing to take up whatever processes are developed by the Government.

The importance of the program is more apparent when we consider that petroleum obtained in the United States is furnishing the best lubricating oil in the world, and also the highest octane gasoline. Both are essential for the high efficiency of military airplanes. These factors have helped bring about the superiority of air power which we have achieved over Europe and the Pacific. Therefore, why not conserve this petroleum for such use—military and commercial? Why not produce suitable lubricants and gasoline by hydrogenation of coal to serve satisfactorily for many less exacting uses? Why put high-grade gasoline and lubricants to low-grade use? It has been said that gasoline obtained from hydrogenation of coal can be improved to 87-percent octane, suitable for most uses, but not so good for military planes.

Our duty seems to me to be clear. We must conserve the valuable and indispensable petroleum and provide a supplemental quantity of lower-grade fuel for all uses other than flying. For my part, I cannot disregard my duty toward posterity. I will support the bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will be quite brief. I come from an oil-producing State but I am very much in favor of the passage of this legislation. I am glad that an amendment has been added to include oil shale and agricultural products. Personally I do not believe that work of this character to determine the practicality of the production of gasoline and related products from other sources than petroleum can possibly be carried on any other way than with governmental support under existing circumstances and with the oil monopoly as powerful as it is.

I am not going to elaborate upon that statement right now because I hope to do so in an effective way within the next few days. Suffice it to say that in my opinion it is our duty to try to develop sources of these critical fuel materials from every possible angle in the United States, for certain it is that the degree to which we become dependent upon foreign sources will be that much weakness to our country. Perhaps we are going to have to do it, I do not know, but in any case we ought to do the very dead level best we can to provide these resources here at home and we should not be balked in that effort by any private interest whatever. For that reason I welcome this bill and I agree with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] that sometime in the future this money will be regarded as having been well spent and Congress will be applauded for its foresight in making this practical research possible.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment to the text of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 3, line 24, after the word "shall", insert "subject to approval by Congress."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It appears to me that if the gentleman introduces those words we should strike out the three words "in his discretion"; then it would read that the Secretary of the Interior shall also have authority to dispose of any lands, and so forth.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a proper suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire to modify his amendment?

Mr. MAY. Yes. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be modified according to the suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified, and the Clerk will report the modified amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 3, line 24, after the word "Interior", strike out the words "in his discretion" and insert "subject to approval by the Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. My only object was to leave this in the hands of the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the pending bill, H. R. 3209, for a very specific reason. In the first place, I am of the opinion that we might much better develop this synthetic-gasoline process and have it ready in case of need than not to develop it and need it and not have it. We had that experience with synthetic rubber and are still suffering as a result of our failure to prepare for this emergency.

My distinguished friend from Michigan says that private enterprise will take this process up and develop it. That would be fine, but they did not develop synthetic rubber to the point where it met our need when we got in the hole and were short of natural rubber. I am not criticizing them for this; I am just calling attention to the fact that they did not do it and that we had to spend $670,000,000 to develop a synthetic-rubber program.

Another point I would like to make is this: It is said that if grain alcohol had been utilized, we would have been able to develop the same quantity of the elements of synthetic rubber for $100,000,000 that have cost us $670,000,000. That might be true, I do not know, but I do know that the amount of essential grain that would have been used would have brought about a shortage of food products in the United States, although it might have relieved the rubber shortage. I am informed that private enterprise and private institutions that are interested in the development of gasoline from coal, from shale, and byproducts appeared before the committee, and that they were in full accord with this bill. I want to emphasize once more, Mr. Chairman, that we better have this process developed and ready for use even though we do not need it at this time, than to have the day come when we do need it and not have it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 4, line 16, after the word "of", strike out "$30,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000,000."

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the committee amendment having been adopted, it is not subject to new amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is correct. It is not in order to amend an amendment that has been agreed to. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Then no amendments whatsoever are permitted with respect to the amount provided in this measure?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read part of a letter which in my opinion, beautifully portrays the spirit of the Congress of the United States. A gentleman appeared in my office a few days ago and asked me to support a subsidy for a certain purpose. I am not going to mention his name, or his connections, as I am not authorized to do so, but from his letterhead it would appear that he represents an important organization.

Here is what he says in this letter:

We too are thrifty, rugged individualists. There is, however, just one point to make. In a situation of heavy losses and large inefficiencies, the correction of which will greatly increase our tax-paying power, what other way can you suggest than Uncle Sam's doing this job for the sake of all his children?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This is an intelligent citizen?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. He is of the age of responsibility.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know him, I never heard of him before, but I will venture the statement that he is absolutely confused. With reference to Mr. Eccles, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, he went up to New York the other day and made an address before the Tax Institute symposium pointing out that too much money in the hands of the people will bring inflation to us, if it ever arrives. And with this I agree. He does not say anything about roll-back subsidies preventing inflation. He just talks about too much money in the hands of the people. Then there is Mr. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, who goes out and makes his long speech of a few days ago and points out that there is too much buying power in the hands of the people. Yet your friend writes you a letter and says, "Let us have the Government take care of all the people as though they were irresponsible little children."

What in the world is the matter with the thinking people of the United States today? If this country is to be saved, it will be saved by the literate people, not by the illiterate or the racketeer element.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I thank the gentleman, and want to add this further comment. Government paternalism is both of endogenous origin and growth. It does not come about through public demand, as is commonly alleged, but from those in Government service.

The spirit in Congress for Government controlled and owned industry—that is, totalitarianism — is very pronounced. It is doubtful if the people realize how strong this feeling is in Congress, and I wonder if Congress itself knows where it is leading our country.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to read a letter I have just received from the Petroleum Administrator for War. It follows:

PETROLEUM ADMINISTRATION FOR WAR,
Washington, D. C., February 16 1944.

Hon. JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RANDOLPH: On your inquiry today as to the relationship of a synthetic liquid fuels program to this war, I reply that the relationship is direct.

The R. A. F. air fleet that bombed Berlin last night uses in part British-made synthetic fuel. The luftwaffe that met it uses in part German-made synthetic fuel. Japan has synthetic fuel. It is a matter of chagrin to Americans that we do not already have synthetic gasolines, although, fortunately, the dwindling natural petroleum with which this country was blessed has, through heroic measures of American industry, kept our air forces in the sky, our fleet on the seven seas, and our Armies on all continents.

It is not given to me to know how long this war will last, but I believe we will have enough natural petroleum to finish it. I do not believe we will have enough for another war, and all who study the question think that we will come out of the war to peace with a shortage of domestic natural petroleum.

We need synthetic liquid fuels now, but we have not got them. It took other nations years to develop their synthetics and even the great fuel industries of this country, which have urged this Government to embark forthwith on the program set forth in your bill, do not feel such new industry can be established quickly. It is our purpose to avoid any interference with the unknown future of this war, but the Army and the Navy and all familiar with synthetic fuel possibilities believe that we must start our program now.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Administrator for War.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DELANEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3209) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 434, reported the same back to the House with

sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 28]

Allen, Ill.	Hinshaw	Newsome
Baldwin, Md.	Hobbs	O'Brien, Ill.
Bell	Hoch	O'Leary
Buckley	Hoffman	O'Neal
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Mass.	Pace
Celler	Horan	Patman
Chapman	Izac	Patton
Cole, N. Y.	Jennings	Pfeifer
Cullen	Johnson,	Poage
Curley	Luther A.	Pracht,
Dawson	Judd	C. Frederick
Dewey	Kennedy	Price
Dirksen	Keogh	Reece, Tenn.
Disney	Kilday	Reed, Ill.
Domengeaux	Kirwan	Robsion, Ky.
Douglas	Kleberg	Rowan
Drewry	LaFollette	Russell
Ellison, Md.	Lambertson	Shafer
Elmer	Landis	Smith, Va.
Elston, Ohio	Lea	Smith, W. Va.
Fay	Lemke	Sumners, Tex.
Fenton	Lesinski	Taylor
Fish	Luce	Thomas, Tex.
Fulmer	Lynch	Thomason
Gamble	McMillan	Treadway
Gifford	Magnuson	West
Gordon	Mahon	Whelchel, Ga.
Gorski	Mansfield,	White
Hare	Mont.	Wilson
Hébert	Mansfield, Tex.	Winter
Heffernan	Monkiewicz	Worley
Hess	Morrison, La.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—yeas 140, nays 13.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANTON J. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title: After the word "coal", insert a comma and the words "agricultural and forestry products and oil shale."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a similar Senate bill, S. 1243, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the House bill (H. R. 3209) just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, within the limits of critical materials available, is authorized for not more than 5 years to construct, maintain, and operate one or more demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances with all facilities and accessories for the manufacture, purification, storage, and distribution of the products. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $30,000,000 for the purposes of this act. The plants shall be of the minimum size which will allow the Government to furnish industry the necessary cost and engineering data for the development of a synthetic liquid fuel industry and of such size that the combined product of all the plants constructed in accordance with this act will not constitute a commercially significant amount of the total national commercial sale and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this act, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized—

(a) to conduct laboratory research and development work and with pilot plants and semiworks plants make careful process engineering studies along with structural engineering studies in order to ascertain lowest investment and operating costs necessary to determine the best demonstration plant designs and conditions of operation;

(b) to acquire, by purchase, lease for a term of years or less, or donation, land and any interest in land, including easements and leasehold interests; options on real or personal property; plants and their facilities; secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, irrevocable nonexclusive licenses, and other rights and licenses under patents granted by this or any other nation; to assume the obligation to pay rentals in advance on property so acquired, and to pay damages arising out of the use of any such property: *Provided, however*, That the maximum quantity of land or any interest therein, or any other property, acquired hereunder shall not exceed that necessary to carry on experiments for the purposes herein provided;

(c) to engage, by contract or otherwise, engineers, architects, and any private industrial organization he deems suitable, to do all or any part of the work of designing, constructing, or operating the plants, the operation to be under his supervision, and through leases or otherwise as he believes advisable;

(d) to cooperate with any other Federal or State department, agency, or instrumentality, and with any private person, firm, or corporation, in effectuating the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to sell the products of the plants at not more than actual cost, including amortization of capital expenses, as determined by him, to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal or any State government, but priority shall be given to orders placed by the War or Navy Departments. Any remaining products may be sold at going prices to any purchaser through regular commercial channels. The Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, shall also have authority to dispose of any lands or other real or personal property acquired, but in his opinion no longer useful, for the purposes of this act. No patent or patent rights acquired by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall prevent any citizen of the United States, or corporation created under the laws of the United States or any State thereof, from using any invention, discovery, or process to which such patent or patent rights relate, or restrict such use by any such citizen or corporation, or be the basis of any claim against any such person or corporation on account of such use.

SEC. 4. All moneys received under this act for products of the plants and royalties shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The Secretary of the Interior shall render to Congress on or before the 1st day of January of each year a report of all operations under this act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior may issue rules and regulations to effectuate the purposes of this act. The authority and duties of the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be exercised through the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill just passed, H. R. 3209.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the proceedings by which the House bill, H. R. 3209, was passed be vacated and that bill laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings whereby the bill, H. R. 3209, was passed will be vacated and that bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The title to the Senate bill will be amended accordingly.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion, I suggest to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] that general debate shall continue for 30 minutes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania think that 30 minutes will be sufficient to make his statement and for other Members to speak?

Mr. SNYDER. I have no requests for time.

Mr. POWERS. Might I suggest that we provide for 1 hour and if we do not use it, of course, we can yield it back. Let me further suggest that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself.

Mr. SNYDER. That is agreeable.

Mr. POWERS. I think that will be satisfactory to everybody.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 1 hour, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4183, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, with Mr. HART in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is recognized.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are about to consider provides for the so-called civil functions administered by the War Department. It embraces five activities—namely, cemeterial expenses, Alaska communication system, civil works under the Corps of Engineers, local Soldiers' Home, Panama Canal.

For all, it makes available $86,911,440, in addition to which there will be drafts upon currently available funds which will remain unobligated on next July 1, to the amount of $24,566,539.

We are taking away, through repeal provisions, all unobligated balances in excess of that amount. The total amount we are repealing is $34,957,572.

The bill contemplates by far the smallest expenditure program of any we have provided for since appropriations for war civil activities were divorced from the military appropriations act back in 1938. They reached a peak of roundly $344,000,000. This bill, including the use of previously appropriated funds, calls for roundly $111,000,000.

This tremendous reduction is responsive to these considerations:

First. The added expense occasioned by the war is borne by military appropriations as regards cemeteries and the Alaska communication system;

Second. River and harbor and floodcontral activities are practically confined to maintenance, to avoid conflict with the war program; and

Third. The Panama project of protective works is drawing to a close and the new locks project virtually will be at a standstill.

There are six river and harbor improvement projects, itemized on page 4 of the report, upon which it is planned to expend a total of $3,630,000, and there are but three construction projects under the flood-control head, listed at the top of page 5 of the report, upon which it is planned to expend $1,017,000.

All of the flood-control money; that is, general flood-control money, except $100, is to come from presently available funds withheld from expenditure upon projects for which appropriations heretofore have been made. The balance from such source is estimated to be $16,115,000.

The bill exhausts all but $4,000,000 of that amount, and that $4,000,000 we are proposing the repeal of, because we found that the Department, with Budget approval, had been employing funds appropriated for specific projects upon projects for which we had not been asked to appropriate.

We cannot quarrel with deferring work, but we feel that we should have a voice in the application of funds thus released. To insure that, we are taking away the unallocated balance.

We pursued that course, also as to rivers and harbors. The balance under that head will be $1,482,750. We are taking away $700,000, with the idea that the remainder should be available for contingencies of one kind or another.

The Budget contemplates the use of $2,000,000 of the amount to be employed upon the general flood-control program for advance planning of projects not heretofore commenced. We have raised that two million to four million, cutting down by two million the amount that would be available for repeal.

My committee had the foresight to initiate advance planning in the 1943 fiscal year bill. The Congress has made funds available in the past for such use—approximately $15,000,000 all told, both as to river and harbor and flood-control projects, and we are getting dividends in the way of a backlog of projects which may be immediately undertaken when the labor situation permits and the demand for critical materials somewhat subsides.

You will find in the hearings, on page 4, a list of river and harbor projects that have been made ready for commencement in consequence of our action heretofore, looking to cushioning the postwar adjustment. The cost to complete such projects is said to be $163,000,000 plus.

Then, if you will turn to page 36 of the hearings, you will see a list of flood-control projects that have been or are being made ready for commencement when funds become available for so doing. The $2,000,000 that the Budget submission contemplates will be employed on advance planning would be expended on that list. The $2,000,000 which we have added would be applied to the list on page 38 of the hearings, but I may say that there is some duplication in the two lists—not of money, but projects. An additional $18,000,000 is needed for advance planning on all authorized flood-control projects, and this bill provides but $4,000,000 of that amount.

We tried to ascertain what this advance planning means in the way of jobs. The investment heretofore, we were told, should provide 800,000,000 man-hours directly employed and 1,200,000,000 man-hours indirectly employed. That is worth thinking about, apart from the importance and urgency of accomplishing flood-control work in areas frequently subjected to devastating floods.

There is nothing unusual about other items in the bill. The protective-works project pertaining to the Panama Canal is approaching completion. The third locks project is almost, or will be next year, in a state of suspension.

Canal revenues are very decidedly off. Transit tolls have in the past yielded as much as $24,000,000 a year. In 1943 they had dropped to $7,368,000.

I see no occasion to take any more of the time of the committee, Mr. Chairman. The hearings are not voluminous, and they and the report, I should say, will answer most, if not all, inquiries.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman a moment ago was discussing a program of advanced planning.

Mr. SNYDER. Definitely.

Mr. MOTT. And this appropriation to carry out the work under that planning comes from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. I wish to ask the gentleman if this planning program of projects was authorized by any legislative committee?

Mr. SNYDER. The projects are all authorized and the planning is a recognized incidental expense.

Mr. MOTT. There is no money appropriated in this bill simply upon the recommendation of an executive agency that it needed certain money to carry out projects which it had planned itself?

Mr. SNYDER. The Army engineers have the authorization from Congress for the projects for which the bill provides.

Mr. MOTT. I can understand that in rivers and harbors projects that would have to be the case. I am now asking if that is also the case in connection with any planning program that might be contained in this bill?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; in any other part of the bill.

Mr. MOTT. It has all been previously authorized by a legislative committee and voted by the Congress?

Mr. SNYDER. That is right.

Mr. Chairman, that is all the time I will take myself for the moment.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. I wish to request that the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield me 5 minutes of his time. When I said I had no requests for time on this side I had none. Since then, however, I have received requests for half an hour, and I want to speak for about 3 or 4 minutes myself. If the gentleman will yield me 5 minutes of his time I believe I can adjust myself to the situation.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania consumed 11 minutes.

Mr. SNYDER. Yes; I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, there is very little I have to say about this bill, for the chairman has explained the various items it contains. I suppose this is about the first time in recent years that an appropriation subcommittee has brought a bill to the floor of the House identical with the Budget estimate. It is identical, penny for penny. When you look over the items this bill carries—cemeterial expenses, the Alaskan communications system, civil works under the Corps of Engineers, the local Soldiers' Home, the Panama Canal—you can fuliy realize after looking at the various amounts that have been appropriated for these functions that it is definitely impossible to cut anything from them.

We have instituted a practice that I hope will be followed by some of the other subcommittees—we have sent money back to the Treasury which has not been reappropriated. In the past it has been the custom of the various subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee to leave with the Budget unappropriated moneys. We found by doing that the Budget would use these moneys many times for projects that the Congress did not specifically appropriate for. In other words, the Budget was becoming the appropriation committee and the Congress of the United States. So by sending back to the Treasury from this bill about $35,000,000 we have at least indicated to the Budget what our wishes are in the future.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the gentleman if any provision is made for funds for the construction of a cemetery near Portland, Oreg., in my district, under Public Law 388, passed by the Congress some time back?

Mr. POWERS. Let me say to the gentleman that under the item "Cemeterial expenses" all the present national cemeteries have been taken care of as to upkeep and maintenance. There is no provision made for the individual project that the gentleman mentions. The committee felt that because of the survey that is now being made and on account of a bill which has been introduced or may be introduced placing a national cemetery in practically every State in the Union we should wait until we receive a report from the War Department before authorizing any additional national cemeteries at this time. I commend the gentleman from Oregon in his diligence and insistence in his presentation to our committee that funds be provided for the Portland cemetery.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that I am very sorry some provision has not been made for beginning construction of this cemetery because there is no national cemetery in that whole Northwest area. The gentleman will recall I urged that his committee include an item in the bill for the Portland national cemetery. The nearest national cemetery to our district is in Montana and south of San Francisco. Public Law 388 was passed by the Congress several years ago, during the Seventy-seventh Congress, and signed by the President. The veterans' organizations in my district and all through the Pacific Northwest have been very insistent that something be done to provide burial facilities for deceased veterans, yet we have been unable to get any appropriation to begin the construction of that cemetery. There are no burial facilities for veterans in the whole Northwest area. Personally I feel it is as much a war activity and as much a part of our sacred duty to provide decent burial for our servicemen who sacrifice their lives in the defense of our country as it is to provide food for them while they are fighting on the battlefields. As I said, we cannot make any headway with the Secretary of War or the Bureau of the Budget on this appropriation to carry out the mandate of Public Law 388 of the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Mr. POWERS. I agree fully with the gentleman. He and I have discussed this problem at length. I admire his tenacity. I admire the thought that is behind the project. But may I say that I hope by this time next year there will be a report from the War Department that will clear the situation up and that the gentleman will get the much-needed national cemetery in his district.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. May I say further on the subject of cemeteries, and with special reference to the inquiry of the gentleman from Oregon, that I believe progress can be made in considering a cemetery program for the entire country if provision is made that the several agencies of the Government which own original public domain or have acquired land in the several States are canvassed to see what land they might make available for this purpose. The gentleman from Oregon has been very diligent in this matter and he is further ahead than other sections of the country in that he has an authorization act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, progress will be made, it seems to me, if a canvass is made of the several Federal departments that own land in the several States. In the gentleman's State of Oregon there are some very beautiful national-forest lands and very beautiful national-park lands. In the national forests in his State and in many other States throughout the country a suitable portion of land could be set aside and dedicated to this very important purpose. That would save the Government the cost of land acquisition and it would also avoid taking additional land off the tax rolls. As the gentleman knows, the Byrd committee and other committees of the Congress have been much concerned over the growing percentage of land that is being taken off the tax rolls and going into public ownership. Where we have these large tracts of land that might be usefully employed for such purpose I hope that it can be done.

Mr. ANGELL. May I say to the gentleman that I am heartily in accord with his thought. I have a bill pending to provide for assistance to the States where these lands are taken by the Government. In my own State of Oregon over 50 percent of the land is now owned by the Federal Government. However, I believe the gentleman will understand that a cemetery must be located where friends of the deceased may have an opportunity to visit it, and it must be located where there is transportation available to reach it, also where there are facilities for water and other facilities for development and maintenance. To build a cemetery in the Cascade Mountain area in my own State would be ill advised in my opinion. The lands owned by the United States in Oregon are in the mountain area.

We might as well have no cemetery as to locate it in a remote, inaccessible place because our people who would want to go to the cemetery would not be able to do so. It would be more economical in the long run to buy a site strategically located for this purpose, easily and quickly accessible, near the center of population than to go to the additional expense of developing a cemetery in an outlying district.

Mr. CASE. That would be true if we assume that the development of a cemetery is to be in an outlying district. If 50 percent of the gentleman's State is now owned by the Federal Government, it should be self-evident that with the magnificent highways you have out there and with those beautiful streams, it ought to provide a site which would be easily accessible and where water would be available. I think that is true in many States where the percentage of public-owned land is not anywhere near 50 percent. It certainly would be a boom to the Federal Government if we would start using some of the land which the Federal Government owns in the States instead of constantly thinking that we have to acquire new land, take it out of private ownership, take it off the tax rolls, and pay for it out of the Federal Treasury whenever we have a Federal project. As I stated, the gentleman from Oregon has been very diligent in this matter. There is an authorization for a cemetery in the State of Oregon, but the Bureau of the Budget has not seen fit to submit an estimate at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the consideration of the Members of the House for a bill which will follow the pending bill. I ask those Members who may feel that this is a small bill, perhaps an inconsequential bill, affecting denationalization, to stay here and listen to the discussion. I believe this is a fundamental matter in

American government, one which will require the serious consideration of the Congress sometime in the near future.

The bill to which I refer comes from the Committee on Immigration and proposes to put into the law a means for the denationalization of the Japanese. This is a question of serious interest and importance to the citizens of California because we had in California some 122,000 of the approximately 140,000 Japanese in the United States. I have sensed either a lack of interest in the subject on the part of those people who live in areas where there are few, if any, Japanese or I have sensed that perhaps there is a feeling that California is somewhat prejudiced on this subject; that this is something on which California's feelings are influenced by certain relationships in agriculture and trade. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that is not so, but that we have a familiarity with the subject that gives us an intense interest in the bill and which all of us, or the great majority of the California delegation, would be willing to express here today.

Unfortunately the bill has come from the committee with a very limited amount of time, an hour upon the rule, then 1 hour only for discussion of the bill.

Under the division of that time, it would be difficult to get the time necessary to place before you the principles involved in the entire discussion. I express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], who is in charge of the division of the time that I may be permitted now to speak out of turn.

The bill comes with a recommendation, which I think it is generally understood is the recommendation of the Attorney General, that there be added to section 401 of the naturalization law, which is in chapter 4, providing means for the loss of nationality, a subsection (i) which would provide that any member of any alien race who expressed in writing a desire to be a citizen of the other nation, involving practically a request for denationalization, would then be denationalized. The statement would then be laid before the Attorney General and the decision would be left to the Attorney General as to the propriety of the request and what conclusions should be drawn from it.

Mr. Chairman, there are two points involved at that moment. The first is that this matter, in the opinion of many of us, should go before the courts and not before the Attorney General, no matter who the Attorney General might be. The courts are the agencies of government which have to do with naturalization; they give citizenship to a man, or a woman, and they are the agencies who should decide whether citizenship is to be taken away.

Secondly, it has been repeatedly said in my hearing, and in my hearing it was said before the Committee on Rules, where I was only by accident when this came up, that this would meet the problem of some 4,000 Japanese who had stated in a questionnaire that they preferred allegiance to Japan. I wish it understood, Mr. Speaker, that it will not reach those 4,000 Japanese, nor will it reach 1 of those 4,000 Japanese in the form in which it comes before the House this afternoon. It could reach them only if those members of that group were again voluntarily to step up and say that they wished to be sent back. I do not need to tell you that will not be the case, and I can tell you definitely that it is said even by the bill's supporters, that less than 10 percent of them are expected to do that.

Consequently, the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] will bring before this House this afternoon as a new subsection, in addition to the proposed subsection (i), what would be subsection (j), which proposes, first, that this matter shall be taken before the courts, where we think it properly belongs, and second, that it shall take into consideration these previous statements of the members of a race who have, at a time when they believed their nation was in the ascendancy, preferred to return to that nation.

The legal points will be discussed by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. There is no question here of an ex post facto bar, for reasons which he will state. I most earnestly urge not merely the consideration and the thoughtfulness of the Members of this House but their support of the amendment which the gentleman from California will propose.

Basically, if I have a moment more that I may use for this purpose, I suggest that this will in the future become a matter of serious consideration in the United States. This country has been the great melting pot of the world. Your people and my people have come from other nations and have become American citizens. I am only the second generation on one side of my family in this country. I am a descendant of a group, on the other side, which came from Europe because of religious persecution. Nothing that I would do upon this floor would in any way hinder or stop or handicap the right of a member of another race, compatible with our race, to become a citizen, and acquire and hold citizenship. I suggest that in the history of the world the oriental races have never mixed with the occidental races without the oriental races becoming the dominant peoples. Therefore, it is a question as to how far these things shall go. I hold that the Congress has the right and duty to prevent infiltration, just as much as it has the right and duty to oppose invasion.

In a case in the Supreme Court in 1897, when the matter was much less critical than it is today, the problem was laid before the Supreme Court of the United States and by a 6 to 3 decision the Supreme Court confirmed, quite properly as of that time, that citizenship was acquired by birth in all races. However, there was a long and thoughtful dissenting opinion by Chief Justice Fuller, concurred in by Justice Harlan, and I wish to quote two paragraphs from that 30-page opinion, and to suggest to you that this is not a matter to be passed off lightly but one which should have the serious consideration of the Congress. I quote:

> Now I take it that the children of aliens, whose parents have not only renounced their allegiance to their native country, but are forbidden by its system of government, as well as by its positive laws, from doing so, and are not permitted to acquire another citizenship by the laws of the country into which they come, must necessarily remain themselves subject to the same sovereignty as their parents, and cannot, in the nature of things, be, any more than their parents, completely subject to the jurisdiction of such other country.

Then I skip over to the final paragraph of the opinion, and I quote again:

> It is not to be admitted that the children of persons so situated become citizens by the accident of birth. On the contrary, I am of opinion that the President and Senate by treaty, and the Congress by naturalization, have the power, notwithstanding the fourteenth amendment, to prescribe that all persons of a particular race, or their children, cannot become citizens, and that it results that the consent to allow such persons to come into and reside within our geographical limits does not carry with it the imposition of citizenship upon children born to them while in this country under such consent, in spite of treaty and statute.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman insert in the RECORD at this point the name of that case and the volume and page at which that opinion may be found?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It is the case of *United States* v. *Wong Kim Ark* (U. S. Repts. 169), October term of 1897, and the quotations began at page 725.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that if a parent comes from the other side and marries in this country, and a child is born, that child takes the nationality of the parent, under this decision?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No. The gentleman misunderstood me and perhaps did not hear. What I said was that the Court had decided by a 6-to-3 vote—and I said, very properly at that time—that the child took the nationality of this country. I was using this as an illustration to support the seriousness of the argument. If the gentleman did not hear me before, I am asking support of the amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let us come back to the basic question on which the gentleman is addressing the House. Suppose that a Japanese came here under a merchant permit, under which he had a right to enter this country, and the child is born in this country. Does the gentleman contend that that child's citizenship can be stripped by the mere action of the Congress, in disregard of the Constitution?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If such a question were involved, I should be very happy to discuss it, but such a question is not at

all involved. The question is whether a Japanese who comes here, who defies the United States, and who declares his allegiance to Japan can by this bill which the gentleman's committee reported, then avoid being sent back to Japan. Does the gentleman know that under that bill there could be no action toward sending him back to Japan?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman also contend that if a person of that character, who is born in this country, and who has lived in this country, makes an expression of disloyalty he may be deported?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If he has expressed disloyalty and wishes to be deported.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Assuming that he has expressed disloyalty, would it not be the proper thing, under the War Act or under some other act of Congress, to take him out of circulation by punishing him?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am glad the gentleman has suggested that. We have for the first time in 80 years in this bill violated a fundamental principle of the United States, and that is that people shall not under the hectic conditions of war, be deprived of their citizenship. This bill, brought in by the committee, for the first time set up a new principle on that point.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has a wrong idea of this whole proposition. All we are doing under the proposed amendment is finding that a man by his own conduct, his own words, in his own handwriting, has denationalized himself, has stripped himself of citizenship by his own writing or conduct, and all we do is to make a public finding of that fact.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Many of the 4,000 Japanese who are involved in this are men and women who were born here, and who, when they were infants, were taken back to Japan, raised in Japan, and indoctrinated with the ideas and principles of Japan, and then were brought back to this country for the very purpose for which they find themselves here in wartimes.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of anybody who desires to make a speech this afternoon, let me say I shall be very glad to yield a part of my time, for I do not expect to use all of it. I have two or three things to which I wish to direct attention.

First of all, I was disturbed the other day to read in the morning paper a dispatch which said that where war prisoners were being employed a demand was made by a certain labor organization that a 25-cent weekly check-off be paid on behalf of the war prisoners. The statement was made, as I recall it, that 80 cents a day was required to be paid to these prisoners under the international agreements to which the United States is a signatory, and that in addition to that, under the contract which the contractor had with the labor organization, he was obliged to pay 25 cents per week as their maintenance of membership check-off. The War Department has taken the position, as I understand it, that that 25 cents per week will not come out of the 80 cents that they credit to the war prisoners, but it must be obvious to any one that Uncle Sam pays the bill in the final analysis when he pays the contractor. If it were possible to offer an amendment to this bill to correct that, I would gladly offer it, but I am advised that such an amendment would not be germane or in order.

Of course, I see justification for the payment of the union dues by an American workman, who is a member of a union for whatever benefits his particular union yields its members, but I can see no justification whatsoever for Uncle Sam, whether indirectly in the final price of a contract, or directly in wages to war prisoners, paying union dues for war prisoners. The statement the other day, if I recall correctly, was that some 36,000 war prisoners were involved in that situation. The amount of money may not be great, but so far as I am concerned, I can see no logic in Uncle Sam paying the bill to keep war prisoners members in good standing in some American labor organization.

Mr. NORRELL. Has the War Labor Board agreed to require that this 25 cents be paid?

Mr. CASE. My understanding is that the War Labor Board approved the original contract, and that the interpretation of the contract calls for the payment by any person employed on the project.

Mr. NORRELL. I compliment the gentleman upon his position.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the second thing to which I wish to direct attention is the sale of surplus material. The committee has had some hearings, when Under Secretary Patterson was present, in which he described for us the plan of the War Department to establish a policy for the disposition of surplus materials. That is coming. In the meantime, every Member of the House has been hearing of some sales of surplus material at prices far below that which the Government has invested in them. Today one Member told me that an instance had been brought to his attention where a party was buying women's nylon hose as surplus material at 5 cents a pair. That is the first instance of that kind I have heard, but it illustrates a condition which deserves the attention of the appropriate committees of the Congress.

Directing attention more particularly to the bill before us, this bill, as the chairman of the committee has said, appropriates funds for the civil functions of the War Department.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he heard of somebody buying nylon stockings for 5 cents a pair?

Mr. CASE. I was told today by another Member of the House that a party had purchased some surplus women's nylon hose at 5 cents a pair. I intend to find out more about it and when I get the information I shall be very glad to pass it on to the gentlewoman from Illinois. Now, returning to the bill before us. As has been said in this bill, we set a new precedent in the recapture of money unexpended at the end of fiscal year. We do that in this bill at two or three places. We do it in unexpended funds on river and harbor projects, and also on flood control, and also in respect to funds appropriated for the third set of locks for the Panama Canal.

A few remarks on the last item. Some Members of the House will remember a few years ago, we had a very spirited controversy about starting a third set of locks. There was honest difference of opinion. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] was of the opinion, and expressed it vigorously at the time, that the third set of locks could not be completed in time to meet any impending emergency and that it would constitute an unwarranted drain upon manpower and material to initiate them at that particular time. If any justification for his position was needed, it is found in what has happened. Work has been suspended and now $30,000,000 of unexpended money can be put back in the Treasury.

On page 7 of the committee's report it will be found that for the third set of locks the Congress has appropriated a total of $106,000,000, out of a total estimated cost, and authorization, of $262,000,000. Of the $106,000,000 appropriated, there remains unobligated as of June 30 next, $33,025,045. The committee is permitting an expenditure of $2,767,423 to take care of certain incidental expenses in connection with the project, the protection of the work already done, the completion of certain work which would be lost unless done at this time, but is placing back in the Treasury $30,257,572, which will not be spent at this time.

Now this, of course, does not mean that the third set of locks will not be completed in due time. The money that has been appropriated and expended, some seventy-odd million dollars, is not wasted. In time, presumably, we will go ahead and complete the third set of locks, but the fact that the Government has found it possible at this time and advisable to suspend construction work on the third set of locks, and we find it possible to put $30,000,000 back into the Treasury, should be ample justification for the position taken by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS].

In two other particulars we put some money back in the Treasury, something over $700,000 rivers and harbors money, and something over $2,000,000 of flood-control money. And that is done because of the repeated discovery that money which was being impounded, when not expended, was being used or expended by allocation to projects for which no specific justification had ever been made through the Committee on Appropriations. It is true that some of the projects on which money was being expended are projects which have had legislative authorization, but they were not projects which had been presented to the Committee on Appropriations for appropriations. Consequently, Members will find in the hearings on this bill a great deal of testimony, starting at page

40, on the subject of the budgetary reserves. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] was particularly concerned about the matter and opened up the discussion with General Reybold, to which all of us contributed before the matter was over.

It was the conviction of the committee that the Bureau of the Budget should not be permitted to make allocations from unexpended funds unless the projects were presented to the Congress and to the Committee on Appropriations.

I think it would pay every Member of the House to read the testimony at pages 40 to 43, inclusive, on that subject.

Now, a few words on flood control. It is customary for the Congress to make annual appropriations of $1,000,000 for emergency flood-control work. Last year we had a number of large floods in the country, the result of which was that Congress was called upon for a special appropriation of $10,000,000 under an emergency bill, approved by the commitee having jurisdiction of flood control. At another time the Committee on Appropriations, in a deficiency bill, added a couple of million dollars, so that something over $13,000,000 was appropriated for emergency flood-control work last year.

In connection with the testimony on that subject, I asked General Reybold, the Chief of Engineers, what portion of that money had been used to alleviate floods on the Missouri River last year, and in the Missouri River Basin. He responded that $3,014,000 had been so expended. I asked him whether that had accomplished any new flood-control protection; whether it offered any additional protection for the future. He said, "No," that money merely repaired the works that had been previously built. It offered no additional protection. Then I asked him what the damages of the Missouri River floods were last year and he gave the figure of $47,000,000-plus. So that last year the floods on the Missouri River cost the country $50,000,000. I asked General Reybold whether that $47,000,000 figure represented direct damages or indirect damages. His reply was the $47,000,000 was a direct, tangible damage cost only.

The Army engineers have been making a study of that basin and of other basins where floods caused extensive damage. The legislative committee on flood control has been conducting hearings all this month on these studies and I understand they propose to bring in a bill which would authorize certain flood-control projects. Today the Missouri River happens to be under consideration and it will be again tomorrow. I might say that the Governors of most of the States in the Missouri River valley are here in the city, as well as a great many other delegations. I attended the hearings of the Committee on Flood Control this morning. Testimony was presented by the Chief of Engineers and Col. Miles Reber, former division engineer, and the Governor of South Dakota, the Honorable M. Q. Sharpe, chairman of the Missouri River Eight-States' Committee. It was perhaps the most crowded session that the committee has held. These hearings will be resumed tomorrow morning and those of you who are interested in flood control in either the Mississippi Valley or the Missouri Valley, will be interested in the testimony that will be presented at that time. I suggest your attendance at the hearings tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the very able discussion of the gentleman from South Dakota. He is one of the ablest and most conscientious members of our subcommittee and of this body. His discussion of the subject of the Bureau of the Budget impounding appropriations and setting up a budgetary reserve was a fine contribution to the full and complete consideration of the fiscal policies of our Nation. We are deeply concerned with reference to the action of the Bureau of the Budget in impounding funds which the Congress has appropriated for specific purposes. After those funds are impounded, the Bureau of the Budget often takes authority to release them at a later date for expenditure upon projects not directly related to the original appropriation. I question the authority or power of the Bureau of the Budget to impound funds appropriated for specific purposes by the Congress. Certainly they have no right to impound funds appropriated for a specific purpose and then release these funds for other purposes. If you will turn to page 34 of the hearings on this bill you will find a list of some sixty-odd projects for which this committee made a specific appropriation for flood control in the 1944 bill a year ago. Those projects were not built. Their construction was prevented by the action of the War Production Board. The Bureau of the Budget impounded these funds amounting to approximately $47,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget later released a portion of these funds for the construction of flood-control projects which were not presented to the committee for justification at the time the original appropriation was made. We think this procedure unsound and indefensible. We believe such action is beyond the authority and power given the Bureau of the Budget in its creation. Such action sets the Bureau of the Budget up as a super-appropriating agency. A halt should be called to its activities in impounding money and then releasing them later for use on projects not specifically justified before the appropriate subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. That is the reason we have impounded and recovered into the Treasury $34,957,572 of unexpended balances by this bill. This bill is unique in two aspects, first, we make no change whatsoever in the Budget recommendation as to new money for rivers and harbors, flood control, and for other purposes.

Second. We recover into the Treasury of the United States an unexpended balance or balances of other items for the fiscal year 1944 the sum of $34,957,572. We call attention to the fact we make available to the Corps of Engineers of the War Department the sum of $4,000,000 for the purpose of working out detailed plans and estimates on flood-control projects, both general and on the Mississippi. The expenditure of this money is a good, sound investment on the part of the United States Government and its people. This money will be used in preparing detailed plans and estimates by a group of men belonging to a branch of the War Department who have established over a period of a century and a half their ability to plan wisely and to build well in the field of rivers and harbors and flood control. This money is being made available to men who are educated in the planning and construction of large public-works projects. This money will not be used by star-gazers or dreamers. It will not be used by men who are seeking to build a brave, new world or a new social and economic order.

I hope the House will approve that action of your committee. I call your attention to an interesting fact appearing in the committee hearings. Exclusive of the money appropriated in this bill for new work amounting to $3,630,000 for rivers and harbors, there remains a backlog of approved rivers and harbors projects throughout the whole United States of $159,639,550 on which we can begin work in the post-war period.

On flood control, general, excluding a very small sum made available in this bill, there is $410,000,000 of authorized projects as a backlog, and on flood control in the Mississippi, excluding $13,258,000 carried in this bill, there remains only the sum of $186,843,147 as a backlog for work in the post-war period.

In other words, the sum total of all authorized river and harbor projects and flood-control projects, both general and on the Mississippi River, remaining to be done, amounts only to $756,482,697. It is a matter of general information that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House has completed its study on the omnibus rivers and harbors bill and has reported the same favorably. The Committee on Flood Control is holding hearings and will probably report a bill providing for additional flood-control projects. I take this opportunity to urge earnest and careful consideration by the leadership of both bodies and the membership in general of the necessity for early consideration and action on a general rivers and harbors bill, and on additional flood-control legislation. We need additional authorized projects of this character in order to provide necessary public improvements and employment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if any provision is included with respect to appropriated funds that were appropriated for certain projects throughout the country that have been suspended by order of the War Production Board as nonessential military necessities at the present time and are still in suspension. What did you do with

the funds that had been appropriated and unexpended?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The funds which had been heretofore appropriated for those particular projects, as shown on page 34 of the hearings, were impounded by the Director of the Budget. A portion of those funds has already been spent on projects which were not specifically justified before the committee, and an additional amount of these unexpended balances are being spent for the completion of projects already under construction. The balance of it, amounting to $4,000,000, we have impounded and are returning to the United States Treasury.

Mr. MAY. That was the question. I did not know whether "impounded" meant that you were getting it back to the Treasury.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. If the Members of the House approve the recommendation of the committee as carried in this bill it will be placed back in the Treasury of the United States. If the money is to be appropriated and spent hereafter, the Congress of the United States should make a specific appropriation for the specific project, and the money should be spent exclusively on that project.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will be glad to.

Mr. MAY. I think, as a general principle, the Appropriations Committee ought to see to it that unexpended appropriated funds for any project, either flood control, navigation, or any other department of the Government, ought to be recovered into the Treasury from time to time so that the Congress can keep its hands on the expenditure of the money.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky I am in agreement with the general principle involved there. However, I realize there can be some specific cases where such action would not be wise or desirable. This committee is of the opinion that the War Department should have a reserve fund of its own for emergency purposes. There are some other specific examples which I have in mind at the present time where it would be a wise policy to permit a particular Government agency to have on hand what might be called an emergency fund with which it can take care of unexpected items or for expenditure upon projects for which the original appropriations were made and which have been held up by the War Production Board or the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MAY. I have no fault to find with that principle at all.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. CASE. In the general appropriation bill for the War Department we have a transfer clause, so that as to general military operations there is a percentage transfer permitted.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am interested in the Panama Canal, but it is not clear just what is meant on page 13 of the bill, line 5, "that $30,257,572 of the appropriation 'Construction, additional facilities, Panama Canal,' is hereby repealed." Are you returning some money to the Treasury?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. We are returning the money to the Treasury, because we were informed that unless the War Production Board would release items of steel and other construction items essential to the building of the second set of locks there would be no construction work undertaken during the fiscal year 1945. Therefore we recovered that money to the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE. But on the same page, you do appropriate $9,170,000 for the Panama Canal.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is not for construction. That is for operating expenses of the Panama Canal.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. To what section is the gentleman referring when he referred to the fact that there is a provision for the turning back of these funds?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] just called attention to one. It recovers $30,000,000 which we had heretofore appropriated for a second set of locks at the Panama Canal. Then there is $4,000,000 in flood control, general, and $700,000 unexpended balance of rivers and harbors improvements.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. CLASON. As I read the report of the hearings it would appear that the Army engineers wished to have $5,000,000 with which to prepare detailed plans and specifications for newly authorized projects. The Bureau of the Budget cut them to $2,000,000. I am wondering if your committee felt it would have been wise to have allowed them to have the full $5,000,000 so that it would be possible to have a proper backlog of well-thought-out projects at this time.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. We restored $2,000,000 of the amount that the engineers wanted making a total of $4,000,000. We gave them $2,000,000 more than the Budget recommended. However, we did not provide the full $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama, has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. COMPTON. I move to strike out the last two words.

I take this time to ask a question of the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. The State of Connecticut is very much interested in flood control, but we are somewhat suspicious of actions which might be taken by the Federal Government to include hydroelectric power projects in some of these appropriations. I would like to ask the distinguished chairman if any of this money to be appropriated here is to be used for hydroelectric purposes.

Mr. SNYDER. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON] that there is only $1,000,000 in here for flood control altogether, and none of it can be used for hydroelectric power.

Mr. COMPTON. On page 7, and subsequently, there seems to be a considerable sum of money appropriated. I just wanted to make sure that no part of this could be used for that purpose unless it was specifically appropriated.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COMPTON. I thank the gentleman very much, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL WORKS

Maintenance and operation, certain Federal water mains outside the District of Columbia: For the maintenance, operation, improvement, extension, and protection of Federal water lines located outside the District of Columbia required to serve nearby Government establishments and facilities with water from the water-supply system of the District of Columbia, including interconnections with other water systems for emergency use wherever located, to be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, $12,000.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, now that the Clerk has read up to the item "United States Soldiers' Home" the entire portion of the bill dealing with rivers and harbors and flood-control items has been read. I want to say to the Members that this is the first time within my memory of 12 years' service in Congress that a civil functions War Department bill has been read under the 5-minute rule without some Member trying to amend the bill and place therein either a river and harbor or a flood-control project within his district or State. Mr. Chairman, I have no criticism of that practice. Many of these projects approved by the War Department engineers are worthy and in time all of them, of course, will be included in our bill, but it has been the policy of the committee and the policy of the engineers to include no projects during this time of emergency which do not definitely relate to the war effort and which are not definitely helpful to the war effort.

I rise at this time to thank the membership for the attitude they have taken and to guarantee as far as I personally am concerned that when we go to conference with another body if any river and harbor or flood-control projects are added to this bill in that body which have not been sent down by the Bureau of the Budget, I for one will definitely oppose them and will not come back with my signature on the conference report if any of those projects are agreed to. I say this, I hope, in all kindness, but certainly in all fairness, because if the Members of this House who have worthy projects refrain from trying to put them

in this bill at this time I see no reason why another body should be allowed to load up the bill with projects of a similar type. I do not know whether I am speaking for the chairman or other members of the committee but I do know I am speaking for myself. If the chairman or any other member of the committee cares to make a statement either for or against what I have said, I think the additional assurance might give the House a little more hope than we have on the usual appropriation bill that goes to another body which is so economy minded in the public and in the press but which, in the vernacular, puts on an appropriation bill "everything but the kitchen sink."

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HART, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR LOSS OF UNITED STATES NATIONALITY UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 433, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4103) to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Morrison, La.
Andresen, August H.	Gifford	Newsome
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Bell	Gorski	O'Connor
Bland	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Leary
Boren	Hare	O'Neal
Boykin	Harris, Ark.	Pace
Buckley	Hébert	Pfeifer
Burch, Va.	Heffernan	Pracht, C. Frederick
Celler	Hess	Price
Coffee	Hobbs	Ramspeck
Cole, N. Y.	Hoch	Reed, Ill.
Courtney	Hoffman	Robsion, Ky.
Cox	Holmes, Mass.	Rowan
Cullen	Hope	Sadowski
Curley	Horan	Satterfield
Dawson	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Ill.
Dewey	Keogh	Slaughter
Dirksen	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Domengeaux	Kleberg	Smith, Va.
Douglas	LaFollette	Smith, W. Va.
Ellison, Md.	Lambertson	Sparkman
Ellsworth	Landis	Taylor
Elston, Ohio	Lemke	Treadway
Fay	Lesinski	Vincent, Ky.
Fenton	Lynch	Vursell
Fish	McMillan	Wheichel, Ga.
Fuller	Maas	Wilson
Fulmer	Miller, Mo.	Winter
Gale	Monkiewicz	Woodruff, Mich.

The SPEAKER. On this call 331 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

PROVIDING FOR LOSS OF UNITED STATES NATIONALITY UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield to the minority 30 minutes. This rule makes in order H. R. 4103. It is an open rule and provides for 1 hour general debate. The bill has been approved and reported by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization by a unanimous vote and its enactment is urged by that committee. I fully appreciate there are some Members who, when they hear that a bill reported by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is to be considered, become unduly alarmed. But in this instance there is no reason for any apprehension because I think we all agree with the intent and purpose of this legislation. The purpose of the bill is to permit certain citizens of the United States to renounce their American citizenship and to permit such renunciation while the person is within the United States.

We have in this country many thousands of Japanese who were born in the United States, which makes them American citizens. Though they have been considered by us as American citizens, the "great and glorious" Japanese Government always maintained that they have not lost the citizenship of the despicable Japanese Nation. But we are informed by the committee, and the report shows, that there are about 2,000 of these Japanese who do desire to renounce their citizenship. Well, I would say that is fine; let them renounce their citizenship. The sooner we get rid of them, as I have stated, the better it will be for us.

I concede that there are some Members who would like to go much further than this bill. But after careful consideration on the part of the committee and in view of the recommendation of the Attorney General and others in the Immigration Service who are of the opinion that we should not go any further to begin with, I believe that this bill should be passed. Of course, I myself would be most happy if we could get rid of all of them as quickly and as speedily as possible. That also might apply to other disloyal and un-American persons in the United States who should be given full privilege to get out immediately, because, after all, if they do not recognize the greatest and most liberal country in the world and fail to appreciate it, we have no use for them and they should be given that permission to withdraw their nationalism or their citizenship.

I want to be brief because the chairman of the committee desires to speak on the bill or on the rule, and in view of the fact we are permitting only 30 minutes on each side for general debate. We have allowed such limited time because that was the amount of time requested when application was made for a rule. We honestly believed that there would be no one who would be opposed to this first step that we are taking to enact legislation to get rid of these undesirables, and therefore, very little time would be required for debate and consideration. I am informed there are some gentlemen who will offer amendments. However, I feel that after the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has given careful consideration and study to the matter that its recommendations should be followed. I have the utmost confidence in the committee. Its membership does not always agree, but when they do come to an agreement and report a bill unanimously, there is no question in my mind but that it must be a meritorious and deserving bill.

Mr. Speaker, reserving the balance of my time, I yield with a great deal of pleasure to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has made a very lucid explanation of the rule and the bill. I do not know that I can add anything, but at the risk of repetition, may I say that this a wide-open rule providing for 1 hour's general debate and then the bill is to be read under the 5-minute rule. That is all there is to the rule. I do not know of any serious opposition to the bill. I am advised that there are those who want to offer a particular amendment; and with that amendment, I am told, there should be no opposition. I express no opinion about the amendment because the Committee on Rules is not advised. I therefore now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON], who is to propose the amendment.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to try to help the chairman of the Committee on Rules, who said he would like to go a little further than this bill goes. That is why I am going to offer an amendment. What are we trying to do here today? We are trying to

pass a law amending the Nationality Act, so as to provide a way or provide means and mechanics of denationalizing or expatriating one's self. Now, what does that mean? To expatriate yourself is to wipe out your citizenship and acquire another one or simply to wipe it out and not acquire another one. Under this proposed law, which is general in its application, it is provided that this may be done by signing a formal renunciation of your citizenship on a form prepared by the Attorney General, and in the presence of an officer whom he designates and with the consent of the Attorney General.

I think this proposed bill is nothing but legal opium. It does not do what the bill purports, on its face, to do. Here is what I conceive to be the joker in the bill, if you can call it that: The Attorney General has said that this only applies to renunciations made after the date when the bill is passed. The Japanese who signed a questionnaire in which they acknowledged their allegiance to Japan, can simply refuse to sign again and thus nullify this bill. We want to make it apply any time that a man made that sort of statement, either orally or written, or at any time his conduct showed that he did in fact renounce his citizenship, from the time of the adoption of the selective-service law on September 10, 1940, up to and including the duration of this war.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. No; I do not have the time.

As a matter of fact, the matter of expatriation is just as old as our Government. In 1795 the Supreme Court mentioned the fact that any citizen had a right to relinquish his citizenship. Furthermore, it said, "It is not only proper, but it is the duty of the legislature to make such provision" for expatriation, *Talbot* v. *Janson* (3 Del. 133). In 1868 we passed a law, which is still on the books of our country, that a person could relinquish his citizenship; that it was his inherent right to do so (U. S. C. 8: 800). All we are proposing to do by our amendment is to make the right effective. While the bill is general, it has been discussed with reference to the Japanese. We in the West understand the Japanese problem. We believe there are thousands of Japanese who, by their conduct during this war, who by their writings, who by their statements have in fact expatriated themselves. We want the law to apply to those people. We are providing the mechanics whereby any court that handles naturalization matters can conduct a hearing and make a determination that a man has in fact wiped out his citizenship by his written statements, by his oral statements, or by his conduct. That is all there is to the bill as I propose to amend it.

We can see no objection to the amendment which we wish to offer to make the bill effective.

How big is this problem? In California there are almost a hundred thousand Japanese. In the Tule Lake relocation camp there are 16,000 Japanese who were sent there because they were presumed to be disloyal. They were sent there from other camps. We want to find a way, by giving due process of law, giving a man an opportunity for a hearing, to have a court consider the matter, and if the conduct of the man, if his writings, or if his statements are sufficient to convince that court that he has renounced his citizenship, we want that court to be able to find that very thing.

In addition, there are 14,000 Japanese in Washington, and about 4,000 in Oregon, and others in Hawaii and various other places running into the hundreds of thousands. All our amendment proposes to do is to adopt the old principle, over a hundred years old, that has been on the statute books for 75 years, and provide the mechanics to find that a man has in fact by his own voluntary conduct wiped out his citizenship. We think, then as a matter of course, in the treaty of peace, it will provide for the deportation of these Japanese who have expatriated themselves.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. There is this uncertainty in the minds of many people: They cannot realize that a man can expatriate himself and that we do not have a provision for deportation in this bill. A man can wipe out his citizenship and still cannot be deported under the provisions of this bill. But at the termination of this war we will have our big chance to take these people who have expatriated themselves and transport them to the country of their allegiance.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. IZAC. Is it not true that if this bill is passed in its present form all of these malcontents at Tule Lake, who have already demonstrated their opposition to the Government of the United States, will go scot free and we will not be able to do anything to them, provided they get word from Japan to lie low?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is true. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. If they do not sign another relinquishment, then they will go free, unless my amendment should be adopted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, the gentleman wants the House to understand that this bill is all-inclusive. It is not just a measure affecting Japanese alone? It affects everybody.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is correct. It affects everybody, no matter who he is.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Secondly, when the gentleman speaks about these disloyal individuals, of course, he has in mind the Japanese. But, the gentleman also wants the House to understand that anyone can be hailed into court under this amendment which he has suggested, whether he is a Japanese or not.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Certainly, if he has committed an act that warranted that or had made writings that warranted that, and that indicated that he had expatriated himself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. This is the thing that disturbs me: I might suggest that I am in sympathy with the attitude generally expressed by you Members who know more about this. Under your amendment who could institute a proceeding that would result in the trial of the issue in a court?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. In my opinion, and I am speaking from my experience in the State of California, it would be instituted by the district attorney of the county. The superior court is the court of general jurisdiction in the State of California and that court has jurisdiction of naturalization matters. It could be brought there, or it could be brought by the United States attorneys in the Federal courts.

Mr. HALLECK. Would it contemplate a complaint made by some individual?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. It might be started that way. It could be started on the initiative of the Attorney General or the United States attorneys themselves, or the district attorney of the county.

Mr. HALLECK. This is what disturbs me, in line with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has just suggested, as to the all-inclusive provisions of this bill; supposing that someone of German ancestry, born in this country, was alleged to have said or done certain things that would be said to make him pro-German as against being pro-American. Under your amendment could a charge be instituted against him?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALLECK. And that man could be denationalized under your amendment?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. He could be, provided they submitted proof which convinced the court that he should be denationalized. This bill does not open the door for any witch hunt, in my opinion.

Mr. HALLECK. However, your amendment would go beyond the 4,000 Japanese who, as I understand have heretofore signed in writing, some relinquishment of their citizenship in this country and expressed a desire to be considered as citizens of Japan?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Those 4,000 are not included in this bill, because they have to make another written renunciation, which I do not believe they will do.

Mr. HALLECK. I understand that.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes; it would go beyond that.

Mr. HALLECK. It would reach those but it would reach beyond that too.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. It would.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization reported this bill unanimously after conducting hearings on the bill. At the present time there is nobody opposed to what this bill tries to do. The only opposition to the bill might come from those who want it to go further. I want to call particular attention to the fact that the proposal of the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] would in effect destroy the purpose of the bill, because, in my opinion, it would be entirely unconstitutional, because it would be ex post facto. In other words, it would provide for penalties by a statute we passed this month, for something that a citizen of this country had done previously. The only thing that would prevent, under the terms of the proposal offered by the gentleman from California, denationalizing of persons who declared their loyalty to Germany in the First World War, would be the statute of limitations. But this very proposal is an illustration of the thing which the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has found out, namely, that you cannot go too far without being unconstitutional.

So I want you to view all of these proposals from the standpoint of whether or not they will destroy the very intent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization had when they reported out this bill. I know personally that many members of that committee wanted to go further, but after hearing the testimony and learning the effects of certain proposals they decided that this was the only feasible, practical, and constitutional thing to do at the present time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that House Resolution 433 and bill, H. R. 4103, with the Johnson amendment are passed unanimously.

The question just arose in the colloquy between my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] as to whether this bill is all-inclusive. As a matter of fact, this bill is intended primarily and 100 percent for the Japanese. I read from the committee report:

> The purpose of the bill is to permit, under the conditions specified therein, certain citizens of the United States to renounce their United States citizenship, and the bill is so drafted as to permit this renunciation of United States citizenship to occur while the person is within the United States.
>
> The bill, as indicated in the letter of the Attorney General to the Speaker, and hereinafter quoted, is designed primarily to deal with the problem presented by a group of persons of Japanese descent who are native-born United States citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation should be adopted. While those of us from the Pacific coast would prefer a more far-reaching proposition we support the current bill as a definite expression of American sentiment. The whole question of what to do with those Japanese now domiciled in the United States should be given deep study by the Congress. The gentleman from Washington, Representative HENRY M. JACKSON, now serving in the Army, introduced a resolution seeking to establish a committee to determine on a national policy. The question should be gone into from every angle. The House would do well to adopt the bill introduced by the gentleman from Washington, Congressman JACKSON.

Japanese philosophies are diametrically opposed to American ideals and American principles. Portuguese navigators were the first Europeans to discover Japan. The Portuguese first visited Japan in 1542. There followed a brief period of political, commercial, and religious contact with other European countries. In addition to the Portuguese, Spaniards, English, and Hollanders visited Japan as missionaries, traders, or mere soldiers of fortune. Early in the eighteenth century, however, the Japanese Government deliberately decided to cut itself off from all outside world influences. It was a crime punishable by death for a Japanese to leave his native country or for a foreigner to enter Japan. It is reported that on one occasion Portugal sent a trade mission only to have the Japanese authorities execute several members of the mission. The survivors were sent back with this message: "Think no more of us, as if we were no longer in the world."

For nearly three centuries Japan remained aloof. It was our own Commodore Mathew Galbraith Perry acting on behalf of the United States Government who actually broke Japan's policy of remaining apart. That was in 1853. You know what happened. We did everything humanly possible to aid and assist the Japanese. We encouraged them to raise their standards of living. We became Japan's best customer for products of the Island Empire. No people in all history ever evidenced more actual friendship for another nation than ours did for the Japanese. The answer was an underhanded punch delivered at Pearl Harbor.

Japanese ideologies and ours are as different as night and day. Groups and organizations from California have passed resolution after resolution against return of the Japanese to our State. These resolutions have been introduced in the House and referred to legislative committees.

I want to read a telegram that was sent by the Bataan Relief Committee to President Roosevelt. This is dated Salinas, Calif., September 18, 1943:

> Recent press releases indicate that you are authorizing internment of all "disloyal" Japanese (those who have indicated their wish to return to Japan) and to allow all others to return to their former residences as soon as possible.
>
> Most of us on the west coast who have had the opportunity to know the Japanese in a business way for years, feel that many of those so-called loyal Japanese may actually be disloyal. Regardless of that belief, we do know that the feeling against the Japanese on the west coast is extremely bitter, and fear that the return of Japanese to this area might result in bloodshed which would be followed by the murder of our American boys who are still prisoners of the Japs. This small community had 142 boys in Japanese prison camps. Unnecessary deaths, due to the Japanese refusal to accept food and medicine through the Red Cross, are rapidly reducing that number.
>
> We therefore respectfully urge you to reconsider your decision in this matter.
>
> BATAAN RELIEF COMMITTEE,
> E. M. SEIFERT,
> *Acting Chairman.*

I quote from letter written June 25, 1943, by Walter S. Johnson, of San Francisco, to Hon. CLARENCE F. LEA, as dean of the California congressional delegation:

> DEAR MR. LEA: Thank you very much for sending me your letter of June 18, enclosing the resolution adopted by the California delegation of Congressmen on June 14. I am certainly glad to note this action on the part of our California Representatives, which is certainly a substantial step in the right direction. There should be an amendment to the Constitution which would prevent American-born Japanese from automatically becoming American citizens. I say this for the reason we now know how extremely treacherous this race is and how impossible it is, or ever will be, for them to be assimilated into our national life.
>
> Now, I don't know how the Federal Bureau of Investigation can possibly distinguish between a loyal and a disloyal Japanese. For the last 25 years our company has been doing business with Japanese in California and Arizona, who grow and ship fruits and vegetables. There never has been in all our dealings with these people a time when we ourselves could determine who among these people were honest and worthy of credit. One particular Jap, named C. M. Otoy, who lived in Santa Maria, went bankrupt twice, and in order to continue receiving supplies would make some effort to pay up his obligations. However, we later learned with the funds he should have used for payment to his creditors, he built himself a very fine home back in Japan, which faced a small bay. The pictures of it would indicate the cost would easily have more than paid off all he owed his creditors here. Otoy's pretensions were so suave and convincing none of us suspected him to be anything less than an unfortunate grower who had experienced a bad market but wanted to fulfill his obligations at the earliest possible date. We now know he deliberately used his funds, owing his creditors here, to build himself a handsome abode in his native land. It is common knowledge the bulk of the earnings of the Japanese from their activities here in California have been sent back to Japan. If we continue to let these people enjoy the protection of citizenry, we can know in advance they will continue to send the bulk of their earnings back to Japan instead of using such funds, along with the rest of us, in the building up of this Nation.
>
> I do hope while our people are fully aroused to the treachery of the Japanese, laws will be introduced and passed that will safeguard us against this race not only during the period of the war but for the years to come.

I also want to read a letter addressed to me under date of July 9, 1943, by the San Diego Chamber of Commerce:

> SAN DIEGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
> *San Diego, Calif., July 9, 1943.*
> Congressman THOMAS ROLPH,
> *San Francisco, Calif.*
>
> MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The executive committee of the San Diego Chamber of

Commerce desires to compliment you upon the resolution adopted by the California delegation on June 14, opposing the return of the Japanese to this area and recommending the exchange of interned Japanese for American citizens held as prisoners in Japan.

Very sincerely yours,

SAN DIEGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
D. W. CAMPBELL, *General Manager*.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain letters and communications I have received.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if there is any legal right that we value higher than our Constitution-given right of citizenship, it is the right of life itself. Citizenship should not be taken from people lightly, and certainly the deprivation of citizenship should not be the result of star-chamber proceedings.

This bill is bad, bad because it gives to one man more power than any good man should ask for and certainly more power than any bad man should receive. It gives to the Attorney General of the United States the right to pick out certain people—his friends, his pets—who would be allowed to use the procedure. It gives to the Attorney General the right to draft a form to his own liking, a form of renunciation of citizenship in the consideration of which no Member of Congress, no member of any citizenship group of the United States would have any right to criticize. It gives him the right to designate some Government official before whom one of his chosen few could come, sign a form, and be relieved of his American citizenship. It gives him the right to designate as that official one of his own deputies in his own office, or, perhaps, a lighthouse keeper somewhere down the Potomac River. Do you want to give any man in the United States that kind of power over the sacred legal right of citizenship? No good man should want that power. No bad man should have that power.

Had you had an Attorney General clothed with that kind of power 25 years ago you might not have had the case of Grover Cleveland Bergdoll, for he could have just gone down before that lighthouse keeper and signed the form giving up his American citizenship and been relieved from all his then obligations under the Selective Service Act.

And today there are too many of them, if you please, who would be glad to shed themselves of American citizenship in order to rid themselves of the responsibilities which that citizenship entails. There is a man downtown by the name of Washie Bratcher who went to a doctor, took a lot of pills to build up his blood pressure artificially so that he might escape the draft. How much easier it would have been for Washie Bratcher to have gone down to some office of some petty official in the Government, one designated by the Attorney General, and, in star-chamber proceedings, sign a paper and be relieved of the responsibilities of citizenship, responsibilities which many a proud American boy is defending with his life upon far-flung battle lines.

Just the other day we read of a renegade relative of a great American family, a writer, some said he was, named von Gontard, who was arrested in New York for evading his high responsibilities as an American citizen, as did the notorious, stinking Grover Cleveland Bergdoll 25 years before. He is in the clutches of the law awaiting trial. Do you not realize, Mr. Speaker, that if this law is written on the statute books that some man of great influence, someone able to hire high-priced lawyers might, in a star-chamber proceeding before some inconsequential official so "arrange" matter that the despicable von Gontard might conveniently relieve himself of his citizenship, thereby escaping his high responsibilities at a time when our distressed country needs the services of its sons more than ever before.

Is this bill, Mr. Speaker, a bill for the relief of the Bergdolls, the Washie Bratchers, the von Gontards?

If that was what its drafters had in mind, their work could not have been the better done.

No one despises the treacherous, cowardly, disloyal Jap more than does the one who now stands before you. No one more earnestly desires the deportation of the disloyal citizen of Japanese origin than does the one who pleads before you this moment. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to place this great power in the hands of any man, fraught, as it most certainly is, with such great danger to the Republic, just to deport a few hundred confessed disloyalists. We know who they are and we know how to handle them. The ones we should fear are the crafty, lying betrayers, the uncaught traitors. Let us set up procedure that will catch them. They number into the thousands, ten of thousands. Why do we talk of heavy artillery when we are but pulling the trigger of pop-guns?

Let us recommit this grossly inadequate and highly dangerous legislation and bring out a bill that will get us somewhere.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the Immigration Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am really surprised at my colleague's making the charges that he has so eloquently made. He would make it appear that the Attorney General would have too much authority. May I say that in Mr. Biddle we have one of the finest men in the country, a man who is trying to protect the interests of America and the interests of our people. He has given this matter most careful study and he has had many conferences with the Committee on Immigration.

What the gentleman says does not appear in the bill at all. If you will look on page 1, line 9, you will find the following:

Making in the United States a formal written renunciation of nationality in such form as may be prescribed by, and before such officer as may be designated by the Attorney General—

And so forth. That is all it does. It deals with voluntary renunciation. The Attorney General only passes upon it.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. Under the very text the gentleman has read no one can make this renunciation except when approved by the Attorney General and no one can make this renunciation except upon a form approved by the Attorney General and no one can make this renunciation except before an official of the Government of the United States designated by the Attorney General.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does the gentleman want the Congress to prepare these forms? Do you want the Congress to start preparing all kind of forms? The Department of Justice is the logical branch of the Government to handle this problem and the Attorney General should be given authority to devise the proper procedure. That is all this bill does.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman asked me a question, Who I want? The gentleman has asked me a question. Let me answer it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. GEARHART. You can only get citizenship in a court and you can only take it from him in court.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry. I would like to finish my statement.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I want to know if I can have a question asked me which I am not permitted to answer?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York declines to yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, our committee had before it H. R. 2701 introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], dealing with the expatriation of certain nationals in the United States. I will put this bill in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the House and I will also insert the report thereon by the Department of Justice. The report submitted to the committee by Mr. Biddle clearly states the objections to the bill.

H. R. 2701

A bill to provide for the expatriation of certain nationals of the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter IV of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, subch. IV; Supp. I, title 8, subch. IV), is amended by inserting after section 401 thereof a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 401a. (a) A national of the United States, whether by birth or naturalization,

shall lose his nationality if he is convicted, under subsection (b) of this section, of knowingly and intentionally expressing, either orally or in writing, loyalty to a foreign state.

"(b) (1) Upon affidavit showing good cause therefor, it shall be the duty of the United States district attorney for any judicial district to institute proceedings in any court specified in section 301 (a) in such district against any person residing in such district for the purpose of expatriating such person on the ground that he has knowingly and intentionally expressed, either orally or in writing, his loyalty to a foreign state. Such person shall have 60 days' personal notice in which to make answer to the petition of the United States; and if such person be absent from the United States or from the judicial district in which such person last had his residence, such notice shall be given by publication in the manner provided for the service of summons by publication or upon absentees by the laws of the State or the place where such suit is brought.

"(2) When a person shall be convicted under this subsection of knowingly and intentionally expressing, either orally or in writing, his loyalty to a foreign state, he shall cease to be a national of the United States. In case such person was a naturalized citizen, the court shall declare the certificate of naturalization of such person to be canceled, and shall order such certificate to be surrendered to the Commission."

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1943.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of this Department relative to a bill (H. R. 2701) to provide for the expatriation of certain nationals of the United States.

Under existing law a national of the United States, whether by birth or by naturalization, becomes expatriated by operation of law if he (1) obtains naturalization in a foreign state; (2) takes an oath of allegiance to a foreign country; (3) serves in the armed forces of a foreign state if he thereby acquires the nationality of such foreign state; (4) accepts employment under a foreign state for which only nationals of such state are eligible; (5) votes in a political election in a foreign state or participates in an election or plebiscite to determine the sovereignty over foreign territory; (6) makes a formal renunciation of nationality before a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States in a foreign state; (7) deserts from the armed forces of the United States in time of war and is convicted thereof by a court martial; or (8) is convicted of treason (U. S. Code, title 8, sec. 801).

In addition, a naturalized national of the United States loses his nationality by operation of law if he (1) resides for at least 2 years in the country of his birth or former nationality, if such residence confers the nationality of such country on him by operation of law; (2) resides continuously for 3 years in the country of his birth or of which he was formerly a national; or (3) resides continuously for a period of 5 years in any other foreign state (U. S. code, title 8, sec. 804).

Moreover, the naturalization of a naturalized citizen may be revoked in judicial proceedings instituted for that purpose on the ground that such naturalization was procured by fraud or on the ground that the certificate of naturalization was illegally obtained. (U. S. Code, title 8, sec. 738.)

The bill under consideration would create an additional ground for expatriation and would provide that a national of the United States, whether by birth or naturalization, shall lose his nationality if he is "convicted" of knowingly and intentionally expressing, either orally or in writing, loyalty to a foreign state. The proceedings for the expatriation of such persons would be instituted by the various United States attorneys upon affidavits showing good cause therefor. Upon "conviction" a person would cease to be a national of the United States, and if he was a naturalized citizen his certificate of naturalization would be canceled.

The phraseology of the measure is vague and indefinite and no standard is provided for the determination of the meaning of the phrase "loyalty to a foreign state." Moreover, the measure might be used as an instrument of oppression by personal enemies of an accused who could cause an innocent person untold trouble and embarrassment merely by misquoting him or by wrenching some written statement out of its context.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I am unable to recommend the enactment of the bill.

I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

We had another bill before us, H. R. 3489, which I will also insert in the RECORD together with a copy of the Attorney General's opinion. I believe that Congress should be guided by the Attorney General, especially in time of war. The Attorney General definitely points out the undesirability of this legislation.

H. R. 3489

A bill relating to certain Japanese residents of the United States and to certain citizens of Japanese descent found to be unfriendly to the United States

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) all alien residents of the United States of Japanese origin shall forthwith be taken into custody, and the President is requested to make, through the appropriate channels, arrangements with the Government of Japan for the exchange of such aliens for a like number of citizens of the United States (not of Japanese origin or descent) who are resident in or interned in Japan or held as prisoners of war by Japan. If such arrangements cannot be made, or if any of such alien residents cannot be so exchanged, such alien residents, or those who cannot be so exchanged, as the case may be, shall, after the termination of hostilities in the present war with Japan, be deported in the manner provided by sections 19 and 20 of the act of February 5, 1917, entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States."

(b) All citizens of the United States of Japanese descent who are found to be unfriendly to the United States shall forthwith be taken into custody, and the President is requested to make, through the appropriate channels,. arrangements with the Government of Japan for the exchange of such citizens of Japanese descent for a like number of citizens of the United States (not of Japanese origin or descent) who are resident in or interned in Japan or held as prisoners of war by Japan. If such arrangements cannot be made, or if any of such citizens of Japanese descent cannot be so exchanged, such citizens of Japanese descent, or those who cannot be so exchanged, as the case may be, shall, after the termination of hostilities in the present war with Japan, be deported in the same manner as in the case of aliens described in subsection (a).

(c) If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application thereof to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

FEBRUARY 8, 1944.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of this Department relative to a bill (H. R. 3489) to provide for the taking into custody and for the exchange of Japanese aliens and certain United States citizens of Japanese descent.

Section (a) of the bill would direct that all alien residents of Japanese origin shall forthwith be taken into custody.

Under existing law, however (U. S. C., title 50, sec. 21), and the President's proclamation of December 7, 1941 (6 Federal Register 6321), alien Japanese may be taken into custody and detained for the duration of the war. The case of every alien Japanese suspected of disloyalty has been thoroughly investigated and reviewed, and those alien Japanese deemed by me to be potentially dangerous have been ordered interned.

On the basis of exhaustive investigations conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I have found that internal security required the internment of fewer than 2,000 Japanese aliens in the continental United States, and I am informed that only about 700 Japanese aliens have been interned by the commanding general in the Territory of Hawaii. This legislation would, nevertheless, require some agency, not specified, to take all alien Japanese into custody. The only effect of this provision would be to require the taking into custody of persons who may be detained under existing law but whose detention has not been found necessary.

Since the outbreak of war the Department of State has been actively and continuously endeavoring to arrange an agreement with the Japanese Government to exchange Japanese nationals in this country for citizens of the United States who are held by the Japanese. Two exchange voyages have been made by the *Gripsholm* and almost 3,000 persons (including some citizens of other American countries) have been repatriated. The Japanese Government, however, is apparently not anxious for the exchange of all of its nationals, and is willing to take back only a fairly small, selected number. Thus the second provision of the bill, requesting the President to make arrangements with the Government of Japan for an exchange of nationals, would recommend an objective which this Government has already tried to attain.

The third provision of subsection (a) would require the deportation at the end of the war of those Japanese nationals not exchanged during the war. A large proportion of the Japanese aliens in this country are law-abiding and loyal to the United States. They came here many years ago, in accordance with our laws, and have raised families composed of citizens of the United States. Compulsory deportation of all Japanese nationals at the termination of hostilities appears to me to be objectionable.

Section (b) of the bill pertains to citizens of the United States of Japanese descent who were found to be unfriendly to the United States, and provides that they shall

be taken into custody, exchanged, and deported in the same manner as aliens are to be dealt with in section (a). The enactment of this section of the bill would be a departure from our entire constitutional and legal history.

This section does not provide for any agency to carry out its program, nor does it specify the manner in which citizens of the United States of Japanese descent are to be adjudged unfriendly; nor does it provide for loss of citizenship by such persons. Moreover, it does not prescribe a practical method of deportation, since the bill provides that such citizens shall be deported in the manner prescribed for aliens in the preceding section, which section, in turn, refers to sections applicable solely to aliens. It is doubtful, therefore, whether section (b), if enacted in its present form, would produce any practical result.

Even were these uncertainties clarified, the bill would be of doubtful wisdom. The bill applies solely to one group of citizens, selected on the basis of race. Racial discrimination is foreign to our traditions as a democratic people. The provision may also involve a constitutional problem concerning which I express no opinon.

In addition, the bill provides for the taking into custody of citizens of the United States who are not charged with commission of crime, but are charged merely with the vague status of being unfriendly. To predicate an administrative proceeding looking to the detention of American citizens upon such a defective standard, is obviously objectionable.

Moreover, exile, which is what the deportation of such persons would constitute, is entirely foreign to our constitutional history. I do not know of any way in which the exile of citizens of the United States can be reconciled with the principles for which we are fighting this war.

In respect to matters of detail, I desire to make the following observations.

First, deportation has always been thought of as referring to aliens who are to be transported to some country with which they have had previous connection. The citizens to be exiled by this bill may never have been out of the United States and, therefore, there would be no place to which to deport them. There is, in addition, nothing to indicate that any foreign government is prepared to accept exiled United States citizens.

Second, since this bill does not provide for expatriation of exiled citizens, there would be nothing to prevent such exiles from exercising their constitutional right of reentering the United States as soon as they were deposited in some foreign country. Thus, the entire process would be rendered useless.

From the standpoint of internal security the legislation appears unnecessary.

In view of the foregoing considerations, I am unable to recommend the enactment of the bill.

I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

We also had before us H. R. 3012, introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] which definitely creates some grave constitutional questions.

H. R. 3012

A bill to create the Japanese Deportation Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) there is hereby created a commission, to be known as the Japanese Deportation Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), which shall be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one member to act as Chairman. Vacancies in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made. Each member of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 a year.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and two members of the Commission shall, at all times, constitute a quorum. The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall, as soon as possible after its organization, prescribe rules and regulations for the conduct of its proceedings.

(b) For the purposes of this act the Commission shall have the power to issue subpenas for and to compel the attendance of witnesses, require the production of books, papers, and other documents, and to administer oaths and examine witnesses upon any matter within its jurisdiction. In the case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued by the Commission, the Commission may invoke the aid of any district court of the United States in requiring the attendance of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence, and such court, within the jurisdiction where the inquiry is carried on or where the party subpenaed resides or may be found, may issue an order requiring the person to whom the subpena is directed to appear and testify before the Commission or give evidence touching on the matter in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. Any person so required to attend as a witness shall be allowed and paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

(c) Whoever in any proceeding before the Commission, or in any document produced for the consideration of the Commission, knowingly makes a false statement under oath of a material fact shall be guilty of perjury and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

(d) The Commission shall, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of a secretary and general counsel, and shall, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such other employees as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Commission may call upon any other department or independent agency of the Government for such expert assistance or for copies of such books, papers, or records in their possession as may be helpful to the Commission in the execution of its functions, and it shall be the duty of any such department or agency to comply with any such request for books, papers, or records.

(e) The Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice shall make such investigations with respect to persons of Japanese descent who are nationals of the United States as may be requested by the Commission, and shall report to the Commission the results of any such investigation.

(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place.

(g) The Commission shall keep permanent records of the proceedings before it and orders issued by it, copies of which shall be made available, upon request, to the heads of the various departments and independent agencies of the Government.

(h) The Commission may make such expenditures (including expenditures for rent and personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, for office supplies, periodicals, and books of reference, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary in the execution of the functions of the Commission. All expenditures of the Commission, including necessary traveling and subsistence expenses outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Commission, shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Commission or by any employee thereof designated by the Commission to perform such duty.

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission to determine whether persons of Japanese descent who are nationals of the United States and found within the United States or its Territories or possessions (1) have given aid or comfort to any enemy of the United States in the present war, (2) have been or are advocating or teaching the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or (3) have knowingly and intentionally expressed by deed, or by word, either orally or in writing, loyalty to a foreign state.

(b) Whenever any such person of Japanese descent is charged with giving aid or comfort to any enemy of the United States in the present war, advocating or teaching the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or knowingly and intentionally expressing by deed, or by word, either orally or in writing, loyalty to a foreign state, the Commission shall issue and cause to be served upon such person a complaint stating the charges and containing a notice of hearing before the Commission at a specified place and time. The person so complained of shall have the right to file an answer to the complaint and to appear in person or otherwise and give testimony at the place and time specified in the notice of hearing. The testimony taken in any such proceeding shall be reduced to writing and placed in the files of the Commission. Thereafter, in its discretion, the Commission, upon giving of notice, may take further testimony or hear argument.

(c) If upon all the testimony taken the Commission shall be of the opinion that any person named in the complaint has given aid or comfort to any enemy of the United States in the present war, has been or is engaged in advocating or teaching the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or has knowingly and intentionally expressed by deed, or by word, either orally or in writing, loyalty to a foreign state, then the Commission shall transmit its decision to the Attorney General who shall thereupon issue a warrant of deportation and take such person into custody for deportation to Japan or to such other place outside the Western Hemisphere as may be determined upon by the Attorney General.

SEC. 4. (a) Any person aggrieved by a decision of the Commission may obtain a review of such decision in the circuit court of appeals of the United States, within any circuit wherein such person resides or has his principal place of business, or in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such court a written petition praying that the decision of the Commission be set aside and that the warrant of deportation be canceled. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission, and thereupon the Commission shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the testimony and findings of the Commission. No objection to the decision of the Commission shall be considered by the court unless such objection shall have been urged before the Commission. The findings of the Commission as to the facts, if supported by evidence, shall be conclusive. The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree, affirming or setting

aside any decision of the Commission, shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in sections 239 and 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

(b) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) shall operate as a temporary stay of execution of the warrant of deportation. If the judgment of the court is adverse such person of Japanese descent shall forthwith be deported.

SEC. 5. Any person of Japanese descent deported under the provisions of this act shall cease to be a national of the United States on the date of his deportation.

SEC. 6. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. This act shall cease to be in effect 5 years after the date of the termination of the present war with Japan, as proclaimed by the President.

FEBRUARY 8, 1944.

HON. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Chairman, Committee on Immigration and Naturalization,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your request for the views of this department relative to a bill (H. R. 3012) to provide for the creation of a Japanese deportation commission and for other purposes.

The bill would create a Japanese Deportation Commission to be composed of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate (sec. 1). It would be the duty of the commission to determine whether persons of Japanese descent who are nationals of the United States (1) have given aid or comfort to any enemy of the United States in the present war, or (2) have been or are advocating or teaching the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or (3) have knowingly and intentionally expressed by deed, or by word, either orally or in writing, loyalty to a foreign state (sec. 3a). If any such person is charged with any of the foregoing acts, a complaint issued by the commission would be served on him. He would be accorded an opportunity to file an answer and given a hearing (sec. 3b).

If the Commission finds that the person has engaged in the conduct specified, it would transmit its finding to the Attorney General, who thereupon would take such person into custody and deport him to Japan or to some other place outside of the Western Hemisphere (sec. 3c).

Section 4 provides for an appeal to a circuit court of appeals. A finding of fact by the Commission, if supported by evidence, would be conclusive.

Section 5 provides that a person deported under the provisions of the bill shall cease to be a national of the United States on the date of his deportation.

It is to be observed that this bill does not deal with alien Japanese. Since there are substantially no naturalized Japanese (the only exception being a comparatively small number of veterans of the First World War), it follows that this bill deals principally with persons whose United States citizenship derives from birth in the United States. This bill applies to one group of natural-born citizens, selected on the basis of race. Racial discrimination is foreign to our tradition as a democratic people. In accordance with customary procedure, I express no opinion as to the constitutionality of the measure, but suggest that there may be a constitutional question which requires consideration by your committee.

The first ground of deportation proposed by the bill, i. e., giving aid and comfort to any enemy of the United States in the present war, is not different in substance from the offense of treason as defined in United States Code, title 18, sec. 1. The Constitution prescribes the manner in which treason may be proved in a criminal case. If it is intended that the administrative body determine the same issued under broader rules, there is serious question as to the desirability of the provision. If, on the other hand, the Commission is to be bound by the constitutional requirements as to proof, considerable doubt would arise as to the utility of the provision, since any person who could be deported pursuant to it could in all probability be prosecuted criminally on a charge of treason.

The second ground upon which the Commission would be empowered to order deportation is a determination that he has been or is advocating or teaching the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States. It is to be observed that here again the prescribed conduct is similar to that already prohibited by a criminal statute (title I, Alien Registration Act of 1940; U. S. Code, title 18, sec. 10). Thus, the problem would again arise whether an administrative body should properly be given power to impose the penalty of deportation for conduct defined as a crime and for which criminal penalties are provided upon conviction by a court. It is extremely doubtful, therefore, whether there is any useful purpose to be served by this clause of the bill.

The third ground upon which the Commission may order the deportation of a United States citizen is the knowing and intentional expression by deed or word, orally or in writing, of loyalty to a foreign state. The concept of loyalty is not one subject to precise legal definition, and the idea of an expression of loyalty by deed is even more vague. The standards for such conduct cannot be prescribed precisely, and thus inevitably the measure would call for the deportation of citizens on nothing more than a general determination by an administrative body of an extremely vague matter. Such severe penalty should not be imposed upon the basis of such a vague criterion.

The legislation appears to be undesirable in principle because of its provisions for imprisonment, deportation, and expatriation of citizens of the United States. To provide that a citizen of the United States shall be detained on the basis of an administrative finding of disloyalty, as opposed to a judicial conviction of crime, appears repugnant to basic American principles.

Likewise, exile—which is what the deportation of such persons would constitute—is entirely foreign to our constitutional history. I do not know of any way in which the imprisonment and exile of American citizens, without judicial trial, could be reconciled with the principles for which we are fighting this war.

The bill involves an administrative difficulty in requiring deportation to Japan or some other place outside of the Western Hemisphere determined upon by the Attorney General. While the war continues it would not be possible to deport anyone to Japan. It is not now possible to deport citizens of the United States to any other place, inasmuch as deportation can be accomplished only if the country to which the person is to be deported agrees to receive him. I know of no country to which such persons could now successfully be deported.

In view of the foregoing considerations I am unable to recommend the enactment of the bill.

I have been informed by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

What is the purpose of the pending bill? The committee has been studying the afore-mentioned bills for months. We are in sympathy with our colleagues from California in this matter; we would like to go much further than they would and deport every disloyal Japanese or every disloyal person in this country, but we do not want to do anything that would be termed unconstitutional.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman for a very brief question.

Mr. DONDERO. An alien must come into a United States court to acquire citizenship. I am wondering if it would not strengthen the bill if he were required to go back into a United States court in order to renounce his citizenship?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That does not apply in time of war. This is a war measure. The gentleman would be right if this were not a war measure; but this is a temporary act in time of war to rid this country of a lot of so-called native-born Japanese who are definitely disloyal and who have no place among decent people.

Mr. Speaker, we can deport an alien who is in this country. We have no trouble about that; but the question arises here: Can we do certain things under the Constitution? Can we deport a native-born American who wishes to renounce his American nationality?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman has just said that we can deport an alien, that there is no trouble about that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. What about Harry Bridges?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I wish the gentleman would not confuse the issue here. We have a very important bill before us now. It is a vital piece of legislation. We know what to do with aliens.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not at this time. I cannot yield. A little later I will yield to the gentleman when we get into the Committee.

Under the Constitution a man born here of any race is an American citizen. What are we going to do with him in court? How can you disfranchise him? As much as I hate some of these disloyal Japanese and other disloyal persons in this country, I would not want my hatred to influence me to prescribe some remedy for the situation which would not be in accordance with our Constitution. If you will read the Constitution you will find that he is an American citizen, ir-

respective of what he said or what he has done. If that Japanese or any person has said something against our Government, you can pass a law to punish him, you can send him to jail, you can keep him there as long as you want. That is proper, that is constitutional. But you cannot take away his birthright, and that is exactly what my colleagues from California want to do. I am not ready to surrender those principles and doctrines of our Constitution.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Has the gentleman read the law of 1868 that expressly says a man has the inherent right to wipe out his own citizenship?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes, but we have statutes now providing how a man can expatriate himself. What the gentleman is trying to do now is to inject something new. We live in different times, there are different circumstances. Of course, a man can go to another country and renounce his allegiance to this country or take an oath of allegiance to that country. We have men in this country today who are disloyal, who are undermining our Government, yet we do not know how to get rid of them unless we do it by this act. We will give them the right to expatriate themselves, take them out of circulation and keep them in confinement here until such time as we may be able to exchange them for some of our war prisoners who are over there today.

That is the whole question before us. This committee has gone as far as we can go. If the delegation from California can present any other bill that will do more than we can do under this bill, I assure them of a respectful hearing and an immediate opportunity to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the debate thus far has made it clear that the bill before us is brought here primarily to affect the Japanese; nevertheless, it is all inclusive and does affect all citizens.

Second, as I glean from the debate, the bill makes the renunciation of citizenship entirely voluntary. In other words, the citizen of the United States must take affirmative action to renounce citizenship before this law would become operative. I am impressed with the idea that the bill now before us is entirely voluntary, while with the Johnson amendment to be offered, force and power would be lodged in the Government to take away the citizenship of the citizen without his consent.

I think that pretty well sums up what this debate is all about. Possibly I have made a wrong analysis. I do not pretend to know all about the bill. In general debate the Immigration Committee, which is of unanimous opinion, will fully explain.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I want to make the point that the ex post facto provision of the Constitution applies only to criminal statutes. It does not apply to a proceeding like this or to a deportation proceeding, and there is a case decided by Chief Justice Taft on that point.

Mr. MICHENER. The difference between "retroactive" and "ex post facto" is that "retroactive" applies to the civil law and "ex post facto" applies to the criminal law. As I understand the debate, the committee bill deals only with acts committed after the bill becomes a law, while the Johnson amendment relates back to previous acts.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, a member of the Immigration Committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The amendment suggested by the gentleman from California would also open up the whole field of parol testimony as to the citizenship of any man in the United States.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; if that amendment were adopted, as I analyze it, it would mean that any citizen who at any time back yonder, said or did anything that might now be construed to be unpatriotic or as indicating that he desired to renounce his citizenship, could be proceeded against under the terms of the law.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is one of the things about which we should think twice before we act once. These are times when we must not be controlled by prejudice, sentiment, or emotion. We must contemplate possibilities, not probabilities.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has a lot of trouble with every bill it brings to the floor. This is possibly due to the fact that the subject in these days is most controversial. But let us be fair about it, let us all sit on the cake of ice, as it were, and think the thing through and act quietly and deliberately, so that in the end we shall enact what we believe to be for the best interests of all our people. I can understand the feeling of the gentlemen from California. They have intimate knowledge of the Japs, even though they are American-born. It would seem that these Members, however, do not agree among themselves. In these circumstances let us pass the rule, bring the bill up for consideration, and then act deliberately.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, having spoken on this matter before, I do not wish to take time now to cover the same points, but there are one or two things that I think definitely should be before us.

First of all, the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] placed the whole argument in a nutshell when he said that the bill brought out from the committee will not do what the committee expects it will do. Those of us who are familiar with the subject understand what he meant and why it will not do that. It has been brought out fully that both the bill and the proposed amendment cover only the war period and cover only those things which might have been written since the beginning of the war. This does not, as some gentlemen say, go back into past history.

May I say this, and I think if the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] will permit me, I will say this for him, there is no desire whatever on the part of any of the California delegation—all of whom are very much interested in this bill, obviously, because we had 122,000 of the 140,000 Japs—to write into the law by amending this bill or otherwise, anything which would revive any possibility of what is generally referred to here on the floor as witch hunting. Since the question has been raised on both sides of the House, both on the floor and in private discussion, that the inclusion in the Johnson amendment of oral testimony and actions would be likely to raise that question, I may say that my understanding is that when the amendment is actually submitted by the gentleman from California it will not include those features but will include only written statements of renunciation, which it is the inherent right of one of any race, Japanese, German, or any other, to make if he so desires.

Our feeling about the committee bill is that it will not reach the very people it is intended to reach, and the best evidence I can give you is the informal statement of the bill's supporters that out of the 4,000 people who should come under the bill they hope to get 400.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan who so well and ably addressed the House.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I did not yield for compliments to the gentleman from Michigan because my time is very limited. However, I agree with the compliments and I think all Members on our side will agree with them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For the gentleman's information, by the passage of this bill we can take out of circulation over 1,000 disloyal Japanese, who do not belong in the camps but belong in jail. There is where we want them to go.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish to say that the gentleman from New York seems to be the only person who knows anything about the subject who holds that opinion. I also wish to say that the bill as presented does not recite the certificate which the Attorney General is supposed to have the national sign to be denationalized.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. Did I correctly understand that when the amendment is offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] it will be limited to a written statement, rather than including oral statements or conduct, as previously drawn?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California to answer that.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I will eliminate the "oral statements" but not the "conduct." The "conduct" will be in the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The amendment could be limited to written statements and undoubtedly will be.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman in his previous statement made clear that this is not a deportation bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. This is not a deportation bill. That is a separate subject for us to take care of.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my statement this afternoon the text of the bills H. R. 2701, 3489, and 3012, together with the reports from the Attorney General on each of these bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I think we could understand better the provisions of this bill if we knew something about the facts and the background which brought it into existence. All the Japanese were moved by the military authorities from the Pacific coast to relocation centers, and were placed there for the purpose of relocating those Japanese throughout the United States. After they got the Japs in the relocation centers the Federal authorities submitted a questionnaire to them for the purpose of determining their loyalty. That was the famous question 28, which we have read so much about in some of the newspapers. I will read you that question:

> Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America, and foreswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese Emperor or any foreign government, power, or organization?

The form of that question was changed from time to time, but there were 5,376 Japanese who answered that or substantially the same question with an unqualified "No." There were an additional 446 who answered it with a qualified "No," and an additional 234 who gave no reply whatever. After the W. R. A. had continuous trouble in these relocation centers they finally decided to move the unqualifiedly disloyal Japanese to Tule Lake, some 16,000 of them. So we have the spectacle of having some 16,000 Japanese, most of whom are American citizens, avowedly disloyal to the United States, locked up behind a fence.

The Attorney General proposed a bill whereby these Japanese could sign a written renunciation of their nationality in the United States, which would put them in a position of being aliens, and thereby the Government of the United States in a better position to deal with them now and after the war. There is only one basic difficulty in that bill, and that is that it requires a further and additional act of renunciation of loyalty on the part of those Japanese. We in California do not think they are going to make that renunciation and that such should not be necessary. The Attorney General will prepare a form, and I presume will circulate it around among the Japs. Those who want to will step up and put their names on it, and those who do not want to will not do it, notwithstanding any previous declaration of disloyalty they have made, or any previous acts of disloyalty. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] seeks to go back to that original statement, the answer to question 28, or the actions of the Japanese in the relocation centers, and make those acts or declarations the basis of taking away their nationality, instead of our having to go around and say, "Please, Mr. Jap, will you now sign a written renunciation of nationality?"

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. I yield.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Under the terms of the amendment, would not that take in people of Italian or German origin?

Mr. ENGLE of California. It would apply as I understand it to anyone, and I assume that anyone who makes an unequivocal renunciation of nationality, whatever his nationality happens to be, should be in the same category.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I assume this is the gentleman's position, and that of the other Members from California, that if these Japs were disloyal and admitted their disloyalty a year or two ago, they are evidently disloyal at this time.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That is exactly the assumption we make, and further than that, we claim we ought not to have to go around now to these same Japanese who heretofore had said "No" to question 28, and say, "Please, Mr. Jap, sign a further declaration of disloyalty," before we can proceed against them as enemies of this country, and on the termination of hostilities deport them from the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I think that is a fair position to take.

Mr. IZAC. Even if they were leaders, and committed an overt act out there and overthrew constituted authority in Tule Lake, this bill as it is now will not reach them.

Mr. ENGLE of California. That is correct, that is exactly the point—under the bill we can do nothing if they refuse to sign the paper prepared by the Attorney General.

RESOLUTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE STATES OF WASHINGTON, OREGON, AND CALIFORNIA, IN REGARD TO TULE LAKE SEGREGATION CAMP, AND RESIGNATION OF DILLON S. MYER, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF THE WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Whereas the Tule Lake camp under the jurisdiction of the War Relocation Authority has become a segregation center for the housing of Japanese, and American-born persons of Japanese descent who have declared their loyalty to the Emperor of Japan, and their immediate families; and

Whereas such persons have virtually placed themselves in the category of enemy aliens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Members of the House of Representatives from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, whose names are appended hereto, That the President of the United States be requested to transfer the supervision and direction of such or any such camps to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; and

Whereas recurrent disturbances, strikes, and riots within the war relocation centers have from time to time focused attention on the War Relocation Authority; and

Whereas since its inception there have been continuous charges against the War Relocation Authority of incompetence, extravagance, and inefficiency in the management of the camps, and coddling, appeasing, and concessions to disloyal and trouble-making inhabitants of the camps, which charges have been supported in considerable measure by investigations made by a committee of the House of Representatives; and

Whereas in particular, it appears that proper precautions have not been taken for the internal security of the camps, either for the inhabitants or the administrative personnel in the camps, and proper measures for fire protection, safeguarding, and economical use of governmental property in the camps have not been taken; and

Whereas the public generally and on the Pacific coast in particular has lost confidence in the present administration of the War Relocation Authority and the inhabitants of the camps themselves have demonstrated a lack of respect for and confidence in the War Relocation Authority: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Members of the House of Representatives from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California whose names are appended hereto, That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, requested to require the resignation of Dillon S. Myer, the National Director of the War Relocation Authority, and the President of the United States is hereby petitioned to appoint a new National Director of he War Relocation Authority with directions and authority to make necessary changes in the personnel and administrative procedure to secure adequate measures of internal security within the camps and proper and efficient use and safeguarding of Government property in said camps; and be it

Resolved by the Members of the House of Representatives from the States of Washington, Oregon, and California, whose names are appended hereto, That the said members support legislation that in principle will provide that any citizen who shall be convicted of knowingly and intentionally expressing, either orally or in writing, loyalty to a foreign state, shall be deprived of his citizenship, and his expatriation or deportation ordered; and be it further

Resolved, That the foregoing resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States.

Dated January 26, 1944.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD, CLAIR ENGLE, CLARENCE F. LEA, ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, RICHARD J. WELCH, BERTRAND W. GEARHART, CARL HINSHAW, JOHN PHILLIPS, WALT HORAN, HOMER D. ANGELL, LOWELL STOCKMAN, HAL HOLMES, J. LEROY JOHNSON, THOMAS ROLPH, JOHN Z. ANDERSON, NORRIS POULSON, JOHN M. COSTELLO, CECIL R. KING, JAMES W. MOTT, HARRIS ELLSWORTH, FRED NORMAN.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we have approximately 25,000 Japanese interned in our State, and no one could be more interested in this legislation than I, because we are very much concerned that some of these people may be left there to mingle with our people when this war has been completed. However, I am interested in seeing any legislation that might be adopted constitutionally, and that under it we should be able to take these people out of our country. I sat for several hours last summer, and I heard some of these young people denounce our Government. It made me feel a definite revulsion against this sort of people. I have been informed, and as an attorney I am sure of it, that if we try to make any legislation ex post facto, these good people would not be so reluctant as to stand back and take it. They will go to the Supreme Court of the United States and throw this legislation out. Anything that we pass here must be so that it will stand up. We want them if necessary to get their renunciation again, but let us not be so stupid as to pass legislation which may be declared unconstitutional.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I have only 2 minutes. Anything we pass should require an overt act, to protect all these other people who may come under the same regulation. I have studied the committee bill, and I think it will take care of these people who are absolutely disloyal to our Government. We must be careful in weighing this measure, as it applies to all people in the United States. We want to get rid of the Japanese in this country who have been disloyal and are disloyal. Let us pass legislation as proposed by the committee, and then get the overt act by the Attorney General, and we can eliminate them permanently from our country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am just as anxious as any gentleman from California in bringing about the deportation of any and all of these Japanese. I am more or less familiar with the situation in his State. I have spent a great deal of time there, and I do not blame the people of California for their intense feeling, but unfortunately, in view of all factors, this is the best legislation that we can present for consideration at this time. I do not want to forego the opportunity at least to bring about the departure of two or three thousand disloyal Japanese whom we can use in exchange for our boys held as prisoners over there, though it is my feeling that we should get 50 Japs for every American.

I am concerned with the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] when he voiced the opinion this proposed legislation, if enacted, will permit some persons to avoid military service should they renounce their citizenship. Is the gentleman aware that under our draft law we can take into our armed services any alien and that aliens are being inducted in the service and we are permitting them to be naturalized? But who would favor getting disloyal people like these in the service anyway? The sooner we get rid of them the better. Here is an opportunity to do so under a bill that is constitutional, and we must not take any chance in passing legislation that the Supreme Court may decide is unconstitutional.

Mr. GEARHART. Only a few hundred have asked the privilege of voluntarily renouncing their American citizenship, whereas there are 122,000 Japanese in continental United States, thousands of whom are disloyal but none of these could be deported under your bill without their consent.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman said a little while ago that there was close to 6,000 who did sign the petition.

Mr. GEARHART. When there was no law under which they could expatriate themselves, 2,000 asked for the privilege, but when you put this on the statute books, only about 300 will do it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4103) to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 4103, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yied 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this bill undertakes to do one thing and one thing only. I am afraid that some of our friends misunderstand the purport of the bill. I regret very much that our friends from California, whom we are trying very hard to help, have seen fit to raise objections to the bill.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Not just now.

Mr. GEARHART. Perhaps I understand it too well.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The truth of the matter is that the committee had several bills before it. The committee tried to solve the problem. I want to interject a statement at this point, which I think the Members of the House know, that there is often a wide divergence of views in the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. I respectfully submit when you see that committee get together on a public bill it deserves the earnest consideration of the House. When you see the gentleman from New York, the able chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and myself agreeing on an immigration matter, I think it is at least worth considering. The gentleman from California proposes to submit an amendment here and I want to direct my remarks to that amendment. The bill has been rather thoroughly discussed. But if the amendment which the gentleman from California proposes to submit should prevail you immediately place precious American citizenship, the citizenship of people who were born here, in jeopardy. Bear in mind that this bill is general. It must be general. It would be unconstitutional otherwise. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from California in its present form would make oral testimony and all sorts of testimony admissible to take away the citizenship of any native-born American. Under that even perjured testimony could be used to strip a native-born American of his citizenship and he might be kicked out. Again bear in mind his amendment applies to everybody. Whose citizenship would be secure? Do they want to go to the extent of placing everybody's citizenship in jeopardy? People who were born here and whose parents were born here and so forth?

I doubt this Congress wants to do that. I doubt the American people want to go that far. As for the Japanese, I do not think any man in this House has a greater detestation for them than I do. No man in this House would go further in dealing with these people than I would. I am willing to adopt any measures necessary in dealing with them. They deserve no pity and they shall get none from me. But in passing laws here we must have some regard for the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States. The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, your committee, has studied this question thoroughly. We did not go into this matter in a haphazard way. We gave consideration to every bill that was presented. Every Member, I think, wanted to go as far as he could. We are in entire sympathy with the objective of our friends from California. Your committee received the benefit of a thorough study of all these bills by the Department of Justice and did not act on any bill until the Department of Justice had a chance to give thorough study to the question. As a result of that thorough study by the committee and as a result of the thorough study of the Department of Justice, we have brought out this bill designed solely to enable persons to divest themselves of citizenship who say in writing that they do not want American citizenship, that they do not want to remain citizens of this country, that they wish to give up their citizenship. We want such people to have a chance to become alien enemies. At the present time they are not alien enemies; they are American citizens. We want to convert their status from citizens of the United States to the position of alien enemies. That cannot be done under the law as it stands, so says the Attorney General. Who can object to that? Of course, we want to go further and we may find a way to go further. I hope the Justice Department can work out some plan to

go further, but let us at least go this far now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. As I stated, the Justice Department has made an exhaustive study of the law and tells us that there is now no way for these disloyal persons to renounce their citizenship and thus become alien enemies. This bill provides that way. That is all it does. If these persons do not want to keep their American citizenship, certainly we do not want them to keep it. This bill is the first step to get rid of a lot of Japanese. Other steps may follow, but we must start. Frankly, this bill was prepared by the Justice Department and is requested by that Department to accomplish a specific purpose.

Now, as to naturalized Americans, we have a remedy now for dealing with them. That is not the immediate problem presented in this bill. We are dealing here with people who were born here—native-born Americans. Now, to amend this bill to deprive native-born Americans of their citizenship on oral and all sorts of other testimony, as I understand the amendment proposed would do, is a matter of doubtful constitutionality, to say the least, and one which should be approached with great caution. I value my American citizenship. I am thinking of the Apostle Paul who declared that he was born a Roman citizen and he valued his citizenship. People who are born here are citizens by our law.

I want to say to you again that we studied this thing carefully. We are willing to go as far as we can go. If the gentleman from California or anyone else will submit a bill to our committee and will get the Attorney General of the United States to say that that bill is constitutional, I will give any such bill my earnest consideration and support it if I can. But let us pass this bill now, for it will be a definite step in the right direction and will solve an immediate pressing war problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, confusion runs apace. If there is any Member who thinks we are going to be able to deport any disloyal Japanese or disloyal Germans under this legislation, I would suggest that he read the bill.

No one will be expatriated and become subject to deportation except those who voluntarily go up to the Office of the Attorney General, knock on the door and ask for that privilege. At one time, so I am told, some 2,170 Japanese indicated that they wanted to repatriate themselves to Japan. Well, there was not any law then under which it could be done. When you write this statute on the books and it becomes possible for them to do it, I give you as my best opinion not more than two or three hundred Japanese will then repeat their request to renounce their American citizenship. Since their first declarations they have been hearing something about the results of the contest upon the battlefields and upon the high seas. Those Japanese that were so full of love for Japan a year ago are not so enthusiastic for that country's chances of success as they were. So, instead of getting rid of any large number of Japanese you will only get rid of a handful, practically none at all.

Unless you adopt the Johnson amendment you will not be able to even consider the involuntary deportation of any Jap, even if he might be a person that hates us, that has a stiletto in his hand and is awaiting an opportunity to kill an American official or to blast and destroy our military establishments.

So we will have to adopt the Johnson amendment to make this bill even slightly respectable.

Some of the speakers who have preceded me have been boasting a bit of their legal training, pointing out that they are lawyers, this as a prelude to announcing that we cannot use evidence of occurrences which happened before the act went into effect to establish grounds for expatriation of the disloyal Japanese. The matter of deprivation of American citizenship is not a criminal proceeding. It is a civil proceeding. Therefore, that provision of the Constitution prohibiting expost facto laws does not apply. We can constitutionally pass retroactive legislation dealing with this subject. The Johnson amendment is entirely constitutional in this particular.

The reason I object to this is not because of any love I might have for the Japanese, for it will not affect enough Japanese to count. The reason I am against this legislation is because it is inherently bad. America should never set up any star-chamber proceedings, clothing any persons with authority to take citizenship away from Americans behind secret doors. This applies, Mr. Chairman, to natural-born citizens just the same as to those acquiring citizenship by naturalization.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from southern California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. In placing this power in the hands of the Attorney General, would it not recall to many of us the things that happened in the last war under Attorney General Palmer, the witch hunting that occurred at that time; and would this not be empowering some other Attorney General, not necessarily the one there now, but perhaps one at some future date, to do the same thing that Attorney General Palmer did?

Mr. GEARHART. I entirely agree with the gentleman. Who can say that there will not be third-degree methods used in these star-chamber proceedings which this act will authorize; that men will not be compelled to sign "voluntarily under compulsion"—a paradox, indeed, but nevertheless one that can be understood by those who, like myself, know something about the overzealousness of some law-enforcing officers.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I am glad to yield to the able gentleman from central California.

Mr. OUTLAND. Is it the gentleman's opinion that statements made in the past by Japanese renouncing citizenship can be used? I think that is an important point. If it is possible, by all means it should be used.

Mr. GEARHART. The renouncements that occur in Japanese consulates?

Mr. OUTLAND. No. Statements that have been made by Japanese-Americans, where they said they would like to return to Japan or they did not owe allegiance to America. I should think that statements of that kind made in the past should be used.

Mr. GEARHART. If the Johnson amendment is adopted disloyal statements as well as disloyal conduct can be proved and if the evidence is sufficient to justify it an American citizen of Japanese ancestry can be legally deprived of his American citizenship and, as a proven alien enemy, be deported at the convenience of the United States.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has made one of the most inconsistent arguments it has been my privilege to hear. In the first place, in his remarks on the rule he stated that if this bill were passed it would open the door to escape from the draft, escape from the payment of taxes and what not. An alien is subject to the draft; an alien is subject to the payment of taxes. This bill will not relieve anybody of anything except American citizenship for which they have expressed dislike. The burden of the gentleman's argument is: "If you do not do it like I want it done, you should not do it at all."

Then the gentleman proceeds to say that this law will permit star-chamber proceedings. I submit he is grossly in error. No star-chamber proceedings can be possible under this legislation. But, granting that it could be, granting for the sake of the argument that what the gentleman says is true, the situation for which he contends would be far worse than his expressed fears of this bill. He wants to legalize hearsay testimony and to make past offenses the basis of present crime. He wishes to deprive persons of citizenship by ex post facto legislation.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Proceedings in open court are not star-chamber proceedings, nor are they secret.

Mr. GOSSETT. But, you want to convict a man for what the man said last year.

Mr. GEARHART. The same as you convict him of murder on things he did and said before he came to court.

Mr. GOSSETT. You do not convict a man of murder under a law passed today if the murder were committed a year ago.

Mr. GEARHART. But the distinction is not fair, because you are talking about a criminal statute and I am talking about a civil proceeding, against which the ex post facto law does not operate. You can pass retroactive laws legally.

Mr. GOSSETT. The Attorney General disagrees with you insofar as this legislation goes.

Mr. GEARHART. I read today decisions of the Supreme Court holding that naturalization proceedings are civil proceedings and not criminal.

Mr. GOSSETT. There are probably many other decisions bearing upon this situation which the gentleman has not read.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. After denaturalization a man is subject to deportation, under a warrant of deportation, which is equal to a quasi-criminal proceeding.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is true.

Now, frankly this bill does not go nearly as far as I would go. But that is no basis for objecting to this bill. Because you cannot deprive everybody in this country who ought to be deprived of citizenship is no reason for not accommodating those who wish to expatriate themselves. You will recall a story which appeared in the newspapers about some lady in the Middle West somewhere——

Mr. GRAHAM. That was in Detroit, in the United States district court.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman. That is correct. Some lady came in and said she wished to God she could go back to Germany, that she did not appreciate her American citizenship, that it was a burden to her and she wanted to divest herself of her American citizenship. Now, who under heaven would contend for a minute that any person who wishes to divest himself of his American citizenship should not have that privilege? That is simply permitting one to expatriate himself who wishes to do so.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSET. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. Why is it then, if the gentleman takes that position, that we should not take away the citizenship of Japanese who have declared that they did not want American citizenship; that they wanted to maintain their citizenship in Japan, in answer to question No. 28?

Mr. GOSSETT. If they repeat and reaffirm that answer, under this bill they would be deprived of citizenship.

Mr. NORRELL. Why require them to repeat and reaffirm? Do you take it that it would be unconstitutional?

Mr. GOSSETT. We are not passing this act just to apply to Japanese. This act applies to everybody. At some time a reasonably good citizen may have said something derogatory of his American citizenship. He may have repented of that. In an abundance of precaution we want to close the door to any fraud, to any conviction of a person on hearsay testimony, to any frame-up by his enemies. We are being particularly cautious in this matter in order to avoid injustices.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is there any objection to having a court hold an open hearing and find that a man did in fact expatriate himself?

Mr. GOSSETT. No.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Under his writings, or by his conduct?

Mr. GOSSETT. I have no objection to that.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is all my bill provides.

Mr. GOSSETT. Except that you are going to convict him for something he did last year.

Mr. LEROY JOHNSON. I am willing to omit the oral part in that bill, and leave it to his written statements and to his conduct.

Mr. GOSSETT. Under the gentlemen's suggestion if this matter is placed in the courts and there is a court action the respondent or defendant could appeal from the trial court to the Court of Civil Appeals, then to the Supreme Court and put the country to a great deal of expense. We want to simplify it, if you please.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. We do not care about the expense; we want to get rid of these people who are clearly disloyal and have expatriated themselves; that is all we want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GOSSETT. Again, I think you will get quicker action under this bill than under the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman from California wants to include in his amendment the conduct of an individual in addition to his writing. When you include conduct does not that open the entire field of oral testimony again?

Mr. GOSSETT. I think so unquestionably.

Mr. Chairman, I want hurriedly to summarize what seem to me to be the objects of this bill. This bill simply adds another subdivision to section 401 and provides a method through which a person resident in this country can of his own volition denaturalize or expatriate himself. If it does not go as far as you want it to go you should be glad that it goes as far as it does. This thing of American citizenship has always been a precious heritage. We do not want to deprive anyone of it lightly, and yet we want the man who comes in and signs a written statement saying: "I want to get rid of my American citizenship" to be accommodated; we want to accommodate him in the simplest, easiest, and cheapest way possible. I want to remind you that this does not go as far as I want to go, but it goes as far as the Attorney General thinks we can go at this time. Mr. Chairman, the loss of citizenship is a serious matter. More than a century ago Sir Walter Scott expressed himself on the value of citizenship or loyalty in the following lines:

Breathes there the man, with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
This is my own, my native land!
Whose heart hath ne'er within him burn'd
As home his footsteps he hath turn'd,
From wandering on a foreign strand?
If such there breathe, go, mark him well;
For him no minstrel raptures swell;
High though his titles, proud his name,
Boundless his wealth as wish can claim,—
Despite those titles, power, and pelf,
The wretch, concentred all in self,
Living, shall forfeit fair renown,
And, doubly dying, shall go down
To the vile dust, from whence he sprung,
Unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4103) to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to insert therein an article which appeared in the New York Times with respect to farm income having risen to $19,000,000,000 in the year 1943.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] is recognized for 25 minutes.

OIL—THE LIFEBLOOD OF OUR NATION

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, today and every day we are shipping to our boys on the fighting fronts unbelievable quantities of vital supplies—food and clothing and trucks and guns and tanks and planes and ammunition. It is no military secret that two-thirds of the gigantic shipping space which carries those supplies of war is filled with oil and gasoline and other oil products.

Let me make that clear. Two out of every three tons of war supplies being carried to our armies abroad are tons of oil.

According to Secretary Ickes, one of our battleships burns up 1,000,000 gallons of oil on just a short cruise. When our Flying Fortresses fly from England to Berlin in a thousand-plane raid, they

burn up 2,000,000 gallons of gasoline. That is enough gasoline to fill the tanks of 125,000 American automobiles. That much gasoline would take your car or mine on 5,000 round trips from Washington to California. And remember that 2,000,000 gallons of gasoline takes care of only one such raid over Berlin.

On the home front, ordinary peacetime consumption of oil in the United States amounts to 450 gallons per capita. That means energy available to American citizens equivalent to the work of 4,500,000,000 men laboring 8 hours a day 6 days a week year in and year out. In effect, our petroleum provides us with an average of 36 strong, able-bodied slaves for every man, woman, and child in the United States; for the average American family, petroleum does the work of a staff of 144 servants.

We are having it proved to us in most dramatic terms that the world of today—in war as well as in peace—floats on a sea of oil.

At the same time we are told that up to the present time 65 percent of all of the oil that the entire world has used has come from American wells. We are told that the known reserves of oil in this country are rapidly dwindling. It is obvious that our country cannot maintain a sound economic position in the postwar world if this lopsided situation is allowed to continue.

It is no wonder that we are beginning to get excited about oil supplies. It is no wonder that we are getting out our maps of the world, trying to find out where the known oil reserves of this earth are, and trying to work out arrangements which will insure access to those reserves for the United States. Decisions on oil are being made here in Washington today which can exert a deciding influence on the history of the world for the next hundred years. For now we know that any nation's standard of living in peacetime and her power in time of war will depend to a great extent on the freedom with which she has ready access to sufficient supplies of oil.

Those decisions about oil supplies must be right decisions. As representatives of the people of this country, it is our business to see that they are right decisions.

Everybody knows that we need oil. But some of the people who are making these decisions seem to be overlooking the further fact that we want that oil to be where we want it when we want it.

On February 27, 1923, almost exactly 21 years ago, our Government set aside 35,000 square miles around Point Barrow, Alaska, as a naval oil reserve. This huge slice of Alaska—about 22,400,000 acres—is known by geologists everywhere as one of the most promising oil lands on the face of the earth. Twenty-one years ago oil there was seeping out of the earth in some spots. Today it is literally oozing out in small streams.

I have talked here about this Point Barrow reserve on four different occasions. There seem to me to be new reasons for calling it to your attention again.

Why did we want that oil reserve at that particular spot 21 years ago? Because we knew that the time might come when Alaska would have to be protected from attack by the Japanese. If that time came, we knew that having oil in Texas or California or Pennsylvania was not going to be good enough. We would have to have it in Alaska.

As I have pointed out here before, I wanted to know just how valuable as oil reserves those 35,000 square miles of Alaskan land around Point Barrow were. Let me summarize some of the things I found out. In an article in the January issue of Harper's Magazine, Wallace E. Pratt, one of the world's outstanding geologists and vice president and director of Standard Oil of New Jersey, says:

> The Point Barrow oil contains a valuable lubricating fraction and is low in sulfur, a common deleterious impurity in crude oil. Weathered samples show a gravity of 18.6 degrees, American Petroleum Institute scale, but the fresh oil might be of lighter gravity.

I have also consulted on this matter with William T. Foran, a geologist who has spent many successful years in oil exploration in South America and in the Near East. He is one of the few geologists who has spent any length of time in Alaska studying at first hand the possibilities in the Point Barrow reserve. In 1923–24 he conducted surveys there for our Government.

Mr. Foran tells me that the seepages there at Cape Simpson are undoubtedly the result of a slightly fractured oil pool, with fault vent to the surface, and that this occurrence is evidence of the most positive nature that oil has accumulated in the subjacent area. He says that no less than eight major anticlines suited to accumulation of oil traverse the reserve area from east to west. The source region for oil in this region, according to Mr. Foran, is suggested by the presence of rich oil shales occurring in the zone below the coal series, and he notes that porosity, sand, and shale conditions in this lower series are well suited to the migration and pooling of oil. His analysis of the residue of the seepage oil suggests that it is comparable to Gulf coast crude and quite similar to crude from the Blue Ridge field of Texas.

It is Mr. Foran's opinion that, of all the probable areas in which oil may be found in Alaska, this Barrow reserve shows unusual possibilities. Having all the geological qualifications of a great potential oil area, it is, he believes, one of the most attractive untested areas on the whole North American Continent.

Now what happened to the development of the Arctic's oil resources between 1923 and the outbreak of this war?

On this 22,000,000 acres of precious oil reserve at Point Barrow, nothing happened. Not even one exploratory drill was put down to enable the United States Navy to find out just how much oil it had in this vast reserve withdrawn from the public for some future emergency.

In other parts of Alaska a great deal happened. Private industry, risking vested capital in the constant competition to find new sources of oil, went prospecting. Early efforts were made in a narrow strip along the coast at Yakataga clear across Alaska to the south from the Barrow reserve. Sixteen wildcat wells were drilled in the Kanatak-Alaska Peninsula region. From 1923 to 1926 Standard Oil of California drilled without success on the most attractive looking structure over in the Alaska Peninsula region. Another deep and expensive failure was drilled there by the Associated Oil Co. of California. Wildcatting in this area costing more than $3,000,000 finally came to a halt in 1938 when one of the deepest tests of the region—a joint operation of Standard of California, Tide Water Associated, and Union of California—was abandoned when the test well reached a depth of 7,596 feet.

All of this effort confirmed the shrewd judgment of the Navy. They had looked the whole situation over and then put their own fence around the 35,000 square miles of land which everybody agrees is the most likely oil land in Alaska.

Meanwhile, a Canadian oil company, Imperial Oil Ltd., had drilled over at Fort Norman, across the border in Canada. They found oil. There wasn't much market for it up there in the frozen north, so for 20 years production was restricted to an average of 80 barrels a day. This took care of the local trade.

Now let's look at what happened 20 years later.

What the Navy thought might happen some day did happen. In 1942 the Japs did attack Alaska. We needed oil in a hurry, and we needed it in Alaska, not in Texas or Pennsylvania.

I have criticized General Somervell on this floor for the awful waste and extravagance in building that 500-mile pipe line from Fort Norman to Whitehorse over one mountain range after another, and for the many other aspects of that whole Canol business which authorities have pointed out as hasty and ill-advised.

But in spite of that criticism, I will say that the general found himself on a spot when the Japs landed in the Aleutians. The Army had to have gasoline and oil in Alaska. And the Army had to have it in a hurry. The Navy could not give the general tankers or convoys to get it there by sea. He could not haul it overland across Canada. He went to the only proven oil wells anywhere near Alaska and made a contract with their owners to expand their production.

Where was our precious United States naval oil reserve then—this 22,400,000 acres of land set aside for use in case Japan attacked Alaska? It was just where it was 20 years before—lying up in the cold North with oil seeping out of ground never yet pierced by a test well. Failure to develop that Barrow reserve cost the taxpayers of this country $130,000,000. That is what we paid for the Canol project.

Earlier this month Secretary Ickes announced that the Government had contracted to spend another $165,000,000 to build a 1,200-mile pipe line from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean Sea. The announced purpose is to make oil available to us when and where we need it. Again I ask, What about the Barrow

reserve located in one of the most strategic spots right here in our home territory—not half-way around the world and 10,000 miles away in a region we cannot possibly hold or defend?

There are three pertinent questions to be asked about this 22,400,000-acre Barrow reserve: First, Can it be developed now? second, Do we need to develop it now? third, Who should develop it now?

First, then, Can it be developed now?

Let me quote again from the statement by Wallace Pratt:

> The country is ice-bound and barren of timber. The unfavorable climate, the lack of marine transportation facilities, the isolation, and the bleak environment have discouraged development. For a Navy that has been interested in petroleum principally as fuel for battleships, a reserve so ice-bound as to be inaccessible to the fleet for three-quarters of the time has had little appeal. With the impetus given aviation in Alaska by the present war this attitude may change. Five hundred miles south of Point Barrow is Fairbanks, the inland metropolis of Alaska, which has become a great center of flying activity and a main base, both civil and military, for airplane maintenance and supplies including aviation fuel and lubricants.
>
> * * * The operation of oil wells and a modern cracking plant at Point Barrow could be made largely independent of weather. Products such as aviation fuels could be moved southward by pipe line across the Endicott Range to Fairbanks despite ice and low temperature. The ice-bound Arctic coast is not an insuperable obstacle to the development of this promising prospect.

Other oilmen with whom I have talked agree with this statement.

The next question is, Should this reserve be developed now?

As I said earlier, this business of getting more oil for our country really means having plenty of oil where we want it when we want it. Our question therefore simmers down to this:

Do we need plenty of oil in Alaska?

If you will look at any one of the hundreds of new maps of world airways, you can see the answer to that question immediately. We are not going to have to wait until after the war for Fairbanks, Alaska, to become a key point in the system of international transportation by air. Fairbanks is today in the straight line of our Army Air Transport Command route to China and India. After the war, it will be a junction stop on the way to China, India, Australia, the Near East, and Russia. It must be a refueling stop, too. Alaska, the last of our frontiers, will undoubtedly see a period of development after this war comparable only to the rapid development of our western plains after the Civil War. We will need oil in Alaska in great quantities for peacetime operations. And the Barrow reserve is the best known source of that oil.

When we sit around the economic peace table after this war, the fact that we are developing this giant Barrow reserve of oil might easily be a most important fact.

And what of the military value to our Nation in developing this reserve now? Like every other American, I hope there will never be another war. But I have learned my lesson. I know that the only way to prevent war is to be prepared for war. We must be prepared to defend any spot of our soil against any combination that is likely to be raised against us. And if there is to be another war, Alaska cannot be defended without plenty of oil. And the only way to prevent attack against Alaska in the future is to have enough oil there to meet any attack. I have been reliably informed that long before their attack on Alaska in 1942, the Japs made a tour of that territory around the Barrow reserve to see whether or not it offered any threat against invasion.

If this great oil reserve can be developed now, if it should be developed now, then who should develop it?

For that question I do not have an answer, but I want to see responsible authorities get to work now to find the best answer. With its splendid organization of Seabees, the Navy itself could develop it. Maybe the Army and Navy should develop it together. Maybe it should be developed with funds provided by the Petroleum Reserve Corporation. Maybe it should be turned over to private industry to develop. It is certainly true that thus far in the history of oil development, private companies alone have shown the continuous initiative and enterprise which gets things done, and, under the pressure of constant competition, gets them done without the extravagant waste of time, money, material, and manpower.

Gentlemen, I want again on this floor to ask the United States Navy what it proposes to do now with the 22,400,000 acres of oil land in the Barrow Reserve?

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE BALFOUR DECLARATION; PALESTINE, THE JEWISH HOMELAND

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Balfour Declaration is a sort of a Magna Charta for the Jewish people of Europe, especially at this time when most of the nations saw fit to indulge in a campaign of extermination and when Hitler and his satellites are doing everything in their power to destroy the Jewish people.

The only place which these people can find to reestablish their lives and to make a new home is Palestine. Palestine is not a British possession. Britain was only given a mandate by the League of Nations, a mandate which makes it a trustee for the benefit of the people of Palestine, and which is based on Britain's declaration that "His Majesty's Government will facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish homeland."

In 1924 our Government became a "contracting" party to the Palestine mandate. This was effected by a convention signed between the United States and Great Britain, in which there appeared these significant articles:

First. That no discrimination shall be made among the inhabitants of Palestine on the grounds of race or religion or language and that no person should be excluded from Palestine because of his religious beliefs.

Second. This convention could not be modified except with the consent of the United States.

Notwithstanding these specific provisions of our convention with Great Britain, the British Government without consulting us, and without obtaining permission from this country, issued what is known as the Palestine White Paper.

Under this so-called White Paper, it was provided, among other things, that Jewish immigration to Palestine should be limited to not more than 75,000, and that this total must be reached by March 31, 1944, after which no Jews would be allowed to enter Palestine. In other words, the Jewish homeland would be the only place from which Jews would be absolutely barred as Jews—in spite of the fact that Britain solemnly pledged herself to establish a Jewish homeland in Palestine.

Our Government cannot permit that a friendly government like that of Great Britain should thus flout its own solemn pledge in favor of the Jewish homeland in Palestine.

It is also of importance to note that while most of the countries in the Near East are straddling and "sitting on the fence," not giving the United Nations the slightest help or cooperation in the war, it is the Jews of Palestine who participated in this war to the fullest extent. They have written a vivid chapter of brilliant, eager, and courageous participation in the war on the side of the United Nations. Their self-sacrifice and courage have excited the admiration of the British and American officers under whom these men and women have served.

Pierre van Paassen has called the Jewish participation in the war and the extraordinary heroism displayed by the Jews in Palestine during all of the campaigns in the Near East as the best-kept secret of this war.

But the secret is out. There is no question that Britain is entirely unjust in closing the doors of Palestine to Jewish refugees at a time when they need it most.

The New York Times has published an editorial which I will incorporate in my remarks:

THE WHITE PAPER

According to the original provisions of the White Paper issued by the British Government on May 17, 1939, Jewish immigration into Palestine was limited to 75,000 for a 5-year period and was due to be stopped completely on March 31, 1944. Even that small quota was not filled because of war conditions, and the terms were modified last November to permit the entry of immigrants who were unable to reach the country before the deadline. But a mere extension of the time limit is not enough. As the end of the 5-year period draws near it is clearer than it was in 1939 that the ban imposed by the British after years of disorder and the failure of the abortive round-table conference was a stopgap rather than a solution of a complex and burning problem.

The case for American intervention in this question is stronger than it was 5 years ago. The presence of our troops and supply depots in the Near East and our vital concern in peace and order in this strategic area give us a greater right to urge that the white paper should now be abrogated. At the time it was published this newspaper opposed the rigid limitation on the flow of immigrants into Palestine as unjust and unacceptable, and everything that has happened since confirms and strengthens that opinion. The increasingly desperate state of

those of Jewish faith in Europe has made it more than ever evident that in these tragic years the doors of any place or refuge, instead of being closed to a crack, should have been opened wider.

On the future political status of Palestine there is room for wide and deep divergences of view. This question remains, and promises to remain for a long time to come, one of the most complex and highly charged problems of post-war statesmanship. But it is significant that Jews and non-Jews, no matter how much they differ on this point, stand solidily in support of that part of the current congressional resolution that advocates American initiative in seeking to obtain the resumption of immigration. The hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee reveal general agreement on the justice and necessity of removing the White Paper ban. This is a fair reflection of public opinion in this country. The final settlement of the Palestine problem fits into the framework of the general peace. It depends on the code of justice and security the victors are able to establish. Meantime there can be no question that humanity and a sense of reality demand that the arbitrary ban should be lifted and immigration should be permitted on the most generous terms possible.

The Times is by no means a paper which favors Zionism, nevertheless it has taken the sound view that the British White Paper is at the present time a tremendous mistake.

On the basis of Britain's pledges, as well as for humanitarian reasons which we must not lose sight of, I respectfully urge that the Committee on Foreign Affairs recommend favorably the resolution requesting Great Britain to abrogate the White Paper and that the Congress of the United States take immediate action on it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HOCH for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee this afternoon and to include therein certain resolutions passed by the Pacific coast delegation on the Japanese question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE]?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw;

S. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site; and

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 17, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be meetings of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Thursday, February 17, 1944, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, for the consideration of post-war planning.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backing of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Thursday, February 17: Continuation of the projects discussed on February 16.

2. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers, and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

3. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

4. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1196. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year 1945, containing estimates of appropriations amounting to $27,989,819,500 cash and $2,800,000,000 contract authorization, total cash and contract authorization, $30,789,819,500, and proposed provisions affecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 423), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on appropriations. H. R. 4204. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934; with amendment (Rept. No. 1150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1633. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1943, so as to provide for the full participation of institutions of the United States in the program for the training of nurses, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 227. Joint resolution extending the period for the acquisition by the Railroad Retirement Board of data needed in carrying out the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4205. A bill to grant additional compensation to certain veterans pursuing vocational training under part VII of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 4206. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of a bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4207. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of a bridge across the Monongahela River in the county of Allegheny, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 4208. A bill to create a new Cabinet post to be named Secretary for Veterans; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4209. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggrevated by military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4210. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. J. Res. 235. Joint resolution authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Cook Inlet, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors

By Mr. TALLE:

H. J. Res. 236. Joint resolution to provide for a streamlined, simplified, and coordinated Federal tax system; to authorize and direct the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make studies and recommendations in connection therewith; and to provide for the creation of a temporary advisory council to said committee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. Res. 442. Resolution to create a committee of the House to investigate the petroleum industry and problems of petroleum supply; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 4211. A bill for the relief of Ralph J. Herrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4212. A bill for the relief of Robert Rowe and Mary Rowe; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of Karl Lungstias; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4898. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of the Zetetic Club, of Indianola, Iowa, with 24 signers, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1161, the Murray-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4899. By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Maplewood Ladies Aid, of Malden, Mass., regarding the abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4900. Also, petition of various and sundry persons of Malden, Mass., with reference to the abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4901. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Arthur R. Marquardt and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., containing approximately 600 signatures, opposing prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4902. By Mr. HILL: House Joint Memorial No. 1 of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the United Nations to take steps to find even temporary havens of refuge for homeless and hounded Jews, and requesting that Palestine be opened wide to Jewish immigration and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4903. Also, House Memorial No. 2, of the House of Representatives of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the Congress of the United States to take such steps as will provide for the commissioning in the Army of the United States of licensed chiropodists in order to serve persons serving in the Army with proper foot and leg treatment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4904. Also, House Joint Memorial No. 3 of the first extraordinary session of the Thirty-fourth General Assembly, State of Colorado, urging the Congress to assume the obligations of getting to the men and women in the armed services the absent voters' ballots prepared by the States, and to return said ballots to the proper State and local officials with all due dispatch, insuring secrecy in the ballot, and requesting that the Congress not attempt to assume the right to determine the qualifications of the voters and the form and contents and time and method of casting, counting, and canvassing the ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4905. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition signed by 3,000 citizens of the Twenty-seventh District of New York, regarding consideration of prohibition at this session of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4906. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Bronx County Medical Society, Bronx, New York City, opposing the medical and hospital sections of the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4907. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of Charles C. Hyre, Mrs. R. S. Hickman, Rev. Everett C. Zinn, Rev. B. S. Burhans, J. H. Funk, Nellie P. Boggess, and Mrs. A. B. Rohrbough, citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging that Congress enact a law prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors during the duration of the war and the period of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4908. By Mr. ROLPH: Assembly Joint Resolution No. 15 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States regarding the matter of additional legislation to end the general uncertainty under which producers of agricultural commodities are now laboring; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4909. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 16 of the California Legislature, relative to the hospitalization of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4910. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 14 of the California Legislature, memorializing the President, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Office of War Information, relative to the prompt release of war news; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4911. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 13 of the California Legislature, relating to termination of war contracts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4912. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 12 of the California Legislature, relating to the prevention of undue hardship on California industries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4913. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9 of the California Legislature, relative to the enactment of legislation by Congress permitting the taxation of property belonging to the United States by the States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4914. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 5 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to provide for the disposal by the United States Government of certain military vehicles and other equipments suitable for civilian use to United States veterans of the present conflict, to cities, and counties, and to the State departments of education at the lowest possible price, and also to enact legislation for the financing of such purchases whenever necessary; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4915. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation providing a bill of rights for veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

4916. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 1 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress to simplify the income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4917. Also, House Resolution No. 51 of the California Legislature, relating to the ceiling price on hay; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4918. Also, House Resolution No. 57 of the California Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact legislation declaring illegal all waivers of compensation or adjusted compensation by men of the armed forces upon their discharge as a condition for honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4919. Also, House Resolution No. 48 of the California Legislature, relative to prolonging the wild fowl shooting season; to the Committee on Agriculture.

4920. Also, House Resolution No. 47 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing Congress for legislation concerning the delivery, distribution, casting, collection, and return of the absentee ballots; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4921. Also, House Resolution No. 31 of the California Legislature, relating to commending the railroads and their personnel for the exceptionally competent performance of services throughout the Nation in this present war emergency; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

4922. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 17 of the California Legislature, relative to memorializing the President of the United States to exert his influence upon the Government of Great Britain to bring about the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper concerning Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4923. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of E. Wesley Woodruff and Isabel B. Sarver on behalf of the North Street Methodist Church, Wheeling, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4924. Also, petition of Stanley Owoc, president, Council 133, of the Polish National Alliance, having a membership of 2,500, comprising Brooke, Hancock, Marshall, and Ohio Counties, W. Va., urging the State Department to favor and foster the cause of a righteous adjustment of the integrity of the former pre-war boundaries of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in the abundance of Thy mercy another day is added to the record of the lengthening years. For the morrow and its needs we do not pray. For the day which now bathes us in its

returning light, set Thou a seal upon our lips. Plant an understanding of our brother's need in our hearts. Vouchsafe to us some revelation of Thy truth upon our darkened minds. As patriots make us worthy of the past and equal to the present. We cannot adequately serve this troubled day without some guidance from Thy wisdom to lift us out of our bewilderment, some power from Thine infinite resource to strengthen us in our need.

May Thy servants who have been called to administer the affairs of this Nation make daily choice of spiritual integrity amid the corruption that is in the world through the lust of power, that, being unafraid, they may contend for the right as Thou dost give them to see the right. Lift upon us the light of Thy countenance as we come grateful for the best traditions of the Nation whose servants we are, anxious for it to play its destined role in this great day, prayerful for our embattled sons now scattered over all the earth, eager to clear the way for an ordered society of nations that shall give substance and hope to man's dream of brotherhood. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 16, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operations of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil, shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3916) to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Meichior;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw;

S. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1077 An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site; and

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT RURAL DELIVERY SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 153)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the form of an amendment to the Budget for the Post Office Department, fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, increasing the amount for Rural Delivery Service from $103,315,000 to $107,690,000 (an increase of $4,375,000), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

SURVEY TO DETERMINE CAUSES OF CRITICAL LABOR SHORTAGE DESIGNATION OF HARTFORD (CONN.) PRODUCTION AREA

Mr. DANAHER (for himself and Mr. MALONEY), by unanimous consent, presented for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the court of common council and approved by the mayor of Hartford, Conn., which resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That—

Whereas Hartford has made outstanding contributions and efforts ever since the War of Independence to fight for and preserve our democracy, and has again in this present world conflict so richly earned the designation of the arsenal of democracy; and

Whereas the manufacture of airplane motors and propellers and Colt machine guns and cannon in the Hartford area, which together with kindred other products are a vital and integral part of the Nation's war efforts in this world conflict; and

Whereas the Hartford area in this State has been declared a critical labor-shortage area, whereby through the attendant loss of contracts Hartford can lose the opportunity to continue in these war efforts; and

Whereas continuance of such a designation of critical labor-shortage area can bring upon the city of Hartford sudden extreme adverse economic circumstances: Therefore

We earnestly petition, That this board of aldermen respectfully request of the Federal Congress, through its Senators and Representatives, that the Federal Congress instruct the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and such other Federal agencies involved to cooperate with representatives of the local communities involved, together with labor representatives and industrial representatives; all of whom will cooperate together in conducting a survey to determine the causes of the critical labor shortage designation and make such constructive recommendations as they deem advisable and further to publish a report of their findings and recommendations as soon as they are determined; and that copies of this petition are forwarded to each Connecticut Senator and Representative in Federal Congress and the President of the United States, and we respectfully urge that they act in unison to accomplish the purposes of this petition.

ABSORPTION OF RADIO INDUSTRY BY THE NEWSPAPER INDUSTRY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for insertion at this point in the body of the RECORD and appropriate reference, a resolution that was "unanimously adopted by the New Haven Central Labor Council at its last regular meeting, opposing the absorbing of the radio industry by the newspaper industry"—and I am quoting from the resolution—and urging the adoption of legislation "to prevent"—what is referred to as—"the continuance of this monopolistic trend."

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the present trend in the United States of the acquiring of radio broadcasting stations by large newspapers is a threat toward the control of public opinion and the stifling of controversial issues from an unbiased point of view;

Whereas control of radio stations by newspapers tends to restrict the information offered to the public to that which serves the interest of the newspapers;

Whereas absorption of these radio stations by amalgamation or combining with newspapers is a monopolistic tendency and not in accord with the democratic principles of the United States;

Whereas a distinct threat to democracy in the newspaper-radio combine is apparent when we realize that it is operated for profit and not in the public interest when a conflict between the two arises;

Whereas control of radio by newspapers puts the public in the position of getting only such news which is not influenced by their advertisers, or in any way adverse to their interests;

Whereas control of public opinion through radio and newspapers becomes a dangerous weapon for fascism as was the case in Germany when newspapers and radio stations were combined and used for Nazi propaganda;

Whereas whenever participation by many is replaced by control of a few powerful interests any further advance in radio is apt to be blocked since it may conflict with the profits of newspapers. This will be more and more apparent as television becomes a practical reality: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the New Haven Central Labor Council goes on record as opposing the absorbing of the radio industry by the newspaper industry and that legislation be passed to prevent the continuance of this monopolistic trend. In the interests of democracy, a

free press, and a free radio, such combinations must be dissolved and prohibited in the future if we are to have unbiased, intelligent public opinion in this country which is in the last analysis the basis of all democracy; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the senatorial and congressional representatives from this district as well as a copy to Chairman Fly of the Federal Communications Commission.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1538. A bill for the relief of Charlie Holcomb; with amendments (Rept. No. 690); and

H. R. 1273. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre; without amendment (Rept. No. 691).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Edwin Foley; without amendment (Rept. No. 692);

H. R. 2875. A bill for the relief of Adelard Demers; without amendment (Rept. No. 693);

H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 694);

H. R. 3195. A bill for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 695); and

H. R. 3371. A bill for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 696).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 248. A bill for the relief of Louis Courcil; with ar amendment (Rept. No. 697); and

H. R. 2385. A bill for the relief of Nadine Gorman; without amendment (Rept. No. 698).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1355. A bill for the relief of Robert C. Harris; with amendments (Rept. No. 699);

S. 1665. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; without amendment (Rept. No. 700);

H. R. 544. A bill for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 701); and

H. R. 2880. A bill for the relief of H. G. Tooley; without amendment (Rept. No. 702).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1313. A bill for the relief of Delores Lewis; with an amendment (Rept. No. 703); and

H. R. 2183. A bill for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister; without amendment (Rept. No. 704).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 929. A bill for the relief of Irving L. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 705); and

H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart; without amendment (Rept. No. 706).

By Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1660. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the county of Crow Wing in Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 707).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1006. A bill to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 708).

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE OIL INDUSTRY—PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report Senate Resolution 253, providing for an investigation with respect to petroleum resources in relation to the national welfare, with certain amendments thereto. The original resolution provided for a committee of nine to make a complete study and investigation of the petroleum problem, and to recommend a national policy. The resolution, as amended, provides for the appointment of two members from each of four committees, in order to cover jurisdictional questions in the Senate: First, the Committee on Foreign Relations, since the committee to be appointed will deal very much in the foreign field; second, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which is concerned with transportation; third, the Committee on Commerce, which has had rather plenary jurisdiction of petroleum production; and fourth—and this is the new committee which is introduced because of the extensive studies it has made in the petroleum field in the past 2 years—the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

So, Mr. President, the resolution as now proposed to be amended and recommended by the committee provides for the appointment of two members from each of the four committees and a ninth member to be named by the President of the Senate.

I understand that the resolution, as amended, by the Commerce Committee, will be referred, under the rule, to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Maine will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONTRACT TERMINATION OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Printing I report back Senate Resolution 241, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) submitted by Mr. MURRAY, on January 20, 1944, was read as follows:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Subcommittee on Contract Termination of the Committee on Military Affairs be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said subcommittee during the first session, on S. 1268, a bill to facilitate the termination of war contracts; S. 1280, a bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; and Senate Joint Resolution 80, a joint resolution to prohibit the use of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee system of contracting in connection with war contracts.

Mr. WHITE. Is the Senator asking for immediate consideration of the report?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator indicate what the resolution is?

Mr. HAYDEN. It authorizes the printing of hearings held before the subcommittee on contract termination of the Committee on Military Affairs. It is a very important subject.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. WILLIS each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MISSOURI RIVER PROGRAM—STATEMENT BY GOVERNORS OF MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND WYOMING

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement submitted today by the Governors of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives dealing with the development in connection with the Army engineers of an irrigation, reclamation, and power program on the Missouri River.

There being no objection, the statement was received and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to Colonel Reber discuss the plans of the Army engineers for the development of the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries. The plan is too general to permit intelligent comment upon it in any great detail. We believe, however, if carried into effect it will accomplish its purpose, which is to protect the area below Sioux City from all future flood damage.

We note that to secure flood control below Sioux City the Army engineers were compelled to plan the construction of numerous storage reservoirs above Sioux City. These reservoirs have been referred to as multiple-purpose reservoirs. That is, they are to provide space to store floodwaters, which is later to be used for providing a wider and deeper navigation channel from Sioux City to St.

Louis, for irrigation and other purposes, all of which are commendable.

Back in 1902 Congress enacted the Federal Reclamation Act creating the Bureau of Reclamation and assigned to that agency the task of making the old homestead law operative throughout the 17 arid and semi-arid States of the West by providing an artificial irrigation water supply so that 160 acres of land would support a family the same there as in the more humid States of the Nation. The purpose of the homestead law was to open land to production, settle, and stabilize the country and develop it. The Reclamation Act was designed to extend the benefits of the homestead law to the arid and semiarid half of the Nation.

In view of the above it was inevitable that these two agencies of the Federal Government would come into conflict over the use of the waters of the upper Missouri River. Here were two separate Federal agencies working under entirely different basic laws, responsible to separate committees of Congress, and serving conflicting purposes; one seeking to store floodwaters to prevent flood damage and to reserve the water for later use in aid of downstream navigation, the other seeking to store the same floodwaters higher up the streams and tributaries for later use upon the land for the production of crops and the closer settlement of farm homes. To a certain extent one might say that the basic concept by the people living along the more than 2,000-mile course of the Missouri River from its headwaters to its mouth, concerning what constitutes the highest use of its water, is just as divergent as are the views of these two Federal agencies. Because of these divergent views of the people the Army engineers wisely agreed to submit their plan for the use of the waters of this river to the Bureau of Reclamation for comments looking toward a reconciliation of views, or a correlation of plans for an over-all basin-wide multiple-purpose development program which would more nearly satisfy the needs of the entire area. The Army engineers' plan, with the comments of the Bureau of Reclamation, were then wisely taken under advisement by the Bureau of the Budget while en route to this Committee of Congress on Flood Control. The Bureau of the Budget was sufficiently impressed with the comments of the Bureau of Reclamation to request the Bureau of Reclamation to rush to completion their over-all plans for the upper basin of the Missouri River and its tributaries which have been under way for several years and for which some 50 or more independent reports had previously been completed. May 1 was the date set for these two completed reports to be in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget, the administration's only available coordinating agency today.

We who represent the upper basin States of Montana, Wyoming, and North Dakota have believed that this was a fair and equitable procedure, that the two agencies guided by the administration's Budget Director as a sort of neutral referee, and with only a slight delay, could not help but come forward with a compromise that would be fair and equitable to all interests and to all sections of the basin and to the Nation.

Upon arriving in Washington we discover, however, that a third committee of Congress, established to serve another phase of the work of the Army engineers (the Rivers and Harbors Committee) has reported a bill and is seeking a rule to bring it to a vote on the floor of the House. This bill would lay claim to and establish by law such claim, as shown on page 199, paragraph 495, of House Document No. 238, 35,000 cubic second-feet of the 37,600 cubic second-feet which constitutes the total average flow for the last 14 years of the Missouri River at Kansas City, as shown by records of the United States Geological Survey (1929 to 1942, inclusive). We accept this as a coincidence but request that an effort be made to amend that bill to protect the rights of our upper-basin States to an equitable portion of the stream's flow for domestic, irrigation, mining, and industrial purposes.

The Bureau of Reclamation has indicated that there is a minimum of 4,400,000 acres of additional land in the four upper-basin States that should be irrigated, enough to provide family-size farm homes for forty to fifty thousand additional farm families, America's greatest source of strength and self-reliance. This increase of irrigated farm lands would affect our respective States as follows: In Montana it would increase our present irrigation acreage by approximately 1,300,000 acres. In Wyoming, from the upper Missouri alone (the Yellowstone and tributaries) it would increase our present irrigated acreage from 547,000 to 1,147,000 acres. In North Dakota it would increase the irrigated acreage from 17,120 to 1,517,120 acres. Four million four hundred thousand acres of new irrigated land in the upper basin of the Missouri would more than add the production of a new State to that region, but most of all it would stabilize both our population and our production for all time to come and with the incidental power which such a program would develop, considerable industrialization of the area would follow, so that eventually the area could support double, or more, the present population.

We are not opposing the use of a reasonable amount of water for navigation below Sioux City but we are emphatic that the use in perpetuity of 32,000 or 35,000 cubic feet per second out of an average annual flow of 37,600 does not constitute either the most economic or the most beneficial use of such a valuable natural resource. If there could be inserted in the river and harbor bill or this committee should insert in your flood-control bill language which guarantees a certain fair and equitable portion of Missouri River water for upstream consumptive use (an amount which might be agreed upon) and provide further a program for ultimately installing locks and dams so that as upstream demands increased the lock and dam installation program could provide the same or better water navigation with less and less water, thus releasing more and more water for upstream uses, we believe that you would be pointing in the direction of a fair and equitable solution to the problem.

It is apparent to anyone that capital cannot be attracted to the construction of docks, tugs, or barges, or to irrigation works or farm improvements, until a fair, equitable, and permanent division of the use of the Missouri River water has been determined, and we doubt that any division which is not fair and equitable will be permanent.

We urge early conferences between the chairman of the Flood Control Committee, the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. We urge that further effort be made on the part of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation to compose differences looking toward proper amendments to the river and harbor bill.

It is our present purpose to ask the proper committees of Congress to request the Bureau of Reclamation to make their basin-wide report available to the Congress at the same time that their report goes to the Bureau of the Budget, in order to expedite the consideration of the over-all Missouri River program by committees of Congress and the Missouri River States committee.

JOHN MOSES,
Governor of North Dakota.
SAM C. FORD,
Governor of Montana.
LESTER C. HUNT,
Governor of Wyoming.

REGIONAL ECONOMIES AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Regional Economies and the National Economy," delivered by the Vice President at Minneapolis, Minn., on February 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS TO LITHUANIAN MEETING AT WORCESTER, MASS.

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him to a Lithuanian meeting held in connection with the drive for the purchase of War bonds and the celebration of the twenty-sixth anniversary of the independence of Lithuania at Worcester, Mass., on February 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY—ADDRESS BY JUDGE ROLAND J. STEINLE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of juvenile delinquency delivered by the Honorable Roland J. Steinle, judge, circuit court, Milwaukee County, Wis., at a meeting of the Child Welfare School Conference, Milwaukee, January 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUBSIDY SAVINGS—LETTER BY CHESTER BOWLES

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject of subsidy savings written by Hon. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator, and published in the New York Times of February 16, 1944, and an editorial from the New York Times in reply to the letter, which appear in the Appendix.]

WIN THE WAR—POEM BY JAMES PATRICK McGOVERN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Win the War," composed by James Patrick McGovern, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TUNNELL BEFORE POLISH SOCIETIES AND CLUBS IN DELAWARE

[Mr. WALSH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator TUNNELL before the Council of the Polish Societies and Clubs in Delaware, at Wilmington, Del., on February 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OIL FOR TOMORROW—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Oil for Tomorrow" written by William Philip Simms, which appears in the Appendix.]

STALIN MAKES THE PEACE TERMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHICAGO DAILY TRIBUNE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin Makes the Peace Terms" from the Chicago Daily Tribune of February 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in the course of yesterday's debate the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] submitted a question regarding the functions of the United Relief and Rehabilitation Administration which bore upon a thoroughly fundamental and important point in connection with it. He asked the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who had the floor at the time, whether there had been any consideration given to using the American Red Cross as the instrumentality for this service. The Senator from Iowa replied:

No such proposal was made at any time when I was present at meetings of the committee.

I think that answer is textually correct; there was no such proposal made. On the other hand, I should not want the record to stand with any implication that that phase of the matter was not at least discussed in the committee. I read from the record of the hearings two or three questions and answers so that the record may be complete, because I think the point raised by the Senator from Tennessee is thoroughly pertinent. In the course of the examination of Assistant Secretary of State Acheson I asked him this question:

Is there any conflict between U. N. R. R. A. and the traditional historical service of the Red Cross?

Assistant Secretary Acheson replied:

Mr. ACHESON. No; I should think clearly there was not. It is possible that there might be in some one phase, but there is not in the conception of this organization. The Red Cross at no time has undertaken, and I think I am correct in saying that it does not wish to undertake, large-scale relief. It is not equipped to do it, and it does not want to do it. What it is interested in is in the medical aspects of relief, the medical services, and the care of children and old people.

Senator VANDENBERG. Would there be any conflict at that point between U. N. R. R. A. and the American Red Cross?

Mr. ACHESON. No; I do not think there would. The U. N. R. R. A. agreement itself provides that any organization working in any territory shall do so with the consent and the approval of the Director General, and it is up to him therefore to get together with all these agencies and work out with each one what its appropriate job is.

Senator VANDENBERG. Has there been any sort of complaint at any time from the American Red Cross regarding the scope of U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. ACHESON. Not that I know of.

I simply wanted to make the record complete, Mr. President, upon that thoroughly pertinent point.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I should like to ask the Senator if the M. E. R. A. was given any consideration?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator explain those letters so that I may know what he is talking about?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I refer to the Middle East Relief Association.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unable to say.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to say that it was highly proper to make, and I am very glad that the Senator from Michigan has made, the correction as to any conclusion that might be drawn from the RECORD in my reply to the Senator from Tennessee. As suggested, I simply stated that no such discussion had taken place when I was present, which was true.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, yesterday I listened with a great deal of interest to what my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], had to say in opposition to the pending joint resolution known as House Joint Resolution 192. I say I listened to him with unusual interest because I share in his opinion and because I look upon him at this hour with a great deal of admiration and with entire inspiration, for it has been my observation that on every occasion he has evidenced and demonstrated his interest in America. In other words, I look upon him as one who is more thoroughly interested in America and its future than he is in any other country of the world.

It is refreshing to find myself in the presence of such a man, for the very reason that our Nation seems to be filled with those who are evidently more interested in saving the world than in saving America itself.

Mr. President, I wish to state at the outset, without the slightest hesitation, that I am for America first, and so long as I remain a Member of this body I shall vote the dictates of my conscience as they lead me toward the ultimate interests of this country ahead of the interests of any other country upon the face of the earth.

The Senator from Iowa stated to us yesterday that at the time the vote was taken in the Committee on Foreign Relations upon the pending joint resolution he was 1 member of the committee against 16; in other words, the ratio was 16 to 1, as he expressed it on the floor of the Senate. He was the only member of the committee who voted against reporting the joint resolution. I voted to report it, as the Senator will recall, but at the time I did so I stated to the chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in the presence of the members of the committee, that I was voting to report the joint resolution to the Senate because I wanted the American people to have the benefit of our discussion in this body in reference to the matter, and at the same time I told the chairman that I reserved the privilege of voting against the joint resolution in the Senate if I so desired.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad the Senator from North Carolina referred to the colloquy which took place in the room of the Committee on Foreign Relations, because it occurred just exactly as he has stated. He announced at that time that he would probably oppose the proposal on the floor of the Senate. In referring to the classic ratio of 16 to 1 yesterday I perhaps did an injustice to the eminent Senator by suggesting that he had supported the joint resolution, when he merely supported reporting it to the Senate.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator, but the Senator did not do me any injustice at all.

Mr. President, the joint resolution before the Senate calls for the expenditure of $1,350,000,000. I shall not read or discuss the entire joint resolution. I shall confine my discussion largely to the interests of our country, and to the amount of money which is sought to be appropriated in carrying forward the objectives of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution is entitled, "Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization," and the first paragraph reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such sums, not to exceed $1,350,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States (including contributions in funds or otherwise and all necessary expenses related thereto) in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, established by an agreement concluded by the United Nations and Associated Governments on November 9, 1943.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the joint resolution. I shall not vote $1,350,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the United States of America to be used by any international organization; and this joint resolution, as explained by the able Senator from Iowa yesterday, is not a thing in the world but a measure to formulate an international organization for which, as I say, we will put up all the money.

The time has arrived, the hour has struck, when we must look after our own interests. Every person, soldier and civilian, who today sits in the galleries of the Senate, is interested in this subject, because if the joint resolution shall be enacted, whereby we by our respective votes will appropriate $1,350,000,000 to this international organization, it will mean taking $10 out of the pocket of every man, woman, and child in the United States, and that will be merely the beginning. In other words, I contend that the $1,350,000,000 will mean nothing but an ante in the jackpot.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's trend of thought, but in connection with the statement he just made of the international character of the organization, let me interpolate that the First Assistant Director General to Governor Lehman, I understand, is Sir Arthur Salter, and that the assistant to the Director General for setting up the personnel in the Bureau of Special Areas in the international field, is Mr. Metchnikov, of the Soviet Union. In connection with the statement that Sir Arthur Salter is the First Assistant, and the discussion yesterday as to where relief would stop and rehabilitation and reconstruction start, I think it would be pertinent, and I know the Senator would be interested, to put into the RECORD a brief quotation from a speech made by Sir Arthur Salter just a

few weeks ago to an American group of farmer cooperatives. I do not certify to the accuracy of this quotation because it was handed to me only this morning, but it is as follows:

Whoever relieves will rebuild. Whoever rebuilds will formulate the pattern of government.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much indebted to the Senator. It is true that when we begin relief, we begin rehabilitation, and when we begin rehabilitation, we confront the question of financing the entire world.

As I stated a moment ago, someone has to be able to say "No." It appears that we are so accustomed to saying "Yes" to appropriations that it is difficult for some of us to say "No"; but, so far as I am concerned, I am saying "No" now. I do not propose to give away any more money that belongs to the taxpayers of this country, money which we will need, and when we make the appropriation of $1,350,000,000 we are merely voting to put the hands of the Treasury of the United States into the pocket of every taxpayer in the United States and take therefrom $10; and that is but the beginning.

Mr. President, who is going to pay for this international organization? The taxpayers of the United States of America. If we do not stop this willful, sinful waste of money which belongs to the American people, the United States will be bankrupt.

Is it true that the United States is going to pay for all of it? Let us see. It is said that 44 countries will participate in this international relief program. I wish to give the names of the 44 countries which are going to participate in it. I obtained them from the report. They are: The Commonwealth of Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, the United States of Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, the French Committee of National Liberation, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Liberia, Luxemburg, the United Mexican States, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippine Commonwealth, Poland, the Union of South Africa, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, we are called upon to pay $1,350,000,000, which is two-thirds of the entire amount to be put up by all 44 nations, and, although we are called upon to put up two-thirds of the money, we have but one-forty-fourth of the total vote in the affairs of the organization. In other words, despite the fact that we are putting up two-thirds of all the money which is to be contributed initially to this world-wide, power-politics international organization, we have but 1 vote out of 44 votes which are to be cast by the Council itself.

Mr. President, I say we are putting up more than two-thirds. Who is going to pay for it all? The United States of America is going to pay for the whole thing, just as the United States of America is paying for the whole war and for the rehabilitation of the whole world. Let us see whether that is so. We have what is called lend-lease. Last night when I left the Senate I called up the Lend-Lease Division of the State Department. I contacted a very courteous gentleman, who very kindly gave me the information I sought—Mr. East, of Lend-Lease, whose telephone number is Executive 7030, extension 707. I asked him to tell me which of the countries that are participating or about to participate in this world international organization were receiving lend-lease from us, and I found that every single one of the 44 countries which are supposed to put up one-third of the money in this international enterprise is today receiving lend-lease money from us.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator would except Canada, would he not? Canada is not receiving lend-lease from us.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am coming to that.

Mr. AIKEN. But Canada is included in the list of 44 countries.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is true. I am coming to that, I will say to the Senator. Every single country of those who are supposed to put up the one-third is receiving lend-lease from us today, with the exception of the Philippine Commonwealth and Canada. Canada, so I have been informed, pays cash for all the stuff she receives from us.

Mr. President, I asked Mr. East about Liberia, and he stated that he did not know whether or not Liberia was receiving any lend-lease, but I understand that Liberia has received several million dollars which we have poured in there by reason of her aid in the war. I therefore argue that we are not only called upon to put up $1,350,000,000 but that we are giving money, we are giving lend-lease, to every single one of the 44 countries, with the exception of Canada.

Mr. President, I am vitally interested now in saving as much as we can of Uncle Sam's money, because I am afraid that one of these days we will wake up and find ourselves a bankrupt nation. At the present time we have a national debt of approximately $300,000,000,000, and I venture to say without the slightest hesitation that within 2 years we will have a national debt of $500,000,000,000. I am anxious to save all the money we can save for ourselves, in order that we may care for our own when the time comes that we must do so, for we shall be called upon to take care of our heroes when they shall have returned from the 72 posts at which they are stationed around the world.

Mr. President, we are now in desperate financial condition. I heard the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, state on the floor of the Senate the other day that we have not only scraped clean the bottom of the pot, but that we had scraped it clean 100 times. Today we find that all we can raise in additional taxes is a bit over $2,000,000,000, whereas the administration and the Treasury Department have called for the raising of more than $10,000,000,000 of additional taxes. Yet here we are, in the desperate straits in which we find ourselves financially, proposing to give to an international organization, over which we have no direction, 1 percent of our national income.

Mr. President, I am interested in the boys who are to be returned to the United States. Someone said the other day that when the war is over, and when the men and woman in uniform return to American shores, from every part of the world, that for the next 50 years no one will be elected to public office unless he or she has worn the uniform abroad, and that perhaps will be well for the country, since the men and women who in every part of the world are fighting and helping to keep America American, to save America for Americans, are going to make their demands upon this great Nation, and their demands will be based upon their conception of all they believe to be right and for the best interests of the United States of America.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Did I understand the Senator to say that the present national debt was $300,000,000,000?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I say the present national debt and authorizations are in excess of $300,000,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Does the Senator have a break-down of this sum?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No; I do not, but I will be very glad to obtain it for the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I wonder if the Senator would procure the break-down and place it in the RECORD in connection with his remarks?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall be very glad to do so. I refer to total appropriations and authorizations. I repeat that within 2 years perhaps, and certainly before the war shall have ended, we shall have a national debt in excess of $500,000,000,000. What I am interested in is saving something for the men who are fighting to keep America American. What I am interested in is saving something with which to care for our soldiers, sailors, and other members of the armed forces—men and women—all over the world who are fighting to save America.

Let us see, Mr. President. We talk much about the soldiers, we brag of them, we pay high tributes to them; but what I want to do is back up those tributes and back up those declarations by action. By that I mean saving something to care for the men who will be returned to this land blind, armless, legless, maimed, sick, incapacitated, and to care for the widows and the orphans this horrible war has made and will yet make. When we became engaged in this war, almost 25 years after World War No. 1, we did not have enough beds in our hospitals to provide hospitalization for the veterans of World War No. 1. In preparation for this war we have made installation, or at least have planned for the installation, of 100,000 beds in hospitals. I am told that now the program will have to be in-

creased and I surmise it will have to be increased to the extent of providing for the installation of 300,000 beds in our hospitals.

We are voting billions of dollars almost daily, and we speak of billions as we used to speak of millions, until the national debt is rising to such a point that it is becoming dangerous, insofar as perhaps it will be beyond our ability to care for those who will return from the war. Let us see. Today millions of our men and women are in uniform. It will be our duty to care for the sons, the husbands, the sisters, and the wives who are serving our country today and who are in uniform. When they come back hundreds of thousands of them will be maimed, blind, and deranged. It will be our duty to care for those veterans, and it will be our duty to care for those who are made widows and orphans by this war. If we continue spending money as we are spending it now, I wonder how we shall be able to care for men who are expecting us to be able to care for them in their physical misery, and who are expecting us to be able to care for their families when they are no longer able to earn a living for them.

Mr. President, some days ago I talked to Mr. Millard W. Rice, who formerly was legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Today he is national service director of the Disabled American Veterans. I shall read a summary of a statement he made a few days ago before a committee:

> More than 850,000 will be discharged with disabilities as the result of active service during World War No. 2, if the proportions of World War No. 1 are repeated, according to a statement made by Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans, recently before the Senate Committee on Finance, and on the basis of the same proportions, 1,250,000 World War No. 2 veterans will be in receipt of pensions for service-connected disabilities by 1970. But, the percentage of service-disabled veterans of World War No. 2 will very likely be more than out of World War No. 1, in view of the fact that World War No. 2 is a tougher and longer war, being fought on many more fronts, with the end not yet in sight. It, therefore, appears not out of reason to estimate that there might be anywhere from 1,250,000 to 2,500,000 wounded and disabled veterans out of World War 2.
>
> Their care will impose a tremendous responsibility upon the Veterans' Administration, which demands an extensive expansion of its facilities. Therefore, the Veterans' Administration ought not to be imposed with the many proposed post-war adjustments for able-bodied veterans. Since first things should be taken care of first, the Veterans' Administration should remain the one governmental agency charged primarily with the responsibility of providing governmental benefits for America's service disabled and their dependents, without also being given the responsibility of providing for the various types of post-war adjustments for able-bodied discharges.

That was a statement by Mr. Millard W. Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. President, I have before me a statement in reference to the subject matter under discussion. I desire to bring it to the attention of the Members of this body. We are perfectly willing to provide the unfortunates of Europe or of any other part of the world with such aid as we may be able to provide. We wish to provide the starving with food; we wish to provide the ill with medicine; we wish to do all we possibly can do for the unfortunates of the world. But we have arrived at the point where it appears to me that the one nation and the one people of all the world who are doing everything for the world are the taxpayers of the United States of America. I think we have done our part; I think we are doing our part; and we have done our part, and have continued to do our part, for a long time past.

Let us see. Not so long ago there were hundreds of organizations in the United States for the purpose of providing relief for Russia, for France, for Poland, for Czechoslovakia, for almost every other country in the world. There were so many such organizations and so much money was being collected from time to time that someone in America suggested that there be organized a similar organization for the relief of Americans themselves.

Only a few days ago I read a newspaper account of a private relief organization in New York which had sent many hundreds of thousands of dollars to Russia, and tons upon tons of clothing, medicine, and other supplies. So, for years past we have been collecting money and sending it to all the other countries of the world, and I think we have done our part insofar as such relief is concerned. We have helped our allies. We are cooperating with our allies. We are bearing more than our share of the war. We are giving our sons, our daughters, and our dogs. Even before we got into the war we gave England a number of destroyers. Even before the declaration of war we sent our sons out of the Western Hemisphere. Even before we got into the war we had men in England, Iceland, and Greenland.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether the Senator saw the statement which was published in the newspapers the other day attributed to Mr. Sulzberger, owner and publisher of the New York Times. When the Senator was speaking of lend-lease, I was reminded of that statement. It will be recalled that Mr. Sulzberger, of the New York Times, was one of the most ardent supporters of lend-lease. It will also be recalled that those who were in favor of lend-lease were saying that lend-lease was for the purpose of keeping us out of war. That was said to be the purpose. It was not for the purpose of getting us into war. The other day, in speaking to the Red Cross, of which he is one of the officers, Mr. Sulzberger made the statement that he was one of those individuals who believed that when we enacted the lend-lease law we went to war. He further stated that that was an act of war on the part of the United States.

I should like to have the Senator recall that that was exactly the statement which I made on the floor of the Senate. I said that when we voted for lend-lease we were voting for war. Now we find some of the very persons who were the strongest advocates of lend-lease admitting what I said on the floor of the Senate, that when we voted for lend-lease we voted for war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I saw that statement in the newspapers. In that connection, I recall that when we were discussing lend-lease on the floor of the Senate, before we entered the war, it was said that the purpose of lend-lease was to help Great Britain. I heard the Senator speak on several occasions, and my recollection is that the Senator said that the passage of the Lend-Lease Act was a declaration of war.

I am speaking of aiding those across the water, to show that we have done everything we can. We are giving our sons and daughters. We are giving our blood. We are giving billions of dollars and bankrupting our Nation to help our Allies. There is nothing cheap about us; we are going the whole hog. All we want to know is how far we must follow and what we are to encounter on the road.

I recall that we were called upon to help those across the sea by lifting the arms embargo. That meant that we would be permitted to manufacture guns and place them on ships and put them in the hands of our friends across the seas so that they could kill their enemies. The able Senator from Montana voted against lifting the arms embargo. The able Senator from Montana stated at that time that if we lifted the arms embargo we would be an accessory to the crime; that we would be equally guilty, and equally involved, and that that was the first step toward war. The able Senator from Montana did not want the country to get into the war, and he voted against lifting the arms embargo.

Then came the proposal to repeal the neutrality law. We wanted to help the peoples of the world with whom we were in sympathy. A few months before we had enacted a neutrality law to keep us out of war. Then it was said, "If you will repeal the neutrality law, that will take us away from war." The Senator from Montana said that it would take us another step toward war, and the Senator from Montana voted against the proposal, because he knew that it would lead us to war.

Then came lend-lease. The Senator from Montana said:

> I will not vote for lend-lease, because it is nothing more nor less than a declaration of war. It will take us into war, and we do not want war. We do not want our sons and daughters killed.

The Senator from Montana voted against it. Others said that all those steps were taking us away from war. Well, we are in war.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator will remember Mr. Herbert Agar, who was one of the leaders in the movement in support of the foreign policy of the administration, and one of the strongest proponents of lend-lease. He was also a proponent of the repeal of the arms embargo, and other measures.

Immediately after we enacted the lend-lease law, Mr. Agar made a speech in Boston and he quoted what I had said, and what other Members of the Senate had said. He said that I was correct. Other Senators had said that it was an act of war, virtually a declaration of war. Mr. Agar said that the statement made by those who said that it was for the purpose of keeping this country out of war was wrong, and that they were misrepresenting the facts to the American people. I stated that he said they were misrepresenting the facts. He used even stronger language than that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his observations. I recall the matters to which he refers. I voted against lifting the arms embargo. I believed that such a step was a step toward war. I voted against the repeal of the neutrality law, because I knew it was a step toward war. I voted against lend-lease because I knew it would take us into war. I am glad I voted as I did. I recall that at that time the able Senator from Montana and I were both cussed from one end of the world to the other. We were called Nazis, Fascists, copperheads, appeasers, traitors, and everything else.

Why was the Senator from Montana called all those ugly names? Simply because he voted according to the dictates of his conscience, which led him to believe that those acts were steps toward war. The Senator from Montana did not want us to get into war. I mention that merely to show that we are doing all we possibly can; but we should not pauperize and bankrupt ourselves to help someone else. The time has arrived when we must start voting for the United States of America and quit trying to save the world.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. A short time ago I happened to be at a dinner where a lady said to me, "You talk like an America Firster." I replied, "What are you—an America seconder? It seems to me that you must either be for this country first, or for this country second. Whether you are for this country or for some other country, I am glad to have it said that I am for America first, rather than for America second."

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much.

Under the lease-lend operations we have taken from the taxpayers of America billions upon billions of dollars and given them freely to all the nations of the world. I do not hesitate to say that in my opinion we shall never get back a dollar of it. We have given billions upon billions of dollars of the people's money to other nations of the world. We are not "chinchy," we are not cheap; we are very liberal. It seems to me that sometimes we are too liberal with the taxpayers' money.

Furthermore we have put into uniform more than 10,000,000 men and women, who are now scattered throughout the entire world. They are as brave a group of men and women as the world has ever known.

Moreover, labor in this country has produced more during this war than the combined production of the Axis, or the combined production of our allies. We have done the greatest production job that any country has ever done. We have produced more than any other country in the world, or any combination of countries. We have provided ships by the millions of tons, with which to transport food, medicines, munitions, and everything else to our allies. As I stated a moment ago, hundreds of private charities are now in operation, and our generous, big-hearted people are contributing to them from time to time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, the Senator realizes that these exertions of the United States—that is to say, the billions of dollars contributed by way of lend-lease, and the billions of dollars spent by charities in buying goods, which billions of dollars have been contributed during this period, are now counted into the expanded national income in the formula set up by U. N. R. R. A. for the purpose of still further penalizing the United States.

In other words, the formula set up by U. N. R. R. A. is on the basis of a percentage of the national income of each country. Therefore, both things work against us. The expanded national income, by reason of the increased production which we have brought about to give the other countries lend-lease and charity, and also the more favorable exchange position which the United States has come to have by reason of that same operation, give an entirely fictitious national income to the United States in comparison with other nations. So it is my belief that instead of 65 percent of all the world relief, which it has been admitted the United States will bear, we shall be bearing actually somewhat in excess of 90 percent, when we consider the expansion of our national income due to lend-lease and the more favorable exchange position created by the same operation.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged for the observations of the Senator from Missouri.

As I said a moment ago, in line with what the Senator from Missouri has said, instead of paying two-thirds of the expense we shall be paying about 90 percent of it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me one further observation, we are asked to authorize an appropriation of $1,350,000,000. I think most of us realize that that is merely an initial appropriation. While the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] spoke truly yesterday when he said that it is limited by the terms of the measure under consideration to this one appropriation—nevertheless we are being asked to set our feet on a course, and we shall have to pay the whole bill.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that if this one initial expenditure of $1,350,000,000 were to be spent in the United States—to use one example, if it were applied to flood control in the Mississippi Valley, it would put the whole valley with all its tributaries beyond the danger of flood. The venture would pay for itself in 8 or 10 years, and render magnificent dividends in perpetuity from then on.

I believe that we owe a certain obligation to feed the desperate people of stricken countries. Nevertheless, when we talk about appropriating $1,350,000,000, and paying approximately 90 percent of the total cost, after all is said and done, we are dissipating a very considerable portion of our national assets.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. I think the Senator and I see eye to eye on this matter. The time has come when we must think at least a little about the United States of America.

In addition to that, let us see what else there is. We are scattering billions of dollars over the face of the earth. The other day a Senator stated that we had put about $6,000,000,000 in Central and South America. Our armies which are now in Europe are buying up millions of tons of foodstuffs and spending millions upon millions of dollars for continued purchasing of foodstuffs for the purpose of feeding civilian populations and taking care of emergencies as they arise. As I have already stated, we now have before us a joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of $1,350,000,000. That would be merely the ante. It would be only the beginning. The next thing will be rehabilitation. The joint resolution evidently means rehabilitation, because the words "relief and rehabilitation" appear in the title.

After that we shall have a world-wide bank. We have about $21,000,000,000 in gold buried in Kentucky. It has been suggested that we organize an international bank, a world-wide bank. That suggestion has been made by many persons across the sea because they want us to set up a bank so that they can all borrow money from us. We shall be called upon to rehabilitate the whole world.

Since this war began many of the countries of Europe have called upon us to help them. Since the war began on September 3, 1939, more than 600,000 aliens from European countries have come into the United States. They have left their native countries, ignored the interests of their nations, and have come to the United States, where they can bask in the sunshine of prosperity and safety instead of staying at home and looking after the interests of their respective countries. Six hundred thousand of them have come over here while our men and women in uniform have gone to their countries to fight over

there for their national interests and the "four freedoms." We have been good to them.

In addition to all that, I read in the newspaper just the other day of the organization of another war relief agency. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson; the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau; and someone else constitute a committee of three. As I understand, their proposal is to bring into this country more persons from foreign countries.

In other words, we are pouring money out of our National Treasury, scraping it dry more than a hundred times, as stated by the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the other day, skyrocketing our national debt to the point where perhaps we will not have money enough to pay pensions to widows, or care for our own armless, legless, and blind soldiers. We are giving our money away and at the same time permitting aliens from all parts of the world to come here and obtain jobs. Whether or not they come in on a temporary visa, once they get here they will never go back, and they will occupy the jobs which our soldiers and heroes of this war should have.

I again assert that the time has arrived for us to speak out in behalf of and in the interest of more than 10,000,000 of our men and women who are now in uniform, even if we do not care anything about the people who are paying the taxes. We should save American jobs for American citizens.

Before we got into this war we said in effect, "It is going to be wonderful." Many friends of mine came from North Carolina to see me. I remember one friend of mine from Greensboro, N. C., who was then with the collector of internal revenue. He called upon me and said, "Bob, I am joining up tomorrow. I will see you in a few months." I said, "How so?" He replied, "Why, we will whip the whole world in 6 months."

We have been in the war more than 2 years and we have not yet got started. We do not know where or when the war will end. We do not know how long it will take. Yet we are being asked to appropriate billions of dollars to be contributed to an international organization which is not under our control.

Consider what is happening in Italy today. After we had won northern Africa and Tunisia we were led to believe that we would sweep Italy without any difficulty whatsoever. We have been marking time there, mired down for weeks, which is attributable largely to the elements, for no braver men ever fought than our men. Consider that General MacArthur issued a statement the other day that winning the war against Japan was not a question of merely jumping from island to island right into Tokyo. We do not know how long the war is going to last; we do not know how many of our sons and daughters are going to be killed and buried beneath foreign soil, thousands upon thousands of miles away from home. We do not know how many thousands of our sons and daughters are coming back deranged, without legs or arms, and of no benefit to themselves or their families, except for their presence. Yet we propose to vote $1,350,000,000, 1 percent of our national revenue, to an international organization.

What about the international organization? I wonder how much it is going to cost. I should like to know something about the administrative expense of it. I asked the able Senator from Michigan yesterday how much Governor Lehman, the Director General, was going to get. He said he did not know and did not care. Well, I do not know, but I do care. Insofar as I am concerned, I want to save every penny we can for the rehabilitation of our boys and girls, men and women in uniform, when they come back, whether it be a year or 5 years from now. I want to have a nest egg for them, and that is why I want to save the money for them, and that is why I want to save the jobs for them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I hold in my hand the veto message of the President of the United States, dated May 22, 1935, of a bill that was passed by the Congress of the United States, House bill 3896, to provide for the immediate payment to veterans of the face value of their adjusted-service certificates, and so forth. I should like to call the attention of the Senator, if I may, to one or two statements which were made by the President at that time. He said:

> The second "whereas" clause, which states that the payment of certificates will not create an additional debt, raises a fundamental question of sound finance. To meet a claim of one group by this deceptively easy method of payment will raise similar demands for the payment of claims of other groups. It is easy to see the ultimate result of meeting recurring demands by the issuance of Treasury notes. It invites an ultimate reckoning in uncontrollable prices and in the destruction of the value of savings that will strike most cruelly those like the veterans who seem to be temporarily benefited. The first person injured by skyrocketing prices is the man on a fixed income. Every disabled veteran on pension or allowance is on fixed income. This bill favors the able-bodied veteran at the expense of the disabled veteran.
>
> Wealth—
>
> The President said—
>
> is not created, nor is it more equitably distributed by this method. A Government, like an individual, must ultimately meet legitimate obligations out of the production of wealth by the labor of human beings applied to the resources of nature.

The President of the United States never made a more direct and frank statement than that of the economics of finance.

> Wealth is not created, nor is it more equitably distributed by this method. A government, like an individual, must ultimately meet legitimate obligations out of the production of wealth by the labor of human beings applied to the resources of nature. Every country that has attempted the form of meeting its obligations which is here provided has suffered disastrous consequences.

The President in his veto message then referred to what would happen to the Treasury. He said:

> Some years ago it was well said by the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho that, "The soldier of this country cannot be aided except as the country itself is rehabilitated. The soldier cannot come back except as the people as a whole come back. The soldier cannot prosper unless the people prosper. He has now gone back and intermingled and become a part of the citizenship of the country; he is wrapped up in its welfare or in its adversity. The handing out to him of a few dollars will not benefit him under such circumstances, whereas it will greatly injure the prospects of the country and the restoration of normal conditions."

I cite that to show that at that time the President was worried about the payment of the soldiers' bonus because of the effect it would have upon inflation and the financial condition of the country.

I happened to be a Member of the Senate at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Did not the President veto the soldiers' bonus?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the President vetoed it, and I am reading from the veto message which he sent to the Congress at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. He said we did not have sufficient money to pay it, did he not, and that it would create inflation?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; that the bill would create an inflation if enacted at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. What amount of money did the bonus involve?

Mr. WHEELER. About $2,000,000,000, as I recall.

I call attention to that fact because at that time we were seeking to pay a contract to the soldiers which we had agreed to pay, but to pay it to them in advance of the time when it matured. That was vetoed.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator permit an interruption at that point, with the permission of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was justifiable on the ground that the Government had not made the contract until 5 or 6 years after the time when the money was fairly owed to the soldiers. The Government had entered into a contract to pay the bonus at maturity, the provisions of the bill which the Senator is now discussing provided for payment before maturity. If the bonus had been given to the men when they were discharged from the Army, in the first place, the time at which it was fairly owed, a large saving would have resulted.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator was entirely correct as to the theory on which the President was proceeding, but the actual facts were that the measure which the President vetoed simply brought the contract to maturity at a time before it would have been brought to maturity under the terms of the contract which had been entered into. If the Government had made the contract

at the time it should have entered into it there would have been a very considerable saving.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from North Carolina will recall the statements made upon this floor and the statements made in the reactionary press of the country to the effect that the payment of the bonus at that time would wreck the country, that to pay the soldiers $2,000,000,000 would cause a tremendous inflation. That was the language used by the press and the President of the United States at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, what was the national debt at that time, does the Senator know? It was about $20,000,000,000, was it not?

Mr. WHEELER. As I recall, it was between twenty and thirty billion dollars.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Between twenty and thirty billion dollars?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. President, the bill which was vetoed was to pay a debt which we owed to the soldiers and which we had agreed to pay.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I voted for it, and I voted to override the President's veto.

Mr. WHEELER. So did I.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wanted the soldiers to have some money then, and it is a good thing the Congress gave it to them then because I am afraid we will not have any left for them in this war.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; if we are going to give the resources of this country away to foreign countries. I want to say that nobody on the floor of the Senate is more in sympathy with the unfortunate people and the refugees of stricken countries than am I, and I am perfectly willing to do whatever is necessary to help rehabilitate those countries and put back on their feet their people who have been ruthlessly driven from their homes by Mr. Hitler and his group. But I say that in doing that we are the trustees of the taxpayers' money. If we give away the substance of the taxpayers and burden the Senator's children and my children, and our grandchildren for the next 150 or 200 years, we will pauperize the American people, we will have to turn to the printing press, as Mr. Roosevelt intimated we would have to do if we gave the soldiers the $2,000,000,000 bonus; or we will have to repudiate our debt, because we will not be able to service it if it keeps on rising by leaps and bounds, as it has been doing.

First, we are to give the President of the United States $1,300,000,000 to be turned over to a group of 44 different countries, to be used as they see fit, when we have only 1 vote in the body, without any strings to it whatsoever; and when they once get it they will have authority, under the proposed legislation, to make contracts and more contracts, and commitments and more commitments, and then they will come back to this country and say, "We have already made these commitments. While you have authorized only $1,300,000,000, you are morally bound, under the provisions of the act, to give us more money and more money and more money to carry out the provisions of the act which you approved."

In the first place, if we are to pass anything at all, we should limit the amount to less than $1,300,000,000, until we ascertain whether that much will be needed. Secondly, we should call on the President of the United States, to whom the money is to be turned over, to make quarterly reports to the Congress as to where the money is being spent and how it is being spent. For Congress just to turn over to any President unlimited sums of money, to be spent as he or someone else he delegates may see fit, would involve a violation of the oath of office which every Senator took to uphold the Constitution of the United States and protect the interests of the people of the United States, when they took their seats in this body.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I shall not violate my oath.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I call his attention to the fact that under the remarkable set-up proposed, there are managing members and contributing members, and we are to be the principal contributing member, not only the principal one, but the controlling member, in the matter of contributions. It is admitted we are supposed to contribute 65 percent of the expenses of this organization. But other nations, some of which, for very good reasons, are not expected to contribute to the expenses of the operation, are permitted, by paying a modicum of the expenses of administration, to have the same voice in the administration of the fund that we have. For instance, the Russians. I have the very deepest and heartfelt admiration for the military achievements of the Russians. They do not think they should be included as contributing members, and I think there is very much in what they say, that they have a tremendous problem of rehabilitation themselves. They have been through the treadmill, they have been through the fiery furnace, and they say they should not be expected to contribute to the rehabilitation of some of the other countries, but if they should not contribute to the rehabilitation of some of the other countries, why should they have an equal voice with the United States in the administration of the funds by the contribution of a mere million and a quarter dollars to the administrative expenses?

It does not seem to me to be right, in the first place, that all contributing members should have the same voice in the administration, without regard to the amounts they contribute. In the second place, it does not seem to be right that noncontributing members should have the same voice as we, who will probably contribute three-fourths to the whole enterprise before we get through.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator. Of course, some of the countries are making contributions toward the administrative expenses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think they should put up some of the administrative expenses, but the idea that the United States should have no greater voice in this matter than noncontributing nations seems to me unjustifiable. But after we once enact this proposal, Congress will have really signed off, they will not have much more to do with it, because it will be a commitment, no matter what the distinguished Senator from Michigan said yesterday. Although an American, and a very distinguished American, has been selected to be the head of the organization as an initial proposition, we are to have no more voice in the management of the concern, after contributing $1,300,000,000, than our friends the Russians, who are contributing a million and a quarter to the administrative expenses. That does not seem to me to hold together.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREEN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I read now the contributions, by percentages, of the various governments to the total amount of $10,000,000, decided on as the necessary administrative expenses:

	Percentage
Australia	1.50
Belgium	1.00
Bolivia	.10
Brazil	1.50
Canada	3.00
Chile	.20
China	5.00
Colombia	.30
Costa Rica	.05
Cuba	.20
Czechoslovakia	1.00
Dominican Republic	.05
Ecuador	.05
Egypt	.70
El Salvador	.05
Ethiopia	.05
French Committee of National Liberation	4.00

Where are they to get the money?

	Percentage
Greece	0.50
Guatemala	.05
Haiti	.05

Haiti will have one vote the same as the United States will have.

	Percentage
Honduras	0.05
Iceland	.05
India	4.00
Iran	.10
Iraq	.10
Liberia	.05
Luxemburg	.05
Mexico	.70
Netherlands	1.50
New Zealand	.30
Nicaragua	.05
Norway	.30
Panama	.05
Paraguay	.05
Peru	.25
Philippines	.05
Poland	1.00
Union of South Africa	1.00
U. S. S. R.	15.00
United Kingdom	15.00
U. S. A.	40.00
Uruguay	.20
Venezuela	.10
Yugoslavia	.70
Total	100.00

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator from North Carolina will permit another interruption, there is nothing in the joint resolution, as I read it, or in the whole set-up, which would prevent the other governments from paying their contributions, if they desire, out of lend-lease funds. We may be paying 100 percent before we get through.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I might state to the Senator, in that connection, that I called up the State Department last night, the lend-lease division, and found that every member of the 44 nations which are supposed to make contributions to relieve the suffering of the world is getting lend-lease, except Canada and Liberia. So, as the Senator has ably stated, these other countries can pay their part out of the money we give them. So we wind up by paying it all, just as we are going to wind up in everything else.

Mr. WHEELER. The following is a provision found in article X as to voting:

> Each member government represented on the Council or on any of its committees or subcommittees shall have only one vote.

In other words we will have the same vote that Nicaragua will have, and the same vote Liberia will have.

Mr. REYNOLDS. In other words, we will have only one vote out of 44.

Mr. WHEELER. Whether we are to contribute all the money, or 40 percent or 60 percent—and I venture the assertion that we will contribute far more than 40 percent, because some of the other countries cannot contribute anything unless the money comes out of lend-lease—the other countries will have just as much to say as the United States when it comes to voting, as to where the money is to be spent, and how it is to be spent.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Absolutely, and I wish to make this further statement to the Senator in reference to the expenditure and distribution of the money: Russia will not be contributing anything in the way of money or supplies which are proposed to be distributed to the unfortunate people involved, as the Senator from Montana understands. Russia is simply aiding by way of contributing toward the administrative expenses. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I believe I shall be able to show him that most of the money in question will go to Russia; that none of it will go to the Philippines. The Philippines are now under the direction of the Japanese. Neither is there mention of Singapore, Malaya, Java, Sumatra, Bali or China. None of those places or countries are mentioned. All the proposed aid is intended for relief in Europe. Who is going to have charge of Europe? The Senator from Montana knows who will have charge of Europe after the war is over.

Mr. WHEELER. Does anyone question who will control or dominate Europe after the war is over?

Mr. REYNOLDS. No.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly Russia is going to dominate Europe.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Stalin is going to own all of Europe and control all of Asia. He has already said he is going to take part of Finland, part of Poland, part of Rumania, and all of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Bessarabia. We know that one of the difficulties in Italy today arises from the fighting and the intrigue which is going on between the Fascists and the Communists over who shall have control after the war. One of the great troubles we find in Yugoslavia today, according to all reports we receive, results from the fact that the Communists and the Fascists there are at outs with one another. They are now fighting over who is to control Yugoslavia after the war, the Fascists or the Communists. It will all wind up in Mr. Stalin having control of all of Europe and there will be a renewal of the revolution in Spain after Franco is knocked off. Russia will have control of all of Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Greece.

All the money it is now proposed that we provide will go to those countries. That is one danger about the matter. To whom will the money be given? It must be distributed over there. With whom will those who will distribute the money side? When it comes to dealing with Yugoslavia are those who have the matter in charge going to side with the young king's friends or with Mr. Stalin's representatives? The relief administration we are considering is one of the greatest instrumentalities of power politics we can possibly place in any one's hands.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think we will have much to say respecting who will control Europe after the war is over. At this time it is very difficult to predict who will control Europe. But when we think of all the suffering there will be after the war is over we may reasonably conclude the chances to be that Russia will dominate Europe.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. WHEELER. I am opposed to the Fascists or the Nazis controlling Europe, but I also dislike to see the Communists run Europe. What I should like to see set up in Europe is some form of a united nations of Europe which would be based upon a democratic form of government similar to the one we have in the United States of America. I think it should be the aim of the United States to try to bring about some form of a united states of Europe, or at least something along that line, after the war is over. But I doubt whether we will have very much to say about the matter, because I think the actions of Russia heretofore have indicated both to Mr. Churchill and to the United States that Russia is going to pursue a course which she thinks is in her best interest, and that she is going to tell us in so many words that it is practically none of our business what position she takes with reference to Finland, Poland, and other countries. If that takes place, there may be some persons who will want to go to war with Russia before this thing is over; but, so far as I am concerned, I shall be just as jealous to keep our country out of war with Russia after the present war is over as I was in trying to keep the country out of the present war before we got into it. If Russia dominates Europe, which I think she will to a very large extent, there will be those in this country who will want us to go to war with Russia, but I shall not be one of them.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not know about that. I think many persons who were crying, "War, war; let us go to war," before we went into this war, have had a bellyful of it. When we get through with this war, and have hundreds of thousands of our soldiers killed, and millions of them wounded, and not enough hospitals to take care of them, and when the country has no money with which to take care of them, and when our people will be broke, as they will be, and sick at heart because of the loss of our loved ones who are buried in the cold soil of foreign countries—then, Mr. President, I think those who were yelling, "War, war; let us have war," will have had a bellyful.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think that before we get out of the international mess in which we find ourselves the American people will come back to good old American nationalism. By that I mean that they will come back to thinking about their own soil.

We hear a great deal about rehabilitating the world, and what we are going to do after the war, and all this and that. What I should like to hear from some of the candidates for President is their pronouncement with respect to what their position is concerning world affairs. I think the candidates for President should let the people know where they stand with respect to international matters, and let the people know where we are now, and what our position is with respect to the rest of the world. Let us ask of each of the candidates, "Are you an American nationalist? Are you first for America? Are you first for your own country, or are you going to think about other countries first, and after that be for your own country?"

We ought to have a show-down between the interventionists, the internationalists, the world "globalonyists" and starry-eyed pinks, all that crowd, and the America firsters and American nationalists.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator means those who are for America first and those who are for America second?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. President, I shall conclude in a moment. I wish to read something which John Marshall said:

> When our own people are free from poverty and want and malnutrition it will be time enough to begin to plan to permanently suckle the world at the expense of American taxpayers.

He also very rightfully said:

> The power to tax is the power to destroy.

Thomas Jefferson, who lived in Virginia and about whom we hear a great

deal, but whose principles are not very widely followed or practiced, said:

It is the duty of the people to support the Government. It is not the duty of the Government to support the people. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them, they must become happy.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Practical Help—or Sappy Sentiment?" The one who sent it to me did not say in what newspaper it was printed.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICAL HELP—OR SAPPY SENTIMENT?

"Hottentot Internationalism" is the apt label that William P. Witherow, chairman of the board of the National Association of Manufacturers, pinned on all those schemes to leave a bottle of milk on the doorstep of every house from northwest China to Spitzbergen.

This Hottentot internationalism, for which the American taxpayer will be asked to sweat out the money, is also the emotional base of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, which is beneficent and humane in purpose, but which will, like so many beneficent and human contraptions of squandermaniacs and professional do-goodies, in the end make millions of Europeans and Asiatics dependent on our Treasury indefinitely.

In plain English, Hottentot internationalism will tend to make what is known as bums out of millions of persons who if left to themselves after the war might learn how to scramble to their feet in the pre-New Deal American way.

THE MEANING AND DANGER

Mr. Witherow expounded the meaning and the danger of Hottentot internationalism in these words in one of the liveliest and most unusual of the speeches made before the recent second war congress of American industry of the National Association of Manufacturers:

"Our compassion for a war-torn world should not fail to draw the line between sane benevolence and maudlin sentimentalism. Beyond that line lies the policy of Hottentot internationalism.

"A perpetual policy of free hand-outs for the world is not benevolence. It is a weakness—and of a dangerous sort. Sound charity stops at the point where it ceases to strengthen the recipient and encourages indolence. He who doles out charity beyond that point is not only deceiving himself, but he is cheating the one he thinks to help. And that is equally true whether the object of spurious charity be a sidewalk panhandler, a great nation, or a Hottentot.

"There are some who cling to the theory of Hottentot internationalism as our post-war policy. Although unfair, both to the American people and to the people it would pauperize, this attitude is still evident in some places."

It is evident in a good many places in the Washington regime.

In fact, this Hottentot internationalism seems to occupy the minds of almost every bureaucrat, Treasury bagman, and world superstater in the National Capital.

It is all a part of the "mammy government" which they have partly succeeded in palming off on us in the last 10 years.

The U. N. R. R. A. is merely the N. R. A., Tugwellism, Ickesism and Hopkins' and Wallace's crackpotism played on world scale.

OUT TO REHABILITATE THE WORLD

They are out to rehabilitate the world, while it is America alone that should be the first thought of professional weepers over the pantless Hottentots.

Mr. Witherow in the following defines the difference between maudlin sentimentality and practical philanthropy:

"Practical-minded Americans can see that the answer to the problem of the Hottentot is not to deliver a quart of milk to his doorstep every morning. The real answer is to help him find the way to a better life. Don't try to give it to him. Convince him of the value of effort, of the need for gathering a few more coconuts, and then buy these coconuts from him. Establish enterprise and trade. Then he can buy a cow of his own. With his cow and a few rhythmic motions he can be his own milkman. And instead of waiting for the international milkman—Uncle Sam—he can have not only a quart a day but a gallon a day."

In a word, let us help Europe and Asia get on their feet by pointing out to them that they have feet—that is, the will to come back by their own efforts.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an article by a well-known writer, Mr. Benjamin de Casseres, entitled "That Is an American."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Books, magazines, the mouths of foreign lecturers, the editorial pages of newspapers, and the radio are cluttered up telling us who the Russians, the Chinese, the Germans, the Italians, and a dozen or so other peoples are and what their particular "cultures" and political "ideologies" should mean to us. They work like riveters on our skulls.

This knowledge may have a certain value. But isn't it time for the whole world—and some millions of Americans included—to find out—

WHAT IS AN AMERICAN?

St. John de Crevecoeur, a Frenchman who settled in America in the eighteenth century, was the first man to ask—in 1782—that overwhelmingly vital question in these words:

"What, then, is the American, this new man?"

In 1782 De Crevecoeur could not answer that question definitely, or he was too near the making of that new man—the American.

But today, 161 years afterward, I will undertake to reply to De Crevecoeur's question.

The American:

He feels the emotion of mental, moral, spiritual, and physical liberty in every corpuscle and atom of his body all the days of his life—

So much so that he would rather live on one meal a day and have freedom of speech and pen than have three meals a day and be enslaved.

He feels walking about in his soul the living spirits of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln on the political level and Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry D. Thoreau, and Walt Whitman on the literary-philosophical level, and he partakes of their doctrine of rugged pioneer individualism with the same exaltation of spirit that those seven mighty new men announced it.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

Knowing the immemorial crimes of the state and the crimes of a myriad of European and Asiatic rulers against the body and soul of the individual man and woman, he regards the state and all its blandishments and bribes for the purpose of absorbing him into its diabolic maw of suspicion—to say the least.

He sees in all forms of collectivism the enemy of his body and soul and of the United States, in whose traditional roots of individual liberty he lives.

In holding to his deeply grounded instincts and ideas and in clinging tenaciously to his Fourth of July emotions, he cannot be moved by sneers and epithets like "horse-and-buggy" and "reactionary."

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is suspicious of any political or social idea that comes from Europe, whether it is labeled Lenin, Hegel, Marx, or Beveridge, that does not give him more liberty.

He knows that no idea that will make him a freer man politically and socially ever has, or ever will, come out of Europe.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He believes in his own unique destiny.

He believes that the grandeur and safety of his future lie in projecting himself along the routes of his past.

He combats with voice, pen, and vote all the alien-minded forms of public parasitism that are infecting the United States, whether they are called communism, fascism, state socialism, New Dealism, technocracy, or Beveridgeism.

He knows they are strangling hands out of Europe's and Asia's million-year-old charnel houses of war, slaveries, and tortures.

He wars on them—peaceably if possible, physically if necessary.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He believes in tolerance. But he is intolerant of all groups—Fascist, Communist, Socialist—whose very existences depend on the extermination of all opponents.

He believes in equality before the law, but opposes tooth-and-nail all forms of artificial legalized equality created by demagogues for the purpose of pulverizing 135,000,000 persons to a common Marxian level.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is the foe of New Deal bureaucracy, which he knows is a form of superconstitutional government which will, in the end, wind up in a master bureaucrat—a dictator.

He opposes with all the pride, dignity, and self-reliance of a deep-soil native of this land all doles, hand-outs, cradle-to-grave security bribes—except to the helpless, the sick, the incapacitated, and the congenital, incompetent bum.

He will never give up his right to criticize any public official, from the President down, either in war or peace.

He walks upright, fearlessly, eye-to-eye, belonging to a people that was the first on the planet to do so.

His spine was not made to crook or his knees for crawling before those in power.

He is self-made—that is, no political or ecclesiastical power molded him against his will.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He is for free enterprise, which is a right implied in every line of the Constitution, and is the very breath of article 1 of the Bill of Rights.

He believes in competitive business and personal rivalries, in emulation, and in contest as a spur to better and greater accomplishments. And the sharper the rivalries the better.

He believes in a reasonable protective tariff, as Jefferson and Hamilton did, to protect his high level of living against foreign coolie levels.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He fights and sweats out taxes today to maintain this new kind of country—a country toward which all people's hands are pathetically stretched and toward which nearly all governments have their prehensile "pickers and snatchers" moving.

He is not fighting for Russia, for China, for England, or for France.

He is not fighting to dissolve himself in a fetid international witches' cauldron called a "world state."

He is not a "citizen of the world."

He is not going to transport his American sovereignty to the Kremlin or to Downing Street or to Geneva or to Chungking.

He is for America first—always.

THAT IS AN AMERICAN

He remains seated with the founding fathers in Independence Hall and in Constitution Hall.

He remains a nationalist.

He spurns internationalism as a device to pick his pocket and to gag his mouth and paralyze his pen.

He is a self-determined, aggressive, ever-watchful being, suspicious and cynical of all that Europe and Asia promise us.

That is a United States American; that is a Yankee Doodle American.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that I shall vote against the pending measure because it provides for an international organization, and that we shall have practically no say about the conduct of its affairs. When the proper time comes I shall submit a number of proposed amendments to the joint resolution. I propose to amend it by reducing the appropriation from $1,350,000,000 to $350,000,000.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Montana a question, with his permission.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Yesterday reference was made to resolution No. 12, on page 40 of the pamphlet entitled "First Session of the Council of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration." Paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12, which was particularly referred to, I now read:

5. It is recommended that in cases where home production exceeds home consumption, the Government or recognized national authority concerned should take all steps necessary to enable the excess of production available in a country to be put at the disposal of other liberated areas which may need such supplies to cover their deficits.

With that in mind, I should like to make an observation, and then ask a question. We are to contribute approximately 60 or 65 percent, I think, of the fund; at least our contribution is to be in the amount of $1,350,000,000. What authority will determine whether we have a surplus of production? If the authority set out in the resolution determines that we have a surplus of production, if it makes the determination in good faith, and if this particular organization constituted of 44 members, or some subcommittee thereof is the legal authority what would there be to prevent this organization from coming into the United States now, immediately after it is set up, and becoming a competing organization along with Lend-Lease and other agencies to purchase foods which we badly need in this country, especially for our armed forces?

I ask that question for the reason that the Senator from Montana made some remarks yesterday about that phase of the subject when the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] was speaking on the joint resolution. As I recall, paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12 was brought into the discussion, and the Senator from Montana made some reference to it.

The thing I am concerned about is this: We debated for several days the matter of consumer subsidies, because some felt strongly they would inflate prices. One of the organizations which has taken a great deal of our food and which has helped to inflate prices in this country has been the agency created under the Lend-Lease Act. Would not the force and effect of the creation of the agency proposed under the pending joint resolution be to place another competing agency in the field? If the new agency spent $1,350,000,000, would not that in reality reduce our agricultural program of approximately $8,000,000,000 nearly one-fourth? If that be true, it could create a hardship upon the consuming public in this country, and, in reality, we would be subsidizing the United Nations of the world, instead of helping our people at home.

If the statements I have just made throw any light on the question I should like to have the Senator from Montana answer. My question is asked in the light of the explanations made. I should like to have the Senator's reaction to the statements I have made and the questions I have asked.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, paragraph 5 of resolution No. 12 reads as follows:

5. It is recommended that in cases where home production exceeds home consumption, the Government or recognized national authority concerned should take all steps necessary to enable the excess of production available in a country to be put at the disposal of other liberated areas which may need such supplies to cover their deficits.

I assume that what is being referred to there is some liberated country which may have an overproduction or a production which exceeds its home consumption, and the thought is that such surplus should be used in other countries which do not have a surplus. It seems to me that other constructions could be put upon that language, however, since it is so broad that it could be interpreted in various ways. Nevertheless, that is the construction which I should say any reasonable body would place on it.

However, when we read paragraph 1 of resolution No. 12, on page 40, we find that it provides in part as follows:

1. Rehabilitation supplies are to consist of materials, such as raw materials, machinery, and spare parts needed to enable a recipient country to produce and transport relief supplies for its own and other liberated territories.

What does that mean? It means that the group to be formed under the joint resolution could buy machinery in one country and could set it up in other countries for use in those countries. If we examine the operations under lend-lease, the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act, and if we consider the amount of money we are furnishing through lend-lease to other countries at the present time, we find that far more of it is going for other things than for war purposes; a far greater proportion is going, not for war, but for post-war uses.

For instance, I happen to know the president of a certain company in this country. He told me that his company—I will not give the exact figures—was sending to a certain country more than three-quarters of a billion dollars worth of equipment which was to be used, not as war materials, but for post-war rehabilitation, for the building of machinery and other articles to be used after the war.

Mr. President, perhaps my view is too narrow, and perhaps I am too old-fashioned. Of course, as I said earlier today, I greatly sympathize with the poor, unfortunate people of the invaded countries who are being driven from their homes and are being persecuted. In 1936, I returned from Europe and denounced Hitler for the persecution of the Jews that was occurring in Germany. I denounced him for it on many public platforms in this country. I have denounced the persecution of the Catholics in Mexico, and I have denounced every persecution of any class of people in any country on the face of the globe. But there comes a time when there is a limit to what the United States of America can give away for charitable or other purposes without dragging the great mass of the people of the United States down to a point where they will become beggars and paupers.

In this country there are some persons who think far more of Russia than they do of the United States. There are some persons who think more of some other country than they do of the United States of America, and all they are thinking about is how to get money out of the Treasury of the United States to send it to some other country.

I say the time has come in the United States of America when the American people should demand of their representatives in the Halls of Congress that they put a stop to the wasteful and extravagant spending of money and the throwing of it away and the dumping of it across the ocean, when the result will be to ruin our own country.

Perhaps I may tell a story I heard the other day about two black-face comedians. One of them said, "You know, I have just been studying my history. You know, I just learned something about George Washington."

The other man said, "What was it?"

"Well," the first one said, "you know who George Washington was; don't you?"

"Why, of course. He was the Father of his Country."

The first man said, "Yes; and he was also the first President."

"That is right," the other one said.

"But," the first one said, "I will tell you something you didn't know." He said, "He took a silver dollar and threw it across the Rappahannock River."

The other fellow said, "Oh, that's nothing. We have got people now who have picked up the whole damn Treasury and thrown it across the Atlantic Ocean." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I intended to vote for the pending measure until it was explained yesterday by the senior Senator

from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I think he rendered a great service to the Senate and to the people of the country when he explained the measure to the Senate. After listening to his explanation of it, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that, so far as I am concerned, I owe a duty to the American people to vote against turning over $1,350,000,000 to an international organization over which we shall have no control and in which we shall have only one vote, although we are asked to contribute more than 60 percent of the funds which will be given to that organization, to be spent as that group, composed of representatives of the various nations who are contributing practically nothing to it, says they shall be spent.

Will we receive any credit for it? Not at all. The people of the United States will not receive the credit for it. In my judgment, when the people of this country come to their senses and realize what is being done, when they realize that we are taking out of the pockets of every man, woman, and child in the United States $10 to start with, and perhaps much more, we shall find an aroused public opinion in the United States which will condemn every Member of the Senate, which is so recklessly throwing away the money of the American people and spreading it to the four winds.

The American people are extremely sentimental. They are extremely sympathetic. In time of need they have come to the rescue of the people of every other country in the world. But, Mr. President, they have spent that money themselves. They have turned it over to the Red Cross or have given it directly and said, "Here is a gift." Never before in history have they turned money over to a group of nations without having anything to say as to where it is to be spent or how it is to be spent.

I have great respect for Governor Lehman. I think he is a great executive and a fine man. I also have great respect for our representative in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization. But I repeat that in my judgment we are taking a step which will result in every Member of the Senate who votes for it living to see the day when he will regret voting to turn $1,300,000,000 over to foreign groups to spend as they will without any control by the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the able Senator for his answer to my question. I should like to ask the Senator to answer another question.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to answer it if I can.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear all the discussion between the able Senator from Montana and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] yesterday afternoon; but as I have studied the joint resolution I have been interested to know what the Senator's view is with respect to the restricted authority granted in article V, subparagraph 1, on page 12. Does the Senator feel that that provision satisfactorily limits the authority granted in article I, subparagraph 1, which reads:

> The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property, to enter into contracts and undertake obligations, to designate or create agencies and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings and in general to perform any legal acts appropriate to its objects and purposes.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming felt that paragraph 1 of article V on page 12 restricted the amounts which might be appropriated and the contracts which might be entered into under the provisions of article I, subparagraph 1. Does the Senator care to express an opinion on that subject?

Mr. WHEELER. I am sorry I cannot agree with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I am giving only a curbstone opinion, because I have not looked into the question closely; but I am convinced that under that provision the R. F. C. could lend money to this organization without coming to the Congress. We have given the R. F. C. the broadest kind of power to lend money to organizations of all kinds. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Morgenthau has a stabilization fund of $2,000,000,000, which he can spend in almost any way he desires. Why it was expressed in this language I do not know; but certainly before any money is spent it ought to be expressly stated in plain language that the Administration must come to the Congress of the United States.

The Senator from Nebraska knows, as do all other Senators who have had dealings with the bureaus and departments of Government, that once we give them power in loose language, they go far beyond the intention expressed by the Congress. That is true not only of this administration but of every administration. It has been true as long as I have been a Member of the Senate. We cannot be too careful about expressly stating our intentions in the simplest language so that there can be no question whatsoever about them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I asked the question because of the experience we have had in the payment of consumer subsidies. I cannot find anywhere in the statute books the authority for such payments. This administration pays consumer subsidies. I do not believe it has the authority to do so.

Is there any doubt that a constituted authority—whether it be the R. F. C. or some other governmental agency—may be able to circumvent Congress? Should we not make plain our intention? If there is any agency in our Government from which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization can obtain money to fulfill a contract which it enters into, which exceeds the authorization of $1,350,000,000, it seems to me that it ought to be made clear that the only constituted authority to which it can go for an additional appropriation for an unfulfilled contract which may require more money than is allocated, is the Congress of the United States. If the administration feels that it is legal to pay consumer subsidies, as it is doing today without authority, will it not exceed the authorization of $1,350,000,000 if it chooses to do so? I do not see any difference between a United Nations subsidy and a consumer subsidy here at home. If the organization can go to some agency other than Congress and obtain money which is not appropriated by Congress, we are indirectly granting larger appropriations to the organization than the limitation in article V on page 12.

Mr. WHEELER. I invite attention to a statement which has already been mentioned today by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The statement was made by Sir Arthur Salter in a recent speech to the cooperatives. He said:

> Whoever relieves will rebuild, and whoever rebuilds will formulate the pattern of government.

This organization of 44 governments or authorities is to do the relieving. Russia will play a dominant part. Great Britain will play an important part, and we shall have 1 vote. If what Sir Arthur Salter says is true, that whoever relieves will formulate the pattern of government, what kind of a pattern of government will be set up in Europe after this war? Who will set up the pattern of government? I cannot believe that any Member of the Senate, under existing conditions and circumstances, can come to any other conclusion than that Russia will dominate Europe after this war is over. Some say that Russia will be so busy rehabilitating her own country that she will not be interested in other governments, and will not need to be interested in them.

With the poverty and misery which will exist in Europe after this war is over, what kind of a government will appeal to the masses of poverty-stricken people? Will they turn to the Government of the United States, or to Great Britain, which has been bombing them? Russia has not been bombing them. Or will they turn to the people who have been successful in resisting the Nazis, a people who believe in communism, which appeals to the masses of the people in their misery? Anyone in his right senses who knows anything about the psychology of the masses of the people of the world under such conditions must realize that Russia will dominate those countries. We shall probably rehabilitate them.

I am in sympathy with efforts to rehabilitate the starving people of stricken countries, whether they are to be dominated by Russia or by some other country, or some other form of government. However, I believe that the proposal before us is a blank check. My Republican friends have been out on the stump. Time and again they have criticized Democrats for giving blank checks to the President of the United States, and yet Republicans rise on the floor of the Senate and say that we ought to give a blank check, not to the President of the United States, but to a foreign group over whom we are to have no control.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have heard the Senator from Montana speak, and I did not intend to interrupt him. Like some bodies which have movement, he gets worse the farther he goes.

Mr. President, this is not a blank check to anybody. It is delimited as to amount, and it is delimited as to authority in as clear-cut language and fashion as we knew how to delimit it.

I do not care to comment especially on the other general remarks of the Senator from Montana. He has said that he is in sympathy with the liberated peoples. However, they cannot eat sympathy. Sympathy smells good, but it is not sustenance; it is not nourishment. The liberated peoples cannot eat sympathy. They cannot wear sympathy.

A little later in this debate I shall point out to Senators who are contending that we have no control over the organization, that I have a solution for that difficulty. The solution which I would suggest is merely to tell the other nations to get out of the way and let us operate the organization. We will furnish all the money and all the officers, and we will have absolute control. That is what we did in the First World War. Later in the debate I shall place in the RECORD facts showing that instead of $1,350,000,000, which it is now proposed to appropriate, in the First World War we spent $2,600,000,000, practically all of it out of our own pockets. If Senators would prefer to return to that sort of procedure and not cooperate with other nations, very well.

The value of the cooperation of other nations lies not so much in the amount they contribute as in their interest and obligation wherever they are able to do so, to rehabilitate themselves and provide relief for themselves. One of the cardinal principles of this organization is to urge and stimulate them to do so.

I did not wish to take up the Senator's time, but I could not resist the temptation at this point to express my views.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to refer to what the Senator from Montana said in his concluding remarks with respect to Republicans who are now supposed to be approving blank checks. The remark must have referred to me because I am the only Republican who has risen to discuss this matter. I should like to say to the Senator from Montana that I have spent the last 6 months on the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in trying to make sure that this will be no blank check. If he will compare the original agreement with the agreement which is now before the Senate he will find the present net result so totally different that he will, I am sure, on reflection, be inclined to say that the Republican Senator to whom he referred had done a pretty good job in seeing to it that this is no blank check. The best proof which I can give the able Senator from Montana that it is not a blank check is the language of Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson himself, which I again repeat in one sentence:

> Congress would have complete power at any time to stop its contributions or to lay down the conditions as to their uses.

When I have achieved a concession from the representative of the Department of State that his power under this grant is limited as the language which I have quoted indicates, I respectfully submit to my able friend from Montana that it is no blank check which I have recommended.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know anything about the work the Senator from Michigan has done, but I am sure he has worked hard and worked sincerely. Let me say with all due respect to him—and I have a great respect for him and I am personally fond of him—that I still contend that what we are asked to do is to give a blank check to the President of the United States When the Senator says it is not a blank check, I assert that, while the amount is limited, a blank check is being given to this organization so that it may spend the money anywhere and in any way it may wish to spend it.

Does the Senator from Michigan think for one moment that the statement made by Dean Acheson is binding?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Certainly, I do.

Mr. WHEELER. Bless my soul, I have seen many persons come to Congress from various governmental departments, as have other Senators, and have heard them make statements as to what the policies were. I can cite the Senator to statement after statement made with reference to the policies of nearly every bureau, and we have seen the bureaus do exactly the opposite of what their representatives had told us would be done.

When the question of subsidies came before Congress, and we passed a bill granting subsidies, it was stated that subsidies would be given only for—what? Only for the producer in cases where there had not been sufficient production in this country to take care of the war needs. When I contended that the money would be given to the processors, distinguished Senators stood on the floor of the Senate and said, "Oh, no, not at all; that is not the purpose of it. It is to be used solely to be paid to producers." It was said that the processors and packers would be used as the agents of the Government of the United States, and that the subsidy would be passed on to the producer and the stock grower. I submit that there is not a stock grower in the United States of America who has received the subsidy, but instead it has gone entirely to the processor.

In reference to the F. C. C. legislation and S. E. C. legislation, if the Senator from Michigan will read the record of what the representatives of those organizations stated they would do, and then will recall what they later did, he will agree that such statements were not binding on the organizations. Therefore, I contend that the statement of the representative of the State Department—with all due respect for his honesty and sincerity—is not binding on Congress.

I object to accepting as binding the statement of an individual who comes before one of the committees and agrees that his statement is what counts. What counts is what is written into the law, and how plainly it is written into it by the use of simple language, so that even the Supreme Court of the United States cannot misconstrue it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will indulge me for just a moment, the Senator from Montana does not need to waste any time in trying to prove to me that we have a slippery administration downtown.

Mr. WHEELER. It is not only true of this administration, but it was also true of the departments in Mr. Hoover's administration; it was also true in Mr. Coolidge's administration, and God knows it was true in Mr. Harding's administration, which was one of the most corrupt administrations the country has ever known.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's precedents are now running into ancient history, which could be amplified in a bipartisan sense. The exhibits which he has presented here were all connected with the existing practice of the present administration. I could add several other exhibits to sustain and fortify the point which he has made. What I am saying to him is that that is precisely the reason why, so far as I was able to do so, I spent 6 months on the Foreign Relations Committee in trying to tie the language down in such a way that impositions on the congressional appropriating powers would not be possible under this grant.

I respectfully submit to the Senator from Montana that if he will study the entire resolution and the total hearings, and if he will contemplate the language in article V and article VI of the agreement which specifically limits our obligation not to this authorization but to the appropriations which are ultimately specifically to be made by Congress, which can be made under any limitations which Congress wishes to attach to the appropriations, he will agree that there is not even a remote parallel between the blank check he has talked about, which I as cordially condemn as does he, and what is contemplated under the present circumstances, which is not anything like a blank check.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If I have followed the Senator from Michigan correctly, the first agreement which was submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee, or which was called to its attention, was not at all in accord with the ideas of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct; nor with the views of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then a subcommittee was appointed, was it not, to go into the matter and that subcommittee, as I understand, had a great deal to do with the present text of the agreement?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. After the text of the agreement had been worked out, did the subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee then assure the President of the United States, who, I understand,

signed the agreement on behalf of the United States, that the agreement was satisfactory to the subcommittee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I cannot speak for the whole subcommittee, but, as one member of the subcommittee, I shall regretfully have to say to the able Senator from Utah that I had no hospitality at the White House for about 10 years; I have not been in contact with the distinguished President of the United States and I can give him no information whatever on that aspect of the affair.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator have any information as to whether or not that information did go to the President through the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no information whatever on the subject. All I know is that the ultimate agreement was approved by the State Department, which speaks for the executive arm of the Government in relation to this measure, and it was approved by the subcommittee, and it was approved by the full committee by a vote of 16 to 1.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when I took the floor I did not intend to become a referee, so to speak, between Senators in this debate, but I want to thank them all for their contributions. And now that the senior Senator from Michigan is here I should like to get some information from him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What does the Senator mean by that? I have been on the floor continuously in this debate.

Mr. WHERRY. I mean the Senator was not here when I questioned the senior Senator from Montana. What I am interested in particularly is the limitation of authority. The able Senator from Michigan, is present on the floor, I suppose, is present as much or more than any other Senator on either side of the aisle; and I should like to have his opinion as to the limitation of authority.

I got from his very forceful presentation yesterday, which I appreciated very much, that in the final analysis the way to control the thing is to limit the appropriations. I agree with him in that respect; but, after all, I think that the incident cited by the senior Senator from Montana is a parallel case, for if we have to resort to control of appropriations, then the administration can run around the Congress of the United States, and can get the money for contracts to which they have pledged their name by coming to the constitutional body, the Congress, for the money. That is my opinion, and in that connection I cite the illustration offered by the senior Senator from Montana, there is no authority on the statute books for the administration to pay a consumer's subsidy, and yet they found some reason for paying it, and they can find it again, if Congress does not choose to give the authority. I am asking whether the senior Senator from Michigan feels that the authority proposed to be granted is restricted by article V, section 12?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am very glad to answer the question of the Senator, though I thought I had undertaken to make my opinion indubitably clear yesterday afternoon.

In the first place, let me say I recognize no analogy between this situation and the other appropriations to which the Senator has referred and other abuses of power by administrative agencies, because I repeat to the Senator that I think the language used in this agreement is the precise result of that experience in an all-out legislative effort to see to it that that sort of a tragedy shall not occur in respect to this particular administration.

I wish to give the Senator an example to prove that I think the administrative agencies are moving with a degree of good faith in respect to this adventure which I would agree has not been too evident in some of its other actions to which both the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Montana referred. I give the Senator this exhibit: The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was set up probably 4 months ago. It had been in preliminary operation I suppose for 60 or 90 days. During that time there were undoubtedly blank check appropriations particularly in respect to foreign affairs, in the hands of both the President and the State Department, which might very legitimately have been drawn upon to make a preliminary contribution to this instrumentality on the part of the United States. Instead of that, the United States has not contributed one thin dime up to this hour and the State Department has said it to us in direct testimony before the committee that it will not permit one thin dime to be dedicated to this purpose until Congress has passed this joint resolution.

That is a totally different attitude, I submit to the Senator from the administrative attitude against which he appropriately complains and against which the able Senator from Montana complains. I cannot emphasize too strongly that in the 16 years I have been in this body, the greater part of it on the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have never had an experience like the present one in its total sympathetic cooperative attitude on the part of the State Department and what appears to be the wholehearted purpose to yield itself completely to the congressional intent and will in respect to this entire affair.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the able Senator for his statement.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not contradicting the Senator from Michigan, but that is not sufficient when we are appropriating a billion three hundred and fifty million dollars to an organization over which the United States is to have no control.

The senior Senator from Texas said that while I had great sympathy for the stricken people of various countries of Europe, those people could not live on sympathy, and he wanted to know whether I and some others of us wanted to have the Government of the United States spend what it spent before—$2,600,000,000. I say "Yes" to that question. So far as I am concerned and so far, in my judgment, as the people of the United States are concerned, they would rather spend $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 or whatever may be necessary; but they want to know who is going to spend it, where it is going to be spent and how it is to be spent rather than to turn it over to a committee composed of Russia, Great Britain, Haiti, Santo Domingo, Liberia, and almost every other country on the face of the globe. Certainly the American people are generous, certainly they may be called upon to spend $2,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000; but when we spend it let us spend it in the name of the United States of America. Let us spend it in the name of the people of the United States. Let us enable the people of this country to know when we are appropriating their money that it is going to be spent under the auspices of the people and the representatives of the people of the United States, and not be turned over to an international organization over which we have no control except to the extent of 1 vote out of 44. That is the position I take.

I am not complaining that the amount is $1,350,000,000, but I say that it is time that the Congress of the United States of America begin to consider how much money will be left in the pockets of the people and how much of our resources will be left for the soldiers when they come back. We had better begin to determine whether or not we are going to reduce the people of this country to a state of poverty similar to that which prevails in Europe, China, and elsewhere in the world. We had better examine to see whether we are representing the best interests of our Government, or are representing the interests of some other government.

I appreciate that many of my colleagues do not agree with my philosophy with reference to this matter, but, so far as I am concerned, I shall not vote to turn over $1,350,000,000, or much of that sum of money, to a group, to be spent by them, if I am the only Member of the Senate to vote against it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to make a further observation, apologizing to the able Senator from Nebraska for the intrusion on his time.

With much the Senator from Montana says, in its general over-all application, I am in total agreement. In fact, that is the reason why I took 2 hours on the floor of the Senate yesterday in trying to emphasize the fact that I think the limitations upon the grants in this agreement are far more important than the grants themselves.

The Senator says that he prefers that we should spend our own money, under our own administrative responsibility. So do I. But this happens to be tied in squarely with the war effort. It is definitely and specifically and indispensably part of the war effort. It links squarely in behind the Army as it moves on from a liberated territory, and it would be

just as sensible to say that we will not have anything to do with the war itself, except as we can totally run our own Army, and totally disregard essential cooperations with the other armies of the nations of the earth.

I insist that as a peacetime operation—and I said it 50 times yesterday—I would consider it fabulous improvidence if this particular agreement were to stand as a precedent or a model or a pattern for any part of our post-war reconstruction world-wide responsibilities. It is nothing of the sort. It is definitely and specifically a part of the war effort, which cannot be avoided. If U. N. R. R. A. does not do this task, the Army itself will have to stay behind and do it. It must be done in some such partnership fashion, and I have yet to hear of a better way to do it than the one proposed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me further?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand the Senator's position that it is part of the war effort and just as necessary as carrying on the war. I do not subscribe to that view. I think it is the wrong philosophy, and that it is not borne out by the facts.

Of course, we have to follow up and take care of and feed the people of the liberated territories, but is there any reason why we should turn this money over to 44 different countries, they to have the say as to how it shall be spent? If we are to spend it, let us turn it over to the appropriate agency of the United States and let that agency say whether they will spend it in cooperation with Great Britain, or in cooperation with Russia; but let us not turn it over completely to somebody else to say how the money is to be spent, with the United States having 1 vote out of 44, or whatever the number may be. I do not think that can be justified on the ground that it is carrying on the war. I am just as anxious to see the war carried on to a successful conclusion as is any other Member of this body, notwithstanding the fact that there are many people and many organizations which, because one who believes in the United States, and in protecting our interests, does not agree with this or does not agree with that, want to brand him as something other than an American.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is not implying any such attitude on my part?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not, not for one moment, but I do say to the Senator, in all sincerity, while I agree with everything he has said regarding helping to feed stricken and starving people as a part of the war effort, it should be done by a Government agency, and we should let that Government agency work in cooperation with Great Britain, or let them work in cooperation with Russia, or with the other nations; but let us not turn the money over to a group of countries, many of which have little or no interest in the matter. Let Great Britain and the United States say how the money is to be spent in eastern Europe and Italy, and how it is to be spent in Yugoslavia, if we go into that country, how it is to be spent in France, in Belgium, and in Holland. Why turn it over to many other countries, and let them squabble as to how it is to be spent?

I think it is a serious mistake to have such an organization saying how the money of this country is to be spent. It cannot be justified, in my judgment. I would rather spend more money and have it controlled by some agency of this country, and have it cooperate with Great Britain, or cooperate with Russia when it relates to Russian territory, or cooperate with China when it relates to Chinese territory, than let a lot of countries, many of which have not anything in common with Great Britain or with the United States, say where and how the money is to be spent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to state again that when I asked for the floor I did not intend to make a speech on the joint resolution, but I feel that if I have made no other contribution than to have had the senior Senator from Michigan, the senior Senator from Montana, and the senior Senator from Texas, express their views and observations, I have really done something to throw light on the measure. I once again desire to thank them all for using the time. I had only sought the floor to ask a question about some of the terms and provisions of the joint resolution.

Now that some of these most important matters have been called to my attention, and in view of some of the statements which have been made, I wish to say that certainly I am not one of the Republicans who desire to give this administration, or any other administration, a blank check. I also wish to say that, regardless of how I shall vote upon the pending joint resolution, I want it thoroughly understood that I am willing to go just as far as anyone else in providing relief for the people of the liberated countries, and, in my opinion, all Senators are agreed on that. We want to do our part, and accept our responsibility, and I shall gladly join in any appropriation necessary to effectuate that purpose.

There are, however, one or two things I do not want to see done. The senior Senator from Michigan has convinced me at least of the importance of the provision in the bill limiting the authority. The crux of the joint resolution is the limited authority attempted to be written into it, and I agree with what is proposed in that regard. If we are to approve the measure, we must provide limited authority, we must know the obligations we undertake, and we must know what is to be expected in the event the obligations, or further obligations, may be renewed.

On that account, I asked whether or not the senior Senator from Montana felt that article V, on page 12, limited the authority conferred in article I, on page 2. It seems to me that article I, on page 2, goes much further in intent than the restrictions provided in article V, on page 12. It seems to me that as the joint resolution is written, the organization of 44 nations could enter into contracts, which would not be terminated, which would not be expected to terminate, before the appropriation would become exhausted. Then the only thing the U. N. R. R. A. could do, would be to come back to some constitutional body. To what constitutional body would it come? Would it come to Congress, or to the R. F. C., or some other Government agency, and say, "Here, we spent this money; you gave us the authority, and now we want you to make good on the promise."

Mr. President, I do not want to be challenged later as giving even moral support to a promise we do not expect to fulfill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. By any stretch of the imagination does the Senator think that the R. F. C. could be defined as an "appropriate constitutional" body?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer that question by asking the senior Senator from Michigan this question: Does he think that the constitutional body has been defined in the measure as the Congress, or as some agency from whom the U. N. R. R. A. can obtain money when it needs it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator cannot get me into any quarrel over charges which he makes against this administration with respect to use of funds which it may obtain contrary to the specific intention of the Congress of the United States. I wish to say again, that is the reason why this thing intrigued me from start to finish, and I tried to find if it was possible to put down in black and white a rule which was binding.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I ask, What is a constitutional body? A constitutional body is any body which is created under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States. The R. F. C. is a constitutional body.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The R. F. C. could not remotely be considered to be a constitutional body under the language in question at the point where it appears in this measure.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is a great lawyer, and he knows——

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Montana must not be sarcastic. One of my virtues is that I am not a lawyer. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, what is a constitutional body? We create various bureaus which are arms of the Congress of the United States, and they are quasi-legislative bodies. I say that under the language in question the R. F. C. can contend that it is a constitutional body. It is a body which is created under the Constitution of the United States. It is not the intention of the Senator from Michigan that it should be so considered, and it is not the intention of many who helped to draft the proposed legislation; there can be no question about that; but why not say in plain simple language, so there can be

no question about it, "the Congress of the United States"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The reason is very simple and obvious. The language in this agreement applies to all the nations signatory to it. We have to describe the appropriate constitutional body which, under any given form of government, has the constitutional control of appropriations. I do not think the Senator upon reflection would really undertake to certify the opinion that the R. F. C. is a constitutional body in the accepted sense of that phrase.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I agree that it is not in the accepted use of that phrase. The Supreme Court of the United States has differed not only with me but with great constitutional authorities in the country whose reputations as constitutional lawyers go far beyond mine—and I do not claim to be a constitutional authority—as to what is the meaning of the phrase.

The Senator from Tennessee suggested yesterday—and I think his suggestion to be very appropriate—that a provision should be inserted in the measure that, with respect to the United States, those who represent us in the organization cannot come back here and obtain money without the consent of the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I rose for the purpose of making a suggestion similar to the one just made by the Senator from Montana. This language can easily be changed so as to make absolutely certain what is intended. The Senator from Michigan very strenuously asserts that it was the intention that only the Congress of the United States should have the decision. If that be the case, then I suggest that after the word "bodies", on page 12, line 9, the period be stricken and a comma or a dash inserted, followed by the words "in the case of the United States, the Congress", or "in the case of the United States it means the Congress of the United States."

The reason I make that suggestion is that, as we all know, several years ago, under the Constitution and in a perfectly constitutional way, we gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the power to borrow money on the bonds of the United States, and we have since given the President power to use such money for a great many purposes similar to those in question, and I think unquestionably the R. F. C. could be construed to be a constitutional body. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] both say that it was intended that the Congress of the United States was the body which should appropriate the money. If that is what is intended, let us remove all doubt, because it is a very important matter, as we all know, and we ought to say exactly what we mean, and mean exactly what we say in this matter. For that reason I have suggested an amendment after the words "constitutional bodies" to add "in the case of the United States the Congress of the United States is meant."

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his statement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not care to prolong this metaphysical constitutional argument with respect to the difference between a constitutional body and any other body. This question, however, arises in the United States not only in respect to the Federal Government, but in respect to all the States. Most of the interpretations which have given to that subject with respect to the State constitutions, which are more numerous than the interpretations with respect to the Constitution of the United States, have to do with offices and bodies within the State which have been divided into constitutional and statutory offices and bodies.

As a rule, constitutional offices or bodies have been held to be those which are specifically established in the constitution under which they exist. Other offices created by legislation in the States are regarded to be statutory offices and not constitutional offices, although they are created under power given to the legislatures by the constitution under which they operate. So there is a very clearly drawn distinction between statutory offices and constitutional offices, and I think the same distinction would apply to the R. F. C. or to any office created by Congress as an agency of Congress or the Government, as distinguished from the bodies which are specifically created by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest a further exhibit as identifying the meaning of the language.

Mr. WHERRY. Which language?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The language which is causing the able and vigilant Senator from Tennessee so much trepidation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not trepidation, but actual fear.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Well, I am sometimes impressed by the Senator's fears and sometimes I am not. I am referring to the language on page 12 in line 9, "appropriate constitutional bodies." I respectfully suggest that the first sentence of the joint resolution says:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

And so forth—

such sums—

And so forth—

as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States—

And so forth. Read in connection with that clear and unequivocal statement it seems to me, if I may again use the word "fantastic"—it seems to me to be fantastic to think that anyone would undertake to say that the appropriate constitutional body to make appropriations in the United States or to provide one nickel for this institution, would be any other than the Congress itself.

I simply wish to add, and then I am through for the day, that if I so totally lacked confidence in this administration that I feared it would distort the words "constitutional bodies" to mean the R. F. C. in order to go behind the barn and cheat the intent of Congress, I certainly would not vote for the joint resolution at all, just as I have never voted for the administration at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say in connection with what the Senator from Michigan has said, that I have every confidence in the present administration. But we are confronted with a question as to the meaning of words. We all here say that what we intend is that the money to be used for the purposes of the joint resolution is to be drawn from the Treasury of the United States after action by the appropriate committees of the Congress and by the Congress itself. If we all mean that, why do we not say precisely what we mean?

I have had the legislative drafting service of the Senate prepare an amendment which contains this language, and I challenge any Senator—it makes no difference who—to rise and say the language I propose will not carry out what it says we mean. Of course, we must do this by way of reservation; we cannot put it in by way of amendment, because it must be agreed to by the other nations.

The language is as follows:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

That is exactly what the Senator from Michigan says his language or the language of the joint resolution as reported intends. If that is what it intends, why not say so?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, just a further word, and then I shall keep the promise I made a moment ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not make such a promise. We like to hear the Senator from Michigan; he is always interesting.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator insists on this identification, which seems total surplusage to me, instead of attempting to do it by reservation to the agreement as it is carried in the resolution, that procedure obviously requiring subsequent consent from other governments, inasmuch as it is dealing solely with the domestic question, I suggest that the Senator attach his definition at the end of the joint resolution, so that it will relate to the portion of the joint resolution which refers to the activities of our own Government of the United States. In that way it would be just as effective.

However, I wish to add that I think it is surplusage. I think it would be just as sensible to say that wherever the word "President" is used in the joint resolution it means Franklin D. Roosevelt until next January, and then it means someone else.

Mr. McKELLAR. It might not; he might be President after next January. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we hope he will not be. [Laughter.]

I desire to make a concluding statement, and then I shall yield the floor. I wish I felt as confident about the limitations in the joint resolution as the senior Senator from Michigan seems to feel. I cannot feel other than that article I, on page 2, goes a long way toward having this organization enter into obligations which will go far in excess of the appropriation now sought to be authorized, and that then the organization will come back and want additional appropriations. Of course, we add a limitation by requiring that the request for additional appropriations must be brought to the Congress, as the senior Senator from Michigan has so ably and forcibly shown here this afternoon.

But my decision as to whether I shall support the joint resolution will depend upon whether this thing can be buttoned up and sewed up with respect to the limitation of power.

I do not want to provide for this administration or any other administration a loophole which will enable it to exercise powers beyond the powers intended to be granted under the pending measure. I saw now that it seems to me there is a question. Question has been raised all the way through. The fact that the able senior Senator from Michigan stated over and over again that there were limitations, and yesterday charged the Appropriations Committee that they were the only ones to pass on this matter, convinced me that there is some doubt as to whether the pending measure contains sufficient limitation of authority.

I say that for the reason that it is my humble opinion that contained in the agreement is the substance of provisions which should be contained in a treaty. If that be so, a favorable vote by two-thirds of the Senate should be required, instead of a majority vote by both Houses of Congress. For that further reason, I feel we should see to it that the limitations are contained in the joint resolution.

I appreciate the amendments which have been submitted; and I hope other amendments will be submitted, so that we shall have a piece of legislation which will require that Congress, not any other body which might be interpreted as being a constitutional body, shall be the one to pass on the question whether we shall appropriate and continue to appropriate for contracts which will be made, not by the Senate, not by the United States Congress, but by a group of 44 nations joined in an organization in which we shall have only one vote. We will not obtain protection there. We must obtain it in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] gave an exact definition of constitutional and statutory offices and bodies. There should be no confusion at all on that point, because the courts have unanimously, I think, interpreted "constitutional offices" just as the Senator described them—those that are authorized or named in the Constitution itself.

The joint resolution now pending before the Senate is based wholly on the agreement which is found in the document I hold in my hand, entered into at Atlantic City on November 9, 1943. That agreement is the foundation of the joint resolution, and is based upon it.

Mr. President, whatever is contained in the joint resolution obtains its authority from the agreement. I desire to call attention to the fact that the agreement is certainly in treaty form, if not in name. What we are undertaking to do here is to approve, by implication at least, an agreement entered into with some 40 foreign nations, having to do with a continuing subject. It is not a finished subject; it is not an agreement that they shall perform some individual act, and then end. It is a continuing subject for whatever length of time may be necessary.

So, Mr. President, I am greatly concerned about the meaning of this contract, about the method by which it was entered into, and about where it will lead the United States of America. Under our form of government this country can enter into an agreement in the form of a treaty with another nation or other nations only by the act of this body. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has said that this proposal is not a treaty. I do not know. It is certainly a treaty in form, if nothing else.

Chiang Kai-shek, being a dictator over his country, can sign a treaty, agreement, contract, or whatever it may be called, by placing his name on it. Joe Stalin, being a dictator in his own country, can bind his country to a contract, agreement, treaty, or whatever it may be called, by placing his name on it. As to whether or not Winston Churchill can bind Great Britain by placing his name upon an agreement, I do not know; but I do know, without any if's or and's about it, that the President cannot bind his country by placing his name upon a contract or agreement without the approval and consent of this body.

The agreement which I have before me was made weeks ago, without the knowledge or consent of the American people and without the knowledge or consent of this body. It has never been submitted to us for approval or confirmation. It was signed on behalf of this country by the President of the United States.

It is provided in the joint resolution that this agreement, contract, treaty, or whatever it may be called, shall go into effect upon his signature. Therefore, this contract went into effect on the day the President of the United States signed it, without the knowledge or consent of this body and without the knowledge or consent of the American people, and, in my opinion, without any authority to do so. In my opinion, that is one of the most serious things in connection with this joint resolution and the contract or agreement upon which it is based.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to a few of the things which cause me great concern. If it were not for the very able discussion and explanation of the senior Senator from Michigan yesterday I am quite certain in my own mind that I would vote against the joint resolution. In my opinion, he has shown that the joint resolution is in reality a part of our war effort. If that be so, we are bound to do some things which we would not otherwise do. That is why I have been so concerned about the language of the contract and whether or not the Senator has satisfactorily explained it to us.

Yesterday I asked the Senator from Michigan who is to control the interpretation of this sort of agreement. He said he did not know, but he presumed that the 43 other nations which signed the agreement, contract, or treaty would control, and our one little vote would be pretty ineffectual in deciding the interpretation of the contract.

We shall be up against the same thing that we were up against in connection with the so-called Moscow agreement or pact of a few weeks ago. I was much interested in it. I have never seen the exact terms of it. I do not know what it is, except as it is reported in the newspapers. However, I find news comments to the effect that there are three distinct, separate, and somewhat contradictory interpretations placed upon the Moscow Pact by the three principal countries involved.

If we can believe the press reports with respect to the Moscow Pact, Russia has interpreted it to mean that no central European federation will be tolerated by Russia. Russia interprets it to mean that there will be no artificial union of powers in Russia, and that there will be no buffer states between Russia and the rest of Europe. That is the Russian interpretation of the Moscow Pact.

What does our Secretary of State say about it? His interpretation is in complete disagreement with that of Russia. Secretary Hull says that the Moscow Pact means that there shall be no more alliances, no more spheres of influence, and no balance of power.

How does England interpret the Moscow pact? England interprets it to mean that it is necessary for England to have the balance of power which has been controlling Europe for hundreds of years, in order that England may continue to exist.

Those are the three interpretations of the Moscow Pact by the three principal countries. The interpretations are completely at variance. I use that only as an illustration of what may happen when this agreement goes into effect, if it is not already in effect. There may possibly be 44 different interpretations as to what the contract means; and certainly the United States of America would receive short shrift from its associates if our interests should happen to conflict with those of other nations.

I invite the attention of the Senate to one or two things in the joint resolution. Yesterday the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] called to our attention the powers to be conferred upon the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

They are set forth in article I, subparagraph 1, on page 2 of the joint resolution.

The Administration shall have power to acquire, hold, and convey property—

That is a pretty broad grant of power to this Council, made up of representatives of foreign governments. There is no limitation as to where property may be acquired, how it ma. be acquired, or what amount may be acquired. The Administration is simply given power to acquire property.

The Administration is to have the power to convey property. It may buy and sell property anywhere in the world. Under the provisions of this section it may "enter into contracts and undertake obligations."

What obligations? What contracts may the Administration enter into without our knowledge and consent? We are bound by article I, subparagraph 1, to turn over the operation of the whole program to a council of foreigners.

The Administration is also to have the power—

to designate or create agencies—

We might lend them some of our bureaus, but this Council is to have power to create any number of new ones—

and to review the activities of agencies so created, to manage undertakings, and in general to perform any legal act appropriate to its objects and purposes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Having raised the question as to what this organization is, what would the Senator say is the legal effect of the organization? It cannot be a partnership of nations, can it, because nations are unable to be partners? How would the Senator class the organization?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I class the agreement as a treaty, and the organization might be termed a "league of nations" or a "confederation of nations." I believe the point raised by the Senator is fundamental.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator have any information as to how this agreement was approved by other countries? Did they submit it to their respective legislative bodies for approval? Has the Senator any information on that point?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have no information on that point.

Mr. WILLIS. I have seen no statement concerning how the agreement was received and approved in other countries.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. According to the pamphlet issued by the committee, or by the Council of the United Nations at its first session, purportedly the heads of the various nations signed the agreement. That is the only information I have on the subject.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator has no information as to their constitutional authority for signing?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I have not. I know that it is necessary that the legislative bodies of France and England approve any agreement entered into by their representatives.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I notice that on page 2 of the joint resolution the Administration, which is the association, takes unto itself the power "to acquire, hold and convey property."

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not such power be determined entirely by the place and location at which this association was attempting to exercise the power?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator restate his question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have stated that on page 2, line 21 of the joint resolution now under consideration, the following language is set forth: "The Administration"—which is the association—"shall have power to acquire, hold and convey property." Would any such act be governed by the laws of the area in which the association or Administration attempted to hold or convey property?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator means that the Council would have no authority unless the laws of the particular nation involved approved the act of the Council.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Perhaps the Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the attempt to determine what kind of an association this is, let us consider this question: Because a sovereign nation cannot be sued without its consent, the United States, for instance, certainly could not be sued and could not sue, could it?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, when we come to the language which states that the Administration has the right "to enter into contracts and undertake obligations," do we not have to say that these contracts and these obligations must be interpreted by the law of the area in which they are to be entered into? How could this association enter into a binding contract here in the United States? It certainly could not enter into a contract upon which a suit could be based and maintained, could it?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not believe so, unless by this resolution such authority is granted.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what I was coming to. By adopting this resolution do we approve and ratify this particular organization?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I think we do. I think it is unquestioned that the minute the Congress gives its O. K. to this resolution it approves the whole U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do we classify this as being an executive agreement at the time it was entered into, and assume that we are now ratifying that executive agreement, and insofar as the Congress of the United States is authorized to do so, are creating an organization approved by the United States Congress?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It would seem so to me. We are going further than that, if I may be permitted a suggestion. The minute we approve this resolution we approve the contract which was entered into by the 44 nations, and approve by a vote of this body, a treaty in form.

Mr. FERGUSON. If I may inquire further, when we say that we are approving all contracts, is it not true that we are approving them only insofar as moral obligations are concerned? In other words, this creates no legal obligation, because the United States as a Nation cannot be sued unless it consents to the suit. However, we can create moral obligations in the minds of our people and in the minds of the people of other nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And when we have a moral obligation, and no legal obligation, we are more strongly bound to carry out the moral obligation, to a certain extent, than we are to carry out the strict terms of a legal obligation.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

I now return to the point which I started to discuss a moment ago. I refer to section 5 on page 11 of the resolution. The language to which I refer reads as follows:

The Director General shall make periodic reports to the Central Committee and to the Council covering the progress of the Administration's activities.

Yesterday, in connection with the discussion relative to those reports, I raised the point that the Congress of the United States would know nothing about what was going on under this contract except what it gained from the newspapers.

The next sentence of this paragraph reads:

The reports shall be made public except for such portions as the Central Committee may consider it necessary, in the interest of the United Nations, to keep confidential.

By that language we have surrendered every right to know what is taking place on the part of the Council, and what it is doing. Yesterday I asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan if the Congress would be informed and he said, "Oh, yes; the President informs it." I am sorry to differ with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Michigan, but the President does not inform us. Support for that statement is found on page 12 of the joint resolution, article VI, reading as follows:

The Director General shall submit to the Council an annual budget, and from time to time such supplementary budgets as may be required, covering the necessary administrative expenses of the Administration.

To that extent only would the President report to Congress the money he had received, and the money he had paid out. The report would perhaps be in the form of an itemized statement. However, there are no reports provided for in this resolution to be furnished Congress or anyone else concerning what this organization of foreign governments does with our money in carrying out the program of relief, and all the activities implied in the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment at this point, on page 11——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to advise the Senator that

a committee amendment is now pending. The Senator may offer his amendment now only by unanimous consent.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Chair. I wish to state the purpose of the amendment, and then I shall ask unanimous consent to offer it, if I may do so. On page 11, line 11, following the word "Council," I propose to add the following words, "and to the Congress"—just those four words. In other words, I wish to provide that these reports must be made to the Congress as well as to the Council.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator means the Congress of the United States?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; the Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we should follow the orderly procedure. The Senator will have an opportunity to offer his amendment, but I do not think the pending committee amendment should be set aside for the purpose of allowing a Senator to offer another amendment now.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well. Is there any objection to having the amendment printed so that it may lie on the table?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no; the Senator has that right.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator proposes to offer an amendment to the agreement itself, which in turn would have to be ratified by all the other nations.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; I presume that is true. However, I think it is most essential that the Congress of the United States shall know what takes place under the agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the Senator realizes that as to the language of the agreement itself, if we are to amend it so that Congress shall be notified by the Director General, as well as by the Council of the organization, every other nation signatory to the agreement will have the right then to amend the agreement so as to provide that its legislative body shall also be notified.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I cannot see why that should not be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that event we would have this agreement going back and forth for an interminable length of time before we would really know what it was.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I ask the Senator from South Dakota especially in what respect will he say that the amendment he would offer on page 11, line 11, would alter the requirement provided in section 2 of the resolution itself and on page 15, lines 1 to 3, which read:

> The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations and of operations under the agreement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There is no requirement, as I read the joint resolution, for a report on the activities of the Council. The President is to report on expenditures of money and on operations under the funds placed in his hands, but we will know nothing about what is going on and about what the Council may have done. That is the purpose of my amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I did not hear the precise amendment offered by the Senator, but I gathered that it was to that portion of the joint resolution which embodies the agreement itself. As the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has said, if we modify the agreement, then it has got to go back to every nation which is a party to it, and if it were not approved by all these nations it would be a nullity, and they would not be bound by the provisions of the agreement. In other words, if we amend the agreement it will have to go back to be ratified again by all who have heretofore approved it, or it will be a nullity as to those who do not assent to the reservation or amendment. I think I am correct in that respect.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Let me say to the Senator that the interest and welfare of the American people are far more important than the welfare or the interest of 43 other nations, and it is our job to try to protect the American people first.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will permit me, I think everyone agrees with the Senator in the statement he has just made. The only point I had in saying anything was inferentially to suggest that the Senator's amendment might be added at another place, a later place in the joint resolution, and not be added as an amendment to the agreement which is simply recited in the joint resolution.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator, and thank him.

Mr. President, as I stated in the beginning, and now repeat, I do not oppose now nor would I oppose at any time assisting in any manner that we could toward the relief of people who have been stricken in this tragic war. I do not want to be placed in the position of appearing to oppose that objective. I am only calling attention of the Senate to some of the provisions of the joint resolution which are detrimental to our people, but not for the purpose of opposing the resolution itself.

The very point the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] brought about a moment ago was mentioned yesterday by me in a query submitted to the senior Senator from Michigan. My query was:

> While we have the legalistic right to do thus and so, as the Senator has so clearly pointed out, is there not a moral obligation to go along with the agreement and fulfill all its terms, regardless of what Congress may decide to do in the future?

To that question the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] replied as follows:

> I do not think so; and when I have concluded my schedule of limitations, I think the Senator will agree with me that the situation is fairly clear.

Immediately before that question I asked the Senator from Michigan this question:

> Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan a question. If the other forty-odd members of the Council should place a different interpretation upon some decision than our own representative or our Congress places upon it——
>
> Mr. VANDENBERG. It would be just too bad.

That is the point which was brought out by the junior Senator from Michigan. If we enter into this contract, if we approve all the provisions set forth in the joint resolution and in the contract, it will be "just too bad" for us and probably for the world if we do not go along with the proposal.

A Senator said on the floor yesterday that we can withdraw from this organization if we want to at any time and thereby relieve ourselves of the obligation. But, Senators, that is not true. We cannot withdraw from the organization at any time we want. The provisions of the joint resolution itself take care of that, but the moral obligation, stronger by far than the legal part of it, prohibits us from withdrawing. If we enter into commitments and obligations across the water, if we start rehabilitation programs across the water, even though they be mismanaged to our disgust and our anger, and we want to get out of the organization, we cannot get out of it; we are in it to the finish. We are in it not only because of the moral obligation but we are in it because the joint resolution itself says the only way in the world we can get out of the agreement is to serve notice at a time 6 months after the agreement goes into effect, and then we cannot get out for 12 months after we have served such notice. The last provision of the joint resolution says it shall terminate on June 30, 1946, which is a trifle over the 18 months it would take us to get out of the organization. So in my opinion, Senators, the provision with reference to withdrawal and being relieved of the obligations is simply a futile gesture and does not mean a thing in the world.

In another portion the joint resolution provides that before we can get out we must make every payment and perform and finish every commitment we have said we would undertake. So while Senators may talk about withdrawal, there is no such thing as withdrawal. We have got to take the thing as it is, and know we are going through with it, or stay out of it. That is the decision the Senate must make when it finally comes to vote upon the joint resolution.

Mr. President, I am wondering in what position we are with regard to the resolutions which might be considered to be in the form of amendments, some 34 of them, which are included in the report of the organization. Some of them go pretty far; some of them really commit us to do things which, in my judgment, do not appear in the joint resolution itself. If the Council can change the picture by subsequent resolution or

amendment, or whatever it may be called, what is to prohibit the Council, loaded against us as it is at the start, from changing the agreement and the resolution to suit themselves?

Senators, I think this matter is so serious that we should give it plenty of time before acting upon it, not with the idea of opposing proper proposal along this line but with the idea and hope of protecting the interests of this country and preventing the waste of our substance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham.

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;

H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended;

H. R. 2340. For the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442);

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943;

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3916. An act to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words on the joint resolution. The questions which I asked the able Senator from South Dakota might indicate that I was against the joint resolution. That is not the case. I believe that we should try to make up our minds as a Congress to determine whether or not we want to appropriate the sum of $1,350,000,000 for relief and rehabilitation. I have come to the conclusion that that should be done by the Congress of the United States. I realize that this is an unusual piece of legislation. It is in effect an approval of an Executive agreement by the President of the United States which he entered into last November. It is unusual in that, by adopting a joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of money, we are asked—and I believe the Senate will do it—to approve that Executive agreement.

There is no doubt in my mind that the joint resolution does not authorize the R. F. C. or any other statutory body to finance this association of nations. I think the able Senator from Kentucky gave a proper definition of a constitutional body. I should like to add that I think the distinction between a constitutional body and a statutory body is that the Congress has the power and the authority to abolish or to alter in any way a statutory body, whereas it has no authority to abolish a constitutional body.

The constitutional body referred to, I am satisfied, because of the wording in the agreement, is the Congress of the United States. The R. F. C. does not appropriate money. "Appropriate" is not a proper term when applied to what the R. F. C. does. It may lend money, it may advance money, but it does not appropriate money. The word "appropriate" as used in the joint resolution clearly refers to an appropriation by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that when, by the joint resolution, we enter into this agreement, we should carry out every letter and every word of it, and that we should be prepared in the future not to expect to look too closely into what the money has been used for, because when we ratify the agreement, we are giving authority to the governments of the United Nations to go into the war areas and, approving their discretion and their judgment, to the best of their ability, to grant relief and bring about rehabilitation as they may see fit, so far as this Government is concerned, to the amount mentioned in the first part of the joint resolution, on line 4, which is $1,350,000,000.

Mr. President, I for one am willing to go along with the proposal. I do not believe this should ever be considered as a precedent indicating that the Senate of the United States is relinquishing its right to approve so-called Executive agreements, or is relinquishing its right in the future to approve treaties, and it should be clearly understood that by approving this agreement, we are not giving away or altering in any way the Constitution of the United States or our constitutional authority to approve treaties as treaties, and that we have the right to approve Executive agreements if we are called upon later to appropriate money.

We are not by this act determining what is an Executive agreement and what is a treaty. We are ratifying the proposed agreement as an Executive agreement, and we are authorizing an appropriation of a certain sum to carry it out.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask consent at this time to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and I shall ask then to have it printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend article X, on page 15, by the insertion of the following:

SEC. 5. None of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

In the first line on page 11, it is proposed that "Sec. 3" shall be changed to "section 6."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the joint resolution, but with a good many reservations and doubts, and I should like therefore to explain why I intend to vote for it.

Yesterday I asked the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] as to the nature of this particular proceeding, and it was suggested that this is something new, that it is an Executive agreement to be approved by a majority of both Houses of Congress. That is something different from what we have understood as an Executive agreement, and something different from a treaty.

What concerns me about the proposal is that if the Executive can enter into an agreement and say, "I make this agreement subject to the approval of the Congress," and thereby relieve himself of the obligation of making a treaty and submitting it to the Senate for approval by a two-thirds vote, we are establishing a precedent which would be very dangerous indeed. If by Executive agreement there can be set up an international food relief organization, and it can be removed from the treaty field simply by saying it shall be subject to approval of the Congress, then exactly the same thing could be done in the case of a league of nations; a league of nations could be established subject to the approval of the Congress, and at once we would lose entirely the power to carry out the treaty-making process provided in the Constitution. I do not think this Executive agreement can be validated simply because it is subject to congressional approval.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Without expressing approval of or dissent from the philosophy of the Senator from Ohio, he is aware, is he not, that the last World War was finally terminated by the United States not by the ratification of a treaty, but by the adoption of a joint resolution, in which we endeavored to claim all the benefits and privileges of the Versailles Treaty without assuming any of its obligations? That was a departure, too, from constitutional procedure.

Mr. TAFT. What the Senator states is that we did not assume any obligations, and the whole question about a treaty is whether we assume obligations, so that I do not think there is any precedent in that respect. We may have ended the war by joint resolution, we may have recognized the settlements made, but so long as we did not assume any obligations, it cannot be said that under the Constitution we should necessarily have to act by treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the process which the Senator is discussing is concerned if we can by joint resolution accept the benefits of a treaty to which we are not a party without violating our procedure, or the proprieties, is there any difference between that and undertaking obligations which might ensue under the same sort of procedure?

Mr. TAFT. I think so, yes. If we can get any benefit, I do not suppose we care whether we ratify the instrument or not. The question is, can the Executive, without two-thirds of the Senate, assume obligations? That is the substantial question. I do not think we did get any benefit, that is, to the extent of getting any benefits of promises from any nation to do anything. In effect, we attempted to recognize the settlements made, the boundaries fixed, in the Versailles Treaty, but, so far as I know, we never received any benefits from it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In line with the argument the Senator has been making, and in spite of the fact that he says he intends to vote for the joint resolution, I should like to ask him whether, if such a joint resolution as this were enacted, and once we set such a precedent—and despite the fact that the Senator from Michigan so ably argued yesterday that we were not setting a precedent, it seems to me inescapable that we are—he believes it is likely that at anytime in the future any treaty will ever be presented to the Senate under the constitutional process as provided by the Constitution itself? It seems to me this is a far-reaching departure, which is a congressional recognition of the principle of Executive agreements to be approved by Congress, rather than treaties to be approved in accordance with the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds majority.

Mr. TAFT. That is the difficulty I have been trying to get over, but I do not think it is a precedent, if the Senator wants to know my view.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have been trying to get over it, too, and I find myself unable to get over it in any logical way I have heard discussed. I listened to the very persuasive speech of the Senator from Michigan yesterday, hoping that I could be convinced by it, but unfortunately I find myself in the position of regarding this as a bypassing of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is, however, without any doubt, an authority in the President to do certain things by Executive agreement. Where the line is between what can be done by Executive agreement and what can be done by treaty is uncertain, but I hope at least to suggest where that line is. My conclusion is that this is properly an Executive agreement; not an Executive agreement because approved by Congress, but valid before approved by Congress. In fact, the resolution says so in so many words on its first page:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated * * * such sums * * * as the Congress may determine from time to time to be appropriate for participation by the United States * * * in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, established by an agreement concluded by the United Nations and associated governments on November 9, 1943.

So the validity of this agreement in no way depends on the action of Congress. Congress is asked to appropriate money to support it, and the agreement itself makes it clear that we are free to do so or not, as we choose. But the agreement is a valid agreement. The organization has been established. Governor Lehman has been appointed Director General. The whole thing is set up. This is not an Executive agreement approved by Congress. This is an Executive agreement. Its validity stands or falls on the question whether it is an Executive agreement or a treaty by the United States. If it is a treaty it should be submitted to the Senate for ratification by two-thirds vote. If it is an executive agreement it does not have to be submitted to Congress at all, except as Congress may be asked, and as it may be necessary, to provide money.

Executive agreements may be made, and if they are in the proper field of Executive agreements, they stand or fall on the basis of their own nature. But of course if money is necessary to be appropriated in connection with them, Congress must be asked for the money. That is the situation as I see it now. We do, by appropriating money, indicate that we approve of the agreement, but such approval is not essential to the validity of the agreement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has the Constitution before him on his desk. I wonder if he would be good enough to point out the provision of the Constitution which authorizes an Executive agreement.

Mr. TAFT. I think there is a provision which would apply in the general power to conduct foreign relations. The Senator will find many Supreme Court opinions dealing with the right of the President to make Executive agreements. I wish I could say that the Senator is correct, that we could not enter into any obligation with a foreign nation without making a treaty, but that is not a fact. It is not supported by precedent. Precedent after precedent has supported the

right of the President in certain fields to make Executive agreements. The important thing for us is to determine what those fields are, and to see that the Executive agreements are held to the fields where there is a proper scope for the making of Executive agreements.

A year or two ago I cited to the Senate a book written, as I recall, by Mr. McClure, who was in the State Department, in which he maintained that anything could be done by Executive agreement. If that is so, the function of the Senate in foreign relations has come to an end.

I do not think that extreme position is tenable, but it is taken by some persons. I am afraid, however, that once this resolution is adopted it will be said, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] suggested, that if this is a new thing, and if it is based simply on the principle that anything can be done by Executive agreement if it is submitted to congressional approval, undoubtedly it will be used as a precedent for every other negotiation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that I am very familiar with the book to which he referred, which was cited not only by the Senator from Ohio on the floor, but cited at great length before the Finance Committee by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

What I dread about the joint resolution is that no matter what excuses may be made for it, it comes here in the precise form of the suggestion made by a responsible official of the State Department, evidently put out more or less by authority, although signed by his own name, that in the future it is entirely constitutional and possible to bypass all submissions of treaties to the Senate, and to proceed in this very way, according to the very model presented in the pending joint resolution, without ratification by the Senate according to the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before the Senator answers the statement made by the Senator from Missouri I wish to call attention to certain words of the Constitution.

> He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Now here is a treaty, and it is certainly a treaty, because it is an agreement with 43 other nations or subnations. Forty-three of them agree with us.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. All financed by lend-lease.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know whether they are all financed by lend-lease; but here is an agreement, as we know, with foreign countries, submitted to the Congress and not to the Senate. A treaty is an agreement between foreign nations, as we all know. Here is a proposed agreement with 43 other nations. It is just as plain as the nose on a man's face; there cannot be any mistake about it. Under those circumstances, since the Senator is not able to put his finger on any provisions providing for Executive agreements with foreign nations, except the provision I have read in the Constitution, I am sure there cannot be any doubt about its being a treaty.

Mr. TAFT. I wish the Senator from Tennessee were correct. I mean I wish that were the law. But it is not the law. Supreme Court opinion after Supreme Court opinion has held that under the general provision that the Executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States, and possibly in connection with his power to appoint ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls, the President of the United States has certain power to enter into Executive agreements with foreign nations. I cannot cite to the Senator the cases which have so held, but there have been many of them. I should like to agree with the Senator. I wish it could not be done. But, unfortunately, I am afraid it can.

I might ask the Senator from Tennessee, did he himself vote for the trade agreements?

Mr. McKELLAR. Which agreements?

Mr. TAFT. For the Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. McKELLAR. Congress passed an act dealing with trade agreements.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. That measure was passed within the constitutional limitation. The President signed it in the usual way. I have no doubt that we could make an agreement of that sort. But that is something that dealt with trade. The Constitution gives us power over interstate and foreign commerce, and we simply exercised that power. It is a specific power contained in the body of the Constitution, which anyone can see. But there is not a word in the Constitution with respect to Executive agreements.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, before we go further I should like to run over the classes of Executive agreements as I have analyzed them, and I must admit that my study is not complete and that I may not be entirely correct.

In the first place, there is no doubt that minor matters may be dealt with by Executive agreement, and the most usually cited instances of minor matters are postal agreements as to the transmission of mail, the honoring of the stamps of other countries, and extradition treaties—so-called treaties, but which actually in most cases have been made by the President without submission to the Congress.

I think it is generally true that all minor matters, or matters which do not assume any substantial obligation with foreign nations, may be handled by the President by Executive agreement.

In the second place, in the field of minor matters the Senate not long ago approved the so-called Panama agreement. It was not really a minor matter. That agreement was approved by a majority of both the House and the Senate. I have no doubt the Senator from Tennessee voted for it. I think I voted against it on the ground that it was an amendment to a treaty, and so it seemed clear to me that even though it were minor it ought to be done by a treaty. But my impression is that the Senator from Tennessee voted for it. If it was valid, it was valid on the ground that it was a relatively minor matter, a matter of business negotiation which was not particularly important.

Where the line is to be drawn between minor matters and important matters, I cannot say; but I think we can insist on having classified as major matters certain things which definitely are not minor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. Does he consider an authorization of an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 a minor matter? I consider it a major matter.

Mr. TAFT. I agree, but there is another reason why I think the pending matter can be handled by Executive agreement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Speaking of Executive agreements, I find by reading the list of signatories to the agreement the President signed for us, without our knowledge or consent, that 13 of the signatories to the agreement signed it with reservations requiring approval by their own legislative bodies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, undoubtedly the trade agreements can be justified only on the ground that they can be handled by Executive agreements; because if it were merely a matter of domestic law, such an agreement could be changed the moment it was made; whereas, under the trade agreements procedure, when an Executive agreement is made, without action being taken by either House of Congress, to bind the United States for 3 years not to change its tariffs, that is something which Congress by itself could not do. It could only be done, I think, under the treaty-making power; and I voted against the agreements on that ground. But the agreements were voted for by a majority of the Congress on the theory that such matters could be handled by Executive agreement. I suppose it might be said that 3 years is a very short time, and that if at the end of 3 years a change could be made, the matter would not be so important that it could not fall within the rule applying to minor matters which can be dealt with by Executive agreement.

There are also matters which are clearly matters of domestic policy which can be handled by action of a majority of both Houses. If, for instance, we desire to authorize a policy of lending money to foreign countries, I think that is a domestic matter, although it may be carried through by agreements with foreign nations, and although, when authorized, we obligate ourselves to make those payments. But, obviously, I think it could be established by congressional authority, and then Congress would have to appropriate the necessary money.

In any case, any of these minor matters may have to be submitted to Congress, because one thing which is true of an Executive agreement is not true of treaties, and that is that an Executive agreement cannot modify an existing statute. An existing statute may prevail over an Executive agreement. I am inclined to think that an Executive agreement can be changed by statute if it attempts to deal with domestic law. But that question, at least, has not been settled.

There is another type of Executive agreement which I think can be made, and that is an Executive agreement by which the President binds himself with respect to his policy for the balance of his term, in reference to matters within his power. That is the only justification for some Executive agreements. We entered into an Executive agreement with the other United Nations that we would not make peace with Germany without their approval. The agreement was not submitted to Congress. Congress is the only body which can make peace. I do not think the agreement is binding on Congress. I suppose that so long as the President continues in office he can bind himself not to make peace; and he is the only man who can initiate a treaty of peace.

So, I assume that the United Nations agreement may be good for the remainder of the President's term, but that after his term is over it will no longer be binding on the United States. Thus, Mr. President, I think the President can undoubtedly by Executive agreement bind himself for the remainder of his term to pursue some policy.

It seems to me that justification for the U. N. R. R. A. agreement can be sought in only one way, and that is that it is a part of the war effort. Undoubtedly during the war the President may combine our armies. He is now authorizing the American armies to serve under foreign commanders.

The pending measure is strictly limited to 2 years. If it runs beyond the actual end of the war it will still be a part of the war, as I see it; and I am inclined to believe that by Executive action during the war the President is going to have to enter into a whole series of agreements with foreign nations, that will not affect post-war policies. That, to my mind, is the nature of this particular agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to suggest—I sought to secure the Senator's attention a few moments ago on that particular point—that we assume the following situation: As Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, during a state of war, what is there to prevent the President in the exercise of his powers in that function to call together representatives of the other United Nations, and to say to them, "We are going to have to provide some relief so long as the war continues. Acting as President of the United States, I will hand over to you some money, and set up this fund, if I can get the money from the Congress."

Is not that about what the pending measure would mean?

Mr. TAFT. That is about it; yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. And what is there to prevent him from meeting with the other chiefs and saying to them, "I will do this if I can get the money from Congress"?

Mr. TAFT. I think that would be the case. I think there may be many other agreements. If they are confined to the operations in the war effort, I think they may come under the general power of the Executive to enter into agreements. Of course, if they require money, the agreements would have to be approved by Congress, if money for use under the agreements were desired.

But, apart from that, I believe the pending measure is a war measure. If we do not provide for relief, the Army can do it. Armies are obligated to see that everything possible be done to feed the people of occupied areas into which they go. Under lend-lease we have already authorized the making with other nations of agreements which may provide exactly the same relief, except perhaps not in enemy countries. The making of lend-lease agreements is clearly an Executive function authorized by Congress, and the money is provided by Congress; but an executive agreement is not a treaty. The agreements that have been signed with foreign nations are executive agreements, and their validity depends upon the statutes passed by a majority of the Members of Congress. Executive agreements are not treaties.

Mr. President, what I think is not an Executive agreement is the proposal for a United and Associated Nations stabilization fund. That was submitted by Secretary Morgenthau to the members of the Banking and Currency Committee and the Finance Committee. On July 28 he submitted it again. It has been revised. It is in the form of an agreement. But Secretary Morgenthau himself said:

> The international stabilization fund of the United and Associated Nations is proposed as a permanent institution for international monetary cooperation.

It seems to me that is of such outstanding importance, it is of such permanent policy, that I cannot see how we can enter into an agreement with England and other countries to set up a joint stabilization fund to which large sums of money must be contributed, unless we are willing to do so by treaty.

The distinction which I see is that the pending joint resolution is limited to 2 years during a war, as a part of war operations, whereas the international stabilization fund would be a permanent plan for the welfare of the world.

We have an even more extreme case, I think, in the agreement submitted by Secretary Morgenthau as the preliminary draft outline of a proposal for a United Nations bank for reconstruction and development. That fund is also to be a permanent fund. It grows out of the war, but has no relation to the war. I cannot see how we can enter into an agreement with the other nations to put up a certain amount of money unless the matter is submitted to the United States Senate in the form of a treaty.

Obviously a final agreement to enter into an international organization for the maintenance of peace, with the obligation to use our armed forces to enforce the peace, as is contemplated in the Connally resolution, must be by treaty.

I do not feel entirely confident of my position, but there is no doubt in my mind that Executive agreements can be made, and I believe that cooperation between nations at war together justifies this thing being done as an Executive agreement. It is not the fact that this must be submitted to Congress. It is the fact that this thing itself is part of the actual operation of the war.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Constitution does recognize the difference between a treaty and an agreement. The first subsection of section 10 of article I relates to treaties. It provides as follows:

> No State shall enter into any treaty—

And so forth. That is an absolute prohibition. But in subsection 3 there is a qualified prohibition relating to agreements, namely:

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress, * * * enter into any agreement—

And so forth. I do not care to discuss it, but I think there is an express recognition of the difference in quality between agreements and treaties.

Mr. TAFT. Whatever may be in the Constitution, by the construction of the courts today there is no doubt of the Executive power to make agreements. The only important thing is to define what falls within the field of Executive agreements, and what falls within the field of treaties.

The important thing, from my standpoint, is that it cannot be made an Executive agreement simply because it may be said that it must have the approval of Congress, and that anything can be put into an Executive agreement if we reserve the right of Congress to ratify it. If we do that we end forever the whole power of the Senate to pass upon agreements, treaties, or obligations with foreign nations. I am voting for this proposal solely on the ground that it is a part of the war effort, and something in which the President can properly engage.

Mr. President, as to the question of policy I have also had some reservations. I do not question the importance of undertaking relief. I served in the American Relief Administration immediately after the end of the last war. I saw perhaps $2,000,000,000 distributed during a year or more for the relief of foreign nations. I think we never received better value for our money. I think it created more good will than it was possible to dissipate by some of the things we did afterward.

I feel very confident that the proposed relief is a part of our whole war effort. So long as we are involved in the war, it

seems to me that we must carry through the obligation and see that the war is conducted with as little harm as possible, particularly to the people who are fighting on our side. I believe that kindness and liberality of treatment are what distinguish us from the Germans and the Japanese so far as occupied territories are concerned. Certainly I do not wish to follow a policy which would subject us to an unfavorable comparison, in many cases, with what the Germans and Japanese have done. They have done much to condemn them, but there have been instances of their having done exactly what is proposed here.

I am opposed to financing our future trade by loans to foreign countries, but the prevention of starvation is another matter. Although I do not believe that the joint resolution goes so far as to provide assistance in the restoration of property, I should be willing to contribute machinery or whatever may be necessary to get the economic machine going again in those countries, provided it comes from this country. I should vote against the joint resolution with the greatest regret. I think it embraces a policy which we should approve. I am sure that if we were to reject the joint resolution, it would be construed as a disapproval of that policy.

I do not believe that an international organization can be an efficient distributor of relief. If I had to initiate the program, I would propose an international council, in which everyone could speak up, whose members would constantly confer, but who would leave the actual administration of the relief to the particular country which was prepared to put up the money for the relief. I think such an organization would be more efficient. That was what we did after the last World War. I believe that in that instance we did a very efficient job. It was done promptly. Even before the armistice came, we provided for the accumulation of great stocks of supplies. We put ships in motion the moment the armistice came. We were able to negotiate with every other country. We had some difficulty with the blockade, because the British would not lift it immediately; but I am perfectly certain that if that had been an international organization it would have been 6 months before anything could actually have been done. Perhaps we have more time to plan now; but up to this time the Army has been doing the work, largely because the other organization has not been able to get started, or to find sufficient funds.

I believe that an organization which has six masters, and cannot do anything that will offend a particular nation, is likely to be a slow and rather unsatisfactory organization. On the other hand, the Administration has the initiation of foreign policy. It has chosen this method. I may be mistaken. Perhaps the organization in this case can be made as efficient as individual administration.

I believe that if we are to provide food, and are to be generous, we ought to have full credit. I doubt very much if, in the intricacies of an international organization, with employees from every nation in the world, there will be such credit. After the world war we had a small organization from the food administration. The whole distribution was made by the United States Food Administration. The organization was officered by Americans. When the war ended we must have taken 500 men out of the Army who wanted to stay a while longer. They went into every country in Europe. They were fine, upstanding men. They made a favorable impression for the whole American people. The people to whom relief was being administered appreciated what they were doing. All the way from Armenia to Rumania, Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Finland, American supplies were distributed largely under the American flag. I think that was a more satisfactory method than that which is here proposed.

I somewhat question the wisdom of having a council of four deciding how and where the distribution shall be made, when, as a matter of fact, only one of the four will really provide any of the relief supplies. Great Britain will make a contribution, but obviously England has no food or other resources. The British contribution will come very largely from Canada and Australia. The Canadians have been most generous. For example, in the Greek relief, they have been more generous than has the United States. They have been more concerned with feeding children in occupied countries than we have. Certainly the Canadians should participate. I do not see why the relief should not be distributed by a council made up of those who are to supply the relief.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under the proposal now pending, it will be possible for relief to be given to India, will it not?

Mr. TAFT. With the consent of the British, yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Why is the consent of the British necessary? Is that simply because they have jurisdiction over the territory? Section 4 of the joint resolution is the one which provides for assistance.

Mr. TAFT. Section 4 provides as follows:

> In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

In another section there is an agreement that relief may not be carried on in the territory of any member government without the consent of the member government, if I correctly remember.

Mr. BREWSTER. What troubles me in that connection is the very great evidence of want which we saw in India. Thousands were starving. Apparently the situation is still continuing. That is a primary responsibility, I assume, of the British Commonwealth of Nations. The thing which greatly impressed me was that much of what Canada or Australia would be able to do would, under the ordinary laws of humanity, go first to those for whom they are primarily responsible. It seemed to me as I saw many of the 350,000,000 Indians that it would be a very great drain on the resources of any nation which undertook adequately to supply their needs.

Mr. TAFT. I believe the House of Representatives wanted to make clear that there was nothing in the agreement which would prevent distribution of relief to India. I do not think there was.

Mr. BREWSTER. India has not been an occupied nation. There has been practically no encroachment on the territory of India; has there?

Mr. TAFT. That may be true.

The provision to which I have referred was in article VII, reading in part as follows:

> Notwithstanding any other provision herein contained, while hostilities or other military necessities exist in any area, the Administration and its Director General shall not undertake activities therein without the consent of the military command of that area and unless subject to such control as the command may find necessary.

That language would certainly limit the distribution of relief in India.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator mean that the Indians would come under the definition of "military necessities" existing in the area? The hostilities have encroached very little on the territory of India. They have been chiefly in Burma, I believe. But India might well come under the language "military necessities."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 3, beginning in line 5, may be found the answer to the Senator's question. The language reads in part as follows:

> To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food—

And so forth. If the people of India can be considered as victims of the war—and I believe the starvation there is attributed to the war in that area——

Mr. BREWSTER. It has been caused largely by the cutting off of the rice supply by the Japanese occupation of Burma.

I think this matter has arisen under the language found near the beginning of the agreement, which has so often been referred to:

> that immediately upon the liberation of any area by the armed forces of the United Nations or as a consequence of retreat of the enemy—

And so forth. I think that is the basis on which it is usually thought of as being designed for the relief of occupied territory.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. In just a moment. My impression is that under paragraph 2 (a) of article I, reading in part, that—

> Subject to the provisions of article VII, the purposes and functions of the Adminis-

tration shall be as follows: (a) To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations—

India would be covered, even if the other clause had not been included.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Of course, if occupation is the test, the British have been in hostile occupation of India for nearly 200 years.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate. There is this to be said in favor of a joint organization, and that is that I think we do want today to emphasize our desire to cooperate with the other United Nations as closely as possible. Probably it is very important today that we make it clear that we are prepared to engage in that cooperation, because some of the other allies seem to be forgetting the fact that cooperation is also necessary on their part. However, I do not believe that such a policy can be said to be definite enough to justify any change in our policy. It can be said for this method that it emphasizes tremendously our desire to cooperate just as closely as possible with the other United Nations. Therefore, I shall vote for the joint resolution, although I do not like the method provided for in it, and I have some doubts about that. I have indicated the fear, at least, that it will be used as a precedent for other things for which I do not think it can properly be used as a precedent. However, since the administration has chosen this method of achieving an object which I think is all-important in the war effort, I propose to vote for the joint resolution.

PHOENIX-TEMPE STONE CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 375) for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co., which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 16, which will be stated.

The amendment of the committee was, on page 16, line 2, to strike out "at the conclusion of 2 years following the termination of hostilities on all fronts unless specifically extended by an act of Congress" and insert "on June 30, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made therefor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will accept the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assume the Senator, by the language contained in the amendment, does not mean to limit the expenditures by the entire organization to the amount we would appropriate; does he?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. CONNALLY. What the Senator means is that he does not want the organization to assume any obligation——

Mr. McKELLAR. Any obligation beyond that of the appropriations which would be made by the Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. As to the United States?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have no serious objection to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether his amendment would be a reservation, or an amendment to the text of the agreement?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been stated by the chairman of the committee, and I believe generally acquiesced in by most Senators on both sides of the aisle, that the amendment should appear as a separate section on page 15. That will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. It would have to be in that form, because it could not be an amendment to the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment which I offer, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Texas will accept the amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator agree to have included in his amendment, in line 4, after the word "character", the words "and time"? The language would then read:

That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to the modification.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection I may add that the time of the contribution will be determined by the act of Congress appropriating the money for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it will; but I have no objection.

Mr. WHITE. What the Senator from Kentucky has said probably is true, but I think it would avoid controversy if those words were inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee adopt the modification suggested by the Senator from Maine?

Mr. McKELLAR. I adopt it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator's amendment is somewhat didactic. It solemnly states what everyone knows, or should know—that in the case of the United States the constitutional body of the United States when it comes to appropriations is the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will accept the amendment, I will plead guilty to the charge.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to argue with the Senator from Tennessee about fine distinctions as to language, because of course the Senator is much more familiar with distinctions in the use of language; he has been in the Senate so much longer than I have.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to caution the Senator from Texas against making suggestions to the Senator from Tennessee along that line.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize that the admonition the Senator from Kentucky gives me arises from an experience he had regarding raiment, during a colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee.

I shall not endanger my own safety in that respect, though I see no objection to saying that A is A and B is B.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, and I hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Tennessee adopted the suggestion of the Senator from Maine and modified his amendment accordingly?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think the Senator has had his quota. He has had two amendments added to the joint resolution. Has he still another one?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. I offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, and then I shall yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 21, after the word "area", it is proposed to insert "(except areas within enemy territory)."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I would not be in favor of that amendment. I do not know what the circumstances are, but there may be place within enemy territory where we would want to furnish relief, for instance, Formosa. That island certainly is within enemy territory. I have no great objection to furnishing some relief to enemy countries. I think we are obligated when we invade them to afford relief if they are without other means of support.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment, and I trust the Senator from Tennessee will not insist upon it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall have to do so. Under the joint resolution as now written relief and rehabilitation may be furnished to any enemy country. The members of the committee, as I understood, said that it was intended by the provisions of section 4 to include India only, and that it was not intended to include Germany, Austria, France, Belgium, and various other nations of the earth.

Mr. TAFT. What about Sicily and Italy? Are they not enemy countries? They have been enemy countries, and portions of them maintain they still are. Certainly the definition is a very doubtful one.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quite sure the Senator from Ohio would not want, and I do not believe any other Senators would want, to give relief to that portion of Italy which is now under the control of Germany. Under the provision, I repeat relief may be extended to enemy countries taken over. I hope the Senator from Texas will reconsider the matter, accept the amendment, and take it to conference, anyway, and let it be considered there.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The only ground on which Italy could be included in the joint resolution would be on the ground that they had ceased to make war. The only time we could possibly afford relief to people of Germany would be when they have ceased to make war. So, either it excludes Italy, or it does not mean anything. I think it excludes Italy, and I think it is fully intended that we should distribute relief in Italy and Sicily.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood that both the distinguished Senator from Texas and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, members of the subcommittee, stated that the purpose of this provision was to include India. I can see a reason for that, and I am perfectly willing that that shall be done, but unless the provision is limited as I suggest, let us see what the result would be. Our bomber planes and other planes have been raining bombs over Berlin, and I presume they have caused a great deal of loss of life and injury to persons and to property. Is it the idea of anyone that we should go to Germany and make reparations for that damage?

For instance, suppose we have destroyed the greater proportion of the buildings in the city of Berlin, is it possible that we are going there and give relief to rehabilitate that city and restore it? What is the use of blowing it up if we are going to make the American people pay the bill for restoring it? It does not seem to me that we ought to provide for it in this joint resolution, and I hope the Senator from Texas will reconsider, and take the amendment to conference.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the amendment, as we know is proposed to be added to the India section. I do not know whether the Senator from Tennessee thinks he is prohibiting U. N. R. R. A. from distributing relief in enemy countries by putting it into the India section. If not, if it only affects India, of course, the amendment does not mean anything.

Mr. McKELLAR. I submitted it to the draftsman of the Senate, who is a very competent and efficient man, and I believe that it will have the effect he says it will have. I told him what we wanted to do, that we wanted to provide for relief in India, as the committee has stated it was their purpose to do; but not to extend it to enemy countries. India is not an enemy country. I presume a number of Senators have been to India and have seen the conditions which have been portrayed here this afternoon—a tremendous horde of poor, dilapidated, and hungry men, women, and children. It would be the height of charity to help them, but in order to help them I do not think we ought to put a provision in the joint resolution by which we would be obligated to help the people in enemy countries.

Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. TAFT, and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe the Senator from Kentucky was on his feet first, and I yield to him, and then I shall be glad to yield to other Senators.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that section 4 provides that:

In expressing its approval of this joint resolution, it is the recommendation of Congress that insofar as funds and facilities permit, any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease may be included in the benefits to be made available through the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The crux of that paragraph is found in the words "any area important to the military operations of the United Nations which is stricken by famine or disease." Suppose we go into some Japanese territory in the Pacific, as we have conquered territory that was formerly under Japan, suppose we go into portions of Germany which from a military standpoint will become important to the operations of the United Nations, and we find famine and disease there that would jeopardize even the safety of our own Army. If we included the amendment of the Senator, then we could not do anything to relieve that situation. It seems to me inasmuch as we are undertaking to provide by the section that relief may be afforded in any area important to the military operations of the United Nations, where there is famine and disease, we ought not to restrict it if the area happens to be a strip of enemy territory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in this war every inch of Germany is important to the military operations of the United Nations; not a single foot of German territory is unimportant to the military operations of the United States in the war, and for us to invade that country and then obligate ourselves at the same time we invade it to furnish relief to those who may be suffering or dying by reason of famine or disease seems to me to be monstrous.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose we go into Germany. As we go into Germany, the territory we take over behind the Army must be administered.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no question about that. That is not what is being referred to here.

Mr. BARKLEY. It may be.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Army proceeds, let us say, into the middle of Germany. The Army does not want to take charge of all the territory it may have occupied, and U. N. R. R. A. would take charge in order to relieve it. It is in that sense that the Senator's amendment would even prohibit the U. N. R. R. A. from going in behind the Army at any stage and undertaking to relieve famine and disease which might themselves affect the safety of the Army.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. When the Army takes charge of any part of Germany, it is not Germany any longer, but it is the property of the United States or of the Allied Nations.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is enemy territory.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it is anything else but enemy territory. It is Allied territory in the sense of the meaning here. Of course, they would have a right to do it.

I yield now to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator to the last portion of the paragraph which was read by the Senator from Kentucky. The effect of this section, that is, section 4, is not to amend the agreement but merely to state the recommendation of the Congress in this regard.

I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Texas, in charge of the joint resolution, as to whether or not section 4 would have any effect whatsoever, so far as the agreement is concerned, or so far as the authorities who will operate under it are concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. If I may be permitted by the Senator from Tennessee to answer——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as the legal effect is concerned, I do not think section 4 has the force of law. Other terms in the agreement and in the preceding portions of the joint resolution, define where the relief shall be expended. As I view it, this is merely a suggestion to the organization, that if they can find a way to do what is needed, it is hoped they will do it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder whether the Senator would be satisfied if the amendment read, "except areas occupied by the enemy." It seems to me that would reach what the Senator is trying to cover.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it would, and I modify my amendment to that effect.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect would the amendment, even as modified, have in Finland, for instance, which is enemy territory to some of the United Nations, although not to us, or in Norway? Would they be regarded as enemy territory?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; neither of them would be regarded as enemy territory, because they are not enemy territory to us, certainly not.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the amendment be restated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert on page 15, line 21, after the word "area", the words "except areas occupied by the enemy."

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think there is any danger of our extending any relief to territory actually occupied by the enemy, and I shall not resist the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. OVERTON. Before the amendment is acted on, Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not know that the amendment as modified carries out the intention of the Senator from Tennessee. Suppose some of the United Nations should be occupied by the enemy, suppose a part of England should be occupied by the enemy; could not relief be sent into that territory? I think it should say, "and while occupied by the enemy."

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the suggestion of the Senator is well taken, and I further modify my amendment by accepting his suggestion. Let the clerk state the amendment with that modification. I think clearly it should be so corrected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as now modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, line 21, after the word "area", it is proposed to insert "except within enemy territory and while occupied by the enemy."

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a word, Mr. President. I wish to quote from the report of the committee, on page 9, which shows that there is no purpose to do what the Senator from Tennessee is seeking to prevent:

> The policy resolutions adopted by the Council specifically provide, furthermore, that the Council must approve the scale and nature of such operations and that all expenses of operations in an enemy or ex-enemy country should be borne by that country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

> No amendment under article VIII (a) of the agreement involving any new obligation for the United States shall be binding upon the United States without approval by joint resolution of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment. It has been worked over by the committee and the State Department, and we have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, some time ago I offered an amendment in line 11, page 11. I wish to withdraw the amendment, because of the suggestion made as to it being mixed up with another provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was never formally offered, and the Senator has a right to withdraw it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I offer the amendment, which I now send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15, after line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

> The Director General shall make periodic reports to the Congress of the United States of America covering the Administration's activities.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any objection to having the amendment agreed to, but the Director General is not an officer of the United States, he is not under the control of the United States, he is an officer of the organization we are proposing to set up by the agreement. What legal power have we to direct him as to what he shall do with respect to the administration of his office? That is not a captious question, because I think it is generally agreed that we as a Nation, singly, and by ourselves, have no control over the Director General. It happens that today the Director General is an American citizen, but suppose that some time in the near future he should happen to be a British citizen or a Chinese citizen, would we have any right to say to him that he should make a separate report to the Congress of the United States?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. We might not be able to enforce the provision, but so long as we held the purse strings, I think they would submit a report to us.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think they would do that anyway, but the question whether we have the power legally to control the Director General is what we are considering. If we cannot control him, I have some doubt as to the wisdom of making such a gesture.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the purpose of the amendment, but if we are to do what is proposed at all, it seems to me the amendment should be leveled at the American member of the Council, who will be our member. Another safeguard is that before any appropriations are made the organization must come before Congress, and I assume that the one who comes before Congress will be our representative, or the Director General, Mr. Lehman, and he will have to make a report, and we will ask, naturally, what they did with the money previously provided. It seems to me the effect of this might be offensive to some of the other nations, since it might seem that we were assuming to take charge and dictate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Would the Senator have any objection to the amendment if it were modified so as to read "the American member of the Council," instead of "Director General"?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator what he finds lacking at the top of page 15, where the language is:

> The President shall submit to the Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations and of operations under the agreement.

Is not that the appropriate point at which to require reports?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; I feel that that language refers only to the expenditures and the receipts of money.

Mr. BARKLEY. The whole operation is under the agreement. Not only appropriations but all operations are under the agreement. Everything done is under the agreement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. My thought was that that language did not go far enough. That is why I submitted my amendment, so as to require someone who could do so

to report to Congress what the organization was doing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. We thought we were doing precisely that thing in the language on the top of page 15.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not insist on his amendment. It seems to me the language just quoted by the Senator from Michigan completely answers the Senator's suggestion. The language provides that the President shall submit reports. He is the man who is shot at, instead of some subordinate. It seems to me the language is entirely adequate, in addition to the additional safeguard which is provided by the necessity for coming to the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Suppose the President should not submit a report of the organization's activities?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, someone can always express such a fear. The President, however, does submit reports when it is provided that he shall do so by act of Congress. The President has to come to Congress for every dollar he receives.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. We are still waiting for the report on the Food Congress held last winter.

Mr. BARKLEY. That was not held by direction of Congress.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will not insist on his amendment. It seems to me the provisions of the bill are quite adequate.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not feel that the provisions of the bill go far enough. Regretting, as I do, not being able to agree with the views expressed by the Senator from Texas, I shall ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have not heard any Senator protest against the proposal that the United States provide $1,350,000,000 of the money paid into the Treasury by American taxpayers who are so loaded down with debt and weary and tired of taxes now that they can hardly budge. It is proposed that we shall put up $1,350,000,000 of their money, which we shall need so badly to provide for our veterans when they return, and place that money in the hands of a group of foreigners to do with as they please. As a Member of the United States Senate I protest against it. If there shall be but one vote against the proposal I shall vote against the United States putting up $1,350,000,000 of the hard-earned money of the weary taxpayers of this country and placing it in the hands of a group of foreigners to do with as they wish.

Mr. President, I can now see that the Senate is going to vote the $1,350,000,000. In view of the fact that we are putting up two-thirds of the money, and that perhaps, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] said today, we shall probably put up 90 percent of the money, because all the 43 countries participating in this matter are receiving lend-lease from us, with the exception of Canada and Liberia—in view of the fact that we are putting up virtually all the money to feed all the world, I think at least 50 percent of the money contributed by us could be spent in the purchase of American farm products and machinery, medicines, and such other things as are going to be used by this world-wide distributing organization.

Therefore, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the figures and words "$1,350,000,000 in the aggregate", it is proposed to insert ", of which 50 percent shall be spent for the purchase of farm products and other supplies in the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that this organization is not controlled by us, that we have only 1 vote in 44, and in view of the fact that we are participating very heavily in this war, and that the lives of our men are in jeopardy in virtually every part of the world, and, in view of the further fact that we are interested in the preservation of the lives of those men, and that we do not want any foreign organization to interfere with our military activities, I maintain that before the proposed international organization composed of 44 nations, in which we have 1 vote, is permitted to go into a territory and to begin its operations, the Chief of Staff of our Army who is in charge of that particular territory should be consulted in order that the activities of this foreign international organization may not interfere with our military operations, or be likely to do damage to any operations which are in the minds of our military authorities to be carried forward.

In line with that thought I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, after line 4, it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 6. No program of relief or rehabilitation or policy contemplated or proposed by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be placed into operation, without it having first been submitted for approval to the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United Nations in charge of the area in which the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration proposes to operate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that is already taken care of in the joint resolution where it is provided that within military areas nothing shall be done by the organization without the consent and cooperation of the commander of our armed forces in that territory.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for the adoption of my amendment, Mr. President, because I think its provisions are specific. I am under the impression that probably our military commanders would welcome a qualification of that sort, so there would be no question about the organization coming in and interfering with their military program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that our Army is making expenditures of millions of dollars in buying foodstuffs for the purpose of making distribution to the civilians of different countries in which we operate. In view of the fact that we have a Government school in Charlottesville, Va., where we are training men to administer aid and to participate in suggestions relative to government in the respective countries after we enter them, I am rather of the opinion that those individuals whom we have in the field now would be better prepared to handle this relief than any foreign organization we might set up. Therefore, I think the appropriations should be made to the Army to augment the money they have now for that particular purpose in emergency cases. I, therefore, offer an amendment to that effect, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as Congress may determine to be necessary, to the Army and Navy, for use of military governments established in occupied countries for the adequate conduct of relief and rehabilitation and related necessary activities. A complete record shall be maintained by each military government of all expenditures and submitted to Congress in semiannual reports of the Army and Navy, whichever the case may be.

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of funds for use by military governments established in occupied countries in conducting relief and rehabilitation and related activities."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I believe we are all in agreement that there is no greater humanitarian organization upon the face of the earth than the American Red Cross. The American Red Cross is considered to be one of the finest organizations of its kind that was ever formed anywhere in the world. For many years it has done a magnificent job, a job of which not only we in America are proud, but of which the people of the world are actually very proud; because during its existence the American Red Cross has administered to the sick, the wounded, and the unfortunate in almost every section of the entire world.

In view of the fact that the American Red Cross is an American organization,

in view of the fact that we are actually to put up 90 percent of all the money to be used under the pending measure, in view of the fact that the American Red Cross already has a world-wide organization, and that we have implicit faith in it, and that all other nations of the world have implicit faith in it, I think the fund should be administered by the American Red Cross.

However, instead of providing in my amendment, or my substitute, as it might be called, that $1,350,000,000 shall be authorized to be appropriated, I have provided that not to exceed $350,000,000 in the aggregate shall be authorized to be appropriated. I ask that the Senate direct that the money for relief be distributed by an organization we know, not by an international organization in which we shall have virtually no voice—only one voice among 43 others.

Mr. President, I send my amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $350,000,000 in the aggregate, as the Congress of the United States may determine from time to time to be appropriated, and such sums to be used for relief among the populations of areas liberated by the armed forces of the United Nations. Such sums shall be administered solely by the American Red Cross, using the facilities of their international organization.

SEC. 2. The American Red Cross shall submit to Congress quarterly reports of expenditures made under any such appropriations.

SEC. 3. Relief shall be defined as aid in furnishing food, clothing, shelter, the prevention of pestilence, and recovery of health of the peoples of the liberated areas.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution authorizing an appropriation of funds to be administered by the Red Cross for relief in areas liberated by the armed forces of the United Nations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I submit the last amendment I propose to offer, and send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the resolving clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $350,000,000,000——

Mr. REYNOLDS. No, Mr. President; not $350,000,000,000, but $350,000,000.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $350,000,000 to be expended under the direction of the President, for the furnishing of food, clothing, medicine, and other absolute essentials of life, to relieve starvation and suffering among individuals in those countries which have been overrun by, or have directly suffered from hostile action of, the enemies of the United Nations in the present war.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the appropriation of $350,000,000 for use in relieving starvation and suffering in countries which have been overrun by, or have directly suffered from hostile action of, the enemies of the United Nations in the present war."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the record show that the amendment provides for $350,000,000,000 or $350,000,000?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I corrected the clerk's reading of the amount. The amount stated in the amendment is $350,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amount carried in the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. Three hundred and fifty million dollars.

Mr. REYNOLDS. But, Mr. President, considering the way the Congress appropriates billions of dollars, one might think the amount was $350,000,000,000 instead of $350,000,000. I suppose the clerk mentioned $350,000,000,000 because the national debt has almost reached that amount at the present time.

Mr. President, I think this matter is of great concern to everyone in America. I do not desire to take up very much of the time of the Senate in discussing the amendment. I have offered the amendments in order that my record may be clear. I want the American people to know I am not going to vote $1,350,000,000 for a group of foreigners and aliens in an international organization to spend all over the world.

I submitted the amendment to cut down the amount to $350,000,000; $350,000,000 is a great deal of money—a very great deal of money. We do not know where the money will be spent; we do not know to what particular use it will be put. We know it will be spent in stricken countries, but at the same time we do not know exactly what organizations there will be called upon to make the distribution; because in an organization of this kind there is bound to be some politics. It is almost inevitable that there will be some politics in it—just as we see today, in Italy, a fight occurring between the Fascists and the Communists, and just as we see occurring in Yugoslavia today a fight between the Fascists and Communists.

We in the United States are being called upon to put up virtually all the money to be used to feed all the world, just as if we had not already done everything possible in that direction. Mr. President, we have done a great deal. Not only have we done a great deal through governmental action, but let us see what we are doing through private activities. I read a brief newspaper article which bears on that point:

SOVIETS GIVEN $16,781,333 IN RELIEF GOODS LAST YEAR

NEW YORK, February 14.—Russian War Relief, Inc., announced today that $16,781,333.74 worth of clothing, medical supplies, and miscellaneous articles were consigned through it to the Soviet Union last year.

In a report to the agency's board of directors, Edward C. Carter, president of the organization, said that clothing comprised 70.07 percent of the shipments; medical supplies, 20.42 percent; seeds, food, and miscellaneous items, 4.35.

Mr. Carter said that of the relief goods consigned $7,742,430 was contributed in goods by Americans. The remainder was received in cash contributions through war chests and the National War Fund, he said. Administrative, promotion, and operating costs total 4.43 percent of income, the report stated, an amount which Mr. Carter said was believed to be the lowest ever achieved by a comparable agency.

The 1944 goal, recently announced, is $21,000,000, which includes a $9,000,000 allocation from the National War Fund.

So, Mr. President, we find that from private charitable sources the Soviets were given $16,781,333.74 worth of clothing, medical supplies, and other articles last year, and that the goal for this year is $21,000,000, to be collected in this country and to be sent to the Soviets.

I think we have done our part, and I am protesting about our chucking away the money of the taxpayers of our country.

Mr. President, the reason why I keep harping on the matter is because, scattered all over the world we have 10,000,000 or 11,000,000 men and women in uniform who are dying and bleeding and suffering. When the war is over, we shall have to take care of their widows and their orphaned children, and we shall have to take care of hundreds of thousands of invalids—veterans who will be armless, legless, blind, or deranged. The question is, when the war is over will we have the money with which to take care of our own veterans who will have gone forth to fight for the "four freedoms' throughout the world?

I am interested in that, and I think the time has come to cut down the amount to be authorized. If we approve the pending measure as it now stands, it will really be our recommendation for an appropriation of $1,350,000,000. Of course, Mr. President, we all want to help those who are afflicted. We all appreciate the suffering which is being experienced by the unfortunate people in the invaded countries, and our heart goes out to them in sympathy. But, Mr. President, charity must begin at home. If we give away everything now, what shall we have left for our own veterans when the war is over? And only God knows when the war will end. No one else knows. The war may last for years.

I am pleading today in the interest of our men and women—our soldiers who are fighting on 72 fronts throughout the world. I hope to God we will save enough so that we shall be able to buy the medicine and food and to furnish the nurses required in order to take care of the hundreds of thousands of wounded who will return to this country after the war is over. I ask for a vote on the question of cutting down the amount from $1,350,000,000 to $350,000,000. Let us give away $350,000,000. We have plenty. They will do what they want with it. But for God's sake, let

us save $1,000,000,000 of this money for our own soldiers.

Mr. President, in this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article written by Constantine Brown in his column entitled "This Changing World," and a newspaper article in reference to a young American hero who has returned to this country blind, broke, and 20.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of January 25, 1944]

THIS CHANGING WORLD

(By Constantine Brown)

If a section of the United States were hit by a major tragedy and funds for its relief and rehabilitation had to be obtained by private contribution in which, say, Thomas Lamont, was the principal contributor, no one would be surprised if his representative were given a decisive voice in the distribution of the funds.

It appears, however, that what seems logical in regard to domestic affairs is not logical in a large-scale international undertaking.

Congress has been asked to appropriate $1,350,000,000 for the relief and rehabilitation of the devastated and hungry areas of the war-stricken world.

The people of the United States never have been stingy in assisting other nations when they were in distress. Americans contributed hundreds of millions after the World War to feed not only our former associates, but they sent aid into Russia, which at that time was ostracized by our Government, and into Armenia to save millions of people from starvation.

The relief and rehabilitation of Europe, the United Nations Governments have decided among themselves, must no longer be based on charity. All parties concerned must do their bit to raise a large fund to help the starved peoples of Europe and Asia soon after their liberation from the Axis yoke. Industries and public utilities which have suffered so much from the "torch" policy of the Germans and the Japanese and from aerial warfare, will have to be restored to permit quick economic rehabilitation. The devastated areas comprise practically the whole of Europe—with the exception of the few remaining neutral countries—and the major portion of China.

For this purpose the United States, which has the largest national income of the world, probably will be assessed an amount equal to 1 percent of its 1943 income.

It is immaterial whether or not the 1943 figure represents the real income of the United States or is an inflated amount due to war conditions. It is argued in some quarters that American industry will remain very busy long after the war, since it will be forced to produce for the whole civilized world everything from hairpins to machine tools and planes.

But what appears important to many legislators—even though they are going to vote for the required appropriations—is that while the American taxpayer is the heaviest contributor to this undertaking, the United States has only a 25-percent voice in the handling of both relief and rehabilitation.

A committee of four forms the directing council of the U. N. R. R. A., in which Britain, Russia, China, and the United States are represented with equal voice, although there is a most unequal contribution of funds.

Nations which are to receive assistance are to be consulted whenever their own countries are involved, but do not participate in the framing of the U. N. R. R. A.'s general policies.

The United States Government was careful to see there was no hitch in this United Nations' attempt to present a solid front to the world. The whole matter was presented to the country as the first endeavor of the associated powers to work in complete harmony and on the surface the project does not seem to involve any controversial political problem. But it appears that with the best will in the world politics cannot be kept out of the organization.

Definite trends and a race for jockeying for political domination are only too obvious in Europe today.

The Russians are in the midst of an offensive in old Poland. In Yugoslavia there is a bitter fight between the representatives of King Peter and those of Moscow. A similar situation is said to exist in Greece. In Italy there seems to be an ill-concealed struggle between the supporters and nonsupporters of the House of Savoy. In France several factions are preparing for a fight for power after the Nazis have been eliminated and Gen. Charles de Gaulle hopes he will be the man who will guide his country's destinies. There are many who still oppose him.

Feeding the starved people of all these countries will be a strong trump card for the would-be leaders. Food in a starved country is far more important than gold, and the organization which has the key to the larder in its pocket can impose itself on that country.

If the council of four were composed of representatives of countries not involved in the game of power politics we could look on it as an adequate directorate to insure a fair distribution of the materials purchased largely with the American taxpayer's money. But unfortunately both Britain and Russia are involved in that game and their representatives might be tempted into some sort of "patronage" which would help their protégés obtain political supremacy, for a while, at least.

The fact that America has no decisive vote in the U. N. R. R. A. is likely to get this country involved in the game of power politics when we favor unwittingly the formation of this or that puppet government in Europe.

RETURN OF A HERO: BLIND, BROKE, AND 20

McCLOUD, CALIF., February 12.—Young Robert Wetzel has been led back home from the wars in Italy—back to the beloved mountains he no longer can see. He arrived with $2 in his pocket, a Japanese-American soldier for an escort and a receipt showing his Government would not even buy a pair of glasses to cover his sightless eyes.

A receipt made out by the post exchange of McCloskey Hospital, Temple, Tex., acknowledges that Wetzel paid $8 for glasses—Wetzel paid, not the Army. Date: January 24.

He asked for his new glasses, for there was—and is—a chance he will see again. But the Army doctor, as Wetzel recalls the words, said:

"If you could be put in shape to fight again, the Army would pay for the glasses. But since you are being discharged, you will have to pay for them yourself."

BLIND VET AT 20

Bob Wetzel was 19 when he entered the Army, scarcely 20 when he came back, a blind veteran, to this mountain community, where his father works in the office of the lumber company.

He was in that spearhead formed by Company I, One Hundred and Thirty-fifth Infantry, the night of October 13 when the Volturno churned red with blood. They crossed the Volturno, established the beachhead.

But that beachhead was a thicket of land mines, Wetzel heard an artillery shell coming, dived into a ditch—and landed on a mine.

His left eye was literally torn from its socket. Three fragments pierced the right eye. He was totally blind.

It was five hospitals and 70 days from the Appennines of Italy to the Siskiyous of California.

An Army major came one day and told him of a bitter failure.

"They had tried to take those splinters out of my right eye with a magnet and it didn't work," said Wetzel.

"But he said there was a chance that corrective glasses might restore vision to my right eye."

From that moment he lived for the day when treatment could begin. They fitted him with his first glasses and soon he could see shadows, only shadows. But it was seeing.

The problem, they told him, was one of constant adjustment of the lens to strengthen the eye.

Two weeks later the blow fell. He was told he was being discharged.

"Of course, I wanted to get back home," Wetzel related, "so I didn't feel so badly about it.

"But if I was going to see again, I thought they should do everything they could now. I thought they could keep me and transfer me to a hospital near home."

PAID FOR GLASSES

"I wanted the new glasses right away, but the doctor just gave me a prescription and told me to get it filled at the post exchange. So I went and paid the $8, but haven't received the glasses yet."

He was placed in a hospital car with a Japanese-American corporal as an escort to deliver him home.

Wetzel's father concluded the recital:

"Bob is not bitter. He thinks the Army is grand. We all do. But perhaps the public should know about cases like Bobby's. We're thinking about all the thousands of other wounded men.

"Bob has a mother and father to come to, and the American Legion is handling his case.

"But what about the men who won't have a family to come home to?"

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, because of the fact that I have been serving as a member of the conference committee which has been holding both morning and afternoon sessions, it has been impossible or impracticable for me to be present during much of the debate in the Senate on this very important subject. I do not intend to take more than a minute or two of the time of the Senate.

I believe that when a measure of this kind is before the Senate of the United States for approval or disapproval, the Senate is facing one of the most important problems it has faced, at least during my short period of service here. I am not willing to vote without at least registering for the RECORD some of my thoughts on the matter. My remarks shall be very brief, I can assure the Senate.

Mr. President, I can remember the trainloads of relief supplies which were collected in the prairie States of the West, including my own State of Nebraska following the last war. I was then engaged in the milling and grain business and in the manufacture of flour. I know that the millers from all over the United States solicited trainloads and shiploads of flour, which

were taken to the devastated areas of Europe and distributed through relief organizations. Some of our most distinguished people joined in that work and donated their time and effort, and performed valuable services, indeed.

I am of the opinion that today the American people are just as liberal as they were at that time; they are just as anxious to help in the terrible catastrophe which faces many of the people who live in the war-devastated areas; and I am sure the American people will come to the rescue. But here we are adopting a different policy. We are saying to the people who gave of their might in the previous war situation, "This time the Government will take charge of relief."

If one is a stockholder in a large corporation, does he think for a minute that his duty as a citizen is fulfilled when the board of directors or the president of the corporation gives $1,000, $10,000, or $100,000 for relief? The man who wants to give wants to give as an individual. If relief is to be administered through a corporation—and in this instance our Government is acting in the capacity of a corporation—if we give the last penny of the substance of this Nation, no individual citizen will feel in his heart that he has contributed to the solution of the problem.

I for one want the people of America to decide how charitable they wish to be. I have no doubt that they will be charitable to the extreme limit in this catastrophe, as they were in the previous catastrophe.

I do not know how I can register my protest against a measure of this kind, meritorious as it may be, without casting my vote in the negative. At the same time, I want the Members of this body, and others who may look at the vote in the RECORD, to understand that I expect them to be as liberal in this instance as they have always been in the past. I do not wish to create an organization behind which everyone can hide and say, "I have made my donation through the Treasury of the United States by paying taxes; therefore, I do not wish to contribute at this time."

I do not believe that we, as a government, have any more right than have the officers of a corporation to become the charity organization for each individual citizen of this country. I, for one, want to give. I expect to give, and I have no doubt that the people of America will give liberally. However, I am sure they will not like the idea of setting up a tremendous relief organization, in which much of the money will be wasted in administration, and in which they will have no opportunity to decide where their gifts shall go.

In my State—and I know the statement applies to other States—there are many distinguished citizens of wealth, as well as citizens of very ordinary means, who came from some of the war-torn countries of Europe and elsewhere, or whose ancestors came from those countries. For years they have been contributing liberally to organizations which gave relief to the people in their fatherland. They will do so again. They would give a thousand times more as individuals to an organization of that kind than they would give to the Treasury of the United States to become their representative in charity.

I for one hope that the people of America will continue to be as charitable as they have been in the past, and that they will continue to give in the old-fashioned way, a method by which they know that their contributions reach those whom they wish to help. Because of that principle, I shall have to vote against the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that I tried to save the United States a billion dollars, and also to show how I voted on the proposal. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, a short time ago I sent to the desk an amendment which I asked to have lie on the table. I now offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order at this time. There is an amendment pending. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I could not give my support to the joint resolution in its original form, previous to the amendments which were adopted this afternoon. After studying the measure and hearing it fully discussed, I am still unwilling to vote for it so long as the amount which we are authorizing to be expended remains at $1,350,000,000. I should be willing to go to a limit of $500,000,000 of absolute commitment if the joint resolution were so amended as to provide such an amount. I am unwilling to go beyond that point at the very beginning of this most extensive program of relief throughout the world which is to be conducted at our expense.

I wish my country to do its part. I wish my Government to share the responsibility of all civilization in the performance of humanitarian works necessary and incidental to the catastrophe which has come upon the world. I think we should be acting very generously if we should provide an authorization of $500,000,000 at this time.

I give this reason for not wanting to go further: In the first place, Mr. President, I do not agree to many of the terms and provisions of the agreement which has been entered into. I do not like at all the idea or principle of the United States furnishing 67½ percent of all the money which is to be expended under the terms of the joint resolution, and at the same time turning over to other nations which are participating, and some nations which are not participating in the contribution of the over-all relief fund, the control of our money. That is exactly what is proposed. The Council would be composed of representatives from 44 nations or authorities signing the agreement, including our own representative, who would have only one vote. Russia, which would make no contribution whatsoever to the fund to be distributed and expended, would have an equal vote with the representative of the United States in the control and distribution of the fund. From my viewpoint, that is one of the serious objections to the joint resolution.

Even with the amendment which I have suggested, I should very much dislike to vote for the joint resolution, but I should be willing to yield my better judgment and go along if I could be assured that we are to retain the control to the extent of the obligations to be created by the Council of the relief authority.

Mr. President, there is another provision in the articles of agreement which causes me to take the position I take with reference to the amount of the authorization which we are about to make, and that is that we cannot withdraw from this agreement or from whatever obligation we incur, for a period of 1 year after giving notice of withdrawal. We must first give 6 months' notice, and then we are not permitted to withdraw for 1 year thereafter. That, Mr. President, represents more than half of the time for which this authorization would be made.

It has been said that we hold control of the money because the Administration must come back to Congres for an appropriation. Mr. President, when we authorize the appropriation of $1,350,000,000, I know from my observation and legislative experience in the Congress that we have already gone more than half the way; indeed, we have gone two-thirds of the way toward actual expenditure of the money. I am not ready today to go that far with $1,350,000,000. I am ready to go that far with half a billion dollars, which I think is very generous.

I would rather put that limitation on the authorization now so that in the course of the expenditure of the money, and in the course of the operation of the U. N. R. R. A. up until the time that authorization is exhausted by the expenditures which will be made under the authority of the authorization, we can have an opportunity to see how this organization is working, how it is being administered, and how its affairs are being conducted. Then we can determine, after having had such an opportunity, whether this Nation and we as the Congress wish to commit this Government to any further part of the program outlined and in process of execution by the U. N. R. R. A. It is true that we can keep our hands on the purse strings; but if we provide this authorization we shall morally obligate this Government for every dollar of it, and I am not ready to go that far at this time.

Mr. President, I wish to make one further observation in reference to the withdrawal provision. We cannot withdraw even at the end of a year and a half unless our Government has by that time met all financial, supply, or other material obligations accepted or undertaken by it.

According to my interpretation of the language of the joint resolution, if we make an authorization today of $1,350,000,000, there will be, in my judgment,

an obligation for us to perform to that extent before we can withdraw from it. I do not know that we shall ever want to withdraw. I hope the organization will be so conducted that we will never want to withdraw from it. However, Mr. President, I want the Congress to keep its hands on the purse strings and to reduce the amount of the authorization to half a billion dollars or less. Then, if additional appropriations are requested, we can make an additional authorization when the time comes. We shall have an opportunity then to look at the picture, obtain reports, and know how the enterprise is operating. In that way we can better judge the situation. There is no reason why we cannot determine about another authorization at the time when an additional appropriation is needed.

Mr. President, if the joint resolution is amended so as to provide a limit of $500,000,000 in the authorization, with the amendments agreed to this afternoon, one of which, that offered by the Senator from Tennessee, prohibits the making of obligations by the Council and by the administrator of this authority beyond the amounts of appropriations already made, we shall be able to retain essential safeguards, which I think we ought to retain for the protection of our own Government and our own people in launching this tremendous enterprise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] to reduce the authorization from $1,350,000,000 to $350,000,000. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I wish to modify my amendment by limiting the amount of the authorization to $500,000,000 instead of $350,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the calling of the roll has been started and one Senator has voted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from North Carolina has modified his amendment so that the amount of the authorization is to be $500,000,000 instead of $350,000,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the roll call has started and one Senator has voted. Discussion is not in order. Furthermore, after the yeas and nays have once been ordered, a modification of the amendment is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will resume the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present, and I, therefore, withhold my vote.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER'S name was called). I have been asked to announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent on business of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present and voting he would vote as I have voted, and, therefore, I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate by illness. If present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained from the Senate by a slight cold. He has a pair with his colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am advised that if present and voting the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained from the Senate on public business.

If present and voting the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "nay."

If present and voting the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained attending the funeral of Representative Schuetz, of Illinois.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—17

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	McClellan	Wheeler
Butler	Moore	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	O'Daniel	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Overton	Wilson
Ellender	Reynolds	

NAYS—47

Andrews	Gerry	Murray
Austin	Gillette	Nye
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Stewart
Barkley	Gurney	Taft
Bilbo	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Hayden	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Holman	Tunnell
Capper	Jackson	Vandenberg
Caraway	La Follette	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Wallgren
Danaher	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maloney	Weeks
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ferguson	Mead	Wiley
George	Murdock	

NOT VOTING—32

Bankhead	Hill	Revercomb
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Bridges	Kilgore	Russell
Brooks	Langer	Scrugham
Buck	Lucas	Smith
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McNary	Tobey
Chavez	Millikin	Truman
Downey	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Glass	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.
Hawkes	Reed	

So Mr. REYNOLDS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on page 1, line 4, to strike out the figures "$1,350,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "$500,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have sent an amendment to the desk, which I now offer and ask to have stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend article X, on page 15, by the insertion of the following:

SEC. 5. None of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

In the first line on page 11, it is proposed that "Sec. 3" be changed to "Sec. 6."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have no desire to cast any reflection on the good faith of the proponents of the joint resolution, or on those who have already been appointed to administer it.

It is unfortunate that many of us are to be measured as to our desire for permanent world cooperation by our vote upon the pending measure.

It is unfortunate that the joint resolution was not submitted to the Senate without the request for an authorization, so that it could have been worked out thoroughly, and could then have repre-

sented the sentiment of the Congress. It is unfortunate that the people of this country have had no opportunity to express themselves upon the objectives of the joint resolution. It has been drawn by the Executive, and placed before us on a very nebulous foundation.

I say again that it is unfortunate that we have not had opportunity thoroughly to work out the provisions of the pending joint resolution, and thus give adequate expression to the views of those of us who are anxious that we should cooperate in a real and practical movement for rehabilitation of the countries which have been devastated by the war. I have no objection to the appropriation of this vast sum of money for the relief of war-stricken areas. I do say, however, that if we are to provide two-thirds of the money, the high purpose and good will of America should not be submerged by distribution under the administration of twoscore nations which supply the other third. If we subscribe two-thirds of the stock, we certainly should control the business.

Many of us are anxious that other provisions be added to the joint resolution. Many of us are anxious that some means be provided to take care of the starving women and children in the lands which are already occupied by the armies of the Allies, and also in those lands where the Axis Powers are in control. Starving women and children will provide a very weak foundation for those countries for tomorrow. Taking care of them is a present crying need, and a solution of this problem might have been worked out in connection with the joint resolution by proper consideration of it.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to call attention to the fact that the Senate recently adopted a resolution calling upon the State Department to initiate negotiations with the British and others to provide relief for children in the occupied areas to which the Senator refers. The matter could not very well have been included in the pending joint resolution. If what he suggests is to be done, it will have to be done by the International Red Cross. It would have to be the subject of negotiation with the British with regard to relaxation of the blockade. So I think Congress has done all it could, and I have no doubt that the State Department will proceed under the request of Congress to negotiate for the relief the Senator has in mind.

Incidentally, all the countries concerned are willing to provide their own money, so we do not have to furnish money for that particular undertaking. I think it should be perfectly clear that this joint resolution is entirely consistent with the resolution already adopted, and Congress has gone on record, and has asked the State Department to proceed with the other relief to which the Senator refers.

Mr. WILLIS. I thank the Senator. I was not present on the day when the resolution was agreed to, but I am in hearty sympathy with it. The effort has been too long delayed. It seems to me it could well have been made a part of the program we are considering, inasmuch as some of the nations in this present plan have heretofore resisted, and may continue to resist, the effort to provide relief for starving women and children.

Mr. GILLETTE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I suggest to the Senator that, if I understood his proposed amendment right, it proposes to amend article X, on page 15. Article X is a part of the article having to do with United Nations Rehabilitation and Relief, and is not subject to amendment. There is no portion of it on page 15 which is part of the joint resolution and subject to amendment. I am afraid the Senator has not applied his proposed amendment as it should be applied.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I modify my amendment by providing "at the proper place in the joint resolution insert the following"——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. May we have the amendment stated again?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide a safeguard against expansion by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration into the fields of governmental ideology. I am free to say that nowhere in the resolution can one find any provision which might be construed as authority for any such extension on the part of the administration. In the last few years, however, we have seen the present administration exercise the dubious policy of going out into fields entrance into which was not definitely barred by legislation. I wish to have the Senate provide a safeguard for the American people against deviation by the organization from the policy set forth in the agreement, so there may be no expansion by it into fields of governmental ideology. For that purpose, I have offered my amendment.

Since the beginning of the war we have seen the administration exploit many different forms of governmental ideology to the world and to the American people. The administration has talked about the "four freedoms." We have heard something about the Atlantic Charter. These matters all seem to have been forgotten, and now we have this new kind of world organization offered to us. Therefore I am proposing my amendment, so as to provide a safeguard against such expansion as I have spoken of, and so that we may still keep faith with the nations of the world, to assure them that the American people have no purpose and no desire to force any specific ideology, much less our own system in America, upon other nations of the world.

Mr. President, I think we should make clear that none of the funds which are to be appropriated from time to time for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall be used for the purpose of propagandizing for any new system of politics or religion or education. I regret that we could not have had an opportunity to amend the agreement itself to the same effect. The only way I know of providing such a limitation is by keeping our hands upon the purse, and saying that no fund shall be used for such purposes.

Mr. President, I hope to have the hearty and sympathetic support of the Senate for this amendment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. LANGER'S name was called). I make the same announcement as before, that the Senator from North Dakota is absent from the city on official business.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], which I transfer to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained from the Senate by illness. If present and voting he would vote "Nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is detained from the Senate by a slight cold. He has a pair with his colleague, the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained from the Senate on public business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has been called from the Senate to attend a conference.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained attending the

funeral of the late Representative Schuetz, of Illinois.

The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 18, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Ellender	O'Daniel
Andrews	Ferguson	Reynolds
Austin	George	Shipstead
Barkley	Gerry	Taft
Brewster	Gurney	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Holman	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Jackson	Wagner
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Walsh, N. J.
Capper	La Follette	Weeks
Caraway	McClellan	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wherry
Connally	Maloney	White
Danaher	Mead	Wiley
Davis	Moore	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson

NAYS—18

Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bilbo	McFarland	Stewart
Gillette	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Green	Murdock	Tunnell
Guffey	Murray	Wallgren

NOT VOTING—33

Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Langer	Scrugham
Byrd	Lucas	Smith
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McNary	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Truman
Downey	O'Mahoney	Tydings
Glass	Pepper	Walsh, Mass.

So Mr. WILLIS' amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution is open to further amendment.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, before the yea-and-nay vote is taken, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD—I shall not read it, in order to save time—a letter and memorandum with reference to the expenditures by this Government for relief during and following World War No. 1. This tabulation includes money which was loaned for specific relief purposes, as well as money which was appropriated directly or contributed. The tabulation shows that the Government of the United States expended in these loans and gifts of all kinds approximately $2,600,000,000, rather than the $1,350,000,000 carried by the pending joint resolution.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1943.

The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ACHESON: I send you herewith a memorandum on the cost of relief and rehabilitation to the United States in World War No. 1.

There appears to be a great deal of confusion as to what exactly is meant by loans, advances, or grants, so I think this attached memorandum should be considered only as an approximation and not used authoritatively in detail.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

THE COST OF RELIEF AND REHABILITATION TO THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD WAR NO. 1

1. The total cost to the United States of financing relief and rehabilitation in continental Europe in World War No. 1 is estimated at approximately $2,600,000,000. (See attached table.)

2. Of this $2,600,000,000, some $2,300,000,000 represents United States Government loans directly or indirectly for relief and rehabilitation. Approximately $1,000,000,000 of the $2,300,000,000 were loans directly for relief purposes, primarily for foodstuffs. The remaining $1,300,000,000 was spent by foreign governments for relief and rehabilitation supplies against general credits established by the United States Treasury. Only about 10 percent of the $2,300,000,000 of loans was repaid; the remaining 90 percent was, in effect, a gift.

3. The estimated total cost to the United States of financing relief and rehabilitation to continental Europe, $2,600,000,000, was 4 percent of the national income for 1919, which is estimated at $64,200,000,000.[1] The $2,300,000,000 of relief and rehabilitation loans by the United States Government comprised 3.6 percent of the 1919 national income, and the $1,000,000,000 of direct United States Government relief loans totaled 1.5 percent of the national income of that year.

4. The scope of relief covered by the above figures cannot properly be compared with the prospective cost of relief and rehabilitation after the present war, in view of differences in the geographic areas involved, in the composition of relief and rehabilitation supplies required, in the degree of devastation, and in the number of displaced persons, to mention only leading differences.

[1] The estimate of national income is from National Income and Its Composition, 1919–38, by Simon Kuznets, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1941, p. 137, table 1.

Financing of relief and rehabilitation in continental Europe by United States public and private agencies, World War No. 1 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

1. U. S. Government relief loans:[2]	
(a) Prearmistice (to Belgium)	223.2
(b) Armistice and post-armistice	778.3
	1,001.5
2. Other United States loans to continental Europe, Dec. 1, 1919, to Nov. 1, 1920 [2]	1,266.0
3. U. S. Government gifts	37.0
4. Gifts of private agencies	340.0
Total	2,644.5

[1] Source: Relief Deliveries and Relief Loans, 1919–23, and Europe's Overseas Needs, 1919–20, and How They Were Met, League of Nations, 1943.

[2] Only 5 or 6 percent was repaid.

FOOTNOTES TO TABLE 1

NOTE.—Numbers of footnotes refer to items in table 1. Reference is to relief deliveries and relief loans, 1919–23, unless otherwise stated.

1. (a) P. 56, footnote 1, column 10. Official figure of Committee for Relief in Belgium.

1. (b) P. 55. These loans were made by:
1. Liberty loans.
2. U. S. Liquidation Commission.
3. American Relief Administration and U. S. Grain Corporation.

2. Europe's Overseas Needs, 1919–20, and How They Were Met, League of Nations, 1943, pages 25–27, tables 14 and 15. This figure represents mainly United States Treasury advances in addition to the direct relief loans in item 1 (b). Total advances of $2,560, less $778 for direct relief loans, less $215 for advances to the United Kingdom gives the figure of $1,567 for 1919 and 1920. To this may be added advances during December 1918 of $193, giving a total of $1,770. If expenditures not directly related to relief and rehabilitation are deducted, amounting to $504, the figure is $1,266, which is the figure given in the table.

3. Page 7, table 1.

4. Page 7, table 1, and page 26, table 8B.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. CAPPER's name was called). The senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] has been called from the Chamber. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). On this vote, I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who is absent attending the funeral of the late Representative Schuetz. Not knowing how the junior Senator from New Mexico would vote, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I am advised, however, that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who

is absent on public business. I am advised that the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that he would vote as I have voted. Therefore, I permit my vote to stand.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY].

My colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Massachussetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], who is detained in a conference, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I am advised that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who would vote "yea" if present, is detained because of a slight cold. He has a general pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

I am advised that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	George	Murray
Andrews	Gerry	Nye
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Stewart
Ball	Gurney	Taft
Barkley	Hatch	Thomas, Okla.
Bilbo	Hayden	Thomas, Utah
Brewster	Holman	Tunnell
Burton	Jackson	Vandenberg
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Wagner
Connally	La Follette	Wallgren
Danaher	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Maloney	Weeks
Eastland	Maybank	White
Ellender	Mead	Wiley
Ferguson	Murdock	

NAYS—14

Bushfield	Moore	Wheeler
Butler	O'Daniel	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Overton	Willis
Gillette	Reynolds	Wilson
McClellan	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—35

Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Brooks	Kilgore	Russell
Buck	Langer	Scrugham
Byrd	Lucas	Smith
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Tydings
Downey	O'Mahoney	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	Pepper	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) was passed.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1140) to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there shall be in the Department of the Interior an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties in the Department of the Interior as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, or may be required by law. The Assistant Secretaries of the Interior shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of $9,000 per annum. The additional office provided for by this act shall cease to exist at the expiration of 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as determined by the President by proclamation or by the Congress by concurrent resolution.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AUTHORITY TO COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO CONVEY LAND

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday the Senate passed Senate bill 1657, to amend an act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land. On the same day the House passed an identical House bill, H. R. 4059. Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I shall ask unanimous consent that House bill 4059 be considered, with a view to its passage, in which case I shall ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate passed Senate bill 1657, a bill to amend an act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land, be reconsidered, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4059.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The House bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4059) to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922).

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1657 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

SALE OF FISH IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, on Tuesday the Senate passed Senate bill 1641, relative to the sale of shad or herring in the District of Columbia. On the same day the House passed an identical bill, House bill 3997.

Therefore, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I shall ask unanimous consent that the House bill be taken up, with a view to its passage, in which event I shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 1641 was passed, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3997.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3997) to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3997) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the vote by which Senate bill 1641 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill is indefinitely postponed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Sundry employees for appointment and/or promotion in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., of Douglaston, N. Y., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Robert E. Hannegan, resigned; and

Joseph T. Sylvester, of Portland, Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine. (Reappointment.)

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters; and

Frederick G. Newell, to be postmaster at Niagara Falls, N. Y., in place of E. V. Canavan, deceased (reported adversely).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY—SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Martin Travieso to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. McMahon to be associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these two nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF DRY-MILK SOLIDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the unfinished business is House bill 149, the title of which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 149) to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids was announced as next in order.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have been asked by a number of Senators what the prospect is for legislation next week. The unfinished business will no doubt be disposed of within an hour or two on Monday. Barring the possibility of a veto message, which must go first to the House, and which, if the veto is sustained there, will not come to the Senate, I do not anticipate much legislation of importance next week. It may be possible for us to take a recess from Monday until Thursday, and from Thursday until the following Monday, depending upon contingencies which are not absolutely certain at this moment. However, on the whole, I believe that the program will not be heavy next week.

I now move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, February 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from February 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Edward Caswell Wallington, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Carl Ernest Hocker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), subject to examination required by law.

Lt. Col. John William Leonard, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Richmond Trumbull Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John McDonald Thompson, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. James Alward Van Fleet, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Edward Gill Sherburne, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Walter Wood Hess, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Michael Frank Davis, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. John Fuller Davis, Cavalry (temporary brigadier general).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Carl Randolph Mitchell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1944.

Lt. Col. Michael Gerard Healy, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 3, 1944.

Lt. Col. Martin Fred DuFrenne, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 13, 1944.

Lt. Col. Philip Lewis Cook, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 18, 1944.

Lt. Col. Charles Fremont Snell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 21, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Howland Allan Gibson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1944.

Maj. Edward John Kallus, Medical Corps, with rank from March 5, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

Maj. Otis Blaine Schreuder, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 29, 1944.

To be major

Capt. Robert Purcell Rea, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 20, 1944.

To be captains

First Lt. Alf Torp Haerem, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 18, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

First Lt. Stanley David Burton, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 20, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Warren Charles Caldwell, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 12, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James Melvin Epperly, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 8, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Philip Francis Coholan, United States Army, with rank from March 7, 1944.

To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) Marvin Earl Utter, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from January 31, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Loren Thomas Jenks, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 3, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Gervase George Sherwood, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 3, 1944, subject to examination required by law.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Ralph Henry Pugh, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 4, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) James Clarke Griffin, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 12, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Bartholomew Day, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 24, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Charles Edwin Brown, Jr., United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 27, 1944.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Steve Pettie Gaskins, Jr., United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 29, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Martin Travieso to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

John P. McMahon to be associate judge of the municipal court of the District of Columbia.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Irene E. Hodges, Ashville.

COLORADO

Edna A. Kennedy, Peetz.
Alice J. Reed, Sanford.
Merrill D. Harshman, Wiggins.

GEORGIA

Melcena Royal, Ambrose.
Floyd L. Crawford, Appling.
Billy S. Hickman, Colbert.
Cleone M. Fincher, Culloden.

KENTUCKY

Mary M. Stahr, Hickman.

MASSACHUSETTS

Josephine M. Welsh, Sudbury.
Elizabeth C. Kelley, Thorndike.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth P. Bailey, Advance.
Lawrence G. Garvin, Avondale.
Manning B. Mahafee, Caroleen.
Albert K. Dickens, Castalia.
Edelweiss Mishoe, Castle Hayne.
Thomas G. Long, East Rockingham.
Margueritte M. Wells, Henrietta.
Zora Leah Thomas, Hiddenite.
Ruth B. Hickey, Hiwassee Dam.
Ruth R. Wyatt, Hobgood.
Grace Pugh, Hudson.
Carl P. Linn, Landis.
Marion H. Current, Leicester.
Margaret L. Rourk, Leland.
Lossie S. Campbell, Lucama.
Arthur Lee Nicholson, Macon.
Annie F. Briscoe, Mill Spring.
James R. Crutchfield, Moncure.
Elma B. Harris, Mooresboro.
Bessie C. Cox, Newton Grove.
Samuel P. Covington, Pinnacle.
Lawrence V. Sigmon, Rosman.
Sue C. Worsham, Ruffin.
McLain L. Furr, Stanfield.
Hardee C. Butler, Tuxedo.
Maggie S. Cooley, Wagram.
Eva Walker, Walkertown.

PENNSYLVANIA

Emory C. Gardner, Hellam.

VERMONT

Harleigh A Somers, Barnet.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who takest the wings of the morning, we would have Thy Spirit lead us to the ancient pastures of our fathers and bind us again with the ties of human relationships, dispensing the blessings of free government. Do Thou calm all differences and let our devotions be far from the din of the streets and from the tangled thoughts of the crowd. Hear us as we pray: "May the words of our mouth and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer."

O Father of matchless mercy, grant that every crown of prosperity may suggest a brother's cross, every hearthstone remind us of the homeless and those who live and die in solitary places. We pray for an honest, sincere consideration of the opinions of others. There is no quality which has more response than courtesy, the aroma of good conduct; he who sows it reaps love. As fervor and faith are the seeds of democracy, give us such earnestness to do the right that distressed humankind shall be free to stand amid the storms and blasts of time. O may we be servants among men, the nobler of the noble and the truer of the true. While our fair world is wrestling with the demons of darkness may we scorn their inglorious strife, and over the sea and over the tides of iniquitous war let us see Thy face and hold Thy hand. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;

H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; and

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills, a joint resolution, and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 429. An act authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell;

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea;

S. 616. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo;

S. 662. An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes;

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulations No. 1 (a);

S. 866. An act to fix compensation of registers of the district land office in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended;

S. 891. An act for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins;

S. 1028. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 1102. An act for the relief of Helene Murphy;

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge;

S. 1227. An act to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting the Federal officers;

S. 1232. An act to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior;

S. 1272. An act to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross;

S. 1326. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka;

S. 1335. An act to amend the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled "An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain", approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202);

S. 1340. An act to provide for the grading of restaurants in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1387. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1407. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

S. 1421. An act making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1539. An act to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors;

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O–3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1546. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield;

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell;

S. 1579. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933;

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy;

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended;

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia Government and the White House Police force";

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 1669. An act to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets.

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps.

S. 1677 An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property

lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.

S.1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943;

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities; and

S. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate to have printed for its use additional copies of a consolidated edition of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the bill S. 942 to amend the Interstate Commerce Act relative to the regulation of rate bureaus.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a letter I have sent to the London Daily Mail.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Governor of my State, Governor Dewey, yesterday made a rather bold announcement that he was going to insist upon appointing all the justices of our supreme court with the consent of a sort of rubber-stamp State senate. The citizens are limited to the right only to reject his appointment at the polls. His appointees would remain in office until the citizenry acts. This is a rather brazen proposal. He also has the temerity to say that New York City, do or die, shall be compelled to swallow that proposal, but those in the northern part of New York State shall have the right to reject it. That is his idea of equality before the law. It is a sort of a case where a Governor wants to be the legislative as well as the executive branch, and the public be damned. Louis XIV said, before the Parliament of Paris, "L'état, c'est moi"—I am the state—and Governor Dewey now seeks to be the State in its entirety. He would be the "be all and end all" of New York. He would be imperator, nabob, and caliph all rolled into one. His action is a straw in the wind. Let Republican delegates to a coming convention beware.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials from the Pittsburgh Press concerning the soldier vote.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me on February 1 at the annual convention of the American Road Builders held in Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

THE LATE JAMES R. CLAIBORNE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of great regret to me to be forced to announce the death in St. Louis yesterday of the Honorable James R. Claiborne, who served in this House for 4 years during the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses, elected to his first term at large and his second term from what is now the Twelfth District of Missouri.

Everyone who came in contact with Bob Claiborne, as I knew him, held him in high esteem. He was an eminent and distinguished attorney. During the 4 years he served in this House he was devoted to his duties. He was a man who did not hesitate to express his own convictions, and his independence had considerable to do with his retirement from Congress.

His great-grandfather and grandfather were pioneers in Virginia.

Mr. Claiborne had been sick for a number of years, and he leaves a devoted wife as well as a daughter and son. I know that the Members of this House join me in extending our deepest sympathy to his widow and children in their hour of sorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at two points in the RECORD, at one point to include an address delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] at Cincinnati, on February 12, and at the other point to include a newspaper item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make regarding the C. A. A. this afternoon and include therein a list of 672 heroes which I have compiled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the Federal war ballot, with my comments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Lothair Teetor, of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in this morning's Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on more about soldier voting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me before the Republican Clubs of Rhode Island, at Providence, on Saturday, February 12, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I have just listened with mingled feelings of awe and surprise to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] who has taken occasion to remind the House that the present distinguished and able Governor of that State, Thomas E.

Dewey, is planning to foist upon the State of New York the selection of a number of judges without consulting anyone except the members of his own party and the Senate.

My mind goes back to yesteryears, and I think of another distinguished gentleman. He spoke of Louis XIV and his influence upon the French judiciary. I speak of Franklin the Third, and his influence upon the courts of this country, who established the appalling precedent of naming 7 out of the 9 members of the present Supreme Court of the United States, to the Federal district courts 113 as against 80 who were sitting before him, and to the circuit courts of appeal 37 now sitting as against 17 appointed by other Presidents. If a precedent is needed, the distinguished Governor of New York has it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by the Honorable Josephus Daniels regarding a speech delivered by our colleague from California [Mr. IZAC] on the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXCLUSION OF JAPANESE FROM UNITED STATES

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the Congress will speedily pass the pending bill, H. R. 4103, and that such amendments as are permissible under our Constitution extending and strengthening the scope of the act will be adopted.

While I come from a section of the country in which fortunately there are no Japanese, I sympathize deeply with those of my colleagues who live in sections of our Nation where the scourge of the Japanese has so seriously complicated their lives. The problems of California and those States on the west coast are ours also in South Carolina and we are anxious to fully cooperate in the speedy and proper solution of these difficulties.

The President in speaking to us the day following Pearl Harbor referred to December 7, 1941, as "the day of infamy." Indeed, of all the unfortunate experiences our country has had since its birth, none is comparable to the dastardly, unjustified assault made upon us at Pearl Harbor.

Although for 100 years we have been extending a friendly hand to Japan, yet our sympathetic, cooperative efforts have been of no avail. The philosophies of the Japanese people are so diametrically opposed to our ideals they can never be reconciled. Our devoted Christian missionaries and friendly, cooperative commercial and business representatives have labored long and faithfully among these benighted people. Yet, after the expenditure of uncounted moneys and time, not the slightest ray of hope can be observed.

Let me urge upon you, my colleagues, to join with us in broadening the scope of the pending bill so that under its terms eventually every person with Japanese blood flowing in his veins may be for all time excluded from our shores.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 443), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 346 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not exceeding $5,000, which sum is hereby allocated from the amount made available to the Committee on Agriculture by House Resolution 258 in carrying out the terms of House Resolution 38, both of the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTESTED ELECTION: JAMES C. MORELAND, CONTESTANT, AGAINST LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, CONTESTEE

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia, from the Committee on Elections No. 3, submitted the following report on the resolution (H. Res. 444) the contested-election case of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, for printing in the RECORD:

ELECTION CONTEST CASE OF JAMES C. MORELAND, CONTESTANT, AGAINST LEONARD W. SCHUETZ, CONTESTEE, SEVENTH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

The Committee on Elections No. 3, having had under consideration the election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, submit their unanimous report and recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, be dismissed."

STATEMENT

The contestant in his petition alleges that the "contestant actually received at said election more votes than contestee received, and were it not for the several and divers material and substantial incorrections, imperfections, frauds, mistakes, miscounting, mistallying, illegalities, and other wrongs hereinafter set forth, contestant would have been declared to have received more votes and the highest number of votes cast at said election and accordingly elected to said office instead of contestee."

In support of his allegations the contestant in his notice of contest referred to specific wards and precincts in which he contended that "there were sufficient of the aforesaid irregularities and miscounting of votes on the part of the respective election judges and clerks therein to change the result of said election" as it was officially proclaimed. He set out in his notice of contest the number of votes he would gain in each of these wards and precincts upon a recount.

The official return showed that the contestee received a total of 179,906 votes and the contestant received 177,931. This gave the contestee a lead of 1,975 votes over the contestant. There were 1,007 voting precincts in the congressional district.

The contestant in his notice of contest alleges that a recount of these particular wards and precincts to which he specifically referred would show a total gain in votes for the contestant of 4,948.

On the 16th day of February 1943 the contestant petitioned the House of Representatives for an extension of time in which to complete his evidence and indicated in this petition that the reason he desired additional time was for the purpose of making a review or recount of the ballots cast in the general election and in particular the ballots cast in the wards and precincts about which the petitioner has specifically complained in said notice of contest.

On the 6th day of April 1943 the House of Representatives adopted a resolution extending the time for taking testimony by the contestant for 30 days from April 12, 1943.

According to the evidence the contestant and the contestee agreed upon the procedure to be followed in the recount which began on Monday, April 19, 1943, with representatives of both the contestant and contestee present. The recount continued daily through Tuesday, May 4, 1943. During this time the ballots were counted in all of the wards and precincts about which specific complaints were made in the notice of contest with the exception of Leyden Township where it appears that only a comparatively small vote was cast and in which township the contestant claims that a recount would give to the contestant a gain of 22 votes.

At the close of the recount on Tuesday, May 4, 1943, the contestant discontinued any further recount of the ballots although 7 days of the time allotted to the contestant for taking testimony remained and only approximately 42 percent of the total ballots cast had been recounted.

The evidence shows that the precincts counted during this time were the ones in which the contestee received a heavy majority and that while only 42 percent of the total votes cast were counted these votes included approximately 56 percent of the total votes cast for the contestee and only approximately 28 percent of the votes cast for the contestant.

In the recount certain ballots which were disputed by either the contestant or the contestee were not counted for either party and there was a total of 646 such ballots.

Although the total votes received by the contestant and the contestee as shown by the recount varied from the total votes received by the contestant and the contestee as shown by the official count, and although the change represented a gain in votes for the contestant so as to indicate a reduction in the majority of the votes received by the contestee by about 898 votes, still it is clear that this did not give to the contestant a majority of the total votes over the contestee.

The results of this recount made by the contestant of the wards and precincts specifically referred to in his notice of contest fall far short of substantiating the gains in votes for the contestant which the contestant claimed in his notice of election contest such a recount would show, and still leaves the contestee with a clear majority of the total votes cast in the congressional district.

The committee call attention to the fact that according to the evidence the irregularities about which objections were made in the recount by either the contestant or the contestee and the variation in the total votes for the contestant and the contestee in the various precincts as shown by the recount appeared among ballots cast for the contestant as well as among ballots cast for the contestee. As the contestant stated before the committee, "there are many reasons" for this such as improper initialing of ballots by election holders, improper marking of ballots, failure of election holders to initial ballots, spoilation of ballots, and other reasons. As stated above, this included ballots cast for the contestant as well as ballots cast for the contestee. (There is no evidence whatsoever of fraud on the part of the election officials.) So, it is evident that this condition was general and prevailed among all of the ballots cast and it can, therefore, be seen that the gains made by the contestant in the partial review or recount which included only 42 percent of the total ballots cast, but which included at the same time over 56 percent of the ballots cast for the contestee, is by no means conclusive proof that the trend of the change as shown by the recount in favor of the contestant would have continued throughout the recount of all the remainder of the ballots. This is particularly so in view of the fact that the remaining precincts which were not recounted included those in which the contestant received a heavy majority of the votes and about which precincts the contestant made no specific complaint in his petition.

So in reality it appears that the contestant has actually made a recount of all the votes which he challenged in his notice of election contest, for which purpose he requested additional time in which to prepare his evidence, and has admitted in his evidence which he presented to this committee that even after such recount the contestee still has the largest number of total votes.

The contestant discontinued the recount at his own instance 7 days before the time allowed him for taking testimony expired and evidently made no effort to continue the recount after the ballots cast in the precincts about which he made specific complaint in his petition had been recounted.

Under these circumstances the committee does not consider that the results shown by the partial recount submitted as evidence by the contestant is sufficient evidence to warrant the committee entering into a recount of all the ballots cast in the election.

Had the contestant desired to recount all of the ballots cast in this election for the purpose of securing evidence to submit in support of his contest he did not exhaust the remedy afforded him for such a recount.

It is the duty of the contestant to produce evidence sufficient to support the allegations set forth in his petition, and as this committee has heretofore held, it is not the duty of this committee to take upon itself the obligation of securing evidence for either party to a contest for the purpose of substantiating the allegations set forth in an election contest.

In the opinion of the committee the evidence submitted by the contestant does not substantiate the allegations made by the contestant in his notice of election contest.

The committee do not find any evidence of fraud.

The committee recommend that the election contest be dismissed.

Respectfully submitted.

Hugh Peterson, Chairman, Eugene J. Keogh, John L. McMillan, O. C. Fisher, John W. Murphy, Charles A. Plumley, Ralph A. Gamble, Angier L. Goodwin, Homer A. Ramey.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 444) the election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois, be dismissed.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to correct the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER], in his defense of Governor Dewey's court-packing plan in New York City.

The Constitution of the United States provides that members of the Federal bench shall be selected by the President for life, whereas the constitution of the State of New York provides that judges shall be selected for the State courts for a term of years by the citizens through the medium of their vote.

I have always maintained that it is far more wise that the citizens should have this right. To allow the head of the executive department to select the members of the judicial branch has inherent danger. It is my own recollection that Governor Dewey personally opposed the so-called Supreme Court packing plan of a few years ago.

The people of the State of New York have been wise through the last 150 years in their selections. They have selected men of the type of Charles Evans Hughes, Benjamin Cardozo, Frederick E. Crane, and a host of others who were not mere ornaments of the bench but men who did much to establish the law of the country and whose judicial philosophies are still held to be examples of propriety, law, and ethics. What has caused Governor Dewey to demand these Fascistlike powers? Could some gentleman on the other side of the aisle enlighten me on this point?

If the Governor intends to use the Aurelio case as the example of the impropriety of the present system of electing judges, allow me to remind my Governor that far more hand-picked Federal judges have been charged with unethical conduct, malfeasance, and nonfeasance than have those judges who have graced the Supreme Court of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Soldiers' Magazine, on the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Santa Monica Outlook.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRINTING COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF THE SENATE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 34.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use a consolidated edition of 1,000 copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress or the bill (S. 942) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for agreements between common carriers by railroad, between common carriers by pipe line, between common carriers by motor vehicle, between common carriers by water, and between freight forwarders, for the making and filing of rates, fares, charges, or classifications for transportation of passengers and property, and for other purposes.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wondered if it was an oversight on the part of the gentleman from New York who has just addressed the House in enumerating the category of well-known judges who were elected by the voters of New York when he omitted to mention Judge Aurelio. If that was an oversight, I take the opportunity now to supply the omission. I would like to say further that the concern of the other gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] about interference by the Executive in the affairs of the legislative body is a recent thing. Have he and his colleagues of the New Deal forgotten the "must" legislation of the past 8 or 10 years sent down here by the President? I am sure no Republican Governor, least of all the great Governor of the State of New York, will ever be

guilty of sending to any legislative body the kind of "must" legislation which was sent to this body.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE LATE DANIEL BROADHEAD HEINER

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I announce the passing on February 14, 1944, of the Honorable Daniel Broadhead Heiner, a former Member of this body. Mr. Heiner was elected to the Fifty-third and Fifty-fourth Congresses from Armstrong County, Pa.

He was a descendant of a colonial pioneer family, a great-great-grandson of Gen. Daniel Broadhead, a colonel on Gen. George Washington's staff.

He was collector of internal revenue in Pittsburgh during six Presidential administrations. In this capacity he served under Presidents McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. He was admitted to the bar of Armstrong County in 1882 and served as district attorney in this county of Pennsylvania.

Born in Kittanning, Pa., in 1854, Mr. Heiner was graduated from Allegheny College and Dickinson Law School. During his lifetime, he was a prominent banker and a Republican leader.

Mr. Heiner had been married 58 years and his wife, Mrs. Belle Acheson Heiner, preceded him in death only 4 days, having passed away on February 10, 1944. He is survived by one son, William Graham Heiner, Esq., of Pittsburgh.

It was my privilege to know him real well. Armstrong County and the State of Pennsylvania have lost an outstanding citizen.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

APPOINTMENT OF NEW YORK STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned about the speeches that have taken place here this morning in regard to the conditions in my State, New York State, and I am not going to stand here to try to defend any particular judge. The voters of New York City took their stand and named their choices for the existing vacancies. I would like to call attention to the gentleman who preceded me, that when our President or any President, as a matter of fact, names one to the Federal bench he does so with the endorsement of the Senate. New York's Governor does not want any such limitation of the powers he seeks. Furthermore, if the Governor of our State desires to establish one procedure in regard to the nomination of the judges in our State, I do not see how he can expect to apply it only to New York City and not to the entire State. If it is the consensus of opinion in New York that the Governor of New York shall appoint or name the judges with the consent of the New York State Senate, I think the same thing should apply to the entire State and not only to New York City.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a resolution relating to small business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on January 23, pertaining to our distinguished and esteemed colleague, Hon. ROBERT CROSSER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief letter addressed to the instructors of Hunter College by the president of that college.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Elizabeth (N. J.) Daily Journal entitled "Union Dues for Prisoners of War."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address I delivered with reference to the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the regular business of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Idaho Granger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert the so-called Federal ballot, this bobtail ballot, just as it is printed in the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARSHALL FIELD BANQUET

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, last night Fulton Lewis, Jr., in a Nation-wide broadcast over the radio, left the impression that in my speech on yesterday relative to the Marshall Field banquet, I was interfering with the freedom of the press.

How any intelligent man could have come to that conclusion is more than I can understand.

It is not interfering with freedom of the press to demand that Marshall Field pay taxes on his vast income, just as other men do.

It is not interfering with freedom of the press to demand that he pay taxes on that part of his income which he is now wasting in riotous living, or on useless or subversive publications, such as PM.

While our boys are fighting and dying to protect American institutions, and while their fathers and mothers are saving and scraping to get every dollar they can to buy bonds and pay taxes, I submit that it is no time for a man like Marshall Field to escape taxes on a $70,000,000 income of which he never earned a cent, or to escape taxes on that part of his annual income used to finance a publication that is attempting to destroy the very things for which those boys are fighting.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
United States House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the following-named committees: Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress; Expenditures in the Executive Departments; Invalid Pensions; Public Lands; Roads; War Claims.

Respectfully yours,

DANIEL K. HOCH,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignations are accepted.

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 30]

Arends	Flannagan	McCowen
Baldwin, Md.	Ford	McMillan
Bates, Mass.	Fulmer	Morrison, La.
Bell	Gamble	Newsome
Bloom	Gifford	O'Brien, Ill.
Brehm	Gordon	O'Leary
Brooks	Gorski	Pfeifer
Burch, Va.	Halleck	Philbin
Chapman	Hare	Pracht, C. Frederick
Cole, N. Y.	Hartley	Price
Costello	Hobbs	Reed, Ill.
Courtney	Hoch	Richards
Cullen	Jennings	Robsion, Ky.
Curley	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rowan
Dawson	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Dewey	Kee	Short
Dingell	Keogh	Smith, Va.
Dirksen	Kirwan	Smith, W. Va.
Domengeaux	Knutson	Snyder
Doughton	Landis	Taylor
Douglas	Lesinski	Whelchel, Ga.
Elston, Ohio	Lynch	White
Fenton		Winter
Fish		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read:

FEBRUARY 17, 1944.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully yours,
ROGER C. SLAUGHTER.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Rules: ROGER C. SLAUGHTER, Missouri.

Banking and Currency: DANIEL K. HOCH, Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a question of the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege of the House is set forth in a resolution (H. Res. 446) which I send to the Clerk's desk, and on that I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on February 15, 1944, the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate of the United States, where it is now pending, a treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, which was signed in Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, including a report on the treaty made to him by the Secretary of State (Executive A, 78th Cong., 3d sess.); and

Whereas under the terms of said treaty, the United States of America disposes of certain waters of the Colorado River by alloting them to Mexico in guaranteed annual quantities, and provides for the delivery of said waters, thereby invading the privilege of the House; and

Whereas said treaty makes provision for use in the beneficial interest of Mexico of certain public works on the Colorado River, for which public works citizens of the State of California and of other States have obligated themselves to pay, under contracts with the Secretary of the Interior; and

Whereas the Congress enacted the Boulder Canyon Project Act (Public, 642, 70th Cong., approved Dec. 21, 1928), in section I of which the Congress authorized the construction of the Boulder Dam and a main canal and appurtenant structures located entirely within the United States now known as the All-American Canal "for the purpose of controlling the floods, improving navigation, and regulating the flow of the Colorado River, providing for storage and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof for reclamation of public lands and other beneficial uses exclusively within the United States, and for the generation of electrical energy as a means of making the project herein authorized a self-supporting and financially solvent undertaking"; and

Whereas under the terms of the said Boulder Canyon Project Act, citizens of the State of California have entered in good faith into contracts with the Secretary of the Interior for the purchase of electrical energy in such quantities and at such prices, and have entered into contracts for the payment of construction costs and operating expenses of the All-American Canal, necessary to make the said projects self-supporting and financially solvent undertakings under the terms of said act; and

Whereas at a conference of the Governors of the seven States of the Colorado River Basin, held at Denver, Colo., in August 1927, the said Governors unanimously adopted a memorial to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of State, the essence of which is contained in the following words, to wit:

"Now, therefore, and to the end that no unfortunate misunderstanding may arise between the United States of America and the United States of Mexico, and that no false encouragement may be given to present or future developments along the Colorado River in the United States of Mexico, we the Governors of all seven of the Colorado River States, with our interstate river commissioners and advisers in conference assembled in the city of Denver on this 26th day of August 1927, do hereby in great earnestness and concern make common petition that a note be dispatched to the Government of the United States of Mexico calling attention to that Government to the fact that neither it nor its citizens or alien investors have any legal right as against the United States of America or its citizens to a continuance of the flow of the Colorado River for beneficial purposes, and that the United States of Mexico can expect no such continuance except to the extent that, as a matter of comity, the two Governments may declare hereafter by treaty and that especially under no circumstances can the United States of Mexico hope to use water made available through storage works constructed or to be constructed within the United States of America, or hope to found any right upon any use thereof." (Hearings, House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on H. R. 5773, pt. 2, p. 202, January 1928); and

Whereas paragraph 2 of section 3, article IV of the Constitution of the United States of America provides, "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States or of any particular State": Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby instructed to inquire into the facts hereinbefore recited and any other facts deemed pertinent thereto by said committee, and report to this House as soon as practicable:

First. Whether the waters of the Colorado River, or any of them arising within the United States are "property belonging to the United States," within the meaning and sense of the Constitution.

Second. Whether a treaty in which the United States disposes of the waters of the Colorado River, or any of them arising within the United States, to the United States of Mexico, without action by the Congress is authorized by the Constitution.

Third. Whether a treaty disposing of the waters of the Colorado River, or any of them arising within the United States, to the United States of Mexico, to which any State makes claim that such disposition is prejudicial to such State, is authorized by the Constitution, such claim notwithstanding.

Fourth. Whether the public works known as Boulder Canyon Dam and the All-American Canal, and their incidental works and appurtenant structures are "property belonging to the United States" within the meaning of the Constitution.

Fifth. Whether a treaty which disposes of any portion of the beneficial use of such dam, canal, works, or structures to the United States of Mexico, without action by the Congress, is authorized by the Constitution.

Sixth. Whether a treaty making disposition of such beneficial use to which disposition any State shall make claim that its rights or interests are prejudiced thereby is authorized by the Constitution.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would not employ this unusual procedure except that the matter I have brought before the House is one of gravest importance to the people of my State and of the other States of the Colorado River Basin.

I feel strongly that the prerogatives of this House are so deeply involved that this matter should be given the most thorough study and careful deliberation lest we discover at some future date that we have waived our rights and through inaction abandoned much of our control over public funds.

The pending treaty with Mexico for distribution of water of the Colorado River presents some of the most vital questions that have been raised in international affairs in this hemisphere. Far-reaching constitutional issues are involved as well as the interests of several million people residing in the areas intended to be benefited by the Boulder Canyon Project Act.

Before discussing the particular points which I deem worthy of special study, I

wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the taxpayers of southern California alone have obligated themselves to the extent of approximately one-half billion dollars in paying for these monumental public works that were intended primarily to benefit the citizens of this country. By guaranteeing to pay for the construction of Boulder Dam, the 250-mile-long Colorado River aqueduct, the huge power lines, Parker Dam, and the All-American Canal, they have committed themselves to reimburse the Federal Government for many millions of dollars advanced to finance these undertakings.

The provisions of this treaty appear to take away a large part of the benefits expected from these works. As a result, a storm of protest already has arisen in California and such serious questions raised that my resolution should be adopted speedily and these doubtful points weighed thoroughly.

I think this House should know of some of the reactions in southern California to the announcement that the United States had agreed to deliver to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet of water annually.

The City Council of Los Angeles has by unanimous vote authorized a telegram of protest against ratification of the treaty. The city's official objections have been transmitted to both the President and the Senate. In addition, the City Council has approved the employment by the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of a special expert to analyze the treaty and prepare exhibits showing the detrimental effect this international agreement will have on the taxpayers of the community.

The directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, after hearing that ratification of the treaty would in effect give Mexico first priority on a large part of the water discharged from Boulder Dam, asked Governor Warren to intercede with President Roosevelt in an attempt to have this treaty modified so the interests not only of California but of Arizona will be adequately protected.

The reason why this agreement is considered of such vital importance to Los Angeles has been emphasized by Mayor Bowron. Pointing out the people of Los Angeles and other communities making up the metropolitan water district have committed themselves to an outlay of $220,000,000 for an adequate water supply, the mayor last week declared the treaty may definitely limit the growth of the Los Angeles area. If this water distribution agreement is ratified, the ability to furnish an adequate water supply for a population of 10,000,000—which would be a reality within a short space of time at the recent rate of growth of these communities—would be seriously jeopardized. There is a grave question whether new industries could be assured the necessary water for their operations if the limitations resulting from the treaty are imposed.

The California State Chamber of Commerce has shown a definite concern about the consequences of this international agreement. The question was raised by Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, one of our most noted educators and public figures, who is chairman of the State chamber's natural resources committee, whether this treaty should not make Mexico's allotment of anything over 750,000 acre-feet of water unconditionally junior to the rights and claims of the other parties to the interstate compact and the contract between the Federal Government and the States of California and Arizona.

This House should not overlook the fundamental fact, Mr. Speaker, that the Boulder Canyon Act, designed to make water from the Colorado River available to the citizens of the United States, was enacted by both Houses of Congress. This treaty, in my opinion, will have the effect of amending this great piece of legislation. And, I should like to point out, the amendment would be accomplished by the executive branch of the Government with the approval of two-thirds of the Members of one branch of the Congress.

The contract between the Federal Government and the States of Arizona and California apportioning the waters discharged from Boulder Dam likewise was put into effect by legislation requiring the approval of both Houses of Congress. There is a grave question whether this contract can be modified or altered merely by ratification of a treaty or whether the parties to the contract—which means the entire Congress—should not give their consent to any changes.

One very essential point which deserves painstaking deliberation is the way this treaty would commit the Congress to future expenditures that are not even estimated in any of the papers accompanying the treaty. Under the pact now awaiting ratification, the United States agrees to construct a new regulating dam and reservoir on the Colorado River at an unnamed site between Boulder Dam and Parker Dam. In addition, this country is obligated to construct or acquire works needed to deliver the specified water to Mexico at the various diversion points.

If this provision of the treaty becomes operative, this House at some future time will be called upon to appropriate unknown sums of money to finance these operations. No specific authorization ever has been voted for such undertakings. As a result, a point of order might lie against the appropriation. If the money were not forthcoming, the United States would not carry out all of its pledges to Mexico and the treaty in all likelihood would be held to have been automatically invalidated. Embarrassing international consequences easily could result, straining the good will between our two Republics.

The net effect of this treaty, Mr. Speaker, is to deprive the citizens of a large portion of the Nation of rights and property. In simple terms, the United States would be disregarding the treasured "due process" clause of the Constitution.

Water in the southwestern portion of this country is one of the most valuable of all properties. For the United States to give to Mexico without the specific permission of the whole Congress a substantial portion of this prized possession would be a flagrant contradiction of the constitutional guaranty that no citizen shall be deprived of his property without due process of law.

The adoption of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, would not affect adversely our international relations. Nor would it have any injurious effect on any of the people of this country. The problem of reaching an agreement on distribution of this water has been before us for more than a score of years, so there is no need for haste in ratification of this treaty.

Not only should the House be advised as to its rights in this vital matter, but the people of the Western States are entitled to sufficient time to study the complicated provisions of the treaty and the far-reaching consequences which may flow from it. They should be afforded an opportunity to prepare exhibits and collect evidence which should be weighed before the treaty is ratified. The adoption of my resolution undoubtedly would help prevent hasty action, thus enabling these affected parties to protect their rights and safeguard their interests.

I am advised that requests have been made for postponement of action on this treaty in the other body, and that both of the distinguished gentlemen from my State asked for this courtesy, since they feel the effects of the treaty would be decidedly contrary to the welfare of our people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that adoption of my resolution will harmonize completely with their attitude on the question.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to read from the letter of the Secretary of State to the President which accompanied the treaty that was transmitted to the other body. On page 3 of his document appears this language:

> Part III, which is divided into six articles, prescribes the rules that are to govern the allocation and delivery to Mexico of a portion of the waters of the Colorado River. By article 10 the United States guarantees to Mexico a minimum quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water each year, this water to be delivered in accordance with schedules to be furnished in advance by the Mexican section of the Commission. Beyond this minimum quantity the United States will allocate to Mexico, whenever the United States section decides there is a surplus of water, an additional quantity up to a total, including the 1,500,000 acre-feet, of not more than 1,700,000 acre-feet per year.

Mr. Speaker, competent engineering authority has disclosed in a memorandum which I hold in my hand that the contracts already entered into by the Secretary of the Interior with the people of the States of California and Arizona for the waters of the Colorado River, which are there available, are in all probability far in excess of the average amount which will be available from those public works. To further allocate 1,500,000 acre-feet to the United States of Mexico will no doubt seriously impair the rights and privileges of the people of those States and their right to the enjoyment they have had under the Colorado River Compact and which they hope to enjoy in the future.

I understand that just recently the State of Arizona through its Governor has signed a contract and that the Governor intends to call a meeting of the State legislature to ratify that contract. I see the gentleman from Arizona is on his feet. May I ask him if that is true?

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to confirm what the gentleman from California has just said. The Governor of Arizona has signed a contract for 2,800,000 acre-feet of water out of Lake Mead and has called the State legislature to act upon it. I think all the waters of the lower Colorado River available in the lower basin have been contracted for and disposed of, besides what has been put to beneficial use, so that there probably is no such amount of firm water to be had for Mexico as is said to be provided for in the treaty, without depriving some of our own lands of water.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California who so ably represents the district embracing the famous Imperial and Coachella Valleys.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The amount which Arizona would want is 2,800,000 acre-feet. I wish the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] would point out that the water being offered Mexico in this treaty is firm water, that is, water which comes ahead, sufficiently down in the priority scale of water that it would take away other water which the people think they are sure of getting.

Mr. HINSHAW. I can see nothing in the treaty which indicates that the water to be allocated to Mexico is other than firm water. I desire to read from part III, article 10, of the proposed treaty, a subparagraph:

Of the waters of the Colorado River, from any and all sources, there are allotted to Mexico:

(a) A guaranteed annual quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet (1,850,234,000 cubic meters) to be delivered in accordance with the provisions of article 15 of this treaty.

Mr. Speaker, the run-off into the basin of the Colorado River has a minimum flow of approximately 4,000,000 acre-feet per year and a maximum flow of approximately 28,000,000 acre-feet over the past 45 years that are of record. The public works that have been built upon the Colorado River are very largely for the purpose of storing the excess waters in time of excess in order that they may be used in the times when there is a drought.

It is figured by the engineers that there is available for use on the Colorado River not more annually than a total of 16,000,000 acre-feet. That amount of water is to be allocated to the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and California. Under the terms of the contracts that are already entered into by the Secretary of the Interior, the entire 16,000,000 acre-feet average flow has been allocated to the various interests of the various States, and perhaps more.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in my remarks I desire to insert a certain matter which has been presented to me by the engineers, concerning the contracts that have been entered into under the Boulder Canyon Project Act, and other matters relating thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NOTES ON COLORADO RIVER

MEXICO

1. The Colorado River drains about one-thirteenth of the area of the United States.

2. Total area of drainage basin in the United States—242,000 square miles.

3. Total area of drainage basin in Mexico—2,000 square miles.

4. All of the water supply of the river comes from the United States.

5. Mexico contributes no part of the water supply of the river.

6. Mexico has no storage sites where the river flow could be impounded.

7. Mexico received all water used prior to construction of Boulder Dam from diversions made in the United States.

8. Mexico, because of existing treaty provisions, can build no diversion dam on the river without permission from the United States.

9. Mexico's maximum use of Colorado River water from natural flow (prior to construction of Boulder Dam) was 750,000 acre-feet in 1925.

10. Mexico's use of Colorado River water during period 1920 to 1930 (maximum period prior to Boulder Dam) averaged 600,000 acre-feet per year. In 1934 (lowest river flow of record) Mexico received only 228,000 acre-feet.

11. Mexico could not have continued irrigation of all land under cultivation prior to Boulder Dam if the United States had not controlled the floods and silt.

12. Mexico has an extensive underground water basin in the delta which should be fully explored to determine yield by pumping which would be available and could be used to firm up surface supply during periods of low river flow. This amount should be part of the river water apportioned to Mexico.

13. Mexico was offered 750,000 acre-feet per annum by the American section of the International Water Commission in 1929–30, after exhaustive investigation of entire Colorado River situation. This amount was considered to be just and generous by American section.

COLORADO RIVER COMPACT BETWEEN STATES OF RIVER BASIN

14. Has been ratified by all of the Basin States, except Arizona, and has been approved by the United States.

15. Apportions by paragraph 3 (a) from waters available in the Colorado River system ("system" is defined as including the main stream and all of its tributaries within the United States) the beneficial consumptive use, to (a) States of the upper division (Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico), a total of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum, and to (b) States of the lower division (Nevada, California, and Arizona), a total of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum.

16. By paragraph 3 (b), permits the States of the lower division to increase their use by an additional 1,000,000 acre-feet per annum.

17. By paragraph 3 (c), provides that if the United States recognizes a right in Mexico to any Colorado River water, such water shall be supplied first from waters in system which are surplus over those specified by paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b); if such not sufficient, each division shall bear deficiency equally. (Theoretical surplus is over 2,000,000 acre-feet.)

18. By paragraph 3 (d), the States of upper division are not to cause flow of river at Lee Ferry (division point at Utah-Arizona boundary between upper and lower divisions) to be depleted below an aggregate of 75,000,000 acre-feet for any period of 10 consecutive years.

19. There is much ambiguity in the terms of the compact, which has resulted in controversies as to their meaning and application. The basis of division of the water was not that of the most feasible or economic use of the water; it was arbitrary and gave far greater protection to the States of the upper division than to those of the lower division. Construction of Boulder Dam and the All-American for the control of floods and silt, regulation of water supply, and elimination of international difficulties was of great and vital importance. California had no alternative other than accept the compact, in order to secure these works.

BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ACT (45 STAT. 1057)

20. Authorizes construction of Boulder Dam and All-American Canal to provide for storage of Colorado River waters and delivery thereof for reclamation of public lands and other beneficial uses "exclusively within the United States."

21. Provided that before any money be appropriated for construction, the Secretary of the Interior make provision by contracts for revenues sufficient to repay cost of works to the United States.

22. Provided that no person shall have the use of stored water, except by contract with the Secretary of the Interior, such contracts to be for "permanent service."

23. Provided that the act should not become effective unless and until (a) all seven basin States ratified Colorado River Compact, or (b) if said States failed to ratify within 6 months, then when six of the States, including California, ratified compact, and in addition (c) California bound itself by act of its legislature to limit its beneficial consumptive use (diversions less returns to the river) of Colorado River water to not exceed 4,400,000 acre-feet of compact paragraph 3 (a) water plus not more than one-half of any excess of surplus waters unapportioned by the compact.

24. Provided that the act should be subject to Colorado River Compact.

25. Arizona did not ratify compact, the other States did, and therefore California by act of its legislature accepted the limitation on use of water as provided by the act, in order to assure construction of the works authorized by the Boulder Dam Act.

CALIFORNIA CONTRACTS

26. Users of power in California have entered into contracts with the United States which provide for (a) repayment to the United States of the entire cost of Boulder Dam and power plant with interest (except for $25,000,000 of the cost of the dam charged to flood control, payment of which is deferred for a period of years) plus (b) payment of $300,000 annually to each of the States of Arizona and Nevada in lieu of taxes, and plus (c) payment of $500,000 annually into a fund to be used for other developments in the Colorado River Basin.

27. Users of water in California have entered into contracts with the United States providing for repayment in full to the United States of the cost of the All-American Canal and for delivery of water totaling 5,362,000 acre-feet per year, under the following priorities:

	Acre-feet
First priority: To agriculture (Palo Verde Valley, Yuma Indian project, Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley)	3,850,000
Second priority: To the metropolitan district of southern California	550,000
Third priority: To the metropolitan district of southern California 550,000 acre-feet and to the city and county of San Diego 112,000 acre-feet (on equal priority)	662,000
Fourth priority: To agriculture	300,000
Total	5,362,000

28. Projects to use this water are either constructed or well advanced in construction on which expenditures of several hundred millions of dollars have been made. The people of southern California have mortgaged their farms, their homes, and their business to guarantee repayment.

SITUATION ON RIVER BELOW LEE FERRY

29. Records prepared by Bureau of Reclamation show that for periods such as 1897 to 1908 and 1930 to 1940, the upper States would have to reduce use to less than 7,500,000 acre-feet per year in order to meet compact obligation of 75,000,000 acre-feet in 10-year period at Lee Ferry. This means that development in lower States from main stream must be based on not to exceed average of 7,500,000 acre-feet per year being available at Lee Ferry.

30. Considering inflow to river below Lee Ferry and use of large storage in Lake Mead, release at Boulder Dam during critical periods of 8,500,000 acre-feet per year will be possible.

31. On this basis, we find the following situation:

	Acre-feet
Available below Boulder Dam per year	8,500,000
Reservoir and other river losses below Boulder	600,000
Available balance	7,900,000
Nevada contract	300,000
California contracts (existing projects)	5,362,000
Arizona, requested contract [1]	2,800,000
	8,462,000
Deficit	562,000
If Mexico is conceded use prior to Boulder Dam	750,000
Deficit	1,312,000
Additional guaranteed Mexico by proposed treaty	750,000
Total deficit	2,062,000

[1] In addition, Arizona is asking for ½ of any excess or surplus waters unapportioned by the compact but as such is so far beyond any possible available water, no allowances has been included.

32. On the basis of allowing water for only what may be termed "present existing projects," on the main river below Boulder Dam, the following situation exists: (All uses shown are "consumptive" uses.)

	Acre-feet	
Available below Boulder Dam per year		8,500,000
Reservoir and other river losses below Boulder		600,000
Available balance		7,900,000
Nevada contract		300,000
California contracts		5,362,000
Arizona:		
Indian projects	360,000	
Yuma project	200,000	
Gila project [1] (first unit)	600,000	
		1,160,000
		6,822,000
Available for Mexico		1,078,000
Guaranteed Mexico by proposed treaty		1,500,000
Deficit to be made up by lower States [2]		422,000

[1] The Gila project, for full development of all its units as proposed, would require 2,000,000 acre-feet; to date only the first unit is under construction.

[2] This is on the assumption that all waste, drainage, and other return-flow waters could be charged to Mexico, which is quite improbable; actually the deficit would be greater—nearer to 600,000 acre-feet.

33. Except during critical periods of low flow, there will be varying amounts of surplus water available in the lower river. While projects in the United States, due to their cost and type, could not be justified upon the use of such water, Mexico could use it to advantage. In the lower delta in Mexico water can be put on the land at a very low cost and could justify being left idle when water was not available. Furthermore, pumping from the underground basin in Mexico, would make it possible to offset shortages during critical periods.

34. In view of all of the foregoing, it would seem that since any use of water in Mexico from the Colorado River must be at the expense of lands in the United States, the most which should be guaranteed Mexico would be the amount used from natural flow prior to the construction of Boulder Dam—750,000 acre-feet. Use of any additional water by Mexico should be made subject to a prior right of contracts made by the Secretary of the Interior for Boulder Dam water.

FEBRUARY 8, 1944.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the Boulder Canyon Dam was built for a great purpose. It was built for the purpose of holding back the waters of the Colorado River and also for the retention of silt. To the best of my knowledge, the Colorado River carries more silt by several times than any other great river in the world. The Boulder Canyon Dam provides for the retention of 1,400,000 acre-feet of silt in the next 50 years. If it were not for the Boulder Canyon Dam, the delta land lying in Mexico would be overrun by destructive floods nearly every year. To that extent, of course, the works of the Boulder Canyon Dam benefit Mexico.

There are other benefits proposed, but in the course of this treaty we find that the United States, as provided in article 12, is to build a regulating dam, known as Davis Dam, at a point between Boulder Dam and Parker Dam. Of course, that project was authorized by the Congress in the enactment known as section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. It was provided that the cost of that dam should be recovered to the Federal Government through the sale of power to the people in the United States, all of the costs of that dam being allocated to power. The repayment to the Government is expected to take place in 40 years at 3-percent interest through the sale of power. None of the funds being expended on that dam have been allocated to the purpose of river regulation.

Approximately $7,000,000 has already been appropriated by this Congress for the purpose of building the Davis Dam. Crews were working in pursuance to a contract let to the Utah Construction Co., and the work was stopped by orders of the War Production Board in December of 1942. That matter, of course, is still pending. The Davis Dam is considered in this treaty as part of the works that are agreed to be constructed by the United States for the purpose of providing a regulated flow of water to the United States of Mexico. Yet at the same time the people who are to purchase the power from the Davis Dam will be required to repay to the Federal Government the entire cost of that dam.

An estimate furnished to me this morning by the Department of the Interior indicates the cost of the Davis Dam, on a pre-war basis, would be $41,200,000, all of which amount the users of power would be obligated to repay to the Federal Government in the price of electrical energy.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a memorandum on behalf of the Committee of Fourteen of the seven Colorado River Basin States and I desire to call attention to certain matters that they have set forth in this report. I desire to place in the RECORD at this point a number of points raised by the Committee of Fourteen, for the perusal of the Congress.

There is one matter contained on page 70 of this report that I should like to read:

> The United States has conducted the Boulder Canyon project and the local agencies have invested hundreds of millions of dollars in the construction of their facilities on the faith in the provision in the Boulder Canyon Project Act that the stored waters of the Colorado River are for beneficial uses exclusively in the United States.
>
> Any material allotment to Mexico of stored water would amount to partial repeal by a treaty of the most important provisions of this act.

Elsewhere it points out in this report that every drop of water that is sent over the line into Mexico would decrease the amount of available water in the United States and thereby cause the future development of that much land in the United States to be retarded, if not absolutely prevented, whereas the United States of Mexico would achieve additional development far beyond anything historical from the use of the water.

It is well known that water to the West is as dear as life itself. Without water there is no life. That is one of the reasons, or the principal reason, why we have come before the Congress in the past asking for the cooperation of the United States through the Congress in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution to enable us to better utilize this water. In so doing we have guaranteed to repay those moneys advanced by the United States pursuant to acts of Congress and are repaying those moneys to the United States faithfully. It is no expense to the United States whatever. It is an expense to our people who use the water and the power, and we are proud to repay the advances with interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the matter is fully set forth in the remarks which I have made. I would like to recall to the House once more in conclusion paragraph 2 of section 3, article IV of the Constitution of the United States of America, which provides:

> The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States, and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States or any particular State.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Regardless of the merits or demerits of the treaty, will the

gentleman at that point amplify his reasons as to how the Congress, that is the House, has jurisdiction of the matter, when it appears it is purely a question of whether or not the Senate of the United States shall ratify or reject the treaty?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have set forth the facts in the resolution which I have submitted but I shall be glad to repeat briefly for the gentleman. The wording of that portion of the Constitution, which I have just read, says that "the Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States." It is claimed this property which is being disposed of to the United States of Mexico is "property" within the meaning and sense of the Constitution. Therefore Congress itself, not one body of Congress or an executive agency, has power to dispose of that property.

Mr. THOMASON. Assuming that the Committee on the Judiciary of the House should agree with the contention of the gentleman, just what could that committee or the House do in connection with the matter except to express their feeling regarding the proposed treaty, or make recommendations to the other body as to how they should dispose of the matter?

Mr. HINSHAW. I may say to the gentleman that I believe that to be the proper function of the Congress, that is, both Houses, the Congress and the President as the approving authority, and it should in all probability enact legislation amending the act relating to the disposition of the waters of the Colorado River and provide for their equitable distribution through an amendment to that act. At the same time, no doubt, the Congress would be willing to consider any damage that was wrought upon the users of that water who believe, by virtue of the fact they are going to pay for it, that they may be entitled, perhaps under the due process clause, to reimbursement or offset for some of the cost they have obligated themselves to pay which will accrue to the benefit of Mexico.

Mr. THOMASON. I am not prepared to argue the merit or demerit of the treaty with the gentleman, but I just wondered if he has any precedent in a matter of this sort, when my quick reaction to it is that the other body has sole and exclusive power and authority to either ratify or reject that treaty.

Mr. HINSHAW. There are precedents in the House and I can refer the gentleman to volume III of Hinds Precedents and items 2563 and 2564, which the gentleman can study.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Last year we had a bill which was submitted to and passed by the Congress providing for the ceding to the Republic of Panama some territory belonging to the United States in the confines of the Panama Canal Zone.

Prior to that we had had a treaty negotiated, but the State Department felt then that an act of Congress was necessary in order to have the United States dispose of this territory, even though there had already been a treaty. It seems to me that that might be a precedent during this very Congress for the action that my colleague from California is now recommending.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to my colleague from California, and thank my friend from Ohio, a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, for his pointed observation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not possible, in reply to the gentleman who just asked about a precedent, that you will not find many cases in which the United States, through an executive agency, has attempted to give away the property of the United States? It must be understood that Mexico supplies no water to the upper and lower basins from which it is to be given water. Further, Mexico, as a nation, has no technical claim whatever upon this water. There is a casual right which we are willing to recognize, for perhaps 700,000 acre-feet; no more. The rest is an outright gift, not merely of property, if water is property, but of interests in actual physical property, because there are construction works upon the river which have been built by citizens of the United States, and which belong to the United States, which, under this treaty, are being given to Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the integrity of this House is directly involved, if under the act, in this case I think the Swing-Johnson Act, a certain division of water is set up, and the people of an area, no matter where that area may be, obligate themselves to reimburse the United States on the basis of the word of Congress in a bill which originates in this House of the Congress, and which must be passed by both Houses of Congress.

The people of an adjoining area, represented by the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] and others, have put up some $220,000,000 for the construction of an aqueduct and necessary facilities adjacent to and part of that aqueduct. Theirs is the water that is being given away. The first 3,850,000 acre-feet go to agriculture in the district which I represent. The next 550,000 acre-feet go to the metropolitan water district area, of which I have just spoken, and the next water, which is being given to Mexico by the Department of State through this treaty, is water which the county of San Diego and the county of Los Angeles expect to drink in the years when they will most need it. I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] on the able and courageous manner in which he has presented to Congress the attempted violation of the integrity of this House.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He may be in slight error as to the exact priority but his principle is correct.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. It so happens that 112,000 acre-feet that the city and county of San Diego are to get as a result of the building of $400,000,000 worth of aqueducts and dams is not firm water. It is what we get after all the rest is taken care of, after all of the other people of the upper basin States and the lower basin States and apparently the Republic of Mexico—after all their wants are satisfied we may get 112,000 acre-feet. It is not firm water such as this million and a half that is proposed to be given to Mexico.

Mr. HINSHAW. In all probability if the provisions of this treaty are carried through the city of San Diego will be without this available water in a short time.

Mr. IZAC. Of course, if this war continues and they should pass such a treaty as this, there is no doubt in my mind that there would be reaction from the Army and Navy because we would not have enough water there to take care of the Military and Naval Establishments. So they would see that we would get our water in some way. But, after the war is over the city and county of San Diego will be standing on their own, and there will be no Army and Navy to help us out, and I am wondering what is going to happen to the development of that section of California.

Mr. HINSHAW. It will be smothered, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. IZAC. Water is very necessary for our very life. Here is the point of this whole thing: We have built an all-American canal with American money. We are now proposing that Mexico come up there and use that canal. We let them not only use the works, the concrete, the canal, and all, but we permit them to have 500,000 acre-feet out of that canal, which was never contemplated when it was built. That is just one feature of this thing.

The next thing I would like to call attention to is this: If we pass a treaty of this kind we say to Mexico, "You have no right, under comity or under legal rules to more than you received before our works were installed. However, we are going to give you just double the amount that you used before because we want to be fair and we want to be good neighbors."

I think that would be very fine were it not for the fact that in so doing we are depriving American citizens of the thing that we are so generous with.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona whose State is vitally concerned in this issue.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have not yet read this treaty. I want to assure the gentleman that I am tremendously interested in this, because it is of vital importance. Does this treaty provide for any expenditure of funds? Or does the putting of it into effect call for appropriations?

Mr. HINSHAW. It provides that the United States shall be obligated to construct certain public works, which in my humble opinion, is an obligation to expend public funds. On the other hand, we all know that this treaty cannot go

into effect in full unless, first, the Congress itself has authorized the expenditure of these funds, and I believe also has approved the allocation of the use of the properties and the waters to Mexico.

Mr. MURDOCK. My colleagues from the adjoining State of California have not put this case too strongly. Water is life in our semiarid West. We stand to lose water by this treaty. I am wondering about its other provisions.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman. Copies of the treaty are now available. The injunction of secrecy has finally been removed.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, we are going far afield. The merits of the treaty are in no way before the House. The whole question, as I listened to it, is a resolution which authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to make a study of the treaty and the action taken by the Executive, and the contemplated action to be taken by the Senate in reference to the treaty, and then to report back to the House whether or not, in the opinion of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, the Executive of the United States and the Senate of the United States have a right, constitutionally, to consummate the treaty. That is all that is before the House.

Something has been said about precedent. Now, there is precedent. The gentleman from California has just called it to my attention. It is away back there, but it stands.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Speaker, I am given to understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, intends to move that this question be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, in order to determine whether or not the questions raised in the resolution should be inquired into.

Mr. MICHENER. If that is done, the gentleman gets control of the floor under a misapprehension of the facts and the rules, because before any action can be taken by the Speaker under the present procedure, the Speaker must determine that a question of constitutional privilege is embodied in the resolution. If the Speaker so finds, then it would be in order for the gentleman from California to insist upon a vote on his resolution, and if he does that and the matter is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, you have not gone anywhere except to ask that committee to give its opinion as to the legality of the action contemplated or threatened to be taken by the President and the Senate.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is all the resolution goes to.

Mr. MICHENER. There will be no vitality in any such action, regardless of the merits of the proposition.

Mr. HINSHAW. Now, Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and I believe that a majority of this House will disagree with the gentleman, that there would be no vitality in the resolution. It would certainly inform, by regular processes, the other body, and the President of the United States, of the opinion of this House in relation to the constitutionality of the acts being proposed. I submit that the Committee on the Judiciary of this House, being a committee composed of some of the most learned legal talent in the United States, and, in my opinion, at least equivalent in their knowledge and common sense to the highest court of the land, would have good reason to report to the House concerning its constitutionality.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HARLESS].

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I want to compliment the gentleman from California on his interest in this matter. You gentlemen in the East can hardly realize the importance of water in the West. This matter is of such magnitude I am sure that every Member of this House has an interest in determining what course should be taken, as much as the Senate. I simply wanted to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] for bringing it to our attention.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman from Arizona, who is ever alert to the interests of his State.

Mr. Speaker, there being no further questions to be asked on this matter, and as I have stated as much as is necessary to present the matter to the House, I trust that the House will be unanimous in its favorable action on this resolution, favorable to the public interests which I, and the gentlemen who have spoken with me, represent. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this resolution should take the regular procedure of any other resolution, and the bill referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and report back to the House on what action shall be taken.

I move that the matter be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The resolution is referred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

Without objection, a motion to reconsider will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That section 1 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting from the first sentence thereof the term '31st of March' where that term first appears therein and substituting in lieu thereof the term '30th of June', and by deleting from the second sentence thereof 'on the basis of the cost, including not more than one year of carrying charges, of such assets to the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of twelve months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less' and inserting in lieu thereof 'on the basis of the cost, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower'. The first appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation on the basis established by this amendment shall be made as of June 30, 1944.

"SEC. 2. Section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); by striking out in the first sentence of such section 'February 17, 1944' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1945' (this amendment to be effective as of February 17, 1944); and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: '*Provided, however*, That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"'(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the Act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"'(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided*, That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further*, That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"'(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions.'

"SEC. 3. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, except as provided in section 4 hereof: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which programs involving such payments or losses have been announced on or before January 14, 1944, such programs may be carried out to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but such programs shall be completed not later than June 30, 1944: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be maintained and announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That none of the foregoing provisions shall apply to any payments or losses incurred in transactions with respect to domestic sugar beets and sugarcane and competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oil seed and oil seed meals: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments or soil-conservation payments authorized under existing law, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law.

"SEC. 4. (a) Within a period of one hundred and twenty days from the effective date of this Act, and within each six-month period thereafter, maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established on milk and the products thereof (pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or Public Law 729, approved October 2, 1942), shall be adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case may require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs, feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home grown), and other costs since January 1, 1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war and civilian purposes: *Provided*, That in determining the extent to which maximum prices shall be adjusted as provided herein, due consideration shall be given to historical and normal differentials customarily applied as between markets and regions: *Provided further*, That in no event shall maximum prices on milk and the products thereof be established below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law Numbered 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further*, That where minimum prices to producers of milk have been regulated under any agreements or orders pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, the War Food Administrator is hereby directed, within the periods prescribed in this section (relating to the adjustment of maximum prices), to adjust such minimum prices to reflect adjustments in maximum prices determined and ordered pursuant to the provisions of this section. Except as expressly provided herein, nothing contained in this section is intended, nor shall be construed to repeal, amend, or supersede the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended.

"(b) In order to effectuate the purposes of paragraph (a) of this section, the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator are hereby directed to hold public hearings on a regional or market basis as the case requires. For such purposes there shall be utilized the hearing procedure and the personnel of the Food Distribution Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture established under the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and such other personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration as may be required. As soon as practicable after the completion of the hearing, but in any event within the periods specified in paragraph (a), the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator shall make public their joint findings based only on relevant substantial evidence of record at the hearing and the Price Administrator forthwith shall issue an order adjusting such maximum price or prices on the basis of and in conformance with such findings.

"(c) Any person (within the meaning of section 302 (h) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended) who is adversely affected by the order of the Price Administrator may, within thirty days after the action adjusting such maximum price or prices, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals specifying his objections and praying that the order be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part.

"The War Food Administrator shall be made a party to the proceedings and upon service of the summons and complaint, the Price Administrator shall certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record upon which the order adjusting such maximum price or prices was based. The proceedings in and the determinations, orders, and decrees of such court shall be subject to all applicable provisions of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; except, that wherever the term 'Administrator' is used therein, it shall, for the purposes hereof, be construed to mean the War Food Administrator and the Price Administrator: *Provided*, That during the pendency of such proceedings the Price Administrator may not modify or rescind his order adjusting such maximum price or prices except upon the basis of additional joint findings on evidence adduced pursuant to the order of the court. The provisions of this section shall terminate coterminous with the expiration of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended.

"SEC. 5. The Commodity Credit Corporation may sell at a loss perishable fruits or vegetables, owned or controlled by it, the increased production of which has been requested by the War Food Administrator, if there is danger of substantial loss through deterioration by spoilage."

And the Senate agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
ROBERT W. KEAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
D. WORTH CLARK,
JNO. THOMAS,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Section 1, relating to the method of appraising the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation, is the same in the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement.

Section 2, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to June 30, 1945, and providing for the audit of its financial transactions, is the same in the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the conference agreement, except for a typographical error in the Senate amendment and the following technical change with respect to a date referred to in such section. For the purpose of extending the life of the Corporation, the House bill struck out the date "December 31, 1943" in existing law and inserted in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945". Before the bill passed the Senate, this date in existing law had been changed to "February 17, 1944" by the joint resolution approved December 23, 1943. Consequently, the Senate amendment and the conference agreement refer to the date in existing law as February 17, 1944; and, since it is unlikely that this bill can be enacted into law by February 17, 1944, the conference agreement provides that the amendment extending the life of the Corporation shall take effect as of February 17, 1944, even though it should be enacted after that date.

Section 3, containing restrictions upon the payment of subsidies with respect to agricultural commodities, was much the same in the House bill and the Senate amendment. The House bill provided that subsidy programs announced on or before October 13, 1943, might be carried on until December 31, 1943. The Senate amendment provided

that programs announced on or before January 14, 1944, might be carried on until June 30, 1944. The conference agreement follows the Senate amendment in this respect. The House bill provided that this section should not apply with respect to competitive domestic vegetable oils and fats and oilseed. The Senate amendment provided that the section should not apply with respect to those commodities and also that it should not apply with respect to domestic wool, sugar beets and sugarcane, oilseed meals, and wheat flour for export. The conference agreement follows the Senate amendment in this respect; except that (1) it omits the reference to wheat flour for export, as the provisions of the section do not in any manner affect the present program with respect to wheat flour for export, and (2) the conference agreement omits the reference to wool. The provisions of the section will not interfere with any program such as the present program under which the Commodity Credit Corporation has arranged to purchase the 1944 wool clip. Insofar as this program is concerned, there is no necessity for excepting wool from the provisions of this section, and the reference to wool is omitted only for the purpose of preventing the inauguration of consumer subsidy programs with respect to this commodity. The Senate amendment also contained a provision, which was not in the House bill, providing that nothing in the section should be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law. The conference agreement retains this provision with a clarifying change to make it clear that the parity payments and soil-conservation payments referred to are not limited by the reference to title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended. The Senate amendment made certain other changes of a clarifying nature in the language of this section of the House bill. The conference agreement adopts these changes with an additional clarifying change, which makes it clear that the maximum prices referred to in the section are those established under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942.

Section 4 of the Senate amendment related to the adjustment of maximum prices for milk. There were no provisions in the House bill corresponding to this section of the Senate amendment. The section provided that within 120 days from the enactment of this act, and within each 6-month period thereafter, maximum prices on milk and milk products should be adjusted on a regional or market basis as the case might require to the extent necessary to (1) reflect changes in farm labor costs (including hired workers, farm operators, and members of the families of farm operators engaged in work on the farm computed for all such labor on the basis of wage rates for hired farm labor), feed prices (including all feed fed whether purchased or home grown), and other costs, since January 1, 1941; (2) place the production of milk and the products thereof on a competitive basis with alternative opportunities which are available to producers of milk; (3) correct inequities as between markets; and (4) maintain or increase the production of milk and the products thereof for war or civilian purposes. It also provided that consideration should be given to historical and normal differentials customarily applied as between markets and regions, and that in no event should maximum prices on milk and the products thereof be below support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942. The section also provided for adjustments of minimum prices pursuant to the provisions of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to reflect adjustments in maximum prices made pursuant to the provisions of this section. Subsection (b) of this section of the Senate amendment provided for holding hearings for the purpose of establishing maximum prices under the section. Subsection (c) provided for appeals to the Emergency Court of Appeals from orders issued under the section, provided that the War Food Administrator should be made a party to the proceedings in such court, and provided that the proceedings in such court should be subject to the applicable provisions of section 204 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. The section provided that its provisions should terminate whenever the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, expires. The conference agreement retains this section of the Senate amendment, omitting the language which specified what was to be included in farm labor costs, and with other changes which are of a clarifying nature.

The provisions of section 4 (relating to the sale at a loss of perishable fruits and vegetables by the Commodity Credit Corporation) of the House bill were the same as the provisions of section 5 of the Senate amendment. These provisions are retained as section 5 of the conference agreement.

Section 6 of the Senate amendment increased the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation by $250,000,000. The provisions of this section are omitted from the conference agreement.

BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
ROBERT W. KEAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to address these few remarks to the the merits of the bill or the report. I voted against the bill when it was in the House. I was appointed a conferee and signed the conference report. It perturbed me somewhat as to whether I should have signed that report or not, but after consideration I did sign it and I intend to vote against it. I acted as the agent of the House when I became a conferee. You charged me to carry out your will and I endeavored to do that.

Under the Constitution it is provided that the identical bill must pass both Houses before it can become law and the instrumentality by which that is effected is the conference. I felt it was my duty to subordinate my own views to the expressed will of the House and, therefore, I signed the report in order that the orderly processes of legislation should not be retarded and that the final passage should be expedited.

I make this statement because I do not want to be subjected to the criticism of any of my colleagues who may think it is inconsistent for one to sign a report and vote against it.

I now feel I am free to exercise my own judgment. I am no longer a conferee and under no obligations to carry out the will of the House; therefore, I intend to vote as I voted previously, against the conference report; and if the bill is vetoed, I intend to vote to sustain the President's veto.

The bill as it comes back here is practically the bill that was sent to conference except there are a few more producers' subsidies in the bill. It states no fixed policy, it enunciates no principle except that the unorganized, nonvocal majority, the consumers, shall not have the benefit of a subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes back to us in better form and more understandable than when it left us. We anticipate that if we adopt this conference report and this bill goes to the President the usual argument will be made that unless consumer subsidies are paid we are going to have inflation. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is not an economist not on the Federal pay roll but who is in hearty accord that the payment of consumer subsidies is decidedly inflationary based upon the premise, as has been so frequently said, that we leave that much more money in the consumers' pockets with which to bid for nonavailable consumer goods.

Mr. Bowles himself admits that it adds to the national debt. Mr. Bowles says in a letter, a copy of which I have here:

> Of course, there are arguments against subsidies the validity of which I recognize. They will add to the tax burden and increase the national debt.

Of course, those are inflationary tendencies, nothing to the contrary notwithstanding. He goes on further to say:

> They introduce new principles into the American economy which have never before been experienced.

Thereby dissipating the argument that subsidies of this nature which we prohibit in this bill have been paid for the last 8 or 10 years. These are new subsidies which introduce new principles into the American economy, as Mr. Bowles says.

We anticipate this bill will be vetoed and we anticipate that in the veto message the claim is going to be made that unless we pay these subsidies we are going to have inflation. I have covered that, but I would like to have you all bear in mind the statement by Mr. Bowles and the allegations made by these economists who are not on the Federal pay roll when you listen to the arguments as to why we should pay consumers' subsidies. Personally, I feel so keenly that there is a fundamental question involved in this issue that if this Congress fails to override the President's veto we must effectuate a temporary strategic retreat but only for the purpose of consolidating our lines in anticipation of a very strong counter offensive.

It will be recalled that the O. P. A. expires on June 30. This question of consumers' subsidies is more allied with the prices established under the Price Control Act than prices paid by the Credit Corporation to producers, so we might expect that the counter offensive will be in the form of attempts to limit the operation of the Price Control Act in

such a manner as to prevent the socialization of agriculture through this vehicle of paying consumers' subsidies.

The fundamental problem involved in this issue is not the $400,000,000 or the $800,000,000 involved; it is whether the Federal Government is to be given absolute control over the production, the processing, and the distribution of food, which means the socialization of agriculture. In the 1935 Banking Act, and in another act passed in 1939 known as H. R. 6971, the fundamental problem before the House was, "Shall the Federal Government socialize banking and credit?" Just as this issue is involved in some of the acts pending in Congress today which would socialize medicine, which would socialize social security, which would socialize industry and business, so the question as to whether America shall be socialized is the fundamental issue involved in this bill before us now.

There are those in the Government who insist that America become a socialistic nation in order that it may take its position in a confederation of socialized nations following this war. Perhaps they are sincere in the belief that if we do not socialize America in order that we may take our position as one of a group of Socialist nations following this war, we might find ourselves isolated economically, politically, and socially from the rest of the world. However, there are some of us who believe that America can wield greater influence in the post-war economic, political, and social world if she strengthens herself under her Constitution, thereby impelling other nations to join with us instead of our having to destroy the American form of government in order that we may join a socialistic coalition of nations combating republican democracy. That is the fundamental issue involved.

Mr. Speaker, I have said this bill has been clarified in some respects. I want to make a statement which I do not think can be successfully contradicted, that this bill in no manner prohibits or interferes with any support-price program, with any parity program, with any soil-conservation program, or any program set up to encourage the production of agricultural products. If you will read the bill, and you do not have to read it too carefully, you will find that we prevent in this bill the payment of subsidies or the absorption of losses for a definite purpose. We prohibit the payment of subsidies and the absorption of losses for the purpose of preventing a reduction in maximum prices or in lieu of increasing maximum prices.

What do we mean by "maximum prices"? If there was any question in the House bill as to what was meant by "maximum prices," then we have clarified that in this conference report by stating specifically that these maximum prices are the maximum prices established under the Price Control Acts.

So there can be no question but that what we prohibit in this bill, and the only thing which we prohibit, is the payment of subsidies or the absorption of losses for the purpose of reducing maximum prices established under the Price Control Act, or in lieu of increasing maximum prices established under the Price Control Act. It does not interfere with the operation of any price-support program either in respect to prices or subsidies where the support price is below the parity price, because the Price Control Act already provides that no maximum price shall be put on any agricultural product below the parity price. This bill does provide, however, that if the support price on an agricultural commodity is above the parity price, the maximum price shall be increased to the new support price.

I want to clarify that the term "maximum prices" in this bill has no relationship whatever to prices paid to the producers of agricultural products. They have relation solely to the maximum prices established under the Price Control Act. We forbid the manipulation of those maximum consumer prices by the payment of subsidies, and make it very definite that we continue all of the subsidy programs that are for the purpose of encouraging the maximum amount of production.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The price of which the gentleman speaks is the retail price?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is the retail price, because the maximum prices set in the Price Control Act are the prices to the consumers. That is why I have so frequently said that in order to have an understanding of this you have to be fair enough to distinguish between consumer prices and producer prices. I think we have made that very clear.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman very plainly contends that this is not going to affect the producer as far as prices are concerned. Does the gentleman contend that it is not going to affect the pocketbook of the ultimate consumer?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have never made any such contention. I have always contended that it was going to affect the pocketbook of the ultimate consumer. It will affect him in this way. It will affect him by compelling him to pay 5 cents more per pound for butter and an average of 3 cents per pound more for meat, which means that the individual who will then pay out of his own pocket to the corner grocery that 5 cents will be relieved of the obligation of having to pay 15 cents into the Federal Treasury to reimburse the Treasury for the nickel which under existing law it pays to the corner grocery store. This means that he will make an investment of a nickel today to save 15 cents 5 years from now.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman explain to the House section 4 of the conference report? The reason I ask this is that the milk producers in my part of the country are going out of business. They have no way to get any help from the War Food Administration and the O. P. A. I am hopeful that this amendment will take care of that difficulty.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement handed to me by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation entitled "Why Dairy Products Require Special Legislative Treatment." I think it is all found in there.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say briefly, Mr. Speaker, that section 4 in respect to milk is in keeping with our philosophy of the bill in that it compels an increase in the price of milk to absorb increases in feed costs and labor costs and all other costs. The reason why it has to be treated differently than other foods is that the production of milk and milk products and the price of milk and milk products are determined by marketing agreements within the different milksheds. Under the Price Control Act, the Price Administrator has interpreted that act to mean that he can set only a general price. So if he is compelled to set a general price, it might be an unfair price in Texas because it might be too low, and it might be unfair to the consumers in another area because it would be too high.

As I understand this provision, it allows the milk producers to get together under their marketing agreement acts and determine upon the price and apply that price in the different milksheds throughout the country. That is in substance what I understand it to be, but I place this statement in the RECORD to supplement the statement I have made.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. The gentleman made a statement a moment ago that the banning of subsidies would not affect the income of the producer. If subsidies are banned and it is decided not to raise the maximum or ceiling price to the consumer, obviously it would adversely affect the producer.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let us analyze that. We will say that as of a few months ago the support price of butter was 46 cents and the parity price of butter was 41 cents, and for a matter of a few weeks the price of butter to the retail consumer was 46 cents. The Government came along and said, "We are going to roll the price of butter back to parity, which is 41 cents, and the Treasury is going to pay the difference, or 5 cents." If the producer of butter had been receiving 25 cents a pound from that 46-cent butter, he is still receiving 25 cents, no more and no less, because whether the Government pays it out of the Treasury or whether the consumer pays it out of his pocket has no relationship whatever to the amount the producer of butter receives. It affects your pocketbook, as I have explained to the gentleman from Missouri,

by taking from that pocketbook 5 cents which you would otherwise use to compete for unavailable consumer goods. According to the agreement the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and I have in respect to the ratio between taxes and bonds, you will have to pay 15 cents into the Federal Treasury in the future to pay back the 5 cents you allegedly save today.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman if he feels in his own mind that the other half of the dairy industry, that represented by the fluid milk, is properly protected by this legislation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say that the legislation was sponsored by the dairy producers. I have been told that they have been in contact with all branches of the industry, and that this suggestion which is written into the Senate bill here is the culmination of their collective thought.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If it covers the products of milk, I think the gentleman is right.

WHY DAIRY PRODUCTS REQUIRE SPECIAL LEGISLATIVE TREATMENT

Milk and its products require special treatment as distinguished from governmental policies affecting most other farm products.

This fact was recognized by the Food Administrator Herbert Clark Hoover in the First World War when he set up a series of regional milk price tribunals to determine adequate prices for milk under rapidly shifting war conditions.

It was recognized by the British Government when the English milk "scheme" was inaugurated a number of years ago under which all of the milk for whatever purpose in England was placed in a common pool.

It was recognized by Canadian provincial governments which established milk-price control authorities especially to meet the pressing problems created by the depression.

It was recognized by the Congress of the United States as early as 1933 in the passage of the first A. A. A. legislation. In that legislation common treatment was accorded the so-called five basic commodities (cotton, corn, wheat, tobacco, and rice), but special treatment was provided for milk and its products, and a special agency of government was set up to meet the particular problems of the interstate milksheds and to deal with national pricing problems of such commodities as butter, evaporated milk, dried milk, and cheese. This legislative authority, which Congress has clarified several times, is now expressed in the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 as amended.

Sixteen State legislatures have also provided special machinery for administering milk-price control.

The essential distinction between the Federal and State price legislation lies in the fact that the Federal authority only determines and maintains producer prices, whereas in most of the States the milk control agencies fix both producer prices and distributors' margins.

While much of this legislation was passed originally on an emergency basis, its administration has become so imbedded into the life of the communities that it is doubtful whether the milk industry will ever again be completely returned to private competition.

The reason why milk requires special treatment could readily be seen if one made a topographical map of milk routes feeding a group of urban markets. Because of transportation factors and urban needs, the producers supplying each city market, together with its subordinate markets, are grouped naturally into what is called milksheds. These milksheds do not differ greatly in their nature from watersheds. Just as the water drains according to the contour of the land through creeks and rivers into the large water basins, so milk is gathered along country lanes and moves down the great highways and by rail to where it can be most economically consumed. These milksheds today are well defined throughout the Nation, and generation after generation of milk producers have customarily supplied the same markets and rarely change except for extraordinary conditions. In fact, there are points between adjacent milksheds where the milk flows in different directions just as water would from the divide of a mountain range.

These milksheds differ as to volume and cost of production and as to pricing policies. In one community milk may be quoted by the 100 pounds and in the other by the quart. In communities of high production costs, milk sells at a much higher price than in communities of lower costs. For example, historical price differentials have nearly always prevailed as between the high cost production of the Atlantic seaboard and the low cost production of the Middlewest. Likewise, the Intermountain Region, the Pacific coast and the southern States have their particular and peculiar milk market problems.

In consequence, there is no such thing as a national price for milk either at the producer or the consumer levels. There may be national competitive prices for evaporated milk but producers in different regions receive different prices. There are regional price differentials on the wholesale price of butter and butterfat. There are similar regional price differentials on American cheese.

Production of milk also is unlike that of the other great agricultural commodities in that it is a twice a day job whereas no other farm production even approaches this rate except the poultry flocks.

Because of this regularity of production and the advanced work which has been done by many agricultural colleges, it is now a matter of fairly scientific accuracy to measure the changes in production costs in the various regions. This would not be possible if there was not a dependable regularity of production yields and production trends. In any region the dairymen can forecast the week in which production will begin to rise, when the peak will be crossed and the low level again be reached.

HOW EASTLAND-M'CLELLAN AMENDMENT REVITALIZES PRICE LAWS

In the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 and in the Price Control Acts of 1941 and 1942 Congress provided for flexibility of price treatment for milk and its products (in the first especially and in the second generally). Had the administration of these two laws been allowed to function in the spirit intended, there would be little further reason for enacting the Eastland-McClellan amendment as a part of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. But the President by Executive order of April 8, 1943, froze existing prices and paralyzed price administration in both the O. P. A. and in the W. F. A. The real reason then for inclusion of the Eastland-McClellan amendment is to break the "log jam" in the pricing of milk and its products and which is causing a steady decline in the total production of milk for all purposes. That decline is impeding the war effort. Meantime production costs have continued to rise.

With respect to milk and its products, the Eastland-McClellan amendment would revive the active administration of these two acts but would make some changes in the procedure necessary. Such changes include:

1. Four legislative standards to guide the administrative authorities are provided. These standards are so phrased as to permit considerable leeway in the preparation of findings.

2. The public hearing method developed over the years is revived but the hearings are to be conducted jointly by W. F. A. and O. P. A.

3. The territorial scope of the hearings is expanded to cover regions in which both interstate and intrastate markets are located.

4. The producer referendum which in peacetime is an important feature of the Federal milk order system, set up under the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act, is set aside during the life of the Price Control Act.

5. Maximum prices may not be below support prices.

6. Determination of the need of price changes must be made at least twice a year (under normal competitive conditions the price of milk to producers and to consumers historically changes more frequently than by 6-month periods in many communities. In almost every milkshed representatives of producer cooperatives and distributors have been accustomed to meet monthly to discuss changing conditions of production and changing market needs).

Administrative authorities are given 120 days from the time of the enactment of the bill to reestablish their hearing and price-adjustment machinery. In view of the fact that the country has already been divided by the War Food Administration into 24 representative regions for purposes of industrial rationing of the fluid-milk supply, the time limit of 120 days is deemed sufficient. The technique of the public-hearing method is well developed and very few additional employees will be necessary to swing flexible price administration back into action.

WHY THE LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW

Price adjustments on milk and milk products in lieu of subsidies are specifically provided for in this amendment for the following reasons:

1. Milk is perhaps the most widely produced of all farm commodities—normally being produced on more than 75 percent of all farms in the United States.

2. Of all major farm-commodity groups, prices of dairy products have risen least since the 5-year period immediately preceding the war

3. The cost of producing milk has increased considerably more than have the prices of dairy products.

4. Milk production has increased much less on a percentage basis during the war period than other competing farm commodities, notwithstanding that it is a critical war commodity.

5. Since the middle of 1943 both milk and butter production have been declining at an accelerating rate as compared to 1 year earlier.

6. Dairy products are now bearing more than one-third of the entire food-subsidy burden (about $441,000,000 annually) and their removal would be disastrous to future dairy production if substitute machinery, such as this amendment, is not provided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the frankness of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is appreciated. Of course, he could not have answered my question honestly other than to admit that the provisions of the bill, as agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees, maintains the producers' price, but on the other hand it increases the consumers' price. That has been my contention all along. The gentleman's view means that the housewives would increase their budget when the price of the necessities of life, which he named, goes up.

I believe that the producer is not only entitled to the cost of production but he is likewise entitled to a fair return on his labor. I have always contended that, but what happens to the people that I represent, the consumer? When you abolish the food subsidies you automatically increase the cost of living. What is the inevitable result? It will be a demand for an increase in wages. That statement cannot be honestly disputed.

There is one class of people, especially in the large cities, who have been practically overlooked insofar as increase in wages is concerned. That is the so-called white-collar worker. Unorganized, he has not benefited, his salary envelope contains practically the same, and he has had trouble in trying to maintain a proper standard of living. Under the terms of this bill, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] admits, the cost of his meat, butter, milk, bread, and so forth goes up. In other words, the cost of food subsidies is transferred to the pockets of the consumers. Who can deny that statement? I say, Mr. Speaker, this is no time to disturb a program which has proved successful.

Time and again I have stated on this floor that I try to legislate from a national rather than a local standpoint. I think in casting my votes of all the people of the United States and not those residing in my community. That was my attitude when a few days ago I supported by voice and vote a bill appropriating nearly $40,000,000 to import farm labor into this country. Not one cent of that money will be spent in my congressional district. However, when you take that money out of the general fund of the Treasury to be used to supply the farmers with much-needed labor, at least part of that money came from the pockets of my constituents in the form of taxes. The money used for food subsidy came from the pockets of all the taxpayers of the United States. That is freely admitted. I have heard the pleas of those who represent the dairy farmers. I have heard the pleas of those who represent the producers of beef, cattle, wheat, corn, and other necessities of life. I have listened to those pleas, but it seems that those who represent the farmer are unwilling to listen to the plea of those who represent the people who reside in the urban centers. The great farm organizations of this country favor subsidies for farm labor, favor parity prices, favor an increase in the price of milk and other farm products, and at the same time they flood us with resolutions opposing food subsidies. The wholesaler and the retailer will be unable to absorb the increase in price that will result if food subsidies are discontinued. They will pass it down to the consumer.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is unfair and I cannot support this conference report. I hope that the President will veto the bill. I will vote to sustain the veto.

Under the permission granted me, Mr. Speaker, feeling that it is an excellent contribution on advising the people of this country what will happen if food subsidies are discontinued, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Post of February 15, 1944, reproduced in the Washington Post this morning at the expense of the International Latex Corporation of Dover, Del. This corporation feels it is rendering a public service in reproducing this editorial. So do I. The editorial follows:

The Senate has just kicked subsidies out of the food picture and opened the door to inflation. Unless its action is reversed, the American consumer can expect the price of the family meat and potatoes to start a fast uphill climb that will leave the family dollar away behind.

An argument that opponents of subsidies have been making lately is that subsidies don't save us anything since "we pay for them with higher taxes, anyway." We might as well pay higher prices directly to the grocer, the argument goes, as pay higher taxes to the Government to support subsidies. It all goes to the same place.

This argument is a fake from start to finish. There are two clear answers to it:

First, we don't pay nearly as much in subsidies as we would pay directly over the grocery counter. The fact is that a billion or a billion and a half dollars spent in subsidies saves eight to thirteen billions on the total food bill.

HERE'S HOW IT WORKS

How? Well, let's say that the dairyman finds that his feed costs have increased, that he must charge a cent more on a quart of milk to break even, or to make his usual profit. He raises his price to the jobber by that cent.

The jobber, in turn, does not increase his price by just 1 cent. When the milk leaves his hands, it has risen not by a cent a quart but by a cent and a half, or perhaps 2 cents.

When it gets to the groceryman, he'd be less than human if he did not announce that henceforth, due to the higher prices he has to pay, milk will now cost the consumer 3 cents more per quart. It is a law of inflation that an increase in price at the origin of the product always means a doubling or tripling of that increase to the final purchaser.

Under the food-subsidy program, the Government pays the dairyman that extra cent he requires in order to break even. But the price then stays the same to the jobber, to the groceryman, and to the consumer. The snowballing of prices is stopped. The price rise is quarantined at one level; the infection is localized.

That's only one argument for subsidies. Here's the second: While it is true that the $1,000,000,000 used for subsidies may be tax money, not all of it is the tax money of the average consumer. Only a small part of it may, in fact, come from his specific taxes.

The rest may be excess profits collected by the Government from war-profits-swollen firms. The Government thus redistributes these profits, takes them from those who have made too much and uses them to keep down the food prices of the millions who have made too little.

SUBSIDIES ARE GAINING FRIENDS

When the Senate killed subsidies, it counted on the rapid march of the war to dull the keen interest of a few months ago in the subsidy debate. But along with soldier voting, subsidies have been the great issue of the year.

A measure of the rightness of the people's fight is that even the New York Times has shifted its position to come out carefully for a few subsidies. Those two stalwarts of stalwart Republicans, Senators VANDENBERG and TAFT, have also joined with the prosubsidy forces.

These men are not innovators. They simply acknowledge, as most Republicans and fewer Democrats (mostly Southern) will not, that subsidies are an established part of the wartime food picture. They know that in the past year, 25 food subsidies have been operating, holding down prices all the way from tomatoes to milk.

They know that there is nothing new about subsidies; that, indeed, there is something new and dangerous about a wartime economy that does not subsidize its food prices.

We call upon all Americans to join together to save a working part of their economy. Their very bread and butter is at stake here.

Let your Senator and your Congressman know how you stand. If you don't fight hard and at once, you and your children, after June 30, 1944, will be eating less and paying more.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report. I was opposed to the bill when it was originally presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I opposed the bill when it came to the floor.

As a conferee, I refused to sign the report or the statement, for the reason that the amendments offered and finally accepted from the other body exceeded the provisions of the House bill.

I am opposed to the bill in toto. I shall vote against the conference report. I shall also vote to sustain a veto if the bill is vetoed.

My reasons are simple but fundamental. I am convinced that this bill if enacted would open wide the gates to a torrent of inflation that would disrupt the war effort and defeat all efforts to stabilize prices to consumers, while guaranteeing to producers not only a floor or a support price but permitting price increases in all essential food products. It would cost the consumers hundreds of millions if not billions of dollars.

The proponents of this measure say that subsidies to consumers is a new and dangerous philosophy.

Just how much more dangerous is it than subsidizing producers? If we follow that to its logical conclusion we should say to every manufacturer that if his product costs too much, we will enable him to sell at less and pay him the difference.

The subsidies to consumers is a war measure to black inflation. The subsidies to farm producers is and has been for some years a permanent subsidy.

So that opposition to consumers subsidies is not a philosophy at all. It is merely a hate-Roosevelt phobia. The farm bloc and its supporters must shoulder the responsibility if inflation engulfs the Nation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, misadministration by many of the Federal war agencies has caused much confusion and misunderstanding in the minds of our citizens on the home front.

An understanding and a workable solution is possible. We suggest the O. P. A., W. P. B., and U. S. D. A. summon to Washington one or more representative citizens from each congressional district in the Nation and get a clear picture of how impracticable many of their directives and regulations are in operation.

Possibly members of the local rationing boards serving their towns and counties without pay, and farmers and cattlemen directly from the grass roots could offer more light on the subject than could any other groups, for the rationing board members hear the story of every individual in their respective boundaries, and the farmers and cattlemen know first handed.

The foremost question in the minds of the average citizen from the rural regions—which include all of the Third District—is how Washington continues to grant the demands for higher wages of strikers in war industries and holds fast upon their ceiling prices on farm products and livestock. When a wage increase is granted, it is elementary that the cost of farm products should increase to equalize the purchasing price of the dollar, but this has not happened. To the contrary, millions have been paid for subsidies in the industrial sections of the country, which is simply a hidden wage increase for many of those who have been receiving higher wages by striking. A small amount has been paid to the producer, which is very negligible and not a drop in the bucket by comparison with the amount received by organized labor as a wage increase.

Remember this. In the words of organized labor, every person who is not a dues-paying member of a union is just a "scab." Remember further that we so-called scabs outnumber the members of these present-day privileged organizations by eight to one.

The cost of transportation and hotel bills of 1,000 citizens coming to Washington would be an act of economy and not an additional expense.

If the question of subsidies were put to a popular vote, the margin would also register eight to one against subsidies.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw a little parallel at the outset in calling the attention of the House to a very interesting cartoon by Mr. Berryman in today's Star. Two United States bulletins are on a board and a Yankee doughboy is looking at them. The top bulletin starts out with a statement by Vice President WALLACE: "Vice President WALLACE says American Fascists are trying to gain control of delegates."

Just below the bulletin board has on it: "Alf Landon declares fascism is here in America and its name is the New Deal."

This is what the doughboy says: "If these American leaders are telling the truth, why are we fighting over here?"

The scene is somewhere out at the front. That has a very interesting connection with the matter which is drawing to a close here now; the question involved is whether or not we are to be faced in this country by the action of the Congress with the financing of continued confusion, confusion in excess of that which troubles the doughboy. We have seen enough concerning both confusion and the failure on the part of certain agencies whose edicts, regulations, and requested directives without the sanction of this body are extraconstitutionally taking away from the American people their right to function and produce as they know how, their right to function and produce under a system which that flag stands for. This is not a partisan question, gentlemen. I stand here as a Democrat. I want to read to you a little matter that comes from another man who was a Democrat, the Democrats elected him a long time ago as President of the United States. His name is Grover Cleveland. He had this to say on the occasion of the Centennial of the Constitution of the United States:

As we look down this past century to the origin of our Constitution, as we contemplate its trials and its triumphs, as we realize how completely the principles upon which it is based have met every national peril and every national need, how devoutly should we confess with Franklin, "God governs in the affairs of men"; and how solemn should be the reflection that to our hands is committed this ark of the people's covenant, and that ours is the duty to shield it from impious hands. We receive it sealed with the tests of a century. It has been found sufficient in the past, and in the future years it will be found sufficient if the American people are true to their sacred trust.

Another centennial day will come and millions yet unborn will inquire concerning our stewardship and the safety of their Constitution. God grant that they may find it unimpaired; and as we rejoice in the patriotism and devotion of those who follow us rejoice in our fidelity and in our jealous love for constitutional liberty.

The difference in cost to an American consumer between the continuity of a system of government referred to in that famous Centennial, of between 5 and 15 cents is too cheap a price for such a conversion. I am for this conference report. It is the very best that could have been wrought, I think, in the face of a tremendous and inconceivable confusion which has surrounded this measure and the diabolic and misdirected efforts by many well-intentioned men to confuse this issue and bring the American people to their knees as degenerate dependents. Some time ago in talking to a Member of this body, I was reminded of the words of the present President of the United States in which he said, "It is better that we should die on our feet than live forever on our knees." I agree with him. When this message confronts him as to whether or not he shall veto it, in case he may have forgotten that he said that, I call his attention to it here on the floor of the House as one who shares with him and with all Americans the obligations and duties which we are sworn to defend and carry on.

In 1936 the President of the United States said this:

In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

There are many Members of this body who heard this statement. I hope he will remember that. When you go down through the long list of evidences in the American forum of reason, and the ideologies back of them, which make their appearance without limitation, a clear and definite conflict is shown to exist between our form of Government and a proposal that the American people are unwilling to pay for their own meals today and are willing to charge them to future generations. The immediate past record of the operations of the O. P. A. and the known confusion which inevitably will come out of the administration, under directives without the sanction or knowledge of the representatives of the people, of a wide- and far-flung subsidy program, which this bill prevents, is sufficient within itself to warrant your support. I hope the President will react in accordance with what I believe all Americans should do in a like emergency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, there have been many statements since this subsidy question was first considered, that the advocates of the continuation of subsidies are trying to lead America along the path of state socialism. Nothing could be further from the truth. As the Speaker so well said here in his address the other day, "America is not going socialistic unless the voters at the polls vote to make America socialistic." If we continue these subsidies we will not be any more socialistic or communistic than Canada is or Great Britain, who have been using the subsidy program and I do not think they have been incorporated in the United Soviet Republics. What we are trying to do is to save the value of the American dollar. We are trying to keep the cost of living from soaring sky high and thus oppressing the poor, unorganized people and the white-collar workers and those who live on a fixed income. We are also trying by preventing the rise in prices, to keep wages at a reasonable level so that the war will not cost us increased billions of dollars which would be saddled upon the American taxpayers in this generation and generations to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] 10 minutes.

THE ROLL-BACK-SUBSIDY FALLACY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, those who advocate the payment of roll-back

subsidies argue three principal propositions. One is that roll-back subsidies will prevent inflation. The second is that roll-back subsidies will substantially take those who are in the economic squeeze out of their unfavorable situation. The third is that roll-back subsidies will hold down the cost of war by preventing increases in wages and a consequent rise in the prices of goods purchased by the Government.

I emphatically deny that roll-back subsidies will serve either of those purposes. Now let us look at the situation for just a moment. Roll-back subsidies will not prevent inflation. I submit as evidence in support of that statement a very scholarly address made by the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System at the Tax Institute Symposium in New York just a few days ago, February 8, where, I understand, he appeared at the direct request of the President of the United States to deliver this address to show that the inflationary forces are moving toward the point where the situation will get out of our control and that in order to prevent the inflationary destruction which is potentially ahead of us, certain steps must be taken with respect to increasing the tax levies in order to prevent the inflationary forces from doing their dirty work. Quoting directly from Chairman Eccles we find these words:

I shall not undertake to restate my views on war finance, but in discussing the problems of inflation control after the war, we must realize that the chances for success at that time will be vitally affected by fiscal policies during the war. Our tax effort so far has been entirely inadequate in relationship to our huge wartime expenditures and it has lagged far behind that of our allies.

Further quoting from the statement of Mr. Eccles we find:

Our home-front fight against inflation will have to continue for a considerable time after the war ends. The eventual answer to the inflation problem must be found in the production of goods in quantities sufficient to meet all the demand. * * * Another difficulty which will confront us in the postwar period will arise from the huge amount of purchasing power held by the public. This will largely be the result of our heavy reliance upon borrowing in the financing of our war expenditures, and, in particular, upon borrowing from the banks.

In the 2 years from January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1944, the public debt increased by $105,000,000,000, and of this increase the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks have absorbed $48,000,000,000. Of the total of $169,000,000,000 of Government debt outstanding at the end of 1943, $72,000,000,000 were held by the commercial banks and the Federal Reserve. This extensive borrowing from the banks resulted in a corresponding increase in our money supply. Including currency as well as demand deposits, the total money supply held by the public at the close of the year amounted to over $80,000,000,000, or nearly twice as much as 2 years ago. To this must be added over $30,000,000,000 of time deposits and the many billions of United States Government securities held by the public. This huge volume of liquid funds is the basis for the inflationary problem in the transition period.

Nowhere in that address did the chairman contend that roll-back subsidies would alleviate the situation which we now face. He preached the sound theory of the necessity for the production of goods, and what is likely to happen when the people have at their command as free economic agents a great excess of buying power as related to a scarcity of goods.

In support of my statement I also refer to the address of Mr. Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, December 16, 1943, before the Worcester Economic Club, Worcester, Mass., in which he said, among other things:

What then, it may be asked, is the role of war borrowing? The answer must be that war borrowing is a method of postponing, not the cost itself, but the final allocation of the total burden of the war to some future date, when the costs now paid for through the sale of bonds are finally assessed in the form of taxes—at which time it is inevitable that a much larger portion of them will be paid by the persons now in the armed forces than if they were assessed today. When this fact is seen in its stark reality, it is clear that the money cost of the war should be met as far as possible by taxes, and so be paid for once and for all by today's civilians at the same time that the men in the service are paying their much higher price in human cost on the fighting fronts.

Mr. Speaker, here the Under Secretary of the Treasury speaks my language. Why in the name of common sense are Members now advocating that we sell more bonds, increase the debt, make heavier the tax load on service men and women when they return from the war to pay—for what—for a portion of my grocery bill which I should pay myself, or to contribute to the payment of the grocery bill of every Member of this House, and through the hidden machinery of the "roll-back" subsidy program as it ties directly into the ration food coupons we have in our homes or in our pockets? Shame on us for advocating such a rotten scheme. Further quoting Mr. Bell, he says:

At the present time the Federal Government is purchasing about one-half of the total volume of goods and services being produced, while the remaining 50 percent is being purchased for private use. Federal taxes, however, are bringing in only about 20 percent of the gross income generated by production, leaving about 80 percent in private hands. There is, thus, a discrepancy equivalent to about 30 percent of the value of total output which makes up the Federal deficit on the one hand and the corresponding necessary private savings on the other. To the extent that total borrowing exceeds the aggregate amount of savings consciously and intentionally undertaken, we are placing liquid assets in the hands of persons who may use them to put added pressure on price ceilings.

And in the face of these hard facts, Mr. Speaker, men stand on this floor and advocate further borrowings, greater deficits, and more debt in order to assist in paying the grocery bills of those who have excess buying power at this very hour.

And Mr. Paul, of the Treasury Department, in his address before the Indiana State Bar Association, Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, January 7, 1944, last, gave us some keen thoughts on this question of inflation, taxation, and debt. Mr. Paul, General Counsel of the Treasury, said:

I want to say unequivocally that the revenue bill of 1943, as it is about to be debated on the Senate floor, is a tragic failure. It fails to meet the three principal tests of a wartime revenue measure. First, it does not raise enough revenue. Second, it fails as an instrument to reduce inflationary pressure. Third, it denies to more than 50,000,000 taxpayers the simplification of tax law to which they are entitled. We may as well face the facts at the outset. With war expenditures of $92,000,000,000 in the current (1944) fiscal year, a revenue yield from existing taxes of $41,000,000,000, we are running a deficit of $57,000,000,000. With all this spending the American people have saved more than ever before. They have accumulated in the last 3½ years liquid savings of more than $55,000,000,000, of which fully half is in increased currency and bank accounts. Is it not clear that they could afford to pay $10,500,000,000 of additional taxes? I, for one, believe they would have been willing, if not glad, to do so. One might understand a refusal to be taxed, if it meant more purchasing power in the pockets and bank accounts of taxpayers. But the grim fact is that as a people we gain nothing by refusing to pay taxes. On the contrary, we stand to lose a great deal. Inflation very well may take what we do not pay to the tax collector.

I need not go to any higher authorities than those three gentlemen, because they speak for the administration. But they do not advocate roll-back food subsidies to prevent inflation. Their views are too sound to follow such a fallacy. They speak for the President of the United States, who I understand may perhaps veto this bill if it is approved by the two Houses. We could give plenty of other authorities, but why go any further?

When you step over into the field of those who advocate roll-back subsidies, oh, they advocate roll-back subsidies to prevent inflation. The O. P. A., to prevent inflation; the War Food Administration, to prevent inflation; the Economic Stabilizer, to prevent inflation. And why do these planners all advocate the roll-back subsidy scheme? Oh, if we only had the answer to that question. Herein lies the plan to further control, to further govern our people by permissive orders; to further dictate and control every move we make in the field of economics. This group of planners all know, just as well as anybody, that roll-back subsidies will not be a great factor in preventing inflation.

Now, will roll-back subsidies take the unfortunate people out of the economic squeeze? They will not. The maximum you can possibly hope to get out of this is a benefit of 2¾ cents a day per capita of 12 cents a day for an average family, or let us say, the price of a glass of beer. Does any Member of this House believe that the sensible families of this country will have their economic appetite satiated in the form of a mess of pottage amounting to 12 cents per day for a family? If you were the father of a group of children, the head of a home, would you let your birthright be purchased with a roll-back subsidy that amounted per day to no more than a glass of beer? Would you, therefore, not ask for an increase in wages or salaries if you had to continue in the economic squeeze after roll-back subsidies were ap-

plied? The people in our factories, on our farms, in our white-collar jobs have got too much sense to be purchased by that kind of a proposition. They just will not go along with it.

Another thing: The coupon book which you carry in your pocket or which your wife carries, these little brown coupons entitle you to your cut on whatever appropriation is made by this Congress for the purpose of paying roll-back subsidies. The prayer is prayed in the name of the fellow who is in the economic squeeze, but the man who is not in the economic squeeze gets his cut of the appropriations, because of the food right that the coupon gives to him. There is the fallacy of this proposition of taking the poor fellow out of the economic squeeze. If you want to pray a prayer in his name, do so, but in the name of God and of humanity and justice see that he gets the benefit of the appropriation after it is made, instead of spreading it to us people who do not need it and who protest against it.

One other point: Will the roll-back subsidies prevent the cost of the war advancing, and an increase in the debt? Of course, they will not. I contend that the charts which have been presented to us on this floor and which will probably be presented again, will not stand a scientific and economic analysis. They are prepared to mislead those who look upon them. I have not been misled. Those charts will not hold water. They will not stand on their own feet. I do not have time to argue that. We cannot bring them in here, and we cannot fight that out, but I did not want that argument to be left unanswered.

Now, if these prices or costs of war are to continue, they will continue even after you pass roll-back subsidies and put them into operation. There is no question about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have found that the advocates of roll-backs and consumers' subsidies are not interested in securing the maximum production of essential foods.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is correct. See what Chairman Eccles says about that. This roll-back subsidy proposition and this program under which we are operating does not conform to that of Canada and England, as has been argued on the floor awhile ago. Get your facts and put them down and square them up and you will find that my statement will stand by the evidence that can be put before you.

The Government did increase milk prices in Chicago, and they have enough milk. The increased production brought more milk—what they wanted. The question which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] raised is, "Do you want production of foodstuffs?" If so, you pay the price and get the production. If you do not want that production and will be satisfied to go with a hungry gut, then go without food, post your beautiful low prices, and let the population cry for food—but along with this, be prepared for revolution.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. There should be a distinction made between this country and a country that is getting lend-lease from us.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Surely.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a further fact that if we do get an abundance in the production of these essential foods, the abundance itself will hold down the price to the consumers?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is either true or else our economy has been false since 1776. We can take our choice on that proposition.

Now the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] says we want to hold these prices down. Well, cut your prices and put them on the walls of the grocery stores in gold letters—beautiful low prices—and let the people walk in and live on the low prices, with no goods to buy. You have got no moral right to ask the farmers of this country to produce foodstuffs below the cost of production, and in the same breath give the manufacturer whatever price is necessary to get implements of war produced, on the basis of cost plus a profit. The farming people of this country do not propose to be subjected to that kind of straitjacket, and they will take care of this situation in due course, make no mistake about that.

I shall support the conference report as has been submitted, with pleasure. If the President vetoes the bill I shall vote to override his veto with a great deal more pleasure.

I agree with the gentleman who submitted the proposition that we do move toward a Fascist state as the Government more and more takes over control of the forces of production and distribution, those forces which deal with such matters, and the flow of capital, and all administered under the policies and personnel of a single political party. If that is not fascism, what is it? We move away from the private enterprise system as we move more and more to Government control, and the farmers of this country fundamentally object to this kind of operation being imposed upon them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 16 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I have not yielded myself any time, but I wish to go on record as supporting the conference report.

PRICE AND STABILIZATION PROGRAM HAS SAVED TAXPAYERS $65,000,000,000 ALREADY ON WAR COST ALONE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the generosity of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] in yielding his time to me. Obviously, I cannot yield to everyone in the short length of time I have. Practically all the speeches that have been made, have been made in opposition to subsidies and I hope and trust the Members will not ask me to yield until I have finished my statement.

I am not going to talk about 5 cents on a pound of butter or 3 cents on something else. I am going to talk about billions of dollars in savings in our national debt, by reason of our stabilization and price-control program. We have some facts and figures to back up what we say.

Briefly, this chart [indicating] has been carefully prepared and can be relied upon. For the last 9 months the stabilization line has been held. There has been no increase in the cost of the war. There has been no increase in the cost of living. During the last war we had no price-control program, and the price of steel went from 187 to 695 percent above what it was before the war. During this war it has not gone up 1 penny. Neither has the price of tin, nor cement, nor other basic commodities that largely enter into the cost of this war.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield. I stated that I hoped Members would not ask me to yield until I finished my statement.

Now, we have a similar period of time that we can compare the period of time we have recently gone through with. That is an example that is on all fours. During the first 51 months of World War No. 1, when we had no price control or stabilization acts, we can compare those prices with prices during the 51 months of this war. If we do that, and if we had paid the same prices as were paid during the same period of time in the First World War, our national debt would be $65,000,000,000 more today than it is.

FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS SAVING FOR EVERY MAN, WOMAN, AND CHILD

That is a saving of $500 for every man, woman, and child in America.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS SAVED EVERY 24 HOURS

It represents a saving of $50,000,000 every day of 24 hours on war cost alone. So we are not talking about 5 cents on butter, or 3 cents on something else. We are talking about a stabilization and price-control program that is saving the American people, the taxpayers, on war cost alone, not counting the cost of saving in their living expenses, but on war cost alone, $50,000,000 every day around the clock.

PROGRAM WORTH SAVING

Is that kind of stabilization program worth working for? Of course it is. You can always pick out little insignificant things and criticize any program. It is easy to criticize. But this program has worked. It has absolutely worked, and we have the proof here to demonstrate that it has worked.

Maybe your plan is a better plan. Maybe it is. I do not know. Maybe I have a plan that is better. But I am not willing to try it. I am not willing to destroy a program that has absolutely worked and is now saving us $50,000,000

a day in war cost alone. I am not willing to scuttle that kind of a program and try out some plan of some other person, not even my own plan.

Let me state that in this program it does not make much difference how much money is put up here [indicating] above this price-control dam whether it is used to pay subsidies or anything else. So long as that dam holds we are saved and we are not going to have inflation.

SUBSIDIES IN PRICE-CONTROL DAM

During this war we have more money in circulation than we ever had before in history. When the war started we had six and one-half billion dollars, today we have twenty billions in actual money in circulation in the pockets and tills of the people of this country compared with three and one-half billions at the beginning of the First World War, and only six billions at the end of the war. We have more inflationary pressures today than ever existed in the history of this country against this price-control dam. There is one main cornerstone in this price-control dam and that is subsidies. If you tear that stone out you run the risk of destroying the program that is saving the American taxpayers $50,000,000 every 24 hours in this war program alone. So I plead with you not to destroy this program just because you do not like some little part of it. It is too substantial and too effective for us to run any kind of risk like that.

BILL TO INCREASE COST OF LIVING AND CAUSE INFLATION

I am going to vote against the conference report. When the President vetoes the bill, and certainly he will have to veto it to be consistent for he knows that this will jeopardize the whole stabilization and price-control program, he knows this will greatly increase the cost of living, he knows it will cause inflation and he will certainly have to veto this bill, and when he does I expect to vote to sustain the President's veto.

CONGRESS HAS NOT COOPERATED IN FIGHT AGAINST INFLATION

I think it is the duty of this Congress to support the administration in any program to keep down inflation; but this Congress has not cooperated—this Congress has been an inflationary Congress. We have too many votes against us to prove otherwise. It is an inflationary Congress. The President had a program that Congress helped to give him and then Congress takes away from him the means, the vehicles, and the weapons with which to stop the inflation that we have asked him to arrest. Inflation is too serious.

SUBSIDIES AS PRINCIPLE NOT INVOLVED

Do not get it in your minds that this bill prevents subsidies; it does not. The question of subsidies as a principle is not involved in this bill. It is just like this Congress saying that we want to pass a law to make it a penitentiary offense to steal in the District of Columbia. The House would take up the bill for consideration and pass a bill, saying, in substance, that it is a violation of law to steal and amend it so, as it states, except you can steal automobiles, motorcycles, and bicycles; that is all right. Then we send it over to the Senate and the Senate says that it is all right, that the House passed good amendments but we think it should be extended, that it is all right to steal motorcycles, automobiles, and bicycles but there should be some amendments to exempt people for stealing horses, cows, and hogs. That is exactly what has happened in this bill.

We had a bill under consideration here that was supposed to prevent subsidies but the House went ahead and enumerated—it will aggregate about 50 things if you analyze all that it includes—it includes 50 things here on which roll-back subsidies or any other kind of subsidies are all right. We are against subsidies but we are willing to accept these 50 things. Then we sent the bill over to the Senate and the Senate said: "Well, the House accepted these things; all right, we want to add about 50 more." And the Senate did. So the question of subsidies as a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker, is not involved in this bill. It recognizes and condones subsidies all the way through. It is just a matter, I think, of some people wanting to get back at the Commander in Chief or the President of the United States on a few things they are opposed to. Let them do it, but let them do it in a way that will not jeopardize the whole stabilization and price-control program. We have too much at stake. We are saving a billion and a quarter dollars a month, we are saving $50,000,000 a day compared with another definite similar period in our history which we all remember. That involves too much for us to run any risk of destroying because there are certain minor matters in the program that we do not like.

DO NOT RUIN COUNTRY TO GET BACK AT O. P. A.

There are things about O. P. A. that I do not like, but I am not willing to run any risk of destroying this program in order to get back at O. P. A. There are lots of annoying and irritating things about O. P. A. Maybe a lot of people do not receive enough in rents, rents are too low; maybe prices in some cases are too low; maybe their wages are too low; but I say to you in all seriousness that they are better off and our country is better off by receiving dollars although an insufficient number of dollars, but dollars of a kind that will buy something that is substantial and worth what things are worth today rather than to receive twice as much in dollars which will buy only one-quarter as much.

INFLATION NO. 2 PROBLEM

And may I warn you that the most serious problem that faces our country on the domestic front today is that of inflation. We can destroy our country from within while our sons are winning this war on the 55 battlefronts of the world fighting the enemy. We have a chance here to help hold the line, we have a chance to help prevent inflation, we have a chance to save this country on the domestic front, and I hope this Congress cooperates with the President even though it requires an about face, a turning about of views in order not to run any risk. Remember the $50,000,000 per day saving now just on war cost alone.

INFLATION CAN STOP PRODUCTION

Inflation can break down our domestic front, it can stop work, it can stop production. Suppose we have a race between prices on one side and wages on the other; and that is the kind of race you will have if you break this line. Wages will rise, prices will rise, one trying to outrun the other. It will not be long until the money the wage earners receive will purchase so few goods and necessities of life that the wage earners may be inclined even not to want to work for that kind of money. Then we would be reduced to barter. Do you believe a country like ours with one-hundred-and-thirty-some-odd million people can survive on a barter basis? Of course not. But if our money becomes worthless we are likely to stop production in this country because our workers will not work for that kind of money, so we have a serious decision to make and there is no more important decision to make than right here on No. 2 problem confronting this country. No. 1 problem is that of winning the war on the battlefields; No. 2 is that of preventing inflation here at home. So, I beg you to consider this problem not from a partisan political standpoint but from the standpoint of our country, realizing that sometimes we have to take some things we do not like. I do not say I approve of everything in this stabilization price control program; I do not by any means, but I am willing to take a lot of things I do not like in order to keep from taking a lot of things that are much worse than what I am having to take. I know of nothing that would be more serious, more injurious, and more detrimental to the war effort, to the boys on the battlefront, to their dependents here at home, and to the civilian population than for us to make the awful mistake of breaking this line and causing inflation to engulf us here in America.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired; all time has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their own remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 151, noes 74.

Mrs. NORTON and Mr. COCHRAN demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 249, nays 118, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—249

Abernethy	Andresen,	Auchincloss
Allen, Ill.	August H.	Baldwin, Md.
Andersen,	Andrews	Barden
H. Carl	Arends	Barrett
Anderson, Calif.	Arnold	Bates, Mass.

Beall	Hale	Norman
Beckworth	Hall,	Norrell
Bender	Edwin Arthur	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bennett, Mich.	Hall,	O'Hara
Bennett, Mo.	Leonard W.	Pace
Bishop	Hancock	Peterson, Ga.
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Bolton	Harris, Ark.	Pittenger
Bonner	Harris, Va.	Ploeser
Boren	Heidinger	Plumley
Boykin	Hendricks	Poage
Bradley, Mich.	Hess	Pratt, Joseph M.
Brehm	Hill	Ramey
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Rankin
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Holmes, Mass.	Reed, N. Y.
Bryson	Holmes, Wash.	Rees, Kans.
Buffett	Hope	Rivers
Burgin	Horan	Rizley
Busbey	Howell	Robertson
Butler	Jarman	Rockwell
Camp	Jeffrey	Rodgers, Pa.
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Rogers, Mass.
Carlson, Kans.	Jennings	Rohrbough
Carrier	Jensen	Rolph
Carson, Ohio	Johnson,	Rowe
Case	Anton J.	Sauthoff
Chenoweth	Johnson,	Schiffler
Chiperfield	Calvin D.	Schwabe
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Scott
Clark	Johnson,	Scrivner
Clason	J. Leroy	Shafer
Clevenger	Johnson,	Short
Cole, Mo.	Luther A.	Sikes
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Ill.
Colmer	Johnson, Ward	Simpson, Pa.
Compton	Jones	Slaughter
Cooley	Jonkman	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Kean	Smith, Ohio
Costello	Keefe	Smith, Wis.
Courtney	Kerr	Sparkman
Cox	Kilburn	Springer
Cravens	Kilday	Stanley
Crawford	Kinzer	Starnes, Ala.
Cunningham	Kleberg	Stearns, N. H.
Curtis	Kunkel	Stefan
Day	Lambertson	Stevenson
Dies	Lanham	Stewart
Disney	Lea	Stockman
Dondero	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Drewry	LeFevre	Sumners, Tex.
Durham	Lemke	Sundstrom
Dworshak	Lewis	Taber
Eaton	Luce	Talbot
Elliott	McConnell	Talle
Ellis	McCord	Tarver
Ellsworth	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Elmer	McGregor	Thomason
Engel, Mich.	McKenzie	Tibbott
Engle, Calif.	McLean	Treadway
Fellows	McWilliams	Troutman
Fisher	Maas	Vincent, Ky.
Fulbright	Mahon	Vorys, Ohio
Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.	Vursell
Gallagher	Martin, Iowa	Wadsworth
Gathings	Martin, Mass.	Ward
Gearhart	Mason	Weichel, Ohio
Gibson	May	West
Gilchrist	Merrow	Whitten
Gillette	Michener	Whittington
Gillie	Miller, Conn.	Wickersham
Goodwin	Miller, Mo.	Wigglesworth
Gore	Miller, Nebr.	Willey
Gossett	Miller, Pa.	Wilson
Graham	Mills	Winstead
Grant, Ala.	Monkiewicz	Wolcott
Grant, Ind.	Morrison, N. C.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gregory	Mott	Woodruff, Mich.
Griffiths	Mundt	Woodrum, Va.
Gwynne	Murray, Tenn.	Worley
Hagen	Murray, Wis.	

NAYS—118

Allen, La.	Coffee	Hart
Anderson,	Crosser	Hays
N. Mex.	D'Alesandro	Hébert
Angell	Davis	Heffernan
Baldwin, N. Y.	Delaney	Herter
Barry	Dickstein	Hinshaw
Bates, Ky.	Dilweg	Holifield
Bland	Eberharter	Hull
Bradley, Pa.	Ellison, Md.	Izac
Brooks	Fay	Jackson
Buckley	Feighan	Johnson,
Bulwinkle	Fernandez	Lyndon B.
Burchill, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	Judd
Burdick	Fogarty	Kefauver
Byrne	Folger	Kelley
Canfield	Forand	Kennedy
Cannon, Fla.	Ford	King
Capozzoli	Furlong	Klein
Carter	Gale	LaFollette
Celler	Granger	Lane
Chapman	Green	Larcade
Cochran	Harless, Ariz.	Ludlow
McCormack	O'Toole	Snyder
McMurray	Outland	Somers, N. Y.
Madden	Patman	Spence
Magnuson	Patton	Sullivan
Maloney	Peterson, Fla.	Thomas, Tex.
Mansfield,	Pfeifer	Tolan
Mont.	Poulson	Towe
Marcantonio	Powers	Voorhis, Calif.
Merritt	Priest	Walter
Monroney	Rabaut	Wasielewski
Mruk	Ramspeck	Weaver
Murdock	Randolph	Weiss
Murphy	Robinson, Utah	Welch
Myers	Sabath	Wene
Norton	Sadowski	White
O'Brien, Mich.	Sasscer	Wolverton, N. J.
O'Connor	Satterfield	Wright
O'Konski	Scanlon	
O'Neal	Sheppard	

NOT VOTING—61

Bell	Gordon	O'Brien, Ill.
Bloom	Gorski	O'Leary
Burch, Va.	Gross	Philbin
Cullen	Halleck	Pracht,
Curley	Hare	C. Frederick
Dawson	Hartley	Price
Dewey	Hobbs	Reed, Ill.
Dingell	Hoch	Richards
Dirksen	Kearney	Robsion, Ky.
Domengeaux	Kee	Rogers, Calif.
Doughton	Keogh	Rowan
Douglas	Kirwan	Russell
Elston, Ohio	Knutson	Sheridan
Fenton	Landis	Smith, Va.
Fish	Lesinski	Smith, W. Va.
Flannagan	Lynch	Taylor
Fulmer	McCowen	Vinson, Ga.
Gamble	McMillan	Whelchel, Ga.
Gavin	Manasco	Winter
Gerlach	Morrison, La.	Zimmerman
Gifford	Newsome	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Douglas for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Fish for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Elston of Ohio for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Gross for, with Mr. Price against.

Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. O'Leary against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. C. Frederick Pracht for, with Mr. Hoch against

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Robsion of Kentucky for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. McCowen for, with Mr. Bloom against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Flannagan with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Gordon with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Newsome with Mr. Knutson.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANDBOOK FOR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the handbook which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has prepared for the service men and service women. It will be carried up to date with the mustering-out-pay bill in it. If any of the Members want it, they can get it for $17.50 a thousand by notifying the Joint Committee on Printing or the Public Printer at once. If it is not ordered at this time in this printing, they will cost 10 cents each.

GRANTING ADDITIONAL POWERS TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 2644, to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain the bill?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The day before yesterday, when the House considered the District legislation, this measure was withdrawn at the request of the distinguished Member from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. He felt that the provisions of the bill might infringe on the work of that committee. It is a proposal to simply give to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia certain powers that they do not now possess so that we, as a legislative committee, will not constantly come to Congress and ask for the designation of streets and similar regulatory matters and administrative functions that should be placed within the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain that I have looked over the bill very carefully and I think it should pass. I have no further objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered within their discretion—

(a) In accordance with such regulations as they may make, to provide for the waiver of payment by any person in the military service of the United States of any annual or other periodic fee required by law to be paid to the District of Columbia or to any District of Columbia board or commission as a condition to retaining or renewing any license or permit to engage in any business or calling or to practice any profession in the District of Columbia.

(b) To make, adopt, and enforce regulations requiring persons, firms, and corporations, other than utility companies, engaged within the District of Columbia in the business of plumbing or gas fitting, or of installing, maintaining, or repairing heating, ventilating, air-conditioning, or mechanical refrigerating apparatus, equipment, appliances,

systems, or parts thereof, or of installing, maintaining, or repairing apparatus, equipment, fixtures, appliances, or wiring, using, or conducting electric current, to furnish and keep in force a bond running to the District of Columbia with corporate surety authorized by the United States Treasury Department, and by the Insurance Department of the District of Columbia to do business in the District of Columbia in an amount not exceeding $5,000, conditioned upon the performance in accordance with law and regulations in force in the District of Columbia of all such work undertaken by such person, firm, or corporation, and to keep the District of Columbia harmless from the consequences of any and all acts performed by said person, firm, or corporation in connection with such business during the period covered by the said bond.

The surety on any such bond may terminate its liability under such bond by giving 30 days' written notice thereof, served either personally or by registered mail, to the principal and to the Commissioners; and upon giving such notice the surety shall be discharged from all liability under such bond for any act or omission of the principal occurring after the expiration of 30 days from the date of service of such notice. Unless on or before the expiration of such period the principal shall duly file a new bond in like amount and conditioned as the original in substitution of the bond so terminated, the license of the principal to engage in such business shall likewise terminate upon the expiration of such period. Upon making any payment on account of its bond, the surety shall immediately notify the Commissioners.

In the event the surety becomes insolvent or a bankrupt, or ceases to be authorized by the United States Treasury Department, or by the Insurance Department of the District of Columbia to do business in the District of Columbia, the principal shall, within 10 days after notice thereof, given by the Commissioners, duly file a new bond in like amount and conditioned as the original and if the principal shall fail to do so the license of such principal shall terminate. If a recovery be had on any bond the principal shall restore the bond to its original amount.

Any person aggrieved by the violation of any law or regulation in force in the District of Columbia relating to such business shall have, in addition to his right of action against said person, firm, or corporation, a right to bring suit against the surety on said bond, either alone or jointly with the principal thereon, and to recover in an amount not exceeding the penalty of the bond any damages sustained by reason of any act, transaction, or conduct of the principal which may be in violation of law or regulation in force in the District of Columbia relating to such business.

The Commissioners shall furnish to anyone applying therefor a certified copy of any such bond filed with them upon the payment of a fee to be fixed by the Commissioners therefor, and such certified copy shall be prima facie evidence in any court that such bond was duly executed and delivered by the person, firm, or corporation whose name appears therein.

(c) To rent any building or land belonging to the District of Columbia or under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, or any available space therein, whenever such building or land, or space therein, is not then required for the purpose for which it was acquired, and to rent any used personal property belonging to the District of Columbia which is not then needed for the purpose for which it was acquired: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this paragraph shall have the effect of changing in any manner Public Law No. 732, Seventy-fourth Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the operation of stands in Federal buildings by blind persons, to enlarge the economic opportunities of the blind, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1936.

(d) To grant revocable permits upon such terms, conditions, bonds, and rentals as the Commissioners may impose for the construction of tunnels, and the laying of conduits and pipes in the alleys, streets, and avenues in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

(e) To suspend, with or without pay, any officer or employee appointed by them and, under such rules or regulations as they may prescribe, to delegate this power to any officers or employees of the District of Columbia.

(f) After public hearing to name and change the name of any highway, bridge, building, or other public place or property in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners.

(g) To fix, assess, and collect fees for copies of orders, regulations, permits, certificates, and transcripts of records furnished by the District of Columbia, such fees to be paid to the collector of taxes and deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia.

(h) Where not otherwise specifically provided, to prescribe a penalty upon conviction of a violation of any rule or regulation authorized by this Act by a fine of not more than $300 or imprisonment of not more than 90 days.

SEC. 2. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to appoint such number of employees of the District of Columbia as they shall consider advisable as contracting officers, who, under the direction of the said Commissioners, may exercise any powers with respect to making and entering into contracts on behalf of said District of Columbia and administering said contracts that are now vested by law in the said Commissioners, except as herein otherwise provided; but no contract of $1,000 or more entered into on behalf of said District of Columbia by any contracting officer appointed pursuant to this act shall be binding upon said District of Columbia, or give rise to any claim or demand against said District of Columbia, until approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or a majority of them, sitting as a board.

All contracts entered into by any contracting officer in which such contracting officer or any of the Commissioners shall be personally interested shall be void, and no payment shall be made on any of such contracts by the District of Columbia or by any officer thereof.

That with respect to all contracts of the District of Columbia which contain stipulations for liquidated damages for delay the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and empowered to remit the whole or any part of such damages as in their discretion may be just and equitable.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioners may transfer to, impose upon, and vest in the Director of Inspection of the District of Columbia all or any of the duties imposed upon, and all or any of the powers, rights, and authority vested in, the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia, the Inspector of Plumbing of the District of Columbia, and the Electrical Engineer of the District of Columbia, by any law, and the Commissioners may authorize the said Director of Inspection to delegate any or all of such powers to the Chief Engineer of the Department of Inspection of the District of Columbia and to the Chief of Inspection of the Department of Inspection of the District of Columbia and to their respective deputies when acting for them.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations provided for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia, so far as possible, shall purchase material, supplies, including food supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, in accordance with the regulations and schedules of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department or from various services of the Government of the United States possessing materials, supplies, passenger-carrying and other motor vehicles, and equipment no longer required. Surplus articles purchased from the Government, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price, not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. The various services of the Government of the United States are authorized to sell such surplus articles to the District under the conditions specified, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to amend, alter, or repeal the Executive order of December 3, 1918, concerning the transfer of office materials, supplies, and equipment in the District of Columbia falling into disuse because of the cessation of war activities.

SEC. 5. The Commissioners may, in their discretion and when they deem such action to be in the public interest, effect settlement with owners of real estate authorized to be acquired by purchase or condemnation for District of Columbia purposes, through such title company or companies in the District of Columbia as may be designated by the Commissioners, and to pay from appropriations available for the acquisition of such real estate reasonable fees to cover the cost of the services rendered by such title company or companies.

SEC. 6. The power and authorities conferred by this act are to be construed as in addition to and not by way of limitation of the powers now vested by law in the Commissioners.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 13, strike out the words "United States Treasury Department" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury to do business pursuant to section 3 of the act of August 13, 1894 (28 Stat. 279), as amended (U. S. C., title 6, sec. 8)."

On page 3, line 16, strike out the words "United States Treasury Department" and insert "Secretary of the Treasury to do business pursuant to section 3 of the act of August 13, 1894 (28 Stat. 279), as amended (U. S. C., title 6, sec. 8)."

On page 4, line 11, strike out the words "may be" and insert the word "is."

On page 4, line 20, insert:

"The Commissioners are further authorized to provide, in accordance with such regulations as they may prescribe, for the examination of the qualifications and fitness of all applicants for licenses to engage in any of the businesses herein enumerated by a board, consisting of not less than two persons who have been actively engaged in the District of Columbia for at least 5 years next preceding their appointment in the business for which license is sought (one of whom shall have been an owner or manager and one of whom shall have been an employee competent to superintend the performance of work) and not less than one official of the District of Columbia, appointed by the said Commissioners: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall repeal existing law relating to the examination and licensing of master plumbers and gas fitters."

On page 6, line 8, strike out subparagraph (f) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(f) To name highways and to name and change the name of any circle, bridge, building, or other public place or property in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners, and after public hearing to change the name of any highway under the jurisdiction of said Commissioners."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to see if we can find out what the program is going to be for the next few days.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad that the gentleman has asked that question.

The appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice will be brought up. I understand they have agreed to 5 hours' debate. If the bill is disposed of tomorrow and passed then I will ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until Monday, which I would do anyway. But if it is disposed of, then I will ask unanimous consent that the call of the Consent Calendar on Monday be dispensed with and that it be in order to call it on the following Wednesday. Therefore on Monday there will be no business and on Tuesday there would be no legislative business. So if the bill which we are about to start debate on now is disposed of by tomorrow afternoon or sometime tomorrow there will be no business until Wednesday of next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be nothing of a controversial nature?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. There will be nothing of a controversial nature, except what can be brought up by unanimous consent only.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Stars and Stripes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WORK OF COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS NO. 3

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to call attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Committee on Elections No. 3, of which I have the honor to be chairman, has finished all of the business before this committee and has reported to the House the results of its various issues decided.

During this Congress four contested election cases have been disposed of by this committee. All four of these contests were highly controversial and three of the contests were vigorously prosecuted before our committee.

The members of our committee have proceeded in a strictly nonpartisan spirit in considering these contests, feeling that the right to a seat in this great body as reflected by the wishes of the electorate of the respective congressional districts should be scrupulously protected as an essential element of our Government, regardless of the party affiliations of the parties to the contest or the members of this committee.

Numerous meetings of the committee have been held and I here commend the members of the committee for their attendance at these meetings. I know that no committee of the House has a better record of attendance and I doubt that any committee has a record that will equal it.

The members have been studious in their consideration of the issues involved in each case and have attempted to reach a decision in each instance with all the speed that it could wisely act.

In each case the decision of the committee has been a unanimous decision of all the members, and each report and resolution brought to this House by our committee has been adopted by the House without controversy.

At a time when there is a tendency to criticize Congress for failue to expedite the issues before it, I call to the attention of this body and the American people the fact that this committee has handled its business with dispatch, has disposed of all the business before it, and now has a clear calendar. As chairman of the committee I thank each member of the committee for the splendid attendance upon the committee and for the able, fearless, and loyal service they are rendering the American people as members of this committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a speech by the Vice President of the United States given in Seattle last week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the debate on the conference report and to include statements by Messrs. Eccles, Bell, and Paul.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include some testimony given before the Committee on Foreign Affairs by Mr. Neuman, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Albuquerque Journal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars; in one to include an editorial from the Jewish Veteran, and in the other, a letter from Norman H. Davis, of the American Red Cross.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MURDOCK was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the Appendix.)

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, February 16, in the State of Maryland, is officially proclaimed Republic of Lithuania Day. I would like to take this opportunity to publicly acknowledge the great contribution made to the State of Maryland and to the United States of America by citizens of Lithuanian birth and ancestry, especially the sincere loyalty which they have manifested to the land of their adoption by their wholehearted support of the war effort, both by sending their children to serve in our armed forces and by subscribing so generously to the various War bond drives.

Just as Americans of Lithuanian extraction contributed to the progress of the United States, so also, it is an established fact, did the Republic of Lithuania contribute to the cultural progress of Europe, a right which she has been deprived of by her aggressive neighbors. During her period of independence she justified the trust placed in her and proved to the civilized world her capacity to properly govern herself, true to the established principles of democracy.

Lithuanians, ethnically, are neither Slav nor Teuton. Therefore, any allotment of her territory to, or subjugation by, any of her neighbors would prove to be a disturbing influence upon the future peace of Europe.

It will be a happy day when civilized nations are rid of the Nazi hordes and are rehabilitated economically and politically, and the freedom that they enjoyed before the war has been restored. A complete victory for the United Nations will assure all of the smaller nations, including Lithuania as well as the larger nations, their rightful place in the sun.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a message from the Government of China regarding the recent action of the House and Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] displays a painting drawn by an artist of a dam to illustrate his argument, and the gentleman's argument is like the design of his dam. It is designed wrong to meet pressure. The arch is on the opposite side and away from the

water. The shoulders rest away from the anchor and can easily be drawn from place. The effect of pressure on his subsidy dam would be to pull instead of compress. It is apparent to an engineer that the designer knew little about dams and damn little about pressure. It is indeed an ideal design for an argument favoring subsidies.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be continued for a period not to exceed 5 hours, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from California, the ranking minority member [Mr. CARTER], and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, up to the present time I have a number of requests, but I believe by keeping those requests down as much as possible, we can close debate in 5 hours or less. Therefore, I have no objection to the agreement.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4204, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

GENERAL

I wish to begin my statement with a word of commendation for the members of this subcommittee who worked so assiduously and tirelessly during approximately the 3 weeks in which the committee had under consideration over 100 appropriation items contained in this bill for the fiscal year 1945. Each appropriation item was scrutinized very closely, and reductions were made wherever it was felt that such reductions would not impair any of the functions directly or indirectly connected with the war effort. In a number of instances, particularly in connection with items of appropriation less directly connected with the war effort, reductions were made to the extent that the amounts allowed are below the estimated requirements for the current fiscal year, leaving the bureaus affected with but one alternative, and that is the reduction of personnel with corresponding reductions in other objects of expense.

The total amount recommended by the committee for the three departments encompassed by this bill for the fiscal year 1945 is approximately $231,300,000. The Members of the House are familiar with the fact that the 1945 estimates contain amounts necessary to defray the cost of war overtime, whereas appropriations in the estimated amount of $22,700,000 are still to be made for war overtime for the current fiscal year. Accordingly, when this additional amount is added to the appropriations of $211,615,000 already made for the current fiscal year, we arrive at a total of approximately $234,300,000 for 1944, as compared with $231,300,000 for 1945, or a net decrease of approximately $3,000,000.

The reduction of approximately $6,000,000 under the Budget estimates effected by the committee reduces the funds for these three departments for the fiscal year 1945 to the minimum need, and it is strongly recommended that no consideration be given to additional reductions. While the three departments covered by this bill are old-line agencies, they have nonetheless felt the impact of the war to a very great extent. Most of the bureaus and divisions of these three departments are directly concerned with the war, and the rest of the bureaus are indirectly concerned with the war through the performance of services for war agencies, for which services the war agencies would otherwise have to establish organizations of their own.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The amount of approximately $44,234,000 is recommended for the Department of State for the ensuing fiscal year. When the cost of war overtime still to be appropriated for the current fiscal year is added to the 1944 appropriation, the amount allowed is an increase of approximately $5,189,000 over the current year's requirements. Of this amount, approximately $898,000 is for the Domestic Service, $3,615,000 is for the Foreign Service, and $676,000 is for the items contained under the heading of "International obligations."

The work of the Department of State in this crucial period in international affairs is directed to two main objectives: First, the maintenance of international cooperation essential for the united war effort involving, among a vast number of functions, the supervision of wartime restrictions and controls to insure operation with a minimum of international conflict, and the protection of long-time policy objectives of this Government; and, second, the laying of groundwork for sound international policies to follow the war in the light of the position of the United States in international affairs, which places upon it a tremendous responsibility for leadership.

The Department operates in an advisory, coordinative, and servicing capacity with respect to some fifty-odd departments and agencies of this Government; its advisory and cooperative relationship with intergovernmental bodies and groups, exclusive of direct relations with representatives of foreign governments, is practically incalculable. This point is directed not so much at the volume of the work but particularly at the breadth of subjects and problems which must be studied, understood, and dealt with. We cannot afford at this time not to have a strong Department of State.

The increase allowed by the committee for the domestic activities of the Department was for two purposes: First, the amount of $430,000 for the Division of Communications and Records; and, second, approximately $397,000 to cover the cost of 94 positions considered necessary and authorized by the Department. With respect to the first item, the tremendous increase in the volume of work in the Division of Communications and Records has forced the Department during the current year to borrow employees from the War Department, and also to use personnel charged to the Foreign Service activity of the Department. The committee considered it vital for the Department to use every means to keep its international telegraphic traffic operating and otherwise to maintain all records on an absolutely current basis so that there will be no delay in actions which it may be necessary for the Department to take in connection with any of the economic and political problems which are facing the Department daily.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The amount of $28,770,000 is recommended by the committee for the Foreign Service activities of the Department of State. This, as I have previously indicated, represents an increase of approximately $3,615,000 over the requirements for the current fiscal year. Approximately one-half of this increase, or $1,618,000, results from the proposed transfer during the fiscal year 1945 of certain functions heretofore performed abroad under the supervision and guidance of the Office of Foreign Economic Administration to the Department of State. These funds have heretofore been appropriated to the Office of Foreign Economic Administration, but were transferred to the State Department for the purpose of augmenting the Foreign Service Auxiliary to perform work for the Office of Foreign Economic Administration. The Department of State and the Bureau of the Budget felt that this money should be appropriated directly to the State Department in view of the fact that the work, in any event, was performed by the Foreign Service officers of that Department. The balance of the increase allowed of approximately $2,000,000 is primarily for, first, the purpose of defraying the cost of transportation of the Foreign Service officers, which has increased considerably because of the increased activity in the foreign field and because of the increased cost in transportation; second, the cost-of-living allowances for the Foreign Service made necessary because of the slightly increased personnel and the inflationary spiral which is taking place throughout the world at the present time; third, miscellaneous salaries and allowances for the purpose of granting to alien employees certain small increases in compensation in lieu of overtime granted to American employees and for additional

salary requirements in the courier service necessary for the adequate safeguard of confidential communications; and, fourth, the Foreign Service Auxiliary, for the purpose of augmenting the present staff. The importance of this last-named item cannot be overemphasized in view of the fact that the economic nature of the functions in which this Service is engaged is such a vital part of our effort to bring this war to an early and successful conclusion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The reason the office was changed to the State Department was that responsibility might be fixed in one office and the State Department handles our foreign affairs. I am very glad it was transferred.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is correct.

A strong Foreign Service, especially at this time, is a national necessity. It plays a vital role in counteracting enemy influence in neutral countries. A diplomatic tug-of-war is going on continuously and the outcome in various countries affects the course of the war itself profoundly. Whether a strategically placed neutral state joins the Axis, remains neutral and favors the enemy, or decides to aid the cause of the United Nations can affect the length of the war and involve costs measured in billions of dollars and priceless lives. Then there are the great responsibilities in the field of foreign relations in the postwar world, which should not find us unprepared. It would not be good statesmanship to spend billions to win the war and not make adequate provision for our State Department and for our diplomatic and consular establishments abroad, which must play a leading part in the conduct of this Government's foreign relations during and after the war.

Vital decisions on foreign policy are of course made by the President, but they must be based on accurate information garnered from every part of the world, which is correlated and interpreted by the Department of State and other agencies of the Government in Washington. The Foreign Service is the field force through which the necessary contacts with foreign governments are established, and on which we depend for an interpretation of the official acts and public opinion of foreign countries. It submits a tremendous volume of material for distribution to all departments of the Government. During the past year such factual and interpretative material has reached the rate of some 28,000 reports per month distributed to 54 departments and agencies.

In addition to reporting, our diplomatic and consular officers perform under the guidance of the Department of State a very large volume of this Government's day-to-day business abroad, involving negotiations with foreign countries the protection of American interests, furtherance of friendly relations and solidarity with other countries, the promotion of trade and commerce, and an infinite variety of services for American citizens and the public.

INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS

The amount of $7,046,000 is recommended for the international obligations of this Nation, which amount represents an increase of approximately $676,000 over the requirements for the current fiscal year.

This appropriation is, first, to provide funds for payment by the United States of its annual share in the expenses of certain international commissions, congresses, bureaus, or other associations of which it is a member and from which it receives certain benefits, and to the maintenance of which it is committed to contribute annually by reasons of treaty provisions or law; second, to provide funds necessary to defray the cost of international conferences, proposed and undetermined, in which the United States Government will be a participant; and third, to provide funds necessary for carrying into effect the established cooperative program with the South American republics as enunciated and agreed to in the resolutions and declarations adopted at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace at Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1936, and at the Eighth International Conference of American States held at Lima, Peru, in 1938.

Although reductions in other items included under this heading result in a net increase of approximately $676,000, one item, namely, the cost of "international conferences," not heretofore carried in the bill, accounts for $1,500,000 of the total appropriation. The need for this item is more or less uncontrollable as the number or extent of conferences in which the United States might participate during the fiscal year 1945 is not known at the present time. It should be noted that, in the event this amount proves to be more than adequate, funds appropriated for this item can be used for no other purpose; on the other hand, if the amount proves to be insufficient, recourse may be had to deficiency appropriations.

The amount of $3,450,000, a reduction of $1,050,000 under both the current year's appropriation, and the budget estimate, is recommended for "cooperation with the American republics."

The program for which this appropriation is recommended is the result of several years of careful thought and actual experience in developing those types of activities which will benefit most our present and future relationships with the other American republics. This is not an emergency program worked out for any temporary purpose. It is a long-range endeavor in which the facilities of our Government are joined with the effort and support of the other American countries.

The results of this program are to the very direct benefit of this country. Let me cite two illustrations. We are cooperating with several countries in agricultural experiment stations for the development of such present-day strategic products as rubber, quinine, and manila hemp. The Western Hemisphere is the native habitat of the rubber tree, yet this country let itself become dependent for its rubber on importations from the other side of the world. These agricultural experiment stations are developing strains of rubber than can resist the disease of the Tropics of the Americas. They are developing strains of rubber that will greatly exceed the yield of the rubber trees of the Far East. There is no reason why we cannot get all of our natural rubber needs from our neighbors in the Americas. The same goes for quinine of which there is a shortage for our soldiers, and for manila hemp which is essential for the ropes that every warship must carry. For a mighty small expenditure, we are laying now one of the foundations of our future security.

Take another illustration. Under this program we are training airplane pilots and mechanics and meteorologists from the other American republics. Upon their return to their own countries, they insist upon cooperation with the United States in aviation matters. They want our air lines to cooperate in the extension of air services. They want our planes and equipment. They want to work with United States aviation.

Another very important aspect of this program is that it is worked out on a cooperative basis. In some projects the contribution of other countries is a direct financial one which in aggregate exceeds our own. That is the case regarding some of the agricultural experiment stations I referred to. In other cases, they furnish equipment and facilities. In others, they provide a certain share of the expenses concerned in the training of technical personnel. For example, I can tell you that our Government is very anxious to improve radio-communication facilities within this hemisphere, and the other countries are equally eager to do all they can toward that end. However, their ability to cooperate depends not only upon the existence of sufficient technical equipment but also upon trained personnel to use this equipment. We are, through this program, rendering needed assistance to train these technicians.

Each of these individual projects is carried out by that agency of the Federal Government which is best qualified to deal with the program. However, the entire program is under the guidance and direction of the Department of State. This method of administrating the program was put into effect at the recommendation of Congress and has proved to be of extreme value in insuring that all the activities, regardless of their individual merit, contribute the maximum to the policies of the United States Government as interpreted by the Secretary of State.

Although this program is of a long-range character, it has already clearly demonstrated its value. The small expenditures made are being compensated many times over in ways that appeal to your sound judgment and mine. It is the sort of program that merits full support.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Considering the amount of estimated overtime still to be appropriated for the

current fiscal year, the requirements of this Department in 1945 will approximate the requirements for 1944. The total amount recommended by the committee is approximately $116,500,000, representing an increase of about $800,000 when compared with the current year's requirements. The functions of the Department are divided into four major subdivisions, namely, Legal Activities and General Administration, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Prison System.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

The first item, as the title implies, handles the legal work of the Federal Government, the functions being allocated to some 21 offices and divisions. Testimony presented reveals that the work load in all the divisions has been increasing steadily primarily as a result of the war and the many wartime statutes that are now in effect. The principal item under this heading is one covering appropriations for the Lands Division. It should be noted that the Lands Division is purely a service organization, having little or no control over the amount of work delegated to it by other agencies of the Government engaged in the process of acquiring land and structures for Federal use during the war emergency. The amount of $4,275,000 is recommended for this Division for 1945. It was testified that on the basis of the present rate of progress, if no new requests for acquisitions of lands are received, it would require approximately 3 years to dispose of 74,000 tracts of land now pending in condemnation.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Almost one-half of the total amount contained in this bill for the Department of Justice represents appropriations to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for which the amount of $49,850,000 is recommended. During the past year, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has continued to perform its work with such efficiency that even though we are now in our third year of war no foreign-inspired sabotage or espionage plots have been successfully culminated.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I am very favorably impressed with the excellent work that the gentleman's subcommittee has done in connection with this bill, and I want to especially commend the gentleman and his committee for their support and encouragement with reference to the work of J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. However, I notice there is a certain sum of money not allowed. Will the gentleman explain why there was a cut to the extent of $230,000?

Mr. RABAUT. The amount the gentleman mentions when compared to the total sum appropriated is infinitesimally small and we felt it could be absorbed in the general turn-over of the Department.

To John Edgar Hoover and his staff must go the credit for effectively throttling such abortive attempts of enemy infiltration as have been planned. All complaints of suspected espionage and sabotage are thoroughly scrutinized by special agents of this Bureau.

I wish to point out that during the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 there were 56 convictions for violations of the espionage statutes, and 90 convictions of violations of the sabotage statutes. None of these crimes of sabotage was foreign inspired.

Since the outbreak of war approximately 15,000 alien enemies have been apprehended. Searches of dwellings of reported alien enemies were conducted in 26,000 cases, resulting in the seizure of tremendous quantities of contraband articles such as firearms, ammunition, explosives, and other nefarious devices. These results attest to the vigilance and thoroughness with which Mr. Hoover and his staff are protecting our country from the enemy within our borders.

The report your committee received of the handling by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of violations of the criminal provisions of the Selective Service Act was most heartening. We have had no mass dragnets looking toward the apprehension of selective-service violators, yet many thousands of such violators through the efforts of the Federal Bureau of Investigation have complied with the provisions of the statute and have become available for induction into our armed services. Although the true worth of this particular activity cannot be measured by the number of violators who have been convicted, yet since the passage of the act there have been almost 7,000 persons convicted and sentenced for such violations.

Although the bulk of investigative effort is rightfully channeled into internal security matters by the Federal Bureau of Investigation the investigations of violations of other criminal statutes such as kidnaping, bank robbery, automobile theft, and other comparable crimes are being closely supervised to eliminate the possibility of any such crime waves sweeping our country either now or in the coming post-war period such as have been experienced in the years past.

The identification activities in Washington reveal .. continued increased work load. During the fiscal year 1943 approximately 27,000,000 sets of fingerprint records were received for handling, an increase of approximately 12,000,000 sets over the previous fiscal year. The handling of these records has been of undisputed assistance not only to our law-enforcement organizations but to our entire war industry.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation continues to render most valued assistance to other war agencies. In its files section alone on an average of 35,000 names are searched each week at the request of other war agencies so that valuable information which may be in the Federal Bureau of Investigation files can be made available to such agencies.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

With reference to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the amount of $28,300,000 is recommended. This is approximately the same amount as will be required for this service for the current fiscal year. Reductions in certain of the activities in this service, resulting primarily from a recent reorganization, will enable this subdivision of the Department to expend approximately $1,470,000 additional for alien enemy detention in 1945. Most of the credit for this reorganization is due Mr. Earl G. Harrison, Commissioner, who, according to testimony, has instituted some very needed reforms. At approximately this time last year the Service had in operation 12 key facilities with an internee population of about 6,000 aliens. At the present time the Service is operating 16 detention facilities with an estimated population of 9,000 aliens. It is the sense of the committee that further reductions in the amount of appropriations cannot be effected without seriously jeopardizing this activity. As a matter of fact, the estimates for 1945 were predicated on an internee population of 8,000; whereas, as I have already indicated, the population at the present time is 9,000.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Federal Prison System is $15,930,000, representing an increase of about $600,000 over the current year's requirements. The System is responsible for the custody of a daily average population of 17,000 prisoners in 25 Federal penal and correctional institutions. In addition, it is responsible for a daily average population of about 3,500 Federal prisoners housed in some 700 non-Federal institutions. Whereas there has been some decrease in the regular peacetime offenses, these have been more than offset by the influx of wartime offenders, principally violators of the Selective Service Act and violators of other national defense laws. Furthermore, as our Army has increased, there has been an increase in inmates as a result of military court martials.

The number incarcerated in Federal institutions dropped to a low point of about 15,200 in September 1943 from a high point of over 19,000 in December 1939. It now appears, however, the Federal prison population is again on the upgrade because since September there has been a steady increase until, at the present time, there are approximately 16,000 prisoners in Federal institutions, an increase of 800 in the past 4 months. It is estimated the number of Federal prisoners will average 16,400 during the fiscal year 1945, upon which these estimates were based. It should also be pointed out that the cost of items necessary for the Federal prison system to purchase in maintaining the prison population has gone up somewhat in price, resulting in an estimated cost per man per day of 81.7 cents for 1945, as compared with 78.5 cents per man per day for 1944. I wish to state for the information of the Members of the House that the Federal prison institutions are now producing war materials to the approximate value of $19,000,000 per year, with the average value of goods produced per employed inmate per year at $5,300 as compared with approximately $1,500 per man per year in 1939. During the past year one carload of war materials was shipped by

Federal prisoner industries every 44 minutes of each working day. Also, on the prison farms commodities to the value of nearly $1,000,000 were produced during the past year. This, incidentally, goes a long way toward supplying food for the prisoners and feed for the stock necessary to operate the institutions.

What I am about to say has nothing to do with the amount of appropriations required for the Federal prison system for 1945. I must tell you of the great interest in the war effort that is being manifested by the inmates of our penal and correctional institutions and of the spirit of cooperation that has existed in connection with the purchase of War bonds. Up to December 31, 1943, the prisoners in our Federal institutions had invested over $375,000 of their meager earnings in War bonds—an average of nearly $250 per inmate. Many of them have been donors to the Red Cross blood banks, and great numbers have expressed earnest and sincere desires to serve their country in the armed forces. Approximately 400 prisoners have already been released for the purpose of going into the Army or Navy. This is, indeed, a commendable record and a record which exemplifies, better than I could otherwise describe, the unity of this Nation at the present moment.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The bill before you contains the amount of approximately $70,600,000 for the Department of Commerce—a reduction of approximately $2,000,000 under the appropriations already made for the current fiscal year, but a reduction of approximately $9,000,000 under the total requirements for the current fiscal year, or after the inclusion in the 1944 requirements of approximately $7,000,000 still to be appropriated for war overtime. Although the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and subsidiary corporations have been considered in connection with the estimates for this Department, no withdrawals from the Treasury general fund are made for this organization. By law, the Congress fixes the amount that may be used from corporate funds for administrative purposes. Accordingly, the total amount given excludes the administrative costs of this organization. This Department is very closely related to the war effort, particularly through the work done by the Census Bureau, Civil Aeronautics Administration, Coast and Geodetic Survey, National Bureau of Standards, and the Weather Bureau. Prior to the war, the Department had accumulated a mass of data and general information that has been of immeasurable value to all of the agencies of the Government directly concerned with the prosecution of the war.

The amount of $5,665,000 is recommended for the Census Bureau—an increase of approximately $1,400,000 over the current year's requirements. A large part of the increase granted is for the purpose of maintaining permanent nucleus staffs in the various divisions of the Bureau for greater efficiency and economy of operation. Heretofore, large staffs were employed as and when required for each of the censuses which must be taken according to law. The resulting uncertainty of job tenure has caused disruptingly high turn-over of employees. Furthermore, it is the thought that much necessary information which is needed in connection with these censuses can be developed in between census periods, which will result in an over-all reduction in the cost of each census. The remainder of the increase is for additional salaries and expenses in connection with the customs statistics activities. Specifically, the funds will be used for the conversion from the commodity classification system now followed to a standard commodity classification in order to place all such statistics on a uniform basis. Much confusion has resulted heretofore because of the different methods of classification of export and import commodities employed by the different agencies of the Government and it is felt that this system should be standardized because of its important post-war aspects.

The amount of $33,844,000 is recommended for the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the establishment and maintenance of air-navigation facilities and for the enforcement of safety regulations. Although civilian flying has decreased in volume considerably during the past 2 or 3 years, this decrease has been more than offset by the increase in military flying and, in view of the fact that this activity was established for civilian purposes, it is incumbent upon the organzation to maintain our Federal airway system which at the present time approximates 40,000 miles. The amount of the decrease of approximately $11,000,000 under the current year's requirements is due principally to the inclusion in the 1944 appropriation of an item of almost $10,000,000 for the development of civil landing areas, and a reduction of approximately $1,000,000 in requirements for technical equipment to be installed in the various airports throughout the country.

With respect to the Coast and Geodetic Survey, this is primarily all war work. This service is engaged in three major functions, namely, the production of marine charts, the production of aeronautical charts, and the execution of geodetic surveys along our coasts and throughout the interior of the United States and Alaska. Of the total amount of $5,625,000 recommended in the bill for this bureau, 66 percent will be spent for marine charts, 21 percent for aeronautical charts, and 13 percent for geodetic surveys.

The amount of $1,905,000, recommended by the committee for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, is slightly less than the estimated 1944 requirements for this activity. It is felt that this Bureau should be strengthened because of its close touch with the economic fabric of this country, which will no doubt make it a very important activity after the war period. The matter of small business was discussed at some length during the hearings, and I for one feel that any organization that is making an effort to aid and preserve small business in this country should have the support of the Members of this House.

With respect to the National Bureau of Standards, for which the amount of approximately $2,900,000 is recommended, and the Weather Bureau, for which the amount of $12,700,000 is recommended, there is little to be said. The former is engaged almost exclusively in war work, involving the mechanical construction of a great many instruments and special devices, and the testing and inspection of materials for war use. The results of the work of the Weather Bureau has shown its effect not only in this country with respect to our aviation and food crops, but in other countries and areas of the world as well, with respect to our military operations.

I feel very strongly that the bill should be passed as presented.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us making the regular appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce has been very well summarized by the chairman of our committee. There are some important items in the bill which I plan to discuss when we read the bill for amendment. At this time, however, I wish to confine my remarks to the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civilian Pilot Training.

You will observe that the bill now before us carries no estimates for Civilian Pilot Training, but the estimates for this item for the fiscal year 1945 will be submitted in a supplemental budget.

Many questions have been asked whether these large appropriations for the training of pilots through Civilian Pilot Training program have been justified. I will endeavor to give you a report on the activities of not only the C. P. T. but also of the C. A. A. I believe when I complete this statement that you will all agree with me that the appropriations were more than justified, and the record will show that these appropriations resulted in tremendous value to our war effort.

I want to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues on the committee for their great interest in civilian pilot training and especially for their serious work on the program from its inception. I especially wish to commend our chairman the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT; the gentleman from California, the Honorable ALBERT E. CARTER; the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable JOHN H. KERR; the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable BUTLER B. HARE; the gentleman from Ohio, the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES; and the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, who early realized that aviation would be the means of winning the war and realized the necessity of training civilians to fly in order that the Army and the Navy would have a large reservoir of pilots when the need came. That need arose and was met by a program for which this committee had previously provided substantial appropriations.

WAR RECORD OF C. A. A. AND C. P. T.

We on the home front have a job to do that transcends everything else—winning this war as quickly and economically as possible. Today our soldiers, sailors, and marines are slugging their way forward on battlefields all over the

world. They are enduring the dangers and hardships that try men's souls, and they are meeting the test superbly, though not without heartbreaking cost.

At this very moment American boys are falling—your sons and mine, the father of the little boy down the street, the brother of the corner grocer, the sweetheart of the girl next door.

Thinking of this and everything our men in uniform bear so cheerfully, I get somewhat impatient with those who sit by their fireplace, warm and comfortable, complaining about their hardships and sacrifices. But these will not divert us. We can and will see that our men at the front get everything they need to smash on to final victory—food, clothes, ammunition, guns, ships, tanks, and planes—above all, planes, more and better planes, with all the facilities needed to get them up and keep them up in the air. We will make quite sure that our advancing troops and hard-hitting ships are never without a protecting umbrella.

Air power is the key to victory. It is not only the key to victory now but to our national security and prosperity in the future.

Air power truly conceived consists of more than planes on the battle front. Its roots lie deep in the civilian home front. To be strong, it must be based on a sound civilian aviation structure. Without any exaggeration whatever, aviation is everybody's business. More particularly, it is the business of the Congress, which by the policies it adopts can make or break it.

To illustrate what I have said and to bring the basic problems of air power into sharper focus, I want to speak here of an outstanding civilian contribution to the war effort, one that has forwarded air power in every respect. It is about time, I think, that credit should be given where credit is due—to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The C. A. A. has marshalled the civilian aviation resources of the country and forged them into an instrument of the greatest value. Through its bold and realistic approach to the basic principles of air power it has provided a leadership difficult to match in any other field.

In 1938, when war clouds loomed dark and large on the horizon, the far-sighted men in C. A. A. proposed a civilian pilot training program designed to make this country air-minded and provide a reservoir of trained airmen in case of sudden emergency. We in the Congress studied the proposal and authorized such a program, first on an experimental basis, later on a country-wide basis, and the dividends of that policy are beyond calculation. It was one of the most effective measures of national preparedness ever undertaken.

Months before the Nazis fell on Poland, the C. P. T. program was under way, turning out pilots—not military pilots but skilled airmen ready to be taught the tricks of fighting in the air. We appropriated $4,000,000 for the initial program. After it had proved itself we upped the figure to $37,000,000 and appropriated $25,000,000 the next year—in both cases voting larger funds than recommended by the Budget. And never was money better spent.

By Pearl Harbor, within less than 3 years, the number of licensed civilian pilots in this country had jumped from less than 25,000 to more than 100,000. At the same time the number of civilian planes more than doubled, rising from 12,000 to almost 25,000, with a corresponding stimulus to the aircraft-manufacturing industry. More than 65,000 of these pilots were graduates of the C. P. T. courses offered at more than 600 colleges and flying schools throughout the country. Thousands more young Americans were inspired to win their wings by the widespread interest in aviation aroused by the C. P. T. program in all the 48 States.

That program, wisely, was a decentralized program. It did not involve Federal duplication of already existing facilities. Rather, it organized local colleges and flying schools into a great cooperative endeavor to serve the public interest, not only in the immediate vicinity but for the Nation as a whole. Consequently, it was a grass-roots program, reaching out into every corner of the land, and I know from experience in my own State that it brought aviation to country crossroads where it had never been before.

It did more than teach American youth to fly. It made aviation and its problems a lively subject of discussion everywhere—at businessmen's clubs, chambers of commerce, college faculty meetings, college dormitories, local school boards, women's clubs, Pullman smoking rooms, country clubs, trade-unions, the Grange and farmer cooperatives, fraternal organizations, meetings of parent-teacher associations—everywhere that people were alive to present developments and thinking about the future.

That is one fundamental of air power—wide public interest in aviation, and the widest possible public participation. We can never become a nation on wings, as we must, if we make a cult of flying—if the country as a whole does not become air-minded. That was one of the primary aims of C. P. T., and it accomplished that purpose beyond the expectations of its most enthusiastic supporters.

But what about the ground and flight instruction offered by C. P. T.? Did that measure up to standard? How have its graduates fared since graduation? What are they doing now?

By the summer of 1941, 6 months before Pearl Harbor, they were streaming into the armed forces at the rate of 1,000 a month. Bear in mind that at the beginning of 1941 the Army Air Force had approximately 6,000 pilots, with some 7,000 cadets in training. By the end of the year the Army had perhaps 20,000 flyers who had reached or passed the training received by the 65,000 C. P. T. graduates. The Navy had perhaps 10,000 such pilots. The exact figures necessarily still are maintained secret.

This great reservoir of C. P. T. graduates immeasurably speeded up the building of our now incomparable Air Forces. As General Arnold declared in his recent report—I quote:

> The Civilian Pilot Training Program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration constituted a valuable pool from which personnel could be drawn.

TUFTS COLLEGE AN EXAMPLE

I have here before me a list of the C. A. A. pilots trained at Tufts College near Boston, Mass., between the fall session of 1939 and the spring session of 1942. Of the 111 graduates, 54 went directly into the Navy, 32 into the Army, and 25 into the aviation industry at some job requiring special aviation skill. In sum, every last one of these boys volunteered for services directly forwarding the war program. This list is a very interesting and significant document, and I give it here as an outstanding example of this great program:

SUMMARY OF PRESENT STATUS OF MEN WHO TRAINED AT TUFTS COLLEGE UNDER THE CIVILIAN PILOT TRAINING PROGRAM—PRIOR TO JULY 1, 1942, EXTRACURRICULAR

PRIMARY, FALL 1939

Parker M. Bartlett, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve, Washington, D. C.

Robert Bertagna, chief carpenter's mate, construction battalion, United States Navy.

E. Arthur Bonney, technical adviser to Flight Engineering Department of Army Air Corps at Sheppard Field, Tex.

Richard J Coar experimental test engineer, Pratt & Whitney.

Aaron Garber, Boston Navy Yard, electrical engineer.

Everett F. Kimball, private, Army Air Force.

Charles A. Lister, General Electric Co., design engineer.

Forrest G. Parker, Jr., lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve. Assistant Officer in Charge of Air Station, Creeds, Va.

Raymond W. Peach, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, instructor in instrument flying, Naval Air Base, Atlanta, Ga.

James Robinson, industry.

Albert A. Schaal, ensign, AV-(N) United States Naval Reserve.

Norman R. Sherman, captain, United States Marine Corps.

Delmont J. Sylvester, lieutenant, Army Air Corps (overseas duty).

Herbert S. Wight, lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve, Washington, D. C.

PRIMARY, SUMMER 1940

Gerald E. Achin, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve, Air Station, Glenview, Ill.

Laurence C. Bommarito, lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve, Parachute Battalion, demolition unit.

Joseph L. Cafarella, Tufts College Medical School.

Edward M. Chamberlain, ensign, United States Naval Reserve Air Force.

Gordon C. Hart, naval aviation cadet.

Edward W. Jervis, Jr., ensign O-V(S) United States Naval Reserve.

Edward Kalustian, engineer.

Guy M. Mitchell, Jr., naval aviation cadet, Corpus Christi, Tex.

Richard B. Mitchell, lieutenant, Army Air Force. Took part in raids on Tunisia.

Arthur N. Olive, Jr., lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve. Construction Corps volunteer specialist.

William R. Page, Atlas Powder Co., chemical engineer, Paducah, Ky.

Paul D. Pfanstiehl, ensign E-V(S) United States Naval Reserve. Naval Torpedo Station.

Charles J. Ross, Jr., copilot, Air Transport Command, North Atlantic Division; technical adviser on radio blind-landing and direction-finding; multi-engine and instrument flight instructor; chief ground instructor, Pilot Training Division, Burlington, Vt.; instruction staff of radio operators' training program, Burlington; director of research, Northeast Airlines.

Leonard S. Rubin, naval aviation cadet.

Ralph C. Runels, naval aviation cadet, Corpus Christi, Tex.

William K. Woodard, Tufts Medical School. Navy.

Llewellyn A. Young, contract engineer working with Navy.

SECONDARY—FALL 1940

Robert T. Holland, General Electric Co., application engineer, aviation division.

Aaron G. Olmsted was second lieutenant in Army; now test pilot for Pratt & Whitney.

Raymond W. Peach.[1]

PRIMARY—FALL 1940

John Allyn, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve; active duty in the Aleutians since November 1942; pilot of bomber.

Frank E Bennett, Jr., lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve; Naval Air Corps; instructor.

John J. Burke, lieutenant, Army Air Force; reconnaissance squadron.

John O. Cimaglia, captain and operations officer in Army Air Corps; Africa.

Sidney A. Edwards, lieutenant, Army Air Corps; fighter squadron; killed in accident July 1, 1943.

Charles E. Griner, Jr., supervisor, tool and gage planning and scheduling.

Bennett D. Katz, captain, Army Air Corps; piloting new planes to overseas destinations.

David W. Kinney, ensign, United States Naval Reserve; on a destroyer.

Leon E. Kruger, Army aviation cadet.

Robert B. Overstreet, lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve; instrument instructor (multiengine)

Harold H. Ricker, transition instructor for the Army Transport Command.

John J. Santosuosso, ensign, United States Naval Reserve; Pacific duty.

Richard G. VanGundy, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve; Corpus Christi, Tex.

Carl E. Wartchow, ensign AV(S), United States Naval Reserve; Alaska.

George R. West, second lieutenant, Army Air Force; instructor.

William R. Mitchell, General Electric Co.; aircraft equipment.

PRIMARY—SPRING 1941

Robert J. Franklin, Army aviation cadet; Louisiana.

Harry W. Hollmeyer, second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve; marine fighter squadron, Solomon Islands.

Manuel S. Lato, second lieutenant, Army.

Allan M. Morton, ensign, United States Naval Reserve; overseas.

James D. Nisbet, metallurgist.

Vernon H. Sherman, second lieutenant, Army; Wendover Field, Utah.

Harold Weldon, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve; torpedo bomber pilot; overseas.

Douglas Wilson, Army private; accidentally killed by drowning at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md., July 15, 1942.

SECONDARY—SPRING 1941

Leopold Ackerman, lieutenant, Army; Africa.

[1] See primary.

Robert B. Aldrich, ensign, United States Naval Reserve; fighter pilot aboard carrier.

Frank E. Bennett, Jr.[1]

Edward M. Chamberlain.[1]

Gordon C. Hart.[1]

Robert B. Overstreet.[1]

Harold H. Ricker.[1]

Thomas E. Stretton, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, Naval Air Station, Pensacola.

Richard G. Van Gundy.[1]

George R. West.[1]

PRIMARY—SUMMER 1941

Frederick C. Bowen, lieutenant, Army Air Force; instructor.

Fred S. Card, Jr., lieutenant, junior grade, Naval Aviation.

Emilius R. Ciampa, second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve, Marine Aviation.

Herbert P. Culp, supercharger engineer.

Hector G. Gal, Jr., lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

John G. Hayward, naval drydock, South Boston; associate marine engineer.

Francis R. Kitchell, Jr., lieutenant, United States Naval Reserve.

Abraham Klaiman, Naval Aviation Cadet.

William P. McIntosh, captain, Army.

John L Quigley, private, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

Ross H Reynolds, Jr., lieutenant, Signal Corps. Active duty since 1941; spent in connection with radar equipment. In England almost a year.

Leonard S. Stone, Army aviation cadet.

Mario Tamburino, chief draftsman.

Henry C. Young, Dallas Aviation School.

SECONDARY—SUMMER 1941

Edward W. Jervis, Jr.[1]

John C. Kelleher, Jr., lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve. Flight leader on carrier in Pacific.

Allan M Morton.[1]

Charles J. Ross.[1]

PRIMARY—FALL 1941

James A Brickett, Jr., ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

William F. Haneman, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve.

Charles D. Kimball, ensign, United States Naval Reserve. Naval air base.

John P Lacy, lieutenant, junior grade, United States Naval Reserve.

Oliver A. Parker, second lieutenant, Army, pursuit pilot.

Kenneth E. Perry, ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Thomas J. L. Redmond, ensign, United States Naval Reserve.

Richard W. Russell, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, instructor, air station.

Stanley I. Skelskie, private, Army, Reserve Officers Training Corps.

David Stiles, Navy, V-5.

Richard F. Tobin, lieutenant, Army Air Corps, overseas duty, awarded the Air Medal.

Orme Wilson, Jr., ensign, AV-(N) United States Naval Reserve, flight instructor.

Jason L. Wolfson, lieutenant, Army Air Force, flight instructor.

SECONDARY—FALL 1941

Alden I. Avery, lieutenant, Army Air Corps, Ferry Command.

Robert J. Franklin.[1]

Milton Green, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps.

Malcolm P. Murphy, copilot, Pan American-Grace Airways, Inc.

John M. Oldsman, pilot, Army Air Corps.

Charles R. Plum, General Electric Co. and Boeing Aircraft.

Aaron Tenenbaum, civilian flight instructor.

[1] See primary.

PRIMARY—SPRING 1942

Vernon A. Allen, ensign, United States Naval Reserve Air Corps.

Salvatore J. Bagnulo, aviation cadet, United States Marine Corps Reserve.

Robert P. Brown, naval aviation cadet.

James L. Grandfield, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps, flight instructor.

George H. Heshion, Jr., naval aviation cadet.

Malcolm E. Johnson, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps.

Stanley Mackey, naval aviation cadet.

Hugh D. McQuillan, aviation cadet, Marine Air Corps.

Gerald F. Meehan, flight instructor, Army Air Corps.

Thomas B. O'Leary, Jr., lieutenant, Army Air Corps, flight instructor.

Ferdinand A. Oliverio, naval aviation cadet.

Williams J. Plummer, Jr., completed four C. C. A. courses, waiting assignment.

Robert F. Upton, Watertown arsenal.

Franklin Walter, second lieutenant, United States Marine Corps Reserve, flight instructor.

SECONDARY—SPRING 1942

Stanley N. Bjurback, ensign, United States Naval Reserve, naval aviation instructor.

James A. Brickett, Jr.[1]

Harold F. Kedian, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps, flight instructor.

Herbert F. Meyers, second lieutenant, Army Air Corps, Ferry Command, accidentally killed in plane crash June 26, 1943.

Richard W. Russell.[1]

Leonard S. Stone.[1]

Jason L. Wolfson.[1]

Once in the Army and Navy, these C. P. T. boys did better in advanced flying courses than those who had not had the advantage of their training, as the records prove. Less than 12 percent of them, or approximately 1 in 10, washed out in Army primary training. The rate for non-C. P. T. trained was more than 43 percent, or approximately four times as high. While wash-out totals were not so large, the ratio in the Navy was about the same.

And these C. P. T. graduates have gone on to make names for themselves wherever American planes are flying—in combat, in the grasshopper squadrons of the Field Artillery, in the far-flung operations of the Army Air Transport Command, and the Naval Air Transport Service.

Three-fourths of the famous American Eagle Squadron which fought with the R. A. F. in winning the crucial Battle of Britain were American boys whose first taste of flying came at our small civilian flying schools.

Across the world in China several of the famous Flying Tigers were boys from your home town and mine who learned to fly at the local airport.

Ten minutes after the war started at Pearl Harbor, two C. P. T. graduates were in the air downing Japs—Lt. George Welch, of Wilmington, Del., and Lt. Kenneth L. Taylor, of Hominy, Okla. They took to the air under a rain of Jap bombs, and each shot down two attackers. They landed, under fire refueled, stocked up on ammunition, and again took off, Welch shooting down two more Japs before the battle was over.

[1] See primary.

Nineteen of the seventy-nine men who slashed at Tokyo with Gen. Jimmy Doolittle were products of the C. A. A. contract schools, and some suffered the tragic fate of those that were captured.

The Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron has an impressive string of victories to its credit. This is an all-Negro unit, from mechanics to pilots, and many of the pilots and other personnel are C. P. T. graduates.

Six of the 19 members of a Navy squadron in the battle of Midway that shot down 27 enemy planes were C. P. T. graduates. So were 5 of the 12 crew members on the 3 ships that recently came back to Washington after the amazing raid on the Ploesti oil fields.

I could go on reciting the names and exploits of hundreds and hundreds of air boys—all equally heroic—who got the first spark of interest in flying through C. P. T. at their home-town airports. I could give almost every man in this Congress the name of someone from his district—probably a hero decorated for bravery in action—who was started on his way to a flying-fighting career by a civilian instructor at a civilan flight school working with the college or university in his home town or nearby.

I like the story of Milton Tootle, of Missouri, trained at St. Joseph College. "The youngest and most inexperienced pilot on our carrier," proudly say his fellow pilots. But he took off and as he left the flight deck he heard the radio say that a dive bomber was coming in to attack from the port quarter.

"I wasn't thinking of much," said Tootle later, "except that I wanted to get myself a Jap." So he plunged into his own antiaircraft barrage to do it, bagging the dive bomber, but his plane was hit by his own flak.

Tootle bailed out and was picked up later, to be told by his commanding officers that he had saved the huge carrier with its precious freight of men and machines.

Now, who are our outstanding aces in this sky-fighting business? At the very top stands Maj. Joe Foss, of the Marines, from Sioux Falls, S. Dak., with 26 Jap planes to his credit; Capt. Richard Bong, of the Army, from Poplar, Wis., with 21 Japs to his credit; and Capt. Walker Mahurin, of the Army, from Lafayette, Ind., who has shot down 12 Nazi planes. All learned to fly at Civilian Pilot Training Schools, veritably the breeding place of aces, the mother of heroes of the air.

Now take a look at the over-all picture of these kids you and I knew back home, who were trained by the commercial pilots you and I knew back home, and the colleges which you probably attended back home.

I have here a list—and it is only a partial list—of the graduates of these hundreds of civilian flying schools who have gone into battle and been decorated for their exploits. Here are your home-town boys, the 672 of them who, at the last count, were wearing heroes' medals.

There are 5 who have received the Medal of Honor, the highest and most rarely awarded decoration conferred by the United States; 10 of them have been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the next highest honor we give our fighters; 51 the Navy Cross; 121 the Silver Star; 250 the Distinguished Flying Cross; 30 the Purple Heart; 4 the Navy and Marine Corps Medal; and 354 the Air Medal.

One of these 672 heroes received 18 decorations, another 9, another man was given 7, to another went 6, 13 received 4, 40 were given 3, 98 received 2, and 516 were given 1.

I think you will be interested in seeing this complete list, and the folks back home will want to see it, so I am going to include it at the conclusion of my remarks.

I am not saying that these men received their full training in this civilian program. That is not the fact. Everyone of these boys, after he had learned to fly, went on to Army and Navy schools to receive advanced training in swift pursuit ships or heavy bombers, to be instructed in gunnery, tactics, formation flying, and so forth—all of the specialized things a man must know before he can blast the enemy from the air.

But I am saying that in the beginning, when these boys were novices, no one knew whether they were loaded with TNT or would prove to be duds. Some skilled instructor had to assay their flying ability and put them through their elementary instruction to determine whether they were good pilot material or not. This C. A. A. screening process saved the armed forces millions of hours of precious time, releasing planes and personnel for advanced training needs.

The greatest credit is due to these instructors and to the C. A. A., which recruited or trained the vast majority of them.

When the C. P. T. program started, instruction was largely in the hands of the "old timers" at local airports, veterans of the last war and of barnstorming days, men who so loved aviation that they refused to give it up even though financial returns were practically nil and occasionally they had to skip a meal or two. To make sure that their skills were not rusty, the C. A. A. examined and rerated all instructors. This was of the greatest importance and was immediately reflected in the amazing safety record of C. P. T. That record so impressed the hard-boiled insurance underwriters that they made six voluntary reductions in premium rates for C. P. T. students. These rates fell from $20 to $4.90 within less than 3 years—or more than 75 percent. At the same time insurance rates on planes were reduced, which put money into the pockets of every private flyer in the country, thereby stimulating aviation by so much.

To assist these instructors, the C. A. A. made invaluable studies to standardize ground and flight courses, developing improved technical devices, better texts, and new visual aids. Most of these have been taken over and adapted by the armed forces for their own needs, thus assuring a uniform high quality of training. How many people know that C. P. T. texts have become best-sellers? Since 1939 almost 2,000,000 copies of these technical manuals have been sold, spreading knowledge of aeronautics and the gospel of aviation far and wide.

As the C. P. T. program expanded, the supply of veteran instructors was soon exhausted and the C. A. A. began training its own. All of these men have made a vital contribution in building up our military air forces. Many went into uniform to teach at Army and Navy air bases. More than 10,000 have been employed as civilians at schools under contract to the armed forces or working under arrangements with the C. A. A. That the C. A. A. trained an overwhelming majority of these instructors is evident from the fact that up to Pearl Harbor it graduated more than 9,000 and since then has added 11,000. Thus the C. A. A. has provided a teaching force capable of turning out 150,000 pilots a year. If pilot production has reached the seemingly impossible figure we set for it a few years ago, it is thanks primarily to C. P. T.

With the outbreak of hostilities, of course, the C. P. T. was wholly geared to meeting military needs, devoting all of its time, acquired skills, and accumulated facilities to the purpose, turning out pilots by the tens of thousands in accord with specifications laid down by the Army and Navy. Late in 1942 it became the C. A. A. war training service.

C. A. A. AND FIELD ARTILLERY

Early in 1942 the C. A. A. undertook an interesting war job for the field artillery, teaching artillery officers to use light planes as elevated and movable observation platforms.

Here is a perfect example of the way skills learned in civilian flying can be applied to the military machine with which we are winning the war. First, the Air Corps and the Field Artillery discussed who should fly the planes. As the Field Artillery insisted on having a trained artillery observer in the plane, its own officers were taught to fly the planes and maintain them in the field.

A school was set up at Fort Sill, and civilian instructors were supplied from the C. A. A.'s training program. These men, long experienced in flying light planes, taught the artillerymen to do things which the C. A. A. would never countenance in private flying. They took off from small fields, climbed as fast as they could to 500 feet, made their observations, got back on the ground, and hid their planes as fast as possible. Thus every battery had its aerial eyes above it while it was firing, getting instant accurate reports on where its shells were landing, instructions for change of aim and elevation.

These pilot-mechanics were trained in all phases of operating light planes, including maintenance in the field. They were taught how to swing an airplane motor to the limb of a tree and give it a complete overhaul in the field.

These pilots have made amazing contributions to the war. They swarm over the line of guns in the field; they carry messages; they often encounter the enemy's pursuit planes, and some of them have been shot down. One of these pilots, Lt. Julian W. Cummings, who had

learned to fly in the C. P. T., took off from the deck of a small L. S. T. boat before dawn on the day of the north Africa landings and flew throughout the day observing enemy movements, spotting artillery fire, and carrying messages. At one time he landed beside a road, borrowed some gasoline from surface vehicles, and hopped off again, being decorated for his exploit.

Another pilot in one of these "Grasshopper Squadrons" was chased one day by a swift and murderous Messerschmitt. But he so maneuvered his slow light plane that the eager German overshot his mark, crashed into a mountainside, and went up in flames.

When the Fort Sill school started in 1942 it had 24 training planes. Today 300 airplanes are in use at the field. All of the instructors are field-artillery officers and technical men trained by the original C. A. A. instructors, many of whom were invited to join the field artillery as commissioned instructors and still are doing yeoman service.

SERVICE IN LATIN-AMERICA

Another significant war job has been undertaken by C. A. A., which is conducting one of the most practical programs yet designed to forward our good-neighbor policy in this hemisphere. It has trained hundreds of pilots and mechanics to man the Central and South American air lines, thus assuring the expansion of air commerce to the south. At the present time it is training here in the United States 110 aviation students from the Latin-American republics, and examinations are now being given in 11 of these countries to select the 119 likeliest candidates to take the third course offered in 3 fields of aeronautics. Since 1941 almost 500 such students have been brought to this country.

Many were given special training as instructors, so that they could pass on their knowledge to their fellow countrymen when they returned home.

This part of the program has already borne fruit in Mexico and Brazil. In these two Allied Nations pilot training schools on the C. A. A. model have been established with the help of supervisory personnel loaned by the C. A. A.

C. A. A. SPECIAL SERVICES

In addition to all this, the C. A. A. has trained 1,536 men of the armed forces in traffic control work. This includes 605 Army enlisted and 628 Navy enlisted men trained as control-tower operators; and 303 Army officers trained as flight-control officers.

The C. A. A. has also given heavily of its own specialized personnel. Its former deputy administrator, director of safety regulation, regional manager at large, and three regional managers, and the director of its standardization center are just a few of the key people now serving in the military air forces. Approximately 1,200 C. A. A. employees have gone into the armed services, and the great majority of these have training and experience of immeasurable value to the air forces. In the Air Transport Command, in the air communications network, in the airport control towers and filter centers, in the laboratories at Wright Field, you will find ex-C. A. A. employees in important posts.

All told, since it began its pilot-training program, the C. A. A. has turned out more than 200,000 airmen. Since April 1942, all have been members of the Air Corps Reserve or on active duty as Army and Navy cadets. At the present time all Army and Navy cadets get their first flight instruction under C. A. A.

I am informed, however, that the Army and Navy plan to concentrate all of their aviation training at their own schools after June of this year. They can do this because the peak of production in pilots has been passed and it is now only necessary to keep up replacements.

OUR FUTURE AVIATION

This raises a problem of vital importance to every American citizen, particularly to those who are interested in the future of this Nation in the air. What is going to become of these civilian schools no longer needed by the armed forces? The question is all the more immediate because the original act authorizing the Civilian Pilot Training program expires at the end of this fiscal year.

We here in the Congress must soon come to some decision about it. There can be no doubt that it has more than justified itself by its achievements, as I have made plain. The question now is, Should it be continued? If so, under what auspices?

It will be said, of course, that when the men begin coming out of the armed forces we shall have plenty of trained pilots. That is perhaps true so far as immediate needs are concerned. But it is not true for our long-range needs.

What worries me is this: How are we going to assure a fresh crop of pilots each year? We cannot live long on our backlog. We cannot afford a big gap in the ranks of our airmen. Every year hundreds of thousands of youngsters come of age, almost all of them wanting to fly. Are we to tell them that we do not need them—that we have enough pilots—that they had better stay on the ground? If we do, we will pay for it later, not only in military terms but in commercial and economic terms as well. The nation of the future will be that nation which most completely provides its youth with an opportunity to fly. I do not wish to speak of any particular plan for doing that on this occasion, but I do wish to raise the question here and everywhere in the country. It will take the combined brains of all if we are not to make a mistake that may affect our far future.

What I have said is only one aspect of air power. There are others equally fundamental. A sound aviation structure requires something more than planes and pilots. It demands a well-planned airport system, ground facilities of many kinds, and a vast network of navigation aids to assist military, commercial, and private flyers in getting from here to there swiftly and safely, with no annoying delays at either end or along the way.

Before the war, at the direction of the Congress, the C. A. A. made a survey of the airport situation in the country. Based on this survey, the C. A. A. drew up and presented to the Congress a tentative program envisaging a network of 4,000 airports to meet our more or less immediate needs.

The war has caused many shifts in that original airport plan. To date, approximately $400,000,000 has been appropriated by the Congress for the national defense airport-development program, which is limited to the development and improvement of sites designated as essential to the war effort by the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Commerce. All of this appropriation is now either expended or specifically allocated.

ACTIVITY IN ALASKA

And that money has accomplished wonders, not only within our continental boundaries but in our outlying possessions. When Gen. Billy Mitchell was a young lieutenant stationed in Alaska, he said that whoever controlled that land would have the United States at his mercy. Nobody paid him much mind.

When we first felt the threat of war, officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, sharing Mitchell's conclusions, began extending the airways and constructing new airports in the Territory, smoothing the way for the airplane, which had already proved its usefulness in overcoming Alaska's difficult transportation problems.

Here was another great reservoir of civilian facilities, on the spot, ready and waiting for the military to tap it.

If Alaska were not strictly on the hush-hush list of the War Department, I could tell you the most engrossing stories about what happened up there. Here is one story, however, that is indicative. The C. A. A. was planning an airport in the vicinity of Dutch Harbor. The usual difficulties in getting materials, priorities, even money to do the job, were encountered. This time, however, somebody did something about it. The C. A. A. official on the job—and not too high an official at that—took his professional career in his hands and began to give orders. He had the airport under construction and well along toward a usable state before receiving any assurance that the money needed would be available, using other funds for the purpose because he realized the importance of that airport.

The field was completed just 7 days before the Japs struck at Dutch Harbor, and they got the surprise of their lives when land-based Army planes came swarming upon them from a civilian field they knew nothing about. That field probably saved Alaska, as more than one high Army officer has acknowledged.

Nowhere has the skill of the civilian been put to better use in the conduct of the war than in Alaska. Sourdough pilots who have learned from bitter experience how to operate airplanes in that bleak region have been invaluable to the Army. Airport and airway engineers, whose labors have educated them

in the terrain, weather, natural history, and other peculiar Alaskan conditions, have been a vast mine of information and a storehouse of ability for Army and Navy units defending our farthest frontier.

As soon as the Japs had been pushed off of Kiska and Attu, the airways engineers of the C. A. A. resumed their plans for an airway down the Aleutian chain, installing the radio facilities which—while it is still held secret—we know must be in use now in our occasional bombing of the Kurile Islands, part of Japan's homeland.

This sort of thing has gone on all over the world. Not long ago a radio range which first went into service near Evansville, Ind., guiding peaceful traffic through our home skies, was uprooted and planted abroad and it is now sending out its guiding signals from Ascension Island in mid-Atlantic. Scores of other radio facilities are in operation along the world routes, set up and made to work by the C. A. A. experts who developed them.

AVIATION COMMUNICATION SERVICE

In August of 1942 the C. A. A. was called upon by the Army to assist their airway communication system in the immediate establishment of urgently needed communications, weather reporting, and air navigational facilities on the northeast airway—the ferry route to Great Britain. Recruiting its own trained personnel, 21 civil and radio engineers were assigned to remote projects in Canada, Labrador, Greenland, Iceland, and the United Kingdom. Working as civilian supervising engineers and utilizing available military working crews, 7 projects were completed early in 1943 and the remaining 10 projects by August 1943.

These projects included communication circuits, both high and low frequency. The latter were provided to preclude disruption of communications during magnetic storms common to the Arctic regions. Air-to-ground control circuits were also provided at a number of points. Radio range navigational aids were provided at 13 stations, and at 5 of them equipment was furnished by the C. A. A. by dismantling domestic facilities and transferring them to foreign locations where they were reinstalled and commissioned under C. A. A. supervision.

Recognition of these services by the C. A. A. has been given occasionally by the Army. Recently, a story in Communications magazine of November 1943, by Lt. Walter W. Fawcett, Jr., of the Army Air Forces communications system, said:

> The Army Air Forces communications system also exercises operational control of six intercontinental broadcasting stations developed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. These stations, among the most powerful radio installations in existence today, are located at strategic points for world coverage. They collect and disseminate, on both point-to-point and air-ground circuits, operational and weather information covering entire global areas. Great credit is due the C. A. A. for the outstanding cooperation given, principally along engineering and technical lines, in the development of the present colossal Army airways communications system.

These six stations encompass the world. Recently the C. A. A. intercontinental station at New York worked a big flying boat all the way from its home port of New York to a point beyond Cairo. From there to Australia, the boat was in contact with various foreign stations. On its homeward flight, it soon came within range of another C. A. A. station on a south Pacific Island, and the crew reported "it seemed we were back home again." From there on in, over 6,700 miles of ocean, a C. A. A. station was its constant companion.

TOMORROW'S AIRPORT PROGRAM

In the United States proper, the C. A. A. has been building new airways and airports to speed the winning of the war. Recent development of airports has necessarily been concentrated upon the larger fields. As a result, there has been a twelvefold increase in the number of our major civil airports—with paved runways at least 3,500 feet long and capable of handling the largest transport craft. We had only 76 such fields 2 years ago. By the end of 1943 we had 940, nor does this include many large airdromes built by the armed forces for their exclusive use.

The situation in regard to smaller airports is this. We have 1,213 class I airports, the lowest category, each with landing areas 1,800–2,500 feet long. We have 905 class II ports, with paved runways from 2,500 to 3,500 feet long. These are situated, for the most part, near smaller cities and larger towns. We shall need many more of this class for future commercial flying. Nor can it be said that we have enough larger ports, as those in many of our major cities are already overcrowded.

There are at the present time approximately 3,000 classified airports in the country. This is 1,000 short of our pre-war plan, and it now appears that our pre-war plan will not meet our post-war needs, which in spite of the war demands made on the C. A. A. are receiving serious and detailed scrutiny.

There are in this country approximately 6,670 communities containing 1,000 people or more, as recently pointed out in a searching analysis of the airport problem by Mr. Charles I. Stanton, able Administrator of C. A. A. It seems reasonable to suppose that each of these communities will wish to be accessible by air. Some of these communities can profitably make joint use of a single airport. Making that allowance, we arrive at a national total of 6,000 airports as a realistic target to shoot at in the immediate post-war years.

As we have only 3,000 ports at the present time, that means doubling our present airport capacity. Like the question of training pilots, this is also an immediate problem. At the end of the present fiscal year the authorization of the National Defense Airport Development Program expires.

Shall we let it die? Or should it be continued in some form? If this Nation is to continue in the front rank in the air, we cannot afford simply to wash our hands of it.

How are the necessary airports going to be provided? By the Federal Government? By the States? By local governments? Or by a combination of all three?

Here again the C. A. A. has been foresighted and on the job. It has suggested a tentative formula by which the Federal Government and the States might become partners in building the Nation's post-war civil airport system in much the same way that they have cooperated in building our national highway system, admittedly the best in the world. As suggested by Mr. Stanton, Administrator of C. A. A., such a formula would take account of four factors: First, the area of the State; second, its population; third, number of registered aircraft in the State; and, fourth, the existing number of accredited airports. Under this plan, as in the Federal Highway System, each State would have to match a specified percentage of its quota of Federal funds.

Decentralization of Federal operations and delegation of more responsibility to State aviation agencies should be beneficial. Airport improvements or construction projects within each State would then be selected and carried out by the State's aviation agency. Only projects included within the C. A. A. national airport plan would be eligible for Federal aid, and C. A. A. standards of location, lay-out, and construction for the class of airport proposed would have to be met.

There has long been need of a clarification of the relationship between the Federal and State Governments with respect to aviation. Many have feared that the States would seek to regulate individual aircraft and airmen without regard to the problem as a whole, thus creating a mass of conflicting rules and standards, such as are found in the motor-trucking and divorce laws. This would be peculiarly disconcerting in the case of a flyer who passes from State to State in midair, often being unaware of State boundaries as he passes over them. State officials, on the other hand, have lived in fear that local needs and wishes would be inadequately considered by Federal officials.

The field of airport development offers a splendid chance for the Federal Government to work in partnership with the State authorities by establishing a policy which for more than 20 years has proved its practicability in the field of highways. Federal airport authorities would retain control of national planning and of minimum standards, just as Federal highway authorities have done. Yet local problems would be decided at the State level where such decisions should be made, and the sincerity with which State authorities advocated specific projects would be demonstrated by the dollars they put up to match Federal funds.

It may be contended that Federal aid should be extended only to airports having at least interstate significance. But the very nature of the airplane makes even the smallest airport a base for interstate operations. Moreover, the experience of Public Roads officials with Federal highway aid provides a valuable lesson. At the outset, Federal highway aid was limited largely to trunk

routes. But local and feeder traffic has become such an important factor in the whole highway picture that there is steadily growing demand for Federal aid on other classes of roads.

As I have said, this airport problem is the immediate concern of every man in this Congress, both as a Representative of his district and the Nation as a whole.

THE FEDERAL AIRWAYS SYSTEM

Lastly, a word on another aspect of air power. Too few people know about the Federal Airways System, what it is, how it functions, and what its needs are. It is the arterial system of the air. It consists of 35,000 miles of well equipped air routes with air navigation facilities of many kinds—beacon lights, emergency landing fields, radio range stations, automatic control devices, omni-directional radio markers, an elaborate weather reporting and forecasting system tied in with the United States Weather Bureau.

Here again the C. A. A. has made invaluable contributions to the war. More than 9 out of 10 planes now flying the Federal Airways are military aircraft bound for some distant point in this country or on their way overseas. Without the facilities and procedures worked out by the C. A. A. there would be a hopeless tangle in the air, particularly around congested airports. These facilities and procedures have been of the greatest use to the armed forces wherever they happen to be operating.

All this has been done by an agency set up to promote the peaceful commerce of the skies. It is a perfect example of how our democratic system works at its best. By its foresight the C. A. A. anticipated many of the problems created by the war—training pilots, extending and improving the airways, building airports, so that these were ready to be used when the emergency arose. And by its foresight again it hopes to anticipate many of the problems certain to come with the peace. It is alive to all the possibilities of the air age we have now entered. It is planning to lay down on the soundest foundations the real bases of air power. Its program deserves the fullest support.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I would like to say that I appreciate the mighty fine talk the gentleman has just delivered. I know that his subcommittee and the C. A. A. and the C. P. T. are entitled to all the praise he has given them and also the fine type of flying and fighting that our boys, who have been taught in those great institutions, have displayed in this great war.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], who is also a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and who went along with us in making these appropriations. When we realized we had to have pilots he was one who contributed a great deal to the efforts of this committee to make this program successful.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I want to add that I am very proud to say that the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Mr. Pogue, is a very good friend of mine. He is one of my constituents. He lives a short distance from my home town and we in Iowa, of course, are very proud of Mr. Pogue and the fine job he has been doing.

Mr. STEFAN. I wish to tell the gentleman, who comes from the State where the tall corn grows, that I, too, know Mr. Pogue very well. We, too, admire him and his vast knowledge of aviation matters.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like also to add a word with respect to the work which was accomplished by the civilian branch of aviation under the great difficulties about which I know something. You have not overdone the matter at all in giving the credit which you have to them and to all those instrumental in making possible what has been accomplished. I do wish to say I sent for information and learned something about that. Why I undertook to interrupt the gentleman was because he referred to an institution in New England of which I have a right to be very proud, and that is the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. But I was just going to suggest that the gentleman also say, and I will say it for him if he will permit, that while the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has made a very fine record with regard to the men whom they have turned out, and the record which those men have made for that institution, Norwich University, of which I happened to be president about 14 years, is at least a close second.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. All of these schools in which this program was conducted have done a wonderful job.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Some years ago the gentleman from Nebraska began harping about this problem. I thought it was more or less an obsession with him. But the gentleman had a lot more foresight than most of us had regarding this problem. I want to commend the gentleman for the work he has done. He has made a great contribution to the war effort in promoting this civilian aeronautical program. In that connection I would like to ask the gentleman this question, if he chooses to answer it. What does the gentleman think about placing all of the aviation departments and all of the aviation activities under one head?

Mr. STEFAN. We may have the Lea bill on the floor of the House for consideration some day. That is a very controversial bill. Aviation is too big to stop. Some compromise may be reached and some agreeable aviation legislation may result.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is in sympathy with that kind of a proposal?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; when the objectionable features have been ironed out.

Mr. BENDER. I want it to appear in the RECORD, that all of us deeply appreciate the personal efforts of the gentleman from Nebraska, and the work of his subcommittee in behalf of the general aviation problem, both civilian and war. You have made a great contribution, which we do appreciate.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I think a great tribute is being paid this afternoon by the fact that the Members have such confidence in the work of this committee and that they feel you have done such a good job that it is not necessary for a great many of them to watch this appropriation bill. I think it is something you should feel very proud of, as well as the chairman of the subcommittee, that the Members have such confidence in your work.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman very much. I am sure I speak the appreciation of the membership of our committee for his kind words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks. I have already secured permission in the House for extending this list of 672 heroes in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LIST OF GRADUATES OF CIVILIAN FLYING SCHOOLS DECORATED FOR BATTLE EXPLOITS

Abercrombie, William W., Long Beach, Calif., Navy Cross.

Adams, Don D., Raineville, W. Va., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.

Adams, Lyle M., Novinger, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Adams, William B., Glendale, Calif., Silver Star.

Adkins, Frank E., Clarksville, Tenn., Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star.

Adler, Arthur L., Bronx, N. Y., letter from Secretary of Navy.

Adrianse, Lyle A., Grandville, Mich., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Aenchbacker, A. E., Atlanta, Ga., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.

Aiken, Albert S., Cheverly, Md., Air Medal.

Albright, William H., Denver, Colo., Silver Star.

Allen, Gordon L., Lubbock, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Ambrose, Kenneth W., Berkeley, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Anderson, Andreas P., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Anderson, Charles L., Portland, Oreg., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.

Anderson, Emmet D., Jr., Lubbock, Tex., letter from Secretary of Navy.

Anderson, John W., Laurens, S. C., Air Medal.

Anderson, William T., Columbia, Tenn., Air Medal.

Arndt, Augustus L., Newton, N. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Arnoldus, Robert T., Summerville, Oreg., Air Medal.

Asch, Alfred C., Beaverton, Mich., Purple Heart.

Ashley, Edward S., San Antonio, Tex., Purple Heart.

Auman, Forrester C., Seagrove, N. C., Silver Star, Air Medal.

Austin, James H., Charlotte, N. C., Air Medal.

Austin, William R., Roanoke, Va., Silver Star.

Avendano, Joseph, Brawley, Calif., Silver Star.

Bailey, Kenneth D., Durham, N. C., Medal of Honor, Silver Star.

Bailey, Melvin D., Quitman, Tex., Silver Star.

Baker, Joe B., Tyler, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Baker, Robert H., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Baker, Ross C., Alexandria, La., Air Medal.
Baker, Wayne, Detroit, Mich., Navy and Marine Corps Medal.
Balenti, Richard P., Altus, Okla., Air Medal.
Ball, Edgar D., Nashville, Tenn., Air Medal.
Ballentine, Henry R., Summerville, Pa., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Bankhead, Heber B., Wellsville, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bannon, John R., Rochester, Minn., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bartels, Louis E., Clinton, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bartholomeo, Victor H., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal, Silver Star.
Bass, Horace A., Roanoke, Va., Navy Cross.
Bastian, George F., New Orleans, La., Air Medal.
Bauer, Carl R., Santa Monica, Calif., Silver Star.
Beadle, Frank R., Grand Rapids, Mich., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Beal, Frederick R., Santa Rosa, Calif.
Beasley, William D., Tampa, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Beidelman, Frederick W., Jacksonville, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Belew, Harold E., Fresno, Calif., Air Medal.
Bellows, Donno C., Mason City, Iowa, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bennett, Earl C., Baltic, S. D., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Benson, Robert H., San Francisco, Calif., Navy Cross.
Bergner, Karl W., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Berman, Samuel D., Terrace Park, Ohio, Air Medal.
Bestgen, Walter E., Wichita, Kans., Air Medal two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Bevins, Hiram O., Milton, Vt., Air Medal.
Bevlock, James J., Philadelphia, Pa., Distinguished Service Cross.
Bird, Clement W., Albuquerque, N. Mex., Air Medal.
Birdsong, George F., Clarksdale, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Blank, John E., Ferndale, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Blanton, Thadd H., Gainesville, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Blevins, Hilary M., Kuchorman, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Bley, Charles W., Berkeley, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Byerley, Daniel W., Seattle, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Byrnes, Robert C., Winfield, La., Air Medal.
Bobrow, Alan L., Philadelphia, Pa., Air Medal.
Boll, John J., Ironton, Ohio, Air Medal.
Boock, Robert A., Springfield, Ill., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Booker, Dennis G., St. Cloud, Minn., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bone, Jim K., Cresson, Tex., Air Medal.
Bong, Richard I., Poplar, Wis., Distinguished Service Cross, Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, 14 Oak Leaf Clusters.
Booth, Harry J., Charlotte, N. C., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Borich, Nick, Portland, Oreg., Silver Star.
Bowers, Robert H., Phoenix, Ariz., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bowers, William J., Seattle, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Boyden, James C., Colorado Springs, Colo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Bradbury, Joe E., Bexley, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Brainard, Ceylon H., Pasadena, Calif., Purple Heart.
Brannon, Charles E., Montgomery, Ala., Navy Cross.
Brinson, Sheldon S., Bainbridge, Ga., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Britton, William K., Plainview, Tex., Air Medal.
Brookhart, Joseph W., Hyattsville, Md., Silver Star.
Brooks, Norman E., Pheonix, Ariz., Air Medal.
Brorein, Carl D., Tampa, Fla., Air Medal.
Brown, Bryan W., El Paso, Tex., Silver Star.
Brown, Jack D., Salt Lake City, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Brown, Llewellyn L., Jr., Malverne, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Brown, Robert J., New York City, Distinguished Service Cross.
Browning, Richard C., Buffalo, N. Y., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Buck, Sidney E., Kensington, Md., Air Medal, nine Oak Leaf Clusters.
Bunderson, Mack V., Emery, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Burger, Arthur L., Springfield, Mass., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Burges, George D., Charleston, S. C., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Burnett, Pelham R., Baltimore, Md., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Burns, John P., Berkeley, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Burns, Ralph W., Malden, Mass., Air Medal.
Burr, Albert H., Coral Gables, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Butler, John C., Buckeye, Ariz., Navy Cross.
Butler, Richard D., San Diego, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Caldwell, Morris C., Nashville, Tenn., Silver Star.
Calhoun, William R., Jr., Birmingham, Ala., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Callender, Alvin D., Lake Providence, La., Air Medal.
Cameron, William R., Hanford, Calif., Silver Star.
Campbell, C. W., McComb, Miss., Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Campbell, Kendall C., Lamar, Colo., Navy Cross, Gold Star.
Campbell, Leonard N., Roseville, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Campbell, Robert B., Marshall, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Campbell, William P., San Francisco, Calif., Silver Star.
Cannon, Joseph E., Gladstone, Mich., letter from Secretary of War.
Carey, Ernest H., Gridley, Calif., Air Medal.
Carey, Henry A., Ithaca, N. Y., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Carson, Bill E., Oklahoma City, Okla., Air Medal.
Carter, George H., Norfolk, Va., Silver Star.
Carter, Irwin W., St. Petersburg, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Carter, William D., Nashville, Tenn., Distinguished Flying Cross, two Gold Stars.
Caulkett, George W., Dallas, Tex., Air Medal
Chambers, Arthur L., Mount Tabor, N. J., Silver Star.
Check, Raymond J., Granville, N. Dak., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Cheli, Ralph, Bethlehem, Pa., Medal of Honor, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Clancy, William E., Jackson, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Clark, Charles D., McAllen, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Clark, John F., Remington, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Clark, Thomas J., Ligonier, Pa., Air Medal.
Clark, Walter, Lincolnton, N. C., Silver Star.
Cliburn, Charles E., Hazelhurst, Miss., Purple Heart, Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Clifford, John K., Tacoma, Wash., Navy Cross.
Clinton, Carl C., Fort Smith, Ark., Air Medal.
Clute, George S., Watsonville, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Coe, Donald R., Humboldt, Kans., Air Medal.
Coit, Harland J., Montclair, N. J., Air Medal.
Cole, Richard E., Dayton, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Coleman, Samuel E., Tacoma, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross, Gold Star.
Collingworth, J. D., Borger, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Compton, George A., Pennington, N. J., Air Medal.
Compton, James E., Salina, Kans., Air Medal.
Compton, William B., Compton, Calif., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Comstock, Harold E., Fresno, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Conger, Jack Eugene, Des Moines, Iowa, Navy Cross.
Conn, Myron R., Coalinga, Calif., Silver Star.
Conrad, Earl O., Jr., Great Falls, Mont., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Coolbaugh, Walter W., Clarke-Summit, Pa., Navy Cross.
Coonan, John J., Edgewood Station, R. I., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Corry, Roy A., Santa Ana, Calif., Navy Cross.
Cramer, Charles O., Akron, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Cresto, John G., Kansas City, Mo., Silver Star.
Cronkite, John L., St. Petersburg, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.
Crouch, Horace E., Columbia, S. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Crouchley, Edward A., Providence, R. I., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Crow, Robert C., Cleveland, Ohio, Navy Cross, Silver Star.
Currey, Douglas V., Sacramento, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak-Leaf Clusters.
Dahl, Milton R., Seattle, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dalton, Roy Bale, Arkadelphia, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
D'Arcy, Robert M., Arlington, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Davenport, John D., Landrum, S. C., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Davidson, George M., Kendrick, Idaho, Air Medal.
Davidson, James J., Winona, Minn., Silver Star.
Davidson, William K., Austin, Tex., Air Medal, Gold Star.
Davis, Eugene C., Williamstown, Pa., Purple Heart.
Davis, Lowell, L., Vina, Ala., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Davis, Nelson P., Tampa, Fla., Silver Star.
Dean, George B., Lansford, N. Dak., Air Medal.
DeBaum, Clyde E., Bicknell, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross.
DeBlanc, Jefferson J., Martinville, La., Navy Cross, Air Medal.
Deeds, James A., Oakland, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Denault, Francis P., West Springfield, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dennison, Ethan A., Jr., New York, N. Y., letter from Secretary of the Navy.
Detour, Buren L., San Diego, Calif., Navy and Marine Corps Medal.
Devoe, Augustus A., Jr., Spotswood, N. J., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dibb, Robert A. M., Los Angeles, Calif., Navy Cross.
Dietrich, Alfred E., Detroit, Mich., Air Medal.
Diffley, John M., Birmingham, Ala., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.
Dillon, Barclay H., Jr., Birmingham, Ala., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Dillon, Stephen P., Long Beach, Calif., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.

Dimmitt, Robert E., San Bernardino, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dinn, Wallace L., Corpus Christi, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dinsmore, Samuel H., Olympia, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Disalvo, Joseph F., Batavia, N. Y., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.
Dittler, Donald C., Cleveland, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Divine, Robert A., Fresno, Calif., Navy Cross.
Dockstader, Robert B., Long Beach, Calif., Silver Star.
Doherty, John J., Fort Smith, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Donnell, Earl Roe, Jr., Dallas, Tex., Air Medal.
Dorton, Randall M., Jr., Washington, D. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Dowie, Frank D., Jr., Des Moines, Iowa, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Doyle, M. F., Parsons, Kans., Silver Star.
Drakilich, Dan D., Superior, Ariz., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Drury, Frank C., Damby, Mo., Navy Cross.
Dutton, Albert H., Portland, Oreg., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Dwyer, William P., Randolph, Nebr., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Early, Cleland E., Sinnet, Tex., Silver Star.
Ebert, Harry W., Jr., Winchester, Va., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Eck, Walter A., Milwaukee, Wis., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Ek, Bruce H., Spokane, Wash., Navy Cross.
Eland, Stanley C., Portland, Oreg., Air Medal.
Elledge, Raymond P., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Ellis, Eugene B., Brownfield, Tex., Air Medal.
Ellis, Lewis N., Chattanooga, Tenn., Distinguished Service Cross.
Ellis, Sherman E., Springfield, Mo., Air Medal.
Ellison, Harold J., Buffalo, N. Y., Navy Cross.
Ely, Don L., Los Angeles, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Emerson, Donald K., Riverside, Calif., Silver Star.
Engle, Godfrey, Jr., Albany, Tex., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Erwin, James C., El Dorado, Ark., Air Medal, one Gold Star.
Erwin, Paul V. B., Miami, Fla., Air Medal.
Esmay, Carle H., St. Maries, Idaho, Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Estes, Chandler B., Athens, Ga., Air Medal.
Eubank, Robert H., Mabank, Tex., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Everett, David R., Fullerton, Calif., Air Medal.
Fairbank, Henry A., Stockton, Calif., Air Medal.
Fairfield, W. A., San Francisco, Calif., Purple Heart.
Farrow, W. G., Washington, D. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Faulkner, Lawrence M., Pleasant Hill, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Feightner, Edward L., Elida, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Feldman, Jack H., Pittsburgh, Pa., Purple Heart.
Felk, Charles, Carsonville, Mich., Air Medal.
Ferguson, Joseph W., Pueblo, Colo., Silver Star.
Fields, John W., Shamrock, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Fields, Virgil C., Ventura, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Fincher, Deltis H., Waldron, Ark., Silver Star.
Fisher, Louis W., Portland, Oreg., Air Medal.
Fischer, Phillip S., East Orange, N. J., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Flaherty, Robert F., Waterloo, Iowa, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Forbes, Jimmy M., Kansas City, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Ford, Robert V., Winston-Salem, N. C., Silver Star.
Formanek, George, Chicago, Ill., Navy and Marine Corps Medal, Distinguished Flying Cross, Gold Star.
Forrer, Sam White, Griffin, Ga., Navy Cross.
Fountain, Zed D., Hattiesburg, Miss., Silver Star.
Francis, Everett R., Newark, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Francis, Magnus W., Vallejo, Calif., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Frattali, Vincent C., Scranton, Pa., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Freeman, Charles M., Rochester, N. Y., Silver Star.
Freeman, David B., Jr., Moline, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Foss, Joe J., Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Medal of Honor, Navy Cross, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gaede, David L., Columbus, Ohio, Purple Heart.
Gaffney, John P., Lakewood, Ohio, Soldier's Medal.
Gallagher, Thomas J., Dorchester, Mass., Air Medal.
Gardner, Richard B., Salt Lake City, Purple Heart, Air Medal.
Gaskell, Claude W., Opportunity, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross
Gaunt, Frank L., North Platte, Nebr., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Gentry, Wayne R., Kimberly, Idaho, Air Medal.
George, Herbert W., Missoula, Mont., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Gerry, Clark H., Tucson, Ariz., Air Medal.
Gibbs, Harry B., Wheeling, W. Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Giddens, John R., Inverne, Ala., Purple Heart.
Giddens, Paul O., San Bernardino, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Gignac, Edward J., North Vassalboro, Maine, Silver Star.
Gilbert, Fred R., Bellflower, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gish, Russell C., Waterville, Minn., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Glick, Howard L., Topeka, Kans., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Goerke, Dalton C., Burr, Nebr., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Golberg, Robert T., Blooming Prairie, Minn., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Goldstein, Otto, Norwalk, Conn., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Gowdy, William R., Cincinnati, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Grant, Charles S., Washington, D. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Grashio, Samuel C., Spokane, Wash., Silver Star.
Gray, Gordon E., Kirkwood, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gray, Robert, Killeen, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Green, Donald J., Anaconda, Mont., Silver Star, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gregory Lewis H., Quincy, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Greve, Thomas E., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Griffen, Thomas C., Chicago, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Griffith, John H., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal.
Griswold, Don T., Clarinda, Iowa, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Gustke, Russell F., Port Huron, Mich., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Haberman, Roger A., Ellsworth, Wis., Navy Cross.
Hagenback, James J., Chicago, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hair, James M., Gatesville, Tex., Air Medal.
Halford, James A., Orosi, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Gold Star.
Hall, William M., Mobile, Ala., Navy Cross.
Hamilton, Linton D., Detroit, Mich., Air Medal.
Hamilton, Merle C., Orchard, Nebr., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hand, Clarence B., Miles City, Mont., Air Medal.
Hanna, Walter J., Jr., Gilroy, Calif., Silver Star.
Hansen, Paul M., Milan, Mich., Air Medal.
Hanson, Eugene R., Burlington, Iowa, Navy Cross, one Gold Star.
Harries, Frederick C., Hurley, Wis., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Harris, Bill, Springville, Calif., Air Medal.
Harris, Ray E., Kansas City, Mo., Air Medal.
Hartman, Elmer, Basin, Wyo., Air Medal.
Hawes, Robert E., North Dartmouth, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Hazard, Richard C., Pomeroy, Wash., Navy and Marine Corps Medal.
Heard, John J., Jr., Kerrville, Tex., Silver Star.
Heck, Edward, Jr., Oakland, Calif., Navy Cross.
Heinitsh, Reginald D., Columbia, S. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Helveston, George T., Tatum, Tex., Silver Star.
Henning, Richard T., Albemarle, N. C., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Henry, William Earl, Bakersfield, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, Gold Star, Air Medal.
Herndon, Joseph T., Colorado Springs, Colo., Air Medal.
Herndon, Nolan A., Sulphur Springs, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hickman, Cleveland D., San Francisco, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hodges, Kenneth S., West Los Angeles, Calif., Air Medal.
Hogan, Stephen C., Chicago, Ill., Navy Cross.
Hollingworth, Lloyd D., Wilmington, Del., Air Medal.
Holmes, Walter T., Jr., Denton, Tex., Purple Heart, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Holsey, Raymond E., Altus, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Holt, Marion H., Jonesboro, Tenn., Distinguished Flying Cross..
Hoover, Fred D., Jr. Gladstone, Mich., Silver Star.
Hoover, James K., Sulphur Rock, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hopper, George A., Jr., Banning, Calif., Letter from Secretary of Navy.
House, A. T., Jr., Long Beach, Calif., Air Medal.
Houseworth, Carl H., Harveyville, Kans., Air Medal.
Howes, Edward B., Highland, Calif., Air Medal.
Hronek, William H., Snoqualmie Falls, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hudson, Henry D., Watervliet, N. Y., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Huey, Stanley G., Seattle, Wash., Air Medal.
Hughes, Charles E., Oakdale, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Hyland, Norman D., Mobile, Ala., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Hynds, Kermit C., Austin, Tex., Silver Star.
Ilfrey, Jack M., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Irwin, Darrell D., Duluth, Minn., Distinguished Flying Cross, Gold Star.
Iverson, Leroy C., Valley City, N. Dak., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Jackson, Jean D., Tulsa, Okla., Silver Star.
Jacobson, Sidney W., Shreveport, La., Silver Star.
Jennings, Wallace R., Santa Ana, Calif., Air Medal.
Jobe, Fletcher H., Chatttanooga, Tenn., Air Medal.
Johnson, Charles C., Fort Worth, Tex., Purple Heart, Silver Star.
Johnson, Clarence, Jr., San Bernardino, Calif., Air Medal.

Johnson, Dee A., Logan, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Johnson, Gerald R., Eugene, Oreg., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Johnson, Grove C., Omaha, Nebr., Air Medal
Johnson, Harold C., Richmond, Calif., Air Medal.
Johnston, John C., Greenville, N. C., Air Medal.
Jones, Curran L., Columbia, S. C., Silver Star.
Jones, Jack, Mansfield, Ga., Air Medal.
Jones, James F., Lake Butler, Fla., Purple Heart, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Jones, R. M., Godley, Tex., Air Medal.
Jordan, George W., Rockford, Ill., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Judd, Daniel H., Berkeley, Calif., Air Medal.
Jurkens, Edward A., Sterling, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kaiser, James M., Youngstown, Ohio, Silver Star, Air Medal.
Kappeler, Frank A., Alameda, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Katz, Aaron, Cleveland, Ohio, Navy Cross.
Keller, Robert F., Wichita, Kans., Air Medal.
Kelly, Robert E., Dallas, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kelting, John A., Toledo, Ohio, Silver Star.
Kennedy, Lawrence C., Fairfax, Mo., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Kennedy, Robert D., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal.
Killian, Clinton H., Roosevelt, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross. Air Medal.
Kinney, William E., Springfield, Ohio, Silver Star, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Kinzer, Edward B., Beckley, W. Va., Navy Cross.
Kirk, Kenneth J., Jr., Barre, Vt., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kirkpatrick, Donald, Evanston, Ill., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kish, Andrew K., Nixon, N. J., Silver Star.
Kjerulff, Lauritz T., Lake Charles, La., Air Medal.
Kopf, J., Jr., Modesto, Calif., Silver Star.
Koutelas, George E., Kansas City, Kans., Navy Cross.
Kuehnast, Irving L., Badger, Iowa, Air Medal.
Kunz, Charles M., Minneapolis, Minn., Navy Cross, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Kyes, William B., Elwell, Mich., Purple Heart.
Kyle, Paul J., Arlington, Va., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Lamb, Robert A., Brooklyn, N. Y., Air Medal.
Lamm, Louis J., Vici, Okla., Air Medal.
Landers, John D., Joshua, Tex., Air Medal.
Larsen, Carl A., Renron, Wash., Air Medal.
Larson, Robert R., Albert Lee, Minn., Air Medal.
Laven, George, Jr., San Antonio, Tex., Distinguished Service Cross.
Lawrence, Claude H., Mount Airy, N. C., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Leader, Kent E., Winchester, Idaho, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Lebrecht, Royden L., Denison, Tex., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Lee, Donald H., Jr., Detroit, Mich., Air Medal.
Lee, Jack (deceased), Alamogordo, N. Mex., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Lee, Stanley, Denver, Colo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Leland, Glen C., Jr., St. Petersburg, Fla., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Lesicka, Joseph J., Westmorland, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Leslie, Gene J., Bailey, Tex., Air Medal.
Liffner, Harry W., New York City, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Lind, Harold A., Wilmington, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Lindsey, Virgil B., Washington Park, N. C., Purple Heart.
Lombard, John D., Ionia, Mich., Silver Star.
Long, Robert H., Gainesville, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Long, Stanley A., Marquette, Mich., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Lovelace, John Wade, Commerce, Tex., Air Medal.
Lumkin, George T., Louisburg, N. C., Navy Cross.
Lundy, James T., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Air Medal, three Oak-Leaf Clusters.
McAteer, James J., Philadelphia, Pa., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
McBreen, Francis J., Spokane, Wash., Silver Star.
McCafferty, Donald E., Hempstead, N. Y., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McCarty, Martin W., Jr., Lubbock, Tex., Air Medal.
McClaran, Clarence E., Marshall, Tex., Purple Heart.
McClung, Guy H., Lawton, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McComsey, Robert M., Lancaster, Pa., Air Medal.
McCool, Harry C., Colorado Springs, Colo., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McDonald, John Bruce, Wake Forest, N. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McDonald, Norman L., Framingham, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
McDonald, Robert L., Reno, Nev., Air Medal.
McDonnough, John M., Oakland, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McEniry, John H., Jr., Bessemer, Ala., Silver Star.
McGee, John N., Spokane, Wash., Silver Star.
McKane, Edmond R., Oklahoma City, Okla., Silver Star.
McKearn, William, Beloit, Wis., Silver Star.
McKnight, Louis S., Port Neches, Tex., Air Medal, two Oak-Leaf Clusters.
McLemore, Richard M., Helena, Mont., Silver Star.
McMahon, Robert F., Mitchell, S. Dak., Purple Heart.
McMarrell, Mac M., Kendallville, Ind., Purple Heart.
McMurray, Henry S., San Leandro, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
McWherter, R. W., Paris, Tex., Air Medal.
McWilliams, Major H., Thayer, Miss., Air Medal.
McWilliams, Robert, Jr., Clarksdale, Miss., Purple Heart, Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
MacDonald, Ward Douglas, Fremont, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Macia, J. H., Tucson, Ariz., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Madole, Eugene P., Long Beach, Calif., Navy Cross.
Maglio, Frank J., Sanger, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Magness, Thomas M., Ventura, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak-Leaf Cluster.
Manchester, Donald D., Spokane, Wash., Air Medal.
Mangas, John H., Portland, Oreg., Silver Star.
Manning, George M., Muskegon, Mich., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Manthe, F. L., Sacramento, Calif., Air Medal.
Markley, Robert H., Nordin, Okla., Purple Heart.
Marontate, William P., Seattle, Wash., Navy Cross.
Martensen, William B., Pomona, Calif., Air Medal.
Marthey, Clarence L., Butte, Mont., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Martin, Marion T., Three Rivers, Tex., Silver Star.
Martin, Robert B., Waco, Tex., Silver Star.
Massey, John M., Athens, Ga., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Mathis, Peyton S., Jr., Montgomery, Ala., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Matthews, Winton E., Albany, Tex., Air Medal.
Maul, Elmer, Denver, Colo., Navy Cross.
Mayes, John Bernard, Newberry, S. C., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Meder, Robert J., Lakewood, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Medford, John C., Fort Towson, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Melbraaten, Harold E., Billings, Mont., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Merrill, Milford A., Long Beach, Calif., Navy Cross.
Mickish, Albert J., Perry, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Middleditch, Lyman, Jr., Highlands, N. J., Distinguished Service Cross.
Middleton, Arthur J., Portland, Oreg., Air Medal.
Miles, Earl C., Fullerton, Calif., Air Medal.
Miller, Benton E., Los Angeles, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Miller, Carr L., Rockwell, N. C., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Miller, Chas. J., St. Louis, Mo., Air Medal.
Miller, Richard E., Fort Wayne, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Miller, Richard G., El Paso, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Miller, William E., Neillsville, Wis., Air Medal.
Mills, A. L., Lawrence, Kans., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Mills, Lloyd J., Cove, Oreg., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Mobbs, George D., Wooster, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Moody, Calvin C., Blytheville, Ark., Air Medal.
Moore, Joseph T., Clinton, Ind., Purple Heart.
Moore, Marshall W., Pontiac, Mich., Silver Star.
Moore, Pren L., El Centro, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Moore, Thomas C., Clewiston, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Moore, Thomas F., Coral Gables, Fla., Navy Cross, Silver Star.
Moose, Robert A., Omaha, Nebr., Air Medal.
Morgan, Corwin F., Gainesville, Fla., Navy Cross.
Morris, Herbert A., Durant, Okla., Air Medal.
Morris, Wm. P., Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Mowry, Emerson D., Woonsocket, R. I., Air Medal.
Muehlberg, John R., Montclair, N. J., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Myers, Duncan C., Bradenton, Fla., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Naismith, Robert E., Alhambra, Calif., Air Medal.
Neal, Charles P., Bunkie, La., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Neal, Scott H., Ranger, Tex., Purple Heart.
Nelson, Eyestein, Poulsbo, Wash., Air Medal.
Newbury Edw. S. E., Bakersfield, Calif., Air Medal.
Newman, W. A., Kansas City, Kans., Silver Star.
Ney, Robert J., Eagle Lake, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Nickerson, Henry J., Wheeling, W. Va., Navy Cross.
Nicks, John D., Indianapolis, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Nielson, C. J., Hyrum, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Oestretcher, Robert G., Columbus, Ohio, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Oliver, Bernard J., Prescott, Ariz., Silver Star.
Oliveros, Chas. G., St. Augustine, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Omohundro, Thos. T., Wagoner, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Oscar, Robert E., Cleveland, Ohio, Air Medal.
Ostrom, Dewey A., Seattle, Wash., Air Medal.

Overend, Walter J., Fennville, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Owen, Geo. Frederick, Redstone, Mont., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Owens, Joel A., Jr., Skiatook, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Oauk, Charles, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Paine, Charles J., Jr., Waycross, Ga., Air Medal.
Palmer, Phillip T., Wellington, Kans., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Parker, Ben L., San Diego, Calif., Air Medal.
Parker, George A., Riverside, Calif., Silver Star.
Parker, James E., Compton, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Parkinson, Thos. C., Baltimore, Md., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Pebworth, Jack, Oklahoma City, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Penn, Perry H., Gotebo, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Perry, Elton S., Phoenix, Ariz., Distinguished Service Cross.
Perry, Robert L., Palo Alto, Calif., Silver Star.
Peterson, David R., Long Beach, Calif., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Pfund, Melvin G., Norfolk, Nebr., Purple Heart, Silver Star, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Pierce, Francis E., Coronado, Calif., Navy Cross.
Pierce, Russel K., Jr., Fremont, Nebr., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Planck, Carl G., Jr., Charleston, S. C., Silver Star.
Poire, Joseph C., Dubuque, Iowa, Purple Heart.
Poleschuk, Stephen, Youngstown, Ohio, Silver Star, Air Medal.
Polhemus, Edward B., Temple City, Calif., Air Medal.
Pond, Kenneth A., Jackson, Mich., Navy Cross.
Porter, Larry D., Cedar Springs, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Portmore, Gilbert S., Framingham, Mass., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Posey, Eldon E., Elk Valley, Tenn., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Potter, Henry A., Pierre, S. Dak., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Potts, Emeree W., Jr., Abingdon, Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Pound, William R., Alhambra, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Prchal, Louis A., Omaha, Nebr., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Presley, Frank H., Encinitas, Calif., Navy Cross.
Price, Robert Leo, Wichita, Kans., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Pringle, W. M., Jr., Greensboro, N. C., Air Medal.
Pyle, Clifton, Marshall, Tex., Air Medal, Three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Raddin, James H., Hattiesburg, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Ramsay, Robert L., Jr., Hollywood, Calif., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Raper, William S., Wheeling, W. Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rauch, Carl T., Cadillac, Mich., Purple Heart.
Rawles, Robert L., Los Angeles, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Ray, Paul E., Tulsa, Okla., Silver Star.
Read, Robert R., Lawton, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Reber, Marlin E., Ypsilanti, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Reed, Bill J., Siloam Springs, Ark., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Register, Francis R., Bismarck, N. Dak., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Reynolds, Bradley A., Helena, Mont., Air Medal.
Rice, Arthur T., Farmington, Utah, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rice, Dixon B., Seattle, Wash., Air Medal.
Riley, Earl F., Greensbury, Ind., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Riley, Joseph A., Wahpeton, N. Dak., Navy Cross.
Ringblom, Allen H., Miami, Fla., Navy Cross.
Ritchie, Robert M., Morrison, Ill., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Roddenberry, Eugene W., El Paso, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rodgers, William R., Rolling Fork, Miss., Silver Star.
Rogers, Arthur L., Rome, Ga., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Roitsch, Clarence A., La Grange, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Roller, Jack, Los Angeles, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rollow, Jesse D., Jr., Washington, D. C., Silver Star.
Ross, James S., Arkansas City, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Rothenburg, Allan, Washington, D. C., Navy Cross, Silver Star.
Rouse, Arthur Jr., Oxford, Nebr., Air Medal.
Rowland, J. M., Fort Worth, Tex., Silver Star.
Royal, Francis R., Manbanola, Colo., Silver Star.
Rozzelle, Richard E., Washington, D. C., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Russell, Donald H., Lafayette, Ind., Air Medal.
Sageser, Ralph James, Chattanooga, Tenn., Air Medal.
Salter, Richard D., Elmhouse, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Sanders, John J., Corpus Christi, Tex., Air Medal.
Sandoval, William B., Walnut Park, Calif., Navy Cross.
Sandretto, Amedeo, Eureka, Calif., Air Medal.
Saxhaug, Kenneth W., Wahpeton, N. Dak., Air Medal.
Schaefer, Regis J., Pittsburgh, Pa., Silver Star.
Schmidt, Jynn, Greenville, Ill., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Schichner, Leroy A., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal.
Schill, Richard T., Houston, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Schleeh, Russel E., San Francisco, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Schlegal, Paul W., Fleetwood, Pa., Navy Cross.
Schlendering, Harold, Pasadena, Calif., Navy Cross.
Scott, Robert R., Los Angeles, Calif., Navy Medal of Honor.
Seaman, Clarence O., Fresno, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Secrest, James LaVell, Meridian, Miss., Air Medal.
Sessler, Howard A., Arlington, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Setzer, Marvin J., Pomona, Calif., Air Medal.
Shaffer, Dale L., Decatur, Ill., Silver Star.
Shaffer, Joseph D., Long Beach, Calif., Silver Star, Air Medal.
Sheffield, Frederick, Jr., Waltham, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Sherk, James G., Beaumont, Calif., Air Medal.
Shine, Wilbur G., Delano, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Shinn, Lloyd A., Chico, Calif., Air Medal.
Shipman, Mark K., Fresno, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Shore, Walter G., Kansas City, Mo., Silver Star, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Shriver, Philip K., North Bend, Oreg., Silver Star.
Sibert, J. W., Indianapolis, Ind., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Siegfried, William E., Lodi, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Simmons, Alva A., Portales, N. Mex., Navy Cross.
Simpson, Archie D., Round Hill, Va., Air Medal.
Simpson, Howard B., Medicine Lodge, Kans., Air Medal.
Simpson, Jerome C., New York City, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Sims, Jack A., Kalamazoo, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Skinner, John, Jr., Pilot Knob, N. Y., Silver Star.
Slaughter, Charles W., Brooksville, Fla., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Slocumb, Clyde B., Doerum, Ga., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Sloulin, Wesley C., East Williston, N. Dak., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Smith, Brandon C., Electra, Tex., Air Medal.
Smith, Henry K. Omaha, Nebr., Air Medal.
Smith, Luther P., Jr., Hattiesburg, Miss., Silver Star.
Smith, Martin L., Kidder, Mo., Air Medal.
Smith, Merton V., San Bernardino, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Smith, Russell L., Palo Alto, Calif., Air Medal.
Smith, Virgil H, McAllen, Tex., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Snook, Allen W., New Salem, Kans., Air Medal.
Sparks, Kenneth C., Blackwell, Okla., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Spire, Harold, Los Angeles, Calif., Purple Heart.
Staples, George M., Sherman, Tex., Air Medal.
Stege, John A., Lancaster, Calif., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Stockton, Donald E., Redmond, Oreg., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Stodghill, William E., Rayville, La., Silver Star.
Story, James B., Winfield, Kans., Air Medal.
Stover, Glenn R., Findlay, Ohio, Air Medal.
Strait, William V., Jr., Gainesville, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Strole, Francis M., Kansas City, Kans., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Sullivan, Woodruff, Jr., Norwich, Conn., Air Medal.
Sutliff, Don L., Blackwell, Okla., Air Medal.
Swan, Robert S., Middletown, N. Y., Air Medal.
Swiger, James R., Warrington, W. Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Swett, James E., San Mateo, Calif., Medal of Honor.
Tate, Clark A., Fulton, Mo., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Taylor, Thomas K., St. Louis, Mo., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
Taylor, Wallace C., Ontario, Calif., Silver Star.
Terrell, Jennings S., Jr., Hamblin, Tex., Purple Heart.
Thacker, Clarence L., Kissimmee, Fla., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Thal, Bernhardt N., Chicago, Ill., Air Medal.
Thomas, George R., Jr., Glendale, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Thompson, Donald V., Farmington, Minn., Air Medal.
Thompson, Lassiter, El Paso, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Thomson, John A., Webster Grove, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Thorington, W. R., Montgomery, Ala., Silver Star.
Tice, Clay, Jr., Phoenix, Ariz., Silver Star.
Tollen, James R., San Francisco, Calif., Air Medal.
Townsend, Guy M., Houston, Tex., Air Medal.
Traylor, Melvin A., San Diego, Calif., Silver Star.
Truelove, Denver V., Lula, Ga., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Tucker, Charles, La Crescenta, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Turner, William L., Idalau, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.

Tuttle, Ralph F., Coffeyville, Kans., Air Medal.
Uber, Clyde S., Newcastle, Pa., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross.
Vale, Charles M., Stuart, Fla., letter from Secretary of the Navy.
Vammen, Clarence Earl, Aberdeen, Wash., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Van Eeuwen, C. W., Grant, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Varlan, Bertram S., Boise, Idaho, Navy Cross.
Viens, Leo E., Pawtucket, R. I., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Vitunac, Walter C., Pittsburgh, Pa., Air Medal.
Voellmeck, Joseph, Seattle, Wash., Air Medal.
Voss, John D., San Antonio, Tex., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Wade, Ernest C., Bristol, Va., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Waldroup, Marvin M., Jr., Dixie, La., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Walker, Leland A., Jr., Salt Lake City, Utah, Purple Heart.
Walter, Donald A., Painesville, Ohio, Distinguished Service Cross, Purple Heart.
Watts, Ralph K., Compton, Calif., Silver Star.
Webber, Donald L., San Diego, Calif., Air Medal.
Weeks, Murry E., Greenwood, Miss., Air Medal.
Weiland, Charles P., Ashton, S. Dak., Air Medal.
Welch, George S., Wilmington, Del., Distinguished Service Cross.
Welch, James W., Jr., St. Augustine, Fla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Weller, Charles E., Beaumont, Tex., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Werner, Richard K., Kenmore, N. Y., Purple Heart.
West, Leonard A., Hancock, Mich., Air Medal.
Wheadon, Elmer M., Los Angeles, Calif., Air Medal, three Oak Leaf Clusters.
White, Herbert C., Lufkin, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
White, John Howard, Kensett, Ark., Distinguished Flying Cross, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Whitlock, Charles P., New Brunswick, N. J., Air Medal.
Whittaker, Ray E., Knoxville, Tenn., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Wikle, Jesse O., Jr., Madison, Ala., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Wildner, Carl R., Amherst, Mass., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Wilhoite, Thomas M., Guthrie, Ky.
Wilke, Jack W., Covina, Calif., Navy Cross.
Williams, Carl T., Jr., South Gate, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Williams, Griffith P., San Diego, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Williams, James M., Huntsville, Tex., Air Medal.
Williams, R. E. E., Marietta, Ohio, Air Medal.
Willis, Robert H., Oakland, Calif., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Wilson, Gordon H., Whitesburg, Ky., Air Medal.
Winkler, John M., Chanute, Kans., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Withee, Orville A., Minneapolis, Minn., Air Medal.
Wolf, Gomer A., Mt. Vernon, Ohio, Air Medal.
Wolfe, Merritt C., Akron, Ohio, Air Medal.
Wood, John E., Denver, Colo., Air Medal.
Woodring, Dugan W., Noble, Okla., Silver Star.
Working, William H., Nashville, Tenn., Air Medal, two Oak Leaf Clusters.
Worthington, Jos. A., Kingsville, Tex., Air Medal.
Wright, Bill, Commerce, Tex., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Wright, John M., Hernando, Miss., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Wyllie, William P. Jr., Topeka, Kans., Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Yates, Leo M., Ogden, Utah, Air Medal, one Oak Leaf Cluster.
Yates, William J., Calexico, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Yelvington, James L., San Marcos, Tex., Purple Heart, Silver Star.
Yenalavage, Anthony, Kingston, Pa., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Young, Howard N., Berkeley, Calif., Purple Heart.
Younkman, Marshall A., Tulsa, Okla., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Zant, Robert W., Grand Rapids, Mich., Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Zuber, John W., Missoula, Mont., Air Medal.
Anderson, James A., Cleveland, Ga., Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal.
Hays, John E., Bakersfield, Calif., Distinguished Flying Cross.
Horner, Richard E., Wrenshall, Minn., Silver Star.
Lanphier, Thos. G., Detroit, Mich., Navy Cross, Silver Star, one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal.
Pearsal, Edward L., Brooklyn, N. Y., Silver Star, Life Saving Medal.
Perry, John Edward, Silver Star.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] such time as he may desire.

THE VANISHING STATES

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House the report filed by the gentleman from Texas, Chairman MANSFIELD, of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, being Report No. 1000, to accompany H. R. 3961, the so-called river and harbor bill.

I call your attention particularly to the minority report, which discusses and directs attention to several matters, but particularly to the language in the first paragraph, which evidences no respect for the living or the dead, which reads as follows:

That penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to the possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission, and such recommendations shall be based upon consideration of the proper utilization and conservation in the public interest of the resources of the region and the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to construct powerhouses and install power machinery and appurtenances for the development of hydroelectric power at any dam heretofore or hereafter authorized by any act of Congress: *And provided further*, That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made, the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations.

Mr. Chairman, Congress either assumes or undertakes to avoid a very great responsibility when it tries to delegate to the discretion of the Chief of Army Engineers the authority necessary to permit him to desecrate graveyards; disinter the dead; destroy towns; disrupt State highway programs; divert railroad routes, and in general, without conference with the States, to construct dams, powerhouses, penstock dams and other facilities, if and when and wherever the Secretary of War and the Federal Power Commission in times of peace may recommend. This spells the end of democratic-republican government and is the construction of a foundation for a 100 percent socialization of this Government, under a blanket purely totalitarian, dictatorial, and a military authority. It cannot be that we will allow it. It is time the people understood what is being undertaken so insidiously to destroy the ancient landmarks under the guise of an alleged progress which leads down the broad road to destruction of all they have fought for and we are now trying to preserve.

And the minority report of the committee says with regard to that paragraph:

We oppose this delegation of power as unnecessary and unwise, especially at a time when the country is demanding that the Congress more effectively recognize and assume its duties and responsibilities as defined by the Constitution.

It is apparent that Congress will be in almost continuous session for an indefinite period and, therefore, there is no justification for such a sweeping and all-inclusive delegation of authority to any office or agency of the Government.

"GOD HELPS THOSE WHO HELP THEMSELVES"

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter which should vitally and intensely interest every Member of this House, the Governors and the people of every State in the Union, because it is another attempt of the gargantuan octopus of New Deal bureaucracy, federalization, and centralization to swallow what is left of the rights reserved to the States not already absorbed by this giant drunk with power.

AN UNCONSCIONABLE PROVISION

The provisions referred to are unconscionable, in derogation of, in disregard of, and also destructive of the rights of the States.

It would be a dangerous step to take for Congress to delegate so much power, if any in the premises, to the sole judgment of any Chief of Engineers of the Army.

The provision has bound up within it the dynamic power to destroy the States and to drown them off the map.

It is unbelievable to think that Congress would consider such a proposition of delegation of its powers as against the rights of the States, at least to be heard in some court, before they are executed.

A PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Think it over and be ready to vote for an amendment to be offered intended to save your State from the humiliation of being further sunk in the obscurity of totalitarianism and federalization, and all States from losing their lives as component parts of this Union, while the people lose their liberty.

It is time now to recapture some of our congressional powers and prerogatives, to stop delegating and wasting our authority again.

The States are pretty well forced out of the picture in which they should be the dominant actors in an effort to save themselves. They should be aroused to what confronts them and eager to fight to live. If they are not so aroused and do not try through their lawfully constituted representatives to save themselves, to recapture what they have lost, and to take their place in the sun to fight further Federal depredation, destruction, devastation, and confiscation, as only can be done under the totalitarian despotism now attempted, we shall wake up to find that we have no country to save.

God save us, the States, and the Government.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks, I wish to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ROTATION OF SERVICE IN THE NAVAL FORCES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to insert as part of my remarks a letter I received from the Navy Department regarding the rotation of men in service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was received by me today from the Navy Department regarding the rotation and relief of men who have served a long time at sea and in foreign lands. It is a matter I have discussed frequently with the War and Navy Departments:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL,
Washington, D. C., February 17, 1944.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Reference is made to your telephone conversation of February 16, 1944, in the interest of naval personnel serving outside the continental limits of the United States.

The Bureau has announced the policy of rotating enlisted personnel for rehabilitation leave and reassignment, after a minimum period of service of 18 months in hazardous duty afloat or in outlying stations. However, this is promulgated as a matter of policy and not of directive, since the granting of leave or rotation must be consistent with the maintenance of the fighting efficiency of the service. The method of effectuating this policy is a matter within the cognizance of administrative commands, and the granting of leave remains the prerogative of the commanding officer.

In order that necessary personnel may be available for rotation, the Bureau has authorized interchange of personnel between fleets and naval districts and has conducted surveys of shore based personnel with a view to limiting tours of shore duty; and relief crews in excess of the actual operating force have been provided for submarine and air operations. Construction battalions are returned as units when circumstances permit and new battalions are formed using experienced ratings as the nuclei. Quotas have been assigned to the fleets to supply men for the manning of new construction, and experienced men who have served long periods at sea are returned to the United States to become the nucleus crews of new ships. Key ratings may or may not receive further schooling in addition to rehabilitation leave when returned for a new assignment.

Requests for consideration under these programs should be addressed to commanding officers for consideration by the personnel officers of the distribution commands.

By direction of the Chief of Naval Personnel.

Sincerely yours,
THOS. H. BINFORD,
Captain, United States Navy,
Director of Enlisted Personnel.

This will be good news, I am sure, and I hope to have even better from the Navy Department soon about the return of men to our shores. I have been asking the Army steadily also to try to work out a plan to return the soldiers, for a time anyway, whenever possible, to our shores after they have been on long tours of duty overseas.

I want in no way to interfere with the conduct of the war, but I do know that nothing will be of greater benefit to the service men and women and to their families than to relieve them, at least for a time, not only from the actual fighting but from the extremely bad and unhealthful living conditions under which they have to exist in certain foreign countries.

As a result of my interest I received in a letter from the War Department today information which is as follows:

TWO HUNDRED THOUSAND TROOPS RETURNED TO UNITED STATES FROM OVERSEAS AREAS

More than 200,000 troops, exclusive of sick and wounded, have been sent back to the United States from overseas areas since the beginning of the war, the War Department announced today.

Some of the personnel were sent back to the United States under the policy of rotation which is essentially the exchange of men in overseas theaters for replacements furnished from the United States in accordance with advance requisitions submitted by theater commanders.

Others were sent back under a returned personnel classification, and for them no specific replacements were furnished from the United States. In this category fall men sent back for emergency reasons, for discharge, or, in the case of officers, for the more efficient distribution of the most highly qualified individuals.

In a restatement of its rotation policy for other than air crew personnel, the War Department emphasized that those sent back to the United States will be those with the longest service in their particular overseas command or those with the longest service overseas.

"Each theater commander will prescribe for his theater the period of service which will render individuals eligible for consideration for rotation," the War Department stated. "It must be understood that eligibility does not bestow the right to be relieved from an overseas theater, but only establishes a basis for selection, the actual relief being dependent upon the personnel situation, exigencies of the service, and prosecution of the war."

To date, the minimum period for eligibility for rotation has been decreed as 18 months for service in the north African theater and 2 years in the Alaskan and Caribbean commands. Prescriptions for eligibility in other theaters, including the Southwest Pacific, are being formulated.

The availability of shipping for the transportation of rotational replacements is one of the main factors in controlling the number of eligible men who can be sent back to the United States under the rotation policy. Military exigencies and the personnel situation are other factors.

The purpose of rotation as set forth in the new policy statement is threefold:

1. To insure efficiency of a command by replacing those who do not require hospitalization, but whose morale or health has been adversely affected by prolonged periods of duty under severe conditions, and whose effectiveness cannot be restored by rotation within the theater.

2. To return to the continental United States experienced personnel for use in training and in the formation of new units, or for other purposes.

3. To return by replacement therefor, personnel considered by the theater commander as deserving of such return. Men who have been wounded in action more than once, even though released from the hospital to full duty, are to receive consideration in this connection.

For those men whose health or morale can be restored without a return to the United States, theater and similar commanders have been instructed to "use every means available to them to maintain personnel efficiency by exchange within their commands." The instructions directed that special consideration be given to the relief of personnel of this type on duty at remote or small stations.

On their arrival in the United States, personnel sent back under the rotation policy will be granted sufficient leave of absence or furlough by port or station commanders to enable them to spend 3 weeks wherever they choose. Such personnel will not be ordered to overseas commands again until they have performed duty in the United States subsequent to the furlough or leave granted by the port or station commanders.

Mr. Speaker, I shall continue to urge the War and Navy Departments to at once issue prescriptions for bringing the men back from the South Pacific and other areas which are the most trying of any theaters of war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today the names of certain students at Tufts College.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. MANASCO, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. KENNEDY), for 1 day, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 429. An act authorizing the President of the United States to award posthumously in the name of Congress a Medal of Honor to William Mitchell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 556. An act for the relief of Pedro Jose Arrecoechea; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

S. 616. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Vullo; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 698. An act to amend part II of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

S. 866. An act to fix compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 891. An act for the relief of Rebecca Collins and W. W. Collins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1028. An act to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1102. An act for the relief of Helene Murphy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1112. An act for the relief of Taylor W. Tonge; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1227. An act to amend section 1 of the act providing punishment for killing or assaulting the Federal officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1232. An act to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Patents.

S. 1272. An act to amend section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, 1925, as amended, for the purpose of making the provisions of such section prohibiting political contributions apply equally to labor organizations and management organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1323. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margaret M. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1326. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1335. An act to amend the fourth and fifth provisos of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain," approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437, 438; 30 U. S. C., secs. 201, 202); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1340. An act to provide for the grading of restaurants in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1407. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a civil government for Puerto Rico and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1917, as amended, and known as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee upon Claims.

S. 1539. An act to authorize the carrying of Civil War battle streamers with regimental colors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. O–3 at the United States Naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1546. An act to amend an act relating to the incorporation of Providence Hospital, Washington, D. C., approved April 8, 1864; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1579. An act to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1669. An act to clarify the law relative to allowances for mileage of graduates of the United States Military Academy and transportation of their dependents on assignment to their first duty station and to the mileage allowance of persons entering the United States Military Academy as cadets; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers quarters on February 9, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;

H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended;

H. R. 2340. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3152. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442);

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Wade Bros, a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the Outlying Degaussing Branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L–76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943;

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3916. An act to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 18, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backing of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Friday, February 18: General Reybold, General Robins, Colonel Goethals, other representatives of the Office of Chief of Engineers and proponents and opponents of projects in other regions in the United States.

2. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

3. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1197. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting statistics of natural gas companies for 1942; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1198. A letter from the First Assistant Administrator, War Food Administration, transmitting a report of State list of payments to payees who received $1,000 or more under the 1941 and 1942 agricultural conservation and parity-payment programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1199. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to vest title to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (ex *Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original U. S. S. *Michigan*, Inc."; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1200. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a list of names whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1201. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for employee health program; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1202. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), for the purposes of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1203. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, amounting in all to $139,719,249 (H. Doc. No. 424); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 443. Resolution providing funds for expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 346; without amendment (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3609. A bill to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4217. A bill for the relief of sundry claimants, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DIES: Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. Pursuant to House Resolution 282. Resolution to report on Peace Now Movement; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia: Committee on Elections No. 3. House Resolution 444. Resolution to dismiss election contest of James C. Moreland, contestant, against Leonard W. Schuetz, contestee, Seventh Congressional District of the State of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKS.

H. R. 4214. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of establishing a national cemetery at St. Cloud, Fla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4215. A bill to extend to the custodial-service employees of the Post Office Department certain benefits applicable to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 4216. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4218. A bill to provide for the wearing of wound chevrons and war service chevrons by members of the land and naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COSTELLO:

H. R. 4219. A bill to provide for the appointment of female pilots and aviation cadets in the air forces of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 4220. A bill to extend for the duration of the war, without the payment of any further premium, policies of insurance issued by the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MERRITT:

H. R. 4221. A bill to suspend the running of the periods of limitation relating to assessment and refund of certain taxes of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Resolution 237. Joint resolution to amend section 3 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution for the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, and so forth," approved February 8, 1918; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 446. Resolution directing the House Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into the facts concerning the treaty entered into between the United States and the Republic of Mexico with regard to the disposition of certain waters of the Colorado River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation reimbursing municipalities for loss of personal property used in war production and exempt from taxation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to relax the stringent rationing of butter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 4222. A bill for the relief of Wallace Swenson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4223. A bill for the relief of Rear Admiral William L. Calhoun, United States Navy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4224. A bill for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4225. A bill to authorize the presentation to Lt. Col. William J. Wilkins of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4226. A bill for the relief of H. F. Owen; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4925. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition of the Asbury Park liquor beverage organization, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4926. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. L. R. Sangston and 120 other citizens of Loveland, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4927. Also, petition of F. J. Taylor and 42 other citizens of Yankton, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4928. Also, petition of Rev. T. Garland Smith and 84 other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4929. Also, petition of Addie Lancaster and 98 other citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4930. Also, petition of Charles W. Clark and 78 other citizens of Pella, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4931. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Cunningham and 329 other citizens of Roanoke, Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4932. Also, petition of Ora E. Altum and 101 other citizens of El Paso, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4933. Also, petition of Jane Miller and 108 other citizens of Bridgeport, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4934. Also, petition of John W. Gilbert and 153 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4935. Also, petition of Mae Williams and 93 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4936. Also, petition of Mrs. J. Forgas and 134 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4937. Also, petition of Harry M. Ingradam and 171 other citizens of Batavia, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4938. Also, petition of Miriam Davis and 99 other citizens of Portland, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4939. Also, petition of Mrs. Palmer and 94 other citizens of the State of Washington, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4940. By Mr. CANFIELD: Concurrent resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4941. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition submitted by Zollie C. Carpenter, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, St. Louis, Mo., and signed by thousands of St. Louis citizens, petitioning Congress to pass the soldier-vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

4942. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of W. J. Brumbaugh and other members of the Evangelical Church and church school, of Heckathorn Church, South Oil City, Pa., urging enactment of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4943. Also, petition of C. G. Kiser and other members of the Evangelical Church and church school of Venus, Pa., urging enactment of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4944. Also, petition of Mrs. H. C. Hulings, president, Gleaners Bible Class of Grace Methodist Church, Warren, Pa., favoring enactment of legislation restricting sale of alcoholic beverages in environs of military camps, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4945. Also, petition of the Women's Missionary Society of the First Baptist Church, Franklin, Pa., favoring enactment of Senate bill 860 and House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4946. Also, petition of H. C. Seigworth, president, and other members of the Men's Brotherhood Class of the Tionesta Methodist Church, Tionesta, Pa., urging support of Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4947. Also, petition of Clara M. Friggle and other residents of Franklin, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4948. Also, petition of Mrs. C. Lettie Wilkins and other citizens of Franklin, Pa., urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4949. Also, petition of James T. Hanna and other members of the Methodist Church and church school of Venus, Pa., urging enactment of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4950. Also, petition of W. R. Ross, of Cooperstown, Pa., and other signers of Venango County, Pa., urging passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4951. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Dr. Walter P. Taylor, president, the Wildlife Society, College Station, Tex., opposing Senate bill 1046 and House bills 3864 and 3884; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

4952. Also, petition of Robert A. Manire, State director, agricultural education, Austin, Tex., favoring additional appropriations for war-training food production; to the Committee on Appropriations.

4953. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the employees of the Eastern Manufacturing Co., Inc., of Boston, Mass., favoring the Wright-Compton resolution and the Taft-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4954. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Jewish Welfare Board, Queens area, New York, protesting against the coming into force of the white paper, and urging our Government to use its best offices with our ally, Great Britain, to bring about the abrogation of the white paper so that there may be a full implementation of the Balfour Declaration for the Jewish homeland; that the Jewish people shall have the right of free entry and immigration into Palestine; and to found colonies where the Jewish immigrants may be settled and find homes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4955. Also, resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of the Borough of Queens, N. Y., endorsing the recommendations of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, that the Government agencies begin immediately to liquidate surplus holdings in land and real estate which are not needed for Federal activities; that consideration be given to the feasibility of assigning the operational functions of appraising, acquiring, abstracting, recording, and disposing of all real estate owned and controlled by the Federal Government to be a central unit to reduce inequity, lack of uniformity, duplication, and waste of funds in connection with Government acquisitions and disposition of real property; and that this

unit shall be a part of already existing Government machinery; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4956. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition signed by a number of residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, New York, protesting against the enactment of any or all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4957. By Mr. WILEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4958. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing House bill 2082 or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4959. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president of the Bradbury Heights Citizens' Association, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Benning Heights Apartments; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4960. Also, petition of the national secretary, Women's International League, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Austin-Wadsworth bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of compassion and deliverance, enable us to forsake the taskmasters of hate and discouragement; Thou who dost know and require, do Thou endow us with a chastened sense of all men, then shall the chant of creation be Jehovah's praise. Human life is too precious and the world too fair to be darkened by the clouds of neglect and despair. Forbid that America should ever repudiate the Golden Rule and allow life to be materialized into a sham and mockery. O take our unused powers, our ideals unfulfilled, and our possibilities unachieved and let our soul breathe the breath of God.

Heavenly Father, the real crown of life is service and the finest minds covet the aim of Calvary's cross as they hear its challenging call to gallantry; O may it haunt the valiant hearts of men. In childhood's hour the paths to the altar were plain, but the tides of the world have dulled them; we have lost the wonder and the overmastering compulsion and the sight has faded and the memory of the Prince among men has chilled. O Harbinger, human and divine, when the strongholds of sin confront us, clothe us with chivalrous spirits to accept the challenge. Bless our great Republic for its genius, for its national life, teaching that no one can call Thee Father without having man as brother. "Rise up, O men of God, have done with lesser things and give mind and strength to serve the King of kings." In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 14, 1944, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 208. Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1944.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Shaner, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3997. An act to amend the code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4059. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.; and

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION (H. DOC. NO. 441)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States.

To the House of Representatives:

I received yesterday afternoon, February 17, 1944—H. R. 3477 (S. 1458)—a bill which extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until June 30, 1945, but which by its restrictive provisions would compel an increase in the cost of food and the cost of living to the people of the United States.

I promptly return the bill, without my signature, and urgently recommend that the Congress take action as soon as possible to extend without hampering restrictions the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Farmers could thereby make plans for the planting of crops and know the support prices on which they can rely.

The reasons for my disapproval of H. R. 3477—my most emphatic and vigorous disapproval—must already be known to every Senator and every Representative. The issue of using Government funds to hold down the cost of living is not a new issue and my views on it have been expressed before and at some length, particularly in my message vetoing a similar bill (H. R. 2869) on July 2, 1943.

This bill, like that bill, is an inflation measure, a high-cost-of-living measure, a food-shortage measure.

This bill will raise the cost of food in the Bureau of Labor Statistics index not less than 7 percent and will raise the whole cost of living materially.

If this bill were to become law, the housewife would soon have to pay:

Ten cents a pound more for butter.

Nearly 8 cents more a pound for cheese.

One cent more for a quart of milk.

One cent more for a loaf of bread.

Seven cents more for a 10-pound bag of flour.

Hamburger would go up 4 cents a pound.

Pork chops would go up 4½ cents a pound.

Sliced ham would go up 6½ cents a pound.

Chuck roast would go up 3½ cents a pound.

Round steak would go up 5 cents a pound.

The cost of many other necessities would be increased materially.

While increasing the cost of living, the prohibition of consumers subsidies will not add one dollar to the income of the farmers.

This bill would in effect reverse the policy of the Congress; in effect, it repeals the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942.

It is clear that we cannot hold the wage line if the Congress deprives us of the means necessary to hold the cost-of-living line.

No major country at war today has been able to stabilize the cost of living without the use of subsidies.

If the wage line breaks—and I do not see how it can be held if this bill becomes law—not only will food costs rise still further but all other costs will rise—including the cost of all munitions and supplies for the Army and Navy by many billions.

Not only will it cost every American family more to buy the necessities of life, not only will it cost more to run our factories and our farms, but also the costs of conducting the war will rise proportionately day by day.

The weight of the increased burden will fall on all of us, but most of all on the unorganized workers and others who live on small and relatively fixed incomes, among whom are most of the dependents of our fighting men.

The bill presented to me would destroy the stabilization program.

I cannot accept responsibility for its disastrous consequences.

I hope the Congress will not compel these consequences.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 18, 1944.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, a roll call must be had.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 226, nays 151, not voting, 51, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—226

Abernethy	Grant, Ala.	O'Hara
Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Allen, La.	Gregory	Peterson, Ga.
Andersen, H. Carl	Griffiths	Phillips
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Pittenger
Andresen, August H.	Gwynne	Ploeser
Andrews	Hagen	Plumley
Arends	Hale	Poage
Arnold	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pracht, C. Frederick
Auchincloss	Hall, Leonard W.	Pratt, Joseph M.
Baldwin, Md.	Halleck	Ramey
Barden	Hancock	Rankin
Barrett	Harness, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Harris, Ark.	Reed, N. Y.
Bender	Heidinger	Rees, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Hess	Rizley
Bennett, Mo.	Hill	Robertson
Bishop	Hoeven	Rockwell
Blackney	Hoffman	Rodgers, Pa.
Bolton	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Mass.
Boren	Holmes, Wash.	Rohrbough
Bradley, Mich.	Hope	Rolph
Brown, Ga.	Horan	Rowe
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Russell
Brumbaugh	Jarman	Sauthoff
Buffett	Jeffrey	Schiffler
Busbey	Jenkins	Schwabe
Butler	Jennings	Scott
Camp	Jensen	Scrivner
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Anton J.	Shafer
Carlson, Kans.	Johnson, Calvin D.	Short
Carrier	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson, Ill.
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Simpson, Pa.
Case	Johnson, Ward	Slaughter
Chenoweth	Jones	Smith, Maine
Chiperfield	Jonkman	Smith, Ohio
Church	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Clason	Keefe	Sparkman
Clevenger	Kilburn	Springer
Cole, Mo.	Kinzer	Stanley
Cole, N. Y.	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Colmer	Kunkel	Stearns, N. H.
Compton	Lambertson	Stefan
Costello	Lanham	Stevenson
Courtney	Lea	Stewart
Cox	LeCompte	Stockman
Cravens	LeFevre	Sumner, Ill.
Crawford	Lemke	Sundstrom
Cunningham	Lewis	Taber
Curtis	McConnell	Talle
Day	McGehee	Tarver
Dewey	McGregor	Thomas, N. J.
Disney	McKenzie	Thomason
Dondero	McLean	Tibbott
Dworshak	Maas	Troutman
Eaton	Mahon	Vincent, Ky.
Elliott	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson, Ga.
Ellis	Martin, Iowa	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	Martin, Mass.	Vursell
Elmer	Mason	Wadsworth
Engel, Mich.	May	Ward
Engle, Calif.	Merrow	Weichel, Ohio
Fellows	Michener	West
Fisher	Miller, Conn.	Whitten
Fulbright	Miller, Nebr.	Whittington
Fuller	Miller, Pa.	Wigglesworth
Gallagher	Mills	Willey
Gathings	Monkiewicz	Wilson
Gavin	Mott	Winstead
Gearhart	Mundt	Wolcott
Gibson	Murray, Tenn.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gilchrist	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff, Mich.
Gillette	Norman	Woodrum, Va.
Gillie	Norrell	Worley
Goodwin	O'Brien, N. Y.	
Gossett		
Graham		

NAYS—151

Anderson, N. Mex.	Burgin	Dickstein
Angell	Byrne	Dies
Baldwin, N. Y.	Canfield	Dilweg
Barry	Cannon, Fla.	Dingell
Bates, Ky.	Capozzoli	Drewry
Beckworth	Carter	Durham
Bland	Celler	Eberharter
Bloom	Chapman	Ellison, Md.
Bonner	Clark	Fay
Bradley, Pa.	Cochran	Feighan
Brooks	Cooley	Fernandez
Bryson	Cooper	Fitzpatrick
Buckley	Crosser	Flannagan
Bulwinkle	D'Alesandro	Fogarty
Burchill, N. Y.	Davis	Folger
Burdick	Dawson	Forand
	Delaney	Ford
Furlong	Klein	Rabaut
Gale	LaFollette	Ramspeck
Gordon	Lane	Randolph
Gore	Larcade	Rivers
Gorski	Ludlow	Robinson, Utah.
Granger	McCord	Rogers, Calif.
Green	McCormack	Rowan
Harless, Ariz.	McMurray	Sabath
Harris, Va.	Madden	Sadowski
Hart	Magnuson	Sasscer
Hays	Maloney	Satterfield
Hébert	Mansfield, Mont.	Scanlon
Heffernan	Marcantonio	Sheppard
Hendricks	Merritt	Sheridan
Herter	Monroney	Sikes
Hinshaw	Morrison, N. C.	Snyder
Hoch	Mruk	Somers, N. Y.
Holifield	Murdock	Spence
Hull	Murphy	Sullivan
Izac	Myers	Thomas, Tex.
Jackson	Norton	Tolan
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Brien, Ill.	Towe
Johnson, Lyndon B.	O'Brien, Mich.	Voorhis, Calif.
Judd	O'Connor	Walter
Kearney	O'Konski	Wasielewski
Kee	O'Neal	Weaver
Kefauver	O'Toole	Weiss
Kelley	Outland	Welch
Kennedy	Patton	Wene
Keogh	Peterson, Fla.	White
Kerr	Pfeifer	Wickersham
King	Poulson	Wolverton, N. J.
Kirwan	Powers	Wright
	Priest	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—51

Beall	Gifford	Newsome
Bell	Hare	O'Leary
Boykin	Hartley	Patman
Brehm	Hobbs	Philbin
Burch, Va.	Johnson, J. Leroy	Price
Coffee	Kilday	Reed, Ill.
Cullen	Knutson	Richards
Curley	Landis	Robsion, Ky.
Dirksen	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Domengeaux	Luce	Smith, W. Va.
Doughton	Lynch	Sumners, Tex.
Douglas	McCowen	Talbot
Elston, Ohio	McMillan	Taylor
Fenton	McWilliams	Treadway
Fish	Manasco	Whelchel, Ga.
Fulmer	Miller, Mo.	Winter
Gamble	Morrison, La.	
Gerlach		

So two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sumners of Texas and Mr. Kilday for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Hobbs and Mr. Manasco for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois and Mr. Newsome for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Talbot and Mr. McWilliams for, with Mr. O'Leary against.

Mr. Brehm and Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. Fenton and Mr. Gerlach for, with Mr. Richards against.

Mr. Curley and Mr. Gifford for, with Mr. Hartley against.

Mr. Fish and Mr. Miller of Missouri for, with Mr. Coffee against.

Mr. Landis and Mr. McCowen for, with Mr. Philbin against.

Mr. Knutson and Mr. Dirksen for, with Mr. Lesinski against.

Mr. Douglas and Mr. Elston of Ohio for, with Mr. Price against.

General pairs:

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Hare with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. McMillan with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I heard my name mentioned as being paired to sustain the veto. I voted "no," which is a vote to sustain the President's veto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman was not paired.

Mr. MURPHY. When the name of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] was called I responded "No." I did not want any error about it.

Mr. HERTER changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. O'KONSKI changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The veto message and bill, together with the accompanying papers, are referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered printed.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action taken by the House.

LIBERALIZING PENSION LAWS RELATING TO VETERANS OF THE SPANISH WAR

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2350), an act to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

On page 3, after line 2, insert:

"SEC. 4. The act of May 1, 1926 (44 Stat. 382-384; U. S. C., title 38, secs. 364-364f), is hereby amended by adding a new section thereto No. 9, to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 9. No pension or increase in pension shall hereafter be allowed to the widow of a veteran of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, under any law, unless there was continuous cohabitation from the date of marriage to the date of death with the person who served, except where there was a separation which was due to the misconduct of or procured by the person who served, without the fault of the widow: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed so as to discontinue any pension granted prior to the enactment of this act.' "

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is the so-called Spanish-American War veterans' pension bill, and this amendment added by the Senate is simply an amendment that requires the wife to have been living with the veteran at the time of his death. Is that correct?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is right.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no other change in the legislation except that?

Mr. BUCKLEY. That is all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by

the national commander of the Jewish War Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX] may revise and extend his own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects; in one to include a resolution passed by the City Council of Lynn on the subject of the coal situation in that city, and in the other, to include a resolution of the City Council of Lynn requesting that a Jewish homeland be established in Palestine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement from the New Yorker.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement by Rabbi Silver. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that the cost will be $157.50.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two other subjects; in one, to include an article by David Olbrin from the Pittsburgh Press, a Scripps-Howard newspaper; and in the other to include a letter from a soldier.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE HENRY A. CLARK

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to announce the passing of a former Member of this body, Hon. Henry A. Clark, of Erie, Pa. His death occurred Tuesday, February 15, after a brief illness.

Mr. Clark celebrated his ninety-fourth birthday on January 7, this year. His death brought to a close not only a long, but a most useful and highly eventful life.

After availing himself of the local educational facilities, he entered Harvard in 1870, and was graduated 4 years later. During these years he and some classmates started a college paper, later known as the Crimson, which achieved national reputation. History records that a later editor of this publication was one Harvard student by the name of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Clark was a lawyer by profession and in politics he was a Republican. His first political office was member of the council of the city of Erie. He was later city solicitor. He served three terms in the State legislature. He was the sponsor of the law establishing the commission form of government for cities of the third class in the State of Pennsylvania, which law is generally referred to as the Clark Act. In 1916 he was elected to represent his district in the Sixty-fifth Congress, or better known as the World War Congress. Declining to be a candidate for reelection, he resumed the practice of law. In 1921 he was appointed by Gov. William C. Sproul as presiding judge of the orphans court of Erie county, to which office he was chosen at the next election for a full 10-year term.

It was my good fortune to be personally acquainted with Judge Clark for many years. When I was first elected to Congress, he called upon me at my office for the purpose of giving me some friendly, and which later proved most valuable, information and advice.

For years he has been known as Erie's grand old man. The many who mourn his passing will long cherish his memory.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of the business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of the simplification of income-tax reporting.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORSHIP AND CHARACTER OF MR. WALLACE'S SPEECHES

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUSBEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE CONSENT CALENDAR, FEBRUARY 21, TO BE CALLED WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Consent Calendar may be dispensed with on Monday next, that it may be in order to call the calendar on Wednesday of next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what else will be considered on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Wednesday we will take up the further consideration of the bill from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization that was under consideration the other day.

I have no other program to announce for next week at this time except what I announced yesterday that if the State, Commerce, and Justice appropriation bill is disposed of today I will ask that when the House adjourn today it adjourn until Monday next. I will ask that anyway.

There will be no legislative business on either Monday or Tuesday. While we shall meet on Monday and Tuesday there will be no legislative business if the State, Commerce, Justice bill is disposed of today.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope the majority leader will have in mind that the Commodity Credit Corporation expired last night, and that it might be necessary to give some consideration almost immediately to legislation continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think the majority leader would not like to put himself in the position of prohibiting the taking up of that resolution on Monday or Tuesday if the committee acts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The majority leader is not putting himself in that position. The duty and responsibility rests upon the gentleman from Michigan and the other members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to report out a bill forthwith. I assume that the bill will be introduced here on Monday. I assume the gentleman's committee will meet promptly, and if so, it will be up Wednesday; but I cannot put it on the program until the committee reports out a bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Can the gentleman assume that the committee will not meet tomorrow and report it out and put it on the calendar so it can be considered Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the committee meets and reports out a bill Monday it will be brought up on Wednesday of next week.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then it is the understanding that it will not be brought up until Wednesday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. We have an understanding with the House that there will be no legislative business on Monday and Tuesday if the pending appropriation bill is disposed of this week.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then the gentleman from Massachusetts assumes the responsibility——

Mr. McCORMACK. Was the gentleman from Michigan here yesterday?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman assumes the responsibility then of not giving this House an apportunity to vote to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation before Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is trying to get a little political advantage over me.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to know if the gentleman is taking that responsibility.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has a responsibility of his own. He should get his bill out.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have already exercised our responsibility. The House is going to be in session on Monday and Tuesday, but the gentleman precludes us from bringing up the resolution at that time by saying there will be no legislation considered before Wednesday. Understand me, I am not so keen about continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation. The President has assumed his responsibility and exercised it, but there are those Members in this House, and I assume a majority of them, who do want to continue it and I am going along with their desire and will cooperate.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts has an agreement with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am not chairman of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman had been here the other day he would have heard what was stated. The gentleman from Massachusetts had an agreement with the minority leader and with the House that there would be no legislative business until next Wednesday except that any matter that could be passed by unanimous consent would be brought up. Now, does the gentleman from Michigan understand the significance of a gentleman's agreement?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and the gentleman——

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman from Michigan understand the significance——

Mr. WOLCOTT. And the gentleman assumes responsibility if the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot function.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan is trying to pull off a little sharp politics and he knows it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is mistaken; there can be no other assumption about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Michigan——

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not care whether the Commodity Credit Corporation is continued or not. If Members on your side want it continued I want to go along with them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Surely the gentleman is familiar with the meaning of a gentleman's agreement. If the gentleman's committee reports out a bill on Monday that can be passed by unanimous consent we will pass it; if not we will call it up on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. I hope the gentleman will withdraw the request if there is going to be any controversy. There is a lot of business to be transacted today.

Mr. McLEAN. There is no controversy, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey has reserved the right to object. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be proper for the majority leader to announce that it has been arranged that on Tuesday next, in accordance with the time-honored custom of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not know who was going to read it. The purpose of meeting on Tuesday, of course, was to follow the time-honored custom. It will be carried out.

The SPEAKER. A statement appears on the front of the calendar that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will read Washington's Farewell Address on Tuesday, the 22d.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after the other special orders for the day I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of subsidies, with particular reference to the President's veto message.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I expect to make this afternoon in the Committee of the Whole I may include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper tribute to Francis M. Sullivan, American Legion legislative chief.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK SYSTEM

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JEFFREY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JEFFREY. Mr. Speaker, by an act of Congress enacted in 1933, the Federal Home Loan Bank System was created. Its purpose was to encourage and protect private thrift and private home ownership.

The act created an independent agency of the Government to be supported by local member institutions without cost to the taxpayer.

By Executive order dated February 24, 1942, this independent agency created by act of Congress was made a part of the National Housing Agency and became subject to the supervision of the National Housing Administrator.

I have today introduced a bill reestablishing the Federal Home Loan Bank Board as an independent agency. I believe that this agency to protect private savings and assist building and loan associations and other privately owned mortgage loan institutions should be completely disassociated from public housing authority.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and to include therein a brief resolution from the Michigan Legislature.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, the Speaker suggested that no 1-minute speeches be indulged in today?

The SPEAKER. The Chair hopes there will be no further 1-minute speeches.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, then may I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a 1-minute speech?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, according to the press and the radio, the President might veto the tax bill. His excuse will be that the amount of revenue collected under the tax bill is not sufficient. He is demanding $10,500,000,000 while the tax bill will produce $2,300,000,000.

It is the considered judgment of the House and the Senate that the increase provided in the new tax bill is as much as the country can stand at this time.

The President's real reason for vetoing the tax bill, if he does veto it, is not its failure to produce sufficient revenue. His principal reasons are that he is opposed to the provision in the bill which freezes the social-security tax at the

present rate. He knows that the business interests of the Nation are in favor of freezing this tax but he also knows that the social-security tax amounts to $1,300,000,000, which is quite a sum which he will get even if the tax bill is not passed. And he further knows that Socialists, Communists, and the radical element are anxious to have the social-security tax increased.

Another reason why he would be influenced to veto the tax bill is because it contains a provision requiring the filing of income returns by some organizations which heretofore have been exempted. These will include many organizations or radicals who are the principal sources of support which the President counts on strongly to reelect him for his fourth term.

If the tax bill fails because of the veto of the President, no other tax bill will be passed in this session.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein some editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from a conference of physicians in Vermont and New Hampshire.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter that I received with a petition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BURCHILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a committee report of the Elections Committee with reference to an election contest in Oklahoma, and also to include certain statements with reference thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two letters on the soldiers' vote question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered on February 2, 1944, by Paul G. Hoffman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered on January 29, 1944, by Sidney J. Williams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered on Monday next I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address by Chester Bowles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

WALTER WINCHELL

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I present a privileged report and resolution (H. Res. 430) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish the House of Representatives the answers to the following questions:

1. Is Walter Winchell in, or is he in any way officially connected with the Navy?

2. If Walter Winchell is either in the Navy, or if he is in any way connected with the Navy, what is his rank and in what way is he connected with the Navy?

3. If Walter Winchell is in the Navy, or if he is connected with the Navy, has he been assigned to inactive duty and if he has been assigned to inactive duty, what, if any, are his duties?

4. What compensation, if any, does Walter Winchell receive from the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Navy may be read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1944.

Hon. CARL VINSON,
Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: House Resolution 430, requesting information as to the status of Walter Winchell, was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for reply.

The questions propounded by the resolution are set forth below, with the answers thereto immediately following:

Question 1. Is Walter Winchell in, or is he in any way officially connected with the Navy?

Answer 1. Walter Winchell is in the United States Naval Reserve.

Question 2. If Walter Winchell is either in the Navy, or if he is in any way connected with the Navy, what is his rank and in what way is he connected with the Navy?

Answer 2. He is a lieutenant commander in the United States Naval Reserve.

Question 3. If Walter Winchell is in the Navy, or if he is connected with the Navy, has he been assigned to inactive duty, and if he has been assigned to inactive duty, what, if any, are his duties?

Answer 3. He has been assigned to inactive duty. Since assigned to inactive duty, he has no duties connected with the Navy.

Question 4. What compensation, if any, does Walter Winchell receive from the Navy?

Answer 4. He receives no compensation from the Navy.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Respectfully,

FRANK KNOX.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as the letter from the Secretary of the Navy furnishes all of the information called for by the resolution, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4204, with Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out

of order and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, House Resolution No. 431, which I introduced a few days ago, seeks to create a select committee of six Members of the House, three from the majority and three from the minority, to be named by the Speaker with authority and direction to conduct a study and investigation of all news releases, published material, motion picture and radio broadcast material, pertaining to any Member of Congress or any other public official other than an officer of the armed forces, or to any candidate for public office, or any public issue, such as national legislation, which may be disseminated to the armed forces of the United States, either within or without the country, by or through any Government agency.

This resolution does not propose or contemplate the censoring of the news and like material furnished to our armed forces. Neither is it partisan in nature or intent. Instead, it calls only for a continuing congressional study of such news and like material furnished to our men and women in the armed forces, and a report to the House of Representatives as to any findings the committee may make, or recommendations the members may have, in connection therewith. I believe it is the plain duty and responsibility of this House to establish such a committee and to make such a study and investigation. It must be remembered that practically all of the news and informational material furnished to the armed forces is channeled through one governmental agency or another. Also that such material and information is gathered, prepared, and disseminated to our fighting legions, both at home and abroad, at the expense of the American public.

I believe, therefore, that this Congress has a mandate from the American people to carefully supervise and check the activities of the various governmental bureaus now exercising the great and grave responsibility of deciding what our forces in the field can read, or see, or hear. Likewise I feel certain that we owe to our constituents the duty of ascertaining how their money is being spent for the dissemination of news and propaganda within the armed forces.

Let me also remind you—if any of you need such a reminder—that this Congress has provided the means whereby the men and women in the armed services will be given the opportunity of voting in the coming November elections. Certainly the Congress, which gives to those who fight our battles the opportunity to vote, should also make certain that all the information upon which our armed sons and daughters must base their judgment as to how to vote, is a fair, unbiased, and impartial presentation of the facts. The Congress of the United States has the right to make certain, and the duty to know beyond question, that both sides of every story, especially as pertaining to candidates for public office, to public officials, and to public issues, are presented to our service men and women without color or misrepresentation and in a purely factual manner.

We will soon have five million or more of our young Americans overseas. It is hoped and expected that practically all of them will have the opportunity to participate in the November election. To participate intelligently they must be properly informed as to the candidates and the issues upon which they will be called to vote.

However, the problem goes much farther than that. Some time in the not too distant future—and certainly the sooner the better—millions of our young men and women—approximately 11,000,000 of them—will return home to take up the orderly pursuits of civilian life. These veterans will constitute the very cream and best of our citizenship. They are the younger generation which will carry on after you and I relinquish our places. Many of them will have been out of the country 1, 2, 3, or even more years. Over these millions of young Americans the Office of War Information, the news services of the War and Navy Departments, and other governmental agencies have, to no little extent, the tremendous power of shaping their views and their opinions of their own homeland. These youngsters are, for the most part, of that glorious impressionable age. Insofar as the broader phases of life are concerned they are in the formative stage. They are now passing through what is both an heroic and a tragic experience. Of necessity, much of the information they now receive as to the happenings here on the home front is controlled by our Government. They are not only getting Government-controlled information that is being distributed directly to them but they are also getting, as a natural circumstance, the propaganda that is being directed to the people of foreign countries. On the basis of this controlled news and this propaganda, these young Americans are forming views which are vital to the future of their country. Manifestly we do owe them the tremendous responsibility of seeing to it that they are dealt with fairly.

There has long been much controversy, both within and without the Congress, relative to the activities of the Office of War Information. We are all aware that the Appropriations Committee of this House has made a serious study of O. W. I. operations, and most of us know of the abuses which have been uncovered. Congress has succeeded in somewhat controlling the domestic propaganda activities of this governmental agency, but on the foreign front it is still running high, wide and handsome. To a great extent it not only controls the flow of news to our soldiers, but it also controls the form and kind of much of their entertainment. But assuming we have had no experience with the O. W. I.—assuming it has been the very perfection of sweetness and light; a bureaucracy so angelic that, like Elijah, it may at any time ascend unto Heaven in a cloud of pure white smoke—assume it to be all of this—this legislative body still has a responsibility, a serious one, indeed, to check, and to study, and to know what is being said and done.

Let me give you some instances: The other day Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, a Republican candidate for the Presidency, spoke here at a meeting of Nation-wide importance. He spoke, not as the Governor of Ohio, but as a candidate for the Presidency. Yet in sending an account of his statements overseas the Office of War Information made no reference whatsoever to his being a candidate for the Presidency. Governor Bricker made some very important statements as to his position on domestic affairs. In fact, such statements were the actual high lights of his address. Yet the Office of War Information made no reference whatsoever to the Governor's statements on domestic matters. Instead it mentioned only that which he had to say regarding this country's future foreign policy.

Several weeks ago a Member of the other body, the Senator from Pennsylvania, issued a statement charging that the action taken by that body on the soldiers' vote bill was the result of an "unholy alliance" between southern Democrats and northern Republicans. His statement was broadcast quite fully to the armed forces overseas, but believe it or not, and quite strangely, the very pointed reply of his colleague, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, was in no way mentioned.

Subsequently the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, sent a message to this Congress in which he branded certain legislation then before us as being a fraud, and strongly intimated—to say the least—that the Congress by its passage would be attempting to perpetrate a fraud upon our fighting forces—that the passage of the bill was being unduly delayed—and challenged the Members of Congress to stand up and be counted. This message of the President to the Congress, with all of its serious implications against this great representative body, was sent in its entirety to the armed forces by every possible means of distribution through several agencies of the Government. However, the reply of the minority leader of this House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Martin], first in asking unanimous consent that the bill be taken up for immediate debate and vote, and later in waiving the rights of the minority so that a roll call on the very issue involved could be had, thus answering the President's challenge to stand up and be counted, was not given to the armed forces by these same governmental agencies. Neither were any of the other statements of those opposing the position taken by the President and Commander in Chief disseminated to our fighting forces. As far as the armed forces are concerned the only information they have on the soldier vote issue are the charges contained in the Presi-

dent's message. They have not been given the other side of the story.

There is not a Member of this body who does not know there is something bigger than the Presidency, or the success of a political party, at stake here in America during the next 10 months. Many of us know there is a movement afoot to destroy the influence of Congress and to make it as impotent as the German Reischstag, which, if successful, would mean the end of representative government here in America.

I do not charge that the President is a party to it; but I do know that his statement, intimating the legislative branch of the Government is seeking to perpetrate a fraud on the armed forces in connection with legislation before it, is helpful to such a movement. His famous "fraud message" carried the very definite implication that he himself was against political profiteering at the expense of the boys and girls in the armed forces but that we in Congress—unless we accepted his views—would be favoring and permitting it. We know that even at this late date the soldier vote issue has not been presented fairly to our fighting forces abroad. In lesser degree the same thing holds true as to many of the statements that have been made as to the congressional position on subsidies, taxes, and other controversial issues.

We have been repeatedly told that the young men and women who wear the uniform of our country are righteously indignant about strikes on the home front, but have they been furnished information as to the contentions of some of the more substantial labor leaders as to where the real fault lies for and with present labor conditions? So far as I can learn they know nothing of the complaint of these men that labor is subjected to the directives and conflicting policies of some 25 different governmental agencies here in Washington. Neither do they know that many patriotic members of organized labor are opposed to strikes in wartime and are using their influence to prevent them. And, judging from the way in which the report on Governor Bricker's recent speech was handled, our service men and women do not know how any of the candidates for the Presidency, with perhaps the exception of one, stand on wartime strikes, or what they may favor as a national labor policy. The same can be said as to many other important issues, such as post-war plans, and the respective parts the American free-enterprise system and the Federal Government should play therein.

I believe every fair-minded man and woman in America must agree it is absolutely essential to the future welfare of this Nation, for which our boys are fighting, and in which they will have to live, that they know both sides of every controversial issue. Certainly there are two sides to every question. Certainly it is vitally necessary that the activities of every branch of Government, and of every public official, and the position of every candidate for public office, be presented to these defenders of democracy in a true, fair and impartial manner.

While the military seems to control all news distributed to the forces abroad, the fact remains that most of this news is supplied to it by O. W. I., and is transmitted over facilities under lease by the O. W. I. Further, it is likewise true that our armed forces are exposed to the propaganda disseminated to the peoples of foreign lands and published in the press or heard over the radio in the lands in which they are located.

The O. W. I. is a hodgepodge of ideological hues. There are red, pinks, and pastels down there. To an extent I suppose this is unavoidable. Dealing with foreigners of every description they probably have to have foreigners of every description to do the dealing. Anyway there are any number of aliens on the payroll. Presumably there are pro-Tito and anti-Tito men, pro-King George and anti-King George men dealing with the propaganda for the Balkans. We all recall how our Government was embarrassed when the O. W. I. described Victor Emmanuel as the "moronic little King."

Our State Department may or may not have policies dealing with the various foreign countries. It makes little or no difference to the multihued ideologists of the O. W. I. They have their own varied and conflicting policies. They are engaged in an intellectual revelry. Is there any reason that the Congress of the United States should not know what they are doing? Is there any reason why we should not keep a continuous tab on them?

We have only to read the daily newspapers to know that they are forever in a turmoil of intrigue among themselves. Only a few days ago three men were dismissed after what was reported to be a show-down between the Director, Elmer Davis, and the playwright, Robert F. Sherwood.

I quote also from an article from London under date of January 17 by the famous United Press correspondent, Henry J Taylor. He wrote:

> When a canvass is made on the effectiveness of the United States civilian agencies in this theater of war, common consent puts the American Red Cross at the top of the list and the Office of War Information at the bottom. It's the same old story of impartial, experienced management, single-mindedly going about its job, as contrasted with a bunch of headless hunch players who fret, fritter, and flop, meanwhile smothering able men and women within the organization who otherwise would use their talents well.

Mr. Taylor goes on to tell of the work of the Red Cross. Then he says:

> By the same tests I have been unable to find a single good word among Americans here for what is called by some the "Grosvenor Square Country Club" and by others the "Office of War Misinformation."

Mr. Taylor adds:

> One of the most obvious delinquencies is waste—waste of money, waste of people, waste of time.

However, my purpose is not to make an attack on the O. W. I. And it is not my purpose to interfere with the work which is being done by the Appropriations Committee. I have given this picture of the O. W. I. only as it relates to the serious situation; that it is in this loose way the viewpoints of millions of our young men and women toward the home front are being formed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say frankly that I have been gravely disturbed by the propaganda which these young people have been getting. There seems to have been a deliberate effort to picture the home front, the parents and sweethearts here at home, in the worst possible light to them. There seems to have been a deliberate effort to play one front against the other. It is not only subversive to our future welfare, it is subversive to the present morale of these gallant young people.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall press for an early hearing before the Rules Committee for my resolution and for prompt consideration of its passage. I invite my colleagues to join with me in this endeavor.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the ranking majority Member.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, when these appropriation bills were up in the last session, I undertook to discuss the origin and the importance of the Department of Justice, giving some history about this great organization of our Government. Today I want to talk a little about the Department of Commerce, another important activity of our Government. In the presentation of these bills we hear a good deal of discussion about the amounts involved; and ometimes the bills are very controversial, both before the Committee on Appropriations and in the Committee of the Whole. What I would like to do is to impress upon the Congress and upon the people of this country the importance of the work of the various departmental activities of our Government.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Department of Commerce is the most interesting and the most highly differentiated Department of our Government. It was created by an act of Congress, February 14, 1903, and within this 40 years there has been assigned to the supervision and administration of this Department many hundreds of national activities relating to the material, economic, and social development of this Nation. A glance at the history of this governmental Department discloses one of the most complex and interesting features of our Government. I wish on this occasion to call the attention of the House to many of the various activities which this Department of our Government coordinates and administers.

First. Bureau of the Census: This is a fact-finding agency and a constitutional function, it covers a survey of our citizenship statistics, agricultural statistics, vital statistics, and the census of manufacturers, the census of business, and the tabulation of data on imports and exports of the United States. The

compiled data and information in this important governmental function is continually sought by almost every individual and business of this Nation, and at this time this information is of great value to our war activities.

Second. Coast and Geodetic Survey: The technical work which this department does provides full information concerning our ports, our harbors, and our anchorages, and fully charts the seacoasts, harbors, and other coastal obstructions in every part of the United States territory. It employs a staff of expert sailors and surveyors, and as an illustration of its importance it has been called upon to accomplish about three times as much work concerning our war activities as in normal times.

Third. Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce: The outstanding purpose of this important division of our Government concerns the fostering, promoting, and developing of foreign and domestic commerce, and the dissemination of information thereon. It is one of the large activities of the Government and provides data and a comprehensive knowledge of all business. This division was established in 1912 and its Reference Field Service is established in many parts of the United States. Many members of this Bureau serve on international committees involved in the prosecution of the present war.

Fourth. The Patent Office: This division of our Government is a constitutional activity and it is involved in the administration of our trade-mark laws and the issuing of all manner of patents and protection thereof. The examining and associated divisions of this activity are now temporarily located in Richmond. The Commissioner of Patents has administrative and judicial functions and the income from this important feature of our Government now amounts to more than three and one-half million dollars.

Fifth. National Bureau of Standards: This division of our Government was established by an act of Congress in 1901. Its large shop and chemical facilities and administrative offices are located within the city of Washington and there are located five branch laboratories to test materials within the States. The present war burden has enlarged the work of this facility and it now serves every department of our Government. It tests every kind of material used and all instruments, appliances, and structures. It has custody of all national standards of weights and measures.

Sixth. The Weather Bureau: This interesting activity of our Government was established by joint resolution of Congress in 1870. Its functions have been extended to serve the whole Nation and all individuals. It issues daily bulletins on current weather conditions and conducts investigations directed toward fuller knowledge of basic weather sources. This information is of inestimable value to the major military activities of this country.

Seventh. Civil Aeronautics Administration: The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, whose functions are administered under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of Commerce, has for his purpose the encouragement and fostering of the development of civil aeronautics and air commerce. This work involves one of the largest appropriations in the Government. It provides for the establishment of airways and landing areas, and the enforcement of regulations concerning them, the inspection of airmen and all craft machinery, and provides flight instructions for Army and Navy cadets' guidance and the facilitation of traffic control. It has established seven regional offices in the United States and one in Canada. The Aeronautic Board is composed of five members with three outstanding functions, namely: (a) The regulation of the economic aspects of air carrier operations; (b) the promulgation of safety standards and equipment; and (c) the investigation of aircraft accidents.

Eighth. The National Inventors' Council: The National Inventors' Council functions under the Department of Commerce and is composed of 19 members and 130 committeemen. The membership embraces some of the most noted inventors, industrialists, and public officials of this Nation, and is most important in that all inventions and ideas by the public or the War Department have to be scrutinized and evaluated by this distinguished Council. To date this Council has investigated more than 170,000 suggestions.

Ninth. Under the supervision of the Department of Commerce is the Inland Waterways Corporation, Foreign Trade Board, and the Textile Foundation, Inc.

MALCOLM KERLIN

There are many faithful employees connected, some for many years, with the Department of Commerce, and I wish to record my appreciation and admiration at this time for one intelligent, outstanding man whose long connection with the activities of this Department of our Government and whose faithful service has brought to him honor and meritorious distinction. That man is Malcolm Kerlin, administrative assistant to the Secretary, a modest gentleman, always in love with his work. Thoroughness has been the touchstone of his official career. He has tread the rough pathway of duty and patience and steady perseverance into the ranks of those this country delights to honor.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND W. C. COSTELLO

Under the Department of Commerce is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. This Corporation is the the greatest fiscal agency ever organized on this earth. Jesse Jones became a member of the board of directors upon its organization or soon thereafter and was the chairman of that board from 1933 to 1939 and until he became Secretary of Commerce. The board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has at all times been constituted of men of both professional and practical financial ability. The personnel of this board has always been of the highest type and its present chairman, Ex-Senator Charles B. Henderson, is a superb citizen in every respect and an outstanding public official who with his codirectors are rendering a service to this Nation in this period of its history never before equalled in its scope and in its importance.

I cannot neglect to speak of the vital and efficient work of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation done by its splendid assistant, Hon. W. C. Costello. Mr. Costello has been connected with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation since its organization. He is a master of detail involving all the work of this institution and its subsidiaries. His services are invaluable on account of his attractive personality and his approach to every matter and his accurate information in respect to those matters which come under his observation. Mr. Costello's valuable and conscientious service and fidelity to duty deserve the confidence, respect, and esteem of every patriotic citizen of this Nation. He has courage and an optimistic outlook upon life and when approached by either his superiors of those who seek favor at his hands, he not only renders the service required but he also impresses the recipient with his accurate knowledge and with the pleasure involved in the duty performed. He is a good man and has the happy faculty of being able to pick crumbs of comfort out of a situation no matter how unpleasant or disagreeable that situation may be.

At this point I wish to insert in my remarks a summary of the business record of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; this record we should all be proud of. In my opinion, it has never been surpassed in the annals of history and should always quicken the pride of the manhood of this Nation; no scandal has ever effaced its integrity and no finger of scorn ever touched its high and valuable purposes.

SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES DECEMBER 31, 1943

During the past 3½ years the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been devoted almost entirely to war work, much of it through its subsidiaries, in cooperation with other Government agencies. Its subsidiaries and affiliates are operated by Reconstruction Finance Corporation personnel with Reconstruction Finance Corporation facilities on a reimbursable basis.

In the war program Reconstruction Finance Corporation, itself, as distinguished from its war subsidiaries, makes loans to manufacturers, large and small, engaged in war work for plant expansion, machinery, equipment, working capital, and other purposes. These include loans to finance the production or processing of essential materials, minerals, metals, and chemicals; military equipment, including aircraft, engines, accessories, instruments, and parts; ordnance—guns, tanks, shells, and explosives; ships; radio equipment; machinery; machine tools; motor vehicles; food, food products, and dehydrated foods; pipe lines; 100-octane gasoline; and a great many other items necessary in the war effort.

The Corporations created for defense and war activities are:

1. Defense Plant Corporation, to finance or construct plants and to acquire machinery, equipment, etc.;

2. Metals Reserve Company, Rubber Reserve Company, Rubber Development Corporation, and Defense Supplies Corporation, to acquire various supplies of metals, rubber, and other strategic and critical materials, and to facilitate their distribution to war industries or the consuming public; the payment of abnormal transportation costs on sugar, coal, and petroleum where the normal methods have been interrupted by submarine warfare;

3. United States Commercial Co., to compete with enemy countries for the purchase of materials that might be of use to the enemy, some of which would be useful to ourselves;

4. Defense Homes Corporation, to build housing facilities in connection with the manufacture of war materials; and

5. War Damage Corporation, to insure against the destruction of property by enemy action.

These companies—with the exception of Defense Homes Corporation, which has been transferred to the National Housing Administrator and the United States Commercial Co. and the Rubber Development Corporation which have been transferred to the Foreign Economic Administration—are all owned, managed, and operated under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce, by Reconstruction Finance Corporation directors and personnel.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiaries act as service agencies in the war program. Neither the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor the Secretary of Commerce determines policies in connection with the war. When the President, the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, the Petroleum Administration for War, Director of War Mobilization, and the Director of Economic Stabilization, or the Rubber Director establishes the need for plant facilities, materials, services, or supplies, for which no other provision is made, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, through one of the above-named subsidiaries, when requested to do so by the appropriate war agency and with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, undertakes to provide them. In this way it serves those responsible for war production, procurement, and policies.

Directly and through its several agencies, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from its organization, February 2, 1932 to December 31, 1943, has made commitments aggregating more than $38,100,000,000, of which $24,500,000,000 has been for war and defense purposes. Of the total commitments, $7,200,000,000 has been canceled, including $3,500,000,000 war commitments.

In addition to the foregoing, by direction of Congress Reconstruction Finance Corporation advanced to other Government agencies and for relief $2,800,000,000 for which Congress authorized the Treasury to cancel its notes.

Commitments now outstanding aggregate approximately $10,100,000,000, of which $9,100,000,000 is for war purposes.

Disbursements on the total commitments have been in excess of $20,800,000,000, of which more than $12,100,000,000 has been repaid, leaving something over $8,700,000,000 outstanding at this time.

Disbursements in the war and defense program have been over $10,700,000,000, and of this amount $4,500,000,000 has been repaid from sales of materials, loan repayments, rentals, and other sources.

Following is a brief statement summarizing the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and each of its war subsidiaries to December 31, 1943:

Defense Plant Corporation, from organization, Aug. 22, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1943

Authorizations	$10,167,000,000
Cancellations	1,891,000,000
Disbursements	6,176,000,000
Repayments, rents and sales	1,820,000,000

The foregoing are:

For the construction, equipment, partial equipment, or expansion of plants for the production or fabrication of ships, bombing, fighting, transport and cargo planes, tanks, heavy guns, ordnance, magnesium, aluminum, steel, tin, copper, and other metals, chemicals, synthetic rubber, high-octane aviation gasoline, machine tools, flying schools, pipe lines, barges, and other facilities for the transportation of petroleum, etc.

Defense Supplies Corporation from organization, Aug. 29, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1943

Authorizations	$6,766,000,000
Cancelations	607,000,000
Disbursements	2,344,000,000
Repayments and sales	1,228,000,000

The foregoing are:

For the acquisition, sale, or carrying of critical and strategic materials and supplies necessary in the war effort, including aviation gasoline and component parts, wool, fibers, alcohol, drugs and chemicals, fats and oils, sugar and molasses, rationed and frozen manufactured articles, hides, etc.;

For the elimination of Axis control, equipment, and personnel from Latin-American air lines in South America;

For the training of citizens of the other American republics as aviation pilots and technicians;

For the purchase of materials from Russia;

For the payment of abnormal transportation costs of the movement of coal to the Northeast and petroleum and petroleum products to the east coast over the cost of water transportation interrupted by submarine warfare, including the extraordinary cost of buying petroleum products in the Chicago area as against costs in the field;

For the payment of abnormal transportation costs on sugar;

For the payment of subsidies on meat, butter and flour;

For the acquisition of idle tires and tubes;

For loans and advances to oil companies for the construction of plants to manufacture aviation gasoline.

Rubber Reserve Company and Rubber Development Corporation from organization of Rubber Reserve Company June 28, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1943

Authorizations	$1,379,000,000
Cancelations	538,000,000
Disbursements	648,000,000
Repayments and sales	514,000,000

The foregoing are:

For the acquisition, sale, or carrying of crude rubber from the Far East, Liberia, the Belgian Congo, and Central and South America;

For increasing the production and availability of wild rubber in Central and South America by providing transportation facilities, foodstuffs, equipment, supplies, etc.;

For the purchase, sale, and carrying of balata (a rubber substance) from South American countries and guayule from Mexico;

For the planting and development of cryptostegia in Haiti, and experimental planting in the United States;

For the purchase of tires and other manufactured rubber products from Brazil;

For the purchase of all scrap rubber in the United States and sale to the reclaiming industry;

For the operation of plants for the production of synthetic rubber and its constituent parts.

Metals Reserve Company from organization, June 28, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1943

Authorizations	$4,316,000,000
Cancelations	436,000,000
Disbursements	1,431,000,000
Repayments and sales	884,000,000

The foregoing are:

For the acquisition, production, sale, and carrying of critical and strategic metals and minerals from both domestic and foreign sources, including aluminum, antimony, asbestos, bauxite, beryllium, cadmium, chrome, copper, diamonds, graphite, iridium, iron, lead, manganese, mercury, mica, nickel, platinum, quartz crystals, tin, tungsten, vanadium, zinc, and others;

For payment of premiums on excess domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc;

For salvage programs involving the acquisition of critical materials either partly or entirely fabricated and their conversion into forms necessary to the war;

For scrap steel programs involving the acquisition of obsolete structures and other high-cost scrap and sale to consuming steel mills, etc.

United States Commercial Co., from organization, Mar. 26, 1942, to Dec. 31, 1943

Authorizations	$643,472,241.97
Cancelations	64,281,915.28
Disbursements	139,319,454.61
Repayments and sales	29,042,831.43

The foregoing are:

For the acquisition, sale, or carrying of strategic and critical materials, principally to compete with enemy countries for the purchase of any material that might be of use to the enemy and for ridding the Western Hemisphere of the Axis and Axis-influenced interests in communications companies.

WAR DAMAGE CORPORATION

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was directed by an act of Congress approved March 27, 1942, to supply funds to the War Damage Corporation, upon request of the Secretary of Commerce and with the approval of the President, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $1,000,000,000. Its purpose is to provide reasonable protection against losses incident to the destruction or injury of tangible property resulting from enemy attacks. It operates through 546 fire-insurance companies, their agents, brokers, and branch offices, and through 88 casualty and surety insurance companies on money and securities. Over 5,150,000 policies have been written and $242,800,000 in premiums collected on approximately $140,000,000,000 of insurance.

DEFENSE HOMES CORPORATION

This Corporation was created in October 1940 to construct housing facilities in defense areas.

Pursuant to Executive order this Corporation was transferred to the National Housing Administrator at the close of business August 31, 1942. Up to that time it had expended approximately $28,000,000 and had commitments for an additional $33,000,000 required to complete the projects then under way. Three thousand eight hundred and sixty-three housing units in 17 locations had been completed; 7,047 in 7 locations were under construction or contracted for.

Reconstruction Finance Corporation direct activities

Authorizations	$2,450,000,000
Cancelations	650,000,000
Disbursements	1,100,000,000
Repayments	400,000,000

In addition to its war activities through the aforementioned agencies, Reconstruction

Finance Corporation makes loans to manufacturers engaged in war work for plant expansion, machinery, equipment, working capital, and other purposes; and buys from, or makes loans to, dealers in articles or commodities rationed by Federal agencies, including automobiles, oil burners, tires, typewriters, refrigerating and gas-burning equipment, and other items.

The above figures include a $425,000,000 secured loan to Great Britain to provide the British with additional dollar exchange without necessitating the forced sale of their American securities, the proceeds to be used by them to pay for war supplies purchased in this country and contracted for prior to the approval of the first Lend-Lease Act. Three hundred and ninety million dollars of the loan has been disbursed. Collections from interest, dividends, and other income from the security, including a small amount from the sale of collateral, have been $97,600,000. Of this amount $61,500,000 has been applied on the principal of the indebtedness, and the remainder as interest or held as reserves.

SMALL BUSINESS LOANS

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been especially helpful to small business enterprises in the war effort and during the war period. In the last 12 months it has authorized some 3,300 loans, aggregating approximately $498,000,000 to business enterprises. About 3,000 of these average $20,000 to the loan.

Altogether, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authorized over 20,500 loans, aggregating $2,615,164,000, including loans on rationed articles. Banks have taken participation to the extent of $153,424,000 in over 5,300 of these business loans. Approximately 90 percent of these loans in number were in amounts not exceeding $100,000 and 77 percent were not over $25,000. Approximately 10,000 of the total were for war purposes and the remainder for other purposes.

NONWAR ACTIVITIES

In addition to its war activities, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation continues its normal functions, including particularly making credit available at reasonable rates in almost all fields of enterprise when it cannot be obtained at fair rates and terms from private sources.

The RFC Mortgage Company

	Number	Amount
Authorizations	63,825	$428,759,000
Cancelations	7,121	121,228,000
Disbursements	54,226	290,357,000
Repayments and sales, etc.	34,580	185,725,000

The RFC Mortgage Company was created in 1935 to assist in the reestablishment of a normal mortgage market on urban income-producing property. It makes real-estate mortgage loans to aid in the construction of new buildings for which there is a demonstrated economic need and upon properties in distress where the applicant cannot obtain funds elsewhere at reasonable rates and terms.

At the present time the principal functions of the RFC Mortgage Company are (1) creating a market for and purchasing mortgage loans upon housing constructed in defense areas under the provisions of the war housing insurance amendments to the National Housing Act, and (2) purchasing loans from institutions insured under the National Housing Act, thereby enabling such institutions to finance needed housing in the defense areas.

The Company has recently announced that it will make loans to relieve distress caused by wartime restrictions and regulations to property owners and businessmen whose business has been seriously curtailed or completely destroyed by reason of such restrictions and regulations. Although only a few loans have ben made pursuant to this announcement, it is probable that during the coming year considerable demand upon the Company will be made for this type of assistance.

As of December 31, 1943, the Company has net earnings of $2,552,000 over interest and operating expenses.

Federal National Mortgage Association

	Number	Amount
Authorizations	69,584	$285,094,000
Cancelations	2,688	13,785,000
Disbursements	66,891	271,290,000
Repayments and sales, etc.	49,888	206,642,000

The Federal National Mortgage Association was created in February 1938 to establish a market for F. H. A.-insured long-term amortized mortgages and make available the full benefits of the National Housing Act to all who wished to build new homes. As of December 31, 1943, the Association had earned $20,552,430 above interest and operating expenses.

Disaster Loan Corporation

	Number	Amount
Authorizations	24,012	$34,121,000
Cancelations	2,902	3,662,000
Disbursements	21,102	30,447,000
Repayments	14,873	26,254,000

Disaster Loan Corporation was organized February 15, 1937. Its function is to provide loans made necessary by floods or other catastrophes during the period between January 1, 1936 and January 22, 1947.

ELECTRIC HOME AND FARM AUTHORITY

In October 1942, Reconstruction Finance Corporation acquired the assets and assumed the liabilities of Electric Home and Farm Authority for the purpose of liquidation. From organization in August 1935, the Authority assisted 382,596 urban and farm families by financing the purchase of approximately 430,000 appliances and electric wiring installations aggregating $53,048,461. The program involved the aid of and cooperation with 667 publicly and privately owned utility organizations and 7,105 appliance merchants and electrical-wiring contractors. The territory covered all or part of 37 States.

When Reconstruction Finance Corporation assumed liquidation of the Authority in October 1942 there were outstanding 133,327 installment contracts and notes aggregating $7,994,799. Liquidation is now complete with the exception of a few small items which are in course of settlement.

The net earnings amount to approximately $700,000, which, with the capital of $850,000, will make a total return of approximately $1,550,000.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

In addition to its other activities, Reconstruction Finance Corporation acts as fiscal agent for Commodity Credit Corporation in the disbursement and receipt of funds in its several programs. During the year ended December 31, 1943, Reconstruction Finance Corporation disbursed for account of Commodity Credit Corporation $3,530,000,000, compared with $2,061,000,000 during the previous 12 months' period; and received collections totaling $3,647,000,000 in the year ended December 31, 1943, compared with $1,789,000,000 in the previous 12 months' period. The number of transactions involved in these activities is in the hundreds of thousands a year. Reconstruction Finance Corporation handles these operations for Commodity Credit Corporation at cost and without profit or loss to Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

The act creating the Smaller War Plants Corporation provides that Defense Plant Corporation shall service and administer loans, advances, plants, equipment, facilities, leases, or other property resulting from transactions completed under that act. This service is performed on a reimbursable basis through Reconstruction Finance Corporation personnel and Reconstruction Finance Corporation facilities. During the past year and one-half a total of 611 loans aggregating $32,908,000 and 231 lease agreements in the amount of $7,615,000 have been turned over for service and administration on this basis.

JESSE H. JONES, SECRETARY

I think the coming generations deserve to know something of the record of the administrative head of the Department of Commerce and the subsidiary activities administered under that department. The work done through the Department of Commerce and under its Secretary, Hon. Jesse H. Jones, involves the most important epoch in our national history. What I shall say here about Mr. Jones will be approved by a great majority of the people of this Nation regardless of political affiliations; he has been all his life a busy man and a successful one. It was Longfellow who said that—

> The talent of success is nothing more than doing what you can do well, and doing whatever you do, without a thought of fame.

The triumph of this common virtue in the life of Jesse Jones has brought to him the distinction of being one of the greatest public servants this Nation or any other nation has ever produced. Mr. Jones is extremely modest, and I am satisfied that the conscious fact that he is doing and has done well one of the most important and comprehensive services ever done in this Nation or any other nation satisfies his pride and it has compensations that cannot be measured in gold.

The work which Mr. Jones is doing supplements practically the work of every other agency in this Government, and there has never been an intimation that politics was ever involved in the consideration of any matter ever coming under his observation.

His great character stands out as a shield from all darts and calumny of his enemies. This character has brought him power and influence, has made him friends and has opened a sure and easy way to distinction, wealth, honor, and happiness. His record as a public servant will stand out conspicuously in the history of this Nation as long as that history is preserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, there are some things in connection with this bill that I feel should be brought to the attention of the Congress. I have only had an opportunity to go through part of it—that part relating to the Department of State.

I have before me and I shall include in the RECORD under the permission that was

granted me in the House, tables furnished by the Department of State indicating the expenditures under the different appropriation titles in the bill.

TABLE 1.—*Statement of obligations and expenditures, 1944 appropriations, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1943, Department of State*

Title	Obligations	Expenditures
Salaries, Department of State, 1944	$3,213,784.27	$3,213,784.27
Printing and binding, Department of State, 1944	156,406.53	14,237.62
Contingent expenses, Department of State, 1944	179,968.64	77,587.11
Passport agencies, Department of State, 1944	29,601.23	29,599.63
Collecting and editing official papers of Territories of the United States 1944	3,752.87	3,752.87
Greater Texas and Pan American Exposition (transfer to State)	250.00	250.00
Salaries of Ambassadors and Ministers, 1944	290,605.50	227,451.56
Salaries:		
Foreign Service officers, 1944	2,353,517.34	1,961,349.04
Foreign Service clerks, 1944	1,831,215.23	1,119,621.26
Foreign Service Auxiliary (national defense), 1944	1,469,573.00	991,305.62
Miscellaneous salaries and allowances, Foreign Service, 1944	540,967.00	308,212.66
Transportation, Foreign Service, 1944	340,862.08	101,385.93
Contingent expenses, Foreign Service, 1944	2,018,590.37	1,369,709.72
Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service:		
1944	1,279,378.89	375,930.87
1943 and 1944	2,915,151.60	2,382,540.02
Foreign Service quarters, 1944	1,215,408.60	672,810.39
Cost of living allowances, Foreign Service, 1944	455,000.00	219,549.90
Foreign Service buildings fund	111,303.22	236,196.49
Foreign Service retirement and disability appropriated fund	865,600.00	865,600.00
Representation allowances, Foreign Service, 1944	112,500.00	45,417.47
Valley gravity canal and storage project, Texas (transfer to State)	27,569.00	15,373.57
Foreign service pay adjustment, appreciation of foreign currencies (State), 1944	250,000.00	103,278.73
United States contributions to international commissions, congresses, and bureaus, 1944	708,762.93	708,762.93
International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, 1944	124.87	124.87
International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico:		
1944	150,299.00	60,454.40
1943 and 1944	102,203.00	37,721.81
International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada and Alaska and Canada, 1944	17,540.21	17,008.56
International Fisheries Commission, 1944	14,800.00	----------
Salaries and expenses, International Joint Commission, United States and Great Britain, 1944	14,542.20	14,542.20
Special and technical investigations, international joint commissions, United States and Great Britain, 1944 [1]	----------	----------
American Mexican Claims Commission, 1943 and 1944	608,389.31	608,129.65
Rio Grande canalization, Department of State, 1942 and 1944	7,826.00	4,953.51
Lower Rio Grande flood control, Department of State, 1943 and 1944	176,066.00	87,195.06
Emergency fund for the President, national defense (allotment to State), 1942-44	7,862,458.42	7,765,576.32
Total	29,324,016.71	23,639,414.04

[1] Amount appropriated $49,000. Of this amount $47,500 transferred to the Department of the Interior and $1,500 to the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Statement of obligations and expenditures for the appropriation "Cooperation with the American republics, 1944," July 1 to Dec. 31, 1943, Department of State*

Department and project title	Obligations	Expenditures
Department of Agriculture:		
Development of complementary agricultural products other than rubber	$298,561	$131,177
Development of rubber production	140,855	140,855
Intern training in agricultural economics	----------	----------
Intern training in agricultural extension	----------	----------
Intern training in soil conservation	----------	----------
Bureau of the Budget: Intern training in public administration	----------	----------
Department of Commerce:		
Development of vital statistics in the American republics	16,611	11,008
Civil aviation training	42,854	21,366
Tidal investigation	1,859	1,859
Magnetic and seismological observations	15,405	8,620
Intern training in geodetic surveys and detail of experts	----------	----------
Intern training in map and chart reproduction	----------	----------
Intern training in hydrographic surveying and detail of experts	----------	----------
Intern training in foreign trade statistics	----------	----------
Cooperative maintenance and operation of radiosonde stations in Mexico	4,194	2,241
Cooperative maintenance and operation of radiosonde stations in Cuba	----------	----------
Intern training in meteorological science	93,000	28,627
Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs: Travel grants to journalists	34,808	34,505
Federal Communications Commission: Intern training in Federal regulation of radio broadcasting	----------	----------
Federal Security Agency:		
Exchange of fellows and professors	4,679	2,020
Assistance in connection with the teacher exchange and travel grant program	5,421	2,275
Intern training for school teachers	----------	----------
Studies of Latin-American education and evaluation of student credentials	11,174	1,878
Preparation and exchange of materials on education	2,899	1,476
Promotion of Pan American Clubs	3,535	1,705
Promotion of language teaching	8,304	2,884
Administration of inter-American educational program	16,022	7,394
Details of medical and scientific personnel	20,245	16,173
Public health fellowships	20,548	1,570
Department of the Interior:		
Mexican Fishery Mission	5,828	3,133
Fishery development studies	5,373	3,071
Fellowships in fishery science	----------	----------
Cooperative investigations of strategic minerals	31,615	31,615
Department of Labor:		
Maternal and child welfare services in cooperation with the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood	10,142	10,142
Care of dependent and delinquent children	2,850	2,850
Maternal and child health services	2,404	2,404
Cooperation with Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations through assignment of child welfare consultant to cooperative agricultural experiment stations	2,585	2,585
Intern training in maternal and child health and welfare	----------	----------
Headquarters administration	3,901	3,901
Cooperation and intern training in welfare of employed women	2,375	2,375
Intern training in the administration of laws relating to labor standards	927	927
Library of Congress:		
Detail of library technicians	2,112	2,112
Duplication of collections for exchange with institutions of the American republics	1,501	701

TABLE 2—Continued

Department and project title	Obligations	Expenditures
Library of Congress—Continued.		
Archive of Hispanic culture	$1,176	$1,176
Preparation and exchange of albums of recordings of American music	----------	----------
Guide to official publications of Latin America	5,864	3,864
Law guide and center of Latin American legal studies	10,321	4,890
Smithsonian Institution:		
Preparation of a handbook of the South American Indians	3,897	3,500
Cooperation with scientific institutions	----------	----------
Cooperative investigations in anthropology	6,861	6,290
Department of State:		
Selection, translation, and printing in Spanish, Portuguese, and French, of certain publications of this Government for dissemination in the other American republics, and to provide other translating and interpreting services required to carry out projects in the broad program of inter-American cooperation	53,561	39,130
Travel of advisory committees	646	----------
Travel grants to leaders	36,996	10,644
Grants to students	309,807	140,484
Professorial missions	44,838	1,960
Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations	28,817	8,743
Training of vocational education teachers	----------	----------
Cultural institutes and services	345,104	107,800
Grants to American schools	120,000	----------
Total	1,780,475	811,930

For the appropriation "Cooperation with the American republics, 1943–44"

Department and project title	Obligations	Expenditures
Department of State:		
Travel grants to leaders	$44,417	$27,320
Maintenance grants to students	16,998	9,389
Professorial missions	9,248	6,225
Buenos Aires convention	3,947	2,190
Total	74,610	45,124

In the time that I shall consume here I shall only call attention to a few of the items, because they are so far away from the amounts appropriated that it seems to me we should have a thorough explanation of them.

The second item is "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses. The appropriations for this year are $410,000; the amount expended to December 31, 1943, was $77,587 or at the rate of about $156,000 a year, $250,000 below the appropriation.

For ambassadors and ministers the amount appropriated was $625,000; the amount expended to the 31st of December was $227,451, or at the rate of $455,000 a year, $170,000 below the appropriation.

For Foreign Service officers' salaries the amount of the appropriation was $4,250,000; the amount of the expenditures $1,961,000 for the first 6 months. In spite of that we have an increased appropriation this year of $500,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. How much is the appropriation?

Mr. TABER. For the current year $4,250,000. That was the figure I gave in the very first place. In other words, with an expenditure of $300,000 and more below the present appropriation there is an increase of $500,000 in the appropriation.

Transportation of Foreign Service officers: There is an appropriation this year of $850,000. Expenditures for the first 6 months, $101,000, or at the rate of $200,000 for the year; yet they are given an increase of $250,000, or $1,100,000 for the next year.

Foreign Service quarters: The appropriation for this year is $2,550,000; the expenditures in the first 6 months $672,000, or at the rate of $1,346,000 a year. The appropriation in this bill is the same as it was for the current year.

Salaries of clerks, Foreign Service: The appropriation was $3,097,000 this year. The first 6 months' expenditure was $1,119,621, or at the rate of $2,240,000 a year; yet there is an increase in the appropriation of $603,000 for next year.

Contingent expenses, foreign service, the appropriation this year was $4,400,000; expenditures for the first 6 months $1,369,000, or at the rate of $2,740,000, with a surplus of practically $1,900,000.

Foreign Service auxiliary: The appropriation was $3,050,000; the expenditures for the first 6 months were $991,000, or at the rate of approximately $2,000,000 a year and yet they are given an increase to $6,200,000 for next year.

Then there is the item for cooperation with American republics. Appropriations for this year were $4,500,000. Expenditures the first 6 months $881,930, or at the rate of $1,624,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Someone not familiar with appropriations might get by with this sort of statement, but for someone as familiar with appropriations and procedure of departments in the matter of expenditures and obligations, as the gentleman from New York, knows his argument will not lie.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman from Michigan will——

Mr. RABAUT. I asked the gentleman to yield. If he wants me to explain to him I will. If not then he need not yield.

Mr. TABER. Go ahead, but do not deceive the House.

Mr. RABAUT. No; I do not want to deceive the House.

Mr. TABER. Do not tell them my figures will not stand because they will.

Mr. RABAUT. No; the gentleman's figures will not stand.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Michigan knows better.

Mr. RABAUT. I have the figures in my hand. I say the gentleman's argument will not stand.

Mr. TABER. The argument does stand.

Mr. RABAUT. Nobody knows they will not stand any better than the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Michigan knows that my argument will stand because these items that are in here as obligations are not obligations, they are allotments. The hearings disclose that they are not obligations but allotments. For instance, $800,000 is set up for the training of pilots and they said they had trained none. How could there be an obligation for something not carried out?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I will if the gentleman will proceed within the range of reason, but when he states I am misrepresenting things to the House the gentleman must know if he reads the hearings, even his own testimony, that I am stating the situation just as it is.

Mr. RABAUT. That is all fine, but let us stick to the figures.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. As I said, no one knows better than the gentleman from New York the procedures of the departments, what obligations mean, what expenditures mean and what appropriations mean. There is no use taking the House off on a tangent and then having them come to their senses after it is all over. Let us give them the facts. Expenses are one thing, obligations another. An annual program is one thing and a percentage of it on a half-year basis is another. The gentleman just referred to the matter of contingent expenses. The expenditures were $1,396,000 plus, and the obligations are $2,018,000. The appropriation for the whole item it $4,400,000. That is exactly what it is. Are those the figures the gentleman from New York has before him? In other words, when $2,000,000 is obligated and the gentleman talks about what the exact expenditures have been up to date, the picture is not being presented in its fullness to the House.

Mr. TABER. On the other hand, the gentleman must realize from his long experience as chairman of this subcommittee that these figures that are given as obligations are contracts that are entered into for future performance; they are not things that have been delivered or services that have been performed and paid for.

Mr. RABAUT. In most instances, the gentleman knows as well as I do, they are just exactly what they purport to be, obligations of individual items that are set forth on the sheet that the gentleman required from the State Department.

The gentleman is not a member of this subcommittee. It is true he is very familiar with appropriations and I highly respect him.

I want him to present it to the House in such manner as not to have it in anyway appear other than it actually is. This I think the gentleman should do. I do not know how many figures he intends to give, but I am proud to defend any one of them. All I ask is that the gentleman present them as he would present them if they came from the Deficiency Subcommittee of which he is a member.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman has spoken long enough in my time.

Mr. RABAUT. I shall be glad to yield the gentleman some more time if he wants it.

Mr. TABER. I am not calling attention to anything that is not correct. I would not call attention to these figures without calling attention to the other ones were it not the fact that I realize and have known the operation of these departments for many years and know they report as obligations items that are a build-up for future expenditures over a long period.

I know that you can tell nothing about a lot of these so-called obligations without the actual cash expenditures being before you. You can tell nothing about them at the end of the year unless you have the actual cash expenditures. It is true that there might be a few dollars in here of services that have been performed or of dollars that have been obligated where the money has not been actually spent, but that would not be the general picture nor would it be the picture on which you could base an analysis of the operations.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. Suppose this appropriation is not expended, it goes back to the Treasury of the United States, does it not?

Mr. TABER. Certainly it goes back to the Treasury of the United States, but why should we present to the departments a temptation to spend money beyond the range of their requirements for things that they legitimately need to do?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KERR. Would it not be better to wait until the fiscal year is ended, then see whether you are right or wrong about it? You come in here and assume because this money has not been spent that it is not going to be spent.

Mr. TABER. You always provide your departments with much more money than they need.

Mr. KERR. They cannot spend it without an act of Congress.

Mr. TABER. They can spend it if they have the people on the roll and they have the authority to put the people on the roll. I hate to be a party to tempting the departments to go way beyond their requirements here by giving them too much money. That is the thing that bothers me about this picture. It may be that there is another philosophy of government than that which I have which is that the departments should only be given the money that they actually need to properly operate. If someone else has a different philosophy of government than that and desires to proceed upon a different method, why I am sorry, but I cannot agree with them.

I want to call attention to cooperation with the American Republics. They have what they call obligations. They have civil aviation training, $42,000 and expenditures, $21,000. In connection with that operation they tell us out and out that they have had no students the first half of the year. They had an allotment for this purpose in the 1944 bill of $735,000, yet they have spent only $21,000 and they say they have obligated $42,000. They have done nothing along

the line of getting students. Personally, I do not know what that kind of operation means. It does not seem to me it is one of the things, as it is being carried, that this Government should engage in. Maybe I am wrong, maybe there is something else to it.

Let us take the Office of Education and the Federal Security Agency. The expenditures in both cases have been very small. There are several items and they will total to only a very small figure. I think the allotments might total something ike $40,000 and the expenditures something like $14,000 or $15,000. It is apparent that they are not there planning any substantial activity.

In the Public Health Service there is an allotment of something like $130,000 and an expenditure of $17,000 with an obligation set up of about $40,700. It does not look like a big job there. Then we have a lot of other items.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Relative to this training program, on page 202 of the hearings I interrogated Mr. Spencer on this subject. I asked him:

Do you mean to say that you have no right to use the unappropriated balances?

He answered:

As I say, we only can select students for the particular program after the money became available. It would be risky to do so before the money is appropriated. The selection of students may be made during the 6 months after July 1 and the funds not obligated until the last 6 months of the fiscal year.

Mr. TABER. I appreciate he said that. On the other hand, I do not remember the date that this bill became law last year but my recollection is that it was about the middle of May.

Mr. RABAUT. July.

Mr. TABER. The 1st of July. If this is a real project that needed to be done at this time so far as training aviators from South America is concerned, I cannot conceive how it would take 6 months to get them together. Maybe I am wrong, maybe the demand for that sort of training is so light that it would take 6 months, but I cannot believe it. Personally, I just believe that we have saddled them with a program which is not any good to the relationship of the United States and the South American republics, a program that tends to make our own people build up rather than cut down on expenditures.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

RACIAL AND RELIGIOUS HATE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, it is understood, of course, that I am speaking out of order and it may be out of order in more ways than one. What I have to say is on a subject that I ought to confine my statements to exactly what I have prepared.

In these United States there should be no prejudice against any nationality or against any religion. This is the land of the free and the home of the brave.

For some years now, and especially in the last 4 or 5 years, there has developed in this country a deep-seated prejudice against Jewish people. Many men, occasionally a Member of Congress, unable to contain themselves longer, denounce the Jews.

Men who entertain anti-Semitic views are just as wrong as they are unjust. I do not say that there are no bad men, criminals, or undesirable people of the Jewish race in this country. There are such people among the Jews as there are among all peoples. But as a racial group they deserve the credit of being as good as any other group.

It has often been called to my attention that Jewish people are filling too many positions in the Government service and that this indicates that there is a concerted drive from some quarter to employ just as many Jews as possible.

If one can put his prejudices aside long enough, he will learn that if there are a great many Jews in the Government service, the fault lies with Congress, and no one else. The fault lies in the form of government we have established, under which every citizen is entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It lies in the fact that here in the United States every citizen is entitled to the equal protection of the law and equal justice before the law.

Congress passed the Civil Service Act in 1883 and we are still operating under that act. No one can secure a civil-service position without first being carefully examined by the Commission. Whatever the position, the applicant must show himself proficient in the branches of learning required by the position.

Under our system when a Jew writes such an examination and secures a high rating, he is called to the service ahead of those who received a lower rating. Every Jew under Federal civil service received the best rating or he would not have been called. If the Jewish young people are studious and are earnest and faithful students and master the subjects taught in our schools, what is there in this Government or our way of life to prevent them from advancing themselves solely upon merit? Shall we say—can we say—that the student who answered the questions correctly did not pass because he was a Jew? There is nothing more foreign to our free Government and its institutions.

The following figures on the Jewish population of the world are significant:

Number of Jews in the world before the outbreak of hostilities in Europe: 16,000,000. Of this number 4,770,000 were in the United States.

Number of Jews slaughtered in the 12-month period before the outbreak of the war and to date in Germany and German occupied territory: 3,000,000 or 19 percent of all the Jews in the world.

Number of Jews who either fled or were driven out of this same territory: 4,650,000 or 29 percent of all the Jews in the world. Many of these, of course, are numbered among the Jews who were slaughtered.

Practically all of the property owned by Jews was confiscated. The Hitler system of slaughtering Jews was so worked out in detail that thousands were stripped of all clothing and shot en masse. Others were buried alive in trenches. Others were compelled to dig graves for their own people and were themselves shot when the work was finished.

Of the 4,650,000 Jews driven out of countries controlled by Germany, a great number are dead, and those who reached friendly countries such as England, Russia, and the United States were entirely destitute, putting a heavy burden on these countries brought about by the obligation to do what humanity dictates.

The Jewish population of the world at the present time does not exceed 13,000,000 and the population of the world is 2,000,000,000. The Jews, therefore, constitute sixty-five one hundredths of 1 percent of the population of the earth. In the United States with a population of 130,000,000 there are about 5,000,000 Jews, or nearly 4 percent of the total. Of these, between three and four million are in New York City.

To me it seems cowardly for people to take part in a movement whose object is to drive this weak minority out of our midst and deny them the same protection, the same privileges, and the same opportunities which we who are not Jews enjoy.

We all admit that the Nazi form of government is the most autocratic, the most dictatorial, and most inhuman system of government ever to show itself on the face of the globe. We should also remember that this form of government was made possible because of prejudice against the Jews. Opportunists fanned the flames of this prejudice to such an extent that 85 percent of the Jewish population of Germany were either murdered or driven out of the country destitute. The number of Jewish people slaughtered in Europe during this war and the preceding 12 months before the war was approximately 19 percent of all the Jews in the world. Hitler came to power on a wave of fanatical prejudice against the Jews.

Should we allow this prejudice to continue in the United States, we are playing directly into Hitler's hand. We would be doing here what Hitler has done in Europe. We are sympathizers with Hitler in every move we make which builds up a prejudice against Jews or any other racial group.

Yet those responsible for fomenting this Jewish prejudice profess to be outstanding patriots to the cause of free government.

It is a sign of weakness to indulge in hate. It is more disastrous to the hater than the hated. Any individual who deals and traffics in hate must, during lucid intervals, hate himself.

Lastly, it is cowardly for any man in the United States to vent his dislikes and prejudices against a defenseless minority.

We have very few people in North Dakota of Jewish origin, so it cannot be said that I am speaking politically now. What Jews we have are just like the rest of us. We live, raise our families, bury our dead, attend school, work for good government and justice for all. We send our sons and

daughters to war, we support this Government in its hour of danger, and no one asks whether we are Jewish, Irish, Swedish, or any other racial group.

If this great Nation is ever to go down upon the rocks of hate and prejudice against any religion or against any racial group, you may rest assured that North Dakota will be the last to be engulfed in the sea of intolerance.

We have 50 different racial groups in North Dakota, with every shade of religious belief, but at this time we are merely one people with one aim and purpose: To win this war and establish peace throughout the world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, there are many items in the pending bill—H. R. 4204—which should be carefully scrutinized. This measure which appropriates the money for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce is increased over the appropriations for the fiscal year 1944 in the amount of $19,689,922. While this measure is somewhat less than the estimates for the fiscal year 1945, yet when a measure contains any increase whatever, at this particular time, it should be carefully analyzed and scrutinized, because we are engaged in a frightful war, and we need our money and our resources for the prosecution of that war to ultimate victory.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct with his figures as far as he goes.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thought I certainly was correct, because I took them from the report.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman will refer to the bottom of page 2 of the committee report, he will see that the amount of $22,766,000 is estimated as the cost of war overtime pay for the fiscal year 1944. If that is added to the appropriations already made for that fiscal year, it is apparent that the committee's recommendation is $3,076,078 less than the total requirements for 1944.

Mr. SPRINGER. I had read those figures. I thank the gentleman for calling them to my attention. I have just stated that the measure in itself is somewhat less than the estimates for the fiscal year 1945. I further stated that when a measure contains any increase whatever, at this particular time when we are engaged in a frightful war, it should be carefully analyzed and carefully scrutinized. I am quite certain the chairman of the subcommittee agrees with me in that statement.

It is necessary, Mr. Chairman, for us to maintain our Government in time of war. The Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce must continue. Appropriations must be made in order to accomplish the orderly continuance of those agencies of our Government. However, the amount of money which is appropriated for each of the essential and permanent agencies of government is a matter which every Member of Congress must carefully scrutinize. Too often the departments of our Government are overzealous in their efforts to secure more and larger amounts of money from the Committee on Appropriations, in order to place a larger group of employees on the Federal pay roll; and, too, quite often the desire may be found to exist to increase the office personnel in order to make the work lighter upon any particular individual or group in that particular department; and, may I suggest, that in many instances the heads of the departments of our Government certainly have the desire to increase the appropriations for their particular agency in order to establish a precedent for the coming or succeeding years, whereby the appropriations may be the easier to obtain for their work and in their department by reason of the precedent established. May I say that such flimsy arguments, which are not based upon sound logic, certainly cannot obtain at this time. It is the duty of each and every department of our Government to cut down their force, and reduce their personnel, to the very minimum—just as many of our people throughout the country are doing—in order to conserve our resources insofar as possible. We must maintain our war effort. We must prosecute this war to its ultimate conclusion and to an ultimate victory. We cannot stand idly by and witness the civil departments of our Government squandering and wasting the money of the taxpayers in their own agency, and thereby making an additional hardship upon all of our people to raise the money by taxation, or by the purchase of bonds, to supply the additional sums for their use. This waste and extravagance is merely an obstruction to our war effort. Every dollar that is wasted, or extravagantly spent, in time of this frightenful war, merely means that such sum of money is diverted from our war effort—and a heavier burden then falls upon the people to provide the additional amount of money required for the prosecution of this war.

Mr. Chairman, there is a limitation on the part of the people to continue to provide the funds for both war and civil functions. The people are taxed to the very limit of their ability to pay, and they are requested to buy bonds, and to contribute to every war agency, and they are doing their best to comply with every request. The people want to win this war as quickly and as decisively as it is possible to do so. They want to save the lives of our men and boys insofar as it is possible to do so. Our army needs equipment, and more equipment. General MacArthur, in the South Pacific, is fighting as a lone wolf, and he needs men and equipment. He needs planes, tanks, and guns. Every dollar that is appropriated by this measure which is not absolutely necessary to maintain the civil functions of the departments of Government, on a proper basis in time of our most disastrous war, means that our victory is thereby postponed—and that the lives of our men and boys in the Army and in the Navy will pay the price for the waste and extravagance involved. These are frightful days, and these are serious times. This is not the time to spend and squander money that is not entirely essential in any department of our Government; but, this is the time to buckle up our belts and economize—this is the time to save in every agency of Government—and to send the extra dollars into our war effort.

Mr. Chairman, while our boys are fighting on every battle front in the world—while they are sniping the foe from fox holes in every clime—while they are dying in this terrible war all to the end that they may have a bigger and better United States of America in which to live when they come back—I for one do not want to welcome them back and then present them with an income-tax form, which they will not understand, but which will call upon them to respond, as a debtor, and to pay for the waste and extravagance which those now in power have permitted to exist, and to continue, throughout the past 11 years.

Those men and boys in the Army and Navy have heard the expression, "this is an all-out war," and they have been led to believe that every American citizen is striving to that end; they believe everyone is saving, and that they are economizing for war. But, may I say, when they learn of the squandering of money, and of the waste that has been permitted, and of the terrific tax burden imposed upon the people, and which will be a part of their burden when they return, they will really wonder what the war was all about. And this very measure, which imposes an additional burden upon all of the people, and which will be a burden upon those boys who are now fighting for our country throughout the coming years, is one of those instances which will be viewed with alarm by our fighting men and women. The philosophy of those in the armed forces would call upon the Appropriations Committee to cut down, and reduce, the amount of this bill, and to make it even smaller than the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 for those departments. Let the appropriation be reduced, and let those departments cut down their personnel, let less people do more work, let them get in step with the war effort, and let them recognize that we are facing a dim and unknown future, just as the people throughout the country now realize.

Mr. Chairman, this war is not over. No one can venture any correct guess when victory will ultimately come to our fighting forces. But that victory will come, it must come, and the boys will then come home. Let us not welcome them with a "due bill," let us use good judgment in the granting of the money these civil agencies may have to use and spend, and let us place a positive limitation thereon—let us reduce those amounts, and let us provide for the future of our country. To grant a huge increase in the appropriation for these civil agencies of government, in the face of our war and its very serious implications, is certainly unwise and imprudent. It is my fervent hope that every item in this

measure, which exceeds the amount granted in the last appropriation bill for these same agencies, will be vastly reduced, and that the amounts finally granted in this measure will be reduced below the amounts so appropriated for the fiscal year 1944. These agencies can well proceed with their work without the extra amounts, and especially in time of war. I am confident they do not want to be accused by the returning soldiers of having aided in boosting the debt of this Nation to an unprecedented figure, and to which they, our service men and women, will have to respond and aid in paying. It is high time that our departments of government get in step with the war effort, and begin to aid in stopping the waste and extravagance which is running rampant in every agency of our Government. Our people want this waste and extravagance stopped, and the soldiers and sailors of our country, serving under our flag, demand that it be stopped.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak just a moment or two on the high cost of guessing. None of us wants to think that our country's affairs and particularly our war energies are being mismanaged; but there are some Washington fumbles that just must be reported. The people have a right to know what is going on and no amount of political pressure can silence my voice when I speak for the people of the Ninth District of Indiana. The mess the Washington bureaucrats have made of the synthetic-rubber situation could have been the mistake that could have cost us the war. At best it is bound to have prolonged the struggle, and therefore has caused and will cause the deaths, unnecessarily, of hundreds of our boys.

Almost all of you will recall my efforts along with certain other Members of Congress to get the Government to throw its weight and money behind a synthetic-rubber program which would put rubber into our war effort in the shortest possible time. The only proven method of producing good rubber was from butadiene made of farm products. At that time we had millions of bushels of grain for which the farmers and the Government had no market. Farmers were required to pay penalties for overproduction. Yet, we were overruled by the bureaucrats who were under the influence of the oilmen. Even if our oil process for the production of butadiene had been a proven success, it is common knowledge that our oil supply is very limited and that we do not need to find new uses for petroleum products, but new supplies.

Look at the Government spending millions in Canada and Persia to acquire supplies there, while all the time our production of grain which could be used for rubber production is practically unlimited. But we were merely a small group of patriotic public servants who wanted the war won as quickly as possible. We were opposed by the oilmen of the country who, with millions to spend, politics to pay, and an inside track to the White House, had all the advantages of pressure, prestige, and "pull." The outcome was that production of butadiene from petroleum products was the Government's choice of methods and only enough allocation of funds was made to the alcohol manufacturers to shut them up.

Now, we come to the point of the story. The Government has spent to date—Government money, your taxes and mine—$227,700,000 on the butadiene-from-petroleum-products method and we have less than 100,000 tons of usable synthetic rubber to show for it. The Government has built or rebuilt 15 plants for the big petroleum interests and of that number 7 have not yet produced a pound of rubber for 1 of 3 or 4 reasons, such as not being completed yet—2 years and more after Pearl Harbor, mind you, and we needed rubber as soon as we could get it—5 are operating at from 30 to 50 percent designed capacity pending solution of operating difficulties, pending plant changes, pending completion of facilities, or just pending; and only 3 are operating at capacity. That is the picture of the rubber-from-petroleum-products method, and we have predictions about their future production ranging anywhere from this coming May on into infinity.

For the sake of comparison, let us look at the synthetic-rubber-from-farm-products picture. In the first place, it was not necessary to build plants on anything like the scale required for petroleum products method. We only have three alcohol plants in which the Government has invested any money, so far. And the cost has been less than half the amount spent on the petroleum method—$112,800,000 to be exact. I have it on irrefutable authority that these three plants were designed to produce 220,000 tons of butadiene, which quota they have met, and I quote:

> All alcohol-butadiene plants completed and have operated at 150 percent of rated capacity.

As if all the above is not enough to wrap the rubber situation around somebody's neck and make it stick, we have the general opinions of the men who have used the petroleum-based product and the farm-alcohol-based product and they say that the farm-alcohol-butadiene product is far and away superior and perhaps the only product yet worth mentioning. It would seem that the Washington money changers have sponsored a gigantic experiment for the oil companies. You and you have paid for the men, material, and time that it took the oil interests to find out whether or not they could horn in on the synthetic rubber field.

I have tried faithfully to present the two pictures of this situation. From them you can draw your own conclusions. The comments herein are in skeleton form, and I am checking more thoroughly into the situation every day. You may be sure that I shall give you the facts I turn up as I uncover them and I may say that no further than I have delved into this mess, I already believe that the exposure of the synthetic-rubber situation is destined to make the Tea Pot Dome scandal look like the escapade of a bunch of growing boys who sneaked out behind the barn to smoke corn silks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the liberty of American labor is in danger just as the liberty of the rest of us is in danger. There are some problems which labor should ponder. One of them is the iniquitous Austin-Wadworth bill, which is pending before the Congress. As I told you in last week's broadcast, this bill, if enacted, would put every man, woman, and child in the military service of the Nation and, as a result, there would be set up a military dictatorship in this country. Let it be remembered that any law which would virtually enslave the people of the United States under a military dictatorship, even though it might be of a temporary character, or of alleged temporary character, would most certainly enslave the working people along with all the rest of the citizens.

The one development which can hasten and strengthen the demand for the enactment of this manpower mobilization bill is a series of continued strikes. The White House wants this manpower bill enacted, make no mistake about that. Congress at the present time is opposed to it. If some labor leaders and some labor unions keep strikes going, then the White House will merely have to sit complacently by and wait until popular indignation turns in the direction of this manpower mobilization bill whereupon the administration would move to press the public demand for its passage.

A long time ago both William Green and Philip Murray solemnly pledged themseves and their organizations to refrain from striking during the period of hostilities. We know, of course, that there have been many thousands of strikes in war plants since those pledges were made. I am glad to say Bay City's record in this respect is far, far better than in the country at large, and our workers are to be congratulated upon the fidelity they have displayed during these tragic days. I think it is fair to say that in no instance, so far as I know, were these country-wide strikes approved by either William Green or Philip Murray. These fine leaders must have been greatly embarrassed and humiliated by these strikes and by the fact that they were led usually by radical leaders who had no regard for their national officers or for their own obligations to help supply the armed forces with much-needed equipment.

Every patriotic American citizen, every father and mother who has a boy or a girl in this war, should ponder with deep concern the Department of Labor records covering the year 1943. These figures disclose that a total of 1,900,000 workers went out on strike in that period, the man-days lost being 13,500,000.

I do want to emphasize the fact, however, that notwithstanding the unauthorized strikes, the completely unjustified strikes, and the failure and refusal of certain elements within the ranks of labor to live up to their responsibility, and the solemn promises of their national leaders, the great mass of American workers have lived up to their responsibility in a splendid way. They have stayed on the job; they have made it possible for our boys in the fox holes to meet the enemy, fully equipped with the finest weapons and matériel.

The danger which hangs like a dark cloud over labor is that these unauthorized strikes, these industrial disruptions, these unfair assaults on business, big and little, by self-seeking labor leaders whose traffic is industrial disruption, and whose stock in trade is an artificially created discontent of the workers, will strengthen the demand of the administration for the Austin-Wadsworth manpower mobilization bill, and will bring about a public pressure for such a law to be enacted. I wish to impress this fact upon the mind of every person having the welfare of labor at heart, and to beseech the workers of this country to stay on the job; don't give these would-be bureaucratic dictators an excuse to force through Congress a bill which would take from all our people the last shred of liberty remaining to us.

Wise labor leaders can clearly foresee, as the Members of Congress can foresee, that this mobilization bill is the most dangerous measure which could be passed by the Congress. It is dangerous to the liberties of all of us. It is especially dangerous to the liberties of farmers and wage earners. Whether Mr. Roosevelt is successful in his quest for a fourth term and another 4 years in the White House, or whether he is not; whether his health will hold up another 4 years in the White House, or whether it does not; or whether the Grim Reaper spares him for another 4 years, or does not, the fact remains that he cannot be President of the United States forever. The mutations of time and frailties of human existence have foresettled that question. Even though nearsighted labor leaders may believe Mr. Roosevelt, under his autocratic powers, which he would have if all men and women are placed in the military service of the Nation by legislative act, would favor them over all other citizens, it still remains a fact that the power would remain in the Presidency regardless of whether the occupant of the White House was disposed to discriminate in favor of certain labor leaders or certain labor unions, or not. The occupant of the White House might not then be so disposed.

We are confronted by a sinister condition of affairs when an official of the rank and authority of Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, who at all times is fully informed as to the manpower needs, stated publicly that "National service legislation is not necessary to meet manpower needs," but adds that if the administration wants the act, then we should have it, and he will support a drive to force such a bill through the Congress. Such a line of reasoning as that carried to its logical conclusion would be that if the administration thought that Mr. Roosevelt ought to be a dictator, and if the administration thought we should abandon our free form of government, presumably Mr. McNutt would think that then we should have it. Now it must be clear to everyone that if an act putting every man, woman, and child in this country under the absolute military dictation of the Commander in Chief is not necessary to meet manpower needs, then we ought not to have such a law passed, such shackles should not be put on the liberties of the people, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. McNutt and the whole "palace guard" to the contrary notwithstanding.

The need for such an act as this manpower mobilization bill has not been shown. It cannot be shown. Chairman McNutt knows it cannot be shown, and that is why he was willing to say "National service legislation is not necessary to meet manpower needs."

We are getting pretty far away from the concept of the founding fathers when high public officials are willing to give the President unneeded and unnecessary military dictatorial control over every man, woman, and child in this country. We are getting pretty far away from the ideals of those men who shed their blood on the battlefields of the Revolution and who toiled and sacrificed to achieve freedom for us, when high officials, including the President of the United States, are willing to press for the enactment of a law which would set up a practical dictatorship in this country, when such a law is not needed in the war effort at all.

We are getting pretty far away from the ideals of Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln, and the other illustrious Presidents who have maintained the Bill of Rights, when the man in the White House, the man who will be a candidate for a fourth term in the Presidency, and other high officials like Manpower Chairman Paul V. McNutt, are willing to strike down the liberty of the citizens under the Bill of Rights, to make a scrap of paper of the Constitution, and to put the shackles of dictatorship on the liberties of the people of this Nation.

We are getting pretty far away from the ideals for which our heroic men and women are struggling and dying on the battle fronts of the world today to protect and sustain and perpetuate individual freedom under the Bill of Rights when the highest officials in the administration advocate the shackling of the peoples' liberties under an act which would deny them a recourse to the civil courts in order to protect their liberties, which would deny them a redress from any source against the whims, the arrogance, the mistakes, and even the nefarious designs of a bureaucracy which has already demonstrated that it will not keep a solemn promise and that it will work its policies in secrecy and darkness rather than in the light of day.

The people of the soil, the independent agricultural population of this country had better be vigilant or each field will have its signpost with the permit to plow and reap sticking up in the middle of it, as Vice President WALLACE declared he could foresee as set forth in his book, America Must Choose.

The wage earners of this Nation who love their liberty, who value their freedom, had better begin to tell their Representatives in Congress everywhere throughout the land to defeat this manpower mobilization measure, or they will find their liberty gone, their unions impotent, and their wages and working conditions prescribed by some bureaucrat in Washington.

It would be an unthinkable betrayal of the men and women on the fighting fronts for the Congress to pass this act in their absence, to let them come home to find that not only their relatives were under a dictatorship, but that they, even though honorably discharged for wounds, or because the war had ended, would continue to be under the dictatorship of a political bureaucracy.

The same sort of promise is being made in this case which has been made numerous times by this administration before—and numerous times cynically broken without apology or regret. The promise is that this is purely a war measure and would end with the war. That is not only an empty promise; it is an attempted fraud upon the people of this country, because the administration itself, in its 1939 revision of the industrial mobilization plan, wrote in a section providing for the continuance of these war powers of the President after the war should end, until such time as he, or two-thirds of both Houses of the Congress might choose to end them. The President himself sought to conceal this 1939 revision of the industrial mobilization plan with that clause in it from the press and the people, and did so until Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of my State, had that revised plan made a Senate document so it could see the light of day.

Do not be fooled, therefore, by these promises that this proposed manpower mobilization law should be used only as a war measure. Just remember Mussolini and Hitler, both champions originally of union labor, were given dictatorial powers under which they destroyed union labor. Do not forget that no dictator has ever voluntarily surrendered his dictatorial powers. When this manpower bill is called up in the Congress, we will find ourselves at the crossroads. It will then be determined whether we are to go forward under free constitutional government or follow the lead of the existing dictatorships in the world today. The question will be. Which road shall we take?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to call your attention to the report of the Committee on un-American Activities filed yesterday with reference to the Peace Now movement.

I want to urge the Members of the House to carefully read this report. I have instructed the secretary of the

committee to mail to each Member of Congress a copy of the report and it should be in your hands in the morning.

This movement constitutes a more serious threat to our country than many people believe. One of the moving spirits in the organization, if not the founder, emigrated from Oslo in April 1940. He received his passport from the Nazi-controlled police department of Norway. Upon arrival in the United States he became very active in organizing pacifist groups into the movement known as Peace Now. That organization sent to certain religious and political leaders in the United States various letters and pamphlets; and in these letters the religious leaders are urged to use their influence to persuade everyone in the armed forces to lay down their arms immediately and to refuse to fight.

I have here a number of pamphlets that have been widely distributed by this organization and I want to read briefly from some of their statements. They have certain questions and answers. Question 1:

Is not the United States fighting for its very existence as a nation?

Answer. Our enormous military, industrial, and financial power make it absurd to say that we are in any way threatened with the loss of our independence by anything Germany or Japan could do. They are much more in danger of losing theirs by our action.

In these answers and in the other pamphlet the position is taken that the United States and England were largely responsible for the war. They maintain that it is the patriotic and Christian duty of American citizens to refuse to make any contribution to the war.

Our committee having carefully considered the correspondence, the pamphlets, and the activities of this organization unanimously found that it was un-American, engaged in seditious and treasonable activities in the United States. I know there are those who will minimize the danger of such a movement. It is, of course, true that a very small percentage of people belong to the movement or are active in any respect in the movement. The Axis propagandists, however, are able to take this movement, its pamphlets, and its declaration and make it appear to their own nationals, and to neutral countries, that in the United States there is a well-organized movement representing a substantial number of our people demanding peace at any price. At this particular time when the Axis Powers are attempting to bring about a negotiated peace to salvage something from the war, it is more than a coincidence that a movement like this should arise in the United States headed by an alien who came to this country in 1940 with the permission of the Nazi-controlled Government of Norway. In order to illustrate how effective such propaganda can be in the hands of enemy propagandists, I have here a letter written by a sergeant in our military forces. I read from this letter:

The other day one of our short-wave radios picked up a statement which was quoted as being made by Dr. George W. Hartman, professor of educational psychology, Columbia University, New York.

By the way, Mr. Hartman is chairman of the Peace Now movement.

The broadcast came from station JANS, a Japanese-controlled station in Java. The statement was to the effect that he, Dr. Hartman, advocated the immediate end of the war, that we had no just cause to fight Japan.

In other words, the propagandists of Japan are using the utterances of the Peace Now organization as justification of their attack upon the United States at Pearl Harbor and as evidence to support their contention that there is a strong demand in the United States for the immediate cessation of hostilities and the establishment of peace at any price.

He goes on to say, and I want the House to weigh carefully his words:

You can readily see what effect this would have on the men out here who are going through hell when such an influential man makes statements like that.

This morning I talked to a representative of the Department of Justice and urged that the Department lay all of the evidence in our possession before a grand jury in the District of Columbia with a view of indicting these people as seditionists. I recognize the fact well that people are entitled to their opinions, even in time of war. We have made provision for conscientious objectors; but when people in addition to being conscientious objectors, insist upon the right to organize, during such a critical time as the one through which we are now passing, and disseminate propaganda throughout the country sending some of it to the Spanish Ambassador with the request that the Spanish Ambassador use that material, even though it may fall into the hands of the enemy propagandists and be used not only to bolster up the morale of their own people but in order to propagandize among our troops in foreign lands to deceive them into believing that there is a widespread sentiment in the United States in favor of immediate peace, such activity becomes treasonable and those who engage in it should be held accountable for their actions and activities. I sincerely hope the Department of Justice will take immediate action against all those who are active in this movement.

I do not have time to read all of the excerpts from letters that officers of this organization have written and sent throughout the United States, but I invite the Members of the House to read carefully the report and I especially invite the Department of Justice to read the evidence which we obtained under subpena from the offices of the organization, because I am convinced that there is a clear-cut case of sedition and that it becomes the imperative duty of the Government of the United States to act. If these people had said that because of their religious beliefs they could not bear arms that would have been within their constitutional rights; but when they band together, when they send their emissaries throughout the country calling upon American citizens whose boys are fighting and suffering in the war to refuse to support the war effort and when they furnish their material or make it possible for the enemy agents and enemy propagandists to obtain that material to use as an effective weapon of propaganda to influence their own nationals and neutrals and to attempt to influence the armed forces, it seems to me it is time for the Government of the United States to act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I would feel remiss in my duty today were I not to tell my colleague, the gentleman from California, how much I appreciate his services on the subcommittee. The gentleman from California and I have been the two ranking members of this subcommittee for a good many years. His devotion to his duty and to his constituency and to the House in the matters under consideration here are well known to every Member. I am anxious to pay him that tribute.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my Democratic friend for his very generous words. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Michigan for the fairness and impartiality with which he conducted these hearings. He gave the minority every opportunity to cross-examine as they desired, to bring out any of the evidence, and I am sure I speak the sentiments of each and every minority member when I express to him our thanks for the way he handled these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of over $231,000,000. This committee cut below the figure of the Bureau of the Budget $5,987,000. The bill has been trimmed down considerably. Let me say that approximately 180 witnesses appeared before this subcommittee, giving testimony in regard to these appropriations. The amazing fact about that is that although we had a mounting national debt, we have a Treasury that is depleted, with no money in it, and we are running on borrowed money, there was not 1 single witness who came there and asked for a reduction of appropriations.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I recall that the gentleman from California, when each of these witnesses appeared before us, asked each witness whether or not he gave serious consideration to the ever-mounting public debt, and I think the gentleman from California got various kinds of answers to that question. He and I have been alarmed over the rise in the public debt. That question was asked of many witnesses by the gentleman from California. Would he care to tell the House what his impressions were from those answers?

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is correct. Witness after witness came there asking for money and I often asked them if they knew the amount of the national debt. A good many of them had a general idea of what it was. I asked them if they took into consideration the ability of the Government to provide this money when requesting appropriations and I regret to say that I did not get as encouraging and as direct answers to that question as I would like to have received. I sat there representing not alone these bureaus and departments that must function to carry on the work of the Government but I sat there also representing the people who are paying the taxes, in order to carry on this work. I am considered the parsimonious member of the committee. I am always for cutting these appropriations down and we have done a very fine job in cutting down the appropriations this year too, although not as far as I would like to have gone in many cases. If you will turn to page 24 of the report and look in the last column you will find a minus sign after each and every item which indicates that there was a cut under the amount of the appropriation made last year. You understand also that I as one member of the committee cannot have my way entirely. You will also recall that here on the floor of the House just about a year ago I made a fight and offered an amendment to reduce the appropriations for the item titled "Cooperation With American Republics." My motion failed by a few votes and there was appropriated for that specific work last year the sum of $4,500,000. I thought this year that should be scaled down considerably and after arguing the question at length in the committee it was decided that we would scale down the request. They requested this year the same amount that we gave them last year and we did scale that amount down $1,050,000 and, having reached that figure as a matter of compromise, I agreed that I would not offer an amendment here on the floor to this bill reducing it further. Personally I would like to have seen that reduced somewhat below the amount provided herein.

There are several other items in here that I would like to have seen reduced further than they are. I am not going to call your attention to many of them but I would like to call attention to one of considerable size and that is the Foreign Service Auxiliary of the State Department.

That is a service, temporary to be sure, set up during the time of war where the State Department places additional employees in its stations throughout the world. Last year we gave them the sum of $3,050,000 for this auxiliary service, but this year the bill now under consideration carries $6,200,000. In my opinion that is too much of an increase. The State Department people must work longer hours, and I am not unmindful of the fact that they have a very unusual burden placed on them during wartimes, but I do feel that when we give them 1,165 employees for this auxiliary service scattered throughout the world, when we take into consideration the ability of the American taxpayer to pay this tremendous additional sum, I at least am forced to the conclusion that we are going too fast in that direction and that we will have to call a halt in these expenditures.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In connection with the new offices and the expanded personnel that has been placed in the Caribbean Sea area, we have increased there considerable, have we not?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman give us any information based upon his work in this committee as to what general plans are unfolding in the Caribbean Sea area with respect to the development of the Caribbean Sea economic empire under the jurisdiction of the United Kingdom and the United States and perhaps the Netherlands, France, and the small republics, such as Cuba, Haiti, San Domingo, and some of the other countries at a later date? In other words, may I ask the gentleman, Do the hearings on this bill carry any information with respect to that particular matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have no information directly on that point, but I have taken a trip through that area and through the South American republics. I am firmly convinced that nations other than the United States are looking out for themselves in that area, if that suggestion is any help to the gentleman. May I say further, as I was about to say when I yielded to the gentleman, I am one of those who believe that we should maintain the most friendly relations with the American republics, and, of course, with many other nations. I am not against a program of cooperation with the American republics, but I am against a program of cooperation with them where this country pays the entire cost or pays 90 percent of the cost, when the per capita indebtedness of the South American countries is small and inconsequential in comparison with the national indebtedness of the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I say that the gentleman has expressed my views in very concrete form on that particular subject? I was seeking additional information to that which is contained in two booklets with probably 75 to 150 pages recently issued by the State Department on this particular subject. I have read these booklets and I want to know if there is in these hearings any additional information? That is what I really wanted to find out.

Mr. CARTER. There is no definite information on that exact point. May I say, as I said at the beginning, that this bill has been cut very decidedly under the Budget estimates and while there are certain items that I would like to have seen cut further, there has been a pretty general trimming of the bill all down the line.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that a great deal of valuable information can be brought to this country by these persons who are members of the Foreign Service?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. We have in London 121 additional employees, we have in Rio de Janeiro 83, in addition to our full force down there, and when they return some of them undoubtedly will bring back valuable information; so will many of the travelers who go down there at their own expense bring back valuable information.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have a feeling that many of these persons who are down there can bring back valuable information to firms that could not afford to send a representative down there.

Mr. CARTER. That is true, undoubtedly.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In the over-all picture of this appropriation bill, the Committee indicates a reduction below the Budget estimates of $5,987,000. I note that the 1945 amount as recommended in the bill is $231,304,700, which is $3,076,078 below the actual appropriation for last year when you include the $22,766,000 which would have to be added to last year's appropriation to take care of the overtime pay under Public Law 49. I assume—and I assume I am correct, and would like to have the gentleman correct me if I am not—that included within the $231,304,700, the amount recommended for 1945, provision is made for the payment of all required overtime pay under Public Law 49, so as a matter of over-all picture your recommended appropriation is actually $3,076,078 less than the total appropriation for the fiscal year 1944 and $5,987,000 less than the Budget estimates for this year.

Mr. CARTER. That is right. I thank the gentleman for calling that to the attention of the Committee, because we really have reduced more than appears on the face of the report at a hasty glance.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. I think the Committee should also know the cost of that overtime-pay bill as far as these three Departments are concerned last year was $22,766,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman have a computation to show what the total overtime pay amounts to for the fiscal year 1945 for these three Departments, which would show the comparative amount for the next fiscal year as shown in your estimates for last year?

Mr. RABAUT. I will supply it later to the gentleman. I have to dig it out of the mass of information we have here.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman has that information, will he insert it as part of his remarks?

Mr. RABAUT. I will. The approximate amount for war overtime pay for fiscal year 1945 contained in this bill is $24,300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to address the House for a few moments on the much-discussed question of juvenile delinquency. It is a subject which is claiming the attention of a number of Government agencies for which appropriations are recommended by the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, and the House, I believe, would be interested in knowing some of the things they are doing. And your constituents and mine are concerned about what the war is doing to the rising generation. There is not a father or mother in the United States who is not troubled and anxious about what is happening to our young boys and young girls during these times. Parents are worried and distraught not only by fears for the boys who must take their places in the battle lines, but they are also disturbed about what is happening to the young people at home. Everyone who has children and a lot who do not, have some theory and some more or less practical notions as to how to control the behavior of young people and prevent juvenile delinquency. The papers and magazines are replete with near answers and platitudes. Many books have been written on the subject. Conferences and meetings and investigations dealing with juvenile delinquency seem to have no end. There has, in short, been a lot of sound and fury, it seems to me, without much action.

Just now it seems to be the style to view with alarm the shortcomings of young people and to conclude that youth is headed for the gutter because a few of them, made restless by the times or who seek to live their lives in a hurry, have offended against the law, customs, or sensibilities of our generation. A great many people are climbing aboard the band wagon which is playing on this theme—some, of course, with a sincere desire to help youth, but others, in order to gain publicity or profit through public interest in the subject. And there are a few who are on the curb-juvenile-delinquency band wagon, because they live on sensationalism and sentimentality. There are also those who simply cannot put themselves in the place of young people of today, and so they criticize and scold them about problems they have not had to face up to themselves. Some of the people who are talking the loudest cannot comprehend the temptations, pitfalls, and frustrations created by this war. Incidentally, there never was a time when the older generation did not view with alarm the actions and attitudes of the younger generation. The prophets of the Old Testament found most grievious faults in their sons and daughters, and now in our day a few "Pecksniffians" prophesy dire things about our boys, talk glibly about "khaki-wacky" victory girls, and slander the very group who are fighting their battles. The older generation apparently not only reserves the right to conscript the younger generation but to criticize them as well, and without, mark you, doing much about it or helping them in any understanding way.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am reminded that some 2 years ago a certain distinguished woman of this Nation made a remark, according to the newspapers, which I think was very unfortunate. She said, "It is all right, but the girls should know their capacity."

Mr. RABAUT. I agree with the gentleman. It was very unfortunate.

Now, although some of these righteous statements irk me a little, I don't mean to infer that there isn't a real problem of juvenile delinquency which we must candidly face and try to remedy. But let us be realistic about it and depend upon the facts and not on vague generalities or condemn a whole generation because of the actions of an infinitesimal few. And I can sympathize incidentally with those boys and girls who gave out a newspaper interview the other day expressing their disgust and impatience with those of their elders who were trying to regulate their conduct with not too clean hands themselves. Without posing as an expert in juvenile delinquency—although as a father of nine children I think I am somewhat qualified to talk about the problems of young people—I want to call your attention to a few of the facts that have been developed before our Appropriations Committee. The Federal Government, through the Children's Bureau, the United States probation system, the Bureau of Prisons, the United States Public Health Service, the Office of Education, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Office of Commodity War Services is in the aggregate devoting a great deal of attention and a not inconsiderable amount of money to studying the problems of young people and trying to find ways to meet their needs. I have made it my business to question some of those most concerned, and I have discovered some very interesting facts.

Crime is a dangerous threat to the very security of the Nation. That there is a definite problem is apparent from a review of the records. Statistics compiled by the Federal Bureau of Investigation from actual arrest records made by police departments throughout the United States show that in 1942, our first full year at war, arrests of girls under 21 years of age increased 55.7 percent over the 1941 figure. Arrests for drunkenness among girls, for example, increased 39.9 percent, for disorderly conduct 69.9 percent. For boys in this same period, arrests declined 3.6 percent—not such a heartening figure in view of the thousands in the armed forces.

During 1943, arrests for girls under 21 years again went up 47.9 percent over the already high figure of 1942.

Juvenile delinquency, of course, is not primarily a wartime problem, but the conditions which produce delinquency have been greatly aggravated by the war situation. In our earnest effort to get on with the war, we have had a tendency to ignore the importance of some of the new stresses in our domestic life. Broken homes have always contributed substantially to the problems of delinquency. Now, countless homes are daily being disrupted by our military and domestic manpower demands. Also the drafting of fathers is certainly going to create some very serious problems for the mothers who must, for a time at least, be disciplinarians as well as homemakers. It's going to be particularly hard for the young, inexperienced mother who is left with the responsibility of developing those basic habits and establishing those behavior patterns that will from this time forward control the way in which her children will go. I shudder at what the consequences to this Nation may be unless we get busy and give them something more than merely enough money to keep the wolf from the door. Also, the cities and towns which have had bad housing and overcrowded living conditions, limited health facilities, and nothing but the most unsatisfactory commercial amusements, honky-tonks, pinball palaces, and juke joints, invariably have large numbers of young offenders. The wartime migrations of industrial workers and the surge of families to cities like Detroit and Los Angeles have brought countless numbers of youth into such communities where their basic housing, health, education, and recreation needs cannot be satisfied.

The first sobering consideration is that present-day juvenile delinquency may foreshadow a marked increase in crime within a very few years. The reports of the Federal Bureau of Prisons reveal that well over 60 percent of the adult offenders now in the institutions under its jurisdiction began their careers as juvenile delinquents, and it is generally agreed that a similar pattern is found in nearly every adult institution in the country. The fact that the youth of today who makes his appearance in a juvenile court is a prospective recruit in tomorrow's army of crime is a direct threat to the future well-being of the Nation. This is, however, but one of the reasons why we must take positive action.

But let us look at the other side of the picture for a moment. World War No. 2 has taught us as nothing else could do what values are inherent in the training and leadership of youth. Youth rides the tanks, youth pilots the planes, youth fights to the finish on both sides in Europe and Africa and Asia today. Before we go too far then in our condemnation of youth or in our plan to check their natural exuberance, let us remember that youth is the hope of the world today as always.

I have faith in youth. We shall get nowhere with all our plans for a better adjustment of the juvenile problem if we tackle it in a carping, critical, negativistic, and repressive attitude. Youth wants opportunity for expression—for new friendships—for high adventure—for emotional satisfaction—for successful achievement and the rewards that

follow it, as well as for religion and education and some of the calmer, cooler virtues which we elders are wont to offer them. It will not satisfy the millions of young soldiers who have visited many places, seen many lands, met many people, good and bad, and experienced many things, including the hardships of war, if on their return we offer them only indifference and a laissez-faire economic system. Nor do we want some Hitlerian "Jugend" regimented like sheep, forced into a mold of conformity by national gauleiters. We want to preserve that individuality in American boys and girls which is the heritage our fathers left us and which is the outstanding characteristic of our success in war and in peace.

So it is clear, at the outset, that we ought to stop such wholesale condemnation of our youth. We have had enough talk and recriminations. What we need is sanity and calm. Hysteria will get us nowhere. In the second place, we should not encourage anyone to believe that a great centralized program to regiment and to remake the youth of America will solve the problem of juvenile delinquency. At bottom, Mr. Chairman, the solution of the problem rests with the individual American and the American community. There is scarcely a city or a town which does not have within itself most of the resources through which these problems can be met. Schools, churches, youth serving agencies, law enforcement units, civic groups, and all private citizens have a real vital part to play. All that is needed is leadership, information, advice, and counsel. These the Federal and State Governments can and must supply.

If that were done, each State, I believe, could reorganize the present State defense councils into advisory bodies to improve educational methods, find employment opportunities and modernize methods of criminal justice and correction. Each of these State councils, which I presume would be headed by the Governor, should include representatives of the legislature, the judiciary, and heads of appropriate State agencies. The State councils would in turn organize local bodies to do something about preventing juvenile delinquency. It would also, of course, take the lead in other fields of social action bearing on the crime problem.

We know from past experience that there are many concrete and specific methods which can be used effectively to prevent crime among young people. The Coordinating Councils of Los Angeles, the Chicago area project, the Cleveland industrial areas project, and the Detroit Council of Social Agencies have accomplished much. These coordinating councils or projects are merely organized groups of private citizens who find out in what sections of the city the greatest amount of youthful crime occurs and then proceed to do the many well known things which prevent juvenile delinquency. They carve out an area and get busy on establishing boys' clubs, for instance, or they provide a playground. But most importantly they find fathers and mothers to help straighten out situations which make for crime in their own block. They get the school principal and the teachers to help and they bring to bear group pressure on the individual boys and girls who create trouble. The precinct police captain is called upon to close up or bring under control those taverns, barrooms or jukejoints that are bad hang-outs for young people. The ministers and priests are enlisted to help individual families and particular boys and girls. They attend the sessions of the juvenile courts to see the kind of cases that come before the court and volunteer to act as sponsors for neighborhood boys and girls. They call upon the local charities to help handicapped children.

It is the old well-known technique of getting down to cases, building up local pride, and bringing pressure to bear on situations which make for crime. We know more about the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency than we are practicing. What is needed is leadership. There are many thousands of civic-minded persons in every community who are anxious to help. Capitalizing on their pride, community spirit and love for their boys and girls is the way to solve the juvenile delinquency problem. It is the "hard way," I admit, but it is the only way to make real progress.

My friends, we cannot longer sit idly by. The childhood of America is the treasure of the Nation. Of what avail would it be if, after the present far-reaching, costly, and bloody holocaust, our country should find that not only the raging battle fronts but also the home front has claimed precious lives? And what would be the comfort of winning the war if it transpired that not only had fathers, sons, and brothers given life and limb to the great cause of human freedom but that many thousands of boys and girls back home had embarked on habits of action and ways of thought that can only lead to careers of trouble and unhappiness both to themselves and families and to the country at large? Let us go forward in the many practical ways that are available to us and do something to alleviate the fears of the fathers who are bearing the heat of the battle, help the distraught mothers, and protect the youth of America.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to most of the gentleman's speech and I think he has made some splendid observations. But I wonder whether or not the hearings before the gentleman's committee dealing with this problem of juvenile delinquency inspired any specific program or recommendation to deal with this problem other than mere generalities and "onward movement" and that sort of thing. The gentleman's speech indicated very clearly there is a definite problem; and I have read Mr. Hoover's speech on the subject and I have read the statistics, which show there is a definite problem. The gentleman realizes that, does he not?

Mr. RABAUT. There is a definite problem.

Mr. KEEFE. The records in his county and in every county in the United States show a tremendous increase in juvenile crime which is included in the general term of "juvenile delinquency." The gentleman has made a very eloquent plea for sanity in dealing with the subject. I wonder if the gentleman has developed any clear-cut, definite program that either the States or the Federal Government could undertake to deal with this problem and to aid in its solution.

Mr. RABAUT. The best program that I know of rests with the private individual in America.

Mr. KEEFE. In the home?

Mr. RABAUT. In the home and on the street. We have too many adults forever setting a very bad example to the youth of our country. You do not need anybody to call it particularly to your attention. It is apparent every place you go. The adults of America have little thought about the bad example that they set and it is high time that they set a better example to the youth of America.

That is the first step that could be taken. Much depends upon the homes of the country. As I said in my talk, too many people find their way into the penal institutions of this country from broken homes; and as such they are the innocent victims of their forebears.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman concedes, does he not, and I assume he has given a great deal of study to it from the comprehensive talk that he has just made, that the local municipalities where they have actually tackled this problem in an effort to meet it through municipal enterprise, have been supremely successful.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Many of them have been supremely successful in providing the facilities that give an opportunity to youth to give expression to their ideas rather than, as the gentleman says, high pressuring them and keeping them down and subduing their natural emotions, and all that sort of thing. But does the gentleman have any idea of any comprehensive program that the Federal Government, as such, could enter into to deal with that problem?

Mr. RABAUT. I have tried to set forth in my remarks that the program resolves itself into different parts. First comes the community.

The community should take into consideration the teachers, boys' clubs, girls' clubs, the home. When you come to tenement districts it can be reduced almost to the block movement; to a movement within the block. There is always some leadership that has an interest in young humanity. Of course, you could not lay down a pattern for the whole country, because after all we have a variety of conditions in the United States, from New York to some

small community out in the outskirts, and the remedy must fit the situation. But when there is recognition of infraction of the law it is time to take the problem in hand at once and not wait until it runs wild. Some action should be had on the part of authority to assist where the home is divided; not so much because of the break in the home, but because of the fact that the father and mother in the home, possibly some of the older children, are giving their support to the war effort. Now, it will be a sad commentary if our own home front is so completely ruined because of something we tried to do in the war effort but as a result of which we leave our progeny an inheritance of questionable value. I do not know how much of a victory we may be in position to claim for ourselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that it is very important to have industry go to where the workers are, rather than to force the workers away from families and break up the homes, where there are no homes for the workers to go to. I think that is a serious problem. We should not break up homes for the service. It seems to me it is equally important as far as work is concerned.

Mr. RABAUT. It is important, but of course, in the position we find ourselves, due to the war effort, I do not know that we can do that. Where it could be done I would say it is a very good idea.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, most historians agree that the Battle of Quebec was one of the decisive battles in history, because it determined that the predominant language of the North American continent was to be English rather than French. It meant that the basic ideas and philosophies of government and of culture to dominate the development of the United States and Canada were to be not Latin ideas but Anglo-Saxon—Anglo-Saxon law and jurisprudence, Anglo-Saxon type of democratic self-government expressed in the language of the King James version of the Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, Shakespeare, and the Magna Carta.

An equally important decision was made when China began to modernize and took as the foreign language her children were to learn not German or French or Spanish or Russian but English.

When Japan began to modernize in the latter part of the nineteenth century, she sent a commission around the world to study the systems of government in various countries. It finally settled on the German system and the present Japanese constitution was largely written while the commission was still in Germany. The Japanese adopted German, not English, as their foreign language and slavishly modeled their political system, their educational system, their military system, after the German imperial system. We see the results today.

When China, in 1911, overthrew the Manchu Empire, she chose as her model not Germany but the great sister republic of the west, America. The largest, the oldest, the strongest, and the greatest of all the colored peoples in the world decided it would adopt and follow the Anglo-Saxon tradition of democratic self-government. The more one considers the matter the more one perceives that there have been very few more important decisions in history than that. Some results are visible today and will continue for decades and, I believe, for centuries. Who was responsible for the decision? One man more than any other, Sun Yat-sen. He was born in a little country village in China with no more natural opportunity and advantages than Abraham Lincoln. However, he had a chance to go to a mission school and later to study in a Christian high school in Hawaii during the most formative years of his life; there Sun Yat-sen became completely committed to the American type of democratic government and society. He set one goal before him, and for 40 years he never swerved from that goal—to get the Chinese people united into a great independent republic on the American pattern, able to take her rightful place among the free nations of the world.

The twentieth anniversary of his death will occur on Sunday the 12th of March. I have today introduced a resolution, and a similar resolution is being introduced in the Senate, authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to designate March 12 as Sun Yat-sen Day in honor of the first Provisional President of the Chinese Republic.

In China the school children begin studying their foreign language, English, not in high school, but in the third and fourth grades. I was always surprised to find how many Chinese children by the time they finished high school, knew far more real facts about George Washington and Abraham Lincoln than the average American youth. The Chinese study and discuss our great heroes and their ideas and deeds. They honor and revere the great leaders who founded and built this Nation.

I think that calling America's attention to this great man of Asia by designating a day in his honor would be mutually beneficial. I know the Chinese would deeply appreciate it as deserved recognition of the father of their republic, and it could mean a lot to a great many Americans, too, if they would study the life and work and teachings of this man whose shadow lengthens with each passing year and whose service to our own country, through influencing the Chinese people to hold firmly the torch of human freedom, even during the 10 years prior to Pearl Harbor, while we as a nation slumbered, has saved and will save more American lives and American dollars than any of us yet realize.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Appropriations has called attention to the fact that it has held this particular appropriation in line except for increases because of overtime wages.

I just want to call this to your attention, that when the so-called overtime bill was passed it was understood that the hours of employees were being increased, and it was also assumed that by increasing the hours of time it would be unnecessary to increase the number of employees, but rather that the employment, as far the number of employees was concerned, would be materially reduced. Nothing has been shown in this appropriation bill or in the bills we have already considered, indicating there has been any reduction in employment by reason of the overtime pay or the additional time of employment.

My position regarding that question was that the lower-salaried individuals should receive increases in pay, but it did not seem to me necessary to increase the pay for those who were receiving $7,000, $9,000, and $10,000 per year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. KERR. There is one conclusion that my friend has overlooked entirely. The evidence before this committee with respect to every activity was that they they were doing three times as much work as they were in normal times. There are wartimes. The gentleman overlooks that entirely.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If that is correct, it seems to me if they are doing so much more work than they were heretofore, then certainly we should not need to increase the amount of employment. The gentleman is certainly mistaken about the matter of overlooking the fact that these are wartimes. The very fact that our country is at war is the very reason why we ought to cut all non-war services to the bone, and use the manpower and money for the prosecution of the war. I do not say these people work more than in normal times, but other people do and are glad to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, in response to the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], I have no detailed information as to the agencies covered by this appropriation bill. But, referring to the activities of the House Committee on Civil Service, acting under a resolution passed by this House, a committee of which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is a very valuable member and the ranking Republican member, and in which activity he has been one of the leaders, we have brought about since July 1, 1943, a net reduction in the number of civilian employees in the Government of approximately 215,000, which means a saving, on an annual basis, of over $400,000,000 a year. So that we are making some progress in the opposition direction from the one in which civilian employment was moving when the House authorized this investigation. At that time the number of employees was increasing on an average of 100,000 per month. Now it is going the other way. I am glad to be able to tell the House that, because we are doing it under authority of this House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But what I want to direct the gentleman's attention to is that within the last hour it has been suggested that the reason for the increase in this particular bill is because of overtime pay amounting to $20,000,000. That is one of the reasons given for increasing the bill. The same thing was said with reference to the measure that we had before us last week.

What I am trying to call attention to is that if it is necessary to increase the amount of payment to these employees as it is indicated here then we ought to have either more service or else cut it down; otherwise we receive no benefit for paying more money. I am not saying we should not pay them for overtime except those in the higher brackets whom I thought were getting enough money at the time.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I agree with the gentleman from Kansas that when we pay them more money we have the right to get more work from them but I believe the Members realize that the hours were extended sometime before the pay was increased, and we are working employees now 48 hours as against 39 prior to the war and we are paying them 21.6 percent, just a little less than straight time. We often hear talk about overtime pay; as a matter of fact the greater part of the Government employees are not getting overtime, they are getting straight time or a little less than straight time. Some Government employees under the Wage Board procedure do get overtime, but the employees under this bill do not. I do not know anything about the details of the particular agencies here; I have not the information before me, but it is a fact that your committee directed to make this investigation is getting results. The gentleman from Kansas and the other members of the committee have contributed their full share to that activity and I think we are making some progress which is saving the taxpayers a lot of money.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 14 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I know the Committee will pardon me for continuing the subsidy debate, but in view of the many exaggerations and misstatements in the President's veto message it seems incumbent upon someone to answer him so that the RECORD will at least have some semblance of being correct. The exaggerations and misstatements in the President's veto message seem to be in keeping with a studied plan to confuse this issue. I want to call attention to just two or three examples incident to this studied plan to confuse the American people in respect to the consumer subsidy issue. Here are some headlines carried in the Washington News on November 17, 1943: "Subsidy ban to up prices by eight billion, says Bowles."

Quoting Mr. Bowles they say:

In a Nation-wide radio address last night, Bowles declared that we are going to be in trouble as far as the cost of living is concerned if Congress bans use of subsidies after January 1 as proposed; the continued use of subsidies, now costing about $800,000,000 a year, is a businessman's bargain considering that it can prevent a minimum increase of $8,000,000,000 in the cost of living in a single year.

That was on November 17, 1943. About 3 weeks after that, under date of December 8, Mr. Bowles wrote a letter. He was writing to a man who had studied this subsidy program and Mr. Bowles knew this man to whom he was writing could not be fooled as he apparently had attempted to fool the American people. On the 17th of November, or about 3 weeks after this radio statement had been made by Mr. Bowles, he had this to say in this letter, a photostatic copy of which I have. Bear in mind that $800,000,000 is spent yearly for subsidies according to his statement and we agree that this amount is approximately correct. Bowles had this to say in his letter and I quote him:

Let us examine the possible consequences if subsidies are defeated. There will be an immediate rise in the cost of living by an amount 20 to 25 percent greater than the amount now being expended in subsidies.

Twenty-five percent of $800,000,000 is $200,000,000. This added to $800,000,000, which is the amount being paid in subsidies, gives us $1,000,000,000, an increase in the cost of living of $1,000,000,000 instead of the $8,000,000,000 he had claimed 3 weeks before, or about 12½ percent of what he claimed in his radio speech to the American people. It was perhaps in keeping with that theory of confusing the American people that the President in his veto message today said:

I promptly return the bill without my signature, and urgently recommend that the Congress take action as soon as possible to extend, without hampering restrictions, the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Farmers could thereby make plans for the planting of crops and know the support prices on which they can rely.

There is nothing in the bill which he vetoed that has any relationship whatsoever to any support price program and we have a right to assume that Mr. Roosevelt knows it. And further is it in keeping with this studied attempt to confuse the public mind on this issue when Mr. Roosevelt says:

This bill, like that bill—

Referring to the similar bill he vetoed on July 2, 1943—H. R. 2869—

is an inflation measure, a high-cost-of-living measure, a food-shortage measure.

Yet it has been said and agreed upon that there is not an economist in the United States not on the Federal pay roll who does not contend that the payment of consumer subsidies is inflationary.

Further to confuse this issue after Mr. Bowles had at one time said that the increased cost of living would be $8,000,000,000 and then 3 weeks afterward said the cost of living would go up $1,000,000,000, the President with perhaps abandon says that the cost of living will go up 7 percent unless they continued to pay consumer subsidies. He said that butter would go up 10 cents a pound. It had never been claimed before even in Mr. Bowles' fantastic statements that butter would go up more than 9 cents a pound, but the President pulls 10 cents a pound out of the hat, and although the consumer subsidy is only 5 cents the President says in his veto message today that if we stop paying the subsidy of 5 cents a pound on butter that butter will go up 10 cents. We cannot understand these mathematics.

He says that the price of cheese will go up 8 cents a pound, although the most we have ever paid as a subsidy on cheese—and it is questionable whether that constitutes even a consumer subsidy—is 4 cents a pound. The President is 100-percent wrong when he says the price of butter will go up 10 cents although we are now paying only a 5-cent subsidy on it; the President is 100-percent wrong when he says the price of cheese will go up 8 cents a pound when we are paying a subsidy of only 4 cents a pound on it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I cannot yield; I am sorry.

The President goes on to say further that hamburger will go up 5 cents a pound, pork chops 4½ cents, sliced ham 6½ cents, and so forth.

Yet, according to his own Office of Economic Stabilization the average price of the meat subsidy is 3 cents.

Was Mr. Roosevelt right when he picked out a few of these high prices and said they would go up from 4½ to 6½ cents in this message today? Or was his Office of Economic Stabilization correct when it said that the average would be 3 cents? He says it is clear that we cannot hold the wage line if the Congress deprives him of the means necessary to hold the cost-of-living line. All right; break it down. He asks for only $1,000,000,000, and Mr. Bowles said in the letter I quoted that unless we paid these subsidies the price of living would go up 25 percent more than we are paying, or $1,000,000,000 — $200,000,000 over the

amount of the subsidies which is $800,000,000.

Divide $1,000,000,000 by 132,000,000, the population, and you have a little less than $7 per capita per year; you have a little less than 60 cents a month per individual, a little less than 2 cents a day per capita. So, as was brought out yesterday, the increase in the cost of living to the head of a family of 5 would be less than 10 cents a day. But the census tells us that the average American family consists of only 3½ people; so the increase in the cost of living would be a little less than 7 cents a day to the head of the average American family, perhaps a little bit more than we give to the newsboy when we do not have the correct change.

Do you tell me, Mr. President, that patriotic American labor is going to strike, is going to tie up war production, is going to stop this war, merely because their cost of living has been increased from 7 to 10 cents a day? That is a reflection upon the patriotism of every wage earner in America.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman, Is it not perfectly clear that this proposal to give to the working people of this country a roll-back subsidy which amounts to about 2 or 3 cents a day is an attempt to sell them the idea that that is justification for denying them a needed increase in wages of perhaps 8 cents an hour such as was asked by the nonoperating groups of the railroads?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there has been more demagoguery, more exaggeration, more intellectual dishonesty, more superficial thinking in respect to this consumer subsidy controversy than any other matter with which I have come in contact in this Congress in the 13 years I have been here.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Has there to the gentleman's knowledge been any credit given the offset that is to be expected in the living costs by the suspension or freezing of the 1 percent social security income tax that will be almost $1,300,000,000 and which goes directly into the pocket of the workingman?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Certainly, because the amount paid in subsidies is nowhere near the 1 percent of the wage earners income. The President would take 1 percent of the wage earner's income, if he vetoes the tax bill. He is shedding crocodile tears about the 7 cents, but how does he justify the fact he is going to take from the American wage earner another 1 percent which does not go into their retirement fund or reserve fund but goes into the Treasury of the United States to be used for current expenses?

Mr. SCRIVNER. May I also observe that this 1 percent goes to the income group up to $3,000 and does not benefit those who are receiving more than $3,000 a year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my understanding.

The President goes on to say:

If the wage line breaks, then it is going to cost the American public many more billions of dollars than it would otherwise.

He predicates the necessity for breaking the wage ceiling on this minor, little, inconsequential increase in the cost of living. But is it a decrease in the cost of living to the American wage earner when, by the investment of from 2 to 10 cents a day now, he will save himself the necessity of having to pay back into the Federal Treasury from 6 to 30 cents a day a few years from now? Is it morally sound to say to the American consumer that the Treasury of the United States will pay a part of his grocery bill, thereby leading him to believe that we are keeping the cost of living down, only to have the obligation to pay not that same amount but three times that amount into the Federal Treasury by that man's children and grandchildren? It is morally wrong; there is not any moral or economic justification for the payment of consumer subsidies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Service quarters: For rent, heat, fuel, and light for the Foreign Service for offices and grounds, and, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a), for living quarters and for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, $2,550,000: *Provided*, That payment for rent may be made in advance: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State may enter into leases for such offices, grounds, and living quarters for periods not exceeding 10 years and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5): *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, in an amount exceeding $4,000 for an ambassador, minister, or chargé d'affaires, and not exceeding $2,000 for any other Foreign Service officer: *Provided further*, That under this appropriation and the appropriations herein for "Contingent expenses, Foreign Service," and "Miscellaneous salaries and allowances, Foreign Service," not more than $5,000 shall be expended for heat, fuel, and light for living quarters for each ambassador or minister occupying a Government-owned building for residence or residence and office purposes, and not more than $1,700 for such purposes in the case of any other Foreign Service officer, and during the incumbency of a chargé d'affaires the limitation on such expenditures shall be the same as for the occupancy by the principal officer.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 8, line 20, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$3,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I realize this is another case of attempting to enter where angels fear to tread. When amendments are offered to cut down any items of appropriation bills, we are always told that the committee has investigated this matter carefully, has gone into it as carefully as possible, and that, therefore, amendments to reduce such appropriations are out of order.

It may be that this House wants to allow this item of $4,000 for these individuals. This is an additional allowance of $1,000 for living expenses of high salaried people. I understand 47 of them are to have, under this bill, $4,000 instead of $3,000 per year for living expenses; $1,000 or $47,000 does not seem to amount to very much, the way money is spent. Even $1,000,000 does not amount to much, comparatively speaking.

I just want to call your attention to the fact that for a small number of our foreign representatives the committee have increased an item from $3,000 to $4,000.

In other words, you increase this item 33⅓ percent. That is for a small group of individuals. These particular individuals are the high-salaried members of this group. They receive salaries all the way from $10,000 to $17,500. You selected them particularly. You are handing them this extra money along with all the other expenses they receive, which are numerous. That is, you pay their expenses for transportation of themselves, their families, their furniture, and equipment. Various other items of expenses are paid, yes, they even get overtime pay. And here you are allowing them not $1,000, or $2,000, or $3,000, but $4,000 each. That is $333 for additional expenses. Why not put it back to $250 per month, which is a lot of money just for living expenses, and save $47,000. While we are giving consideration to the arguments of the distinguished chairman, let us also give a little consideration to the taxpayer who will have to foot the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. What is this money for?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, it is for additional living expenses for certain of those in our Foreign Service. We have items here for rent, fuel, light, and all that sort of thing, amounting to $2,550,000. And this group of 47 is picked out to receive an additional allowance of $1,000 above the $3,000.

Mr. JENNINGS. What is the average salary?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It runs all the way from $7,500 up to as much as $17,000. They also receive overtime pay.

Mr. JENNINGS. How much would it be altogether?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This item here would amount to $47,000.

Mr. JENNINGS. Let us put it in terms of dozens of eggs and pounds of butter, and pork, and steers, and the other things that the people who are struggling to make ends meet must give up in order to further pay these people who are already getting a pretty good salary, I guess, or they would not take the jobs.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Absolutely. The point is, this money goes to people who are well paid, and is an additional amount to take care of their expenses. Now, of course, they are going to say the increased cost of living is the reason for that. It seems to me the $3,000 per year

in addition to other allowances, and a top salary should be sufficient.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Kansas yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I yield to the able chairman of the subcommittee, who is one of the most industrious and serious Members of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. It is very well to see the distinguished gentleman from Kansas so alert on this subject. Where was he when the deficiency bill, which set these figures, was approved by the subcommittee?

The subcommittee on appropriations which had under consideration the deficiency bill, already approved this amount of $4,000 and the regular committee is carrying it on in view of the hearings that the subcommittee had on that very subject. That subcommittee includes the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the ranking minority member. This is nothing new. It has been in here before and it has been passed by the House. The regular committee is taking cognizance of the action of the subcommittee having charge of deficiency appropriations and has gone along with it. Now we reduced it from $5,000 to $4,000. Will the gentleman turn to the hearings at page 79——

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have it before me.

Mr. RABAUT. There the gentleman will find that the percentages of increases in rent in a great number of places are listed, running from 113 percent to 180 percent, 200 percent, 400 percent, 480 percent, and 300 percent, 113 percent, 118 percent, 111 percent, and so on. These are the increases in rents throughout the world. If you have such increases in rent as that, you can imagine what the other increases are.

Do you want to load that onto the individual or do you want the Government and Cordell Hull and the State Department and Mr. Stettinius to prevail in that respect for our people abroad?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is my contention that these men should be willing to cooperate a little bit and assume some share of the higher costs of living.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, Foreign Service: For representation allowances as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931 (22 U. S. C. 12), $300,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 9, line 22, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$225,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I realize I am in for a good scolding again by our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee because I am again asking to cut down a little on expenses. But here is an item for which I can see no justification. I would not want to say the item is covered up, but if you will read the hearings, as near as you can get to understanding them, this is what they call representation. It goes, of course, for so-called entertainment. It goes for liquor, as a matter of fact. Let me call your attention to the fact that these representatives, our foreign representatives, as I have suggested heretofore, are paid high salaries. They receive liberal allowances in addition thereto.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am interested in this question of liquor. There is a shortage in this country and I just want to know if this is liquor for our representatives to get them in a mellow mood; or do we want to let them take this liquor to get the other fellow drunk? I am interested in it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will explain it.

Mr. JENNINGS. Because the people tell me they cannot buy it, even if they have the money, and here we are taking money out of the taxpayers' pockets, out of the pockets of good, hard-working, church-going, God-fearing men and women and buying liquor for people all over the world. It is not good morals, it is not good economy, and it is not good government. It is making us the laughing stock of the whole world.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the House will read the hearings they will find that this is money spent for liquor. That is what most of this goes for. It is not admitted in the hearings. But if you will read the hearings they are rather interesting. Part of this is sort of off the record, but nevertheless this money is spent for liquor by these representatives for so-called entertainment.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. How much liquor is proposed to be bought? How much will it cost?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is proposed to buy about $300,000 worth of liquor.

Mr. JENNINGS. Whisky?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Whisky and other liquors.

Mr. JENNINGS. Or whatever the name of it is?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know the name of it.

Mr. JENNINGS. Still the distinguished majority leader stands on the floor of the House and turns his head into a fountain of tears, about the people not having bread and meat in this country, when we are going to spend $300,000 of the people's money to buy liquor for foreigners, when our own people are hungry.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, of course, is going to say it is not all for liquor, but that it is just for entertainment. You will find, if you will look into this matter, that almost all of this sum goes for liquor.

Mr. JENNINGS. One more question. How can you entertain a man without liquor in a foreign country?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Well, I do not think you need to spend $300,000 for liquor, even in foreign countries. If our foreign representatives do not have sufficient influence to get along with foreign officials without using liquor, then there is something wrong with our diplomatic corps and our representatives abroad.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is the reason they are taking us for a ride. Our boys are not used to this heady, strong wine and strong drink. It is said in the Good Book:

Give good, strong drink to him who is about to perish; wine to him who is cast down. Let him drink and forget his poverty and remember his misery no more.

But the great trouble of it is, I am afraid it will have the effect that Shakespeare intimates it has when he says, "Why will a man put an enemy in his mouth that will steal away his brain?"

I think that is the reason they are taking our diplomatic and consular representatives in South America for a ride that has cost us about $10,000,000,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If you are not willing to strike the $300,000, then, at least you should be willing to support my amendment and save at least $75,000 of the taxpayers' money; even this amount would buy a lot of food for starving people in various parts of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if the Diplomatic Service has any such days as we are having here today and if they feel in the same mood that this particular individual who is addressing the House feels right now, I want to say I could enjoy some of this stuff that they are talking about.

But I want to quote an excerpt from the hearings, which may be found on page 96. This is a statement of one of the most respected men in the Diplomatic Service, none other than Ambassador George Messersmith, a man who represented the State Department before our subcommittee for many years. He since has been appointed Ambassador to Mexico. George Messersmith is a personal friend of mine and of other members of the committee as well as many Members of the House.

As I said previously, he is most highly respected. He is one of the champions of the State Department and of the personnel of the State Department. I want to quote what he has to say and put it in the public record:

I have written you from time to time regarding the question of representation allowances and I feel that I should raise the question again because of the fact that the increased cost of entertainment, either at home or in public places, and increased rates of income taxes has rendered it more difficult for most of us, and especially has made it impossible for some of the members of the staff to continue the official entertaining they were carrying on at their own expense.

We have been niggardly in this idea of reciprocation. Our Foreign Service is in competition with the foreign services of other countries at every post. If we want to walk out on our responsibilities, if we want to be the type that stands apart and says "You can entertain me because I have a Government back home

that does not seem to understand." Every year this subject comes up in this House, and some folks raise the same cry and ask for the same answers; and they are getting them today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Now let us be halfway fair about this.

Mr. RABAUT. I have been so fair that I have bent over backward.

Mr. REES of Kansas. This particular appropriation is for $300,000. All I was asking you to do was to cut it back to $225,000, where it was last year. Three years ago it was $125,000.

Mr. RABAUT. I want it on the record. I am not walking out on what I believe when I stand on this floor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Nobody charges you with that.

Mr. RABAUT. No. But I have seen too many gentlemen talk against it—the gentleman from Kansas is excluded from my remarks—but I have heard too many that could vote a certain way on this question of entertainment, and how they acted differently in other circumstances.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not think that when you go on trips you ought to use the Government's money.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, certain necessary trips are taken.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have not been on any of those trips.

Mr. RABAUT. Every place you go in and out of America, American representatives of this country are entertained. I feel it is the duty of this country to act in a reciprocal manner, and I am going to throw no stones at the agencies of the Government in the far corners of the world, especially when the Army and the Navy are visiting those points today. God knows they need some relief from the war fronts.

I ask for a vote on the question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENNINGS. I move to strike out the last word.

Now, I am not a bit excited. I am not angry. I am not undertaking to castigate anybody for having gone on a junket. I do not know anything about that sort of a trip because I never was on one. But I am talking about a cold-blooded proposition. Why do we want to take liquor or booze or wine or beer or any other form of intoxicant and use it in our so-called diplomatic relations with other countries? I know we are easy marks. All roads lead to Washington. It is the only capital in the world where things are given away, and those who get what we give them take it with almost as much alacrity and as much joy and enthusiasm as the New Dealers experience who are throwing it at the birds.

Recently it was charged by a distinguished Senator from Nebraska that we have built 500 airports down in South America and do not have title to any of them; and that we had paid those people down there American wages when they would have been glad to work for their own standards of pay. That very night young Nelson Rockefeller who has been at the head of that squandering, said that this Government had only spent and agreed to spend $600,000,000. In a few days a distinguished Senator on the other side got up and said we had spent, had agreed to spend, and were obligated to spend, only $3,000,000,000. Now, whether we have wasted $3,000,000,000 or $1,000,000,000, that is something that the American people are not able to stand at this time. This talk about our not being able to get along with those people unless we give them a drink is just a lot of piffle, a lot of rot, and I do not care who it comes from, Democrat or Republican. When we are putting the money on the barrel head, when we are feeding them and clothing them and paying them wages they never dreamed of getting, and at a time when we have got old people all over this country begging for an allowance from this Government and from the State governments to keep soul and body together, we come in here and propose to spend $300,000 for intoxicating liquor to make somebody in a foreign country like us. After we have knocked the head out of the barrel and given them virtually all we have got, how much more must we do to make them like us?

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Where do you get this $300,000 for intoxicating liquors?

Mr. JENNINGS. That is what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] said, and I believe what he says.

Mr. RABAUT. Are you following the gentleman from Kansas, or the legislation?

Mr. JENNINGS. I am not following anyone. I know the gentleman from Kansas well enough that I know he is telling the truth. You do not mean to say that this money is not to be spent for liquors, do you?

Mr. RABAUT. I say to you there is no place in this bill where it says $300,000 for intoxicating liquors.

Mr. JENNINGS. Well, what is the appropriation? It is $300,000, is it not, and it is for entertainment. You know and I know, and everybody else knows that it is to be spent for liquor and wine.

As a matter of fact, when this matter was up before, I protested the use of the money of the taxpayers of this Nation to buy intoxicating liquors for anyone. This item of $300,000 for the purchase of intoxicants was so "hot" that it was handled in an off-the-record manner in the hearings before the committee. I quote from page 96 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Appropriations on the Department of State appropriation bill for 1945:

EXCERPTS FROM LETTER OF AMBASSADOR MESSERSMITH

Mr. RABAUT. We have had a long discussion off the record of this representation allowance in the Foreign Service. I think a part of this letter to which reference has been made will be put in the record.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

[Excerpts from letter dated December 23, 1943, from Ambassador Messersmith]

"We have written you from time to time regarding the question of representation allowances and I feel that I should raise the question again because of the fact that the increased cost of entertainment, either at home or in public places, and the increased rate of income taxes has rendered it more difficult for most of us and especially has made it impossible for some of the members of the staff to continue the official entertaining they were carrying on at their own expense."

Mr. Chairman, the Honorable ALBERT J. ENGEL, the distinguished Representative from Michigan, recently, in a carefully prepared address, set forth the following startling facts:

In July 1945 the national debt of this country will be $245,000,000,000. The back-breaking size of this load of debt is apparent when we consider that the total assessed value of all property in this country—real estate, personal, mixed, both tangible and intangible—in 1943 was only $150,000,000,000. We are fast approaching the point when the Federal Government alone will owe twice as much as the assessed value of all property in the Nation. On top of this are the debts of 47 States—Nebraska owes no debt—the counties and incorporated cities and towns, not to mention individual and corporate debts.

On January 1, 1943, the President reported an unexpended balance in the hands of the Federal Government of $170,000,000,000. He asked for and was given an additional appropriation of $115,000,000,000 in 1943.

On January 1, 1944, the President reported that he had spent, entered into obligations to spend, and had made commitments to spend from January 1, 1940, to December 31, 1943, the sum of $344,000,000,000.

And through lend-lease gifts to our allies and nations we are undertaking to make friends of we have spent $16,000,000,000.

This is the record of our generosity. It is unparalleled in all the history of mankind. And in the face of this unprecedented spending and giving, we are told we will lose the friendship of the world if we do not give it a $300,000 drink to wash our gifts down their throats.

We have been talking about billions. I am going to talk about this $300,000. I am going to talk about it in terms the plain people, the working people, the little business man and woman, and the farmers can grasp and understand. They are going to have to pay the bill. They are going to have to pay for these drinks.

In terms of farm products, what does $300,000 for liquor, wine, and beer for foreigners equal?

Three hundred thousand dollars equals 3,000 steers, at $100 each.

Three hundred thousand dollars equals 10,000 hogs, at $30 each.

Three hundred thousand dollars equals 30,000 lambs, at $10 each.

Three hundred thousand dollars equals 600,000 pounds of butter, at 50 cents per pound.

Three hundred thousand dollars equals 1,000,000 dozen eggs, at 30 cents per dozen.

It is the proceeds of three hundred $1,000 bonds.

And we are about to spend $300,000 the Government does not have for something we do not need and can do without.

It is time to call a halt. This is a good place to stop squandering money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperation with the American republics: For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet the obligations of the United States under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations between the United States and the other American republics, signed at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and to carry out the purposes of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics," approved August 9, 1939, and to supplement appropriations available for carrying out other provisions of law authorizing related activities, including the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease for the duration of the experiments and demonstrations, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $125,000 for printing and binding; stenographic reporting, translating and other services by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; and, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, tuition, compensation, monthly allowances and enrollment, laboratory, insurance, and other fees incident to training, including traveling expenses in the United States and abroad in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, of educational, professional, and artistic leaders, and professors, students, internes, and persons possessing special scientific or other technical qualifications who are citizens of the United States or the other American republics, and the expenses of transportation and subsistence of employees, including the cost of transportation of their immediate families and household goods and effects in going to and returning from posts of assignment in foreign countries, and living quarters allowances, including heat, fuel, and light, in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 26, 1930 (5 U. S. C. 118a): *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized under such regulations as he may adopt, to pay the actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens of the other American republics while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and to make advances of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses of members of advisory committees in accordance with section 2 of said act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 249a); purchase (not to exceed $15,000), hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled and animal-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase of books and periodicals; rental of halls and boats; and purchase, rental, and repair of microfilming equipment and supplies, and colored photographic enlargements, $3,450,000; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to make contracts with, and grants of money or property to, governmental and public or private nonprofit institutions and facilities in the United States and the other American republics, including the free distribution, donation, or loan of publications, phonograph records, radio transcriptions, art works, motion-picture films, educational material, and such other material and equipment as the Secretary may deem necessary and appropriate, and such other gratuitous assistance as the Secretary deems advisable in the fields of the arts and sciences, education and travel, publications, the radio, the press, and the cinema; all without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; and, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American republics any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department or independent establishment for the purposes of this appropriation and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, or independent establishment to which amounts are transferred: *Provided further*, That any funds herein appropriated which may be transferred to the Federal Security Agency for the Public Health Service shall be available for the salaries and expenses of not to exceed four additional regular active commissioned officers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $100,000 of this appropriation shall be available until June 30, 1946: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $400,000 of the amount appropriated in the Department of State Appropriation Act, 1944, shall be available until June 30, 1945.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 32, line 2, after the colon, strike out the rest of the paragraph beginning with the word "*Provided*" in line 2.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment because I believe there cannot be expended efficiently any such amount as is carried here and in addition the amount that is carried in the reappropriation of $400,000; in other words, there would be available for expenditure if the bill goes through as reported by the committee, $3,850,000. Should my amendment be adopted there would be available next year $3,450,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. That is true, it would make available the additional sum of $400,000 next year but would substract it from this year's appropriation. Is that not right?

Mr. TABER. It might.

Mr. RABAUT. It most certainly would do that because the Treasury contributes nothing to this.

Mr. TABER. I will explain just what it will do if the gentleman will listen.

Mr. RABAUT. All right; just so the House understands it.

Mr. TABER. I want the gentleman to understand it.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman means he is going to instruct me on my own bill?

Mr. TABER. I do. I thought from the way the question was asked that the gentleman did not understand it.

Mr. RABAUT. All I can say is that the gentleman has some job on his hands.

Mr. TABER. All right; we will try to explain it to the gentleman. The gentleman said it would be subtracted from this year's appropriations. That is not exactly the situation. It would be subtracted from this year but if they did not spend the amount of $400,000 out of this year's appropriation then they would be able to spend that amount of $400,000 next year in addition to next year's $3,450,000.

Mr. RABAUT. That is exactly what I said.

Mr. TABER. Not as I understood it. The gentleman was a little mixed in it; that is all.

I wish now to call attention to just what the operations have been on this proposition. The appropriations for 1943 were $1,685,000 according to the hearings at page 188 and 189. I do not know whether that is expenditures or appropriations from the way it is set up. On the other hand the figures seem to indicate that it must be expenditure, yet the way it is set up it reads: "Appropriations."

The appropriations for 1944, that is this current fiscal year, are $4,500,000. Of this amount in the first 6 months there was expended $811,930; in other words they spent less than 20 percent of the appropriation in the first 6 months. They tell us they obligated larger amounts, $1,780,000. Of that amount $309,000 was grants to students.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. We come to an item here of professorial missions, $44,000 with expenditures of $1,900. There is an item for a convention for the promotion of inter-American cultural relations $28,800 obligation as against $8,700 expenditures; and an item selection, translation, and printing in Spanish, Portuguese, and French $53,500 obligations against $39,000 expenditures. This indicates that they had allotments for these purposes. The same thing applies all the way through, setting up very considerable sums above the expenditures which will not accrue and the operations of those things will not accrue until the last half of the fiscal year and perhaps later. Having that in mind if they could obligate as much more in the next half of the year they would obligate altogether only $3,400,000, and that is the amount of the appropriation for this year that is carried in this bill by the committee. Why we should need to increase it above what would seem to be a reasonable amount for the fiscal year I do not understand and that is why I feel that if we provide $3,400,000, which is just about the amount they might spend or obligate this fiscal year if they go along the rest of the year at the rate they went the first half, they would have plenty of money to do everything they need to do. I cannot see any reason at all for encouraging these people to spend more money. The things they are undertaking that would make a special appeal are such things as intern training and meteorological serv-

ice and civil-aviation training. They allocated $800,000 to the civil-aviation proposition for this year but they spent only about $21,000, and they have obligated only $42,000.

According to what they say on page 202 of the hearings, as I remember the page number, they did not have any students at all in this civil-aviation proposition the first half of the year, although it is an item they have been allocating money to heretofore.

I believe there are a few items in this proposition and a few items in the Department of Agriculture that perhaps might be advisable, such as the development of rubber production for which they claim to have obligated $140,000 and allocated for the year $310,000, such as the development of complementary agriculture products, for which they have spent $131,000 out of an allotment of $428,000. I would not want to see it wiped out if it would do anything toward promoting international good will, but I do feel that we are going too strong when we add this $400,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. This item in the bill, as the distinguished gentleman well knows, is to cover international agreements between this country and South American countries.

Mr. TABER. I do not so understand it. I understand that this represents allotments to these different countries that these things can be rearranged somewhat. Some of it is for interchange of students, some of it may be desirable, some of it is for the development of rubber, some of it is for the training of aviation students, but I do not understand that it is covered by international agreements.

Mr. KERR. This item which has been reduced by the subcommittee $1,505,000——

Mr. TABER. No; because the $400,000 was not included in the budget; so you have got to take that out and the reduction instead of being $1,050,000 is only $650,000.

Mr. KERR. That was an arrangement of the subcommittee's in order to reduce this matter $1,050,000, the very thing that my distinguished friend objected to.

In respect to these agreements, if the gentleman will turn to a law known as Public Law 255 of the Seventy-sixth Congress he will see that this item along with others cover international agreements we have made with other nations. I do not mean that it is entirely that, because it covers other things, but it does take care of matters that are covered by international agreements we have with the South American republics.

Mr. TABER. I do not understand that that is the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The original figure for the item "Cooperation with South American republics," as originally brought to the committee, was $6,000,000. We had quite a debate on that in the committee last year and we agreed to cut the amount to $4,500,000. On the floor an attempt was made to cut it another million and a half dollars, which failed. I think that effort was led by the distinguished gentleman from New York, who has not forgotten it and wants to start all over again.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield? I did not even speak on that last year.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is correct. The effort was made by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

We fixed the figure at $4,500,000 and this year it came to the committee at that figure. The committee considered it at great length and there was a long controversy about it. It was one of the most bitterly fought portions of this bill. We finally agreed to accept a cut of $1,050,000 provided we could have a carry-over, if the same could be effected, of the $400,000 from this year's appropriations to be used in 1945 instead of $100,000 which had been allowed heretofore. So the $400,000 that we are talking about and which the gentleman's amendment seeks to reduce is not new money out of the Treasury. The $400,000 is a part of the current year's appropriation. We give them permission in this bill, if they can effect that saving this year, to better coordinate the program and not crowd it toward the end of the fiscal year, to carry the sum over to augment the amount, that is being given in this bill, namely, $3,450,000. That is the whole situation as far as this money is concerned. It is not new money out of the Treasury, and all the talk about it is misleading. I want the House to understand the situation and I hope therefore the committee will be sustained inasmuch as this provision was part of the full agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 24, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth: For salaries, fees, and expenses of United States marshals, deputy marshals, and clerical assistants, including services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise; services in Alaska in collecting evidence for the United States when so specifically directed by the Attorney General; traveling expenses, including the actual and necessary expenses incident to the transfer of prisoners in the custody of United States marshals to narcotic farms without regard to the provisions of the act approved January 19, 1929 (21 U. S. C. 227); purchase, when authorized by the Attorney General, of four motor-propelled passenger-carrying vans at not to exceed $2,000 each; and maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; $4,370,000: *Provided*, That United States marshals and their deputies may be allowed, in lieu of actual expenses of transportation, not to exceed 4 cents per mile for the use of privately owned automobiles when traveling on official business within the limits of their official station.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill be passed.

The motion was agreed to.

Accoringly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4204) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill be passed.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HARRY B. WOLF

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, with regret I rise to call the attention of the House to the death yesterday of one of my predecessors, Harry B. Wolf, formerly Congressman from the Third District of Maryland, who served in the Fifty-ninth Congress, 1905 to 1907.

Mr. Wolf had always been active in the business and political life of our community and had earned a great reputation as one of the most brilliant cross-examiners at the Maryland bar.

His death yesterday came as a shock to his many friends in Baltimore and throughout the State.

He was a devoted husband and father. My heartfelt sympathy goes to his widow and his family, two members of which are now serving in the armed forces, one son, Lt. Col. Edwin J. Wolf, with the Engineer Corps in China, and Capt. Frederick S. Wolf, flight surgeon, Medical Corps, in England.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleage the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include editorials in each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter adressed to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters and telegrams received in reference to the bill H. R. 4000 by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Mr. W. E. Patterson, an attorney of Prescott, Ariz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein certain excerpts from the hearings on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement on shipping and shipbuilding on the Great Lakes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BURCH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. DREWRY), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. FULBRIGHT, from February 21 to 26, on account of official business.

To Mr. TALBOT, for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. MCWILLIAMS, for 1 week, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 662. An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 1428. An act to amend the provisions of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia government and the White House Police force"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;

H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; and

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.;

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior; and

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 17, 1944:

H. R. 3477. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

On February 18, 1944:

H. R. 205. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who have claims for damages or losses allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway, Miami to Jacksonville, Fla., and for other purposes;

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 550. An act for the relief of Renzie Graham;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy and Son;

H. R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald S. Johnston;

H. R. 2075. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia", approved February 28, 1898, as amended;

H. R. 2340. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 2580. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips, as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada; to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands; and for other purposes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory

of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442);

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade;

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942;

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L–76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943;

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3916. An act to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backing of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

2. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1204. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, with a view to determining whether improvement of the section from Three Rivers Point to the Niagara River is advisable, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 8, 1938; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1205. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 10, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on flood-control works in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River, with a view to determining the extent of damage to crops and lands adjacent to the Intracoastal Waterway, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 6, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1206. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 17, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of a report on the Ohio River, with a view to providing protective works in the vicinity of the mouth of the Saline River and for the protection of interstate highways and railroads from floods, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on June 16, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1207. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 20, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Pass Cavallo, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 24, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1208. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting the report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the month of November 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1209. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated December 10, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1210. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated January 6, 1944, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Sackets Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1211. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the seventh report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended September 30, 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1212. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to assist the States to establish and maintain school lunch programs; to the Committee on Education.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. House Resolution 430. Resolution requesting information as to the status of Walter Winchell. (Rept. No. 1162). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 4227. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 4228. A bill to reestablish the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, to re-create the offices of the members of said Board, and to transfer functions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration from the National Housing Agency to said Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 4229. A bill to authorize the naturalization of native-born Filipinos who are permanent residents of the United States and Filipinos who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War No. 1; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4230. A bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until July 1, 1945, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

H. J. Res. 238. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 239. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until July 1, 1945; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 240. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Sunday, March 12, 1944, as Sun Yat-sen Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON of Maryland:

H. Res. 447. Resolution authorizing the disbursing officer to deduct stipulated amounts from Members' salaries for War-bond purchases; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to remove all barriers on Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to speed up delivery and not to determine the qualifications of soldiers' vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Revenue and Taxation Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4231. A bill for the relief of Sarah Jane Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4232. A bill granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Ann Hoke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4233. A bill for the relief of Joe Pruett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4234. A bill for the relief of Maj. L. J. H. Herwig, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4961. By Mr. ANDREWS: Recommendations presented to the United States Government by the national board of directors of the Mazzini Society, Buffalo, N. Y., having to do with matters relating to Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4962. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition of the New Jersey State Legislature, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to open doors of Palestine for Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4963. Also, petition of the Tricounty Cooperative Auction Market Association, Inc., urging that the Palestine white paper of May 1939 be rescinded to permit Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4964. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of E. K. Haywood and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4965. Also, petition of Robert J. Kelly and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4966. Also, petition of Harold E. Miller and 18 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4967. Also, petition of Arthur L. Lerch and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4968. Also, petition of Floyd Ament and 17 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4969. By Mr. FULMER: House resolution of the house of representatives of South Carolina, submitted by Hon. Lake W. Stroup and C. H. Gresham, memoralizing and requesting the National Congress to return all possible war equipment after the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4970. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of Jersey City, N. J., advocating that Palestine be opened to Jewish immigrants and that it be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committe on Foreign Affairs.

4971. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, opposing the enactment of any proposal involving the transfer of the administration of unemployment compensation from the States to the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4972. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication from John W. Fletcher, of Cave in Rock, Ill., protesting against the difference between prices paid to the farmer for eggs and the price paid by the consumer; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4973. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Mabel E. Hackett, of Marne, Mich., and 13 others, opposing House bill 3477 and approving Government subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

4974. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions containing the signatures of 246 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District, State of New York, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4975. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of the Leonardville (Kans.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union, urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4976. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition of Guido Lippera and others, of Stockport, N. Y., protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4977. Also, petition of Estella Empie, president, Howes Cave (N. Y.) Woman's Christian Temperance Union Local, and others, petitioning the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 2082, introduced by Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON, of South Carolina, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of mobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4978. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Rockland County, N. Y., protesting vigorously against any drastic change in the present laws of the United States and the State of New York which govern and control the sale and distribution of alcoholic beverages and which might tend to bring about a return to the intolerable conditions which existed during the previous prohibition experiment and which would also bring about a loss of substantial revenue which is now being derived from the legal and orderly sale and distribution of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4979. By Mrs. NORTON: Concurrent resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4980. Also, resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the city of Jersey City, N. J., addressing itself to the President of the United States with the earnest appeal that all appropriate action be taken to insure the withdrawal, in its entirety, of the Palestine White Paper of May 1939, with its unjustifiable restrictions on immigration and land settlement, respectfully urging that the gates of Palestine be opened to Jewish immigration and Palestine reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth, to the end that the Jewish people may be enabled to take their rightful place in the progressive order of mankind which it is devoutly hoped may issue from the present struggle; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4981. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, opposing the Bryson prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4982. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. J. T. Steele and others, of Oakland and Jasper Counties, Mo., urging support of legislation similar to Senate bill 860; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4983. By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of Local 259, United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America (Congress of Industrial Organizations), Holyoke, Mass., for the enactment of the soldier-vote bill which will allow the Federal Government to make it easily possible for all men and women in the armed services to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father who doth neither slumber nor sleep, we are the people of Thy pastures and the sheep of Thy hand, and Thy pastures are green and Thy hand is bountiful. As each morning banishes the night and gilds the skies, Thou hast taught us to pray at the altar of the new day, "Give us this day our daily bread"; and out of the richness of the good earth Thy tender mercy provideth for man and beast his food. Thou doth feed our souls with the bread of beauty. We thank Thee for the petaled loveliness of the flowers, the far-off gleam of the stars, the music of the streams, the deep call of the sea, the far stretches of the plains, and the majesty of the mountains. Yet, housed in so royal a palace, alas, so often we go in leanness of soul.

O Thou who art the bread of life and who hast promised that if we truly hunger and thirst after righteousness we shall be filled, we confess we are starved with the husks of this earth, yet never satisfied with the bread that perisheth. With a deep longing we crave for the food of the spirit. Our hearts cry out for the Living God and pant for the crystal springs that are in Thee alone. That we may be strengthened with might for the living of these days, Bread of Heaven, feed us till we want no more; Strong Deliverer, be Thou still our strength and shield. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, February 17, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.;

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior;

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;

H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; and

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege, but I promise not to detain the Senate very long.

Ordinarily I pay no attention to statements which are made outside this body, either in the press or over the radio, like that to which I am about to refer, because usually it is not worth while to notice them. They are made either by irresponsible persons, or are deliberately and maliciously made for the purpose of injuring someone, and it is of very little consequence, ordinarily speaking, what they may have to say or what they do say.

Since the tax bill reached the Senate on November 26, 1943, a writer here in Washington has repeatedly made charges against members of the Finance Committee by name, and against certain members of the Ways and Means Committee by name, but has aimed his principal attack at me. He began with the statement that an attorney of this city had frequently or usually attended my birthday dinners in the office of the Secretary of the Senate. I have before me a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, Colonel Halsey, in which he states that this attorney had never been in his office during any time while I was there; in other words, that he had never attended a gathering of any kind, character, or description in Colonel Halsey's office when I was present. So he began his whole tirade with a deliberate lie.

I do not wish to mince words. I am hoping that some of what he calls "his editors" will read and have the opportunity of publishing what I now say. However, that is a matter for their deliberate judgment.

Last week when we had for consideration before this body an important measure my attention was called to a statement printed in the Washington Post. I did not interrupt the proceedings because the Senate was trying to reach a vote, but after the adjournment of the Senate I obtained a copy of the particular issue of the newspaper and looked for the article. Since it referred to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I thought that I would be justified in bringing it to the attention of the Senate and in commenting upon it.

It is not often that an ordinary, congenital, deliberate, and malicious liar such as Drew Pearson refers to a printed record on which it is possible to pin him down. However, in this instance he did. I am about to read a part of what he said. He spoke of an address which I made in the Senate on the subsidy question. I care nothing about what he said concerning the address, but he followed his observation with this statement:

> However, what his gallery spectators didn't know and what GEORGE's colleagues had apparently forgot is that the Senator made an equally persuasive speech for subsidies on July 15, 1942. On July 15, 1942, the RECORD shows that Senator GEORGE delivered another ringing oration in which he was able to persuade the Senate that Government should pay an estimated $300,000,000 in subsidies to the big oil companies. The oil companies were worried over higher transportation costs.

And so forth.

> So GEORGE argued that a subsidy was necessary to protect O. P. A. maximum prices on oil, and he commended Jesse Jones, chief sponsor of the oil subsidy which, declared Senator GEORGE, "will ultimately lead to the proper solution of the problem."

Quoting for the first time:

> The Senator from Georgia was just as eloquent for subsidies to the big oil companies then as he was eloquent against subsidies to the dairy farmer and other small producers last week. Though exactly opposite in each case, he won his point.

Mr. President, I knew I had never made a speech for a subsidy in this body except what may be called production subsidies, such as soil-benefit payments and payments going to farmers for the doing of certain things required of them, or authorized to be done by them, under legislation which Congress had enacted. Therefore, I went to the RECORD to see what he might be talking about. To my astonishment, I found that on July 15, 1942, the Senate had under consideration an appropriation bill, namely, H. R. 7319, making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes. To that bill my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had offered an amendment which, in effect, forbade the payment of any money appropriated under the act for the purpose of putting it into a pool to take care of the extra costs to the oil companies in those States particularly where there had been no increase in the cost of transporting oil into the State.

During the course of the consideration of the amendment, as the RECORD shows, my colleague had some conferences with representatives of executive agencies of the Government, and stated that he would not insist on his amendment, or would withdraw it, which was entirely proper.

Just before the amendment was withdrawn, or at least after quite a long discussion of the general problem was presented, I made a few remarks in the Senate, referring entirely to the amendment and the subject matter of the amendment which my colleague had offered.

It will be remembered that what my colleague sought to do was simply this: Georgia had been included in district No. 1, and gasoline had been rationed in that district to one-half of the normal consumption based upon a certain period of consumption. Not only that, but there had been an approved increase in the price of gasoline in district No. 1, including the State of Georgia, by 2½ cents a gallon, the added price of 2½ cents a gallon to go into a pool to compensate the oil companies for the shipment of oil into district No. 1—the eastern district—at the time when the oil shortage in the northern part at least of district No. 1, throughout the New England States specifically, had become very acute.

Georgia should not have been included in district No. 1. We had made the fight on this floor against it. Georgia should not have had imposed upon it an additional 2½ cents a gallon for every gallon of gasoline or oil used in Georgia because there had been no increase in the transportation of oil into Georgia, the oil flowing into the State prior to that time, at that time, and now, through two established and well-operated pipe lines—one coming through the State from the south to the north and the other through the State from the west to the east.

That was the issue before the Senate. There was involved no question of paying anybody a subsidy, except that, incidentally, the extraction that was being taken out of the pockets of the people of Georgia was to go into a fund, and against that idea I had protested upon this floor; my colleague had protested; and the distinguished Senators from Florida had protested because their State stood in exactly the same position.

So I looked back to see what I had said on this particular occasion and I wish now to read it and put it into the RECORD, because it is the truth:

> Before the question is acted upon—

That is, the request to withdraw the amendment restricting the expenditure of money—

> I wish to make a statement.
>
> I have been interested in this question from the beginning. In fact, I addressed the Senate at some considerable length before the increase of 2½ cents a gallon in the price of gasoline in the Seaboard States went into effect. I have been aware of the fact that an effort has been made to bring about a solution of the difficulty. The solution that is offered to the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries is not an altogether satisfactory one, but I think it is a step that will lead finally to a proper solution of the question.

He quoted that much, but the cowardly cur omitted the statement which followed. I repeat a portion of what I have read:

> The solution that is offered to the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries is not an altogether satisfactory one, but I think it is a step that will lead finally to a proper solution of the question; that is, it will lead finally to a Nation-wide rationing of gasoline, if it becomes necessary for any legitimate emergency purposes.

That has been my whole contention; it has been my position from the beginning that, if there were any reason on earth to put a quota upon Georgian consumers of gasoline, and if there were any reason on earth for increasing the price of gasoline by 2½ cents a gallon in Georgia, a Nation-wide program of rationing should be put into effect.

I had made a speech on the subject on the floor of the Senate; I had never advocated a subsidy; I did not approve even the R. F. C. program. I expressely stated that it was not an altogether satisfactory method, but that it might lead to the facing squarely of the issue of putting a Nation-wide quota on the use of gasoline, if it were necessary for the saving of rubber or for any other reason, to place a quota on gasoline in the Seaboard States, but particularly in the State of Florida and in the State of Georgia.

He further makes the statement that I had approved the O. P. A. ceiling prices and said that it was necessary to pay this subsidy in order to prevent puncturing the ceiling prices. Let us see what the facts are about that. This is what I had to say on that point:

Of course, the problem might be and might have been handled by merely allowing the distributors of gasoline throughout the country to increase their prices. The real question arises because a maximum price has been fixed which, when we consider the actual cost of producing the product, plus the increased cost of transporting it, will not permit its movement into the Seaboard States. That is the exact situation.

Now:

The Administrator of the O. P. A. is strongly insistent that none of the maximum prices be interfered with, or, as he puts it, be punctured, and I think everyone can agree that in that respect he is right, if he has first fixed the maximum price on a fair, just, equitable, and economic basis. He has fixed the maximum price of gasoline, however, all over the country. The same thing was done as to sugar. He did not allow for transportation costs in fixing the price, because it was fixed with reference to the whole area of the United States. There has been at all times plenty of sugar, and sugar would have moved into the areas where it was needed and desired if the price limitation fixed by the O. P. A. had permitted the fixing of additional costs of transportation.

I had resolutely stood against the O. P. A. prices on gasoline and their method of excluding from those prices the necessary cost of transporting gasoline from the point of production to the point of consumption. I had stood against their policy, an identical one, on sugar, and I had stood positively against any subsidy. All that I said was that perhaps, while it was not an altogether happy or satisfactory solution offered by the R. F. C.—and at that time I did not know the details of the program except as it was reported on this floor—nevertheless it might ultimately lead to a proper solution of the question, which was the rationing of gasoline on a Nation-wide basis.

There was no question of subsidy before the Senate. Incidentally the question arose because of the desire of my colleague to protect the State against the imposition of an additional 2½ cents a gallon on all petroleum products when there was no excuse or justification for such increase. That is all we were seeking to accomplish. Yet this man, whose articles are published by newspapers that have the responsibility of leadership in their States, is stating here that by a tirade I had swept the Senate off its feet and had brought about the payment of $300,000,000 to the oil companies by way of a subsidy.

What sort of a liar is he, Mr. President, when in the very face of the RECORD which he himself invites every word that he said is disproved? I care not what he says on ordinary occasions; I care not what I understand he said last night that the clans were gathering here to override the President's veto on the tax bill, and that GEORGE would be the leader of that movement. I have not spoken to a living soul in the House of Representatives about what the House would do with reference to the tax bill, save to one member of the Ways and Means Committee, who came to my desk today after the Senate had convened. I merely asked him what his program was on the other side with respect to the tax bill. I care nothing about that kind of statement, but I wonder if "my editors" have the guts and the courage and the honor to publish the facts in answer to this man's libel. Some of them will have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I know some of the motive, some of the malice, back of this sudden attack by Drew Pearson on me, an attack that was commenced almost simultaneously with the transmission of the tax bill to this body, even before public hearings had been opened by the Finance Committee of the Senate on the bill. Down deep is a fight against representative government. It is a smear campaign against the legislative branch of this Government.

Now that this man has finally referred to the RECORD as sustaining his libelous charges, I have felt justified in bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate.

Again I ask, What sort of a liar is Mr. "Skunk" Pearson? The Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, has denounced him as an "unmitigated and a congenital" liar; the President of the United States has more recently denounced him as a "chronic liar," but I ask, What sort of a liar is Mr. "Skunk" Pearson?

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 141 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

NOVEMBER 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the activities and expenditures of the Corporation for the month of November 1943, including statement of loan and other authorizations made during the month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case, etc. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, submitting, pursuant to law, the seventh report of that office covering the period ended September 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of South Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House resolution memoralizing and requesting the National Congress to return all possible war equipment after the war

"Whereas our Government is now spending millions in war equipment which is being sent all over the world, but we feel that such is aiding our allies in a wonderful manner; and

"Whereas in the near future when peace plans are formulated, we especially request the National Congress to instruct the delegates to the peace conference to see that all possible war equipment is returned to this country so that the same can be used for the benefit of the farmers and citizens generally: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives*, That we request whenever possible, the delegates to the peace congress stipulate that all war equipment, especially jeeps, trucks, and other property that can be used or sold in this country, be returned and donated or sold at a reasonable price to our citizens, generally, and not left to ruin and decay in other countries as was done in the World War No. 1; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Member in Congress from South Carolina."

A resolution of the Bradbury Heights Citizens' Association, Washington, D. C., favoring legislative action to prevent an alleged unwarranted "invasion of the Bradbury Heights community area through loans insured by the Federal Housing Administration in violation of the public interests of the home owners presently living within the Bradbury Heights community"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted at a regular meeting of New Canaan (Conn.) Post, No. 30, American Legion, favoring the taking of such action as will insure that the children of France, Holland, Belgium, and Norway be fed under the supervision of the International Red Cross; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Elizabeth, N. J., favoring action looking toward the opening of Palestine for the entry and settlement of as many Jewish refugees as may need or shall desire to go there, and also the establishment of such political, economic, and administrative conditions as will insure the development of Palestine into a self-governing Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITE:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maine, praying for the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Taft resolution, being Senate Resolution 247, favoring action by the United States looking to the restoration of Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of Elkton, Md., praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill, being the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 5,225 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama	182
California	15
Connecticut	37
Illinois	352
Minnesota	286
Missouri	18
New Hampshire	12
New Jersey	26
New York	426
North Dakota	66
Ohio	3,174
Oklahoma	19
Oregon	134
Pennsylvania	413
Tennessee	1
Texas	5
Virginia	59
Total	5,225

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation showing 1,181 petitioners, praying for the enactment of the bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Colorado	694
Illinois	26
Louisiana	1
Minnesota	35
New York	291
Ohio	127
Oregon	1
Texas	6
Total	1,181

RESOLUTIONS OF FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE STATE UNION OF NEBRASKA

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, last week on the floor of the Senate, and in some of the hearings on the subsidy matter, it was reported that the national president of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America was favorable to consumers' subsidies. This morning I am in receipt of a letter, enclosing copies of several resolutions, from Chris Milius, the State president of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative State Union of Nebraska. He encloses for me and for the RECORD several resolutions relative to the stand the Farmers Educational and Cooperative State Union of Nebraska has taken with reference to some of the controversial issues confronting the United States Senate. These resolutions were adopted by the legislative committee of the Farmers Educational and Cooperative State Union of Nebraska, and the president has signed his name to the letter, stating "These reports were adopted very harmoniously, and express the opinion of our membership." This legislative committee is made up of one representative from each of the counties throughout the entire State.

I wish to point out to the Members of the Senate particularly, and ask that at this point it be incorporated as a part of my remarks, Resolution No. 1, which has to do with petitioning Congress that it change the time back from war time to standard time, in order that the farmers may be able to produce more of the food products, so necessary for our armed forces and civilian population.

I also particularly refer to the resolution which calls attention to the reduction of governmental expenses as one method of helping to fight the inflationary trends of this time.

I also ask that special attention be directed to the paragraph of the resolution which has to do with petitioning Congress that the farmers of Nebraska be furnished more machinery, in order that they may be enabled to produce more crops, so badly needed by our civilian population and our military forces.

I ask also to have included in the RECORD another resolution from the same group, representing the Farmers Educational and Cooperative State Union of Nebraska, which resolution has to do with their position on farm labor, and also the subsidy question.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter and resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD in full, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE STATE UNION OF NEBRASKA, INC.,
Omaha, Nebr., February 18, 1944.

Senator KENNETH WHERRY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On February 9 and February 10 the Nebraska Farmers Union held their annual convention.

Enclosed you will find a copy of the resolutions presented by the resolution committee, also a copy of the legislative committee's report, which committee is made up of 1 county legislative man from 36 counties in our State. These reports were adopted very harmoniously, and express the opinion of our membership.

I hope that you will find time to go through the issue of our Farmers Union paper following the convention, which will give you an account of our meetings step by step.

Trusting that you will feel free to write me at any time regarding legislation affecting farmers in Nebraska, I remain

Yours very truly,

CHRIS MILIUS,
President.

---

1. Whereas the present war time is of no value to the majority of people and has brought only dissatisfaction among the general public, has proved detrimental to the farmers, has hindered them in their war effort: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Farmers Union of Nebraska, ask the powers that be to discontinue war time and use standard time only.

2. *Resolved*, That we recommend that the bureaus on closely related lines of Government work be consolidated, reduced, and red tape be cut in order to reduce expenses of our Government.

3. Due to the great drought and depression in Nebraska from 1933 to 1940, Nebraska farmers were unable to buy badly needed steel products for farm use. Now that conditions have improved, and farmers find themselves without the necessary equipment for capacity production, therefore we direct the attention of the War Production Board to the great need for a much larger allotment of steel for farm machinery and other equipment for Nebraska and other drought-stricken States that we may do our full share in producing the food necessary to maintain the armed forces and civilian population of the country.

4. Supplementing Resolution No. 11, adopted in the report of the legislative committee in opposition to Federal aid to our public schools, we hereby express our opposition to proposals now brewing for additional State aid to public schools. This State aid would centralize control of our schools in Lincoln as Federal would centralize control in Washington.

RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
HARRY A. NELLOR, *President.*
WM. M. TURNER, *Secretary.*
OSCAR E. OLSON.
H. P. WRIGHTSMAN.
R. G. JENNY.
GEORGE D. MEYER.
ED LIDMILA.

---

1. We, the legislative committee of the Farmers Educational and Co-operative State Union of Nebraska, recommend that this State convention of 1944 repeat the request of 1 year and 2 years ago asking the Congress of the United States to outlaw all strikes as sabotage against the war effort of the United States.

2. We asked for pay-as-you-go taxation a year ago. We now ask that a simple and understandable income tax report form be provided so as the enormous, costly, and useless waste of time now necessary to fill out these complicated tax schedules be saved for productive war effort.

3. We repeat our admonition of past years, that increased living costs and lower standards of living are an inevitable part of war and increased taxes. Increased wages to certain groups only passes their share of this burden on to still other groups. Agriculture being the end-man, who cannot pass the tax and production burden on demands honest thinking and honest sharing of this burden by all groups by stopping the continual wage increases that continue to shift the war burden.

4. In past years we recommended a large draft of Federal employees into the actual war effort, a 48-hour week, and an actual draft of workers into vital industries as a solution to the manpower problem. Inasmuch as strikes have not yet been outlawed as sabotage, many unnecessary Federal bureaus still waste manpower, and the men deferred from military draft to help in vital industries waste time in strikes and jumping from job to job, we would therefore withhold our approval to a new general service act until good faith has been shown in administering war measures already enacted. When a deferred man does not stay on the job, he should be drafted at once.

5. As in past years, we urge that price ceilings in agriculture be fixed high enough to permit adequate production without the use of subsidies from the Federal Treasury.

Subsidies are inflationary, as they leave the consumer with money in his pocket that would otherwise pay the balance of the grocery bill.

Subsidies are wasteful of not only Federal money borrowed for war purposes, but are wasteful of time of thousands of persons used to administer them.

Subsidies have discouraged production by the uncertainty and the lower prices to farmers that have accompanied the subsidy system.

Subsidies are only another wage increase to other groups at the expense of agriculture. Can we back the attack with subsidies?

6. In the matter of a Federal ballot for soldiers, we hold that any and all election laws should remain in the jurisdiction of State governments.

We believe that the men who drew our Federal and State constitutions had good reason to keep the Army and Navy out of politics both for the protection of the armed services and the men in them, and the country at large.

If a ballot is given to the soldiers, we insist that it be the same as used in his home precinct.

7. *Be it Resolved,* That the laws of Nebraska be amended to place gravel on farm-to-market roads, other than county roads, from the money obtained from gas tax.

8. Inasmuch as family labor and the increase in price of farm labor has not been included in parity prices, we recommend fair prices for agriculture based on parity and cost of production, including a fair wage for all farm labor.

9 We know that after the last war a lot of war equipment that was suitable for civilian use was destroyed or rendered useless. There will be demand for new equipment, and we know also that a lot of farmers and construction companies, etc., would be glad to pay a good price for the left-over equipment.

Therefore, we demand that the Congress of the United States take the necessary steps to make this usable equipment available for sale to private enterprise at a reasonable price.

10. We favor the change of the Nebraska Constitution making the legislature a 100-member house instead of the present 43.

11. We are opposed to any plan whatsoever of Federal aid to our public schools, since it will inevitably lead to centralization of control and dictation of our educational program from Washington, D. C.

HARRY PARMENTER,
Secretary.

RIGHT OF PETITION OF GOVERNMENTAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] and myself I ask unanimous consent to present a letter from Elvin Bryant, secretary, western Iowa branch, sixth division, Railway Mail Association, Council Bluffs, Iowa, embodying a resolution adopted by that association, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WESTERN IOWA BRANCH,
RAILWAY MAIL ASSOCIATION,
Council Bluffs, Iowa, February 15, 1944.

Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following is self-explanatory:

"Whereas Federal law (5 U. S. C. 652) provides that the right of civil-service employees to petition Congress either individually or collectively shall not be interfered with; and

"Whereas the Comptroller General of these United States has violated this law in his gag order forbidding employees under his jurisdiction from making any contact with Congressmen without special permission: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the western Iowa branch of the Railway Mail Asscciation in regular meeting this 15th day of February vigorously opposes and condemns the policy set forth by the Comptroller General; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That we urge Congress to immediately investigate this order with a view toward setting aside that part of the order that is in violation of Federal law (5 U. S. C. 652), and that the right to petition Congress, either individually or collectively, be immediately restored to the civil-service employees under the jurisdiction of the Comptroller General; and be it further

"*Resolved* That a copy of this resolution be submitted to Senator GILLETTE, Senator WILSON, Congressman JENSEN, all of Iowa; and a copy be submitted to the president of the Railway Mail Association; and a copy spread upon the minutes of this meeting; and a copy sent to the editor of the Railway Post Office for publication."

Sincerely,

ELVIN BRYANT,
Secretary.

LIBERTY OF LITHUANIA—RESOLUTION BY AMERICAN LITHUANIANS OF PITTSBURGH, PA.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, on February 13, 1944, in the Lithuanian Citizens' Hall in Pittsburgh, Pa., I addressed an enthusiastic and sincere meeting of the American Lithuanians in that district, which meeting was sponsored by the Lithuanian Roman Catholic Priests' Association and the Allied Lithuanian Organization of Allegheny County.

After a stirring and sincere pledge of unity in the war effort of this Nation and our allies, the assembled members then approved the following resolution, which I ask consent to have referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and printed in the RECORD.

These American Lithuanians have utmost confidence, Mr. President, that the factors presented in their resolution will be given full and fair consideration by this Government at the proper time.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the American-Lithuanians are proud of their sons and brothers, husbands and sisters, who are devotedly doing their part whether on the battlefield in action against the enemy, on the high seas, or at the assembly lines on the home front; and

Whereas hundreds of thousands of citizens of Lithuanian descent look up to you, Mr. President, as the greatest champion of freedom in our time for the benefit of the common man and small nations; and

Whereas the American-Lithuanians have not forgotten their old country in Europe and had watched with a natural feeling of simple human pride the steady progress there in every field of human endeavor until the smothering of independent life in Lithuania by cruel aggressors; and

Whereas the American-Lithuanians are deeply grateful to you, Mr. President, for the American Government's unflinching determination not to recognize acts of aggression in Lithuania as expressed by responsible officials of the American Government; and

Whereas we are further convinced that the crushing of the enemies of the United Nations will bring to Lithuania, to use the words of the Atlantic Charter, "the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government" in the same measure as it will to the other enslaved small nations of Europe, and as proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we American-Lithuanians appeal to you, Mr. President, and to the American people to use your good offices to liberate the Republic of Lithuania, and we are confident that our Government will never deviate from its traditional principles of ever championing the cause of justice and the rights of the unjustly oppressed.

RELOCATION OF JAPANESE EVACUEES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a resolution adopted by the American Legion, Department of Maryland, Inc., at Baltimore, Md., protesting against the diffusion of Japanese prisoners of war in critical defense areas such as the State of Maryland, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADMINISTRATION OF GOVERNMENT UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD resolutions adopted recently by Berryton (Kans.) Grange, No. 1430. The tenor of the resolutions is that the farmer members of Berryton Grange are opposed to government by directive and bureaucratic decrees, which they look upon as leading away from government by law to a government by a ruler; that they want Government agencies to operate under the Constitution; and that employees of such agencies also be required to operate under the Constitution and laws of the land. I send the resolutions, embodied in a letter from Grace M. Underwood, secretary, to the desk.

There being no objection, the letter embodying resolutions was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERRYTON, KANS., *February 12, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: At its regular meeting February 9, 1944, Berryton Grange, No. 1430, unanimously adopted the following resolutions:

"Whereas the present administration is attempting to govern by directives and bureaucratic decrees; and

"Whereas such practices would inevitably lead to a government by individuals and not by laws enacted by the people; and

"Whereas such government would be dictatorial and not democratic: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That Berryton Grange favor such legislation as will require all Government agencies, their appointees and employees, to operate under the provisions and restrictions of the National Constitution; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to National Master Albert S. Goss, to State Master C. C. Cogswell, and to the Kansas Senators and Representatives in Washington."

We will appreciate any consideration you may give these resolutions.

Very sincerely,

GRACE M. UNDERWOOD,
Secretary, Berryton Grange, No. 1430.

FOUR-LANE HIGHWAYS — RESOLUTIONS OF CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE OF SALINA AND PRATT, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD at this point identical resolutions adopted by the Chambers of Com-

merce of Salina, Kans., and Pratt, Kans.; endorsing a large post-war highway construction program, but disapproving the four-lane highways between large cities as proposed in the latest message from the President on the subject.

Such four-lane highways are fine, but as these resolutions point out, they would serve only a small proportion of the people of the country. Under such a program, so limited, Kansas, which has the second largest highway mileage of any State, would get only one-seventieth of the funds, and only one highway—east-west—and no north-south highway. It is my judgment that the program will have to be more inclusive if it is to merit and obtain approval. I send the resolutions to the desk.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we accept in principle the importance and economic soundness of a post-war road-construction program, believing it would be one of several impossible solutions of the unemployment problem, providing the program enough to distribute the benefit: equitably, and to include most of the important Federal, State, and interstate highways.

However, we do not believe the super four-lane highway post-war road program, submitted by President Roosevelt to Congress recently, representing only 1 percent of the road mileage of the country, proposing to spend $750,000,000 annually on four-lane highways which would cost more than $150,000 a mile, is the type of post-war program the taxpayers are thinking about or would approve.

The proposed plan would connect large metropolitan cities with four-lane highways and ignore many important State, Federal, and interstate highways, would represent only 1 percent of the total road mileage of the country, and its ultimate cost would be from $7,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. If such a program were adopted, it is reasonable to suppose that other important State, Federal, and interstate highways would have no Federal aid for many years. Therefore, it is the opinion of the road committee of the Salina Chamber of Commerce that any post-war road construction program should be broad enough to distribute its benefits widely and recognize the fact that taxpayers who would be called upon to help pay for the program do not all live on four-lane highways, and we respectfully ask for a wider distribution of public road funds than is proposed by the bill now before Congress.

Under the proposed plan, Kansas, with the second largest road mileage of any State, would receive but one-seventieth of the allocation of road funds, and only one east-west highway is included, and no north-south highway: Be it

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be mailed to the State highway commission, all members of the Kansas congressional delegation, and to chambers of commerce.

Adopted at special meeting February 11, 1944, Salina, Kans.

Respectfully submitted.

SALINA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
ROADS AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE.
C. H. GAYTHROP, *Chairman.*

Attest:

CHARLES H. BREN, *Secretary.*

The information contained in this resolution expresses the sentiment of the roads and transportation committee of the Pratt Chamber of Commerce.

We urge the careful consideration of the information contained therein.

PRATT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
ROADS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE.
F. W. WOOLWINE, *Chairman.*
A. L. ROYALTY,
Secretary-Manager.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 1488. A bill to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 709).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner; without amendment (Rept. No. 710).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2189. A bill for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard; without amendment (Rept. No. 711).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1412. A bill for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 712); and

H. R. 1847. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 713).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 714); and

H. R. 3547. A bill for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson; without amendment (Rept. No. 715).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1518. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld; without amendment (Rept. No. 717); and

H. R. 2999. A bill for the relief of Leo Gullo; without amendment (Rept. No. 716).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

S. Res. 225. Resolution for a study of problems relating to the readjustment in civil life of veterans of World War No. 2; with amendments, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PRINTING OF BARUCH AND HANCOCK REPORT ON WAR AND POST-WAR ADJUSTMENT POLICY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, reported an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35), which was read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of Bernard M. Baruch and John M. Hancock submitted to the Director, Office of War Mobilization, relative to war and post-war adjustment policy, be printed as a Senate document, and that 7,000 additional copies be printed, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the House document room and 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the concurrent resolution would authorize the printing of what is known as the Baruch report.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. In what numbers?

Mr. HAYDEN. Five thousand for the House and 2,000 for the Senate. The report is not an expensive one to print.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills reported that on February 17, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 199. An act for the relief of Robert Norheim;

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw;

S. 949. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage town site; and

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1725. A bill authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Administration to loan certain surplus aircraft to private glider clubs and similar organizations; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS:

S. 1726. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1727 (by request): A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to acquire and dispose of certain surplus property; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1728. A bill granting a pension to Emma S. Boutwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1729. A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient management of personal property owned or controlled by the United States, to govern the use and disposal of surplus war

property, real, personal, and mixed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. BANKHEAD introduced Senate Joint Resolution 116, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION — INTRODUCTION OF JOINT RESOLUTION, AND PROPOSED AMENDMENT THERETO

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself, I ask consent to offer an amendment to the joint resolution which has just been introduced by the Senator from Alabama and request that it be printed and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

C. A. RAGLAND, SR.

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 256), which was referred to the Committee on Claims:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 961) entitled "A bill for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr." now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such section and report to the Senate, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant; and the said court shall so proceed with the same and report to the Senate, irrespective of any statute-of-limitations bar, and irrespective of any administrative requirements or contractual provision relating to notice of protest as to filing claim therefor.

DECLINE IN THE CONSUMPTION OF COTTON AND PRODUCTION OF COTTON GOODS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution which has to do with the severe decline in the consumption of cotton and also the severe decline in the production of cotton goods. After the morning hour, Mr. President, I should like to discuss the resolution at some length.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 257) was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of six Senators, to be composed of two Senators who are members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, two Senators who are members of the Committee on Commerce, and two Senators who are members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the members from each such committee to be appointed by the chairman of such committee, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the reasons for the decline in the consumption of cotton. Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an order for which I ask immediate consideration. I may say to the Members of the Senate that the order proposes the filling of various vacancies by minority members. I have discussed the matter with the majority leader and I think he has no objection to it, and I believe there will be no objection to it from any other source.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The order was read by the legislative clerk, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] be assigned to service on the Committee on Rules;

That the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] be relieved from further service on the Committee on the Judiciary and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Foreign Relations;

That the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] be assigned to service on the Committee on Manufactures and the Committee on Rules;

That the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] be assigned to service on the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs;

That the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] be relieved from further service on the Committee on Rules and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Military Affairs;

That the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] be relieved from further service on the Committee on Pensions and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Naval Affairs;

That the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] be relieved from further service on the Committee on Naval Affairs and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Finance;

That the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] be assigned to service on the Committee on Pensions;

That the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] be relieved from further service on the Committee on Banking and Currency and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations;

That the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] be relieved from further service on the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on the Judiciary;

That the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] be relieved from further service on the Committee on Education and Labor and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

That the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] be assigned to service on the following committees: District of Columbia, Education and Labor, Interoceanic Canals, Post Offices and Post Roads, and Public Buildings and Grounds.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO IN BEHALF OF CANDIDACY OF CARL WUERTELE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him today in behalf of Maj. Carl Wuertele, Democratic candidate for Congress in the First Colorado Congressional District, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON AND OUR PRESENT DAY PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Washington and Our Present-Day Problems," broadcast by him over Wisconsin radio stations, February 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GUFFEY TO POLISH-AMERICAN CITIZENS' LEAGUE

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator GUFFEY at the twenty-third annual banquet of the Polish-American Citizens' League of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia on February 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

KEEP AMERICA FREE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Keep America Free," delivered by him on February 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF ALASKA AND WRANGELL ISLAND

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Little on Account," written by Frank C. Waldrop and published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 18, 1944, and Senate Resolution 123, requesting a report from the Secretary of State with regard to sovereignty over Wrangell Island, which appear in the Appendix.]

PRESTIGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM PHILIP SIMMS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Slipping Prestige," by William Philip Simms, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR VAN NUYS BY H. C. CARLISLE

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the late Senator Van Nuys by H. C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUGAR RESEARCH FOUNDATION PROGRAM

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Sugar: The Unknown," relating to the program of the Sugar Research Foundation, written by Sydney B. Self and printed in the Wall Street Journal of February 1, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOV. JOHN W. BRICKER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Real Bricker," from the Detroit Free Press of February 12, 1944, and a portion of a broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on February 11, 1944, referring to Gov. John W. Bricker, of Ohio, which appear in the Appendix.]

FRANK T. HINES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HILL, and Mr. AUSTIN conferees on the part of the Senate.

STANDARD OF IDENTITY OF DRY MILK SOLIDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 149) to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Taft
Buck	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	McClellan	Tydings
Capper	McFarland	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wallgren
Chavez	Maybank	Weeks
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	White
Connally	Moore	Wiley
Davis	Murdock	Willis
Eastland	Murray	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I announce that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. OMAHONEY] are detained by illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH], are absent on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent on business of the Government.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the bill (H. R. 149) to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids is precisely what the title implies. It is not designed to fill the same place in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for nonfat milk solids as is at present in the law supplied by the definition of butterfat solids as already set out in the law.

Under the definition proposed for the purposes of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, nonfat dry milk solids, or defatted milk solids, would consist of the dried product of sweet milk of cows from which the cream has in whole, or in part, been removed. Such product shall not contain more than 5 percent of moisture nor over 1½ percent of fat unless otherwise indicated.

Under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act as now administered, by Government compulsion, dry milk solids containing less than the whole of the butterfat of milk is required to be sold under the designation of "skim."

The word "skim" is a term which stigmatizes the product to which it is applied because it carries the impression of inferiority or worthlessness.

Every article of merchandise is sold on its reputation, its good or bad name. The compulsory application of this bad name to a good product is inaccurate, unfair, and retards the use of this very valuable food product by millions of consumers of the country. The purpose of this bill is to remove that stigma from a valuable and wholesome food.

Mr. President, the term "skim milk," although a term in common acceptation, does not accurately describe the product. It connotes inferiority, lack of wholesomeness. We all know that the term "skim milk" goes back to a period of 40 years and more ago when milk was actually separated with a skimmer because it was only way in which it could be separated. In those days skim milk was generally considered worthless, and in general practice was fed to the hogs. Since that time new and adequate machinery has been devised and come into general use for the separation of the butterfats of milk from the nonfat solids of milk, and it has been discovered and proved beyond the peradventure of a doubt by the highest scientific sources that nonfat milk is one of the most wholesome of foods, and supplies vitamins which indeed can be obtained from no other article.

In spite of that fact, the proportion of nonfat milk solids which are actually in use for human consumption has been very small in comparison with the amount of nonfat milk which is used for other purposes, such as feed for animals. This situation has to a very considerable extent been improved by the use of milk powders, and condensed milk, which has been sent abroad in enormous quantities to our armed forces and to the people whom we are feeding on the other side of the globe, but the use of the term "skim milk" is and still remains a very considerable barrier to the most efficient use of this great reservoir of splendid, nutritious food for human consumption.

Mr. President, I do not think I could better state the case for the bill than is contained in a letter written to the House committee by Prof. E. V. McCollum, professor of biochemistry at the Johns Hopkins University, who is one of the most eminent authorities on nutrition in the world, and one of the discoverers of the theory of vitamins. Dr. McCollum, writing to Chairman LEA of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, said:

> It is my hope that your committee will approve and Congress will pass H. R. 149 in order to do justice to an excellent food product.
>
> The term, "dry skim milk," which is now the legal name for dry milk solids, is unfair and untrue; it means inferiority and I'll tell how that came about.
>
> But first, let me say that this product, which we want legally to call dry milk solids is now recognized by all nutritionists as the most valuable part of milk. It is also our greatest undeveloped food resource. If its development had been encouraged instead of being held back by a bad name, and we now had twice or three times as much milk powder for overseas shipment, our present emergency food problem would be greatly simplified.
>
> It is another case of short-sightedness—too little, too late.
>
> The historical reason why "skim" is a bad name is this: People were taught years ago that only the cream or fat of milk was valuable. Besides, the skimming method was primitive; milk stood for hours without refrigeration to let the cream rise, it deteriorated, and often the skim milk was only fit for hog feed. Skim milk came to mean hog feed and still does in the minds of most people.
>
> Dry milk solids or defatted milk solids today are made from sweet separated milk. This milk is cooled immediately after milking and taken to modern manufacturing plants by quick transport. There it is put through a mechanical cream separator, shot under the pressure to the drier and becomes powder within a few seconds. There has been no deterioration as in the old-fashioned skimming process. In a food so delicate as milk, this is of first importance.
>
> In my research work in nutrition—

As I said, Mr. President, Dr. McCollum is one of the pioneers and great figures in the development of vitamins—

> I have had much contact with food processors, particularly the baking industry. These

bakers, before the Government took over, used 70 percent of the dry milk solids. In 1923 I spoke before a national convention of bakers and urged them to use dry milk solids in their bread. Since that time the use of the product in bakery goods greatly increased, because dry milk solids improves the loaf, enriches the bread. Yet bakers have learned not to tell their customers that they use what is legally called skim milk—they can't advertise that they enrich their bread.

Today the United States Government in its food distribution administration bakery order requires "all white bread shall be enriched, shall contain not less than 3 parts nor more than 4 parts of solids of milk or skim milk to 100 parts of flour * * *."

How ridiculous to say "enriched" with "skim" milk; it is like saying black is white to the average consumer.

But when the order says, "enriched with solids of milk," that is different. The consumer knows that "solids of milk" is good food.

How can the Government justify requiring this industry to live under the handicap of the word "skim" and at the same time, in its own bakery order, use the terms "solids of milk" and "skim milk" as meaning the same thing?

Some people contend that "dry milk solids" is not the whole truth, since most of the fat is taken out. However, the industry for years has used the term "powdered whole milk" to designate "whole milk powder" I'm sure that "dry milk solids" is much closer to the truth than is the term "dry skim milk." If desired, "dry milk solids" might be modified by adding the words "not over 1½ percent fat." Or the words, "defatted milk solids" could be used. Nobody can claim that this is overstatement, for some fat does remain in the product. To those word purists who contend that "defatted" is not true because some fat does remain, let me say: Nobody questions the words "dehydrated" or "dry," yet in all products put through a dehydrating or drying process some water does remain.

I hope that I have made myself clear that I believe this fine, nutritious product, one of our greatest food resources, deserves a good name such as "dry milk solids" or "defatted milk solids." I sincerely request your honorable committee, in the interest of building up our supply of human food, to approve this bill and recommend its passage by Congress.

Mr. President, I have before me statements by a number of other authorities. I may say that the House committee held hearings for 5 days on the bill, and that practically the only opposition, aside from that which came from one or two very minor organizations or groups, came from Mr. Campbell, of the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am glad to yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me inquire whether any consumers' groups appeared in opposition to the bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that some small consumers' groups did.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a list of organizations endorsing the bill, as appears on pages 144, 145, and 146 of the House hearings. The list includes the names of general agricultural associations, organizations, and societies; dairy organizations and associations; educators and public officials; various farmers', dairy, public health, and consumers' publications; consumers' associations and consumers.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENDORSEMENTS OF H. R. 7002, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, AND H. R. 149, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

GENERAL AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATIONS AND DAIRY ASSOCIATIONS

Alabama Dairy Products Association, Birmingham, Ala.
American Dairy Association of Indiana, Indianapolis, Ind.
California Dairy Council, San Francisco.
Georgia Dairy Association.
Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
Indiana Manufacturers of Dairy Products.
Indiana Milk and Cream Improvement Association, Indianapolis, Ind.
Indiana Milk Control Board, Indianapolis, Ind.
Kentucky Farm Bureau Federation, St. Matthews, Ky.
Minnesota Creamery Operators' and Manufacturers' Association, Minneapolis, Minn.
Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation, St. Paul, Minn.
National Association of Local Creameries, St. Paul Minn.
North Carolina Dairy Products Association.
President, National Dairy Council, Chicago, Ill.

EDUCATORS AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS

Abbott, Ouida Davis, head, department of home economics research, University of Florida.
Combs, W. B., professor of dairy husbandry, University of Minnesota.
Ellington, E. V., vice dean, College of Agriculture, State College of Washington.
Fairbanks, B. W., division of animal husbandry, University of Illinois.
Henderson, H. B., head, dairy department, University of Georgia.
Iverson, C. A., head, department of dairy industry, Iowa State College.
Leverton, Ruth M., department of home economics, University of Nebraska.
Nelson, P. Mabel, department of foods and nutrition, Iowa State College.
Pfeifer, E., Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.
Roadhouse, C. L., professor of dairy industry, University of California, Davis.
Roberts, Lydia J., chairman, department of home economics, University of Chicago.
Renner, Kenneth M., head, department of dairy manufacturers, Texas Technological College.
Scott, W. Kerr, commissioner of agriculture, North Carolina Department of Agriculture.
Schricker, Henry F., Governor, State of Indiana.
Shepardson, Charles N., head, department of dairy husbandry, Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College.
Steggerda, F. R., department of physiology, University of Illinois.
Swanton, Milo, Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.
Townsend, M. C., Food Distribution Administration, Washington, D. C.
Trovatten, R. A., commissioner, department of agriculture, dairy, and food, St. Paul, Minn.

PUBLICATIONS

The Arcata Union, Arcata, Calif.
The American Journal of Public Health.
Capper Publications, Inc., Topeka, Kans.
Capper-Harmon-Slocum, Cleveland, Ohio.
The Dairy Record, St. Paul, Minn.
The Examiner, Los Angeles, Calif.
The Farmer, St. Paul, Minn.
The Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife, Philadelphia, Pa.
The Ferndale Enterprise, Ferndale, Calif.
The Fresno Bee, Fresno, Calif.
The Humboldt Times, Eureka, Calif.
The Michigan Farmer, Detroit, Mich.
Milk Plant Monthly, Chicago, Ill.
The Modesto Bee, Modesto, Calif.
Northwest Farm News.
The Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif.
The Pacific Dairy Review, San Francisco, Calif.
The Pacific Rural Press.
The Pennsylvania Farmer, Harrisburg, Pa.
The Phoenix Gazette, Phoenix, Ariz.
The Press Democrat, Santa Rosa, Calif.
The Sacramento Bee, Sacramento, Calif.
San Francisco Examiner, San Francisco, Calif.
Southern Dairy Products Journal.
The Times, Eureka, Calif.

CONSUMER ASSOCIATIONS AND CONSUMERS

American Bakers Association, Chicago, Ill.
American Bakeries Co., Atlanta, Ga.
American Bread Co.
American Institute of Baking, New York, N. Y.
American Medical Association.
Atlanta Association of Better Restaurants, Atlanta, Ga.
Braun Baking Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Capital Bakers, Inc., Harrisburg, Pa.
Cobb's Sunlit Bakery, Green Bay, Wis.
Columbia Baking Co., Atlanta, Ga.
Cos Cob Parent-Teacher Association, Cos Cob, Conn.
Frances F. Freeman (Mrs. W. R.), Indianapolis, Ind.
Mrs. M. R. Friend, 5000 East End Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
Georgia Bakers Council.
Georgia Hotel Association.
Grocers Baking Co., Lexington, Ky.
Meta Given, home economics specialists, Chicago, Ill.
Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, American home department.
International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Washington, D. C.
Interstate Bakeries Corporation.
Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, Park Ridge School for Girls, Polo, Ill.
Virgil W. Jorgensen, Laurel Brook Farm, Sonoma, Calif.
Junge Baking Co., Joplin, Mo.
Langendorf United Bakeries, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
The W. E. Long Co., Chicago, Ill.
Markwardt's Quality Bakery, Joplin, Mo.
Nashville Chamber of Commerce, Nashville, Tenn.
National Cotton Council of America, Fort Worth, Tex.
New England Bakers Association, Boston, Mass.
New Harmony project, Indiana Commission.
Newman Chamber of Commerce, Newman, Calif.
Pennsylvania Bakers Association, Philadelphia, Pa.
P. S. Peterson Baking Co., Omaha, Nebr.
C. R. Phillips, president, La Salle National Bank, Chicago, Ill., dairyman.
Quality Bakers of America, New York, N. Y.
Railway Business Association, Chicago, Ill.
Southern Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, Nashville, Tenn.
Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville, Tenn.
Southern Wholesale Confectioners Association, Inc.
Sweetheart Bakeries, Mexico, Mo.

MANUFACTURERS

Abbotts Dairies, Inc., Cameron, Wis.
Armour Creameries, Louisville, Ky.
Barron Cooperative Creamery, Barron, Wis.
Beatrice Creamery Co., Snow & Palmer Division, Bloomington, Ill.
Bowman Dairy Co., Chicago, Ill.
Brooklawn Creamery Co., Salt Lake City, Utah.

Chestnut Farms-Chevy Chase Dairy, Washington, D. C.
Consolidated Dairy Products Co., Seattle, Wash.
Chautauqua Malted Milk Co., Mayville, N. Y.
Dairymen's Cooperative Creamery of Boise Valley, Caldwell, Idaho.
Des Moines Cooperative Dairy, Des Moines, Iowa.
Dried Milk Products Cooperative Eau Claire, Wis.
Dry Milk Producers' Sales Agency, Chicago, Ill.
Oscar Ewing, Inc., Louisville, Ky.
Ewing-Von Allmen Dairy Co., Louisville, Ky.
Grand Ledge Milk Co., Grand Ledge, Mich.
Golden Valley Creamery, Newman, Calif.
Hershey Creamery Co., Harrisburg, Pa.
Ladysmith Milk Producers' Cooperative Association, Ladysmith, Wis.
Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.
Lansing Dairy Co., Lansing, Mich.
Milk Producers Association of Central California, Modesto, Calif.
Murray Milk Products Co., Murray, Ky.
Pabst Farms, Oconomowoc, Wis.
Page Milk Co., Shelbyville, Ind.
Pearl Creamery Co., Pullman, Mich.
Frank Pilley & Sons, Inc., Sioux City, Iowa.
Richland Cooperative Creamery Co., Inc., Richland Center, Wis.
Rochester Dairy Cooperative, Rochester, Minn.
Skagit County Dairymen's Association, Burlington, Wash.
Sunnyland Dairy Products Co., Ruston, La.
Sunshine Farms, Inc., Lafayette, Ind.
Supplee-Wills-Jones Milk Co., Philadelphia, Pa.
Twin City Milk Producers Association, St. Paul, Minn.
Twin Ports Cooperative Dairy Association, Inc., Superior, Wis.
Tennessee Dairies, Inc., Dallas, Tex.
Upper Snake River Valley Dairymen's Association, Idaho Falls, Idaho.
Verifine Dairy Products Co., Sheboygan, Wis.
Weber Central Dairy Association, Inc., Ogden, Utah.
Whatcom County Dairymen's Association, Bellingham, Wash.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as I have said, I have before me the statements of a number of other authorities. The testimony on the bill has been very full and complete. I do not desire to detain the Senate at this time by reading all the authorities, although I may recur to them later, after the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] shall have spoken. I simply desire to call attention to the fact, before I take my seat, that Mr. McNutt, the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, of which the Food and Drug Administration is a part, appeared before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and said he saw no objection whatever to the definition of defatted milk solids in such a way as this, but he thought it should be done by law, in the same way that the definition of butter has already been provided by law. That did not seem to meet with the approval of Mr. McNutt's subordinate, Mr. Campbell, who since that time has been conducting a systematic lobby in opposition to the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand that the following States have written regulations authorizing the use of the term "dry milk solids": Minnesota, Michigan, Illinois, Utah, Washington, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. I understand, furthermore, that no State has opposed the use of the term.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator, and I think the Senator's statement is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, that is all I care to say about this matter at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, when this bill was before the Senate Committee on Commerce, I conducted a one-man opposition to it. The probability is that I shall conduct a one-man opposition to it on the floor of the Senate. But if only one vote is cast against the bill, it will be mine. I am opposed to the enactment of the bill, Mr. President, because it runs counter to a sound policy of our Government, a policy which was inaugurated in 1906, and which has not been deviated from to the present day. In the Pure Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act it has been provided that all foods shall be designated by their usual and ordinary names, and that this requirement that foods shall be called by their ordinary names is not in the interest of the manufacturer, but is in the interest of the consumer. It is so declared in the act.

I am further opposed to the bill because when we enacted the Pure Food and Drug Act we set down certain principles and rules by which and under which the act was to be administered, and the administration of the act was conferred upon the Pure Food and Drug Administration. We left the administration of the law to the Pure Food and Drug Administration. In order to prevent any arbitrary action by the Food Administrator we provided for an appeal to the courts from any decision made by the Food Administrator.

There is a history back of this particular bill. Some of the manufacturers of dry skim milk or powdered skim milk or skim-milk powder, as it is commonly designated, appeared before the Pure Food Administration and requested that the name be changed from the designation by which it is commonly known, and that it be given the name of dry milk solids. A hearing was had before the Pure Food and Drug Administration. After testimony pro and con had been received, the Pure Food Administrator came to the conclusion that the ordinary, usual, and common name by which this product is known is dry skim milk or powdered skim milk or skim-milk powder, and so he held. That was several years ago.

The proponents of the bill—these manufacturers—took an appeal, under the law, to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, sitting in Washington.

The Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals rendered a decision sustaining the views of the Pure Food Administrator. This is what the court held:

> The Administrator was not required to hold it impracticable, for regulation purposes, to use what the evidence sufficiently showed to be the common or usual name of a product among ultimate consumers, merely because such a designation might not be as conducive to sales by producers as some term of commercial coinage and glossing. The Administrator's obligation under the statute was simply the promotion of honesty and fair dealing in the interest of consumers. While he would have no right to adopt a designation for the purpose of destroying trade in a legitimate food product, there could ordinarily be no arbitrariness involved in using the common or usual name of such a product for regulation purposes.

That is the decision rendered in Twin Milk Producers Co. against McNutt, reported in One Hundred and Twenty-two Federal Reporter—second—page 568.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not wish to interrupt the thread of the Senator's argument. I should like to know if the Senator thinks there is anything in that decision which goes to the merits of the bill. If we admit, for the purpose of the argument, that the Pure Food and Drug Administration had authority to make the decision it made in that case, does that have anything to do with the power of Congress to change a definition and promulgate a new definition which is exactly in line with the definition of butter? I do not understand that the court was passing on that question.

Mr. OVERTON. The purpose of referring to the decision was simply this: When we enacted the Pure Food and Drug Act we provided that the designation to be given to food should be a matter of administration. We provided that the Administrator should be governed by the cardinal rule, which we declared to be in the interest of consumers, that foods should be designated by their common and usual names, in order that those who buy may know what they are buying, and those who use the product may know what they are using.

To prevent any arbitrary decision by the Administrator we said that any manufacturer or anyone else who is opposed to the decision of the Administrator shall have the right of appeal to the courts; and there we left it. It is not a legislative matter. It is an administrative matter. According to the solemn pronouncements of Congress. I do not question that Congress may alter the policy at any time, as is sought to be done by this bill. Instead of calling the product by its usual name, with which every one is familiar—skim milk—it is sought to give it some "hifalutin" name with which very few purchasers and very few users are familiar. They would not know what they were getting if it were called by that name.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator know that Government agencies are now referring to this product as "nonfat milk solids"?

Mr. OVERTON. No; I do not.

Mr. AIKEN. They certainly are. I have sent to my office for some of the releases which have been issued within the past 3 weeks, referring to the product as "nonfat milk solids."

Mr. OVERTON. The products must be sold under the label of "powdered skim milk", or "dry skim milk," or "skim milk powder." They may not be designated by any other name when sold. As a matter of description, they may be

called nonfattening, and some agencies of the Government may use that term.

Mr. AIKEN. Some agencies of the Government are doing so.

Mr. OVERTON. But if the Senator is undertaking to say that the legal name for skim milk is what it is called in the bill—defatted milk—the Senator is in error.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator spoke of calling products by the names by which they are commonly known. It seems to me that the name which is commonly used by agencies of the Government could well be considered, and should be considered, as the common name of the product. Certainly Government agencies refer to this product as "nonfat milk solids."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I venture the assertion, without fear of successful contradiction, that if one were to go from household to household throughout the United States and ask housewives, "What is a defatted milk solid?" or "What is a nonfat milk solid?" 99 out of 100 housewives would say they did not know. That is not the common and usual name by which skim milk is known. Skim milk is skim milk.

The other day, in order to test this theory, I resorted to two tests. I talked with a number of Senators who had not heard about the bill. I asked them, "What is a defatted milk solid?" Invariably the answer was that they did not know. They asked me. I said, "It is a nonfat milk solid." They then asked me, "What is a nonfat milk solid?" When I told them it was skim milk they understood what skim milk is.

I get my milk from Thompson's Dairy. Thompson's Dairy is advertised to be the oldest dairy in the city of Washington. Every morning at a quarter to eight I listen to the broadcast from that old reliable dairy. Mr. Claude Mahoney delivers a very interesting broadcast. I have been patronizing Thompson's Dairy for a number of years. I telephoned to the dairy and said, "Have you any defatted milk?" The answer was, "What are you talking about?" I said, "I am talking about nonfat milk. Have you any nonfat milk?" The answer was, "No." Then, after a moment's reflection, the person at the other end of the wire said, "Are you by any chance referring to skim milk?" I said, "That is exactly what I want. Do you sell it under the name of defatted milk?" The reply was, "No; we do not. We sell it under the name of skim milk." I asked, "Do you sell it under the name of nonfat milk?" The reply was, "No; we do not."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Using the Senator's own illustration, in the present state of the law, if they should undertake to sell it as "nonfat milk," Mr. Campbell would try to put them in jail.

Mr. OVERTON. Certainly. They did not know what "defatted milk" or "nonfat milk" was. I venture to say that 90 percent of the wives of Senators do not know what "nonfat milk" is.

Why single out for special consideration the particular group of manufacturers who manufacture dried skim milk or skim milk powder? If we are going to change the phraseology, if skim milk is such an opprobrious term that people will not utilize any product derived from it, why stop at skim milk powder? Why not go back to the very source of the product itself? Why not legislate that skim milk shall hereafter be known as "defatted milk" or "nonfat milk"? Yet when we order skim milk from our dairymen today we order skim milk. We do not order "defatted milk." When they send it to us they send it in a bottle labeled "skim milk." If there were any force in the argument that "skim milk" ought to be changed to this peculiar phraseology, the purpose of which is to hide the fact that it is skim milk, why not apply it to fluid skim milk, and say that fluid skim milk shall be known as "defatted milk" or "nonfat milk"? I will reach that subject a little later. I intend to offer an amendment which will cover not only this product, which is comparatively so little used, but various other skim-milk products. I shall have an amendment to propose along that line, and I hope it will be accepted if we are to pass this bill. I shall also have some other amendments to offer.

Mr. President, I was about to make the observation that the bill is contrary to the policy and provisions of our law.

Back in 1906 Dr. Wiley, who was a pioneer in pure food legislation, became the author of the 1906 act. One of the cardinal principles which he insisted upon, and which was incorporated in the act, was that foods should be known, designated, and sold under their common and usual names. In 1933 the late Senator Royal S. Copeland, one of the ablest Senators who ever graced this body, one of the finest men I ever knew, and who was not only a splendid Senator but also an eminent physician and health officer of vast experience, introduced a bill amendatory of the Pure Food and Drugs Act. I served on the subcommittee of the committee to which the bill was referred. It was insisted that this principle should not only be retained in the new law, but emphasized and reiterated in different ways in different parts of the law.

The pure food and drug law was not enacted in the interest of the manufacturers, or in order that manufacturers might more readily dispose of their wares and their products. Pure food laws were enacted in the interest of the consumer and in order to protect the consumer. One of the best ways to protect the consumer is to provide that when buying a product he may know what he is buying, when he buys food he may know what he is buying, and that he may know it by the designation of the name by which it is known.

Ever since there has been such a thing as skim milk it has been known as skim milk.

The Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act provides—

Whenever in the judgment of the Administrator such action will promote honesty and fair dealing—

In the interest of what?

in the interest of consumers—

Not in the interest of manufacturers, not in the interest of wholesalers, not in the interest of retailers, but in the interest of consumers—

he shall promulgate regulations fixing and establishing for any food, under its common or usual name so far as practicable, a reasonable definition and standard of identity, a reasonable standard of quality, and/or reasonable standards of fill of container.

That is what the act provides. The law was enacted in the interest of the consumer, not in the interest of the dried milk manufacturer, the powdered milk manufacturer. Elsewhere the act further declares:

A food shall be deemed to be misbranded * * * if its labeling is false or misleading in any particular.

Are we to be told that when anyone wishes to buy dried skim milk he must consult a dictionary in order to ascertain what the term "nonfat dry milk solids" means, or what the term "defatted milk solids" mean?

Mr. President, the very purpose of this bill is to brand the product so as to conceal what it is. That is evidenced by the fact that when the bill was first introduced the sponsors of it undertook to call the product "dry milk solids," the purpose of which was to mislead the public into believing it was buying whole milk which had been dried.

However, under pressure exerted during the House hearings the sponsors of the bill were finally willing to modify the peculiar nomenclature which they are attempting to give to this well-known product, and to substitute "nonfat" or "defatted" milk solids. I assume they will console themselves with the thought that when they advertise the product as defatted they will advertise it as "nonfattening." They will say, "By the use of this product, those who have an excessive avoirdupois, or too much embonpoint, will be benefited by the defattening influence of defatted milk solids."

The Pure Food and Drugs Act further provides that, where there is no representation as to definition and standard of identity, nevertheless, the common or usual name of the food must appear upon the label.

Mr. President, I think that was one of the soundest policies we could possibly have enacted in the interest of the consuming public—that a product should be known by its common and usual name.

The purpose of this bill is to mislead the public into the supposition that it is buying something other than skim milk. I make that assertion because the proponents of the bill contend, and the able Senator from Missouri in his opening argument has so stated, that there is a sales resistance to the opprobrious term "skim milk." They want to get around

what they conceive to be a sales resistance, and therefore they wish to give the product a name which will mislead the public into supposing that it is not skim milk when, as a matter of fact, it is.

We all know what skim milk was originally. The cream was removed by the use of a ladle or a spoon. Later a mechanism known as a cream separator was developed by which the cream was separated from the rest of the milk content. However, in advertisements pertaining to these mechanical cream separators, the spout down which the skim milk flows after the separation has taken place is called the skim-milk spout, and the receptacle which receives it is designated as the skim milk bowl. The other spout is called the cream spout. I have no doubt that the Senator from Missouri will say that under the new process we no longer skim milk, but separate it. However, under the new mechanical process for separating the milk the by-product on one side is known and classified as skim milk, and the remainder is cream.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know whether the Senator paid any attention to the observations of Dr. McCollum which I cited. However, Dr. McCollum pointed out that as between the old skimming process and the separating process there is a very great difference in the quality of the residue after the fat has been removed. In the old days it was necessary to allow milk to stand for several hours before skimming off the cream. Quite frequently the milk deteriorated because of varying temperatures. Under the modern method of separating the milk it is possible to separate it at the right temperature, and the residue of the milk, after the fat has been taken out, is perfectly preserved in every way.

Mr. OVERTON. Oh, Mr. President, that is pure sophistry. Milk can deteriorate at any time. It can deteriorate under either the old process or the modern process. If milk is kept for a long time, of course it will deteriorate. If skim milk is kept at the back door of delivery all day, it will deteriorate. It must be put into the refrigerator. I was reared on skim milk.

Mr. President, there is another ground upon which I object to the enactment of this bill. I regret that there are very few Senators here present. I started out with the observation that in all probability I was conducting a one-man opposition to it. The Senator from Missouri said something about strong pressure being brought to bear against the bill. The only pressure that has been sought to be exerted upon me, and I know upon a number of other Senators, is the pressure of the manufacturers of this particular skim-milk product. I have no doubt that they have interviewed every Senator; I know they have been at my office, knocking at my door time after time. They undertook to persuade me of the justice of their cause. But, Mr. President, if we once depart from the salutary rule that all food products shall be known by their common and usual names, that they shall be informatively labeled in order that the consuming public may know what they are buying and what they are eating—once we depart from that rule even in the interest of the dry skim-milk manufacturers, we will be establishing a dangerous precedent. When any of the manufacturers or producers are dissatisfied with the name, however common and however usual it may be, with which their product is labeled by the Pure Food Administration, which we entrusted with that power—whenever they are dissatisfied, they will come before the Congress of the United States for relief.

Why should the powdered skim-milk manufacturers, the representatives of only a very small portion of skim milk and its products, come before the Congress of the United States and undertake to have this provision of our law altered and this policy departed from in their own interest in order, as they openly state, that they may break down sales resistance to a product known as skim milk?

I see the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] in his seat. He lives on a farm; he was reared on a farm; I have no doubt he has drunk gallons upon gallons of skim milk, and when he drank it it never occurred to him that he was consuming defatted milk or defatted milk solids. It is drunk and marketed as skim milk and is a valuable and nutritious product.

Instead of coming to Congress and undertaking to have the Congress—I use the word without any criticism—stultify itself by having a special act passed in their favor, these manufacturers should educate the people as to the benefits to be derived from the consumption of skim milk.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator from Louisiana will allow me, is it not true that the manufacturers of oleomargarine, and especially certain interests, do not have any desire that the name "oleomargarine" be changed, nor do they have any desire that it be used in any way unless the public is fully informed as to what it is?

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is correct, and probably I shall have some amendments to the bill dealing with oleomargarine, because, once we depart from this salutary principle, we had just as well take a number of other steps now, so we can put ourselves on record as to what we are going to do about it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator has referred to me as drinking skim milk. I want to inform him that I drank it because I got the butter that came from the whole milk, and was not rationed on it.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator has done just what I did as a boy. I would skim the milk, drink the skim milk, and then take the cream and churn it, so that we would have butter for the table.

Mr. SMITH. Exactly.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not think the consumers throughout the United States want this bill enacted. The representatives of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers Associations are opposed to the enactment of the bill. The Federation of Women's Clubs of the United States are opposed to the enactment of the bill. Let me quote a statement made by the representative of the Federation of Women's Clubs. Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, testifying before the committee, said:

> While the bill was being drafted the committee would not admit anything of which Dr. Wiley did not approve.

That was the bill of 1906.

> One thing in which he believed, and had in mind all during his life, was that this was a consumers' measure; Congress had no idea of providing a law to protect the manufacturer, the producer, or distributor of food. They wanted to protect the consumers, and hence informative labeling is and was a cardinal principle of the original law of 1906.

And it is a cardinal principle of the Copeland pure food bill of 1938 which we had under consideration for 5 years and on which exhaustive hearings were held.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply want to ask the Senator from Louisiana whether Mrs. Wiley made the statement in behalf of the General Federation of Women's Clubs or whether she made it on her own behalf, for, as I understand, the General Federation of Women's Clubs does not take stands on questions such as this but undertakes to present both sides of a controversy. That is what prompts me to ask the question whether Mrs. Wiley was speaking for herself or for the Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. OVERTON. Her statement appears under the heading, "Statement of Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs," and she starts off by saying:

> Mrs. WILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the group of women who, in 1906, more than any other group, stood behind and helped pass the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906.

Then she goes on to make this statement which I just quoted. Following that she said:

> The General Federation would oppose this bill, H. R. 7002, because it would mislead the consumer when buying dry skim milk into believing that she was buying dry whole milk. The upholding of a cardinal principle of the Pure Food Act is more important than that the producers of dry skim milk should find a better market for their product.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not get anything from that statement which would indicate that the Federation of Women's Clubs had taken any action on the question.

Mr. OVERTON. I agree with the Senator, there is nothing either one way or the other on it, so far as her testimony is concerned.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the second paragraph of Mrs. Wiley's testimony she disavows any authority to speak for the Federation of Women's Clubs. She says:

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has a rule that resolutions can only be passed at its annual conventions. There are about 90 active resolutions now before the General Federation.

Mr. OVERTON. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. From page 204.

Mr. OVERTON. I was reading from page 55.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mrs. Wiley said, as appears on page 204 of the hearings before the House committee:

There are about 90 active resolutions now before the General Federation. While it is true that there is no active resolution at the present moment covering this actual bill, H. R. 149, I speak because back in 1906, Dr. Wiley paid tribute to the General Federation of Women's Clubs as one of the organizations which helped pass the original pure food law of that year.

So that Mrs. Wiley specifically disavowed any authority to speak for the General Federation of Women's Clubs, and I call the Senator's attention to the fact that among those who have endorsed the bill, as I presented the list here a while ago, is the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. OVERTON. Let me take the Senators one at a time. They are crowding me, and crowding me fast. [Laughter.]

I think the Senator from Missouri will agree with me that Mrs. Wiley is outstanding, not only as the representative of the Federation of Women's Clubs, but that she is an outstanding American. Mrs. Wiley is the widow of one of the ablest men who ever served the Federal Government in any capacity. I do not think there is any disagreement on that.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think any of us disagrees with the Senator's statement regarding the qualities of Mrs. Wiley. However, she was making reference to what occurred back in 1906, when the general public knew absolutely nothing about vitamins B, C, and D, which were later found to be present in skim milk, and other qualities which have also been found to be present in skim milk. I think we should consider this from the standpoint of what is known of the value of skim milk at the present day, rather than insist on going back and referring to skim milk as it was known 40 years and more ago.

Mr. OVERTON. Skim milk is known today for just what it is. When one buys skim milk from his dairyman, he knows it is separated milk. The ordinary householder knows what skim milk is. Skim milk, or separated milk, if Senators wish to call it that, is milk from which the cream has been in large part removed.

I now refer to the testimony of Mrs. Henry R. Atkinson, representing the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, an organization, according to Mrs. Atkinson, "having nearly 3,000,000 paid memberships." Mrs. Atkinson has something to say about this question. She states:

Mr. Chairman, my name is Mrs. Henry R. Atkinson, and I represent the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, an organization having nearly 3,000,000 paid memberships.

That is a rather respectable organization, one having 3,000,000 memberships.

We have more than 28,000 local associations in 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

I shall make a brief quotation from what Mrs. Atkinson had to say:

We endorse everything that Dr. Wiley and the other witnesses for the industry have told this committee about its merits—

That is, the merits of skim milk—

and we are perfectly willing to use the product. The point is that when we use it we want to know we are using it. We do not want to think we are using whole milk.

I have no doubt that when this product is sold as defatted milk solids, the impression would be, the impression probably sought to be created, that it is whole milk, because the desire is to get away from skim milk, and the opprobrium which attaches to skim milk, according to the proponents' own statements. I do not think they will be able to do it.

Mr. President, there are only about six Senators present. Will I lose the floor if I suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not unless some Senator makes the point.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Taft
Buck	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	McClellan	Tydings
Capper	McFarland	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wallgren
Chavez	Maybank	Weeks
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wherry
Clark Mo.	Millikin	White
Connally	Moore	Wiley
Davis	Murdock	Willis
Eastland	Murray	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, at the time when the absence of a quorum was suggested, I was making the observation that the manufacturers of powdered skim milk hope to be able to sell their product by giving it a different name, so that the purchasing and consuming public will not know what they are buying and consuming. The manufacturers hope to get away from the use of the name "skim milk," and hope to be able to sell the product under a name which, although I cannot describe it as euphorious, certainly is quite unique and bizarre—the name of "defatted milk solids."

In the majority report the statement is made:

The word "skim" is a term which stigmatizes the product to which it is applied because it carries the impression of inferiority or worthlessness.

Again it is said:

It is difficult for a good product to sell under a bad name.

Mr. President, in order to remove the so-called stigma which, it is contended attaches to the name "skim milk," it is proposed to give the product the extraordinary and "hifalutin" name of "defatted milk solids." However, I think the manufacturers and distributors of this p oduct will find that they have not accomplished their purpose; because certainly when they offer on the market "nonfat milk solids," the consumers will want to know what they are buying, and the best explanation—in fact, the only one—which can be given to the consumers is that they are buying a skim-milk product. Then the consumers will understand. Therefore, the so-called opprobrium which attaches to the name "skim milk" will follow the "defatted milk solids" designation.

It is said that "skim milk" is a term of opprobrium because skim milk is fed to hogs. That is quite true. But other products which are fed to hogs are consumed by man. Corn is fed to hogs, but also is eaten by man. But there is no sales resistance to corn, when it is attempted to be sold for human consumption, merely because it is also fed to horses or hogs. Potatoes are also fed to hogs; but there is no sales resistance on the part of humans to sweetpotatoes or white potatoes because they are fed to hogs. All the refuse of the kitchen and all the scraps taken off the dining table are fed to hogs. Practically everything that goes into daily human consumption is also fed to hogs, but that is no reason why we should not consume health-giving food—merely because hogs or horses also consume a like food.

However that may be, if the members of the public ever make any inquiry at all, as they probably will, as to what they are buying when they are offered "dried milk solids," they will find out it is their old, nutritious friend "skim milk products".

This bill comes before the Congress with an adverse report by the Food and Drug Administration and by the Federal Security Administration. Mr. McNutt, in submitting his report, said, among other things:

An important feature of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act which has proved of great value to consumers is its requirement of informative labeling of food and drug products.

That is the underlying principle—that the labeling should be informative; it

should let the purchaser know what it is he is buying.

I continue to read from Mr. McNutt's letter:

To insure that consumers will be neither misled nor confused by the names employed on labels, the act requires that labels of foods and drugs bear their "common or usual" names, and the "common or usual" names of ingredients. Although in the present case it has been found that milk from which the milk fat has been separated and moisture removed is commonly known as dried skim milk, powdered skim milk, or skim-milk powder, H. R. 7002—

That was the old bill, not the present one—

seeks a designation of this food as dry milk solids or defatted milk solids. At best these proposed names are confusing; at worst, thoroughly deceptive.

Dried skim milk is a valuable food, but it should be sold for what it is.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is talking about skim milk. When he and I were boys, cream was taken from milk by skimming it off the top of the milk. Today there is no such thing as whole milk. It is all separated milk. So is not the term "skim milk" a misnomer in itself?

Mr. OVERTON. What is the difference in the product?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There is no difference in the product. But we used to let the milk stand until the cream rose to the top, and then the cream was skimmed off. But today it is no longer skimmed but separated.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct; and today separated milk is skim milk.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; it is separated milk.

Mr. OVERTON. Why not let it be called that today?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is what it is called in my State.

Mr. OVERTON. It is not so denominated in the pending bill.

Mr. President, I read further from Mr. McNutt's letter:

No good is to be accomplished by so changing the definition and standard as to create the impression that the product in question is not a skim-milk product. Even if this should accelerate sales temporarily, it is probable that producers and marketers would find in time that the consuming public has discovered the product's mislabeling and reacted accordingly.

Since enactment of the bill would weaken the consumer protective features of the food and drug law and would create a wholly undesirable precedent, I recommend that it not be enacted.

This Agency is advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee, as it is not believed that this legislation could be considered as being in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. President, this bill is unquestionably in the interest of an isolated group of manufacturers, and is contrary to the unmistakable provisions of the Pure Food and Drugs Act. If we are going to legislate that way, and take the administration of the Pure Food and Drugs Act from the authority where we lodged it, if we find that the use of the term "powdered skim milk" is the use of a bad name, and we ought to change it to "nonfat milk" or "defatted milk," why do we stop at powdered skim milk or dried skim milk? Very little of that is consumed directly. It is used principally by bakers and packers of meat. They know what it is. They will probably know what dry milk solids are, just as they know what skim milk and powdered skim milk are. But if we really wish to be benefactors of humanity in this legislation, why not go through the whole category of skim milk? Why should the opprobrium of skim milk attach to fluid milk, which all of us buy directly and use on our tables? Under the law it must be labeled skim milk. If we order skim milk, we find that it is labeled "skim milk."

Mr. President, I wish to propose an amendment to the bill in order to carry out the philosophy and the logic of the proponents of the powdered skim-milk bill. Let me read the amendment which I propose to offer:

For the purposes of said Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, skim milk shall be labeled and renamed as "nonfat milk" or "defatted milk."

I wish to protect the direct consumer. I wish to protect the family of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] and the family of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I wish to provide that when we order skim milk, we may no longer order it by the name "skim milk," because that is an opprobrious term. We should order it in the name of this new designation, and it should not be permitted to be sold as skim milk. It should be sold as "nonfat milk," or "defatted milk." If the Senator from Missouri is correct in his statement, and if the majority report is correct, do not Senators think it would be infinitely better to go to the very source of supply; namely, fluid milk? All powdered skim milk is made from fluid skim milk. At the very source of this terrific abuse upon the consuming public, let us change the name and call it "defatted milk" or "nonfat milk." Then we shall be legislating logically. Then, according to the contention of the proponents of the bill, we shall be legislating wisely.

As I have stated, powdered skim milk is not the only manufactured product of skim milk. What are we to do with evaporated skim milk? Are we still going to require that evaporated skim milk be designated as "evaporated skim milk"? Perish the thought! We should at once change the name, if the contentions of those on the other side are correct, from "evaporated skim milk" to "nonfat evaporated milk" or "defatted evaporated milk." What are we to do about concentrated skim milk? That is a product which is sold on the market. It goes directly into consumption in the household. Are we to allow that abuse to continue under pure-food labels? Or should we not correct it and provide that concentrated skim milk shall be relabeled and named "nonfat concentrated milk" or "defatted concentrated milk"?

Then there is our old friend condensed skim milk. Are we going to let that be called "skim milk"? Horrors! That will never do. We must change the name, as it is proposed to do for the manufacturers of powdered skim milk. We must take care of their brothers in manufacture and call condensed skim milk "nonfat condensed milk" or "defatted condensed milk."

There may be some other skim-milk products which are sold. These are the only ones which occur to me. If the philosophy of this bill is to be adopted, and if we are to legislate administratively, and take the whole thing out of the hands of the Pure Food Administration and proceed to give our own nomenclature to foods which are laboring under perhaps more or less distasteful or opprobrious names, we should go still further.

For example, take the product known as oleomargarine. There is not a product on the market which suffers more under an adverse name than does oleomargarine. Year after year on the floor of the Senate that product is berated when revenue bills are brought up for consideration, and taxes are imposed upon it. State legislatures impose taxes on oleomargarine which are not imposed upon butter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the name "oleomargarine" was adopted by the oleomargarine manufacturers themselves. If the Senator would like to adopt a name for oleomargarine which actually describes the contents of oleomargarine, as a vegetable, nonbutter preparation, I am satisfied that everyone who is interested in dairy products would be glad to go along with him. If the Senator will devise a definition which accurately describes oleomargarine for what it is, I am sure that I will have no objection to it, and I do not think any other Senator will. However, I think he would have a great deal of opposition from oleomargarine manufacturers and those who are interested in the oleomargarine business.

Mr. OVERTON. Under the encouragement of the Senator from Missouri I will offer such an amendment in due course, after we shall have considered the other amendments.

As a matter of fact, oleomargarine has just as much nutritive value as has butter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not making any contention about the nutritive value of oleomargarine. All I say is that it is not butter, and ought not to be sold as butter.

Mr. OVERTON. I am undertaking to present the case of oleomargarine under the philosophy of the pending measure. I feel friendly toward oleomargarine. The Senator from Missouri is bound to know that it is suffering from a bad name, and that we should not submit to it for a moment, but that we should change the name. I will suggest a new

name for it, and if it is not the right name perhaps the Senator from Missouri or some other Senator will suggest a more appropriate or palatable name. We want something which will break down the sales resistance to oleomargarine.

Oleomargarine contains vitamin A, which is a very vital part of the product, and which in oleomargarine is much more uniform than in dairy butter. Dairy butter varies in the quantity of the vitamin A content in the product. During good summer weather, when the pastures are verdant, when excellent feed is given to the cows, dairy butter has as much as 900 units of vitamin A per pound. However, when winter comes, or bad seasons, and the food is not so nutritious, the product degenerates down to as low as 100 units of vitamin A per pound.

On the other hand, oleomargarine has approximately 1,000 U. P. C. units of vitamin A, and maintains that content with fair uniformity.

The product oleomargarine, and the one now mostly used, is made from vegetable oils. So I will suggest, and I hope the Senator from Missouri will agree with me that it is proper, although if he has a better name I am willing to take it, to amend the act by inserting another section declaring that—

For the purposes of said Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and of the Federal Oleomargarine Act, all "oleomargarine" in which the fat is derived primarily from vegetable sources shall hereafter be designated as "vegetable butter."

If any Senator has a better name than "vegetable butter" I shall be very glad to adopt it.

Mr. President, there is another food which is also suffering under a sales resistance name. It should be changed. So long as we are to act administratively with reference to the Pure Food and Drugs Act we should do everything we can do at one time. I refer to the food known as spinach. The word "spinach" has a very distasteful and obnoxious sound to the human ear. It makes the human palate revolt against this nutritious food. That fact is emphasized in the common saying, "It is all spinach." When we say "it is all spinach" we express our complete disgust. Yet spinach is a wonderful vegetable. It contains vitamin A in tremendous quantities. We certainly need vitamin A today. Vitamin A is a great relief to night blindness. Vitamin A is being given to our pilots on the battlefields and in training in order to increase their night vision. I have no doubt that if they were fed more spinach it would certainly develop their capacities as pilots. In the midst of this great war effort we should do everything we can to aid it.

Spinach also contains a world of vitamin B_1. The B_1 vitamins are very nutritious. A deficiency of B_1 vitamins is general among the people of the United States. That situation should be corrected.

Spinach also contains vitamin C. We all know there is no better remedy for scurvy than vitamin C.

In addition to the elements I have named, spinach contains iron. Spinach is strength-giving, allow me to observe to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS]. It gives one power, strength, and muscle. We all know Popeye the Sailor Man. We know that as soon as he takes spinach he becomes strong and powerful, and when he is deprived of his spinach he is so weak that a child can handle him.

Mr. President, I wanted my children to eat spinach. The dietitians recommend spinach. I read in magazines and in scientific journals that spinach was one of the best things in the world for children. It developed them and gave them strength and health. So I took my children around to see the moving picture of Popeye the Sailor. I took them to see picture after picture in order to ascertain what effect the pictures would have on them. We laid spinach before them, and sometimes it was barely tasted, or not touched at all. So I took them again to see Popeye the Sailor, with apparently no results. I took the matter up with them one day. I said to them, "Why do you not eat spinach? Have you not seen the wonderful effect it will have? Have you not seen how you will be made strong and healthy if you eat spinach, and do you not want to be strong and healthy?" They replied, "Yes, father, but we do not want to look like Popeye." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, something will have to be done. We are all very much indebted to Popeye the Sailor for undertaking to remove the opprobrium which attaches to this very valuable food called spinach on account of its name. We must act legislatively. We must come to the assistance of Popeye. I suggest that—

For the purposes of said Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the vegetable commonly known as spinach is hereafter renamed and designated as "health and strength greens."

I think that would be a better name than the nomenclature of "defatted milk solids." I suggest for spinach the name "health and strength greens." It is an inviting name. Everyone understands what health and strength mean. It is very difficult to understand the name used in this bill, namely "nonfat milk solids." If we adopt the name which I have suggested for spinach, we will be able to induce our children to eat it, our aviators will be eating it, the public generally will be consuming it, and we shall all be healthier, stronger, and a more robust people.

Mr. President, there is one other product which I desire to mention. The thought originates with my childhood experience. I recall that when I was a little boy, about twice a year either my father or my mother would appear in the morning at my bedside with a dose of castor oil in a cup or a glass. It would be put down before me for my consumption. In one of the parental hands was a nice bright silver coin. In the other was a switch. I was given this option: "Drink the castor oil and you will receive the money. If you do not drink it you will get a whipping, and you will have to drink it anyway." So, confronted with those two options, I arrived at the inescapable conclusion that I had better drink the oil and take the money; but ever since then I have had terrific antipathy to castor oil, and I am not the only one, for I think generally people have such an antipathy. Yet it is one of the finest medicines and laxatives in the pharmacopoeia. And now as we are undertaking to legislate away opprobrious names which the terrible Pure Food and Drug Administration is imposing upon a suffering public, why not act in behalf of castor oil? Let us give it a new name; let us make it easy of advertising; let us make it so that on every drug-store counter it may be served possibly in preference to orangeade, malted milk, or other popular beverages. Therefore, Mr. President I am going to suggest that the name of castor oil be changed to "the elixir of life" or "the nectar of the gods." [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. President, I will begin with amendment numbered 1, which I offer and ask the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, it is proposed to add the following new section:

For the purposes of the said Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, "skim milk" shall be labeled and renamed as "nonfat milk" or "defatted milk"; that "evaporated skim milk" shall be labeled and renamed as "nonfat evaporated milk" or "defatted evaporated milk"; that "concentrated skim milk" shall be labeled and renamed as "nonfat concentrated milk" or "defatted concentrated milk"; and that "condensed skim milk" shall be labeled and renamed as "nonfat condensed milk" or "defatted condensed milk."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not wish to prevent any further discussion that may be desired in reference to the amendment, but I should like now to ask for the yeas and nays on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Clark, Mo.	McClellan
Andrews	Connally	McFarland
Austin	Davis	McKellar
Bailey	Eastland	Maybank
Bankhead	Ferguson	Mead
Barkley	George	Millikin
Bilbo	Gerry	Moore
Bone	Gillette	Murdock
Bridges	Green	Murray
Buck	Guffey	Nye
Bushfield	Hatch	O'Daniel
Butler	Hayden	Overton
Byrd	Hill	Radcliffe
Capper	Holman	Revercomb
Caraway	Jackson	Reynolds
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clark, Idaho	La Follette	Shipstead

Smith	Tydings	White
Taft	Vandenberg	Wiley
Thomas, Idaho	Wallgren	Willis
Thomas, Utah	Weeks	Wilson
Tunnell	Wherry	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

(At this point several Senators asked and obtained leave to have matters printed in the RECORD.)

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, since some of the Senators now present were absent at the time I offered the pending amendment and undertook to explain it, I think perhaps I should briefly explain just what the purpose of the amendment is.

The bill now before the Senate is an attempt to change the name of one single product of skim milk, that is, the product generally and commonly known as skim-milk powder, or powdered skim milk.

I take the position that if we are to adopt the policy of legislating names for different products we should go further than does the bill, especially in view of the fact that the argument made for the enactment of the bill is that skim milk is such an opprobrious term that the human gorge just rises against it, and people do not want to consume skim milk, because it is simply "hog wash."

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], because I know he is very much interested in dairy products. A bill has been introduced, but it deals with only one isolated, fragmentary product of skim milk, a manufactured product, not the fluid that is consumed on the table.

The main product of skim milk which is used, and which goes into direct consumption, is the fluid skim milk; and if we are to adopt the proposed legislation upon the ground suggested, unquestionably we should go to the very source of the trouble and change the name of skim milk to "nonfat" or "defatted milk," and so on down the line change the name of evaporated skim milk, concentrated skim milk, condensed skim milk, and so forth. That would be in line with the main bill.

Mr. President, a moment ago I asked that we have the yeas and nays on the amendment, and I hope the yeas and nays may be granted. I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are demanded on the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I do not like to be obstreperous, but since for some reason or other the Senate seems to be taking little interest in the bill, since it is difficult to obtain a quorum, and very few Senators are now on the floor, and since evidently there cannot be obtained any recorded expression of the senatorial reaction to this great problem which confronts the American people, under these circumstances, while I dislike to do so, I shall again have to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has any business been transacted since the last call of the roll?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; business has been transacted.

The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	O'Daniel
Andrews	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Revercomb
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Bridges	Holman	Taft
Buck	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Butler	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	McClellan	Tydings
Capper	McFarland	Vandenberg
Caraway	McKellar	Wallgren
Chavez	Maybank	Weeks
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	White
Connally	Moore	Wiley
Davis	Murdock	Willis
Eastland	Murray	Wilson
Ferguson	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. OVERTON. May I renew my request for the yeas and nays on this question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request for the yeas and nays may be renewed.

Mr. OVERTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make the point of order, Mr. President, that no business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. OVERTON. I contend that the refusal of the Senate to grant the request for the yeas and nays is a matter of business.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make the point of order against the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the present occupant of the chair no business has been transacted since the last quorum call, and the point of order is well taken.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, before I send the next amendment to the desk I wish to make a statement. I could, of course, have each one of the proposed sections submitted as separate amendments, and I could ask for the yeas and nays on each one, and could undertake to delay matters by asking repeatedly for quorum calls. I have no such desire. It is evident to me that the Senate does not wish to go on record in respect to any of these amendments, and probably not in respect to the bill itself. I shall, therefore, offer as one amendment the amendments which I now send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, it is proposed to add the following new sections:

SEC. —. For the purposes of said Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and of the Federal Oleomargarine Act, all oleomargarine in which the fat is derived primarily from vegetable sources shall hereafter be designated as "vegetable butter."

SEC. —. For the purposes of said Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the vegetable commonly known as spinach is hereafter renamed and designated as "health and strength greens."

SEC. —. For the purposes of said Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, castor oil shall hereafter be labeled and designated as "elixir of life" or "nectar of the gods."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendments being considered en bloc? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Louisiana would not agree to separate the castor-oil amendment, so that we could vote on it separately. The Senator has offered a suggestion which might induce an increased consumption of castor oil if we could call it something else.

Mr. OVERTON. I think they are all of equal import.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, Mr. President, I know the Senator from Kentucky is probably fascinated by the new designation of "elixir of life" or "nectar of the gods," he himself being a purist in phraseology as well as in thought. Probably he would like to have a separate vote taken on the amendment.

I always like to yield to the majority leader, and I am perfectly willing——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator is about to yield to me, I withdraw the request. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Louisiana, which will be considered en bloc. [Putting the question.]

The amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] at the beginning of his remarks stated that what was done should be done in accordance with a sound policy. Of course, that is entirely true. However, in order to be in accordance with sound policy a term used must be properly descriptive, and it must be descriptive not only at the time when first used but as of today.

Very briefly, I wish to refer to something which all of us know very well, namely, that as time goes on many words have a tendency to acquire meanings quite different from the ones they originally had. Consequently, although a word might have been appropriate and suitable at some time in the past, it does not necessarily follow that it will be appropriate at a later time.

Let me refer to several words with the history of which we are all familiar. The word "pagan" does not necessarily mean a person who lives in a village, nor does the word "heathen" describe merely one who lives on a heath. Yet the contrary was once the case in regard to both of these words. The word "adventurer" has acquired a significance which as of today is not a favorable one; yet basically the word "adventurer" is a perfectly good word. An adventurer is, etymologically speaking of course, one who seeks adventure. Yet we know that there has been a decided deteriorating change in the significance of the word. An adventurer today is one who attempts to do something which is not in any sense commendable.

The word "prejudice" in itself means nothing in the world but a judgment reached before one has obtained the material facts; yet today it has acquired a meaning with which we must reckon, and one which is certainly an unfavorable one. Today a "dunce" is not necessarily a man who follows the views of Duns Scotus, as once he was. A "legend" is not necessarily a writing as to which an obligation inheres that it be read. The word "silly" has changed materially in nature. A "pert" person is not necessary one who is quick and alert. I mention these instances to illustrate the changes in the meaning of words which frequently result as time goes on.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand that the Senator from Maryland is in favor of the bill because he thinks that "defatted milk solids" is the correct descriptive name which relates entirely to one product of skim milk, namely, powdered skim milk. Let me ask the Senator whether, if that be true, the fluid skim milk which is served on all our tables should not have its name changed, and whether the Food and Drug Administration should not be permitted to designate such "skim milk" as "defatted" or "nonfat" milk.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, in what I have said I have not meant in any way to indicate there is only one term in use which is misleading. There may be many others. Probably a change in some of some other terms should be considered, if they must appear for instance on labels of manufacturers, should they carry erroneous impressions.

However, that is not the situation we are now considering. In the Commerce Committee only the one term "skim milk" has been considered. It has been considered very carefully. If the Senator from Louisiana wishes to bring up the matter of having considered other terms which are alleged to be misleading, and wishes the Commerce Committee to examine into them, the Senator from Maryland as a member of that committee, should be very glad to help in doing so.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, let me inquire what is the difference between calling fluid skim milk "defatted milk" and calling powdered skim milk "defatted milk solids"?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. There may be reasons which are not now apparent to the Senator from Louisiana or to me. That distinction is a matter which has not been given consideration by the Commerce Committee. I do not know whether the Senator from Louisiana has gone very carefully into the matter of attempting to analyze the question whether there is a basis for distinction between them and the present question before us. But if he wishes that matter brought up, introducing a bill to that effect, and the bill is referred to the Committee on Commerce, I should be very glad as a member of that committee to try to study the subject very carefully in cooperation with him.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator desires to make a distinction, he might consider the necessity or desirability of making a distinction as between a manufactured product and one which is not manufactured, or as between a fluid product and a nonfluid product. Likewise, why should not evaporated milk be called "nonfat evaporated milk"?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I gladly report to the Senator what I said a moment ago, namely, that the matter is one which no doubt is entitled to serious consideration, and I, for one, should be glad to study it.

I do not wish to trespass on the time of the Senate by referring to numerous items of history, but I shall mention one or two additional ones. In some of the old books on theology we find again and again our Lord referred to as "the ringleader of our salvation." Certainly no one with any proper sense of respect or reverence would today use any such language as that.

The tendency of words to undergo a change in their meaning and usage has existed for many years. Such a change is now going on; and we must reckon today upon such a process of transition, and must at times consider fully whether a term formerly used is the proper one to be used today, whatever may have been its qualifications sometime ago. It is not necessary for us to consider why the change in meaning occurred. The question is whether the meaning of a word has really shifted. If such a change has resulted, and if a certain term has deteriorated in value or otherwise has changed in meaning, that fact is a pertinent point to consider and possibly to warrant a change in phraseology. What previously has been a sound policy in such matters need not, of course, be such today.

Let me mention one other word before I conclude. Milton might use the word "admire" in the sense of wonder at, without any implication at all of approval; but certainly that is not the meaning today.

I have cited several instances of what happened years ago. Similar changes are still developing as to words in use. The term "confidence man" is made up of two perfectly good words, but certainly no one would say that the combination as used today is a flattering one. The term "second-story man" is one which is found in present-day usage. There is nothing obnoxious in those words when used individually, but certainly that phrase is not a suitable one for use in a complimentary sense.

I wish to emphasize the fact that the term "skim milk" has acquired an opprobrious and highly unfavorable meaning in present-day usage no matter what the reasons for such a deterioration may be. The charge has been due to general ignorance or to the fact that many persons do not realize that many good food qualities still remain after milk is skimmed or separated. The letter from the illustrious Dr. McCollum, of the School of Hygiene and Public Health of Johns Hopkins University, which has been read by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], brings out that fact very forcefully. But the point is that the term "skim milk" today has an interpretation in the public mind which is a grossly misleading one. Since that is the case, it is not a sound policy, if I may use the words previously used by the Senator from Louisiana, to insist upon the retention of a phrase which today has a meaning quite apart from its original meaning. I think the industry should not be required to continue to labor under the burden of a name which is both inaccurate and contemptuous. I hope the bill will be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, and ordered to be engrossed, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. OVERTON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I do not know how he would vote, if present. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who, if present, would vote as I have voted. I therefore allow my vote to stand.

Mr. BRIDGES (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I transfer that pair to my colleague [Mr. TOBEY], and let my vote stand.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent because of business in the Government departments.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] are absent because of attendance at a committee meeting. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent because of public business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; and

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is detained on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 4, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Green	Revercomb
Austin	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Taft
Bridges	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Holman	Tydings
Bushfield	La Follette	Vandenberg
Byrd	McClellan	Wallgren
Capper	McFarland	Weeks
Caraway	McKellar	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Mead	White
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wiley
Davis	Moore	Willis
Eastland	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Daniel	
Gerry	Radcliffe	

NAYS—4

Maybank	Russell	Tunnell
Overton		

NOT VOTING—46

Andrews	Bankhead	Brooks
Bailey	Bone	Burton
Ball	Brewster	Butler
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Chavez	Kilgore	Smith
Connally	Langer	Stewart
Danaher	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McNary	Tobey
George	Maloney	Truman
Gillette	Murdock	Wagner
Glass	Murray	Walsh, Mass.
Gurney	O'Mahoney	Walsh, N. J.
Hawkes	Pepper	Wheeler
Jackson	Reed	
Johnson, Calif.	Robertson	

So the bill, H. R. 149, was passed.

DECLINE IN THE CONSUMPTION OF COTTON AND PRODUCTION OF COTTON GOODS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, today I submitted a resolution requesting an investigation by a committee of this body of the use of cotton and the production of cotton goods throughout the United States. I might say that the textile industry is the largest industry in our State of South Carolina, and the largest in our section. Hundreds of thousands of workers are employed in the industry, and countless millions of dollars are paid in taxes to the school districts, to the State, and to the Government itself. In addition to all the textile manufacturing industry means to us, the cotton which those engaged in that industry use is the product of the farms of the South, and is the main money crop in our section.

Last week the Washington Star carried the following article from the Associated Press:

COTTON CONSUMPTION FAR BELOW YEAR AGO DURING JANUARY

The Census Bureau reported today that cotton consumed during January totaled 819,469 bales of lint and 99,117 bales of linters, compared with 916,785 of lint and 110,772 of linters during January last year; for the 6 months ending January 31 consumption was 5,090,896 bales of lint and 652,868 of linters, compared with 5,623,308 and 686,234.

Cotton on hand January 31 was reported held as follows:

In consuming establishments, 2,377,580 bales of lint and 466,078 bales of linters, compared with 2,495,764 and 506,439 a year ago.

In public storage and at compresses, 12,120,142 bales of lint and 82,227 bales of linters, compared with 13,069,529 and 90,878.

Cotton spindles active during January numbered 22,217,994, compared with 22,935,012 in January last year.

Mr. President, I might say that the falling off in consumption shown by those figures amounts to some 600,000 bales in 6 months, or more than a million bales for the year.

Of course, coming as I do from a textile State and from a cotton-producing State, I am well aware that the consumption of cotton has increased during the war period, but I am also well acquainted with the fact that the consumption for last month was the lowest since February 1941. It is my opinion, as it is the opinion of those engaged in the war effort, that textiles are one of the main products necessary for the war. The largest consumers of textiles of course are the Army and the Navy. From uniforms to tents, from the things necessary to develop tires to the parachutes which the men in the Air Force use, cotton is the principal ingredient.

The Journal of Commerce and Commercial, of New York, under date of Thursday, February 17, with a four-column streamer, had an article under this headline:

Cotton goods production reflecting important decline.

Raw cotton consumption off 18 percent from peak level.

Output now believed down from billion yards monthly to about 800,000,000 to 850,000,000. Causes clear but remedial steps insufficient.

Mr. President, I shall read the article from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial, a trade paper well appreciated in the trade world. I know some of the things stated in the article to be facts. I am not so familiar with other parts of the article as I should be, not having had sufficient time to go into all the details. However, I hope that through the resolution I have offered all that the Journal of Commerce has to say, and all that appears in the figures from the Bureau of the Census, will be fully investigated, so that the hundreds of thousands of wage earners in South Carolina, and in the South generally, and the hundreds of thousands of cotton producers, together with the mill managements, and our entire economy, may be studied and considered before it is too late.

I now read the article from the Journal of Commerce:

From all indications, production of cotton goods is now dropping at an accelerated rate. Such conditions have been reported here from time to time over the past few weeks, but it has remained for the census figures on January consumption of raw cotton in domestic mills to indicate the extent of the loss. According to this report, only 819,469 bales were used in the month, the smallest consumption of this fiber for a January since 1940, and the smallest for any month since February 1941. In January last year the consumption was 916,785 bales, so that the loss from a year ago is 10.6 percent. Peak cotton use was 1,000,000 bales in April 1942, and from this top month a loss of over 18 percent has been recorded. Translating this into yardage figures, it may be ventured that the industry which at its best was turning out about a billion yards of cotton goods monthly probably is now operating only at a rate of around 800,000,000 to 850,000,000 yards a month.

Mr. President, let me say that large firms in many sections do not have the cotton goods to sell to the purchasing public of America. Some of the contracts for the military, according to what I have been told, have been rather difficult to fill.

CAUSES OF DECLINE LONG APPARENT

The factors which are causing this decline are well known. They have been in effect and clear to all observers over many months. Manpower shortages and inefficiencies of fill-in help have been a major factor which, except for one or two divisions of the industry, has not been worked out by the Government.

In other words, Mr. President, the manpower shortage is one of the serious causes of trouble to the industry.

Inadequate prices and margins also have been a large contributing item, since long delays in action on values caused mills to drop overtime operations, while third shifts as they became more costly to operate were often abandoned.

Let me say, Mr. President, that when the working time was lowered from 48 to

40 hours a week, it was not a question of manpower; the same workers were there. In reality a reduction of pay resulted. The workers had previously received time and a half for the 8 hours over 40 hours. The workers were still there. The textile workers are loyal, faithful, and devoted Americans; there are none better. I am proud we have so many in South Carolina.

The undesirability of wearing out machinery for which replacements were hard to get, especially where returns were not sufficient, also has had a deterrent effect on output.

Mr. President, I have been told how difficult it has been on many occasions for the mills to obtain textile machinery to replace the machinery which was running day and night to fill orders for the Army and the Navy. The industry has found it extremely difficult to obtain parts which are so necessary to carry on operations. That difficulty also has resulted in quite a reduction in production. That likewise has resulted in loss in pay to those receiving the now substandard wage of the textile worker.

Tightening up of raw cotton, with fiber locked up in Federal loans to the extent of millions of bales and prices at high levels, have not been encouraging.

Mr. President, I cannot agree with that statement in connection with loans. I think that some of the cotton has gotten into the hands of those who perhaps have withheld it from the market, but that is not true of the farmer's cotton, that is not true of the Government-loan cotton, because we are well aware of the fact that Government loans are based on 90 percent of parity, and we know that the farmer in placing a bale of cotton in a loan today can receive only 90 percent of parity. That loan is so arranged that the southern cotton farmer, the wheat farmer, and others, might always be able to obtain parity prices for their commodities.

The article continues:

Currently, there is evidence that the Government is moving belatedly to correct certain segments of the market, as in the case of its bedsheet orders this week, but this appears so far only as a matter of subtraction of production from one item and its addition to another, with little indication of an over-all increase in output.

Mr. President, the third and final paragraph is as follows:

Reference has been made from time to time here to the need for a general liberalization of prices so as to encourage production. It has been pointed out that by taking strong steps to improve margins for manufacturers output might be stimulated, and that thereafter, if any profited excessively, adjustments might be made. The policy of the Government, on the other hand, is to make piecemeal adjustments after weeks and months of discussion, covering different segments of the industry.

Mr. President, with that statement I agree 100 percent.

But while it consumes time and energy handling the one item, production of other items and even of the item under immediate consideration tends to dry up. Once it has so tapered off, it usually can be restored only by robbing one section of the industry to promote another. This is hardly a course that can be followed with safety in a year when military and essential civilian needs, along with ordinary civilian requirements and overseas and relief demands, are of the volume which Washington officials and others have been outlining. If war agencies refuse to see the clear trend indicated by consumption data of the Census Bureau, then Congress should in the national interest look into the situation.

With that statement I thoroughly agree. I do not know whether the war agencies realize the seriousness of the situation. I do not know whether the people of America generally realize it, but day by day, month by month, fewer and fewer textiles are being made. Day by day and month by month the consumption of cotton is gradually going down, since it started its decline in April 1942.

Mr. President, I say, without criticism of anyone because I do not know the entire details, that I hope every effort will be made to go into the situation from the standpoint of taxes, from the standpoint of manpower, from the standpoint of substandard wages of textile workers, from the point of view of the different divisions of the textile industry itself, and last, but most important, the production of textiles for war and for civilian use, and for the consumption of the cotton of the South.

Mr. President, the cotton situation was outlined and analyzed last fall by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture, which in October had this to say:

Domestic cotton consumption is declining, but consumption in 1943–44 will nevertheless be much above any pre-war pear. So marked was the rise in consumption early in the defense program that the Federal Reserve Board index of cotton consumption advanced from 119 in September 1940 to a peak of 177 in April 1942. * * * In 17 months since that time the index has dropped to 152, a decline of 25 points, and the lowest since February 1941.

This analysis, Mr. President, was made last October. Since then the index has continued downward, downward, downward.

LABOR LIMITING FACTOR IN COTTON CONSUMPTION

One of the principal factors accounting for the decline in cotton consumption has been the high turn-over rate among textile workers which has resulted in inexperienced workers replacing experienced workers, with an accompanying loss in labor efficiency. More recently it has even been impossible to find a sufficient number of replacements so that employment has declined. The peak in employment was reached in December 1942, when the number of employees in cotton manufactures, including small wares, totaled 528,000. By July 1943 the number had declined 5.1 percent to 501,000.

Mr. President, I may say that might be quite true about the total numbers of people working. But greater than that is the decline in the working hours. Greater than that is the decline from 48 hours a week to 40 hours a week. When we get to the basis of 40 hours of work a week in many of the textile centers and in other parts of the country, whether it be in New England or in the South Atlantic section the natural tendency is for textile workers to seek employment in the shipbuilding and manufacturing centers along the seaboard, and to work in various war plants.

The article further says:

In all probability the labor situation in the cotton mills will become even more difficult this season with a resulting decline in cotton consumption from last season's level.

The articles goes on at considerable length. I shall not take the time of the Senate today to read the entire article, although I shall request to have it made a part of the hearings if and when my resolution is considered.

Mr. President, let me say that many of the orders issued by various Government agencies with reference to various and sundry details about clothes and clothing—about the socks and the shirts one wears, about whether one can have cuffs on his trousers or whether one can have a vest with his suit—all those little things, which are totally unnecessary, go with the great big things; and to me, and I know, to every textile millworker, to every cotton-mill owner, to every cotton farmer, to every municipality, to every State, and to every section of the South, the big thing, indeed, the tragedy, is the decrease in the consumption of cotton and the increasing surpluses of cotton, despite which there is a failure to provide the yardage of goods necessary so that the goods may be in the stores and on the shelves of the merchants, and on the bodies of our people.

When hearings on the subsidy legislation were being held before the Committee on Banking and Currency, the mayor of Boston came to Washington and testified about the serious situation resulting from the high prices of goods and the lack of consumers' goods in his section of the country.

Mr. President, I hope that through this resolution governmental agencies which have to do with production, credit, taxation, O. P. A. orders, War Production Board allotments, and so forth, and so on, may be given an opportunity to be heard, and that the great textile and cotton industry of the South may be benefited.

The taxes derived from this industry make possible the operation of our local governments and from it the people earn their livelihood. This great industry, the raising of cotton and the movement of it from the cotton fields to the stores on Main Street is, I might say, the very foundation of our economy and our welfare. I fervently trust conditions affecting it will be thoroughly investigated, with the hope that the present decline which started in 1942 will be stopped, and that the textile industry will continue its important place in our economy, so that when peace returns, which, let us hope, will not be long postponed, our main industry will be in a position to carry forward.

The sons of textile workers and cotton farmers are on every battle front in the world. Let us do all we can to preserve their occupations while they are absent.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate

to the bill (H. R. 2350) to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2644. An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4204. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 34, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use a consolidated edition of 1,000 copies of the hearings held before said committee during the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress on the bill (S. 942) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for agreements between common carriers by railroad, between common carriers by pipe line, between common carriers by motor vehicle, between common carriers by water, and between freight forwarders, for the making and filing of rates, fares, charges, or classifications for transportation of passengers and property, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2644. An act to grant additional powers to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 4204. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., of Douglaston, N. Y., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph T. Sylvester, of Portland, Maine, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry J. Healy to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander, from October 1, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry D. Reed, Jr., to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from October 3, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Francis X. Popper, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from October 3, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Marvin T. Paulson to be aide, with rank of ensign.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER AT NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y.—NOMINATION REJECTED

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick G. Newell to be postmaster at Niagara Falls, N. Y., on which an adverse report had been submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was rejected.

POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on which favorable reports had been submitted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Joseph T. Sylvester to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 1, with headquarters at Portland, Maine.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Henry J. Healy to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander, from October 1, 1943.

Harry D. Reed, Jr., to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from October 3, 1943.

Francis X. Popper, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from October 3, 1943.

Marvin T. Paulson to be aide, with rank of ensign.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Annie L. Bell, Slocomb.
William Harry Tillery, Vinemont.

CALIFORNIA

George S. Clarke, Grossmont.
Alfred S. Rusconi, San Joaquin.
Ruth P. Wilson, Spring Valley.

COLORADO

Maggie Jacobsen, Naturita.

INDIANA

Alice B. Robinson, Bruceville.
Floyd L. Linendoll, Orland.
Omer R. Huff, Troy.
James A. Beavans, Warren.

MISSOURI

Lloyd Sapp, Ashland.
Eugene W. Kurtz, Wyaconda.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate February 21 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

POSTMASTER

NEW YORK

Frederick G. Newell to be postmaster at Niagara Falls, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Reverend William J. Johnston, minister of the Eglinton United Church, Toronto, Canada, offered the following prayer:

Almighty, eternal, most gracious, and loving God, our help in ages past and our hope for years to come: Thou dost open Thine hand and feed us. Thou dost guide us by Thine eye. Thou dost make all things to work together for good for Thy people. Thou hast set the solitary together in families. Thou hast made of the families States and of States this great Nation. Give to us as a people a clear vision of our high duty and endue us with courage and fortitude to do with our might what our hands find to do.

We pray for the better day soon to come to mankind everywhere. Grant that the spirit of brotherhood may increase in the earth, that friendship and understanding may take the place of hate and mistrust, and, O Lord God, ruler of all men, we beseech Thee to make wars to cease to the ends of the earth.

Bless the President of the United States of America and all associated with him in governing this Christian Nation, and may Thy kingdom of love and peace and joy come to our whole earth to the honor and glory of Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 18, 1944, was read and approved.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a suggestion in response to a suggestion made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] about the special orders for tomorrow.

We usually read Washington's Farewell Address, which takes about 40 minutes, and then adjourn. The Chair thinks such a procedure is more dignified. The Chair has no control over it, but that is the way we have been doing and the Chair thinks that is the better way to do it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, has someone been selected to read George Washington's Farewell Address?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] was selected some time ago.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the New York Times; and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a brief statement of my own.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE REVENUE ACT, 1944

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, rumor has it that the President will veto the tax bill so recently passed by Congress. With our finances in the shape they now are, this simply does not make sense. Regardless of whether the President feels Congress passed an insufficient tax bill, the fact remains that the new tax bill raises over $2,000,000,000 of badly needed revenue. I have always believed that a half loaf was better than none at all. People are not complaining too much about present taxes. In fact, there are many who feel we should very definitely increase taxes during the time our national income remains at such a high figure. More revenue is desirable, but in developing new methods to increase such revenue we must be careful so as not to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. Why does not the President permit the Congress to pass a tax bill without sending his administrators up to the Hill to fight Congress on various suggested methods outside those he himself has sent up for consideration? And, of course, it could be that one of the reasons, if not the main reason, for the President vetoing the tax bill is because of the provision that calls for all unions to file financial statements with the Treasury. There is nothing wrong in requesting unions to comply with such procedure. Honest labor officials and the rank and file of labor have nothing to hide from the public. If we need more taxes, let us write another tax bill but not kill the one already passed by the Congress.

Obviously, a decade of reckless spending has so imbued the New Deal administration with strong desires for more and more money that a $2,000,000,000 check from the people is spurned as chicken feed, not to say "picayune." There are many who wish they had a little more money than comes along in the pay envelope, but they are not so foolish to throw back what they do get; they make it do. Franklin Roosevelt has never learned that there is a bottom to the public money barrel. He never will.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just made a statement affirmed that half a loaf was better than no loaf. In making that comparison with the tax bill which the Congress sent to the President he is in error. It is not even half a loaf. It is a puny effort at wartime taxation. Moreover, it opens up further loopholes for more war profiteering and it stops the scheduled increase of social-security taxes at the best time in the history of the country for the increases to be put into effect. It is my opinion that the bill should be vetoed. In fact, I voted against it when it passed the House, even though it had some meritorious provisions, such as the provision requiring reporting by nonprofit organizations.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want to say I agree heartily with what the gentleman said. That is the same reason I voted against it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Did the gentleman vote against the tax bill?

Mr. GORE. I certainly did, because I did not think it was worthy of Congress in the midst of an awful war. Not only is it woefully inadequate as a revenue measure but it actually lets down some bars previously erected against war profiteering.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did the gentleman take this up with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, who has been interested in this matter, and who does not happen to be on the floor at the moment?

Mr. BLOOM. I have not taken it up with her. I have just asked for a conference. I have given the names of the conferees to the Speaker, as we have done heretofore. Three conferees are to be appointed, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Dr. EATON, and myself.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we have had some sort of an agreement with the majority leader relative to this and I wish the gentleman from New York would withdraw his request for the moment until I have had a chance to talk with him to see where we stand.

Mr. BLOOM. I have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York withdraws his unanimous consent request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Newport News Daily Press on the great record of the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution submitted by the American War Dads.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of foreign trade credits insurance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNOR DEWEY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished and gallant colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] is reported in the New York papers as saying that the reason why he voted against the Worley substitute with reference to the soldiers' ballot bill was because the Governor of our State, Mr. Dewey, sent word to this Chamber that the substitute was unconstitutional.

I have an affectionate regard for the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN], but I am afraid he is now crying on the shoulders of his constituents and the tears are somewhat "crocodile." The excuse he offers for his vote will not wash. He leans on a reed. The Governor of our State may have social charm and grace, but he has no "oomph" when it comes to constitutional questions.

The London Daily Mail recently stated that "he makes the best speeches that money can buy." And that "you must know him very well to dislike him." I still maintain he may be excellent at busting rackets, but he is no "great shakes" as a constitutional lawyer. At least our friend from New York had better not follow him on matters constitutional.

I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] will purge himself and vote right the next time. The soldiers' ballot bill federally directed, is the only proposal that will insure a vote for the men in arms.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1944

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] called the tax bill which is now upon the President's desk for action "picayune" he showed abysmal ignorance of our whole tax structure. The gentleman from Tennessee evidently is not aware of the fact that we are already raising from the American people $42,000,000,000 a year, which is 42 times what they paid when I first came to Congress. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is apparently unaware of the fact that, in addition to the $42,000,000,000 that the Federal Government is collecting from the American people, there is collected by the States and political subdivisions another $10,000,000,000.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and also the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who seems to know a little on a great many subjects but not very much on any particular one, that they study the present tax structure of this country before they attempt to pass judgment upon the question of additional taxes.

Among other things, the pending tax bill freezes the social-security tax at the present 1-percent rate for another year. If the President vetoes the bill, and it is not passed over his veto, there will automatically be an additional 1-percent tax on every pay envelope and every employer as of March 1.

As I have repeatedly stated, the average American is already paying taxes, Federal, State, and local, in an amount which is about as great as he can afford.

It was never contemplated that the Social Security Act should be used as a revenue-raising measure, but that is precisely how it has been employed. Every dollar of the so-called Social Security Trust Fund has been lent to the Federal Government, and I O U's left in the till. When it comes time to draw money from the fund, there will be nothing there but these I O U's. Hence it will be necessary to raise the money all over again. In other words, under the President's program, future beneficiaries under the Social Security Act will be taxed twice for their retirement annuities. That certainly was not the intention of Congress.

I know there are Members of this House whose motto is "tax and tax, spend and spend." They ignore the fact that taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, as President Roosevelt so well said in the 1932 campaign.

Again let me emphasize the fact that we have about reached the limit of the American people's ability to pay taxes. We are now the highest taxed people in the world, our per capita tax burden being $357 for every man, woman, and child, as compared with $291 in Britain and $261 in Canada. In addition, our people have had to contend with much greater increases in living costs than have our British and Canadian friends. Thus it appears that the poor American taxpayer is being ground between the upper and nether millstone.

Any general increase in income taxes, such as the President advocates, would fall not alone on those who have enjoyed increased incomes as a result of the war, but as well on those whose incomes have not increased.

The President wants us to face the tax burden realistically, and that is exactly what Congress has done in limiting the tax increase to $2,300,000,000, as compared with the $10,500,000,000 requested by the Treasury. In providing for this lower amount, Congress has simply faced the fact that there is a limit to our ability to pay taxes, even in wartime.

THE REVENUE ACT 1944

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] are exactly right in voicing opposition to the tax bill. I am sorry I have to differ with my friend from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

This tax bill is draining money from all of the little fellows throughout the Nation and because of the loopholes provided in the renegotiation amendments it is funneling that money out to the war profiteers, those who have war contracts. That is why we could not support such a bill as this, and I presume that is why no one will be surprised if the President vetoes it. We are drawing money in from all sides and then funneling it out to war profiteers because they are the ones permitted under this bill to make excessive profits with no longer many of those restrictions in effect that have already brought back $6,000,000,000 to the Treasury.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In response to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] let me say that the gentleman from Tennessee is fully aware of all the things which the gentleman from Minnesota cites, and that the gentleman from Minnesota should be aware, in addition, of the enormous expenditures which we are making for the war and plead for a sound fiscal policy.

Mr. IZAC. It is true we must have more money to run this war, and I would like to get it from those who are making profits out of the war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

O. P. A. REGULATIONS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a copy of a letter I have written to Chester Bowles and a copy of a letter I have received from him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem by Horace C. Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE REVENUE ACT OF 1944

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have never claimed to be a so-called expert. I try to do my job the best I know how, but I say with due modesty that I do not yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] with regard to my understanding of the tax structure of this country, in spite of the fact that he is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. I have some very strong views on this matter. I believe our country can do much better toward paying for this war currently than it is doing. I am convinced, as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has said, that now is the time to provide additional protection under the Social Security Act, for the future of our people, and do it by the kind of tax that would be counter-inflationary at the present time. I stand on that position and I am proud to hold it. Neither do I apologize for my efforts at an understanding of the many and manifold problems with which this Congress is confronted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different topics, one to include an address delivered by myself,

and in the other to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a recent radio speech I made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNOR DEWEY

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago I listened with interest to the reference which my good friend and colleague from New York [Mr. CELLER] made with reference to Governor Dewey. The gentleman mentioned that he might not have enough "oomph" to accomplish certain things. However, in 1942 he had enough "oomph" to break the back of the New Deal in New York State for the first time in 16 years. Years before that he accomplished what everybody thought would be forever impossible when he destroyed the most vicious and diabolical nests of racketeers in New York City the country had ever known. He needed plenty of "oomph" to do that. He had enough "oomph" last summer to go out to Michigan and participate prominently in the Republican convention which drew up the Mackinac agreement. Now he has enough "oomph" to establish one of the finest records that has ever been made by a Governor of New York State. It looks very much to me as though he may still have enough "oomph" to get the nomination at the Republican Convention next June, and after that to be elected President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all legislative business for the day and any other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OPIUM CONTROL

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a resolution I am introducing today, and about which I shall speak more fully under a special order. It requests the President to approach the governments of all opium-producing countries throughout the world, urging upon them in the interest of protecting American citizens and those of our allies and of freeing the world of an age-old evil, that they take immediate steps to limit and control the growth of the opium poppy and the production of opium and its derivatives to the amount actually required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes.

I had a chance to witness first hand the use of opium by the Japanese as a weapon of war in China. We have tens of thousands of American citizens now going into areas in the Middle East and the Far East where opium is as freely available to our men as cigarettes are in the city of Washington.

This constitutes a real threat to their health and welfare. In addition smuggling of opium into the United States is beginning to appear on our vessels as they return from carrying war materials to the Near East. This war should be an opportunity not for expansion and enlargement of this deadly traffic but a chance, once and for all, to exterminate it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from a constituent in Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a set of resolutions from the Farmers Union of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter received from Corning Benton, treasurer, the Phillips Exeter Academy, Exeter, N. H., in regard to tax simplification.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OUTLAND was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

WASHINGTON'S INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in a local paper which for some reason calls itself "Washington's Independent Newspaper," appeared this astounding statement:

> Having broken the American tradition against a third term for any President, the Roosevelt administration now seeks to get a fourth term and thereby push us closer to perpetual one-man government and monarchy. If all this is not European fascism it is at least a reasonable facsimile of same.

Mr. Speaker, this particular paper, not content with attempting to sow seeds of discord against our allies, England and Russia, now has the audacity to refer to our administration as Fascist. The fourth-term issue as such will be decided by our people on its merits, and I have no doubt but that they will prefer a first-rate man for a fourth term rather than a fourth-rate man for a first term. In the meantime the war effort in particular and American democracy in general will be better served if all of us, press, citizens, yes, and even Congressmen, will bear in mind that we are not fighting the war of 1812; neither are we fighting Russia. We should not be fighting President Roosevelt and his administration; we are fighting a war against Japan and Germany and the vicious rotten system that they both represent. Washington's so-called independent newspaper would be doing its country a great service if it stopped publishing such cheap un-American editorials.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

GOVERNOR DEWEY

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I wish to address my remarks to my friend the gentleman from New York [EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. He stated to the House just now that Governor Dewey broke the back of the New Deal which had been in power for 16 years. I refuse to accept that——

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I may have been in error. It might have been 20 years.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I refuse to accept that those years of Mr. Hoover's administration were in anywise connected with the New Deal.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I was referring to the State of New York.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am talking about the New Deal, which came into existence in 1932 and not in the year 1926. If the gentleman wants me to correct him further, let me remind him that the Presidential election is this year 1944 and not next year, 1945, as the gentleman stated in his remarks.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I was talking about Roosevelt as Governor of New York.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

THE WAR SITUATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I read the newspaper this morning with a great deal more pleasure than I have read any newspapers on any Monday morning since the 8th of December 1941. I heard the radio reports last night with more satisfaction than at any time I have listened to the radio since December 7, 1941.

On Monday the 8th of December 1941, we heard a great deal about the Japs at Pearl Harbor. On this Monday the 21st of February 1944 there is news about the Japs, and of a different kind. And it seems to me appropriate that we should record our appreciation to the boys all over the world, who are responsible for the good news we have had today.

It has been good news from Italy where the beach head is holding.

It has been good news from the European Continent where General Arnold's airmen carried on our greatest and most hazardous air battle of the war with more than 2,000 planes engaged, and knocked out 25 percent of German fighter production at a cost of only 22 ships.

And it has been good news, delicious news, from Truk, where the Navy so completely destroyed the enemy that on the second day not a plane arose to challenge us. At Truk, mighty Truk which the Japs have been fortifying for a quarter of a century, 201 enemy planes were destroyed and 19 ships, including 2 light cruisers, 3 destroyers, 1 ammunition ship, 1 seaplane tender, 2 oilers, 2 gunboats, and 8 cargo ships. At Pearl Harbor our losses were 177 planes, 3 destroyers, and 2 battleships sunk, 6 other battleships damaged. Except the *Arizona*, these have been restored to service.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to insert the opening paragraph from the communique by Admiral Nimitz announcing the return visit paid to the Japs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, here is the opening paragraph from the communique by Admiral Nimitz, which should be remembered in American history from this day forward:

The Pacific Fleet has returned at Truk the visit by the Japanese Fleet at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and effected a partial settlement of the debt. Initial approach was undetected.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kansas rise?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw it but that on Wednesday next following the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a speech made Saturday evening by the gentleman from Pennslyvania [Mr. GAVIN] over the Mutual network.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the fact that the speech of Paul Hoffman, The Winning of Peace, takes more than two pages, that it be printed in the RECORD. The estimated cost is $120.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO FACILITATE THE RESUMPTION OF CIVILIAN PRODUCTION

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the Baruch-Hancock report is the most comprehensive and constructive chart yet made to bring about an orderly change of American industry from war to peacetime operation.

I am surprised at the unjustifiable and unfair criticism of the sound recommendations made by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, one of our elder American statesmen, who considers every problem from the yardstick of what is best for America. Mr. Baruch combines wisdom, experience, and vision, which is the greatest of all. He has no ax to grind, and his only motive is to serve his country by making use of his vast knowledge and experience in the last war and in this to help solve our tremendous post-war economic problems, to encourage free enterprise, and to provide employment for the American people, including 12,000,000 returning veterans. Mr. Hancock likewise is a man of broad experience in both government and industry.

The Congress has no greater friend and supporter, nor is there a firmer advocate of constitutional government, than is Mr. Baruch. He not only understands that Congress must enact legislation to prepare the way for the demobilization and transition from war to peacetime economy but that first or immediately vital problems must be acted on first by Congress.

In his report he emphasizes that the Congress must write legislation now to be effective on the termination of the war with Germany providing for the cancelation of contracts, payment of governmental obligations, taking the Government out of business, and encouraging American industry to expand and employ labor on an unprecedented peacetime scale.

He has faith in America, and in both capital and labor to work together, and in the capacity of private enterprise to meet the new post-war requirements to produce more peacetime goods than ever before and to create an era of abundance and prosperity.

The blueprint he has submitted should be carefully studied by every Member of Congress, as it covers most of our important demobilization and transition problems. There is no real reason for any conflict between Congress and the recommendations contained in the Baruch report. The Congress can be depended upon to write legislation aimed to solve our post-war financial, industrial, and economic problems without establishing additional bureaucratic agencies or governmental control and regimentation of business.

It is safe to say that Congress favors the Baruch report because it is based on sound economic principles and the preservation of private enterprise, as opposed to the continuation of Government ownership, collectivism, and state socialism.

The Baruch-Hancock report is a challenge to Congress to get into immediate action upon these problems, but there will be much to be done even beyond these recommendations, including the post-war use of our large merchant marine.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address by Hon. Marvin Jones.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WINCHELL STIRS ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, barking over the radio last night, Walter Winchell, that little communistic "kike" who called Congress the "House of Reprehensibles" and who is doing more to stir anti-Semitism in this country, and doing more to injure President Roosevelt than any other man alive, writhing under former exposures, touched the lowest segment of infamy ever reached by a radio broadcaster in America.

In one of his filthy, indecent insinuations, he stooped to as base a level as that of the loathsome ghoul at night, that invades the sacred precinct of the tomb, goes down into the grave of a buried child, and with his reeking fingers strips from its lifeless form the jewels and mementoes placed there by the trembling hands of a weeping mother.

God pity such a scavenger! God pity the Blue Network, or any other radio system that would permit such salacious broadcasts.

How much longer will the decent people of America have to endure such filth?

How much longer will the decent, patriotic Jews of America have to endure the punishment he is bringing upon them?

How much longer will patriotic gentiles have to endure his infamous persecutions?

Mr. SABATH rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Illinois rise?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I really would have been surprised had the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] not arisen to attack somebody. When he cannot attack Marshall Field, Drew Pearson, PM, the Chicago Sun, or any other progressive publication advocating, for example, the Federal soldiers' vote bill, he, of late, has been assailing Walter Winchell using, in the judgment of many people, language of violent, but unwarranted, denunciation with which he is so able.

A few days ago the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] assailed Winchell, charging that his name is not Winchell and that he was causing a tremendous amount of harm to the Jewish people. The Jewish people are just as patriotic, just as loyal, and have sacrificed with the same devotion and energy, and to the same extent, as the record shows, as any other race. I do not know Winchell personally, but I do hear his broadcasts at times and I have not heard him say anything that could be construed as unpatriotic but, on the contrary, he has always counselled patriotism and devotion to American ideals and, in that connection has called attention to many persons who have been indicted and convicted of making subversive and seditious statements and for unlawful activities. Unfortunately, several weeks ago, he used the expression "House of Reprehensibles," which I regret, but it was intended in a facetious vein and undoubtedly he had reference to those few Members who have been continuously vilifying him. So far as I can recollect, that was his first reference to Congress collectively, although he has mentioned individual Members of Congress from time to time during the course of his broadcasts. With respect to the utterances of some of the Members, it is to be regretted that they leave the impression with many listeners that they are speaking for a majority of the membership when, in fact, they speak for a very, very small group.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the gentleman from Mississippi say that he has nothing against the Jewish people. Nevertheless, it appears that whenever opportunity presents, he does attack anybody of the Jewish faith. I have received thousands of letters, in the interest of the good name of the House of Representatives to answer his accusations and statements that, I regret to state, have created prejudice in some quarters. I, myself, as chairman of the Committee on Rules, have been subjected to his criticism many times, he charging that I have delayed consideration of different legislation before the committee, such as his resolution to vastly expand the jurisdiction of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation and the servicemen's vote bill, but I have ignored it. However, today I could not restrain myself when he again attacked Walter Winchell. It seems to me that he would desist from traducing and attacking a man who has rendered a real selfless service to the country, especially in view of the report of the Secretary of the Navy submitted upon the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] bearing on Winchell's service as a Naval Reserve officer, which report definitely showed that he received only 2 months' compensation while on active duty, which he immediately turned over to the Navy Relief Fund, and that he was responsible for the raising of large sums for Navy relief.

He is an American—American in his views and courageous in bringing to light the activities of people who, knowingly or unknowingly, are creating prejudice and intolerance.

I know, and a vast majority of the Members know, that many other columnists, publicists, and radio commentators have unfairly vilified, assailed, and attacked Members of the Congress, Congress itself, as well as the President. I always have felt that our time should be devoted to legislating and cooperating in every way in the winning of the war rather than wasting it in personal vituperation against critics, writers, and radio commentators. It has also been my belief that it is unfair for a Member of Congress to attack anybody on the floor who does not have immunity of a Member and opportunity to answer such attacks.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of harmony and for the welfare of our country, let us devote our time, talents, energy, and ability to effecting unity and cooperation looking to an early victory and safeguarding our freedom and liberties. In conclusion let me say earnestly that I hope the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] will desist from these daily defamatory speeches, otherwise I shall be obliged to object.

Mr. RANKIN. As long as he spreads his filthy tirades over the radio, I will continue to protest on this floor. No decent, self-respecting person can defend his loathsome utterances last night.

Mr. SABATH. In the interest of the dignity and manliness of the House, I hope both the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and Mr. Winchell will refrain from these personal diatribes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

THE PACIFIC SITUATION

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I rarely address the House except when I am concerned with important pending legislation, but so much has been said this morning about this, that, and the other, mostly the other, that I desire to express my appreciation of the remarks of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], when he called attention to the fact that the United States Navy is on the march in the Pacific Ocean. I think it would be well if we would more frequently let the country know that we are in touch with the situation and that we know that instead of knocking on the doors of Tokyo the next thing the United States Navy will be doing will be going inside those doors. It will be crashing the doors of Tokyo down and entering without invitation. Our hearts beat with proud emotion at the mastery of the seas our Navy is now showing the world. Our fighting men on land and sea are living up to the high mark of fighting ability and patriotism that has characterized Americans throughout our illustrious history. The American and British Air Forces are now repaying Nazi Germany tenfold for her unthinkable sins of the past. Congratulations and good wishes to the boys of the Air Forces.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

AMERICAN OIL PIPE LINES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to say that deeply as I feel about the matters I shall discuss there is one thing of paramount importance today, and that is the victories that have already been referred to in the House which have been won on a number of different fighting fronts by the armed forces of our country. I render my heartfelt thanks to the valor and courage of these fighting men before I begin my speech.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak this afternoon about pipe lines—petroleum pipe lines. The whole peace and security of our country and our whole foreign policy are in my judgment, involved in the matters which I shall discuss. The question whether the major oil companies of the United States are going to be able to dictate policy to the Govern-

ment itself, is directly involved. Under the Petroleum Administration for War a great complex structure of committees has been established, every one of which, as well as the direct personnel of P. A. W., is dominated by recent or present employees of the major oil companies of the United States. Yet here are made the real decisions as to what is going to be done with the petroleum industry in the United States, and, as I shall show in my speech, as to matters which affect the whole peace of the world. Frankly, I do not blame the oil companies for this situation as much as I do governmental policy. Once it became apparent that one huge petroleum corporation could insert one of its officials into a policy-making position in the Government, the others naturally felt that they would be left far behind unless they could do likewise. And it is a fact which cannot be disputed that, whatever the reasons may be, the net impact of the war has been to greatly benefit the major oil companies of the country and to hurt very badly, indeed, the independent producers of crude oil, which is the reason I have believed the small producer should be given a better return for his crude product without increasing oil and oil-product prices clear across the board. There are only two real answers to the problems which we face. One is the restoration of true competitive conditions in the petroleum industry, at least as soon as the war is over. This will be a tremendous job, and I have not the time this afternoon to go into what it entails, though I hope to do so at an early date. But we are confronted with another task. There are some circumstances where monopoly has already been fastened upon petroleum to such an extent that only the wisest and best action by the Government itself can possibly offer a decent solution. It is to circumstances of the latter sort—outside, not inside, the United States—that I am addressing myself today.

In recent weeks much publicity has been given to two pipe lines. The first of these is the pipe line from the oil fields at the mouth of the Mackenzie River to the refineries constructed in the northwest portion of Canada at Whitehorse. This is the now famous Canol project, the broad conception of which is understandable enough on the part of the War Department in the early days of the war when it appeared altogether possible that we might have to fight Japan in Alaska. I am not here today to criticize the military or the War Department for having spent money in order to supply gasoline and other petroleum products to our armed forces. All I have to say about the Canol project is two things: First, that it could have been planned in such a way as to have entailed vastly less expenditure; to have gotten gasoline available to our armed forces much more quickly; to have located the refineries on American soil at Fairbanks, Alaska; and, all in all, to have been a true war measure which, under the present cumbersome program, it can hardly be accurately said to be. I believe it was wrong to carry this project through in the manner that it has been carried through, after ample warning of its impracticability had been given by the staff working upon the matter to those in charge of the program generally. In the second place, I want to ask just what the American people bought with their money in this instance. One answer is that it was buying national protection, but, assuming that everyone is in the war together, it appears to me that, even in providing for national defense, we should not have situations where the expenditure of vast amounts of Government money means, on the one hand, only a huge out-of-the-pocket expenditure for the people of the United States and, on the other hand, that huge financial advantages will accrue to powerful private interests as the result of the expenditure of that money. The only question I want to ask about Canol is, What did we buy? Well, we bought a pipe line and refineries, the future fate of which is still uncertain, though I believe negotiations are being carried on which will probably put our country in a better position with regard to them. The thing we did not buy, however, and over which we obtained no control whatsoever, is the oil or any part of the oil in the Mackenzie Delta field. There is only one company operating in that field. It is called the Imperial Oil Co. The Imperial Oil Co. belongs 70 percent to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, an American corporation, and the largest single one of all the major oil companies. Whatever else may happen, at least it is true that a vast amount of public money has been spent, the result of which is to open up an oil field, whose potentialities are only beginning to become apparent, where all the leases are in the hands of the Standard Oil Co., of New Jersey through its subsidiary, the Imperial Oil Co.

The one problem in connection with that oil field was that of transportation. The pipe-line construction was the outstanding expense and outstanding risk. That expense and that risk the United States Government took. Unless something can be done to change the situation, the benefit from that risk-taking enterprise on the part of the United States will accrue to the largest major oil company in the world—Standard Oil of New Jersey—adding to its monopolistic control, and putting the people of this Nation and other nations elsewhere as well, in a further position of dependence upon it. Let us not deceive ourselves. The one all-important point in this whole world-wide oil question is the control of oil. For the investment of public money in the Canol project the United States should certainly have acquired some degree of control over the oil to be developed there and some right to share in the profits which, in all probability, will accrue after the war from the oil development which the American people's money made possible. Canol, however, is largely water over the dam. But that is, I earnestly hope, not the case with regard to the proposed pipe line across Arabia.

In this case the Government is agreeing to construct a pipe line at public expense in one of the most difficult and hazardous areas of the world, thus taking a major risk with regard to a huge oil development project without acquiring any right, title, or interest in the basic resource, which is the oil itself. As I shall presently show, the Government will be in effect endorsing a cartel over which it will have no control whatsoever. The expenditure of all this public money will not modify in the slightest degree the monopolistic control of the oil resources now resting in the hands of three or four major American companies on the one hand and the British Government as the major owner of British companies on the other.

The construction of this pipe line will increase vastly the economic power and monopolistic control of these major oil companies, but, on the other hand, the Government will acquire nothing more or less than a commitment to protect American private interests in this whole area and to make itself liable to be caught in the very middle of international complications and trouble which I do not like to contemplate. Here again my main complaint is summed up in the question, "What is the Government buying with its money?" and if it could be shown that the Government was buying national defense, which I do not believe for a moment can be shown, then I would reply that I agree we must provide for national defense in every way we can, but that it does not seem to me reasonable just because our country is in need for the United States as a nation to be called upon to make a deal which, on the one hand, may prove a very great expense, indeed, to the American people, but which will through the years add to the stranglehold of an oil cartel over the resources of the world without any corresponding financial or economic advantage or any improvement in international relations whatsoever. The basic significance of these two pipe lines is that the Government is induced to pay for the riskiest, most difficult part of the job, now, while the war is on and while we are under the impulsion of war dangers and war psychology, without the Government gaining any control of the basic resource or changing the monopoly situation a bit for the benefit and protection of the people or the smaller units in the petroleum industry. Neither of these pipe lines is so located that anyone except one, two, three, or four major oil companies can take advantage of them in any way in the future.

The Truman committee of the Senate, in its recent report, called for the development immediately of an American policy with regard to oil. Nothing could possibly illustrate the desperate need of such a policy as well as the real facts about what has taken place with regard to the pipe line to be constructed at United States Government expense clear across Arabia for the transportation of oil owned by three American major oil companies—Standard Oil of California, Texas Co., and Gulf Oil Co.—from the oil fields in Saudi Arabia to the Mediterranean Sea. At the moment arrangements are being made to serve also the Qatar field, in which Standard of New Jersey, Shell, and Socony-Vacuum own altogether a half interest.

Briefly we have here an agreement which, whatever may be said officially about it, appears to be sufficiently complete in every detail so that engineers are about to be sent out to undertake the survey. It is furthermore an agreement as to which neither Congress nor the general public has been informed in any adequate way whatsoever. Worst of all, insufficient time has been granted to Government departments and agencies, especially the State Department, which are vitally concerned in this matter to study and pass mature judgment. Now, what I will have to say about this pipe line is said from three points of view: First, an analysis of the proposal as a war measure, which is the alleged justification for it; second, an analysis of it from the point of view of the business proposition which the Government undertakes; and third, an analysis of it from the standpoint of the future peace of our own country and the world in general. It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that the main decisions in this matter ought to rest with the State Department. And yet, I am convinced that that Department was substantially bypassed so far as the real decision is concerned.

There can be little doubt of the vast importance of the Persian Gulf area from the standpoint of future supplies of petroleum. Indeed, it appears to be convincingly true that a majority of the world's remaining supply of oil which does not originate within the borders of the major nations and which, therefore, is available for general international commerce, lies in this area. Estimates of the amount of oil in this area vary so widely that I shall not attempt to include those figures except to say that anyone who controls the oil of the Persian Gulf area will be in a position to exercise an effective monopoly of the supply of oil in the Eastern Hemisphere outside of Russia. The only other important source of oil which is likely to exist on earth is that in our own country and the Caribbean area. Two things of tremendous importance immediately become apparent. The first is that it is to the definite national interest of the United States that oil in the United States and in any other portion of the Western Hemisphere, particularly in the Caribbean area, should not at any future time flow to other portions of the world, but should be either used in, or reserved for, our own country and other nations of the Western Hemisphere. This simply will not happen unless the oil of the Persian Gulf area is supplied to the Eastern Hemisphere at a price sufficiently below the price of Western Hemisphere oil so as to prevent Western Hemisphere oil flowing out of this hemisphere. The second consideration of major importance is that the power to exercise monopoly control of Eastern Hemisphere oil is far too great to be left wholly in private hands, particularly where it is a moral certainty that those private agencies will enter into cartel agreements with the British for the maintenance of monopolistic prices for oil in that region. One of our major companies has already done this very thing. Under the present arrangement, a monopoly of Eastern Hemisphere supplies will be in the hands of the British Government on the one hand and the Standard Oil Co. of California, the Texas Co., and Gulf Oil Co. on the other hand.

Now we are told that this pipe-line deal is a war measure. If so, Congress and the American people have a right to know why it was not undertaken a long time ago, since all the information now available was prepared and available to the very agencies which now recommend and approve it considerably over a year ago. If, by any stretch of the imagination, this pipe line was to be constructed as a war measure, certainly it should have been undertaken long before this and would have been so undertaken. There must be other reasons, legitimate or otherwise, why it was not undertaken a year and a half ago, and why it is now being started. I submit it is almost inconceivable that a project of this magnitude requiring as much material as this pipe line will take, as many and great problems of engineering as it will entail, and as many international complications as will be involved, can be completed in time to be of use in this war. For it is obvious that the only practicable use of this pipe line as a war measure is in connection with the European war since the oil itself is located on the Asiatic side of the Arabian Peninsula and would be available for the war against Japan where it now is, instead of on the Mediterranean. Mr. Speaker, this is not a war measure and simply cannot be justified on that ground. In the second place, this oil is just as far away from the United States as is possible for it to be and still be on the earth. It is clear around on the other side of the world. It would, therefore, appear to be, unfortunately, in the worst possible location from the standpoint of serving any war needs that the United States might ever in the future have. This is not to say this oil is unimportant to us. But it is to say that its military importance can never at best be anything but indirect.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. May I ask the gentleman if he can in his own time explain to the House by what authority any Government official has or will obligate the Government to spend $200,000,000 to build pipe lines in a foreign nation?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not know whether I can explain that or not, I may say to the gentleman, but I appreciate his asking the question.

Mr. FISH. Does not the gentleman think the Congress is entitled to know the answer?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I certainly do.

Mr. FISH. I wish the gentleman in due time, either today or some time in the future, would give us the answer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I hope I can.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Would the gentleman guess it might be the War Powers Act that we have heard so much about?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Maybe so, I do not know. I am personally of the opinion that it is going to take tremendous gymnastics to try to justify this as a war measure.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Nevertheless, I want to say at this point, that probably such a pipe line should be constructed, and if so it is probably best that it be constructed by the United States Government. I believe this for reasons which will be clear before I have finished, but will say briefly that the major reasons are two. First, because of the great importance of the oil in the Persian Gulf area, and its importance as a means of conserving our own and other Western Hemisphere oil, and second, because of the policy pursued in the past by the British who are committed to the cartel, high-price system, which system in my judgment must in some manner be broken if the objectives of the people in the current war are to be achieved. I take it that the fundamental objective of this war is to establish a period of peace in the world and, therefore, I do not think that the pipe line ought to be constructed under the present agreement. For I cannot see how that objective which alone can be of benefit to the American people will be served by that agreement. As an American citizen I am proud and thankful for the foresight of those American oilmen who found this most important field of oil in Saudi-Arabia. I hail their foresight and their perseverance. But even they will, I believe, agree in the long run that the national interest of our country has to come before everything else.

Now to come to my second major point, What about the business proposition which is here proposed? To state the matter broadly, what this proposal boils down to is for the Government of the United States to build a pipe line, costing at least $150,000,000 and probably considerably more than that, for the benefit of three or four major oil companies, notably the Arabian-American or Standard-Texas Oil Co., owned jointly by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. This question must be asked immediately. If this is to be our policy with regard to oil, can the Government possibly stop short of building pipe lines for all the other major oil companies of the United States as well as these favored ones?

Now what the Government gets in return for these expenditures is, so far as I am able to determine, practically nothing whatsoever.

The question I want to ask is, once again, What are the American people buying with their pipe-line money? Much is made of the fact that under the terms of this agreement the Government is going to get its money back in a period of 25 years, whereas it will still own the pipe line. Well, the way the Government is going to get its money back is simply by having the companies guarantee that they will run enough oil through the pipe line so that by paying the Government a reasonable transportation charge the original cost of the pipe line will have

been returned in a 25-year period. The companies would have to pay somebody to transport this oil anyway, so they are not making any concession to the Government in this respect whatsoever. They are only saying that if the pipe line is built, they will use it, a thing which will obviously be to their own direct financial interest, and furthermore, it is highly questionable how much this pipe line will be worth after 25 years of use. It is altogether possible that it will have to be replaced before the end of that time. Even if this is not the case, it is obviously worth an untold amount to these oil companies, for its construction means that the Government of the United States obligates itself to protect not only the pipe line but the entire system of petroleum production and distribution in that area. I furthermore submit that no investment as hazardous as this pipe line is could possibly be justified economically unless it would return the original cost with interest within a 25-year period. It is certainly pertinent to observe that the pipe line constructed by the British in this same region was, after 8 years' use, too rusty for pressure to be safely applied in it.

In the second place, it is said that under the terms of this agreement the companies promise that they will not sell any of the Saudi-Arabian oil to enemies of the United States—that is, countries which our State Department requests they should not sell to. Are we to understand from this that if the Government does not build this pipe line for the companies, then they will sell to enemies of our country and to countries which our State Department requests them not to sell to? If this is the case, it is nothing short, in my judgment, of a reflection upon the attachment of the oil companies to the interests of the United States, and I cannot believe that they want us to assume that. Surely, they would not sell to enemies of our country, and surely the Government does not have to build a pipe line, under conditions altogether unfavorable to its own interest, to keep them from selling oil to its enemies.

Incidentally, it ought to be pointed out that this pipe line is only the beginning of tremendous investments that someone will have to make in this area. What is going to be done about refineries on the Mediterranean coast, for example, remains to be seen. But the construction of such refineries which might cost hundreds of millions of dollars, is clearly the next necessary step after the pipe line.

In the next place, we are told that the Government gets an option to buy a billion barrels of oil over a 50-year period and this is supposed to be something of great importance. Let us analyze that for a moment. We are at present producing about a billion and a half barrels of oil per year in the United States. Nor is this appreciably more than the amount we were producing prior to Pearl Harbor. In other words, this billion barrels is only about two-thirds of 1 year's current American production and consumption. Furthermore, at the very least, the Saudi Arabian fields can be counted upon to produce 40,000,000,000 barrels of oil, and this, I think, is a conservative estimate. The real importance, therefore, lies in the other 39,000,000,000 barrels and what the effect of permitting those 39,000,000,000 barrels to fall into the hands of an oil cartel will be upon the future peace of our country. Furthermore, suppose the Government does purchase 1,000,000,000 barrels of oil from the Standard, Texas, and Gulf Oil Cos. The most reliable figures that I can get on the cost of production of this oil are to the effect that it will run around 20 cents per barrel. In addition to that, approximately 20 cents royalty will have to be paid. Under the terms of the agreement, the Government is allowed to purchase this billion barrels of oil at a price 25 percent less than the posted price for oil either in the United States or in the Persian Gulf area, whichever is lower. But it is the oil companies which will post the price, and if we can judge at all from past experience, which certainly we can, the price posted in the Persian Gulf area will not be substantially lower than the price in the United States. Assuming that prices in the United States will rise after the war in any case, it is certainly not exaggerating to say that the posted price in the Persian Gulf area will be not less than $1 per barrel. This would mean that the Government would buy the oil at the well for 75 cents per barrel. This also means that the oil companies would be making a profit of 35 cents per barrel on every one of those billion barrels sold to the Government, or a total profit of $350,000,000. Here again I am convinced that I am estimating on the conservative side.

What is the Government going to do with the oil after it has got it? It can, of course, transport it to the Mediterranean through the pipe line. But then it will either have to sell the oil to whoever happens to have a refinery at that point or it can just sell the crude oil to such oil company as may be handy, in which case there would obviously be no advantage whatsoever for the United States Government in having purchased the oil in the first place. The third alternative is to ship the oil to the United States. Remember that over the contemplated 30- to 50-year period the total amount of this billion barrels of oil will be substantially less than the supply from 1 year of American production and, therefore, from any realistic point of view, of little consequence to our long-run petroleum supply. But the only way the Government could possibly make effective use of this oil, in any case, would be to transport it to the United States. The cost of such transportation, according to the best figures I can get, will run in the neighborhood of 80 cents per barrel if delivered on the east coast and about $1 per barrel if delivered on the west coast. Taking the lower of these figures, the cost of the oil plus transportation to the Government, delivered in the United States, would be $1.55 per barrel, or considerably in excess of the probable cost to the Government of domestically produced oil. In other words, the 25-percent reduction is again no concession, for all it would mean would be that the companies, by selling the oil to the Government, would get a volume of business that they could not otherwise have at all. Only if the prices in the United States, and therefore Persian Gulf prices, increased to a point where 25 percent of the posted price in the Persian Gulf area was equal to the total cost of transportation would there be any financial gain to the Government from purchasing this Persian Gulf oil and bringing it to America, and unless that it to be done the Government would then, as I have already pointed out, have either to construct its own refineries on the Mediterranean coast and use the finished product there, or else it would have to sell the crude back to some refining company, in which case the only advantage it would get would be that it could be in the business of buying and selling oil without benefiting American national interests.

I want to assert at this point that it seems to me that if we are considering the future of the United States with regard to the supply of liquid fuel, the most important thing that has happened in recent years is, in all probability, the action taken by Congress to provide for effective scientific experimentation in the production of liquid fuels from coal, farm products, and shale. For, however, one figures the petroleum situation and whatever the exact facts may be regarding it, certain it is that the degree to which the United States can make itself, or at any rate the Western Hemisphere, self-sufficient as to the production of liquid fuel, the better off we are going to be. We cannot deceive ourselves that the development of petroleum substitutes is going to be quick, easy, or a cheap process. It may be years before practical substitute methods of producing gasoline, for example, have been perfected. But that someday in the proximate future that job must be done is evident.

And now for my third and most important argument.

Everyone will admit that if the expenditure of Government money is going to result in greater security for the United States, or in the promotion of peace for coming generations, the expenditure of that money would be worth while, even though as a strictly business proposition it may not be able to be defended. In the case of this pipe line, however, exactly the opposite is the case. For what the United States is buying with its pipe-line money under the present agreement is a terrific international liability with no compensating advantages whatsoever. I say this because I know that without Government control in the public interest of the policies to be pursued with regard to this oil where they affect international relations and the economic well-being of the people in the area and, indeed, in the whole Eastern Hemisphere or where they affect the price of this oil and the general policy of distribution—I know that without effective governmental control in these matters, this oil is going to be sold under control of a cartel which inevitably will be arranged by the American major companies and the British. Not only will this cartel be formed but it will be a cartel endorsed in effect by

the United States Government through its action in this pipe-line agreement. The United States Government will be virtually a partner to the cartel, but a partner without the slightest degree of effective control over what the cartel itself may in the future do. Under cartel control the oil will be sold at a high price, for the British are committed to a cartel system already and our own major oil companies certainly have not been averse to it. They have sought through the years to affect such cartel arrangements in every way they could and, indeed, Members of Congress have recently been in receipt of literature sent out by the major oil companies defending the cartel system and pointing out what a great boon it can be to the common people. We have, however, yet to see any effective evidence of its having benefited the common people in this manner.

At the very least monopoly control of this Eastern Hemisphere oil by the Standard-Texas Oil Co. on the one hand and the British on the other hand means high prices for Persian Gulf oil. It will probably mean such high prices that two most serious results will take place. In the first place, the oil will not become available generally to the people of the Eastern Hemisphere. Neither will it benefit the common people of the regions from which it is being taken. All over Europe and Asia there will develop a tremendous drive to secure this oil on a better basis. The United States will have obligated itself to full participation in the protection of these oil fields as well as the pipe line. The Atlantic Charter will have been violated fundamentally. No, Mr. Speaker, the United States Government has got to have enough control as to this oil so that it can see to it that it is used as an instrument of peace rather than as a source of friction and a possible cause of future conflict. Our Government has got to be in a position where it can deal with the British Government in this matter. It is utterly unsafe for the future of our own children to leave this monopoly of Eastern Hemisphere oil in the hands of cartels. Under this agreement the British Government, which owns the major share of the Anglo-Iranian Co., and the Arabian American (Standard-Texas) Co. will have the fixing of the price of Eastern Hemisphere oil. We know pretty well from experience the policies the British will pursue, and certain it is that nobody short of the American Government itself can expect for a moment to bring about a change for the better in this policy, least of all the American major oil companies to whose apparent financial interest it will be to go in with the British on a cartel arrangement. There is nothing in this pipe-line agreement whatsoever to prevent this from happening. Indeed, the agreement provides on the other hand that none of the companies entering into it with our Government will be asked to violate any cartel agreements.

In the second place, the result of cartel control of this oil will be that we will lose more Western Hemisphere oil to other parts of the world. The reason I say that is the following: If the prices of Persian Gulf oil are to be rigged by monopolies without any control in the public interest, those prices will be held at a sufficiently high point so that it will remain advantageous to ship Western Hemisphere oil into the Eastern Hemisphere. This, from the point of view of the future of America, I do not want. On the contrary, the enlightened interest of the United States is to see Eastern Hemisphere oil used for the benefit of people generally in the Eastern Hemisphere for the raising of their standard of living, and thus for peace. This agreement advances that cause not one single, solitary bit. Moreover, I can foresee a time when, with our own oil drained away, other American oil companies will be compelled to come on bended knee begging the companies with Arabian oil to share it with them. The results of such a situation I need not elaborate.

Mr. Ickes has gone out of his way repeatedly to emphasize that under this agreement the United States Government will not be interfering in any way with the private business of the oil companies. But this is not private business, and it is the Government's right and duty to insist on a position of reasonable control. In the first place, there is not now, and never can be, any effective competition whatsoever with regard to this Saudi-Arabian or Persian Gulf oil. It is already monopolized either by the British or four or five American major companies. In the second place, as I have pointed out, it constitutes a vital monopoly of Eastern Hemisphere oil and is, therefore, not only charged with the interest of the American people, but with that of all peoples of the world. To say that for our Government to put itself in a position to impose conditions with regard to the oil which will protect the peace and safety of the American people would be an invasion of the rights of private property interests, is to make a mockery of the principle that Government should stay in the field of legitimate and proper public business and keep out of the field of legitimate and proper private interests.

It is a well-known fact that the British Government over at least a 30-year period has owned the majority of the stock of the Anglo-Iranian Co. which in turn controls other British interests in the Persian Gulf area. On its investment, according to the president of the Anglo-Iranian Co., the British Government has received back its original investment four or five times over, and has drawn dividends of over 15 percent per year. The book value of its stock has increased more than tenfold. With these figures in mind, it can readily be seen that considerable progress could be made in the reduction of the national debt of the United States if our Government shared in the earnings resulting from the exploitation of the tremendous pools of oil in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. Does not the gentleman think this is a disillusioning development in view of the fact that there were portrayed to us the salutary benefits to be derived from the Atlantic Charter, wherein it is provided that the economic resources of the world would be more equitably divided? Does not this contravene one of those provisions of the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it does. I think it is the duty of the United States Government to see that this vital monopoly of available oil resources in the Eastern Hemisphere is handled, as nearly as it is within our power to see it handled, in accordance with those principles. I think it will preserve the lives of the American people in the future if that is done. May I say to my distinguished colleague that he touched on one of the two most important points in my speech.

Our own Government has got to share ownership or effective control of the basic resource, oil. It ought not, in my judgment, to interfere with the practical carrying on of the business of oil production, nor would it need to do so. But it certainly ought to share in the profits of the enterprise, and it certainly, above all things, must have control over the policies pursued which so intimately affect our international relationships and our people's hope of future peace. Either we should have nothing whatsoever to do with this whole matter, involving as it does a guaranty of this whole Persian Gulf area, clear on the other side of the world, or else we should be in a position where we can insist that the policies pursued can be such as to promote peace and to make it unlikely that trouble will develop in the future because of the activities of an oil cartel, dominating the economic life of the Eastern Hemisphere. This oil ought to be produced in such a manner and at such a price as to prevent the diversion of any of our own oil out of the Western Hemisphere. It should be produced in such a manner that the nations without oil resources will not complain about the matter or feel that they have been dealt with unfairly in the light of America's solemn promise. It should be produced so that the common people of the nations from which the oil comes can be definitely benefited and their present abysmal poverty alleviated.

Some people are apparently afraid the Government will have too much to say about the oil business. My fear is that the major oil companies already have too much to say about governmental decisions and the determination of public policy.

There are altogether six major oil companies which stand to benefit tremendously from the construction of this pipe line by the Government. They are the Standard Oil Co. of California—known in Arabia as the California-Arabia Standard Oil Co.—the Texas Co., the Gulf Oil Co., Socony-Vacuum, Shell, and Standard Oil of New Jersey. The first three of these companies are, of course, those who signed the agreement with Mr. Ickes. Socony-Vacuum, Shell, and Standard of New Jersey own between them one-half of the entire Qater Field, which is on a small peninsula just to the

south of the Standard-Texas interests. Negotiations are now in progress which unquestionably will result in having this pipe line serve the Qater Field and these other three major companies. Now what are the Government departments which have the determining influence on decisions regarding oil? They are four in number. First, the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, attached to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and whose recommendations are in the nature of the case necessarily adopted in a routine manner by the Joint Chiefs of Staff upon whose shoulders rest decisions affecting the whole future fate of mankind. Second, and in my judgment, most important and most influential, the Petroleum Administration for War. Third, the State Department. And fourth, the Foreign Economics Administration. Let me recite again the six major oil companies which have a direct interest in this pipe line. They are: Standard Oil of California, Texas Co., Gulf Oil, Shell Oil, Socony-Vacuum, and Standard of New Jersey. Without comment I submit the following facts to the House.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE. Is it just a coincidence that the Petroleum Administrator for War, Mr. Ralph Davies, happens to be vice president of Standard Oil of California? There is no connection whatsoever between the two?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am coming to that very coincidence, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. COFFEE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Without comment, I submit the following facts to the House:

The agreement was recommended to the joint Chiefs of Staff by the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, the executive officer of which is Commodore Andrew Carter, for years an official of the Shell Oil Co. Associated with him is General Pyron, for years vice president of the Gulf Oil Co. In the Petroleum Administration for War, Mr. Ickes' Deputy Administrator is Mr. Ralph Davies, vice president of Standard Oil Co. of California, who, in addition to the salary which he receives as Deputy Administrator for the P. A. W., has been continuously in receipt of an annual salary of $47,000 from the Standard Oil Co. of California. The head of the Foreign Oil Division of the Petroleum Administration for War was, up until approximately 2 months ago, Mr. James Terry Duce. Mr. Duce was an official of the California-Arabia Standard Oil Co. before he took his position as Chief of the Foreign Oil Division for the United States Government, and he left that post in December to go back to work for the California-Arabia Standard Oil Co., for whom he is now working as a high official. In the State Department, the Petroleum Adviser up until a few months ago was Mr. Max Thornberg, who was and is now vice president of Bahrein Petroleum Co., a subsidiary of the Standard Oil Co. of California, owning a considerable portion of this Saudi-Arabian oil field. Like Mr. Duce, Mr. Thornberg is no longer with the State Department. His place was taken by Mr. Charles Rainer, present Petroleum Adviser to the State Department, who was for years the representative of the Socony-Vacuum Co. in India and the Orient, and who served under Mr. Victor Barry, another official of the Socony-Vacuum Co., in the Foreign Economics Administration before he came to the State Department. In the Foreign Economics Administration, the Oil Division was headed up until a couple of months ago by Mr. Victor Barry, an official of the Socony-Vacuum Co. in charge of Near Eastern marketing for many years. It will be noted that the three men who headed the Foreign Oil Division of the P. A. W., the Oil Division of the Foreign Economics Administration, and the Oil Division of the State Department were all three men with direct connection to the companies benefiting from this pipe line, and all three of them left their posts where they were making decisions of public policy for the United States Government with regard to oil at approximately the time that the work on this agreement was complete.

I do not criticize these men for having been oilmen. I have nothing against them for being oilmen. The better oilmen they are the better I like them. But a policy which permits people with direct connections with these same oil companies to determine public policy where those companies are affected is as wrong as anything can possibly be.

Of course, this may be only a coincidence, but I submit that if so, it is an extremely strange one. Perhaps the most amazing thing of all, however, has to do with Dr. E. DeGolyer. Dr. DeGolyer has been prominent among the major oil companies for many years, and was, in the past at least, extremely close to British oil interests, and has been repeatedly employed by the major companies which are interested in the Arabian field. He was employed by the Standard of California, Texas Co., and Gulf Oil Co. as their appraiser of oil property belonging to these companies in Saudi-Arabia. He had no more than finished this work than he was hired by the Petroleum Reserve Corporation as appraiser for that Government Corporation in connection with this pipe line. With all due respect to the great technical ability which Dr. DeGolyer undoubtedly possesses, this appears to me to be hardly the proper method to use in order to give a wholly impartial and independent report to the Government and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that this is the kind of a deal which the State Department wanted. I say that wholly on my own responsibility, but I believe if the full truth were known, it would be found that that Department approved this agreement only because it was presented to it as a measure of national defense, under which heading I do not believe the project can be classified. In any case, the Economic Division of the State Department never had an opportunity to study the proposed agreement. It was apparently sent to the petroleum advisor of the State Department under instructions from the Petroleum Administration for War to the effect that it must be returned within a matter of hours, or at most, a day or two. Accordingly, no real study could be given it by the State Department, and the petroleum adviser of that Department did return it approved in the short time designated by the Petroleum Administration for War, and without permitting the Economics Division, which was clearly the agency with direct responsibility in the matter, to give it any attention. This reminds me of the original contract between the Navy and the same Standard Oil Co. of California for the operation by the Standard Oil Co. of the Elks Hills reserve. That contract, subsequently declared illegal and canceled, was, it will be remembered, put through the White House under pressure of a similar sort, though from different official sources, in approximately 24 hours.

And while I am speaking of Elks Hills, let me contrast for the House that every sort of pressure has been and is now being exerted to get our Navy into partnership with Standard Oil of California for so-called unit operation of that great Navy oil reserve, and yet this same major oil company, along with the others involved, has adamantly opposed any kind of participation by the Government in the control of Saudi Arabian oil. I want to expand upon that last statement.

I shall not attempt to give all the story of negotiations that have been carried on with regard to this matter. Suffice it to say that it has been under discussion for a long time, and that such a proposal has been turned down in the past when it might have served the purposes of this war. As I have stated, if this is supposed to be a war measure, one must ask the question, "Why were the agreements and arrangements for a pipe line to be constructed in this very place not approved when all data were in the hands of the same authorities, which now approve it, more than a year ago at which time it could have been of great value to the war effort?" Under present circumstances it is a commercial post-war project. Perhaps a little history of what has been going on will shed some light on why the pipe line was turned down in the past, but has been started on its way at present. For in the beginning of negotiations our Government, through its highest officials, was insisting that the only way to handle the problem was for the Government to purchase, at a fair price, title to the oil concessions held by the American companies in Saudi Arabia, and then to lease to those companies for operation. This the companies flatly refused, whereupon it was proposed that the Government acquire a 51-percent interest in the oil. This again was flatly refused. The Government backed down again, this time to a proposal that it should have a 30-percent interest. This, too, the companies objected to, and held out adamantly against any arrangement involving any Government control whatsoever in this matter.

Finally, the efforts of the Government to secure the interest of the American people by acquiring a degree of control

were abandoned, and the pipe-line agreement was then consummated. In other words, the reason the pipe line was turned down in the past would appear to be simply because our Government was insisting upon the very solution which I, myself, have advanced in this speech—namely, that it should share in the ownership and control of this oil by paying a fair price to the major oil companies for such share—and certain it is only after the insistence on the part of the Government to share such an effective control was finally abandoned was an agreement reached. Apparently the price which had to be paid was the price of leaving the major oil companies in complete control, not only of oil, but of the future economic and political destinies of hundreds of millions of people, including those of the United States. This, Mr. Speaker, is too high a price.

This pipe line can and no doubt should be built, but it should be built under different circumstances from those proposed in this agreement. For the expenditure of their money the American people should get something of value to them and the one thing of paramount importance is a degree of control over this oil so it will not be a source of future danger to our country's peace. Under this agreement the American people accomplish nothing in that direction. The net result of their expenditure will be to strengthen immeasurably the monopoly positions already held by a handful of major oil companies. It were better, in my judgment, to start in earnest, from this very day, to develop substitutes for petroleum, even though the cost be higher and the road long and hard; and certainly it were far better to remove the yoke of the majors from the independents of our country, to proceed earnestly for the development of Western Hemisphere oil—in Brazil, for example—and to alter Government policy in such a fashion that it will not, in almost every single case, benefit the majors at the cost of the independents.

I am no expert in this field, but as to the broad outlines of my contention, I am sure that I am right. The monopoly point of view and monopoly practices are, next only to the dictatorships of Japan and Germany, the greatest enemy of democracy, freedom, and peace that exists in the world. Mr. Speaker, this is not the "best we can do," for under this agreement the American people will not only expend an unpredictable sum of money on a pipe line for the use of private companies, but, much more important, they will assume international risks and face almost certain danger without acquiring thereby a single substantial compensation. To say this pipe line ought to be built should not, in this great democracy of ours, mean that in order to get it built we must accept the dictation of governmental policy by the major oil companies through their representatives in Government positions. I am certainly not willing for my country to become committed in such a way as to face the danger of future war on the other side of the globe. This is why I want to be able to require a course to be pursued with regard to oil which will prevent rather than cause such conflict and which will save our Western Hemisphere oil. Nothing in this agreement or in any other agreement that fails to give the Government a decent measure of control can serve either of these ends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter addressed to Wendell Willkie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a brief memorandum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore entered the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

OPIUM REGULATION

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and insert in the midst of my remarks certain press releases from our Government and the Governments of Great Britain, the Netherlands, and China.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to follow up the remarks I made earlier today with regard to the following joint resolution:

Whereas for nearly 40 years the United States of America has led the fight to destroy the illicit traffic in and nonmedicinal consumption of opium, as evidenced by its abolishing the opium monopoly system which it inherited in the Philippine Islands; its calling at Shanghai in 1909 the first international commission to consider the opium problem; its suggesting the calling of the three International Opium Conferences at The Hague in 1912, 1913, 1914; its urging at the International Opium Conference of 1924–25, sponsored by the League of Nations that the only effective way to suppress the demoralizing use of opium and its derivatives (heroin, morphine, etc.) was to control the source of the evil by limiting the cultivation of the poppy plant to the legitimate medicinal and scientific needs of the world; and its further participation in the Geneva Conference of 1931 to restrict the manufacture and distribution of narcotic drugs; and

Whereas the laws of the Chinese Government strictly prohibit the cultivation of the opium poppy and the use of smoking opium in all territory under its control, and the people of China have valiantly resisted the attempts of the invading Japanese militarists to enslave them by encouraging and even compelling the cultivation and use of opium; and

Whereas final defeat of Japan will terminate the illicit traffic in narcotics which has been carried on by the Japanese military in all territories they have occupied in the Far East; and

Whereas the British and the Netherlands Governments have recently announced their decision to prohibit the use of opium for smoking and not to reestablish their government monopolies for the sale of smoking opium in the territories formerly controlled by them in the Far East when those territories are freed from Japanese occupation, stating, however, that the success of their action must in the final analysis depend upon the cooperation of the opium-growing countries; and

Whereas because of our military operations in certain other areas in Asia, there are now thousands of young American citizens in countries where opium is cultivated and freely available and other Americans are on vessels delivering war materials to those countries, which condition constitutes a real threat to the health and welfare of these Americans and affords easy opportunity for the highly profitable smuggling of opium into the United States where its use has been greatly reduced: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress express its conviction that this World War ought to be not an occasion for permitting expansion and spreading of the opium traffic, but rather an opportunity for completely eliminating it; and be it further

Resolved, That the President be, and he hereby is, requested to approach the governments of all opium-producing countries throughout the world, urging upon them in the interest of protecting American citizens and those of our allies and of freeing the world of an age-old evil, that they take immediate steps to limit and control the growth of the opium-poppy and the production of opium and its derivatives to the amount actually required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes.

This is an involved subject, and I wish to review some of the efforts that our country has systematically carried out since we got into this opium problem when we took over the Philippine Islands and inherited the opium monopoly there from the Spanish regime. From that day to this we have consistently led the fight, not only to free our own peoples from it, but to liberate the world from this vicious evil.

I have gone over the reports of the various opium conferences, the first of which were all sponsored or initiated by the United States, and have seen the failure of the various halfway measures that have been tried. We face today new dangers from a possible extension of the traffic, and also new opportunities to do something constructive and decisive and effective about it.

But before I recount some highlights of the opium story I want to explain my own special interest in the subject which began when I saw first-hand how the Japanese Army used opium as a war measure in China.

In the midst of the recent reports of atrocities carried out by the Japanese military against American soldiers on Bataan, I think it is worth while to call attention to the fact that not much has been said about the single greatest and most diabolical atrocity of all. Japan's systematic official forcing of conquered peoples to grow and use opium. For example, when the Japanese armies came into the northwest province of Shansi in the fall of 1937, there had been no opium grown in that province

since the Chinese Revolution in 1911. Smoking-opium was imported under a provincial monopoly but no one had seen an opium plant for 26 years. Within 10 days after the Japanese captured the city in which I was working, just 6 years ago, I saw their soldiers officially passing out opium seed free, and compelling the Chinese farmers to plant it in those areas along the highways and railways which the Japanese were able to control against guerilla attacks; forcing them to take rich land, producing wheat and rice and millet and beans, food for the Chinese people, and plant it in opium. Within 6 months one out of every six or eight of those fields was already "white unto the harvest" with the poppy. The Japanese killed the farmers if they did not plant opium; the Chinese guerillas trying desperately to prevent the enslavement of their people, sometimes executed the farmers if they did plant it.

Far worse than crude opium is its more deadly derivative heroin. Heroin is different from any other drug in that it causes a permanent deterioration of human personality so that the ordinary heroin addict is finished within 5 to 8 years as far as ever being able to become a useful, dependable, honorable citizen again. There is no method of rehabilitation known to medicine whereby we can reclaim and reestablish as a substantial, trustworthy citizen, a person who has become a confirmed heroin addict.

One of the first things the Japanese did when they took over China was to seize all the cigarette factories and set up a tobacco monopoly. Then we discovered that anywhere from one to three cigarettes in some packages apparently were loaded with heroin, for within a few months we found many Chinese smokers of Japanese cigarettes developing cravings which could be satisfied only by heroin. They had become addicted to heroin, without knowing it.

Even worse than the introduction of heroin through cigarettes was its direct injection into human beings by hypodermic. I cannot prove this absolutely, because we were never able to get hold of a hypodermic and analyze the contents, but this is the sort of thing which happened in many parts of China: The Japanese would capture a city and, quite understandably, guard the city gates closely. Anybody who went in or out had to have their permission. In order for a farmer to get through the city gate in the morning, as he brought in his load of vegetables or grain, he had to have a hypodermic from the Japanese guards. When he went home in the afternoon they gave him another hypodermic. We made repeated inquiries. The Japanese said they were cholera or plague inoculations. Of course, no one gives cholera inoculations to the same man twice in the same day. Besides, when they did actually give a cholera or plague injection they would give the recipient a certificate to that effect. The truth became evident when these victims developed heroin addiction.

It was the calculated, systematic debauching, enslaving, demoralization of a people so that it perhaps could not have enough stamina, enough vitality, enough strength to be able ever to rise up, get on its feet, and throw off the oppressor's yoke.

Mr. BURDICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. What is the native state of that drug, heroin?

Mr. JUDD. Heroin is an alkaloid derived from opium. Opium has to be put through a certain crude processing to make it suitable for smoking; or it can be broken down in more elaborate factories into several pure drugs. There are three or four main ones—morphine, codeine, papaverine, heroin. Western doctors have completely discontinued the use of heroin because we discovered this peculiarly vicious effect.

One of the chief reasons for the failure of the attempts by western nations to suppress opium was that they were never willing, excepting the United States, to do more than try to control the manufacture and distribution of the drugs. But the root of the evil is the plant itself. Growing it is a very lucrative occupation. It takes very little care or cultivation or effort in collecting the juice. It grows on a great many types of land. The product is very small in bulk, and it produces a very large cash revenue. Therefore, there is a tremendous incentive to cultivate opium. The United States has contended all along, as I shall point out later, that the evil cannot be controlled until the actual growing of the plant is limited to legitimate needs.

Mr. BURDICK. Is opium processed in China?

Mr. JUDD. Not until by Japan in recent years. Previously the Chinese had never used anything but smoking opium. In America many persons who never drink habitually will drink a cocktail occasionally when served at a party. Just so in old China, a host would sometimes serve opium pipes to his guests after a feast. A good many men who never smoked opium at home or in dens would smoke a pipeful a half dozen times a year. Relatively few became abject slaves to it as most westerners do when once they start using it. The worst addicts were among the very rich and the very poor.

But the Japanese built factories in Tientsin, in Manchuria, and Korea for producing from crude opium the refined alkaloids which create an infinitely worse addiction.

Most of the smuggling of narcotics into America and Europe was sponsored and engineered by Japanese, using degraded Chinese and Koreans. The Japanese provide the drug free until a man is enslaved and then cut down the supply. In order to get the drug without which he can hardly live, he has to do the will of his overlords even if it be against the interest of his own country. It is a way of trying to break the resistance of conquered peoples, of compelling those whom they could not woo over by propaganda, to consent to the conquest and bow their necks to the Japanese oppression.

Chinese leaders have fought opium valiantly for two centuries. The story of the Opium War over 100 years ago is too well known to need recounting. After the Chinese Revolution in 1911 under Sun Yat-sen, the new Chinese Government adopted a program of systematically eliminating the growth and use of opium over a definite period of years. It burned huge quantities of confiscated opium at public bonfires in Shanghai; but when victory was almost in sight internal disorder developed. Yuan Shih-Kai attempted a counter-revolution, foreign nations intervened, and the opium abolition movement collapsed. Then came the war-lord period, the struggle for power that follows most revolutions. Opium was a quick source for a war-lord's revenue; the cultivation of opium spread again and became very common throughout many parts of China.

Then when Chiang Kai-shek finally came to the top 10 years ago he laid down in 1934 a definite 6-year program of eliminating opium, province by province, county by county, so much every year. Some persons were officially executed as examples, if they returned to opium smoking or hypodermic injections after being "cured" three times. By 1940, except for parts of four provinces away back in the west and southwest where the Chinese Government has not had full control, opium cultivation had been completely suppressed even in the midst of a terrible war. Chiang rejected resolutely all suggestions that he help finance China's resistance by licensing opium and deriving huge revenues therefrom.

The Japanese Army made it a capital offense for Japanese soldiers to use opium. They forced it on the Chinese, but would kill any Japanese who used it. However, I noticed in press reports last week that in pill boxes on the Kwajalein atoll there were found silver and wooden opium pipes that the Japanese soldiers had been using.

No people, no matter how strict its discipline, whether Shintoist, Mohammedan, Christian, or what not, can play with opium and come through without its own citizens contracting the habit. Usually the country's economy becomes in part dependent upon opium, so that the government finds itself making excuses for degrading its own people in order to get revenue from their vice.

You all know that the British, Dutch, and French possessions in the Far East were in greater or less degree financed by government monopolies of opium. The revenue ranged from 2 percent of the income of the Dutch East Indies Government up to 20 percent of the income of the British Straits-Settlements Colony, which includes Singapore. Heretofore, these countries have always argued that they could not abolish the system because their respective economies were dependent upon it. But a few months ago in response to notes from our Government, the British and Dutch issued official statements saying that when they recovered from the Japanese the territories formerly under their control, they would prohibit opium smoking and would not reestablish their government opium monopolies, the licensing of opium dens under official blessing, and so forth.

These statements represent the most important forward step in many years. and I include them below, along with the comment of our Department of State:

[From parliamentary debates, House of Commons, London, November 10, 1943]

OPIUM SMOKING, BRITISH FAR EAST TERRITORIES—TOTAL PROHIBITION

Captain Gammans asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies whether he is in a position to state the policy of His Majesty's Government in regard to the prohibition of opium smoking in far eastern possessions after the expulsion of the Japanese.

Colonel STANLEY. By the Hague Convention, 1912, His Majesty's Government undertook to take measures for the gradual and effective suppression of opium smoking. The Geneva Agreement, 1925, contained provisions supplementary to and designed to facilitate the execution of the obligations assumed under the Hague Convention and in particular provided that the importation, sale, and distribution of opium and the making of prepared opium for sale shall be a monopoly of the government. Under the system of government monopoly, supplies of prepared opium were restricted to habitual smokers and as a result of the administrative measures and the general improvement brought about in social conditions during the 20 years preceding the Japanese aggression much progress has been made toward the suppression of opium smoking.

His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom have now decided to adopt the policy of total prohibition of opium smoking in the British and British protected territories in the Far East which are now in enemy occupation and, in accordance with this policy, the prepared opium monopolies formerly in operation in these territories will not be reestablished on their reoccupation. The success of the enforcement of prohibition will depend on the steps taken to limit and control the production of opium in other countries. His Majesty's Government will consult with the governments of other countries concerned with a view to securing their effective cooperation in the solution of this problem.

[From press release of November 10, 1943]

ROYAL NETHERLANDS GOVERNMENT,
MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

The Royal Netherlands Government, having considered its attitude with regard to the opium-smoking habit in certain parts of the Netherlands Indies after the liberation of these parts from enemy occupation, has decided to take all necessary measures for the discontinuance of that habit and for the complete suppression of the use of opium for smoking in the whole area of the Netherlands Indies. These measures will include the abolition of the opium monopoly.

This decision is based on the following considerations:

In certain parts of the Netherlands Indies smoking of opium was still authorized, in conformity with the rules laid down in the agreement signed at Geneva on February 11, 1925, which had in view to bring about the gradual and effective suppression of the manufacture of, the internal trade in, and the use of prepared opium as provided for in chapter II of the International Opium Convention, concluded at The Hague on January 23, 1912. As a state signatory of the protocol annexed to the agreement of February 11, 1925, the Netherlands undertook to strengthen the measures already taken in accordance with article 6 of the Hague Opium Convention of 1912, and to take any further measures which might be necessary in order to reduce consumption of prepared opium in the territories under their authority, so that such use might be completely suppressed within a period of not more than 15 years from the date on which a commission to be appointed by the Council of the League of Nations, would decide that the poppy-growing countries had insured the effective execution of the necessary measures to prevent the exportation of raw opium from their territories from constituting a serious obstacle to the reduction of consumption in the countries, where the use of prepared opium was still temporarily authorized.

For many years past the Netherlands Indies opium moncpoly has endeavored to restrict the use of opium as much as possible in order to pave the way for total prohibition as the ultimate aim of the Netherlands Government's opium policy. Encouraging results had been reached and the total consumption was steadily decreasing.

When the Netherlands Indies have been liberated from enemy occupation, an entirely new situation will arise. The Royal Netherlands Government does not know what kind of opium policy will have been applied during the period of the occupation. But it has come to the conclusion that it may avail itself of this opportunity to advance the moment of the complete suppression of the use of prepared opium and bring about its immediate and complete abolition.

The Royal Netherlands Government realizes that, if total prohibition is to have the desired effect of stopping the habit of opium smoking, international cooperation is indispensable. It feels fully confident that such cocperation will not be lacking. It does not doubt that all Governments concerned will appreciate its decision and collaborate fully in order to eliminate the conditions which used to constitute serious obstacles to the effective enforcement of total prohibition.

At the outbreak of the war preparations for an international convention for the limitation of the production of raw opium had advanced to a considerable extent; these preparations are now being continued by the opium section of the League of Nations Secretariat within such limits as present circumstances permit. The Netherlands Government trusts that, when normal communications are restored, effective measures on an international basis will insure that the exportation of raw opium from the poppy-growing countries will not impede the complete suppression of the use of opium for smoking, and that every effort will be made to prevent illicit opium from finding its way into the Netherlands Indies.

In cases where the health of addicts would be endangered by sudden abstention from the use of prepared opium, the Netherlands Government is prepared to take the necessary measures for their recuperation, namely by giving these addicts the opportunity of following a cure to be weaned of the opium habit.

LONDON, *October 1, 1943.*

[From press release]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
November 10, 1943.
No. 473.

The following statement was issued by the Acting Secretary of State today:

"I have noted with satisfaction the decision announced today by the British and the Netherlands Governments to prohibit the use of opium for smoking and to abolish opium monopolies in their territories when those territories are freed from Japanese occupation.

"For many years it has been the policy of the United States Government, domestically and internationally in cooperation with other governments, to seek the eradication of the abuse of opium and its derivatives. To this end it initiated the movement resulting in the calling of the International Opium Commission at Shanghai in 1909. It participated in the conference called at The Hague which resulted in the Hague Opium Convention of 1912. Article 6 of that convention provided for the gradual suppression of the manufacture, the internal traffic in, and the use of prepared opium. Subsequently each of the governments parties to the Hague Opium Convention having possessions in the Far East enacted legislation which it deemed to be appropriate for the fulfillment of this article. The United States Government met its obligations under the Hague Convention through legislation which effectively prohibited the manufacture, importation, or sale of smoking opium both at home and in its possessions.

"In view of the measures which have been taken during the last 20 years to combat the abuse of narcotic drugs, among which was the coming into force of the Narcotics Limitation Convention of 1931, this Government feels that the problem of smoking opium should now be susceptible of solution.

"With reference to the question of limitation and control of production, mentioned in the statements made by the British and Netherlands Governments, the United States Government has for many years taken every opportunity to urge that only by limiting the cultivation of the poppy for the production of opium and other narcotic drugs can clandestine manufacture be stopped and the illicit traffic be effectively combated. This Government will therefore be glad to continue its cooperation in international efforts to bring about a solution of this problem.

"On September 21, 1943, the United States Government addressed aide-memoire to the British, Netherlands, and other interested governments in regard to the suppression of the nonmedical use of narcotic drugs in areas in the Far East now occupied by Japanese forces when such areas are reoccupied by the armed forces of the United Nations. It is a source of deep gratification that the action taken by the British and Netherlands Governments is so closely in accord with the policy of the United States Government in this regard."

The above decisions by Britain and the Netherlands give us for the first time the support of certain western empires without whose support our efforts have been doomed to failure. They, in turn, state frankly that their efforts to suppress the use of opium in their colonies will depend upon the cooperation of the opium-growing countries; otherwise smuggling cannot be effectively controlled.

The countries which are now producing the largest amounts of opium are mostly in the Middle and Near East. Iran is the greatest producer. As many as 50 to 75 percent of the gendarmes and police force in Iran, we are reliably informed, are addicts. Both raw and prepared opium can be bought as readily. This constitutes an acute menace to us and to our allies. Our ships are in the great new port of Basra every day unloading lend-lease war materials, mostly for Russia. We have thousands of American citizens working in Iran, and the British and the Russians and other allied countries have thousands there, too. The situation is most conducive to the development of addiction among curious or lonely or discouraged boys. Others succumb to the temptation to pay 50 cents for a small package of opium which they can sell for as much as $50 in America. It seems so easy; the package can be so readily concealed aboard ship. High officials in our merchant marine have expressed concern at the increas-

ing number of such small packets found here and there on the returning ships.

The narcotic addict in America has been very hard pressed. Because of the dislocation by the war of the usual channels of supply, it has been almost impossible for him to get his drug. He will do anything to get it, pay any price. We cannot close our eyes to this mounting danger to our own domestic control of narcotics, which is very effective at present.

At this particular time we have an unprecedented opportunity to overcome the old objection habitually raised by the opium-growing countries that limitation of cultivation will upset their economies. The pouring of lend-lease materials and moneys into some of the countries, such as Iran, the development of highways, railways, harbors, and factories is making them prosperous as never before. They now have an ideal opportunity to restrict the growth of opium without seriously disturbing their financial stability. Their people need good food from their land more than money from opium.

An additional reason for our making representations at this time is that some of these countries are dependent upon us today as they have not been before. They need our money, our materials, our men. We therefore have a position of special influence. Out of concern for the health and welfare of our own men and those of our allies, as well as the citizens of the countries involved, we can in a gentle, courteous, and yet firm way approach those governments, urging that they take immediate steps to limit the cultivation of opium to the legitimate needs of the world, which amount to less than 400 tons a year.

Thus most of the excuses that have been used in the past are no longer tenable. China has largely suppressed opium cultivation in the areas she controls. Her position is indicated clearly by the following statement:

STATEMENT READ BY DR. K. C. WU, POLITICAL VICE MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS, CHINESE GOVERNMENT, AT A PRESS CONFERENCE ON NOVEMBER 24, 1943, AT CHUNGKING

The Chinese Government has noted with great satisfaction the statement of the British and the Netherlands Governments of November 10 announcing their decision that opium smoking will be prohibited and opium monopolies will not be reestablished in their territories to be freed from Japanese occupation. This announcement is most welcome for it has been the constant policy of the Chinese Government to seek the eradication of the abuse of opium, its derivatives, and other dangerous drugs. A 2-year program for the suppression of the illegal use of manufactured drugs and a 6-year program for the suppression of opium smoking have been strictly carried out in free China since 1934 in spite of the Sino-Japanese war. Since 1940, opium smoking and poppy cultivation are absolutely prohibited in this country and it is the firm intention of the Chinese Government to enforce this prohibition also in all the areas which will be liberated from the Japanese occupation and in which our enemy has been deliberately spreading the use of narcotics in order to weaken our resistance and demoralize our people.

The Chinese Government has equally been concerned about the problem of opium smoking in the far-eastern territories of certain powers, where most of the victims were Chinese. Although opium smokers in China were severely punished, Chinese nationals who lived in those territories were allowed freely to indulge in this vice. Moreover, the fact that opium smoking was legally allowed to exist impaired the success of the policy of total prohibition of which China and the United States were the principal advocates, and was inconsistent with the letter and spirit of the Hague Convention of 1912. The recent decision of the British and Netherlands Governments, therefore, has filled a gap in the antiopium front and augurs well for the future cooperation of all the United Nations in their common struggle against the scourge of drug addiction.

With regard to the question of limitation and control of opium production mentioned in the statement made by the British and the Netherlands Governments, it goes without saying that China strongly favors such limitation and control as testified by the fact that China has already prohibited the cultivation of poppy since 1940. In view of the recent decision of the British and the Netherlands Governments, a satisfactory solution of the opium problem has surely been brought much nearer than before.

Japan is going to be smashed some day and that will give us the opportunity to end the illicit traffic which has been carried on by the Japanese all through the Far East and in fact all over the world.

The British and the Dutch are willing to go along now. I am sure the Russians will also because they have controlled opium very rigidly in their own land. Most of the producing countries are in considerable degree dependent upon us, and we need only to urge that they put into effect promises they made 30 years ago in the Hague Convention. So surely we have here a chance not only to stop the extension and expansion of this vicious, destructive, demoralizing traffic, we have an opportunity to take vigorous leadership in advocating measures which will once and for all eliminate it from the world as we eliminated it from the Philippines. The Asiatic peoples trust us on this score. They have confidence in us because of our record. Such a unique opportunity may not come again in years. We must not delay.

I did not know until I began to investigate that two or three countries in South America have started the cultivation of the opium poppy in the last few years. The usual reasons are given, namely, that it is highly profitable and necessary to support national budgets thrown out of balance by the war and the loss of normal trade. This is the first insidious beginning in our own hemisphere. We do not like it, and yet, of course, we have no power to forbid them to grow it. If, however, we can get all the United Nations to come together on this proposition and agree to limit the production of opium and its derivatives to the strictly medicinal and scientific needs of the world, then its further extension can certainly be prevented. The people of Asia particularly look to America for moral leadership as well as for political, military, and commercial leadership. I believe we should take this action now for moral and humanitarian reasons; yes, and also for reasons of intelligent, long-term, national interest.

Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of the House may inform themselves on the matter with a minimum of trouble, I want now to review America's part in the long fight against opium.

It is necessary to go back for nearly 50 years when the United States assumed control over the Philippine Islands and found we had inherited from Spain, the Government opium monopoly with its accompanying opium dens. Theodore Roosevelt when President of the United States refused to continue this method of procuring revenue based on the demoralization of peoples for whose welfare and protection we had assumed responsibility. The opium dens were closed and a law passed prohibiting the further importation of opium into the islands, save for medicinal purposes. But it was obvious that it would be impossible to prevent the smuggling of opium into the thousands of scattered islands of the Philippines without the collaboration of the neighboring countries where the use of opium was encouraged.

In 1909 President Roosevelt invited these nations to meet at a commission in Shanghai, hoping to arrive at some understanding whereby the traffic could be curbed and finally eliminated. This initial attempt on the part of the United States at Shanghai was followed by three international opium conferences held at The Hague. At the first conference of 1912 the Hague Convention was signed, calling for the gradual suppression of opium smoking and the closing of opium dens. Immediately following the close of the third opium conference at The Hague, the First World War broke out and the definite progress made in solving the opium problem was abruptly checked. Under cover of the war Japan at once began to flood China with morphine, a drug at that time unknown to the Chinese.

At the termination of the war America had the Hague Convention inserted in the Versailles Treaty, in the hope that the Convention calling for the suppression of opium smoking in the Far East and the greater control of the drug in the west would automatically go into effect with the ratification of the Versailles Treaty. The opium problem then passed from the jurisdiction of The Hague and the leadership of the United States into the hands of the newly created League of Nations.

Although not a signatory to the Versailles Treaty nor a member of the League of Nations, the United States, nevertheless, evinced her willingness to cooperate with the League in the opium issue by accepting an invitation to attend a conference under its auspices with the understanding that certain proposals should be presented on the part of the United States and given serious consideration. In fact, it was upon this understanding that an appropriation was granted by Congress and the Government consented to send an American delegation to Geneva.

Some 50 nations assembled at Geneva in November 1924 "as a means," so the League of Nations invitation read, "of giving effect to the principles of the

United States." It was the American contention that the first place to attack an evil is at its source, even as the ravages of malaria and yellow fever were not halted, until their source, the mosquito, was discovered and vigorously assailed. This was also the opinion of the eminent authority Sir John Jordan, many years British Minister to China and thoroughly familiar with the opium problem. As adviser to the opium committee in Geneva he had repeatedly expressed the view that whatever the amount of opium grown it would all be consumed, and that the opium traffic could only be stopped at its source which was the cultivation of the opium poppy.

The United States accordingly proposed at the Geneva Conference that a serious attempt be made to restrict the cultivation of the opium poppy to the world's legitimate medicinal need. The United States also proposed that a commission of experts be sent to the handful of opium-producing countries and with the cooperation of their governments devise ways and means whereby legitimate substitutes could take the place of opium, over and above medicinal needs, without unduly disturbing their financial equilibrium. The producing nations were prepared to seriously consider the American proposals. They frankly admitted it was the revenue, not the drug, which interested them, as being Mohammedans they were forbidden its use. If without cost to themselves, experts could visit their countries to determine what other crops or substitutes could take the place of opium, without disturbing their budgets they would welcome such a commission. Gandhi also cabled from India his approval of the American position and condemned the method by which western nations procured revenue based on the corruption of eastern peoples under their rule.

The United States also sought to obtain a definite date for the putting into effect of the Hague Convention. Its signatories (all present in Geneva) had present in Geneva) had agreed 12 years before at the First International Opium Conference, "to gradually and effectively suppress" opium smoking. This gradual suppression, had been accelerated to progressive suppression at the Second Hague Conference of 1913.

Unfortunately, the Geneva Conference evinced little disposition to discuss the restriction of poppy cultivation or to name an approximate date for the abolition of smoking opium in the Far East. Instead, the Conference contended that the more effective way of dealing with this evil was by controlling drug manufacture in the west. In other words, it put the cart before the horse.

Bishop Brent, for many years bishop of the Philippines, and thoroughly familiar with the opium problem in the Far East, was a member of the American delegation. Bishop Brent was greatly disillusioned by the League's refusal to meet the opium issue frankly. He referred to the Conference as a meeting "where free discussion was impeded and honest proposals side-tracked by legalisms and technicalities." He expressed indignation at the attempt of the Conference to establish one law for the protection of the peoples of the west from a highly dangerous drug, and another law for the peoples of the east under a system which exploited for financial gains the health and lives of the peoples under their protection, to whom the Covenant of the League refers as "those colonies and territories which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves whose well-being and development should prove a sacred trust of civilization."

After many weeks of fruitless effort to obtain discussion on the control and restriction of the source of the evil or to obtain a definite date for the putting into effect of the Hague Convention calling for the termination of opium smoking, the American delegation was finally informed by the president of the conference that he did not consider it "within the competence of the conference to discuss the American proposals." Being convinced of the futility of its further attendance the United States withdrew its delegation from Geneva.

Thus ended a sad chapter. The opium question gave the League of Nations an ideal opportunity to demonstrate to America and the world its ability to deal with a great moral problem which had caused constant conflict between nations and had taken a toll of countless lives. But unfortunately, not only ethics but great financial interests were involved with which the conference did not care to deal.

Some years later, in 1931, the League of Nations decided to call another conference for the specific purpose of considering the western angle of the opium problem, control of the manufacture and distribution of narcotic drugs. To this conference the United States also sent a delegation.

While much publicity was given this meeting and greater restrictions were imposed upon the manufacture and distribution of drugs in the west, it was the opinion of the head of one of America's greatest manufacturing companies, that:

> The mere control of the manufacture and distribution of opium without control of the source of production, which is the cultivation of the poppy plant itself will not suffice to abate the narcotic evil.

It was also the opinion of this authority that the restriction of the Government-controlled manufacture would automatically lead to illicit manufacture, as in his judgment anyone with a casual knowledge of the subject and with a crude plant could manufacture morphine of a kind for bootlegging purposes. It is not just the limitation or regulation of an evil that public welfare and public opinion demand, but its eradication. We do not try to limit smallpox or yellow fever or the white-slave traffic. We try to exterminate them. But this was not the solution which many of the nations constituting the League were prepared to consider at that time. The Geneva committee was not an unbiased board prepared to judge the case on its intrinsic merits, but was composed of a group of the very nations to whom their opium revenue in the Far East was an important factor.

With the setting of the sun in Geneva, the committee of the League of Nations was forced to admit that the restriction of drug manufacture and the pursuit of the elusive smuggler had not solved the opium problem. It finally agreed that the only logical solution had been proposed by the United States a score of years before when it strove in vain to scotch the evil at its source and restrict the cultivation of the opium poppy to the world's medicinal need.

The United States properly wants to have some definite assurance that our American troops and civilian forces which are contributing so much to winning the war in Asia are not to be contaminated by the flood of opium in the east today. Except for the smuggling of opium from Iran the supply to America has greatly decreased due to the war. But with the termination of the war and the trade routes once more open, not only the United States but the world at large could be flooded by the great stores of opium that have been accumulating in the east.

It is fitting to recall the last words of Bishop Brent at the Geneva Conference, when without success the United States tried to impress upon that body the necessity of first striking the opium evil at its source by controlling its production.

> The nations, large and small—
>
> The bishop said—
>
> are gathered here in Geneva to use concerted action for the building up of a new world on principles of equity, and justice, and moral helpfulness. The time has come for action on one of the great moral issues of our times, and the tide of opportunity runs high. We are in the valley of decision. There are but two alternatives—the nations must learn or perish.

His words fell on deaf ears then. During the intervening 20 years the production and use of opium trebled. It took a civil war in the United States to abolish slavery. It would seem that it is taking another war to bring about the abolition of another form of slavery even more destructive of the dignity and well-being of man.

Mr. Speaker, once more the nations are in the valley of decision. We have a chance to eliminate this vicious evil if the United States will lead out in vigorous proposals. Many other nations will go along today as they would not yesterday. We owe it to our own men working and fighting in Asia, and to our future trade and national welfare to make the strongest possible effort, taking advantage of the recent action by the British and Dutch and of our present position of special influence in the Middle East, to urge the opium-growing countries to make an immediate start in the restriction of production to the medicinal needs of the world.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

POLITICAL ACTIVITIES BY UNIONS—USING THE WAR FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein certain letters, pamphlets, and handbills.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the only reason for taking this time is to call the attention of the House again to political action with which the Members may or may not be familiar.

The war has been used as an excuse for much bad legislation; many activities which have little to do with winning the war.

The President said something about unity and a cessation of political campaigning. Once in a while, someone writes in, charging that Congress, Congressmen, are playing politics, but the most persistent, continuous, and determined effort along political lines is made by the administrations' political allies, notably the C. I. O. politicians.

Now, get the following facts and note how the war is being used to further a fourth term for Roosevelt:

The C. I. O. has endorsed Roosevelt for a fourth term.

It has announced that it intends to form committees for political action throughout the country.

The C. I. O. has also announced that it intends to defeat all those Members of Congress—both Democrats and Republicans—both in the Senate and the House, who have failed to do its bidding; who do not blindly accept and follow every New Deal policy.

The President's War Labor Board has many times granted to the C. I. O. a maintenance-of-membership clause in its contracts with employers. That clause means that, if an employee in a war industry, working to support the husband, brother, or son on the fighting front is a member of a union, he must, within 15 days, either resign from the union or continue to be a member, pay union dues and special assessments.

Time and again, the C. I. O. has called strikes, maintained picket lines, to prevent members who were in arrears on dues from working in industrial war plants.

Now, from Cleveland, Ohio, comes a circular put out by the C. I. O. and entitled, on the first page, "Jobs, Now and After." It then states, among other things:

> We all know the No. 1 job this year is to knock out the Axis and win the war. No question about that.
>
> But who isn't thinking about after? The point here, brothers and sisters, is: We're not going to just think about after—we're going to do things about it, starting now.

The circular then states:

> Things must be changed. Congress must be made to wake up. Living costs must be held down. Wages must be increased by a more just and higher formula.

That, being interpreted, means that those who produce the food on the farm must get no more for what they grow, while being required to pay higher wages for all farm help and a greater price for everything they buy.

Who is so foolish as to think that the cost of things which make up living can be held down if wages are increased? Who does not know that an increase in wage goes into every stitch of clothing, every ounce of food, which is handled by anyone receiving the increased wage?

To elect Roosevelt for a fourth term and to secure control of Congress the C. I. O. has started a dollar campaign. The caption on this part of the pamphlet reads, in part:

> THE C. I. O. DOLLAR CAMPAIGN
>
> It takes money to put up a real fight. The Cleveland C. I. O. political action committee has a plan for financing. Here it is:
>
> THE PLAN—$1 FROM EACH
>
> Each C. I. O. member is being called upon to pitch in a buck. As a receipt each contributor will be given a swell lapel button showing he did his part.
>
> The political action buttons will soon be in your shop. Have your dollar ready.

All those familiar with the labor situation and with union activities know quite well that in the vast majority of war plants no one but a union man with a union button showing his dues are paid can hold his job without abuse, intimidation, or violence, either to himself or his family. The union button in many plants is the passport to a job.

Now comes this C. I. O. union and proposes to put the "political action buttons" in "your shop."

Then, in larger black-face type, it carries this warning, "Have your dollar ready."

Everyone familiar with the communistic union practices knows that that is a threat that every worker either come across with his dollar or he will be called to account by the union.

If the union officials demand the payment of a dollar as a condition precedent to working in that particular factory, the employee will either have to pay it or be kicked out of the union.

Most contracts between the union and the employer require the employer to fire the union man who is not in good standing. What is the net result?

A Republican who desires to vote for Bricker, for Dewey, or for some other candidate for President, in order to hold his job, in order to work to supply the food or the munitions needed by his own flesh and blood on the fighting front, will be required to contribute his dollar to the campaign of the President of the new dealers for a fourth term.

The Atlantic Charter said something about the "four freedoms." Just where does the C. I. O. get the right to make a man's job dependent upon his contribution of a dollar to the campaign fund of the opposition political party?

What a howl would go up—and justifiably so—if the employer tried to assess each employee even 10 cents for a political campaign fund for the Republican Party. How quickly would the employer trying such a procedure be haled before a New Deal court by a New Deal attorney general.

Has there been a trade between the administration, the new dealers, and the C. I. O.? If not, how can this C. I. O. organization make this promise? The circular says:

> Your dollar is your investment in your future. An investment that will pay real dividends is jobs, decent wages, better working conditions and a greater measure of economic security.

What right has the C. I. O. to tell an employee in a war industry that, if he contributes a dollar, he will receive a job, decent wages, better working conditions, and a greater measure of economic security, than he would receive if he did not contribute?

The history of our Republic does not show that the record of the Democratic Party justifies any such promise. The record of the New Deal is one of tax and tax, spend and spend; and only the war, which will cost the lives of perhaps a million men—and God forbid—saved the New Deal from political disaster.

No one questions the right of any employee to contribute any sum which he may desire within the law to any candidate, to any political organization. But when our people are crying out against an increased public debt, against higher and ever-higher taxation, there is no reason why any organization, political or otherwise, should assume the authority or be permitted to exercise the power, to assess employees in war industries, or any other industries, for that matter a dollar or any other sum for a political campaign.

A copy of the circular to which I have referred and of the so-called order of the day issued by the national C. I. O. committee are printed herewith, and marked, respectively, exhibits A and B.

EXHIBIT A

JOBS NOW AND AFTER!—ALSO: WAGES AND LITTLE STEEL FORMULA—HOLDING DOWN LIVING COSTS—THE 1944 ELECTIONS

THE C. I. O. DOLLAR CAMPAIGN FOR POLITICAL ACTION—JOBS NOW—JOBS AFTER

We all know the No. 1 job this year is to knock out the Axis and win the war. No question about that.

But who isn't thinking about after? The point here, brothers and sisters, is: We're not going to just think about after—we're going to do things about it, starting now.

We tackle the home front

Most of us know that Congress has been putting the skids under the home front by refusing to back up the President's program for price control, equitable taxes and curbing war profiteering.

Wages, however, have been pegged to the Little Steel formula allowing only a 15 percent wage increase, while living costs have risen between 30 and 35 percent.

Things must be changed. Congress must be made to wake up. Living costs must be held down. Wages must be increased by a more just and higher formula.

How? We must work lots of ways—new ways. We must pay more attention to government—to politics.

We must get the facts, the truth, to the public. We must unite and organize the people.

We must use the radio, the newspapers, the printing presses—in fact we must utilize every means for getting our message to the people.

THE C. I. O. DOLLAR CAMPAIGN

It takes money to put up a real fight. The Cleveland C. I. O. political action committee has a plan for financing. Here it is:

The plan—$1 from each

Each C. I. O. member is being called upon to pitch in a buck. As a receipt, each contributor will be given a swell lapel button, showing he did his part.

The political action buttons will soon be in your shop. Have your dollar ready.

Your dollar is your investment in your future—an investment that will pay real dividends in jobs, decent wages, better working conditions, and a greater measure of economic security.

What will your dollar do?

No bones about it—1944 is a crucial year. Big things are at stake.

Recently several billionaires met in New York and appropriated $1,000,000 for a propaganda campaign through the radio, newspapers, motion pictures, and other publicity channels. All this—to promote the objectives of the National Association of Manufacturers. You know what that means.

Our duty in the 1944 elections is to get the truth to the people. That means millions of pieces of printed material, radio broadcasts, posters, handbills, post cards, letters, leaflets, etc.

We must engage in a vigorous campaign to see that our union members are registered voters. We must stimulate the growth of ward labor committees. We must work to defeat reactionary candidates and to elect to public office those who are friends of labor and the people.

THE C. I. O. DOLLAR CAMPAIGN FOR POLITICAL ACTION

The campaign

One dollar contribution to the political action fund by every C. I. O. member.

Fifty thousand dollars as financial goal to be raised in a lively 3-month drive.

Each C. I. O. local union has been assigned a quota of contributions in proportion to size of membership.

Prizes to local unions that fulfill their goals first.

Issued by: Political Action Committee, Cleveland Industrial Union Council, C. I. O., 1000 Walnut Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. Telephone: CHerry 8373.

Beryl Peppercorn, Chairman, Wm. F. Donovan, E. C. Greenfield, Joseph Kres, Pete Zvara, Louis Hahn, Patrick Quinn, Frank Jerome, Marie Prince, Harry Smith, Joe Miller, Max Amdur, Richard E. Reisinger, Paul Miley, Wm. M. Davy, Lillian Clott, Wendell Ringholz, Vincent Favorito, Perry J. Carpenter, J. Spluvak, J. A. Miller, Ray Dennis, Paul Jahn, Alex Balint.

Register to vote! Board of Elections, City Hall, PRospect 4250. Daily: 8:30 a. m. to 4:30 p. m. Saturdays: 8:30 a. m. to 12 noon.

EXHIBIT B

ORDER OF THE DAY

You are hereby called upon to become a soldier on the home front.

Victory abroad—and at home—is the order of the day.

The forces of democracy and freedom are on the march!

North Africa is now in Allied hands—Mussolini has fallen—our armies surge forward in Italy.

Bombs over Germany, over France, over Holland and over Poland—over all of Europe—will spell the end of the Fascist and Nazi tyranny.

Hitler and his Nazis are on the run on the Russian front.

The rising sun of Japan is beginning to set.

The price will be great—in blood and sacrifice, in sweat and tears; many fierce battles loom, yet we shall win—on the military front.

But shall we lose the fruits of victory? The next generation faces death in World War No. 3 unless we mobilize now to win the peace.

The forces of reaction, of privilege, of greed, and of power seek a return to economic chaos.

Under the guise of a return to the status quo, they seek to return to the unbridled exploitation, unemployment, and confusion that would sound the death knell of the rights and the interests of the common people.

Their aims are reflected in the actions of some of our lawmakers.

The grossly unfair tax bill, the scuttling of the Farm Security Administration, the repeal of the $25,000 salary ceiling, the shameful torpedoing of the National Resources Planning Board, which was supposed to plan for the world of tomorrow, the passage of the Smith-Connally antilabor, antidemocratic bill, the refusal to appropriate money to roll back the high cost of living, the refusal to control the scandalously high profits being made by corporate interests—these are all part of reaction's program.

These are but a few of the weapons of our enemies on the home front.

A crucial battle looms ahead—a battle equally as important as the battle on the military front.

It is a battle to protect and extend on the home front those rights and interests for which those who believe in freedom and democracy are fighting and dying on the field of battle.

It is a battle for which labor must marshal all its resources and all its strength.

It is a battle against reaction—against our enemies on the home front—a battle in which we fight with ballots.

Our watchword—bullets to win the war—ballots to win the peace!

Because of the critical fight ahead, your national executive council, at its regular quarterly meeting held September 19–21, determined by unanimous vote to join hands with the National C. I. O. Political Action Committee headed by Sidney Hillman.

Our program calls for the solicitation, from each member of the Textile Workers Union of America, of not less than $1. Half the amount collected by each local union, joint board, federation or any other subordinate body will be retained by it and earmarked for local use for political purposes only.

The National C. I. O. Committee has established regional offices throughout the country and labor and all progressive forces are rallying to the call.

The time grows short!

The situation is urgent!

Act at once for freedom and democracy!

TEXTILE WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA, C. I. O.,
EMIL RIEVE, *General President,*
GEORGE BALDANZI, *Executive Vice President,*
WILLIAM POLLOCK, *General Secretary-Treasurer.*

Do you see what it means? It means that Republican workers in war plants, who want to work in support of their own flesh and blood that they have sent to join the armed forces, that those men, Republicans, who want to support a Republican candidate for Governor, for President, for Congress, those Republicans must contribute $1. Oh, you say, it does not say they must. But the button is there and, in view of what has happened, we know—we are not so simple as not to know—that the man in the shop who fails to come across with his dollar, with his contribution to the C. I. O.—not to the Democratic campaign fund but to the C. I. O. New Deal campaign fund—and you Democrats are going to catch it just as much as we Republicans—that every one of those Republicans must contribute to the campaign of the man he is going to vote against or lose his job. That is what it means. How do you like it?

It is along the same lines as this British statement from the British press the other day in which the British are insisting that the President be reelected for a fourth term.

You know, Republican dollars go into the tax fund, strange as it may seem; and if you will analyze the figures, you will find that the northern industrial States contribute an overwhelming amount proportionately of the Federal tax bill. Yet those Republican dollars are being used as the dollars of Republican workers in factories are being used, to defeat the candidate which the taxpayer and the union worker wants. I say it is rotten, and we ought to put an end to it.

I wish I could get the Rules Committee to bring out a resolution—House Resolution 13—to investigate the sources of these funds and what they are being used for in this announced campaign to defeat all of those in Congress who voted for the Smith-Connally bill.

You probably have received this circular from the C. I. O., in which it is said that the Dies committee had no business investigating the C. I. O. Perhaps not; I do not know the legal angle to that proposition; but one thing is sure, and that is the circular announces they would submit their books and their papers to a committee of Congress.

When they go around and tell a man who has a brother or a son, or a woman who has a husband or son in the armed forces, to come across with a dollar in order to support their favorite candidate, it is about time this Congress takes action.

You need not go along with them on the theory that anyone here is going to escape their opposition. I know Members on the Republican side who over a period of 4 or 5 years have voted every time for everything in committee and in the House that the C. I. O. has asked for. I know two of those individuals on our side who now have C. I. O. candidates against them. So you are going to get it anyway, and you are not going to escape anything by ducking it. Why not meet it as it should be met, by letting the truth be known?

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, during the last 3 or 4 days we have had several meetings of the conferees of the House and Senate in which we endeavored diligently and earnestly to come to some agreement and to make some adjustment between the opinion of the Senate conferees and the opinion of the House conferees. Repeatedly one expression has come up not only there but here on the floor in reference to trusting the officers of our defense forces to carry out a Federal absentee ballot act. I have called the attention of the Members to the fact that this was objectionable and that personally I felt deeply the insinuations as to the integrity of the leaders of our American manhood abroad.

In the Washington Post today appears an article by Marquis Childs, which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON CALLING

(By Marquis Childs)

DEBATE OVER SOLDIERS' VOTE

Behind the long, fretful debate over the soldiers' vote is a distrust of democracy itself. In their bitter partisanship, the Republicans found themselves in bed with some odd characters. For the party of Lincoln to seem to follow the lead of Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, is a strange spectacle.

It's too bad Lincoln couldn't have heard Congressman RANKIN'S appeal to racial prejudice—subtle, implied, but there just the same—in the course of the debate on the Federal ballot bill. For all his tolerance, Lincoln had a way of dealing with frauds and shams and cruelties. And those who orate once a year on his birthday should remember that he believed in the people.

We are fighting this war to prevent powerful enemies from dominating the world and dictating how we shall live—within what narrow boundaries. We want to keep the fundamental rights that we've won.

Yet even on our side the process of going to the people, of taking the ballot, has become more and more rare. Voting in recent years has been a luxury. Even in Germany after Hitler there were a few "ja" votes; the habit died hard. Long before the fall of France, cynicism and corruption had all but destroyed democracy there. Britain has not had a general election since 1938.

By contrast, it's good to hear of a place where the war has not interrupted the custom of going to the people. It's a long way off, and it may be no real parallel, but, anyway, it's good news.

In Australia they've held two elections since 1939, and in both those elections their soldiers voted, even though they were scattered over the face of the globe. The first was in 1940, the second in 1943.

In time for the election last year, Australia adopted a provision giving the right to vote to all men who have served, or are now serving, in the armed forces outside the boundaries of the country, regardless of age. Since the draft age is 18, it meant that thousands of voters under 21—some of them under 18—cast their ballots for the first time.

There's a lesson in democracy. The question as to whether soldiers should or should not vote was never raised. A little touchy on the question of 18-year-olds voting, the opposition contended that the very fact the government had extended this privilege would prejudice the youngsters in favor of the party in power.

But here is how it turned out: The polling was carefully supervised by men not in uniform. The ballots were brought back to Australia and counted. And it was found that the servicemen voted in almost exactly the same ratio as the civilian population.

I believe the same thing would happen with our own forces. A lot of nonsense has been forthcoming about how impressionable are the men in our Army to the role of the Commander in Chief. Why they've never known another President, it has been smugly said. As though this generation of young men and women had been entirely cut off from the stream of American history.

More often than not first voters are conditioned by home environment. They tend to absorb their politics from their parents. There's no reason to believe this generation is different.

Moreover, theater commanders and others who come back to Washington report that the men overseas deeply resent the muddle over labor which has resulted in strikes and work stoppages. Isn't it possible that this resentment would find expression at the polls in votes against the administration responsible for the muddle?

Much of the quibble over the safeguards to be thrown around the soldier vote is an insult to the intelligence and integrity of those who are doing the fighting and the dying in this war. It's an insult, too, to the Army. The suspicion appears to be that the Army cannot be entrusted to get a fair and impartial presentation of the opposing candidates to the men overseas.

One of the most thorough reporters in Washington, Roscoe Drummond, of the Christian Science Monitor, went over thousands of words sent out by the Army News Service to American soldiers around the world. He rated the Army News Service almost perfect for impartiality. That is an answer to those who suspect the Army of trying to influence the votes of Americans in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a terrible commentary that we cannot send a ballot to the soldiers overseas and give every one of them an opportunity to vote, if they cannot vote for the entire ticket then to vote as much as is possible under the circumstances.

I call the attention of the membership of the House to this article, I request that they read it and let it sink deeply in their minds.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the article referred to in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MONKIEWICZ asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts, indefinitely, on account of the death of his mother.

To Mr. JAMES GLENN BEALL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 22, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be meetings of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 23, 1944, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, for the consideration of post-war planning.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearings on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backing of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

1. Tuesday, February 22: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Weather Bureau, Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

2. Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as folllows:

1213. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a Minimum Wage Board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1214. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting report of the Federal Trade Commission on Distribution Methods and Costs, Part III—Building Materials—Lumber, Paints, and Varnishes, and Portland Cement (H. Doc. No. 442); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2666. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3345. A bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4235. A bill to amend chapter 16 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4236. A bill to amend section 20 (11) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the period of limitation, during the war and emergency period, for the institution of suits against carriers by railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 4237. A bill to provide that Naval Reserve officers who are graduates of Naval Reserve Officers' Training Schools shall be eligible for permanent commissions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4238. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4239. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4240. A bill to extend the insurance benefits granted by section 602 (D) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to parents of certain deceased members of the armed forces even though such parents are not dependent; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4241. A bill to vest title to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (*ex-Michigan*) in the foundation for the original U. S. S. Michigan, Inc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution requesting the President to urge upon the governments of those countries where the cultivation of the poppy plant exists, the necessity of immediately limiting the production of opium to the amount required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to designate Horace C. Carlisle as poet laureate of Congress, with the privilege of having his poems printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Ambassador to Chile, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to send a Member of the House of Representatives to a legislative session of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies to be held in Santiago, April 14, 1944; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct the delegate to the peace conference to see that all possible war equipment is returned to this country to be used for the benefit of the farmers and citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4987. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Men's Club of Temple Emanu-El, of Buffalo, N. Y., representing 300 members, urging the President and the Congress to take all appropriate and necessary action to insure immediately the withdrawal and nullification of the Palestine White Paper of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4988. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the employees of the Star Binding and Trimming Corporation, New York City, urging the passage of House Resolution 418, for the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4989. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4990. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Bronx County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4991. By Mr. FULMER: Concurrent resolution submitted by Inez Watson, clerk, house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., requesting the Congress of the United States to provide that United States income-tax returns be simplified; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4992. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the Fairfield Rotary Club, Fairfield, Ill., signed by Eldon P. Fleming, president, and L. H. Garrison, secretary, earnestly urging the adoption of House Resolution 418; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4993. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Bonnie Kirby, of Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 3761; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4994. Also, petition of Hattie Goodloe, of Red Oak, Tex., favoring House bill 3843; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4995. Also, petition of A. Louise Dietrich, R. N., general secretary and chairman, Texas committee on legislation, Texas Graduate Nurses' Association, favoring House bill 3761; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4996. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Congregation Beth Sholom, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper, and urging the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4997. Also, resolution of Congregation Sherith Israel, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper, and urging the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4998. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of H. Hardesty and 719 other citizens of the Third and First Congressional Districts of West Virginia, protesting against the passage of any such prohibition legislation as is contemplated by the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4999. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary of the Lions Club of Mayaguez, Mayaguez, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to discrimination of Puerto Ricans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5000. Also, petition of the city clerk, Elizabeth, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5001. Also, petition of the president, Union Republic Youth, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5002. Also, petition of Asuncion Maldonado, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Governor Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5003. Also, petition of Luis Garcia, of San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to independence of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, we thank Thee for the stirring ministry of the past, for the story of noble deeds and selfless service, the memory of valiant men who have left their image and superscription forever upon our national life and whose wisdom and sacrifice have been vital factors in making and preserving us a nation. Especially this day we thank Thee for the shining virtues, the moral wisdom, and the elevated patriotism of Thy servant, the first President of the Republic, who still stands among us in lofty reserve.

With clamorous voices demanding our ears we would listen again to his calm and reassuring voice as, being dead, he yet speaketh with unerring judgment, exhorting us to union and harmony. May these warning sentiments bequeathed for the meditation of all future generations come to us with undimmed freshness as a message for these times. Like him whom we this day praise and honor, may we be unswayed by passion or prejudice. May our patriotism be like his, who, being tested by the pedestals of ambition, turned from the temptation with indignation and abhorrence. By patience and faith may we, like him, rise above the difficulties, discouragements, and dangers which confront us, as in this day of desperate battle his

unsheathed sword inspires the fighting men of America wherever liberty is challenged by tyranny. So, as the ages roll on, may a grateful nation cherish the luster of his virtues and the greatness of his service. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, February 21, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Radcliffe
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Bankhead	Guffey	Russell
Barkley	Hatch	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Smith
Bone	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Jackson	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Bushfield	La Follette	Tydings
Butler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Byrd	McFarland	Wallgren
Capper	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Caraway	Maybank	Weeks
Chavez	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wiley
Connally	Murdock	Willis
Davis	Murray	Wilson
Eastland	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of January 24, 1901, the Senate every year on this date listens to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address. Under that order the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been designated to read the address this year.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation,

and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental

maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions

of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with

ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverence and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on February 22, 1937, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who has just read Washington's Farewell Address, delivered in the Senate an address telling of the Senate's custom in regard to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address each year, and giving some historical background for the address. Since this material is of general public interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks following the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

There being no objection, the address delivered by Mr. THOMAS of Utah was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the reading of Washington's Farewell Address on his birthday is a Senate custom which the country highly approves. It is a mark of respect due the Father of Our Country. This custom began in the eighties of the last century. Through the nineties, year after year, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, submitted a resolution providing that the address be read. On January 24, 1901, he changed his resolution to read as follows:

"*Ordered*, That, unless otherwise directed on the 22d day of February in each year, * * * Washington's Farewell Address shall be read in the Senate by a Senator to be designated for the purpose by the presiding officer." (Senate Journal, 103, 56–2, January 24, 1901.)

Since the standing order was adopted the Farewell Address has been read alternately by a Democrat and Republican each year.

Laudable as the reading of the address is, it may become a perfunctory practice or it may result in an adherence to one-sided or at least sloganized deductions if we do not from time to time rehearse the real meaning of the address and the reasons for which it was written.

Washington's Farewell Address was not merely advice for future generations prepared by our great first President without consultation, nor was it without partisan political significance. Great as the address is, and important as it has become, it was a defense of his administration quite as much as an exposition of wisdom and virtue. Washington's wisdom and virtue may be accepted as universal, but his defense must not be separated from his time. The address did not receive unanimous approval. The opponents to his administration saw in it only partisan motives. This is historical fact, not a reflection upon Washington.

A great compliment that can be paid to General Washington was that he took advice. Woodrow Wilson writes:

"General Washington * * * set an example which few of his successors seem to have followed. * * * He made constant and intimate use of his colleagues in every matter that he handled, seeking their assistance and advice by letter when they were at a distance. * * * It is well known * * * that his greater state papers * * * are full of the ideas and the very phrases of the men about him whom he most trusted. His rough drafts came back to him from Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Madison in great part rephrased and rewritten, in many passages reconceived and given a new color." (The President of the United States, by Woodrow Wilson, pp. 67 and 68.)

Professor Beard pictures the background and the address thus:

"This state of affairs confirmed Washington in his determination to retire. * * * He was weary from his burdensome labors in field and forum. * * * Once he had received respectful homage on all occasions; now, near the close of his second administration, he was shocked and grieved to find himself spattered with the mud of political criticism. Having definitely alined himself with the Federalist group, * * * he had voluntarily incurred the risks of partisan attacks. Nevertheless, he was distressed beyond measure to hear himself assailed, as he complained, 'in such exaggerated and indecent terms as could scarcely be applied to a Nero, a notorious defaulter, or even to a common pickpocket.'

"* * * In September 1796, on the eve of the Presidential election, he announced his decision in a Farewell Address that is now among the treasured state papers of the American Nation.

"In this note of affection and warning to his fellow citizens, Washington directed their attention especially to three subjects of vital interest. Having dimly sensed the conflict impending between the North and the South, he gravely cautioned them against sectional jealousies. Having suffered from the excesses of factional strife, he warned them against the extremes of partisanship. * * * Having observed the turbulent influence of foreign affairs upon domestic politics, he put them on their guard against 'permanent alliances, * * * artificial entanglements, * * * (and) the insidious wiles of alien intrigues.'

"Then in simple words of reconciliation he expressed the hope that his country would forgive the mistakes which he had committed during his 45 years of public life, and that he might enjoy, in the midst of his countrymen, 'the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.'" (The Rise of American Civilization, by Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard, pp. 371, 372.)

Professor Nevins writes:

"Earnestly desiring leisure, feeling a decline of his physical powers, and wincing under opposition abuse, Washington refused to yield to the general pressure for a third term. This refusal was blended with a testament of sagacious advice to his country in the Farewell Address of September 19, 1796, written largely by Hamilton, but remolded by Washington and expressing his ideas." (Biography of George Washington (retirement), by Allan Nevins.)

Professor Philbrick, in writing of Alexander Hamilton, has this to say:

"His activity in the Cabinet was by no means confined to the finances. * * * It is often said that Hamilton's counsels were predominant with Washington. In domestic affairs this is, on the whole, true * * *. With regard to foreign relations, common sense and better judgment usually supported Jefferson's counsels—but where those qualities were involved Washington needed no counsel. Neutrality and isolation were American policies (to be found in the letters of every public man) before any occasion arose for their official promulgation. There was here no real difference between Hamilton and Jefferson—one sympathized with England, the other with France, but both desired neutrality. * * * In January 1795 Hamilton resigned and returned to the practice of law in New York * * *. But though in private life he remained the continual and chief adviser of Washington, * * * Washington's Farewell Address cannot fairly be said to have been written by Hamilton; for Washington had worked upon it for years, and Madison had contributed to it. But though Washington supplied what he called the body to Hamilton, the latter apparently largely redressed it; and in particular he added what he described as such reflections and sentiments as will wear well, * * * and redound to future reputation." (Biography of Alexander Hamilton, appearing in the Encyclopaedia Britannica, author, Francis S. Philbrick.)

From the above and other sources we know that early in 1796 Washington began his valedictory. This constituted the first draft, which was sent to Hamilton. Hamilton made a digest known as Abstract of Points to Form an Address. From this digest Hamilton began what he called a major draft, and as a result of correspondence the major draft passed back and forth between Washington and Hamilton, and by revision and extension was considerably amended. After Hamilton had completed this major draft and had sent it to Washington, he made another draft known as the draft for incorporating, meaning that Washington might choose either the major draft as material for consideration, or incorporate the other draft with Washington's first one. Washington then began the preparation in his own hand of a manuscript for the printer, known as his own final manuscript, from the material furnished him by Hamilton.

After Washington died, and down through the years, sentences and paragraphs from Washington's address have been pounced upon and quoted as scripture to serve a purpose at a given time or a given place. In a year like the present, when neutrality is on the minds of all, Washington's defense of his own neutrality acts may be used to justify or to condemn a neutrality stand of the present. This is hardly fair. It is the world of today that we must legislate for; not the world as it was in Washington's day. If the address is used for argument today, it is the spirit of the whole that should guide us and not a single phrase or paragraph. The reading of all the related paragraphs to the defense of his neutrality policy proves that he did not conceive conditions to remain as they were, nor did he assume future policy necessarily to be identical with his. His reference to neutrality comes in justification of his proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 and the subsequent legislation. His stand on neutrality referred definitely and particularly to what had been done. Note his words:

"After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

* * * * *

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. * * * Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."

Thus from experiences which were his own came the following general principles:

"The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. * * *

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel."

Running through the whole of the address we discover the elements of growth, as expressed above in the words "the period is not far off." We note also his desire for constitutional change only by peaceful process, and the theory that the time may come when our strength may be sufficient to withstand all threats to our peace. Thus one reason for our neutrality then was a necessary one due to our weakness.

Washington, with the wisdom of a prophet, foresaw that an adherence to the policies of fair dealing and honesty would bring its reward to the Nation just as it does to the individual. Nowhere in Washington's writings do we find the assumption that conditions are static. It would be impossible for him to have accepted that philosophy when we understand the theories of his time in regard to the concept of progress. The fathers of our country were influenced in their philosophical outlook by the theory of progress which broke upon the European and American world like a new renaissance after certain contacts with an older civilization. Condorcet and the Encyclopédistes had caught the spirit of progress. Washington, Jefferson, and our whole early governmental processes reflect it. Without the idea of progress could our Government have adopted the motto for its great seal, "Annuit coeptis. Novus ordo seclorum"?

Chief Justice Jay, in his decision in *Chisholm* v. *Georgia* (2 Dall. 419), lays down the doctrine that a new order of legal processes was set up under the Constitution which was a break with the past. Jay carried the idea too far, because, of course, there can be no break with the past. The people soon overcame the legal consequences of Jay's decision by adopting the eleventh amendment.

The following quotation from Jefferson also reflects the spirit of progress of the time:

"I shall not die without a hope that light and liberty are on steady advance. We have seen, indeed, once within the records of history a complete eclipse of the human mind continuing for centuries. * * * And even should the cloud of barbarism and despotism again obscure the science and liberties of Europe, this country remains to preserve and restore light and liberty to them. In short, the flames kindled on the Fourth of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them." (Jefferson's letter to John Adams, September 12, 1821.)

Washington's idea was one of change resulting in growth and development for he had already written:

"As the member of an infant empire * * * and as a citizen of the great republic of humanity at large, I cannot help turning my attention sometimes to this subject. I would be understood to mean I cannot avoid reflecting with pleasure on the probable influence that commerce may hereafter have on human manners and society in general. On these occasions I consider how mankind may be connected, like one great family, in fraternal ties. I indulge a fond, perhaps an enthusiastic, idea that, as the world is evidently much less barbarous than it has been, its amelioration must still be progressive; that nations are becoming more humanized in their policy; that the subjects of ambition and causes for hostility are daily diminishing; and in fine that the period is not very remote when the benefits of a liberal and friendly commerce will pretty generally succeed to the devastation and horrors of war." (Washington's letter to Lafayette, August 15, 1786.)

Students of the history of ideas know where Washington got the phrase "one great family, in fraternal ties."

As these ideas continue to evolve in his mind, he conceived of a changing and more refined justification of war, for he wrote that the resort to war can be justified only on the score of maintenance of self-respect. Thus, by 1795, he believed—

"It is well known that peace (to borrow a modern phrase) has been the order of the day with me since the disturbance in Europe first commenced. My policy has been, and will continue, while I have the honor to remain in the administration of the Government, to be upon friendly terms with, but independent of, all nations of the earth; to fulfill our own engagements; to supply the wants and be carrier for them all; being thoroughly convinced that it is our policy and interest to do so. Nothing short of self-respect, and that justice which is essential to a national character, ought to involve us in war." (Washington's letter to Gouverneur Morris, December 22, 1795.)

If we do not consider a man's life, his writings, and his aspirations as a whole, but consider them only in minute detail, and if we draw deductions from those details, we may find a mass of contradictions and end in an argument over petty deductions. Thus, in spite of all that Washington advised against alliance (and the alliance principle was the international curse of his time, as it is of ours), Washington said this:

"At present everything in America is tranquil, and I hope will long remain so. It is not our interest to seek new broils, and I hope our neighbors will not commence them. * * * I never expect to draw my sword again; I can scarcely conceive the cause that would induce me to do it. But if, contrary to all expectations, such an event should take place, I should think it a fortunate circumstance, and myself highly honored, to have it supported by yours. * * * My first wish is * * * to see the whole world in peace, and the inhabitants of it as one band of brothers striving who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind." (Washington's letter to the Marquis de la Rouerie, October 7, 1785.)

Here, again, we may refer to the prophetic Washington. He did look into the future, as

anyone who has accepted Condorcet's theory of progress must and if he could have seen this day, he would not see the whole world in peace, but he would see a group made up of many nations "striving to contribute most to the happiness of mankind," and he would see his own country cooperating with most of the nations of the world, or with citizens of most of the world's nations, in international problems "striving to contribute most to the happiness of mankind." Washington's dream of the nations working together has in a sense been fulfilled. His own country participates officially in at least 6 forms of what we may call permanent international cooperation, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, the United States took part in more than 50 international conferences and congresses. During the same year America participated in 5 international expositions and celebrations and associated itself with about 15 permanent international commissions, committees, institutes, tribunals, and similar organizations. During the same year the United States participated in more than 15 permanent international bureaus, unions, and similar organizations. The United States now is a party to treaties of conciliation with more than 35 countries. Likewise, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, the United States functioned through 5 special arbitration tribunals of limited duration. The above international undertakings are all outside our regular Diplomatic and Consular Services.

Was Washington thinking only of the Thirteen States when he wrote the following? Probably so; I do not know. But the program which he conceived for the future welfare of the Thirteen States is in spirit a program which we might conceive as broad enough for the future welfare of all States. Washington's program was:

"First. * * * Union of the States under one Federal head;

"Second. A sacred regard to public justice;

"Third. The adoption of a proper peace establishment; and

"Fourth. The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States, which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions, which are requisite to the general prosperity; and, in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community." (Washington's Legacy, addressed to the Governors of all the States on the disbanding of the Army from his headquarters at Newburgh, N. Y., on June 8, 1783.)

To the extent that we in America have followed Washington's four principles we have succeeded in becoming what we are. To the extent that the world as a whole will adopt those principles, the people of the world may enjoy peace and orderly intercourse. It is the idea which I would stress. For no one in the world today would advocate a world-wide superstate. But the rest of the program has universal application.

And thus Washington dreamed. But no dream can equal the real march of America. Even Condorcet could not envision progress equal to this simple retelling of actual history:

Under heaven Columbus sailed and a new world was found. Here men of common hope from many climes made homes. These men, nurtured in freedom, brought to the New World tried and lasting ideals of the old, and when the motherland failed to cherish the best of its own, a clash occurred. This Jefferson justified and made purposeful by the Declaration of Independence (1776). Led by Washington, patriots put down the mighty, and those of low degree sought safety in law. Blessed by peace, but not yet one in purpose, the fathers of the new Nation covenanted for a more perfect union. They proposed a government to bring justice to life and liberty in pursuit of happiness. Thus 13 States became one, and democracy was given birth. Citizens, guided by a President, spoke their will through Congress, and that they might never lose their rights through the force of the past or the will of the dead, and that the letter of the law might not kill but its spirit live, a supreme court was established, and thereby the Constitution of the United States became a living oracle, fitting past purposes to present needs and freeing the minds of men from fear of the future (1789). Loosed from powers that dull and thwart, the people, inspired with justice, caused the newly founded democracy to fill the vacant places. Imbued with zeal to make sleeping nature serve and the desert blossom as the rose, they pressed on that many might earn blessings formerly garnered only by the few. Onward and upward and ever forward they advanced, unashamed to pray, willing to die, happy in planting that men might eat. Urged to use, bent on building, they never once turned back. Moving westward, by purchase, they added vast Louisiana (1803). Next, south, they won by cession the Floridas (1819). Then into Texas they went, which, by annexation, became part of the Union (1845). By agreement with neighbors on the north, Oregon was divided, bringing lasting peace to a long boundary (1846). After strife a sister nation to the south ceded and sold Mexican soil (1848). To this mighty country, rich in plenty and secure in law, many thousands came to enjoy her benefits and admire her greatness. They built a nation of freemen, a nation of thoughtful women, a nation of forward-looking children, where each, equal before the law, is master of himself but servant to all; where the majority rule, but the minority are protected; where kings may pause to see justice done, but where no king shall ever reign. This land, where men are responsible and restrained but free to think, to come, to go, and to do—so great in territory, so noble in tradition—nevertheless fought with itself, and under Lincoln men gave their all that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people should not perish from the earth. Wounds healed, the people again made one, no longer is there North and no longer is there South. With new faith in old purposes, Alaska was purchased, removing despotic rule from America (1867). To surround the land by a single sea, Roosevelt built the Panama Canal, which united a nation by dividing a continent (1904). No longer are the waters of the earth separate. No longer is there East and no longer is there West. For God hath wrought that men may have joy and in this land of promise gain life abundant. Then a strife-maddened earth called democracy to its assistance. Men died that war might be no more. Victory gained, Wilson proposed and nations set up institutions for peace and legal process (1919). The path of peace is not assured, but the way to peace is in the earth.

Thus Washington's dream of "one great family in fraternal ties" and of himself "a citizen of the great republic of humanity at large" is today democracy's promise for the future.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE—RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, by unanimous consent, presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration

Whereas European Jewry was the first victim of the enemies of democracy, having been singled out for especial attack and ruthless persecution to an extent which has shocked the conscience of the civilized world; and

Whereas Great Britain issued on November 2, 1917, the Balfour Declaration pledging the establishment of a national home in Palestine for Jewish people; and

Whereas this policy was not only incorporated into the mandate for Palestine, but was was also concurred in by the United States in a joint congressional resolution of 1922, and further sanctioned in the British-American Convention of 1924; and

Whereas this declared policy of the British and United States Governments was in effect abrogated by the Chamberlain administration through the issuance of the Palestine white paper of 1939 which will by its terms stop all further Jewish immigration into the Holy Land by March 31, 1944, thereby sealing the doom of the remnant of the Jewish population of occupied Europe; and

Whereas this act of inhumanity constitutes a violation of international covenants solemnly entered into and is contrary to the traditional American sense of justice and fair play: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the House of Assembly concurring):

1. The legislature expresses its profound sympathy to the victims of Nazi persecution, which challenges all traditions and teachings of Christianity and Americanism.

2. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey respectfully urges and petitions the President of the United States, Congress, and the Secretary of State to use the weight and prestige of their respective offices to the end that the doors of the ancestral home of the Jewish people shall be opened wide for free entry of all Jews who are in need of a haven of refuge and desire to build their homes there; and that in pursuance of its clear intent and purpose, the pledge of the Balfour Declaration be honored so as to bring about the development of a self-governing Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, which shall become a part of the new democratic world order in accordance with the fight for the "four freedoms" in which we are engaged

3. The Secretary of the State of New Jersey be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress of the United States.

4. This concurrent resolution shall take effect immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—PETITIONS

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have notation made thereof that I have today received petitions from citizens of New Jersey praying for the enactment of the so-called Green-Lucas soldiers' vote bill. I am informed that the petitions are signed by 7,000 persons in New Jersey, each of whom indicates that he or

she has one or more relatives in the armed forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and ordered to lie on the table.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—REPORT OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 718) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) introduced Senate bill 1730, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Helen Halverson; and

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1733. A bill to provide additional allowances for certain dependents of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

POST-WAR ECONOMIC REHABILITATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, out of order I ask permission to introduce a bill in behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and to make a very brief statement regarding the bill. I ask also, Mr. President, that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, because that committee would, in the main I think, have jurisdiction of it.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1730) to create an office of demobilization, establish general policies for the operation of that office, provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, provide for the disposal of surplus Government property, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced is drawn to effectuate the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning.

Since it was drawn the report of Mr. Baruch has been released and made public, and an Executive order has been issued in conformity therewith appointing certain persons to perform certain of the duties recommended by Mr. Baruch.

There is nothing sought to be done by Mr. Baruch that cannot be done under the provisions of this bill. The post-war committee report and the bill deal with the questions in broader outline, in many cases, than does the Baruch report, but in the objectives sought to be accomplished there is no possible conflict.

This bill creates an office of demobilization which would be subordinate to the Office of War Mobilization during the period of hostilities. It states the basic objectives that Congress is seeking to accomplish and lays down broad general policies for their accomplishment. Under it the director of demobilization would appoint deputy directors to handle the problems of surplus property disposal, contract termination, plant disposal, human demobilization, and other problems that were presented in the total picture. The work of these deputies would be coordinated by the director of demobilization and the general policies of the director would be subject to constant scrutiny by a joint congressional committee, which is set up in the bill and which would have authority to sit with the demobilization board. The director would be accountable to the Executive, but also would be accountable to Congress, in these broad policies.

The Baruch report would have all the coordination between these activities through the Director of Mobilization, under his executive authority. He would have a work director, a surplus property administrator, and a contract termination board, all set up by Executive order, and he would come to Congress for such legislation as was necessary to enable them to function. In relation to surplus property Mr. Baruch specifically recommends against congressional enactment at this time.

I believe the Congress will be glad to grant any legislative authority that is necessary, and this bill attempts to accomplish that. It goes further, however, and starts the administration of these difficult but not impossible problems off on a firm legislative foundation and avoids the possibility of a pattern being set that will be unsatisfactory to the Congress and that at a later date they may have to change, with consequent confusion.

In addition to setting up the office of demobilization and providing for surplus disposal, the bill also incorporates the provisions of Senate bill 1718, which was jointly introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself on February 11 and which, in its entirety, as I understand, is expressly approved by the Baruch report.

A TRIBUTE TO THE FORGOTTEN MAN—ARTICLE BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Tribute to the Forgotten Man," written by him for the National Record which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS OF FOREIGN TRADE—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the problems of foreign trade, delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas, at Kirksville, Mo., on February 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VICTORY, WHAT THEN?—ADDRESS BY JUDGE NEAL W. WORKMAN

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Victory, What Then?" delivered by Judge Neal W. Workman, at Laurens, S. C., November 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROSPECT OF RUSSIAN-FINNISH PEACE—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the prospect of a Soviet-dictated peace with Finland, written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPPOSITION TO MR. CHURCHILL—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Churchill Is Slipping," written by Frank C. Waldrop, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SELFISHNESS, AMERICA'S PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1—ARTICLE BY CHAPLAIN GROVER C. SCHWARTZ

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Selfishness, America's Public Enemy No. 1," by Chaplain Grover C. Schwartz, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FIRST COMMANDER IN CHIEF—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our First Commander in Chief," from the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REVENUE BILL—VETO

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is informally and unofficially, of course, before us the veto message of the President of the United States on the tax bill. The message, of course, goes to the House of Representatives, and will be a matter for the consideration of the Members of that body. Perhaps any comment on the message in the Senate at this time would be inappropriate, but I cannot refrain from pointing out, by way of factual analysis only, the wholly unsatisfactory and inconclusive grounds upon which the President has been misled into vetoing the bill.

I do not refer now to the recommendation recently made by the President for additional revenue of ten and one-half billion dollars, and I do not minimize the importance of increasing the revenue as much as possible. When the bill came to the Senate from the House it would have raised a little less revenue than the bill would have raised as it was finally passed by both Houses. In the Senate, both in the committee and on the floor, we increased the revenue which would be produced by the tax bill, and in conference the bill agreed upon and reported to both Houses and passed by both Houses provided for a slight increase in revenue over that which would have resulted from the House bill as it originally passed that body. I am not discussing that at this time, beyond one statement which I should make.

There was in the House strong disagreement with the method recommended by the Treasury and Judge VINSON. That strong opposition was not overcome, and the House sent to the Senate a bill under which, as I have said, even slightly less revenue would have been raised than under the final conference-report bill.

In the Senate committee we directly asked of the Secretary of the Treasury if he had changed his views or withdrawn his positive opposition to a sales tax in any form, or to compulsory savings or compulsory loans. We were told, categorically, "No." So the majority of the Senate committee believed then, and I am sure believe now, and, in my opinion, all America believes now, that if we are to raise revenue in addition to the heavy burden of taxes resting upon the American taxpayers we must be free to consider new methods of taxation and new procedures in obtaining taxes. That is all I have to say on that point.

Mr. President, I wish to notice factually certain specific reasons enumerated by the President to support his disapproval of the bill. I shall, therefore, have to read from his message. Among the special privileges pointed out by the President as reason for his veto are:

(a) Permission for corporations reorganized in bankruptcy to retain the high excess-profits credit and depreciation basis attributable to the contributions of stockholders who are usually eliminated in the reorganization. This privilege inures to the benefit of bondholders who, in many cases, have purchased their bonds in the speculative market for far less than their face value. It may open the door to further windfall profits in this market because of the undeserved benefit received by reorganized corporations.

I wish most respectfully to point out that corporations which emerge from bankruptcy or from receivership proceedings are not always taken over by bondholders. Indeed, infrequently is that true, in point of fact. Only in the case of railroads is that statement actually applicable, and railroads already have precisely the treatment which the Senate and House gave to other corporations whose physical identity was actually preserved, or in a large sense preserved.

So long as they remain in bankruptcy or receivership, of course, they have the same basis of taxes and they have the same valuations. We merely provided that when corporations other than railroads emerged from receivership they would retain the basis of values for taxation purposes enjoyed by the old corporations. In explaining on the floor of the Senate the amendment which made this provision I used language which I had desired to call to the attention of the Senate, but I do not have it before me at the moment. Substantially it was what I have already stated this morning.

The second objection in the veto message to a specific provision is as follows:

(b) Percentage depletion allowances, questionable in any case, are now extended to such minerals as vermiculite, potash, feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, barite, and spodumene. In the case of some of these minerals the War Production Board refused to certify that current output was inadequate for war needs.

Percentage depletion was extended in the House to flake graphite, vermiculite, potash, beryl, feldspar, mica, lepidolite, and spodumene. The Senate added talc and barite, and reduced the rate on potash from 23 percent to 15 percent. All these allowances are limited to the duration of the war, with the exception of the allowance as to potash, which is made permanent.

The Treasury concurred only in the action taken in granting percentage depletion to fluor spar, flake graphite, sheet mica, and beryl. Under the bill as passed by the House there was added to the list of minerals exempt from excess-profits taxes, because of strategic importance, fluor spar, flake graphite, and vermiculite. The Treasury objects to the inclusion of vermiculite among these strategic minerals. All these changes were added by the House.

Mr. President, there has long been a controversy over making percentage depletion allowances, but it has become a fixed policy of this Government, speaking through its several Congresses, to allow percentage depletion in the case of certain minerals.

In the list are some strategic minerals which have been added during the war, the producers of which have been given percentage depletion allowances, not against their normal tax liability, nor against their surtax liability, but only against excess-profits taxes. In the case of all these new metals and minerals, except potash, the benefit is simply given during the actual continuance of the war.

Mr. President, in Canada it has been found necessary to give far larger benefits to strategic minerals and metals than we have considered giving in the United States. The Canadian Government has reversed its policy during the war, and out of necessity.

In the case of potash the depletion allowance is continued. If there is any vital mineral on which depletion allowance can be justified, it is potash.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to make a brief statement, then I shall yield.

During World War No. 1, when we had not developed sources of potash in this country, the price of potash went to the extreme height of nearly $400 a ton. American agriculture was helpless in that situation. Since World War No. 1 we have found, I believe, some two or three deposits of potash in this country, and in the bill passed, Congress was merely giving to the potash producer relief against the war excess-profits tax. Yet our good President has been misled into the recitation of that very just provision as a ground for his veto message.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to interrupt the Senator merely to say that with respect to potash it would seem that the President says the depletion allowance is something new and has just been made. In a sense that is correct. But there have heretofore been permanent allowances, called discovery allowances, which had been awarded to the potash industry. The present tax bill changes the form and provides for a depletion allowance instead of a discovery allowance. I am sure this must not have been called to the attention of the President, but if the bill comes before the Senate for discussion I shall be glad to explain the situation.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I had not intended to indulge in any long discussion.

The third ground of the veto is stated as follows:

(c) The lumber industry is permitted to treat income from the cutting of timber, including selective logging, as a capital gain rather than annual income. As a grower and seller of timber, I think that timber should be treated as a crop and therefore as income when it is sold. This would encourage reforestation.

Mr. President, if there was ever a nicely adjusted provision in a tax bill that meant conservation of a fast-disappearing natural resource vital to the prosperity of the Nation, to wit, our timber, it was in this half-way step which Congress took to provide some protection to the timber owner.

What is the situation under existing law? If one owns timber and sells it outright to a milling company he is entitled to treat his gain as a capital gain. Indeed, that is all the gain he has. He has not manufactured anything. He has not done anything. He has simply sold a part of his realty. The President has been misled into saying that the timber is a crop. He evidently has in mind an annual crop. By all the concepts of all the laws of every civilized nation growing timber is a part of the realty, and it is so in fact.

If under existing law—not under the bill as vetoed—the owner of timber which he has grown on his land, and conserved and protected against fire for 40 years, sells his timber, he has a capital gain, and only a capital gain. But if he takes his own mill onto his own land and cuts his own timber, he must account for all the profits he makes, and he is soon pushed up into the high bracket excess profits tax, and his timber is simply taken away from him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the public probably does not understand the difference between the tax charged against the owner of the timber to which the Senator refers if he pays on the basis of a capital gain, or if he pays on the basis of annual income. The Senator from Georgia has already pointed out that if he or I own a tract of timber—which I do not, I will say—we may have owned that timber and it may have been growing for 40 years. We may have been compelled to pay some money by way of expense in the development and the preservation of that timber. We may have been required to insure it because of forest fires. We finally sell the timber in a block or in a body to a milling company, a sawmill, or a lumber producer. Whatever price we get for it, we account for it as a capital gain, and pay taxes on it accordingly.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if I decide that I want to mill that lumber myself, and I buy a sawmill and move it in onto the timber, cut it myself, and saw it up into

lumber and sell it myself, I am compelled under the present law to be taxed as if that were income for that year, and I am allowed nothing in deduction for all the expense I have been put to in producing and preserving the timber during the years of its growth. Is that true?

Mr. GEORGE. That is substantially correct. The timber amendment, in my opinion, is a very just amendment. It does not open a loophole in our tax laws for other natural resources which are not at all comparable. Those of us who come from the deep Southeast are well aware of the fact that in many instances the land without the timber is of little or no value. The real value is in the timber. It requires time to produce it. It requires the payment of taxes, the maintenance of fire protection, and many other costs. If the owner of the timber cannot go on his own land and cut it without accumulating an income which will rapidly push him up into an excess-profits bracket, he is virtually forbidden or prohibited from utilization of his own timber.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may, I should like to ask the Senator another question. The bill which the President has just vetoed provides that the owner of the timber who himself cuts it and markets it is allowed the same tax privilege that someone else would be allowed if he bought the timber and himself sawed it and marketed it?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is essentially true, because any purchaser of the timber who immediately cuts it, of course, recovers the full amount he paid for the timber before he begins to have a net taxable income.

Mr. BARKLEY. And a company which is in the lumber business, buying timber year by year, and sawing it year by year, of course, accounts for any profit as an annual income. It seems to me that is an entirely different proposition from that of a man who has over a period of a half a century developed a forest or a tract of timber, and then either decides to sell it as an entirety, or to cut it and market it himself. If he sells it he gets a capital gain, but if he cuts it and markets it piece by piece or by the thousand feet, under the present law he is taxed on income and not as a capital gain.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator correctly states the case.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator from Georgia comment on the statement "This would encourage reforestation"? Is it not true that the more profitable the lumber industry is the more reforestation would be encouraged? Is not the amendment designed to encourage reforestation?

Mr. GEORGE. Unquestionably it is so designed. It was recommended to us by a vast majority of the reforestation offices in the several States. They recommended the amendment on the ground that it represented a conservation program. This is what it would permit: If one owns a thousand acres of timbered land, with hardwood and softwood, and timber of all sizes and ages scattered throughout the thousand acres, he may take his mill onto the land, and he may by selective cutting continue his timber operations or lumbering operations with respect to that land through a long period of time; indeed, he can do it perpetually. It is the only basis on which the timber owner can really become a true conservator of timber. He is not only induced to reforest, to replant as he cuts the timber, but he is enabled to do it because he is not required to take it all off at once. All the amendment would do would be to give to the owner the right to treat his income from his timber—not from his operations, not from his profits on his lumber sold—but from his timber, as a capital gain.

The President, in striking down the potash amendment and in specifically condemning the timber amendment, unwittingly has struck agriculture and forestry very definite and staggering blows.

The next ground enumerated in the message is as follows:

(d) Natural gas pipe lines are exempted from the excess-profits tax without justification and in a manner which might well lead oil companies to request similar treatment for their pipe lines.

Mr. President, I may say in all frankness that the Senate committee disagreed with that provision in the bill as passed by the House. We struck out the percentage depletion allowance for pipe lines; but the House conferees insisted, and we finally agreed, as one must finally agree in connection with any complicated bill such as a general tax bill. However, there were very strong arguments made to the effect that in the case of the pipe lines serving gas wells the pipe lines are a part, themselves, of the property, and must necessarily be given some special tax treatment, or else the excess-profits taxes would destroy the income from the gas.

The next ground enumerated in the veto message is as follows:

(e) Commercial air lines are granted an unjustifiable extension of the tax subsidy on their air-mail contracts.

When the conferees were sitting on the 1942 tax bill, I believe it was—at least, the tax bill prior to the present one—the question involved in this amendment was presented to the conference. The Treasury expressed approval of the principle; whereupon I said that the Senate conferees would abandon any effort to insert an amendment which we thought was open in conference on this particular point. In all good faith, Mr. Surrey undertook to perfect an amendment, to be offered during the committee consideration of the tax bill on this particular subject. Mr. Surrey was directed to confer with, or he elected to confer with, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, whereupon they raised some objection to the whole method of taxing commercial air lines, and objected. Mr. Surrey very properly stated the case to me. Nevertheless, we offered the amendment, and I offered it with a full explanation of precisely what it was; and it went into the conference, and was accepted.

Under the Second Revenue Act of 1940, an airplane company was not required to pay an excess-profits tax if its excess-profits-tax net income, after excluding its air-mail subsidy, did not exceed its excess-profits-tax credit. That is in existing law. If its excess-profits-tax net income exceeded its excess-profits credit, with the air-mail subsidy excluded, it was required to pay a tax on its air-mail subsidy income as well as on its other income. The advantage of this relief was nullified to a large extent where the corporation had an unused excess-profits carry-over. This exempt air-mail income reduced the amount of the unused excess-profits credit available as an offset in reducing the excess-profits-tax net income in other taxable years. This section provides that where the air-mail subsidy exclusion prevents the taxpayer from paying an excess-profits tax for the year excluded, it shall not reduce the unused excess-profits credit to be carried over and applied to other taxable years.

That is the full effect of the amendment. It is entirely in harmony with the theory of existing law. It is just. But beyond all that it applies to only two or possibly three commercial air lines in the United States. That would not seem to be a substantial basis upon which to veto a general tax bill.

In speaking about the so-called Johnson amendment—I think we may refer to it as such—about which I have already spoken, let me add that this amendment permitting corporations emerging from bankruptcy or receivership to use the basis of the predecessor for tax purposes was agreed to with certain modifications. In order to avoid refunds, however, the amendment was made applicable only to 1943, a year on which taxes have not as yet been paid, and to subsequent years. It was also provided that no gain or loss would be recognized to the shareholders upon the receipt in 1943 and subsequent years of new securities for the old securities. A somewhat similar provision, which all Senators will remember, had already been given to common carriers by rail, and I think, on the whole, the provisions have been generally approved, although the railway companies themselves have constantly insisted that what they really wanted was a different treatment—that is, that the treatment accorded them did not go far enough.

Mr. President, I shall not consume more of the time of the Senate. These are the specific reasons set out beyond the first general observation made by the President that he had asked for $10,500,000,000, whereas the bill really would provide an amount in excess of $2,000,000,000 in new revenue.

I express profound regret that the President has seen fit to point out in his message that the social-security tax, under the freeze provision carried in the bill which was presented to him, has reduced the income of the tax bill by $1,100,000,000.

Of course, Mr. President, the social-security tax is a special fund. It is collected for a special purpose. It becomes a loan fund available to the Treasury—indeed, a compulsory loan fund—when it passes into the Treasury; but it is no different from any other loan made by the Treasury. Under existing law the Treasury has authority to take Federal bonds to the counters of the Federal Reserve bank, pass them over, and compel the bank to take them. Under the law the Treasury is required to put its bonds into the special social security fund and take the tax out, minus, of course, such proportion of the tax as may be necessary to meet the current cost of administration. In no conceivable sense is the social security fund a revenue item, whether it is frozen or unfrozen. It affects only the fiscal policies of Government on its bond selling side.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is fair to the Senator and to the Senate, as well as to any one else who may be interested, to state that in the Committee on Finance the Senator from Georgia and I both voted against freezing the social-security tax.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee adopted the amendment by a very large majority. When the bill came to the Senate the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the committee, felt bound by the action of the committee. I myself felt perfectly free to oppose on the floor of the Senate the freezing of the social-security tax, and I did so. In the remarks which I made I stated that under no circumstances would I vote for the stepping up of this tax for revenue purposes. I would not vote for the tax to be stepped up unless it were needed in the fund, merely because the Treasury found a fund from which it might borrow. I believe that taxes ought to be levied for the support of the Government, as taxes, although the law authorizes the Treasury—and compels it, as a matter of fact—to borrow from this fund.

The Senate disagreed with my position, and the amendment was written into the bill. It seems to me, in all frankness, that it is not quite accurate bookkeeping in the Treasury to subtract the increased amount of $1,100,000,000 a year from the $2,100,000,000 which the tax bill would raise, and say that by reason thereof the net tax produced by the bill would be $1,000,000,000 or less. That sort of bookkeeping is out of harmony with my views as to fiscal policy in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. The Senator has correctly stated what happened in the Finance Committee and on the floor of the Senate. The Senator very ably argued against the amendment, but he did so solely on the ground that he was interested in the ultimate preservation of the social security fund itself. The Senator has precisely stated the position which he then took. As I have stated, I regret that the President has dealt with the social security fund in the manner indicated in his message.

Mr. President, I have no desire to be critical. That is not my purpose in making this brief statement. If the President really thought it proper to increase the burden of taxes on the American people at this time, he could well have approved the bill and asked in a message for immediate consideration of other revenue-producing measures. If he thought that the provisions which I have explained to the Senate were objectionable for any reason, it would have been easy enough to have approved the tax bill and asked the committees of Congress to give immediate consideration to their modification or repeal. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has already begun work on the technical and administrative provisions of the tax laws, and every reference the President has made would come within the direct purview and scope of the undertaking of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

The committees have worked on this bill for quite a long time. Two and a third billion dollars of additional revenue sounds insignificant at this time; but when that amount is added to the present tax burden of $40,000,000,000 it becomes quite a different thing. Men may have honest differences of judgment. My own judgment, as I have heretofore stated it, is that unless we can consider all methods and all means of raising revenue, with assurance of administration support, it is not feasible—and I do not believe it is right or just—to increase the individual income rates, because the increase must of necessity fall on incomes from $60,000, or $70,000 all the way down to the lowest bracket. The greater part of the increase must of necessity fall on the so-called white-collar class, or middle brackets. While I do not like a sales tax, I would have the courage to go down the line for a sales tax if the administration wanted it. I would consider the application of the excess-profits-tax principle to individual incomes, but that has been consistently opposed by the Treasury. I would be willing to go down the line for a compulsory loan or compulsory savings program, but that has been constantly opposed by the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, that is the situation. In addition to the present tax burden of $40,000,000,000, this bill would have brought into the Treasury two and one-third billion dollars more. Furthermore, Mr. President, because of the marked improvement which we made in the Contract Renegotiation Act, at least $2,000,000,000 would have been covered into the Treasury. In my opinion, the Contract Renegotiation Act, as proposed to be amended by the conference report, would meet the reasonable test of any court; but, without the amendment, no one can say with confidence that it may not become necessary for the courts finally to root it out, lock, stock, and barrel. If so, the refunds which the Treasury will make will be not inconsiderable. Two tax bills such as we presented, and more, would be required to provide for such refunds.

We sought honestly to devise a perfectly valid renegotiation-of-contracts act. We approached the problem directly so that the contractors and the Government agencies would all know what they were doing, and what it all meant, and so that it would greatly facilitate the whole process of renegotiation. To the credit of every one of the services, so far as I know, no one has complained either to the committees or to the executive branch of government about the renegotiation-of-contracts act.

Mr. Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, has said that under the present act the renegotiations of contracts in the year 1942 had resulted in the recovery of approximately $5,000,000,000—I do not use his exact figures—of which at least one and one-half billion dollars would not have come into the Treasury through taxation. However, unquestionably under the law which we presented to the President in the present tax bill, renegotiations covering the fiscal or calendar year 1943, the great peak year of production, would have amounted to more money, and the actual net gain to the Treasury would have been fully $2,000,000,000. The President has lost that sum to the Treasury by the veto if the House shall approve the Presidential veto.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I feel some responsibility in this situation as the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, which has conscientiously labored upon this measure for many difficult months.

The President's veto may never reach the Senate. I hope that it will. But if it be not overridden in the other House the Senate will never have an opportunity to express its opinion in respect to the President's thesis. Therefore, immediately on the heels of the arrival of the President's message in the other House, I wish now briefly to make the RECORD clear and to state my own reaction.

Mr. President, I wish to say first of all that the case is summed up for me in an accurate editorial in yesterday's New York Times, which certainly has not been an unsympathetic newspaper so far as the present administration is concerned. On yesterday morning an editorial in the New York Times stated in part as follows:

> A veto of the present tax bill would be an irresponsible act.

I repeat: It "would be an irresponsible act."

I now read the concluding sentence from the editorial:

> If the President vetoes this measure there can be but one answer. Congress should override the veto.

Mr. President, I do not believe this veto of the tax bill has been justified at any point in the President's often mistaken and frequently distorted discussion of the problems involved, as already clearly disclosed by the able Senator from Georgia in his recent analysis. If the newspapers correctly report the recommendations of his own congressional party leaders to him, all of whom voted for the bill, he would have been better advised to have signed the tax measure despite any of its incidental infirmities.

There will never be a tax bill without some infirmities, particularly under the auspices of this whole House and this Treasury.

Mr. President, if the new revenue provided by the bill is inadequate from the Presidential standpoint, then it is a curious and irrational cure which would stubbornly reject any new revenue whatever from the same source.

New revenue to the tune of approximately two and one-half billion dollars is still not to be despised even in the martial climax of a prodigal era of illimitable deficit spending. To demand $10,000,000,000 in new taxes as essential to the public welfare, and then to insist upon getting nothing from new taxes—and that is the veto's net result in a practical sense—is a rule-or-ruin attitude which is as contemptuous of Congress as it is of sound public economy.

Mr. President, there is a point beyond which taxes cannot go without destroying the ability of our national economy to function. The anxiety of Congress to stop short of this breaking point may be unimpressive to the Executive, but it is not unimpressive to millions of taxpayers who are already at the breaking point.

It is easy to speak in general terms of new astronomical Federal revenues—and significantly the President has never spoken otherwise than in general terms—but it is quite something else to point the specific way. The Treasury's indefensible pattern for this bill was summarily kicked out of the window by the well-nigh unanimous attitudes of the House Ways and Means Committee, and of the Senate Finance Committee. The Treasury's pattern was ruinous. It is perfectly obvious that those committees, dealing realistically with their responsibilities, will continue to reject any such pattern, and with bipartisan eloquence. The Treasury apparently will offer no other. Yet, it glumly entrenches against any alternative pattern from any other source. Meanwhile the President is comfortably silent upon this score. He is content simply to complain.

It therefore seems equally obvious to me that this veto, if sustained, will write down the end of new revenues for 1944. If that is satisfactory to the President, he has embraced precisely the right formula to achieve such result. Even if his veto is overridden the President has already cost the Treasury $85,000,000 in new money by postponing the effective date of this bill 1 month. That, I repeat, is a curious achievement for one who is loudly shouting for more revenue.

Mr. President, I wish particularly to advert to the renewal of the pretense by the President that the freezing of social security pay roll taxes for old-age and survivors benefits is a threat either to the integrity of the social security system, or to the adequacy of general Treasury revenues. This is the third annual time the President has tried this sophistry on Congress. Each time Congress has bluntly disagreed. In 1942 the Senate disagreed immediately following the receipt of a Presidential letter on the subject which was much stronger than the present veto. The Senate disagreed at that time by a vote of 50 to 35. It disagreed again in connection with the present tax bill by a vote of 48 to 17, which is more than enough to override a veto. Coming events cast their shadow before.

Let it be made perfectly plain that the President is really not vetoing the action of Congress in respect to social-security taxes; he is really vetoing his own Secretary of the Treasury. He is vetoing Mr. Morgenthau, because it is Secretary Morgenthau's rule of thumb which the Congress has followed in deciding that the needs of social security do not require a doubling of the pay-roll taxes in 1944. Lest there still be any remaining doubt upon the subject anywhere in responsible circles, I read into the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Morgenthau which was given before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 24, 1939. I wish this might have been on the Presidential desk, although, in his present mood, perhaps it would have made no difference. I quote from Mr. Morgenthau's testimony:

> We should not accumulate a reserve fund any larger than is necessary to protect the system—

He is speaking of the old-age and survivors insurance system—

> against unforeseen declines in revenues or increases in the volume of benefit payments. Specifically—

Mr. Morgenthau testifying—

> Specifically, I would suggest to Congress that it plan the financing of the old-age insurance system with a view to maintaining for use in emergencies an eventual reserve amounting to not more than three times the highest prospective annual benefits in the ensuing 5 years.

Mr. President, that is the rule recommended to the Congress by the President's Secretary of the Treasury; that is the rule which Congress substantially wrote into the statute in 1939 in response to the recommendation of the President's Secretary of the Treasury. The same Secretary of the Treasury, who still lingers in the Cabinet.

Remember the rule, that the reserve is adequate if it is three times the highest contemplated expenditure in any one of the ensuing 5 years. What are the facts? The immutable, indisputable facts from the Social Security Board itself, are that the reserve, instead of being only three times the highest contemplated expenditure in any one of the next 5 years, is 11 times that reserve on the basis of any normal anticipation, and, on the basis of the most exaggerated contemplation which the Social Security Board could conjure, it is still five times the necessary reserve, and far beyond the safety zone specified by the President's own Secretary of the Treasury.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this message vetoes first a member of the Cabinet. It is not justified in doing even that, because the mathematics of the situation are so plain that there can be no mistaking the net result. I can never be made to believe that substantial majorities of a responsible Congress in both the House and the Senate would have three annual times voted in this fashion, despite similar Presidential opposition, if there could be the slightest legitimate complaint.

However, Mr. President, the veto message invites consideration of the use of the social-security tax in a different phase. I greatly welcome the forthright, frank, and square-toed statement just made by the able majority leader the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] a few moments ago respecting the uses of social-security funds and the impropriety of consulting any collateral reason with respect to their accumulation. If the President separates his argument from the needs of social security itself and if he embraces for his theme the general needs of the general Treasury or of the general battle against inflation, he confesses a purpose to use social-security funds for other than social-security purposes, and I do not hesitate once more to assert my own belief that such an attitude is a breach of public trust. Furthermore, to use pay-roll taxes in this fashion in my opinion is to assess a discriminatory gross personal income tax—because that is precisely what it ultimately amounts to—against the lowest income groups among our workers, which is an unconscionable departure from equitable taxation principles.

Mr. President, the Executive suggests in his amazing message that this is a good time to increase the social-security tax anyway. Why? Because industry and labor are best able to adjust themselves to such increases at the present time in view of their enhanced income. Mr. President, that may be true of some industries; it may be true of some branches of labor, but it is not true of the 15,000,000 white-collar workers of this country who have just about reached the point where the last straw will break their backs, and it is not true in respect to the great mass of little business in this country which has literally been upon its knees in Washington begging that the social-security tax should be frozen, exactly as Congress has done it, and exactly as the President is undertaking to undo it. I venture the prophecy, Mr. President, that if this veto is not overridden and the pay-roll tax increases 100 percent 1 week from today the burden will be distinctly and hurtfully felt by many of the President's constituents who are entitled to be saved from this needless burden so long as it is indisputably unnecessary for the integrity of social security itself. The message will not be quite so popular 1 week from today as it is this afternoon, if it is popular at all at any time.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say about this message. I feel very deeply about it. I think—and I repeat what I said in the beginning—that the editorial in yesterday's New York Times did not overstate the fact when it is asserted, "A veto of the present bill would be an irresponsible act."

In my opinion it is an irresponsible act which springs more from a studied political campaign aimed at a fourth term on an anti-Congress platform than from any sort of elementary justification in economics or in fact.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, following my remarks, I should like to have the editorial in the New York Times, from which I have quoted, printed in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENACT THE TAX BILL

The President's remarks at his press conference last week were taken by most of his listeners to imply that he intended to veto today or tomorrow the tax bill now on his desk. We hope that this interpretation was a mistaken one. A veto of the present tax bill would be an irresponsible act.

The Treasury, it is true, had asked for a tax bill to yield an additional $10,500,000,000. The bill actually passed by Congress is calculated to yield only an additional $2,300,000,000. We believe this amount under present conditions to be inadequate. But it is not insubstantial (it is greatly in excess of the total revenues from the individual income tax as late as the fiscal year 1941, for example), and the Treasury could ill afford to lose it. It has been estimated that the new tax bill would increase the total Federal annual revenues to what a few years ago would have been regarded as the incredible sum of $42,239,000,000. The practical effect of a Presidential veto, unless Congress were able to override it, would not be to force Congress to bring in a new bill increasing revenues but to deprive the Treasury even of the revenues provided by the present bill. The President's delay in acting on the bill has already, in fact, deprived the Treasury of increased excise taxes of $85,000,000 that it could otherwise have collected in March.

The President's advisers may have told him that if he vetoes the bill the net loss in revenues will be only about half as much as those provided by the bill, because he would also be vetoing the provision in the new bill that postpones the increase that would otherwise take place in the social-security pay-roll tax. But this argument is weak on several counts. The veto would still cost the Treasury at least $1,000,000,000 a year in net loss of revenues. And it would substitute an ill-advised tax for better taxes.

The present social-security tax is 1 percent on wage and salary earners and 1 percent on the pay rolls of employers. It yields $1,300,000,000 a year. If the Congressional postponement were to be canceled by a Presidential veto of the tax bill, there would begin next month a 2 percent tax on wage-earners and a tax on employers of 2 percent of their pay rolls. The yield of the tax would be increased to $2,600,000,000 a year. So far as the social-security program is itself concerned, there is no need to increase the tax rate now. The present social-security system is designed to operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. The act even provides that if the contingency reserve exceeds three times the highest yearly outlay expected during the following 5-year period Congress must be notified. The present contingency reserve is close to $5,000,000,000. The $1,300,000,000 in social-security taxes that we now collect is already more than six times the out-going benefit payments, and more than four times the estimated maximum outgo in 1949. So far as the social-security program itself is concerned, there is no good excuse for raising the rates now.

The argument that we should raise the social-security rates now on anti-inflation grounds implies that social-security revenues ought not to be considered merely in relation to the needs of the social-security system but rather as part of total revenues, and that the social-security system itself should be treated as part of a compensatory program of Government taxing and spending. Such an implication is a serious one for the future of the social-security system, but it does not need to be examined here. The anti-inflation argument, even if directly applicable to the social-security program, could not justify a veto of the present bill; for such a veto would mean an annual net loss of $1,000,000,000 in taxes.

It is worth examining, morever, the kind of increased taxes that doubling of the social-security rates would now impose. A tax on pay rolls is a tax on employment and an increase in costs of production. Under present conditions it would force up prices further. The Government, moreover, would have to pay for its increased revenues from this source either in loss of other corporation tax revenues or in increased subsidies; so that the amount of its gain on net balance would be questionable. From the standpoint of the workers the increased tax would mean an added income tax, without exemptions, of 1 percent.

Here is a strange inconsistency in administration policy. The President has refused to accept a general retail sales tax at any level whatever, on the ground that low-income families cannot afford it. Yet a general retail sales tax of 2 percent would obviously press much less heavily on low-income families than would a flat social-security tax of 2 percent without exemptions. A retail sales tax would discourage spending, which is a highly desirable end when inflation is threatened. A family could to some extent mitigate the tax by reducing its spending. But there is no way under which an employed man can escape the flat income tax under the social-security system. It can be argued, of course, that in such a tax a man is only being forced to pay for his own future security. But does not the same argument apply to any tax to defray the costs of the present war?

This brings us back to the weaknesses of the administration's own tax program. Congress rejected that program for the sound reason that the increased taxes it proposed would have imperiled the productive processes themselves. Congress failed to compensate for this rejection by even a moderate general sales tax because the administration was flatly opposed to such a tax. How can such opposition be reconciled with an effort to increase a flat income tax without exemptions?

It is hard to believe that the President would veto the new tax bill simply because it contains a provision requiring labor unions to file financial statements with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This is merely a mild and belated step to bring some measure of publicity and accountability into the handling of union funds. It is necessary, among other reasons, to help protect the individual union member against exploitation by unscrupulous union bosses wherever these exist.

Even if the President were otherwise justified in vetoing the new tax bill, he would not be justified in allowing Congress to waste months of precious time in framing the measure without having made unmistakably clear from the beginning precisely what he would veto and why.

If the President vetoes this measure there can be but one answer. Congress should override the veto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the President's veto of the tax bill does not make sense. Why does he not accept the additional taxes levied, all of which were included in his program, and then ask Congress to pass another law simplifying and increasing the personal income taxes? The Treasury's original plan did not ask for $10,500,000,000 of additional taxes but only for $7,000,000,000 of taxes and $3,500,000,000 of compulsory savings, which meant Government bonds. The compulsory savings feature would undoubtedly have reduced the sale of bonds through voluntary pay-roll deductions, and would have represented no gain to the Government. The additional money the President wants, thus estimated to be about $4,500,000,000, could be provided only by a general increase in personal income taxes or by a sales tax. A sales tax would certainly have been vetoed if it had been included in the bill. Why does not the President take the increased tax offered by the bill now?

The bill, first, increases the tax on luxuries about as the Treasury requested.

Second, it increases the excess-profits tax on corporations from 90 to 95 percent.

Third, it simplifies, while increasing slightly, the net income tax by abolishing the earned-income credit, simplifying the Victory tax, and repealing the second windfall provision.

Fourth, it improves the renegotiation provisions by providing a court review, to which every American is entitled when dealing with the Government, and exempting small business concerns with a total annual Government business of less than $500,000.

Fifth, it freezes the social-security old-age-pension rate of 1 percent instead of letting it increase to 2 percent on the employer and 2 percent on the employee.

The President's message suggests that the increased old-age-pension money can be balanced against the additional taxes, but of course they are entirely distinct. The increase from 1 to 2 percent is not needed for social-security purposes, because the fund is already much larger than estimated. But the President proposes to borrow from the old-age-pension fund all the additional money produced by these taxes, to help finance the war. Congress does not feel that the old-age-pension funds should be used for general financing purposes.

It is unfortunate that the good features of the bill should be endangered by the President's veto, and the tax collections reduced by $2,300,000,000 annually, simply because Congress has refused to accept the admittedly unsound recommendations of Secretary Morgenthau regarding the individual income taxes.

EXTENSION OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is the desire of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who has today reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency Senate Joint Resolution 116, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945, to have it taken up for consideration tomorrow. It will be in order to do that. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be made the unfinished business, with the understanding that it will not be taken up for action until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be Assistant Seecretary of Commerce, vice W. L. Clayton, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 22 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice W. L. Clayton, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

POSTMASTERS

NEW YORK

Irene Bruno Ameele, East Williamson.
Edward J. Reidy, Elmira.
Beulah Meier, Holtsville.

PENNSYLVANIA

Albert R. Hinkle, Clearfield.
Lawrence E. Oyler, Gettysburg.
Tillie Kuchinsky, Lost Creek.
Lucille J. Mensch, Marienville.
Frank Mager, Matamoras.
Donald R. Sheehan, Mehoopany.
Hilda M. Fabian, Ottsville.
Florence I. Risch, Sarver.

TENNESSEE

Curtis W. Younger, Atwood.
Katie Potts, Bon Aqua.
Glennie K. Harrison, Cosby.
Hollis K. Stephenson, Eagleville.
Shafter E. Kidwell, Mohawk.
James T. McCabe, Richard City.
Edith D. Hill, Shouns.

TEXAS

Leta McElligott, Bells.
Andrew R. Davis, Brackettville.
John A. Leinweber, Ingram.
Sislie Curtis, Larue.
Sallye Godbold, Leakey
Lura E. Seale, Lolita.
Wayland B. Weatherred, Pampa.

VIRGINIA

Jippie S. Yeatts, Hurt.

WEST VIRGINIA

Jesse C. Garlow, Maidsville.
Icie O. Anderson, Watson.
John C. Coleman, Wilcoe.

WYOMING

Andrew Lee Johnson, Jackson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, O God of our salvation; for the glory of Thy name deliver us and purge away our sins, so that we Thy people and the people of Thy pasture may give Thee thanks forever. O let the generations show forth the praise of the Lord and His strength and the wonderful works He hath done. We look out upon our country; may we not stray into doubt or disquietude; thwart every thought of discontent and ingratitude; unfold unto us a most promising future.

O pity the unfortunate who fail to break forth into the ecstasy of admiration because of the great achievements of our Republic; grant that the measures of patriotic ambitions may carry with them a marvelous something of the providence of Almighty God; His vital breath has been our strength and will be our security in the years to come; O anoint our souls on the mountaintop of Thy hidden might. By the valiant sacrifices of the past our soil is sacred with the billowy graves of our sons and daughters. O Lord God of the ages, with most reverent breath we pray: We bless Thee for the Virginia knight of free government, who knelt at the sacrificial altar of the Colonies with all his earthly store. Father of forgiveness, we ask for the spirit of his deep convictions which did not shimmer nor move. What tears have we wiped away, what contributions have we made to the public weal, where is our bountiful beneficence, what noble examples have we set before our people? O grant that with the giants of heart and conscience we may give noble evidence of our worthiness. In the name of the Son of God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution to print, with additional copies, the so-called Baruch Report on War and Post-War Adjustment Policy.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 872) entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HILL, and Mr. AUSTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico read as follows:

To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and

critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me tc my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the *secure* enjoyment of indispensable *outlets* for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalship alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous

mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western;* whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However, combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, expose to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foments occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchial cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain

there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and

confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverence, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THE REVENUE ACT OF 1944 (H. DOC. NO. 443)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3687, entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes."

I regret that I find it necessary in the midst of this great war to be compelled to do this in what I regard as the public interest.

Many months ago, after careful examination of the finances of the Nation, I asked the Congress for legislation to raise $10,500,000,000 over and above the existing revenue system. Since then persons prominent in our national life have stated in no uncertain terms that my figure was too low.

The measure before me purports to increase the national revenue by a little over $2,000,000,000. Actually, however, the bill in its net results will enrich the Treasury by less than $1,000,000,000.

As a tax bill, therefore, I am compelled to decide that it is wholly ineffective toward that end.

More specifically the bill purports to provide $2,100,000,000 in new revenues. At the same time it cancels out automatic increases in the social-security tax which would yield $1,100,000,000. In ad-

dition it grants relief from existing taxes which would cost the Treasury at least $150,000,000 and possibly much more.

In this respect it is not a tax bill but a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy.

The elimination of automatic increases provided in the social-security law comes at a time when industry and labor are best able to adjust themselves to such increases. These automatic increases are required to meet the claims that are being built up against the social-security fund. Such a postponement does not seem wise.

The clause relating to renegotiating of war contracts terminates the present renegotiation authority on December 31 of this year. This seems unwise at this time because no person can at present determine what a renegotiation time limit should be. More experience is needed. The formal right of appeal to The Tax Court that is granted by this bill is an inept provision. The present Tax Court exists for a wholly different purpose and does not have the personnel or the time to assume this heavy load.

The bill is replete with provisions which not only afford indefensible special privileges to favored groups but sets dangerous precedents for the future. This tendency toward the embodiment of special privileges in our legislation is in itself sufficiently dangerous to counterbalance the loss of a very inadequate sum in additional revenues.

Among these special privileges are:

(a) Permission for corporations reorganized in bankruptcy to retain the high excess-profits credit and depreciation basis attributable to the contributions of stockholders who are usually eliminated in the reorganization. This privilege inures to the benefit of bondholders who, in many cases, have purchased their bonds in the speculative market for far less than their face value. It may open the door to further windfall profits in this market because of the undeserved benefit received by reorganized corporations.

(b) Percentage depletion allowances, questionable in any case, are now extended to such minerals as vermiculite, potash, feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, barite, and spodumene. In the case of some of these minerals the War Production Board refused to certify that current output was inadequate for war needs.

(c) The lumber industry is permitted to treat income from the cutting of timber, including selective logging, as a capital gain rather than annual income. As a grower and seller of timber, I think that timber should be treated as a crop and therefore as income when it is sold. This would encourage reforestation.

(d) Natural gas pipe lines are exempted from the excess-profits tax without justification and in a manner which might well lead oil companies to request similar treatment for their pipe lines.

(e) Commercial air lines are granted an unjustifiable extension of the tax subsidy on their air-mail contracts.

It has been suggested by some that I should give my approval to this bill on the ground that having asked the Congress for a loaf of bread to take care of this war for the sake of this and succeeding generations, I should be content with a small piece of crust. I might have done so if I had not noted that the small piece of crust contained so many extraneous and inedible materials.

In regard to that part of the bill which relates to wholly unobjectionable tax increases, may I respectfully suggest to the Congress that the excise taxes can easily and quickly be levied. This can be accomplished by the passage of a simple joint resolution enacting those provisions of the bill which increase the excise taxes. I should be glad to approve such a measure. This would preserve the principal revenue provisions of the bill without the objectionable features I have criticized.

In another most important respect this bill would disappoint and fail the American taxpayers. Every one of them, including ourselves, is disappointed, confused and bewildered over the practical results of last year's tax bill. The Ruml plan was not the product of this administration. It resulted from a widespread campaign based on the attractive slogan of "Pay-as-you-go." But, as was said many years ago in the State of New York in regard to that same slogan "You don't pay and you don't go."

The Nation will readily understand that it is not the fault of the Treasury Department that the income taxpayers are flooded with forms to fill out which are so complex that even certified public accountants cannot interpret them. No, it is squarely the fault of the Congress of the United States in using language in drafting the law which not even a dictionary or a thesaurus can make clear.

The American taxpayer has been promised of late that tax laws and returns will be drastically simplified. This bill does not make good that promise. It ignores the most obvious step toward simplifying taxes by failing to eliminate the clumsy Victory tax. For fear of dropping from the tax rolls those taxpayers who are at the bottom of the income scale, the bill retains the Victory tax—while at the same time it grants extensive concessions to many special-interest groups.

The suggestion of withholding at graduated rates, which would relieve millions of people of the task of filing declarations of estimated income, was not adopted.

I trust, therefore, that the Congress, after all these delays, will act as quickly as possible for simplification of the tax laws which will make possible the simplification of the forms and computations now demanded of the individual taxpayers. These taxpayers, now engaged in an effort to win the greatest war this Nation has ever faced, are not in a mood to study higher mathematics.

The responsibility of the Congress of the United States is to supply the Government of the United States as a whole with adequate revenue for wartime needs, to provide fiscal support for the stabilization program, to hold firm against the tide of special privileges, and to achieve real simplicity for millions of small-income taxpayers.

In the interest of strengthening the home front, in the interest of speeding the day of victory, I urge the earliest possible action.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 22, 1944.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and accompanying document will be printed as a House document.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to postpone further consideration of the President's message until Thursday next, February 24.

The motion was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter that appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, February 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. NORMAN and Mr. MONKIEWICZ asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the death of our late colleague Leonard Schuetz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a committee report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of our distinguished chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Judge Marvin Jones entitled "Corn Goes to War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Los Angeles Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article, and further to extend my remarks and include therein a radio speech I made on George Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short newspaper excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on February 21, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;

H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; and

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 23, 1944, in the caucus room of the old House Office Building, for the consideration of post-war planning.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backing of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1215. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1216. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of The Alaska Railroad for services rendered from May 1, 1943, to

September 30, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1217. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Senate Joint Resolution 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities; with amendments (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4242. A bill to authorize an examination and survey with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along the coast of New Jersey from Sandy Hook to Cape May; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4243. A bill to extend the time for filing certain applications for insurance payments under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4244. A bill to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of all temporary substitutes in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to prepare plans for the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth aniversary in 1946 of the signing and publication of Washington's Farewell Address; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of John Bud Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4247. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jessie McManus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eura Reid; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5004. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Toms River, N. J., urging abrogation of British white paper and allowance of Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5005. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Charles P. Roberts and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5006. Also, petition of Dolton Durham and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5007. Also, petition of Paul D. Sidley and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5008. Also, petition of C. A. Woxman and 18 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5009. Also, petition of Cyrus F. Gatewood and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5010. Also, petition of Zollie C. Carpenter, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, St. Louis, Mo., and signed by hundreds of St. Louis citizens, petitioning Congress to pass the soldier-vote bill in the following language: Who has a better right to vote? My kin are fighting for their country and for democracy. No one dare make it difficult for them or interfere with their right to vote. I respectfully request that you do everything in your power, by your vote and your action on the floor of Congress, to pass the soldier-vote bill which will allow the Federal Government to make it easily possible for all men and women in the armed services to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5011. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5012. By Mr. HESS: Petition of 1,000 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against any legislation to bring back national prohibition of the sale of liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5013. By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of the thirty-seventh annual meeting of the Lumber Dealers' Association of Western Pennsylvania, requesting simplification of the tax laws and other subjects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5014. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia assembled under auspices of Palestine open-door committee, supporting unrestricted Jewish immigration to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5015. Also, petition of various members of Local 612 of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, Derry, Pa., supporting a soldier-vote bill to make it easily possible for all men and women in the armed services to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5016. Also, petition of the Olivet Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring America's participation in establishing a Christian world order and government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5017. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Westmoreland County, Pa., in support of Resolutions 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5018. By Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Petition of A. Armbruster and 458 other residents of Floyd County, Ind., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5019. Also, petition of Forest Tignor and 49 other residents of Rockport, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5020. Also, petition of Roy Martin and 22 other residents of Rockport, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5021. Also, petition of Russell Herron and 32 other citizens of Rockport, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5022. Also, petition of Floyd W. Swallow and 49 other residents of Richland and Rockport, Ind., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5023. Also, petition of James C. Horne and 24 other residents of Richland, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5024. Also, petition of James Yellig and 49 other residents of Mariah Hill, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5025. Also, petition of J. W. Bacon and 36 other residents of Lynnville, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5026. Also, petition of Chris C. Tremper and 47 other residents of Grandview, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5027. Also, petition of John C. Nicholson and 49 other residents of Elberfeld, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5028. Also, petition of George Snyder and 49 other residents of Dale, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5029. Also, petition of Herbert Helmich and 75 other residents of Chrisney, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5030. Also, petition of Harry Killebren and 43 residents of Boonville, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5031. Also, petition of Charles Miles and 40 other residents of Boonville, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5032. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition signed by 753 residents of East Liverpool, Salem, and Steubenville, Ohio, protesting against the passage of any such prohibition legislation as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5033. By Mr. MERROW: Petitions signed by 28 residents of Berlin, N. H., urging support of House Resolution No. 418; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5034. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition signed by 137 voters from 17 Vermont towns, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5035. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the National Maritime Union of San Francisco, with

reference to grade labeling; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5036. Also, petition of the National Maritime Union of San Francisco, with reference to subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5037. Also, petition of the congregation of Emanu-El of San Francisco, abrogating Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5038. Also, petition of the Sisterhood Temple, Sherith Israel, of San Francisco, abrogating Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5039. Also, petition of the Jewish War Veterans Ladies Auxiliary, No. 152, of San Francisco, abrogating the Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5040. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of C. W. Griesser and others of Joplin, Jasper, and Newton Counties, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5041. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition of approximately 1,180 signers, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5042. Also, resolution adopted by Temple Beth Israel, of Maywood, N. J., entreating the President of the United States and the Congress to use their good offices in compelling Great Britain to perform its written obligations to the Jewish people by carrying out the terms and conditions of the Balfour Declaration and of its mandate over Palestine and to further compel Great Britain to take action forthwith to vitiate its Palestine white paper completely; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5043. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Albert E. Taylor and 4,419 other residents of the First Congressional District of West Virginia and vicinity, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou seeking Shepherd of our souls, in days of darkness and doubt Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort us. Give us to understand that in the narrow fold of Thy will we are more free than in the wide plains of our own unhallowed desires; that in following Thee we find an adventure that our aimless wanderings can never know. We thank Thee that nothing in life or death, in this world or any other world, can separate us from Thy love which passeth understanding.

Hear our prayer for those in a world cursed by war, in these fearful times living hourly in the presence of danger and death. Be Thou the comfort of the bereaved, the home of the homeless, the guardian of the widow and the fatherless. Sustain those who suffer from wounds and sickness. Be Thou the Shining Presence in every fear-shadowed area of life. Take to Thyself those who are swept away by the hurricane of battle. Hasten the glad day when righteousness and justice shall be triumphant and peace shall bless our land and every land and the prophetic vision shall be fulfilled: "Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls salvation and thy gates praise." We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, February 22, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 21, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 158) for the relief of Colonel Anderson F. Pitts.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 21, 1944:

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage, townsite; and

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

On February 22, 1944:

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Melchoir;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret; and

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Burton	Eastland
Andrews	Bushfield	Ferguson
Austin	Butler	George
Bailey	Byrd	Gerry
Bankhead	Capper	Gillette
Barkley	Caraway	Green
Bilbo	Chavez	Guffey
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Bridges	Connally	Hill
Buck	Davis	Holman
Jackson	Nye	Tydings
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
La Follette	Overton	Wallgren
Lucas	Radcliffe	Walsh, Mass.
McClellan	Revercomb	Walsh, N. J.
McFarland	Reynolds	Weeks
McKellar	Russell	Wheeler
Maybank	Shipstead	Wherry
Mead	Smith	White
Millikin	Taft	Wiley
Moore	Thomas, Idaho	Willis
Murdock	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Murray	Tunnell	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

CONTROL OF PRICES AND INFLATION: FAIR WAGE AND LABOR POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received from Mr. Arthur E. Gerch, secretary of the Wisconsin Retail Food Dealers Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., a copy of a resolution which I should like to have printed in the RECORD. It relates to a suggestion which they think should be put into effect in relation to attempting to control the O. P. A.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION REITERATES NEED FOR INFLATION CONTROL ACT

Whereas the Price Control Act will expire on June 30, 1944, and whereas the Little Steel formula and the President's hold-the-line order have been upset by recent wage and other concessions to various groups, the effect of which has been to bring closer and uncontrollable inflation; and

Whereas the Wisconsin Retail Food Dealers Association, representing a large number of the independent retail grocers of the State of Wisconsin, favors and is prepared to lend its support to the establishment of a sound

program of inflation control, including control over food prices at all levels as will encourage maximum production, discourage black-market operations and be fair and equitable to processors, distributors, and consumers;

The board of directors of the association hereby reiterates its firm conviction that both price control and rationing are vital wartime necessities; and

Whereas in the opinion of the board, the foregoing objective can only be obtained through additional legislation which will

(a) Strengthen the system of price control and at the same time eliminate abuses and inequities now apparent.

(b) Establish a firm, fair national labor policy under which all wage earners will be accorded equality of treatment;

Resolved, first, that the following amendments to the Emergency Price Control Act should be adopted when and if such act is extended:

1. Provision for judicial review by local Federal district courts of all price regulations, including power on the part of the court to determine the validity and legality of such regulations and in proper cases for the granting of interlocutory relief.

2. Additional safeguards of the right of efficient operators to earn and retain such reasonable wages and profits as will enable them to remain in business and supply essential needs of their customers.

3. A more definite restatement of the intent of Congress with respect to the requirement that the powers granted by the Price Control Act shall not be used to compel changes in established business practices. The board is convinced that the O. P. A. has disregarded the intent of Congress in this regard and believes the section is in need of clarification.

4. Section C of the act providing for classification of stores has been so administered as to confer an undue competitive advantage upon certain types of operators and in the opinion of the board should be repealed.

Resolved, second, that in lieu of the breakdown of the Little Steel formula, a simple statutory wage ceiling be established with provisions for periodic adjustments to compensate for any material increase in actual cost of living, and to remain in effect for the duration of the war.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOLMAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 2956. A bill for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 719).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1618. A bill to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorize the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national forest receipts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 720).

By Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

H. R. 3618. A bill to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 721).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 454. A bill dividing the State of Florida into two judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding terms of court therein; with amendments (Rept. No. 722).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Augustine H. Gray, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Service Squadron Eight;

Brig. Gen. James T. Moore to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 1st day of February 1944;

Brig. Gen. Francis P. Mulcahy to be a major general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 5th day of February 1944; and

Sundry citizens and meritorious noncommissioned officers for appointment as second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George W. Renchard, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

Mr. SMITH. I ask consent to make a unanimous report from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on a nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Grover Bennett Hill, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLMAN (for himself and Mr. MCNARY):

S. 1734. A bill authorizing acquisition by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise of certain forest lands within the Mount Hood National Forest in Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1735. A bill to amend the act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

After section 212, insert the following new section:

"SEC. 213. No part of any appropriation made by this or any other act shall be allotted or made available to, or used to pay the expenses of, any agency or instrumentality established by Executive order after such agency or instrumentality has been in existence for more than 1 year, if the Congress has not appropriated any money specifically for such agency or instrumentality or specifically authorized the expenditure of funds by it. For the purposes of this section, any agency or instrumentality established by Executive order shall be deemed to have been in existence during the existence of any other agency or instrumentality, established by a prior Executive order, if the principal functions of both of such agencies or instrumentalities are substantially the same or similar. When any agency or instrumentality is or has been prevented from using appropriations by reason of this section, no part of any appropriation made by this or any other act shall be used to pay the expenses of the performance by any other agency or instrumentality of functions which are substantially the same as or similar to the principal functions of the agency or instrumentality so prevented from using appropriations, unless the Congress has specifically authorized the expenditure of funds for performing such functions."

BRITISH INTERFERENCE IN AMERICAN ELECTIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate a letter I have just written to Hon. Elmer Davis, of the Office of War Information, dated February 22. The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1944.

Hon. ELMER DAVIS,
The Office of War Information,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DAVIS: I have just seen the Associated Press dispatch from London, dated February 19, which is as follows:

"To give American troops newly arrived in Britain a quick fill-in of the news they have missed while afloat, the British Ministry of Information distributes a little four-page tabloid newspaper at ports of arrival.

"A recent issue, it was learned today, carried the following story, not credited to any source:

" 'Roosevelt's opponents are ready to spend $50,000,000 to beat him if—as they assume—he makes a fourth-term bid for President at the November elections.'

"The Ministry of Information declined to permit an Associated Press reporter to examine a copy of the issue which contained the story. However, the same story was published in the London Daily Express."

I then said this to Mr. Davis:

I cannot imagine anything more disruptive of the relations between Great Britain and America than for the British Ministry of Information to attempt to propagandize American troops in the coming election, especially when such propaganda is based on rumor and is submitted without details or proof.

I would be obliged to you if you would investigate the matter and ascertain whether this report is correct, namely, that the British Ministry of Information is distributing a newspaper to all of the American troops arriving in Great Britain and including in this newspaper such items as the quotation above given—to the effect that the opponents of Roosevelt are ready to spend $50,000,000 to defeat him.

As the final effort is being made by Great Britain and America to administer the death blow to our enemies, it is vital that our relations not be disturbed by an attempt on the part of Great Britain to influence by propaganda, or otherwise, the results of our election.

We Americans will fight out our political battles within our own shores and any effort by foreign nations to influence this election will be deeply resented. Nothing more mischievous could be done to disturb the harmony that should exist in time of war

between two great peoples who are fighting side by side for the common cause.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

Mr. President, when the reply to my letter is received I shall read it to the Senate.

LABELING OF FOOD

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post there appeared an article by a former O. P. A. official, Edmund F. Maher, who gives a clear conception of the vicious intent of a certain bill which has been called the labeling bill. It is claimed that if this bill were enacted into law it would stop practically all free enterprise, discourage research, place the careless, irresponsible packer in the same class with the man who is scrupulous about his products and his methods of processing, and would practically wipe out all trade names, and curb advertising to a great extent.

This article is worth reading. The canners, manufacturers, and consumers are entitled to protection.

AMERICAN ATTITUDES AND LEADERSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "American Attitudes and Leadership," delivered by him at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, February 21, 1944, as the final lecture of a series on international post-war problems, which appears in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Washington, an American Nationalist," delivered by him on February 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTES TO JOSEPH B. EASTMAN AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Traffic World describing a testimonial dinner tendered Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISCRIMINATING AGAINST OUR NEIGHBORS—ARTICLE BY SUMNER WELLS

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Discriminating Against Our Neighbors," written by Sumner Welles and published in the Chicago Sun of February 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL REFORM IN PUERTO RICO

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Are We Going To Reject the Bill?" from the San Juan (P. R.) El Mundo, of February 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report of the proceedings of the meeting of the Bataan Relief Organization at the Mount Vernon Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., February 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VETO OF THE REVENUE BILL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 23, 1944, entitled "An Unwise Veto"; an editorial from the New York Times of February 23, 1944, entitled "The President's Veto"; and an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 23, 1944, entitled "The Tax Bill Veto," which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on yesterday the President of the United States sent to the House of Representatives, and indirectly to the Senate, a message vetoing the tax bill recently passed by both Houses of the Congress after 6 or 8 months of deliberation upon it. I should have preferred to discuss this veto message on a proposal to pass the bill over the President's objections, but not knowing what action the House will take, and therefore not knowing whether the Senate will be given an opportunity to vote upon the veto, I have decided to discuss it now.

The President says in his message that he regrets it, but that he had to veto the bill in the public interest. He says that many months ago he asked Congress to increase the taxes by ten and one-half billion dollars, and that—

Since then—

To use his own language—

persons prominent in our national life have stated in no uncertain terms that my figure—

That is, the President's figure—

was too low.

This reference in justification of his veto is obviously to Mr. Wendell L. Willkie, the up-to-date Halley's comet darting across the firmament hither and yon to illuminate the heavens with an array of fantastic figures which neither it nor anybody can comprehend. I cannot but wonder, Mr. President, whether this spectacular celestial nomad has frightened the President into the use of figures quite as fantastic, though not as large.

The President states that while the measure purports to increase the national revenue by a little more than $2,000,000,000, the actual net result is a little less than $1,000,000,000.

The Treasury Department has but yesterday reported that the net increase in taxes provided in this bill amounts to $2,194,000,000. The staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue set up by Congress estimates the net income to be around $2,300,000,000.

But let us take the figures of the Treasury Department itself, which we might well admit are conservative. This $2,194,000,000 figure is arrived at after deducting from the gross increase in revenues provided in the bill any losses from other categories that may occur by reason of the bill itself. Whether these losses amount to $150,000,000, as the President states, or to a smaller, or a larger sum, as estimated by the Treasury, they were all taken into consideration and deducted from the gross increases carried by the bill in order to arrive at the $2,194,000,000 reported by the Treasury. It may be that that figure is subject to a further readjustment on account of what the Treasury calls nonrecurring items amounting to about $75,000,000.

In order still further to belittle the amount of revenue provided in this new tax bill the President has resorted to one of the most unjustifiable methods of calculation it is possible to conjure up, which obviously was handed to him by a mind more clever than honest. He refers to an amount which he figures as $1,100,000,000, which he claims would be collected by a doubling of the social-security taxes on March 1 of this year. I am one of the members of the Committee on Finance who voted against the freezing of the social-security tax when it was passed on by the committee. I not only voted on the floor of the Senate against freezing that tax, but I made an argument against it when the amendment was before the Senate for its consideration. The amendment freezing the tax at 1 percent, instead of automatically raising it to 2 percent, was adopted overwhelmingly both in the committee and in the Senate.

In my discussion of that proposal on the floor of the Senate I stated that I had never regarded the moneys procured by this tax as anything but a sacred fund to be used for the payment of the worthy purposes contemplated when the social-security law was enacted, and that I did not at that time, nor at any other time would I, vote to increase this tax merely for the purpose of letting the Treasury use it as revenue to carry on the ordinary expenses of the Government. It is true that in order to hold this fund inviolate and to obtain an income from it the law provides that it shall be loaned to the Treasury, originally at 3 percent interest, but now at a rate averaging the rate on other loans. But it is a loan. It is not Treasury capital. It is no more to be regarded as income in the Treasury than is the money obtained by the sale of War bonds, and it must be repaid, just as they are to be repaid, the only difference being that this loan bears a higher rate of interest than that borne by any of the War bonds now being sold to the public.

But even if this social-security tax should raise the amount which the President estimates, he has no right to say that if it is left in the pockets of employers and employees, instead of being collected from them, it will reduce the annual income of the Treasury by that or any other amount. It simply is not an accurate statement of the facts, and everybody knows it. As a matter of fact, it will not raise that amount, because 2 months of the year have already elapsed, during which time the increased social-security taxes have not been and will not be collected.

In his desire to criticize the bill and complain of Congress, the President, in talking about the desire for tax simplification, said—and I quote him:

The Nation will readily understand that it is not the fault of the Treasury Department that the income taxpayers are flooded with forms to fill out which are so complex that even certified public accountants cannot interpret them. No—

Says the President, with a comma—

it is squarely the fault of the Congress of the United States in using language in drafting

the law which not even a dictionary or a thesaurus can make clear.

Mr. President, no man could have made that extraordinary statement who has sat in tax committees in the Capitol of the United States. If it was made by anybody who ever sat in a tax committee, it was a deliberate and unjustified misstatement in order to place upon Congress the blame for universal dissatisfaction with tax complexities, and in order to produce the illusion that the executive departments have in vain protested against this complexity. Congress is to blame for these complexities to the extent, and only to the extent, to which it has accepted the advice, the recommendations, and the language of the Treasury Department, through its so-called experts who have sat in on the passage of every tax measure since I can remember. Every member of the House Ways and Means Committee and every member of the Senate Finance Committee knows that every time we have undertaken to write a new tax bill in the last 10 years we have started out with the universal desire to simplify the tax laws and the forms through which taxes are collected. We have attempted to adopt policies which would simplify them. When we have agreed upon a policy, we have submitted that policy to the Treasury Department to write the appropriate language to carry out that policy; and frequently the Treasury Department, through its experts, has brought back language so complicated and circumambient that neither Solomon nor all the wise men of the East could understand it or interpret it.

In his effort to justify this veto message, the President has gone forth with a searchlight and magnifying glass to find inconsequential faults. The President states—and I quote him:

> The bill is replete with provisions which not only afford indefensible special privileges to favored groups but sets dangerous precedents for the future.

As evidence in support of this statement, the President refers to the provisions of the bill permitting corporations reorganized in bankruptcy to retain certain excess-profits credits and other items attributable to the contributions of stockholders who are, to quote the President, "usually eliminated in the reorganization."

This is cited as a loophole in behalf of special privileges. As a matter of fact, nobody knows at this time whether there would be any loss whatever to the Treasury on account of this provision. It all depends upon the outcome of litigation now pending in the courts, the outcome of which no person can foresee with any degree of certainty. But even if the litigation should result in making this provision effective, it would merely allow corporations which have come out of bankruptcy to claim and obtain the same credits which corporations which are still in bankruptcy obtain. Therefore no person can categorically claim that this provision would result in loss to the Treasury.

The President cites the percentage depletion allowance on a few new and insignificant items in this bill, not heretofore carried in tax bills or in the present law, and says that such allowances are questionable in any case. It is well known, Mr. President, that the Treasury has always been opposed to any sort of depletion allowance in the development or marketing of minerals; and the use by the President of the phrase "questionable in any case" indicates that his objections in this regard coincide with the traditional views of the Treasury. But according to the Treasury's own figures, the amount of revenue involved in this provision is so insignificant as to make a veto on that ground almost grotesque.

The President refers to the lumber industry as being permitted to treat income from the cutting of timber as a capital gain rather than as annual income, and cites that provision of the bill as a loophole in favor of special privilege. In all fairness to the Congress and to the people who read the President's message, it ought to be stated that under the present law, if a man owns a tract of timber and sells that timber, or sells the land on which it grows, to another person, company, or industry, he is allowed to pay taxes upon the amount which he receives as capital gain, not as annual income, for the year in which it is sold.

The difference between the tax provisions relating to capital gains and those relating to annual income are technical and are not understood by the average citizen or by many experts. I have neither the time nor the disposition to go into an explanation of this difference at this time. Suffice it to say that under the present law the owners of timberland may sell it to a lumber or milling company, or to anyone else who moves in upon it and cuts the timber and sells it, and are allowed to pay taxes on the basis of a capital gain. The person who buys, cuts, and markets the timber pays taxes on an annual income basis, because he is in that business; and in order to arrive at his income for that year upon his operation in that or any other field, he is allowed to deduct the costs originally, together with the expenses of operation, to arrive at the net income upon which he will pay a tax. But if the owner of that same land and that same timber, instead of selling it to another, moves a sawmill upon it and cuts it himself and sells it himself in the market, he is taxed upon it as income for that year. In other words, if he sells it outright to another, he is taxed in one way. If he cuts it himself, he is taxed in another way. This discrimination was recognized by the committee as an injustice to owners of land containing timber.

I voted for this timber amendment as a member of the Finance Committee. I voted for it on the floor of the United States Senate. As one of the conferees on the part of the Senate, I signed the conference report containing it. For that vote I make no apology to any human being. I did not vote for it in order to create a fantastic or imaginary loophole to allow someone to escape taxes. I voted for it as an act of justice to those who grow timber over a period of a generation, or half a century, and who are entitled to just treatment, no matter in what manner they dispose of the timber.

The President, in order to justify his treatment of this amendment, cites his own experience as a timberman, and from his experience he regards such income as constituting annual income. I do not know to what extent the President is engaged in the timber business. I do know that he sells Christmas trees at Christmas time. They are no doubt of easy growth and short life, and I have no doubt that the income from their sale constitutes annual income not only to him but that such income would constitute annual income to any other person engaged in a like enterprise. But, Mr. President, to compare those little pine bushes with a sturdy oak, gum, poplar, or spruce, which requires a generation of care and nurturing to produce in the forest, and from which no annual income is derived until finally it is sold, is like comparing a cricket to a stallion.

The President refers to a certain exemption in the bill from the excise profits tax for natural gas pipe lines, and uses that as a horrible example of loopholes which Congress has deliberately provided for special interests. The amount of taxes provided in this provision, Mr. President, according to the Treasury's own figures, would not exceed $5,000,000.

He refers to commercial air lines, not more than three of which could possibly be affected by the provisions of this bill, according to the Treasury's own figures. The amount of taxes involved in this extension of the tax subsidy on mail contracts is not a penny more than $1,500,000. Those are the items which the President, with a searchlight and magnifying glass, has gone about to find in order to sustain the veto, in order to prove to the American people that the Congress of the United States has deliberately used the taxing power to impoverish the poor and make the rich richer.

The President said that he had been advised by some not to veto this bill "on the ground"—to quote his own language—"that having asked the Congress for a loaf of bread to take care of this war for the sake of this and succeeding generations, I should be content with a small piece of crust."

I am one of those, Mr President, who advised the President not to veto this bill. I not only advised him, but I implored him not to veto it, because I did not then believe, and I do not now believe, that the veto which he has sent to Congress was justified. I make no apology for that.

The President said that he had been advised that, "having asked the Congress for a loaf of bread to take care of this war for the sake of this and succeeding generations, I should be content with a small piece of crust." Then he states that he might have given heed to such advice—"if I had not noted that the small piece of crust contained so many extraneous and inedible materials."

Mr. President, how small a piece of crust is this, and how inedible is it, containing, as it does, $2,250,000,000? How small a piece of crust is this, and how inedible is it? This "small piece of inedible crust" is more than the national debt of the United States Government

prior to the First World War. This "small piece of inedible crust" is more than twice the annual cost of the Federal Government prior to the First World War. This "small piece of inedible crust" constitutes a sum of money large enough to pay the entire $1,350,000,000 which Congress last week authorized to be expended for the relief of human suffering in occupied territories, and still leave $1,000,000,000. This "small piece of inedible crust" constitutes a sum of money large enough to buy many airplanes and tanks, and many millions of rounds of ammunition. It is large enough to establish many hospitals for the relief of those injured in this war. This "small piece of incdible crust" constitutes a sum large enough to pay two-thirds of the cost of the mustering-out-pay bill for members in the armed services of the United States, which Congress passed only a few weeks ago, and which the President himself recommended and signed.

Mr. President, to refuse this "small piece of inedible crust" is the same as if a starving man were to say to his would-be benefactor, "Unless you serve me with a full eight-course dinner, I will not eat a bite."

In his effort to belittle and discredit Congress throughout his veto message the President says:

> It is not a tax bill but a tax-relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy.

That statement, Mr. President, is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress. Other Members of Congress may do as they please; but, as for me, I do not propose to take this unjustifiable assault lying down.

For 31 years I have continuously represented the great Commonwealth of Kentucky in the Congress of the United States—14 years in the House of Representatives—almost without opposition in my own party or in the Republican Party throughout that entire period. When my present term as a Senator shall have expired I will have served that great Commonwealth continuously for a period of 32 years. Unless I am misinformed, that constitutes a longer period of service than can be claimed by any other previous Kentuckian who has served in either branch of the Congress. When my present term in the Senate shall have expired, I will have served in this body for 18 years continuously, which is a longer period than any previous Kentuckian can claim for continuous service in the Senate.

Mr. President, out of the fullness of my heart, I entertain a profound gratitude to the people of my State for giving me the opportunity to serve them and the Nation during this tragic period of our history. On the 27th day of next July I shall have served as majority leader of this body for 7 years. You may be surprised to know, Mr. President, that, so far as I have been able to trace the record back in senatorial history, this is nearly twice as long as any other man of any political party has served as majority leader of this body.

Mr. President, this is the first time during that long service, which I had thought was honorable, when I have been accused deliberately of voting for a bill that constituted a relief measure impoverishing the needy and enriching the greedy.

Mr. President, for 12 years I have carried to the best of my ability the flag of Franklin D. Roosevelt. For the past 7 years I have carried the flag of this administration as majority leader of the Senate, and during these years I have borne that flag with pride because I felt that President Roosevelt in himself in the great crisis in the history of our country and the world constituted a dynamic leader for whom the people yearned. I dare say that during the past 7 years of my tenure as majority leader I have carried that flag over rougher territory than was ever traversed by any previous majority leader. Some times I have carried it with little help here on the Senate floor, and more frequently with little help from the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Whether I have made a good majority leader, an indifferent majority leader, or a bad majority leader, the record itself will speak. There is nothing in that record that I would now change; there is nothing in that record that I would not repeat under the same circumstances that existed during this course of my legislative history. But, Mr. President, there is something more precious to me than any honor that can be conferred upon me by the Senate of the United States or by the people of Kentucky or by the President of this Republic, and that is the approval of my own conscience and my own self-respect. That self-respect and the rectitude of that conscience I propose on this occasion to maintain.

I thank Heaven that my future happiness does not depend upon whether I shall retain the post of majority leader of the Senate for another hour. As proof of that, Mr. President, and in confirmation of this statement, I have called a conference of the Democratic majority for 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning in the conference room of the Senate Office Building, at which time my resignation will be tendered and my services terminated in the post which I now hold at this desk.

Before leaving it, Mr. President, I wish to say that I have disagreed many times with my colleagues here on both sides of the political aisle; but I have sought to earn their respect and their esteem. Before I depart from this station I wish to express my deep appreciation for the courtesies which I have uniformly received. I shall carry with me to my dying day the most sacred memories of long and honorable service in the two branches of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, let me say, in conclusion, that if the Congress of the United States has any self-respect yet left it will override the veto of the President and enact this tax bill into law, his objections to the contrary notwithstanding. [Prolonged applause on the Senate floor, Senators rising.]

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, supplementing the remarks of the distinguished and honored Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I refer to paragraph (c) on the second page of the President's message of yesterday. This paragraph refers to and comments upon the item in the tax bill which relates to the lumber industry.

The production of lumber and timber constitutes the greatest single industry in the entire Oregon section. I have received a number of messages relative to this item in the President's veto message, amongst them a telegram from David T. Mason, of Portland, Oreg. It so well expresses the thoughts of those who have their investments in and are devoting their lives to the development and production of timber in the Oregon area, that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *February 22, 1944.*

Hon. RUFUS HOLMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Reference President's veto message of revenue bill, I understand message in part states in effect, "Lumber industry is allowed to treat income from cutting of timber as capital gain rather than as ordinary annual income. As a grower and seller of timber, I believe timber should be considered a crop, and the income should be taxed as ordinary annual income. This would encourage private forestry." The President is 100 percent wrong in the last two sentences quoted, for it is now widely recognized that the greatest present obstacle to private forestry is the present income tax law, because it does tax income from cutting of timber as ordinary annual income. If timber were an annual crop like corn it should be so taxed. but timber crops generally require 50 years or more to grow to the harvest stage, during which long period of growth without protection by insurance they are exposed to great hazards of fire, insects, disease, wind, and other damage. The gain from such a crop is not an ordinary income created within the tax year, but is a capital gain created over a long period of years and such gain should be taxed as a capital gain, just as capital gains of other kinds are already taxed under existing income tax law. In recognition of the present discrimination against timber the Congress—in this revenue bill—provided for suitable equitable tax treatment upon the recommendation of forest owners, of State foresters, of eminent professional foresters, of the congressional Committee on Small Business, of the War Production Board, and of others.

DAVID T. MASON.

EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if there is no other amendment to be offered, I desire to present one on behalf of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. In cases where producers have expanded or hereafter expand production of nonbasic agricultural commodities pursuant to any public announcement made under section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1941, as amended, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator through loans, purchases, and other operations under such section 4 (a), to completely fulfill all commitments made to such producers. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator shall use such of the funds available for carrying out the provisions of such section 4 (a) as may be necessary, and such funds are hereby made available for such purpose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this amendment is offered in order that there may be a reaffirmation by the Congress of the policy of assuring farmers who have expanded their production in the past, or who have agreed to expand it in the future, the support prices upon the basis of which they have made the expansion of production.

I wish to say that the amendment is not intended to be critical of anyone, but it is felt by many familiar with the situation that it would be very helpful in bringing about future responses of farmers to the requests of the Government for expanded production if this reaffirmation of the purpose to grant support prices in every instance where possible could become a part of the pending joint resolution.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that in my own State—and I think the statement is applicable to the States of many other Senators—a situation has developed with regard to the price of eggs which has made the position of those who responded to the appeal for increased production of poultry and poultry products very difficult.

I was advised early this month by Mr. Button, the director of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture, that in January the average price of eggs in Wisconsin was below 30 cents a dozen, and that with rising production costs poultry is being disposed of rapidly. Egg production during 1944 is expected to be substantially under that of 1943.

Perhaps a great deal of the damage, so far as pork production is concerned, has already been created. However, I feel that action by the Senate and the Congress in adopting the amendment now proposed to the pending joint resolution will have a reassuring effect, insofar as the farmers are concerned, because it will demonstrate that Congress is determined to assure them support prices for their commodities insofar as possible, in cases in which they have expanded production in the past, or in which they may be asked to expand production in the future.

The amendment really speaks for itself. I conferred with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] concerning it, and he indicated to me that he had no opposition to the amendment. Since it is merely a reaffirmation of the policy which we all wish to have followed, and since I cannot believe that it would have any effect in delaying consideration of the joint resolution, I tender it to the judgment of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] for himself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 2. No funds appropriated to, borrowed by, or in the custody or control of any governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) shall be directly or indirectly used by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency (including any Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation) to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce or maintain, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities: *Provided*, That with respect to any such commodities for which programs involving such payments or losses have been announced on or before October 13, 1943, such programs may be carried out to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law, but winding up and liquidating such programs shall proceed after the date of enactment of this act, and shall be completed within a reasonable time not later than June 30, 1944: *Provided further*, That support prices shall continue to be maintained and announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *And provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments, soil-conservation payments, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Gillette
Andrews	Byrd	Green
Austin	Capper	Guffey
Bailey	Caraway	Hatch
Bankhead	Chavez	Hayden
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Bilbo	Clark, Mo.	Holman
Bone	Connally	Jackson
Brewster	Davis	Johnson, Colo.
Bridges	Eastland	La Follette
Buck	Ferguson	Lucas
Burton	George	McClellan
Bushfield	Gerry	McFarland
McKellar	Reynolds	Walsh, Mass.
Maybank	Russell	Walsh, N. J.
Mead	Shipstead	Weeks
Millikin	Smith	Wheeler
Moore	Taft	Wherry
Murdock	Thomas, Idaho	White
Nye	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
O'Daniel	Tunnell	Willis
Overton	Tydings	Wilson
Radcliffe	Vandenberg	
Revercomb	Wallgren	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The amendment I propose at this time is the same as section 3 of the bill which was vetoed by the President. In effect it prohibits, with certain exceptions, the payment of consumer subsidies.

The bill which was vetoed was passed by substantial majorities in both Houses of Congress. If the House of Representatives and the Senate were correct in their votes at that time, a Presidential veto does not change the existing facts. We were correct at that time, at least, a large majority of us thought we were; and we are still correct, in our own opinion. I have offered the amendment for that purpose, because I believe it should be contained in any extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act. I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I shall not go into the subject. We threshed it out, and the Senate passed the bill, and the President vetoed it.

Now we are endeavoring to save the Commodity Credit Corporation agency in which all the farmers are deeply interested. Of course, if the amendment were adopted, and if the joint resolution containing the amendment were passed by the House, it necessarily would be vetoed again. That would simply be a matter of marching up the hill and marching down again.

So I hope the amendment will not be agreed to, and I speak in the interest of the farmers when I say that.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this is like history repeating itself. I remember that last spring we passed a bill substantially like the bill we passed this year. It was vetoed. The veto was upheld in the House, and again we had the question of passing a bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. At that time I think I voted in favor of another amendment prohibiting subsidies, or at least limiting the amount of subsidies. I think I offered such an amendment.

Of course, it is true that the pending joint resolution impliedly approves for the time being, at least, the subsidy program. However, I feel differently this time, for this reason: The Price Control Act of 1942 and the Stabilization Act of October 1942 both expire on the 30th day of June. The authority to pay subsidies—at least, the authority to pay rollback subsidies—through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation rests, I think, very uncertainly on the provisions of the Price Control Act of 1942. It seems to me that we have a very much more effective method of dealing with the subsidy question in the Price Control

Act than we have in this particular joint resolution.

As a matter of fact, the amendment which has been offered, and which was contained in the other bill, would continue the present subsidy program until the 1st of July 1944. Consequently, the Price Control Act expiring at that time, we can deal just as well with subsidies after the first of July, through the Price Control Act, as we can deal with them in the pending joint resolution. In fact, we can deal much more effectively with them through the Price Control Act, because, of course, it will be impossible to veto an extension of the Price Control Act even though it limits the payment of subsidies, because it is obvious that the price-control system must continue after the 1st of July. I believe we can deal much more constructively with the question of subsidies, I believe we can pick out the kind of subsidies which should be approved and those which should not be approved, more effectively in rewriting that section of the Price Control Act than we can do in the pending joint resolution.

So, Mr. President, despite the fact that I sympathize with the purposes of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], I believe the practical thing to do at the present time is to pass the pending measure providing for an extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, and to postpone the entire subsidy controversy until we have to deal with the renewal of the Price Control Act of 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gerry	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Bailey	Green	Russell
Bankhead	Guffey	Shipstead
Barkley	Hatch	Smith
Bilbo	Hayden	Taft
Bone	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Bridges	Jackson	Tunnell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Tydings
Burton	La Follette	Vandenberg
Bushfield	Lucas	Wallgren
Butler	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Byrd	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Capper	McKellar	Weeks
Caraway	Maybank	Wheeler
Chavez	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wiley
Connally	Murdock	Willis
Davis	Nye	Wilson
Eastland	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 2. Section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following:

"*Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further,* That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of 1 fiscal year: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation, as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that the amendment is offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and myself. I merely wish to state that the amendment as read is a clause lifted from the original bill offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and has to do only with the requirement of financial reports being handled through the General Accounting Office. I am not certain but that the Senator from Alabama is willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection to the adoption of the amendment as read. I think it is a good amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska on behalf of himself and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, before the vote is taken, I wish to read a letter which I have received from a farmer in Minnesota. The letter is typical of letters which I have been receiving from all over the State. It deals with farm prices and how the farmers feel about them. I have received many other letters on the same subject, but this one is so illuminating, so typical, and so well written that I wish to read it into the RECORD. I have permission from the writer to put it into the RECORD. I read it as being a typical letter. The letter is as follows:

Senator SHIPSTEAD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I read nearly every day about how much money the farmer is making and what the Government plans to do with the enormous farm income. Evidently I live on the wrong farm, for to date I haven't seen an oversupply of loose change here.

Fifteen months ago, the Government was selling wheat at 75 cents per bushel for feed. The hogs raised on that wheat sold for $16.25. Today that same wheat is over $1.30 per bushel and hogs are $13.45 top. Does the Government expect the farmer to pay his taxes out of that?

Two months ago, I sold eggs at the store for 42 cents per dozen and paid $4.50 per hundredweight for concentrate. One month ago, I sold eggs for 27 cents per dozen, a drop of 15 cents, and paid $4.65 per hundredweight for the same brand of concentrate. That makes a cut of very near $100 per month in income from a flock of 400 chickens. And they tell me eggs are selling at 60 cents per dozen to consumers in Washington.

His letter is dated January 11. At that time my household was paying 68 cents for small eggs and 72 cents for ordinary large-size eggs. He continues:

I can't find anything left to buy bonds or pay taxes out of eggs, either.

Now, I am also selling milk to the North American Creamery. I get $2.45 per hundredweight after expenses are out for hauling. That pays for their feed and about 20 cents per hour for labor. Then I take a sheet of paper down to the A. A. A. and collect 30 cents per hundredweight subsidy. Perhaps I can find a few cents out of that for taxes. I don't feel that the subsidy money is honest money anyway, but I can't afford to turn it down. I can't understand why we aren't allowed to have an honest price for our produce. I don't know what the feeling is like to be a W. P. A. worker or receive any relief money distributed by the New Deal, but now

we are practically forced to go down and ask for part of our pay check.

He means he has to go down to the triple A office to get his 30 cents a hundred pounds on milk. That means that he must drive down to that office, and burn up gasoline in order to obtain the 30 cents instead of being paid through the creamery. He says:

If we must have subsidies why can't it be paid through the creamery?

In short there must be something rotten in Denmark. It is no wonder farmers are selling out. There will be one more right here this year if the situation doesn't change.

My brother, Marvin, * * * has been in the Army for nearly 3 years. My wife's brother has been in New Guinea for 19 months, and we want to do all possible to help them get home as soon as possible.

If I keep my hogs, I have to buy more feed. If I kill them or starve them, it's a big job to dispose of them. If I feed them, I've got to pay it out of my pocket. What would you suggest? The chickens don't worry us much because they are pretty good eating.

My suggestion is that we get all the farmers in Washington out on farms with the rest of us, or else let them keep their fingers out of it and stop telling the farmers how it's done.

If we are going to have subsidies, crop control, permits to market our produce, rationing, and all the alphabetical bureaus and control groups, burning up new tires and gasoline to spy on the rest of the public (they call it law enforcement), why doesn't the Government establish a national W. P. A. and have everyone work for the New Deal. I am told that is the way it works in Russia.

Yours truly,

O. R. HANSEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to offer from the floor an amendment to the joint resolution. I move to strike out the words "June 30, 1945" in line 6 and to insert in lieu thereof the words "December 31, 1944."

I offer that amendment constructively. I feel that the date proposed will provide a sufficient length of time for the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue in operation. The crop will have been raised; production will have been had, and if the life of the Corporation be extended to December 31, 1944, its existence will continue to the last day of this Congress. After the November election, 1 month will remain in which it can be renewed; and we will have a month in which we can consider continuing incentive payments, payments for support prices and also consumer subsidies; but if we extend it to June 1945, this Congress is in reality binding the succeeding Congress on the payment of consumer subsidies, which has been the bone of contention in this entire legislative program.

I think the Senator in charge of the joint resolution should accept the amendment because if we extend the Commodity Credit Corporation until December 1944, we will give every producer of crops a chance to know what the situation is, his incentive payments will be made, there will be no question about present subsidies, and during the time from November to December 31, Congress will be given an opportunity to reconsider or consider whether or not they want to extend the consumers' subsidies during that period and for the next 6 months of 1945.

I do not want to debate the issue concerning consumers' subsidies; that is not the relief I am asking for. I feel we should not bind the new Congress by continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation with a blank check until June 1945. I think we ought to terminate it on December 31 of this year, and then have a reconsideration of the legislation and decide to pay or not to pay subsidies, and let the next Congress decide that question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I regret to see a disposition in some quarters to resist substantial continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is the only financing agency of the Government that renders direct and helpful service to the farmers all the year around. The joint resolution before the Senate proposes to let the Commodity Credit Corporation continue until June 30 of next year, which will be the end of the fiscal year. That is exactly the provision contained in the bill which the committee twice reported and which the Senate by a large majority adopted. It is a copy taken from the bill which we passed, just as the section the Senator from Nebraska offered is a copy taken from that bill.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has statutory duties, mandatory duties, to perform at least 2 years after the conclusion of the war. So, instead of shortening the time of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, we ought in fact to extend it at least to cover the period during which Congress has placed upon it duties to perform.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, I inquire what would that date be?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I cannot tell the Senator, but whatever the date, the Commodity Credit Corporation has duties in the matter of loans on basic commodities given to it by Congress and which it is required to execute.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to say to the Senator that it will be perfectly satisfactory to me to have it run over to next year. I would let the Senator write the date in. I do not want to hurt in any way the production of any crop, wool, sugar, or any other crop, which might be suggested, but my theory is when that crop period is over we should not extend consumer subsidies any longer.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Consumer subsidies have nothing to do with the Commodity Credit Corporation. If we did not have any consumer subsidies, the R. F. C. could engage in providing them. The Senator knows my position about that and no Member of the Senate worked harder against subsidies than did the Senator from Nebraska. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a farmers' organization, and merely extending it to next June does not make a great deal of difference, for we will have an opportunity before that time, if we want to deal with the subsidy question, to deal with it in connection with the renewal of the O. P. A.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the Senator from Alabama if this date is left as it now is, can the Commodity Credit Corporation make commitments running all through the crop year 1945? It appears to me that the purpose of the Senator from Nebraska is not to prevent payment of subsidies that are promised on this year's crop, but to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from promising them a full year ahead, even though the next Congress might outlaw them?

Mr. BANKHEAD. As the Senator knows, we will have opportunity in June to deal with that before the new crop comes in.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Commodity Credit Corporation cannot, as I see it, commit itself to pay subsidies next year. All the Commodity Credit Corporation can commit itself to is to pay support prices. The question whether or not such support prices shall be passed on to the consumer is a question of price control, and can be dealt with in the Price Control Act when we review that act. It does not seem to me that by continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation we in any way commit ourselves to the payment of subsidies, except as the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Price Control Administrator refuse to pass on prices paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation. What we were trying to do in the antisubsidy amendment applied not only to the Commodity Credit Corporation, but it applied to the Price Administrator and it applied to the R. F. C., and to all other agencies. The actual continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as I see it, does not in any way change the subsidy situation from what it is today.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. TAFT. I think obviously the place to deal with it is in the renewal of the Price Control Act that expires on the 1st of July, and we will have full opportunity then to say how long subsidies may be continued.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with the explanation of the senior Senator from Ohio, I withdraw the amendment, inasmuch as we can consider it before July when the extension of the Price Control Act is under consideration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is withdrawn. If there be no further amendments the joint resolution will be read the third time.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended, as of February 17, 1944, by striking out

"February 17, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945".

SEC. 2. In cases where producers have expanded or hereafter expand production of nonbasic agricultural commodities pursuant to any public announcement made under section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1941, as amended, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator through loans, purchases, and other operations under such section 4 (a), to completely fulfill all commitments made to such producers. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator shall use such of the funds available for carrying out the provisions of such section 4 (b) as may be necessary, and such funds are hereby made available for such purpose.

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further,* That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of 1 fiscal year: *Provided further,* That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions."

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, which has devoted several difficult and laborious months to the formulation and development of the current tax bill, I feel impelled to comment briefly with respect to the President's recent veto of that legislation which bore the sincere endorsement of the vast majority of both Houses of the Congress.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that the Chief Executive was ill-advised in taking the veto step, and I cannot but feel that his action is not in the interests of the general welfare of the Nation.

As one who has watched the development of this issue from the day the Treasury Department with the President's approval first submitted its impossible program for the raising of ten and one-half billion dollars in additional revenue—a program which was steeped in political considerations and a complete disregard for the welfare of the vast majority of the small businessmen and white-collar workers in America—and as one who has witnessed the absolute hostility of the Treasury Department and the executive department to the various revenue-raising proposals presented in the Congress, I can only say that I challenge the President and any of his aides to make out a case for the tax program which they advocate.

The Members of the Congress have sincerely and conscientiously worked to prepare a tax bill which would provide needed revenues to the National Government, and which at the same time would not completely destroy the economic security of this Nation and render our people helpless in the face of approaching post-war years.

I feel very keenly about this recent action taken by the President; but I do not desire at this time to impose further upon the Senate. Therefore, I shall conclude my remarks by asking unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. an editorial which appeared in this morning's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "Veto of Tax Bill a Mistake." This editorial sets forth in clear language my own reaction to the Presidential veto of the tax bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETO OF TAX BILL A MISTAKE

In vetoing the 1944 tax bill the President says he is impelled by regard for the public interest. The Inquirer believes that, in the broader view, his action is opposed to the public interest.

We say this with full realization of the measure's many faults and deficiencies to which we have so frequently and pointedly directed attention.

Even addititonal tax revenue of more than $2,000,000,000 is inadequate. But it is not negligible. It should have been far more and might easily have been if the Treasury and the administration had cooperated with Congress and if both branches of the Government had shown courage and wisdom in seeking rich sources of revenue as yet untapped.

The President's message mentions as an offset to the extra taxes provided by this bill its freezing of the social-security taxes, which, he says, would deprive the Treasury of more than a billion dollars.

Aside from the fact that the so-called social-security taxes are not real taxes—even though utilized to meet the Government's running expenses—since they represent money which will have to be returned to the contributors, their wholly inexcusable doubling at this time would place an unnecessary burden on wage earners and business.

The effect would be to hinder employment and to raise costs of production and consequently increase prices. The provision for keeping social-security taxes at their present levels is one of the commendable features of this tax bill, and it is to be hoped that whatever Congress may or may not do, it will reenact this provision, even if in different form.

That would not deprive the Government of any revenue it is now receiving from this source.

Considering that this bill would take half a billion dollars more from corporations, $665,000,000 more from individual incomes, and a billion dollars more in excise taxes, it is difficult to follow Mr. Roosevelt's reasoning that it is "not a tax bill, but a tax relief bill, providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy."

The failure to make the slightest move toward simplifying the many complicated and confusing provisions of the present law is a matter to which the President rightly calls attention.

In enumerating what he regards as fatal faults of this measure, besides its inadequacy as a revenue producer, Mr. Roosevelt noticeably omits any constructive recommendations for taxes to supply the Government's needs.

Now, when the national income is at its peak, is the time to get as much money as possible from taxes and hold down the proportion of borrowing. But it can't be obtained from the only program the Treasury has deigned to suggest or support—from those incomes that have virtually nothing more left from which to give.

Secretary Morgenthau has persistently refused to advocate "taxing where the money is"—incomes swollen by the war—or to consider a general retail sales tax, the simplest and least burdensome levy, with the additional advantage of curbing inflation.

If Congress, unwilling to see the Government lose these two billions of extra revenue, should pass this bill over the President's veto, its prime duty would still remain.

This is to enact a simple but comprehensive measure, possibly entailing a thorough overhauling of our present tax system, which will bring in all the money required, but at the same time equitably distribute the common burden.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations in the United States Public

Health Service, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 23 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS EFFECTIVE FROM THE DATES INDICATED

Nunzio J. Carrozzo, March 4, 1944.
John L. Lincoln, February 19, 1944.
Carl Enna, March 19, 1944.
Joseph A. Moore, February 7, 1944.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS TO BE SURGEONS EFFECTIVE JANUARY 4, 1944

David C. Elliott
Benton O. Lewis

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS TO BE DENTAL SURGEONS EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 5, 1944

Oscar Mikkelsen
Mark E. Bowers

DENTAL SURGEON TO BE SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 11, 1944

William C. Parker

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY PASSED ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1, 1944

Kaarlo W. Nasi

PASSED ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEER TO BE TEMPORARY SANITARY ENGINEER EFFECTIVE FEBRUARY 1, 1944

Franz J. Maier

SENIOR SURGEONS TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTORS EFFECTIVE MARCH 18, 1944

John F. Mahoney
Marion F. Haralson

SURGEONS TO BE SENIOR SURGEONS EFFECTIVE FROM THE DATES INDICATED

Edwin H. Carnes, January 21, 1944.
Gregory J. Van Beeck, March 11, 1944.
Franklin J. Halpin, February 21, 1944.

PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SURGEON EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1944

Dale C. Cameron

The following officers are now serving under temporary commissions:

Nunzio J. Carrozzo	Oscar Mikkelsen
John L. Lincoln	Mark E. Bowers
Joseph A. Moore	Edwin H. Carnes
David C. Elliott	Gregory J. Van Beeck
Benton O. Lewis	Franklin J. Halpin

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we rejoice that, through space we cannot measure and by laws we cannot understand, our times are in Thy hands. We pray for the light of Thy truth to make wise our understanding that we may have clear discernment in all our conclusions; ours is a moral duty which no one can justly ignore or evade. Remind us of the scroll of those who, in every age, have stood forth for justice, tamed wickedness, and contributed to the ethical standards of their day. Let the volume of their experience inspire us to carry our convictions and visions with rapture into our national life.

Heavenly Father, in our need of Thee we kneel at Thy holy altar, making humble confession of our mortal sins; have mercy upon us and forgive all that is past. O God, if needs be, reproach us, discourage our faint-heartedness, and share our problems. Allow not Thy voice to be lost in the roar of the world's earthquake, wind, and fire; O make us equal to the demands of its tragedy. Blessed Lord, while clouds may cluster about the morning star they are destined to fade into a new and glorious day. Let Thy kingdom come in all our hearts, speaking kindly words: Charity thinketh no evil; a soft answer turneth away wrath; behold how good and pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity. In the spirit of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. FRANK T. HINES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States, with House amendments thereto, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT.

PLACING FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS ON SALARY BASIS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. BURCH of Virginia, Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia, Mr. WARD, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. MASON.

GRANTING INCREASES IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES, POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. BURCH of Virginia, Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia, Mr. WARD, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. MASON.

PENSIONS TO SOLDIERS, INDIAN WARS, 1817 TO 1898

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 85) to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, strike out all after "month" down to and including "Act" in line 15.

Page 6, strike out all after line 15 over to and including line 5 on page 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. As I understand it, these amendments make no material change in the bill at all?

Mr. LESINSKI. They make no material change. This bill was passed by the House on June 28, 1943.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ORGANIZATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 192, to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation organization, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk reported the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, Mr. EATON.

FOURTH INTERMEDIATE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1168) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 435) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Fourth Intermediate Report (H. Rept. No. 1024) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That 6,000 additional copies of the Fourth Intermediate Report (House Rept. No. 1024) of the Select Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies be printed for the use of said committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERREGIONAL HIGHWAYS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1169) back favorably without amendment, a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 379, current session, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the National Interregional Highway Committee outlining and recommending a national system of interregional highways, and ask for immediate consideration thereof.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,800 additional copies of House Document No. 379, current session, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the National Interregional Highway Committee outlining and recommending a national system of interregional highways, of which 2,200 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 2,200 copies for the use of the House folding room, 700 copies for the use of the Senate document room, and 700 copies for the Senate folding room.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRONOLOGY OF MAJOR INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 1170) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 425) authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Chronology of Major International Events, With the Ostensible Reasons Advanced for Their Occurrence," as a House document, and I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "Chronology of Major International Events, With the Ostensible Reasons Advanced for Their Occurrence," prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech I made in Boston on Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FRANCESCO P. MASTRILLI

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 480) for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 3, after "shall", insert ", upon being charged to the Italian quota."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY ANGELL

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2131) for the relief of Henry Angell, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 12, after "shall", insert ", upon being charged to the quota of the country in which he was born."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in what country was he born?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think he was born in Rumania. I believe he was born in Rumania, I am not sure. This is a bill introduced by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS]. I do not have the record here. It has passed the House and it has passed the Senate. But the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization failed to put in that he should be charged to the quota of the country in which he was born, and that a number should be deducted from that quota.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I think when you go letting these aliens in this country——

Mr. DICKSTEIN. They are here already.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, there are too many here now. That is what I am objecting to. When you make them citizens and admit them, you ought to give the country to which they are to be charged. There is too much laxity. Let me ask the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS], what country did this man come from?

Mr. ELLIS. The records I have indicate Poland. He is a young man who came here in 1913 and served in the Army of the United States. He went to China with the Army and served throughout the World War and never took the trouble to get his citizenship.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand. What I am trying to find out is what country he came from. He ought to know what country he is from.

Mr. ELLIS. I say, my record is that he was born in Poland.

Mr. RANKIN. Then the bill ought to show that he is charged to the Polish quota, to the Republic of Poland.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, what difference does it make as long as the individual is charged to a country?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but he might be shifted from one country to another. I am not going to object, but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that from now on bills of this kind must show the country to whose quota these people are to be charged. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire from the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization if these two petitions for relief were not considered at the same time that the bill concerning Mary Lovis Lovett was considered and reported by the House?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not think so. I think it was a different date. These are two bills that passed the House and went over to the Senate, the Senate added these minor amendments. All we are doing is agreeing to these amendments. The matter you are referring to probably will come up on another date.

Mr. ROWE. It was objected to here last week.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That bill went back to the committee, and it will be reported out in an omnibus bill. That will be provided for.

Mr. ROWE. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next my colleague from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] be allowed to address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the Pentagon Building.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business on the Speaker's table is disposed of, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, bureaucracy feeds upon two things, power and money. Take either away and the anguish thus induced is exceedingly vocal. It is hardly surprising that President Roosevelt has protested that the amount offered in the current tax bill is not sufficient. The question is, Sufficient for what? It is certainly a sufficient amount added to the forty billion per year to take out of the taxpayers' pockets. Probably it is not sufficient to support the maze of bureaus headquartered in Washington and the palace guard. It might be well for the President and his palace guard who are so opposed to Congress to visit the people back home in our own country instead of so many foreign lands that are recipients of lend-lease supplies emanating from American taxpayers. Why not find out the condition of our own taxpayers and forget about pleas for glorified W. P. A.'s in Europe or Asia? Are Roosevelt's palace guards, the avowed enemies of Congress, so obtuse that they do not know that the American taxpayers are now paying to the limit of their capacity? Are these well-paid bureaucrats on solid ground in saying that the American taxpayers, particularly the farmers, wage earners, and white-collar workers should pay more taxes? It is beginning to look as if President Roosevelt, who has in the past claimed to be so close to the pulse of the people, has forsaken them and now wants to turn them over to the mercies of tax collectors.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an article from a radio broadcast.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two matters, first, to include an article that appeared in the Irish Echo on January 15, 1944; and also to include a radio address that I gave over radio station WLAW, on George Washington.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Archbishop Francis J. Spellman, entitled "Bigotry is Un-American," which appeared in the American Magazine of March 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, first to include an editorial from the St. Louis Star Times, and second, a letter from the New Yorker magazine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a table from the United States Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune, and to extend my own remarks and to include a statement which I made before the Committee on Flood Control this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FACTS DEVELOPED BY THE JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. GAVIN asked and received permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I think some of the facts recently developed by the Joint Congressional Committee on Nonessential Expenditures would prove interesting reading to the Members of the Congress.

The greatest bureaucracy of all times holds forth in Washington. Today it maintains a civilian civil-service pay roll of 3,063,379 employees. The annual pay roll of this civilian horde is over $8,000,000,000 a year, or about twice as much as the total cost of all operations of the National Government in 1932, including the Army and Navy.

The Farm Security Administration has 2,700 local offices. The O. P. A. employs 2,700 lawyers, while the British, who also have a rationing and price administration, employ only 10.

It costs $100,000,000 a year for the bureaucrats to travel and to communicate with their many branch offices. See America at Government expense.

Thousands upon thousands of bureaucratic directives have been issued which supersede laws that actually are on the statute books.

Federal Government inefficiency and waste has made the war cost twice as much as it should.

The national debt is heading toward $358,000,000,000. The intrinsic value of all property in the United States is between $350,000,000,000 and $400,000,000,000. Where will you be, neighbor, say about the year 1949, if anywhere? Or do you not care?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an item, Talent Search Winners.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, a bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation without subsidy involvements until June 1945 will be brought us for action soon. In last week's bill the subsidy issue was paramount. In order to register my protest and the protests of my constituents against the mismanagements of those in authority, I joined with the majority of my party voting for the bill and against the veto. Now I must make clear my basic position.

Fundamentally I am opposed to Government controls and general subsidies. In normal times I would stand vigorously against them. But these are not normal times. We are at war with all the machinery of our lives thrown out of gear. Disciplines, restraints, controls are not only inevitable but are imperative. I can look at the future through my own eyes only. These show me the problems of the lowliest families, of those with frozen incomes, of all those struggling to support their children who are the hope of America's tomorrow. These show me that without some method of controls the inflation spiral already begun will sweep us out on a hideous tide. Because of certain convictions relative to what are the really fundamental issues and certain that one of the most basic needs is that for restrained and controlled action, but with no illusions relative to the self-interest and mismanagement of those in authority, I shall support a policy of restraints because my vision of the dark days that lie ahead tells me that even badly managed controls are better than no controls at all.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer, under date of February 1, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to

extend my remarks and include a statement by Judge Francis Carr, a distinguished California attorney.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address by our colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short article by Mr. Kennedy, of the Chicago Times, on the subject why the President cannot and should not at this time declare whether he is a candidate or not.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune and an answer to that editorial written by Clarence K. Streit, which was subsequently published in the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement from the Ford Motor Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the conclusion of other special orders today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after the disposition of all business and any other special orders I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KEEFE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Commission on Interstate Cooperation, which the secretary wrote to me, including a resolution which they passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star-Journal on the difference between Mr. Willkie's and the President's tax program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address by H. W. Prentis, president of the Armstrong Cork Co. at the two hundred and fifty-seventh meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board in New York on January 20. I am advised that this will require three and two-thirds pages at a total cost of $165.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter sent to me by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include an exchange of letters with the War Department, and also an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an outline for a durable peace by R. W. Castleberry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a joint statement of Chairman DOUGHTON and Mr. KNUTSON on the subject of the tax bill veto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday after the disposition of matters on the regular calendar and any special orders heretofore granted I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 234) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this is simply an aid to the small tobacco grower of less than 1 acre.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right. The resolution has been agreed to by all the Representatives in Congress from the burley districts, and was reported by the Committee on Agriculture unanimously. May I add that the current burley situation is indicated by the following figures, which are given in millions of pounds for crop-years beginning October 1:

Year	Production	Stocks	Disappearance
1941	336.8	798.1	379.6
1942	343.5	755.3	412.8
1943	385.4	686.0	----------

In considering these figures exports can be neglected, since they continue to run less than 2 percent of total production with lend-lease included of approximately one-half million pounds. Furthermore, exports are not expected to increase significantly in the near future.

The October 1, 1943, stocks of 686,000,000 pounds, farm-sales weight, represents 20 months' inventory at the rate of disappearance last year of 412,800,000 pounds. It is expected, however, that disappearance during the current year will be somewhat larger. Burley usage and exports rose 8.8 percent in 1942 over 1941. If this rate of increase is maintained this year, disappearance will amount to 449,100,000 pounds. Current changes in domestic burley usage are influenced largely by the continued increase in cigarette manufacture, but they are substantially influenced by the continued decline in the manufacture of smoking tobacco. Recent changes in manufacture of chewing tobacco are small and have relatively slight effect on the current burley prospects.

If disappearance during the current year approximates 450,000,000 pounds, stocks next October 1 will have declined to 621,400,000 pounds. In order to replace a disappearance of this size, it is necessary to harvest about 480,000 acres if average 1937–41 yields of 940 pounds per acre would be realized. And to improve the stocks position or to insure against crop failure would, of course, require a larger planting.

The increase in acreage under the resolution would be about 3 percent, which would amount to between 17,500 and 20,000 acres. And this increase would go to some 80,000 small burley growers.

I also call attention to the fact that the limitation relating to 25 percent of the cropland on the farm will not require the reduction of any allotments otherwise or heretofore established in excess of 25 percent of the cropland.

The resolution, in my opinion, will do more to improve the economic condition of these 80,000 small burley growers than any other single piece of legislation ever passed by the Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand, this is simply an increase in allotment of every grower to 1 acre.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is all.

Mr. JENNINGS. It will not operate to decrease any allotments that the grower now has?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This is simply in aid of the small tobacco grower?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I am strongly in favor of the resolution. Many of my growers are small growers and if they can get their acreage increased to 1 acre will be better able to take care of their families. The tobacco money means a great deal to these small farmers.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I thoroughly agree with my distinguished colleague from North Carolina. He has been a true friend of the burley tobacco growers and has taken a leading part over the years in every burley fight. I know of his deep interest in the small growers, which I share, and I believe this step will do more to improve their condition than any other step we ever took.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This does not harm anyone and does not increase production in any amount over that sufficient to meet the demand?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman is correct. It is thought that this additional acreage is needed in order to replace disappearance, to improve our stock position, and to insure against crop failure. The increased demand for cigarettes since the war commenced has resulted in record usages of burley tobacco. It is further thought that the small growers of burley tobacco could, if their acreage allotments were increased, produce additional burley tobacco without adversely affecting their production of essential food and fiber crops.

Burley tobacco is grown on many small farms. Most of the allotments for 1943 range from seven-tenths of an acre to 3 acres, the average being about 2.4 acres. The total acreage allotted for the production of burley tobacco in 1943 was about 470,000 acres. The burley tobacco acreage allotments for 1944 have been increased 20 percent over 1943 in order to provide for increased production of tobacco to meet the increased tobacco usage. Small growers are in a better position to produce additional burley tobacco without adversely affecting the production of essential food and fiber crops. With the increase already made in the course of establishing the 1944 burley tobacco acreage allotments, it is estimated that an acreage equal to about 3 percent of the total acreage otherwise allotted in 1944 will be required for increasing allotments pursuant to the provisions of this resolution.

This resolution will affect primarily farms now having burley-tobacco acreage allotments of between seven-tenths and 1 acre. In addition, those burley-tobacco farms which had allotments for the first time in 1943 and were therefore ineligible for increases under the one-half acre minimum provision of the act would be raised to 1 acre. The additional acreage will be distributed among about one-third of the burley-tobacco farms. It is believed that the effect of the resolution will be to further encourage these farmers by giving them an opportunity to obtain a slightly larger income from burley tobacco, and, as a result, will tend to increase rather than decrease the production of food and feed during the war period. However, it is not believed to be advisable to make any greater increases in burley acreage allotments generally at this time, as such increase would adversely affect the production of food and feed during the coming year in quantities determined to be necessary.

Mr. GORE. I desire to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia on the work he has done.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the increased demand for cigarettes and other tobacco products has resulted in record usages during recent years of burley tobacco; and

Whereas, due to a shortage of labor and equipment and the need for the production of essential food and fiber crops, the production of burley tobacco has not kept pace with this increased usage; and

Whereas small growers of burley tobacco could, if their acreage allotments were increased, produce additional burley tobacco without adversely affecting their production of essential food and fiber crops: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 313 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the burley tobacco acreage allotment which would otherwise be established for any farm having a burley acreage allotment in 1943 shall not be less than 1 acre, or 25 percent of the cropland, whichever is the smaller, and the acreage required for apportionment under this joint resolution shall be in addition to the national and State acreage allotments.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 30 minutes on the subject of the O. W. I.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Consent Calendar will be called.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

The Clerk called the first bill, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXPEDITING PAYMENTS FOR PROPERTY ACQUIRED DURING WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 919, to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STATUS OF RETIRED JUDGES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 156, relating to the status of retired judges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEWART, Mr. DISNEY, and Mr. SIKES objected, and, under the rule, the bill was stricken from the calendar.

AUTHORSHIP OF POLITICAL STATEMENTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2973, to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political statement relating to a candidate for election to any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to call the attention of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary to the fact that this bill which seeks to regulate the dissemination of political pamphlets undertakes to control the election of the Resident Commissioner of the Philippine Islands. I doubt very much if Congress has any authority to regulate elections held in the Philippine Islands.

I have discussed this matter with the author of the bill, and he is quite willing that this provision be deleted from the bill. So I hope that whatever member of the Committee on the Judiciary is handling this matter may inquire into it and prepare an appropriate amendment when the bill is called up the next time.

Mr. WALTER. The author of the bill called my attention to that situation. I

am certain there will be no objection to the amendment that he will probably prepare today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING CLARK-McNARY ACT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 45, to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, as I stated 2 weeks ago, this bill carries too much money for consideration on the Consent Calendar. I therefore object.

COMPLIANCE WITH STATE INSPECTION LAWS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3405, making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stocks, or seeds that may be distributed by agents of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I said I would object to this bill unless certain objections were taken care of. I understand it has been impossible to get consent to such amendments. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COOPERATIVE SUSTAINED YIELD UNIT AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN OWNERS AND OPERATORS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 250, to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of receiving an explanation from some member of the committee as to the reason why sale of timber from these tracts does not have to be by competitive bids. In the absence of an explanation I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FOREST RESOURCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3848, to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill carries too much money for consideration on the Consent Calendar. I therefore object.

ASSISTING IN RELIEVING ECONOMIC DISTRESS IN PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 981, to assist in relieving economic distress in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands by providing for unemployed persons, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. MADDEN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

TO AMEND PUBLIC LAW 537, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, APPROVED MAY 2, 1942

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2908, to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I asked that this bill be passed over without prejudice because the report was not in accordance with the Ramseyer rule. Has any change been made? Has a new report been made?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot ascertain that a new report has been made and I therefore ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SECTION 6 OF THE DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT OF 1941, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3912, to amend section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. KEAN objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

LOSS OF UNITED STATES NATIONALITY UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4103, to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this bill is the unfinished business of the House I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING TIME FOR ISSUANCE OF REVENUE BONDS OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2778, to further amend Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1935, as amended by Act 23 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1937, Act 58 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1939, and Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii 1941, to extend the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered to June 30, 1945.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1935, as amended by Act 23 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1937, Act 58 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1939, and Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii 1941, to extend the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered to June 30, 1945.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, amending section 17 of Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935, as amended, so as to extend the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under said Act 174, is hereby ratified and confirmed and revenue bonds may be issued under and pursuant to the provisions of said Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935, as amended and as further amended by said Act 16, without the approval of the President of the United States and without the incurring of an indebtedness within the meaning of the Hawaiian Organic Act, and said Act 174, as amended, shall constitute full authority for the issuance of said bonds without reference to and independent of the Hawaiian Organic Act."

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARRINGTON: On page 2, line 3, strike out "1935" and insert in lieu thereof "1943."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935."

RELEASING REVERSIONARY RIGHTS OF THE UNITED STATES TO CERTAIN PROPERTY IN STOCKTON, CALIF.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3552, to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator is authorized and directed to release to the county of San Joaquin, Calif., all reversionary rights in the United States under the deed of August 8, 1940 (which deed is recorded in book of official records, volume 699, page 482, in the office of the county recorder of San Joaquin County, Calif.), to a certain portion of the so-called old post-office site at Stockton, Calif., namely, that portion of lot 13, block 24, east of Center Street, in the city of Stockton, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a point on the easterly line of California Street distant 130 feet southerly from the intersection of the southerly line of Market Street with the easterly line of California Street; thence southerly along the easterly line of California Street 20 feet;

thence easterly and parallel with the southerly line of Market Street 151 feet and 6 inches, more or less, to the easterly line of said lot 13; thence northerly along the easterly line of said lot 13 for 20 feet; thence westerly parallel with the southerly line of Market Street 151 feet and 6 inches, more or less, to the point of beginning.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR SHIPPING FIELD SERVICE

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 182 to create the War Shipping Field Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House joint resolution?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I object.

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC-DOMAIN LANDS IN ARIZONA FOR ADDITION TO THE HAVASUPAI INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3865, to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, there is an identical Senate bill, S. 1000, which has already passed the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to substitute the Senate bill, S. 1000, for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 5, 8, 17, and 20 of township 30 north, range 2 west, of the Gila and Salt River base and meridian, Arizona, on the public domain, be, and the same are hereby, permanently reserved as an addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation. This withdrawal is made subject to valid existing rights of any persons thereto initiated prior to August 29, 1940, the date on which these lands were temporarily withdrawn from further disposition by the Secretary of the Interior pending the enactment of legislation adding them to the Havasupai Indian Reservation.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to exchange lands within the area described in section 1 with the State of Arizona for all or a portion of the State-owned lands identified as sections 28 and 29, township 30 north, range 2 west, and the west half section 32, township 31 north, range 2 west, Gila and Salt River base and meridian. The lands received from the State under such exchange shall become a part of the Havasupai Indian Reservation.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to purchase certain improvements on the State-owned lands from the lessee of said lands, at a price to be agreed upon by and between the contracting parties. The sum of $11,100, or as much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the United States Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to purchase said improvements.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 3865, was laid on the table.

RESTORING TO CONTROL OF TERRITORY OF HAWAII CERTAIN HAWAIIAN HOME LANDS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3403, withdrawing and restoring to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and amending sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 202 (c) of title 2 of the act entitled "Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920," approved July 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 108), as amended, be further amended to read as follows:

"(c) One of the members shall be designated by the Governor as Chairman. An executive officer and such clerical assistants as may be necessary shall be appointed by the Commission to serve at its pleasure. The executive officer shall reside habitually at the major Hawaiian Homes settlement. He shall receive an annual salary in such amount as shall be set by the Commission, from time to time, not to exceed $6,000: *Provided*, That if the compensation for like positions in the Territorial service is fixed by classification thereof, pursuant to any schedule established by legislative or executive authority, such compensation may equal but shall not exceed the amount certified for the position by the Board, Commission, officer, or other agency determining such classifications for the Territorial service, in accordance with established Territorial procedure. Clerical assistants shall be paid in accordance with Territorial practice for such services. The members of the Commission shall serve without pay, but shall receive actual expenses incurred by them in the discharge of their duties as such members. Of the originally appointed members one shall be appointed for a term of 1 year, one for a term of 2 years, one for a term of 3 years, one for a term of 4 years, one for a term of 5 years. Their successors shall hold office for terms of 5 years except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he succeeds. A member may also be removed by the Governor for cause after due notice and public hearing."

SEC. 2. So much of section 203 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, as designates the land hereinafter described as available lands within the meaning of that act, is hereby repealed and the land restored to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii.

On the island of Molokai: That portion of Palaau, Apana 2, being an addition to the Molokai airplane landing field, as follows:

Parcel 1. As returned to the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii by Resolution No. 68 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, dated March 3, 1941, and consisting of 13,527 acres, more or less, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the southeast corner of this piece of land, on the west boundary of the present Molokai Airport, the true azimuth and distance from the northwest corner of the Molokai Airport (Executive Order No. 809) being no degrees fifty-six minutes thirty seconds two hundred and forty-two feet, and the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Middle Hill being one and fifteen one-hundredths feet north and sixteen thousand one hundred and twenty-eight and one one-hundredth feet west, thence running by true azimuths measured clockwise from south;

(1) Sixty degrees twenty-five minutes eight hundred and forty-one and seventy-four one-hundredths feet along the remainders of fifty-foot road and lot 170 of the Hawaiian Homes land;

(2) One hundred and eighty degrees fifty-six minutes thirty seconds eight hundred and twelve and sixty-two one-hundredths feet along the remainder of lot 170 of the Hawaiian Homes land;

(3) Two hundred and forty degrees twenty-five minutes eight hundred and forty-one and seventy-four one-hundredths feet along the remainders of lot 170, Pine Avenue, lot 158 and fifty-foot road of the Hawaiian Homes land, to the west side of the present Molokai Airport; and

(4) No degrees fifty-six minutes thirty seconds eight hundred and twelve and sixty-two one-hundredths feet along the west side of the present Molokai Airport to the point of beginning.

On the island of Hawaii: Those portions of Keaukaha, tract 1, being additions to the Hilo airplane landing field, comprising several parcels of land as follows:

Parcel 1 Land situated at Keaukaha, tract 1, Waiakea, South Hilo, island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, being portions of lots 96, 97, 182, 183, 184, 185, Desha Avenue, and 25-foot alley, of the Keaukaha residence lots, as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2723 and 3017, on file in the office of the Territorial surveyor at Honolulu.

Beginning at the south corner of this piece of land, and on the west boundary of the Hawaiian Homes land, the true azimuth and distance from the northwest corner of the Hilo Airport addition, as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2723 and 3017 on file in the office of the territorial surveyor at Honolulu, and on the south side of Kamehameha Avenue, being one hundred and eighty degrees no minutes four hundred and three and thirty-one one hundredths feet, and the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Halai being two thousand five hundred and twenty and thirty-one one-hundredths feet north and fifteen thousand five hundred and fifty-three one-hundredths feet east, thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. One hundred and eighty degrees no minutes six hundred and fifteen and ninety-five one-hundredths feet along Government land and tract A of grant deeded by Territory of Hawaii to Hilo Railroad Co.;

2. Three hundred and ten degrees forty-two minutes four hundred and one and sixty-six one-hundredths feet along the remainders of Desha Avenue, lots 96, 97, 25-foot alley, and lot 182 of the Keaukaha residence lots; and

3. Forty degrees forty-two minutes four hundred and sixty-six and ninety-seven one-hundredths feet along the remainders of lots 182, 183, 184, 185, and Desha Avenue of the Keaukaha residence lots to the point of beginning, and containing an area of two and one hundred and fifty-five one-thousandths acres, more or less.

Parcel 2 Land situated on the south side of Kamehameha Avenue, at Keaukaha, tract 1, Waiakea, South Hilo, island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, being all of lots 449 to 486, inclusive, all of lots 546 to 564, inclusive, and portions of Kauhane, Spencer, Pua, and Kamaka Avenues of the Keaukaha residence lots, as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2723 and 3017, on file in the office of the Territorial surveyor at Honolulu.

Beginning at the northwest corner of this piece of land, being also the southwest corner of Kamehameha and Kauhane Avenues, the coordinates of said point of beginning

referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Halai being two thousand one hundred and seventeen feet north and sixteen thousand eight hundred and eighty feet east, thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes two thousand and seventeen and eighty-five one-hundredths feet along the south side of Kamehameha Avenue;

2. Three hundred and sixty degrees no minutes four hundred and fifty feet along lots 448 and 487 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

3. Three hundred and sixty degrees no minutes fifty feet across Kamaka Avenue;

4. Three hundred and sixty degrees no minutes two hundred and twenty-five feet along lot 545 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

5. Ninety degrees no minutes three hundred and ninety-two and forty-eight one-hundredths feet along lots 583, 582, 581, and 580 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

6. Ninety degrees no minutes fifty feet across Pua Avenue;

7. Ninety degrees no minutes eight hundred and one and fifteen one-hundredths feet along lots 579, 578, 577, 576, 575, 574, 573, and 572 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

8. Ninety degrees no minutes fifty feet across Spencer Avenue;

9. Ninety degrees no minutes six hundred and seventy-four and twenty-two one-hundredths feet along lots 571, 570, 569, 568, 567, 566, and 565, of the Keaukaha residence lots;

10. Ninety degrees no minutes fifty feet across Kauhane Avenue; and

11. One hundred and eighty degrees no minutes seven hundred and twenty-five feet along Puuhala Reserve and the present Hilo Airport addition, as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2723 and 3017 on file in the office of the Territorial surveyor at Honolulu, to the point of beginning, and containing an area of thirty-three and five hundred and eighty-five one-thousandths acres, more or less.

Parcel 3. As returned to the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii by Resolution No. 78 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, dated May 13, 1942. Land situated at Keaukaha, tract 1, Waiakea, South Hilo island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, being the whole of lots 446, 447, 448, 487, 488, 489, 543, 544, 545, 584, 585, and 586 and portions of lots 581, 582, and 583 and a portion of Kamaka Avenue, of the Keaukaha residence lots, as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2723 and 3017, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of this piece of land, being also the northeast corner of lot 446 and the southwest corner of Kamehameha and Baker Avenues, the true azimuth and distance from the northwest corner of Hilo Airport addition (of twenty and fifty-four one-hundredths acres and on the south side of Kamehameha Highway), as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2723 and 3017, being two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes and three thousand six hundred and eighty-eight and seventy one-hundredths feet, and the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Halai being two thousand one hundred and seventeen feet north and nineteen thousand one hundred and ninety-two and twenty-three one-hundredths feet east, thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Three hundred and sixty degrees no minutes four hundred and fifty feet along the west side of Baker Avenue;

2. Three hundred and sixty degrees no minutes fifty feet across Kamaka Avenue;

3. Three hundred and sixty degrees no minutes four hundred and fifty feet along the west side of Baker Avenue;

4. Ninety degrees no minutes two hundred and ninety-four and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet along the north side of Kawika Avenue;

5. One hundred and eighty degrees no minutes one hundred and twelve and fifty one-hundredths feet along lot 583 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

6. On hundred and ten degrees fifty-five minutes three hundred and fifteen and thirteen one-hundredths feet along the remainders of lots 583, 582, and 581 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

7. Two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes two hundred and ninety-four and thirty-six one-hundredths feet along lots 548, 547, and 546 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

8. One hundred and eighty degrees no minutes two hundred and twenty-five feet along lot 546 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

9. One hundred and eighty degrees no minutes fifty feet across Kamaka Avenue;

10. One hundred and eighty degrees no minutes four hundred and fifty feet along lots 486 and 449 of Keaukaha lots to the south side of Kamehameha Avenue; and

11. Two hundred and seventy degrees no minutes two hundred and ninety-four and thirty-eight one-hundredths feet along the south side of Kamehameha Avenue to the point of beginning and containing an area of six and eighty one-hundredths acres.

Parcel 4. As returned to the Commissioner of Public Lands of the Territory of Hawaii by resolution numbered 78 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, dated May 13, 1942. Land situated at Keaukaha, tract 1, Waiakea, South Hilo, island of Hawaii, Territory of Hawaii, being the whole of lots 93, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, 101, and 102 and portions of lots 92, 96, 97, and 103 and a portion of Desha Avenue of the Keaukaha residence lots, as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2723 and 3017, more particularly described as follows:

Beginning at the northwest corner of this piece of land, being also the northwest corner of lot 94 and on the southeast side of twenty-five-foot road, the true azimuth and distance from the northwest corner of Hilo Airport addition (of twenty and fifty-four one-hundredths acres and on the south side of Kamehameha Highway), as shown on Government Survey Registered Maps 2723 and 3017, being one hundred and eighty degrees no minutes one thousand seven hundred and fifty-one and eighty-seven one-hundredths feet, and the coordinates of said point of beginning referred to Government Survey Triangulation Station Halai being three thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight and eighty-seven one-hundredths feet north and fifteen thousand five hundred and three and fifty-three one-hundredths feet east, thence running by azimuths measured clockwise from true south:

1. Two hundred and forty-three degrees fifty minutes one hundred and seventy-seven and ninety-three one-hundredths feet along the southeast side of twenty-five-foot road;

2. Three hundred and thirty-three degrees fifty minutes two hundred and thirty-five and sixty one-hundredths feet along lot 92 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

3. Two hundred and forty-three degrees fifty minutes one hundred feet along the remainder of lot 92 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

4. Three hundred and thirty-three degrees fifty minutes two hundred feet along lot 91 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

5. Three hundred and thirty-three degrees fifty minutes fifty feet across Desha Avenue;

6. Two hundred and forty-three degrees fifty minutes one hundred feet along the southeast side of Desha Avenue;

7. Three hundred and thirty-three degrees fifty minutes two hundred and thirty-five and sixty one-hundredths feet along lot 103 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

8. Two hundred and forty-three degrees fifty minutes one hundred feet along the remainder of lot 103 of the Keaukaha residence lots;

9. Three hundred and thirty-three degrees fifty minutes two hundred feet along the southwest side of Kauhane Avenue;

10. Sixty-three degrees fifty minutes six hundred and eighty-eight and thirty-six one-hundredths feet along the northwest side of twenty-five-foot road;

11. One hundred and thirty degrees forty-two minutes two hundred and eighty-six and seventy-three one-hundredths feet along the remainders of lots 97 and 96 and Desha Avenue of the Keaukaha residence lots; and

12. One hundred and eighty degrees no minutes seven hundred and thirty-two and sixty-one one-hundredths feet along Government land and tract A of grant deed by the Territory of Hawaii to Hilo Railroad Co. to the point of beginning and containing an area of $10^{849}/_{1000}$ acres.

SEC. 3. That section 207 (1) (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, be amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Commission is authorized to lease to native Hawaiians the right to use and occupancy of a tract or tracts of Hawaiian Home lands within the following acreage limits per each lessee: (1) Not less than 1 nor more than 40 acres of agricultural lands; or (2) not less than 100 nor more than 500 acres of first-class pastoral lands; or (3) not less than 250 nor more than 1,000 acres of second-class pastoral lands; or (4) not more than 1 acre of any class of land to be used as a residence lot: *Provided, however*, That in the case of any existing lease of a farm lot in the Kalanianaole Settlement on Molokai, a residence lot may exceed 1 acre but shall not exceed 4 acres in area, the location of such area to be selected by the lessee concerned: *Provided further*, That a lease granted to any lessee may include both a residence and an agricultural or pastoral lot, the gross acreage of both lots not to exceed the maximum acreage of either the agricultural or pastoral lot, as the case may be, and as provided for in this section: *And provided further*, That any such detached residence lot shall be located on the same island as the agricultural or pastoral lot concerned, and within a reasonable distance thereof. The Commission is also authorized to grant licenses for terms of not to exceed 21 years in each case, to public-utility companies or corporations as easements for railroads, telephone lines, electric power and light lines, gas mains, and the like."

SEC. 4. That section 207 (1) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, be further amended by adding thereto a new subsection to be numbered "(c)" to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission is also authorized, with the approval of the Governor, to grant licenses to the United States for terms not to exceed 5 years, for reservations, roads, and other rights-of-way, water storage and distribution facilities, and practice target ranges: *Provided*, That any such license may be extended from time to time by the Commission, with the approval of the Governor, for additional terms of 3 years: *Provided further*, That any such license shall not restrict the areas required by the Commission in carrying on its duties, nor interfere in any way with the Commission's operation or maintenance activities."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 14, strike out lines 14 to 24 (inclusive) and insert the following:

"(c) (1) The Commission is also authorized to grant licenses to churches, hospitals, public schools, and stores (the latter to be owned by lessees or by organizations formed and controlled by said lessees) for lots within the district in which agricultural lands are leased under the provisions of this section.

"(2) The Commission is also authorized, with the approval of the Governor, to grant licenses to the United States for terms not to exceed 5 years, for reservations, roads, and other rights-of-way, water storage and distribution facilities, and practice target ranges: *Provided*, That any such license may be extended from time to time by the Commission, with the approval of the Governor, for additional terms of 3 years: *Provided further*, That any such license shall not restrict the areas required by the Commission in carrying on its duties, nor interfere in any way with the Commission's operation or maintenance activities."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the report on the bill just passed an error has been made in describing the contents of one of the sections and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a correction of that report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Delegate from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wish the record to show at this point that an error appears on page 2 of Report 1121 accompanying H. R. 3403, in describing the contents of section 2 of this bill.

The report reads:

Section 2 of the bill amends section 203 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act to allow homesteaders on the island of Molokai, in the Kalanianaole Settlement, an additional residence lot not adjoining the agricultural or pastoral lot, provided the residence lot shall not exceed 4 acres, and the gross acreage of both lots is not to exceed the present acreage limitation under the act.

The report should read:

Section 2 of the bill amends section 203 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, restoring to the jurisdiction of the Territorial government five parcels of land now under the control of the Hawaiian Homes Commission, in order to permit their transfer by executive order of the Governor to the United States for use by the War Department in connection with airfields on Molokai.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 207 (1) (a) of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 to allow homesteaders on the island of Molokai, in the Kalanianaole Settlement, an additional residence lot not adjoining the agricultural or pastoral lot, provided the residence lot shall not exceed 4 acres, and the gross acreage of both lots is not to exceed the present acreage limitation under the act.

The error was inadvertently made in the office of the Delegate in composing the report, and as it involves only a mistake in the designation of the contents of the different sections, is of no serious consequence.

AMENDMENT TO BANKRUPTCY ACT (FARM MORTAGE MORATORIUM)

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4166, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact a rule has been granted on this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 31 OF THE SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1146, to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 is amended to read as follows:

"REGISTRATION FEES

"SEC. 31. Every national securities exchange shall pay to the Commission on or before March 15 of each calendar year a registration fee for the privilege of doing business as a national securities exchange during the preceding calendar year or any part thereof. Such fee shall be in an amount equal to one five-hundredths of 1 percent of the aggregate dollar amount of the sales of securities (other than securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States or such securities issued or guaranteed by corporations in which the United States has direct or indirect interest as shall be designated for exemption from the provisions of this section by the Secretary of the Treasury) transacted on such national securities exchange during the preceding calendar year and subsequent to its registration as a national securities exchange."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "has", insert "a" and after the word "or", insert "an."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO ACT APPROVED JUNE 15, 1943, PROVIDING FOR THE TRAINING OF NURSES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1633, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1943, so as to provide for the full participation of institutions of the United States in the program for the training of nurses, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes", approved June 15, 1943 (Public Law 74, Seventy-eighth Congress), is amended by striking out, in section 7 thereof, the words "is authorized to procure and provide insignia" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "is authorized, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, to procure and provide uniforms and insignia"; and by adding at the end of such act the following new sections:

"SEC. 11. (a) The head of any department, establishment, or other Federal agency is hereby authorized to request and accept transfers of student nurses, transferable pursuant to subsections (e) and (f) of section 2, to any Federal hospital operated by his agency in the continental United States, exclusive of Alaska, and to provide for the continued training of such student nurses requisite to graduation: *Provided*, That the period of training in no case shall extend beyond the period required for graduation by the institution from which the student nurse was transferred, but may be terminated at any time prior thereto as the interests of the service may require.

"(b) During the period of such training student nurses shall be entitled to a stipend at such uniform monthly rate as may be prescribed by the President, and shall be entitled to (1) travel expenses as authorized by the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, including travel incident to their initial transfer and in returning to the location from which transferred upon completion or termination of the period of training; (2) quarters, subsistence, and laundry (including laundering of uniforms) while at Federal hospitals; and (3) necessary medical and hospital care in Federal hospital facilities: *Provided*, That no student nurse receiving a stipend fixed pursuant to this section, shall be entitled to any overtime or additional compensation under the War Overtime Pay Act of 1943. The appropriate appropriations of the agencies concerned are hereby made available for the purposes of this section.

"(c) Should any student nurse so transferred and in training suffer disability or death while in the performance of duty, she or her dependents shall be entitled, under the same conditions and to the same extent, to the benefits which are provided for civil employees of the United States to the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 751–793).

"SEC. 12. The Surgeon General shall designate distinctive insignia to be worn by nurses who have been graduated pursuant to training received under this act and who in accordance with their undertaking are engaged in essential civilian nursing services for the duration of the present war. Such insignia and the uniforms and insignia designated by the Surgeon General in accordance with section 2 to be worn by student nurses receiving training and courses under plans approved pursuant to this act, or any distinctive part of such insignia or uniform, or any insignia or uniform any part of which is similar to a distinctive part thereof, shall not be worn by any unauthorized person, under the penalties provided by the Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216, as amended; 10 U. S. C. 1393), for the unlawful wearing of the uniform of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ACQUISITION BY RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD OF CERTAIN DATA

The Clerk called the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 227) extending the period for the acquisition by the Railroad Retirement Board of data needed in carrying out the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That effective June 30, 1943, and notwithstanding any other provision of law, each employer subject to the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, and each other company, association, or person who is in possession of data required by the Railroad Retirement Board to establish service and compensation prior to January 1, 1937, shall continue after June 30, 1943, to furnish reports with respect to such data to the Railroad Retirement Board currently as completed, and be compensated therefor, under the same terms and conditions and in the same manner as provided in Public Resolution No. 102, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, and with the same effect as though the data were furnished under that resolution, until such time as all data required have been furnished to the Board, or until such time as the unobligated balance in the special fund established by section 6 of such Public Resolution No. 102, which fund is hereby continued, has been fully obligated, but in no event later than June 30, 1945. Any unobligated balance remaining in the said special fund after all data required have been furnished to the Board or on June 30, 1945, whichever date is the earlier, shall revert to the railroad retirement account.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOWAWAYS ON AIRCRAFT

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1386, making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who, without the consent of the owner, charterer, or person in command of any aircraft and with intent to obtain a ride or transportation in such aircraft in flight, shall board or be within such aircraft scheduled to fly or flying between any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone or any place occupied by, or under the jurisdiction of, the armed forces of the United States and any place outside thereof; or between points within the same State, Territory, or possession, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or any place occupied by, or under the jurisdiction of, any of the armed forces of the United States, but through the air space over any place outside thereof; or wholly within the air space over any Territory, possession, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or any place occupied by, or under the jurisdiction of, the armed forces of the United States shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 2. Any person who, without the consent of the United States, its duly authorized officer or agent or the person in command of any aircraft owned or operated by the United States and with intent to obtain a ride or transportation in such aircraft in flight, shall board or be within such aircraft scheduled to fly or in flight shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 3. The word "aircraft" means any contrivance now known or hereafter invented, used, or designed for navigation of or flight in the air.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this Act shall modify, restrict, alter, or change any law of the United States enacted for the purpose of preventing any person from entering the United States in violation of the laws of the United States or for the purpose of securing the deportation from the United States of any person who, under the laws of the United States, shall be subject to deportation.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING UNITED STATES TO BE MADE PARTY DEFENDANT IN CERTAIN CASES INVOLVING PARTITION OF PROPERTY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3609, to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very important bill and I would like to call upon the author, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], to explain the bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an amendment to title 28, section 901, of the United States Code. The original provisions of this act provided that the United States could be made a party defendant only in proceedings to foreclose mortgages and in foreclosure of liens. Approximately 2 years ago this House passed an amendment to that act which provides that in suits to quiet title the United States can be made a party defendant. Since the war began, and due to the acquisition of many rights and claims by the Government, some of the owners of the real estate upon which these claims and rights have been and are asserted have died. Their estates are in process of settlement and there has been no method provided by which the title to real estate and personalty can be cleared. It is highly desirable that the claim or right of the Government may be ascertained and determined in order that estates may be promptly settled.

The pending bill, now before the House, merely extends the right to make the United States a party defendant and to extend that right to make the United States a party defendant in partition proceedings and in petitions or proceedings filed by administrators and executors to sell real estate to pay debts, in order that the title to the real estate may be cleared, the claim of the United States ascertained, thus enabling the estate to be settled promptly and the entire matter concluded and completed.

This bill was reported out of the Judiciary Committee of the House by a unanimous report for its passage.

This legislation is badly needed at this time. In the future years, as we readjust ourselves, following this war, this amendment to existing law will be found to be very helpful. Many attorneys have requested that the amendment, which I have here presented, be passed in order to facilitate the settlement of estates and in order to clear the title to both real estate and personal property.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that this measure will be passed without opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases," approved March 4, 1931, as amended (46 Stat. 1528, U. S. C., title 28, sec. 901), be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Upon the conditions herein prescribed for the protection of the United States, the consent of the United States is given to be named a party in any suit which is now pending or which may hereafter be brought in any United States district court, including those for the districts of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and in any State court having jurisdiction of the subject matter, to quiet title to or for the foreclosure of a mortgage or other lien upon real estate or personal property, and in all cases where the partition and sale of real estate is sought by any of the owners thereof, and also in all cases wherein an executor or administrator seeks to sell the real estate and/or personal property of any decedent to pay debts, for the purpose of securing an adjudication of any mortgage, claim, lien, or right the United States may have or claim to have on or against the real estate or personal property involved."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEVING FORMER POSTAL EMPLOYEES WHO PERFORMED POSTAL DUTIES AFTER INDUCTION INTO THE MILITARY SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3763, to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of law relating to dual compensation, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts, and relieve certifying officers of liability, for payments made to postal employees who, after induction into the armed forces of the United States, performed postal duties while on furlough or otherwise relieved of active military duties, of the amounts to which such employees would have been legally entitled had they not been in the armed forces.

SEC. 2. If credit is allowed in disbursing officers' accounts, in accordance with section 1 of this act, the employee receiving the payment shall not be required to refund the amount thereof; and any such amount which has been collected from such employee because improper under dual compensation laws shall be refunded to him, or if deceased, to his legal representative.

SEC. 3. This act shall be applicable only to services rendered prior to January 1, 1943.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the bills on the calendar for today.

COOPERATIVE SUSTAINED-YIELD UNIT AGREEMENTS WITH FOREST OWNERS AND OPERATORS

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, when the bill S. 250, Calendar 211, was called, I raised a question for which there was no ready answer by any Member on the floor. Since that time the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] has appeared and is prepared to answer the question. I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 211 and that the bill S. 250 may be called up at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with private landowners of timber tracts, looking toward a sustained-yield unit operation. The bill provides that the sale of the timber from these tracts shall not be under open and competitive bids, which would permit the Government to sell timber to any person of their own choosing. The question I have to ask is, Why competitive bids are not required for the sale of this timber?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, answering the question of the gentleman from New York, as the gentleman states, the bill would permit the Departments to enter into agreements with private owners of timber for the purpose of establishing what are known as sustained-yield units in the timbered area. These units lie along water courses and in geographical units rather than in any legal units, and in order to promote a sustained-yield policy it is often necessary to include in such units timber privately owned. In order to make a deal for the operation of the unit on a sustained-yield basis, the Government has to enter into contracts with private owners of the timber and in making these agreements agree to sell Government timber.

It is not deemed practical to entertain competitive bidding in such a situation, since the only person who could logically operate the Government-owned timber would be the person with whom the agreement is being negotiated. Therefore, the Departments, the forest industries, and the author of the bill all agree that since competitive bidding is not practical or possible, and since both the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service are well aware of the value of these properties, it is entirely proper to make such agreements on the basis of negotiation.

Mr. COLE of New York. If it is true that the landowner is the only logical person who might buy this timber after it has been cut, then where is any hazard encountered by permitting it to be sold under competitive bidding, if by reason of circumstances he will be the only person who will bid on it?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I did not make it clear. The agreement is for the purchase of the timber before it is cut. It is an operating agreement. It has nothing to do with the marketing of the product from the land.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is this bill confined to any one portion of the West or to any national forest area, or is it open to all parts of the country as general legislation?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. It is a bill that affects all of the country where national forests are located. I believe some 36 States have forest areas. The Forest Service may embark upon a sustained-yield plan wherever it deems such a plan advisable.

Mr. MURDOCK. I feel that the measure has great merit.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Is there anything in this bill that compels the owner of private timber land to enter into any arrangement with the Government?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. No; there is no compulsion whatever. It is purely a voluntary agreement.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 448), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 239) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 449), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4166) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he proposes to bring up either one of these rules tomorrow afternoon?

Mr. SABATH. We are going to try to do so. The majority leader is not here at the moment, and I really do not know. However, I think it is the intention to bring up both of these rules tomorrow, as well as another bill on which a rule has been granted which I hope to file later in the day. That may come up the following day.

Mr. FISH. Both of these will be called up tomorrow, if possible?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

LOSS OF UNITED STATES NATIONALITY UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4103) to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4103, with Mr. GORE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. At the time the Committee rose, when this bill was last under consideration, general debate had not been concluded. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] has remaining 14 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] 25 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the only objection we have to the bill presented by the committee is that it is entirely inadequate to carry out the purpose they say they have in mind.

You recall that the committee bill provides that a man may denationalize himself by signing a form prepared by the Attorney General in the presence of an officer designated by him, and if the Attorney General consents to it.

The letter of the Attorney General quoted in the committee report states that he believes this will take care of some 300 to 1,000 persons who are now in relocation camps in the United States. As far as we are concerned, we are not making this a bill aimed particularly at the Japanese or any other racial group. That matter was injected into the problem by the committee and by Mr. Biddle himself, and the report so indicates. However, it is true that there are probably more persons in that group who will be affected than there are in any other group.

Let us see what the problem is. In 1942 a questionnaire was submitted to over 38,000 internees in these camps. Question 28 of that questionnaire was as follows:

> Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America, and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attack by foreign or domestic forces, and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese Emperor or any other foreign government, power, or organization?

Five thousand three hundred and thirty-three people answered that question in the negative. In other words, they were not willing to swear allegiance to the United States, and they were not willing to forswear allegiance to the Emperor of Japan. One thousand five hundred and fifty-five answered the question in a qualified manner or did not answer it at all. Therefore, we have this situation: We have 6,888 people in these camps who refused to unqualifiedly swear allegiance to the United States. What we say is that that very written act at that time constituted an act of expatriation by the individuals themselves. The theory of our case is this: A man has a natural, inherent right to himself expatriate himself, namely, to himself cast off his citizenship. That was recognized in 1795 in a case before the United States Supreme Court. It has been recognized since that time specifically by act of Congress in 1868. All I am trying to do by the amendment that I shall offer is to provide that any person who in writing during this war, or who by signing a governmental form, shows that he has expatriated himself, to the satisfaction of a nationalization court, shall be deemed to have wiped out his citizenship. It is a fair, reasonable proposition. It simply recognizes the fact that a man may do so, and we are providing a public agency where he will have complete protection of the law, where its particular fact may be heard and given to the world.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. To ask the gentleman one or two questions. In the first place, the gentleman's amendment will extend the provisions of the committee bill to include any person who during this war period has made a specific statement in writing, or one that can be substantiated by this court.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes. We do not impair the committee bill at all.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. You do not change the effect of it, or anything that might have happened prior to the war?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. No.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the second place, it would make it possible for this court to determine that a person in the midst of this war had made a statement renouncing his citizenship and to include him within or under the same terms as the committee bill.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is correct.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman's amendment goes further than that, further than an actual statement in writing.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Oh, no. We have restricted the amendment to include only writing or a signature on a Government form, and only for the duration of the war.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. But the amendment which the gentleman offered the other day went further than that.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. The gentleman is correct. I changed the amendment to meet the objections to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. This measure was considered for about half the time allowed last week, and the bill was very ably presented by its author, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]. It seems now that the only question before the Committee is whether or not the Committee is to adopt the bill as introduced, or whether it is to give favorable consideration to the amendment to be offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. There are two or three things that ought to be cleared up. One of them is that this is not a deportation bill, not at all. No. 2, it ought to be distinctly understood that this applies to all citizens throughout the United States. The discussion, of course, is around the question of Japanese citizenship, and whether we ought to take citizenship away from natural American-born Japanese, and, if so, how it is to be done, not forgetting that we must act within the confines of the Constitution. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] very ably stated, of course, that we are all anxious to deal with the Japanese as we think they should be dealt with under the circumstances of war; but let us not forget that whatever action is taken, this applies to everyone born in the United States or in its Territories. With that in mind we might proceed with a little bit of caution.

The Nationality Code provides means by which a citizen of the United States may expatriate himself or lose his citizenship. When you talk of taking the citizenship away from an American-born citizen, you are going into not only a difficult, but a most important consideration.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In a moment. I point out that the loss of citizenship under law under this code, among other things, is taking an oath or making an affirmation or other formal declaration of allegiance to a foreign state, or voting in a political election in a foreign state, or participating in an election or a plebiscite to determine the sovereignty over foreign territory, or making a formal renunciation of nationality before a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States in a foreign state, in such form as may be prescribed by the Secretary of State. Those apply, of course, where the individual is outside the United States.

This particular measure provides the means by which the individual may lose his citizenship, his nationality in the United States, and so this act simply provides that if an American-born citizen chooses to do so, wants to do so, he may sign a statement or a form as required by the Attorney General of the United States, by which he can renounce such citizenship. If he does so, then, of course, he would lose his citizenship. These gentlemen from California have talked about the question of getting rid of the Japanese. We would like to do that. As I understand it, these individuals they talk about are already in a camp that is under control in some form or other, under our military authorities, but in any event, all we can do immediately with any of these individuals would be to put them in concentration camps. That is all that we can do with them for the present, anyway. We are merely taking citizenship away from them, and that is as far as we can go now. You cannot send them back to Japan or Germany or to Italy, or we cannot transport them to the country of their allegiance right now. Perhaps we might not want to do it at the present time, anyway. Very likely, it is safer to leave them right where they are. If these individuals decide that they want to sign such a statement, well and good. The gentleman from California the other day made a plea for an amendment that would take into consideration any individual who makes a statement that somebody somewhere heard, but now it seems that that proposal is to be in writing.

The distinguished gentleman from California, I recall, made a very strong plea for the prosecution of those individuals who may have been heard making statements that would indicate they were not loyal citizens of the United States. Let us not forget this. This amendment is pretty broad. You are going pretty far afield. Of course, they say the provisions of the Constitution against ex post facto legislation does not apply because this may be a civil action and not a criminal action. But I am wondering whether or not, in view of all you want to do, and in spite of all you expect to accomplish by this legislation, I wonder whether or not it is good precedent to pass an act whereby you

can go back to a certain date, 1939 or 1940. Why not make it 1939 or whatever date you want to put in there? Anyway, is it not a little better judgment and does it not appeal to you as being a little more common sense if you pass an act that is conditioned to apply after it is passed by Congress and signed by the President, rather than to go back and let it apply to some statement an individual made before the act was passed?

Now the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who is one of the able students of the House and one of the Members who is extremely careful with reference to the passage of legislation, comes from the State where this Japanese problem, of course, I know, is terrifically acute. We want to protect the citizens and protect the people of our country. I believe a little while ago he suggested that acts performed before a law is passed, making such act unlawful, is reasonable.

Even though we may be anxious to handle a specific situation, I am wondering about the wisdom of enacting legislation that would reach back and permit citizens to be brought into court, for violation of an act that was not in existence at the time when the alleged violation was committed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, because I have mentioned the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] I will be glad for his further expression with regard to that particular. I yield. I want to say, too, that I have the highest respect for his opinion.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the first place may I say this, that at least so far as I am personally concerned I am extremely eager that whatever is done about this matter is not done on a racial basis, but on a basis of loyalty and on the basis of allegiance on the part of the people, whatever their race might be.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I agree with him thoroughly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the second place, as I read the amendment which the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] now presents, it seems to me the one thing that it would include under the provisions of this bill which is not already included in the bill would be specific statements made as the result of a questionnaire of a Government agency to people in the midst of this war as to which those people answered. I just want to say it seems to me in the present form of this amendment, and I have discussed it with the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] more than once, I am convinced that the only thing he will include that is not in the committee bill is to make it possible for a court to determine that an individual did actually make a written statement in the past on a Government form, given him by a Government agency, in which he renounced his loyalty to the United States. I believe, and I think I am correctly interpreting it, some of us feel that that was an act on his part of sufficient seriousness under the present circumstances so that it ought to be taken into consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Some of us feel that that was an act on his part of sufficient seriousness under the present circumstances so that it ought to be able to be taken into consideration by a competent court which can decide whether the evidence is of that character or not in connection with this man.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman. Of course, we do not have any amendment before us. But I will be glad to take the amendment and examine it. It is far different, of course, from the one we had before us a week ago.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is very true; I think it is quite different.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But I am still wondering whether or not it is good policy to pass an act today that would say that the statement made 2 or 3 or 4 years prior to the passage of this act should be used for the prosecution or taking away of the citizenship of an individual.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, a very able member of the committee.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. It seems to me that the most dangerous part of this amendment is the fact that you have 2,000 naturalization courts in this country. Now I just want to call your attention to the language of the amendment of the gentleman from California:

> Such a formal, written renunciation of nationality or signing a document or form of the United States Government containing such statements or answers as will support a finding of a naturalization court, that such a person has, in fact, denationalized himself by exercising his inherent natural right to divest himself of his nationality.

What that means is this, as I take it, that I can hale into court on my own motion, because this is a civil procedure, any person for any statement that he made in writing on a Government form. This would give me the right, for example, as a citizen, to haul him into any naturalization court of this country, and I might say there are 2,000 of them, and make him accountable in a civil proceeding before that court, for any statement that he made in writing on a Government form or any answer to some questionnaire that the Government had made out—and God knows there are millions of them around the country. It would have no semblance of a formal proceeding. You could have as many of such proceedings as you have people who wanted to bring it. Any time I had an enemy——

Mr. HINSHAW. Oh, no.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Any time I had an enemy who made a statement that I think is derogatory to the country, I could hale him into court and question his right to be an American citizen.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In other words, all in the world this amendment says, as I understand the gentleman from Michigan, is if this individual had signed a statement on a Government form then he could be brought into, as the gentleman suggested, one of 2,000 different courts of the United States, and haled there and be given a going over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

He could be given a going over as to whether or not an examination or whatever it is shows that he is not a loyal American citizen. He could be taken into court on the question of whether or not he is a loyal American citizen on the basis of a complaint filed by another private citizen.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, the gentleman from Michigan is totally wrong, because this is a statement made in answer to a question on a Government form and can only be had by the Government. No private citizen can bring that out.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We started out the other day whereby the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] was going to hale anybody into court who had been heard to make a statement within the last 2 or 3 years. According to the resolution today I understand he is going to be brought in if it is in writing. Now it is suggested by the gentleman it will be a statement in writing on a Government form. What is meant by a Government form I do not know.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman read the amendment?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes. It says, "Government form." Whatever that Government form is has not been defined; nobody knows.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am sure the gentleman from Kansas wishes to be fair.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Absolutely That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May we have the amendment read?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I believe the amendment should be read whenever the amendment is presented by the able gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will not the gentleman from Kansas please read this sentence so that we will know what we are talking about?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me say to the gentleman in all fairness to him, let us get this straight before the House—the gentleman from California has spoken on an amendment that is not before us now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Now the gentleman from California, as I understand his amendment if it is not changed again, is going to submit an

amendment that provides in substance that if an individual has signed a written statement on a Government form—whatever the Government form is I do not know, but the gentleman may define it when he takes the floor—but if he has signed such a statement sometime since December 7, 1941, then that signed statement can be brought into a naturalization court—and there are about 2,000 of them—and that individual be given a hearing and then the court will determine whether or not the signature on that Government form is true and correct. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] has well pointed out that there are thousands of them. If the court finds that he signed the statement on a Government form, then that individual may lose his citizenship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield myself 1 additional minute and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. The statement shall have been in the nature of a formal renunciation of his citizenship.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Now the gentleman has got right back to the same thing that this committee is submitting, except that the gentleman from California would go back to December 7, 1941, and find a statement that was signed by an American citizen, and on that statement have a hearing as to whether or not the individual is a loyal American citizen. That is about the situation as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am in full sympathy with the California delegation who are seeking to attain a certain objective. But, after giving this matter more careful consideration, I find it impossible to go as far as they intend to go under their proposed amendment—the exact wording of which, by the way, I have not seen.

The first point of this proposition, if carried out, will encumber every district court in the country. We will have to have additional jails and additional sheriffs. We will have to have about four times as many judges under this proposed amendment as we have now. We could do nothing more than listen to somebody who has squealed on somebody. We will have confusion such as we have never had before.

Now, we hope this committee is going into this question more thoroughly at some other time and we will be happy to cooperate with the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] to find some legal method by which we can dispose of these disloyal Japanese or other disloyal people in this country. This law does not affect Japanese alone. It affects all persons who are disloyal.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Does not your own report mention the fact that this is aimed primarily at the Japanese?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, it is aimed at the Japanese, but we drew the bill in such form that we could take care of other disloyal Americans.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I concur in your views.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All right. Then we have gone just as far as we can possibly go and stay within the limits of the Constitution.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. If citizenship has any value, does not the gentleman think we ought to have it taken away from a man only in a court of justice, rather than by one man in the United States, the Attorney General?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have great admiration for the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I know you do not believe in star-chamber proceedings. So I wonder why you brought this bill in.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Let us be practical. Here we have a number of disloyal American-born people. They are disloyal now. On their own free will they have stated their preference for an enemy country. They will be disloyal after the war. They are simply no good for this country. It is for the best interest of our country that we get rid of them. Why drag it into court when Congress can pass a law which is within the framework of the Constitution of the United States, by saying that "If you will sign a document—making a voluntary declaration that you are renouncing your American citizenship—you can expatriate yourself." Why drag him into court, bring in witnesses, and drag this out unnecessarily, when we can take a short cut and dispose of the issue without all of the legal proceedings?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If these citizens are disloyal, why, instead of deporting them, are they not tried for treason?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no overt act of treason on their part. They just state that they want to renounce their American citizenship, and we want to pass this bill to enable us to accept their renunciation of their American citizenship and to get the authority to deport them.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is there not an act on the statute books now?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

You can pass any kind of law that will punish unworthy people who are harmful to our war effort, who are useless citizens. You can send them to jail and you can keep them there for any time you wish. But you cannot take away their birthright. That is the argument here before the Congress.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I understand that, but I could not understand why, when people are disloyal, we could not just try them for treason.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly you can do that. If there are disloyal people in this country and we cannot find a way to remove them from citizenship, we can amend the law so as to punish them and take them out of circulation.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is not the purpose of your bill to take away the birthright of these American-born citizens?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. And we just want to enlarge that and get all of them instead of a part of them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I say we cannot go as far as you want to go. We have consulted the best brains in this country. I do not want any better opinion than that of Mr. Francis Biddle, in my opinion one of the ablest Attorneys General we have had in this country. He has taken a great deal of pains to advise with the committee on this important problem.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Has the gentleman ever said that this amendment is alleged or that any of the laws before Congress are unconstitutional?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. His letters on the various bills dealing with this subject matter analyze his objections very clearly. I inserted his letters in the RECORD last week, when we started debate on this bill. The committee, too, has brains enough to tell you the answer, that it absolutely is in violation of the Constitution of the United States and you cannot get away from it.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will you kindly recite the section to us?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, you can read the Constitution yourself. I do not have to answer that question for you.

Now, there is another bill that the Attorney General is considering today which I hope will be filed within the next day or two. There are a number of Americans who left this country in order to avoid service in our armed forces. It is the intention of this committee to give that bill a hearing at the earliest possible date, for the purpose of denaturalizing all those people and expatriating them, even going so far as to keep them from returning to this country. This committee wants to cooperate, but let us do it sensibly. Let us not drag into court thousands of people and confuse all the issues and put a scare into the people of this country, because, in my judgment, it will harm the war effort instead of helping it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is there anything in this bill that deprives a natural-born citizen of his citizenship against his will?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I wish you would pay close attention while I read to you the question which was placed before these Japanese when they were taken into protective custody after Pearl Harbor. Listen to this:

Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese Emperor or any foreign government, power, or association?

Mr. Chairman, to that question 5,333 Japanese answered an unqualified "No"; an additional 1,555 either qualified their answer or refused to answer the question at all. I hope you do not care to share your citizenship in the United States of America with anybody who would answer "No" to the question which I have just read to you; and I trust that every Member of this House will assist us in seeing to it that any person who would answer "No" to the question as to whether he would swear unqualified allegiance to the United States and forswear allegiance to the Japanese Emperor should be kicked out of this country, and fast.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Briefly.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I am pretty nearly in accord with him; but why can we not get at it in a better way by passing a law to make it a crime——

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, my time is so limited I cannot yield further.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will yield the gentleman 1 additional minute. Why would it not be better to pick up this kind of people under an act we pass in this Congress?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate what the gentleman has said. The gentleman's bill does not get at this question to which these people have answered unqualifiedly "No"; and it is very highly questionable whether a bill brought in here which requires a "no" answer to that question hereafter would be answered "No" by these rats who have already answered "No." We propose to take these people who have already said they would not uphold the United States and forswear allegiance to the Japanese Emperor and get them expatriated fast.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. My suggestion is that we try this bill first and see how far we can go under it. If additional law should be needed, we could still have it within a very short time, a month or so. Let us try this first and then see what further step we need.

Mr. HINSHAW. I remind the gentleman that quite a number of Japanese-Americans have already answered the question unqualifiedly "Yes." Some six or seven thousand of them are serving honorably in the United States Army, many on the battlefields of Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1168; 8 U. S. C. 801) is amended by substituting a semicolon for the period after the last word in subsection (h) of such section, adding the word "or" to the said subsection, and adding a new subsection to be known as subsection (i) and to read as follows:

"(i) making in the United States a formal written renunciation of nationality in such form as may be prescribed by, and before such officer as may be designated by, the Attorney General, whenever the United States shall be in a state of war and the Attorney General shall approve such renunciation as not contrary to the interests of national defense."

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON: On page 2, line 5, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "or", and after line 5 insert the following new subsection:

"(j) Making in the United States, during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending on the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, such a formal written renunciation of nationality, or signing a document or form of the United States Government containing such statements or answers as will support a finding of a naturalization court, that such a person has, in fact, denationalized himself by exercising his inherent and natural right to divest himself of his nationality. The finding of such court that any person has thus divested himself of his nationality under this subsection shall be effective as of the date the court determines that such formal written renunciation of nationality was made or such document or form signed, and may be accompanied by such order or decree as such court may deem necessary: *Provided*, That such court may, in its discretion, defer the making of such finding to such a time as it deems that such finding, and any accompanying order or decree will not be contrary to the interests of national defense."

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve all points of order on the amendment.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, there is so much misunderstanding about what we are trying to do here that I should like to take a little time to explain in an elementary way exactly what we are trying to do.

The question now submitted to the House by the committee provides that a renunciation of citizenship may be made by signing a paper, a formal paper, prepared by the Attorney General, and if it is executed, then it must be approved by the Attorney General before it becomes effective.

My purpose is to provide that during the war, and only during the war, any person who by a formal writing, or what is tantamount to a formal writing, one who signs a document issued to him by the Government of the United States which has the effect of renouncing his citizenship shall be deemed to have been denaturalized. In other words, the theory of our proposition is that the right to renounce citizenship is a fundamental, inherent personal right. It was thoroughly discussed and recognized in a case before the Supreme Court in 1795 and the judges were emphatic in that case that it was a fundamental right that a citizen had. It was also recognized by the Congress of the United States in 1868, at which time they made the following statement in a law which is still on the books:

The right of expatriation is the natural and inherent right of all people indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of liberty, life, and the pursuit of happiness.

All we do is to recognize that right; and we safeguard the individual concerned by providing that before he can be denationalized by his own act he may have a hearing in a court and that court must be satisfied that the circumstances, the matter which was signed and everything taken into consideration, did in fact strip that man of his nationality; in other words, all we are doing by my amendment is to say that if a man wishes to do that in writing, if he has done it by signing a form, then the court shall make a public finding of that fact when the evidence convinces the court that the renunciation has been made. How many does it reach? It is true, as the chairman of the committee has said, that the act applies to everyone, but in the report it is recognized that the problem concerns primarily Japanese. What do they say their law will accomplish? The chairman is anxious, and we are all anxious, to get rid of these people who by their own conduct have denationalized themselves, yet the report from the Attorney General states that this law might take care of from 300 to 1,000 people.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. COSTELLO. It might be of interest for the Members to know that over 7,000 Japanese located in these relocation centers requested repatriation to Japan. Over 9,200 of them failed to answer the loyalty question in the affirmative, and I believe 3,200 refused to answer the question at all.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the point that in this question 28, which is very specific, it is stated as follows:

Will you swear unqualified allegiance to the United States of America and faithfully defend the United States from any or all attack by foreign or domestic forces and forswear any form of allegiance or obedience to the Japanese Emperor, or any other foreign government, power, or organization?

I have been informed by the War Relocation Authority that that question was

answered by a positive "No" in 5,333 cases at Tule Lake and, as the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] stated, there are many more in other War Relocation camps who signed that in the negative.

The problem is very important for these people. When they refuse to be American citizens and when they sign this document, have exercised their right to denationalize themselves what is wrong with going to a court and ascertaining and determining that fact? That is all we are attempting to do by this amendment. We are not aiming at any particular group. It so happens that the Japanese are the ones who present the problem to us now. We are not nullifying the committee bill nor are we turning it down. We are simply trying to make the bill effective by putting some teeth in it by our amendment. If a man wants to be loyal to Japan, why in God's name should we carry him on the rolls as an American citizen? That is the purpose and that is the basis for introducing my amendment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am very much in sympathy with the purposes of the gentleman's amendment, but I would like to ask, Why did not the gentleman include in his amendment only those who had answered "No" to that questionnaire, or make it specific that that is the Government's form to which the amendment refers? We want to deal properly with those disloyal Japs. I would like to make the language even more specific than in your amendment.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. There may be other forms, there may be other written statements; but I am thinking only of this particular one, namely, the form mentioned.

I want to propound this question to the members of the committee: Does the United States of America have the courage, the virility, and the discipline to purge itself of people who are gnawing away at its framework and trying to make our Government collapse?

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Is the gentleman convinced from his study that this particular amendment would be constitutional?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes; I am.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. I looked over the gentleman's amendment. It is different from the one he had the other day. The other day I could not quite see his amendment.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I think it is constitutional. The author of the pending bill and the chairman of the Committee on Immigration have talked about the Attorney General's opinion. There is not a single opinion anywhere that I know of in which the Attorney General has said this is not constitutional. There has been some doubt about its retroactivity, but you can go back in civil matters as distinguished from criminal matters. That was decided in 1924 in a case where certain people were convicted in 1918 of violations of the selective service law and other criminal laws. In 1922 they were ordered deported by a warrant of deportation. They tried to get away from that order of deportation by saying that the matter was retroactive. However, Judge Tate swept that view aside and stated that this was a civil matter and a matter which can be based on prior actions or prior conduct.

Mr. CRAVENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Were those citizens or aliens?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. They were aliens. The principle is the same, however.

Mr. IZAC. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Is it not true that many of the people in these war relocation centers are citizens of the United States only because they were Japanese born in California for instance?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes. They are citizens by the accident of birth.

Mr. IZAC. Therefore, the only way we are going to get rid of them is by having the gentleman's amendment adopted, which goes back to Pearl Harbor days?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. IZAC. Since which time these people have proved their disloyalty to the United States of America?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is correct.

There is another phase to this matter. This amendment does not provide for deportation. If we get these people denaturalized, then deportation will follow after the war, as a matter of course. We will have conquered Japan so successfully that we can dictate the terms of the treaty which will undoubtedly include a provision that all these people shall be taken back to Japan. The amendment is very simple. It recognizes the fundamental right that a person has, it gives safeguard to those who have made certain statements, by requiring a decree of a court before we can take the statements at face value, and every safeguard is afforded to the individual, to prevent any injustice.

As I stated previously, I want to emphasize this thought: In a country as strong as our own, if we expect to succeed and continue to live, which we all expect to do, we certainly have the right and the power and should exercise that right and power to purge ourselves of those who are disloyal by their own written admission and whose allegiance is elsewhere. I sincerely hope you will give this amendment your support and help us solve this problem.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think that the amendment should have a provision in it for deportation?

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That would not be appropriate in this law. The matter of deportation will follow automatically if we get a formal judicial finding of denaturalization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] withdraw his point of order?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I withhold the point of order.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any Member of this House who is more concerned than I am about the possible dangers to the civil liberties of American citizens than I am. My own voting record and action since coming to this House will substantiate that statement. In time of war there is always the danger of violating the civil liberties of our people which may later prove to be extremely dangerous in their repercussions. It seems to me, however, that the statement which the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] made in support of his amendment is very clear and very much to the point. I can see absolutely no danger to the civil liberties of the American people in an amendment of this nature.

Let us review the facts in the case for just a moment. There was no compulsion used in enforcing any signatures to this statement which has been read. The statement was signed by over 5,000 Japanese-Americans who declared that they preferred Japanese nationality to American nationality. All that we are doing by this particular amendment is making possible the use of statements on Government blanks that have heretofore been made during the war period.

We are taking every possible step in this amendment to safeguard the American rights some people are so anxious about. If I thought otherwise I would not favor the amendment. It has been very carefully drawn and very carefully worded.

Mr. Chairman, the implication has arisen on the floor of the House a great many times that this is a matter which concerns only or primarily California or the west coast. This is a matter which is as important to New England or to the South or to the Middle West as it is to the west coast. It simply happens that those of us in California have had the opportunity to observe this problem more at first hand than have the other sections of the country. The implications of danger within our midst are as important to any section of the country as to those of us on the west coast.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this particular amendment strengthens the bill, does not weaken it, and I hope it will secure support from Members on both sides of the aisle in helping us do what we are all anxious to do, namely, win the war more quickly and get rid of any possible danger within our own ranks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I prize my citizenship in the United States so highly that I am unwilling to share it with anyone who says "No" to the question that was asked of these Japanese people by the War Re-

location Authority pursuant to their being concentrated by the War Relocation Authority in camps, and I do not think you are willing to share it, either. I do not think you are willing to let them get off scot-free, when they were perfectly willing at a time when they thought Japan was in the ascendancy to make a statement such as that. It may be that some of these boys have changed their minds since, yes, because the Japanese Army and Navy are not doing so well today as they were at the time of Pearl Harbor, and maybe some of them would be willing to turn around now and "rat" on the government which they chose to uphold at that time, just as they "ratted" on us when they thought Japan was going to win.

I think we all realize that our country has been a haven for people who felt themselves oppressed in the country of their origin. We have been glad to receive those people into our arms in the reasonable numbers that we have felt we could assimilate. But the people of Japan are not quite in that category. They have not come here to escape persecution or oppression. They like the climate. The Japanese Government has deliberately sent them here in an attempt to populate the entire rim of the Pacific, and as much more territory as it could lay its hands on, for the purpose of setting up an international empire of its own. They are breeding population deliberately, and the sons of their citizens who may have been born outside Japan are engaged in that deliberate breeding operation just as much as their people at home. If we in this country are willing to stand for a proceeding like that in our country, a proceeding by which they hope some day to overrun some parts of our country, I think we are plain fools.

May I say further that in connection with this program there are many angles that are going to concern the United States in the future. One of them is the fact of dual nationality. I should like to know from the members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization what they are doing about the question of duality of citizenship. There are some 2,000 Japs in this country who were born here and, at the age of 1, 2, or 3 months, were registered with the Japanese consul of some city in the United States as being citizens of Japan. By virtue of their American birth they claim American citizenship also. When the 1924 gentleman's agreement was arrived at, their parents took them back to Japan where they have been educated in the ways of Japan. They are known as the Kibei. Just prior to 1941, during the years 1940 and 1939, nearly 2,000 of these Jap-raised babies came back to this country as grown-up young men, some of them hardly able to speak English, and claimed the right of citizenship in the United States by reason of their birth here. More than 90 percent of these Kibei are dangerous to our safety and welfare. Many of them were trained as spies, and most of them have had Japanese military training. They are the ones who are making most of the trouble in the W. R. A. camps today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The distinguished gentleman is of course very much concerned about the question of dual citizenship. So is the gentleman from Kansas. Other members of the committee are also interested in that question. A great share of that question was disposed of, as the gentleman well knows, in the Nationality Act of 1940.

If the gentleman from California has in mind further legislation that can be passed constitutionally on that question, I assure him that the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization would be very happy to have him come before the committee and submit further legislation on that subject. It will receive the fair consideration to which it is entitled. The gentleman from California is a student of matters pertaining to immigration and naturalization. That committee will be especially pleased to have his constructive views on that question. However, that question is not involved in the legislation under consideration today. We are discussing a different problem. This does not deal at all with that problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from California has the highest regard and the deepest respect for the knowledge and wisdom of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas on the subject of immigration and naturalization. The gentleman from California construes it as the duty of the gentleman from Kansas and his colleague on the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to give full and complete study to all matters relating thereto and to submit to the House legislation which will solve these various problems. The gentleman from California is always glad to cooperate in any such matters to the limit of his humble abilities.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman from California may be sure that the entire membership of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is now giving consideration to the problem the gentleman has just raised.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad to know that.

The problem of duality of citizenship is concerned not alone with the Japanese, it also runs to certain other countries, notably Germany and Italy. Something might be done about that which would assist matters very materially. There is no reciprocity between some of these countries and ourselves in matters of citizenship. How many citizens of Japan are there who were born of United States parents in Japan proper? I know a good many of them have been born there but the Japanese Government does not give any right of citizenship to the children of nationals of any other country when they are born in Japan. They remain distinctly citizens of the country from which their parents came. It is a matter of blood—not one of birthplace with them. I think that may be right and proper. When these children grow up and become of age they may make application for citizenship in the countries in which they were born, if that is what they choose to do at that time, but in the meantime I think the question is very debatable that we should grant them citizenship here just because of the mere fact of their birth here and especially when such privilege is not granted in the countries from which their parents came.

Mr. ELMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ELMER. Did the gentleman know that a lot of Americans who have gone into Canada and England since war has been declared, have taken jobs there, and who have renounced their American citizenship are now coming back and asking this committee to pass special legislation to restore them to citizenship?

Mr. HINSHAW. That may be, but that is their own lookout. If they want to do that sort of thing knowingly, it is up to them. It is not up to me to worry about them. I am worried about the Japs right now, and we do not want them in this country, at least not those that are going to answer "No" to a question of loyalty to this country. It is certainly not fair to those Japanese-Americans who are serving our country honorably in the armed services today, if these others can get away with such a disgrace to our country.

Mr. ELMER. Did the gentleman vote to admit the Chinese to this country, when that bill was under consideration a few weeks ago?

Mr. HINSHAW. I voted for the bill the committee presented to the House, yes.

Mr. ELMER. I voted against allowing any foreigner to come into this country.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the gentleman's privilege. I thought it was wise to vote for that bill. Everybody had asked for it, and it seemed to be logical and reasonable.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. About 2 years ago the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization voted for a resolution authorizing a study of the immigration question, including dual nationality of the Japanese and other races. When we presented the resolution on the floor the gentleman, I think, voted among others against that resolution. The committee at no time in 35 years has had an opportunity to study this problem, which today is so gigantic that it is almost humanly impossible to present any legislation on it with any accuracy.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I do not even remember the resolution having been brought up here. If it was, I do not remember whether I voted for it or against it. I probably voted in favor of it, however.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. It has been said a number of times here today, and also a few days ago, when this matter was before the House, that there is a great deal of confusion about what the issue is. That has been more than demonstrated this afternoon. Most of the time taken up in debate has been spent in discussing the reprehensible action on the part of certain individuals in answering the famous question No. 28 in the negative. There is no question in the mind of any Member of this House as to the reprehensible character of that type of answer or action on the part of any American citizen. That question is not involved in the issue before us, however. There is no question in the mind of any Member of this House as to the fact that that kind of an answer deserves condemnation, and proper action should be dealt with by any legislation that can be directed to it that would be constitutional. We are all in agreement that anyone who expresses disloyalty to this country, as has been done by certain Japanese, should be attacked and dealt with by legislation or by any other means by which it can be legally and properly done, in order that such people may be condemned and deprived of their citizenship. It has been said that the very act that they committed—that is, in answering in the negative—is an act of expatriation itself. If that is expatriation, why should we have any legislation? They are already expatriated, if that is true.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Do we not have to make some formal evidence of that fact? Do you not think that there should be some record of it? The Attorney General proposes by his bill that they shall sign off.

Mr. FISHER. In the United States, under the law, as at present on the books, as set out in the committee report, there are eight different methods in which a person can deprive himself of his citizenship.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. But I want to add another one, and the Attorney General wants to add another one to it also.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; and so do I.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. What is the objection, if a man has set it down in a duly constituted court why not let him do it?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman from California and myself are in complete accord. I am in favor of writing another manner of expatriation. It developed when this questionnaire was signed in the negative that we have several thousand people in this country, natural-born citizens, who answered the question in such a way that showed they were not loyal citizens. They went further and indicated an allegiance to the Japanese Government. That is an expression of disloyalty which every loyal citizen condemns. We have looked into the law to see what can be done about it. We find that there is no statute that goes to the extent of depriving those who thus expressed themselves of their citizenship. The statutes existing at that time, and up to this moment, do not include such expressions as one of the eight ways by which a person can expatriate himself. Therefore, the need for this legislation, and the committee has presented a ninth manner in which a man can expatriate himself and deprive himself under the law of citizenship. The bill now before us provides that such expressions shall constitute an act of expatriation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why should we not write into this act that a negative answer to question No. 28, specifically already filled out and signed, shall constitute ground for expatriation?

Mr. FISHER. If the gentleman will permit me, I am in complete accord with him on that, and I would be glad to do it, and the effect of the committee bill does that thing. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I read it the committee bill is effective only from its date of enactment.

Mr. FISHER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then that would not reach back to the time these men signed the form containing question 28.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman is correct again.

Mr. MURDOCK. I would like to have the act reach back and include those who answered "no" to question 28 and signed the form.

Mr. FISHER. So would I.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. If the Attorney General's bill will take care of that, why does he not say that it will take care of 5,333 cases who answered "no" instead of only 300 out of 1,000 cases?

Mr. FISHER. I am not acquainted with that.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. That is in the report.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the question, therefore, resolves itself into this. There is only one issue involved. That is, whether or not we can now pass a law making an act which took place more than a year ago an offense to the extent that a man may by that act expatriate himself. If we can do that, I am for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. If we cannot, of course the next best thing is the committee bill, about which there is no question of constitutionality. It has been said here an ex post facto law which article I, section 9, of the Constitution provides this Congress has no authority to pass, does not apply to a matter of this kind because it is said that an ex post facto law referred to in the Constitution applies only in a criminal action. Let us see if that is correct.

Cooley on Constitutional Limitations, page 545, et sequentes, says:

> It is not essential, however, in order to render a law invalid on these grounds (ex post facto) that it should expressly assume the action to which it relates to be criminal or provide for its punishment on that ground. * * * Or if it deprives a party of any valuable right, like the right to follow a lawful calling, for acts which were innocent, or at least not punishable by law when committed, the law will be ex post facto in the constitutional sense, notwithstanding it does not in terms declare the acts to which the penalty attached criminal.

Then the Supreme Court, in the *Cummings case* (4 Wall. 333), has held with reference to ex post facto that:

> The deprivation of any rights, civil or political, previously enjoyed may be punishment, the circumstances attending and the causes of the deprivation determining this fact.

In other words, under the law, ex post facto applies to actions by this Congress, which deprive citizens of valuable rights. No one will say that the right of American citizenship is not of extreme value—second only to that of life itself. It follows, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that under the authority of the Constitution and the holdings of the Supreme Court, this Congress is without authority to pass a law to make an act which occurred more than a year ago an act that resulted in loss of citizenship. I wish we had the power to do that in this instance. But the Constitution prohibits us from doing so. Therefore, the best thing we can do is to pass the bill before us and thereby enable our Government to accommodate those Japs who hereafter renounce their citizenship and express in writing their disloyalty to this country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I think some of the details of this bill that seemed at first to be in confusion have been cleared up. I think that I perhaps added to the confusion when the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] was on the floor. I now feel that only one or two details need further discussion. One of those is the fact that the amendment suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] is not an amendment to replace the section which is being added to the bill by the committee but is in addition to that procedure which the committee has suggested. I therefore think there can be little objection to it, even by those who would normally support the committee bill because both procedures will then be in the bill. That is the normal way to make laws: An idea is produced; it goes to committee and the committee brings it out. Suggestions are made to improve that bill. These can be added to the bill on the floor, and in the future other bills may be passed by the Congress which will still further improve the procedure that we are trying to clarify now. So the fact that the committee may be considering another bill should not in any

way be taken into consideration today because such a bill will simply improve the procedure which may be established today.

I think we should take into consideration the fact that those of us who are familiar with this subject feel that the suggestion of the Attorney General as written into the bill by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] does not meet the situation and that there will be possibly six or seven thousand citizens, who have denied or refused allegiance to the United States, who would not be reached. Yet that procedure still remains in the bill, while the new one is added to it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course, the gentleman appreciates the fact that it is almost impossible for this Congress to enact legislation to cover every situation that either the gentleman from California or I would like to cover, if we could.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am interested in the gentleman's position, he being a student of the law, that we can go back under this measure and say that a statement alleged to have been made by a citizen prior to the passage of this act, could now be regarded as a statement that would now take away his citizenship, which would not be taken away under the law at the time the statement was made.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If he made that statement 2 years ago it would not have been in violation of the law. Now the same statement, if this law is passed, of course, would be in violation of this law and would take a man's citizenship away.

Does the gentleman think, in all fairness, if you are dealing with Germans, Italians, British, or any other American citizens, that such a law should apply and go back and do that sort of thing? Does the gentleman believe that that would be a good law?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If since this time, which is the time that the Selective Service Act was passed, a German or an Italian, of his own free will, wrote down that he would not swear unqualified allegiance to the United States or forswear any former allegiance or obedience to any foreign government, then it would be a good law.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is not in the amendment, I will tell the gentleman. That is not in this amendment at all.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is what we are talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, let us bear in mind the legislative situation. The Johnson amendment is not offered as a substitute for the committee bill, but merely as an addition thereto.

The Johnson amendment differs from the committee amendment only in two particulars. It moves the date back to December 7, 1941, when proceedings can be commenced on evidence occurring between that date and now. Whereas the committee bill would merely permit evidence to be considered which occurs after the bill becomes an act of the Congress.

The other particular in which the Johnson amendment differs from the committee bill is in the fact that, in the committee bill, proceedings are star chamber, secret, behind closed doors and drawn curtains, in an office which the Attorney General may select and before some official of the United States whom he may designate.

Under the Johnson amendment all proceedings having to do with decitizenization will be had in courts of naturalization, of which there are 2,000 or more in the United States. Bear that distinction in mind.

The committee, bill is vicious, un-American and wrong, the kind of a bill which we should fight with all the strength at our command. Citizenship is a sacred right, the most cherished of all of the Constitution-given rights that it is our privilege to enjoy. It should not be taken from us in star chamber, secret proceedings, in darkened offices behind drawn curtains. That is precisely the kind of a proceeding which the committee bill would authorize.

I am sorry indeed that the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON] did not offer his amendment as a substitute for the committee bill in order that we might, by one stroke, wipe out this totally un-American procedure that would be authorized if the committee bill becomes a law. It is not my hatred for the cowardly, treacherous, disloyal Japanese that inspires me to speak today, not that nearly so much as the fear that the liberties that are mine may be weakened or destroyed as a consequence of the enactment of the ill-considered measure that is before us. Those constitutional liberties are more valuable to me than anything else that I know of.

No one despises the Japanese more than I do. They have proven themselves to be the most despicable, cowardly, treacherous people that have ever sallied forth upon a warlike mission. No one wants to rid this country of their disloyal American citizen adherents more earnestly than I do. No one wants to bring about their removal more quickly than I do. But I am not willing to write on the statute books laws purposed to rid ourselves of them, much as I hate them and all for which they stand, if by their enactment I am going to undermine and weaken the constitutional foundation upon which my American citizenship rests. We cannot deal lightly with the constitutional rights of others without weakening those upon which our own claims as freemen rest.

This is a time when we should stop, look, and listen. Are we willing to clothe any man in America, the Attorney General or any other official, with such unlimited authority over the most cherished of our Constitution-given prerogatives, our citizenship in this great Republic?

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, the powers which this bill would confer are greater than any good man would ask for, certainly more than any public official prone to error, as all of us are, should have.

The Johnson amendment sets up a procedure that is infinitely better, safer, more effective, than the committee bill it would amend. Under its provisions no citizen would be deprived of his citizenship except in open court in a judicial proceeding.

Let us adopt the Johnson amendment, others, too; then if the portion the committee reported is not eliminated, defeat the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pick up a couple of sentences from the statement of the distinguished gentleman who just left the floor, wherein he says that citizenship is a sacred right. In that statement he is correct. If you adopt the amendment that is before us now you are treading upon those sacred rights.

I want to pay my respects, especially, to the gentleman from California, who has made a strenuous effort to secure the adoption of his amendment. He has sent a copy of his amendment to the membership of the House. He has called your attention to the fact that he was going to bring it before us. However, I do want to call your further attention to the fact that in the letter he quotes from a statement that has been presented, I assume, to certain Japanese who were taken into concentration camps, but that quotation is not a part of the amendment.

Now, read the amendment. Among other things it provides:

> Signing a document or form of the United States Government containing such statements or answers as will support a finding of a naturalization court that such person has in fact denaturalized himself by exercising his natural right to divest himself of his nationality.

In other words, if he signs some kind of Government paper—and there are thousands of them—if he signs or he has signed a document or a form of the United States Government, whatever that may be construed to mean, containing such statements or answers as will support a finding, he will have his citizenship taken away. So, if you get hold of a Government form, some kind of a Government paper, it might be a statement by a Member of Congress written on his own stationery, then you hale that citizen into court and a hearing is held as to whether his citizenship should be taken away.

Now, it would seem from the discussion this afternoon that this is a measure directed to the Japanese American-born citizens. But this measure involves every citizen of the United States. Every natural-born citizen of the United States comes under this bill. So we should be extremely careful how we vote on this matter. The original bill provides that if an American citizen signs a statement voluntarily, on his own accord, divesting himself of his citizenship, he may do so. It is simply adding one more means by which a citizen may divest himself of citizenship.

In either the bill or the substitute of the gentleman from California only citizenship is involved. All the Japanese that I know anything about that are likely to be disloyal citizens are already in concentration camps. Even after you

take citizenship from them, you do not deport them; you do not take them out of the country; you do not punish them; you do not do anything except take away citizenship rights.

I have the highest respect for all those gentlemen from California who are so interested about the Japanese problem, and I agree with everything they say about the Japanese. This is not a Japanese bill. The word Japanese does not even appear in the bill. Look at it. See for yourself. This particular amendment will not punish Japanese. It will divest them as well as others who come under the terms of this measure. Of course, disloyal Japanese, and other disloyal persons should be properly punished. The amendment of the gentleman from California does not do that. The Japanese referred to by the gentleman from California are already in detention or concentration camps. I am just as much in favor of taking away the citizenship of, and punishing, any disloyal person as any Member on the floor of this House. The original bill, as introduced, that does provide for divesting of citizenship, ought to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, if there is anything that the Government of the United States should guard jealously and with care it is the rights of the citizens of this country.

We have fought two great wars on the question of citizenship. The War of 1812 was fought to prevent English from impressing our seamen. Then we fought the great Civil War to free a certain class of citizens who were in bondage. Now we are dealing with another class of citizens. How do we know but what this law may be applied to some different class that we do not have in mind today?

When I was a little boy my father used to call me to his knee and read me extracts from literature. I recall his reading to me from the famous Irish orator, Mr. Curran. You know there has been a great deal of oppression in this world, and particularly have the Irish, as a race, been oppressed. I have always been enthused over the eloquence of the Irish.

On this occasion I want to read to the members of the committee a statement by the great Irish orator, John Philpot Curran, on the subject of universal emancipation, which I find in a book that has been in my family for over 130 years. This book is an heirloom. The great questions of freedom and civil rights and emancipation are just as vital today and just as alive as when Curran issued his challenge to the English in his great oration on Universal Emancipation.

I read from page 31:

> I speak in the spirit of the British law, which makes liberty commensurate with, and inseparable from the British soil—which proclaims, even to the stranger and the sojourner, the moment he sets his foot upon British earth, that the ground on which he treads is holy, and consecrated by the genius of universal emancipation. No matter in what language his doom may have been pronounced—no matter what complexion incompatible with freedom, an Indian or an African sun may have burnt upon him—no matter in what disastrous battle his liberty may have been cloven down—no matter with what solemnities he may have been devoted upon the altar of slavery—the first moment he touches the sacred soil of Britain, the altar and the gods sink together in the dust; his soul walks abroad in her own majesty; his body swells beyond the measure of his chains, that burst from around him, and he stands redeemed, regenerated, and disenthralled, by the irresistible genius of universal emancipation!

We are dealing today with the rights of natural-born citizens of this United States. I think that in passing legislation of this kind all safeguards that should be included in that legislation should be incorporated in this bill. If a citizen of this country wishes to migrate from this country and renounce his American citizenship, that is his right. If a citizen of this country seeks an opportunity to renounce his citizenship, let him have it. That portion of the bill may be all right, but I am opposed to the Johnson amendment. I do not think there should be any abridgment of civil rights or any opportunity for some biased or some prejudiced individual to deprive a natural-born American citizen of his birthright.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, because there seems to be some confusion about it I want to say again, although it has been mentioned before, that the Johnson amendment does not affect the bill which was reported out by the committee. The bill will remain intact.

The Johnson amendment consists of the addition of a new paragraph to the bill. Under the bill as reported out by the committee the Attorney General presumably will prepare a form which will presumably be circulated among those Japanese who have previously declared their disloyalty and those who have not; and those who want to sign it will sign it. The Johnson amendment merely adds an additional paragraph which states that as to those who have made the formal declaration referred to in the amendment will in itself constitute sufficient grounds for a court to declare that they have already voluntarily lost their American citizenship.

Addressing myself briefly to those who have opposed the Johnson amendment, it appears that they are concerned about, first, the constitutionality of the amendment. I am not prepared to discuss the question of constitutionality. There is a respectable body of opinion on both sides and I assume that when the Supreme Court decides it we will know whether it is constitutional or not. Let me point out, however, that if the Johnson amendment goes to the Supreme Court and is thrown out it will not in any way impair or affect the procedure which can be taken and which undoubtedly will be taken by the Attorney General under the other section which is in the bill; so if we Californians who are supporting this amendment lose out in the Supreme Court it has not hurt anything, it has not hurt the Attorney General's bill and it has not hurt the committee bill. Incidentally I do not believe it is an unconstitutional proposition for the reasons mentioned by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

The second proposition which seems to be concerning the members of the committee is the form of the language in the amendment. They seem to think, and I believe they agree with us—and I refer particularly to the gentleman from Texas who agreed that anybody who signed a declaration such as question 28 should lose his American citizenship; in other words, that is just one of our objectives.

At this particular time let me call your attention specifically to the language of the amendment. The amendment states that the person involved in this matter must, since Pearl Harbor, and before the cessation of hostilities, have signed a document or form of the United States Government containing such statements or answers that will support a finding of a naturalization court. And here is the essential language I want you to pay specific attention to: That such a person has in fact denationalized himself by exercising his inherent and natural right to divest himself of his nationality; and that inherent and natural right is a voluntary right. In other words, it boils down to this: If some fellow has answered a Government form, answering the questions or making a statement voluntarily which he knows cannot but denationalize him, then he should lose his citizenship. I do not see how that could hurt anybody. I do not care what nationality he is, if he does that I just simply do not see how anybody can say it is unfair.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned with civil rights and civil liberties, I think as much as anyone in this House. I believe that in time of war we all have to be careful about hysterical acts of any kind. In my opinion the committee bill is well considered and although my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART], has questioned the suitability of giving the Attorney General such power, and I have some doubts of it myself; I am sure that the formal renunciation which the Attorney General would prepare would be subject to review by a court of naturalization providing the person who signed it asked for such review; and, therefore, it would not be final. I also want to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. I do not see anything inconsistent in the two being joined together, and I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE], that the nullification of the Johnson amendment by the Supreme Court would not affect the original bill presented by the committee. If a negative answer to question No. 28 is not sufficient ground for renunciation

of citizenship I do not know how a man could renounce his citizenship. That has been read to you and I will not go through it again. I assume that such renunciation is ground for expatriation, and if the person signing it could prove to the satisfaction of the court that he acted under duress or under coercion I am sure the court would also protect his rights, although I believe that most of these 5,000 Japs signed it voluntarily and in many instances with a great deal of enjoyment.

In time of war we must be careful, but we have this Japanese problem on the Pacific coast and I want to call to the attention of the Members of this House that this problem is no longer located only on the Pacific coast. These people are spread throughout the United States, and under the present program of relocation you will find they will be your neighbors in practically every State in the Union. The problem therefore is widespread, it is not of concern only to the people of California. I am sure the Members from other States do not want people to sign statements saying they are disloyal to the United States, that they owe their allegiance to the Emperor of Japan, as your neighbors. I feel that the Johnson amendment will solve this problem not only for the people of California but for the people of the United States. I will therefore support the amendment.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McMURRAY. Are any of the Japs who answered question 28 in the negative distributed throughout the country?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand that at the present time all those people are located in the Tule Lake concentration camp in California, but immediately upon the cessation of this war they will be free to go to any State they want to, and it is my opinion that many of the Japanese who recognize the antipathy toward them of the people in California will spread to these other States and therefore it will be a problem for all the States.

Mr. McMURRAY. The point I want to make is that none of them have been released; is not that true?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. So far as I know none of them have been released. Some in other camps who have answered similar questionnaires have not yet been taken to Tule Lake. That is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON]. There is nothing in the amendment that refers to the disloyal Japanese problem. There is no question but that every Member of Congress wants to rid the country of any undesirable Jap aliens or disloyal Japanese citizens, but in doing so we do not want to adopt the policy of the aggressor nations of punishing, or even taking a chance on punishing, innocent people because of our failure to find the proper method of getting rid of undesirables. That is the reasonable likely result of this amendment. There is not a word about the Japanese either in the bill or in the amendment. We cannot name the Japanese specifically, because to do so would be class legislation and unconstitutional.

What the amendment does is this, and it is the dangerous part of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from California. We all agree if a man wants to renounce his citizenship voluntarily, let him do it, but this amendment gives any court of naturalization the right to determine and the right to interpret, if you please, any statement that a citizen of this country has made in a Government document or questionnaire during the last 2 years or since the war started.

A proceeding such as that is a civil proceeding. We have approximately 2,000 naturalization courts in this country. Under this amendment a complaint could be brought by one private citizen in the nature of a civil suit or proceeding to question the statement or answer of another citizen to a question, made any time since December 7, 1941, and the court, if you please, would have the right to say whether what a man said, whether he intended it that way or not, was sufficient to divest him of citizenship, and the court could say: "Well, it is my opinion that by this statement you intended to divest yourself of your United States citizenship," and make a finding accordingly. The intent of the individual would not necessarily control, but rather the construction placed on his words by any of 2,000 naturalization judges. That is the thing that is so dangerous and far reaching in this amendment and basically wrong with the whole business. I think an amendment offered on that basis should be defeated. If we want to pass legislation to specifically punish the alien Japanese or disloyal citizen Japanese in this country and thereby get rid of them, I know everyone in this House would support it, but in doing so, Mr. Chairman, we ought to be very careful how we proceed against the rights, privileges, and immunities of the loyal and patriotic citizens of this country.

We should leave no stone unturned to punish any disloyal citizen of this country, no matter what his nationality may be. But in performing our duty in that respect we should be scrupulously careful that in our zeal and enthusiasm to remove the traitors from our midst we do not at the same time set up legislative processes which can be used to hale into court loyal American citizens to question their statements and subject their remarks as free Americans to the scrutiny and judgment of any court or tribunal, no matter how fair or impartial. If we cannot deal with the disloyal Japanese without including the loyal citizens of other races and nationalities, then it is far better that we use existing statutes for their punishment than to embark upon a plan which would jeopardize the freedom of speech of every loyal and patriotic citizen. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from California will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to use any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DICKSTEIN) there were—ayes 51, noes 48.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DICKSTEIN and Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 76, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEARHART: On page 1, line 8, after the colon, strike out everything down to and including the words "national defense" in line 5 of page 2.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, the Johnson amendment, which has just been defeated, would have breathed a measure of respectability into this legislation. Unfortunately, it has failed and has not been adopted. This leaves for our consideration only those parts of the bill which the committee brought in, a bill which I honestly believe is as wrong as wrong can be, a bill that should be defeated at all costs.

The bill confers more power upon the Attorney General than any good man should ask for and certainly more than any finite official should have. It gives the Attorney General the right to devise a form of his own writing in the secrecy of his office. It gives the Attorney General the right to extend the right of renunciation to such persons as he may choose, and only to them, to the secrecy of his private office, and there to permit those persons to whom he desires to extend the privilege of expatriation to sign a renunciation of their American citizenship. Any man who goes there and signs that renunciation will cease to be an American citizen; all this in a star-chamber proceeding, in a secret session, behind closed doors and drawn curtains, in a proceeding of which there will be no official record except such as may be found in the files of that particular official.

Mr. Chairman, is the right of citizenship of such trivial value that we are willing to confer on one man the power of taking it away from those who want to escape some responsibility which is incident thereto? Those of us who, like myself, have had something to do with law enforcement, know something of that which we call overzealousness in public officials. This overzealousness, resulting, as it too often does, in the use of third-degree methods—this behind closed doors, with the curtains drawn, in secrecy—in the office of some petty official of the United States that might be

designated by an oversensitive Attorney General, might result in some involuntarily signing away their citizenship, result in their losing the most sacred Constitution-given right we have. You cannot blow hot and cold with the constitutional right of citizenship, take citizenship from those you do not like, retain it for those we favor. If we do not all join hands to defend this priceless privilege, it might well be lost to all of us.

The Johnson amendment is already lost. My amendment is but pro forma and is of no consequence. The vote on the passage of the bill is imminent.

I plead with you, defeat this unwise legislation. It might well mark the beginning of the end of constitutional freedom in the only country where the torch light of individual liberty is still aflame.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California who has just spoken has made three or four speeches against this bill. He seems to have the attitude that if he cannot have a bill written in accordance with his own ideas he wants to wreck a bill reported unanimously from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

There is nothing in the world wrong with this bill except that it does not go quite as far as some of the gentlemen from California want it to go, but this bill goes as far as it ought to go, in the considered opinion of those who have studied it.

There is certainly no objection to giving those persons in this country who want to expatriate or denaturalize themselves that privilege. This is a war measure. It is applicable only to wartimes. Those of us who might be inclined to be witch burners have tried to restrain our passions in this matter and not exceed the constitutional limitations against ex post facto legislation.

The gentleman from California says this bill opens the gate to star-chamber proceedings. It does nothing of the sort. All the proceedings under this bill will be open and aboveboard. Everybody will be entitled to a hearing. This is simply a measure to expedite and facilitate the expatriation of those who have said in writing that they wish to divest themselves of American citizenship.

I cannot see any reason for all the fuss and fury that has been stirred up and created by this bill. We are making a tempest in a teapot out of the consideration of this legislation. I call on the Committee to reject this amendment and stay by this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 403 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1169–1170; 8 U. S. C. 803) is amended by substituting a comma for the word "and" as it appears between the parenthetical (g) and (h) and adding the following after the parenthetical (h): ", and (i)".

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4103) to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances, pursuant to House Resolution 433, reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GEARHART) there were—ayes 111, noes 33.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORD and Mr. CELLER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] and I be permitted to revise and extend our remarks on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 234) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes, which was before the House this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short articles that appeared in the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent editorial from the Sunday Telegram, of Worcester, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF BERNARD M. BARUCH AND JOHN M. HANCOCK

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of Bernard M. Baruch and John M. Hancock submitted to the Director, Office of War Mobilization, relative to war and post-war adjustment policy, be printed as a Senate document, and that 7,000 additional copies be printed, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the House document room and 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate document room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. JARMAN: On page 1, line 6, after the word "which", strike out "five thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "two thousand seven hundred and fifty."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JARMAN: On page 1, line 7, after the word "room", insert "; two thousand two hundred and fifty for the House of Representatives."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the Senate concurrent resolution as amended.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICE OF FISHERY COORDINATION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I was not present when the Consent Calendar was called today. I indicated at the last call of the calendar that today I would ask unanimous consent to strike from the Consent Calendar the first bill on the calendar, S. 1242, to authorize appropriations for salaries and expenses, Office of Fishery Coordination, Calendar No. 149. I now ask unanimous consent that that bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], at the conclusion of other business and other special orders, may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks upon the bill H. R. 3403.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter by Abraham Lincoln concerning the Presidential election of 1864.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by James B. Carey, secretary and treasurer of the C. I. O.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Morrison, N. C.
Bell	Gavin	O'Leary
Bender	Gifford	O'Toole
Boykin	Hall,	Patman
Bradley, Mich.	Leonard W.	Peterson, Ga.
Busbey	Hare	Pfeifer
Byrne	Heffernan	Poage
Cannon, Fla.	Hobbs	Powers
Capozzoli	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Carson, Ohio	Johnson,	Robsion, Ky.
Celler	Luther A.	Sauthoff
Cochran	Johnson,	Scanlon
Compton	Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Cooley	Jones	Slaughter
Cullen	Kennedy	Snyder
Curley	Kerr	Starnes, Ala.
Dirksen	Kilday	Sumners, Tex.
Domengeaux	Luce	Talbot
Douglas	McWilliams	Taylor
Fay	Manasco	Thomason
Ford	Mason	Treadway
Fulbright	May	Winter
Fulmer	Merritt	
Furlong	Morrison, La.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 361 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has, during the past several months, been giving consideration to tax measures for raising revenue for the prosecution of the war and to provide for carrying on the affairs of our Government. It is estimated that about $40,000,000,000 of revenue will be collected this year. We will spend about $100,000,000,000, according to available figures. July 1, this year, our national debt will be approximately $250,000,000,000, which is about $1,500 for every man, woman, and child in this country and approximately $3,500 or $4,000 for each taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to spend every dollar and use every energy necessary for the prosecution of the war and to bring victory at the earliest date possible. The American people are willing to give everything they have got, if necessary, in order to win this war.

Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the effects of waste and nonessential expenditures upon this country in our post-war economy. I am also concerned with respect to the effect of the waste of manpower, money, and material on the prosecution of the war. Our material and natural resources are not simply figures on a piece of paper. They represent the future of our country, and they should not be foolishly squandered or wasted. Of course, we cannot win this war cheaply. Everybody knows that. War is extravagant and wasteful, and the thing that makes war so terrible is that it has little respect or value for human life or for the misery and suffering it inflicts. We can contribute very definitely to the winning of this war by practicing economy and efficiency in the affairs and management of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, we, as Members of Congress, hold positions of trust for and on behalf of the American people. In the discharge of that duty and trust, it is our obligation to see, as far as can possibly be done, that all waste and overlapping and duplication of Federal activities and functions, as well as nonessential spending of all kinds, are eliminated. Winning the war is paramount. The need of any agency or activity must be determined on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this country are concerned with respect to the red tape, and extravagance and the waste of money, material, and manpower, and confusion by our many Government agencies. There are a number of leaders in our Congress who have expressed disapproval of nonessential and wasteful spending and duplication that is bogging down the war effort. Several committees of this Congress are attempting to make investigations of various kinds with regard to this problem. The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate are checking requests for expenditures more than before. The country is, I believe, indebted to the Joint Committee on the Reduction of Nonessential and Federal Expenditures under the able leadership of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, for the saving of millions of dollars during the past 2 years. A special committee to investigate the national defense program under the capable direction of Senator TRUMAN, of Missouri, has made great strides in pointing out to the Congress and the Nation waste in Government contracts. The Civil Service Committee of the House by reason of its investigations has prevented a great amount of overstaffing of employees and duplication of services that has meant savings of many millions of dollars to our people. The Appropriations Committee of the House has recently employed a limited staff to help examine requests for expenditures for the departments of Government.

Mr. Speaker, even with all this activity in an attempt to achieve a more economical and efficiently managed Government, every day brings knowledge of more extravagant, wasteful practices which have resulted in the expenditure of billions of dollars that should have been saved for the taxpayers of this country. The extravagant use and waste of manpower cannot be estimated. Our Government ought to set the example in the saving of manpower, instead of wasting it. The extravagant use and waste of Government funds is helping to build a gigantic debt from which unborn generations of Americans will be unable to extricate themselves. Bureaucracy is on the march. Mr. Speaker, unless this Congress and this House proceed immediately to correct this situation, it has not discharged its full responsibility to the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention to just a few examples of wasteful and nonessential Federal spending and then suggest an obvious remedy. There are now at least 20 agencies aside from the Department of Labor that deal with national labor problems. There are 134 Federal agencies and bureaus spending at the rate of $164,000,000 a year engaged in research work. Twenty-two agencies deal with matters affecting the fishing industry alone. About 50 Government activities are in the post-war planning business.

Congress appropriates about $15,000,000 annually for the Civil Service Commission for recruiting, investigating, and classifying Federal employees. And yet almost every department and agency has its personnel officers, administrators, investigators, and experts and stenographers who investigate, classify, and recruit employees. This is the important service which the Civil Service Commission is supposed to perform. The Office of Defense Transportation, for example, has been set up as a separate agency. It ought to be a part of the Interstate Commerce Commission. That alone would save between one and two million dollars annually. The air-line companies of this country are regulated by three Federal agencies. These activities could be consolidated in a single commission which would affect a considerable saving. Our Latin-American relations are handled by at least three agencies, the Foreign Economic Administrator, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and the State Department. The waste of money and manpower, as well as confusion with respect to this matter, is described in a subcommittee report of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. There could at least be a consolidation of the duties of two of these agencies with the State Department, and part of the duties of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs ought to go to the Office of War Information. The consolidation of these activities under the Office of War Information and the State Department not only would bring greater

economy but would provide more efficiency. Then we have the Relocation Authority that duplicates the activities of the United States Employment Service and the War Department. The agency ought to be abolished and whatever functions are necessary ought to be put under the War Department and the United States Employment Service. A unification of the lending activities of the Department of Agriculture would certainly save millions of dollars and eliminate unnecessary duplication and delay. Then there are a half dozen more dealing with loans on city property that could be consolidated.

Mr. Speaker, better control by the departments and agencies over their penalty mail would reduce Federal expenditures and would eliminate the necessity of employment of thousands of Government employees engaged in duties that relate to the preparation and distribution of a great amount of unnecessary material, especially during this war period. Almost every agency has its own publicity and propaganda division. Attention has been called to the hundreds of tons of material sent to the newspaper offices of this country each day that goes direct to the wastebasket without even being opened. Why not cut and consolidate such publicity activities and save the paper and the manpower and the expense?

Mr. Speaker, everyone understands and realizes that by reason of war conditions it is necessary that we have more employment in government, but let me call your attention to the fact that the number of bureaus and agencies in this Government had already quadrupled in 10 years before the war effort even began, that a few years ago we had only about 30 principal agencies and that now we have more than 150 of them. At the end of World War No. 1 we had 918,000 civilians on Government pay rolls. That number was reduced to 500,000 before 1930. By 1940, before we even began to prepare for war, there were 1,500,000 employees in Federal service. The grand total now is about 3,000,000. More than 200,000 are in Washington. The annual civilian pay roll of the executive departments is about $8,000,000,000.

In December 1942 Congress passed the overtime pay bill increasing wages and provided employees should work 48 instead of 39 and 40 hours per week. It is disappointing so little showing has been made in reducing the number of employees under this act. The Nation's farms and industries are operating under an acute shortage of manpower, but mighty little effort is shown by executives and supervisors to conserve manpower in our own Government. It is indeed disappointing that our Federal agencies and bureaus very rarely recommend reductions in employment or suggest means of saving manpower or money. The problem of Government employment and Government service challenge the imagination of the average citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct your attention to another item of extreme importance. Prior to March 1933 there were 224 Executive orders. I am informed that now the records show 9,350 Executive orders, and there are many more to come. Let it be understood again by reason of the war conditions there has been need for additional Executive orders, but I challenge the necessity of 9,000 of them. The thing that disturbs me about these Executive orders is that they have the same effect and force as the law itself, and these orders are without the sanction or approval of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there are plenty of other examples of waste and extravagance and mismanagement that have been called to our attention by other Members of Congress. As representatives of the American people, we should not allow these conditions to continue. They must be stopped. I would like to quote from a personal report of the Byrd committee where it says, among other things:

> Functions which formerly would have been placed under the 10 departments of the Federal Government are delegated to a complex multitude of interlocking yet independent agencies, many of which have their own personnel, including administrative sections and statistics sections, thereby duplicating one another's functions at every turn.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the expansion of our Government is characterized by a tremendous increase in the number and complexity of the executive departments, commissions, bureaus, and agencies. They are staff and operating agencies of the Chief Executive. There are only four agencies of the legislative branch—the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office, the Architect of the Capitol, and the Botanical Gardens. There is not a single central staff organization of the Congress to which our membership can turn for the multitude of questions that arise in the course of a day's work on the subject of Federal waste, overlapping, and duplication of activities.

Mr. Speaker, we have in our Government the Bureau of the Budget with its ever-expanding staff of employees that is responsible only to the Chief Executive. Although the General Accounting Office has been given broad authority by the Congress it has become principally an auditing office of the Government. We have the great Civil Service Commission with its tremendous personnel. It is only a staff agency with no authority to advise with respect to Government employment or activity. We have no organization to represent the Congress with respect to the matters to which I have directed your attention. We need a staff agency that can act in an over-all capacity and furnish information and advice to Congress with respect to these important matters. It is utterly impossible for any single committee of Congress to attack these problems and expect to get results. It must be done through a central agency responsible entirely to Congress itself.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that provides for a congressional bureau of efficiency. It would be responsible only to Congress. It would be headed by a director selected by the majority and minority leaders and the Speaker of the House. The director would select three assistant directors, only one of whom shall belong to the same political party as the director. Each director shall head a division of the bureau, being, first, division of complaints and investigations; second, division of independent establishments, commissions and war agencies; and third, division of executive departments, the legislative branch, and the judiciary. They in turn will appoint employees necessary to carry out functions of the act.

It will be their duty to investigate and recommend legislation concerning: First, all nonessential Federal expenditures; second, overlapping and duplication of Federal activities and functions; third, excessive numbers of Federal personnel; fourth, procurement and disposal of all Federal property; fifth, all Federal personnel and administrative management practices; sixth, all requests for appropriations; seventh, exercise of authority and/or performance of functions in excess of constitutional or statutory authority; and eighth, any specific problem referred to the bureau by a joint resolution of Congress.

These three divisions are authorized to receive and obtain evidence regarding matters to which I called your attention. They will receive information and take evidence if necessary, will make investigations with respect to improvement, and, in all, would furnish Congress with definite information and constructive advice on any and all problems whereby our Government services and Government employment could be improved for the benefit of the people of this country. They would be authorized to employ such services as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the terms of the act and as may be required by Congress.

I hope the membership of the House will examine the measure and I trust I may have your approval of this proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that the passage of this measure will do more to provide for efficiency, economy, and for the saving of manpower as well as material and money than any measure that has been submitted for some time. It is likewise my judgment that if the membership of this Congress wants to begin to curb the ever-growing power of bureaucracy in our Government it ought to support the bill I have submitted for your consideration.

I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox.]

THE VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, there are those who feel that the service conducted in this House on yesterday was a hollow mockery, but we should be able to find in the Farewell Address of the Father of our Country a blistering and withering attack upon the totalitarian technique of government by force and fear. Mr. Speaker, while the message of the President vetoing the tax bill is characterized as an impeachment of the intelligence and patriotism of the Congress it does not anger me. My reaction is one of sorrow and distress, for there is to be seen

in it if not confirmation then certainly supporting evidence of the charge that the executive department of the Government has declared open warfare upon the legislative department and expects to force a public opinion that will insure success.

If this proves true, Mr. Speaker, then no matter how our external wars may terminate we shall have lost the very thing which our brave soldiers are fighting and dying to preserve.

I believe in our republican form of government, and I do not want to see it changed into any kind of despotism. I strongly subscribe to the doctrine that all powers of government should be so divided between different departments of government as to make impossible the transgression of one department upon the prerogatives of another without being checked by law.

Mr. Speaker, I am not contending that new conditions do not call for new remedies or that government should not change with the changing spirit of the people, but I do insist that changes which the people have not ordered should not be imposed upon them. We know full well that power feeds upon power, and that power unlimited and unrestrained soon degenerates into oppression. If there be no need for a Congress then let it be abolished—abolished not by edict, not by public neglect, not by the sword, but let it be abolished by the expressed will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, as for myself I am unwilling to put any one person, no matter who he might be, in possession of that boundless field of power represented by the sum of powers delegated to the three departments of government plus the reserved powers retained by the people.

Mr. Speaker, this Government still belongs to the people and I do not want to see it taken away from them. I do not want to see Congress treated with disdain. I do not want to see Members pushed around as if they were wooden men. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think this House should override the President's veto, override it not in anger, not in resentment of what doubtless appears to be a studied insult, but override it in the solemn conviction that not to do so might ultimately endanger the liberties of our people.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous consent request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], and of myself, that our distinguished and beloved chairman shall have the privilege of speaking first on a matter so vital to him and to all of us. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] may speak now, and through an agreement with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] that I may follow him, and then the gentleman from Oklahoma take the place under the special order that otherwise would have been taken by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and also to include at the close of my remarks an editorial carried in today's Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the President in his veto message expressed deep regret that he felt it his duty to return without his approval the tax bill which the Congress, and especially the Committee on Ways and Means, had labored so long in preparing, and which both branches of the Congress approved and sent to the President by overwhelming majorities, in the House by almost 3 to 1 on a roll-call vote and in the Senate with opposition so slight that a roll call was not requested.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore, I deeply deplore, the fact that I feel it my duty in obedience to the dictates of my own judgment and conscience to speak and vote against the position taken by the President of the United States with respect to the tax bill. I repeat, I deeply regret that. I feel compelled to take this course.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you all know how long I have been a Member of the House of Representatives. I have served on the Committee on Ways and Means of the House since 1925, almost 19 years. I have had the honor and the responsibility of being the humble chairman of that committee since March 4, 1933, or almost 11 years, beginning simultaneously with the first term of the present occupant of the White House. I have endeavored at all times, so far as I consistently could, to be helpful to the party with which I am affiliated, and when there has been doubt in my mind about the position of the Executive or my own party I have always resolved that doubt in favor of going along and supporting the policies of the administration.

But, Mr. Speaker, the issue today is one that I consider as important as any in the history of our Government. Our Committee on Ways and Means, having the responsibility of initiating tax legislation, began work on the tax bill several months ago. I can say in all sincerity that I have never known any committee to work more earnestly or more conscientiously in order to bring out the best tax bill possible, a tax bill that would raise as much money as was reasonably possible, consistent with the ability of the taxpayers to pay for the support of this Government during the great crisis that now confronts us. I say our committee has worked long and conscientiously, yet we are accused in the President's message of delay in bringing in the tax bill. Among the other critical things in his statement is that of delay.

I do not criticize anyone so far as that is concerned; but may I say when we first began to give consideration to the tax bill the Treasury, although it had known for months when we were going to begin work on the tax bill, asked for additional time to make their presentation.

We always accord the Treasury Department and the administration the courtesy of allowing them to appear first to make their statements. We appreciate any assistance they can give. We waited for perhaps 4 weeks for the Treasury Department to appear. They said that appearing earlier would interfere with the bond-sale program. Of course, we were not to blame for that.

When we did get to work, we worked almost day and night except at times when we were requested and required to wait again and again on the representatives of the Treasury Department and those who represented the Treasury. Of course, in one or two instances we had to suspend our sessions in order to enable our staff to prepare necessary data. I do not believe there is a member of the great Committee on Ways and Means who would say that there was a deliberate delay on the part of our committee in the preparation and presentation of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, in 1942 we brought in a tax bill which raised revenues unprecedented in amount in all the history of this country. I, as chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, have reported, in obedience to the directions of our committee, more tax bills than any chairman in the history of this country. Our committee has framed more tax bills than have ever been reported in all the history of our country. I am rather proud of that fact.

I would be the last to question the right of the President of the United States to reject or to veto any bill that our committee prepares and reports, or that the Congress in its judgment passes.

I accord the President the right to veto any tax bill and to assign his reasons therefor, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that he should attempt to dictate what should go into a tax bill. I must part company with the President of the United States when he dictates what we shall do.

Mr. Speaker, although the President belittles the amount that the tax bill would produce if it becomes law, he stated at the end of his veto message, "If you will pass that portion of the bill which relates to excise taxes I will approve it." In other words, if you will accept my dictation, if you will do what I say, if you will abdicate your responsibility and your prerogative, then I will approve what you do. If we were to do so, only about $1,000,000,000 of additional revenue would be realized, not the ten and one-half billions requested and demanded.

As far as I know, and as far as I have been able to ascertain, throughout all the history of this country from the time of George Washington down to the present day, this is the first time a President has ever vetoed a general revenue measure. If he had stopped with the veto, there would have been no murmur from me, no frown on my face, no complaint by me.

I believe he was misinformed and misled as to what the bill contains.

I have great respect for the President of the United States, now in office, as I have had for every President with whom I have served. There were six Presidents, beginning with President Taft, down to the present day.

I cannot go into details about this veto message, and it is not necessary for me to attempt to defend the tax bill, because it has had your approval and the approval of the Senate. But I feel that the President should have taken more time and given more consideration to this message, to see whether or not the statements, the implications, and the reflections on the wisdom and judgment of Congress, were well founded.

He did not give to Senator GEORGE, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, or to me, the humble chairman of your Committee on Ways and Means, the courtesy of conferring with us or discussing with us what was in the bill, to see what our thought was on the objections he cited and on which he based his opposition.

Mr. Speaker, there is not one of the objections he raised but that was not considered and discussed and debated in the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both of the tax committees. I do not have time to go into them, but every one of them was considered and approved by a majority, if not unanimously, of both branches of the Congress, and they were approved by each and every Member who signed the report of the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that if the President had had the facts in connection with the objections that he raised he would certainly have stated those objections and couched his message in a more courteous and considered manner.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to trespass further on the time of the House, because tomorrow we have an hour of debate and I shall perhaps use a part of that time.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may have 5 minutes of the time I have allotted to me later in the day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes of the time allotted to me today be given to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina has just evidenced a desire not to take further time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, in this veto message the President states that the blame and the responsibility for the difficulties the taxpayers are having in making out their Federal income-tax returns and the complexity of the returns rest entirely on the shoulders of Congress. If it is a true statement that it rests solely and entirely on the Congress, and any member of the Committee on Ways and Means will rise and verify that statement, I will retract it. I pause to see if any Member of the majority or the minority side will say that that statement is justified. I see that no one rises.

The Treasury is charged with the duty of preparing the returns and issuing instructions. They carry out the will of Congress, of course. But there is not a tax on the statute books today—the Victory tax, the withholding tax, or any taxes that cause difficulty in the computation of tax returns—that was not at least approved by the President of the United States when he signed the revenue bills.

Of the powers given to the Federal Government in the Constitution, none is so carefully guarded as the taxing power. A brief glance at history tells us why the founding fathers placed these restraints and safeguards around the power of the Federal Government to levy taxes. In the Old World taxation had been the instrument most often used to abuse and grind down a helpless people.

Taxation imposed and controlled by persons not subject to the will of those taxed was the direct cause of our Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution. Our forefathers, remembering the injustices of Old World taxation and stinging under the lash of taxation without representation, took every precaution that unbridled and unjustifiable taxation could not prevail in these United States and that taxation could not fall into the control of any person not responsible to the people. Taxation without representation caused the patriots of Boston to rebel, and under the leadership of Washington they and other patriotic Americans threw off the yoke of tyranny and established a democratic government surpassed nowhere in the world today. Are we, the representatives of 130,000,000 Americans, ready to return to the order and place the taxing power in the hands of, or to be dictated by, a small group responsible to the Executive, and to the Executive alone, or are we to keep that power in the hands of the American people, to be exercised through duly elected representatives of their own choosing?

When the people in the Constitution gave the taxing power to the Congress of the United States, they clearly specified that all taxation should be uniform throughout the United States; that direct taxes should be assessed in proportion to the population; and above all, they required that all tax measures should originate in the House of Representatives. Clearly the people were determined to keep the taxing power under the greatest restraint compatible with the necessities of the Republic and to place it, to as great a degree as possible, in the hands of their representatives who were most responsible and amenable to the will of the people, namely, the House of Representatives. Under this rule the Members of the House who originate bad tax legislation can be removed, at least within 2 years.

Thus, no single power in the entire Constitution is so clearly and completely placed in the hands of the Congress, and no one examining history impartially can doubt that it is the will of the people that the Congress of the United States should determine the amount of tax revenue to be secured and the sources and methods of procuring this revenue. So far as I know, no President in the history of our Nation has violated this tradition or attempted to thwart this basic concept by vetoing a tax bill. Notwithstanding this tradition and practice in our Republic since its inception, no one denies the bare legal right of the President of the United States to veto any measure passed by Congress. However, I resent deeply the circumstances, the methods, the reasons, and the language of this veto message. It does not, as a state paper should, concern itself with the central question; it extends far beyond the necessities of the occasion to make gratuitous slaps at the Congress and contains political platitudes which are not only erroneous and unfounded in fact but are subject only to the construction that they are intended to discredit the Congress and to impair the confidence of the American people in their chosen representatives.

Knowing the President of the United States as I do, I do not view this message as coming from him. It has none of the earmarks of his usual dignified, courteous, and helpful approach to matters of state. I see in this document the hands of a group of individuals not in any sense responsive to the will of the American people, with whom the President is pleased to consult in matters of this kind. This seems clear from a reading of the message itself.

Has the President the time or the opportunity to study and understand the complicated reorganization provisions of the income-tax laws to which his message relates, the many involved economic and legal aspects surrounding the technical subjects covered by this bill? You and I know that he does not. Obviously, he is operating solely under the advice of this group to which I refer.

This makes the thwarting of the will of the American people in their carefully guarded grant of the taxing power to the Congress of the United States complete. By this step that power is removed from the Congress and placed in the hands of a group of individuals beyond the reach of the people of this country.

The President in his veto message seeks to place the responsibility for the complication of the tax laws squarely upon the Congress. But under the Constitution, the duty to issue regulations, prepare income-tax forms, and administer the tax laws is an Executive power and not a legislative power. If the forms and instructions are complicated and confusing to the taxpayer, the fault lies not with the legislative branch but with the Executive.

So far as the tax laws are concerned and the formulation of tax policy, most of the efforts of our committee have been devoted to studying and eliminating unsound and ill-devised schemes of taxation sponsored by the Treasury Department. In his Budget message for the

fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, the President stated:

Finally it is more important than ever before to simplify taxation both for taxpayers and for those collecting the tax, and to put our taxes as far as feasible on a pay-as-you-go basis.

With the exception of repeal of the earned-income provision and the disallowance of any deduction for Federal excise taxes, both of which suggestions are contained in the present bill, the only other proposal suggested by the Treasury was the removal of more than 9,000,000 taxpayers from the tax rolls at a time when there is the strongest possible reason for keeping them on the tax rolls. I would like at this point to mention some of the complicated and outlandish proposals suggested by the Treasury Department in the last few years, which, if adopted, would have, in my opinion, caused a complete break-down of our income-tax system. I will start only with their recent proposals which were presented to us since November 1941. On November 5, 1941, the Secretary of the Treasury advocated the following plan to our committee:

A new supplementary tax on net income might be imposed to be withheld at the source on salaries, wages, dividends, bond interest, and similar items, and to be collected on other incomes quarterly throughout the year. These taxes would thus be collected insofar as possible like the pay-roll taxes. They would, however, have personal exemptions and credits for dependents. The supplementary tax would be deducted from net income in computing the income tax. Because of this deduction and because of the personal exemptions the increase in effective rate of tax would never be as high as the stated rate of tax. If the rate of this supplementary tax were 15 percent and the existing personal income-tax exemptions of $750 for single persons and $1,500 for married couples, with a dependent credit of $400 were allowed, it is estimated that at present income levels the net increase in tax revenue would be about $2,800,000,000.

This plan, as will be seen, called for a superincome tax in addition to the regular income tax, and the supertax thus paid would have been allowed as a deduction in computing the regular income tax. Income, which was not from salaries, wages, dividends, bond interest, and similar items, was to be collected from farmers, businessmen, and others, quarterly, throughout the year. This would be in addition to regular income tax. If this plan had been adopted, our farmers and businessmen, in addition to paying the regular income tax, would have to pay a supplementary tax and make quarterly returns. Is this not more than the regular income tax?

Another proposal, which would have undoubtedly caused a break-down of our tax system is the spendings tax. The spendings tax was divided into two parts: One a flat-rate tax to be refunded after the war and a progressive surtax. The refundable part of the spendings tax would be imposed at a flat rate of 10 percent on the total spendings of individuals for consumer goods and services. The exemptions from spending were $500 for a single person, $1,000 for a married person, and $250 for each dependent. The individual spendings surtax was levied at graduated rates on spendings. And the exemptions were different from the individual spendings tax. In the case of the spendings surtax, there was allowed $1,000 for a single person, $2,000 for a married person, and $500 for each dependent. These two spendings taxes were in addition to the regular income taxes.

When the Treasury appeared before our committee this year, they proposed a post-war refund for the individual income, which would have allowed a greater post-war refund to a single person than to a married person or a person with dependents. This is shown by the following table:

Net income before personal exemption	Post-war credit		
	Single person	Married person	Married person with 2 dependents
$2,000	$55	$45	$33
$3,000	74	62	52
$5,000	117	103	91
$10,000	243	227	210

We are now busily engaged in preparing legislation simplifying the tax laws and returns as far as possible. This subject can ordinarily be undertaken when we devote our entire time to it and are not confronted with other problems, such as the raising of additional revenue and legislation relating to renegotiation.

The issue is simple and clear. It is: Shall the people of this Nation retain, as they zealously sought to do in the Constitution, a complete and direct control over the taxes they are to pay, or shall we permit a group of irresponsible individuals to thwart the will of our people?

Under permission previously granted, I insert the following editorial appearing in today's Washington News:

A SORRY VETO MESSAGE

Of all the failures of the Roosevelt administration the most tragic has been in fiscal policy.

Through 8½ years of peace, with a new but little-and-late tax bill every year, the administration never even approached a balanced budget for a single year. It increased the public debt in peacetime roughly from twenty-two billions to fifty billions. Now, after 2 years and 2 months of war, the debt is one hundred and eight-six billions, and the administration has shown itself just as incapable of formulating a war tax program as it was of evolving a peace tax program.

Nor does there seem to be much hope for progress from this point on. For the administration has engaged Congress in a bitter and recriminating battle over tax policies, and has carried the fight to Congress in a way which affords little prospect of compromise or cooperation in the future.

In yesterday's accusing veto message, the President tried to load onto Congress practically all the blame for the whole tax mess—ranging from the inadequacies of revenue to the complexities of tax forms. Yet anyone who has the slightest knowledge of how tax measures have been initiated, developed, and enacted over the last 11 years, knows full well that the Treasury Department's clumsy and clammy hand has smeared every tax statute—and knows also that in playing politics with the Nation's revenue needs, the Treasury spokesmen have reflected accurately the President's own approach.

Rules of common fairness should have constrained the President to admit that the shortcomings of the bill he vetoed, as well as of the whole tax structure, are as much his fault as the fault of Congress.

It was pretty raw to accuse Congress of failing to provide adequate revenues when the President's spokesmen have failed to propose adequate measures, and have indeed blocked every congressional effort to work out a real tax bill.

It was pretty raw to blame Congress for the complexities of the tax law and forms when the truth is that most of the complications have come about through the Treasury's insistence. For instance, the President charges much of this year's tax mess to the Ruml plan, which he disowns. The truth is that the Ruml plan was as simple as any plan could be, shifting the tax base up 1 year to put all taxpayers on pay-as-you-go. If left to its own judgment Congress doubtless would have adopted that simple plan. But Congress didn't adopt the Ruml plan because the President said at the time he would veto it. What Congress did adopt was a compromise drawn up to appease the President and the Treasury. That compromise is causing the trouble which would have been avoided had the Ruml plan prevailed.

The bill the President vetoed is inconsequential. Whether it is killed, or survives the veto, is of little moment. What is of great importatnce is that the administration and Congress get together on honest and adequate taxes to pay as we fight a far larger share of this war's costs. The leadership the President is showing is not calculated to achieve that result.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, any veto message of any President, who in a representative democracy is entitled, as well as the Congress, to speak for the best interests of the people, is entitled to full consideration by the Congress. A veto of a general revenue bill for the first time in the history of the Republic is not only entitled to the fullest consideration of the Congress, but the implications of the message must be considered as well as the direct statements contained therein.

My study of the President's veto message on the 1943 revenue bill has led me to the definite conclusion that I should vote to override the veto, first, because I do not agree with what I consider to be the necessary implications of the message, nor do I feel that the charges against the pending tax bill can be sustained on a factual basis. In time of war the President of the United States carries the heaviest burden of any one man in the United States. Under such circumstances, it would be a physical impossibility for the President to personally familiarize himself with all of the technical details of a complicated tax measure. It is therefore my assumption that the President's confidential adviser or advisers on his veto message either were not familiar with all the facts, or else failed to lay all of the facts before the President.

With respect to the implications of the veto message, I feel the message has

raised a vital issue of representative democracy under a constitutional form of government, in which the power to levy taxes is conferred upon the legislative branch of the Government. The major issue of the Revolutionary War was taxation without representation. The framers of the new government not only provided that the people should be represented by those who laid taxes upon them, but further specifically provided that all revenue bills should originate in the House of Representatives, close to the people both in size of representation and in frequency of election. The President's veto message, submitted to us on yesterday, in effect announces a new principle, namely, that the executive branch of the Government should have the right and the power to shape not only the total tax burden to be imposed, but likewise the manner in which it is to be imposed.

A further implication of the veto message, in my humble opinion, is the implied theory that the Congress is justified in using its taxing power for purposes of social reform. The President refers to the fact that he asked the Congress for legislation to raise $10,500,000,000 over and above the existing revenue system. The message does not say how the sum of $10,500,000,000 of additional revenue is to be raised, but the President's Secretary of the Treasury explained those details to us at the commencement of public hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the pending bill last spring. Secretary Morgenthau requested us to relieve of any further direct contribution to the war effort 9,000,000 taxpayers, shifting their burden to the backs of those of larger income and adding a total of $6,500,000,000 of new income taxes to the current tax liability of those in the middle and high-income tax brackets. He also recommended increases in the income-tax rates of corporations of such severity that in many instances no return or only a nominal return would be left upon invested capital and no reserve fund would be left to those engaged in war production for the essential purpose of peacetime reconversion if we are to maintain the American system of private enterprise.

The first vote taken in the Ways and Means Committee was on the question of the policy involved in that proposed use of the taxing powers of the Government and the committee voted unanimously against it. Time will not permit me to enumerate the numerous instances in the past 10 years in which the Treasury Department, speaking for the President, has urged our committee to use its taxing powers to accomplish social reforms deemed to be desirable and in the interests of public welfare.

In framing the Revenue Act of 1943, the Ways and Means Committee adhered to the principle we deemed to be fundamental, that taxes should be levied for the purpose of revenue and for revenue only. Nor were we unmindful of the fact that the great Chief Justice John Marshall said, in the early case of McCulloch against Maryland that the power to tax "involves the power to destroy." We were unwilling to report to the House a revenue bill which we thought would ultimately liquidate the middle classes of America and impair the structure of many corporate entities. And when we sought to turn to the only remaining major source of revenue, namely, a retail sales tax, Treasury officials emphatically told us, and likewise told the Senate Finance Committee, that regardless of how much the bill fell short of the goal it recommended it did not wish one penny to be added by means of a retail sales tax of any character. And Treasury officials were so emphatic in their opposition to a sales tax that the impression was justified that should such a provision be included in the bill we would invite a Presidential veto.

Acting, therefore, within those unavoidable limitations, we framed a bill calculated to add approximately $2,300,000,000 of new revenue to the existing tax system. Included in that new revenue was an increase of about $660,000,000 in additional personal-income taxes brought about through the elimination of the earned-income credit—a step likewise in the direction of tax simplification—and an increase in corporate taxation of approximately $500,000,000 through the increase of the excess-profits tax from 90 to 95 percent. While condemning that bill as being inadequate and unrealistic, the President has requested us to drop all of the provisions of the bill except those relating to excise taxes and enact as a new war revenue measure a bill merely increasing certain existing excise taxes and adding certain new ones, the aggregate of which will be about $1,000,000,000.

The veto message complains of the action of the Congress in freezing the social-security tax at the level of 2 percent and claims that the bill thus cancels $1,100,000,000 of tax money. Corporations are entitled by law to deduct from gross income all Social Security Act taxes before computing their income-tax liability. I do not have exact figures on what those deductions amount to, but it is possible for them to amount to as much as $500,000,000 in view of the 80 percent effective income-tax rate which many large corporations now engaged in war work are paying In any event, while the social-security pay-roll tax is called a tax, it is in reality a program of compulsory bond purchase, since every dollar of the so-called pay-roll tax is immediately invested in Government bonds, which are then placed in the social-security trust fund. The Social Security Act is a Government insurance program under which both the employer and the employee contribute to a fund to be used to meet the old-age annuity and other insurance benefits. In no sense, therefore, is a pay-roll tax a contribution by the people of the Nation to the war effort, nor was it ever contemplated that the so-called tax on pay rolls would be used to finance the war or any other undertaking of the Government separate and apart from the insurance program.

The veto message alleges that the pending bill would disappoint and fail the American taxpayers because it does not include tax simplification. Last summer, I raised in our committee the issue of tax simplification, and Treasury officials were most emphatic in their statement that, other than revising to a slight extent the tentative form which had been prepared by Treasury officials for use by taxpayers this year, it would be impossible for us to include in the 1943 Revenue Act a tax-simplification program. Consequently, our committee proceeded with the rate bill with the positive understanding that the Treasury Department would have definite suggestions ready for us on the subject of tax simplification when the rate bill had been disposed of. The Treasury Department is not ready yet, although the veto message states:

> The Nation will readily understand that it is not the fault of the Treasury Department that the income-tax payers are flooded with forms to fill out which are so complex that even certified public accountants cannot interpret them. No; it is squarely the fault of the Congress of the United State.

And so forth. Let it be remembered that in every tax bill framed by our committee during the past decade the Treasury Department in every instance has laid down before us a full and complete blueprint of what the tax program is to be, and, prior to last year, those blueprints have been largely followed, on the assumption we were being advised by real experts in the field of taxation. Voluminous regulations have been issued by the Treasury Department on every tax bill and in its own language, and if certified public accountants cannot understand that language, the Congress should not be blamed. All the income-tax forms have been prepared by Treasury officials. Treasury officials prepared the 1040-A form to be used in 1944, carrying 24 entries against a previous 6 entries, and did not make any change in that tentative form until I secured a copy of it and criticized its complexity before our committee, when Treasury officials then slightly revised the form in the interest of simplification.

The pending bill is criticized because it does not carry graduated withholding rates. It is not feasible or practical to provide for graduated withholding rates when there is one exemption for income taxes, a different exemption for Victory taxes, and a multitude of authorized deductions from produced income not involved in the earning thereof. Consequently, Treasury officials frankly told our committee it would be impossible to work out a tax plan to eliminate the necessity of any return for those in the lowest income brackets unless and until the Congress changed those features of the existing law. Our committee took a step in that direction by integrating the Victory tax with the income tax, providing for a minimum income-tax liability for those not otherwise included. Treasury officials objected so strenuously to the policy of thus reaching a group of small earners it induced the Senate Finance Committee to strike that provision from the House bill and restore the Victory tax.

With respect to the Renegotiation Act, the changes in that act carried in the pending bill will result in increased revenue for the Government and in better

administration of the price-adjustment program. The most essential feature in the renegotiation section is the assertion of what we regard to be a fundamental democratic principle, that no citizen of this country shall have his property taken from him by the Government for war purposes or any other purpose without the citizen having a day in court and an opportunity to be heard before a fair and impartial tribunal. It is generally admitted that the Renegotiation Act itself is undemocratic, and this effort of the Congress to make it more democratic should be commended and not criticized. So far as I can understand, not one word of complaint has been voiced to the President by any war agency of the Government called upon to administer the provisions of the Renegotiation Act. On the contrary, I am informed, and therefore so assert, that both the War and Navy Departments feel that the changes provided in the pending revision of the renegotiation law improve it.

The remaining criticisms of the pending revenue bill relate primarily to tax concessions given to coal, natural gas, and lumber companies. The estimated loss of revenue is predicated upon the assumption that such companies will continue to increase production regardless of the impact of war taxes upon them. With all due deference to the patriotism of those engaged in such industries, it is only fair to say that they have a right to receive a reasonable price for the sale and disposal of a consumable natural resource. And it was cogently argued before our committee that a 90- or 95-percent excess-profits tax upon increased war production would not leave to the owner of depletable natural resource a fair price for his property consumed in the war effort. With a view, therefore, of stimulating increased production of products vitally needed in the war effort, some tax concessions were made, the total of which, in my opinion, will have no more than a nominal effect upon total tax receipts.

Knowing how long and how faithfully the distingished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has labored in the vineyard, patriotically serving his State and Nation, and how loyal he has been to the leader of his party, it is a matter of genuine regret to me that the President did not see fit to give him an opportunity to be heard on the merits of the pending bill before he vetoed it. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] has served in the House of Representatives longer than any man has ever served from his native State of North Carolina, and you could count on the fingers of one hand those who in the entire history of the Nation have served longer than he in the House. He has served longer as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee than any other man in history, and has handled more tax bills than any other previous chairman. Within a period of less than a decade under his leadership the revenue laws of the country have been changed and revised from the point where they raised only $3,000,000,000 of revenue to the point where they will raise approximately $43,000,000,000 of revenue, including what is to be raised by the pending bill. Notwithstanding an age far beyond that of three score and ten, no Member of the Congress has worked harder or been more tireless in his efforts in behalf of adequate tax legislation. In the spring of 1942 the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] felt that he had earned the privilege of retirement. He did not need his congressional salary because he had always been a hard worker, a frugal man, and shrewd in his business transactions. He longed to spend the sunset of his life midst the peace and quiet of his beloved North Carolina hills. But the President appealed to him to stay, saying that he owed it to the war effort to give to the Congress and to the Nation the benefit of his long experience in tax matters and his skill in piloting revenue bills. ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON yielded to that plea and stayed with us. And now I am going to stay with him, and if you agree with me that he should not be repudiated, vote with me to uphold his hand by voting to override this veto message. And over and above all else, a vote to override the veto will be a vote not only to maintain our self-respect but a vote to discharge the duty we owe to those who elected us.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, it is an onerous task to be expected to discuss without heat a veto message that contains as many disparagements of the legislative department of government as the message of yesterday. Mark the difference between the Farewell Address of the Father of his Country, that dignified, loving message, as compared with the sarcastic, caustic reference to the legislative department in this veto message of yesterday. All down American history these collisions between the rulers of the people and the representatives of the people have occurred. They usually have occurred on the subject matter of taxation. So this incident is not new. But let me warn the Chief Executive that not once in the course of American history or in the course of Anglo-Saxon history has a contest between the rulers of the Anglo-Saxon people and the representatives of the Anglo-Saxon people been lost by the representatives of the people. The representatives of the people have always won. Our forefathers were fresh from such a contest when they provided in the Constitution that the tax-levying power should be in the House of Representatives, the closest representatives of the people, those who in 2 years would be solely accountable to the people. That rule of law was laid down by the Constitution, the basic law of our country. It has never, as I have heard said, until yesterday, been violated by the Chief Executive. Never, until yesterday, has that tradition or that rule been violated by the Chief Executive. True, he has a right to veto; but has that ever been exercised? It has never been necessary to exercise it. The veto is a safeguard in the event that the legislative department should lose its moorings and do something outrageous and abhorrent to common sense and decency. But the representatives of the people in America have never done that; no occasion has ever yet arisen, and the occasion is not here now, where the Executive needs to come into this body with such a caustic anti-Congress message as this.

Now let me address the Members of the House who like to call themselves liberals. I grant you that right, unless you use it simply as a sweet morsel to roll on your tongues. What greater disciple of constitutional government has there been than Woodrow Wilson? Do you know his language? He said:

> The history of liberty—
>
> The history of liberty, I tell you—liberty of the individual, if you please—
>
> is the history of the limitation on the powers of government.

That limitation is in the Constitution. The tax levying power is a special power of the Congress beginning in the House of Representatives, only to be violated by veto when the Congress itself has violated some fundamental feature, which has never occurred.

Now let us see what the composite judgment of 516 Members of Congress was on this subject. Let us see how much money we need. First let us see how much money we have spent. The First World War began with a public debt of $1,282,000,000. It rose to $26,000,000,000 and we cut it down in the twenties to $16,000,000,000.

We began the Second World War with a public debt of $65,000,000,000. In addition to this we have appropriated $366,000,000,000, $285,000,000,000 of which has been obligated. Under the present law and this bill which has been vetoed, the Treasury estimates we will collect $42,000,000,000. My personal estimate is it will be nearer $45,000,000,000 than $42,000,000,000. Let it go at $42,000,000,000. Add to that $42,000,000,000 the $12,000,000,000 collected in local, State, and municipal taxes, and you have a tax take from the American people of something between $52,000,000,000 and $58,000,000,000. The administration only expects to spend $90,000,000,000 on the war effort this year. True, the President asks for $10,500,000,000, and then some greater authority on mass psychology frightened somebody with some statement about $16,000,000,000. But current history reminds you that after the President had asked for $10,500,000,000 the renegotiation services announced that they had returned $2,500,000,000 to the Treasury and within the last few weeks the Army and Navy have announced in the public press that they are returning $27,000,000,000 to the Treasury. Those facts are part of the evidence that impelled the composite judgment of the representatives of the people that if we could raise $2,000,000,000 by this bill, added to the $42,000,000,000 under existing law, we are raising tremendous amounts of money from the American people. The American people expect their representatives in Congress to raise that money and do not expect the Chief Executive to raise it.

Now, suggestion has been made that this bill raises less than $1,000,000,000. Mark me, we are told that when that message was read to the majority leader of the Senate he said to the Chief Executive:

That statement does not conform to the facts, and if that goes in the veto message I shall take the floor in the Senate and make a speech against the message and will vote against the veto.

That statement is incorrect. Did you notice this veto message was divided in three ways? Here is part No. 1. There is a line. Here is part No. 2, and down here is part No. 3. I wonder who the respective authors of those divisions were.

Now, it was said by the President that "the Ruml plan is not the product of this administration." I thought we had settled it in the interest of national unity last year. I, too, opposed the Ruml plan, if you will remember, not only on the floor but in every vote. But how in the name of all that is honest and reasonable did the Ruml plan ever become the law? Who signed the bill containing the Ruml plan? The author of this veto message. And he complains, because it was popular, about the complications of the tax bills. We have had a tax bill every year in recent years, every one of them more or less complicated, and they could not have become the law in any manner, shape, or form without the signature of the Chief Executive, the author of this veto message.

Now, here is what confronts us. There is an income this year of about $157,000,000,000; $125,000,000,000 of it, or four-fifths of all the income, comes into the pockets of people making less than $5,000 per annum. About half the people are making more money, much more than they made before the war, and about half the people are making about the same as they did, or even less, and their cost of living has gone up. How are you going to get money from the former half except by cutting the throats of the segment that is making less money? The rates on both groups, to be legal, must be uniform. Not a word from the Treasury, not a word from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, not a word from the White House how to do that job. It is one of those things that is humanly impossible. If we attempted it with a personal excess profits tax, the complications in the present tax law would look like a summer zephyr compared with a tornado in complications. Absolutely impossible to do it.

Now, did you hear about the full-blood Indian who did not say what he was talking about? Not a word in the veto message about the swollen coffers of the nonprofit organizations. Yes. Labor unions and others. Down my way a cooperative organization is buying a huge refinery, going into the oil business in competition with other companies and individuals and corporations, and escaping scot free from taxes. This provision makes them come out in the open. It makes the racketeers in labor come out into the open and tell us what they are doing with the honest laboring men's money, and puts it on the table so that we can see what we can do about taxing them. The Treasury has authority to do that now, but it does not do it and has not done it, and this bill makes it mandatory.

Mr. Speaker, this is an anti-Congress fight. This was an anti-Congress message. Read it back and forth and you can make nothing else out of it except that it is an anti-Congress message designed for the 1944 campaign, and that gage of battle was not thrown by the legislative department. It was thrown by the executive department, and we must accept that gage of battle here and now.

When the majority leader in the Senate rises in his place and says, "I shall vote to override this veto; I say in effect this is an improper veto," and when he says it is an attack upon the integrity and intelligence of every Member of Congress, and that any Member of Congress who does not vote to override the veto sacrifices his own self-respect, then I say to you the time has come.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. No; not now.

Mr. Speaker, do you remember even after Polk was elected, Webster rallied the Whigs? "What, though the field be lost, all is not lost. Honor yet remains." Honor yet remains. That is all that is involved. It transcends all other issues. This challenge must be accepted. It is unfortunate that it is here. We may have other collisions of this kind, but this challenge must be accepted, this veto overriden.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed today some very remarkable events on Capitol Hill. These events will be far reaching and of great consequence. No one can foretell their wide implications. I want to compliment the courageous conduct of those who have found it necessary to break some bonds that have heretofore been unbroken. There has come a time in their lives and their service when they have put their country's need and their own honor and their devotion to the great Congress in which they serve, above the bonds of partisan fealty. We on the Republican side have not failed to observe and appreciate this situation and we honor and respect our courageous colleagues who have indicated that they expect to heed the call of duty.

We rejoice especially in the action of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for whom we have just witnessed one of the greatest ovations ever accorded to any Member of Congress by the membership of this House. From this demonstration it is easy to conclude that the House of Representatives has again proven to the world that it is the bulwark of American liberty. It has lived up to the expectation of the framers of the Constitution who reposed in the House of Representatives the sacred trust of keeping the public purse. It has valiantly withstood the attempt of the Executive to usurp the functions of the legislative branch of the Government. In this respect this is not a new fight because for ages and centuries the battle between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government has been waged. History records that in every conflict between the people and the ambitious Executives the people have won. The people will win in this conflict. I am proud to be a Member of this great body, and am especially proud of the action of my colleagues today.

Tomorrow we will be called upon to vote as to whether we will sustain the veto of the President or whether we will reaffirm the action which we have heretofore taken with reference to the so-called tax bill.

There is no denying the fact that the President in sending his veto message acted entirely and completely within his constitutional right. The Constitution provides that when a bill has passed both Houses of Congress that it shall then be presented to the President and he shall either approve it or return it to Congress with his objections. This constitutes a veto. The Constitution does not put any qualifying restrictions on the action of the President. However, the fact that the Executive and the Congress are two coordinate branches of the Government has always suggested that common sense and common courtesy should mark the relationship between both departments. Common sense and common courtesy has built up between these two departments a very strong tradition concerning the attitude of the Chief Executive toward the Congress with reference to all matters of finance. The Executive has both by choice and by constitutional direction been forced to recognize the fact that the Constitution has given to Congress the exclusive right and responsibility of laying taxes and providing the revenue with which to operate the Government. The Constitution also expressly provides that no money can be drawn from the Treasury of the United States except by appropriation properly made in the form of a law by the action of Congress. Thus it can be clearly seen that the Constitution places the responsibility for the collecting and the spending of all moneys directly upon Congress. This fact has been well recognized by all of the Presidents that have served our Republic from the days of George Washington. The present incumbent is the first to violate this heretofore unbroken rule and to shatter this well-founded tradition.

The veto power of the President is the remnant of the powers of the kings. Gradually these powers have been whittled away by the progress of freedom and liberty in the world. When our forefathers wrote the Constitution, they debated this matter most exhaustively. There were some who felt that both the executive and judicial branches of the Government should have the right to veto the acts of the legislative branch and that their veto should stand unless overruled by three-fourths of the Members of Congress. This group had not gotten as far away from the rule of kings as the majority of the members of the Constitutional Convention, for there were many who felt that a majority of Congress was sufficient to override the President's veto. It was finally agreed that the judicial branch of the Government should have no power in overruling the acts of Congress and that a two-thirds majority would be a sufficient re-

quirement of the Congress for overriding the President's veto.

Early in the history of the Republic it was recognized that there were some legislative matters concerning which the Executive could exercise his veto with much more propriety than others. Legislation that concerned the rights of individuals, or the territorial powers of Congress were vetoed by the Presidents with greater alacrity than was legislation concerning the safekeeping of Government funds or the coining and printing of money or the raising and spending of revenue.

One text writer who has written extensively on the veto power of the President has this to say in support of my contention:

> The raising of revenue seems so well recognized a prerogative of Congress that no tax bill has ever been vetoed upon financial grounds, or even from constitutional consideration unmixed with personal animus.

Thus it may be seen that although the President had a perfect right to veto this tax bill, still if he felt called upon to break an unbroken rule, he should surely have some compelling reasons for his action. The contrast between Washington's Farewell Address, as it was read to us in the House yesterday immediately preceding the reading of Mr. Roosevelt's veto message, was most stirring. Anyone hearing both of these messages would be forced to conclude that Mr. Roosevelt's message did not contain any profound objections or reasons why this tax bill should be vetoed, but on the contrary it was so replete with inaccurate statements and unfair innuendo as to compel any fair-minded person to wonder why he had taken such action.

The only question at issue, of course, is whether the President is justified in this veto. That is the question. Before we can decide that, we must consider what the bill does and proposes to do. What does the bill contain? Let me in two or three sentences point out to you that the difference between the proposal of the President and this bill is the difference between ten and one-half billion and two and one-half billion. The President insisted on collecting ten and one-half billion, while the Congress maintains that two and one-half billion is as much as the country could stand. The difference between these two amounts is made up largely of a tax that would come out of people who pay taxes who have an income of less than $5,000. To have sufficient justification for overriding the President's veto, we must be able to show that we are right and the President is wrong.

Let me give you the figures of the revenues and the sources of the revenues that would be produced by the Treasury's bill and the bill passed by the Congress.

The Treasury bill would produce:

From increase in personal income taxes	$6,500,000,000
From increase in corporation taxes	1,100,000,000
From increase in estate and gift taxes	400,000,000
From increase in excise taxes	2,500,000,000
Total	10,500,000,000

The bill being vetoed would produce:

From increase in personal income taxes	$665,000,000
From increase in corporation taxes	502,000,000
From increase in excise taxes	1,050,000,000
From increase in postal rates, etc	97,000,000
Total	2,314,000,000

In the Treasury bill the increase on corporations would be the same percentage on small as larger corporations. In the vetoed bill the increase on corporations would be an increase in the rate on excessive profits.

Mr. Speaker, one of the charges that the President makes against Congress in his message that should be explained is the charge that Congress is solely responsible for the complex tax returns that the people are now struggling with. This message is very well timed for his purpose. All over the country we hear complaints going up that tax forms are so complicated and that the tax laws are so complicated.

The President has taken advantage of that psychology to give to the people the impression that this is all due to the Congress of the United States. The gentleman from Oklahoma laid stress on this item; I want to stress it again. The facts are that not a single line of any regulation or requirement that is written into a tax form or a tax return is prescribed by the law. Not one single line is prescribed by the Committee on Ways and Means, not one single line is prescribed by the Congress of the United States. These forms are left entirely to the Treasury. That is the function of the Treasury, and they have exercised it through all these years. They have exercised it this year. The President must have been misinformed. When we come to consider this matter closely it is no great wonder that the tax blanks are becoming increasingly complex for in the last 11 years we have passed 17 new tax bills, everyone of which has been superimposed upon the old tax structure. Each and every one of these tax bills have reached out farther and farther and have tapped many new sources of tax revenues. Four years ago there were only about 4,000,000 people paying Federal income taxes in this country. Today over 50,000,000 people pay these taxes.

In other words, the number of taxpayers has been increased by 46,000,000 in the last 4 years. You cannot expect a situation like that to be developed without there being a lot of friction and a lot of confusion. And this is more the reason why the Treasury should have exercised the greatest possible care to make the tax blanks as understandable as possible.

A distinguished Congressman presented this proposition to me today: Why not go ahead and follow the President's suggestion and pass legislation levying excise taxes only? Mr. Speaker, this would not be a fair solution of the problem. If we are to pass a revenue bill levying only excise taxes it would be much more statesmanlike to pass a sales tax and be done with it. I am sure that few, if any, of those who support the President's veto will declare for a sales tax.

There is one provision of the President's message with which I agree most profoundly, if I may be facetious. Here is a provision in his message—the last provision in his message where he says:

> In the interest of strengthening the home front, in the interest of speeding the day of victory, I urge the earliest possible action.

I, too, urge the earliest possible action. What is the earliest possible action? The earliest possible action will come tomorrow. That is the time set. On tomorrow the President will have this one paragraph of his message completely answered; it will be completely performed, because tomorrow we will do exactly what we should do, which I am sure will meet with the approval of the American people quite generally.

There are two other criticisms in the President's message that have not been discussed exhaustively this afternoon; one is renegotiation of contracts. If this message is sustained, the renegotiation sections of the bill go out and we return to the same place we were before. We will operate under the present law. Businessmen dealing with the Government in a contractual way will be subject to the same law and subjected to the same treatment as that against which they have complained so severely and so righteously.

There is no question that the new law is a tremendous improvement over the old law. This is attested by the fact that already there have been many changes in the course and attitude of the departments enforcing the law. And there is a much more hopeful attitude manifested by the businessmen, who are expecting to be renegotiated. The President is grossly in error in his statement to the effect that the Court of Tax Appeals is not the proper court to which appeals should be taken. Members of this court were consulted and stated that that court would assume these duties if the Congress assigned them to this court. I am afraid that the President and his close advisers are not in favor of such an appeal. This is a fair amendment. Every aggrieved person should have a right to redress his wrong and to do so in a court of justice.

One other matter I should like to discuss briefly. The President in his message signifies a strong disapproval of the sections which freeze the social-security tax for another year at the present rate of 1 percent. This matter is an amendment added to the tax bill by the Senate. The same step has been taken on two other occasions and were then ratified by the President. There is absolutely no reason to increase the contributions of the employer and the employee this year because the conditions are much more favorable now than they were when the rates were frozen heretofore. There is less drain on the trust funds now than probably at any time since the setting up of the social-security fund. The fund is in splendid shape from the standpoint of solvency. It has a surplus of seven times as much as there are potential demands upon

it. Why then increase that fund? If the President's message is sustained and the social-security tax is not frozen there will be $1,400,000,000 flow into the Treasury, half of which will be paid by labor. Those of you who have shown an interest in the welfare of labor may well take a note of this fact. The men who work and who pay social security will pay half of this large sum; $700,000,000 will come out their pockets and go into the hands of the spending agencies of the United States for distribution in the same manner as it has been distributed in the past. I am afraid that the President's and the New Deal's insatiable desire for money—big money—to spend and spend, has something to do with his opposition to the freezing of this pay-roll tax. The President's statement that the tax bill is a relief to the greedy is unfortunate, especially in view of the fact that it is not in accordance with the fact. Senator BARKLEY agrees with my views in this respect.

Mr. DISNEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. DISNEY. And that 1 percent is gross-income tax?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. It amounts to the same as a gross-income tax of 1 percent of his wages or salary.

Mr. DISNEY. The equivalent of a gross-income tax of 1 per cent?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. However, it is not revenue in the true sense of the word. It is true that the administration uses the funds paid by the employer and employee just as it uses the money that it receives as income taxes which are revenue. And it must not be forgotten that the administration uses these funds just as it uses money that it receives from a buyer of bonds. Therefore, I say again that this money is not revenue but it is borrowed money which the Government must repay to the fund if it is to be honest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What would the gentleman think should be the position of the several Members of the House who opposed the tax bill originally and so voted? Taking the tax bill in the abstract, it is the same bill. Now, what would the gentleman think their position should be tomorrow on the veto message? Will they have a chance to oppose again what they opposed before?

Mr. JENKINS. If the gentleman should be one of those in that category, and if he felt before that the tax bill was right and proper, if he had the full approval of his conscience then, and if he has the full approval of his conscience today, I think that he would vote to sustain the President's veto, if he cannot appreciate the argument of those of us who feel that the President's message is in reality a part of a battle wherein the President is attempting to usurp the powers and functions of the Congress.

Mr. POULSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. May I say that I was one of those who opposed the tax bill. I opposed it for several reasons, having had a little experience along tax lines. However, this time the issue is entirely different. It is far above and beyond the tax bill, it stands upon the fundamental principle of whether we are going to have our constitutional form of government and on that basis I am going to vote to override the veto.

Mr. JENKINS. I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from California. He expresses the sentiment that is running strong in this Chamber today.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman spoke about the renegotiation clause a moment ago. Am I to understand it is the position of himself and his party that there should be no renegotiation of war contracts?

Mr. JENKINS. No. The renegotiation of contracts has not been a party matter at any time. I was a member of the subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee that gave consideration to the amendments to the law. We offered several amendments to the original law which were accepted by the whole committee and which were approved by the House. The Senate made some changes in the House bill but on the whole the Senate followed the House plan. The bill passed by Congress is a great improvement over the present law. If we were to sustain the President's veto we would have to operate under the old law which was very unsatisfactory. The complaints that were made against the administration of the present law were numerous and positive. The amendments provided in this new tax bill, while not as corrective as I should like, still they are a great improvement. The raising of the limit from $100,000 to $500,000 will bring relief to the smaller contractors. The War and Navy Departments approved these changes. Their provision providing for a court review is a very salutary and important improvement. Likewise the fixing of a time limit is an improvement. The President apparently overlooked the fact that the new bill provides that the President may extend the expiration date for 6 months longer.

I shall vote to override the President's veto for I am convinced that the tax bill, as passed by both branches of Congress, is the best bill that could have been passed under all circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the gravest moments in the history of our country. As I look over this great group of splendid Representatives on both sides of the aisle, may I tell you what is uppermost in my thoughts and has been for the 25 years that I have served in the House of Representatives, a body known throughout the world as the greatest deliberative body in the world. If I were to pass out of the picture of this life right now, I would not be able to leave wealth in the form of money or insurance to my loved ones. Anything that I might have in the way of material goods would probably in due time turn to ashes. There is one security that I can leave and the only one that is worth while. It is the security in the form of a heritage that has come from the men representing both parties at all times, that is, our individual liberties guaranteed and paid for with the blood of the patriots of our country. And what a heritage that is.

Mr. Speaker, that is the issue today. It may not seem so to us living at this particular time in the world's history; however, we have seen all forms of representative government all over the globe lose their standing and their force as a voice of free people just because they were not vigilant and brave enough to face the encroachments.

Mr. Speaker, the veto of the revenue bill by the President does not raise a new issue. It is as old as the most ancient struggle for human freedom. It is the age-old contest between Anglo-Saxon liberty and attempted despotic rule. It has been wisely said that the struggle for Anglo-Saxon liberty has always been fought on the battlefield of taxation. The men who organized our form of government were familiar with this age-old fight, made by generation after generation of people to retain control of the public purse as against the attempt of arbitrary power to seize and use it. Throughout the centuries liberty-loving persons have suffered from ax and rack and flame to retain this fundamental right of taxation through the processes of representation. Those who framed our Federal Constitution had suffered from the tyranny of taxation without representation. They knew what happened when in 1603 James I, the first of the Stuart kings, came to the throne upon the death of Elizabeth. He claimed that he alone must decide who might or might not sit in the House of Commons. Furthermore, he decreed that Parliament could debate public matters only by his permission. This challenge of King James was met by men ready to risk life and property to regain the rights of freemen. They made the House of Commons their battlefield.

The first Parliament of King James' reign met in 1604. What was his message to the Commons? He notified this ancient forum of the people to forbear meddling "with anything concerning our government and the mysteries of state," and he further warned them that they derived their ancient liberty of freedom of speech from the "grace and permission" of himself.

What was the answer of the Commons? They informed the King that "the liberties of Parliament were an ancient right; that the affairs of the King, the making of laws, and the redress

of grievances were proper subjects of debate."

King James sent for the record, tore out the leaves with his own hands, and declared, "I will rule according to the common weal, and not according to the common will."

What does history record and the record show? It shows that King James was a reckless spendthrift. Such influence as he could gain he bought with whatever public funds he could get. It is recorded that in 1 month he divided £34,000 among six favorites. Within 2 years the public debt amounted to £800,000. The whole cost of government under Elizabeth had been only £300,000 a year.

The House of Commons resisted the attempted encroachments of King James inch by inch and year by year for 22 years. The fight for arbitrary control of the purse of the people did not end upon the death of King James in 1625. Charles I, the son of King James, came to the throne determined to make Parliament his rubber stamp. The men who met in the Parliament of May 1625 were men of iron; such men as Sir John Eliot and John Pym were not to be intimidated by threats or bribed by office. The House of Commons granted a tax so small that King Charles refused it and adjourned Parliament.

A war on the Continent, which failed, created such an enormous expense that the King in 1626 called another Parliament. Sir John Eliot, a member of the House of Commons, was determined to force King Charles to recognize the rights of Parliament. This attempt of Parliament, under the leadership of Sir John Eliot to regain their legislative rights, was rebuked by the King with this threat:

> Remember that Parliaments are altogether in my power for their calling, sitting, and dissolution; and, therefore, as I find the fruit of them to be good or evil, they are to be or not to be.

This battle for liberty against one-man tyranny went on for years. King Charles I resorted to every subterfuge to get money to squander. He put hundreds of prominent men in irons because they refused to loan him money. He renegotiated the wealthy without trial. John Hampden, one of the richest Commoners in England, when brought before the King's Council to be renegotiated, made this statement: "I could be content to lend but fear to draw on myself that curse in Magna Carta which should be read twice every year against those who infringe it."

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long battle and has required a ghastly sacrifice of blood and lives to win the battle for individual liberty through parliamentary processes. Millions of our young men are fighting on many foreign fronts in order to win for others, so they are led to believe, the liberties which our citizens enjoy under our form of government. To fail to protect, defend, and preserve the integrity and independence of the American Congress is to ignore the principles that have made this country great. It is to betray the brave crusading souls who have deemed no sacrifice too great, even life itself, to leave the rich heritage of liberty to succeeding generations.

Mr. Speaker, I am fully aware that the Congress today faces the grave question of self-preservation. The attack on Congress in the veto message of the President is in reality directed against the free men and women who under our form of government are sovereign in their own right. They act through representation. The instrumentality through which they exercise their sovereignty is the ballot. I am aware that the President in resorting to the veto of the tax bill has acted within his rights under section 7 of article I of the Federal Constitution, but a legislative power equal to two-thirds of the House of Representatives and of the Senate should only be exercised under the most extraordinary circumstances.

The objections contained in a veto message should be clear, convincing, and in strict accordance with the facts. Otherwise, the veto of tax legislation in times of war is a most dangerous exhibition of despotic power.

Mr. Speaker, I have not the time to analyze the President's veto message line by line nor topic by topic. However, the President refers to what he terms many special privileges embodied in the tax bill which he vetoed. I note that in subdivision (e) of his message he states:

> Commercial air lines are granted an unjustifiable extension of the tax subsidy on their air mail contracts.

This criticism on his part is an astounding betrayal of abysmal ignorance. It is as stupid as his pre-Pearl Harbor statement condemning those who urged a two-ocean Navy. It is as inept and on as low a plane as his appeasement policy in suffering and permitting this country to arm Japan when he could have prevented it by recognizing a state of war to exist between China and Japan, and his failure to interfere with the subsidies paid to Japan for her gold in amounts sufficient to pay for the war materials to build her Navy, equip her land forces and supply the engines for her planes, and even the oil to run them.

Now then, what are the facts with reference to the civil air lines which he claims are granted an unjustifiable extension of the tax subsidy on their air-mail contracts under the terms of this bill?

Let us not so soon forget the lessons this war has taught us.

The one thing we had when war came that was ready for war on a minute's notice was the civil air-line industry.

Without the need for long delay and painfully drawn out preparation that industry afforded us transport aircraft and trained men for use throughout the world.

The reason for this is to be found in two acts of Congress. One was the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. The other was a provision of the original Excess-Profits Tax Act.

The 1938 act provided for mail compensation fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board so as to enable the air lines to prepare for the national defense. This meant buying equipment, expanding organizations, extending routes, and laying the ground work for mobilization to do the wartime tasks for which the civil air lines are so peculiarly qualified.

The 1940 Excess-Profits Tax Act would, however, have resulted in defeating the purposes of the 1938 act, by simply taking away what Congress had provided for in 1938, had it not been for a provision we included therein. That provision was that the tax would not apply to an air line in a given year unless the nonmail income alone is such as to give an air line adjusted excess-profits net income.

The amendment to this provision made in the act which the President has vetoed is only a perfecting technical amendment. The present law subjects the air line to the tax if in a single year, due to temporary abnormal conditions, its nonmail income jumps—even though in prior and subsequent years that income is low. So, by the amendment, we would provide simply that for the purpose of figuring the excess-profits credit to be carried over or carried back in determining the air line's status in the tax year there shall also be the mail pay exclusion. Thus the air line will be dealt with in the light of its experience over the period of the carry-over and carry-back years, which is entirely consistent with sound tax policy and, indeed, with the theory of the Excess-Profits Tax Act itself.

It was only because of the 1938 act, buttressed and protected by the provision of the act of 1940, that the air lines were ready for war. Without that legislation we would have had an air-line industry in a hopelessly impotent state. Without that legislation we would not have had the aircraft which saved Dutch Harbor, which stopped Rommel in Egypt, which in so many ways have helped shorten this war. The lives of hundreds of thousands of our troops have been saved by the action of Congress in 1938 and 1940. And a Jap invasion of Alaska, which would have given it bases to bomb our Northwest, was forestalled.

No man can say today how or when this war will end. It, and its succeeding crises, may drag on intermittently for years. We may be, 2 or 4 or 6 years hence, in the same desperate need for those air-line facilities that we faced on December 7, 1941.

But provision of those facilities is no simple and inexpensive matter. The air lines today require new equipment, and lots of it—as soon as equipment is available—to enable them to resume their place as the necessary civil air auxiliary of the armed forces.

That auxiliary can be effective only if it is always ready to carry out its role on the instant. Emergencies, in an air age, will not permit a long and leisurely period of getting ready. We must always have the wings available to fly where it is necessary to fly in order to stamp out the flame of aggression.

The amendment to the law affecting the air lines is, as I have said, only a perfecting, technical amendment. The provision affected is an indispensable item in our program for assuring in the future that we will be strong.

What is at stake? At stake is the essential element of mobility which is the most important thing in modern war. When the Japs attacked Alaska, 10 air lines, says the O. W. I., were thrown into the breach with the essential air transportation that held off the invader. And from the farthest reaches of the Pacific to the sand-swept terrain of Africa similar missions have been performed not once but hundreds of times during these 2 most critical years in our history.

But we cannot now retreat from the legislative policy which has made that air transportation possible. The war is not yet won, and future crises are not yet passed.

Before this war we had only a theory about the importance of the air lines to the national defense.

This war has proved the theory to be a fact. It is one of the precious few pre-war theories which have proved proved sound in the light of much bitter experience.

It is essential that we continue to follow that theory in the future, more than ever is it essential if we are to maintain our air supremacy without which no nation can survive.

These are the considerations which have inspired the Congress. It scarcely comports with the dignity of the Chief Executive of our Nation that this action by Congress should draw upon it the ill-tempered, vitriolic condemnation which breathes throughout the veto message.

Free men of God your birthright claim!
Our Fathers won it with a price.
They paid in full to ax and flame,
Nor counted up the sacrifice.
This is our heritage,
And here we do engage,
Each man unto his son
Intact to pass it on.
So shall they be—as we are—free!

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I speak to you, my fellow citizens, in the name of every patriot who has given his life through all times in the cause of democracy. From the dark ages when robber barons and their men at arms used to levy tribute from the farmers and merchants of the surrounding territory to maintain their petty governments, the people have resisted this form of tyranny. Wars and revolutions have been based on unjust taxation and, in fact, our own forefathers with the watchword of "no taxation without representation" separated from their mother country, England, and set up our United States under its representative form of government which has given an asylum to the oppressed of every nation and the right to earn and the right to keep a fair portion of their earnings.

Section 7 of the Constitution of the United States reads:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives.

This House, elected every 2 years by the people, holds the purse strings of the Nation, and as representative of the people is solely responsible for originating all tax bills.

During the summer and autumn months of last year 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee, 15 Democrats and 10 Republicans, were in session preparing the tax bill for 1944. Before this committee came the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and many of the Government officials, demanding that the taxes on the people be increased so as to raise ten and one-half billions of additional revenue. The Ways and Means Committee refused their request, believing that the people at this time cannot support such additional taxation, and on November 24 the tax bill, raising an additional revenue of $2,139,000,000 was passed by the House.

The same group of Government officials then appeared before the Senate Finance Committee, consisting of 21 members, 12 members of whom are Democrats and 9 Republicans. The same requests were made for additional revenue with the same result. The Senate Finance Committee did not believe that the people could support so great a sum of additional taxes and passed a bill providing for $2,276,000,000 dollars.

Despite the fact that both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States have given adequate hearings to executives of these departments, and despite the fact that the Constitution definitely states that the Congress alone shall levy taxes, the President yesterday vetoed the 1944 tax bill.

This is the first time in the history of the United States that a President has ever vetoed a general tax bill. This action demonstrates as complete a disregard for the rights of the people under the Constitution as did the President's effort to pack the Supreme Court. I again warn you, the American people, that you are at the crossroads. Your Constitution, which guards your rights and liberties, is again in danger.

I do not wish to become involved in a lot of figures, but there are a few that touch so many of our individual taxpayers that I believe they should be set forth. The national income for the ensuing year is estimated as being $150,000,000,000. The Treasury Department has stated that four-fifths of this—$120,000,000,000—will be received by individuals having an income of $5,000 or less, and the balance, $30,000,000,000, by those individuals having an income over $5,000.

The above figures show that the individual with an income of under $5,000 is the backbone of this great country of ours. He, with his wife, probably owns a house on which they must pay off a mortgage and local taxes. He is a member of a church. He probably carries life insurance, and is a member of some lodge or local civic organization, and he assuredly is a large buyer of Government bonds.

Besides these deductions from his income, let us see how the Government has treated him with its tax bills. In 1940 a married man with a gross income of $5,000 paid $110; in 1941 he paid $375; in 1942 he paid $746; in 1943 he paid $893; and under the present tax bill, which the President has vetoed, he would have paid $1,017. I wonder if this family would consider this last tax increase of $124 as a "small piece of crust" as the President so glibly referred to the tax increase in his veto message.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives did not believe that these families, who represent the class of people who receive four-fifths of the national income should pay any more taxes. The remaining group of American citizens who receive the balance of the national income of $30,000,000, are equally heavily burdened. Their tax begins under the most recent tax bill in percentages from about 25 percent and go up to a top rate of 90 percent.

As for corporations, which have done such a magnificent job in the support of our war effort, before they even pay taxes their contracts are renegotiated and any earnings considered in excess of normal are confiscated by the Government. After this operation what earnings are left are taxed up to 40 percent by the corporate, normal, and surtax, and up to 95 percent on any excess profits that might have escaped the searching eye of the Government renegotiators.

I think these facts prove that the American people are heavily taxed, and it must not be forgotten in addition to these taxes the individual must pay his State, county, and municipal taxes. I again stress the fact that the danger in the President's veto is its disregard of our Constitution and the rights of the people's Congress to levy taxes on the people.

Another dangerous situation that became quite evident during the long weeks of the tax-bill hearings is the lack of coordination between the President's close advisers as to economic objectives. Under my own direct questioning I learned from the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of Economic Stabilization that the main reason they desired to increase taxes by ten and one-half billions of dollars is to take from the people this amount of money which they consider as being idle earnings, and which might be expended, and because of the limited amount of civilian supplies to be purchased, might cause a rise in prices and stimulate inflation.

Having personally had a part in the writing of the price control bill and the rationing program growing out of it, it is my belief that if these two price controls are properly administered, with the existing heavy taxes, they will prevent any exaggerated rise in prices during the period of the war.

There is much talk that there has been a 24-percent rise in the cost of living since 1939. This is true but it does not tell the whole story. In 1939 the country was coming out of a depression and there was great unemployment and low prices. The actual combined cost of living today is almost exactly equal to the cost of living in the well-known prosperous days of 1926 and the average weekly earnings are $44 today as compared to $26 in 1926.

What is strange is that while the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of Economic Stabilization are demanding excess taxes in order to prevent inflation due to an increase in the public

debt, in another section of the administration the economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, the monetary adviser of the Treasury Department itself, and several other members of the administration are vigorously pushing for what they call a dynamic and an expanding economy. This group of advisers are planning for an increase in the public debt and are the proponents of the philosophy that public finance is really only a matter of bookkeeping—that a rising public debt has no adverse consequences and that without a constantly increasing debt the United States cannot hope to have full employment and prosperity. It is the plan of these gentlemen to establish three great international financial organizations in which the United States will be a heavy participant, particularly when it comes to cash, although it is not observed that our voting power and control of operations are particularly important. These three institutions would go about the world seeking to make loans for the development of backward areas and, of course, the funds would mostly come from the United States.

I have no doubt but these loans would stimulate the economic welfare of the backward areas in which the money was expended. I am not very sure, however, that the results would be entirely beneficial to the United States, particularly when I noted in an article written by the economic adviser to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, published in January 1944, the very honest but rather naive statement:

> Many readers will raise the very pertinent question of transfer of currency. Can the transfer of interest and dividends which the proposals (loans) entail be made from the borrowing countries to the lending countries without creating an impossible foreign-exchange situation? Intellectual honesty demands the answer that there is no assurance that this proposal can be solved with complete satisfaction. There is, indeed, nothing certain about any program to be undertaken in the very difficult decades lying ahead. We must proceed in part by an act of faith.

I wonder if the hard-pressed taxpayer, if he knew these facts, would not have the same reaction that I do? Let us collect as much taxes as the people can stand and still maintain a decent standard of living. This, I believe, we are doing. Let us borrow from the people any additional sums necessary to finance the war. This we are doing. But, over and above all of these things, let us not forget that we are fighting for a principle.

In this great free country of ours everyone has a right to his point of view. In this present administration there are a group of people, many in high positions, who think the American way of life is out of date, who believe the system under which a man might earn and keep a fair proportion of his earnings is old-fashioned, who believe the only scientific way is for a group of wizards located in Washington to direct the destinies of all of the people. It is this group who constantly attack our constitutional form of government. The American people must choose the form of government that they will have for themselves and their children—whether it will be the representative form of government set up by our forefathers, and which has made the United States the greatest and most powerful nation in the world in the short period of 175 years, or whether they will heed the voice of the experimenter.

This veto is a challenge. The people's Congress hinders the objectives of this bunch of bureaucratic bunglers who attempt to force their will on the people's Congress. We, the people's Representatives, must rise up as one man in the defense of the people's Constitution, and override this veto and keep the people's power where it belongs.

Like a fire bell in the night, I warn you—the American people—your social and economic rights are in danger. Wily wizards seek their destruction. Rise up and be alert.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, and as the only Representative and mouthpiece of the 300,000 people of the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia in this body, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty if I did not raise my voice in protest against the charges that have been made by our Chief Executive against both branches of the Congress in his sharp and scathing denunciation of the tax bill in his veto message.

The people of this country, all classes and factions, rich and poor, industry, labor, and agriculture, have made a record of cooperation and patriotism in this war that is unsurpassed in our annals. We have, in record time, built the world's greatest Navy, and have organized and trained the best-equipped and largest Army this country has ever had.

The representatives of our people here in Congress have promptly and unwaveringly clothed our President and Commander in Chief with every power and authorization necessary for the successful conduct of this war. Our President has not asked for a single power that he has not promptly received. Our Army and Navy staffs have not asked for a single appropriation for war purposes that they have not received. Following the pledge made by Congress in declaring war upon the Axis Powers, truly the lives of all our able-bodied men, and the fortunes of us all have been freely and willingly placed at the disposal of the Commander in Chief in order that this war may be surely and quickly won.

I feel that the President's harsh and caustic castigation of the Congress in this veto message is unwarranted by fact, uncalled for by the situation, and wholly unnecessary. These stinging blows have cut deep into the hearts of men who have labored here in this House and in the Senate just as faithfully and just as tirelessly as have those in high command.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia is a very valuable member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Is it not true in the preparation of all tax bills there has never been any sign of partisanship?

Mr. CAMP. I thank the gentleman for reminding me of that significant fact, which I am going to mention later in my remarks.

These men yield to none in their love for this country. These men feel the responsibility of their position no less than does the Commander in Chief. They have their duty to perform and they are no less mindful of the exigencies of our situation than is he.

What are the criticisms that are hurled at us? What are the facts? In the brief time allotted to me I can only briefly outline them, but I can say in the beginning that the bill so overwhelmingly voted by the House and Senate is a tax bill, written by the proper authority in our Government, after long and careful deliberation, and while no one claims it to be perfect, it represents the deliberate judgment of the people's representatives of this Republic.

Our Constitution provides that Congress shall levy all taxes, and that—article I, section 7—"all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives." Accordingly, the Ways and Means Committee, composed of 25 Members of this body, many of whom are outstanding leaders, began its deliberations September 4 and spent 11 weeks of tireless work, with daily and many night sessions, exploring all fields of revenue. While the bill does not provide for any great increase of national revenue, it does, in my opinion, provide all the increases necessary at this time, and all that our people can, under present circumstances, pay.

When the great expenditures for national defense began it was thought by many authorities that if our people could pay as much as one-third of the cost of this war as we went along, we should reach a goal that would be ideal from every economic standpoint, but the American people are doing that and more. We are today paying nearly one-half of the Government's war expenditures as we go, and the American taxpayer is bearing the heaviest tax load of any in the world.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman said it does not provide additional revenue. May I remind the gentleman it carries an amount that is equal to $2.25 for every man since the dawn of the Christian era. I do not call that peanuts.

Mr. CAMP. Well, it is not peanuts, but it is not the $10,500,000,000 which it was suggested we raise.

It was suggested that taxes be increased at least $10,500,000,000 for the next fiscal year, and this suggestion was said to be based on two propositions: First, the great need of the Government for the additional money, and second, the inflationary problem.

Let us consider the first proposition a moment. It was estimated on August 1 by the executive branch that 1944 Federal expenditures, excluding debt retirement and trust-fund disbursements,

would total $104,000,000,000, $97,000,000,000 of same being war expenditures.

Since that time the War and Navy Departments estimate that they will return unused to the Treasury from $13,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000 of this, leaving Government expenditures at about $90,000,000,000, of which $82,000,000,000 is for war purposes. This is, of course, the largest war expense of all times. A comparison with the war expenditures of other countries gives a better idea of it. It is estimated that the war expenditures of Great Britain in 1944 will be $23,000,000,000, and that of Canada $5,500,000,000. However, the American taxpayers will pay next year more than the total war expenditures of both Britain and Canada; in fact, the most conservative estimate is that they will pay over $40,000,000,000 in taxes, or one-half of our total war cost for the year.

Now, as to the second proposition—the inflationary problem: A serious study of the many proposals brought here under the guise and in the name of preventing inflation will show that many of our economists are "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel." I would not minimize the danger of inflation. Of course, we must do everything we can to close the inflationary gap, but the answer certainly does not lie in placing on our people an additional tax load of $10,500,000,000, a load that will be burdensome and cause suffering, when all the time that sum is only a fraction of the grand total of over $100,000,000,000 of accumulated savings in the hands of individuals in the form of War Savings bonds, cash surrender value of life-insurance policies, savings deposits, demand deposits, and idle currency. This represents $60,000,000,000 excess buying power. If we can maintain in this country the psychology that will render our people free of the fear of inflation, there will be no harmful inflation, and I believe this psychology can be best maintained by strict economy in governmental expenditures, by effective price control and rationing, and by control of wages, and not by burdensome taxes beyond the ability of many of our people to pay, and not by subsidies, which must be paid by taxpayers.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, I believe, raises as much revenue as can reasonably be borne by our people at this time without unduly disturbing our economy.

As far as individual income tax is concerned, we are approaching, if, indeed, we have not already approached, the point of diminishing returns. Few of our people know or realize that in America today, under existing tax laws, for the years 1944 and 1945, no person, no matter how large his or her income, will have left during these years, after the payment of Federal taxes, as much as $24,000 net income per year. A man with $100,000 of net income will have to pay $76,591 Federal taxes, leaving him $23,408.14, and his tax increases from that figure of net income, until when we reach the man with a net income of $700,000, we find that his taxes consume all of his income. This burden of taxation on individuals has been increasing so rapidly that our people have hardly been able to adjust their budgets to it, and I think that it is wise for Congress to let them remain level for a while.

Corporate taxes are in a similar condition. It is recognized that the taxes which are now being imposed directly upon corporations, and indirectly upon the dividend income flowing to shareholders, are as high or higher than those imposed by the other Allied Nations.

It is of vital importance that our corporations be kept in sound financial condition, so that they may be able to convert to peacetime production and provide employment for men leaving the armed forces after the war.

The withholding tax coming out of the weekly and monthly wages of every wage earner and salaried person in America has brought home to them the mounting cost of Government expenditures. Every American now watches Government spending as never before. These people will rise and demand economy and they know that every saving in Government expenditures will lighten their tax burden.

"A penny saved is a penny earned." There is no need to raise more taxes if public economies are practiced.

The President objects to the termination of the renegotiation authority on December 31, 1944. This Renegotiation Act was characterized by Assistant Secretary of War Patterson as "un-American, but necessary," and it was the considered opinion of both Army and Navy price boards that there would be no need for the law after this year. As to this bill giving war contractors a right to appeal from the decisions of the price boards, we believed, after hearing testimony of scores of industrial leaders, that common decency and justice demanded that they have a right of appeal in order that their property may not be taken without due process of law and in order that they have their day in court. As to the designation of The Tax Court as the proper forum to hear these appeals—two of the judges of this court came before our committee and said that they were about current with their dockets and they believed they could well undertake this appeal work and were perfectly willing to undertake it.

That is why that court was designated in this bill as the appeal court on the renegotiation matters.

In all the deliberations of the committee on this bill at no time was there any partisan division, all the members freely joining in the discussions and voting their individual convictions. The bill was reported unanimously.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. It is also a fact is it not that those who carried on the renegotiations were quite satisfied with The Tax Court?

Mr. CAMP. Oh, yes; I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. Our renegotiation amendments in this tax bill met the approval of both the Army and the Navy price-fixing boards and the officials of the Army and Navy who came before the committee and they approved it.

The President's objection to the provision permitting the lumber industry to treat income from cutting timber as a capital gain rather than annual income is noted. This provision was given careful study and thought to be wise by the committees. The President's experience in the Christmas-tree business is hardly illustrative of the principle involved. Timber on trees cut so young as that might correctly be called a crop, but it takes almost a lifetime to grow saw timber.

The President says that the complexity of income-tax forms is squarely the fault of Congress, that the cause is last year's tax bill, with the pay-as-you-go and Ruml plan provisions. Well I agree that the last year's bill is the cause, and I fought hard against that bill and voted against it, but it did not become law until he approved it. If he had vetoed that bill it could never have been passed over the veto. Is he not as much at fault as is Congress on that score?

Mr. Speaker, I think our Commander in Chief, who is doing such a splendid job in these dark war days and in whose ability and fearlessness all of us believe, has not had time to inquire fully into this bill. I feel that he has relied on assistants and helpers who likewise have not understood it. It would have been easy for him to have conferred with Senator GEORGE, of the Senate Finance Committee, who was so thoroughly familiar with every detail of the bill. I am sure that Mr. DOUGHTON, the veteran chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, would have gladly gone into every detail of it with the President. Mr. DOUGHTON has led this great committee ever since our President took the oath of office in 1933. In fact they started out together. The tax revenues of this country have increased under Mr. DOUGHTON'S chairmanship from about $3,000,000,000 in 1933 to over $40,000,000,000 in 1943. I feel sure that if our Commander in Chief had called to his side these two stalwarts he would have had their understanding cooperation in any wise and needful program. But I understand that neither Senator GEORGE nor Representative DOUGHTON was called for nor conferred with.

Mr. Speaker, it is a serious thing to strike at the people's confidence in their parliamentary system. After all the common citizen has only a remote voice in government, but that voice is solely through the duly elected Members of this House and the Senate.

Let us override this veto and then proceed to simplify our tax system in the orderly way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a recent broadcast over the American Forum of the Air.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I just wish to make the observation that tomorrow after the action of the House on the veto message, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will come up for consideration. If that is disposed of tomorrow, there is no business on the calendar for Friday.

Mr. FISH. There are no rules to be considered on Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; there are not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a tax bill wholly satisfactory is something we dream about but never hope to realize. There were a number of features about the 1943 tax bill, as it left the House Ways and Means Committee, of which I have the honor and privilege of being a member, which did not meet my approval; however, when weighted against the many fine and good provisions, I was constrained to support it.

The tax bill recommended to the Ways and Means Committee by the Treasury Department, when stripped of its sugar coating, would only yield about $7,000,000,000, for under its terms there would be a refund of about $3,500,000,000 to certain taxpayers. The money for this refund would, of course, have to be raised through future taxes or bond sales.

Early in the consideration of the tax bill, the Ways and Means Committee unanimously came to the conclusion that a tax bill as proposed by the Treasury Department was out of the question. I entertained high hopes that we might be able to raise between four and five billion dollars. In the committee I made proposals to that end and supported amendments of other members of the committee in that direction. A majority of the members of the committee in their wisdom rejected all such proposals.

The President's principal objections to the tax bill, which was passed in both Houses of Congress by overwhelming majorities, are the provision that would freeze the social-security tax payments at 1 percent until January 1, 1945, and the provision for the reorganization of certain insolvent corporations—section 121. Both these provisions originated in the other body and were not considered by our committee.

The President's objection to the curtailment of the payments toward the social-security fund possesses much merit. But when the President attempts to consider these payments Treasury tax revenue, in my humble opinion he is mistaken. These funds become a part of the Treasury as a result of the purchase of Government bonds by the Social Security Board. To describe these moneys as Treasury tax revenue is tantamount to saying that the money paid into the Treasury by a War bond purchaser is tax revenue. This clearly is a misnomer and misconception for these moneys clearly become obligations of the Treasury and a part of our national debt.

The President's contention that the provision for reorganization of certain insolvent corporations will cost the Treasury $150,000,000 I am informed is assumed on the belief that the Federal Government will win all the several reorganization cases that are now pending in the courts. This is a rather broad assumption.

There are a number of very commendable features of the tax bill that have been overlooked by the President. It makes a step toward simplification of the tax law and the tax form by the elimination of the earned-income credit. The certain deductions for excise tax payments, and so forth, are eliminated. The House version of the bill provided for the integration of the Victory tax into the normal and surtax. I am advised that the conferees had been informed by the War and Navy Department renegotiators that unless most of the changes provided for in the Renegotiation Act, as contained in this bill, are put into law, their hands will be tied. There is no need of my going into detail on the meritorious aspects of the tax bill for they are known to all who have had any dealings with them. There seems to be a discrepancy in the figures in the amount this tax bill will raise. According to the figures of the joint staff, it is assumed that this tax bill will raise the total of $2,315,000,000. In view of the fact that our country needs every dollar that it can obtain to meet the costs of the war, I believe that to reject this tax bill would be a mistake and detrimental to our war effort. If the President feels that we should raise more money, he certainly can ask for another tax bill in addition to this one.

It is no easy task for me to have to vote against my President and the leader of my party. I have great respect for our President and have been a great admirer of his long before I became a Member of the House. Only on one other occasion have I found it necessary to vote to override his veto. I hoped that he would sign this tax bill. It grieves me that he leaves me no other choice at this time. In view of the country's need for the moneys that this tax bill will raise, I am constrained to vote to override the President's veto.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio broadcast I made over the Columbia network on the subject of the post-war program.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COLORED TROOPS IN COMBAT UNITS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I propose to read a letter, dated February 19, 1944, from Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, in reply to an inquiry I addressed to him on February 1 relative to the use of colored American troops in combat units in Europe and Asia, and to make certain comments and observations on the Secretary of War's letter.

Before doing so, I take this opportunity to present a letter from the National Council of Negro Veterans, Inc., of Kansas City, Kans., which is self-explanatory, and helpful in analyzing Secretary Stimson's letter:

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO VETERANS, INC.,
Kansas City, Kans., February 19, 1944.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND COMRADE: The National Council of Negro Veterans, Inc., commends you for your effort to smoke the War Department out on its policy of breaking up colored combat units.

From the reports that have come to this office it seems to be the policy of the War Department, or at least those in charge of operations, to hold up the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron as a shining example of what has been accorded Negroes in this war and expect him to accept anything else that might be perpetrated upon him.

This office will appreciate a copy of the explanation from the Secretary of War, or if you will just drop me a line and let me know what issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the reply will be published in, I will then look it up.

It was not my good fortune to serve in the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth, but I was overseas 10 months in World War No. 1.

This organization will be glad to support any action you deem advisable to abolish discrimination in the armed forces.

Sincerely yours,

MACK C. SPEARS,
National Treasurer.

The letter from the Secretary of War follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 19, 1944.

Hon. HAMILTON FISH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FISH: This is in further reply to your letter of February 1 inquiring as to the Army's plans for using Negro troops.

Your information concerning the utilization of certain Negro personnel from tank destroyer and field artillery units in organization of service units is correct. However, additional tank destroyer units organized with colored personnel have been retained. The Nine Hundred and Thirtieth and Nine Hundred and Thirty-first Field Artillery Battalions, both former components of the One Hundred and Eighty-fourth Field Artillery, are currently being refilled, but present plans contemplate conversion of both battalions to combat engineer units. Certain other existing Negro field artillery units are being converted to heavier artillery, but the Nine Hundred and Thirtieth and Nine Hundred and Thirty-first 155-mm. Howitzer Battalions have not been selected for conversion to heavier artillery or retention as field artillery owing to the unsatisfactory records of both units. To have retained these troops as field artillery and concurrently to have converted or stripped other Negro or white field artillery units with substantially higher efficiency records, would have been an uneconomical use of manpower. The present plan to convert the units to combat engineers is based on similar considerations.

Permit me to explain the causes of these conversions. In scheduling its mobilization program early in the war, the War Department provided a relatively large number of units of a defensive type, such as antiaircraft artillery, coast artillery, and tank destroyer.

This was, as you know, necessitated by potential enemy attacks on our coastlines and by Axis superiority in the air and in armored units. Moreover, as the bulk of the Army was to remain in this country for some time, either in training or manning defensive installations, there was no immediate need for substantial numbers of service troops. The mobilization program at that date therefore permitted an equitable distribution of Negro personnel in all combat arms and services.

Since 1942, however, the likelihood of a direct enemy attack on our coastlines has decreased substantially, and our enemies' air power has deteriorated with respect to ours. Accordingly, economic use of available manpower has dictated conversion of many defensive units composed of both white and colored personnel to other types of units more urgently needed. The necessity of fighting a global war on many fronts has required provision of service units on a tremendous scale.

In converting combat units to service units, the War Department's selection of units to be converted has been based solely on the relative abilities, capabilities, and status of training of the personnel in the units available for conversion. It so happens that a relatively large percentage of the Negroes inducted in the Army have fallen within the lower educational classifications, and many of the Negro units accordingly have been unable to master efficiently the techniques of modern weapons. To have committed such units to combat at the dates of conversion would have endangered operational successes as well as submitted the personnel to unnecessarily high casualty rates. Our limitations of manpower and urgent and immediate need for service units of a type whose mission could be efficiently discharged by the personnel concerned left no choice but to include Negro troops in conversions such as those mentioned in your letter.

Concerning the use of Negro troops overseas, our general policy is to maintain the same ratio between Negro and white troops overseas as exist in the Army as a whole. I am sure you realize, however, that it is impracticable to maintain a uniform ratio of races to branches of service in all theaters.

I find that both white and Negro troops overseas have been transferred from combat to service units in the past, and that this will be necessary in the future as circumstances dictate. Such transfers are caused overseas by operational requirements and changing military situations, each problem being solved individually after full and careful study of all military considerations involved. However, no policy has been established in such cases which is designed to operate discriminately among units according to race.

Your statement that Negro combat units overseas are used on service assignments is, of course, correct. The statement is equally applicable to white units overseas. The fact is, there is no defensible reason for not so employing combat troops when necessary, and the procedure actually is to be encouraged in order to obtain maximum manpower value. As you know, rarely are all combat units in an area committed simultaneously. The decision as to when and how any unit shall be employed rests entirely with the responsible commander.

I believe the foregoing will clarify the major problems raised in your letter. Permit me to emphasize, in conclusion, that any implication that the War Department is deliberately attempting to avoid sending overseas, or to keep out of combat, troops of the Negro or any other race, is entirely without foundation. Our personnel is distributed and employed as required, on duties individuals are qualified to perform, regardless of their racial derivations. Large numbers of Negro troops are overseas or en route and will be given every opportunity to win battle honors and demonstrate their worth in actual combat. The War Department has every intention of continuing its past efforts to make the best possible use of its available manpower in the prosecution of the war without regard to race, religion, color, or other unmilitary considerations.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

As an officer in the Three Hundred and Sixty-ninth Infantry — colored — formerly the Fifteenth New York National Guard, which entered the battle lines within 1 year of the declaration of war in the First World War and served continuously until the end of the war as a combat unit, it is astounding to me that after 26 months of World War No. 2 virtually no Negro units have been engaged in combat except the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron and a few antiaircraft units.

I do not agree at all with the official policy of the War Department in using colored soldiers as service troops, and particularly with its policy of breaking up such a well-known and gallant Negro regiment as the former Eighth Illinois National Guard, which served with distinction and heroism in both the Spanish-American War and the World War.

I specifically asked the Secretary of War why the crack Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment, fully equipped and prepared for any eventuality, is performing service duties at docks and supply dumps while awaiting possible assignment to combat. Twenty-one months have passed since this outfit embarked from California for the South Pacific. Mr. Stimson simply ignored this question and gave it the silent treatment.

I cannot speak for the colored people of Chicago, but I should think they will be shocked when they learn that the old Eighth Illinois National Guard Regiment, of which they rightly have been so proud because of its service as an infantry combat regiment in the last war, is now turned into an engineer regiment after more than 2 years of training in preparation for front-line service as a field artillery unit.

I do not understand how it is that four separate colored regiments made such gallant fighting records in the last war, which was won in approximately 19 months and yet no colored infantry troops have been ordered into combat in this war. The educational standards of colored people have improved in the last 25 years and I cannot agree with the Secretary of War's inference that colored soldiers' efficiency ratings are so low that "many of the Negro units have been unable to master efficiently the techniques of modern weapons." I believe many American Negroes will resent bitterly this broad indictment of their people and the discrimination against their use in combat units in defense of their country.

It seems passing strange that French Senegalese or whole British divisions from India have been fighting so superbly with our allies, and that Russians with low educational qualifications have been the heroes of this war, and that even the Japanese with lesser educational qualifications than American Negroes, have been found to be brave and efficient soldiers.

Fourteen millions of loyal Americans have the right to expect that in a war for the advancement of the "four freedoms" that their sons be given the same right as any other American to train, to serve, and to fight in combat units in defense of the United States in this the greatest war in its history.

It is very apparent, from the contents of Secretary of War Stimson's letter, that there are no Negro combat troops fighting on the battlefields of Europe or Asia, except as I pointed out in my letter to him, the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron and a few antiaircraft units. This was the information I was attempting to obtain as I think the American people are entitled to it, and particularly the 14,000,000 loyal American Negroes.

In the First World War we participated for a period of 19 months, until final victory. In this war we have been in it already for 2¼ years, and it is a sad commentary that up to this time no American colored troops, who fought so well with the French Army in the last war, have been used in the front lines of battle to fight for the preservation of liberty and democracy except the Ninety-ninth Pursuit Squadron.

Any American who is good enough to wear the uniform of his country, regardless of race, color, or creed, must be treated equally and be afforded an opportunity to serve, fight, and die in defense of our free institutions, our constitutional form of government, and for America itself.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the veto message of the President in disapproving the tax bill is typically Rooseveltian. It is more filled with inconsistencies, contradictions, half truths, and unwarranted insinuations than any message he has heretofore sent to the Congress. He charges Congress directly with things for which the executive department is solely responsible.

Every Member of this House must have been impressed from time to time by the things the President has said and done, which seemingly have had as their object the destruction of the faith of the people in their Congress, the last bulwark remaining between them and totalitarianism. Of all the things he has said and done in the past, not one has approached this last attempt to belittle the Congress. He casts aside all bounds of reason and frank truthfulness. What he said in his veto message is a repudiation of his party which has had complete control of the House and Senate since his first inauguration and has supported him loyally. It is a repudiation of and an insult to the finest members of his party in each body, men who honor their State and their Nation in their service here. It was an insult to the great chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, an

individual than whom there has been no more conscientious, able, no more loyal, alert, and active, no individual more devoted to the welfare of his country as chairman of this great committee than he. It was an insult to the great chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, the Honorable WALTER F. GEORGE. It was an insult to both these splendid men that they were not called to the White House for consultation with the President before he decided to make this attack on the Congress. It was an insult to every Member of the House and the Senate who voted for the bill, as well as every member of the two committees which had the same under consideration for long, weary months. It was an insult to one of the branches of our tripartite system of government—the Congress itself.

The lengths to which Mr. Roosevelt will go, the depths to which he will descend in venting his spleen against those who dare to disobey is shown in his reference to the present tax law enacted in 1943. He states:

In another most important respect this bill would disappoint and fail the American taxpayers. Everyone of them, including ourselves, is disappointed, confused, and bewildered over the practical results of last year's tax bill. * * * The Nation will readily understand that it is not the fault of the Treasury Department that the income taxpayers are flooded with income forms to fill out which are so complex that even certified public accountants cannot interpret them. No, it is squarely the fault of the Congress of the United States in using language in drafting the law which even a dictionary or a thesaurus cannot make clear.

Well, let us see about that. First of all, he had last year's bill under consideration for several days and gave it his approval. If the language of the bill was so confusing, why did he not veto the bill? Why did he not then make his disapproval known? If it is as bad as he now says it is, why did he put his stamp of approval upon a measure as important as a bill which taxes the people, when it was so confusing that he did not know what it was all about? After all, a President is supposed to know when he signs a bill whether it is good or bad. If the phraseology of the present law is so confusing why did he not say something about it then? Why wait until he needs an excuse to again belittle and belabor and besmirch the Congress?

If you will look at your income-tax blank, you will find no law written there. You will find directions to aid you in properly disclosing your taxable income. These blanks are prepared in the Treasury Department and neither the Congress nor any Member thereof has had a single thing to do with them. It is not the phraseology of the law as the President would have you believe. The confusion comes from the failure of the Treasury Department to prepare the blank in a way that can be easily understood. The President knows this and it would appear that, shall I say, again he is not quite frank with the public.

The President's allegation that the pay-as-you-go-tax plan was "not the product of this administration" serves to emphasize how he has been misled by his advisers in framing his veto message. Also he apparently has forgotten his own recommendations on the subject. Let me quote from the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943. On pages 9 and 10 of the hearings Mr. Randolph Paul, general counsel of the Treasury Department, said:

The problem of putting income taxes on a pay-as-you-go basis was emphasized by President Roosevelt in his recent Budget message in connection with his request to Congress for $16,000,000,000 of additional collections for the fiscal year 1944.

* * * * *

Owing to the great expansion of the individual income tax now taking place in response to war needs, the strengthening of our system of income-tax payment has become a first order of business.

* * * * *

A suitable pay-as-you-go method will be of great assistance to millions of taxpayers.

Thus the Roosevelt administration is squarely on record as favoring the pay-as-you-go system. In fact, it was at its suggestion that it was made the law.

The President makes another misstatement when he infers that the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943 is the Ruml plan. He must know that the Ruml plan was never adopted by Congress due to the unyielding opposition of the White House and the Treasury Department. The plan which was finally adopted for effecting the change to a current collection basis was in accord with the Treasury's recommendation that there be no complete abatement, of the 1942 income-tax assessment, as provided in the Ruml plan. On this point the Treasury stated, at page 22 of the House hearings in 1943:

Another question is whether the transition to current payment should be made by forgiving a year's liability, by paying 2 years' taxes in 1, or by postponing or deferring 1 year's taxes over several years. In the light of the revenue needs of the Government, and the equitable distribution of the tax burden, complete forgiveness seems very undesirable. Complete doubling up would undoubtedly be too harsh for some taxpayers. Accordingly deferment of payment of taxes for the transition year to the extent necessary to relieve such hardships appears to be desirable.

If the Ruml plan had in fact been adopted, there would have been no complications as a result of the transition to a current collection basis, no doubling up of taxes, and no deferment of collection of the 1942 liability. It is due to the administration's opposition to the Ruml plan that a complicated and burdensome pay-as-you-go law was finally adopted. It not only complicated the returns but increased the tax burden of most taxpayers by 12½ percent for 1944 and 1945. If the President had refreshed himself on the history of the Current Tax Payment Act, I am sure he would not have made some of the statements contained in his veto message, or blamed the Congress for the confusion.

So, my friends, it is not the Congress that is to blame for the confusion the President complains of. On the contrary, it is the Treasury Department that is responsible, the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a news article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STARNES of Alabama, for 6 days, on account of official business.

To Mrs. LUCE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. CELLER, for remainder of week, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2350. An act to liberalize the service-pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents;

H. R. 3997. An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4059. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m. Thursday, February 24, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

The Committee on the Public Lands will continue its hearings on H. R. 1688, a bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon, on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1218. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December

13, 1943, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Loyalhanna Creek at Latrobe, Pa., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 444); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1219. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney, with a view to modifying the existing project between Sanford and Lake Harney, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 20, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 445); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1220. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 11, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of and review of reports on the coasts of the Great Lakes with a view to the establishment of harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels, including Point Lookout Harbor, Mich., Barcelona Harbor, N. Y., Au Sable Harbor, Mich., and Eagle Harbor, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; and requested by resolutions of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 20, 1936, February 10, 1939, and January 24, 1939; and resolutions of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, adopted on April 26, 1937, and December 6, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 446); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with 28 illustrations.

1221. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 15, 1944, submitting a partial report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Arkansas River, Kans., and Ark., Main Stem, and Fourche Bayou, Ark., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on November 19, 1940, April 23, 1942, and July 2, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 447); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with eight illustrations.

1222. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 24, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a review of reports on Leland Harbor, Mich., with a view to determining if it is advisable to modify the project in any way at this time, with particular reference to preventing erosion due to wave wash, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 16, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1223. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 5, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of report on the Cumberland River, with a view to determining whether flood protection in the vicinity of Lebanon, Tenn., is advisable at the present time, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on October 4, 1940; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1224. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

1225. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 435. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the Fourth Intermediate Report (H. Rept. No. 1024) of the Select Committee to Investigate executive agencies for the use of the committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 379, current session, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the National Interregional Highway Committee outlining and recommending a national system of interregional highways; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 425. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Chronology of Major International Events, With the Ostensible Reasons Advanced for Their Occurrence" as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 448. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 239 continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until July 1, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 449. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4166, a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1172). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency House Joint Resolution 239. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until July 1, 1945; with amendment (Rept. No 1173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3619. A bill to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield; without amendment (Rept. No. 1174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PATTON: Committee on Claims. S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1175). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans; without amendment (Rept. No. 1176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of the Waldrop Heating & Plumbing Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1177). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search; with amendment (Rept. No. 1178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ABERNETHY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1682. A bill for the relief of Edwin H. Taylor, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1179). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims: H. R. 2288. A bill for the relief of Donald J. Munson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1180). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2405. A bill for the relief of Clarence P. Hale, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri: Committee on Claims H. R. 2408. A bill for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2846. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring; without amendment (Rept. No. 1183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3114. A bill for the relief of Ruth Coe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of C. C. Evensen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GREEN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4250. A bill directing the Secretary of Commerce, through the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, to make a survey of the need for a system of airports and landing areas throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4251 (by request). A bill to give honorably discharged, disabled, or retired marine employees of the Panama Canal, civil-service preference to extend to them the facilities of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4252. A bill creating a Congressional Bureau of Efficiency; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 4253. A bill to aid merchant seamen and to provide for payment of mustering-out pay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4254. A bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 4255 (by request). A bill empowering the Federal Trade Commission to require advertisers who have been making false claims for their products to inform the public of their misdeeds through publication of the Commission's orders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4256 (by request). A bill to provide readjustment insurance for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4257. A bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MONKIEWICZ:

H. R. 4258. A bill to amend section 201 D of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4259. A bill to create a Surplus Agricultural Products Corporation and to authorize the disposition of excess Government food stocks and related products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 4260. A bill amending section 32 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 774), as amended in order to provide for the maintenance and operation of school lunch programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. J. Res. 242. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act to protect the lives and health and morals of women and minor workers in the District of Columbia, and to establish a minimum wage board, and define its powers and duties, and to provide for the fixing of minimum wages for such workers, and for other purposes," approved September 19, 1918, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 450. Resolution for the consideration of S. 1668, a bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation relative to the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 4261. A bill for the relief of Michael C. Donatell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 4262. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clark Gourley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JEFFREY:

H. R. 4263. A bill for the relief of the parents of the late James W. Seeger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4264. A bill for the relief of Louise Zerweck; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 4265. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 4266. A bill for the relief of Ruth Muzio (Mrs. Joseph Muzio) and to the legal guardian of Louis Muzio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Miss STANLEY:

H. R. 4267. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sophie Bigaj; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIBBOTT:

H. R. 4268. A bill for the relief of Mihjalo Bakic or Mile Vujaklija; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5044. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Christian members of the Buffalo Chapter of the American Palestine Committee on February 16, urging that the United States of America favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5045. Also, resolution adopted by the National Council of Jewish Women of the Buffalo, N. Y., section appealing to the President of the United States that he do all in his power to help to abrogate the Palestine white paper of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5046. Also, resolution adopted by the Young Judea Council of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring enactment of legislation to abrogate the Palestine white paper of May 1939, and to establish in Palestine a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5047. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of various citizens of Missouri urging passage of Green-Lucas soldier-vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5048. By Mr. ELSTON of Ohio: Petition of George Stalf and 922 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5049. By Mr. GILLETTE: Petition of sundry residents of Lycoming County, Pa., favoring passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5050. Also, petition of sundry residents of Wayne County, Pa., favoring passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5051. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of Gov. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, favoring passage of the Wright-Compton and Wagner-Taft resolutions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5052. Also, resolutions of the Jewish National Workers' Alliance of Malden, Mass., favoring the abrogation of the British white paper and the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5053. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition signed by many residents of Butler County, Iowa, urging the enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5054. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of the members of the Welfare Circle, Oakdale Christian Reformed Church, Grand Rapids, Mich., recommending House Resolution No. 117; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5055. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. D. I. Marker and 37 other citizens of St. Marys, Kans., favoring the passage of Senate bill 1617 and House bills 3917 and 3921; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5056. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the Bronx Chapter of the Mazzini Society, Inc., Bronx, N. Y.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5057. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Court Little Therese, No. 1044, Catholic Daughters of America, Bayside, N. Y., and other courts of this national organization, urging that steps be taken at once that Good Friday be declared a national holiday in 1944 and every year thereafter with the proviso that such an observance shall not vitally interfere with the essential war effort of our Nation for the duration of this or any war, and that such essential industries shall be carried on in a spirit of endeavor for the right; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5058. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the board of directors of the Tri-County Cooperative Auction Market Association, Inc., Hightstown, N. J., adopted February 15, 1944, submitting its earnest plea that all necessary and proper measures be taken as will insure that the Palestine white paper of May 1939 be rescinded and abandoned and that no political or artificial barriers be set up to hinder Jewish immigration into Palestine, purchase of land, or the development of the country's resources, that aid and encouragement be given to accelerate large-scale Jewish immigration into Palestine, and that Palestine be reconstituted as a Jewish commonwealth guaranteeing full democratic rights to all the inhabitants thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5059. By Mr. SCOTT: Resolution of the Shrine Club of Philadelphia, praising and renewing faith in the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Memorials.

5060. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of 1,180 residents of the Sixth Congressional District of West Virginia, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) and any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5061. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution adopted by the Newport (N. H.) Rotary Club, urging that the resolution now before Congress relating to the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people be passed; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all races and nations, send out Thy light and Thy truth; let them lead us, let them bring us to Thy holy hill. As we wait in silence before

Thee, may the harmonies of the eternal be gathered out of the seeming discords of the temporal.

Grant us to feel the passion of a high resolve to cherish above all else the glorious destiny unto which Thou hast called us as a nation. Strengthen our hearts in the confidence that Thou hast appointed us for the protection of the weak and hast formed this Union, set between the seas, not for ourselves alone but for a healing ministry to all the world.

"For what are sundering strains of blood
Or ancient cast and creed?
One claim unites all men in God,
To serve each human need."

Make us such faithful servants of that human need and of that common good that we will fear neither the searching judgments of our fellow men nor the final verdict of that Judge of all the earth from whom no secrets are hid. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 23, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2350. An act to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents;

H. R. 3997. An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4059. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CANCELATION OF DEBT CHARGES OF INDIANS AND INDIAN TRIBES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

WAGE INCREASES FOR CERTAIN ALASKA RAILROAD EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for services rendered from May 1, 1943, to September 30, 1943, inclusive (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

OPERATIONS UNDER BOULDER CANYON PROJECT ADJUSTMENT ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first and second annual financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

APPLICATIONS FOR LETTERS PATENT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Patents.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REPORT ON DISTRIBUTION METHODS AND COSTS RELATING TO CERTAIN BUILDING MATERIALS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the report of the Commission on Distribution Methods and Costs: Part III—Building Materials—Lumber, Paints, Varnishes, and Portland Cement (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

DECEMBER 1943 REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD: WAGE INCREASES

A letter from the Vice Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, pursuant to the terms of Senate Resolution 130, agreed to April 9, 1943, the tenth monthly report of that Board, covering the month of December 1943, concerning wage increases (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (2) and Navy, United States Civil Service Commission, United States District Court (Eastern District of Michigan), and the Selective Service System, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President, and referred as indicated:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution respectfully memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon proposed legislation relative to the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan

"Whereas there is now pending in the current session of the Congress of the United States a bill authorizing the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration hospital in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan; and

"Whereas the need of this hospital has been long standing, the Upper Peninsula Association of American Legion Posts having recognized the necessity of such hospital facility in 1936; and

"Whereas a thorough study has been made and this need attested to in resolutions adopted by numerous civic, social, labor, and veterans' organizations, as well as many individuals; and

"Whereas the reasons advanced after a long and thorough study of this project are:

"1. Because of the geographical situation of the Upper Peninsula, the nearest point of the Upper Peninsula is approximately 300 miles and the farthest point is approximately 700 miles from Detroit where a veterans' hospital was erected consisting of only 350 beds, the distance of travel being even greater to the Wood Hospital near Milwaukee and the Hines Hospital in Chicago, the point being that transportation is a vital problem to any veteran seeking hospitalization.

"2. The facilities of these hospitals are greatly overcrowded, necessitating veterans in need of hospitalization waiting months before they can be hospitalized.

"3. There are approximately 14,000 World War No. 1 veterans within the boundaries of the Upper Peninsula, approximately 550 being disabled veterans drawing compensation, and approximately 30,000 World War No. 2 servicemen, and great numbers of these veterans require medical or surgical attention each year, presenting a large transportation problem, whereby they could be taken care of in a facility located closer to their homes, thereby saving human lives and misery to an untold extent, and would mean savings of many dollars in transportation and would expedite the recovery of disabled veterans.

"4. A survey made through officers of the American Legion, Disabled Veterans, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars shows that there are approximately 250 veterans in the Upper Peninsula desperately in need of hospitalization at this time.

"5. Cost of transportation and miscellaneous expense necessary for a veteran to appear before an examination board after appeal is prohibitive under the present policy, and as this cost is usually borne by the local posts, the individuals generally not being able to bear this expense, it works a hardship on those furnishing this relief; and

"Whereas it is imperative to the best interest of the Commonwealth to alleviate suffering and misery which now exists among the veterans in this section of the country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the Michigan Legislature hereby respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to promptly consider and approve the proposed legislation aforesaid; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a suitable copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Franklin Delano Roosevelt; to Vice President Henry A. Wallace; Speaker Sam Rayburn, of the House of Representatives; to all Michigan Members of the Congress of the United States; to Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and Chairman of Board of Hospitalization; and to Governor Kelly and Lieutenant Governor Keyes of the State of Michigan.

"Adopted by the senate January 31, 1944.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives February 4, 1944."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the taking of appropriate action to name a vessel of war after Seaman Joseph Harrington, who made the supreme sacrifice when the *Juneau* was sunk, this vessel being the same one in which the five Sullivan boys lost their lives; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 21, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 375. An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co.; and

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 25, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be Thy holy name, O Lord, our God, whose infinite wisdom, power, and goodness are in the affairs of men. We pray to be strong of mind, pure of heart, and full of that charity which suffereth long and is kind. Estimate our moral and spiritual qualities as individuals and restore unto us the joy of Thy salvation. We pray that cant and self-seeking may be lost and the solidarity of our country become the inspiration of the world.

Heavenly Father, be pleased to bless our homes with health and good fortune and at their altars may every woman be true and honored; grant that the nobility of our mothers may be reflected in our daughters and with their purity and sacrifice guard the souls of the present generation. Heavenly Shepherd, let all America hear and know that her power is dependent upon this: "It is given thee from above." Help us to vindicate Thy truth and deliver our people from the deadly enemies of the flesh which coil in spiritual darkness and, often concealed in radiant light, submerge much of the good we have thought and felt. Blessed Lord: "Love thy neighbor," seems so far ahead of us; it is such a commanding reality. O feed us from the garnered stores of Thy grace that we may pass from stage to stage in the school of our Saviour. Let it set our minds afire, harmonize our ambitions, and send our spirits upward and on. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

THE REVENUE BILL

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the veto message of the President on the revenue bill.

The question is, Will the House on reconsideration pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the question before the House, the veto of the tax bill, has been debated both in the House and in the Senate and in the public press. I think the issue is well understood by the Members of the House and the country. Therefore, I think that further debate is unnecessary, and I move the previous question.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is there not some parliamentary method by which we who are going to support the President's veto message will have an opportunity to be heard before the vote is taken on the veto? I am mindful of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means controls the time, the 1 hour provided by the rules of the House, and unless he makes time available for us we will not be heard. As I do not believe the issue has been given sufficient reconsideration, I hope we shall have an opportunity to defend the veto message of President Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not submitting a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KENNEDY. I should like, and I believe the Chair should suggest, some means by which we would have an opportunity to be heard in support of the President and his courageous stand on the pending tax bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the gentleman from North Carolina would be willing to withhold his motion?

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the Constitution, the vote must be taken by the "yeas" and "nays."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 299, nays 95, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—299

Abernethy	Chiperfield	Gossett
Allen, Ill.	Church	Graham
Allen, La.	Clark	Grant, Ala.
Anderson, Calif.	Clason	Grant, Ind.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Clevenger	Green
	Cole, Mo.	Gregory
Andresen, August H.	Cole, N. Y.	Griffiths
	Colmer	Gross
Andrews	Compton	Gwynne
Angell	Cooley	Hagen
Arends	Costello	Hale
Arnold	Cox	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Auchincloss	Cravens	
Baldwin, N. Y.	Crawford	Hall, Leonard W.
Barden	Cunningham	
Barrett	Curtis	Halleck
Barry	D'Alesandro	Hancock
Bates, Mass.	Day	Harness, Ind.
Beall	Dewey	Harris, Ark.
Beckworth	Dies	Harris, Va.
Bell	Disney	Hartley
Bender	Dondero	Hays
Bennett, Mich.	Doughton	Hébert
Bennett, Mo.	Drewry	Heidinger
Bishop	Durham	Hendricks
Blackney	Dworshak	Herter
Bland	Eaton	Hess
Bonner	Elliott	Hill
Boren	Ellis	Hinshaw
Bradley, Mich.	Ellison, Md.	Hoeven
Brehm	Ellsworth	Hoffman
Brooks	Elmer	Holmes, Wash.
Brown, Ga.	Elston, Ohio	Hope
Brown, Ohio	Engel, Mich.	Horan
Brumbaugh	Fellows	Howell
Bryson	Fenton	Jarman
Buffett	Fernandez	Jeffrey
Bulwinkle	Fish	Jenkins
Burch, Va.	Fisher	Jennings
Burdick	Folger	Jensen
Burgin	Fuller	Johnson, Anton J.
Busbey	Gale	
Butler	Gallagher	Johnson, Calvin D.
Camp	Gathings	
Canfield	Gavin	Johnson, Ind.
Carlson, Kans.	Gearhart	Johnson, J. Leroy
Carrier	Gerlach	
Carson, Ohio	Gibson	Johnson, Luther A.
Carter	Gilchrist	
Case	Gillette	Johnson, Ward
Chapman	Gillie	Jones
Chenoweth	Goodwin	Jonkman
Judd	Norman	Smith, Ohio
Kean	Norrell	Smith, Va.
Kearney	O'Brien, N. Y.	Smith, W. Va.
Keefe	O'Hara	Smith, Wis.
Kilburn	O'Konski	Sparkman
Kinzer	O'Neal	Springer
Kleberg	Pace	Stanley
Knutson	Peterson, Fla.	Stearns, N. H.
Kunkel	Phillips	Stefan
LaFollette	Pittenger	Stevenson
Lambertson	Ploeser	Stewart
Landis	Plumley	Stockman
Lanham	Poulson	Sullivan
Larcade	Powers	Sumner, Ill.
Lea	Pracht, C. Frederick	Sundstrom
LeCompte		Taber
LeFevre	Pratt, Joseph M.	Talbot
Lemke		Talle
Lewis	Price	Taylor
Luce	Ramey	Thomas, N. J.
Ludlow	Randolph	Thomas, Tex.
McConnell	Rankin	Thomason
McCowen	Reece, Tenn.	Tibbott
McGehee	Reed, Ill.	Towe
McGregor	Reed, N. Y.	Treadway
McKenzie	Rees, Kans.	Troutman
McLean	Richards	Vinson, Ga.
McMillan	Rivers	Vorys, Ohio.
McWilliams	Rizley	Vursell
Maas	Robertson	Wadsworth
Mahon	Robsion, Ky.	Walter
Maloney	Rockwell	Ward
Mansfield, Tex.	Rodgers, Pa.	Wasielewski
Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Mass.	Weaver
Martin, Mass.	Rohrbough	Weichel, Ohio
May	Rolph	West
Merrow	Rowe	Whelchel, Ga.
Michener	Russell	White
Miller, Conn.	Sasscer	Whitten
Miller, Mo.	Satterfield	Whittington
Miller, Nebr.	Schiffler	Wigglesworth
Miller, Pa.	Schwabe	Willey
Mills	Scott	Wilson
Monkiewicz	Scrivner	Winstead
Morrison, N. C.	Shafer	Wolcott
Mott	Sheppard	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mruk	Short	Wolverton, N. J.
Mundt	Sikes	Woodruff, Mich.
Murray, Tenn.	Simpson, Ill.	Woodrum, Va.
Murray, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.	Worley
Newsome	Smith, Maine	Zimmerman

NAYS—95

Andersen, H. Carl	Gorski	Myers
	Granger	Norton
Bates, Ky.	Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bloom	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Bolton	Heffernan	O'Connor
Bradley, Pa.	Hoch	O'Toole
Buckley	Hull	Outland
Burchill, N. Y.	Izac	Patton
Byrne	Jackson	Pfeifer
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Priest
Capozzoli	Kee	Rabaut
Cochran	Kefauver	Robinson, Utah
Coffee	Kelley	Rogers, Calif.
Cooper	Kennedy	Rowan
Courtney	Keogh	Sabath
Crosser	King	Sadowski
Davis	Kirwan	Sauthoff
Dawson	Klein	Scanlon
Delaney	Lane	Sheridan
Dickstein	Lesinski	Snyder
Dilweg	Lynch	Somers, N. Y.
Dingell	McCord	Spence
Eberharter	McCormack	Tarver
Engle, Calif.	McMurray	Tolan
Feighan	Madden	Vincent, Ky.
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Voorhis, Cal.
Flannagan	Mansfield, Mont.	Weiss
Fogarty		Welch
Forand	Marcantonio	Wene
Ford	Merritt	Wickersham
Furlong	Monroney	Wright
Gordon	Murdock	
Gore	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—34

Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Morrison, La.
Boykin	Gifford	O'Leary
Cannon, Fla.	Hare	Patman
Celler	Hobbs	Peterson, Ga.
Cullen	Holifield	Philbin
Curley	Holmes, Mass.	Poage
Dirksen	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Ramspeck
Domengeaux		Slaughter
Douglas	Kerr	Starnes, Ala.
Fay	Kilday	Sumners, Tex.
Fulbright	Manasco	Winter
Fulmer	Mason	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Winter and Mr. Hare for, with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson against.

Mr. Dirksen and Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Morrison of Louisiana against.

Mr. Douglas and Mr. Peterson of Georgia for, with Mr. O'Leary against.

Mr. Kilday and Mr. Slaughter for, with Mr. Patman against.

Mr. Hobbs and Mr. Sumners of Texas for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Gamble and Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Fay against.

Mr. Kerr and Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Holifield against.

General pairs:

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Fulbright with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Domengeaux.

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Curley.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have voted to sustain the President's veto.

I have differed with the President's views on many occasions during the last 11 years. I have tried to support his leadership at all times when well-founded reasons based on conscientious convictions did not require otherwise. I have not felt, and I do not feel now, that such convictions can be, or should be, surrendered under the obligations that are assumed by a Member of Congress by his oath of office.

On this account I did not support many of the measures which have been proposed by the Chief Executive during the 11 years of his official tenure. When other Members who are now bitter in their condemnation of him joined with the throngs who shouted "Hosanna" and strewed palm leaves in his path, I admired and supported many of his policies, and I felt then, and feel now, that his leadership has been outstanding in American history, particularly in his handling of foreign affairs before and during the present emergency. But I have never regarded him, nor any other human being, as perfect and infallible, and have never been regarded as a "hundred percenter" or "yes man." While many of those who once shouted "Hosanna" are now after his scalp, I prefer to stand by his side in all matters where conscience does not dictate otherwise.

I do not find this to be an issue upon which I cannot agree with him without sacrificing firm convictions. I am not enthusiastic about this tax bill. It is true, I voted for it, just as most of you did, but nobody had anything to do with writing it excepting the members of the Ways and Means Committee. That that committee labored long, diligently, and conscientiously, no one familiar with the facts will question. Under the rule adopted for consideration in the House, no individual Member could even offer an amendment. We had to vote it up or down as it was written. It contains much of which I approve, much of which I disapprove. I thought it was better than no bill at all. But I am not so strongly wedded to its provisions, as a whole, that I am willing to join with the enemies of my party, and of this administration, to renounce the leadership of the President and bring about a condition of confusion in our national affairs which can redound to the advantage of nobody so much as to that of Hitler and Hirohito.

I believe that the veto message of the President was intemperate in some of its expressions and calculated to arouse just resentment on the part of Members of Congress who feel they have done the best they could with a hard job; but I am not willing to allow resentment, however just, to dictate my position on a matter of such vital importance to the American people. I have not voted in anger.

Perhaps the President, with all of the burdens resting upon his shoulders, may be entitled to as much, if not more, sympathy for asperity, however unjustified, in a message to Congress as was so generously showered in many quarters on General Patton when he had an attack of nerves. Perhaps the President sometimes feels the strain of leadership in this crucial period of the world's history and says things that upon more mature reflection he would have left unsaid.

The outstanding feature of the President's message is the stress he lays upon the necessity for raising more money to pay for this war than is proposed in this bill. With that viewpoint I am in hearty accord. I voted against the Ruml plan. I voted against repealing the Executive order limiting salaries, above taxes, to $25,000 per year. I know the tax burden is heavy. I have paid out in Federal, State, county, and city taxes for 1943 approximately one-third of my total income. I am willing to pay more. When American boys are fighting and dying upon far-flung battlefields and on the seven seas, most of them being paid $50 a month, I am not willing to place any limit upon what I am willing to pay, and to have others pay, excepting the limits indicated by our national need and by our ability to pay. Hard, it may be; it will involve sacrifice. I can sleep better at night if I am able to feel that I am making every sacrifice I can that will help, and ninety-nine one-hundredths of the American people feel the same way. They do not want the boys in service to do the fighting and then come back home to spend the rest of their lives paying the war debt.

So if our Commander in Chief, with his better sources of information on many matters relating to this issue, feels we should try to write a tax bill that will raise more money than this bill will raise, and that for the present it is better to have no bill at all than this one, I, for one, am willing for the Congress to try to write a bill that will raise more money, and I hope that when another tax bill is written, it may be considered under a rule which will at least allow Members not on the Ways and Means Committee to offer amendments to be voted on by the House, suggesting methods they deem proper for raising revenue. It is true the Constitution provides that revenue bills shall originate in the House of Representatives, but I find no provision in that instrument that the duty of writing them shall rest altogether on the shoulders of the Ways and Means Committee.

So I have not voted to over-ride this veto. I am not one of those who want to see the President discredited. I shall not join with those who do. I know that advocating high taxes is not popular, particularly in election years. I know it is much more popular to appropriate money, whether we have it or not. But I have supported in this vital matter the leadership of the President and leave to those whom I represent the duty and power to determine, as they soon must do, whether in this, and, on the whole, I speak for them and by their authority.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in order that my attitude may be recorded I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and that I may extend my own remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in this discussion involving the constitutional right and privilege of the Congress to pass legislation, many references were made to the encroachment on the part of the Executive, and it was inferred, if not directly charged, that he is transgressing upon the constitutional rights of the legislative body.

I do not intend to discuss this at length excepting to remind the Members of the House that under our Constitution, the three branches of Government, the legislative, the judiciary, and the executive, are coequal and, therefore, we must concede that the President has the constitutional right to approve a tax bill or to refuse approval by the exercise of veto. Then, we in the legislative branch can exercise our constitutional right and can vote to either override or to sustain the action of the President. Whether the President was right or wrong on many details of the bill, whether he was properly or poorly advised, I shall not be concerned about here and now. My discussion must of necessity be limited because of the available time.

The bill with which we are concerned, which has been returned to the Congress without Executive approval, like any other bill, has its strong and its weak points, its virtues, and its faults. It is, as has been stated repeatedly, a composite involving the views of 435 Members of this House and the 96 Members of the Senate.

I believe that the President would have gladly given his approval to a tax bill of $2,315,000,000, which in addition to the social-security tax of $1,400,000,000 would have amounted to $3,715,000,000, all of which would have come out of the pock-

ets of the American taxpayers and thus would be diverted, from the dangerous stream of inflation, to the Treasury for war purposes and to the social-security fund to guarantee the future solvency of the plan.

We can readily understand the Treasury's position and the attitude of the President in his objection to the repeated freezing of the social-security tax; and, while the tax bill and the freezing action are separate and distinct, when you credit a freeze of $1,400,000,000 against a revenue bill of $2,315,000,000, you have a net diversion from the inflationary stream of only $915,000,000, and that is not only inadequate but absolutely unjustified at this time. Had there been no move to freeze the social-security tax, due and payable during the year 1944, the total figure of $3,715,000,000 would have been $2,800,000,000 in excess of the visible total diversion from the inflationary stream, which, as I pointed out before, amounts to a net of only $915,000,000.

We can understand the Treasury's position and the sustaining attitude of the President. At least, I can see it in a clear perspective that he desires as much revenue as is possible in addition to the retention of the social-security tax. We can see it in the suggestion of the Executive that if the Congress chooses to reenact the excise taxes, which amount to approximately $1,100,000,000, he will promptly and gladly approve the action. If we will take this figure and add it to the $1,400,000,000 of social-security taxes, which would be collectible should the Congress sustain the President in his veto action, the total amount of money diverted from the inflationary pool would amount to $2,500,000,000, or $165,000,000 more than the total amount of the revenue bill.

I am not an expert in accounting, but it is elementary and clear to me that the revenue bill plus the social-security tax would divert $3,715,000,000 from the spending spree, whereas a credit of $1,400,000,000 against the revenue bill leaves but a net of $915,000,000, which is a difference between what might have been and what we actually face if the President's veto is not sustained, of $2,800,000,000. This $2,800,000,000 is, in turn, and in itself $485,000,000 larger than the tax bill which has brought about the President's disapproval.

As one who has always championed social security on a broad and liberal basis, maintained largely from revenues levied upon industry and upon the beneficiaries, I am in agreement with the President that the time has come when we must put a stop to the ill-advised and repeated underreaming of the social-security plan by a method employed in the Senate which could not prevail in the House. I knew that some day the President, or possibly we in the House, would catch up with this repeated weakening of the social-security fund and would stop this freezing method which endangers the future solvency of the entire structure.

At the time of the consideration of the social-security plan, we had no American Experience Mortality Table such as serves the life-insurance companies as a guide in establishing rates and providing reserves. We had to do the best we knew how and to provide a margin for future safety. Accordingly, we charted a course for the accumulation of reserves early in the life of the plan for we did know one thing as a certainty, and that was that at the outset the drain would be less and as the plan and the country became more mature, the revenues might be less and the drain on the reserves become increasingly heavier. We foresaw, and the experts so advised, a substantial accumulation of reserves in the early years but a tremendous increase in the drain beginning somewhere, as I recall from memory, about 1965 and increasing progressively until about 1985, at which time there would be a dip in the drain and thence a leveling off line toward the end of the chart.

The fault that I find with the repeated and deliberate freezing of social-security revenues is that it has been brought about by an off-hand amendment in the other Chamber and this has been done without any hearings. I have no objection to a revision of the tax rate or a freezing application but I want it to be done in an orderly manner and it must be done only after hearing every argument, pro and con. It is not for us as legislators to arbitrarily freeze the revenues of the social-security fund because we enjoy that privilege and because we might have the right to do so. Let me call your attention to the fact that the social-security reserve fund is growing right now because a great many men and women who have been beneficiaries or who have been drawing upon the fund are today employed in industry. Thus the funds of the social-security plan are growing, not only because of the fact that the number of beneficiaries is smaller but also because, in addition, they are contributing to the reserve fund. It is not always going to be that way or, at least, it may not. We do not know what will be the immediate effect of the war upon the reserve fund, and I believe it is dangerous and unwarranted that we should experiment and approve the repeated strangulation and raiding of what is a trust fund for present and future citizens, the beneficiaries of a great and benevolent plan.

I am constrained, for the purpose of blocking these attempts in the future, to vote to sustain the President's veto.

To conclude, let me say that I concede to my distinguished chairman and to my colleagues on both sides the right to differ with me in my contentions and to choose the opposite course. I hold that that is their privilege and I concede that they are totally sincere in their opposition to the President's action, but I am bound in conscience to defend and protect the Social Security Act until facts and data shall have convinced me that the reserves are excessive and unwarranted. Therefore, I repeat I shall vote to sustain the President and urge you, in the light of my remarks, to do likewise.

Total of revenue bill	$2,315,000,000
Social-security tax freeze	1,400,000,000
Total amount of drain upon inflation pool	3,715,000,000
Total of revenue bill	2,315,000,000
Less social-security-tax freeze	1,400,000,000
Net minimum drain upon inflation pool	915,000,000
Difference between maximum and minimum possible diversion from inflation pool	2,800,000,000
Amount of vetoed bill	2,315,000,000
Amount of vetoed bill (in itself) is less than the difference by	485,000,000

Or to show it in another way—

Reenactment of the excise taxes in the vetoed bill	$1,100,000,000
Plus retention of the social-security-tax freeze	1,400,000,000
Total amount of these two items	2,500,000,000
Amount of vetoed bill	2,315,000,000
Vetoed bill is less than the 2 items shown by	165,000,000

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the revenue bill when it was before us in the House. I voted today, however, to override the President's veto. I have not changed my views with reference to the bill itself. I am opposed to some of the provisions contained in the bill, and I regret that it did not contain other provisions which, in my judgment, should have been included within it. I voted against the bill while it was still before the legislative department of the Government, because that was the only available way I had to go on record with reference to the measure. However, the situation is now completely changed.

No one denies the President has the right to veto any bill passed by the Congress. That is not an issue here. In passing, let me say that I am informed that this is, however, the first general revenue bill vetoed by a President in the more than 150 years of our history. The present Chief Executive has vetoed about 600 bills passed by the Congress, out of some 1,750 vetoed in the century and a half of our history. Jefferson vetoed none. The question before us is not veto power, but the right of the President to control taxation and override the powers of the Congress, composed of 531 representatives of the people. The merits or demerits of the revenue bill is not now the issue before us. The question now is, Shall American constitutional government and our American way of life be upheld or rejected? It is a time to stand up and be counted, and I want to stand up and be counted on the side of maintaining our Republic, foursquare with the Constitution.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. It has been recognized from time

immemorial that the control of the purse strings is the control of the Government. The founding fathers of our Republic were painfully aware of this fact. They provided in the Constitution that the control of taxation should be lodged in the Congress, and only the House of Representatives, being the most numerous and nearest the people, elected every 2 years, should initiate all tax legislation. When they met in Philadelphia to frame the Constitution they had just emerged from a long and bloody conflict, in which one of the major issues was taxation. The Boston Tea Party was still fresh in their memories, and the magic words "no taxation without representation" was ringing in their ears. They could still recite from memory the stinging indictments against despotic powers over them, penned by the immortal Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, which forced the struggling Colonies to sever their connection with the government which imposed them. They vividly recalled that the history of that despotic rule was a history of repeated injuries and usurpations. Among these grievances against which they complained were that the King had made judges dependent on his will; that he had erected a multitude of new offices and sent hither swarms of officers to harass their people and eat their substance; that he had imposed taxes on them without their consent; that he had abolished the free system of English laws, establishing therein an arbitrary government; that he had taken away and altered, fundamentally, the forms of their government; that he had suspended their own legislatures and declared himself invested with power to legislate for them.

Gradually we have seen slipping away the powers vested in the Congress by the Constitution. The Congress is the one bulwark that stands between the American people and despotism. If the Congress shirks its duty and permits the executive branch to take from it the control not only of taxes but of other legislation, the American way of life will be doomed. We have seen the powers of Congress surrendered, one by one, to the Executive, and we have seen bureaucratic control reach out and draw within its meshes the powers of government over the lives and the property of the American people which were vested by the founding fathers in the exclusive control of the Congress. We have seen the tax revenues of the American people squandered and dissipated in profligate spending by an entrenched bureaucracy, until the very financial foundations of our Government are being undermined. Every needed dollar for war expenditures will be cheerfully provided, but today we are spending at the rate of $100,000,000,000 a year, and a national debt looms ahead of three hundred billions, and we are placing a tax burden upon our people by this bill and existing tax laws of upward of $42,000,000,000 a year. We began the war with a public debt of $65,000,000,000. We have since appropriated $366,000,000,000.

We here in the Congress know that much of this spending by uncontrolled bureaus and Federal agencies is wasting the people's substance, is interfering with the successful prosecution of the war, and is heading our Government toward bankruptcy. The Ways and Means Committee of the House, charged with the responsibility of originating revenue legislation and conserving our national wealth, after months of arduous work, has presented this tax bill, which has likewise been approved by the Senate Committee on Finance, and both branches of the Congress. The two objectives uppermost in the minds of the Members of the Congress in this tax legislation is, first, to provide the necessary revenues for the prosecution of the war and the maintenance of the Government; and second, to keep the burden of taxation maintained at a level at which the American people may meet the obligation and keep their own affairs solvent. They rightfully rejected overtures to use the taxing power as a vehicle for bringing about social changes.

Every American recalls that the American patriots of 1776 concluded the declaration of their independence with these prophetic words:

> And for the support of this Declaration, with firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

The pledge was kept. They paid with their blood to keep it. Their fortunes were sacrificed and their lives were gladly given in exchange for their freedom, and that the Constitution and the American Republic might be established. Into our keeping has come that sacred heritage from our forebears. We in the Congress have taken a solemn oath to maintain and uphold it.

Mr. Speaker, the time has arrived again for the American people to make a new declaration of independence. The veto of the revenue bill is only one step in a plan of the Executive to gain control of the purse, to override and destroy the powers of the Congress and to undermine the Constitution, and to bring under the complete control of the executive department all of the functions of government in our country. We were not elected to liquidate the American Congress. The time has arrived for the Members of the Congress in both branches to take a stand either for or against constitutional government and the maintenance, unsullied, of the complete independence of each of the three coordinate branches of the Government—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive. Today we are ruled by Presidential directives and Executive orders. The time is here for the Congress to recapture its constitutional powers, to throw off the domination of the Executive, and restore constitutional government. The vote on this veto has pointed the way.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I saw the First World War from the other end; this war I am seeing from this end—the legislative end. But there is a striking resemblance in the feelings that men have when they are doing the fighting and someone else is doing the profiteering, and that feeling is that there should be no profits made out of any war.

Now we chafe under the sting of a Presidential veto. And so, being slapped, the House now wants to slap back. But do you not think, my colleagues, there is another and a higher consideration to which we owe fealty? Just suppose the President is right. Just suppose that when he says this bill "takes from the needy and gives to the greedy" the facts in the case justify his statement. Is it good statesmanship on our part to say, "Never mind about excessive war profits; let us get 'even' with the President"? My colleagues, I have been into the files of the Navy Department, the War Department, and the Maritime Commission price-adjustment boards, and I know every one of you having a similar opportunity would react as I have. You could no more countenance such unconscionable profits as are being made by war contractors making the things our soldiers have to have to win this war than can I. Now the boards are recapturing most of these profits and saving billions of dollars to the taxpayers of our country. But the bill the President vetoed ends renegotiation on December 31, or, at latest, 6 months after, and then, in truth, the sky will be the limit. There are other loopholes. True, loophole after loophole was eliminated from the bill in conference, and for this every one of us should feel indebted to the conferees; but, my friends, in time of war we must not permit a single loophole in any bill which would permit a single person to become rich. Oh, yes; the President is right—he knows the profits this bill permits and he has taken the same stand we should take. I hold that there rests on his shoulders no more solemn a duty to safeguard the interests of the people of this country than rests on ours. It is not, as some would have it, "How can we get even with the President?" It is, "How can we act for the greatest benefit of the people?" The President is right. I shall support his veto.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I arrived on the floor after my name had been called for a vote to sustain or reject the President's veto on the tax bill. Due to an unavoidable appearance before the State Department on an immigration matter for a constituent, I arrived some 3 minutes late. In such a case the rules of the House prohibit the Member qualifying for the roll-call vote. I immediately entered my name on the pair list in favor of sustaining the President's veto. If I had been present in time for qualification, I would have cast my vote in favor of sustaining the President's veto.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the overriding of the President's veto of the tax bill, permit me to say that the so-called $2,000,000,000 tax bill does not provide sufficient revenue. None of us like to pay further taxes, but we must bear in mind that it is necessary to furnish guns, weapons, and materials to our fighting forces and that we dare not fail our servicemen, even to the extent of one gun; consequently taxes are necessarily high. On the other hand, we must not allow those whose incomes have not increased or those whose incomes have decreased to be overburdened. The tax should be placed on those most able to pay. We cannot escape the fact that many war millionaires were made in the other war; therefore, every precaution should be taken at this time to assure our people that war contractors shall not make excessive profits as a result of the bloodshed of our servicemen during this dreadful conflict.

I fear that this might happen if renegotiation of war contracts were suspended. At this time when we are considering the veto, we must remember that the passions unloosed are still at their flood stage at this hour and that judgments made in the heat of passion are not to be trusted and that deductions drawn from such judgments may not survive the searchings of cool reason. Thoughtful men will therefore be slow to assess the significance of yesterday's drama. Nothing of importance that has happened will lose its significance during a cooling-off period.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SOMERS of New York asked and was given permission to extent his own remarks in the RECOCD.)

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech made by Commissioner Earl G. Harrison, of the Immigration Service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have just voted to override the Presidential veto of the tax bill.

Two billions of dollars is more money than all the farmers of Illinois received for their farm products for 1943. In order to receive even less than $2,000,000,000 it required the work and investment of over 500,000 Illinois farm families working from 12 to 16 hours every day of the year. Yet President Roosevelt tells Senator BARKLEY and the Congress that the $2,000,000,000 additional taxes which would be raised under the bill vetoed, which like all tax measures by reason of numbers falls heaviest on the farmers and laborers of America, is to him, the President, "a mere crust of bread."

Mr. Speaker, the American farmer, laborer and white-collared worker will be found to have little sympathy with the viewpoint of a President who so flippantly shrugs off such an accumulation of the results of their sweat and toil, representing as it does their patriotic effort to maintain their homes while valiantly contributing to the purchase of war bonds to back up the service of their sons on the field of battle.

Mr. Speaker, does not the President know that these patriotic citizens of moderate income are now bearing tax burdens to the very limit of their ability to pay? I am certain that the Congress knows this.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by me on Thursday, February 10, 1944, at a Lincoln Day dinner at Chattanooga, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, as one who has differed many times with the President of the United States and one who has voted against measures sponsored by him and as one who voted against the present tax bill, and against the conference report, I find myself unable to agree with the distinguished gentlemen who are advocating the overthrow of the veto of the President. The President asked the Congress after going into the finances of this country for $10,500,000,000 to carry on this war, which is the most vicious, inhuman contest ever waged between nations or men, where the lives of babies, women, and children and innocents are sacrificed, and where our enemies are more than devilish and savage. The Congress responded to the request of the President by the passage of a measure providing for about one-fourth or 25 percent of that asked for. Surely, the President did not want to bleed white the taxpayers of the country unnecessarily. Surely, he must have thought the ten and one-half billion would be the least we could get along with. Surely, he must have thought that we do not want to leave the burden of paying for this war as well as fighting it and dying in it on the boys who are on the seven seas and on the lands everywhere throughout the world, whose voices for the present cannot be heard.

The distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said the President must have been imposed upon or deceived or both or he would not have signed the message delivered to Congress. I am not so sure that it was the President who was misled or deceived. It may have been the Congress when it responded to the President's call, in the manner in which it did. We must pay taxes if we are going to win this war. I am wondering how the boys who are facing the bullets, bombs, and the dynamite coming from above and in front of them and underneath them, who read the scare headlines in their home papers of the fighting and the quibbling over words that is going on between the White House and the Congress, will feel. I am wondering if they are saying, "What is the use, no cooperation at home, they have only to pay money over there, over here we have to give our blood and our lives. What are we fighting for?"

We are reeling under the impact of a blow to our pride. It has been stung and maybe our intelligence has been challenged. I see nothing in the message to indicate that the Congress did not exercise good faith. Suppose the President has used intemperate language in his veto measure. Suppose he has used reasons for veto that are not compelling aside from the inadequacy of the amount provided for in the bill. Can we under the present war-emergency conditions afford to let it go out over the world to the boys who are fighting and dying for us that we cannot unite and cooperate at home and provide the money with which to fight?

I cannot agree that the President's veto of the tax bill is either a blunder or unwarranted. I for one refuse to be stampeded into a hysterical mood by the loud clamorings of either the press or individuals and I would consider myself other than consistent and fair if I were to vote to override the President's veto. I should consider myself not consistent because I have repeatedly said that the tax bill, particularly as amended by the Senate, is not commensurate with either the needs of the war or our ability to pay, as our ability to pay should be the yardstick. I should consider myself unfair because I would thereby be burdening unborn generations with a debt not of their making and one which could and should have been more properly met at the present time.

I have always voted for what I thought were the best interests of both the people of the United States and my constituents and today in agreeing with the President I, too, say the tax bill was a poor excuse of a bill to raise revenue for a nation at war.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received unanimous consent to insert a certain address in the RECORD. Today I am advised that the cost is $105, that it exceeds the allowance by one-third of a page. Notwithstanding that, I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I delivered on February 22 at Washington's Tomb as the Irish war veterans placed a wreath on the tomb.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VETO OF TAX BILL

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on important business relating to the Military Affairs Committee and did not reach the floor of the House until the vote was announced. If present I would have voted to override the Presidential veto of the tax bill. I believe that under our system of government raising revenue is primarily the function of Congress. Heretofore, never in our long history has any Executive sought to interfere with this function.

Undoubtedly there is urgent need for simplifying the very complex and confusing tax forms issued by the United States Treasury, and Congress itself will have to move at once to this end. But I believe that in this crisis, above all times, we must maintain our constitutional system and preserve the line of demarcation between the powers of Congress and the Executive, upon which our Government is so largely based. Any other course which involves making the representatives of the people the mere pawns of the Executive will inevitably lead to dictatorship, and that is the very last thing the American people want.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of feeding the starving children of Europe.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE TAX BILL VETO

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in voting on the issue that was just laid before the House I found myself in the position that many a President has found himself, confronted with making a decision on a piece of legislation presented for approval that contains many good provisions and some objectionable ones. In making my decision I concluded that the good provisions of this bill outweighed the objectionable features and for that reason I have supported this tax bill. I see no reason why the President cannot come to this Congress in an orderly way and ask for additional tax legislation. I am sure the record of this Congress will show that he will get it.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many criticisms in the President's veto message to which I should like to reply. Because of the limited time allotted to me I shall direct my remarks solely to the criticism that the bill does not provide sufficient revenue.

Should the President's demand for $10,500,000,000 be acceded to, the burden would fall most heavily upon the personal income taxpayer. We have no way of telling what the income under existing laws will amount to, and until that is ascertained it is illogical to make any changes. Changes in our tax laws have been too frequent. They have left the people confused and embarrassed by not knowing or being able to anticipate the amount of their taxes.

The revenues from present taxes, in the aggregate, are steadily increasing with a rising national income and the expansion of consumer spending. In fact, the receipts from existing taxes are rising faster than the Treasury statisticians have anticipated. When the bill providing for payment of taxes out of current income was adopted several months ago, the Treasury stated that it would add only $3,000,000,000 to tax revenues in 1944 and 1945. But at the end of last July the Treasury conceded that its early estimate was too low, and it raised its estimate to $5,000,000,000. Recent reports indicate that this estimate is probably still too low.

It is too early to forecast what the final revenues from the present taxes will be during the present and the ensuing fiscal years. With the national income trending upward and with prices and consumer spending on the rise, tax collections are bound to increase. In view of the existing very high tax rates, further increases should be avoided at least until we know what revenues our present taxes will produce.

The Treasury has time after time revised its estimates of the national income. Not long ago it was speaking of a possible income of $100,000,000,000. This was revised upward to $125,000,000,000, then to $130,000,000,000, and later to $140,000,000,000. Now the Treasury declares that an aggregate income of $152,000,000,000 will be paid out during the fiscal year 1944. We know it will not be long until this figure is revised upward to $200,000,000,000, and probably more.

We must now seriously consider whether the present tax rates are all that the American people can bear without grave and permanent injury to the national economy. These rates will supply more and more revenue as the national income rises. It may be questioned whether it is not unnecessary and unwise to increase those rates for fear that the higher rates might cause diminishing returns and dry up future revenue sources.

Tax collections are mounting with the growth of the national income, the expansion of consumer spending, and higher tax rates. The existing tax rates are already very heavy. We have already provided for increases of 12.5 percent in the income tax upon income received in 1943 and 1944. To the extent that governmental economies can be effected, and there is a strong sentiment in Congress and throughout the country for economies, spending needs may further be lightened.

Under these conditions, a tax holiday in personal income taxes is desirable, at least until the full revenue effects of present taxes are known.

In the spring of 1942 it became apparent to me that the most equitable method of raising revenue for war purposes was by a general retail-sales tax except on food and medicinal supplies. The estimate was that the income from this source would amount to approximately $5,000,000,000 annually. It is plain to be seen what the results would have been had such a program been adopted. It is difficult to understand the resistance of the administration to such a program in the light of the President's comment that he approves of that portion of the pending bill providing for an increase in so-called excise taxes. These taxes are paid by the consumer and amount to retail-sales taxes by a different name.

The logical thing to do at the moment is to observe the operation of present laws. That is the plan under the pending bill. When the income of the Government under existing economic conditions can be definitely ascertained and attention given to reduction in governmental expenditures the problem can be

intelligently handled. Meanwhile, the measure is not without virtue in providing new revenue to the extent of $2,300,000,000.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include therein a short article by the superintendent of schools of Perth Amboy, in my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I made on Washington's Birthday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VETO OF TAX BILL

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the tax bill because I thought we could get a better one and I had hoped that something would be done looking toward simplification. The President, however, presents another issue in his veto message—the maintenance of constitutional processes in America.

Let me quote the President in a campaign address in New York City on November 3, 1932. He said:

> Many unthinking people have inveighed against the Congress in every generation of our Republic, little realizing that they are striking at the very fabric of our Constitution. If they would but think for a moment they would realize that if we were to eliminate the Congress of the United States, we would automatically cease to be a Republic.

Mr. Speaker, the President said in this same speech:

> The present Chief Executive of our Nation (Herbert Hoover) has shown a singular lack of ability to cooperate with the Congress. * * * The relations between the Capitol and the White House have, to say the least, lacked cordiality, understanding, and common national purpose.

Today I vote to override and I think it is high time that cordiality, understanding, and common national purpose in this period of all-out war were restored here in Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement on post-war planning by the Honorable James J. Lyons.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ABSENCE OF MR. RAMSPECK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] is absent from the House today. He was taken to the hospital last night for a very serious operation. I wanted to announce this to the House in order to explain for the RECORD the reason of the absence of the distinguished Democratic whip.

VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] propounded a question to his colleagues a few minutes ago. I should like to ask the gentleman, and, through him, the country, a question: Should it offend any power, no matter where it might be lodged, that in this time of the Nation's peril, the Congress should put its chief concern in its country's good rather than party success? Is it to be considered a sign of mental and moral degeneracy if we should contend that here on earth we are all still mortal and subject to all the weaknesses of human nature, that to us there is still but one God and He resides in heaven?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the New York Times on the Polish situation and the valiant fight the Poles are making for the Allied forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable after so much time had been consumed by Members who took issue with the President in his veto of the tax bill that those who, under the rules of the House, had control of the time in connection with the motion to override the President's veto would not permit myself and other Members who supported the President's position to have time to rebut the assertions made by Members who so vehemently disagreed with the President and attacked his motives.

Mr. Speaker, we have just voted on this issue. I am glad to say that I supported the President in his veto of the tax bill. In my humble opinion he had ample justification for his action and in doing so he was concerned about the greatest good of the greatest number of American citizens, and he acted as fearlessly and as courageously as he has on many occasions in the past in behalf of the humble American citizen of average means.

None of those to whom I listened in their denunciation of the President used any logic to dispute the contentions made by the President. Some hinted in tragic tones that somehow the Constitution was being violated, when actually the President in his veto was performing the duty imposed upon him by the Constitution, namely the vetoing of legislation of which he could not conscientiously approve.

Many of the provisions in this bill had no place in a tax measure. Repeal of previous legislation with regard to social security would have with better grace and perhaps with more courage been handled through separate legislation. Repeal of provisions of the existing legislation with regard to renegotiation of contracts justified the President's statement that it was a relief measure not for the needy but for the greedy. By incorporating this repeal in the tax bill, Congress while enacting legislation to raise over $2,000,000,000 more of revenue, at the same time was abolishing provisions which enabled the Government to recapture excess war profits, which will amount to much more than two billions. For the past 6 months there has been a determined drive to repeal this law, which prevented exorbitant profits on war contracts. Washington has swarmed with lobbyists working for this end. I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee, which held hearings on proposals to repeal renegotiation legislation. No witness from any of the Government departments having these war contracts with industry approved repeal of the major provisions of this law and all endorsed heartily its objective. Indeed, the more far-seeing businessmen who appeared before our committee endorsed the law and stated it would act as a deterrent upon the more avaricious type of individual, who was only concerned about making as much money from the war as is possible, to the detriment of industry and business as a whole. If for no other reason than this the tax bill should have been vetoed. Now the brakes are off. Exorbitant, outrageous profits will, in the future, be the goal of many individuals who are not much concerned about the blood American boys are shedding or what the burden will be on the American taxpayer of small income. The special privileges accorded to the big lumber industries and the exemptions from the excess-profits

tax granted to the natural-gas pipe line owners will put millions of dollars into the coffers of these companies, which can only be made up by increased taxation on other types of business and also upon the millions of small wage earners in America. If this is not special treatment and discrimination against other taxpayers I do not know what is.

Many Members seemed to be very much hurt by the criticism of the legislation contained in the President's message. Many have assumed a persecution complex. And this attitude, this protest about the so-called harsh language in the President's message, comes from a body that almost daily witnesses the most bitter attacks upon the President and his motives that have ever been heard against the head of any Government, in any country, in the history of the world. Certainly Congress does not expect the President in disapproving a bill would laud its provisions or commend the good judgment of those who approved it. Do they think he should strangle his conscience and attach his signature to a law which, in his opinion, is objectionable and against the best interests of the American people? To demonstrate what part partisan politics and animosity to the President played in the final action on this legislation, I would direct the attention of the House and the country to the fact that more than 25 members of the Republican Party who previously voted against passage of the bill before it was sent to the President for his consideration have now reversed themselves and have just voted to override his veto.

Certainly when the President spoke of the complications of the present tax forms and the confusion and irritation created in the minds of the people by these complicated forms, he struck a note that can be well appreciated by all who have struggled with this paper work and the American people can well understand what he was talking about.

For my part I am glad the President consistently adhered to the policy of protecting the millions of American citizens which has characterized his service to the American people, and I am happy to have been one of those who, despite innuendoes and malicious inferences, supported him in the action he took.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MILLS of Arkansas and Mr. LUDLOW asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a magazine clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAPOZZOLI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable, indeed, that such an important measure as this tax bill should be considered at a time when feelings are running high and there is little disposition, in many quarters, to judge it on its relative merits.

This bill, vetoed by the President, is either good or bad, irrespective of what particular language the President has employed in his veto message. Certainly, it must be admitted that the President's language is no part of the bill itself and, therefore, it should play no part in the decision of whether the veto should be sustained or overridden.

Some of my colleagues have said that the language of the President was unfortunate and that more votes would have been cast in support of the veto if different language had been used. However that may be, it is my duty to approach this entire question with a view to serving the best interests of our country. I repeat, the composition of the President's veto message does not add one iota to the bill itself.

When the House took action on the conference report on this tax bill, I voted against it. I felt then, as I feel now, that I could not in conscience vote for this bill. I could go on at some length and discuss the provisions to which I object. Suffice it to state, I regard the bill as unfair to the little wage earner. I should like to call attention to the failure of the bill to abolish the Victory tax, the freezing of the social-security taxes and the elimination of the 10 percent earned-income credit. At the same time the bill terminates the present renegotiation authority as of December 31, 1944.

Of course, it is clear that others have the same right that I have to take action with reference to this bill as best squares with their own thoughts and opinions. So long as we disagree because of the particular provisions of the bill, then we are acting as level-headed legislators. But, if any action of ours is to be taken, irrespective of the merits of the bill, and only by way of getting even with the President, because of the use of the language to which objection has been raised, then I maintain we are failing in our duties as legislators and in serving the country's best interests.

I was opposed to this bill when it was passed and I am opposed to it now. I therefore must support the President's veto as it is consistent with my previous action in this matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a portion of two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article entitled "Congress and the Soldiers' Vote."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which recently appeared in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article by Robert C. Harper, entitled "Army Dentists' Vital Role in Keeping Fighters Fit."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all special orders heretofore entered for today I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend those remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial relative to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a column which appeared in the January 28, 1944, issue of Stars and Stripes, which was forwarded to me by a young man now serving in England; also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]?

There was no objection.

VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the conference report on this tax bill. I also voted against the bill when it first passed the House. I had three reasons for my action. First was that I believed certain of the renegotiation provisions were too liberal and might unnecessarily open the way to war profiteering—notably the provision that renegotiation be discontinued after the first of next year. I did not and do not object to the provision for review in the tax court of future renegotiation decisions.

My second reason was that I believe the bill so inadequate from a revenue standpoint as to be of little consequence. I think this most serious at a time when we should be and could be coming much closer to paying for this war as we fight it—thus sparing future generations, including those actually fighting the war, a part of the future burden that otherwise they must carry.

And third, I opposed the bill because it froze social-security taxes at the very time of all times when they should have been increased as an anti-inflationary measure and as a means of building up for the future a reserve for the protection of millions of people.

These were my reasons for opposing this legislation. They are my reasons for voting to sustain the Presidential veto.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. VORYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES]?

There was no objection.

REPRESENTATIVES HOLMES AND GIFFORD

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I say that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES] is detained from being present today on account of the death of his mother. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] is also unable to be present on account of injuries recently received, but I am happy to say he is recovering.

STATE OF OREGON, DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest land intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "Association", insert "Northwest Oregon Fire Association."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER A. GAWALIS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1594) for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "injuries", insert "and property damage."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED HUNTER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1637) for the relief of Fred Hunter, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREDERICK LEE LITTLEFIELD

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1835) for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

On page 1, line 5, after the word "to", insert "the estate of."

On page 1, line 6, strike out "of Hyannis, Mass."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "him" and insert "Frederick Lee Littlefield, of Hyannis, Mass."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. McGEHEE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Frederick Lee Littlefield."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a soldier which recently appeared in the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO JUDICIAL CODE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 451, Rept. No. 1190), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3592) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 452, Rept. No. 1191), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3956) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection

charges shall not be deemed the payment of interests on deposits. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 448, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 239) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until July 1, 1945. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later, I shall as usual yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill extending the Commodity Credit Corporation to July 1, 1945. I have been informed that there is no opposition; that, in fact, nearly all the members of the great Committee on Banking and Currency are in favor of the bill. I, myself, believe the life of that Corporation should be extended. I feel that there is no opposition to the rule, therefore I shall not take the time of the House further in discussing it. However, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 minutes out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I voted to sustain the veto of the President because I believe he is right, and has the duty and the privilege under the Constitution to veto any bill he feels is not in the right direction. He recognizes the need for raising the sum of money he advocated, namely, $10,500,000,000, so that we can prosecute the war and bring about early victory.

You Republicans who have voted practically as one under the pressure of the Republican machine, had you listened to his urgent pleas and recommendations in 1937, 1938, and 1939 to appropriate a few million dollars for the fortification of Guam and other bases and for defense purposes, not only millions, but billions of dollars would have been saved. If that action had been taken, the tax which the President has asked for would not have been necessary.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday and today, I have received many telegrams urging that I vote to override his veto. Every one of these messages have come from corporations. Corporations as you know have no souls and, unfortunately, have only their own interests at heart, and they seem to fail to recognize their responsibility to their country. The war profiteers are espousing this bill because of the provisions contained therein which will weaken the Renegotiation Act and enable them to retain in their jeans hundreds of millions of dollars. Yes, twice as much as the bill provides for the collection of taxes. In brief, it tends to relieve the war profiteers and imposes additional taxes on the small taxpayer. As I said a few days ago, this is a Republican political bill, but I am satisfied that when the people back home are informed as to the manner in which it was originally forced through in the committee and in the House and the advantage which the Republicans are seeking, it will be bound to react to their disadvantage.

I feel that those men who are fighting for democracy and for the preservation of our institutions and freedom and liberty will look with disfavor upon the action of the Congress today in overriding the veto. I voted to sustain the President, because I know he is honest, sincere, and courageous. He might have used a little stronger language in his veto message than some gentlemen feel he should have, and I am not going to maintain that the President is infallible and has not made some mistakes, but people who are passive and do nothing are incapable of making mistakes. When the President realizes he has made a mistake he, as any great man would do, promptly seeks to rectify it. Is it not to be wondered that in the multiplicity of matters of tremendous importance pertaining to the war and domestic fronts he has been obliged to shoulder that he has made so few mistakes?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me state that I feel we should raise as much money as possible at this time to carry on this war, because there is more money in the country today than ever before and industry has amassed the greatest profits in the history of our Nation. Therefore, it should be much easier to raise the money now than to wait until the boys return and then seek to impose these taxes upon them. This bill tends to legislate in the interest of war profiteers. I say there should be no profiteering to the extent of millions of dollars when our boys are suffering and going through the tortures of hell fighting for humanity and democracy.

The fact is that the taxation the President asked for would not be collected out of capital or out of the billions deposited in the banks throughout the Nation, but would be derived only from the excessive profits and incomes accumulated by the big corporations and those persons who have engaged in war contracts and in furnishing supplies and services to our armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to my beloved friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the House in its wisdom has spoken by a majority of 3 to 1 and I do not see that it serves any great public service to have individuals who supported the President's veto get up here and explain their reasons why. The matter has been settled by the House itself by a vote of 3 to 1. That speaks for itself, and I do not propose to take the time of the House to answer the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the pending rule. It is a wide open rule, providing for 2 hours of general debate, on the bill extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is a simple, practical question. No one has sought to do away with the Commodity Credit Corporation. Even those who were fighting subsidies made no effort whatever to eliminate the Commodity Credit Corporation. This bill provides for its extension for 1 year, or at least to June 30, 1945.

The farmers of America are generally in favor of this extension. They want to know so that they can plan their crops in an orderly way. Therefore, I hope that the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will pass.

I understand, however, that certain amendments will be offered to the bill by members of the committee. This, of course, raises a question whether the House wants to go along and modify the powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is not my purpose to discuss that, but merely to say that the bill comes up under a rule unanimously adopted, and that it is a practical question and should be passed upon today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota.

There was no objection.

THE VETO AND RENEGOTIATION

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, the vote today did not turn upon the details of the tax bill. The RECORD should show, however, the inadequacy and the inaccuracy of the excuses given for the veto.

It has been suggested by the distinguished Member from Minnesota, the Honorable HAROLD KNUTSON, that I speak of the paragraph on renegotiation of war contracts.

The President complained, Mr. Speaker, that a clause in the tax bill terminates the present renegotiation authority on December 31 of this year. That is misleading and is only part of the story.

Waiving the reasons which produced December 31 as a legislative compromise, that date is 10 months away, and the President made no mention of the specific provision in the bill that gives him the right to extend the act 6 months and put the expiration 16 months away.

Congress has changed many expiration dates with less notice than that.

Moreover, the President ignores and overlooks the new title in the bill on the repricing of war contracts, which establishes by statute the renegotiation principle of price adjustment for all new war contracts. Read title VIII, section 801, of the bill:

When the Secretary—

Meaning the head of the specified war procurement agencies covered in the statute—

deems that the price of any article or service of any kind * * * is unreasonable or unfair, the Secretary may require the person furnishing such article or service to negotiate to fix a fair and reasonable price therefor.

The bill, by this section, makes repricing a part of every war contract by statute; every contract entered into 30 days after its enactment. Thus, price adjustment continues. It does not stop. Thus, the termination date on the old statute in effect requires only that renegotiations on old or current contracts shall be completed within 15 or 16 months. It does not terminate price adjustment. The new title establishes authority for repricing by all agencies that are under the present law; there are no exceptions. Whenever the Secretary deems a price unfair, he can act, and "any person aggrieved by an order fixing a price under this section may sue the United States in any appropriate court."

Which brings me to the President's other objection to the revisions in the present renegotiation statute. He says:

The formal right of appeal to the Tax Court is an inept provision. * * * The present Tax Court * * * does not have the personnel or the time to assume this heavy load.

It is true that the provision does not follow the usual Roosevelt formula of creating a new court or a new bureau to handle the job. It follows, instead, the old-fashioned idea of placing a job in the hands of an agency of proved competence and dispatch. It places the job in the hands of a court which has experts in the field of costs and profits and experts in the field of corporate structure and finance. What court would the President suggest for the court of final review?

As to the load—nobody knows whether that will be heavy or not. Appeals go to The Tax Court only if a contractor files a petition against a unilateral order of the Price Adjustment Board. Where the contractor and the Government reach an agreement in renegotiation, there is no review by the Board. And where the contractor accepts the order of the Board, The Tax Court will never hear of the case.

Now, the truth is, that placing this explicit provision for appeal in the renegotiation statute provides a safeguard for recoveries that have been made. All attacks upon the constitutionality of the present statute have been based on the fact that the right of appeal has not been certain. So far from opening the door to recoveries, then, this right of appeal puts a padlock upon the renegotiations that have been completed and accepted. The Chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate, an eminent jurist, estimates that this protects $2,000,000,000 in recoveries heretofore made.

The section of the President's message, Mr. Speaker, dealing with renegotiation reveals no appreciation or understanding of the legislative process whatsoever.

No bill before the Congress, no statute on the books, in an equal space of time, can show an amount of legislative deliberation equal to the amendments on renegotiation embodied in the tax bill. This is a young statute.

The word "renegotiation" as applied to war contracts was first written into legislation by an amendment adopted on this floor, in the House of Representatives, on the 28th of March 1942 during consideration of the sixth supplemental defense appropriation bill. It had been proposed in the hearings of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department on that bill. A tentative text of the amendment was submitted to the Ordnance Branch and the Chief of Engineers and discussed, as the hearings printed at that time show.

I explained that the purpose was to give statutory support to a practice that was then being developed voluntarily where contractors were agreeable. Experience had shown that legislation was necessary to bring in contractors who did not adjust prices voluntarily.

When the bill went to the floor, time was fixed and debate was limited but the amendment was explained and notice given that it would be offered. The customary point of order was raised that in the form offered, it "required executive action," thus placing additional duties on administrative officers of the Government. That point of order was immediately conceded and the amendment was reoffered in a way to avoid the point of order.

A brief excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day tells the story:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1942; pp. 3139–3140]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk, and which I have previously explained. The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 36, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 402–A. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments, designated as "final payment" until the contractor shall have filed with the procuring agency a certificate of costs and an agreement for renegotiation and reimbursement satisfactory to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy as the case may be.' "

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that under the guise of a limitation the amendment would require Executive action.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 36, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

" 'SEC. 402–A. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay that portion of a contract for construction of any character and/or procurement of material and supplies for either the Military or Naval Establishments designated as 'final payment' to any contractor who fails to file with the procuring agency a certificate of cost and an agreement for renegotiation of contract and reimbursement of profits in excess of 6 percent.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 70, noes 8.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment went to the Senate. There the parliamentary situation in the House was explained to Senator MCKELLAR, chairman of the Appropriations Committee in charge of the bill, who proceeded to work out details for an expansion of the amendment into the full statute that has been on the books since April 28, 1942. As I recall, the committee in the other body devoted the entire week of their Easter recess to working out the details of a workable statute, aided by staff members of the War Department.

It was a new thing in profit control. It had its imperfections. When the conference report was before the House, I recall saying that we should not go home and tell our people that we had solved the problem of controlling excessive war profits. I recall urging that committees continue to work on the problem.

And committees did. They watched the operation of the new law.

In the fall of 1942, certain amendments were worked out and made a part of the revenue bill at that time.

In the spring of 1943, Chairman SNYDER, of the subcommittee for the War Department of the House Appropriations Committee, devoted a long hearing to the subject and, out of that, amendments were adopted which added the R. F. C. defense agencies to the War and Navy Departments and Maritime Commission, originally covered.

In January 1943, the Truman committee, through a subcommittee headed by Senator HATCH, undertook a study of the law's operation and issued a report 3 months later.

In June 1943 the House Committee on Naval Affairs held public hearings for 3 weeks. Testimony and exhibits were published in a report of 1,300 pages last October. Recommendations were embodied in a bill that was introduced by the chairman, the Honorable CARL VINSON of Georgia, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

In September, members of the House Ways and Means Committee cut short their vacation to open hearings that ran for weeks. The chairman, the Honorable

R. L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina, and the other members were considerate of every witness. The printed portion of their proceedings packed 1,100 pages, while the full committee and subcommittee, headed by the Honorable WESLEY DISNEY, of Oklahoma, spent many days in unrecorded deliberations.

Many Members of Congress appeared before the Ways and Means Committee. In my appearance I urged four major amendments, all of which, I am glad to say, are in the bill today. At the same time, I warned against repeal and against many of the amendments that had been discussed. The committee was most considerate and I feel that the refinements in the renegotiation statute are mainly due to the faithful and intelligent work done by the members on Ways and Means. It is a great committee of outstanding men, every one of whom serves his country well.

In December the Senate Finance Committee threshed the whole ground again. I joined others in pointing out on this floor that some of the amendments proposed at that time would have been emasculating. As that committee worked, it gained a better understanding of the statute and its effectiveness and brought out a constructive revision based upon the year and a half of operation.

Those revisions were again reviewed and revised in conference with members of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

And the result, Mr. Speaker, is, as the Washington Post said editorially a few days ago, "a testimonial to the legislative process."

Fortune magazine, in its number for February 1944, gives this recent dollar break-down of the accomplishments under the renegotiation statute:

The record of renegotiation

	Recoveries	Price reductions	Total	Recoveries	Cases cleared	Cases in progress	Total
Army	$1,805,008,000	$2,048,067,000	$3,853,075,000	6,226	7,920	3,690	17,836
Navy	816,076,000	890,501,000	1,706,577,000	722	2,432	1,161	4,315
Maritime Commission	80,955,000	55,750,000	136,705,000	141	384	452	977
War Shipping [1]	2,388,000	350,000	2,738,000	23	62	204	289
Treasury [1]	4,730,000	1,430,000	6,160,000	14	72	95	181
Total	2,709,157,000	2,996,098,000	5,705,255,000	7,126	10,870	5,602	23,598

[1] Not included under renegotiation law until April 1943.
An additional 26,000 war contractors have been screened out by the joint assignment board as not subject to renegotiation and another 2,000 are now being renegotiated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was just included in the renegotiation law in July 1943. These figures were the latest available at the end of 1943.

What the eventual results will be no one can say. Under Secretary of War Patterson has repeatedly said that the greatest advantages of the statute will prove to be the benefits in forward pricing. And obviously, the size of recoveries will grow smaller as new contracts are let on the basis of better cost data obtained in the renegotiation of earlier contracts.

Of the $13,000,000,000 of Army funds placed in reserve last fall, $1,500,000,000 was credited to price reduction. Of the additional fourteen billion placed in reserve in January, $10,916,000,000 was credited to "price reductions" from estimates that were necessarily made in the infancy of the war effort.

It will be understood, of course, that many factors entered into these price reductions and that renegotiation and the cost data developed thereby are only parts of the picture.

Enough has been said, however, to show the value of the renegotiation statute, Mr. Speaker, and to show that statutory renegotiation was a product of the legislative processes and a product of the legislative branch of the Government. I have dwelt upon renegotiation because securing and making fast its recoveries makes the provision for appeal to The Tax Court one of the virtues of the tax bill. And the overlooked title on repricing gives to the Government for the duration of the war the gains of the price adjustment procedure developed in renegotiation.

All bills have virtues; all have weaknesses. Did the values of the tax bill escape the President's attention?

Did the writer or writers of the message seriously mean that the veto was inspired by the excuses given? Was it terrible to extend to half a dozen marginal cost minerals — little lithium — spodumene — little mica, feldspar, talc, and so forth — in wartime only, the depletion allowances that have been given for years to big coal, big iron, and big oil?

Do the critics of freezing the social-security tax rate, when reserves are 18 times annual demand, really mean that that trust fund should be regarded as a part of the general revenues of the Treasury?

I refrain from saying anything about a self-proclaimed "grower and seller of timber" seeing no depletion difference between a 4- or 5-year crop of Christmas trees and a forest that yields once in a lifetime. A distinguished Member of another body has said enough.

Mr. Speaker, all men here know the protests that we have had on the tax bill. All men here know where the pressure on the President came from. We had it during our consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, when the history of today's vote is written it will not deal with the details of the tax bill. It will tell, instead, the story of how once again the people's representatives stood up to be counted in the age-old struggle to keep for the people the control over the purse which was won at Runnymede when Magna Carta said that henceforth taxes should not be imposed without the consent of the common council, a struggle that had another round when this country was born. "Taxation without representation is tyranny," our fathers said, and today we have said, "Taxation by command is tyranny, too."

When the roll of today's battle is reviewed, I am glad that my name will show on the side of government by the people. They only are unfit to govern themselves who fear or fail to do so.

TAX BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order. I just want to take this time to explain to the membership of the House the reason for my absence when the vote was taken on the Presidential veto of the tax bill. I called the office of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] at a quarter of 12 and asked if the vote would be taken immediately upon the House convening. I was assured there was going to be an hour of debate and probably 15 minutes' time would be lost; and that the vote probably would not be taken before a quarter after 1. So you can imagine my surprise when I arrived in the Chamber at 10 minutes of 1 from a conference with the War Food Administrator and representatives of the Maryland Canners' Association and found the vote was over. While it would not have influenced the vote at all, I just want to take this opportunity to say I am extremely sorry I was absent and not able to vote with the majority to override the Presidential veto of the tax bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I have already voted twice against the present tax measure—once on November 24, 1943, and again on February 7, 1944. I did so because I felt that during this period of grave emergency and great national income we should pay much more in taxes than the bill provided. I felt that heavy taxes in wartime was one of the best possible forms of insurance against inflation, and I felt that it was not fair to shift the burden of paying our debt on the citizens of tomorrow and the returned service men and women.

Since the President's veto of the tax bill on February 22, 1944, I have been reconsidering my previous position. I am not in accord with some of the arguments which he advances, especially those relating to the mineral and lumber industries, as I am of the opinion that the treatment accorded to the individuals in those two groups is in accord with sound policy. While the clause relating to renegotiation is not as comprehensive as I would like to see it, I think, nevertheless, that a good start has been made and that, through additional legislation, we can strengthen the hand of the Government in the renegotiation of contracts so that excess profits will be cut to a minimum.

I find that, in reviewing the tax bill and the veto message, I could use many kinds of "outs" to justify—at least, seemingly—a change in my previous positions. Certain parts of the tax bill appeal to me; other parts do not. However, I have come to the conclusion that my original

arguments against the bill still hold good and, therefore, I will uphold the veto.

I have a real responsibility back here as the Representative of the people of my district in Montana and an obligation to our men and women serving our country in its hour of need. I must and will do my honest best without regard of party or friends. I have had many difficult decisions to make in my 14 months in Congress. On every question presented to this body I have endeavored to see both sides and I have voted every time on the basis of what I considered best for the national welfare. Every vote that I have cast—and I have missed none—has been my own personal responsibility. No one has ever been responsible for any of my votes, and no one ever will be.

I must, therefore, in good conscience, carry out my original opposition to the tax bill. I cannot look upon this measure from a political or emotional point of view but only from the viewpoint of the national good. The consequences to me are immaterial, but the welfare of my country is paramount.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a resolution from the American Legion Post of St. Louis, Mo., in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in the House of Representatives H. R. 2329, to amend section 75 (a) of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended.

My bill reads as follows:

SEC. 75. (a) The judges of the several courts of bankruptcy shall appoint referees, to be known as conciliation commissioners, and who may be referees in bankruptcy, each for a term of 2 years and may remove them if their services are not needed or for other cause. One or more of such conciliation commissioners shall be appointed for each division or district, or such part thereof as may be designated from time to time, as may best serve the prompt, efficient, and economical administration of the cases filed under this section. Such conciliation commissioner must have the qualifications of a referee in bankruptcy, and be familiar with agricultural conditions and not engaged in the farm mortgage, banking, or farm-financing business. The court, if it deems it advisable, may appoint some suitable person as supervising conciliation commissioner in each judicial district or division, who shall have such supervising functions with relation to proceedings under this section as the court may by order specify.

I have had several hearings before the subcommittee and have been given the best of attention. However, this bill has been incorporated into H. R. 4166 and the bill has been amended to read as follows:

SEC. 75. (a) Every United States district court of bankruptcy shall appoint not more than 20 persons in any one State to be known as "conciliation commissioners." One such commissioner shall be appointed from each division or for the territory served by the city where terms of court are held. The court shall designate the territorial district of each such commissioner. A conciliation commissioner's term of office shall be 4 years, but he may be removed by the court if his services are no longer needed or for other cause. No individual shall be eligible to appointment as a conciliation commissioner unless he is a resident of the district, familiar with agricultural conditions therein and not engaged in the farm-mortgage business, the business of financing farmers or transactions in agricultural commodities or the business of marketing or dealing in agricultural commodities or of furnishing agricultural supplies. In each judicial district the court may, if it finds it necessary or desirable, appoint a suitable person as a supervising conciliation commissioner. The supervising conciliation commissioner shall have such supervisory functions under this section as the court may by order specify.

75. (b) Upon filing of any petition by a farmer under this section there shall be paid a fee of $25 to be transmitted to the clerk of the court and covered into the Treasury. The conciliation commissioner shall receive as compensation for his services a fee of $25 for each case submitted to him, to be paid out of the Treasury when the conciliation commissioner completes the duties assigned to him by the court. A supervising conciliation commissioner shall receive, as compensation for his services, a per diem allowance to be fixed by the court, in an amount not in excess of $10 per day, together with subsistence and travel expenses in accordance with the law applicable to officers of the Department of Justice. Such compensation and expenses shall be paid out of the Treasury. If the creditors at any time desire supervision over the farming operations of a farmer, the cost of such supervision shall be borne by such creditors or by the farmer, as may be agreed upon by them, but in no instance shall the farmer be required to pay more than one-half of the cost of such supervision. Nothing contained in this section shall prevent a conciliation commissioner who supervises such farming operations from receiving such compensation therefor as may be so agreed upon. No fees, costs, or other charges shall be charged or taxed to any farmer or his creditors by any conciliation commissioner or with respect to any proceeding under this section, except as hereinbefore in this section provided. The conciliation commissioner may accept and avail himself of office space, equipment, and assistance furnished him by other Federal officials, or by any State, county, or other public officials. The Supreme Court is authorized to make such general orders as it may find necessary properly to govern the administration of the office of conciliation commissioner and proceedings under this section; but any district court of the United States may, for good cause shown and in the interests of justice, permit any such general order to be waived.

75. (c) At any time prior to March 4, 1948, a petition may be filed by any farmer, stating that the farmer is insolvent or unable to meet his debts as they mature, and that it is desirable to effect a composition or an extension of time to pay his debts. The petition or answer of the farmer shall be accompanied by his schedules. The petition and answer shall be filed with the court, but shall, on request of the farmer or creditor, be received by the conciliation commissioner for the county in which the farmer resides and promptly transmitted by him to the clerk of the court for filing. If any such petition is filed, an order of adjudication shall not be entered except as provided hereinafter in this section.

They have taken from the bill which I have introduced the provision that the conciliation commissioner must have qualifications of a referee in bankruptcy; that a referee in bankruptcy must be a lawyer and qualified. This bill if allowed to go through without the amendment means that anybody may be appointed as a conciliation commissioner. The Members of the House know what has happened in appraisals in regard to matters that happen in our bankruptcy courts. The Federal judges of the United States of America, some former Members here, as well as the referees in bankruptcy of the United States of America, recognize the danger of letting down the bars, that someone, not qualified, might be one of these commissioners. I call the attention of the House that when the bill is called I shall seek to amend House bill 4166, introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], to provide that the commissioners shall have the qualifications of a referee in bankruptcy.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. As I understand it, you have introduced a bill and your bill now has been merged with another House resolution?

Mr. RAMEY. That is right; it has been merged with H. R. 4166.

Mr. JENKINS. And what you are seeking to do is to follow through so the principle of your bill may be properly incorporated in the resolution?

Mr. RAMEY. That is correct.

Mr. JENKINS. Without that we might be confronted with the situation of having referees in bankruptcy appointed who have no qualifications whatever as lawyers?

Mr. RAMEY. That is right, they would have no qualifications whatever as lawyers.

Mr. JENKINS. At the present time, as I understand it, a referee in bankruptcy must be a lawyer admitted to the bar?

Mr. RAMEY. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. What would be the function of these conciliation commissioners?

Mr. RAMEY. Where the calendar of a bankruptcy court is congested.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, are they not, then, in effect, additional referees?

Mr. RAMEY. They are not called that, but in effect they are. The gentleman has correctly spoken.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that under existing law referees must have the qualifications of lawyers?

Mr. RAMEY. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Possibly I am in error, but I did not so remember. I remember that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], who is now a Member, was conciliator in California.

I did not know he was a lawyer. Possibly he is.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield, I think when the gentleman made that statement he referred

to referees in bankruptcy having the qualifications of a lawyer.

Mr. RAMEY. Yes; but this requires the conciliation commissioners to have those qualifications also.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Your amendment would require that?

Mr. RAMEY. My amendment would require that.

Mr. MICHENER. But existing law does not require it, and the bill that has been introduced and reported, as I recall, simply continues the present law in that respect for a period of 4 years.

Mr. RAMEY. That is correct. This amendment would require commissioners to be qualified, thus protecting the public.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As I understand it, the gentleman simply wishes to require that these conciliators have the same legal qualifications that are now possessed by referees in bankruptcy?

Mr. RAMEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that I commend the gentleman from Ohio for presenting legislation to compel conciliation commissioners to have the qualification of referees in bankruptcy? In my own State of Indiana I served as a conciliation commissioner for a period of approximately 6 years. The judge, in appointing conciliation commissioners in our State, appointed practicing lawyers. I think that is a splendid amendment which the gentleman has in mind, and the conciliation commissioners, in my opinion, should have the qualifications of referees in bankruptcy and they should be lawyers. They should be entirely qualified for their service.

Mr. RAMEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. KEOGH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAMEY. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Would the gentleman be good enough to tell me what there is to conciliate in bankruptcy matters?

Mr. RAMEY. You might say what is there not to conciliate. There are many matters for conciliation in bankruptcy matters.

Mr. KEOGH. Let me put my question differently. What is there for a conciliation commissioner to do that a referee in bankruptcy will not do?

Mr. RAMEY. When a court is crowded the court may appoint a commissioner to take testimony. He may appoint a trustee. I do not know what you call them in New York. When the bankruptcy court is crowded he may appoint conciliators.

Mr. KEOGH. In bankruptcy matters it is uniform throughout the country.

Mr. RAMEY. But when a court is crowded you may appoint a referee to take testimony in any court. A referee in bankruptcy, of course, under this law may appoint conciliation commissioners who will assist in expediting litigation.

Mr. KEOGH. In addition to the district judges you have referees in bankruptcy, and you have the inherent power in the court to appoint special masters for the purpose of taking testimony.

Mr. RAMEY. But not making the adjustments.

Mr. KEOGH. Well, should you delegate that authority to another agent?

Mr. RAMEY. I think it is well that it is done at times, if the Federal court is crowded. I do not know of any circumstance where a Federal judge himself has acted on all bankruptcy matters.

Mr. KEOGH. If the Federal court is so crowded that they need these additional commissioners why do we not appoint more judges and more referees?

Mr. RAMEY. I do not think we should spend the money for additional judges, do you? The referees and conciliation commissioners do that same work, and there is no necessity for additional judges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAGNUSON). The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the veto message of the President in connection with the revenue bill and include therein some brief telegrams and some excerpts from the record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we have had under consideration today the President's blockbuster veto message of the revenue bill H. R. 3687. This veto message submitted 2 or 3 days ago immediately attracted Nation-wide attention. While the question of the amount of Federal revenues provided in this bill is important, yet there are matters contained in the veto message that are much more important than the revenue involved. There is more than one item in the bill that did not meet with my approval or the approval of other Members of the House and Senate, yet because of other and higher considerations, I voted to override the President's veto. The President's veto was overridden in the House by a vote of 299 to 95—more than 3 to 1; and was overridden in the Senate by a vote of 72 to 14—more than 5 to 1.

The able and venerable chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, a stanch Democrat and supporter of the President, urged and voted to override the veto. Other Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee and friends of the administration did likewise. In fact, a majority of the Democrats voted to override the President's veto. This veto was so unusual the distinguished Democratic leader of the Senate, and for years the close personal and political friend of the President, denounced this veto message and the action of the President in unmeasured terms, and resigned as leader. Therefore, there must be much more involved other than the amount of revenue or other provisions in this revenue bill.

FIRST GENERAL REVENUE BILL VETOED BY ANY PRESIDENT

In the first place, in more than 155 years of our Nation's history, this is the first general revenue bill ever vetoed by any President. The veto was a vicious and intemperate attack by the President on the Congress of the United States. The Congress, alone, has the power, under the Constitution, to levy taxes and raise revenues. It is not the first time that the President has shown his contempt for this important coordinate branch of the Government. The Congress realized it was a direct challenge to representative government and the representatives of the American people. They met that challenge forthright. The Congress upheld the purpose of the founding fathers, and although coerced and intimidated for a number of years in many ways by the President, it asserted its constitutional prerogative and assumed full legislative responsibility in overriding the veto.

THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE UPHELD

Through the centuries emperors, kings, queens, and princes have usurped the power of the purse and sword. They arrogated to themselves the right to impose arbitarary and burdensome taxes, and to declare war and place their people in battle lines whenever their humor or caprice dictated. When the framers of the Constitution met at Philadelphia to work out a Constitution, they announced in the preamble their purposes to be:

> Secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity—

And so forth. Section 1 of article I in that Constitution provides for the creation of the legislative branch of our Government—to consist of a Senate and House of Representatives. The Congress was to be the representative of the people. Section 8 of article I provided:

> Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

Congress is the only one of the three coordinate branches of the Government that is given this power. Section 8, article I of the Constitution also provides—

> Congress shall have power to declare war, raise and support armies, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

Congress is the only one of the three coordinate branches of the Government that has the power to declare war or to raise and support armies, or to provide and maintain a navy. We can see at once the high purpose of those who had fought the Revolution and had gained their independence from the rule of emperors, kings, queens, and princes to preserve to the people the power over the purse; that is, to raise taxes and revenues and the power of the sword—the Army and Navy. They were reserving these powers to the representatives of the people—the Congress, made up of the House and Senate, and, no doubt, it was out of respect for these provisions of the Constitution that no other President of this country ever vetoed a gen-

eral revenue bill as did President Roosevelt the other day.

By overriding this veto, the Congress challenged the right of the President to take over the purse of the people. Congress said, in no uncertain terms, that it is our duty to raise and collect taxes, and that it is not the duty or the business of the executive branch of the Government.

When emperors, kings, queens, and princes arrogated to themselves this tremendous power, it was nearly always abused and their subjects had to pay with sweat, blood, and tears whatever sums that might be imposed upon them, and their subjects had to go to war whether it was right or wrong, or even against the interest of themselves and their country.

The greatest power that can be wielded by the American people is the power over their own purse strings and the power over the sword. If there must be war, let the representatives of the people declare war. If taxes are necessary, let their representatives provide for the levying and collection of these taxes.

The President was not satisfied with trying to invade the constitutional rights of the representatives of the people, but he used insulting, intemperate, and ill-advised language, and undertook to misrepresent the facts. No one was more critical of his action and his language than the leaders of his own party in the House and Senate.

MISSTATEMENT OF FACTS

The President argues that while he had asked Congress to put an additional tax burden of ten and one-half billion on the American people, Congress only provided about one billion. The facts are that this bill will raise nearly two and one-half billion. Let us not overlook the fact that under the present revenue laws, the American people are paying annually approximately forty billion in Federal taxes and revenues, and, with this new bill, they will be called upon to pay somewhere between forty-two and forty-five billion in Federal taxes and revenues annually. This does not include State, county, city, school, and other taxes, amounting to ten billion annually. So as our tax laws now stand in the States and in the Nation, the American people will pay more than fifty-two billion every year in taxes and revenues. That is more than one-third of the assessed value of all property of every kind and character in the United States.

The President complains about the tax provision as to timber and lumber. He states in his veto message that he is engaged in the production of timber. This statement is ridiculous. He produces some small Christmas bushes or trees on his estate in New York, and perhaps most of these grow wild as they do in my congressional district. They have no relation to timber trees and lumber.

It is very clear that this bill does not and will not permit persons of large incomes to lay aside large sums of money. Under our Federal tax laws, the Federal Government may take up to 94 percent of the net earnings of corporations, and up to 88 percent of the net earnings of individuals. With this new law on the books, and other Federal revenue measures, American citizens will pay in Federal taxes for the tax year of 1944 the following sums on the following incomes: A person with a million-dollar income this year, whose income was substantially the same in 1943 and in 1942, with a wife and two children, will pay $993,455.61. A person with an income of $500,000, with a wife and two children, will pay $481,788.95. A person with a net income of $5,000, with a wife and two children, will pay $843.95. A person with a net income of $3,000, with a wife and two children, will pay $314.16. A person with a net income of $2,000, with a wife and two children, will pay $66.95. When we consider all together our Federal, State, county, and school taxes, it is difficult to see how individuals, farmers, workers, business concerns, or industry can save any money out of their incomes.

The President did ask Congress to increase taxes by $10,500,000,000. If Congress had passed that measure, the American people would pay in Federal taxes and revenues this year more than fifty billion, and if we include State, city, county, and school taxes, they would pay more than sixty billions. The heaviest Federal taxes and revenues ever paid by the American people in a single year before this administration was in the heavy tax year of World War No. 1, when the American people were called upon to pay approximately twelve billions. Under our present Federal tax laws, the American people are called upon to pay three and a half times that amount in Federal taxes, alone.

Now, let us see if Congress has provided money to carry on the war. Beginning with June 5, 1940, Congress has voted approximately three hundred and fifty billions for war purposes alone. The First World War, up to the signing of the armistice, cost twenty-one billions, and if we count the ten or eleven billion we loaned to our allies, the over-all cost of World War No. 1 was less than thirty-two billions. Up to the present time Congress has voted 12 times as much for this war as World War No. 1, counting the ten or eleven billions we loaned to our allies in World War No. 1. According to recent reports of the War, Navy, and other war agencies, there are still unspent more than $188,000,000,000. Of this sum, the War Department has an unexpended balance of more than one hundred and two billions. The Navy Department has an unexpended balance of more than fifty-one billions. The Maritime Commission, R. F. C., and other war agencies have an unexpended balance of more than thirty-five billions. Now, why should the President say in his veto message that the Congress has not levied adequate taxes or has not provided adequate money to carry on the war?

Of course, Hon. Wendell Willkie came out in the beginning as favoring twenty billion additional taxes and revenues, and finally declared himself in favor of seventeen billions additional taxes and revenues.

What does fifty-two billion in taxes represent? Assuming that we have a population of 130,000,000 people, this fifty-two billion represents a sum equal to $400 in taxes for every man, woman, and child in the United States. If the American family averages 4½ persons, this would represent $1,800 in taxes on an average for every family in America. Of course, there are millions of people who pay no taxes except indirect taxes. If we should add another eight billion, as the President requested, a part of it must fall upon the shoulders of more than 40,000,000 workers who are already paying heavy taxes on their wages and salaries.

The people of the United Kingdom of Great Britain are paying approximately eleven billion in taxes annually, and their per capita tax on an average for each person is less than $260, and their annual expenditure for the war effort is twenty and one-half billion. Our annual expenditure for war purposes is nearly one hundred billion. Taxes can be so high that they may destroy the purposes we are seeking to accomplish. Those who invest in agriculture, in industry, and commerce must have some return on their investment or we will discourage and destroy investment, and in that way destroy a large source of tax income to the Government.

Why not economize? This administration, since it has been in power and during the past 11 years, has put through 17 general revenue bills. Every year they have had one or more new revenue bills creating new taxes and increasing old taxes, and they finally now have it up to more than forty-two billion annually. The Government may take as much as 94 percent of the net profits of corporations, and 88 percent of the net profits of individuals. Out of the balance these corporations must pay their State, county, city, and school taxes, and living expenses.

Every dollar necessary must be willingly provided for and spent in carrying on the war but, at the same time, the tax, bond, and stamp money of the people must not be squandered and wasted, as billions have been under the so-called cost-plus contracts, and other billions wasted through incompetency and fraud.

Senator GEORGE, of Georgia, the able chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, predicts that our national debt will reach three hundred and fifty-eight billion, a per capita debt on the average for the 130,000,000 American people of $2,750, and if the average family is a father and mother and three children, their part of the per capita debt on an average would be $13,750.

Much of this immense debt must be assumed in the future by the fine men and women who are now defending this country, and it is a tremendous handicap.

The administration and the Congress should economize in every way possible. All nonessentials should be eliminated. This administration has spent about twice as much money as all of the other administrations together. It has wasted more money than all other administrations. Instead of insisting on taxes, taxes, and more taxes, let us hear more about economy and more economy for nonessentials.

We must win the war, but we do not have to boondoggle. We do need people to carry on the civilian affairs of our Government, but we do not need the 3,000,000 or more that we now have on the Federal pay roll.

The policy of this New Deal administration still obtains—to tax and tax, spend and spend, and elect and elect. If the Congress can be criticized in anyway, it is because we have voted more money than was necessary, and for piling up taxes almost to the breaking point. I feel that the House and Senate did exactly right—that the Democratic leaders were right in urging and in voting to override the President's veto.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point on the veto message on the tax bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those Members who previously voted against the present revenue bill. While a good case could be made both for the bill and against the bill, I felt that in the midst of this war, which I regard as one of survival itself, the bill is inadequate in that it does not raise enough revenue and especially not from the place where the greatest proportionate increase in national income has occurred and where the greatest threat to inflation lies, namely, those whose income ranges from about $1,500 to about $8,000 a year.

On the other hand, the bill has certain definite advantages in addition to raising $2,000,000,000 more of Federal revenue, such as improvements in the renegotiation laws, including possibility of court review, freezing the social-security tax at its present figure, because the reserve is already far above that intended in the law, requiring financial reports by tax-exempt organizations, simplification of the tax laws and tax forms, et cetera.

So my original vote against the bill was made in the hope the Committee on Ways and Means would be able to improve it by retaining the good features and strengthening what I regarded as its weak points which, I may say, are not the same as those which the President in his message gives as his reasons for vetoing the bill. However, the members of the Committee on Ways and Means, including its distinguished chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who certainly cannot be called partisan or antiadministration, stated that if this bill fails, they will not write another revenue bill this year. Therefore one's choice now is not between the present bill and a better one but between the present bill and none at all; or, rather, between the bill under consideration and the existing tax laws. Certainly, the bill is far better in almost every respect than existing law, and, therefore, I voted today to override the veto. It seems to me that is the only sound position one can take under the circumstances.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the State ballot, because I know the officers of the State and counties with the assistance of the Army and Navy will get a ballot to each and every person in the service.

My contention is that those in the service certainly do not wish to be disfranchised for voting for the State, district, county, and local officers. If there ever was a time when the voters should have the opportunity of selecting the people who represent them, it is now.

I ask unanimous consent that the following editorial from the Marion Daily Republican of Marion, Ill., dated February 15, be inserted in the RECORD:

GIVE THE SOLDIERS A FULL BALLOT

The efforts of the Federal administration to put over a limited ballot for the soldiers next November have been in the interests of the head of ticket, to the exclusion of other candidates, and from the start have been such as to bring out a question as to their sincerity. Not only is this position questioned in Illinois, where the State has adopted legislation to get ballots into the hands of her soldiers, but it is also questioned in the solid South.

Expressing its sentiments regarding soldier votes, the Mobile (Ala.) Press says:

"There can be no mistaking the fact that the President's message demanding that Congress enact the Green-Lucas bill to enable members of the armed forces to vote for Federal officials was politically inspired and designed to influence the outcome of the 1944 Presidential and congressional elections.

"Mr. Roosevelt took Congress to task for leaving the soldier-vote question up to the States. It has already been demonstrated that the States can revamp their laws to give absentee servicemen an opportunity to vote by mail. Georgia has already taken the lead and a dozen other States are planning similar action in the matter. If any censure was due from President Roosevelt it was for the States which have held back and refused to enact soldier-voting legislation, including our own Alabama. Mr. Roosevelt might have made a judicious statement along those lines without criticism, but ranting at Congress in an obvious effort to influence the service vote in his favor puts the President in a very poor light.

"It is most revealing that Mr. Roosevelt places no importance at all on the soldiers voting for candidates for State offices, but only for Federal officials. The President said as much when he told Congress that it would be impractical to distribute bulky and varied State ballots among the armed forces. In other words, Mr. Roosevelt champions only limited franchise for members of the armed forces. If they can vote for reelection of their Commander in Chief and for Senators and Representatives, that will be enough for President Roosevelt."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing from many of those who voted to sustain the veto, explaining their reasons. I would merely like to make this observation and comment that this vote of 3 to 1 in the House of Representatives was a new declaration of independence. It served notice upon the American people and upon the Executive that the Congress had and would continue to have control of the purse. The power to initiate revenue legislation was placed by the founding fathers in the Constitution, and it said that that power should rest with the House of Representatives, and we reaffirmed it today by a new declaration of independence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, of course, I disagree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. I think his vote and those who voted as he did was a vote, as properly stated by the President, for a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy.

Personally, I think the President was right. He had a duty to perform to the country. He performed it courageously and honestly. I know that the Nation will recognize and appreciate his fearlessness and his desire to protect those that need protection. Those who will be benefited by the amendment to the renegotiation law naturally have been for the passage of the bill and the overriding of the veto, but the Government is likely to lose hundreds of millions of dollars because of that change. I shall not dwell further upon the subject of this tax legislation, but take leave to insert at this point the President's veto message which outlines more clearly and forcibly why his veto should be sustained. The message is as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3687, entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes."

I regret that I find it necessary in the midst of this great war to be compelled to do this in what I regard as the public interest.

Many months ago, after careful examination of the finances of the Nation, I asked the Congress for legislation to raise $10,500,000,000 over and above the existing revenue system. Since then persons prominent in our national life have stated in no uncertain terms that my figure was too low.

The measure before me purports to increase the national revenue by a little over $2,000,000,000. Actually, however, the bill in its net results will enrich the Treasury by less than $1,000,000,000.

As a tax bill, therefore, I am compelled to decide that it is wholly ineffective toward that end.

More specifically the bill purports to provide $2,100,000,000 in new revenues. At the same time it cancels out automatic increases in the social-security tax which would yield $1,100,000,000. In addition it grants relief from existing taxes which would cost the Treasury at least $150,000,000 and possibly much more.

In this respect it is not a tax bill but a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy.

The elimination of automatic increases provided in the social-security law comes at a time when industry and labor are best able to adjust themselves to such increases. These automatic increases are required to meet the claims that are being built up against the social-security fund. Such a postponement does not seem wise.

The clause relating to renegotiating of war contracts terminates the present re-

negotiation authority on December 31 of this year. This seems unwise at this time because no person can at present determine what a renegotiation time limit should be. More experience is needed. The formal right of appeal to The Tax Court that is granted by this bill is an inept provision. The present Tax Court exists for a wholly different purpose and does not have the personnel or the time to assume this heavy load.

The bill is replete with provisions which not only afford indefensible special privileges to favored groups but sets dangerous precedents for the future. This tendency toward the embodiment of special privileges in our legislation is in itself sufficiently dangerous to counterbalance the loss of a very inadequate sum in additional revenues.

Among these special privileges are:

(a) Permission for corporations reorganized in bankruptcy to retain the high excess-profits credit and depreciation basis attributable to the contributions of stockholders who are usually eliminated in the reorganization. This privilege inures to the benefit of bondholders who, in many cases, have purchased their bonds in the speculative market for far less than their face value. It may open the door to further windfall profits in this market because of the undeserved benefit received by reorganized corporations.

(b) Percentage depletion allowances, questionable in any case, are now extended to such minerals as vermiculite, potash, feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, barite, and spodumene. In the case of some of these minerals the War Production Board refused to certify that current output was inadequate for war needs.

(c) The lumber industry is permitted to treat income from the cutting of timber, including selective logging, as a capital gain rather than annual income. As a grower and seller of timber, I think that timber should be treated as a crop and therefore as income when it is sold. This would encourage reforestation.

(d) Natural-gas pipe lines are exempted from the excess-profits tax without justification and in a manner which might well lead oil companies to request similar treatment for their pipe lines.

(e) Commercial air lines are granted an unjustifiable extension of the tax subsidy on their air-mail contracts.

It has been suggested by some that I should give my approval to this bill on the ground that having asked the Congress for a loaf of bread to take care of this war for the sake of this and succeeding generations, I should be content with a small piece of crust. I might have done so if I had not noted that the small piece of crust contained so many extraneous and inedible materials.

In regard to that part of the bill which relates to wholly unobjectionable tax increases, may I respectfully suggest to the Congress that the excise taxes can easily and quickly be levied. This can be accomplished by the passage of a simple joint resolution enacting those provisions of the bill which increase the excise taxes. I should be glad to approve such a measure. This would preserve the principal revenue provisions of the bill without the objectionable features I have criticized.

In another most important respect this bill would disappoint and fail the American taxpayers. Every one of them, including ourselves, is disappointed, confused, and bewildered over the practical results of last year's tax bill. The Ruml plan was not the product of this administration. It resulted from a widespread campaign based on the attractive slogan of "Pay-as-you-go." But, as was said many years ago in the State of New York in regard to that same slogan "You don't pay and you don't go."

The Nation will readily understand that it is not the fault of the Treasury Department that the income taxpayers are flooded with forms to fill out which are so complex that even certified public accountants cannot interpret them. No, it is squarely the fault of the Congress of the United States in using language in drafting the law which not even a dictionary or a thesaurus can make clear.

The American taxpayer has been promised of late that tax laws and returns will be drastically simplified. This bill does not make good that promise. It ignores the most obvious step toward simplifying taxes by failing to eliminate the clumsy Victory tax. For fear of dropping from the tax rolls those taxpayers who are at the bottom of the income scale, the bill retains the Victory tax—while at the same time it grants extensive concessions to many special-interest groups.

The suggestion of withholding at graduated rates, which would relieve millions of people of the task of filing declarations of estimated income, was not adopted.

I trust, therefore, that the Congress, after all these delays, will act as quickly as possible for simplification of the tax laws which will make possible the simplification of the forms and computations now demanded of the individual taxpayers. These taxpayers, now engaged in an effort to win the greatest war this Nation has ever faced, are not in a mood to study higher mathematics.

The responsibility of the Congress of the United States is to supply the Government of the United States as a whole with adequate revenue for wartime needs, to provide fiscal support for the stabilization program, to hold firm against the tide of special privileges, and to achieve real simplicity for millions of small-income taxpayers.

In the interest of strengthening the home front, in the interest of speeding the day of victory, I urge the earliest possible action.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 22, 1944.*

Mr. Speaker, now as to the bill before us to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation, I am indeed pleased to notice that nearly every gentleman on the other side, as well as on our side, is in favor of this bill. It is a law that has been recommended and advocated and urged by the President. It has done much for the farmers of the United States in general. In view of the benefits they have derived I wonder whether they appreciate all that has been done for them by this act and many other acts that the President has recommended and urged and fought for to aid the farmers and the masses in this country.

Mr. Speaker, when President Roosevelt took the oath of office on March 4, 1933, corn was selling at 19 cents a bushel, wheat at 29 cents, barley and rye at one-third of its selling price today, hogs and cattle at 3 cents per pound, and cotton today is bringing two and three times as much as in 1932 and 1933; and, in fact, all farm products have increased greatly. Despite these higher prices objection and resentment is voiced to the placing of ceiling prices on these products which emanate principally from the "gentleman farmers," the owners of farms ranging from 500 to 10,000 acres. The President has endeavored to protect them from their own greed in order to prevent inflation and is in the interest of the small farmers as well as the wage earner and "white collar" workers—ultimate consumers—who are obliged to live on their small fixed incomes and who are pressed to their last cent in buying food and necessities at present-day prices.

My colleague from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] a little while ago made reference to the amount of taxes proposed in the pending tax bill, pointing out that it equaled the total yearly income of the State of Illinois. I would be thankful to the gentleman if he would include a statement as to the income the farmers of our State enjoyed during the Hoover administration and the succeeding years from the time of his election, and he might also list the laws that were enacted during the 12 years of Republican administration compared with the many beneficial farm measures passed under President Roosevelt's administration.

Mr. Speaker, reverting to the resolution under consideration, I ask unanimous consent to amend it by striking out "House Joint Resolution 239" and substituting, "Senate Joint Resolution 116."

I am doing so because the act has already expired and it is necessary to shorten the proceedings by adopting and accepting the Senate joint resolution, which will forego the necessity of sending it back to the Senate and to conference.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, of course, this was not before the Rules Committee. Does the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously ask for that?

Mr. SABATH. That is what I understand.

Mr. SPENCE. There is no objection, as I understand it.

Mr. MICHENER. I have no objection, except that I do object to changing a rule by unanimous consent, without notice to the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. I have been earnestly urged to make that unanimous-consent request for the purpose of saving time on this important legislation.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. FISH. May I suggest to the gentleman I have no objection to the change and evidently the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has no objection, but I suggest that in the future when the gentleman wants to do that, he take it up with the minority members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. I always do so, but, unfortunately, this matter came to me only a little while ago, and I really did not have time to consult with the gentleman from New York, and others, believing that they were in favor of this legislation and that they wanted to have it enacted as speedily as possible and to eliminate, as I have said, a conference with the Senate.

I thought therefore that would be satisfactory.

Mr. MICHENER. The only reason I reserved the right to object was that when a rule is reported out by the Committee on Rules and comes to the floor I hardly expect the chairman of the Committee on Rules to ask unanimous consent to change the rule without the other members of the committee having been advised.

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry, but the time is short and it merely makes the Senate bill in order instead of the House bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think I will take some of this responsibility. I do not want any trouble about this. Probably I was remiss in my duty in not notifying the minority members of the Rules Committee that I had assured the Speaker and the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that the request would be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Under this reservation of bjection I wish to make the statement that the difference between the House resolution and the Senate resolution is simply that the Senate has already adopted two amendments which we assume would have been adopted here today without controversy in order to expedite the consideration of the bill and to prevent its having to go back to the Senate or to conference. I said that so far as I was concerned there would be no objection. So I think it expedites matters and I hope the minority members of the Rules Committee will accept my apologies for not referring to them.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for the explanation which places me in the position of not violating any of the ethics of the House or Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 116, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945, with Mr. COURTNEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, it is a very refreshing thing when we can have legislation considered that I am confident meets with the approval of all my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber. Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported without record vote House Joint Resolution 239 which provided for the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States from February 17, 1944, until June 30, 1945.

The Senate yesterday without roll call passed Senate Joint Resolution 116, that included the verbiage of the House resolution and also two amendments, one which mandated the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the commitments it had made and the other providing that the accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be audited by the General Accounting Office. These amendments I know are acceptable to all the Members of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, and I feel confident they are also acceptable to all the Members.

I do not know why 2 hours were granted for the consideration of this splendid resolution. I know every one of my colleagues wherever he comes from, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, from the Lakes to the Gulf, knows of the splendid accomplishments of the Commodity Credit Corporation and its constant assistance to our farmers and all producers of food. It needs no encomium from me. You are as familiar with the things it has done as I, and I hope this resolution will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has the committee accepted the Senate amendment requiring the Corporation's books to be audited by the General Accounting Office?

Mr. SPENCE. It has.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the Commodity Credit Corporation is organized under the laws of Delaware with very broad powers in the articles of incorporation. Is it the understanding that the General Accounting Office will examine into the authority and approve or disapprove the accounts under the commodity credit law or under the articles of incorporation?

Mr. SPENCE. I should think it would include all of the functions and activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The Commodity Credit Corporation, of course, still exists as a corporation. I do not know for what period it was created. It has ceased to exist only as an agency of the United States. The General Accounting Office certainly will go into all of the accounts with reference to its activities as an agency of the United States. The only thing in which we are interested is the exercise of its powers as an agency of the United States granted by the Congress of the United States. They certainly can go into all of those, not only their powers, but their expenditures and their authority to make them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Has the Committee on Banking and Currency ever investigated to see whether or not the Commodity Credit Corporation has exceeded its authority in its operations?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not know that we have. I understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation accounts have been audited by the accountants of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which has reported to the Secretary of Agriculture, who in turn makes his report to Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was just interested enough to make the inquiry.

Mr. SPENCE. I believe it is a very good thing to have the Commodity Credit Corporation's accounts audited by an independent agency of the Government responsible to Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. And that will be done in the future. I may say also that the officers of the Commodity Credit Corporation are agreeable to both these amendments; in fact they want them. Representatives of the Commodity Credit Corporation appearing before our committee said they would be glad to have their accounts audited by the General Accounting Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have crystallized the issues in respect to the payment of consumers subsidies and we have announced to the administrators of all of the laws having to do with the production, processing and distribution of food that the Congress is overwhelmingly opposed to the payment of consumers subsidies. We have fought that fight as well as we knew how. We can take great satisfaction in the knowledge that we have at least partially won that fight.

The issue involved in the fight against the payment of consumers subsidies was fundamental. It was whether a republican democracy would be perpetuated as our form of government. We have prevented an expansion of the program which, if carried out according to the timetable announced by spokesmen for the administration, would have effectuated the socialization of agriculture. Insofar as we have prevented that being done, we have succeeded in this fight, but the fight is not over by any means. By the adoption of this Senate joint resolution now under consideration we make no concessions whatsoever in respect to the consumers subsidy issue. We merely salvage what we can from the wreckage.

It was never our intention to interfere with what we consider to be the legal activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. On two or three occasions we have had assurances that there would be no expansion of the consumer-subsidy program. We have a right, therefore, to expect that because a majority of the American people have spoken so overwhelmingly through a majority of their chosen Representatives there will be no material expansion of the consumer-subsidy program. The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized to do a definite job, to assure stability in agricultural prices and production, and it has functioned efficiently and effectively in those respects. It was only when they went out of the realm of their legal activities under directives over which they had no control and for which they were not responsible that we used the bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation as a vehicle to prevent the socialization of agriculture and the destruction of the American republican democracy.

We have made our fight, and we have partially won it. We have crystallized this issue to the extent now that we have

a right to assume the law will be effectively and judiciously administered in the future. For this reason, we see no advantage in further attempts to interfere with the orderly and legal functioning of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is for these reasons that we go along with the bill to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation to June 30, 1945. We give the Corporation no new money. Their lending capacity is restricted to $3,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we provide that their accounts shall be audited by the General Accounting Office as a further assurance that this money will be expended in accordance with the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I wonder if I understood the gentleman correctly. I thought I heard him say that he had some assurances that consumer subsidy programs would not be expanded.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I said on several occasions, on two anyway, we have been given assurances that there will be no expansion of the program.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman relying on those assurances?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Last June we were assured that there would be no expansion of the consumers subsidy program, and in December, when the resolution was passed extending the life of the Corporation to February 17, we were given like assurances. We have no definite assurance that they will not expand their program now, and that is why I made the statement that because of the assurances which we had been given in the past and because of the overwhelming vote announcing the policy on the part of the Congress, representing such a large majority of the American people, in respect to consumers subsidies, we had a right to expect there would be no further expansion of the consumer subsidy program.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I appreciate that the gentleman must be a very trustful individual, in view of what has happened in the past. I hope he is right, but I am fearful it is going to be expanded. They have not paid any attention heretofore to action of the House or to any action of the people at election time.

We have gone along for 8 years with those fellows down there and you see what we got?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We still have as a partial check upon their zeal the deficiency appropriation bill which is now being considered in the Appropriations Committee, and we are given to understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation is now something like $360,000,000 in the hole. Their capital is impaired and they have to come back to the Congress for appropriations to restore their capital. There is an opportunity which we have to prevent the use of any funds for the expansion of this program. I may say to the gentleman also it is hoped that very shortly we will take up a bill to extend the Price Control acts. Of course, we all recognize that the subsidies now being paid, the strictly consumers subsidies are now being paid out of money made available by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under authority of the Price Control Act; so that this question of consumers subsidies is more closely allied with the Price Control Act than it is with the Commodity Credit Act anyway. I can assure the gentleman that the fight has just begun.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine. If we are not going to pay consumers subsidies out of this, that will be all right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. About 3 weeks ago Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, announced that the War Food Administration through the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay certain subsidies to farmers for increased production. In the case of sugar the subsidy would be $3 this year instead of $1.50 a ton that was paid last year. But this proviso was attached to the recommendation or offer made by Mr. Jones: These subsidies will be paid provided that the Congress appropriates the money. Now, does the gentleman figure that the extension of this act will be authority on the part of the Congress for the War Food Administration to go ahead and complete the production arrangements in order to get an abundance of those particular crops?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There never was anything in the bill which the President vetoed which would have prevented the payment of those producer subsidies. Of course, there is nothing in this resolution that prevents the payment of those subsidies. There was nothing in the bill we passed to prevent the payment of subsidies to marginal high-cost producers to obtain the maximum amount of production of any commodity, including food, strategic and critical materials, and every other commodity of which we consume more than we produce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows there has been a great deal of delay in announcing the various production programs for this year, largely predicated upon Congress not having acted. Does the gentleman assume now that the passage of this joint resolution will give them authority to go ahead and let the farmers and other producers know what the program will be for 1944?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It removes all obstacles and alleged obstacles. There is no reason why all of the programs should not be immediately announced.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Does the gentleman feel that the extension of this particular agency until June 30, 1945, is essential to the food production program for the current year, including support prices?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, I would say it is essential that the Commodity Credit Corporation be extended in order that the support price programs may be announced and guaranties given to the producers of our food that they are going to be paid for what they raise in accordance with existing law relative to support prices. I would hesitate to assume responsibility for the condition in the food market if we did not continue the support program. The only way we can continue the support program is by continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY].

Mr. FAY. Mr. Chairman, I regret that because of transportation difficulties I entered the House 5 minutes after the vote was taken on the President's veto message. I wish to state that had I been present on the floor I would have voted with the President, to sustain the veto.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, most of us are somewhat fed up with the question of consumers subsidies. We have been called upon to record our position on at least five roll calls in the past 7 months. Everyone knows where each one of us stands, but let us consider the position in which we find ourselves now.

Today the Commodity Credit Corporation is dead as an agency of the United States—killed last Friday by the President's veto of the bill for its renewal, which had been supported by a large majority of Congress.

Most of us do not want this Corporation to die. We feel that it has rendered fine service to agriculture and that it must be brought to life again in order that farmers may with confidence embark on the program of production necessary to supply the food needed for ourselves and our allies.

Thus we have before us a resolution providing for extension of the Corporation until June 30, 1945, without restriction. Passage of this bill without amendment would represent a complete surrender by Congress of the wishes of its majority.

In a press release issued a short time ago the Commodity Credit Corporation announced that they had ample funds—a billion dollars in fact—which might be used for any purpose for which they saw fit.

Today the Corporation's consumer subsidy program amounts to approximately half a billion dollars. Thus under this bill they could easily double the program.

Fulton Lewis in his broadcast last night made an interesting observation. He called attention to the fact that the Constitution calls for legislation by Congress which may be vetoed by the President and repassed over his veto by a two-thirds vote; but today we are faced with the extraordinary situation that owing to the broad powers granted to

the President and his assumption of even more powers than Congress intended, he may legislate by directive, and unless Congress can get a two-thirds majority to nullify his actions we stand helpless. The country may thus be run by the Executive plus one-third of the legislative body.

The whole question of consumer subsidies falls into this pattern, and the question before us is, Should we surrender unconditionally? I question the wisdom of our doing so on what is a matter of principle. For this reason, at the proper time I expect to offer an amendment providing that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not inaugurate any new subsidies which have not hitherto been announced. My amendment will not interfere in any way with any subsidy program now in effect.

I do not like to retreat, but I acknowledge that honest men have different views as to the advisability of this program, and I recognize that in time of war we must give and take, though I do not feel that this means the legislative body should do all the giving, and the Executive do all the taking. If the President has any respect at all for the majority opinion of Congress he should be willing to accept a compromise.

If he has not we should not surrender but should continue fighting for our principles.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman proposes to offer an amendment to limit the payment of consumer subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the commodities on which they are paying such subsidies at the present time. As I recollect, and I believe I am correct, consumer subsidies on butter, meat, and bread are now being paid by the Defense Supplies Corporation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. KEAN. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the Commodity Credit Corporation is paying any consumer subsidy, that is being paid only on milk.

Mr. KEAN. No; there is milk—and canned vegetables. There are about 20 items.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman differentiates between rollbacks and producer subsidies. As I understand it most of the so-called subsidies paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation are paid to increase the production of the different commodities, rather than as a subsidy to the consumer.

Mr. KEAN. I am thoroughly in accord with the necessity for subsidies to increase production in this time of war.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman agrees with the majority of the Members of the House here that by getting increased production we in turn hold down the prices to the consumers. The philosophy has been, in the O. P. A. and some other agencies of the Government, to bring about scarcity of production, so as to have higher prices, and an additional reason for regimentation, and a demand for consumer subsidies.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman states that this agency has $500,000,000 to operate on. If the gentleman would limit that to the present subsidy announcement, how would the Government save any money? If you spend it all on the commodities announced, there might be some other more important ones, more essential than the ones announced. I am with the gentleman on consumer subsidies, but this matter has been settled for the time being, and I think the gentleman's amendment at this time may mean a delay, and the delay may be too long. It would probably be debated here, and then it would be debated in the Senate, and the President will probably veto it. The farmers cannot wait. They have to plant crops soon, and to know what the program is. I think it is most untimely and unwise to adopt an amendment of that kind at this time.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman's amendment would limit it purely to production subsidies, and to the broad general scope of what is now their program of announced subsidies—whether we would not then better reach the objective?

Mr. KEAN. It is limited to consumer subsidies. The wording of the amendment is much the same as the wording in the bill vetoed by the President, only I have omitted the provision forbidding subsidies by any Government agency. The question of butter, meat, and bread subsidies is left to be taken care of by the House when the R. F. C. bill comes up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the members of both the Banking and Currency and the Rules Committees on both sides of the aisle who have agreed to substitute the Senate bill for the House bill. The Senate bill carried an amendment that was inserted in the bill in the Senate yesterday, which was presented by Senators LA FOLLETTE and TAFT. Several members of this House have introduced identical proposals, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], and myself. Under the terms and provisions of the bill that we have introduced, there would be assurance of complete fulfillment of commitments made to producers who have expanded production of nonbasic agricultural commodities. It is necessary and essential that the Government keep its word with the farmers in order to assure increased production of agricultural commodities to meet the demands of this Nation at war. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it will hardly be necessary for me to take the full 5 minutes allotted me. I had intended to offer an amendment to the pending bill to provide for auditing the Commodity Credit Corporation. However, since the Senate bill contains the identical provision for audit which I intended to offer and since the Senate bill is to be substituted for the pending measure, it will be unnecessary for me to offer my amendment. This amendment, it should be recalled, is the one which I originally offered in the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, where it was adopted by unanimouse consent. It was later accepted by the Senate. The bill containing that amendment was later vetoed by the President.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman inform the Committee what kind of audit is taking place over Commodity Credit operations?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. At the present time, none.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No audit whatsoever?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. No; in the strict sense of the word.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman have any idea that the Corporation may have operated outside of the scope of the authority of Congress?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of course, I cannot speak specifically on that point, but I doubt if there are many Government corporations that operate within the law, because it is the nature of Government agencies not to do so.

Notwithstanding the President's veto of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill which prohibited consumer subsidies and the difficult situation in which the Congress now finds itself, I want to state for the record that I am unqualifiedly opposed to the passage of the pending measure. If it is permissible for the Federal Government to pay consumer subsidies I do not see how any reason can be advanced why it should not be permitted to subsidize wages and other income directly. The payment of consumer subsidies can be nothing other than an indirect method of paying wages and other income out of taxation. I cannot conceive how we could do anything more unstatesmanlike than to charge to future generations any part of the present cost of living. Why is this done? Can it be that we do not know that we are only deceiving the people, if not also ourselves?

Who can possibly tell where this scheme may lead us and can we not see that here is provided one more powerful political weapon for the bureaucracy to wield over the lives of our people?

To me it seems utterly impossible how anyone can take the view that the subsidization of consumers could possibly be an anti-inflationary measure when it is directly the contrary. It cannot be reiterated too often that every dollar raised for the payment of these subsidies must be obtained by the Government printing press, that taxation and the sale of bonds to private individuals are wholly inadequate to meet present Government costs.

How will it be possible for any of us who are responsible for this consumer subsidy program to look in the faces of the soldiers who will be so fortunate as to return to their homeland, knowing that they must pay for the meat and butter we consumed while they were away fighting?

Perhaps one of the greatest fallacies that Congress is laboring under is the belief that we can by legislation create political machinery that can permanently give farmers higher prices for their produce than they could receive in a free economy. We might as well legislate to change the courses of the heavenly bodies. I grant it may be possible to pass legislation which has the effect of temporarily providing higher farm prices for some commodities, but I deny that it can be anything more than a temporary political expedient.

But that is not the worst part of this program. The really serious part of it is that it is regimenting our farmers into a state of slavery. Through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other agencies the Federal Government is dictating to the farmer more and more what he shall plant and when he shall reap. These bureaucratic agencies are destroying his greatest right, which is to have the prices of his produce fixed in an open and free market and to force him instead to come to Washington to be told what his produce shall fetch and how much of it he may keep for his own use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I know it is easier to go along with these things than it is to take a stand on them.

But I intend as long as I am in Congress to do everything I possibly can to prevent the people in my district from being deceived by measures of this kind. I earnestly believe that if the farmers were free from the shackles of bureaucratic rules and regulations and dictation that more essential war foods would be produced and the confusion and dislocations which are so rampant throughout the whole farming community would not exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. We have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I was particularly interested in this legislation and was very favorably impressed with the amendments that were added in the Senate yesterday by Senator LA FOLLETTE and Senator TAFT. Anyone who is interested in it can find it on page 1967 of the RECORD of yesterday, February 23. I might give a further explanation about that particular amendment. The Commodity Credit Corporation is the machinery which is used to support the support prices. Under the general law the so-called basic commodities that represent maybe a third of agriculture are sitting all right. But the rest of agriculture has not the same basic legislation. The nonbasic commodities were expanded and a 90 percent parity price was guaranteed by the Price Control Act and the Commodity Credit Corporation Act. There is a provision whereby the Secretary of Agriculture guarantees 90 percent of parity during the war and 2 years after the war to nonbasic commodities for which he asks an increase in production. I do not want to criticize anyone or go into the details about it any more than to say that the 90 percent parity floor that was guaranteed by law to these nonbasic commodities has not been fully carried out up to this time. This particular amendment will see to it that from now on all these commitments are going to be fulfilled and are going to be fulfilled according to law. To show that this is of rather widespread interest, I will call your attention to the fact that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], a member of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], also a member of the committee, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE], also a member of the committee, have all introduced this resolution as well as myself. The reason was that we know, coming from these agricultural sections, that it is pretty nearly impossible to carry on a national food-production program unless agencies fulfill their commitments. This is especially true when we spend as much time as we have in the last few months trying to figure out schemes of rolling back somebody's grocery bill when we have not even supported the men who produced the food last year and have not paid them what they were promised in the first place. This legislation will have considerable influence on the future agricultural programs. I do not bring it up here with the idea of the economics involved. But it is the fair thing to do. If you are going to have war food production you have to give these producers what has been promised to them. To show that this question has general application, I wish to include at this time and read a letter from the Commissioner of Agriculture of our State. It is as follows:

WISCONSIN STATE DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
Madison, Wis., February 9, 1944.

HON. REID F. MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REID: Present prospects are that the high level of farm production which is so essential to the successful prosecution of the war will not continue. Liquidation of hogs and poultry is already under way, and this may easily spread to other livestock.

In the Price Control Act of October 1942 a commitment was made to producers guaranteeing support prices for agricultural commodities of "not less than 90 percent of parity or comparable price therefor." Agriculture responded with the highest output in the country's history, despite shortages of labor, machinery, and other items.

Recently certain farm producers, after meeting the desired production requirements, find that the support prices upon which they have depended have not always operated. The support price on hogs at first was applied only to hogs weighing from 200 to 270 pounds, though this has since been raised to 330 pounds. Hogs under or over the specified weights have been marketed at lower prices, in spite of the fact that all dressed pork is sold at the ceilings. Nowhere do I find authority for this distinction in the Price Control Act.

In the egg market the situation is even more unsatisfactory. In January the average price of eggs in Wisconsin was below 30 cents per dozen, and with rising production costs poultry is being disposed of rapidly. Egg production during 1944 is expected to be substantially under 1943.

On behalf of the pork and egg producers of this State, I am, at the request of the Wisconsin Board of Agriculture, addressing this to the Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen with the hope that they will immediately inquire into the reasons as to why the guaranties of the Price Control Act have been disregarded, and we urge that action be taken to maintain the announced price supports in the future so that producers may have the assurance necessary to continue the high level of production which is essential to the war effort.

Sincerely yours,
STATE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
MILTON H. BUTTON, *Director.*

I might say at this point that if you take the time to read the Price Control Act you will find that the machinery is set up there; that the Secretary of Agriculture can notify these producers of the future needs. It says in the law that the producers shall be given ample time to make adjustments. In other words, the support prices can be discontinued if and when proper announcement is made. If the Secretary of Agriculture, or probably, now, due to executive order, if the War Food Administrator can see that we are going to have too many eggs or going to have too much pork or any of these other things he has asked to be increased, all he has to do is make a public announcement and give these producers ample time to adjust their business so that they will not be oversupplying the market. As I say, it has not been done up to this time. The result is that producers lose confidence in the promises. I am sure the incorporation of this amendment will sort of iron out the difficulty in the future.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman understands that the Senate bill has been substituted for the House bill?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia that I do. I am just explaining what the Senate put in this particular bill. That was not in the bill that was brought before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to try to discuss this measure at any length. My friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], who is so well versed in all matters relating to agriculture, has given you a very good explanation of the amendment which has been offered by Senator TAFT and Senator LA FOLLETTE, and adopted in the Senate, and which is now part of the bill before the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HULL. I am pleased to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain to the House the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill? I think many Members would like to know what the difference is.

Mr. HULL. I shall be glad to do that. The original resolution brought in by the Committee on Banking and Currency was merely a continuing resolution to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation as a Government agency from February 17 to June 30, 1945. The committee discussed some amendments before bringing that bill in and the idea of the committee was unanimously expressed that the main thing to do was to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation for this period. That is the basis for the Senate resolution. It does not affect subsidies one way or the other and has nothing to do with the subject we have so widely discussed here. Then the Senate put in this amendment to require the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administration to carry out the commitments which have been made by these various agencies in order to induce increased production in nonbasic agricultural commodities. That amendment was unanimously adopted in the Senate.

The only other amendment that was adopted over there was one which appeared in the original bill which was passed by the House and vetoed by the President, a noncontroversial provision requiring the auditing of the books and accounts of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That has also been adopted in the Senate. But for those two amendments the bill is just the same as it passed the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House.

We in the Middle West are particularly interested in the matter of the amendment offered by Senators TAFT and LA FOLLETTE, which now is a part of this bill and which, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] stated, had been presented by himself, as well as myself and others. The fact of the case is, unless something is done regarding poultry in the Northwest in particular, there is going to be a great falling off in poultry production this year. The farmers are getting less than 75 percent of parity for eggs, while the commitment made was for not less than 90 percent of parity. On the other hand, the cost of feeds for livestock has gone up so greatly that many farmers are now reducing their poultry flocks, and some plan to go out of poultry raising entirely. The concentrates that used to cost $30 a ton, or even lower, now cost approximately 4 to 4½ cents a pound in nearly all sections of the Northwest. Not only that, it is difficult to obtain protein feeds even at that price.

This is the season of the year when the farmers of our country make their purchases of little chicks of the hatcheries. They become the pullets of next fall to furnish a large part of the egg production next winter. I have received many letters from farmers stating that they are going out of poultry production. The small-chick hatcheries, of which there are a great number throughout the country, are already feeling the pinch of the situation, and unless something is done to cause the Commodity Credit Corporation to put a floor under prices, which the Congress intended by the act of July 1, 1941, as amended, unless something is done to bolster up this poultry industry, not only the farmers are going to suffer but the chick hatcheries throughout the country are going to find a very short market this spring. Farmers were promised a floor price equal to 90 percent of parity. That promise was made to obtain increased production of poultry and eggs. The farmers responded fully, but the promise has not been kept.

Next fall there will be a shortage of meat products. I do not think anybody expects anything else. The decline in the price of hogs is already being felt just as the letter read by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] from Mr. Button, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Wisconsin, explained. You will also have a shortage of poultry products. You will have a shortage of egg supplies. Unless something is done in the next few weeks to bolster up the so-called nonbasic products of the farmers out in the Midwest, the eastern folks are going to suffer pretty severely in a food shortage—far worse than anything they have seen up to the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I feel the gentleman has touched on a very vital thing. I want to make this observation with the gentleman's permission: In order to secure an abundance of pork, poultry, and poultry products we must have feed in order to get those products. The administration should go out and encourage the farmers to plant more corn, more oats, more barley, and grains for feed rather than cut down in the production of those commodities.

Mr. HULL. I heartily agree with the gentleman from Minnesota. This feed situation is not only acute, at present, but we have had very little moisture in the Northwest this winter. Lack of moisture, lack of snow, especially in that region, creates a shortage of pasture and feedstuffs for livestock, which becomes very serious in a very few weeks. You may remember that in 1934 we had a similar winter out there, and a dry spring and summer. Cattle died by the thousands in the Northwest because they were without pasture and without feedstuffs that summer. The Government moved in and spent millions of dollars moving cattle from one section of the country to the other. That is how quickly such a situation may develop.

In this bill we have an opportunity to help the poultry industry and possibly do something about pork production. We have an opportunity to carry out the will and intent of Congress as expressed by the act of July 1941, as later amended, giving the farmers assurance that they can go ahead and plan out a program, not only to maintain but possibly to increase the supply which is now threatened.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] in some very appropriate remarks called the attention of the House to the fact that he had introduced a bill to create a congressional agency to make for efficiency in governmental operation, to prevent waste and duplication, and to promote economy.

More than a year ago I introduced a bill with a similar purpose. It has been reintroduced in this Congress, and later reintroduced as a House resolution, in order to establish as an agency of the House of Representatives an office of fiscal investigations of a bipartisan or nonpartisan nature. It would be somewhat akin to our office of legislative counsel, not to be disturbed or interrupted by any change in the political complexion of this body. It would be the duty of this office of fiscal investigation to follow up for the House of Representatives the appropriations that are made and to see how the money is expended. I believe we could save untold millions of dollars for the taxpayers of this country if that resolution were passed and that policy were adopted.

It is a well-known fact that when the various agencies and bureaus come before the Committee on Appropriations to get their annual sums allotted them to carry on, their statements are necessarily ex parte, and those bureaus and agencies, when once created, have a tendency to grow and grow until sometimes they reach staggering proportions. There is a great deal of duplication in their work. Some of it may not even pertain to proper Federal functions of government. There is necessarily, under such circumstances, waste and extravagance. In the matter of travel, in the matter of telephone calls, in the matter of printing, and numerous other incidental matters that involve expense, a great deal of money could be saved. This office of fiscal investigations would be at the call of the various committees of this House that had occasion to investigate expenditures

with reference to legislation emanating from those committees.

The resolution I introduced is now pending before the Committee on Accounts. I have appeared before that committee in an effort to get it reported to the House. The chairman of that committee, our beloved friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], is in sympathy with the objectives of the resolution, though he may have some difference of opinion as to just how that objective should be carried into effect. But, in my judgment, it is high time that we had an agency of our own from which we could get definite and accurate information as to what is done with the money we appropriate.

I think in the interest of economy and the taxpayers of our country, we should have speedy action on that measure.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much in sympathy with the resolution the gentleman has introduced, to investigate expenditures in the Government agencies. However I understood the gentleman's resolution reads to investigate the expenditures after the appropriations have been made.

Mr. LANHAM. Not only that, but also to get information and data upon which we would predicate proper appropriations. I realize that the Committee on Appropriations has an agency somewhat of this character.

Mr. STEFAN. Oh, no, not like that.

Mr. LANHAM. But I think we should have an agency of this House available for the service of the respective committees, that could give us accurate and definite information. I think we would be able to save a great deal of money for the taxpayers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. I have spoken several times on the floor of this House in support of this resolution. I think it is high time we took action.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much in favor of your resolution. You indicated that we on the Appropriations Committee have a similar committee. We do not have that information at all.

Mr. LANHAM. Well, that makes it all the more important to have this resolution adopted.

Mr. STEFAN. We need this more than anything I know of. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I am at a loss, many times when department agencies come before us justifying appropriations, to know whether or not those appropriations are really justified, because the people who are justifying them are the people who are directly interested.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right. The hearings are ex parte and no one appears to gainsay any representation the witnesses might make.

Mr. STEFAN. If we could have the information the gentleman suggests I think it would save taxpayers of the Nation hundreds of millions of dollars every year.

Mr. LANHAM. That is my judgment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I gladly yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that the Executive has some 973 experts to advise him on nearly all subjects that come before the President. The only agency that the Congress has is about 80 members of the Legislative Reference Service in the Congressional Library. I know of no other source to which they can refer for information.

Mr. LANHAM. And they do not in particular follow up the expenditure of these appropriations.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. For instance, if we could find out how the money appropriated for this fiscal year was spent, then it might be possible for us to make the appropriate reductions in the corresponding appropriations for the next fiscal year. It is a matter in which I have been very much interested. I think it makes for economy, it makes for the prevention of waste, duplication, and extravagance and I trust that the Members will become sufficiently interested in it to help me and help the committee in giving the House an early opportunity to pass upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to agree with what my colleague from Texas has said relative to a careful check on expenditures. I have found very little criticism of the Commodity Credit Corporation insofar as its domestic policy is concerned, but I should like to call the attention of the House to a condition that has arisen where its activities are conducted outside this Nation. I have in my hand an agreement entered into between the Commodity Credit Corporation, as the agent for the Department of Agriculture, and the Government of Peru, in which we agreed to purchase 200,000 bales of cotton annually from that country.

On April 22, 1942, the United States Department of Agriculture entered into an agreement with the Minister of Finance of the Republic of Peru that provided for the purchase by the Commodity Credit Corporation during the year 1942 of about 200,000 bales of cotton and the surplus of all succeeding crops until the 31st of December following the cessation of hostilities.

That may not be so unusual, but I want to quote from the agreement itself:

> The United States Department of Agriculture through the Commodity Credit Corporation agrees to purchase during the calendar year 1942 up to 1,000,000 quintals of the 1942 crop of Peruvian cotton.

We thought we had done away in this country with the idea of so-called plowing under every third row, but apparently we have undertaken the same policy down in Peru. I continue quoting:

> The purchase price established for the calendar year 1942 shall be the base price for succeeding years, provided that the area planted to cotton in Peru remains at the 1942 figure, which is tentatively estimated to be 135,000 hectares, this estimate being subject to revision by mutual agreement. If the area under cotton cultivation is reduced in any succeeding year, the base price shall be increased 1½ percent for each 1 percent reduction in area.

That seems to be a very unusual procedure by which we agreed to pay 1½ percent more for each 1 percent of reduction. I continue quoting:

> In the event that a net profit should be realized, if and when all of the cotton purchased under the terms of this memorandum during any calendar year is disposed of, 50 percent of that profit shall be turned over to the Central Reserve Bank of Peru as the agent of the Government of Peru for distribution among local producers.

Mr. Chairman, I think a matter of that kind should be checked into very carefully. Probably they have some valid reason for it, but we should be told what it is. I can think of no reason in the limited experience I have had as a Member of this Congress why a policy of that kind should be followed. Why we should take funds out of the pockets of the people of this Republic to pay foreign countries to reduce crop acreage is beyond understanding. I think it is high time to check into it by some agency such as our friend from Texas mentioned.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the gentleman inquire as to why we were subsidizing the cotton business of Peru? Why we were purchasing that cotton at a time when we have a surplus of cotton? Could it have been, I ask my colleague, that perhaps that cotton might have gotten into the hands of the Axis countries and for that reason we were trying to control cotton that might be used against us?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I went into that, but I could not find any period since this contact was made in which any ship of the Axis could have reached their ports.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did the gentleman state under what authority this agreement was made?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It was made by the Department of Agriculture with the Commodity Credit Corporation acting as their agent; but I can find no record of where Congress has approved that agreement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Perhaps it comes under lend-lease operations, the Atlantic Charter, the Declaration of the United Nations. Has the gentleman pursued his investigations that far?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. No; frankly, I have not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words what I want to know is whether or not the Department of Agriculture, using the Commodity Credit Corporation as its effectuating agent, was proceeding under some of these wartime powers in some of these instruments and agreements to which I have referred.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I think it is high time that the Congress investigated and found out why a policy of this kind was placed in effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] that I do not understand why the Government of the United States purchases cotton from Peru when we have such a large surplus here. Whether it is purchased through lend-lease or in any other manner it is news to me.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] was reading from the terms of a contract which has been consummated, which is now in operation and under which we are purchasing the cotton. Is that correct?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I should be very happy to let the gentleman see a copy of the agreement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I was trying to find out was the specific authority the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation had for making such an agreement.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is what I should like to know, too, especially at a time when we have such a large surplus of cotton here in America.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Just lately a notice has come to my desk, and I suppose it has come to the desks of other Members, too, that there would be a shortage of a great many articles made from cotton before this summer was over. If we have a surplus of cotton it does not seem to be consistent with the situation that does exist, and no reason certainly for buying cotton in a foreign country when we have a surplus of cotton today.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I remember that someone came before our committee—I believe it was Mr. Jesse Jones, last year, or it may have been a representative of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Anyway, he stated they had a plan to buy cotton in Peru not because they needed the cotton but because the market for the Peruvian cotton prior to the war was almost entirely in Japan and that it would have ruined the economy of Peru if they had not done something of this sort.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I do not recall that. There may be a shortage of certain varieties of cotton in the United States, but we have such a surplus here that I do not understand the reason for it myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to say a word of commendation for the distinguished gentleman from Texas who has again presented to the House this afternoon the substance of his resolution which is now pending before the Committee on Accounts. This joint resolution provides for the establishment of an agency of the Congress of the United States. This agency will be charged with the responsibility of following through after appropriations have been made by the Congress in order to ascertain the manner and method of the expenditure of those appropriations. It will examine the necessity for those expenditures so that we may have some facts available to the Appropriations Committee when those same general supply bills come before the committee the following year. It will be bipartisan and will be continuous in character as a permanent implement to aid the Congress in the proper discharge of its responsibility to curtail wherever possible the nonessential expenditure of public funds.

I have served on the Appropriations Committee for some years. May I say that after the first 3 months of service upon that committee I was amazed that the appropriation of billions of dollars was being made with a hearing entirely—as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] stated—ex parte in character. The only testimony offered in most cases is by the experts of the agencies asking for the money. The committee must in effect try an important lawsuit without counterevidence and rely wholly upon cross-examination of adverse witnesses in order to develop the real facts. Such a task presents difficulties of major importance.

Today I received copy of a letter from the Under Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Bell. He commented upon the action of the House of Representatives in passing the annual supply bill for the Post Office-Treasury Departments and indicated the criticism of the Treasury Department on account of certain reductions which the House made below the Budget estimates. That letter was addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and in it the Under Secretary very clearly gave notice to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that they would go on, spend the money that Congress has appropriated, and then come back before the deficiency committee asking for a deficiency.

Of what benefit is a budget? Of what benefit is the original action of the House of Representatives on appropriations under those circumstances in controlling expenditures? The gentleman from Texas, in my opinion, is doing a grand service to the people of the Nation and the Congress should get behind him and see to it that this resolution is brought in here for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have watched this movement in favor of what appears to be setting up a Congressional bureaucracy to oversee and fight the Executive bureaucracy. I am wondering if the gentleman does not think it would be simpler to just elect a President who would be interested in reducing the executive expenditures?

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois is quite familiar with my personal views upon that subject. I have expressed them in and out of the well of this House many, many times and in various parts of the country. I may say that I expect to do so many, many times before the next November election. Certainly the solution suggested will appeal as good sense to those of us who want no more of the New Deal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say will be in the way of a friendly observation. First, I do not know a Member on the Republican side or on the Democratic side who is opposed to continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation. This afternoon one of our very outstanding Members on the Democratic side approached me and wanted to know why certain Republicans were opposing continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation and I told him I did not know of any who were. I want to emphasize that and, I repeat, I do not know of any on the Democratic side who oppose continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

As I understand the concept of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it was brought into operation and it has been maintained primarily to stabilize the agricultural economy of this country, which means to facilitate the stabilization of the organized industrial economy as well. A few moments ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] referred to a cotton contract, which is now in operation between the United States and a certain Latin-American country. I believe I speak the views of this House when I say that cotton is the greatest single crop produced in the United States when you consider its benefits to the animal kingdom as well as to the human kingdom, the fibers, the fats, oils, and proteins that come from it. Certainly it is the basic economy of certain great segments of our areas in the Southern States. In turn the southern people convert cotton into dollars and buy manufactured products from the North and the New England area.

We have several forces running in this country and I am going to outline them in this manner: There is the enunciation of the "four freedoms," the Atlantic Charter, the declaration of the United Nations, the lend-lease, the four-nation agreement at Moscow, and the mutual-aid agreements, which I believe exceed 30 in number, that have been completed between the United States and 30 other countries. We also have U. N. R. R. A. and we have 17 or more secret agree-

ments which have been consummated. In these mutual-aid agreements we have title VII, which I believe is uniform in all of them and which serves as a binder tying a number of these agreements and declarations together.

Under those agreements, declarations and laws like lend-lease we are proceeding to support the economy of certain other countries. I am sure if we pursue this question far enough with respect to the cotton agreement we will find that in some of these declarations, agreements, or statutes we will find authority for that specific cotton agreement which has been mentioned.

There is another development in force which is being urged quite aggressively by the Secretary of the Treasury and that has to do with the formation of some kind of a union between friendly nations for the stabilization of an international currency in the post-war period so that that stabilization will facilitate the flow of trade across international borders.

When you take those propositions and go back to the fourth section of the Atlantic Charter, wherein England and the United States, being represented by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt, pledged the agencies of those two countries to make accessible to the best of their ability the raw materials of the earth to countries of like mind on equal terms in the post-war period, you moved into this field of stabilized economic conditions in the post-war period as well as the war period, all tied together by article VII of the mutual aid agreements.

We come down to the Commodity Credit Corporation and we find an amendment, which we will call the Steagall amendment, providing that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall support agricultural prices with 90 percent of parity price loans for a 2-year period after the cessation of hostilities. There are men in this country, leaders if you please, who feel that the high prices which may be thus given to certain agricultural commodities in the post-war period under the 90 percent support price amendment may maintain a price level which will tend to crowd out of the market through the machinery of a high price certain great and basic commodities because of the possibility of synthetic products and substitute products coming in and taking their place on account of being able to move into this market at a price lower than the support price. Somewhere down the line we are going to have to give consideration to that.

This general approach takes us into the field of stock piling. For instance, we have our domestic wool growers, and we have our friendly wool growers in Australia. We now have a stock pile of wool in this country, present and potential and with the 1944 clip, which may exceed 1,300,000,000 pounds and may reach 2,000,000,000 pounds. There is a stock pile of wool. What is to be done with it as related to the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and as related to war prices and post-war prices under the 90-percent support-price clause, for instance?

You will have innumerable stock piles of materials tied up under the Rubber Reserve Corporation, the Defense Supplies Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, perhaps twenty-five or thirty billions dollars' worth of them. The disposition of those stock piles will have to do with the operation of the mutual-aid agreements, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Atlantic Charter, the post-war lend-lease operations, and the various other activities to which I have referred. The man in charge of the disposition of those stock piles will in turn be able to affect very materially, if not control, the economies in the countries to which those stock piles directly apply.

For instance, let us take the stock pile of cotton which we now have on hand and which we may have on hand at the end of the 2-year period, wherein the present Commodity Credit Corporation law provides we shall maintain support prices at 90 percent of the parity price. Sooner or later this Congress is going to have to move into the realm of stock piles and the disposition of stock piles.

Let us take Australia as a specific example. Australia grows primarily wool, hides, and beef. Australia is primarily interested in the United States through the effectuation of these various agreements maintaining the stability of prices on wool, beef, and hides. When we go back into the Dutch East Indies and recapture the rubber plantations, they will be interested in the stability of prices on crude rubber as against our synthetic rubber industry. When Japan comes back into our realm, it will be interested in the stability of the price of silk as against substitute fibers, synthetic or otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Can the gentleman say where the Commodity Credit Corporation obtains this authority to buy cotton from Brazil and guarantee them a certain price?

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I said before, I was trying to ascertain that information from the gentleman from Illinois. Then I also said later, after I took the floor, that it is my opinion that if we search far enough we shall find authority for that specific act in one or the other of the instruments to which I have referred.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It did not come through the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not believe so, because I do not recall any legislation anywhere before our committee that had to do with that particular problem.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has referred to the Government-owned stock piles of these basic products. Is it not a fact that the larger the Government stock pile the more dependent the producer will become on the Government for all time in the future?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The producer always becomes more dependent on a single or approximately single purchaser of his product. If I am a manufacturer of woolen goods and you are my only customer, I become dependent upon your operation. If I can vegetables and you are my only customer, I become dependent upon what you do. If the Government becomes the largest owner of wool, cotton, hides, or whatever it happens to be, I become more dependent upon Government activities. In other words, it tends to rob the producer of his free market, it tends to make him absolutely dependent upon a single purchaser, who may at any time he pleases proceed to dump or refuse to buy.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the first sentence of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended, as of February 17, 1944, by striking out "February 17, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945."

SEC. 2. In cases where producers have expanded or hereafter expand production of nonbasic agricultural commodities pursuant to any public announcement made under section 4 (a) of the act entitled "An act to extend the life and increase the credit resources of the Commodity Credit Corporation and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1941, as amended, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator through loans, purchases, and other operations under such section 4 (a), to completely fulfill all commitments made to such producers. In order to carry out the purposes of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture or the War Food Administrator shall use such of the funds available for carrying out the provisions of such section 4 (a) as may be necessary, and such funds are hereby made available for such purpose.

SEC. 3. Section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby further amended by changing the designation thereof to section 7 (a); and by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided, however*, That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business.

"(b) The financial transactions of the Corporation beginning with the period from July 1, 1944, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transaction and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall continue to have the authority to make final and conclusive settlement and adjustment of any claims by or against the Corporation or the accounts of its fiscal officers: *Provided further*, That a report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, and that each such report shall cover a period of 1 fiscal year: *Provided further*, That a copy of each such report shall be furnished the Secretary of the Treasury and that the findings contained therein shall be considered by the Secretary in appraising the assets and liabilities and

determining the net worth of the Corporation under sections 1 and 2 of the act of March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying legislation authorizing the use of funds of the Corporation for administrative expenses and requiring accountability therefor.

"(c) The expenses of the audit as provided in this section may be paid up to and including June 30, 1946, from moneys advanced therefor by the Corporation, or from any appropriation or appropriations for the General Accounting Office, and appropriations so used shall be reimbursed promptly by the Corporation as billed by the Comptroller General: *Provided,* That any such advances or reimbursements shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses of the Corporation. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all papers, books, files, accounts, financial records, warehouses, and all other things, property, and places belonging to or under the control of or used or employed by the Corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided further,* That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of the Corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of the Corporation as final and not subject to further audit verification.

"(d) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where such records are normally kept in the transaction of the corporate business, and the Corporation shall retain custody of contracts, vouchers, schedules, or other financial or accounting documents, either original or duplicate, relating to its nonadministrative transactions."

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: On page 4, after line 20, insert a new section, to be known as section 4, to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. No funds controlled by or made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be directly or indirectly used by the Commodity Credit Corporation to make any subsidy or other payment, or to pay or absorb losses, on any agricultural commodity or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part therefrom, including milk and livestock and the products thereof, either to reduce, or in lieu of increasing, maximum prices established on such commodities under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, or Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided,* That with respect to any such commodities for which programs involving such payments or losses have been announced on or before February 21, 1944, such programs may be carried out to the extent only that funds are available for such purpose under existing law: *Provided further,* That support prices shall continue to be maintained and announced for any such commodities pursuant to section 4 of Public Law No. 147, approved July 1, 1941, as amended, and loans shall continue to be made pursuant to section 8 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942, but any maximum prices heretofore or hereafter established for such commodities shall not be below the support prices therefor or below the prices specified in section 3 of Public Law No. 729, approved October 2, 1942: *Provided further,* That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the making of parity payments or soil-conservation payments authorized under existing law, or benefits to sugar growers authorized under title III of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, or the sale of feed wheat as authorized by existing law."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] in support of the amendment.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has just been read sounds complicated but in truth is very simple. It merely provides that subsidy programs which have been already announced by the Commodity Credit Corporation may be continued but that no new consumer subsidy programs may be inaugurated by this Corporation. The rest of the amendment merely reiterates that none of the other programs for the benefit of farm production are in any way affected.

Unlike the bill vetoed by the President, my amendment only refers to those subsidies which are being handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Rollbacks on butter, meat, and bread which have been undertaken by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would not be affected.

Unlike the bill vetoed by the President my amendment in no way affects any subsidy program which has been announced prior to February 21.

A majority of Congress by their votes have shown themselves to be opposed to the subsidy program. Through the sustaining of the President's veto last week the will of this majority was thwarted. The resolution which we are considering if passed without amendment represents a complete retreat by Congress. The door would be left wide open to the further extension of the subsidy program only limited by the funds available.

In a statement to the press a short time ago, the Commodity Credit Corporation announced that it had ample funds available—$1,000,000,000 in fact—while at present the subsidy program of the Commodity Credit Corporation amounts to approximately half a billion. There is plenty of money for new subsidies.

I am frank to say I do not like to compromise in any way, but all legislation is a matter of compromise and in time of war none of us should be too stubborn.

If we pass this bill as presented without amendment some may say that by our action we have sanctified the subsidy program. As far as I am personally concerned, I refuse to allow myself to be maneuvered into this position. Let us not sacrifice principle for expediency.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

Mr. DILWEG. What is the difference between the gentleman's amendment and the one offered by Senator BUSHFIELD in the Senate?

Mr. KEAN. I have not read Senator BUSHFIELD's amendment except as I saw something about it in the newspaper—that he had offered an amendment.

Mr. DILWEG. The Senator offered an amendment exactly the same as that offered by the gentleman from New Jersey except that he rolled the date back to October rather than a February date, and also provided that there should be a winding-up process by July of this year, 1944. That was voted down.

Mr. KEAN. I have not consulted with the Senator and I have no idea what he offered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, as one who really tried to compromise in some way the subsidy issue, and find a solution to our inflation control difficulties, I regret that I have to disagree with my friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] on his proposed compromise.

I do not think this is in the nature of a real compromise. I am certain that it does not satisfy those of us who sincerely feel that a well-regulated and limited subsidy program is one of the necessary weapons against inflation. I am also likewise certain that the proposal of my colleague does not and will not satisfy or suit those who are opposed to subsidies.

This proposed amendment would authorize the whole subsidy program now in effect by the Commodity Credit Corporation. It seeks only to freeze that Corporation subsidy program for the duration of the life of the Corporation, which would extend it a full year. As is well known, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the ranking member on the committee, has announced that he intends to fight to seek an absolute subsidy restriction when the price-control bill is up for passage. Thus, if the amendment is passed, the minority will find itself in the completely incongruous position of authorizing today a proposed subsidy program in this measure but which they will seek to invalidate in the next bill that comes out of our committee.

This freezing of the whole C. C. C. program, as proposed, would freeze the bad as well as the good part of the subsidy operation. For instance, you have a subsidy now on milk. The subsidy announced was not enough to insure the production and free flow of fluid milk and the C. C. C. now proposes to raise it slightly to encourage added production. Yet this amendment as offered would freeze the bad subsidy operation that is now not doing the job for milk, whereas perhaps a few more cents per hundredweight for milk would allow the milk producers to get a price that would justify its cost of production. So I do not believe this amendment is going to be at all satisfactory to that segment of our economy.

Again, in subsidies, you must have some flexibility. If you do not have flexible operation, if you freeze the program, you are going to have a vast waste of Government funds, subsidizing things because you have a program authorized, and you will be wedded to the authorization of using up the present program. Thus you would deny putting a few pennies on another price that would perhaps have far greater effect in retarding inflation.

Furthermore, this amendment does not restrict in any way that part of the subsidy program, the roll-back subsidies

being financed by the R. F. C. Under this amendment they could still expend over a billion dollars out of their funds on hand to enlarge the program, through this less attractive means of subsidies. In that way they could nullify completely any restriction that this amendment seeks to place on subsidies. I believe that you gentlemen who have been fundamentally opposed to subsidies will have opportunity to meet this issue squarely when it comes up under the price-control bill.

I believe Mr. WOLCOTT intends to make a strong fight at that time. In the meantime any overloading of the present bill, which is an effort to really help the farmers, and reestablish the Commodity Credit Corporation so that farmers can make plans for planting, and know what the program will be for this year—any overloading with this amendment would send the bill back to a conference, would probably stimulate debate, and perhaps meet another veto. I do not believe that the House wants to risk further delay in reestablishing this important farm agency and thus endanger our war food program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON: After the last word in the bill, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. No purchase agreement entered into by this agency with any foreign government shall become effective until 30 days after its context has been made known to the Congress."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I object to the amendment. I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is not germane. I am reserving the right to make the point of order. I have no objection to the gentleman addressing the House on his amendment.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this amendment is not to handicap or cripple the Commodity Credit Corporation, because I make it very clear in the amendment that it would not limit their activities. It would merely make those activities known to the Congress.

I believe that agreements, such as the one entered into with the Government of Peru, in which we agreed to pay them for reducing their cotton acreage, would not exist if the Congress had known of such intended transaction. I believe that the spotlight of publicity, focusing the attention of the Nation on such activities, would forestall their enactment.

Through such agreements we are fast becoming Santa Claus to the entire world. I would say to those who want, through such agreements, to help our neighbors, let us first help ourselves.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I understand that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has consulted the Commodity Credit Corporation relative to this cotton purchase down in South America. I would like to have him deal with that question.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to give this information. I talked to Mr. J. B. Hutson, the Director of the Commodity Credit Corporation. There was one deal that was handled early in the war after Pearl Harbor for 40,000 bales of cotton, which were bought from Peru. It was bought to relieve the economy of Peru as the result of a sudden shock of the loss of their foreign markets. The cotton is still in Peru. It has been turned over to the F. E. A., Mr. Crowley's organization. I am informed definitely that the Commodity Credit Corporation will not enter into any foreign agreements for the absorption of any product. They are having two foreign operations both of which have had legislative sanction. One is the sugar-purchase program from offshore and the other is the Canadian wheat imports program for cattle feed. I am a little bit afraid we might, through requiring 30 days' notice, on those two that are now being done, in some way defeat the orderly distribution of emergency feed which is being imported from Canada.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Are we assured by the Commodity Credit Corporation that the agreement which was entered into between the Government of Peru and that agency in April to purchase 200,000 bales of cotton each year, has been set aside?

Mr. MONRONEY. It is my understanding and I had the information directly from Mr. Hutson a few minutes ago, after the gentleman announced it on the floor of the House, that every bit of this work is being done now by the F. E. A., Mr. Crowley's organization, that is, the Foreign Economic Administration. Now what other agreements there are, I do not know. There is a lot of preclusive buying and a lot of economic warfare going on. I can assure the gentleman that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not going to be used in any of these deals of that kind.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. If the gentleman is confident that the Commodity Credit Corporation will not carry on such a policy, the need for this amendment, if he is right, would be nonexistent. We would not need it. But it was with the thought of stopping such activities on the part of the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency of government that I introduced this amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think any Member of the House is in a position to make a statement that the Commodity Credit Corporation will not in the future participate in such transactions. The Commodity Credit Corporation is an agency of this Government and we have sanctified and legislated and appropriated and put into operation certain machinery; when that machinery acts and directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to proceed to purchase certain commodities as an agency of the United States Government, how are you going to prevent them from doing so? It may be true that at the moment the Foreign Economic Administration, or whatever the agency is, may be performing this particular function, but perhaps next week by Executive order they may be demolished and it might go back to certain other agencies of government. I think that is the point the gentleman is trying to get at.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Yes, the agreement is self-explanatory, according to a letter from the Department of Agriculture, they agree through their agent, the Commodity Credit Corporation, to purchase 200,000 bales of cotton annually. Such activities at least should be brought to the attention of the Congress. If we are called upon to levy taxes and make appropriations to be spent over the entire world, without any knowledge of where the money is going, I think it is high time we put a stop to such practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COURTNEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration Senate Joint Resolution 116, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 448, and reported the Senate joint resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 239) was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF FRANK T. HINES AS BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 872) an act to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States, for printing in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the business on the Speaker's desk is disposed of, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two articles from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow night it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts state the legislative program for next week, so far as he knows now?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is a bill reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary which was introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. MICHENER. Is that an amendment to the Lemke farm moratorium?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is correct. It is H. R. 4166. Unless it is passed by unanimous consent today, that will be in order on Tuesday next. Outside of that, I have no other program to announce at this time for next week.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, under a special order I had received permission to address the House on Monday next. I ask unanimous consent that that may be transferred to Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from this morning's Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIZALDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different topics, and in one to include a newspaper article, and in the other to include a short address by Federal Judge John C. Bowen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE BERLIN-MADRID-SOUTH AMERICAN AXIS—AND WHAT WE MUST DO TO FIGHT IT

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, last June I made the suggestion on this floor that the House of Representatives should immediately establish a committee to investigate the activities of the Spanish Falange in the Western Hemisphere. As I remarked then, I was prompted to make that request because of the charge leveled against the Franco regime and its official party by the publication of Allan Chase's book, Falange, The Axis Secret Army in the Americas. The committee to investigate these charges was not organized, but since then history itself has acted as this committee—the events of the past year have more than substantiated the charges made in the book.

Only a few weeks ago, for example, we learned that the State Department's report on the revolt in Bolivia charged that Jose Luis Aranguren, an official of the Spanish legation in La Paz and chief of the Spanish Falange in Bolivia, had acted as the go-between between the Nazis and the leaders of the Bolivian revolt. In that same week the State Department, after all these years, was forced to recognize the Fascist character of the Franco regime—was forced to dispatch a strong note to Madrid in which the Axis regime of Francisco Franco was severely taken to task for its services to Hitler. This note was sent after consultations with the British Government, which has also begun to realize what is happening in Spain.

The time for an investigation of the Falange and of our relations with the Falangist Spanish state has passed. Time, which never stands still, moves with lightning speed in war years.

DEMOCRACY SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED IN SPAIN

The time has come for definite, positive, democratic action on Spain. The laws of common sense, of self-preservation, demand this action. The demands of our war machinery, of the post-war settlements, cry out for action. There is only one course that the realities of the world situation permit us to take. We must immediately break all diplomatic relations with Franco Spain.

SEVER DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH SPAIN

Yes; we must make this break now on our own terms—before the Axis forces us to break with Fascist Spain on terms such as Japan handed us at Pearl Harbor.

But we must go further than merely to break with Spain. Merely to sever our diplomatic ties would be to hand the whole Iberian Peninsula to Hitler by default. There is no need to permit Hitler to retain his control of Spain. The overwhelming majority of the Spanish people are violently opposed to Franco and his German masters; they are completely devoted to the cause of the United Nations. The people of Spain are today facing Franco's firing squads because of their sabotage of the German war machine in Spain. The people of Spain are our allies; their enemies are our enemies; their friends are our friends. We have it in our power to help them throw the Germans out of Spain and once more bring the Spanish Nation into the world family of democratic countries.

FRANCO NOT TYPICAL OF SPAIN'S PEOPLE

Franco is not Spain. He was put into the seat of purely nominal power by the combined armies of Hitler and Mussolini during the Spanish War which started in July 1936 and ended in April 1939. That it took 3 years for Hitler and Mussolini to defeat the republic established by the Spanish people in the bloodless revolution at the polls in 1931 is a testimonial to the fierce hatred the heroic people of Spain bear toward the Fascist Axis.

FRANCO IS HITLER'S PUPPET

Franco is and, since 1935, has been Hitler's faithful puppet. Everything he has, he owes to Hitler. Since 1939, Franco has done everything in his power to aid the Nazi cause in this war. The promises of Francisco Franco are worth no more than the promises of Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, and Emperor Hirohito. We are now engaged in the greatest war in the world's history because some statesmen chose to accept at face value the promises of the Fascist rulers of Germany, Japan, and Italy. Are we now going to wait until the promises of the Fascist puppet-ruler of Spain also blow up in our startled faces? What moral or military justification can we present for accepting the word of a proven liar, of a man who won his present post by violating his oath to a democratic republic, by betraying his country to Germany?

NAZI GERMANY IS SPAIN'S GREATEST CUSTOMER

Even the most cursory examination of Franco's services to Hitler leave no doubt as to where Falangist Spain fits into the Axis war picture. According to the statements released by the Spanish Government itself, Nazi Germany is Spain's biggest customer. Let us for the moment ignore the fact that Spain's resources themselves are now in the hands of German owners. Whatever the economics of the matter may be, the fact remains that by Franco's own admission Germany is getting the largest portion of Spain's exports.

SPANISH EXPORTS

What are these exports? Spain produces great quantities of mercury, copper, tungsten, iron, and other vital war materials. On January 25 of this year, Dingle M. Foot, parliamentary secretary to the British Ministry of Economic Warfare, disclosed that in the year just ended Germany received from Spain 100 tons of tungsten monthly. He revealed that 40 percent of Germany's wolfram—the vital tungsten ore—came from Spain, and that 50 percent came from Portugal. Think of it, 90 percent of Germany's tungsten comes from the two Iberian Fascist states we have been appeasing since 1939. How many American and British and Russian soldiers have been killed by the Nazi steel hardened with this Iberian tungsten?

Let us turn again to Mr. Foot's report. Although he gave no figures, he disclosed that Spain ships to the Nazi Wehrmacht large and decisive quantities of iron ore, iron pyrites, hides, tin, wool, cork, turpentine, and fruit.

Spain also ships some fruit to England. But I see by the papers that the oranges sold to England by Franco contain time bombs which blow up not only the car-

goes but also the British ships and crews carrying this cargo.

SPAIN'S MERCHANT FLEET

Spanish products are the least of Spain's exports to Germany. Spain has a merchant fleet which sails the seas in the guise of a neutral shipping navy. Since 1939, Spanish ships have been loading oil, wheat, beef, platinum, radio equipment, machinery, and other war supplies in North and South American ports and transshipping these cargoes to Germany. It was only last month that the United States and Great Britain made the first step toward ending this traffic in United Nations oil to the Nazi war machine via "neutral" Spain. But how many American, British, and Russian soldiers have paid with their lives for this great bonanza Hitler has won by keeping his Spanish puppet state in a condition of phony neutrality?

Spain has made available to the Nazis all of its ports and territorial facilities in Spain and the Spanish colonial possessions. It is no longer a secret that the Nazis have functioning air, submarine, and refueling bases in Morocco, the Balearics, and in Spain itself. Nearly any United Nations sailor who has been in Spanish waters since 1939 can tell you about these bases. On February 6 the Sunday Observer, of London, revealed that Italian midget submarines had been based at Algeciras (Spain) during the crucial years of Mediterranean warfare. Does anyone dare to suggest that Nazi submarines are not at this moment using these same bases in Spain? Why have Pan-American Airways Clippers stopped flying over the Spanish Canaries? Is it because of the German base at Teneriffe?

SPAIN IS DECIDEDLY UNNEUTRAL

Franco has always claimed to be an innocent neutral. I would like to quote a passage from Allan Chase's prophetic book which will better enable you to understand Franco's neutrality for the Axis trap that it is. Chase wrote:

> In Spanish Morocco, while Spain was still a republic in 1936, the Government had a garrison of 1,683 officers and 40,383 men. The (Franco) Fascists increased this garrison in 1939 to two complete army corps—a force of over 200,000 soldiers. By 1943 this 200,000-strong army had been more than doubled in size.

There you have some very cold facts. Against whom are Spain's German military advisers preparing this army of some 500,000 soldiers? Why did the democratic Spanish Republic, which Franco betrayed, need only 40,383 soldiers in Spanish Morocco? Perhaps Generals Eisenhower and Clark and Montgomery can supply the answer in their post-war memoirs. But if you cannot wait until after the war, take a look at the photographs of the graves of the American and British soldiers who died in the north African and the Italian campaigns. Visit an Army hospital and talk to some of the American casualties of these campaigns. Ask them whether we would have suffered as many deaths and casualties as we did in these campaigns if we did not have to waste so many troops to keep watch on the Spanish Moroccan borders. Yes, ask them—and mark their answers well.

SPANISH FASCISTS FIGHT FOR THE AXIS

Mr. Speaker, I can say again that the present Government of Spain is Hitler's, a tool completely at his disposal. Hitler has conscripted Spanish manhood to fight in Russia as part of the German armies. They called them volunteer legions in the beginning. The Blue Division they called these troops, naming them after the blue shirts of the Falange Party, the only official party in Spain. When those United Nations which still maintain diplomatic ties with Franco protested these Spanish troops on the eastern fronts, the Fascist hypocrites in Madrid at first disclaimed the troops. Then they admitted that the Blue Division was indeed a reality, but consisted solely of volunteers. Finally, after continued pressure from London, the Spanish Government accepted the responsibility for sending the troops to aid Hitler, but promised to recall them at once.

This promise was as worthless as the promise of any other Fascist government. The Spanish troops are still killing Soviet soldiers, still murdering Soviet civilians. Only a few weeks ago the Fascist government of Spain cynically told a prominent and rather innocent American correspondent that the only troops which have not been recalled from the Russian front were criminals and other undesirables. Even if true, this is not enough. Are we supposed to be grateful because criminals too dangerous to be allowed at loose in Madrid are now armed and facing our allies in Russia?

GERMAN AGENTS IN SPAIN

Within the past 6 weeks the intelligence services of our European allies have reported that German agents are pouring into Spain and the Spanish colonial islands and possessions. These Nazis are known to the Spanish Government, which aids and abets them in their war against us.

I have examined hundreds of Spanish newspapers and other publications issued in Spain during the past 6 months. Only the fact that these official organs of the Franco state are printed in Spanish distinguishes them from the press of Nazi Germany. Spain's official press is 100 percent Nazi in ideology, in language, and in its treatment of the war. Like the Spanish radio, the Spanish official press hails Hitler and the Nazis, excoriates Hitler's enemies. But what can you expect from a Spanish Government whose chief, Franco, answered Hitler's birthday cable on the anniversary of Pearl Harbor in these words:

> Many thanks to you and the German peoples. May your arms triumph in the glorious undertaking of freeing Europe from the Bolshevik terror.

What can you expect from the Spanish press when the Spanish "Dictatorette" Franco makes endless public speeches declaring that the war we are now fighting is simply a war between fascism and bolshevism and that Franco chooses to back the forces of fascism? What can you expect from a Spanish press when the Foreign Minister of the Spanish Fascist State wires congratulations to the Japanese puppet ruler in Manila and felicitates the traitors for having won their independence from—from whom? MacArthur? And if you think that Spain and the Spanish Falange did not have a hand in the Japanese triumph in the Phillipines, take a look at Allan Chase's book.

In a previous talk, I presented to this House instances of the job Franco and the Spanish Falange has been doing for the Axis in Latin America. Our Government now has in its possession thousands of documented records of the anti-United Nations sabotage, the Axis propaganda, the national fifth-column work the Spanish Government is performing in Latin America through the Spanish diplomatic offices, the Spanish Falange, and the Spanish merchant fleet. The revelations of the Spanish Falangist role in Bolivia is but a minor example of this menace.

FALANGE: FASCISM IN THE AMERICAS

On January 12, for example, the newspaper El Pais, of Caracas, Venezuela, exposed the fact that the Spanish Embassy in Caracas is now distributing money to "no fewer than 200 Germans" working as Nazi agents in Venezuela. The paper further revealed that much of the funds at the disposal of Vite, the head of Nazi intelligence in Venezuela, reached the Western Hemisphere on board the Spanish "neutral" ship, *Cabode Hornos*. This is not an isolated instance. This is a typical case from the pattern of Falangist activities in the Americas. But studying this pattern, you get a pretty good idea of why the Fascist General Pedro Ramirez, Argentina's Franco, broke diplomatic ties with Hitler Germany when the pressure became too great. The Spanish Embassy is still open in Buenos Aires, and the Spanish Ambassador, like the Spanish puppet ruler, takes his orders from Berlin.

"Neutral" Spanish ships deliver thousands of Nazi agents to ports in every American nation. "Neutral" Spanish ships deliver thousands of tons of Nazi propaganda to all of Latin America. "Neutral" Spanish ships rendezvous with Nazi submarines in Latin American waters; supply them with oil, water, and food; give them information on the movements of United Nations convoys. "Neutral" Spanish ships deliver German-trained Spanish agents to lead Falangist front organizations like the anti-democratic, anti-Semitic, pro-Hitler Sinarquistas of Mexico. Talk to an American seaman and ask him what happens on the run to Aruba, for example, when a "neutral" Spanish freighter is sighted on or near the course. He can tell you a thing or two about the way Spanish freighters and Nazi submarines collaborate against Uncle Sam!

WHY DON'T WE ACT?

Mr. Speaker, these facts are known. These facts are no longer secrets guarded by the Nazis. Some day when we break with Franco—and I repeat, if we don't make this break on our own terms we will ultimately have to do it on Hitler's terms—on the day when we break with Franco the State Department will no doubt publish a special White Book containing the detailed record of Franco's services to his German masters. Must this record wait until Hitler is ready? Our Government has the facts now; every democratic

government in Latin America has furnished parts of this dossier of treachery and Falangist intervention in American affairs. Let us publish for the peoples of all the Americas the facts now.

In the face of the cold facts about Franco in Spain and Franco in Latin America, why are we permitting a new smokescreen to be raised in Madrid, in London, and in Washington when the issue of Spain's role is broached? Why all this pious dream—talk about Franco's "new" neutrality? Why all this fantastic nonsense about Franco breaking with Hitler? Why all this raising of false hopes about Spain under Franco becoming a nation friendly to the anti-Facist cause of the United Nations?

CAN SUCH APPEASEMENT BE RATIONALIZED?

We hear strange rationalizations for our policies toward the puppet who makes the sound of a dictator in Spain. We are told by the defenders of this policy that if we get Franco angry he will go over to the Axis lock, stock, and barrel. It is too late for this kind of talk. Franco went over in 1935, when he sold his birthright as a Spaniard to Adolf Hitler. Do the defenders of our policy toward Spain mean to imply that Franco will declare war on the United Nations? Mice do not declare war on lions. Franco has not been pushed into this war as a full belligerent by Hitler, because the German Army cannot defend Spain militarily, and they do not dare arm the Spanish people. Spain's sole military value to Hitler is as a fake neutral facade for Nazi bases in Europe and Africa and Nazi espionage in the Americas.

We are told by the defenders of our policy toward Franco that by our clever strategic purchases in Spain we are depriving Germany of Spanish war supplies. I should like to see anyone try to tell this to the wives and widows of American soldiers killed by Nazis using war materials that came from Spain. Who is kidding whom? Germany knows that neutrality must at least look like a two-way proposition. Therefore, the Germans who control Spain do not hesitate to sell certain surplus Spanish goods to the United Nations. But Spain's German masters are not depriving the German Wehrmacht of anything they need from Spain for themselves. Why should they not trade some surplus Spanish wolfram for some Western Hemisphere beef and oil they can get only via "neutral" Spanish ships? No; the strategic buying excuse just will not stand up against the brutal realities of this war.

EXPEDIENCY A FEEBLE JUSTIFICATION

We are told that foreign policy is something only for experts and that these mysterious silk-hatted gentlemen have handed down the dictum from their exalted heights that it is most "expedient" to appease Franco at this time.

Mr. Speaker, are these not the same experts who placed such tragic faith in the equally expedient policies of appeasing Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, and Petain? Are these not the same experts who hailed the catastrophic pact of Munich and the infamous nonintervention swindle of the Spanish war as the guaranties of peace in our time?

INTERNATIONAL IMMORALITY CONDEMNED

These appeasers and would-be international Machiavellis overlook one of the most powerful truths of our times. That truth is the great role morality plays in the shaping of our destinies. Over and above all military considerations, it was the profound political immorality which characterized the appeasement orgies which led to this war we are now suffering. The appeasement of the Japanese in China and Manchuria, the appeasement of Mussolini in Ethiopia, the appeasement of Hitler and Mussolini when their armies invaded Spain in 1936, Munich, Memel, the Rhineland—you know the record. But the peoples of Europe knew this record, too. The democracies appeased themselves right out of the moral leadership of the world. The people lost their faith in the governments of the appeasers. After Munich, the Soviet Union withdrew in cold terror from the western world. And in this confusion, in this fear, in this moral disintegration which set in with appeasement, Hitler was able to grow strong, to score triumph after triumph, to devastate nation after nation.

Today, thanks to the brutality of the Axis, thanks to the atrocities committed by the European and Asiatic Fascist powers grown strong on appeasement, thanks to the fierce and wonderful heroism of the armies of the United Nations, we have again regained much of our moral strength.

Hitler had the weapons at Dunkerque, but they could not crush the moral strength of the embattled British troops. The German steamroller flattened a third of European Russia, but the moral fiber of the Russian people gave added power to their arms. Even in defeat, the Americans and Filipinos under MacArthur at Bataan, the pitifully equipped Spanish Republicans who held off the Nazis for 3 years proved that an army whose soldiers have the moral power which springs from the knowledge that they are fighting for freedom is an army which can and will come back to erase all temporary defeats.

FRANCO ANALYZED

Franco is one of the most immoral creatures crawling on the bleeding surface of the earth today. A traitor to the democratic Spanish Republic which trusted him with a command, a hypocrite who mouths flabby words about neutrality and sings hosannas to Hitler in the same breath, a Fascist turncoat who opened the gates of his native land to the Moors, to the Nazis, to the Italian Fascists, a miserable puppet of the crumbling Nazi empire—no words are mean enough and small enough to describe the total immorality of this pudgy little Fascist. Franco may be a "fine Christian gentleman" in the eyes of those none-too-innocent simpletons who in the past cheered the Nazis, the Italian Blackshirts, the Japanese beasts as the anointed saviors who were protecting the western world from bolshevism. But, in the eyes of the world, in Europe, in China, and most important of all, in Latin America, the people know Franco for what he is. To all the decent people of this world, Franco is just another despicable Fascist murderer.

LET US CEASE APPEASING FRANCO

How can we hope to lay claim to moral leadership, now and after the war, as long as we continue to appease Franco? How can we ask the common people of Latin America not to go the Fascist way of Argentina and Bolivia when we ourselves take the lead in appeasing the one creature who, more than Hitler himself, symbolizes in Latin American eyes all that is foul and ugly about fascism? How can we tell the people of Latin America that fascism is their enemy when our own Ambassador to Madrid makes public speeches in which he hails what he chooses to call the "wise peace policies" of the Fascist Franco?

ARE OUR DIPLOMATS SYCOPHANTIC TO FASCISM?

All this should be elementary, but certain simple facts do not seem to have penetrated certain sanctums. Some of our diplomats have been so intent on appeasing Franco, so intent on ransoming 14 Italian ships Franco kidnaped when his old pal Mussolini was deflated, that they have not bothered to notice that Franco does not sit so firmly in the seat of Spanish power at all. On the contrary, Señor Franco occupies a rather hot seat perched above a volcano that is due to erupt at any moment.

The truth of the matter is that the Spanish people, who never wanted Franco, who paid with a million lives in their earlier battle to keep him out of Madrid, want him still less today. The truth is that the Spanish people are showing what they think of Franco and his subservience to Hitler in many ways. They are blowing up powerhouses, wrecking trains, destroying factories producing goods for the German Army. Strange stories appear in the Spanish press today, stories of Spanish troops being called out to fight "highwaymen." It is not highwaymen who are so occupying the Franco troops—it is the growing army of Spanish republican guerrillas, the men who started to fight against Hitler in July 1936 and have never stopped.

MOST SPANISH ARE ZEALOUS EXPONENTS OF DEMOCRACY

Perhaps Carlton Hayes and Samuel Hoare do not know it. Perhaps a few social lions in Georgetown do not know it. But Franco and his German masters know it. The Spanish people are on the march again. With or without the blessings of the western world, the Spanish people are preparing to get rid of Franco and to bring Spain openly into the war against Hitler. I know it is the fashion these days to talk of the Spanish people as being war weary, as indeed they are. But just let the Spanish people raise another great republican army, just let this army for once be well equipped, and the world will see mute testimony—in the form of Nazi graves throughout southern Europe—that hatred of fascism is a physical force a thousand times stronger than war-weariness. The Spanish people are

a thousand times more weary of fascism than they are of war.

FRANCO AIDS FALANGE

The Spanish people are forcing the Germans to the wall in Spain. The Nazis and their Spanish quislings are growing desperate about the rising feelings against the Falange, the Spanish branch of the Nazi party, and the only official party permitted to exist in Fascist Spain. They are strengthening the Falange in every way they can. The new Spanish budget for 1944 has tripled last year's government appropriation for the Falange. The Falangist militia, Franco's elite corps, has been absorbed in toto by the Spanish Army. The officers of the Falangist militia now hold the same ranks in the Spanish Army. But even this is not enough, because active agents of the Spanish republican underground have been entering the Falange in order to get their hands on guns for the coming revolt against fascism in Spain.

The Germans are seriously considering the idea of dropping Franco, even of going through the motions of dissolving the Falange. This will not end fascism in Spain, not any more than an identical maneuver has ended fascism in Argentina. But the Germans do hope to bring confusion to the republican ranks by this maneuver, to use it as an instrument which can stall off the inevitable reckoning with the United Nations.

NAZIS FLIRT WITH IDEA OF RESTORING SPANISH MONARCHY

The Germans are ready with a plan to retain their control of Spain. Briefly, the Nazi overlords plan to bring back the Spanish monarchy, which the Spanish people voted into limbo in 1931. This monarchy is to form a government composed of present Franco ministers like Gomez de Jordana, army officers, and certain Spaniards not now in political office. It will bring back from Lisbon the Spanish Laval, Gil Robles, and install him as premier. Gil Robles backed the wrong Fascist horse during the preliminaries to the Spanish War—he made the mistake of collaborating with Mussolini when Franco sold out to Hitler.

NAZI-FRANCO CARTEL MACHINATIONS

This bastard Spanish monarchy might even go through the empty motions of breaking with Hitler. But it will not break with Juan March, the sinister Spanish Zaharoff who brought Hitler to Spain, who shares control of Spain's economic life with the Nazi bankers and the Nazi world cartels. The German propagandists will try to sell this government to the western democracies as the last hope against bolshevism, just as they did succeed in palming off Francisco Franco.

This is no idle pipe dream. The Germans have been laying the groundwork for this cheap trick for over a year. Georg von Schnitzler, of the German chemical trust, has been working on this plan in Madrid for nearly a year. Advance men for this circus of death have been on the road for months. One of the most persuasive advance men for this fake anti-Hitler Spanish monarchy has met with no little successes right here in Washington.

FALANGIST JUAN BEIGBEDER

Would you like to know his name? It is hardly a secret. Many a dinner party in Washington has been enlivened since March 1943 by the coy anti-Franco anecdotes told by Brig. Gen. Juan Beigbeder, of the Spanish Falangist Army. Beigbeder came to this country as the head of an official Spanish military mission. But before that he was in London, where he did a turn at some loaded dinner tables under the billing of the Spanish Hess. Shortly after he came to Washington Beigbeder slipped back into his Hess act. He has been selling his monarchist snake oil and his funny patter for months. Of course, it is odd that long after Beigbeder went through the motions of breaking with Franco he was raised in rank from colonel to brigadier general of the Spanish Army. The appointment was one of many announced in Madrid on October 1, 1943, the Dia del Caudillo, or the Day of the Fuehrer. This might come as a surprise to some of the innocents who have been taken in by Beigbeder in Washington, but it surprises no one who knows that Beigbeder's services to Germany began in Morocco during the First World War.

FASCIST CARTELIZERS ACTIVE HERE

Think for a moment of what the postwar world will be like if this monarchist plan of the Nazis succeeds. It will leave Spain firmly in German hands, yes, even if the masters of Germany are driven out of Germany itself. Cartels recognize no boundaries, fascism has no nationality of its own. If Spain comes out of this war as a Falangist or a monarchist state, it will be a Spain controlled by the I. G. Farben and other German monopolies. It will be a Spain that will prove the cornerstone, the motherland of a new world Fascist bloc. Argentina and Bolivia are already in this bloc. The Spanish merchant fleet is the lifeline between Fascist Spain and the Fascist nations of the Western Hemisphere.

There can be no doubt that unless the Nazis are run out of Spain in fact as well as in fancy, Madrid will become the world headquarters for international fascism. Only this time, it will be a fascism which will have only one world to conquer—Latin America. This makes Spain and everything that happens in Spain a matter of concern for every American nation.

OPPOSITION TO FRANCO FACTIONS

The alleged opposition offered Franco by the Juan Marches, the Gil Robles, the Count Jordanas is a dangerous farce, a farce more dangerous to the Americas than the farce of Munich. Yet this seems to be the only type of opposition within Spain that meets with the approval of the experts who have so much to say about our foreign policy. With bland, myopic eyes they see visions of "legitimacy" where Fascist governments are invaded, but cannot see "legitimacy" for the trees when democratic governments are involved. The last legitimate government of Spain was the republican government elected by the Spanish people in 1936. But our experts, who have been so consistently wrong about Spain since 1936, are again overlooking the wishes and the very existence of the great anti-Fascist democratic people of Spain.

SPANISH UNDERGROUND IS VIRILE

The people of Spain are now preparing to wage an open battle for their freedom. They want no truck with fascism, whether it is the frank fascism of the Falange or the concealed fascism of the monarchy.

They mean business. All the genuinely anti-Axis elements in Spain have united in one great movement. The newly formed Supreme Council of National Union embraces Spaniards of all faiths, all anti-Fascists creeds. Its program calls for the breaking of all ties to the Axis, the destruction of fascism in Spain, a democratic election as soon as the Fascists are driven out, and the extermination of all Nazis. Its manifesto calls for the support and encouragement of the United Nations.

The manifesto of the Spanish supreme council of national union calls first for sabotage of all sorts on the shipment of war materials from Franco to Hitler. It ends with a plea to all patriotic Spaniards to "exterminate the recalcitrant Falangists and the German agents who direct them."

These are not the weasel words of a Franco or a Jordana. These are not the hypocritical mouthings of a Gil Robles. No, they are the fighting words of a people allied with us in our common battle against the Axis; the fighting words of a gallant people who were the first Europeans to feel the grim might of the Nazi fury in this war. In the program and the manifesto of the Spanish people its authors have expressed their moral judgment on Hitler and his Spanish stooges. And they have written the death sentence for those who brought and would prolong the Fascist scourge in Spain.

WE WERE MISTAKEN IN THE PAST

Once before, in 1936, we refused to help the Spanish people when they took to arms in the battle against Hitlerism. Perhaps, had we recognized our legal and moral international obligations during that time, Hitler would long since have been defeated, and we would not now be at war. I, for one, will go to my grave believing that Hitler's career could have ended in Spain had we but forgotten the word appeasement in those bitter years.

Today, we must again determine our future as a nation by our policy toward Spain. For our own protection as a nation at war, we must end the farce of false neutrality by which Hitler has used Spain as a knife at our throats. For our own self-interest we must drive Spanish shipping from the free waters of the world until Spain once again returns to the family of civilized democratic nations. For the sake of our future in the post-war world, we must aid our neighbor nations in Latin America in ridding their lands of the Falangist fifth column.

LET US END THE FARCE OF A SEEMING PARTNERSHIP WITH FASCISM

Democracy is no stronger than its weakest link. There can be no real victory in this war, there can be no real

peace until fascism is crushed in Spain. To accept Spain on Franco's terms, to maintain any further dealings with the Axis puppet regime in Madrid, is to continue to play directly into the hands of Adolf Hitler.

I do not, I cannot, believe that this Congress lacks the moral courage to speak up now, to put itself on record as favoring an immediate break with Franco and a sound, far-sighted, democratic policy of offering the moral and physical resources of our great Nation to the unified Spanish anti-Fascist underground. The Spanish Supreme Council of Natonal Union is now a living reality, ready and anxious to serve its own people and the cause of all free peoples of the United Nations. It takes its place alongside of the French Committee of National Liberation, the Yugoslav Liberation Front, and the undergrounds of occupied Europe. As the spokesman of all that is decent and democratic within Spain, as the chosen instrument of the Spanish people, who are now fighting for us as well as for themselves, it is today the only Spanish body with which we have a moral and a military right to have any friendly relations.

The time has come to break with our enemies and recognize our friends in Spain.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] may on Tuesday next, after the reading of the Journal and at the conclusion of other special orders, address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by me at St. Paul, Minn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of business tomorrow and after any special orders heretofore entered I ask unanimous consent to speak for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday we listened to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address; we have listened to one or two addresses on Lincoln and have had various remarks on what they would do if they were here today. In his youth, the Father of our Country, George Washington, had one maxim that he carried with him throughout his life: "Labor to keep alive in thy breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience."

Toward the end of his career one utterance he made I believe he would make were he here today and ask everyone to observe: "Speak not ill of the absent for it is unjust."

In these times when everyone in official life, whether it be in the legislative, executive, or judicial branch, is geared to high tension, when everyone is willing to give his all so far as his nervous energy is concerned, it is difficult to think clearly. All who are in high positions are besieged with mail and with interruptions. Questions are asked. No one is a superman. Therefore it seems to me that the Father of his Country would ask any man in Congress not to criticize the Chief Executive and ask the Chief Executive not to criticize any man in Congress. We should have criticism of what they do, we should ask questions; but I do not believe any man is big enough to criticize another one as a person or big enough to impugn the motives of any man.

I want to relate an incident that occurred in Ohio in regard to the life of Abraham Lincoln that I believe is apropos today. It is the story of Fort Fizzle. That is not said facetiously, because there is really a place with such a name. The name is Fort Fizzle, and it may be found in Holmes County, 2¼ miles north of Glenmont, which was at that time called Napoleon.

There was a group of people at that time who we would call today fifth columnists. In those days they were known as Copperheads. A copperhead snake is a snake that is difficult to see. He looks like the grass, he sneaks through the grass and does not warn you like a rattlesnake before he bites.

The Copperheads of Ohio in Holmes, Knox, Morrow, and Wayne Counties organized to resist the draft under Abraham Lincoln. They were called Copperheads because they met stealthily at night. They built a fort. They said they would resist the draft. They were inspired by perhaps the world's leading demagogue of that day, Clement Laird Vallandingham. He made an address at Mt. Vernon, Ohio, in which he said:

We have a blankety blank in the White House, an ignoramus, who is heading America to perdition. Build a fort and resist the draft. Organize societies. Have the ladies' society to back you. Wear your badges—

And so forth. These people built a fort and thought they could resist the draft. They had luxury in the fort for a while. The girls were told to make fun of boys in uniform. It was popular to be a Copperhead. The ladies wore little butternut buttons and were called Butternuts. Finally the fort had about a thousand people in it who were supplied from the country with pigs, chickens, and all sorts of things. In the basement of the fort was a distillery. Supplies and luxuries were furnished from the surrounding neighborhood. They lived on the fat of the land so-called.

The Governor of Ohio was notified and sent down General Leadbetter to break up the fort. He went down there and these people scattered to the four winds.

Word was sent to the President, Abraham Lincoln. Edward M. Stanton received the report and said:

I know Lincoln will have a few hangings back in Ohio. It is difficult to convince the President that anyone should be shot or hanged but here are traitors who convict themselves.

What happened? Did Lincoln punish them? He said:

No, I sympathize with those hill people. I am not even going to hang the leader, Vallandingham.

He said:

I will let him escape on bond. Let him put up a big bond and he will forfeit the bond, then the Government will have some money instead of a hanging.

Stanton was extremely vexed and said, "Mr. President, what are you going to do about it?" The President said "Nothing. Those folks will defeat themselves and the whole thing will just fizzle out." It did. Two years later a noted author visited the scene of this fort and christened it Fort Fizzle, in view of the fact that Lincoln realized that folks would punish themselves and if anything were wrong it would just "fizzle out."

If anyone is doing something that is not right in any department it will fizzle out. If folks make utterances when they are unusually unstrung or emotionally distraught, whether the utterances come from one side or the other, truth will uncover the situation and it will fizzle out. It may be that the Chief Executive has copperheads now, and fifth columnists, but they will punish themselves, they will fizzle out. Most of them, thank God, have. The fact that the President made untrue and unwise statements in his veto message should not cause any Member of Congress to match such asininity with wrathful statements or allow himself to be even momentarily emotionally unstable. Coined political catchwords were met with a silent rebuke in form of a veto. Only those in Congress criticized the message who loved the man Roosevelt the most. They were his dearest friends from his own party. The cheap phrases of the message and its emotional effect will soon fizzle out. They love the man and want to save him from himself.

I want to close with the words that you find on the headstone over the grave of Ann Rutledge. Here they are:

Here lie I, humble Ann Rutledge; beloved by Abraham Lincoln; wedded to Abraham Lincoln; not through union but through separation; bloom on, oh Republic, from the dust of my bosom.

You know the story of Ann Rutledge's death. You know how Lincoln was called in the wee hours of the morning, traveling all night, and how in the presence of Mr. and Mrs. Green and the parents of Ann Rutledge, she said, "Abe, I cannot marry you; I am going on. But spiritually we are united. Wherever you go, the soul of Ann Rutledge will go with you."

I think that we are all spiritually united, no difference with which party we may affiliate, no difference what our race or creed may be, we are joined as sons of God in our common cause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

POETRY GOES TO WAR

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, since time immemorial, the true poet has functioned vigorously in the lives and affairs and affections of his people and his age. It has been his peculiar privilege to confer on time the dignity of timelessness. It has been his eternal birthright to lift the hearts and strengthen the souls of men.

Never has this function been more apparent than in years when war stalks the earth. Propaganda is an essential weapon of war, and in propaganda the art of words is king. The poet, by training and by natural gifts, is most highly endowed of all men in the making of such propaganda. Poetry as wartime propaganda assumes one of its oldest duties and takes up one of its oldest challenges. Men have always sung while they marched and while they fought, since the dawn of history. Today the Russians sing as they slog through the Pripyat marshes; the Norwegian lads who are learning to be young eagles in the Canadian flying schools have their own songs, fiercer than the cry of any eagle that ever soared; in the mountains of Greece the Evzones hurled taunts at the enemy set to tunes familiar to the besieger's ear; in Yugoslavia the patriot warriors have a song which echoes from cliff and hilltop and forest, freezing the blood of the invader:

Without warning, without warning, as the lightning crackles,
Swoop, guerillas, swoop, guerillas, on the Hitler jackals!
Bombs are bursting now; Germans stagger;
Crimson gleams the tongue of every Slavic dagger!

What a great number of our most familiar songs have served as rallying points in time of war. Our own magnificent national anthem was composed by Francis Scott Key when, a prisoner on a British man-of-war anchored in the Chesapeake, he saw the Stars and Stripes still waving over the ramparts of beleaguered Fort McHenry. Green Grow the Rushes, O gave the name of Gringo to the Americans who marched against Mexico. And the Battle Hymn of the Republic was written in the light of the campfire by high-hearted Julia Ward Howe during the Civil War. More recently, Colonel McCrae's memorable In Flanders Fields, Joyce Kilmer's Rouge Bouquet, and Allan Seeger's I Have a Rendezvous With Death have entered our lives and our hearts as hymns of heroism.

This month an event unprecedented in the history of American poetry and American propaganda took place. A book of poems, The Unconquerables: Salutes to the Undying Spirit of the Nazi-Occupied Countries, by Joseph Auslander, was used by the Treasury Department in collaboration with the O. W. I. and the Saturday Evening Post, which first published five of the poems, as the spearhead for the Fourth War Loan. The second week of January, that is, the week directly preceding the opening of the Fourth War Loan drive, was named Tribute to the Unconquerables: Prelude to the Fourth War Loan. During this week 280 of our largest department stores all over the country carried extensive and exciting window displays consisting of huge posters bearing these poems, along with other colorful material—flags of the various peoples represented, national costumes, war trophies, and messages from the ambassadors of occupied Europe. Moreover, the entire month of January was designated as "Unconquerables Month," during which War bonds were to be purchased in the name of this or that land whose spirit is still unconquerable against the invaders.

Now that the Fourth War Loan has "gone over the top," we feel that The Unconquerables has given tangible evidence of the usefulness of poetry in wartime. When the first Nazi boot smashed his ivory tower to smithereens, the poet found it his inescapable duty to make battle songs to stir the hearts of men. This newest affirmation of our democratic hatred of tyranny and of our confidence in victory over oppression is only an example of what can be done by the power of the word. True, it is a powerful example; in addition to yeoman service for the Fourth War Loan, The Unconquerables has been used widely in Army training camp shows, in radio shows sponsored by various branches of the armed forces, as a medium to recruit WAC's, as short-wave broadcasts translated, we understand, into more than 25 languages, as patriotic material in foreign-language newspapers in this country, and, most recently, as overseas radio broadcasts under the sponsorship of O. W. I. and all the agencies which make use of their services. The poems have been presented in every imaginable way, from the point of view of purely individual reading through the whole range of useful patriotic propaganda, and even extending into the business world by way of advertising.

We hope that this outstanding instance of poetry in action will inspire our other American poets to speak out for the heritage of faith and courage which is ours. The Unconquerables is a trumpet blast of freedom, a single voice crying out a declaration against corrupt and oppressive forces. Let there be a multitude of such voices, that our songs may be as strong as Joshua's when he crumbled the walls of Jericho. Joseph Auslander proves that even a mechanized war can have its bards, and that tanks and trench mortars and airplanes can stir the heart as fiercely as "the rocket's red glare." Let there be more books with the integrity and indomitable spirit of The Unconquerables. Let our poets speak.

I may say in passing that all of the poems contributed were without compensation of any kind, and that hundreds of thousands of copies, literally millions, have been published, the poem itself being the great compensation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RAMSPECK, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes";

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids;

H. R. 480. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli; and

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Henry Angell.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2350. An act to liberalize the service pension laws relating to veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition, and their dependents;

H. R. 3997. An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4059. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land," approved April 28, 1922.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 25, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, March 1, 1944, on H. R. 4140, H. R. 4238, H. R. 4250, and private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1226. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the first and second annual financial statement and report of operations under the provisions of section 13 of the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act (54 Stat. 774, approved July 19, 1940); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

1227. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a tabulation prepared by the General Land Office listing the leases, the terms of which have been extended under the provisions of section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended by the act of August 21, 1935, during the calendar year of 1943; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

1228. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1229. A letter from the executive director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting one copy of the audit of the finances of the American Legion for the calendar year ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1230. A letter from E. G. Allen, rear admiral, United States Navy, Director of Budget and Reports, transmitting report showing the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of service, with special qualifications therefor, of each person commissioned from civilian life into the Coast Guard Reserve during the period December 1, 1943, to January 31, 1944, who have not had prior commissioned military service, and in the Marine Corps and United States Naval Reserve for the period November 28, 1943, to January 27, 1944, inclusive; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 451. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3592, a bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1190). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 452. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3956, a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed payment of interest on deposits; without amendment (Rept. No. 1191). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HORAN: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 3570. A bill to provide as an emergency war project for the partial construction of the Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1193). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3301. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Polak, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 1189). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4269. A bill relating to the granting of commissions to members of the armed forces who have had training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4270. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in northwest Louisiana, near Shreveport; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 4271. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4272. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4273. A bill providing for the collection of internal revenue taxes and the administration of the internal-revenue laws by an agency independent of the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 4274. A bill relating to the acquisition from the Osage Indian Tribe of certain mineral rights necessary to the construction of the Hulah Dam and Reservoir on the Caney River tributary of the Verdigris River, Okla. and Kans.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4275. A bill to create a Surplus Agricultural Products Commission and to authorize the disposition of excess Government food stocks and related products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 4276. A bill for the relief of James Lemuel Muzzall and James M. Muzzall; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5062. By Mr. EATON: Resolution of the board of directors of the Interborough Chamber of Commerce of Bound Brook and South Bound Brook, N. J., supporting future regulation of national and international air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5063. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of Otto L. Spaeth, of Dayton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5064. By Mr. JUDD: Petitions of over 2,000 citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., and surrounding area, opposing passage of House bill 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5065. By Mr. SCANLON: Petition of 955 residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5066. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Eleanor Clark and other citizens of Thomaston, Maine, urging action on Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to stop manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5067. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles H. Burgess and other citizens of Camden and Rockport, Maine, urging favorable action on the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to stop manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5068. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of J. T. Parris and 83 other residents of Clendenin, Kanawha County, W. Va., asking for the passage of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5069. By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of 41 members of Hobart Unit No. 7, Mothers of World War No. 2, Hobart, Ind., supporting House bill 3435, a bill to incorporate the Mothers of World War No. 2; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5070. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the total cost of public housing per unit and per family, excluding war housing, from its inception to the present time; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in united prayer we come, seeking light upon our ways and strength within our hearts. Forgive us that so often the gentle knocking of Thy love has sounded in vain upon the fast-closed doors of our lives. During these holy days of the Passion may long unswung hinges move at the impulse of Thy patient, persistent call, flooding the cluttered rooms of our being with the beauty of Thy peace and power. May we dare to pray that Thou wilt forgive us as we forgive others. If any slight or wrong rankles in our souls and mars our fellowship with comrades of the common road help us to pluck it out and be healed of Thee. Suffer us not to turn in anger on any who have wronged us, seeking their hurt, lest we increase the sorrows of the world and taint our own souls with the poisoned sweetness of revenge. Out of the rectitude of our intent and the purity of our motives may the voice of a con-

science void of offense whisper the approving assurance.

"Men may misjudge thy aim,
Think they have cause for blame;
Say thou art wrong.
Hold on thy quiet way;
God is the Judge—not they,
Fear not. Be strong."

We ask it in the Name which is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. GEORGE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, February 24, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that the House of Representatives, having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States, with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor;

S. 1633. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1943, so as to provide for the full participation of institutions of the United States in the program for the training of nurses, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1146) to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35) to print, with additional copies, the so-called Baruch report on war and post-war adjustment policy, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 480. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Fred Hunter; and

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Henry Angell.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes"; and

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of Frederick Lee Littlefield.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BURCH of Virginia, Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia, Mr. WARD, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BURCH of Virginia, Mr. WHELCHEL of Georgia, Mr. WARD, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. MASON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. BLOOM, Mr. LUTHER JOHNSON, and Mr. EATON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines, a brigadier general in the Army of the United States, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 379, current session, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the National Interregional Highway Committee outlining and recommending a national system of interregional highways, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2778. An act to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 3403. An act to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian home lands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3552. An act to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.;

H. R. 3609. An act to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service;

H. R. 4103. An act to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances;

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution extending the period for the acquisition by the Railroad Retirement Board of data needed in carrying out the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts; and

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes";

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry-milk solids;

H. R. 480. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Fred Hunter;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of Frederick Lee Littlefield; and

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Henry Angell.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Andrews	Gillette	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Guffey	Revercomb
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Brewster	Holman	Taft
Bridges	Jackson	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Kilgore	Tobey
Burton	La Follette	Truman
Bushfield	Langer	Tunnell
Butler	Lucas	Tydings
Byrd	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Wagner
Caraway	McFarland	Wallgren
Chandler	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Chavez	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Weeks
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wheeler
Connally	Millikin	Wherry
Danaher	Moore	White
Davis	Murdock	Wiley
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ferguson	Nye	Wilson
George	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE REVENUE ACT—VETO MESSAGE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives accompanying a veto message from the President of the United States. Inasmuch as the message from the House had already been read when announced at the door, the clerk will read the message from the President.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3687, entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes."

I regret that I find it necessary in the midst of this great war to be compelled to do this in what I regard as the public interest.

Many months ago, after careful examination of the finances of the Nation, I asked the Congress for legislation to raise $10,500,000,000 over and above the existing revenue system. Since then persons prominent in our national life have stated in no uncertain terms that my figure was too low.

The measure before me purports to increase the national revenue by a little over $2,000,000,000. Actually, however, the bill in its net results will enrich the Treasury by less than $1,000,000,000.

As a tax bill, therefore, I am compelled to decide that it is wholly ineffective toward that end.

More specifically the bill purports to provide $2,100,000,000 in new revenues. At the same time it cancels out automatic increases in the social-security tax which would yield $1,100,000,000. In addition it grants relief from existing taxes which would cost the Treasury at least $150,000,000 and possibly much more.

In this respect it is not a tax bill but a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy.

The elimination of automatic increases provided in the social-security law comes at a time when industry and labor are best able to adjust themselves to such increases. These automatic increases are required to meet the claims that are being built up against the social-security fund. Such a postponement does not seem wise.

The clause relating to renegotiating of war contracts terminates the present renegotiation authority on December 31 of this year. This seems unwise at this time because no person can at present determine what a renegotiation time limit should be. More experience is needed. The formal right of appeal to The Tax Court that is granted by this bill is an inept provision. The present Tax Court exists for a wholly different purpose and does not have the personnel or the time to assume this heavy load.

The bill is replete with provisions which not only afford indefensible special privileges to favored groups but sets dangerous precedents for the future. This tendency toward the embodiment of special privileges in our legislation is in itself sufficiently dangerous to counterbalance the loss of a very inadequate sum in additional revenues.

Among these special privileges are:

(a) Permission for corporations reorganized in bankruptcy to retain the high excess-profits credit and depreciation basis attributable to the contributions of stockholders who are usually eliminated in the reorganization. This privilege inures to the benefit of bondholders who, in many cases, have purchased their bonds in the speculative market for far less than their face value. It may open the door to further windfall profits in this market because of the undeserved benefit received by reorganized corporations.

(b) Percentage depletion allowances, questionable in any case, are now extended to such minerals as vermiculite, potash, feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, barite, and spodumene. In the case of some of these minerals, the War Production Board refused to certify that current output was inadequate for war needs.

(c) The lumber industry is permitted to treat income from the cutting of timber, including selective logging, as a capital gain rather than annual income. As a grower and seller of timber, I think that timber should be treated as a crop, and therefore as income when it is sold. This would encourage reforestation.

(d) Natural-gas pipe lines are exempted from the excess-profits tax without justification and in a manner which might well lead oil companies to request similar treatment for their pipe lines.

(e) Commercial air lines are granted an unjustifiable extension of the tax subsidy on their air-mail contracts.

It has been suggested by some that I should give my approval to this bill on the ground that having asked the Congress for a loaf of bread to take care of this war for the sake of this and succeeding generations I should be content with a small piece of crust. I might have done so if I had not noted that the small piece of crust contained so many extraneous and inedible materials.

In regard to that part of the bill which relates to wholly unobjectionable tax increases, may I respectfully suggest to the Congress that the excise taxes can easily and quickly be levied. This can be accomplished by the passage of a simple joint resolution enacting those provisions of the bill which increase the excise taxes. I should be glad to approve such a measure. This would preserve the principal revenue provisions of the bill without the objectionable features I have criticized.

In another most important respect this bill would disappoint and fail the American taxpayers. Every one of them, including ourselves, is disappointed, confused, and bewildered over the practical results of last year's tax bill. The Ruml plan was not the product of this administration. It resulted from a widespread campaign based on the attractive slogan of "Pay as you go." But, as was said many years ago in the State of New York in regard to that same slogan, "You don't pay and you don't go."

The Nation will readily understand that it is not the fault of the Treasury Department that the income taxpayers are flooded with forms to fill out which are so complex that even certified public accountants cannot interpret them. No; it is squarely the fault of the Congress of the United States in using language in drafting the law which not even a dictionary or a thesaurus can make clear.

The American taxpayer has been promised of late that tax laws and returns will be drastically simplified. This bill does not make good that promise. It ignores the most obvious step toward simplifying taxes by failing to eliminate the clumsy Victory tax. For fear of dropping from the tax rolls those taxpayers who are at the bottom of the income scale, the bill retains the Victory tax—while at the same time it grants extensive concessions to many special interest groups.

The suggestion of withholding at graduated rates, which would relieve millions of people of the task of filing declarations of estimated income, was not adopted.

I trust, therefore, that the Congress, after all these delays, will act as quickly as possible for simplification of the tax laws which will make possible the simplification of the forms and computations now demanded of the individual taxpayers. These taxpayers, now engaged in an effort to win the greatest war this

Nation has ever faced, are not in a mood to study higher mathematics.

The responsibility of the Congress of the United States is to supply the Government of the United States as a whole with adequate revenue for wartime needs, to provide fiscal support for the stabilization program, to hold firm against the tide of special privileges, and to achieve real simplicity for millions of small income taxpayers.

In the interest of strengthening the home front, in the interest of speeding the day of victory, I urge the earliest possible action.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 22, 1944.*

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3687) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? Under the Constitution, the vote must be by yeas and nays.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

MANY SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure that there is no tradition of the Senate which it is more solicitous to preserve than the right of the humblest of its Members upon important or momentous public questions to express their earnest convictions. Many decisions, Mr. President, which we are making in these tumultuous days have reverberations far beyond our poor power to calculate or to imagine. If I thought that today in the few brief words I shall undertake to say I would contribute to anything other than an early victory, a permanent peace, and the general welfare of our Nation and the world, I should say nothing. I have nothing to gain save the inestimable satisfaction of expressing my own sentiments and convictions.

If the vote we are about to take related itself only to the passage or the failure to pass a tax bill, that would be a matter of small concern to the country and the people. If the issue were the right of the legislative branch of the Government to exercise legislative power, anyone who dared to question that right and duty would fly in the face of a direct provision of the Federal Constitution. But, Mr. President, I believe the issue involved goes far deeper than that. I believe I can say that the issue is related to the winning of the war and the future of America; certainly it is directly related to the future of the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, for a little more than 7 years I have been honored by a great State with the right to sit in the Senate. From time to time as I, as a Senator, have cast my votes, I have met in the Senate and in my State the accusation that I was a "yes man" for the President of the United States. I hope, therefore, that my colleagues will indulge me to read one page of a letter written on the 22d day of December 1928 by a young man in a small town on the west coast of Florida, who had just been elected to the State legislature. He was a member of the State Democratic executive committee, and as such received a letter from the Governor-elect of the State of New York, inquiring as to the views of the recipient of the letter as to the future course of the Democratic Party. With the indulgence of my kind colleagues, I should like to read that letter.

PERRY, FLA., *December 22, 1928.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
Governor-elect, New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. ROOSEVELT: It was a pleasure to have from you an inquiry as to my opinion of the conduct of the Democratic Party in the future. I may say, I hope, that the people have implicit confidence in your own judgment and rely upon you to furnish to our party its leadership in the coming years. Your public record and your personal characteristics, which are known to all, eminently qualify you for the position. I had the pleasure for a while of living with Mr. Ferdinand A. Hoyt, of your State, who, as he advises, enjoyed service with you in the New York Assembly, and he has been enthusiastic in your praise.

In your letter you suggest the necessity of an aggressive activity from our party during the entire time between this and the next election. That is a capital idea. The Republican Party, in its publicity, has propagated in the public mind, a belief in the inevitable success of that party. Persistent suggestion has led the people to believe that their own welfare depends upon the success of that party. If that were true, good faith would demand that we encourage and not oppose the idea. To those of us, however, who dwell in the conviction that the welfare of the majority of the people lies in the triumph of the principles espoused by the Democratic Party, there is nothing we can becomingly do but urge persistently that those people adopt as their own, those principles, and add to our persuasion the impetus of their own faith.

To do this with constancy and diligence our party must proceed not from excitement but from conviction. The smell of battle and the hope of victory will stir men to tremendous effort. But such effort, having its origin in excitement must wane with the emotional reaction. It is deep-rooted, dogged conviction of right that makes men endure and persist. We must, therefore, make our ranks solid with workers and people of faith who will give their time and their money when the battle is not raging.

I am convinced, however, that we shall not have our greatest success until we make more perfect in the public mind, the concept of what our party is and at what it aims. For one, I want the Democratic Party genuinely to become the liberal party of this Nation. I want it not to compromise upon that matter, because we cannot go to the people with conviction in our eyes unless we are sincere in our liberalism—in our belief that right in this respect is the conferring of the greatest good upon the greatest number. To do that it shall be necessary that we so declare ourselves, that we shall lose some of those who are now with us. They are appreciated; they are as noble as we, but they cannot go with us in a straightforward policy of liberalism in politics. We must stand for principle and not election always. We must be so firm in our allegiance to a utilitarian political philosophy that the people of this Nation shall know upon whom to call when they are convinced that that philosophy is right. Straightforwardness, honesty, and clearness of statement, sincerity of purpose, must characterize our party's relation with the public.

The remaining part of the letter relates to details of organization. The letter is signed by CLAUDE PEPPER.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me, I am going to take such a short time that I should prefer not to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator a question with reference to the letter, if I may.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. When was the letter dated?

Mr. PEPPER. December 22, 1928.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The letter contains expressions of noble principles and noble thoughts on which I wish to congratulate the able Senator from Florida. But can the Senator from Florida tell us what happened in Florida in that particular election?

Mr. PEPPER. Florida in that election went for Mr. Herbert Hoover, and has regretted it ever since. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I believe, therefore—and I think, Senators, we now have a confirmation of the fact—that the great struggle which has been in progress in this country and in the Congress is because men honestly differ as to what should be the course and the conduct of the majority party. We do not have to indulge in personalities to have differences of opinion. The able Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] honored me by presenting what was, of course, my sentiment in the caucus, that I desired the reelection of our distinguished and honorable and able majority leader. We could not have thought of doing otherwise.

But, Mr. President, it is not a question in the future of this country as to what we do about a detail, but if what has happened, if what we do here today in passing upon this bill shall alter the understanding of the Nation concerning the fundamental spirit and character and purpose of the Democratic Party, if there may be any doubt in the public mind that we are no longer the crusading party which has the greatest good of the greatest number as paramount in our purpose, it means a victory at too great cost for the Democratic Party.

I do not ask the country always to keep a liberal party in power. I know how sentiment acts and reacts. I know how the tides from the beginning of time have ebbed and flowed upon the surface of the earth. But at least, Mr. President, it is fitting that we all preserve such character that the people may be able to find us when they want to use us as the instrument of their policy and of their aim.

I do not believe, Mr. President, there is one of us who will doubt that when most of us molder in the sleep of forgetfulness there will be a star that will shine in the history books and in the hearts of mankind, that will be as luminous and as fixed as the North Star. It will be the name of the leader of our party, Franklin D. Roosevelt. He has held up the light of liberalism and of sacrifice. He has been the champion of many causes, of many downcast and oppressed peoples. I believe that when we vote today we will not only be voting on the tax bill—if that were the only issue

I would vote to override the veto—but we will be voting on what is to be the permanent course and character of our party.

I see in the action which I contemplate, for I know I am in the minority, the specter of twenty-odd years ago; I see a country so divided over detail that if they win the war they will lose the peace; they will have such lack of harmony in their action that they will produce an economic chaos which will condemn more millions to sacrifice and toil and poverty, and will retard the progress of mankind, if it does not contribute to the coming of a World War No. 3 to curse and to destroy another generation of noble and guiltless men.

So, Mr. President, when that issue, as I earnestly see it, is presented, there is but one side I can conscientiously take, and that is the side that will be indicated by voting to sustain the veto of the President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday I was instructed by the caucus of the Democratic Members of the Senate to read to the Senate today the wording of a resolution it unanimously adopted:

Whereas Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, has served as majority leader in the Senate of the United States nearly 7 years; and

Whereas throughout this period he has proved his qualities as a legislative leader, in a time of unprecedented difficulty, to such a degree as to command the unqualified confidence of his fellow Democrats and the full respect of the opposition, at all times being capable and courteous, fatihful to his trust, diligent and courageous in discharge of his duties, and equal to all the trying demands of his position: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the caucus of the Democratic Senators, That we assure Senator BARKLEY of our confidence in him as our leader, of our affectionate regard and abiding respect as a fellow Senator, and of our desire that he shall continue to serve us, our party, and our country in the great post of power and duty to which we have repeatedly called him and which he has honored by service not surpassed in the history of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I rise to take just a moment of the time of the Senate. Much as I like my very able friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], I am forced to disagree with him with respect to the question on which I shall vote today. When I vote upon this measure I shall be voting on pending tax legislation, and that alone.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I am one of the taxpayers of the Nation. I have purchased every bond that my income would permit. I am paying more taxes at this time than ever before. I unhesitatingly and cheerfully say that I am willing to pay more. In fact, Mr. President, I would gladly give to the Government every bond I have if thereby I could help in successfully prosecuting this war, to the end that the basic principles of this Republic shall remain unchanged.

I am a member of the Finance Committee. Few people can thoroughly understand or appreciate the days and weeks which were spent by the committee in the examination and analyzation of the many complex tax problems found in the pending revenue measure.

In all my experience with committee work in the Congress of the United States, I have never attended committee hearings where members were so diligent and interested. Members of the committee in executive session extensively debated the many provisions of the bill in the utmost candor and frankness. I am constrained to say that I should like to have seen written a tax bill which would produce more revenue. I so stated in committee, and nothing has happened since which has changed my mind.

Yet, Mr. President, those who are unfamiliar with this complicated tax procedure sometimes fail to understand the real difficulty legally to reach and tax the new money which has been made through the war effort, without doing real violence to the taxpayers who have not profited through the war effort. It will be recalled that I, along with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], filed minority views on the provisions of the revenue bill dealing with the renegotiation statute. We definitely said in our minority views that we were opposed to unconscionable profiteering. We were opposed to giving anyone a license to make large profits out of war business.

Later, after consultation and conference with the War Department and the Navy Department, we rewrote the present Renegotiation Act, and the act as rewritten apparently is satisfactory to everyone. With that done, Mr. President, the members of the Finance Committee were unanimous in supporting the pending tax measure.

Later on, with a few minor changes the conference reported the bill back to the Senate and it was passed by the Senate with little or no opposition.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I am not unmindful of all that has occurred throughout the hearings upon this measure and since the veto message was sent to the Congress. I do not underestimate the responsibility of my decision. I have weighed this matter with due care and caution. When the roll call comes, and I vote to override the President's veto message, my vote will be cast, Mr. President, in line with what my conscience dictates.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

On this question, the yeas and nays are required by the Constitution. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "nay." He is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am advised that if those Senators were present and voting they would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is absent because of illness. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent on important public business.

I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that if the three Senators mentioned were present and voting they would vote "yea."

The roll call resulted—yeas 72, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—72

Aiken	Davis	O'Daniel
Andrews	Eastland	Overton
Austin	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Bailey	George	Revercomb
Ball	Gerry	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gillette	Russell
Barkley	Gurney	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hatch	Shipstead
Brewster	Hawkes	Smith
Bridges	Hayden	Taft
Brooks	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Jackson	Tobey
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tydings
Butler	Lucas	Vandenberg
Byrd	McCarran	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	McClellan	Walsh, N. J.
Caraway	McFarland	Weeks
Chandler	McKellar	Wheeler
Chavez	Maloney	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	White
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wiley
Connally	Moore	Willis
Danaher	Nye	Wilson

NAYS—14

Bone	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Green	Mead	Tunnell
Guffey	Murdock	Wagner
Hill	Murray	Wallgren
Kilgore	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—10

Downey	McNary	Stewart
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
Glass	Reed	
Johnson, Calif.	Robertson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 72, and the nays are 14. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding.

In order to prevent any doubt arising as to the time of passage of the bill if the question should arise hereafter, the Chair announces the time as 12:49 p. m.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read from the desk at this point the letter of the President of the United States addressed to me on February 23, 1944, and my reply to him, dated February 24, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 23, 1944.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALBEN: As I am out of the city I am unable to have a personal talk with you. If I were there, of course, that is the first thing I would do.

I regret to learn from your speech in the Senate on the tax veto that you thought I had in my message attacked the integrity of yourself and other Members of the Congress. Such you must know was not my intention. You and I may differ, and have differed on important measures, but that does not mean we question one another's good faith.

In working together to achieve common objectives we have always tried to accommodate our views so as not to offend the other whenever we could conscientiously do so. But neither of us can expect the other to go further.

When on last Monday I read to you portions of my tax message and you indicated your disagreement, I made certain changes as a result of our talk. You did not, however, try to alter my basic decision when you realized how strongly I felt about it. While I did not realize how very strongly you felt about that basic decision, had I known, I should not have tried to dissuade you from exercising your own judgment in urging the overriding of the veto.

I sincerely hope that you will not persist in your announced intention to resign as majority leader of the Senate. If you do, however, I hope your colleagues will not accept your resignation; but if they do, I sincerely hope that they will immediately and unanimously reelect you.

With the many serious problems daily confronting us, it is inevitable that at times you should differ with your colleagues and differ with me. I am sure that your differing with your colleagues does not lessen their confidence in you as leader. Certainly, your differing with me does not affect my confidence in your leadership nor in any degree lessen my respect and affection for you personally.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that my reply to the President be printed in the RECORD at this point without reading.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1944.

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: When I reached my home late yesterday afternoon, after the events of the day, Steve Early was waiting with your gracious letter, which he delivered to me in person.

First, let me thank you for your prompt disavowal of any intention to reflect upon my own or the integrity of other Members of the Congress. I accept your statement in this regard at full value and I am happy to feel that it was sincere. If, when I discussed the veto with you on last Monday, I had known that it would be couched in the language which it contained, I would then have protested against it and would have advised you that I would be compelled to reply. However, our argument over the veto related to the measure itself, and when I learned that you had definitely decided to veto the measure notwithstanding any arguments which I had been able to put forward, I felt that there was no further occasion for discussion.

I am sure I need not say to you that I have, during these eventful years, worked with you with an inspiration, a devotion, and a personal affection which has not been approached by any other man, unless it be Woodrow Wilson, at whose feet I sat as a young Member of Congress and learned from him many of the great lessons of liberalism in government and society which I have struggled to advance.

I realize that sometimes language in a written document carries with it connotations not intended by the writer. Sometimes the expressions on one's countenance or the intonations in one's voice indicate a meaning not always carried in the written word. But I feel that upon reflection you will agree that some of the language contained in your veto message was abundantly susceptible of the interpretation which I put upon it in my address to the Senate and which many others put upon it throughout the country.

I am happy to feel, as you have indicated, that you had no such purpose in mind.

I realize that in these terrific times you are burdened with a responsibility no American President has ever borne. Throughout this perilous period my heart has gone out to you in sympathetic understanding, not only of your great responsibility but your high purpose in meeting that responsibility. I want you to know that that faith in you endures in me today and will continue to endure, because I have recognized in you a spokesman of the people, whose chief desire was to advance their welfare and their happiness.

We have on some occasions disagreed as to policies, and we have sometimes disagreed as to methods. Frequently I have submerged my own views in recognition of your more intimate knowledge and your greater responsibility. Sometimes you have yielded your views to mine. In all these circumstances we have maintained a mutual respect, which I have deeply appreciated.

But it seems to me there is something broader and more fundamental than any personal acquiescence as between you and me over matters of public policy and fundamental principle. In this great crisis of our Nation's history we must all seek some common ground upon which we can meet and have confidence in one another. That applies to all the branches of our Government. If we cannot trust one another in this tragic period of the history of our Nation and of the world, how can the people trust us?

I want you to know that you have my utmost confidence and affection, and the personal and official relations which have been to me a source of infinite pride I hope may be continued.

In view of all that had happened, I felt compelled to tender my resignation as majority leader at the Democratic conference today. The conference unanimously accepted it and then unanimously reelected me as majority leader. In spite of my own personal preference to yield this responsibility to some other, in view of their earnest and unanimous action, and in view of your own generous and manly statement to me, I have accepted again the majority leadership of the Senate.

I fervently trust that this incident may be instrumental in bringing the executive and legislative departments closer together in fullest cooperation to the end that we may win this terrible war at the earliest possible moment, bring all of our armed forces back to their homes and loved ones, and be instrumental in bringing to a downhearted and distressed world peace at last.

With great respect, I am,

Cordially and sincerely yours,

ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BILBO:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Mississippi; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Concurrent Resolution 29

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Office of Price Administration in Washington to give the hog producers in Mississippi relief by removing the points on pork for the 90-day period

"Whereas at the request of the Agricultural Department of the United States Government the farmers in Mississippi greatly increased their production of hogs and now have these hogs ready for the market; and

"Whereas there is no market for these hogs and the farmers are faced with a great loss because they cannot sell their hogs; and

"Whereas the Government has assured the farmers that they could get ceiling price of $13.75 per hundredweight for their hogs; and

"Whereas there is a great demand for pork production provided they could be purchased without ration points: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Office of Price Administration in Washington be memorialized to immediately suspend the use of ration points in the purchase of pork for a period of 90 days and that copies of this resolution be sent to the Office of Price Administration and to each Member of the congressional delegation from Mississippi."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Prince Georges Chamber of Commerce, of Prince Georges County, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation to bring about a simplified, readily understandable income-tax law for individual taxpayers; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION BY BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION, NEW MEXICO

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Bataan Relief Organization, Albuquerque, N. Mex., which has been sent to me together with the letter of transmittal from Mr. V. H. Spensley, president, of Albuquerque. I ask that both the letter and the resolution be printed in the RECORD and that they be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying resolution were received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., February 21, 1944.

Hon. CARL HATCH,
United States Senator from New Mexico,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will find enclosed herewith resolution which we respectfully request that you present to the United States Senate, in accordance with our rights as expressed in the first amendment to the Constitution, which provides for the redress of grievance.

In preparing this resolution it was borne in mind that whoever were responsible, besides General Short and Admiral Kimmel, for Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, and Wake, most likely are still enjoying their positions of responsibility. Whether or not these two officers were entirely responsible is a matter of great doubt. Obviously, they are entitled to the trial which they have asked for if it will disperse any unjustifiable clouds of suspicion hanging over them. If they are solely to blame, there can be no justifiable purpose in withholding the facts from the American public.

To know where the responsibility actually lies is our aim. To eliminate inefficiency or worse is our duty, both to our sons who are still fighting and to our country. To secure efficiency will shorten the war, while inefficiency can only lengthen it, even lose it. To be sure that those who are responsible for what has happened are brought to justice may and most likely will remove at least a part of the bottleneck in getting relief to or in rescuing our sons who are in the hands of the Japanese. To remove from their positions those who have had any part in not expending every effort to prove our worthiness of the sacrifices of America's heroes should be

and is the duty of every humanitarian American. To act otherwise is inhumanitarian, therefore un-American. If Americans ever needed justice, both those who are free and those who are imprisoned, they need it now, regardless of who stands in the way and must therefore be removed.

Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

V. H. SPENSLEY,
President.

Whereas Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in his report of September 11, 1943, published in Army Time, a daily news bulletin, Washington 5, D. C., stated that on July 1, 1941, the international situation was extremely critical and that menacing preparations of Japan in the Pacific prefaced attacks upon the British and Dutch possessions in the Philippines and that in view of these potentialities orders had been issued in February 1941 to evacuate dependents of Army personnel stationed there; and

Whereas in the late summer of 1941 troops were ordered to the Philippines; and

Whereas pertinent statements of our Chief of Staff show beyond any doubt that those in authority knew that war with Japan was inevitable and, in view of these potentialities and the American-Japanese negotiations in process in the late summer and fall of 1941, the American people naturally assumed that the administration, Army and Navy officials entrusted with the guarding of our Nation's safety would be on the alert sufficiently to prevent any possibility of such an attack as occurred at Pearl Harbor, as was their duty according to their oaths of office; and

Whereas the removal from active duty of two high ranking Army and Navy officers entrusted with the defense of Pearl Harbor can obviously be rightfully taken by the American people as an admission of criminal negligence since that negligence jeopardized the life and freedom of our entire Nation, and it is beyond question of doubt that their dereliction of duty brought about the extent of the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor and the needless loss of many thousands of American lives, and there is a question in the minds of American people as to whether that dereliction of duty ended with the responsibility of those two officers or whether it extends to other military and naval officers or of some civil authorities in high position; and

Whereas the problem of responsibility for the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor must be solved if the Nation is to obtain the highest degree of morale which is necessary for a complete, all-out war effort; and

Whereas a train crew in charge of a passenger train would at least be charged with manslaughter if it neglected its duty to the extent of the loss of one human life, men under oath of office entrusted with the Nation's safety neglect their responsibility to the extent that thousands of lives are lost directly and thousands of others are needlessly sacrificed to the fate of years of imprisonment in Japan prison camps as a result, and yet after 2 years a thorough investigation has not been made or responsibility fixed or the American people advised as to where the responsibility lies; and

Whereas it cannot now be asserted as a reason for not fixing the responsibility as to do so might hamper the war effort, and it is most obvious that the removal of the men responsible for the many defeats in the Pacific in the early days of the war eminates from the primary defeat at Pearl Harbor, it is imperative if we are to obtain and maintain the most efficient direction of the war effort, and that the removal of those responsible will raise the morale not only on the home front but also among our fighting forces who are required to serve under provided leadership; and

Whereas denial of food, medical, and other supplies to our fighting men at Bataan and Corregidor, who were sent to the Pacific to defend the American right and protection of our flag resulted in needless sacrifice and torture at the hands of a known ruthless enemy and the veracity of all statements made at that time and since, that it was impossible to send them aid, is seriously questioned by us; and

Whereas it is our opinion that adherence to the prescribed duties of those charged with the protection of America and in accordance with traditional humanitarian principles of America would have prevented the enormous loss of life before and after the surrender of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, and Wake, and it is our further opinion that the dereliction of duty of those in authority constitutes the writing of the blackest page in American history and the resulting torture of the mothers, wives, and other relatives of the heroes of Bataan and Corregidor, caused by the diabolical atrocities so heartlessly described in the Army and Navy release of January 28, 1944, is the acknowledged signature of that black page: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bataan Relief Organization and its affiliates representing the mothers, fathers, wives, and other relatives, sweethearts and friends of our sacrified men in our armed forces in the Pacific, who lost their lives and others who are left and who are suffering the most intense mental and physical anguish, are entitled as free Americans to petition the Congress of the United States, in accordance with the Constitution, for an immediate and thorough investigation to fix the responsibility and guilt of those in authority in order to bring about the speedy conclusion of this case, regardless of whom it may involve; and be it further

Resolved, That after termination of such investigation that trial by court martial proceedings, impeachment, or any other means necessary to bring about immediate justice and thorough punishment of those found guilty of the dereliction of duty which they accepted when they took their oaths of office, shall be instituted.

LEGISLATION FOR THE EXTENSION OF MEDICAL CARE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a letter, together with a statement, which I have received from Mr. Bernard J. Geelan, secretary of the central labor council of New Haven, Conn., concerning the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill.

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying statement were received, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL LABOR COUNCIL OF NEW HAVEN,
New Haven, Conn., February 16, 1944.

The Honorable FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a copy of a resolution that was unanimously adopted by the New Haven Central Labor Council at the last regular meeting.

Very truly yours,

BERNARD J. GEELAN,
Secretary.

In considering the merits of the Wagner-Dingell bill for the extension of medical care, the committee of the New Haven Central Labor Council first reviewed the need for such legislation as it exists today and then examined the provisions of the bill to ascertain to what degree these needs will be met. The following is the result of our investigation.

PRESENT NEED FOR THE EXTENSION OF MEDICAL CARE

1. At the present time fully one-third of the population of the United States of America do not have the benefits of adequate medical care. Health is a national asset and we have seen from the large number of men rejected by the draft for physical deficiencies the price we are now paying in ignoring so long the issue of medical care.

2. No constructive program has been offered by the American Medical Association to relieve the present need for medical care. In many instances as for example occurred in Washington, D. C., recently, the American Medical Association by their attitude and blocking of cooperative medicine have indicated their opposition to any plan which will change the present restrictions for increased medical care.

3. The present facilities for medical care are inadequate to offer any extension of medical care. Private prepaid medical plans offer a future only for the finance companies and at best can aid in insignificant percentage of the total population of this country. Hospitals and private institutions are being less able to offer services due to the reduction in gifts and endowments from private sources. This at a time when they should be expanding facilities and increasing their medical services.

4. The present basis for the charging of fees by the medical profession places a heavy burden on one group of the population all out of proportion to the actual costs of medical care.

5. There is an overwhelming need for a bulwark against the anguish and fear of the financial costs of illness which contribute to the present tendency to postpone and delay needed medical care. Illness is one of the greatest causes of poverty today.

HOW THE WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL MEETS THESE NEEDS

1. The bill incorporates the democratic principles of insuring adequate medical care to those who need it. There will be no fear on the part of the doctor regarding the patients' ability to pay for needed medical service.

2. No question of socialization of the medical profession is inferred or intended by the bill. The basis for the bill is the insurance principle and not socialism or any other ism as has been charged by those who wish to restrict medical care.

3. Nothing in the bill will act to prevent any doctor who so wishes from practicing medicine outside of the plan. Furthermore, the choice of a doctor will remain in the hands of the individual.

4. The bill provides for the maintaining of standards in the medical profession and allows for the administration and actual direction of the program by the medical profession with public representation.

5. It will eliminate the present practice imposed upon the medical profession of charging what the traffic will bear in order to compensate for lesser charges and unpaid bills of those who are less able to pay. This present practice is undemocratic and as unfair to the medical profession as to the public it serves.

6. The quality of medical service available under the bill will not be in the least degree less than that received under the present fee plan. To say otherwise would be to discredit the thousands of doctors now serving the armed forces and who are on the Government pay roll.

7. The bill will provide for an expansion of hospital services and greatly expand the possibilities of medical research and will be subject to a democratic process of revision

and expansion as the need and desire to do so is expressed by the people.

8. Finally the bill will bring one step closer the actuality of one of the freedoms for which we are working and for which our soldiers are giving their lives today.

JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution which I have received from Mr. Abraham Zweigbaum, city clerk of New Haven, Conn. This resolution was adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of New Haven and urges approval by the United States Government of the resettlement and rehabilitation of the homeless Jewish people of Europe in Palestine.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Board of Aldermen of the City of New Haven is aware of the tragic plight of the homeless Jewish people of Europe, who look to Palestine as the chief hope for their resettlement and rehabilitation; and

Whereas the board of aldermen is desirous of joining with the many other American State and municipal governmental bodies in petitioning for reaffirmation by the people and Government of the United States of its traditional policy in relation to the Balfour Declaration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Aldermen of the City of New Haven in general meeting assembled urges the Government of the United States to use its good offices with the British Government to effectuate the abrogation of the white paper, so called, to exert its best endeavors to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration, and to the further end that the Balfour Declaration be implemented by the British Government so that its declared purposes and publicly accepted objectives may be realized; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the two Senators from the State of Connecticut, and the Congressman from the Third Congressional District of the State of Connecticut.

RESOLUTION OF CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY PERTAINING TO THE MILK SITUATION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] and myself, to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a resolution which I have received from the secretary of the State of Connecticut, Mrs. Frances Burke Redick. The resolution was adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut on January 27, 1944, and memorializes Congress pertaining to the milk situation.

There being no objection, the resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,
GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
Special Session, January 1944.

Resolution memorializing Congress pertaining to the milk situation

Resolved by this assembly, That the clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house are respectfully directed to execute on behalf of the people of the State of Connecticut and to forward to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled a petition as follows:

"The petitioner respectfully relates that a serious food emergency confronts the people of the State of Connecticut by reason of an existing shortage in the supply of milk.

"That milk is a food of the utmost importance to human life and a vital necessity to the growth and development of our children.

"That the milk supply in the State of Connecticut is constantly diminishing and the increasing wartime population of our State faces an acute shortage of this food.

"That the farmers and the dairymen of Connecticut have the capacity and the ability to produce all of the milk necessary for the people of our State if freed from abnormal Federal governmental regulation.

"That Federal regulations which prohibit the dairy industries of our State from obtaining a return for its product compensable with the cost of production, have made it impossible for Connecticut milk producers to produce for our people a supply of milk which is necessary and adequate for their health and welfare.

"That Federal regulations interfering with the supply of feed concentrates available to milk producers in our State; the inability of the dairy industry to secure competent and adequate labor and to procure necessary equipment and repairs, has further increased the abnormal difficulties faced by our dairy industry and seriously curtailed the milk supply.

"That milk producers like other businessmen must have an adequate return for their products to compensate them for the cost of its production; otherwise the liquidation of dairy farms and dairy herds will necessarily continue to the detriment of the industry and the people of our State.

"That the increasing importation of milk from the northern and middle western part of our country affords only a meager and temporary relief to our State and further upsets the dairy industry on a national basis, and adds to our difficulty in obtaining the normal dairy products from other milk centers of our country.

"That Federal governmental agencies have denied the pleas of our dairy industry for an immediate increased income of $1 per hundredweight for fluid milk protected by proper floor levels; for normal supplies of feed concentrates protected by reasonable price ceilings, and for a centering of responsibility for food production. All of these are necessary in obtaining and continuing an adequate supply of milk.

"That the patriotism, perseverance and self-sacrifice by Connecticut dairymen and dairywomen are the only factors maintaining the supply of milk that Connecticut's busy and hard-working population needs for its continued health and welfare.

"That the government of the State of Connecticut has used every resource at its command to aid, assist, and encourage the dairy industry of our State in the precarious situation that has been created by Federal interference with prices and with availability of feed.

"For the aforesaid reasons, the emergency we now face is entirely a Federal responsibility.

"Therefore we respectfully pray:

"That the restrictions which take away from the people of our State the ability to solve their own milk problems be removed or changed by appropriate Federal action, thus making it possible for our milk industry to maintain and expand production to meet the needs of Connecticut's people.

"Dated at Hartford, County of Hartford, State of Connecticut, this 27th day of January in the year of our Lord, 1944.

"CLARENCE F. BALDWIN,
"Clerk of the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut.

"SEARLS DEARINGTON,
"Clerk of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut."

The clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house are directed to procure the proper presentation of said petition together with a certified copy of this joint resolution, to the Congress of the United States.

His Excellency, the Governor of the State of Connecticut is respectfully requested to convey the contents of said petition and of this resolution to His Excellency, the President of the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1634. A bill to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States; with an amendment (Rept. No. 723).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to limit the operations of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; without amendment (Rept. No. 724).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions; without amendment (Rept. No. 725).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 1736. A bill to provide for the payment for accumulated or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 1737. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1738. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Finance.

S. 1739. A bill to amend the Act of May 24, 1928, as amended, so as to increase the rate of extra pay for night work in the Postal Service, and to extend the provisions of such act to custodial employees; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S.1740. A bill for the relief of Marjorie E. Drake, Edith Mae Drake, Minnie L. Bickford,

and Irene M. Paolini; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1741. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in Hangar V–3 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution creating a commission to explore means of securing an agreement between the United States and Japan for the exchange of certain persons interned by such countries; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2778. An act to ratify and confirm Act 16 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1943, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935, and

H. R. 3403. An act to withdraw and restore to their previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii certain Hawaiian homelands required for use for airplane landing fields, and to amend sections 202, 203, and 207 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3552. An act to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 3609. An act to permit the United States to be made a party defendant in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4103. An act to provide for loss of United States nationality under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. J. Res. 227. Joint resolution extending the period for the acquisition by the Railroad Retirement Board of data needed in carrying out the provisions of the Railroad Retirment Acts; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. J. Res. 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXEMPTION OF O. P. A. OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CRIMINAL CODE AND REVISED STATUTES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, some time ago the House of Representatives passed the bill (H. R. 3847) to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes, and it came to the Senate. In the House it was dealt with entirely by the Committee on the Judiciary. When the measure came to the Senate, because in part it pertained to the O. P. A., and because the O. P. A. had been dealt with by the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill appears to have been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Let me say to the Senate that the bill in no wise affects banking and currency matters or the O. P. A., except that the bill provides that the officers and employees of the O. P. A. shall not be subject to the statute which makes it prohibitory for one in Federal employ to derive emoluments from other sources. It has affected the rationing boards throughout the United States, because they serve without any compensation; and, serving without compensation, their members draw emoluments from their own respective businesses. The Attorney General has held that this law does affect them, and that so long as they serve as Federal officers they cannot draw emoluments from other sources. Hence, it is the desire of the O. P. A. that these offices and their respective membership shall be relieved from the criminal statute.

The bill has passed the House. It has now come to the Senate. I ask that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Let me say that I have already discussed this matter with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and he is agreeable to having the change of reference made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the change of reference will be made.

FEDERAL AID FOR READJUSTMENT IN CIVILIAN LIFE OF WAR VETERANS—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1617) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

STUDY LOOKING TO SIMPLIFICATION OF THE TAX LAWS

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives are authorized and directed to appoint 10 outstanding certified public accountants, 5 of whom shall be appointed by each such committee, to conduct a study of the tax laws for the purpose of suggesting methods for the simplification thereof. The certified public accountants appointed pursuant to this resolution shall submit their recommendations to such committees within 60 days, and such committees shall report as soon as practicable thereafter to their respective Houses concerning the results of such study. The expenses of such certified public accountants under this resolution which shall not exceed $, including compensation at the rate of $ per day while actually engaged in making such study, shall be paid, one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairmen of the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Ways and Means, respectively.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in connection with the concurrent resolution just submitted may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Much has been said during the past few years regarding the complexity of our Federal income-tax laws. Violent criticism has also been leveled against many provisions of such laws, especially regarding the various and complex methods of computing exemptions. The criticisms have been equally caustic of the income-tax forms prescribed by the Treasury Department for the reporting of taxable income.

Some think that persons with high incomes have not been taxed enough, while some of that group felt that the tax base should have been broadened to include almost every earner of income. The task of preparing an income-tax and revenue measure which will be entirely equitable to 130,000,000 persons is not easy. Their interests are of necessity too conflicting.

I have been a member of the Senate Finance Committee since January 8, 1937, and have in that capacity gained an intimate knowledge of the difficulties in drafting tax legislation. This committee, as well as the Ways and Means Committee of the House, had the advice and recommendations of the Treasury Department in matters of estimated tax revenues required by the Government, and the sources from which the tax could best be obtained.

While I did not approve of all provisions contained in the present revenue bill, I was convinced of its practicability and reasonableness in the light of the circumstances prevailing in these most difficult times.

Reference has been made to the fact that the tax laws and forms could not be understood even by the certified public accountants. Notwithstanding this assertion, I have sponsored a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee of 10 certified public accountants, for the purpose of reporting to the Ways and Means Committee of the House and to the Finance Committee of the Senate, within 60 days, their recommendations for the simplification of our revenue laws and the tax reports required thereunder.

Their opinion will be independent of bias, personal or special interests, and seasoned with matured and experienced judgment gained through the professional practice of public accounting in tax matters.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 2 OF REPORT NO. 539 OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That 15,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 539, part 2, current session, submitted by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, pursuant to Senate Resolution 102, relative to the cancelation of war contracts, disposition and sale of surplus property, and industrial demobilization and reconversion, be printed for the use of said committee.

FRANCES SCARBOROUGH

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 258), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from

the contingent fund of the Senate to Frances Scarborough, widow of Harold Scarborough, late keeper of stationery of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

WASHINGTON'S BIRTHDAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONEY

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a Washington's Birthday dinner held by the Democratic Central Committee of Connecticut at the Hotel Taft, New Haven, Conn., on February 22, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SHADOWS OF THE CROOKED CROSS—ADDRESS BY NORMAN M. LITTELL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Shadows of the Crooked Cross," delivered by Hon. Norman M. Littell, Assistant United States Attorney General, in New York City on February 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GILBERT BENJAMIN BOOKOUT—STATEMENT BY STATE REPRESENTATIVE W. H. UNDERWOOD, OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. HILL, on behalf of Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement relative to Gilbert Benjamin Bookout by State Representative W. H. Underwood, of Oklahoma, which appears in the Appendix.]

GEORGE WASHINGTON—EDITORIAL BY TOM LINDER IN GEORGIA FARMERS' MARKET BULLETIN

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "George Washington," written by Tom Linder and published in the Georgia Farmers' Market Bulletin of February 23, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL—EDITORIAL FROM WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Determined to Disagree," relating to the so-called soldiers' vote bill, published in the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., February 24, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS ON INDIVIDUAL INDIANS—LETTER FROM O. K. CHANDLER

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him and to Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma by O. K. Chandler, of Oklahoma, relating to Senate bill 1311, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO TIME FOR POLITICAL MUD SLINGING—ARTICLE BY ROSCOE DRUMMOND

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "No Time for Political Mud Slinging," written by Roscoe Drummond, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 18, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

REMOVAL OF RESTRICTIONS FROM COUNSEL EMPLOYED BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. SHIPSTEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I first wish to express my very great appreciation to the Senator from Minnesota for yielding to me for this purpose. The matter which I wish to call up is quite important and urgent. I have conferred with both the majority leader and the acting minority leader, and they have no objection.

This morning a report was filed from the Committee on the Judiciary relative to House Joint Resolution 230 which, in effect would permit employment of counsel to represent the views of the Congress in the matter of the claim of Messrs. Watson, Dodd, and Lovett, with which the Congress is entirely familiar. Members of the House of Representatives have contacted me and urged the immediate passage of the joint resolution because there is a deadline date when an answer must be filed in the court.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 230) to limit the operations of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico has been good enough to speak with me about this matter, as I understand he has with the majority leader. I am in complete concurrence with the views he has expressed as to the desirability of the prompt passage of the joint resolution, and I hope there will be no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 230) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF BARUCH REPORT ON WAR AND POST-WAR ADJUSTMENT POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 35), to print with additional copies the so-called Baruch report on war and post-war adjustment policy, which were on line 6, to strike out "five thousand" and insert "two thousand seven hundred and fifty"; and on line 7, after "room" to insert "two thousand two hundred and fifty for the House of Representatives."

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments, which divide the number of copies between the document room and the folding room.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator explain what the House amendments are?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendments divide the number of documents between the document room and the folding room of the House. They do not increase the number of copies to be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF NATIONAL INTERREGIONAL HIGHWAY COMMITTEE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 5,800 additional copies of House Document No. 379, current session, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the National Interregional Highway Committee outlining and recommending a national system of interregional highways, of which 2,200 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 2,200 copies for the use of the House folding room, 700 copies for the use of the Senate document room, and 700 copies for the Senate folding room.

Mr. HAYDEN. The concurrent resolution provides for the printing of a document, copies of which the House desire. I move that the Senate concur in the resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

ISSUANCE POSTHUMOUSLY TO THE LATE COL. WILLIAM MITCHELL OF COMMISSION AS A MAJOR GENERAL

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. For what purpose?

Mr. WILEY. To make a motion.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Very well.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on January 7, 1943, I introduced a joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as major general. A similar joint resolution had once previously been passed by the Senate. The joint resolution introduced by me on January 7, 1943, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and that committee has taken no action. The other day there was placed on the calendar and passed a measure which some of the Senators thought was the joint resolution to which I have reference. Now I wish to ask unanimous consent to move that the Committee on Military Affairs——

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I do not yield for that purpose. The Senator asked me to yield, I thought, in order to insert something in the RECORD.

Mr. WILEY. No. I said wanted to make a motion, and I am making that motion now.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Very well.

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted at this time to make a motion to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, and that the joint resolution be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I object. That will stop it for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I herewith file in writing a motion to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, and that it be placed upon the Senate Calendar. I understand that motion must lie over for 24 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the motion made by the Senator from Wisconsin being entered?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not object to the motion being made, but I do object to the committee being discharged.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be entered, and will lie over 1 day.

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS AND DIPLOMACY

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an interesting news dispatch indicating how we are getting our news of international politics and diplomacy particularly as affecting the United States and the Allied Nations.

In an Associated Press dispatch from London, dated February 23, it is reported that in the debate in the British Parliament Leslie Hore-Belisha, an independent member and former Secretary of State for War of Great Britain, addressed the House of Commons. He is quoted as having told the Commons that today the United States and Russia are determined upon an expansionist policy and that "it would be perverse indeed if having made victory for other United Nations possible we were to have vision less clear than theirs on what nature the peace should be."

He said that "America is following in the twentieth century the policy we followed in the nineteenth," and that in Russia, Soviet military growth had been paralleled by an "enlargement of foreign policy."

The answer whether in the post-war world the United States will "pick up her marbles and go home" is to be found, he added, "in the permanent state being inserted in Arabia and neighboring countries."

Of course, he was there referring to our extraterritorial oil rights in Arabia and other countries about which we have heard.

He described this as "a natural biological urge which drives all nations forward."

I presume in making that statement he referred to a grab for more territory.

"Biological?" scoffed Laborite Aneurin Bevan. "Standard Oil!" he said.

It is noted that—

The American Government has announced the Petroleum Reserves Corporation intends to construct a 1,250-mile pipe line in Arabia.

As a matter of fact, that territory is expected to be administered under the laws of the United States, as a protectorate of the United States, and it is very significant that the former Secretary of War of Great Britain says that now, in this century, the United States is engaging in an expansionist policy, such as made the British Empire under the policy of Great Britain in the nineteenth century.

In the New York Times of February 23 we find the complete text of the address of the Hon. Winston Churchill to the House of Commons. His remarks are interesting. In that address Mr. Churchill expressed sympathy for the territorial expansion policy of Stalin. He said:

I cannot feel that the Russian demand for reassurances about her western frontiers goes beyond the limits of what is reasonable or just.

The London correspondent of the New York Times on the same day in reporting this speech says:

In view of the fact that Russia has demanded that her western frontier run from Pillau and Koenigsberg in East Prussia down the Curzon line to the Carpathians, leaving the Baltic States and Lwow inside Russia and that the governments on her western flank be friendly, this statement was considered significant.

That is, Churchill's statement was considered significant in view of the well-known aims of Russia for territorial expansion, which Churchill said he had considered to be within the range of reasonableness and to be just.

On the same day John McGovern, speaking for the Labor Party, complained that the Prime Minister had shown himself a master of evasion in dealing with ticklish points, adding, "In my estimation he now is acting as Stalin's Charlie McCarthy, and he refused to disclose a mind of his own and to assert himself in relation to these great problems that are being thrown up as the war goes on."

A member of the Conservative Party, Kenneth W. M. Pickthorn, said he thought the name "Atlantic Charter" slightly silly, saying it was fairly obvious that "our side is not going to suffer annexation, and as apparently it does not apply to the other side," he was "a little baffled as to what they meant us to think it meant."

It would appear that the ancient land-grabbing game of international politics, sometimes called diplomacy, is still carried on under the guise of war for democracy, even under the Moscow-Teheran agreement.

Churchill and Stalin have spoken. I believe the American people are entitled to know whether or not President Roosevelt agrees with Stalin and Churchill in their views of the agreement made at Teheran, also the one made at Moscow, which the Senate, by a majority of 85 to 5, voted to accept and to enforce by military power.

TOLLS FOR THE TRANSIT OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC OVER GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That tolls may be charged for the passage or transit over the Golden Gate Bridge of Government traffic, of military or naval personnel and their dependents, and of civilian employees of the Army and Navy traveling on Government business, but such tolls shall not be in excess of the tolls charged for the passage or transit of other like traffic over such bridge: *Provided, however,* That subject to the provisions of section 2, military and naval personnel, and civilian employees of the Army and Navy, when such personnel or employees are engaged in the performance of official duties requiring the use of such bridge, together with the conveyances being used by them in the performance of such duties, shall have the use of such bridge free of toll.

"SEC. 2. (a) The use of the Golden Gate Bridge free of toll, provided for in section 1, shall be granted upon the presentation and surrender at the toll lanes of an authorization certifying that the traffic in question is entitled to such right. Such authorization shall be issued and signed by any military or naval officer designated for such purpose in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively. The names and signatures of officers so designated shall be furnished to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, and thereafter authorizations signed by them shall be accepted by such Bridge and Highway District as prima facie evidence of the facts stated therein.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), such right to use the Golden Gate Bridge free of toll may be established by any other device or means which may be acceptable to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; and the Secretary of War and the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, and the Secretary of the Navy and the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, may enter into any appropriate agreements to secure the effective, convenient, and just exercise of such right.

"SEC. 3. Whoever secures or attempts to secure the exemption from toll provided for in this Act or an authorization referred to in section 2, knowing that he is not entitled thereto, and whoever signs or issues any such authorization certifying to such right of exemption, knowing that such right does not exist, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment for not more than ten days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall take effect thirty days after the date of its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
PAT MCCARRAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE F. LEA,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN BILLS, AND SO FORTH, AND TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate, the President of the Senate be authorized to sign any bills or resolutions ready for his signature, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of New Jersey in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE REVENUE BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, when the tax bill vetoed by the President was before this body, I voted for certain amendments which were for the people's rights, but I voted against the passage of the bill. It was my opinion then, as it is now, that that measure should not have been passed, and I most emphatically do not think the President deserved any censure for vetoing it.

The President takes an oath of office, and it is his duty to veto any measure which he conscientiously believes will be injurious to the people. I applaud his courage and his straightforwardness, especially when he so frankly stated the reasons for his veto.

Mr. President, in my opinion this body richly deserved every bit of censure leveled at it by the President. The Senate has not done its duty to the rank and file of the people of this country. The Senate has passed legislation preferring the rich and the wealthy to the poor and those of moderate means. I need cite only a few instances, and I cite them with regret.

Mr. President, at the last Democratic convention the platform unequivocally asked for votes on this plank in their platform:

> To encourage investment in productive enterprise, the tax-exempt privileges of future Federal, State, and local bonds should be removed.

Yet, Mr. President, although the hearings before the various committees showed that there were $18,000,000,000 worth of tax-exempt securities extant, out of which one man alone has an income of $5,000,000 a year clipping coupons, and that 20 others have an income of $1,000,000 a year, when the Democrats upon this floor were called upon to nullify these future tax-exempt securities, what does the RECORD show happened? It shows that Senators elected upon the Democratic ticket, some elected to office by hanging on to the coattails of the President, refused to live up to the platform of their own party. I happen to be one of those humble folks who think that the planks of party platforms mean something, and should not be mere campaign oratory.

Again, Mr. President, after World War No. 1, in the Democratic platform of 1924 we find this plank:

> We favor a graduated tax upon incomes, so adjusted as to lay the burdens of government upon the taxpayers in proportion to the benefits they enjoy and their ability to pay. We oppose the so-called nuisance taxes, sales taxes, and all other forms of taxation that unfairly shift to the consumer the burdens of taxation.

In the Republican platform we find similar assurances to the people, yet neither party kept its promise that in the event of another war, wealth would be drafted the same as the youth of America. What, instead, does the record show?

Why, Mr. President, when the President of this country, Franklin D. Roosevelt, asked that salaries be limited, during wartime only, to $67,200 per year, leaving $25,000 net, only two Democratic Senators, the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], voted "yes," and I was the only Republican.

Again, Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the remarkable speech against the so-called Ruml plan, which made a present of some $9,000,000,000 to the rich, by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. This speech on fiscal policy will bear comparison with any given by Alexander Hamilton. Yet the President's own party, aided by the Republicans, forgave, on a compromise, 75 percent of the billions and billions of dollars due, with the result that we now are taxing little children buying candy and ice cream, taxing movie tickets, taxing girls trying to make a living running cosmetic shops, and raising postal rates, and in many other ways making up the burden taken off the rich, thus making up the difference by loading it on the poor. Why, we are even taxing their food.

Nowhere has the attitude of the Senate been more clearly shown than by the passage of the use tax on automobiles. What could possibly be more unfair to the people of the country than this method of raising tax money. A rich man with a limousine worth $10,000 and a poor man with an old jitney, worth $25, which he drives for an hour or two on Sundays, pays the same tax of $5 each. Could anything be more unjust than this?

When the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] gave his magnificient speech against that kind of taxation, his amendment was defeated by a vote of 35 to 32.

Mr. President, more millionaires have been, and are continuing to be created as a result of this war, than were created by World War No. 1. War profiteers have never been happier, and the people have never gotten a rawer deal in the history of this country. In my opinion, the kind of tax laws we have passed are shameful, unstatesmanlike, and abhorrent in a democracy, and the President was right in saying that this bill was one passed for the benefit of the greedy at the expense of the needy.

In a measure, President Roosevelt is to blame for not sooner championing the cause of the common people on taxation matters. The excuse may be that he has been too busy with the war. Be that as it may, certainly the fault is not that he has vetoed too many bills. In my opinion, he has not vetoed enough tax measures.

When the people of this country finally sift out the truth about this tax situation they will eventually learn, if they do not already know, that never in the history of this country have the wealthy made greater profits, more money after paying taxes. It will finally sink into the consciousness of the people that while their sons and daughters were bleeding and dying on the field of battle, the rich were getting richer and richer, and profits were going ever higher and higher, and when the people realize the truth, I feel certain they will arise en masse in support of the President who had the courage, the fortitude and the duty to forcibly lead this fight in behalf of the people.

There are many things with respect to which I do not see eye to eye with the President. As long as I live I shall never understand why he signed the bill protecting war fraud contractors by the abolition of the Abraham Lincoln statutes. He signed the repeal bill which will rob the taxpayers, as the late Senator Van Nuys of Indiana said, of "billions of dollars"; unbelievable as it may seem, he did sign that measure. I prefer to be charitable encugh to believe that he signed it at the request of some of the "palace guards."

Then there is this matter of wanton waste of materials and manpower. On every side the President must see the waste going on. Everywhere money is being squandered recklessly. There is not a Senator upon this floor that does not know that we could dispose with at least one-third of the Federal employees, and abolish half the bureaus. The President must take his share of responsibility for permitting that kind of situation to continue.

Now I am encouraged. I believe he has made a good start in the vetoing of this tax bill. I, for one, as long as I am a Member of this body, am going to support any President in a fight to make the rich assume their just share of this taxation burden. I owe the President nothing. He went out of his way to defeat me for the Senate. More than any other man upon this floor I have reason to oppose him, but in this tax bill battle every war profiteer will gain and the people lose. The renegotiation of war contracts feature is indefensible, and the appeal clause means that years will pass before the people will get the money from war profiteers they are immediately entitled to while the war is still on.

Mr. President, I voted against this war—with HIRAM JOHNSON, I walked out of this Chamber rather than vote for a measure to send our youth to the slaughter on Europe's battlefields, just us two—but I kept my pledge to the farmers, laborers, and the people of North Dakota who relied upon my campaign pledge so to vote. But I have wholeheartedly supported the President in this war once we got into it, and I agree with the President that the time to pay for this war is now while war profiteers are reaping billions—now while money is being made out of this war, and I support the President in his determination to protect the people's rights and to prevent the creation of thousands of millionaires out of the blood and sorrow of the American people. In substantiation of my statement, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report prepared by the University of California showing how the war profiteers have made and are making their money out of the blood of the youth of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, is is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

With workers it's deficits

	Heavy industries		Light industries		Retail trade	
	January 1941	August 1943	January 1941	August 1943	January 1941	August 1943
Worker's yearly income	$1,660	$2,580	$1,178	$1,788	$1,120	$1,351
Taxes:						
Federal income		78				
Federal Victory		59		35		22
Social security	17	26	12	18	11	14
Total taxes	17	163	12	53	11	36
War bonds (10 percent)	166	258	119	179	112	135
Left for living expenses	1,477	2,159	1,047	1,556	997	1,180
Adequate budget (family of 4)	2,124	2,204	2,124	2,204	2,124	2,204
Deficit	647	45	1,077	648	1,127	1,024

The table shows the yearly income of typical groups of workers under wartime conditions at January 1941, and August 1943, wage levels.

Heavy industries include most war industries, lumber and stone industries, metal industries; heavy industries' income is typical for war workers. Light industries include manufacture of clothing, food, tobacco products, leather, paper, chemicals. The average worker's income in retail trade is typical for a number of service industries where workers receive much less than in manufacturing.

The adequate budget for a family of four is the wartime budget of the Heller committee, University of California, adjusted to average prices in the United States (consumption items only).

The Heller wartime budget omits $405 worth of goods normally bought by a worker's family in peacetime; these are goods now off the market and voluntary reductions in family buying.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to make two motions. First I wish to say that on page 13 of the calendar under the heading "Motions for reconsideration" appears the motion by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] dated July 8, 1943, for reconsideration of the vote by which the Senate passed Senate bill 883 providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. My understanding of the way to bring that matter up is for me to make a motion that the motion of the Senator from Florida be tabled. It is further my understanding that my motion, under the Senate rules, must lie on the table for a period, as I recall, of 24 hours.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my attention was momentarily diverted. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, What motion is he discussing?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator will find, on page 13 of the calendar, under the heading "Motions for reconsideration," that on July 8, 1943, the Senator from Florida made a motion for reconsideration of Senate bill 883. It is now my purpose to move that the motion of the Senator from Florida be tabled. I think that is the way to bring the matter to a head.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish the Senator from Wisconsin would not make the motion today. It is the purpose that when the Senate adjourns today it be until Tuesday next. The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is interested in the measure to which the Senator from Washington refers. I suggest that no action be taken on the matter now.

Mr. WILEY. If it is the wish of the Senator from Kentucky that no action be taken now, I shall defer. I wish to say, however, that the motion for reconsideration was made when I was not present, and after the bill had been sent to the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that.

Mr. WILEY. I know about it; but I will defer to the Senator's wish.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

THE PEARL HARBOR OF PEACE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have listened to a very remarkable speech made just now by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I trust the majority leader will analyze the speech, and give the facts as I think the facts are. I could reply to several portions of the speech which I do not think state the fact.

I wish, however, to discuss briefly the subject The Pearl Harbor of Peace.

America at the time of Pearl Harbor—on the day of Japanese infamy, December 7, 1941—was not a soft America. There was no physical, mental, or moral decadence in the men of Hawaii, Wake, Guam, Bataan, Corregidor, or of the Java Sea. There is no softness in the millions of men in our armed forces today or in those other millions of men and women who are performing such prodigious tasks in the factories, on the farms, in the offices, in the schools, and in the churches of the United States.

Why, then, was the sneak attack at Pearl Harbor possible?

The American people—from Oahu to Washington—had not been fully informed. They had not been given the opportunity which they deserved to weld their energies and their resources into an integrated machine which could have prevented the early tragedies of this war by halting the aggressor nations at the very outset of their career of oppression. Frankly, at the time of Pearl Harbor, the American people were unprepared for war.

Now the American people are prepared to complete the job of ending this war. Industry and agriculture are producing as never before in all history. The materials of war made in this country are being delivered in ever-increasing quantity to their destinations on the fighting fronts all over the world, to the places where their use will do the most damage to our enemies. Three million eight hundred thousand American fighting men are overseas today. By the end of 1944, the number of American fighting men overseas will be more than 5,000,000.

The German militarists know that they are doomed to defeat. Their attempt to avert disaster through U-boat warfare has not halted the shipment of men and supplies which have made the liberation of north Africa, the successful campaign in Sicily, and the landings on the Italian mainland accomplished facts. They could no more prevent the sinking of their last seaworthy battleship, the *Scharnhorst*, than they could that of the blockade runners from Japan seeking to transport vital strategic materials to their bomb factories. The R. A. F. and the Eighth U. S. A. A. F. have battered German war industry and transportation from the north and west. The Twelfth and Fifteenth U. S. A. A. F. have hit like targets from the south. Egyptian-based Allied bombers have hit enemy installations from still another angle. The German Army continues to retreat on the eastern front. In the British Isles, General Eisenhower's vast invasion force is poised to strike.

The Japanese militarists know that they are doomed to defeat. It took 6 months to rid Guadalcanal of its last Japanese soldier. Within the past 3 months, the United States Navy has shelled Japanese shore installations from the Kurile Islands to New Ireland. Triphibious landings have been successfully undertaken on the Gilberts and the Marshalls, as well as on points in New Britain, Bougainville, and the Green Islands. The Japanese fortress of Truk in the Carolines has been visited by our sea-air power. The important enemy outpost at Rabaul has been made untenable. Allied forces are massed on the Burma border, and the brave Chinese are holding large units of Japanese troops at bay.

The Allies and the United States are well on the road to victory.

It is useless to caution Americans about being confident concerning the outcome of this war. Americans are certain that the United Nations will win. Americans are realists. They know that the enemy will eventually collapse before the weight of military power and production marshaled on the side of the Allies. There is little tendency toward the prophetic among Americans. The month, the day, the hour of victory will be revealed only when the month, the day, and the hour of victory arrive. Yet, this uncertainty in time has not had the effect of crushing American confidence in the ultimate achievement.

After victory comes peace. But if the American people are not forearmed to cope with the condition which peace will bring, their accomplishments and sacrifices to win the war will have been in vain.

The United States must prepare for peace so that victory will not result in a Pearl Harbor of peace. I emphasize the statement that this Government must prepare for peace, so that we will not have a Pearl Harbor of peace.

Preparation for peace, as preparation for war, must be planned. It must originate with the people themselves. The people cannot pass that buck to Washington. It must emerge from a fully informed citizenry. The best and most practical suggestions for establishing a

just and equitable peace must be coordinated and made a part of the basic policy of our Nation.

On June 27, 1943, in a speech at Appleton, Wis., I stressed my own position on preparing for peace. I said:

(1) The United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace.

(2) World peace can be best assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common ground on which to work together.

(3) This common ground can only be found by clearing away existing differences, particularly among the major Allied Nations, and building on the basis of definite common purposes a new international order.

(4) Until such time as international relationships become beyond all question orderly and secure the United States should maintain such armaments as will not only enable us to discharge our international obligations but will assure our national security.

Since June 27, 1943, when I brought out these basic factors of preparing for peace, the progress of international developments has been rapid and far reaching. Yet I stand firm in support of the four essential factors of a fair peace which I stated at that time. I have only one other significant point to add to these:

(5) In establishing a common ground for mutual cooperation between nations at peace, especially among the Allied Nations, the utmost care must be taken to preserve the national integrity and political independence of those smaller nations who endured more than their share of suffering through occupation of their territory by our defeated enemies and who contributed their just share toward the United Nations' victory.

Mr. President, I think what I have just stated is basic. America is what the blood streams, the cultural streams, the economic streams, and the spiritual streams of the people from the small nations have made us, and we must see to it that those nations have a fair break. Especially now that we have become the exponent of the "four freedoms," it is no time for us to lie down on the job. We owe a great obligation, especially to our allies, to speak up and to see to it that the "four freedoms" are made permanent for struggling Finland, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and the other overrun nations. Because of the valiant effort those people have put forth, and because of the sacrifices they have made, Poland having stood when she was attacked from both sides, it is our function to provide every aid and assistance, to the end that that great nation, Russia, will see to it that the "four freedoms" are made a thing of practice in her dealings with those two nations.

I share the considered confidence of the American people in the certain military triumph of the United Nations. This is the healthy, normal confidence of a free people. I earnestly look forward to a diplomatic victory as well as to a military victory. It is for this difficult campaign, beyond the accomplishment of the defeat of our enemies, that I urge my fellow countrymen to prepare.

Mr. President, in the world of tomorrow, when the present aggressor nations shall have been vanquished, there must be no Pearl Harbor of peace. We must see to it that on the home front, the economic front, as well as on the international front, we have no more Pearl Harbors.

RECONVERSION PROGRAM APPLYING TO CONSUMER DURABLE GOODS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on January 22, 1944, I submitted a letter to Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, dealing with a subject which I think is of vital importance to the country, and which is of especial importance to my own State. Without intending to criticize Mr. Nelson or the War Production Board, I wish to say that I have not as yet received a written reply to my communication. I did talk with a Vice Chairman of the Board early this month about the letter. I know that the letter has been received. I was told that it had impressed the War Production Board, and that it was a splendid letter. I wish to take the time of the Senate to read it:

JANUARY 22, 1944.

Mr. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NELSON: I write to you on a matter that is giving manufacturers, and many others, great concern—and I feel sure that it is a problem with which you are quite familiar and about which you, too, are greatly concerned. It is the question of the reconversion program applying to consumer durable goods.

Members of the Senate are very much interested both in the plans that are being made to handle reconversion matters and in the procedures and principles adopted for particular programs. Perhaps my interest goes a little deeper than that of some others because I live in a State which participates to a very great extent in the production of the materials of war.

I will be very grateful if you will be good enough to supply me with some information on this subject—with particular reference to the following questions:

Does the War Production Board participate with the armed services in decisions on cutbacks of war orders?

What policies are in effect governing the extent of cut-backs and their distribution between different firms or regions?

What procedures and policies are in effect or being developed to relate the expansion of civilian production permitted to a firm or industry to the extent of cut-backs on war orders which it has received?

Is it contemplated that all producers of a particular product will be permitted to resume production at the same time and in amounts approximately equal to their relative peacetime production, or will some particular companies or regions be permitted to resume civilian production before others?

In the latter event, will it be practicable to employ schemes which require that those companies which first resume production must manufacture some part of their output for sale by the other companies who are kept on war work entirely or mainly, so that the latter do not suffer a fortuitous competitive disadvantage?

Is there a policy with respect to the treatment of firms which now express a desire to enter production of particular civilian items even though such firms did not produce such items before the war?

It is not my intention to convey the thought that the manufacture of necessary war materials should under any circumstances be set aside for the production of civilian goods. I think that that is a question to be determined by the armed services and the War Production Board. But I am greatly concerned that no program which is undertaken react to the everlasting disadvantage of long-established concerns engaged in the manufacture of civilian goods. It is my feeling that as orders for consumer durable goods are being placed that all firms in such a field be treated equally and fairly. I know that in the State of Connecticut, for example, firms in that category are engaged on war orders. Connecticut is a critical labor area. Electric irons, for example, have been made in the State of Connecticut. I further understand that you are to permit the early production of electric irons for civilian use. Is it your intention to afford the manufacturers of Connecticut the opportunity to make such irons and other civilian goods, even though you would not permit them to be manufactured in Connecticut under existing conditions? Would you offer them the orders with the understanding, if you felt it necessary, that such items be made outside of the State of Connecticut?

Because this matter is one of so much importance, I will appreciate an early reply.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MALONEY.

Mr. President, it seems to me—and again I wish to emphasize that this is not criticism—that since this letter was written on January 22 there has been sufficient time for Mr. Nelson or the War Production Board to make reply.

This is a very serious matter, not only to the State which I in part represent, but to most other States of the Union. Senators will recall that in May of last year the Senate passed, by a substantial majority, a bill to establish a civilian supply administration, which proposal was introduced in the Senate by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and myself. For some reason with which I am not familiar, that bill has not been considered by the House of Representatives. The proposal was very vigorously opposed by the War Production Board. I felt then—and I feel even more so now—that the question of civilian supply was of tremendous importance. It is important to every segment of our population, extremely important to the farmers, to every householder and home owner, and to the other people who make up our population.

Shortly after the passage of the bill in the Senate, and I think pretty much as a result of the introduction of the bill, Mr. Arthur D. Whiteside was appointed Vice Chairman of the War Production Board, in charge of the Office of Civilian Requirements. I think that, all things considered, he did a splendid job. Mr. Whiteside was faced with unusual difficulties, and confronted with a national situation which made his task anything but easy. The over-all obstacles confronting him were, of course, due to the war.

I now learn that Mr. Whiteside has gone home. He has resigned from the War Production Board and abandoned the directorship of the Office of Civilian Requirements. I do not know as yet whether anyone has been selected to take his place. However, the civilian-requirements problem continues, and with the passing of time it will become more important. It is important to the consumer, but likewise important—and perhaps in some instances more important—to the manufacturer, and to the employees of industrial plants.

In my own State of Connecticut—and this is true elsewhere—there are many industrial concerns which for more than 100 years have been engaged in the manufacture of civilian supplies; and now, because of the crying need for many of these items, the War Production Board is engaged in a study of how to proceed. For a long time there has been a need for such home items as electric irons, washing machines, and other appliances and equipment of that sort. The War Production Board has announced that it is soon to undertake to grant permission for the manufacture of some of these so sorely needed items.

What concerns me particularly, Mr. President, is that unless the Government proceeds with care, caution, and fairness, some of the old-established firms with great investments and outstanding reputations may lose the business built up over a period of several generations. If, for example, firms in my State, which is a critical labor area State, are denied the chance to engage in civilian production, while firms not hitherto known, or firms not so long established, are granted the right to manufacture these particular items, there is grave danger that the customers of Connecticut industries, who have been acquired over a long period of years, may be lost and the industries themselves submerged. I do not think it would be fair. I am concerned that these manufacturers, operating under long-established trade-marks, high standards of efficiency, and high standards of service, be permitted to compete for, or to share in the production, or at least share in the distribution of these all-important items which are soon to be manufactured.

Senators will note that in my letter to Mr. Nelson I asked him if, assuming it should be felt necessary, he would grant to these critical-area manufacturers the right to manufacture in other areas, if necessary, the kinds of goods which they had manufactured for scores of years before the war. Unless that should be done, I fear that when the war comes to an end there will be a serious industrial dislocation. There is a danger that there may be unfortunate and unnecessary unemployment. I felt in duty bound, and in fairness to the kind of industrialists to whom I refer, in and out of my own State, that I make a further attempt to obtain an answer to this communication.

The question of civilian supply, the question of a need for a careful recognition of civilian requirements, is just as important now, in my opinion, as it was when the Senate, by a substantial majority, passed the civilian supply administration bill last May.

Ever since, I have been hopeful that this all-important question might be considered by the other body. I am still hopeful. I am afraid of the consequences unless we direct our attention closely and forcibly to this question. It covers a wide field. There is a continuing danger of a break-down in some instances. There is a question of unemployment. There may be the opportunity by way of the civilian requirements branch of the War Production Board, to safeguard against unemployment in certain parts of the country. I know, Mr. President, that the thousands of industrialists who are engaged in this particular field, and the tens and perhaps hundreds of thousands of people whom they employ, are entitled to the consideration for which I ask, and that the Senate and the House of Representatives and the country are entitled to the information which I seek.

I respectfully suggest by way of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the War Production Board give heed to this problem and this question.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for appointment and/or promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral Richmond K. Turner, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 4th day of February 1944.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Grover Bennett Hill, of Texas, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Renchard, of Michigan, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Capt. Augustine H. Gray, to be commodore while serving as commander, Service Squadron Eight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO TUESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, February 29, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 25 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

George W. Renchard to be a consul of the United States of America.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNDER SECRETARY

Grover Bennett Hill to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Augustine H. Gray to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as commander, Service Squadron Eight.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

James T. Moore to be a major general, for temporary service, from February 1, 1944.

Francis P. Mulcahy to be a major general, for temporary service, from February 5, 1944.

REGULAR SERVICE

To be second lieutenants

Lonnie D. McCurry	James F. Mayenschein
William C. Doty, Jr.	Otis R. Waldrop
Roy H. Elrod	Nicholas M. Seminoff
Billie S. Adams	Robert J. Craig
Edwin G. Middleton	Arthur W. Ecklund

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pray for the illumination of Thy spirit which guides Thy servants into all truth and draws them together by good works, by common labor in a common field. Keep us from the thrall of disunity and indifference, that we may be more fruitful and understanding, not only in outward thrift but in the more abundant liberty of the soul. Vouchsafe Thy blessing to every heart and hush the spirit of impatience and unwise haste.

Dear Lord, by Thy holy precepts, Thou hast created an ideal of character, open-

ing up the possibilities of our further attainments. Do Thou emancipate us from any false habit or temptation and lead us to still higher realms of virtue with the blessing of pastoral peace and simplicity. We pray that each one of us may be strong, not in pride nor vanity but in the assurance that Thou art our fortress, our high tower, and our hiding place. We pray for proof against every trial, against every besetment, and every false tendency of this mortal life. Grant that we may constantly aggrandize our thoughts of our Heavenly Father that they may be more worthy of Thy majesty and mercy and of Thy love with its potency in the tragic life of this world. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE GEORGE WILLIAM JOHNSON

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty today to inform my colleagues of the death of my predecessor, George William Johnson. He passed away at his home in Charles Town, W. Va., last night.

Mr. Johnson was born on a farm in Jefferson County, W. Va. He was educated in the public schools and graduated in law from the West Virgina University. He began the practice of law in Martinsburg, later moving to Parkersburg in the Fourth Congressional District. He married Miss Mary A. McKendree, a native of Cabell County. Of this union there are two children, Mildred Elizabeth and George McKendree Johnson. The son is now serving in the Army.

Mr. Johnson was first elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress, again elected to the Seventy-third Congress, and continued through succeeding Congresses up to and including the Seventy-seventh. He served on many important committees, including the Agriculture and Appropriations Committees.

George Johnson was a good citizen and an able legislator. He was faithful in the performance of his duties and in safeguarding the interests of his district, his State, and the Nation. I know the membership of the House will join with the West Virginia delegation and the people of our State in extending to his bereaved family our deepest sympathy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short poem entitled "A Tribute to a Mississippi Boy."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF FRANK T. HINES AS BRIGADIER GENERAL OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection, because I understand this is a unanimous report of the conferees and there are no great differences between the two branches.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman is correct

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the statement in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to appoint any former officer of the Regular Army, who, after active military service of more than 15 years, has resigned his commission and who subsequently served for a period of more than fifteen years either as Director of the Veterans' Bureau or as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or both, an officer on the active list of the Regular Army in the grade held by him at the time of such resignation and thereafter immediately place him on the retired list of the Army in that grade and with the retired pay thereof.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any such person may be so appointed and retired while holding civil office, and may continue to hold, or be appointed to, civil office to which compensation is attached, but, while entitled to receive the pay or compensation attached to any such civil office, shall not be entitled to receive active or retired pay by virtue of his military status.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to provide retirement benefits for certain persons who serve as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

And the House agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, with an amendment, which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

Except for the differences noted in the following statement, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

In section 1 the words "advice and" were inserted in the second clause in order to conform with the traditional language of the Constitution concerning the authority of the President to appoint officers of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Section 1 was further amended so as to provide that the terms of the act would only apply to an officer who has performed active military service for more than 15 years. The language contained in section 2 was added for the purpose of expressly authorizing the appointment of any person under section 1 notwithstanding the provisions of existing law pertaining to the holding of more than one office. However, section 2 precludes the receipt by such person of active or retired pay by virtue of his military status while entitled to receive the pay or compensation attached to a civil office.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by publishing a clipping from the Dalton (Ga.) News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio talk by Mr. Chester Bowles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] may extend her own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CHILD-CARE CENTERS

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the child-care centers, administered in congested areas by the Federal Works Agency, have been one of the brightest spots on the home front. They have helped to stabilize badly needed war workers, to enable more women to go into war industry, to reduce absenteeism and labor turn-over, and to prevent juvenile delinquency. As the president of a large industrial concern in Los Angeles writes, "There is nothing that keeps a working mother on the job so continuously as knowing that her child is properly cared for while she works." From all over the Nation, from business, labor, professional men, educators, P.-T. A. groups are coming pleas and prayers that immediate action be taken to provide the necessary funds for the continuance of this program. I am certain that all Members of the House, regardless of party affiliation, recognize the tremendous need of continuing these child-care centers, and the vital importance of expediting the appropriation of the necessary funds at the earliest possible moment. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House has been holding hearings on this matter for the past several days. I am hopeful that their recommendation may be for a substantial appropriation, that the bill will reach the floor of the House within a few days, and that we here will give it our speedy approval.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, following any special orders that may have been entered, my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATION OF AMERICAN VICTORIES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the brave Russian Armies symbolize their victories by firing a couple of hundred guns in Moscow. Would it not be a good idea to celebrate the next United States victory by firing a couple of hundred bureaucrats in Washington? Thus every United States victory on the war front could be celebrated by a symbolic victory on the home front. This would save not only money but ammunition. Of course, not every Muscovite gets a chance to fire a big gur, but every American will, on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

MY VOTE ON THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most difficult votes I have ever cast in this Congress came up yesterday on the question of passing the tax bill over the President's veto. I voted against the bill when it passed the House for the reason that I objected to raising the minimum volume of business subject to renegotiation from $100,000 to $500,000. I learned from digging into the hearings that the Navy Department and the War Department demanded this change to expedite the war effort. The Treasury Department also insisted on this change. It would seem to me, therefore, that the President should have some common understanding with his various departments as President and as Commander in Chief, and that he should put the blame where it actually belongs—and not alone upon the Congress.

The social-security-tax reduction did not mean a loss of revenue to the Government for the reason that the social-security tax is not a revenue measure at all. All the money flowing from such a tax should go into a trust fund for one purpose only—that of paying social-security claims. There are ample reserves in this trust fund now to meet all requirements, if that trust fund has been kept intact as the law provides. Hence a reduction could be made, without affecting our general revenue.

The President is right when he says we must have more revenue and anyone ought to know that we shall have more tax bills. It is not possible for this Congress to keep on appropriating billions every week and then make no arrangements to pay the Government obligations. We must get used to paying taxes to keep up the effort that is now not only necessary but imperative. Suppose we need hospitals to take care of the 60,000 soldiers coming home every month. Can we refuse to make such appropriations? We must make them and we also must increase the tax load.

The present bill will in fact increase the revenue and to some extent is better than nothing. But we must get busy now and draft and pass a tax bill that will bring in more revenue. There is no escape from it if those who have purchased bonds are not to be left holding the sack.

If all this fuss can be kicked up over a revenue bill that will not increase the revenue over a billion dollars, what can we expect when we have another bill that will undoubtedly attempt to raise ten billion more. We have had a tempest in a teapot over nothing.

I voted against this bill when it passed the House of Representatives, as the record will show. I am against the bill now because it does not come anywhere near raising sufficient revenue. The question of approving or rejecting the President's veto presented an entirely different question, wholly aside from the tax bill. If I had voted to sustain the President's veto, I would have voted to strip the Congress of its constitutional power over the purse strings of the Nation. As wrong as Congress may have been in bringing in this scanty revenue measure, still under our Constitution, Congress has that right and I could not bring myself to say that Congress can pass only such tax measures as the President wants.

I can readily understand the impatience of the President when he saw this tax bill. He had for months been demanding a bill which would bring in $10,000,000,000 and this Congress comes along with a bill which barely produces $1,000,000,000.

I think the people are responsible for the whole trouble—if the people generally express themselves as they do around Washington. Here everyone claims that it is impossible to pay any more taxes. That sentiment may have come from all over the country, and if so it was reflected in Congress when this small revenue bill was passed. Up to the time I voted on this bill, not a single wire or letter reached me favoring the veto.

The people, therefore, must prepare themselves to accept a tax measure that provides sufficient revenue to mean something in our huge war effort. I do not know how other people feel, but I know the Government can take all I have if it is needed, and I think it will be before this war is won.

Many of my friends will conclude I voted wrong, and it may be that I did, but I can assure them that I made up my own mind uninfluenced by anyone else. As Lincoln said, "I am not bound to win; I am not bound to be right; but I am bound to live up to what light I have." The form of this Government was debated for weeks at Philadelphia, and the final result was that in the judgment of our fathers this should be a government of three distinct but coordinate departments: The executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches. The Constitutional Convention particularly placed in the hands of the legislative branch—and especially the House of Representatives—the purse strings of the Nation. We have worried along over 150 years under this plan and, as wrong as I may be, I can never vote to take that power away from the House of Representatives. If the people of North Dakota demand that vote, now is the time for them to begin arrangements to get another Congressman.

There is no doubt in the world that the people of the United States have the right to change their form of government, but it should be done, if done at all, by a direct vote of the people. As one of their representatives, sworn to uphold this form of government, I would be usurping dictatorial power in attempting to do that which the people alone can do.

TERM OF OFFICE FOR THE PRESIDENT OF UNITED STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on December 15, 1875 the House of Representatives by a vote of 233 to 18 passed a resolution expressing as its opinion that the precedent set by Washington and other Presidents in retiring from office after their second term had become a part of our republican system of gov-

ernment and that any departure from that was unpatriotic and unwise.

The obvious purpose of the resolution at that time was to stop any third-term ambition which President Grant might entertain. It is well known by all of us that Congress has no power to limit the number of terms which any qualified citizen of the United States may serve as President. Such a limitation can only be provided by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and only the people themselves possess the power to pass such an amendment.

Whatever the effect of the resolution might have been, we do know Grant did not offer himself for a third term.

Now the country has witnessed the breaking of the precedent of more than 150 years, and there is public expression that the President may be a candidate for a fourth term; therefore, I am introducing a resolution similar to that introduced 69 years ago to afford an opportunity to the Members of the House to express their opinion on this very important and vital question. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolved, That, in the opinion of this House the precedent established by Washington and other Presidents of the United States in retiring from the Presidential office after their second terms, has become, by universal concurrence, a part of our republican system of government, and that any departure from this time-honored custom would be unwise, unpatriotic, fraught with peril to our free institutions, and a threat to constitutional government.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today after the conclusion of any other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the safeguarding of vessels, harbors, ports and water-front facilities by the Coast Guard throughout the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Admiral Land on new opportunities open to United States ships after victory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, at the one hundred and thirty-seventh annual banquet of the Washington Light Infantry, a brilliant address was delivered by Mr. John I. Cosgrove, a member of the bar of the State of South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent to extend that address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORLD DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, today, the first Friday in Lent, is the world day of prayer. Today women of 10,000 communities, on 6 continents, are sending up their prayers to the throne of God. In a world torn by the agonies of war, when spirits are drooping and hearts are sad, divine guidance is the greatest of human needs.

Mrs. Virgil A. Sly, of Indianapolis, a leader of religious thought and a notable humanitarian, at my request has prepared a statement to be presented today to the Congress on the origin and purpose of the world day of prayer. That statement is as follows:

WORLD DAY OF PRAYER—FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1944

As far back as 1887, groups of women have been meeting for a day of prayer. Started by a denominational group to pray for their national missions, it has grown to be a world day of prayer and is observed by Christian women in more than 50 countries on the first Friday in Lent. More than 10,000 communities in the United States observed the day last year.

Women meet to pray together for world needs and on this year's world day of prayer today, Friday, February 25, the significance is tremendous. It will take more than the prayers of women on this day, but this experience will increase the days of prayer.

As Walt Whitman once observed, "One of the most hopeful and remarkable things about the United States is the quality of its women," so we have come to learn by means of the world day of prayer that one of the most hopeful and remarkable things about the world is the quality and steadfastness of its women.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this statement in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OBSERVATIONS IN REGARD TO THE FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AND ITS OPERATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion in regard to the Farm Security Administration. I have made an effort to obtain the facts.

To begin with, it was set up as a rural relief agency. Some areas not only suffered from low prices but from unprecedented years of drought. Most fair-minded people who subscribed to a program of relief for our citizens in time of distress due to uncontrollable weather conditions justified a rural relief approach. In other words, it was as justifiable a use of public funds to give relief assistance to a man living on a farm that was not producing through no fault of his as it was to distribute food in the cities to people who had lost their jobs and their means of feeding their families.

If Rex Tugwell led this agency down a questionable road with reckless spending of public funds, this faulty administration has not changed the desirability or the primary objective.

While many of the activities of this agency may be properly criticized, the fact remains that, first, this agency has shown that there is a farm-ownership problem; second, this agency has called the attention of our country to the necessity of consideration to the family-size farm; and, third, this agency should now be considered in the light of its relationship to the war-food program.

Farm tenancy has been increasing for years. Most rural-minded people feel that farm ownership and family-size operations are desirable from the standpoint of a stable agriculture. Big farm operations may show a lower production cost per bushel of wheat, corn, and other food products, but these big operations have usually been associated with mining the soil instead of farming it. Other factors besides the bushel cost must be included in the observations. What the effect is on community life must also be considered, as well as the effect on the soil to be ultimately turned over for future generations.

Any country that has attained greatness has been one that has had a large acreage of fertile soil. The United States has this large area of naturally rich, productive, fertile land; and if its greatness is to be maintained, this land must have the proper consideration. Though some may mislead the people as to the actual soil conditions of our country, the facts are that up to this time we have never any year maintained the fertility of our land. However, we as a people, are beginning to appreciate the soil problem from a conservation as well as from a fertility standpoint. Recognition of the needs is half the battle.

Since the Agriculture Committee has a subcommittee studying the farm-security situation, I think it is advisable to wait for their recommendations before making any additional suggestions. I include herewith a table prepared from information obtained from Mr. Frank Hancock, Administrator:

Farm Security Administration

Number of employees—Jan. 1, 1944:	
United States	10,292
Regional office (includes Wisconsin, Michigan, and Minnesota)	65
State of Wisconsin, employees in—	
State offices	3
District offices	9
County offices	127
Seventh district of State of Wisconsin, employees in—	
District offices	3
County offices	23

F. S. A. loans in fiscal year July 1, 1942, through June 30, 1943

	Number of loans	Average amount of each
United States:		
Original loans	51,015	$703
Supplemental loans	198,705	284
Total amount advanced for all types of rural rehabilitation loans, $97,255,090.		
Wisconsin:		
Origini loans	780	1,345
Supplemental loans	1,363	492
Total amount advanced for all types of rural rehabilitation loans, $1,788,994.		
Seventh district of Wisconsin:		
Original loans	172	----------
Supplemental loans	266	----------
Total amount advanced for all types of rural rehabilitation loans, $308,626.		

Farm purchases under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act

	Total number of farms purchased	Total amount advanced for purchases and supplemental farm loans to farmers acquiring additional acreage and improvements
United States	5,144	$31,270,454
Wisconsin [1]	101	533,832
Seventh District of Wisconsin [1]	10	47,670

[1] In addition 23 farmer project units were sold to farm families for $94,150 under terms of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act

In the light of the above factual information, do you see why just before Christmas—when the supplement appropriation bill was up for consideration that I asked the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, if we would not be criticized for appropriating six millions for personnel, and only seven millions for loans?

Many facts must be borne in mind in connection with this table. The number of previous loans that must be serviced, and the personnel required in the liquidation of certain projects, are among these. Though I do not care to discuss this whole situation in detail today, I do think we should get the facts needed in order to consider the relation of this agency to the war-food program of 1944, and to study the relation of this agency to the post-war agricultural policy of our Nation.

We must in fairness realize that these agencies, operate under the direction of laws. We should be careful and see that these food-producing agencies are given every opportunity to make their best contribution to the war-food program during the war. In the post-war overall program we should consider what part this agency should take upon the return of our armed forces. The farmers union has already called our attention to the relationship of this agency to a post-war agricultural program, especially from a farm ownership standpoint.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter signed by several citizens of my home county.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two editorials on Mr. Bernard Baruch's services to our country.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a notable address delivered by Mr. Arthur G. Drefs, chairman of the board of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce, at the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce at the Jefferson Hotel at St. Louis, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GARNISHMENT, EXECUTION, OR TRUSTEE PROCESS OF WAGES AND SALARIES OF CIVIL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report on the bill (H. R. 2985) to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States (Rept. No. 1194), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 453

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2985, a bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

WHO ARE THE BUREAUCRATS?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] stated a few minutes ago that Russia celebrated its outstanding victories with a salvo of guns and further stated that we in this country should celebrate by firing some of the bureaucrats. I am surprised that he did not say the "sons of guns." However, I understand that Russia is contemplating a change in the form of celebration by the tolling of bells instead of the firing of salvoes, but I hope before this change takes place we will be able to bring about the defeat of the Nazis in Italy and with other victories which shall be ours, especially when we have taken the remaining islands protecting Japan, we can then indulge in a salvo celebration of our own. As to the firing of bureaucrats here in Washington, I agree that we could fire a lot of them, but I feel that the gentleman from Pennsylvania and many on the other side would be the first to object because most of the bureaucrats, policy makers, and men in important positions, especially in places where money is being spent, are Republicans. I understand that 60 percent of the policy makers in the Office of Price Administration and 75 percent of the policy makers in the War Production Board are Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, now who are the bureaucrats whom the Republicans love to label as such? It is Secretary of War, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, Under Secretary of War, Judge Robert P. Patterson, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Frank Knox, the Under Secretary of the Navy, Mr. James V. Forrestal, or the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Ralph A. Bard? Could it be that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and others on his side refer to the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Harold L. Ickes; the Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Donald Nelson; the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr.; the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, Mr. Chester Bowles; or the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, Mr. John B. Blandford, Jr.? Some day I will insist that they name all of the bureaucrats. I feel that the country is entitled to know who the bureaucrats are or whether they refer to the thousands of civil-service men and women who have been in the Government service for 10, 20, and 30 years. Surely, no Republican, by any stretch of imagination, could charge the Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull; the Attorney General, Mr. Francis Biddle; the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones; or the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Claude R. Wickard, of being bureaucrats. I have frequently been asked to obtain the names of these bureaucrats by reason of the fact that many Republican Members, Republican publishers and publicists, have laid great stress in charging everybody in Washington in an official capacity with being a bureaucrat. So I have undertaken on this opportune occasion to mention only a few of the men in high position, with real authority, who would fall in that category. Yes; I admit all were appointed by the President, but I recall the hue and cry on the part of the Republican membership that he appoint some Republicans, and it was upon that demand that the President subsequently appointed these outstanding men to important positions, and I think it is unfair to assail them now as bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] refers to a resolution adopted during President Grant's second administration relative to a third and fourth term. I concede that President Grant was a grand general, but as President he was not faced with the conditions that confront our country and President Roosevelt today. I say to the gentleman from Michigan that if the Republicans could find some man anywhere near possessing the ability,

courage, and determination that President Roosevelt possesses there might be some justification for his observation, but I myself and the people throughout the country recognize that there is no man with the ability, experience, knowledge, and courage that President Roosevelt possesses. They think he should be reelected, in fact, many people think his election should be unanimous, and I agree with them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I secured unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today. I forego that and ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution of the Senate (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 28

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I announced the program for Tuesday. I said that should the Lemke farm mortgage bill, H. R. 4166, be agreed to by unanimous consent yesterday it would not come Tuesday, but it was not agreed to, so it will be called up Tuesday with 1 hour's general debate.

Then the Committee on Rules has reported out a rule on H. R. 3956, to amend the Federal Reserve Act, to provide that the payment of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed a payment of interest on deposits. General debate on that bill is limited to 2 hours. It will be called up following disposition of H. R. 4166. It is my personal view, without in any way tying the hands of the committee in charge of the bill, that only a portion of general debate on that bill will take place on Tuesday, that its consideration would be completed on Wednesday.

Following that, the bill H. R. 2985 to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States, will be called up under a rule reported today by the Committee on Rules, providing for 2 hours of general debate. That will follow the bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act.

That is the program for next week, so far as I now know.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will be no appropriation bill next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is none; that is the information I have received; no appropriation bill. What action might be taken on the soldiers' vote bill I cannot now predict, but that conference report would always be in order for consideration.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman would give that the right-of-way if it was reported?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; if that conference report should come in I know that my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and myself will bring it up at a time when Members will have sufficient notice and plenty of opportunity to be present.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and insert with my remarks a statement from the Better Government Association of Chicago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, for many years out in Chicago, Ill., it has been very difficult to hold a legal election. In many instances it would appear that the votes were weighed rather than counted. It is largely because of one of the most corrupt political machines in the United States, the Kelly-Nash machine. The Better Government Association of Chicago for years have fought for clean elections. They see the opportunity for fraud that the short-pencil boys in Chicago can make out of the short Federal ballot and they have come out with a very strong endorsement of the State ballot plan. Mayor Kelly wants the short ballot.

The statement of the Better Government Association is as follows:

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

LETTER TO AN EDITOR

The tone of your recent editorial on the soldiers' vote bill was admirable. It represents the spirit in which this complex and difficult question should be approached, and its reasonable attitude might well be emulated by others. Seldom in our history has a question of national importance aroused such violent controversy based on complete ignorance of the facts. Few of those who are hysterically urging its adoption have even read the bill itself. And after reading it, one must have some knowledge of the Constitution, of the decisions of the courts, and of the voting procedure in the several States, if one is to express an opinion worth listening to.

A Nation-wide publicity campaign has fostered the idea that opponents of this bill are trying to prevent the serviceman from voting. That idea, of course, is nonsense. It is being stated quite openly that the opposition is a plot on the part of the Republicans and anti-administration Democrats to prevent the reelection of Mr. Roosevelt. If the bill should pass, these people may be in for unpleasant disillusionment, for the contests in the courts that will almost inevitably result from its adoption might well prevent Mr. Roosevelt's taking office again, even if reelected, and might give the Presidency to the Vice President, who would have no power whatever to turn it back to Mr. Roosevelt.

The Lucas bill is popularly called the soldiers' vote bill. It has no right to that title. It should be labeled "An act to disfranchise servicemen from voting for their home town officers," and it does not give the servicemen a clear, legal right to vote even for national officers. Granting that it did, since when in our scheme of government has the ballot for President and National Legislators been more important than the ballot for State, county, and municipal officers? In this connection I should like to quote from a speech made by Mr. Roosevelt on March 2, 1930, when he was Governor of New York:

"Now to bring about government by oligarchy, masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty of our States must first be destroyed except in mere minor matters of legislation. We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever they seem in danger. Thus it will be seen that this home rule is a most important thing—the most vital thing—if we are to continue along the course on which we have so far progressed with such unprecedented success."

The Lucas bill is unconstitutional. It is unconstitutional as to electors of President and Vice President (see art. II, sec. 1, clause 2), as to Senators (see seventeenth amendment, sec. 1, last sentence), as to Representatives (see art. I, sec. 2, clause 1). Let me point out also that the bill would abrogate the power which some States have exercised to vote part of their electors for one Presidential candidate and part for another. In 1916 West Virginia gave 7 electoral votes to Mr. Hughes and 1 to Mr. Wilson. In 1912 California gave 2 electoral votes to Mr. Wilson and 11 electoral votes to Theodore Roosevelt.

This question of constitutionality might have serious consequences. If the results of the election were thrown into the courts, the Nation would be placed in a perilous position. And an unconstitutional soldiers' vote bill is almost certain to throw the results into the courts. In this connection, note the language of the 12th amendment, which states that in the event the House of Representatives shall not be able to choose a President before inauguration day, the office of President will devolve upon the Vice President.

The Lucas bill is unsportsmanlike. It is a straight ballot bill, and every agency for good government has been struggling for years to get people to split their ballots and vote for the better candidate for each office. In practice, under this bill, the serviceman will not have the same liberty of choice that the ordinary voter at home will have. Voters do split their ballots. In 1940 California, Idaho, Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Ohio voted for the Presidential candidate of one party and elected the senatorial candidate of another party. In the same election, Indiana, Michigan, and North Dakota voted for the Republican candidate for President, but elected Democratic Governors; and New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Delaware, Illinois, Missouri, and Montana voted for the Democratic Presidential candidate, but elected Republican Governors. The Lucas bill stacks the cards in favor of one party.

Yesterday, one of the national columnists stated that President Roosevelt had called in

some of his congressional followers and said that he had to have the Lucas bill in order to "save BARKLEY." This statement is probably just gossip, but it illustrates graphically the bitternesses and hates that may be engendered by the bill, which will almost certainly result in a series of court contests by defeated candidates, based on the unconstitutionality of the bill.

The Lucas bill is a bill for disunity. At a time when the administration is demanding unity, it supports a bill which, for reasons given above, will do more in the long run to foster disunity and bad blood than almost any measure one can imagine.

The Lucas bill is unworkable. Perhaps I should modify that by saying it is unworkable unless the serviceman votes a straight party ticket not bearing the names of candidates. I have yet to see a practical plan under this bill for acquainting the serviceman with the name of the congressional candidate in his own district. Unfortunately, the majority of our citizens do not know the number of their congressional district nor the name of their Congressman.

The Lucas bill would throw a heavier burden on shipping and require a larger personnel than the States' rights absentee ballot plan. The Lucas bill ballot must pass through the hands of the War Ballot Commission, of the military, and of State authorities before it finally comes to rest in its own home town.

The absentee-ballot plan, on the other hand, requires little from Congress or from Federal authorities. The principal requirement is that post cards be distributed to all servicemen, on which they can write their home-town authorities asking that an absentee ballot be sent them. These cards do not need to await the approach of election. They could be distributed now. From there on the matter is between the serviceman and his local election board, and is treated like ordinary mail, except that it should be handled in special envelopes, and these envelopes should be given mail priority.

In fact, the Lucas bill, under title 2, has such a plan for "members of the armed forces located within the United States, and where State procedures can be effectively employed, to members of the armed forces located in other places." However, even in this connection, the Lucas plan lugs in the cumbersome and unnecessary War Ballot Commission.

Under this absentee-ballot plan, the serviceman will get his own individual ballot from home. That ballot will have the names of all candidates for all offices from President down to dog catcher. He will not have to go to a bulletin board and make a puzzled search for the names of candidates for Congress in his own home district, and probably pick the wrong names in the end. He will not wonder why he can't vote for governor in his own State. He will have precisely the same status that he would have back home. And that's as it should be.

This plan would not require any special service election day such as is provided in the Lucas bill, section 109 (b) (1). The voter can fill in his ballot when he receives it, put it in the proper envelope, and drop it in the mail.

Now, when September and October roll around, it is probable that approximately one-half of our armed forces will still be within the United States. There will be no trouble in handling these voters by mail. The largest portion of the remainder will probably be in western Europe or northern Africa and can be serviced by vessel without the need of air transport. Only those in service in the Far East and the central and southern Pacific will have to be serviced by plane. This requirement will not throw any great additional load on our Air Service. We have experimented by weighing up some ballots, and I think we are well within the facts when we say that 50 tons of air-borne mail will be sufficient for these regions, and under this plan even this amount will not have to be transported at any one time. Is this too much to ask of government so that our men in service may be just as truly voters as their people back home? Is this too high a price to pay for the preservation of an honest ballot and of States' rights?

Must we always continue to do things the hard way when there is a simpler and better way? A straight line is still the shortest distance between two points.

BETTER GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION, INC.,
J. A. COBBEY, *President.*
FRED W. BLAISDELL, *Executive Director.*

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

O. P. A. STRIKES AT THE FARMER AND THE SMALL BUSINESSMAN

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the original Price Control Act. I did so upon assurance that it would be administered in the best interest of our country. In this it has failed.

I am serving notice today that I shall oppose the continuance of the Office of Price Administration by voting against any appropriations for it. As that Office is now administered, millions of our citizens are feeling the autocratic whiplash of Mr. Bowles and his fellow bureaucrats. I am fully cognizant of the power vested in that agency by the Congress, but I am also aware that it was never intended to deny the rights of free citizens under it. I charge here and now that O. P. A. is playing the game of powerful monopolies and unless it is curbed the American farmer and the small independent businessman will be liquidated. The farmer is asked to produce, produce, and still produce, and he has a right to expect some help from his Government, not impossible orders and decrees. This is a serious situation. Now let us get down to specific cases.

My particular district is rich in agriculture and industry. Thrifty, energetic farmers have developed some of the finest dairy farms in this country. Considerable of the milk produced goes into butter and cheese. A still greater portion goes to the city markets in liquid form to supply the daily needs of men, women, and children. Milk is an important food for all classes of people. Then we have the so-called cash-crop farmers who raise tobacco, hemp, cabbage, onions, beets, and small grain. These people are working long hours, yes, every member of the family is working from sunup to sundown in an effort to meet the demands of our Government and our people for food and more food.

To my surprise, 2 days ago I learned that the city of Monroe in the heart of a rich agricultural area is faced with a milk shortage. A telegram from the mayor of that city says that the situation is acute and urges immediate action by O. P. A. That city may shortly be without any milk. Now what has happened to create this situation? O. P. A. has fixed ceiling prices on delivered milk, but has permitted the spiraling of prices of milk to cheese-plant dairymen. Thus the distributor is not permitted to meet cheese-plant competition and hence he cannot buy milk for delivery purposes in the city. The distributors are limited from paying more than $2.50 per hundred pounds, with a ceiling price to consumers of from 12 to 13 cents a quart. Now the price at the cheese factories has risen to $3.35 per hundred, or a difference of 85 cents per hundred. O. P. A. has been requested to adjust the price level and afford some relief but, as usual, it does nothing. This delay is jeopardizing the health of the citizens of Monroe, for milk is a necessity today. O. P. A. is playing into the hands of the Cheese Trust, which is the group that is responsible for the present situation. Mr. Speaker, this Government agency contends that a rise in price of milk at Monroe will make for inflation. Yet it is not inflation when Borden and Kraft up the prices of milk. What kind of administration is this?

It is indeed interesting, Mr. Speaker, to hear this wail against inflation by O. P. A., when the facts of this situation are so well known. Quite recently a Dr. Goodsell, of the United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, prepared a table showing the net cash and noncash return to all labor on southern Wisconsin dairy farms for the year 1942. All of my district is in southern Wisconsin, and Dr. Goodsell's survey deals with my constituents. His report indicates that my dairy farmers receive 47 cents an hour for their labor. Does this make for inflation? The answer is obvious.

The same kind of treatment is exercised against the Swiss cheese cooperatives in my district. For more than a year we have been pressing O. P. A. for price adjustments and for an order that will protect this industry, but without results. We are still waiting for action. On several occasions Wisconsin Congressmen have waited on bended knee. Men from that industry have come to Washington and argued their case. On each occasion there was the old familiar brush-off. Today the Swiss cheese industry faces ruin because O. P. A. is about to embark upon a one-grade, one-price system in that business. Our people have asked repeatedly for an opportunity to be heard, but without result.

Mr. Speaker, for months the cheese monopoly has been attempting to force a one-grade, one-price order on this industry and I am informed it has succeeded. The real people who have spent years to establish the Swiss cheese industry in this country are ignored, yet they are individuals who have the greatest stake in this business. For several months I have been writing to Chester Bowles requesting information on the policy of his agency toward the farmers and cooperatives on this subject. A few days ago I received the verdict, that O P. A. had decided to adopt a one-price, one-grade regulation on the Swiss cheese industry, and that is play-

ing the monopoly game, for it places the big fellows in a position to force an inferior product on the public at higher prices. Mr. Speaker, that is the death sentence to this business. And it is rendered by a Government agency without the courtesy of a hearing. Talk about a Hitler, talk about discrimination, talk about totalitarianism. Why, Mr. Speaker, we have it right here in these United States. And it has been so since its inception.

Mr. Speaker, I am citing cases in this indictment of O. P. A., and I now come to case No. 3. It deals with MPR–494, fixing the price on southern Wisconsin tobacco, and as affecting the 1943 crop. Again it is a case where the farmer is caught between monopolies and a governmental agency that is doing business with and for that group. I state the facts briefly.

Office of Price Administration has developed a certain technique in the handling of these cases—it is to make a show of fair treatment, then long delay, and finally an order is entered against the farmers. It's the old familiar runaround until everybody concerned is exhausted, disgusted, and fighting mad.

One Daniel M. Pierce, as president of the Wisconsin Cooperative Tobacco Growers' Association and for himself personally, filed an appeal from order No. 494 and requested a modification so that he could secure an increase for his tobacco. The request for an increase was very reasonable, but O. P. A. denied the application on technical grounds, thus causing Mr. Pierce to file a new protest on January 10, 1944. In the order denying the original application, it was quite apparent that all relevant facts were ignored. To meet the issue raised by the growers O. P. A. said that the 1942 price was above normal and hence the 1943 crop was not entitled to an increase. That bluff was called, however, as the crops were identical and were proved to be so. These facts were submitted to O. P. A. and it was thought by the farmers that favorable consideration would result.

On January 26, Mr. S. R. Smith, deputy director, acknowledged receipt of a letter from my office calling attention to the protest filed by Mr. Pierce. To my surprise he intimated that the question might be a moot one, for he said, "It seems likely that most of the crop has been sold," and intimating that no action was necessary under those circumstances. Thus the old cat was out of the bag. This was a sneak attack, and consistent with a program of delay, but they reckoned without full knowledge of the facts. Incidentally, the work of the monopolies is apparent. But follow this sneak attack.

Before the tobacco freeze was released so that dealers could buy tobacco an application for price adjustment on the 1943 crop had been made. O. P. A. refused to act on the application until a few days before the freeze went off, at which time the application was denied. Immediately when the freeze was off the buyers, representing the monopolies, started to buy tobacco. The farmers refused to sell until they knew the outcome of the appeal, so the buyers attached a rider to the contracts providing that the contract price would be increased to the ceiling price if delivery was not made before new ceiling prices were issued. With that kind of pressure the buyers were able to get about 75 percent of the crop tied up. Delivery of the crop was to be after February 12, and every farmer assumed from what the buyers told them that they would get the benefit of any increase in price. But O. P. A. said "No," and the monopolies received the benefit. And, Mr. Speaker, it took eight pages of legal language to decide that the farmers are wrong and big business is right. Now other lawyers have been engaged to decipher or decode those eight pages of legal hocus-pocus.

You can imagine the indignation of those Wisconsin tobacco growers, Mr. Speaker. They are honest, hard-working individuals who have responded to the call of our Government for increased production. They cannot understand the attitude of their Government in this matter. We all know that their costs have risen in the past 18 months. It seems queer, as one farmer has so well stated, that a ceiling of $200 per month has been placed on farm labor by War Food Administration while that same agency and O. P. A. sit back and say it shall be unlawful for the dealer to pay more than 12 cents a pound for his tobacco. But the dealer, Mr. Speaker, does not even warehouse this tobacco, yet he sells it for as much as 18.27 cents a pound under O. P. A. regulations. Big business can have 6¼ cents for contracting for the crop while the farmer must be satisfied with 6 cents for raising it.

Mr. Speaker, the small-business man is also greatly disturbed by the conduct of O. P. A. Just this morning I received a letter from one of them, and I quote relevant parts of his letter:

> We are also much concerned about O. P. A., the extension of which will have to be voted by Congress soon. We believe in price control, but, nevertheless, there are situations which make it very complicated and particularly difficult for the small manufacturer whose prices have been fixed as of March 1942 or prior and who is now operating at a loss by virtue of the fact that they make it almost prohibitive to get price adjustments.
>
> I am associated with a company doing about a quarter of a million dollar business manufacturing essential items whose operating loss last year was four or five thousand dollars. They have been trying for months to get an adjustment on their prices but without success.
>
> If some of the Congressmen knew how difficult it is to even approach this problem and the time and effort it takes, they would find some short cut to help those smaller concerns that need help, particularly in the simplification of the problem where prices are controlling the profit or loss picture.
>
> Vinson's directive setting up a 2-percent profit limit may be all right for a business doing upward of a million dollars worth of business, but it is not fair to the smaller companies whose profit picture was never very good.
>
> This situation creates a vicious circle which will ultimately prevent these companies from producing very essential things, because they cannot continue to operate on a loss basis.
>
> The reason I am vitally interested is that the company to which I have referred is a source of supply to us, but this is not the only instance that I know of where a similar situation prevails.
>
> I asked them why they don't appeal to the O. P. A., and they say that they just can't surmount the red tape necessary and the time involved. However, this company did file their cost figures some weeks ago, hoping that eventually they'll get some relief.
>
> This picture is a factual one, but I am wondering how we can get Congress to really recognize this problem.

That is a frank and candid statement of a businessman who knows and understands the procrastinations of O. P. A.

O. P. A. constantly maintains that small price advances cannot be made as it will start a spiral of inflation, Mr. Speaker. Yet it has consistently taken that attitude against the small wage earner, the farmer, the railroad man, the miner, the small-business man, and many others, but not so when monopolies are concerned, or high-priced Washington bureaucrats. These men have been getting pay increases without the red tape of O. P. A. interference. Why this discrimination?

Mr. Speaker, our constituents are holding the Congress responsible for this situation. But, I ask, what can we do about it? Those of us who voted for price control did not vision that a governmental agency would cause such a disturbance. We can do but two things. First, we have the right to stand in the well of this House and express the will of our constituents. They have no voice except as it is expressed through us. Secondly, we can deny the appropriations requested by O. P. A. when that request is before us. It is my intention to vote against such appropriation until such time as the Congress is assured that present O. P. A. practices are abolished.

Mr. Speaker, one constituent pleads that "something must be done to acquaint O. P. A. and War Food Administration that this is a free country and that we are fighting to protect our industries and not to destroy the individual who is trying to make a living." And he concludes: "Some day O. P. A. and War Food will learn that hundreds of farmers have a vote."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, Oh, for the day when once again we can truthfully say that we live under a government by congressional legislative enactment and not a government by Executive order. Oh, for the day when Congress—the representative of the people—can exercise some control over the numerous boards, agencies, and commissions who are today issuing orders and directives that will, if continued, delay the day of final victory and retard our post-war recovery.

I have asked for this time today to discuss the operation of the War Manpower Commission. Yesterday I delivered a letter asking for an investigation of the War Manpower Commission to

the chairman of the select committee created by this House to investigate the orders and directives of the War Manpower Commission, many of which I believe are illegal, unnecessary, and certainly harmful to the war production program. Unfortunately we have little or no direct control over this agency excepting the control we can exercise over its appropriations. The War Manpower Commission was created by Executive Order 9139 of April 18, 1942.

Just about 1 year ago I sat in on a conference arranged by the senior Senator of Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. At this conference, in addition to Members of the Connecticut congressional delegation, were representatives of the War Manpower Commission and the Smaller War Plants Corporation. At that time we had outlined to us the plans of the War Manpower Commission to set up so-called critical labor-scarcity areas in many of the industrial districts throughout the country. It was proposed that there be four different classifications or groups set up, according to the alleged needs of the particular area. If an area was designated as a group I area, every procurement officer of the Army, Navy, and Treasury Department was forbidden to place any orders for war materials in such an area, if they could be purchased elsewhere.

To start with, the War Manpower Commission prepared one of its well-known questionnaires, asking each manufacturer to indicate the number of employees he could employ. With an eye on future contracts, as well as a desire to speed up the war program, most of these estimates were quite high. As a result of this survey, three of the industrial cities of my congressional district—Hartford, New Britain, and Bristol—were placed in the group I labor-scarcity area. This area has since been known as the Hartford area, and this classification has been consistently maintained for the past year.

As a result of this classification, hundreds of highly skilled mechanics have left the area to accept employment elsewhere and, unless relief can be speedily obtained, several small industries in Connecticut face ruin.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes to picture to the House just what is going on in the cities of Hartford, New Britain, and Bristol as a result of the activities of the War Manpower Commission. As most of you know, labor ceilings were placed in those areas on each industry. No manufacturer in that area is permitted to hire any help except through the office of the U. S. E. S. If a factory loses one of its keymen or a skilled operator is taken into the armed forces or leaves for any other reason, no more consideration is given to that manufacturer in replacing that keyman than would be given to him if one of his sweepers or elevator operators were taken into the military service. The situation in that area has been complicated by the fact that we have large units of the ball-bearing industry located in New Britain and Bristol. As a matter of fact, about 80 percent of the ball-bearing production of the United States is located in Bristol and New Britain and, as we have all read in the newspapers, the situation has been quite tight. Ever since ball bearings were declared as the No. 1 critical item in our war program all prospective employees in that area have been told by the U. S. E. S. that they must accept employment in the ball-bearing industry or loaf for 60 days. The 60-day loafing period is brought about by a regulation of the War Manpower Commission which requires a person to obtain a referral notice from his former employer before he may accept employment in a new factory even though that factory is manufacturing essential war material. If he cannot secure such a referral notice he must under their regulations loaf 60 days. At the end of that time I assume he may be called a free agent.

During the congressional recess last summer I conferred with representatives of organized labor in Connecticut and talked with several of the smaller manufacturers who were concerned with the regulations then in effect issued by the War Manpower Commission. It is quite plain that as far back as last April or May, at least in the small-tool industry, the peak of employment had been reached and that from then on the number of employees engaged in that particular industry would undoubtedly be lowered. The representatives of organized labor at that time urged the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission to make some effort to try to utilize the organizations that had been set up in the small-tool industry. One of our factories in the city of Hartford, manufacturing small tools and employing at one time thousands of employees, has seen their organization dwindle down until now they have a small percent of the number of employees they formerly had.

Organized labor was most cooperative and anxious to produce war material. Still no effort was made and no effort has been made since last April to utilize that trained organization, an organization that had the know-how and the experience. The result is that they have scattered all over the country. If they were to be needed for some emergency, it would take months to assemble the organization they once had.

Further, under the regulations issued by the War Manpower Commission, there is certainly no incentive for an employer of labor to lay off men that he may not need at that particular time, because he knows if he once lets a good man go he cannot get a replacement. It is not at all unusual to find employees striving to be discharged. In some cases they have gone so far as to break a window or commit a friendly assault on their foremen so that they could be fired and given an opportunity to work in some plant where they were really needed.

On last Tuesday a delegation representing the C. I. O. came to Washington, and we spent most of the day in conference with representatives of the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board. We were told at that conference that the shortage in the ball-bearing industry, which incidentally is the only alleged shortage now remaining in the district, was down to 900 employees, a drop from the 2,500 that prevailed during the Christmas holidays. We were assured that they would secure the necessary 900 employees within 30 to 60 days.

We were also told at that conference that contrary to items that appeared in the local newspapers there would be no great increase in the number of employees at the Pratt & Whitney aircraft factory; in fact, it was said at that conference that in all probability the number of employees employed by Pratt & Whitney would not go above the present number. But in spite of that picture, the War Manpower Commission very arbitrarily continues to keep the Hartford area in the group 1 classification.

As a result, many of the smaller factories and machine shops are laying off help almost every week in groups of from 50 to 200. Seeing skilled laborers walking the streets in a critical labor shortage area does not make sense.

Last Monday I talked to the superintendent of one of the smaller factories in Hartford, a factory engaged in manfacturing very essential war material, an article that goes into the manufacture of aircraft engines. He told me that within 48 hours, if the U. S. E. S. would permit it, they could employ from 40 to 50 women, women who reside within a radius of 1 mile from that factory. The sad part of it is that unless these women are given an opportunity to work in that particular factory they will not go elsewhere, they will not accept employment in the neighboring cities, they will not go 15 or 20 miles away from their homes. There is a very sound reason for that. Many of them have small children at school. They feel that they must work somewhere that will allow them the opportunity to get home during the noon hour and see that their children have a hot lunch.

Because of W. M. C. regulations that same thing is happening in many of the cities of Connecticut. The industrial backbone of Connecticut has been its small shops where employees live nearby and where in many cases they own their own homes, and many of them plant backyard gardens during the summer. They simply cannot dispose of their homes and move away, or at least to do that would work an unnecessary hardship.

In addition to the disastrous effect this program is having on the production program, I am concerned because of the number of skilled mechanics who are leaving Connecticut. Skilled mechanics are of great importance to the industrial life of Connecticut. I believe that more basic patents have been issued to Connecticut mechanics than to those of any other State of its size.

It is absolutely hopeless and useless to make suggestions or to present facts to the War Manpower Commission. When received, they are politely ignored. As a matter of fact, I think every Member of this House realizes that it takes about 10 days to 2 weeks to get a letter over to the War Manpower Commission, have that

letter answered, and get the reply back here to the Hill.

If any Member of this House thinks there is not a well-organized effort here in Washington to belittle and discredit Congress, I suggest that you just talk to some of the people who are working in these temporary war agencies, and I refer only to the temporary war agencies. I do not believe this will be found in the regular departments of the Government, such as the Post Office Department, the State Department, the Treasury Department, the Department of Commerce, and others.

It is a well-known fact that even the division chiefs in many of these temporary agencies cannot reply to a Congressman's inquiry without routing that reply through the agency's legal department, not because there is any legal question involved but simply to give the legal department an opportunity to go over the letter and make sure that the orders that have been issued in some of these agencies, directing their division chiefs and others not to give a Congressman any information that they can avoid giving him, are complied with.

In spite of the improved conditions and the assertion on the part of the War Manpower Commission that the shortage in that area amounts to only 900 employees, we were rather surprised to learn last week that instead of taking that area out of the group 1 critical labor area, it is now proposed to expand that program to include nonessential industries, to give department stores, insurance companies, the utilities, and newspaper publishers, a labor ceiling, and, having set a ceiling, to require all employers employing more than 20 people to reduce their staffs by at least 10 percent. It seems to me that of all the cockeyed regulations issued by the War Manpower Commission that is just about the worst.

I realize that, according to the War Manpower Commission, insurance-company employees rate down the line along with the manufacturers of artificial flowers, but what about the boiler inspectors sent out by the insurance companies to inspect the boilers in these industrial plants, the elevator inspectors, and the insurance adjusters of various kinds? They may not be essential, in the minds of the War Manpower Commission, but they certainly are essential to the manufacturer of war materials.

As a matter of fact, there is not an insurance company in that area but what is feeling the effects of losing its former employees. Practically every young man who is not in the armed services has, actuated either by patriotic motives or from a desire to earn more money, left the insurance company and gone into the war industries. Those that have remained are employees who have built up quite a bit of seniority. To require those companies to lay off 10 percent of those employees with seniority and require those men and women trained over a long period of years in office work, to go to work in a ball-bearing factory or an aircraft-engine factory, is not going to solve the production problem. It will take months to train them for any real usefulness. It is an absolutely unnecessary request for sacrifice, one that certainly will not help.

To hear some of the people in the War Manpower Commission talk, you would think the lack of ball-bearings was actually delaying the European invasion. If that were so, then certainly it would be reasonable to suggest that they take the last thousand men taken out of those industries by selective service and return them to their former jobs until the necessary ball bearings have been manufactured. But I do not believe that any evidence is available to indicate that there is any real shortage in ball bearings or that the ball-bearing industry is responsible for any delay in the European invasion.

A piece of link belt or a crankshaft is just as essential as a bearing.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Connecticut problem. The same situation exists in California, in sections of Michigan, and elsewhere throughout the United States. The War Manpower Commission will undoubtedly deny some of the statements that I have made here today, but I have the proof to present to any committee of this Congress, proof that will bear out every contention that I have made. It may be the thought of some that we have no responsibility, and that people back home realize the situation. But, let me read from a letter that came to me yesterday, a letter typical of many others that I have received. This letter is addressed to me and reads in part as follows:

> Will you please tell me what the score is on our plant in regards to vital area. They are laying off help all over Connecticut.
>
> They have gone ahead and are making preparations to move a big share of our electric manufacturing, assembly only.
>
> This means the breaking up of our operators who have been with our plant for the past 20 or 30 years.
>
> This is experienced help but they are assemblers, not press operators.
>
> They will manufacture all parts in Hartford and ship them about 50 miles from Hartford because it is a nonessential area so it is O. K. according to our Government, meaning you Congressmen who helped make these rules which I say are out of order.
>
> Here is a big plant capable of housing 5,500 operators in comfort going on a skeleton basis for no damned good reason at all.
>
> Also you people are tying up our company so it cannot hire any more help yet there are thousands of people walking the streets of Hartford looking for work but they cannot do so or get a job because your set-up of the United Employment Service will not allow people to work where the factory quota according to them is up to par.
>
> There are a lot of good operators who would work for our plant, but if they can't they won't work elsewhere.
>
> Why, I ask you, have we got to move 50 miles from Hartford, and spend all that money to set up an assembly plant when there is plenty of room in our plant to do the essential work? Remember our customers have to be satisfied or else we will lose them.

I realize a lot of good people are employed by the War Manpower Commission, but they have no authority. Their hands are tied. They simply carry out the orders adopted by those higher up, most of whom have no knowledge of manufacturing and no regard for the effect of their orders, or how they work on either management or labor.

I urge this House, through the Smith committee, to act at once to prevent the creation of ghost towns.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a letter received from one of my constituents, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] for 30 minutes.

HIGH FINANCING IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the time seems ripe to say something about the payment of subsidies, and the high financing that is done in making those payments, and in carrying on other phases of Government. Truly, there is a sad tale to unfold.

Stringent State and Federal laws protect investors in private and nongovernmental corporations, such as the time-honored blue-sky laws, the Securities and Exchange Act, and the like-all of which require truth in securities and prohibit the use of investors' funds for other than declared and legitimate purposes.

Now, however, there is discovered an urgent and well-defined need for the protection of those who pay Federal taxes and invest their savings in Government obligations, including the notes, bonds, and debentures of the all too-numerous Federal lending-spending agencies.

The Constitution requires that funds for expenses of the Federal Government be raised by taxation, on bills originating in the House of Representatives; and taxes, when paid, are deposited in the Treasury of the United States.

Article I, section 9, of the Constitution ordains that:

> No money shall be withdrawn from the Treasury but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

Title 31, section 628, United States Code, which carries forward the still-valid act of Congress approved March 3, 1809, provides that:

> Except as otherwise provided by law, sums appropriated for the various branches of expenditures in the public service shall be applied solely to the objects for which they are respectively made, and for no others.

So, the original framework of Federal financing and expenditures required that funds necessary for governmental purposes be raised by taxation and appropriated before they could be spent; and

they could then be used only for the purposes designated by Congress.

Out of our frantic efforts at recovery from the prolonged depression, and in the course of our gigantic war financing and spending, there has evolved an entirely new system of raising and spending money—one which sets at naught the positive provisions of the Constitution and threatens serious consequences, if not total destruction of our original form of government. And this new system has not just happened—it, like many other schemes of the New Deal, has been carefully planned. Not only has the Constitution been surreptitiously violated and circumvented by the "clever little schemes of the "palace guard" in their haste to establish in the United States a new form of government on the ruins of our once-great Republic, and to inaugurate a new world over, but serious changes have been wrought through base deceit by the executive branch of the Government.

Today, there are unknown numbers of lending-spending agencies of Government, including ninety-odd corporations, many of which were created and organized under State laws. A large part, if not most of them, have been and are deriving their operating capital not from taxes levied and collected and then appropriated from the Treasury, but upon the strength of their unlawfully delegated power to borrow money and raise funds on their own notes, bonds, and debentures which are fully guaranteed, as to both principal and interest, by the United States. Despite repeated and heroic efforts, nobody has been able to ascertain with any degree of certainty the actual extent to which this new system and unconstitutional method of financing may pledge the credit of the United States and involve the taxpayers if and when the time comes to make good the pledges of these corporations and other agencies on their guaranteed obligations. It is conservatively estimated that the extent to which they are authorized to issue their guaranteed evidences of indebtedness is not less than $50,000,000,000. In other words, those agencies, corporations and otherwise, are pledging the credit of the United States to the extent of billions of dollars, spending the funds raised on their pledges, and are leaving to the taxpayers—perhaps future generations—the final payment and settlement of their obligations—if they fail to pay out, which is almost a certainty.

It is also known that, in addition to the obligations guaranteed by the United States, some of those same agencies enjoy, and are using, huge lines of credit with the commercial banks of the country and with the member banks of the Federal Reserve System to the extent of many other billions of dollars.

This "palace guard's" new system of financing is a horrible example of constitutional evasion and circumvention of the ancient act of 1809. This method of raising funds is nothing short of an unauthorized pledge of the Nation's credit and an unlawful appropriation, in effect, of public funds—calling for payment after the funds are spent. Certainly no appropriation by Congress is involved; and inquiry discloses that Congress has some control over the administrative expenses of many of these agencies, but no other control over the funds raised and expended by them.

I am not unmindful of the fact that Congress attempted to authorize these things; and they were requested of Congress in the form of must legislation, in the usual New Deal fashion. There was, however, no excuse for Congress having been led into doing violence to the Constitution; and I, for one, shall continue to say that Congress should have been on its guard.

On October 25, 1932, when Mr. Roosevelt was seeking election to his first term as President, he saw fit not only to charge waste in Government against previous Republican administrations, but inveighed against a lack of candor and the practice of deception in reporting on the condition of governmental financing. Specificially, he said:

> I propose that the Treasury, in issuing statements as to the condition of our finances, shall substitute efficiency for inefficiency, and candor for deception.

That pronouncement of candidate Roosevelt was, of course, in accord with the provisions of article I, section 9, of the Constitution requiring "a regular statement and account of receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time." But Mr. Roosevelt has served his second and third terms, and now seeks a fourth term; and what do we find as to his promised fidelity in accounting? Why, one searches the Treasury statements in vain for a showing as to the extent to which many corporate and other lending-spending agencies raise and spend their own funds, or the extent to which they are pledging the Nation's credit. Most certainly, we do not have the promised substitution of "efficiency for inefficiency, and candor for deception," but, instead, we have rank deception and anything but candor in official reports on the Nation's financial condition.

One example, among many others that could be given, is found in the case of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That agency was organized under the laws of the State of Delaware pursuant to an Executive order—one of the numerous pieces of legislation passed downtown after Congress goes home—dated October 16, 1933, purporting to have been promulgated and issued under the National Industrial Recovery Act and other relief acts of that early depression date. Those acts, without more, authorized the President to establish agencies and furnish personnel for carrying out the provisions of the several relief acts; but nothing is found in any or all of them which authorized, much less directed, the creation of a State corporation—a creature of State law—to perform functions of the Federal Government, an altogether unheard-of procedure prior to the advent of the New Deal brain-trusters who have lately been dubbed the palace guard.

The original $3,000,000 capital of Commodity Credit Corporation was allotted by the President from funds made available by the National Industrial Recovery Act. However, within a short space of time after it commenced operations it had incurred a deficit of $97,000,000 and Congress authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to, and it did, subscribe for and purchase enough additional stock of Commodity Credit Corporation to restore its original $3,000,000 and increase its capitalization to $100,000,000. In other words, the R. F. C. made good the Commodity Credit Corporation's $97,000,000 losses and left it with its original $3,000,000 to continue its operations. At the time that restoration and increase of capital was effected, Congress further directed that, from time to time, the Commodity Credit Corporation's assets should be appraised, and the Secretary of the Treasury or the R. F. C. was directed to make such future contributions as might be necessary to maintain the Corporation's $100,000,000 capitalization. How much additional funds have been devoted to making up later losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation appears to be unascertainable; but it is safe to assume that such losses have been heavy, indeed. Proof of this conclusion is found in the fact that, for the 7-year period from 1932 to 1939, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was authorized by Congress to write off more than $2,000,000,000 resulting from its own operations; and it seems safe to assume that losses made up by it for the Commodity Credit Corporation were included in the write-off. In fact, the R. F. C.'s report covering that 7-year period reflects that its transactions with the Commodity Credit Corporation closely approached $2,000,000,000.

Furthermore, Congress has, from time to time, attempted to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation to issue its notes, bonds, and debentures which are fully guaranteed, as to both principal and interest, by the United States. The latest authorization for the issuance of such guaranteed obligations was in the sum of not to exceed $3,000,000,000.

Inquiry further shows that, in addition to the enormous write-offs of losses, the notes, bonds, and debentures authorized to be issued, and so forth. Commodity Credit Corpoartion has arranged for, and uses, large lines of credit with the Nation's commercial banks and with the member banks of the Federal Reserve System; and these credits run into many billions of dollars.

In connection with the attempt to confer upon Commodity Credit Corporation the powers mentioned, Congress has defined other powers and activities of the agency in the most sketchy and incomplete fashion; and it is quite apparent that the Corporation, like many other similar agencies, has been and is adopting and performing functions largely as it chooses, or such as it is told to render and perform by other executive agencies or departments. In other words, its functions are so nebulously defined that, like Farm Security Administration which loaned farmers in the South money to buy poll-tax receipts, the Corporation may decide to do, and then do, almost anything it wants to do, or is told to do. Proof of this is found in re-

cent hearings of congressional committees. Only recently, when it was found that the Corporation had decided to pay, and had commenced paying, subsidies on dairy products and other commodities, members of committees considering whether the life of the agency should be further extended inquired as to its authority for the payment of such subsidies, and asked whether Congress had authorized such payments. Representatives of the Corporation answered that Congress had not authorized the payment of such subsidies, and claimed that authority therefor was to be found in the Corporation's Delaware charter. Evidently, that answer was unsatisfactory; for the battle then started still rages over the payment of subsidies and the matter of whether the life of the Corporation shall be further extended. And the administration is making a last-ditch fight to continue this utterly illegal method of financing.

As to the claim that the Delaware charter empowers the Corporation to perform functions not authorized by Congress, it is worthy of note that its Delaware charter vested the Corporation's management in the Secretary of Agriculture and its Board of Directors, consisting of other Government officials. But, at a recent meeting of the House Banking and Currency Committee there was inserted in the hearings a comparatively recent Executive order which purported to transfer the management of the Corporation's business and affairs from the Secretary of Agriculture and its Board of Directors to the War Food Administration. Manifestly, then, the payment of subsidies by the Corporation must have been ordered by another department or agency as an alleged aid to stem the rising tide of living costs. Clearly, however, the payment of subsidies without authority of Congress, in any event, was a gross abuse of the Corporation's basic powers to stabilize prices through the expedient of buying and selling products and assisting in their orderly marketing. It goes without saying that such conduct is, at one and the same time, a fraud on the Congress and on the public which pays the cost of Government.

An abundance of respectable legal talent holds to the view that the attempt of Congress to delegate to the Delaware corporation the power to pledge the credit of the United States and to spend the capital raised thereby was and is utterly void and unconstitutional. Indeed, the Solicitor for the Department of Agriculture seemed extremely reluctant to claim that the attempt of Congress so to do was valid. And the argument against validity seems inescapable.

Mr. Speaker, under date of November 1, 1943, the Chief Executive submitted to Congress his Outline of Food Program, and it was printed as House Document No. 347. That document, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, is a most remarkable one, and I earnestly urge that you carefully study and analyze. That so-called food message appears to have had a composite authorship, judging by its varying language, the apparently conflicting proposals and the like. But of the few things that are clearly made to appear by the message, it stands out that the President proposed the payment of many, many subsidies, and had authorized the War Food Administration to request a further extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and vastly more money for its continued operation. It likewise is made clear that the President desires not only to pay those many subsidies for the duration of the war, but, in fulfillment of promises made to the farmers—he failed to state the authorship of the promises—for 2 years after the war.

Aside from these few propositions which may be deduced from the document, the President's message is replete with inaccurate statements; and, in many aspects, one gets the idea that much of the language may have been used to conceal, rather than to express, ideas and thoughts. At any rate, we owe it to ourselves not to be misled by that message.

At page 7 of the President's message it is said that, with his approval, the War Food Administration had requested Congress to extend the life of Commodity Credit Corporation and "to furnish additional funds," and the message asserted that the President was urging a vital "war food program" which "will also enable us to carry out our pledge to the farmers; that we will assure them against a price collapse for 2 years following the war." And remember, the Commodity Credit Corporation had, apparently, launched a subsidy program at that time. Then, at page 9 of his message, the President said: "Government funds have been used in various different ways in order to see that the farmer got a fair price for his product," and the means used were described as "administrative methods of guaranteeing a minimum price," whether they take "the form of nonrecourse loans, or guaranteed prices, or subsidy payments, or actual purchase and resale," all included in the price-support programs. At page 10, the President's message asserted the Commodity Credit Corporation's program for 1943 cost the Government $350,000,000.

How, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, do those propositions and plans square with the action of the Alabama Farm Bureau taken at its meeting on or about November 4, 1943, when it adopted a resolution condemning the proposal to pay subsidies to farmers for increasing production, and opposing bureaucratic Washington's growing and centralized power? And, let us not forget, Mr. Speaker, that the late Congressman Harry B. Steagall, a lifelong Democrat and usually ardent supporter of the New Deal, parted with the White House and the "palace guards" on this subsidy matter.

What has been said concerning Commodity Credit Corporation applies with equal force to numerous other lending-spending agencies that are performing governmental functions—many of which, also, are creatures of State laws. And, with their growing tendency to increase in numbers and to expand their fields of operation without proper sanction and approval of Congress, the Constitution, and existing laws, the very foundations of our Government appear to be in great jeopardy.

And this danger becomes greater when it is further pointed out—and it is a fact of record—that these too-numerous lending-spending agencies are not only investing their funds in direct obligations of the United States, but are likewise investing them in the guaranteed notes, bonds, and debentures of each other. The December 1943 issue of the Federal Reserve Bulletin points out that Government bonds—direct obligations of the Government sold for the prosecution of the war—have been and are being bought to the extent of many billions of dollars by Government agencies. This practice puts to shame any scheme of high financing or debt pyramiding ever devised and used in the commercial world by such wizards as Ponzi, Insull, and others.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Is not the process you describe there tantamount to the Government, by indirection, printing paper money, or credit?

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. As I see it, it amounts to just exactly that. Such investments of Federal funds are tantamount to the Government selling its bonds to itself and paying interest to itself; and the agencies, in investing in the evidences of indebtedness of each other are, of course, collecting interest each from the other. Truly, in Government today, the left hand knows not what the right hand is doing.

These facts are truly astounding when heard for the first time; but extended inquiries have shown that but very few people are cognizant in even a small way of what these agencies of Government are actually doing. Indeed, the Members of Congress who are aware of these goings on are few and far between.

The President's food message to which I have referred gave still other "previews of things to come," and of "tomorrow's headline news." At page 8 of that message is found this statement:

> All of the restrictions on acreage which were imposed by the A. A. A. in former years have been removed for 1944, as they were for 1943 with few exceptions. Only tobacco marketing quotas will be maintained—in order to encourage tobacco farmers to put more of their land into food products.

The report of the House Appropriations Committee on the Department of Agriculture bill for 1943 said that the Agriculture Department had represented that sugar benefit payments had been stopped at the time they testified. I am informed, however, and reliably, I think, that the committee recommended, and there was appropriated, some forty-odd millions of dollars. The recommendation was made with the understanding that it would not be used for benefit payments under the Jones-Costigan act. I am also reliably informed that, notwithstanding the committee's statements, the Department of Agriculture requested the Comptroller to, and he did, approve forms for the payment of sugar benefits

for the year 1943 as well as for 1944; and that such payments are probably being made. The Comptroller is said to have taken the view, an erroneous one, I think, that the payment or nonpayment was a matter for administrative determination by the department.

At page 10 of his message on food the President said:

A good part of the great success of the stabilization program in both Canada and Britain is due to the effective use of Government funds in this way.

Meaning equalization payments. But, I ask, whose funds have been used? We have bought hundreds of ships from Canada and numerous other things, and Canada has been given the breaks under the trade agreements. A Department of Agriculture official stated in early 1942 that the United States was making no efforts to extend our foreign trade out of deference to Canada and her handicaps. We have also spent our funds in the purchase of much property from England, including one or more shipyards that cost us millions—mostly, if not altogether, it is said for the purpose of giving Great Britain greater credits in this country as an aid to that country in the war.

At page 16 of the message, the President said:

In order to relieve the pressure on our feed supply, War Food Administration has announced a reduction in the support price for hogs effective October 1, 1944, and has removed certain slaughter quotas. The purpose of this is to encourage hog raisers to market their hogs earlier and at lighter weights.

And also at page 16 is found this:

In addition to this program—

Of subsidizing feed for farmers—

the War Food Administration is bringing in large quantities of grain from Canada for feeding purposes.

Then, after advertising to transportation difficulties, this:

In spite of these difficulties there have been shipped from Canada to the United States, during 1943 to date, approximately 125,000,000 bushels of feed of all kinds.

And the instant closed with the further statement that War Food Administration was absorbing such transportation costs as may be necessary to secure this objective.

One can almost hear the squeals of the little pigs which Mr. WALLACE slaughtered in the early days of the New Deal rampage; and now one must ask, "Whence comes either the money or the authority for the War Food Administration to do those things?" Must we not assume that much, if not all, of the funds necessary to these schemes are coming from the unconstitutionally raised money being handled and expended by the Commodity Credit Corporation, since, as we have ascertained, the management of the business and affairs of that Corporation were transferred by Executive order to the War Food Administration—transferred from the Corporation's board of directors.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for a headline which the President so obligingly foretold: The Washington Post for February 22, 1944, which, lest we forget, is Washington's Birthday—headlined an article in this way: "Transportation subsidy offered kraut packers." The article then says that the War Food Administration—

Moved yesterday to give the "poor man" the benefit of a record winter cabbage crop by offering sauerkraut packers a transportation subsidy as an encouragement to process 50,000 tons of cabbage from the loose-leaf southern green.

The War Food Administration was quoted as saying that, according to indications, 483,000 tons—the largest winter cabbage crop on record—will come from the Southern and Western States this year. Can it be possible that these geographical references have any political significance? Perish the thought.

At page 17 of his message, the President adverted to more plans for the absorption of subsidy costs by the Government, and mentioned "many difficult administrative problems, most of which have been solved by experience."

And at page 13 of the message he said, by way of justifying his food subsidy proposals, that the subsidy costs will be "costs of war" to be paid "out of the Public Treasury." But, Mr. Speaker, it seems that these matters have been and are being solved administratively, rather than through action by Congress, as ordained by the Constitution.

With administrative agencies usurping the powers of Congress; and with a horde of lending-spending agencies pledging the credit of the United States and, in effect, appropriating and spending their own funds, this country is confronted with a serious situation. Prompt action is demanded by Congress, the only branch of Government which has the power to correct these evils.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DISABLED VETERANS OUR FIRST RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therewith certain scientific statements on the effect of shell shock and battle exhaustion on the nervous system and physical condition of the men.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the much-discussed Baruch report recommended that the work of all Government agencies for rehabilitation and reemployment after the war be brought together under one head. This proposal covered not only veterans but also war workers who will be compelled to find new jobs. Obviously this work director proposed in the Baruch report will have one of the most tremendous jobs ever given to any human being.

Already Gen. Frank T. Hines, head of the Veterans' Administration, has been appointed to take over this monumental task. No one who is acquainted with General Hines will question for a moment his sterling characteristics or the wisdom of choosing him for any post of responsibility. But there are two things which I should like to point out in connection with this matter. General Hines is already the head of the Veterans' Administration. As such he has the direct responsibility for administering all laws connected with veterans of this Nation, both as to past wars and to the present war. In his hands is the all-important job of seeing that the needs of all disabled veterans according to their entitlement provided by Congress are met. This in itself will be one of the most tremendous tasks that any agency or the head of any agency was ever called upon to fulfill. To expect General Hines to discharge this task and responsibility and at the same time the whole job of reemployment not only of veterans but also of all war workers in the country seems to me to expect the impossible of any one human being.

I hope I have made myself abundantly clear. There is no one that I should rather see assume this over-all unified responsibility than General Hines. But I do not want the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to undertake it. For nothing should be done which might result in causing the problems of disabled veterans to take second place to any other work of the Veterans' Administration or the man who has responsibility for that agency.

My second observation on this matter is that it is far less important to unify this reemployment program at the top than it is to have it unified in the local communities of the Nation. Demobilized veterans are not going to all come to Washington. They are going back home. The real task is to have in the local communities one place, one responsible body of citizens to whom the discharged veteran can go in order to secure guidance, counsel, and active assistance in making his readjustment to civilian life.

In connection with a bill recently passed by Congress I offered an amendment which would have placed upon the selective-service boards this duty and responsibility. Those boards exist in every hamlet in the Nation and in every neighborhood of our cities. They have the records of practically every man who has been taken into the armed services. Above all, they are groups of people with roots in the local communities. This reemployment job has not even been started until we grapple with it at the local level. I hope Congress will deal effectively with this phase of the problem and not wait for executive action.

I wish to urge upon my colleagues in the Congress that action be taken at the earliest possible date to press forward the all-important part of this work of unifying the work of governmental agencies in solving this reemployment problem. That all-important part of the work is unification of responsibility though not of function at the local community level. Above all, Mr. Speaker, let us permit nothing to happen which would saddle the Veterans' Administration with such broad and onerous responsibility that it might be compelled by circumstance to neglect in any way whatsoever its primary job of administering

promptly, efficiently, and sympathetically all laws relative to disabled veterans.

IS SHELL SHOCK OR BATTLE EXHAUSTION A SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY?

Mr. Speaker, it is now a widely known and accepted fact that no single cause has sent more of our fighting men to the hospital or caused them to be discharged for disability from the armed services than have those disabilities generally termed "neuropsychiatric." In the First World War it was called shell shock. In this one it is called sometimes combat exhaustion and sometimes by other names.

In recent weeks certain sections of the press of the country have been filled with attacks upon Congress for its alleged failure to provide for the needs of the disabled veterans of this war. To a limited extent these attacks have been justified. Congress should have provided mustering-out pay sooner than it did. It should, in my opinion, before this, have passed a bill providing for a period of economic security for veterans over an extended period of time. This could probably be best done by means of a full adjusted compensation measure, but that I shall not go into detail about at present. For the one thing that has been most emphasized in all this publicity has been the apparent neglect of men disabled in line of duty and this, Mr. Speaker, has not been the fault of Congress, for there are now and have been for years upon the statute books provisions for entitlement of these men to hospitalization and proper care as well as compensation for their injuries. In my judgment, these provisions need to be amended and extended, particularly to include in them the same thing that is already included in the Social Security Act and elsewhere—namely, dependent allowances. But here again that is not the main subject of my speech today. The point is that two things have been wrong—one, that the administrative machinery has not worked fast enough to take care of cases which have come up of disabled men among our veterans. I know and I welcome knowledge that strenuous efforts are now being made by the Veterans' Administration and also by the armed service to correct this situation. One of the most constructive things that has been done in years is the adoption by the Veterans' Administration of the new policy of adjudicating all claims of men disabled in this war before they are discharged from the hospital. It should, in my judgment, be an unbreakable rule that such claims should be adjudicated before a man is discharged from the armed services. This will probably require additional personnel for the Veterans' Administration and a concentration by that agency upon this problem of caring for the disabled as its first and primary duty. From this point of view I find it questionable as to how wise it is to impose upon the Veterans' Administration a multitude of other duties unrelated to this primary one.

But there has been another thing that has been the trouble. It has been all too difficult for a man to establish service connection for his disability. The closer he has been to combat with the enemy the harder this has been, for people at the front do not have a great deal of time to keep records, and sometimes it is utterly impossible for them to be preserved once they have been kept. Yet these are the very men who are most entitled to the consideration of their disabilities as evidently service-connected ones. It was in an attempt to correct this situation that I introduced some years ago a bill which eventually became Public Law 361. This bill was reported out of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation through the earnest efforts of the chairman of that committee and every one of its members. The language of that law now on the statute books is not quite the same and not quite as sweeping as it was in my original bill, but it reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to include in the regulations pertaining to service connection of disabilities additional provisions in effect requiring that in each case where a veteran is seeking service connection for any disability due consideration shall be given to the places, types, and circumstances of his service as shown by his service record, the official history of each organization in which he served, his medical records, and all pertinent medical and lay evidence.

In the case of any veteran who engaged in combat with the enemy in active service with a military or naval organization of the United States during some war, campaign, or expedition, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to accept as sufficient proof of service connection of any disease or injury alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by service in such war, campaign, or expedition, satisfactory lay or other evidence of service incurrence or aggravation of such injury or disease, if consistent with the circumstances, conditions, or hardships of such service, notwithstanding the fact that there is no official record of such recurrence or aggravation in such service, and to that end shall resolve every reasonable doubt in favor of such veteran: *Provided*, That service connection of such injury or disease may be rebutted by clear and convincing evidence to the contrary. The reasons for granting or denying service connection in each such case shall be recorded in full.

Mr. Speaker, we can pass laws until we are blue in the face concerning compensation for disabled veterans, but it will not do them any good unless a realistic and, indeed, a liberal interpretation is given to determinations of service connection for disabilities, and especially is this true in the field of mental and nervous troubles, which are the kind of disabilities most rapidly increasing among the veterans of the First World War and the sort of which, I am afraid, we will have the most in connection with the present World War. These poor fellows may not have had an arm shot off or a leg shot off, but if they have given to their country their peace of mind and literally a part of their emotional stability and mental hold on life, they may well have given something that was much more precious to them than even a limb from their bodies. And yet it is with regard to this very group that we find the two greatest difficulties in establishing service connection. Indeed, through the years there has been a discrimination in the amount of compensation paid for permanent and total disability due to neuropsychiatric disability in comparison to physical disability. Now, what Public Law 361 was supposed to do was to say in simple words that if a man had a disability and if he could show by service record of his outfit, that with his outfit he passed through conditions which could reasonably have been expected to cause that disability, it should then be assumed that the disability was service connected, at least in the absence of positive proof submitted by the Government to the contrary. In talking about giving adequate care and protection to our disabled veterans, nothing is more important than the establishment of this principle. But Mr. Speaker, I do not believe we should stop there, and one of the main reasons I asked for time today was to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the result of some careful scientific work done by some of the outstanding physicians and psychiatrists of the country and some of the greatest students of the functioning of the glands of the human body. The material which I wish to include has been assembled through the efforts of Chapter 55 of Disabled American Veterans, which chapter, I am proud to say, is located in Monrovia, Calif., in my district and of which Capt. A. A. Roe is service officer. I cannot refrain from pausing for a moment to give my personal appreciation of the work of Captain Roe and this chapter of the D. A. V. Here is a man, himself permanently and totally disabled and a man of over 70 years of age, a veteran, of course, who devotes his time without stint to working with the problems of disabled veterans of every war this country has ever fought, including the present one. It has been an honor to me to cooperate with him in every way that I knew how to do. Recently in connection with a specific case of a veteran in our section of the country, there was developed the material which I now ask consent to include with my remarks in the RECORD and which, in my judgment, conclusively proves that the effect of the experiences of battle, causing as they do in many cases, severe nervous breakdowns and shell shock have a definite and demonstrable effect upon the functioning of certain glands of the human body which result in a variety of disabilities. To contend that these disabilities, traceable as this evidence, in my judgment, shows them to be, directly to the experience of battle are not service connected is nothing short of unreasonable. I sincerely believe that the testimony, which I now include herewith, should have a marked bearing upon the decisions in these cases in the future:

EFFECTS OF SHOCK OR STRESS OF BATTLE UPON THE ENDOCRINE AND NERVOUS SYSTEMS

Extracts from the best-known scientific medical authority on the subject of hyperthyroidism, its cause and effect, follows: "The fact having been established that the claimant in this case suffered a severe nervous break-down and 'shell shock' as a result of battle experience in France, and the further fact that the Veterans' Administration has diagnosed his ailments as 'hyperthyroidism with thyrotoxicosis,' the medical authorities herein cited should be extremely pertinent to the issues here involved."

For the services rendered by Dr. Harrower, V. Belle Ackerman, Mrs. Carol Lipsey, and William E. Tate, national service officer, Disabled American Veterans, in the compilation of the medical authorities herewith attached, I am deeply grateful.

A. A. ROE,
Local Service Officer, Chapter No. 55,
Disabled American Veterans, Inc.

EFFECTS OF SHOCK OR STRESS OF BATTLE UPON THE ENDOCRINE SYSTEM—WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE THYROID

F. W. Mott, War Neuroses and Shell Shock; London, Henry Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton; 1919, pages 121, 122, 22, 131, 198.

"A very common vasomotor phenomenon exhibited by soldiers suffering with shock, especially those who are troubled with terrifying dreams, is acrocyanosis, cold blueness of the extremities, hence the popular expression of 'blue funk.' In about 10 percent of severe cases of shock there are signs of Graves' disease, viz, some degree of exophthalmos, von Graefe's sign, Moebius's sign, tachycardia, fine rhythmical tremors 8 or 9 per second, and the thyroid gland is more easily palpable than normal."—Pages 121, 122.

"There is a great difficulty in differentiating the symptoms of emotional from commotional shock. The absolutely sudden onset of emotional shock by a horrifying sight, apart from war conditions, can only be explained by a sudden fall of blood pressure, by arrest of function of the vaso-motor center. This fall of pressure is followed by cortical anemia causing loss of consciousness and cortical dissociation, which dissociation in a neuropath may persist in whole or in part, causing psychic deafness, blindness, mutism, and amnesia.

"If we accept Crile's theory we can understand why a normal neuropotentially sound individual may from prolonged stress of war become so run down in kinetic reserve energy that an emotional shock suffices eventually to produce collapse, which, if not fatal, at any rate causes a condition of neurasthenia of considerable intensity and duration.

"I have been struck by the fact that not quite 10 percent of the cases of shell shock have presented mild symptoms of Graves' disease, an indication that the endocrine glands are profoundly affected" (p. 22).

"The points to which I wish to draw special attention, and which form the essence of Dejerine's definition, are continued emotivity and preoccupation causing a persistent neural exhaustion; in fact, an anxiety-neurosis. In both types of psychoneurosis the constitutional factor plays a predominant part. Neurasthenia (nervous exhaustion) with mental preoccupation is more likely to be acquired in officers of a sound mental constitution than in men of the ranks, because there is in the former the sense of responsibility which, in the officer worn out by prolonged stress of war and want of sleep, causes anxiety lest he should fail in his duties. He fears that his memory may fail at a critical moment, and anxiety weighs heavily upon him; mental preoccupation leads to a continued struggle to overcome such doubts and fears" (p. 131).

"It must always be remembered, however, that trauma may be associated with neurasthenia and, if not the sole causative factor, is an important contributary cause; especially is this the case in neurasthenia following shell shock, for although there may be neither visible external evidence of injury to the head or spine, nor any gross nervous signs of organic disease, such as paralysis or irritation phenomena, nevertheless, the higher functions of the brain may have been profoundly affected. A further proof that commotio cerebri has produced an effect upon the higher cerebral centers is afforded by the fact that alcohol has a more toxic effect" (p. 198).

Smith Ely Jelliffe and William A. White, Diseases of the Nervous System; Philadelphia, Lea and Febiger; 1919, pages 225, 231:

"Exophthalmic goiter is a disorder conditioned by a modification of the activity of thyroid gland substance which in turn leads to an increased activity of the vegetative nervous system with a series of cardiovascular signs, tachycardia, exophthalmos, tremor and increased metabolic activity. Under some circumstances the increase in the glandular activity is primary, the vegetative symptomatology, secondary, under others the reverse. In every case the cause for the hyperactivity should be ascertained before therapy is inaugurated. To operate for an acutely disturbed thyroid due to a severe mental shock is hasty and mostly meddlesome therapy. To attempt a psychoanalysis for a septic thyroiditis is equally farcical. As has been pointed out certain forms of hyperthyroid functioning are healthy compensations for defective adrenal capacity. Many of the hyperthyroid states observed among soldiers were due to this interrelationship. A lessening of the adrenal load (from exertion, fear (fight and flight), infections), with pituitary therapy, 1 to 3 grains daily, often very shortly restores the impaired balance, and the thyroid swelling and thyroid symptoms subside. * * *

"The full etiology is still very dark. Many apparently healthy individuals suddenly develop the disorder following a shock. This shock frequently involves the complex of the fear of death or the loss of money. There is a characteristic fear reaction. Minute analyses from the psychoanalytic school are not yet available to permit generalization, but the psychical import of shock is undoubted. In certain personal experiences chronically increased thyroid activity and certain definite unconscious trends have been uniformly associated."

W. Langdon Brown, The Endocrines in General Medicine; London, Constable & Co., Ltd., 1927, page 36: "A sudden shock or a prolonged strain on the emotional nervous system must lead to overstimulation of the thyroid, especially if the motor expression of the emotion is thwarted. Thus, fear has a marked influence in exciting hyperthyroidism, as was well seen during the air raids in London. Self-controlled people, who, nevertheless, suffered acutely, repressed their impulses from the motor to the vegetative level, and received their reward in hyperthyroidism. The same thing was observed after the Kishineff massacres and the San Francisco earthquakes."

G. W. Crile, Diseases Peculiar to Civilized Man, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1934: "In the world of fears, worries, and anxieties, in which civilized man is engulfed, he fears just as the lower animals fear, largely in the physical terms of his ancestral fight or flight. * * * In other words, in fight and flight, man fears with his brain, his thyroid, his adrenal-sympathetic system, in fact with every organ and cell of his body."

Israel Bram, Exophthalmic Goiter and Its Medical Treatment; St. Louis, C. V. Mosby Co., 1936, pages 37, 38:

"The thyroid receives its impulse from the nervous system and acts through a specific substance as an intensifier. Says MacKenzie: 'Fright, intense grief, and other profound emotional disturbances have been recognized as causes of this pathological condition, but I do not think that sufficient attention has been paid to the very close connection between the chronic symptoms of Graves' disease and the more immediate effects of terror. The description given by Darwin and Sir Charles Bell of the condition of the man in intense fear might almost have been written with regard to a sufferer from this disease. The heart beats quickly and violently so that it palpitates or knocks against the ribs. There is a trembling of all muscles of the body. The eyes start forward, and the uncovered and protruding eyeballs are fixed on the object of terror. The surface breaks out into a cold, clammy sweat. The intestines are affected. The skin of the face is flushed, down over the neck to the clavicles * * *.

" 'Such being the condition resulting from severe terror, we have only to imagine the condition to become prolonged by a failure of the nervous system to recover its balance and right itself, and we have a more or less complete clinical picture of Graves' disease.'

"In this connection it may be remarked that soldiers under unaccustomed physical and emotional strain are particularly susceptible to thyroid hyperactivity. The recent World War has engendered thousands of such instances, many of which have been erroneously termed 'shell shock.' Maranon also reported a considerable number of cases of exophthalmic goiter occurring in consequence of stressful circumstances during the war. Hoxic reported that soldiers came back to the base hospital after exhausting battles, with exposure to gas and infectious disease, showing a low blood pressure, dilated heart, and similar signs of exhaustion. The blood pressure would gradually rise until it reached 160 mm. With this increase in pressure was urinary urgency, tremor, heightened reflexes, and an increase in the size of the thyroid."

Israel Bram, Exophthalmic Goiter and Its Medical Treatment; St. Louis, C. V. Mosby Co., 1936, pages 49, 50, 51.

"Just as some present undue sensitivity to drugs, foods, pollens, and temperature, to do those predisposed to Graves' disease present specific reactions of one or another degree to psychic and environmental irritants. * * * On the firing line in battle, during a conflagration, an earthquake, a shipwreck, or a train accident, 49 out of 50 persons may emerge from the harrowing experience quickly to recoil to usual physical and mental health. One of them, however, quickly or gradually develops symptoms merging into the typical picture of 'frozen fright' characterizing exophthalmic goiter. The eyes stare, the heart palpitates, there is subjective and objective trembling, the skin remains moist, insomnia becomes complete, emotionalism dominates mental processes, there is rapid loss of weight, and the basal metabolism rises. This form of psychic trauma (imminent danger to life and limb) is but one type of emotional insult elicited in the history of these patients.

"Varieties or shades of psychic trauma are as numerous as the colors of the rainbow. One person may be immune to one type, yet quite susceptible to another form of psychic insult. While a large number of patients attribute their plight to an automobile or other vehicular accident, others may experience two or more such mishaps with impunity, but rather develop exophthalmic goiter during or shortly after a period of intense worry due to business failure. Again, despite the fact that quite a few other incidents classifiable as psychic traumas had been experienced without tangible harm, a percentage of these persons trace the development of symptoms from the time of the acute emotionalism resulting from a disappointment in love, a chronically criticizing in-law, a badly spoiled child, perhaps a bit of 'neighborly' vicious gossip, the death of a new-born infant, intense apprehension over school examinations or over a business venture. Singly or in combination, these and other conceivable emotion-provoking events appear to serve as the torch instigating the syndrome in susceptible persons. * * *

"Shock and terror incident to accidents and narrow escapes, and harrowing situations with imminent danger to self and others apparently served as the exciting cause in 35 percent of exophthalmic goiter cases in our series of 5,000 case histories."

J. H. Means, The Thyroid and Its Diseases, Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Co.; 1937, page 565: "We have noted that sometimes one of the severe bumps of life is followed by this striking syndrome (Graves' disease). Far more often severe bumps provoke a quite different response. Why is a psychic trauma occasionally followed by exophthalmic goiter in such dramatic sequence that one can hardly doubt a casual relation? It is a case of stimulus and reaction, a very special and peculiar reaction, and we are forced to the conclusion that into its nature must enter the nature of the individual. A person develops exophthalmic goiter after a fright because he is a special type of person. Another might develop asthma or peptic ulcer or manic depressive psychosis after an identical experience. Many more would develop nothing more than very temporary 'jitters.' We must look upon the development of exophthalmic goiter after psychic trauma as the result of a stimulus applied to an individual preconditioned to make that remarkable response. The patient is a loaded gun. The psychic trauma pulls the trigger."

Clifford A. Wright, Medical Record, July 3, 1940, 152, page 11:

"The thyroid has received more attention and discussion than any other gland. Through its intimate relation to the sympathetic nervous system, it has a very close association with the emotions. Not only does the thyroid influence the emotional reactions but, in turn, emotional shock, psychic and otherwise, has a marked influence on the thyroid. Here again personal susceptibility is important. The patient may have a thyroid gland capable of doing the ordinary amount of work required under normal circumstances but not to cope with unusual stress or strain, and in these cases shock is of importance. It is rather generally accepted that psychic trauma and emotional shock are potent factors in the causation of Graves' disease. This is mentioned in most of the medical literature on this subject. * * *

"While it is generally conceded that psychic trauma and emotional shock are important factors in the etiology of Graves' disease and hyperthyroidism, the relation of these etiological factors to hypothyroidism is not as definite. However, Engelbach and others have expressed the opinion that hypothyroidism may be determined by the same causes. The treatment, naturally, must meet the indications."

S. A. Loewenberg, Clinical Endocrinology; Philadelphia, F. A. Davis Co., 1941, page 286:

"Psychic trauma: The histories of many patients reveal that the onset of their exophthalmic goiter is directly traceable to worry, nervous strain, shock, grief, or other psychic trauma. It is, however, to be borne in mind that since this disease is often insidious in its onset the complaint of psychic trauma may appear aggravated because of the already existing thyrotoxic state. A psychic trauma usually affects the most vulnerable spot in the individual, so that various pathological conditions may be brought about in predisposed individuals."

J. H. Hutton, War Endocrinology; Chicago, the Wayside Press, 1943, pages 125, 72, 75:

"French writers described a condition variously referred to as 'suprarenal insufficiencies of war,' 'hypoepinephrine syndrome of war,' 'hypothermia in soldiers,' and 'war dyspepsia due to suprarenal insufficiencies.' This was characterized by asthenia, which was as much mental as physical, with low blood pressure and dyspepsia" (p. 125).

"It is needless to say that nervous symptoms, or tachycardia, point to hyperthyroidism, but it should also be stated that, while in fact many of these patients are quite nervous, some of them are undoubtedly victims of a psychoneurosis. Many such cases have been called exophthalmic goiter, as happened frequently during World War No. 1, when many men with colloid goiters and a psychoneurotic syndrome were classed as Graves' disease. It is in these cases that a careful history, a determination of the basal rate, and a search for signs of hyperthyroidism are essential" (p. 72).

"Toxic diffuse goiter seldom occurs before puberty and is rare in childhood. It is less common now than it was shortly after the end of World War No. 1. There was a great increase in the number of cases following the influenza epidemic of 1918 and the close of World War No. 1. By 1930 these severe types of cases had greatly decreased in number. * * *

"The clinical course: Sometimes the onset is more or less sudden, so that the sufferer can set a definite date for the beginning of his symptoms. Such cases are often preceded by a serious nervous or physical shock. Symptoms in this event are intense. Usually the onset is less dramatic" (p. 75).

NEUROSES FOLLOWING SHOCK

F. W. Mott, War Neuroses and Shell Shock; London, Henry Frowde and Hodder & Stoughton; 1919, pages 1, 2, 3:

"The effects of high explosives upon the central nervous system. * * *

"(2) Psychic trauma: The psychogenic factor is by far the most frequent and important cause of shock followed by a psychoneurosis, particularly hysteria. This factor is complex in its origin, being dependent in a great measure upon the personality of the individual soldier, his mental attitude, and bodily condition at the time of the shock (whether of emotional or conditional origin) which led to his collapse.

"In many cases of shell shock followed by a psychoneurosis the history shows that both physical and psychic trauma had combined to bring about the incapacity for which the soldier had been evacuated.

" 'Shell shock' is a useful term if it is limited to cases where there is definite evidence of a shell or bomb bursting near enough to knock the man down, or blow him up in the air and cause a temporary loss of consciousness. According to Leri a large shell bursting within 10 meters will produce commotional shock. The effect is more severe if it bursts in a closed space such as a dugout, or narrow trench. Army Form W. 3436 now accompanies the man with a description of the occurrence. This was found to be essential, for true shell shock is very properly recognized as a 'battle casualty' and entitled the patient to a gratuity. Moreover, it is very important to recognize the fact that a man who has suffered from true shell shock is not fit to return to general service for 6 months at least, and in many instances not at all."

Irving J. Sands, Nervous and Mental Diseases for Nurses; Philadelphia, W. B. Saunders Co.; 1928, page 11: "The late war has given great impetus to the study of mental and nervous diseases by forcing upon the world problem of the mentally disabled or so-called shell-shocked veterans. * * * After the war many psychiatrists (physicians treating mental diseases) began to investigate the problems of dependency, delinquency, and criminality. They * * * found that these phenomena had a direct relationship to mental disease."

Lewis J. Pollock, Illinois Medical Journal, March 1943, page 165:

"It may be seen that the effect upon any object or man will depend, among other things, upon the distance from the center of the explosion. Thus Carver and Dinsley describe three zones about the point of detonation. That nearest is the zone of brizance in which all life is destroyed. Hughes and Banks note the rending of soldiers into pieces, distintegration rather than rending, stating that these effects are less noted in the open and not much felt beyond 30 yards. In the next zone CO was under compression, and death without external evidence of injury occurred, with capillary hemorrhages in the nervous system; further out in this zone a state of stupor, and awkward gait were observed; and in zone 3, no serious lesions but later development of neuroses. * * *

"That injury to the central nervous system can occur without evidence of external wounds has been amply reflected by the literature of the World War. * * *

"Extremes of opinion were held as to the relation of blast concussion and the neuroses. Roussy believed that it is exceptional for explosions a long way off to produce organic lesions, and Guillain that organic lesions in such cases are frequent. The former believed that the nervous troubles which result should, in the majority of cases, be classified among the so-called hysterical disorders, an opinion concurred in by most British and American writers; the latter, Guillain, believed that 'many patients are wrongly considered as pithiatric, hysterical, exaggerators or simulators.' Between these extremes is the opinion of Claude that, whereas most of the cases observed in the interior are psychoneurotic, it is possible that the functional disorders are kept up by slight structural and physiological changes.

"I have seen numbers of men who, subjected to the blast of nearby exploding shells, had slight signs of organic disturbances. When shortly these signs disappeared, they did not develop signs of a neurosis. Many have commented upon this. Likewise, many had been exposed to changes in pressure who did not later develop a neurosis and the order of the change in pressure seemed to have been the same as in those who developed a neurosis. The symptoms of later developing neurosis after the immediate signs of concussion have disappeared, perhaps in some while they still persisted, differed in no way from those of the neurosis which occurred when the circumstances of blast were absent, and from some of those occurring behind the battle front. Nevertheless, we do not know the character of the changes produced by blast nor their relation to an after-developing neurosis."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on a bill regarding Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the things done to cause the resignation of Gene Garey as counsel for the select committee set up to investigate the F. C. C. are, with one exception, shameful beyond comparison. Robespierre never employed greater force and fear to undermine the psychological foundations of moral freedom.

There can be but one purpose in this move and that is to stop the investigation, and it will stop, that is it will stop for the time being. The investigation

will be renewed, however, but under different circumstances. Congress will not forever tolerate this kind of outside interference in the exercise of its constitutional powers, and the people will not accept as a fixed policy of government this subordination of moral responsibility to political necessity. Gene Garey is a great lawyer and a good man. No braver or more honest man ever lived. I am proud to call him my friend. He was reluctant to accept the counselship of this committee. Doing so involved tremendous financial sacrifice on his part, but being persuaded of the opportunity for him to render a needed public service, he took the place and has given to the work his undivided attention.

The people whom certain broadcasters and smear artists have charged with the responsibility of bringing Gene Garey into the committee were never consulted. They knew absolutely nothing about it. As the then chairman of the committee, I canvassed the entire country in the effort to find a lawyer of the ability, character, and industry that the job demanded. I conferred with hundreds of people in trying to find the right man for this difficult and unwanted position. It was because of the fine things that had been said to me about Mr. Garey whom I had not previously met that I asked him to come to Washington to consult with me. He later came, and I told him of the investigation that I had made and of the conclusions that I had reached. I told him that the committee was not looking for a politician but wanted a lawyer that would do a lawyer-like job and do it without favor to or affection for any party that might be affected, one who would be controlled by no other consideration than that of rendering a service to the Nation. When Mr. Garey reluctantly accepted the position I told him that I did not desire to have anything to do with the building of his organization, that that was his responsibility and was one that I wanted him to take, and at no time while I was with the committee did I seek to interfere with him in the work that he had undertaken.

Mr. Garey's leaving the committee is all that he can do, for under the circumstances his task is an impossible one. It is unfortunate, however, that the public should have to take the loss that is involved. The evil that the committee started out to correct is one that must be corrected soon if all media of communication are not to be paralyzed and the right of free speech and free press be lost forever.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement I made before the Flood Control Committee of the House respecting the proposed flood-control program for the Missouri River Basin and its tributaries. Attached thereto is a letter written to me by the Chief of Engineers under date of December 11, 1942, that I ask also to include.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE GEORGE W. JOHNSON

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I pause during business in the Chamber to call the attention of the membership of the House to the death last night of a former colleague of many of us in this body, the Honorable George W. Johnson, who passed away at Charles Town, in Jefferson County, W. Va.

George Johnson, you will remember, was a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House. He was an aggressive type of individual; he was vigilant in his scrutiny of items carried in the various appropriation bills; he was ever fair and he was energetic in his service to the people of the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia, whom he served in this body for a total of more than 12 years.

He was born in the gently sloping hill country of Jefferson County in the beautiful valley of the Shenandoah, and moved to another part of the State where he saw service which carried him into many sections. Following his defeat in 1942 by the present distinguished member from Huntington [Mr. ELLIS], he retired with his good wife, to their farm in historic Jefferson. So the county which nurtured him in birth once again nurtures him in death.

May I say to you who remember him well that burial exercises will take place on Sunday afternoon at 4 p. m. It is approximately 1½ hours by train from our National Capital to the scene of these rites. I make the announcement this afternoon because those who are here and those Members who will read the RECORD tomorrow morning may decide that they would like to travel to Charles Town to pay a last reverent respect to our former colleague. George Johnson gave to the district he served in Congress a record of achievement; he gave to West Virginia the remembrance today of a servant and friend we shall miss. He was a gentleman who lived up to the highest traditions that we like to think have ever existed in a Member of this body.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FARM PRODUCTION

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, crop planting time is close at hand. Prior to this date, Government farm policies for 1944 should have been made known to every farmer. This year's production goals, the most recently available information on stocks of machinery and fertilizer, and on the probable labor supply with which to do the job, are all-important to the farmer in planning his year's work.

New support prices in keeping with present-day costs of production should have been announced for all farm products. The cost of farm labor is now 286 percent of pre-war days. The weighted average of all production costs on the farm has advanced to more than 200 percent of pre-war costs. Consequently parity figures must constantly be revised upward, and there is no excuse for any farm product selling below actual parity based on present-day costs.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that in 1941, as the result of legislation providing a support price policy, farm-crop prices made strong increases. They were the first significant price increases received by farmers since depression days, as the farmers well remember. Since then the demands of war have continued the upward swing of farm prices, but at the same time costs of production have advanced out of proportion.

The fight to free the farmer from crop controls and production restrictions began to show results in 1942, and at this time most of the actual production controls have been eliminated, at least temporarily. They must be eliminated permanently. Regimentation is out of place in America. We must find other ways to solve our surplus production problems.

When the United States began its war program, greater farm production was essential. The Department of Agriculture reluctantly gave up the production restrictions which had strait-jacketed American agriculture for years. But when those paralyzing controls were removed, there was an immediate tremendous increase in production despite obstacles which appeared insurmountable. In 1942, farmers topped their 1935–39 average production by 32 percent. In 1943 they went on to another crop record, surpassing the 1942 production by 5 percent. Production for each of these years was 50 percent above the best of World War No. 1 crop records.

There is no lack of patriotism among farmers. Their creed is Americanism in its simplest form—love of God and love of country. They have responded patriotically to every demand, whether for great production or for great sacrifices. They are anxious to feed the millions who look to them. They will fight a good fight, but they need help. They need Nation-wide understanding and sympathetic appreciation of agriculture's problems. And they need leaders who are unafraid to place in the hands of the farmer the tools he needs for the job of feeding the world. As we go into our third year of conflict, immense stores of food and fabric are needed for the Nation's great and ever expanding wartime activities. And production difficulties were never more serious than they are at this moment.

The supply of farm labor—never scarce in pre-war days—is now cut to the bone. No group of Americans responded more overwhelmingly than farm boys to the call for men in the armed forces. High wages and shorter hours attracted many from farms to defense jobs. And until Congress took a hand by causing deferment of necessary farm workers, the draft took a heavy toll of those who were left. The price the farmer gets for his products, won at the hardest toil of any class of our people, still does not permit him to compete with industry for workers.

This shortage of manpower is not compensated by adequate machinery. The farmer feels the lack of equipment, of gasoline and tires, and even of rail transportation. Members of Congress have been instrumental in securing for 1944 the highest allotment of steel for agricultural machinery since pre-war days, but much of it cannot be manufactured for months.

Added to the farmer's labor and machinery shortage problems, have been scores of confusing price-control, marketing, transportation, and rationing orders and regulations.

He is aware that the price policy of O. P. A. with regard to livestock feed has been at odds with the production program of W. F. A. That policy has done much to undermine the dairy and poultry industries. As a result, the Nation is heading into a period of severe livestock feed shortages and compulsory livestock liquidation.

And finally, farm prices are not what they seem. The prices received by the farmer for his products have dropped far behind the scale paid for other war services and war materials. In some instances they have not even kept pace with production costs. Small wonder that many farmers are discouraged. Small wonder that many farms are idle.

Farmers are particularly incensed at the administration's insistence on using subsidies under present conditions.

They read statements by the Government's financial authorities that the national income is by far the largest of record—in fact, so large that it constitutes a dangerous inflationary threat. They read of appeals of Treasury and tax officials for higher taxes to drain off surplus consumer buying power.

To the farmer it does not make sense when the Government turns around and demands that Congress vote funds for farm and food subsidies to protect consumers against prices which the Government itself says are fair and proper for farm products.

The fact that funds for subsidies must be borrowed and added to an already staggering national debt intensifies his opposition. The net effect of food subsidies, the farmer argues, is to place a portion of today's grocery bill on the shoulders of future taxpayers—including the boys now fighting our Nation's battles.

The farmer makes this further important and thought-provoking argument against farm and food subsidies:

If, in this time of record income, farmers must take a part of their return in the form of a Government hand-out, when can they hope to be freed from subsidies and Federal control? When can they be freed from form filling and regulations and from the swarm of supervisors?

The farmer takes no stock in the claim that wage rates would have to be increased if subsidies were eliminated. He cites United States Department of Agriculture reports that the average working man is spending a lower percentage of his income for food than ever before. He knows that it is not the prices paid to the farmer which threaten to set off an inflationary spiral.

Of course, some farmers would do away with all price controls and allow prices to reach whatever level the law of supply and demand took them to, but they are definitely in the minority.

The administration has not attempted to deny the necessity for greater returns to the farmer for his products, for it has been shown clearly that he cannot otherwise meet production goals. The farmer does not seek exhorbitant profits. He asks only reasonable price increases which will permit him to meet constantly expanding production costs. The fault in obtaining these necessary price increases through subsidies is easily noted. It avoids the question of simple justice to the Nation's farmers. The farmer wants no left-handed approach which refuses to admit the principle that he is entitled to fair compensation for his labor.

Agriculture is a way of life. It is not just an occupation by which people on the farm are to raise a living for the rest of mankind. While the farmer is producing the raw materials to feed and clothe the world, he is entitled to adequate remuneration for his labor, and he is entitled to enjoy the same security, as well as the same comforts and conveniences, provided for people in other walks of life.

Obviously agriculture, the oldest and the largest and perhaps the most essential of the industries, has not received a just share of the national income. Workers in other industries enjoy wage-hour legislation, accident insurance, unemployment compensation, and now the highest wages of all time. But a better return for his crops, improved living conditions on the farm, and a measure of the security which has blessed so many Americans has through the years been denied to the farmer. The spur of war necessity now serves as a great stimulus for production. New methods are being devised to encourage greater production and to promote the use of farm products in industry. Agriculture can help to find itself by providing needed or even presently unexplored services. But in final analysis we come to this: Needed food production and permanent farm prosperity will be assured if the farmer is placed on a basis of national partnership rather than that of Government beneficiary.

The farmer wants to be turned loose and allowed to farm. The paternalistic policies of the administration toward the farmer cannot lead to a sound and permanently prosperous agriculture. Form filling, plot measuring, ever smaller cash-crop quotas—and now subsidies—have plagued the existence of the American farmer. As we study post-war programs we must determine to find a sounder, more natural solution to our farm problems. I have my own suggestions for a sound post-war farm program and at the proper time I shall advance them. But in the meantime the administration should use its authority for fixing farm prices at levels which make production possible. This I urge for the current farm program, along with adequate information on policies, a simple program, and speed in setting it up.

America's agriculture is too important to our way of life to permit its collapse from gradual starvation. This problem presents a challenge which will not forever accept postponement. In this great world struggle for the preservation of American ideals the American farmer must also have his chance to build his resources and strengthen his faith, and in the triumph of peace to enjoy his share in the victory.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, Mr. O'HARA was granted leave of absence for 1 week, commencing February 28, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Fred Hunter; and

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of Frederick Lee Littlefield.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 29, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 8 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Tuesday, February 29, 1944, at 10 a. m., to further consider H. R. 687 (regulating the use of the mails with respect to insurance contracts). Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, March 1, 1944, on H. R. 4140, H. R. 4238, H. R. 4250, and private bills.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1231. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill, to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of

the United States and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1232. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Square D Co. against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

1233. A letter from the War Food Administrator, transmitting three statements constituting a report with respect to the progress of the liquidation of Federal Rural Rehabilitation projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1234. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V-3 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

1235. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 430); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 453. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2985, a bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1194). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4134. A bill to reestablish the grade of Admiral of the Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1195). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4277. A bill to extend to May 15, 1944, the time for filing individual income-tax returns; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 4278. A bill to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 4279. A bill amending section 2 of the act of Congress, approved February 11, 1929 (Public, No. 719, 70th Cong.), entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4280. A bill to provide additional allowances for certain dependents of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. J. Res. 243. Joint resolution creating a commission to explore means of securing an agreement between the United States and Japan for the exchange of certain persons interned by such countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 244. Joint resolution creating a commission to explore means of securing an agreement between the United States and Japan for the exchange of certain persons interned by such countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 454. Resolution limiting the Office of President to two terms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the chairman of the Syrian Parliament, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to study fully the Arab situation before passing on the question of creating a Jewish state in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5071. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolutions adopted by Local 490 of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Clifton; Passaic County and Vicinity District Council of Carpenters, Paterson, and the International Union, No. 12, Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers, Passaic, all of the State of New Jersey, opposing the passage of the national service draft bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5072. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of L. Rescignano and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., containing approximately 350 signatures, opposing prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5073. By Mr. KUNKEL: Petition of J. H. Dell, of Shiremanstown, Pa., and others, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5074. By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois: Petition of sundry residents of the Sixth Congressional District of Illinois, relative to prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5075. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Resolution from Henry H. Houston, 2d, Post No. 3, the American Legion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5076. Also, petition opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5077. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of John M. Shernick and 20 others, opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5078. Also, petition of William C. Lawrence and 23 others, opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5079. Also, petition of G. S. Lawrence and 24 others, opposing the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5080. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Pedro Rodriguez Mannuel, of San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the independence of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5081. Also, petition of Luis Pereira, of Caguas, P. R., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the independence of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we come with the solemn consciousness that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day as once again in the passing of an honored Member of this body we bow before the mystery of death. We are grateful for thoughts of immortality which swing back the grim barred gates of death, through which the glory from an endless world shines beyond the mind's imagining, beyond our heart's desire. Give us to see that death is no more our enemy, but Thy good angel and our friend who alone can open for us the realm of beauty and bliss in the roomy spaces of a larger life.

The one, clear call has taken from us Thy faithful servant and our beloved friend, with whom we took sweet counsel and whose tolerant outlook often turned the discords of dispute into the music of understanding. But the sorrow of our hearts pleads with us to bless Thee for the close ties which have been severed, for the sanctified wisdom and the pure humanity which made his radiant personality as the candle of the Lord. We remember with gratitude that for him party loyalty was ever but an altar of devotion in the greater temple of his undefiled patriotism. We remember today with joy his long and fruitful years as a public servant, his patient courage, his gentle courtesy, his constant consecration to his great trust. We remember gratefully now one who held his convictions firmly, yet without questioning the sincerity of others whose quest of truth led them along other paths. We think of him today as one who could differ without anger, who could debate without bitterness, who could be defeated without rancor, who could win without exultation.

So, one by one, Thou dost gather the scattered families out of the earthly light to the heavenly glory, from the distractions and strife and weariness of time to the peace of eternity. Vouchsafe unto his loved ones Thy tenderest mercies and the consolations of Thy sustaining grace. In Thy great mercy bring us all at last to the homeland of Thine eternal love. In the name of that One who hath brought life and immortality to light. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, February 25, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF SENATOR CHARLES L. McNARY

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it becomes my sad duty to announce to the Senate the death on Friday, February 25, of our beloved minority leader, the late senior Senator from Oregon, the Honorable CHARLES L. McNARY. I make this statement in behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], who, in execution of the obligation devolving upon him, is even now heading a delegation of our colleagues who are bound for Salem, Oreg., where the funeral services will be held on March 3.

Several Senators have indicated a desire to offer eulogies to the memory of our departed colleague. To those and to all other Senators I would say that on a date later to be fixed memorial services will be held.

Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], I send to the desk a resolution and ask that it be stated by the clerk and be presently considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 259) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY, late a Senator from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT, under the second resolving clause, appointed the following Senators the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator:

Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HILL, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. ROBERTSON, and Mr. WHERRY.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of our departed colleague, I move that the Senate do now recess until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, March 3, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, our Father, we praise Thee that the night has again found the morning, and we behold Thy hand in all Thy works; O give us grace and patience to make real the things divine, and hope to remove anxious fears of the morrow. With no complaint, we pray that we may make every proof of good faith, with kindly words for our fellow men living in peace and with strength enough to return good for evil.

O God, these are the times that try men's souls; we pray that we may rise in the scale of nobility and understanding that all triumphs are unworthy and futile unless the victory over self is won. So send forth Thy light that we may fulfill the measure of duty that is made plain to us, whatever may be its sacrifice. Do Thou shield all hearts from the arch enemies of hate and intolerance whose passions fall like poisoned arrows upon our security. We pray that the basic desire in the breast of every patriot shall be to vindicate our civilization. Thou who art Supreme Love, who faced human sin with death upon the cross, manifest Thyself in that mysterious power which lives in human thought and courage. In Thy mercy pour out Thy fatherly blessing upon every soul of every race, color, and creed. O God, remember the fathers and mothers who are recounting the happy moments of the unbroken fireside and are waiting for the light to flame again upon the family altar. We ask in Thy holy name for the richest counsel to abide in the minds of our President, our Speaker, the leaders and all Members, as all hearts are lifted toward the hills of peace. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 25, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 21, 1944:

H. R. 2340. An act for the relief of the Postal Telegraph-Cable Co.;

H. R. 3076. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur J. Martin, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 3428. An act to amend sections 6, 7, and 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes," approved October 20, 1914 (38 Stat. 741, 743; 48 U. S. C., secs. 440, 441, 442);

H. R. 3605. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires in tents used as quarters by members of the Twelfth Naval Construction Battalion, Long Island, Alaska, on December 26, 1942, and May 26, 1943, respectively;

H. R. 3606. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; and

H. R. 3607. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in tent L-76 at the Amphibious Training Base, Camp Bradford, Norfolk, Va., on March 15, 1943.

On February 22, 1944:

H. R. 213. An act for the relief of Edward H. Smith;

H. R. 399. An act for the relief of John Sims;

H. R. 547. An act for the relief of Kernan R. Cunningham;

H. R. 610. An act for the relief of Pacific Dry Dock & Repair Co., Inc.;

H. R. 850. An act for the relief of George M. Louie;

H. R. 1311. An act for the relief of Dan Crotts;

H. R. 1388. An act to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the construction of a scenic parkway to provide an appropriate view of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park from the Tennessee side of the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1442. An act for the relief of Lafayette Gibson;

H. R. 1467. An act to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Faal;

H. R. 1854. An act for the relief of Ethel Cohen;

H R. 1934. An act for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston;

H. R. 2199. An act to amend an act entitled "An act in relation to taxes and tax sales in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1898, as amended;

H. R. 2639. An act for the relief of William M. Tucker and Nelda M. Tucker;

H. R. 2690. An act for the relief of Oswald L. Sawyer;

H. R. 2691. An act for the relief of Tom S. Steed;

H. R. 2804. An act for the relief of Ruth E. P. Phillips as executrix of the estate of Amos Russell Phillips, deceased;

H. R. 3153. An act for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased;

H. R. 3189. An act for the relief of Thomas Lewis;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;

H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen;

H. R. 3329. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Charles H. Morhouse;

H. R. 3332. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Wade Bros., a partnership composed of M. J., G. W., and Ovid Wade;

H. R. 3760. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Lt. Gen. Thomas Holcomb, United States Marine Corps; and

H. R. 3916. An act to permit the construction and use of certain pipe lines for pneumatic tube transmission in the District of Columbia.

On February 26, 1944:

H. R. 1872. An act for the relief of J. E. McCoy & Son;

H. R. 2560. An act to grant the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of South Dakota and Wyoming relating to the waters of the Belle Fourche River Basin, to make provisions concerning the exercise of Federal jurisdiction as to those waters, to promote the most efficient use of those waters, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2924. An act to give effect to the Provisional Fur Seal Agreement of 1942 between the United States of America and Canada, to protect the fur seals of the Pribilof Islands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2976. An act to grant military rank to certain members of the Navy Nurse Corps;

H. R. 3001. An act for the relief of James T. Rogers;

H. R. 3997. An act to amend the Code of the District of Columbia providing for the sale of fish of the shad or herring species, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4059. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to convey land" (approved April 28, 1922).

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to limit the operations of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; and

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 379, current session, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report of the National Interregional Highway Committee outlining and recommending a national system of interregional highways.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution to print, with additional copies, the so-called Baruch report on war and post-war adjustment policy.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3687) entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, and passed by the House of Representatives, on reconsideration of the same, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senate having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 259):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY, late a Senator from the State of Oregon.

Resolved, That a committee of 18 Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to take order for superintending the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now recess until 12 o'clock noon Friday.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2912) entitled "An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Department of War.
3. Selective Service System.
4. United States Civil Service Commission.
5. United States District Court (Eastern District of Michigan).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on February 25, 1944, he did on that date sign Senate Joint Resolution 116, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

THE LATE SENATOR CHARLES L. MCNARY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the other body is, this afternoon, paying honor to the memory of a departed colleague, Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, in a memorial service. In that service I am sure due notice will be taken of the great service rendered by Senator MCNARY to the people of his country and to the people of his State. He was a great statesman. He was a great Senator and a splendid public servant. Only three men are still in the Senate who were there when Senator MCNARY first took office. He has a record of continuous service in the Senate only exceeded by those three. That he had the confidence and the respect and the love of his colleagues is so well known as to need no reassertion. I believe it is entirely accurate to say that no Member of the Congress was held in higher respect and esteem than was Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not for the purpose merely of speaking of Senator MCNARY as a colleague in the Congress that I arise today. Senator MCNARY was my friend. I knew him as a charming, kindly, and lovable personality. I knew him as a man fond of his home and fond of children and a man possessed of a great and sincere love of humanity. Senator MCNARY always held the point of view that the "big fellows" as he called men of power and infuence, could look out for themselves. His interest and his energy always were devoted to the welfare of ordinary people, and he lived this philosophy both in public and private life. We are going to miss Senator MCNARY as a Member of this Congress. The people of Oregon are going to miss him and they now mourn the loss of Senator MCNARY as a friend, a statesman, and as a man who loved the people and the State he served.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ALMOS W. GLASGOW

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 555, which was objected to last June, be restored to the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

C. I. O. POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I want to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper clipping, dated February 24, 1944, headed "A. F. of L. supports Dies inquiry on political action group."

I also want to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interview with John L. Lewis that appeared in the Daily News yesterday, in which Mr. Lewis tells the story of how the Communists have dominated and controlled the C. I. O.

I also ask permission to include in the RECORD a story which appeared in the New York Times quoting Alec Rose, State secretary of the American Labor Party, saying that Hillman and the C. I. O. leaders were collaborating with the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, including the newspaper articles mentioned.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJUDICATION OF DISABILITY CLAIMS OF VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said in the last 2 months by well informed and partially informed, and by some people not informed at all, about what the Congress has done for veterans of our first war and of the present war. I have a statement here by Gen. Frank T. Hines who, in response to a request by my chief investigator, has made a statement as to some of the things, yet not all of them, that the Congress has done and is doing for the veterans of our present war. I want it to go into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the people may get the facts from an official source and that they may know just how well Congress is providing for the veterans of all of our wars.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the letter from General Hines.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Parents Association of Public School No. 47, in my district, urging the

speedy enactment of the Lynch bill, H. R. 2328.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on Thursday next, after the disposition of legislative business and other business on the Speaker's desk, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances and to include therein two different editorials printed in two papers in my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOSPITALIZATION FOR VETERANS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There were no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the time has come that the Congress should see to it that the hospital facilities of our Veterans' Administration are expanded. Military leaders inform us that grim realities lie ahead in every theater of action. The American public mind has been constantly conditioned for heavy casualties.

The Veterans' Administration hospitals of the Nation are not adequate to care properly for veterans of World War No. 1 and to take on the new duties that will be incumbent upon them in connection with the veterans of World War No. 2. It is far better to have a few more hospital beds than are needed than to have our heroes lack for hospital facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I think that it is also extremely important that our plans for hospitalization be permanent and unified. The Veterans' Administration has done a splendid job. They have plans and specifications for the enlargement and extension of existing facilities. It is in keeping with sound economy and good administration that our hospital program proceed along this line. The blueprints of the Veterans' Administration for additional buildings, additional wards, and added facilities of all kinds at our existing hospital sites should be translated into actual construction now.

"To care for him who has borne the battle" is the first obligation of a grateful republic to the men who are now sacrificing so much for our Nation in every part of the globe. No one knows the full extent of the need. The need may increase in the years that follow the war. We have no right to underestimate in our planning to care for the blind, maimed, broken, and mentally ill fighting men, who will some day return to this country.

Mr. Speaker, again I say that the time to act is now and that we should build on, add to, and enlarge existing structures of the veterans facilities rather than enter into a program of wasteful scattering and duplication.

Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines and Col. George E. Ijams, their assistants, associates, and organization have done a splendid job in the field of hospitalization. They should be directed to instigate a program of expansion without further delay.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial, The Workers Have Won the Homefront Battle, which appeared in the January 19 edition of the Toledo Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IOWA SOLDIERS AND SAILORS WANT TO VOTE STATE BALLOT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Iowa General Assembly in special session made ample provision for all men and women in the armed forces to vote in both the State primary and general elections. The number of applications for absentee ballots already being received by the Iowa secretary of state at this early date is very significant.

Prior to February 11, 1944, the secretary of state did not keep a daily record of the applications received, but he reports that prior to that date he had already received approximately 3,000 applications. He kept a daily record after February 11, 1944, showing that an average of 80 applications are being received every day. For example, during the week of February 14 to 21, 1944, he received 592 applications.

The information above given by the secretary of state indicates that our Iowa men and women in the service are anxious to vote the same kind of a ballot they would vote if they were at home.

EXPEDITE VETERANS' CLAIMS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PREVIEW OF FIRST NATIONAL LABOR AND MANAGEMENT PRODUCTION EXPOSITION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the House has received from the Chairman of the War Production Board an invitation to attend this afternoon in the Department of Commerce Auditorium what has been termed "a preview of the first national labor and management production exposition." This exposition will include in graphic form an explanation of the things that have happened in our country in connection with our war-production program. Probably a great many of you saw this advertisement which appeared in the Washington Post a few days ago, which catalogs some of the production miracle that has been performed by industry and labor and agriculture and the rest of us in this Nation.

I take pleasure in urging as many Members as can do so to attend that exposition, for I am certain it will be well worth while.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HILTON ULTIMUS BROWN, AGE 85

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include some letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief newspaper article

regarding four of our most popular and prominent colleagues.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the San Francisco Argonaut of February 18, 1944, entitled "The Disloyal Japs Must Go."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Fresno Bee, Sacramento Bee, Modesto Bee, Central California newspapers of widespread circulation, entitled "Gearhart Bill Will Make Japanese Say Where They Stand."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial which appeared on February 8, 1944, in the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram and the Pasadena (Calif.) Star-News entitled "Japanese Oath of Loyalty."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a news item.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from New York [Miss STANLEY] may extend her own remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an address delivered by the Reverend Paul Wolfe, of the Brick Church, New York, upon the occasion of the annual Lincoln Day dinner, held on February 12, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act that provides no interest shall be allowed on retirement funds paid to Government employees who leave the Government after service of less than 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than 175,000 applications for refunds pending before the Civil Service Commission. They are coming in at the rate of more than 3,000 a day. They are being held up largely for the computation of interest on these refunds. The interesting thing about it is that the interest items are so small that one-third of them get less than 3 cents interest. More than half of them get 5 cents or less. In fact there are only 10 percent that get 25 cents or more. It costs about 50 cents to analyze each account, so the Government is spending thousands of dollars to analyze these accounts, and our Government is employing a flock of arithmeticians and mathematicians who are figuring out these interest items of 3 to 15 cents and which cost 50 cents apiece. If this is not a waste of manpower and money then I do not know waste of manpower when I see it. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but those entitled to refunds are being held up for many months because the Retirement Division cannot get them out.

The bill I have introduced will relieve that situation by at least 75 or 80 percent. Certainly the employees would a whole lot rather have their money and get it now than to wait for many months and then get somewhere from 3 to 25 or 30 cents interest on the account.

This is a waste of manpower and money, wholly uncalled for. Thousands of dollars con be saved and better service rendered if you will pass this bill. I trust it may have the early approval of this Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from a distinguished statesman, Hon. Robert L. Owen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, March 1, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders heretofore granted I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CARE OF VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is absolutely right in saying that there should be added hospital construction. There has been an inexcusable lag in the construction of veterans' hospitals. I have brought this matter to the attention of the House repeatedly. The first thing we should do is to declare by legislation that the Veterans' Administration is a war agency, second only to the Army and the Navy. Executive order by the President can accomplish this but it should be a matter of permanent legislation. We should have a permanent medical corps. Although the Army has loaned a hundred doctors to the Veterans' Administration and the Navy has loaned 50, we are still behind in the number of doctors. There has been a tremendous shortage of nurses. We must at once have something which I have advocated for many years, and that is a permanent medical corps, if we are going to give our service men and women adequate care. There is no excuse for anything else. Prompt medical care and hospitalization constitute our first and inescapable duty to our disabled service men and women.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is correct in saying that veterans' widows and orphans should be given allowance upon the death of the veteran. The veterans should be given disability pay as they come out of the hospitals or upon their discharge from the service. In some ways the Canadian way works better than ours. There are bills before our World War Veterans' Committee which should be passed immediately.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESS IS THE OBSTACLE IN THE WAY OF REVOLUTION BY CONSENT

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks a statement by Mr. U. V. Wilcox, of the Washington News Bureau.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Congress Gains New Prestige," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of Friday, February 25.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Booneville (Miss.) Independence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHARGING OF TOLLS FOR TRANSIT OF GOVERNMENT TRAFFIC OVER GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"That tolls may be charged for the passage or transit over the Golden Gate Bridge of Government traffic, of military or naval personnel and their dependents, and of civilian employees of the Army and Navy traveling on Government business, but such tolls shall not be in excess of the tolls charged for the passage or transit of other like traffic over such bridge: *Provided, however,* That subject to the provisions of section 2, military and naval personnel, and civilian employees of the Army and Navy, when such personnel or employees are engaged in the performance of official duties requiring the use of such bridge, together with the conveyances being used by them in the performance of such duties, shall have the use of such bridge free of toll.

"SEC. 2. (a) The use of the Golden Gate Bridge free of toll, provided for in section 1, shall be granted upon the presentation and surrender at the toll lanes of an authorization certifying that the traffic in question is entitled to such right. Such authorization shall be issued and signed by any military or naval officer designated for such purpose in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively. The names and signatures of officers so designated shall be furnished to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, and thereafter authorizations signed by them shall be accepted by such Bridge and Highway District as prima facie evidence of the facts stated therein.

"(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), such right to use the Golden Gate Bridge free of toll may be established by any other device or means which may be acceptable to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; and the Secretary of War and the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, and the Secretary of the Navy and the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District, may enter into any appropriate agreements to secure the effective, convenient, and just exercise of such right.

"SEC. 3. Whoever secures or attempts to secure the exemption from toll provided for in this Act or an authorization referred to in section 2, knowing that he is not entitled thereto, and whoever signs or issues any such authorization certifying to such right of exemption, knowing that such right does not exist, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $100 or by imprisonment for not more than ten days, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall take effect thirty days after the date of its enactment."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE F. LEA,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
GEORGE L. RADCLIFFE,
HIRAM W. JOHNSON,
PAT MCCARRAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill as it passed the House authorized the charging of tolls for the passage or transit over the Golden Gate Bridge of Government traffic, including military or naval personnel and their dependents and civilian employees of the Army and Navy traveling on Government business, but contained an exception exempting from toll any person belonging or attached to the military forces of the United States, together with his conveyance, personal baggage, and the military property of the United States in his charge, upon presentation of an order for duty requiring him, in the performance of his duties, to pass over the bridge.

The Senate amended the bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting a substitute. The Senate substitute provided that the exemption from toll should apply to civilian employees of the Army and Navy traveling on Government business under proper military authority, and to traffic of the War Department, Navy Department, Coast Guard, and certain civilian agencies, together with the conveyances being used in the performance of official duties, and all military and naval personnel and their dependents.

It will be noted that the Senate provision provided for a substantial broadening of the exemption from toll.

The substitute agreed to in conference provides for exemption from toll in the case of military and naval personnel, and civilian employees of the Army and Navy, when such personnel or employees are engaged in the performance of official duties requiring the use of the bridge, together with the conveyances being used by them in the performance of such duties. This exemption is to be granted upon the presentation and surrender at the toll lanes of an authorization certifying that the traffic in question is entitled to such right. Such authorizations are to be issued by appropriately designated military or naval officers, whose names and signatures are to be furnished to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District. The substitute also contains a provision authorizing the adoption of any other device or means, acceptable to the Bridge and Highway District, for establishing such right to use the bridge free of toll, and the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Bridge and Highway District are authorized to enter into agreements to secure the effective, convenient, and just exercise of such right. The substitute also contains a penalty provision, applicable to any person who secures or attempts to secure such exemption from toll, or an authorization, knowing that he is not entitled thereto, and to any person who signs or issues an authorization certifying to such right of exemption knowing that such right does not exist. The penalty provision makes the offense a misdemeanor, and provides for punishment by a fine of not more than $100 or imprisonment for not more than 10 days, or both such fine and imprisonment. The substitute provides that the act shall take effect 30 days after the date of enactment, in order to give time for the necessary preparations incident to operation under its provisions.

The practical effect of the enactment of the conference substitute will be to eliminate the present toll-free privilege in favor of military and naval personnel, and their dependents, when not traveling on official business but for their own convenience or pleasure. It would also eliminate the toll-free privilege in favor of civilian agencies, other than employees of the Army and Navy traveling on official business.

Based on the toll-free privilege exercised last year, the toll value of the free privilege amounted to $711,613.25 per year. Of this amount, $390,550 covered Army and Navy official business which still will have the toll-free privilege under this act, if it is enacted. The toll-free privilege eliminated on account of the use of the bridge by military personnel and dependents for their own convenience and pleasure would be $315,397. The amount of toll-free privilege eliminated in the case of civilian agencies would be $5,666.25.

On this basis the toll-free privilege remaining to the Army and Navy would be $390,550 and the toll-free privilege eliminated would be $321,063.25.

CLARENCE F. LEA,
VIRGIL CHAPMAN,
PEHR G. HOLMES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is a rather unusual procedure, but as I understand, in amending the law you are continuing to give the Army and Navy the right to use this bridge free of toll.

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. By this bill the State of California, or whatever subdivision controls the bridge, will be allowed to collect over $300,000 it is not now collecting. Who is going to pay this $300,000?

Mr. LEA. The individuals who use the bridge. There is no charge against the Federal Government, and it is not on official business.

Mr. COCHRAN. I assume there are many activities in that locality and that it is necessary for civilian employees to cross that bridge in order to get to work. Is the civilian employee who I understand now is not required to pay toll going to be required to pay toll to get to work and back to his home?

Mr. LEA. Civilian employees of the Army and Navy cross free. Other civilian employees would pay toll just like anybody else.

Mr. COCHRAN. Can the gentleman advise me if the Federal Government put any money into this bridge?

Mr. LEA. Not one dollar.

Mr. COCHRAN. No money at all?

Mr. LEA. Not one dollar.

Mr. COCHRAN. Had the Federal Government advanced any money then I feel its employees should be allowed to cross the bridge free of tolls when on official business. I am pleased the committee protected the Army and Navy.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF COMMISSION ON PHYSICAL STANDARDS FOR MILITARY SERVICE (H. DOC. NO. 452)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Commission of Physicians appointed to examine the requirements of admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. In addition to this report there are three rather voluminous appendixes. These, of course, should be made available to Senators and Representatives and any other persons wishing to obtain the information there.

I think that this report and these studies will be of definite interest to all.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 29, 1944.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES RECOMMENDING APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE (H. DOC. NO. 456)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report of the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to provide in the present emergency, and for so long thereafter as may be necessary, for the appointment, with the consent of the Senate, of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 29, 1944.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RECOMMENDING THE AMENDMENT OF THE ACT OF FEBRUARY 23, 1931, ENTITLED "AN ACT FOR THE GRADING AND CLASSIFICATION OF CLERKS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, AND PROVIDING COMPENSATION THEREFOR" (H. DOC. NO. 457)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 29, 1944.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—RECOMMENDING AMENDMENT OF ACT OF AUGUST 9, 1939, ENTITLED "AN ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE PRESIDENT TO RENDER CLOSER AND MORE EFFECTIVE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AMERICAN REPUBLICS"

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Acting Secretary of State, with an accompanying memorandum, to the end that the act approved August 9, 1939, entitled "An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American Republics" may be amended to permit the development of similar programs of mutual understanding and cooperation with other nations of the world.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 29, 1944.*

[Enclosures: Report; memorandum.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—VETO OF H. R. 205, CLAIMS FOR LOSS OR DAMAGE RESULTING FROM CONSTRUCTION OF INTRACOASTAL WATERWAY FROM MIAMI TO JACKSONVILLE, FLA. (H. DOC. NO. 453)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 205, a bill which would confer jurisdiction on the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons who sustained damage or loss allegedly resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement by the War Department of the Intracoastal Waterway from Miami to Jacksonville, Fla.

The improvement in question consisted of widening and deepening the Florida East Coast Canal, and connecting sections of the canal through naturally navigable bays and inlets. The record discloses that property owners along the canal, prior to the inauguration of this improvement work by the Federal Government, had protected their lands against invasion of the tides by means of artificial dikes and floodgates. In the process of widening the canal it was necessary to modify or reconstruct some of these diking systems, as a result of which it is said that considerable damage was sustained by certain property owners. It is also claimed that some lands were rendered unfit for cultivation by sea water as a result of the improvement.

In the first place, it is to be said that the work of modifying and reconstructing the dikes was done at Federal expense wherever the landowners permitted this to be done. It is also to be observed that under the terms of the act which authorized the improvement all easements and rights-of-way necessary for the project were to be provided by local interests. Any additional hazards which did not exist prior to the widening of the canal were compensated for by local interests.

Furthermore, it appears from reports furnished by the War Department as a result of its investigation that the damage to the adjacent property resulted either from acts of God or from failure on the part of riparian owners to utilize the reconstructed dikes as the foundation for other improvements needed to protect their land from the effects of salt water which invaded it after hurricane or unusual tidal elevations.

It is further to be noted that this damage, insofar as it may have been due to construction activities, was consequential in character and did not constitute a direct taking of property. The work in question was prosecuted under authority of an act of Congress as an aid to navigation on an important highway of interstate commerce. In the absence of a direct taking or physical invasion whereby owners have been deprived of their property, any damage resulting from an undertaking of this character is generally regarded as indirect and incidental to the legitimate exercise of a governmental power, and our courts consistently have held that the Government is not

legally required to make compensation therefor. Nor has it been the practice or policy of the Government, in undertaking projects or constructing works for the improvement of navigation, to assume or recognize any moral obligation for the consequential effects of such improvements. Especially is this so in those cases where as here the Government cannot fairly and reasonably be charged with neglect.

For these reasons I feel obliged to withhold my approval of the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1944.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the bill and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—MRS. RENZIE GRAHAM (H. DOC. NO. 455)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 550, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize and direct payment out of the public funds to Mrs. Renzie Graham of Athens, Ohio, widow of Renzie Graham, a deceased World War No. 1 veteran, the sum of $1,900 in full settlement of all claims against the United States Government for the death of the said Renzie Graham alleged to have resulted from injuries sustained by him during a period of hospitalization in the Veterans' Administration facility at Dayton, Ohio, due to the negligence of the staff of said facility in connection with treatment given by members of such staff, and for medical, hospital, traveling, and other expenses incurred and paid by Renzie Graham or by his widow by reason of the illness, death, and burial of the said Renzie Graham.

From the facts of record in this case, it appears that the disability which resulted in the death of Renzie Graham was deemed by the Veterans' Administration to have been connected with his military service, and from the date of his discharge therefrom, May 23, 1919, until his death, June 4, 1942, disability compensation in varying amounts was paid to said Renzie Graham, except for the period during which he was pursuing a course of vocational training and was in receipt of training allowance. At the time of his death he was receiving disability compensation at the rate of $100 per month. Thereafter, from June 5, 1942, death compensation benefits were awarded to his widow for herself and 2 children, the current rate being $78 per month. These benefits granted Mrs. Renzie Graham under public laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the death of her hubsand from disability of service origin will continue throughout her lifetime less the amount awarded for her children when their benefits cease, except in the event of her remarriage.

The House and Senate reports on this bill indicate that the proposed payment of $1,900 is intended to reimburse the widow of the veteran for medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her and her husband in consequence of his illness.

The Government has expended large amounts of money to provide medical and hospital care, free of charge to disabled veterans, and the Government laws and regulations properly provide that medical and hospital treatment secured elsewhere by veterans shall not be had at Government expense except in cases of emergency and in cases in which prior authorization for treatment by private physicians and private institutions is granted by the Veterans' Administration, for the reason that suitable facilities and treatment are not available in Veterans' Administration facilities. In order to give favorable consideration to a claim for reimbursement of unauthorized medical expenses, it must be shown that the emergency treatment was required for a service connected compensable disability when no Government facilities were feasibly available and delay would have been hazardous.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has advised me that adequate and excellent Veterans' Administration facilities were available for the care and treatment of the veteran, and for that reason the claims of Renzie Graham for reimbursement of unauthorized medical and hospital bills were disallowed. Under the circumstances, there is no apparent reason why the Government should assume the expenses incurred voluntarily by the veteran.

I am advised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that the facts in this case have been carefully considered and that there is no evidence of negligence or malpractice on the part of the staff while the said Renzie Graham was under treatment at the Veterans' Administration Facility, Dayton, Ohio, or at any other time while he was undergoing treatment as a beneficiary of the Veterans' Administration or its predecessor agencies. On the contrary, skin changes are the common result in repeated irradiations for malignant conditions and the treatment afforded Renzie Graham was the usual treatment under approved methods. When it is considered that the veteran lived more than 20 years after malignancy was suspected and for the greater portion of that time he was regularly and gainfully employed, it would seem that the treatment rendered produced favorable results.

For the reasons above stated I return the proposed bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1944.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the bill and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—CHARLES R. HOOPER (H. DOC. NO. 454)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 2075, a bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

The bill proposes payment of the sum of $5,000 to Charles R. Hooper, of Washington, D. C., in settlement of his claim against the United States by reason of a personal injury sustained, the loss of his left eye, while employed at the United States Navy Yard in Washington.

It appears that the claimant was employed by the Federal Government in the Navy Yard in Washington, D. C., from May 15, 1890, to October 1, 1895, as a blacksmith, and that, on August 1, 1894, while working in line of duty, his left eye was destroyed by a small piece of steel which was cast off of the hammer of a fellow workman.

After leaving the navy yard service in 1895, the claimant established and operated for approximately 10 years a private grocery business. On March 3, 1909, he entered the employ of the Government Printing Office, where he remained until his retirement on account of age, July 1, 1932. The claimant is now receiving an annuity of $1,146.72 under the Civil Service Retirement Act. Approximately 1 year before the claimant was retired for age, an application was made for his continuance in service for 1 additional year, and a certificate was presented in that connection, stating that the claimant "was physically able to perform his duties" in the position he occupied at the Government Printing Office.

Had the Employees' Compensation Act, which was approved September 7, 1916, been in effect at the time this injury occurred, it is assumed that the claimant would have been entitled to a measure of relief thereunder. The Employees' Compensation Act did not, however, have retroactive application and there are a great many other cases of employees who were injured or killed in the performance of duty prior to the enactment of the Employees' Compensation Act, in which cases the benefits of said act have not been available.

Approval of the bill under consideration would extend preferential treatment to the claimant not accorded in the many other cases of a similar or more serious character and would provide payment to the claimant without an appraisal of the amount to which he would be entitled, if any, in accordance with the standards of the Employees' Compensation Act.

I, therefore, regret that I find it necessary to return the bill without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1944.*

The SPEAKER. The objection of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the bill and accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am terribly disappointed that the President has vetoed such a meritorious claim as the claim of the widow of Renzie Graham, a World War soldier, who gave his life for his country. I know all the facts in the minutest detail with reference to this case. I knew Renzie Graham for years before he died, and I worked assiduously on his claim during his lifetime. There is absolutely no question in law or in fact but that this claim is just and meritorious in every respect.

It is not incumbent upon a claimant in order to be entitled to consideration by the Congress to show that every detail of the law has been complied with. In fact many claims, and most claims, against the Government are allowed because there is no law covering such case. There are many cases against the Government which are not covered by any law but which are just and right. If a claim comes within the letter of the law then the the law should control and the courts should adjudicate between the Government and the individual. This could be done through the Court of Claims or whatever court may have jurisdiction under the law governing such a case. The Congress is the agent of the people. If this agency of the people decides that one of the people is being abused or being discriminated against in any way unjustly and if that person cannot avail himself of a remedy through the court, his only forum is the Congress of the United States. The Congress recognizes this fact and has set up among its other committees a Committee on Claims. The Committee on Claims for the House of Representatives is composed of many able men. This committee took up the consideration of the Renzie Graham case and unanimously approved it in the sum of $1,900. The bill then was considered on the floor of the House and was passed by the House by unanimous consent. In other words there was not one single voice or vote in opposition to it. It was recognized by everyone as a worthy claim. The bill then went to the Senate and was considered by the Committee on Claims of the Senate. That committee after due deliberation recommended that the claim be paid. The Senate of the United States considered the matter and by unanimous consent, the bill was passed by that great body.

Now the President, who has always shown a great inclination to veto pension bills of all kinds, vetoes this bill and denies this woman and her children the allowance which the Congress and the Senate had unanimously found them entitled to. The President, or someone acting for him, has gone to great length in setting forth objections and excuses why this bill should not become a law, and the claim paid. Notwithstanding the fact that the President is the Chief Executive of the Nation, I feel that it is my duty to say that the President has again made a very serious mistake by being misled by some of his assistants. I cannot conceive how any person with the least spark of human sympathy could deny this meritorious claim.

Let me briefly outline the facts. Renzie Graham was an honorable, worthy American citizen. He was the head of a little family for which he fought and provided and died. His standing in the community for honor and integrity was without blemish.

Renzie Graham came out of the service of the First World War with a serious throat ailment. He served in France and had seen much hard service. The Government recognized immediately that he had been injured in the service and awarded him a small pension. He took his pension and continued to work when he could at his profession as auditor and officeman. His throat gradually grew worse and he availed himself of the facilities of the veterans' hospital, which the Congress of the United States had set aside for men like him who had offered their lives for their country and who had returned to their homes with broken health because of their services. The Government facilities treated him courteously as he was a man whose courteous actions encouraged courteous treatment in return. He made several visits to the veterans' hospital, and on one of these visits he was severely burned by an X-ray apparatus in the hands of an incompetent person. This burning was not malicious and it was not necessarily carelessness, but it was the work of an incompetent person. Had this been a private hospital at which Mr. Graham was a patient, he no doubt could have successfully prosecuted a damage suit for his injury. He chose not to do this but to continue his treatments. This bad burn, after many treatments by the veterans' hospital authorities and by private physicians, developed a malignancy and was pronounced cancer.

Mr. Graham, realizing his predicament, collected together his meager funds and decided to seek the services of the most eminent cancer surgeon in America. He visited Dr. Chevalier Jackson in Philadelphia on several occasions and was treated by that eminent surgeon. He paid part of his expenses and the Government assisted with some of his expense. Dr. Jackson, through his masterful skill, was able to prolong Graham's life for a few years. During all those years, however, he continued his treatments, as his funds would permit, with local physicians and with the veterans' facilities and with returning occasionally to the eminent surgeon. Having spent his bonus and every dollar he could earn and spare from his family, who were badly in need of more than they were receiving, he gradually grew worse. His employer continued him on his job when he was not able to do the job as it should have been done. As a drowning man fighting for his life, he went to Columbus and consulted the leading cancer surgeon in the State of Ohio. This gentleman, being sympathetic as most great doctors and surgeons are, diagnosed his case without any consideration of remuneration, and told him frankly that his condition was serious and that his time was short, and upon inquiry, having ascertained that the great Philadelphia surgeon had previously operated on Mr. Graham, he immediately advised Mr. Graham that he should by all means return to Philadelphia immediately. Mr. Graham proceeded to his home in Athens, Ohio, from Columbus, Ohio, and contacted the hospital at Philadelphia; and they, remembering him well, encouraged him to come immediately and that they would have a place for him. Everyone seemed to love and respect this deserving man. Before he started for Philadelphia, he communicated with the American Legion and also with my office in Washington. As soon as we received his communication we contacted the Veterans' Administration in Washington, and they in turn contacted the hospital in Philadelphia. The medical authorities at the hospital diagnosed his case exactly as the Columbus surgeon had done and immediately proceeded to perform another serious operation in order to save and extend his life. Graham remained in the hospital for a number of weeks. and when he was able he returned to his home in Athens. His physical condition was such that it was necessary for his wife to accompany him, and it was necessary to expend considerable money in making travel and hotel and other arrangements. Graham returned to his home, where he lived for several months after the operation last above referred to. During that time he presented his claim for reimbursement to cover the expense thus incurred. It would seem that there could be absolutely no reason why this expense should not have been paid. Similar expenses had been paid and Mr. Graham had notified the proper authorities and the proper authorities had also been notified by my office. The claim was not paid. Renzie Graham died, and his widow was compelled to incur reasonable funeral expenses.

All these expenses which Mr. Graham had incurred, plus the funeral expenses incurred by his widow, are covered by the sum of $1,900.

The only possible objection to the payment of this claim was that the Veterans' Administration claimed to have had a regulation which was to the effect that except in emergency cases, the Veterans' Administration would not reimburse for traveling expenses unless the veterans had gotten written approval in advance for the incurring of said expenses. By way of credit to the medical department of the Veterans' Administration, with whom I consulted, as soon as Mr. Graham could notify our office and with whom I consulted after this claim had been prepared and presented, I will say

that I feel sure that every medical officer in the Veterans' Administration would have interposed no objection whatever to the payment of this claim. Having made this regulation they naturally felt that they would not in writing approve an item contrary to the regulation regardless of the fact that they had by implication encouraged the expenditure. In other words, nobody anywhere, except the President, has shown any inclination to oppose this claim. That being the case it meets all the requirements of a claim that should be presented to Congress. In other words, if the law is uncertain and if the regulations are uncertain and if the conduct of the Government officials is uncertain, all these uncertainties weigh as nothing over and against the certainties of the fact that this man had given his life for his country and that his wife and little children were asking to be recompensed from the hands of a great and magnificent Government to the small amount of money actually spent by the soldier in an effort to extend his life and by his family in burying his body.

I repeat that this is a perfect case for consideration by the Congress. The Congress considered it perfectly and thoroughly and unanimously. The Senate then considered it perfectly and thoroughly and unanimously. But the President, failing to see justice through a thin flimsy veil of uncertainty, interposes his great and powerful veto.

Just a few days ago the President interposed his veto on an issue of national importance which the Congress and the Senate resented by overwhelming vote and indicated to him clearly that he had overstepped his bounds. You might ask me why therefore I do not bring parliamentary procedure to test the President's veto in this case and to attempt to override it. Justice and equity would demand that we should take such steps but even though this is a land of the people and by the people sometimes it seems that it is not altogether and all the time for the people. I have decided as a representative of this widow and her family that probably the best course is to await that day when we shall have another President and a different President in the White House. Personally I hope that day is not far distant. If I am a Member of Congress at that time, I shall surely see to it that this case and this claim will be presented to another President in the hope that he can view the matter with compassion and can consider all the facts and see through flimsy uncertainties.

In the meantime, as a word of comfort to Mrs. Graham and her children, let me recite this verse of poetry:

Right forever on the scaffold,
Wrong forever on the throne,
But the scaffold sways the future,
For behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadows
Keeping watch above His own.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday business this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand there has been a little change in the program for today and tomorrow. Will the gentleman tell the House what that is?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I announced that a bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act would be taken up following consideration of the so-called Lemke bill. The chairman of the committee having charge of this bill has asked me to have the bill come up for consideration Thursday, if possible, instead of today. I am informed that he has conferred with some other members of his committee. The program is such that that can be done, therefore the bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act will be taken up and considered on Thursday.

The other bill, H. R. 2985, involving trustee processes and so forth will come up for consideration tomorrow as previously announced.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the Frazier-Lemke bill will be the only one to be considered today?

Mr. McCORMACK. That will be the only one to be considered today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article recently appearing in the Boston Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Waldon Citizen-Herald, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include comments from certain newspapers and commentators.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH.]

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial from the Chicago Sun, also one from the Times and also one additional article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some statistical data concerning the Missouri River Basin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FARM MORTGAGE MORATORIUM

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 449 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4166) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as usual, I shall later yield 30 minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], who is always interested in the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the consideration of H. R. 4166, a bill extending section 75 of the National Bankruptcy Act enacted in 1933, which was passed in the interest of approximately 90 percent of the then distressed farmers of the country. The principal purpose of the bill is to extend for an additional period of 4 years the time within which petitions may be filed under the farm-mortgage moratorium law. Section 75 of the act was designed to relieve distressed farmers who were in default in their farm mortgages and to relieve agriculture from the effects of the deflation in land values resulting from the depression. It permitted a scaling of secured debts and an extension of same by agreement. Failing agreement, it gave to the farmers an absolute stay, the right of retention of the mortgaged property during the stay period, and permission to repurchase the property at an appraised value.

The rule provides for one hour of general debate, after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill before us further provides for the appointment of conciliation commissioners in the district courts of the various States, who will pass upon the applications. It also provides for a fee of $25 to be paid upon the filing of the petition, but limits the fee paid to the conciliation commissioners to $10 per diem.

Mr. Speaker, in 1930, 1931, and 1932 due to the unfortunate conditions that existed throughout the Nation, farmers

were losing their farms, their mortgages were being foreclosed and sold at auction at extremely low prices. In 1933, upon the recommendation of President Roosevelt, in the hope that we could save their farms and reduce the interest on their indebtedness, this law was enacted. I voted for it. I am pleased that I can now report this resolution to further extend that beneficial act which aims to help the few farmers—and I say "few" advisedly—who may be in distress at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I have observed the efforts of the Republicans to avoid at any time a comparison of the condition of the farmers during the 12 years of Republican administration, especially those of the last 4 years, namely, 1928 to 1932, with their condition today, and particularly of the prices they are now receiving for their products. They consume much time in daily discussion and in order to mislead the farmers and the people, they continuously harp about bureaucracy in Washington and the large expenditures of the Government. I agree with them that a great deal of money has been spent not only for war purposes, but we have also appropriated for agriculture in the past 11 years, taking everything into consideration, upward of $15,000,000,000. The annual sums appropriated for agriculture in each of the last 11 years have equaled the yearly appropriations of all departments—the entire cost of running the Government—that were authorized beginning with my first year of service in 1906 through 1917. I think on reflection the farmers should and will appreciate what has been done for them by this administration since their unfortunate plight at the close of the Republican administration in 1933. I do not feel that they will listen at this time to a few professional farm leaders who are attempting to minimize what has been done for them by this administration.

There are a few gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, and even Nebraska, who discount the facts and figures which I have presented as to the benefits which have accrued to the farmers under this administration and attempt to chide me as to my knowledge of farming. For their benefit let me state, though representing a consumer district, I was born on a farm and am familiar with the work and conditions of diversified farming, and, perhaps, have farmed more than all of them combined.

Let us compare the conditions which many of you gentlemen on the other side are trying to forget, those conditions that existed in 1930, 1931, and 1932, when a vast majority of farmers and people were losing their homes through foreclosures. I do not blame you for trying to forget the conditions that existed during those years when farmers with shotguns were pursuing sheriffs and even judges who were carrying out the orders of the courts to sell their farms and homes on the auction block I wish to refresh the failing memory of the gentlemen on the other side—yes, and some on our side—as to the prices of farm products in 1932 and to compare them with the prices of today. I have compiled a short table of figures and statistics submitted to me by the Bureau of Farm Economics, as follows:

Farm prices	1932	1943
Wheat	$0.38 per bushel	$1.19 per bushel.
Corn	$0.31 per bushel	$0.90 per bushel.
Oats	$0.15 per bushel	$0.55 per bushel.
Rye	$0.28 per bushel	$0.64 per bushel.
Barley	$0.22 per bushel	$0.70 per bushel.
Beans (dried)	$1.97 per bushel	$5.37 per bushel.
Cattle	$4.25 per hundredweight (4¼ cents per pound).	$12.36 per hundredweight (12⅓ cents per pound).
Hogs	$3.34 per hundredweight (3⅓ cents per pound).	$14.63 per hundredweight (14⅗ cents per pound).
Calves	$4.95 per hundredweight (5 cents per pound).	$14.18 per hundredweight (14⅕ cents per pound).
Sheep	$2.19 per hundredweight (2⅕ cents per pound).	$7.09 per hundredweight (7⅒ cents per pound).

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe anybody can truthfully deny that today the farmers of the United States are in better position than they have ever been in the history of our country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No, I cannot yield. The gentlemar knows that what I say is true, so I cannot enlighten him. He does not need any enlightenment on it because he knows that what I have stated are incontrovertible facts. He knows we have more money in the country banks today than ever before, and the bankers do not know what to do with it. In many instances they refuse to accept it.

I feel that in view of the fact that most of the mortgages have been paid off, and that the interest on the balances has been greatly reduced, there will be no real need for this legislation. However, to prove my desire to help even the few unfortunates who may have suffered, not due to neglect on our part in aiding them with legislation in every possible way but due to conditions over which some of them perhaps have not had control, I am indeed pleased that I can again bring in a rule making in order the consideration of a bill that will be of aid to the few remaining distressed farmers.

There cannot be any opposition to this from the urban sections always support bill as I have said because the Members legislation in the interest of agriculture and there will not be one who will object, and how there might be anyone representing the farm districts who would oppose it I do not know. So I take it for granted that there will be a unanimous vote for the rule as well as for the bill.

Mr. Speaker, my reason in directing attention to the present-day conditions of the farmers as compared to those existing under former President Hoover's administration is to show that nearly all urban Members have cooperated and favored legislation seeking to aid and better the condition of the real farmers and growers. In contrast, we find that the Members from the agricultural sections, whenever legislation is up for consideration to benefit and improve the condition of the wage earners and masses, unfortunately fail to reciprocate.

I feel that it is proper for me to call attention from time to time to the prosperity of the farmers in comparison to the struggle for a decent living of the white-collar worker and those people who are obliged to live on fixed incomes. That is the reason for my vote in favor of the subsidy bill to hold the ever increasing cost of living down for people of meager incomes in order that they may maintain themselves and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I have given the foregoing facts and information that I feel cannot be honestly contradicted, in the hope that they will be taken to heart by the representatives of the agricultural sections to the end that they will in the future give real consideration and support to legislation affecting the well-being of the wage earners, white-collar workers, and people of small fixed incomes who live in urban centers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, as usual our most brilliant chairman of the Committee on Rules has outlined the principles in his always correct manner. It is perhaps unusual that one from the pavements, one from the bricks of Chicago, should be in accord with one from down-State Illinois, from a district which is perhaps the most diversified farming district in the United States.

The principal purpose of this bill is to extend for an additional period of 4 years the time within which petitions may be filed under the farm-mortgage-moratorium law. An extension of the law was made in 1940 for a period of 4 years.

Section 75 of the National Bankruptcy Act was enacted into law in 1933. It was designed to relieve distressed farmers who were in default in their farm mortgages and to relieve agriculture from the effects of the deflation in land values resulting from the depression. It permitted a scaling of secured debts and an extension of same by agreement. Failing agreement, it gave to the farmer an absolute stay, the right of retention of the mortgaged property during the stay period, and permission to repurchase the property at an appraised value.

In this extension for another 4 years there are some minor changes. They will be outlined to you by the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has had extensive hearings on whether or not there should be an extension of this act.

I do not believe anyone objects to the rule, but I should point out to the Members that the Committee on the Judiciary, after holding extensive hearings, by a vote of 9 to 8 reported this measure

for the consideration of the House. Due to the fact that it was reported by such a close vote, I ask that the Members study this measure carefully, listen to the debate, and give the measure the fair and honest consideration it so justly deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in these remarks two news stories, one from the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of February 21, 1944, and another one from the same paper of February 22, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. This bill as reported would continue the so-called Frazier-Lemke farm moratorium law, with certain amendments, for a period of 4 years. I know of little opposition to a continuance of the law for the time being. However, many of us feel that 4 years is too long. I shall, therefore, vote for an amendment making the period 2 years.

This farm mortgage moratorium law makes applicable to the farmer the benefits of the national bankruptcy law. It is the outgrowth of conditions existing throughout a number of years whereby the agricultural industry was not on an equality with other industries. Its economy had suffered, and many tillers of the soil found themselves burdened with farm mortgages and other indebtedness to such an extent that it was hopeless to even attempt to pay out. The same condition existed with some other groups. In these circumstances, a new concept of bankruptcy was embraced by the Congress and eventually held constitutional by the Supreme Court. So, the farm mortgage law is constitutional.

Now, the principal question before the Congress is to determine whether the bankruptcy privileges made available to the farmer in times of distress, as emergency relief, should be permitted to lapse. My own view is that there is enough good in this law to warrant its continuance for a period of 2 years, with the thought in mind that during that period a resurvey of the law will be made, and, if it is decided to make it permanent, then many perfecting amendments must be adopted. I shall, therefore, vote to continue the law for the 2-year period.

May I call the attention of the membership to page 4 of the committee report. Here will be found the compliance with the Ramseyer rule. In short, turn to page 4 and it will readily be seen just what the proposed changes in the existing law are. These proposals are printed in italics while the remainder of the section appears in Roman type.

Mr. Speaker, as stated by the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] this law has undoubtedly been of great help and has accomplished much good in communities where it has been administered honestly, conscientiously, and as contemplated by the Congress when it was enacted. However, it is difficult to make the administration of any law foolproof. There are mercenary, unscrupulous, conniving, and merciless racketeers found in all walks of life. In certain sections of the country, certain individuals belonging to the above class have been exploiting the Government and the unfortunate farmers in connection with the administration of this law. Indeed, a farm mortgage moratorium racket has grown up in a few communities. The principal offenders are naturally to be found in the State where the greatest number of farmers have sought relief under the law. There is no honor attached to seeking refuge under bankruptcy law, getting one's honest debts scaled down, and compelling the trusting creditor to accept less than the debtor had in good conscience promised to pay. Nevertheless certain mortgagors who would not otherwise think of such a procedure, have yielded to the solicitation and persuasion of these racketeers. Indeed, this practice has become so common that in the State of North Dakota numerous criminal prosecutions in the courts have been had and, as a result of this bad administration, the law is in many places in bad repute. The solicitors, the racketeers, and the grafters who prey upon the farmers for profit under this law cannot be condemned too strongly, and it is refreshing to know that some of the officials in the State of North Dakota are now opening the jails to these culprits.

In the beginning of these remarks I obtained permission to include the accounts of two such prosecutions. These prosecutions are current and both cases were tried during the present month. In the first case, the defendant was convicted by a jury. In the second case, the defendant pleaded guilty and came through with a clean statement to the court.

I call particular attention to the fact that in the one case the newspaper report quotes the statement of the defendant, who was a "solicitor," who knew what he was talking about, and whose statement has not been denied. The newspaper reports are as follows:

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of February 21, 1944]

COGHLAN CONVICTED ON 11 OF 13 COUNTS

A Federal district court jury Monday found Joseph Coghlan, Bismarck attorney, guilty of 11 of 13 counts charging him with making false entries in Frazier-Lemke farm bankruptcy schedules and concealing property of Frazier-Lemke petitioners while acting as attorney and agent for the petitioners.

Coghlan was convicted on seven of nine counts of making false entries and four counts of concealing property.

The jury announced it had reached a verdict at 1:58 p. m., after more than 45 hours deliberation and the verdict was read at 2:05 p. m.

Judge John Caskie Collet granted Defense Attorney Francis Murphy until March 2 for any motions or other proceedings in the case.

Coghlan, 64, went on trial Thursday morning and the case went to jury at 4:35 p. m., Saturday. The maximum penalty on each count is 5 years in prison or $5,000 fine or both.

[From the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Tribune of February 22, 1944]

SOLICITOR TELLS OF HIS FRAZIER-LEMKE CASE WORK

Methods of soliciting Frazier-Lemke farm-bankruptcy cases, property appraisals made after dark, agreements and disagreements over splitting of fees, formation of a "protective association against unscrupulous creditors," and a solicitor's own theory of weaknesses in the Frazier-Lemke law itself—

All these are told in a 7,000-word statement submitted by O. W. Bergan, formerly of Crosby, N. Dak., and Fergus Falls, Minn., to Judge John Caskie Collet when Bergan pleaded guilty in Federal district court here Saturday to charges of conspiracy to corruptly administer the Frazier-Lemke Act.

Here, largely in direct quotations from Bergan's statement, are the highlights of his story:

MET WITH BRAATELIEN

Bergan begins his story with a recitation of a meeting in the fall of 1941 with Olaf Braatelien, his cousin and at that time a Frazier-Lemke conciliation commissioner.

(Braatelien and Sam Semingson, both of Crosby, were convicted February 7 by a Minot Federal court jury of conspiracy to corruptly administer the Frazier-Lemke Act. Indicted with Braatelien and Semingson were Bergan, a fugitive at the time the Minot trial opened, and three men found innocent by the Minot jury—Leo Mahoney, of Columbus, and Giles Ballard and Martin Fossum, both of Ambrose.)

Says Bergan of that meeting with Braatelien:

"Mr. Braatelien mentioned that there would be a large number of Frazier-Lemke cases in Divide County as soon as the farmers would get some money to finance them. He also stated that A. C. Townley (one of the founders of the Nonpartisan League and reputed to be one of the first solicitors of Frazier-Lemke cases in the State) had spent about 2 weeks in the county soliciting cases, but had left because farmers had not yet any money with which to start them * * *."

WANTED TO PAY DEBT

"He ((Braatelien) mentioned that Mr. Townley had made an agreement with Mr. E. A. Tannas (a Crosby attorney), to handle his cases for $50 each. Mr. Braatelien also stated that he wished he could get a large number of cases so that he could pay off the delinquent taxes and save his home."

Bergan then relates his agreeing to solicit cases, tells of meeting Tannas, and continues:

"We made an agreement whereby he (Tannas) was to receive a fee of $50 per case and that cases so handled would thereafter belong to him. In other words, I was through with the cases after he commenced making out the petitions."

Bergan describes his methods of solicitation:

"I was armed with tax lists and mortgage abstracts covering the territory in which I worked and approached the farm problems in a definite and businesslike manner. I asked the farmer approached if he owed much and if he could pay it. In all instances the farmer would reply that his debts were hopeless and that he never could pay them and that his children could not pay them if they were to shoulder them.

STUCK TO SYSTEM

"I would take a slip of paper and roughly put down his assets and his liabilities and would then tell him whether he had a case or not and if he had a case whether it was a fair case or a good one. I told the farmer who had no real estate that it would not be worth it to go through unless he could scale down a thousand dollars or more. I told the farmer who owned real estate that it would not be worth it unless he could scale down

more than $2,000. This standard in my work was adhered to at all times.

"If I saw that they made meritorious cases I obtained a bonded abstract covering all their properties and delivered same to the attorney. When I brought the petitioner to the attorney, he had merely made a synopsis of his case and in most cases this was done verbally. Many of them, in fact most of them, did not know how much they really owed until an abstract was obtained. When the petitioner was brought to the attorney my services and responsibilities ceased.

Bergan said Congressman LEMKE was one of the speakers at a meeting at Columbus of a "protective association" to protect petitioners from "unscrupulous creditors."

CRITICIZES APPRAISALS

Bergan's statement is particularly critical of methods of appraisal of property in Frazier-Lemke proceedings. He declares:

"The method of appraising property was crude, incomplete, and exceedingly primitive. I frequently criticized appraisals on that ground and called attention to the seriousness of the work and why it should be complete and carefully made. I suggested to Braatelien that I would compile a form (for making appraisals) that would be more comprehensive and thorough.

"I also suggested that appraisers be paid a larger fee and make from 2 to 3 appraisals per day instead of 8, 9, and 10 as sometimes was the case.

"I know of appraisals made after dark. I know of appraisals made without going near the property. I know of appraisals made by conference miles away from the property."

COMPETENT MEN

"The men selected to make the appraisals were generally competent and honest men and no reflection is cast upon them. They should have been instructed to do the work thoroughly and carefully and required to fill out blanks that would properly cover the properties. I was surprised that creditors did not object to the manner in which the appraisals were made. It looked like a hit-and-miss procedure to me with the latter predominating."

Of transferrals of property in connection with Frazier-Lemke cases Bergan says:

"At no time did I suggest transfer of property just before filing, but I was often asked about it. I found the situation in many instances like this.

"For many years the farm income in North Dakota had been meager. The boys and girls who stayed home with their parents and worked on the farm had not been getting any remuneration for their work and not having any money with which to pay them, they had been allotted calves and pigs, cows and horses, and in some cases machinery."

NO BILL OF SALE

"There was no transfer such as bill of sale but the transfer was still good. It would have been unjust and unfair to list such property in the petitioner's name when it actually belonged to somebody else. The appearance might look questionable, but the facts should rule in such cases."

Elsewhere in his statement, Bergan comments:

"May I add here that I observed in my contact with farmers * * * it was a practice of Federal agencies to suggest transfer of personal property after they received their claim or a compromise settlement even if it would destroy a claim of another Federal agency.

"I even found that representatives of the Federal land bank had assisted farmers in transferring real estate to sons or daughters so that the seed- and feed-loan offices could not obtain payment of their claims which in some cases run into thousands of dollars by way of judgments.

"The farmers have learned a lot about how to escape payments of debts by representatives of Federal farm agencies."

Of the Frazier-Lemke law itself, Bergan asserts:

"Too much has been claimed for the Frazier-Lemke Act. It lacks substance teeth. Because of its loopholes, controversial and contradictory phases it should not remain on the statute books because it deceives farmers and leads them to expect much more relief than is possible to receive even under a generous and liberal interpretation of the law."

Bergan said that he and Braatelien had disagreed on appraisals and valuations in several cases but "Good will prevailed at all times even under the tongue of criticism." Bergan said he did not pay Braatelien any money on any case and "there was no agreement as to cases or fees."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but extend my appreciation and thanks to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] who fearlessly, honestly, and courageously gives information and expresses his views on any legislation always with the intention of not only aiding our country but in the interests of the general good. I hope that he will continue with that great intelligence and ability that he possesses, in the future as he has in the past, to enlighten the membership.

I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] and ask that he may proceed out of order.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, Palmer Hoyt assures America that "O. W. I. is no propaganda agency." This was the headline to an article by Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Portland Oregonian, and a former director of O. W. I., in the Washington Star of February 20.

After reading this article my mind went back to just the day before, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] made a speech to the House in which he alleges that the O. W. I. was a propaganda agency.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to correct the gentleman. He cannot quote any remarks of mine where I said it was a political propaganda agency.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I will not quarrel with the gentleman from Ohio as to what he said in his speech. If he will read it, he said, "They are sending political propaganda to the soldiers."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I said they were sending only one side of the political issues. I stand on that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. And that is political propaganda.

The difference in opinion between these two Republicans intrigued me and caused me to investigate the charges made by the gentleman from Ohio in his speech of Friday, February 18, which is on page 1878 of the RECORD.

My investigation convinced me that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was badly misinformed in the statements which he made to the House, and that some of them were made when, if he had taken the trouble to investigate, he would have found that the facts upon which his statements were based were without foundation.

I will endeavor to take some of his statements and answer them. The gentleman from Ohio [BROWN] stated that the message of the President on the soldier vote legislation was "sent in its entirety to the armed forces by every possible means of distribution through several agencies of the Government." My investigation shows that, according to a standing agreement with the Press Association, O. W. I. files full texts of all statements, speeches, or messages of the President when they are available in advance. In keeping with this agreement, the O. W. I. filed the text of the President's message on the soldier-vote bill for all the news services to pick up. The text also was sent to Algiers in accordance with a request from the Psychological Warfare Branch of the Army for all soldier-vote material, but also included in the file was a description of the vote in the House of Representatives, showing that Members had stood up to be counted. In O. W. I.'s office in New Delhi, the news file contained 300 words concerning the President's message and 200 words concerning the actual vote, including the fact that the roll was called.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman give us the date that that was sent to New Delhi?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; but I can get it for the gentleman very easily.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Did the gentleman check with the War Department News Service and inquire whether or not they had sent a true report of the matter?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will give that to the gentleman directly. Notwithstanding, let me remind him, in speaking about the O. W. I.——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I was speaking of all agencies of Government. You just quoted the words. You ought to understand the words you quote; I hope you can.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman will find out. If the gentleman could investigate as well as he can make statements, what a wonderful man he would be.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman would understand as well as he can talk, it might make a difference. The gentleman can make many claims.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman from North Carolina has more to say.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from North Carolina can sometimes criticize.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Will the gentleman from Ohio read his own speech? Do you not know what is in your own speech? Who wrote it for you, if you cannot remember what is in it?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Read the quotation again and you will understand it. Read it again. Read the quotation you just made.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Notwithstanding that this had happened, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] stated, "That news concerning the action of the minority leader, Mr. MARTIN, in making a roll-call vote on the soldier-vote bill possible was not given to the armed forces by these same Government agencies," the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] further stated that the statement of Senator GUFFEY charging that "an unholy alliance" was blocking a Federal soldier-vote bill was broadcast quite freely to the armed forces overseas but that the reply of Senator BYRD to Senator GUFFEY was not mentioned. A check of the scripts of the four major shortwave broadcasts in English, French, Italian, and German shows that the Office of War Information did not broadcast anything in regard to the President's veto message, the roll call, or the statements of Senators GUFFEY and BYRD.

In psychological warfare it would be absurd for the O. W. I. to consider that congressional action on the soldier vote legislation was good propaganda material for transmission abroad. For after all is said and done, the information that is sent overseas by O. W. I. reaches people in Allied, neutral, enemy and enemy-occupied countries and such information should assist in the war effort of the United States. The fact of the matter is that the soldier vote news was treated very lightly, or side-stepped whenever possible, because you and I see that it is a very embarrassing topic to talk about with other people.

From hearing Mr. BROWN'S speech, or reading it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, one would infer that the O. W. I. broadcasts to the members of the armed forces or sends to the armed forces publications or other information material. This is not true. The O. W. I. does not broadcast to members of the armed forces, nor does it send to the armed forces any publications or other material. The information services of the armed forces, including the Army papers such as the Yank and Stars and Stripes do have access to the O. W. I. news files just as they have access to the files of the Press Association.

Another glaring error the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] committed was when he said that members of the armed forces "are also getting, as a natural circumstance, the propaganda that is being directed to the people of the foreign countries." Then—for what purpose I do not know—the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] stated "further it is likewise true that our armed forces are exposed to the propaganda disseminated to the peoples of foreign lands and published in the press or heard over the radio in the lands in which they are located." Now, if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] had taken the trouble to investigate, he would have found that the broadcasts from this country are sent by short wave, and it is extremely doubtful that there are many members of our armed forces who have access to short-wave receivers. In addition to this, O. W. I.'s short-wave broadcasts are sent in nearly 30 languages, only one of which is English. I will venture to say that very few American soldiers, sailors, or marines have any knowledge whatever of Chinese, Russian, Arabic, and 25 of the other languages. If they had a short-wave receiver they would get the broadcast in English.

Another statement in the speech of my friend from Ohio shows that he was evidently badly misinformed when he stated that the "O. W. I. not only controls the flow of news to our soldiers, but it also controls the form and kind of much of their entertainment." The truth of the matter is that the O. W. I. has no control whatever over the quantity or quality of the news or entertainment going to the armed forces. Such control is exercised entirely outside of O. W. I. As has been stated by me before, the O. W. I. news files are available to those supplying news to the armed forces, who may pick and choose such news as they will. News and entertainment broadcasts to the armed forces go out over facilities under lease to O. W. I., but O. W. I. has nothing to do with the preparation or presentation of news and entertainment programs.

Now, then, we come to the point in the speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] which caused him to make the speech on Friday the 18th. He seemed to have a grievance because his friend, and his Governor, Mr. Bricker of Ohio, was not properly boosted as a candidate for the Presidency and his full speech at the Lincoln Day dinner in Washington sent out instead of just the part of his speech in regard to the United States' future foreign policy. Naturally O. W. I. selected the Governor's statements concerning foreign policy to send overseas because that is what people in foreign nations are interested in.

It does not make any difference who is nominated on either ticket for President of the United States because every man here knows that unless a short ballot—a Federal ballot law is passed by this Congress—that very few of the soldiers or very few members of our armed forces who are abroad will have the opportunity of voting for anyone. There is only one thing that can be done to give the armed forces the privilege of voting and that is to adopt the short form of ballot as provided in the Worley bill, and my friend from Ohio and his friends should bend their efforts toward having a law passed in order to give our people a right and a chance to vote.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does not the gentleman think there was another reason why the O. W. I. did not want to mention that the Governor came out for an antistrike bill, and condemned very properly and very bitterly the policies of this administration relative to domestic matters?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Well, answering that, I would say after reading the Gallup poll last Sunday and noticing that the gentleman's candidate was away down at the bottom of the list, it would not make much difference what he said.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Of course, he is a candidate in a free convention, not in a controlled convention.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Now after leaving the political cause of his grievance, as you will note from his speech the gentleman from Ohio then seeks to discredit the O. W. I. still further by saying that the O. W. I. is a "hodgepodge of ideological hues. There are some reds, pinks, and pastels down there." He further stated that the O. W. I. employs some aliens and states that these aliens certainly have their own factional ties. Then he further states, "Our State Department may or may not have policies dealing with the various foreign countries. It makes little or no difference to the multihued ideologists of the O. W. I. They have their own varied and conflicting policies."

I was surprised when I heard this statement from the gentleman from Ohio because it showed that my friend was not attempting in his speech to really make a just criticism of the O. W. I. but that he was attempting to spread propaganda—and I might say propaganda against the present administration and in favor of the Republican Party.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The facts are that it is true that the O. W. I. does employ some aliens. The Congress granted them the authority for doing so. We all know that in sending out propaganda in foreign languages that we must have language experts to handle this propaganda, but as to the "reds, pinks, and pastels" it should be known to all, and especially to the gentleman from Ohio, that in common with all employees, aliens employed by O. W. I. are cleared by the regular Government investigating agencies, including the F. B. I., the Civil Service Commission, and O. W. I.'s own security board. For the information of the gentleman from Ohio, I might remind him that Admiral R. P. McCullough, United States Navy, retired, is head of this Board. All persons sent overseas are also cleared with the Intelligence Services of the Army and Navy and by the Department of State.

Of course, the "multihued aliens" employed by O. W. I. may be expected to have their own political, or factional views, but when they write or speak for O. W. I. they do so in conformity with carefully prepared directives, and what they write or say is controlled and monitored to see that they do not depart from

the line laid down by the directives. Nor does the Office of War Information set its own policy distinct from the foreign policy laid down by the Department of State. On the contrary, policy directives are established by a group which includes representatives of the Department of State, and, in addition, representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So the O. W. I. policy is, as it should be, in accordance with both the foreign policy and the military policy of the United States. It might be well for anyone who wishes some information to read the statement of Mr. Robert E. Sherwood, Director of the Overseas Branch of O. W. I., which appeared in the New York Times of February 21 on page 5. In that statement Mr. Sherwood points out that O. W. I.'s principal task at the present time is to supply men and material for the Psychological Warfare Branch of the forces in the western European theater in the same manner that it has, and still is, supplying men and material for the Psychological Warfare Branch of the armed forces in the Mediterranean theater. Just as O. W. I. has combat teams at the fighting front in Italy, and scorces of men behind the lines in Italy, Sicily, and north Africa, so it will have combat teams and supporting staffs with the forces which carry out the invasion of western and northern Europe. These men are in uniform, and they face the same dangers that are faced by the fighting men whom they accompany.

May I not quote part of Mr. Hoyt's statement which I refer to which was in the Washington Star on February 19:

O. W. I. has two branches——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield there before he takes up that subject?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will you advise the House whether or not Admiral McCullough has insisted on a number of the employees of O. W. I. being discharged and has had difficulty in getting the O. W. I. to discharge certain persons?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will advise the gentleman that unless they are cleared through Admiral McCullough and the F. B. I.——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will you answer that question, please?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will tell you they cannot be cleared.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. They are appointed first, and in a number of instances Admiral McCullough has insisted on their being discharged but has had difficulty in getting them discharged—persons whose loyalty has been questioned. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman can take his own time and give names if he wishes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But the gentleman from North Carolina is making some very definite statements. The gentleman should be able to stand up and defend them. I realize, of course, that his speech has been prepared for him by somebody in O. W. I. I am certain of that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Who prepared the gentleman's speech for him?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am able to write my own; but the gentleman admits that they wrote his for him.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do not admit it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman does not admit it?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No; I deny it. I wrote it myself.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But material in it was furnished the gentleman. For instance, take that word "ideologist."

Mr. BULWINKLE. I got the facts.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am asking the gentleman if he wrote that word "ideologist?"

Mr. BULWINKLE. I think I did.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman thinks he did. Now, is the gentleman sure whether he did or not? Let us be frank about this thing.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Now, what is wrong with the gentleman from Ohio? The gentleman made a statement here last week.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am asking about the difficulties Admiral McCullough has had.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman from Ohio made a speech here last week in which he made certain statements. He read a speech here for 30 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It was 22; the gentleman is wrong. Again he is exaggerating.

Mr. BULWINKLE. All right. I exaggerated in this instance just like the gentleman did in his speech.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further because my time is about out. I am quoting from Palmer Hoyt. But before doing so, let me remind the gentleman from Ohio that the word "ideologist" was used by the gentleman from Ohio in his speech on Friday, February 18, 1944, on the floor of the House. And I was quoting from his own remarks, which he failed to recall.

1. The Domestic Branch, whose duties we have discussed, and the Overseas Branch, which is designed primarily to make a case for American armies and American aims, both in enemy countries and in the satellite areas. Totalitarian countries where minds have been conditioned for years by untruths and half truths have come increasingly to regard information from American sources as reliable This is a healthy situation, and it is to be presumed that the reorganized Overseas Branch of O. W. I. will make even further progress along this front. Despite the criticism heaped on the Overseas Branch, the Army has often given public credit to its work, notably in Sicily; General McClure made the flat statement that O. W. I. broadcasts and leaflets distributed behind enemy lines saved thousands of American lives.

One of the most thorough reporters in Washington, Roscoe Drummond of the Christian Science Monitor, went over thousands of words sent out by the Army News Service to American soldiers around the world. He rated the Army News Service almost perfect for impartiality. That is an answer to those who suspect the Army of trying to influence the votes of Americans in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this opportunity to speak on the Office of War Information, not because in my opinion it needs any defense, but because having been one of the members of the armed forces of the United States with the American Expeditionary Forces in the last war, I saw the results of German propaganda in France and I realized then that my Nation also was not doing its full duty in this line. There may have been mistakes made in O. W. I. We all make them, but as I have said before, when this war is over and the history is written the American people will be grateful for the part played by this Government agency in bringing to a successful conclusion this conflict. It is easy to make criticism—but I, for one, feel that I should not get up on the floor to criticize any Government agency unless I have the full facts, and any Member who wishes them can easily get whatever information they desire from the O. W. I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from North Carolina may agree on the facts, but I spent some months on foreign stations and, a Member of Congress, I sought the news whether it came from Roosevelt, Bricker, or any other source.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Just what was the gentleman trying to get?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I can submit and anyone can examine copies of station publications. I have several in my office and will be glad to show them to the gentleman or any Member of the House as an example of the kind of news they get every morning on foreign stations. The sheet is compiled from the radio news broadcast as they pick it up from American stations. It is the regular A. P., the regular U. P., or the regular International News Service. That is all we get. The boys get their home-town papers, of course. Whether that is propaganda or not depends upon what paper one reads.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Those little mimeographed sheets constitute the news. What other news they may get from home depends upon what somebody mails the soldier or sailor. I suppose it may even be expected that the Republican National Committee and the Democratic National Committee will probably slip some political propaganda into the mail to the soldiers and sailors, but the actual news is only a mimeographed sheet taken off the radio broadcasts that these people can pick up in headquarters. I will be glad to show those sheets to any Member of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed very much listening to the address by the gentleman from North Carolina prepared for him by someone who is just about as good at preparing propaganda as those individuals who have prepared some of the propaganda that has been sent overseas. I am wondering why there is so much confusion and so much attention paid to this situation? What are the objections to checking into it? If the situation is such as the gentleman from North Carolina asserts, why not go ahead and have a bipartisan committee to so certify? These matters of information that I received did not come entirely from O. W. I., except from their files of copies of material that have been sent out. It also came from some of the books and some of the publications that have been distributed that are already in evidence, and I shall be very glad to later show to the House. If any Member of the House, after reading them, can say they are anything but propaganda, then I certainly misjudge the intellectual capacity of the membership of this House.

I should like to say further to the gentleman from North Carolina that the address which I delivered to the House was written by myself. The information was obtained, either directly by conversations with representatives of different Government departments who themselves stated that they had sent out only one side of certain stories, or had so stated to other Members of Congress.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman's investigation cost anything?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will cost something, of course, if you have all this news reviewed; but the costs will not be heavy; which reminds me, if there is nothing wrong, if this practice of which I complain is not being pushed, then why should there be any objection to checking into it, because it would show how lily-white pure these gentlemen are down in O. W. I. and in some of the other agencies.

Mr. ROWE. Is it intended to disclose anything but what are the facts?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Certainly not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In view of what happened before a committee of the other body yesterday when one of the President's representatives refused to disclose any information, about how far would the House get, does the gentleman believe, in attempting to find out the facts? Can the gentleman tell me that?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Such withholding of information from congressional committees is, of course, a reprehensible practice, and one which should not long be tolerated. However, there are ways and means of finding out, I remind the gentleman.

I conclude my remarks by saying that up to this minute we have been unable to get a report as to the report which was sent overseas regarding the happenings of last week. Last week there were some events in the Congress of the United States that might be of some importance to Americans overseas, and yet up to this minute we have been unable as Members of Congress to get any information as to what our soldiers and sailors and other individuals overseas were told about Mr. BARKLEY's resignation and the manner in which the Congress of the United States answered the President's veto message. I understand that the veto message was sent overseas, but so far I can learn nothing of the news releases that were sent out as to the action of Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, the vote that was taken on the soldiers' vote bill, the stand-up-and-be-counted vote, was also reported, was it not?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We were promised that it would be reported, but afterward we were told, and learned, that it had not been. Probably after the gentleman from North Carolina discussed the situation something might have been sent out, prior to the preparation of his speech down in O. W. I.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, after this interlude, I find myself in the disconcerting position of wanting to talk on the subject before the House this afternoon, the Frazier-Lemke Act. This act is a matter of interest to the farming groups of the United States, and when I speak on this subject I speak from very real experience with it, having been for something over 3 years the chairman of a commission in the State of California which handled these farm-debt adjustments and which made use directly or indirectly of the methods provided under the Frazier-Lemke Act, which now comes up for renewal. I sincerely hope it will be renewed.

Periodically in the United States there are cycles in which the farmers find themselves in difficulties because of the debts upon their farms. At that time a choice must be made between foreclosure, or making it possible for the farmer to work himself out of the difficulty in which he then finds himself.

I believe this whole program of farm-debt adjustment is one of the good things which has come out of the recent decade. In California this program saved the homes of something more than a thousand farmers. The cost of that to the State was less than the amount those farmers paid in back taxes to the county tax collectors. The total cost of both State and Federal programs was less than the debt reductions. These farmers kept their homes and paid their debts. In the background always was the Frazier-Lemke Act.

Mr. Speaker, the point I would impress upon the House this afternoon is that it was not always filing under the Frazier-Lemke Act which made possible the working out of the problem by the farmer. It was the fact that the Frazier-Lemke Act could have been invoked if all other means failed. Since primarily the solution should always be one of consultation, of adjustment, of arbitration, the Frazier-Lemke Act stands only as a force, if it is needed, behind the adjustments.

I could take a very great deal of time and cite to you individual cases; not cases, Mr. Speaker, of poor farmers, not cases of inefficient farmers, but cases of farmers who have taken prizes for being good farmers, but who in the depression years found themselves in difficulties which could only be worked out by the methods of which I now speak.

I understand that certain amendments will be offered. I am hoping an amendment will not be presented which confines the Conciliation Commissioner appointments only to attorneys, for the practical reason that I have seen many men who were not attorneys give their time freely and successfully to work out these problems.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from California has been a conciliator?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No; I have not personally been a conciliator.

Mr. MICHENER. Oh, I understood the gentleman had been.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was chairman of the State commission under which the conciliators and the county committees both worked, and I am thoroughly familiar with the conciliators' work.

The Pacific Rural Press, of San Francisco, had this to say in its issue of February 19, under the heading "Save the Frazier-Lemke Law":

SAVE THE FRAZIER-LEMKE LAW

Under that law thousands of good California farmers were given a chance to work out their debts during the depression, and, with the advent of better farm prices, have paid off their mortgages or reduced them to bearable weight. In the after-war years when we have another downswing, we may sorely need the law again to save farmers to the land. Meanwhile the law is one of the best guaranties against wild land speculation, Mr. Garrod feels.

The Frazier-Lemke law makes it possible for the California commission to act for farmers, Mr. Garrod points out. In addition to the many farmers who were saved under the Frazier-Lemke law by State and Federal agencies, Mr. Garrod reports that Alfred Aram, counsel of the Farmers' Union, has handled 193 Frazier-Lemke cases for California farmers.

The Mr. Garrod, to whom the item refers, is the president of the California division of the Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America. I

have received the following letter from him personally:

THE FARMERS' EDUCATIONAL AND COOPERATIVE UNION OF AMERICA,
Saratoga, Calif., February 22, 1944.

Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: Our farmers' union does most sincerely hope that Congress will continue in effect the Frazier-Lemke amendment to the National Bankruptcy Act.

To do this will have a double-fold beneficial effect on farmers and farms.

It will, in the first place, continue to help out the poor devils who are up against losing their places, and is the best way of preventing land inflation, because it forces conservative farm loans.

Do the best you can, John; we are behind you.

Sincerely,

R. V. GARROD.

To this I add my own hope, from California's experience, that the Frazier-Lemke Act will be renewed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a splendid article in connection with the Filipinos' magnificent feat of resistance. I understand this may take a little over the amount allowed in the RECORD and, if so, I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD, the excess cost to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include in my remarks a statement from the president of the Farmers' Union and from the Pacific World Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the extension of the Frazier-Lemke Act will help distressed farmers to work out and pay off, then I am for it, but in order for them to work out and pay off is entirely dependent on the trend. You must remember that during those few years when the administration was boasting how its legislation was enabling farmers to pay off, there were several things that entered into the situation. One was a rising market. They will never pay off unless they have a rising market. The other was the fact that new lending agencies were being created whereby those farmers could borrow money from one Government lending agency to pay off the debt to the other Government lending agency. Since it depends on a rising market, then it behooves the administration to make it possible for the farmers to produce and produce more.

Several times I have seen the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] come down into the well of the House and tell us how he loves the farmer, how he has voted for all farm legislation, how he understands the farm problem and how he understands livestock and agriculture generally; but his actions have proven that he is entirely unfamiliar with these things. I heard him say some time ago that "the guilty farmers have more money today than they know what to do with." I resented that statement as did every other farmer and I intend to answer the gentleman in great detail one of these days. I hope he will be present and listen to it. Frankly, I do not believe the gentleman knows the difference between a field of corn and a field of celery, even though he comes from the greatest corn State in that section of the country. I heard him say so often how he understood livestock problems. I wonder if he knows that when a chick is hatched out of the egg it has all the eggs in it that it will ever produce, approximately a thousand. Whether a man gets those thousand depends on whether he knows how to do it, then when he does it the gentleman calls him a guilty farmer. May I say that if he and the administration want these farmers to work out their problems they must give them a market, at least above cost of production.

The man who sells fat cattle today loses money on every steer or head of livestock he sells. The man who sells fat hogs today would be better off if all his pigs had died the day they were born. The man who ships milk is losing money, and likewise the man who sells eggs. If that is not true, why, then, should the Federal Government be insisting on subsidies today?

There is one thing that will keep inflation away in this country, and that is a generous supply of commodities. More and more production and prices cannot rise. The New Deal theory of curtailed production is silly. Inflation will never be kept away by subsidies or conniving on the part of politicians. It is only a generous flow of commodities, and that generous flow of commodities can only be brought about by the administration making it possible for the farmers to produce and encouraging them to produce so that we may carry on.

The gentleman from Illinois has criticized the farmers who have kept going. The livestock section of South Chicago would have failed long ago if the farmers had not gone ahead, although the lower prices caught them because they had fixed charges which they had to meet.

The tobacco farmers may be breaking even, but why, with retail prices higher than ever, should the farmer not have as much as he has often had in peacetimes?

If the Government would let the farmer alone, give him the encouragement of a profitable market, and then if the Government would be run as economically as the average farmer runs his farm, taxes would be only half as high, and the whole world would be better fed and happy soon again.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the Frazier-Lemke Act has been of great benefit to the farmers of Iowa. Its passage in 1933 together with what else was done by the Federal Government during the dark days of the depression alone have not been sufficient. It was necessary for our State to pass a State mortgage moratorium law which remained on the statute books for 6 years, but was not extended in 1939 because of a finding that the emergency for which the bill had been passed no longer existed. Also back of the finding was the fact that the Frazier-Lemke Act was still in existence and would take care of those few farmers remaining who needed assistance.

Mr. Speaker, we should today extend the Frazier-Lemke Act because there are still some farmers who will need its benefits. They need them now in good times more than they needed them in hard times because a farmer who is really up against it today in foreclosure proceedings happens to be caught in a situation where he is not making anything like his neighbors are making and he needs these benefits more than he needed them in times of depression; therefore I believe this rule should be adopted and I favor passage of the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY].

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to offer an amendment, which I will include in my remarks, and which is identical with the language contained in H. R. 7356 of the Seventy-seventh Congress which passed the House on October 21, 1942, but which failed to be acted on by the Senate prior to the date on which that Congress adjourned, December 16, 1942.

This amendment has the approval of those officials who are concerned with and charged with the responsibility of administering the law; that is, the vast majority of the district judges and the National Bankruptcy Conference. It provides for more efficient administration and assures the appointment of conciliation commissioners who are entirely competent and thoroughly qualified to perform the duties involved. I have talked with members of the committee who are placing the substance of this amendment in the bill; therefore, I shall not offer the amendment.

The amendment I proposed is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAMEY: Page 1, line 7, after the word "follows;" strike out commencing with line 7 on page 1 to and including the words "by order specify" in line 18 on page 2 and insert "The judges of the several courts of bankruptcy shall appoint referees, to be known as conciliation commissioners, and who may be referees in bankruptcy, each for a term of 4 years, and may remove them if their services are not needed or for other cause. One or more of such conciliation commissioners shall be appointed for each division or district, or such part thereof as may be designated from time to time, as may best serve the prompt, efficient, and economical administration of the cases filed under this section. Such conciliation commissioner must have the qualifications of a referee in bankruptcy, and the

familiar with agricultural conditions and not engaged in the farm mortgage, banking, or farm-financing business. The court, if it deems it advisable, may appoint some suitable person as supervising conciliation commissioner in each judicial district or division, who shall have such supervising functions with relation to proceedings under this section as the court may by order specify."

I also include as part of my remarks the following:

Sec. 75. Cases filed and pending in the entire country and in North Dakota and South Dakota, covering the fiscal years 1937–42, inclusive, taken from the annual reports of the Attorney General and of the administrative office

	1937		1938		1939		1940		1941		1942	
	Filed	Pending	Filed	Pending	Filed	Pending	Filed	Pending	Filed	Pending	Filed	Pending
Entire country	1,927	4,350	3,424	5,052	1,969	4,372	1,818	4,379	1,700	4,413	1,547	4,680
North Dakota	66	60	823	500	25	105	118	178	213	329	659	872
South Dakota	10	16	38	34	5	7	7	9	4	11	10	19

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the amendment to which I referred and also a report on the section 75 cases filed and pending in the entire country and in North Dakota and South Dakota covering the fiscal years 1937 to 1942, inclusive.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4166) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4166, with Mr. MURDOCK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 4166 extends the Frazier-Lemke Act for a period of 4 years. There are three minor amendments which I shall discuss in a few minutes.

To begin with, let me say that the author of the act, Mr. LEMKE, originally filed the bill, H. R. 1878, which would make this permanent legislation. For one reason or another, hearings were not held on the bill H. R. 1878, so a few weeks ago the committee was presented with the situation that this act was about to expire on March 4 or March 5, and the subcommittee and then the whole Committee on the Judiciary recommended that the act be extended for 4 years. This is the purpose of H. R. 4166.

Personally, I feel that we should have some permanent legislation on this subject, but I believe the present act should be rewritten and should be made a part of the permanent bankruptcy law. Many changes should be made in the basic law, I think everybody admits that. However, we did not have time to go into all of those proposed changes. Therefore, in order to get the law renewed so the modifications could be brought up later and the act could be rewritten, the committee merely recommends that it be extended for 4 years.

In addition to the renewal the changes provided by H. R. 4166 in the old act are, first, that the old act provided that the farmer pay $10 of the filing fee and that the remaining $15 be paid out of the Treasury of the United States, whereas this bill provides that the farmer pay the entire $25 of the filing fee.

The second amendment is that the present law provides for the payment of $5 per day to a supervising conciliation commissioner, and it was found to be very difficult to get people with real ability to work for $5 a day. The committee recommends that the conciliation commissioners be paid $10 a day for their services.

Then, Mr. Chairman, a dispute arose as to section 75 (a), which has to do with the number of conciliation commissioners and also whether or not they shall be lawyers. The old act provided that a good many more conciliation commissioners should be appointed than was provided for in the bill H. R. 4166. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] in March 1943, introduced the bill H. R. 2329, which provided that the conciliation commissioners should have the same qualifications as referees in bankruptcy, in other words, that they must be lawyers. It was pointed out to the committee by the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from North Dakota, that in some sections it was difficult to find men to serve as conciliation commissioners who had the qualifications of referees, in other words, who were lawyers. Therefore, the bill was written so that the conciliation commissioners need not have the qualifications of referees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The Senate Committee on the Judiciary has also been considering this matter. In view of the shortness of the time before the act expires, we decided it would be a good idea, if possible, to try to have the same amendments agreed upon by the House and the Senate so as to avoid conference and so as to pass the same bill here that the Senate would pass. Therefore the committee has agreed to and will submit these amendments to provide in the first section that the district court shall appoint not more than 20 persons in any one district, instead of "State," as is provided in the bill we are considering.

The committee will also submit an amendment to require that the conciliation commissioners have the same qualifications as referees in bankruptcy. The Senate is expected to pass it this way. While I am not entirely satisfied with the amendment, this will at least give us agreement until we can get the matter worked out.

Another amendment that will be submitted by the committee is to strike out the "4 years" in line 5, on page 2, and insert "2 years"; that is, "A conciliation commissioner's term of office shall be 4 years," is the wording in the bill, and the committee amendment will make that "2 years." The reason for this is that the Senate committee has recommended that the act be extended for only 2 years, and the Committee on the Judiciary will submit an amendment that the bill we pass will extend it for only 2 years.

As I said a few minutes ago, I think this legislation has accomplished a good purpose. It is true at this time that not many cases are being filed and that there may not be great present need for this act, but we do not know what the future may hold for the farmers. Certainly, if we are to have special legislation making it possible to reorganize railroads, municipalities, and other types of business, farmers should have some method of getting debts adjusted in the event they meet with hard luck and unfortunate situations beyond their control.

I think the basic purpose of the Frazier-Lemke Act is good, and I think the idea should be extended into permanent legislation. The author of the bill will agree, however, that many changes ought to be made in the law. It ought to be completely rewritten. I am sure the committee will be glad to give the author of the bill an early hearing on the matter of rewriting the law entirely and of getting it in better shape.

The bill as presented is not entirely satisfactory. Many improvements could be made in it, but we have to get the act renewed in order to have it before us so that we can grant hearings, go into the matter thoroughly, and get the legislation in better condition.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The bill has been reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, but I do not think it has passed the Senate.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is that bill identical with the bill reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The bill recommended by the Senate committee is identical with the bill reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary after these proposed amendments have been made. We are trying to have it pass the

Senate and pass the House in the same shape so as to avoid a conference.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, this bill was not introduced until February 10. It is obvious that the Committee on the Judiciary has had insufficient time in which to give thorough study to it. We were further handicapped by the fact that the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy, the gentleman from Alabama, who has given this matter considerable attention, was taken seriously ill and moved to the hospital at about that time. The present law expires by its own terms on March 4 and we must act hurriedly if we are to act at all.

This bill is of no local interest to the people of my district. As far as I am able to ascertain, there has never been a proceeding brought under the Frazier-Lemke Act in the Thirty-fifth District of New York. I think that is true generally in the Eastern States. Nevertheless, I am convinced from conversation with my colleagues from some of the Western and Middle Western States, particularly North Dakota, Texas, Ohio, and California, that the Frazier-Lemke Act has been of incalculable value to the farmers of those sections, especially those who have suffered several years of continuous drought.

It is highly desirable and it is good, sound public policy that the farmers of this country remain in the possession of their own farms. The Frazier-Lemke Act is analogous, in a way, to the business reorganization laws. It attempts to protect the equities of the owners. The objective is to maintain the small farmers or their own lands and under their own management. They constitute the largest and most essential group among us, and there are no better Americans. It has accomplished that in thousands of instances.

There have been many abuses, and this law needs some very careful overhauling. In the State of North Dakota there have been a number of indictments and three convictions for corruption in connection with the administration of it. Some very bad practices have arisen. They should be eliminated if this law is ever made permanent, and I think the question of making it permanent is worthy of thought. However, before we even consider making it permanent law, the whole subject should be carefully studied by the Department of Justice, by farm organizations, by committees of referees, and by the judicial conference.

It is a big subject and an important subject. I am inclined to think that a law can be worked out and should be worked out to make the principle of the Frazier-Lemke Act permanent law.

You may be interested to know of some of the abuses that have crept in. In the State of North Dakota particularly there has grown up a thriving business among men who solicit cases under the Frazier-Lemke Act. A gentleman who recently confessed to the crime of concealing assets and of administering the Frazier-Lemke Act in a corrupt manner states his method of solicitation in this way. He is one of a great many; and I think his method is typical. He says:

> I was armed with tax lists and mortgage abstracts covering the territory in which I worked and approached the farm problems in a definite and businesslike manner. I asked the farmer approached if he owed much and if he could pay it. In all instances the farmer would reply that his debts were hopeless and that he never could pay them and that his children could not pay them if they were to shoulder them.

Having found a farmer in that situation, the solicitor would offer to scale down his debt for a fee. The standard fee, I believe, was $150. He then made a deal, probably champertous, with a lawyer who ordinarily charged $50, so the testimony goes, to attend to legal details. They put the man through the proceeding under section 75 of the Bankruptcy Act promising to reduce the debt materially. That that has been a flourishing business in North Dakota is indicated by the number of cases filed. In 1939, for example, the entire number of petitions filed in the whole country under the Frazier-Lemke Act was 1,969; 25 from North Dakota and 5 from its neighboring State, South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. In 1940 there were 1,818 cases filed in the United States; 118 of which were filed in North Dakota and only 7 in South Dakota.

In 1941 there were 1,700 cases filed in the whole United States. Of this number 213 were in North Dakota as against 4 in South Dakota. In 1942 there were 1,547 cases filed in the whole country; 659 of which were in North Dakota and only 10 in South Dakota. That indicates that there is a racket which must be stopped. I may say in passing that the bar association of North Dakota is alive to the situation and has been instrumental in bringing indictments and criminal proceedings against a number of the most flagrant violators. Three have been convicted and a number of others are to be tried.

I think it is interesting also to hear this man's testimony as to the method of making appraisals, which is one of the serious abuses. In many cases they were unconsionably low and a fraud on creditors. He says:

> I know of appraisals made after dark. I know of appraisals made without going near the property. I know of appraisals made by conference miles away from the property.

Then another scandal, of course, is the concealment of assets. It is revealing to learn how that is done in North Dakota. Here is the testimony of this gentleman who plead guilty to a charge of corruption in connection with the administration of the act. He said:

> For many years the farm income in North Dakota had been meager. The boys and girls who stayed home with their parents and worked on the farm had not been getting any remuneration for their work and not having any money with which to pay them, they had been allotted calves and pigs, cows and horses, and in some cases machinery.

That is the subterfuge by which the assets of the farmers were concealed, when there was not outright falsification of the farmer's schedules.

There is another aspect that I would like to call to your attention while I have the floor, indicating that all is not as it should be in our Federal agricultural agencies. He said:

> May I add here that I observed in my contact with farmers * * * it was a practice of Federal agencies to suggest transfer of personal property after they received their claim or a compromise settlement even if it would destroy a claim of another Federal agency.
>
> I even found that representatives of the Federal land bank had assisted farmers in transferring real estate to sons or daughters so that the seed and feed loan offices could not obtain payment of their claims which in some cases run into thousands of dollars by way of judgments.

I mention those things to call attention to abuses now being practiced and gradually corrected. They must be safeguarded against if permanent law is to be enacted for the protection of honest creditors and debtors and American taxpayers.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that what the gentleman from New York has been reading is the confession made by the defendant who plead guilty and it is a statement taken from the court's record.

Mr. HANCOCK. That is right. It is the statement made by a gentleman by the name of Bergan, who recently plead guilty to charges of conspiracy to corruptly administer the Frazier-Lemke Act.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am sure the gentleman mentions these things not as being obstacles to the continuation of the act, but merely to illustrate that after it is renewed the whole matter should be gone into and the act should be rewritten so that these things will not occur.

Mr. HANCOCK. That is my point exactly; I intend to support this bill, and the continuance of the present legislation for a period of 2 years, not for a period of 4 years as the bill provides. There are a number of cases pending, three or four thousand. And there are others being filed every day. There are still distressed farmers who need relief from crushing debt. I am not willing to cut off this remedy overnight, but before this extension begins and before it becomes permanent law, these defects must be considered and corrected. In the meantime, as I stated a moment ago, the bar association of North Dakota is on the alert and many abuses have been reduced, if not eliminated entirely.

I think it will be a great mistake to extend the life of the Frazier-Lemke Act for 4 years. Two years is ample. In the meantime the whole subject should receive a very thorough and complete study by competent authorities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 3 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman inform the House as to what the cost of the administration of this measure would be?

Mr. HANCOCK. We have not any figures as to the net cost of operation under the present act, but it cannot be very excessive because every time the farmer files a petition he must pay a fee of $25.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HANCOCK. It is now $10, but the filing fee is increased to $25 by the bill. I think the cost will be negligible.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman that this ought not to be extended for more than 2 years.

Mr. HANCOCK. I think at the outside that should be the limit.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I wish the gentleman would tell us a little more about how this law is administered. In practice has it worked out this way, that only few parts of the country use the law? I notice that you read North Dakota had 215 cases. That is one of the smallest States in population in the Union; and South Dakota had only 6. What is the reason for that?

Mr. HANCOCK. The partial explanation is the activity of the solicitors I have mentioned and perhaps an equally important or more important consideration is the fact that North Dakota has suffered from 7 or 8 years of bad crops or no crops at all and has probably been the most unfortunate State in the Union in that regard.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Outside of this isolated case, it is uniformly taken advantage of in all the States?

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, we have just heard the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] state that this act has been of great value to the farmers of his section. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] stated that it had been very useful to his farmers. In personal conversations many Members have told me they feel the act is valuable and should not be terminated, at least without improving amendments and further study.

Someone asked about the cost a moment ago. The fees paid to conciliation commissioners amounted to $40,990 in 1942, and the compensation paid to supervising conciliation commissioners amounted to $30,654.75. The expenses of supervising conciliation commissioners amounted to $4,721.28. That is a total of $76,366.03. As against that we have the fees paid by farmers when they file their petitions. What that amounts to, I do not know, but it must be a considerable amount in view of the number of petitions we know have been filed.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this is a good piece of legislation. It is one of the best pieces of legislation this Congress has an opportunity to pass. We are reenacting the Frazier-Lemke bankruptcy laws as applied to agriculture. Agriculture is one of our basic industries. It is our greatest basic industry. We are told that 30 percent of the people of the United States are directly dependent upon agriculture for their livelihood. If the farmer has a bad year and does not receive the cost of production, then he finds himself in financial distress. I am very much impressed with the conditions that have obtained in this country and the factors that have contributed to the financial depression that have caused the Congress to adopt so many financial expedients in trying to correct a situation that legislation of this kind would automatically correct at its source.

I was very much interested in going through the wonderful Red River Valley in the State of North Dakota to note that most of the farms are owned and operated by the big insurance companies of this country. They have foreclosed on those farms, and now we have land tenancy as a result of those foreclosures. I want to say in support of this legislation that one farmer who is retained on his farm by this legislation is worth 10 farmers who have been rehabilitated by the different agencies set up by this Government at so much expense to the taxpayers. We have the Farm Security Administration, we have many different agencies and dozens of other Federal agencies, created to lend money to the farmers. Always the interest feature figure is included.

In this bill we have a plan whereby we can keep the farmers on the farms. The farmer has learned the crop conditions and knows how to farm in his district and is one of the most valuable assets to the agricultural community.

In reviewing the situation that brought about the conditions that caused so many foreclosures back in the depression years in the early thirties, it has been very interesting to note the change that overtook this country, especially in dealing with agriculture, and profiteering at the expense of the farmer. I remember when prices were normally adjusted, when it took about so much grain to buy a wagon or so much corn to buy a harvester, and livestock and farm products of all kinds were at normal prices. The farming industry was fairly prosperous. Then the World War came on. We had an elimination of competition in the manufacturing industry and the big companies took advantage of conditions to raise the price of the things the farmer had to have. I can remember when we bought a J. I. Case plow for $14. Then the war came and the price of that same plow went to $28—just double. I remember when we could buy a mowing machine for $40. Then the war came on and the price of that mowing machine went to $110 in my State.

I always had my heart set on buying an 8-foot McCormick binder. They were $175 out in our section. Now I would have to pay $350 for the same binder.

I remember I had my heart set on buying an 8-foot Superior grain drill at $60. I bought an 8-foot grain drill the other day, the same Superior drill, and what do you suppose I paid for it? Two hundred and forty dollars. The price of the things the farmer had to buy went up while the things he raised to sell came down—and he could not pay his interest.

Those are some of the reasons for the passage of this bill. Everything in business has been regulated and operated to take advantage of the people engaged in the basic industries, and agriculture is our greatest basic industry. Not only has the farmer been penalized but other basic industries in their order, mining, lumbering, and fishing, everything has been run to take advantage of the people engaged in those basic industries.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield briefly.

Mr. RAMEY. Can you advise us why it is practically impossible for the American farmer to buy machinery at all, whereas in Canada you can buy it practically at cost? I refer particularly to the Lake Erie Island situation, where Mystic Isle has been so crushed by the Department. For instance, at Put in Bay, North Bass and South Bass Islands, no machinery can be bought by those farmers whereas at Pelee Island, Ontario, they can buy American-made farm machinery at practically cost. Why is that discrimination made against American farmers?

Mr. WHITE. I am not familiar with that situation. I will say that the rationing plan of farm machinery may operate to bring about conditions to which the gentleman has referred. There is so much discrimination and so much partiality in distributing all kinds of machinery sent to foreign countries as against the farmers in this country, that I think it is a subject worthy of investigation by the Congress.

But I want to discuss the matter of the conditions which made this bill necessary. Back in the nineties when I was a boy out in the wilds of Idaho, when some youngsters came out to work in the railway office from back in Ohio and Indiana they would say "You know the farmers are prosperous in our State. When the bankers want to make a loan you will see the cashier get in a buggy and drive out to the homes of the farmers and discuss the policies of the banks because the farmers are the directors of the banks." But, when you go through Ohio and Indiana today you will not find any bank directors who are making their living off the farms, or many with bank accounts. What brought about that change? It is the things I have been telling you about. It is the advantage taken by these big manufacturing industries during the last war, when there was

no competition, to establish high prices and stabilize them. We saw nails go from 5 cents a pound to 8 cents a pound in my State. We saw barbed wire go from $1.40 a roll to $5.50 a roll. We saw baling ties go from $1.75 a bundle of 250 ties to $6.50 a bundle. We saw binders go from $175 to $350 each. We saw everything go up. After the war was over and the farmer lost his market, those big manufacturers were able to hold their price levels. They piled up huge cash reserves, and they did not want Uncle Sam to take any share by income taxes, so they simply made stock dividends, which was good financing. The cash was there and by dividing up the stock you just had a share in those huge cash accumulations which they were piling up by profiteering at the expense of the basic industry, agriculture. Then what happened?

The farming industry was so impoverished that nobody would go into that business. The young people on the farms went to town and the speculators went into the stock market, creating a financial condition that the banks saw was getting dangerous, so they said, "We have got to stop this loaning of money to these speculators," and the banks decided they would curtail loans. However, the money from somewhere kept rolling into the market and stock prices kept going up. Then, finally, we were told by financial writers that the stock market was being supported by bootleg money. What did we find? We found that this money that was wrung from agriculture, that kept the farming industry at the point of insolvency, that had been poured into the market at high interest rates to carry on the speculative conditions—finally, when the crash came in 1929 and the farmer could no longer support the load and the factories all closed and people were thrown out of work, the money that had been wrung from the farmers had gone up in smoke. Money, robbed from the farmers, vanished and left everybody broke, and almost wrecked our national economy. If the Federal Trade Commission had come into play, if the law of supply and demand had been permitted to operate through competition, the farmer could have been kept solvent and basic industries would have supported our national economy and we would have avoided the condition that has made all of these expedients and this relief legislation necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with all that has been said with respect to this measure by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] who has already spoken on this measure. There is some question in my mind as to the necessity of this legislation at this time. Under the pending bill it is sought to extend the Frazier-Lemke Act for 4 years. However, as I understand, an amendment will be offered which will limit that extension to 2 years only. That amendment, if passed, will be very helpful to this bill and its final passage, I am certain.

There are some other things that I want to call to the attention of the membership with respect to the necessity of this proposed extension of the Frazier-Lemke Act at this particular time. The matter to which I refer has reference to the number of cases which have been pending in the past, and which have been filed within the last 6 months, or the first half of the current fiscal year. During the first 6 months from July 1 to December 31, 1943, there have been 172 new cases filed. Of that number, 172 cases, 90 of them were filed in North Dakota where the evidence has been presented to the membership respecting the racketeering which has been indulged in under this particular piece of legislation. The racketeering indulged in heretofore is subject to extreme condemnation. Men have been convicted because of their illegal operations under this law. Other criminal cases are yet pending.

One of the distinguished gentlemen from California asked a few moments ago as to the number of cases which had been filed, especially in the southern district of California. I may say to my friend that from July 1 to December 31, 1943, but 12 cases have been filed in the entire southern district of California, which embraces as I understand, a population of approximately three or four million people.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Very briefly I just wanted to remind the gentleman that we do not invoke the Frazier-Lemke Act; that that is an argument in favor of the Frazier-Lemke Act and not against it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank the gentleman for that observation. However, if the people do not use it, except in very rare cases, then why the necessity of the law?

Another matter which I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House is the question respecting the qualifications of conciliation commissioners. I happen to have served for approximately 5½ years as conciliation commissioner in the Federal district in which I reside, and during that entire period of time I had but six cases referred to me as conciliation commissioner. I want to give my experience very briefly with respect to those particular cases which came to my especial attention. In three of the cases referred to me as conciliation commissioner, after the farmer had made his own inventory, as provided by law, and after the meeting of the creditors had been called and held, then the conciliation commissioner, under the law, is compelled to make an inventory of the property, and the law provides that he shall give some attention to the farmer's own inventory, and to any inventory which the creditors have made, but in these three instances, to which I refer, the men seeking relief were compelled to be brought into court and put under oath in order to try to ascertain and find some of the property which had been set forth in the creditors' inventory and some which had been set forth in the inventory made by the individual who filed the petition. In all six of those cases I found the farmers who sought relief under the law were individuals who had never made progress to any great extent in their business of farming. They had created debts, but they had not made any good-faith effort to meet and discharge them. They sought the relief afforded by the law to aid in discharging the debts which they had not in any manner attempted to pay.

Mr. Chairman, the matter to which I wish to direct the attention of the members of the committee is, we do not want to countenance fraud and racketeering under this law. The pending measure reduces the qualifications of conciliation commissioners, but I have been assured that these qualifications will be restored by amendment. My judgment is that lawyers only should serve in that capacity. If the qualifications of the commissioners to be appointed under this law are reduced, then I will vote against this extension of the law. These commissioners must be men of learning, honor, and integrity. The administration of this law, if here extended, must be placed upon a high plane. This law must be so administered as to protect those who are engaged in farming and who in good faith need protection, and not to aid those who would needlessly and recklessly become involved in debt, and who thereafter do not make any good faith effort to pay their creditors but seek to have the mantle of the law thrown about them to escape the payment of their just debts. It is my considered opinion that this entire law needs to be scrutinized and in the future rewritten, and the administration of it must be guarded with care and caution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK.]

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to hold this debate down to the thing before us. The thing before us is not the abuse of the law but whether or not the law is a good law to have on the statute books. The gentleman from Indiana said they had only six cases in his district in the last year. I know they have an arson law in his district and I know, too, that they have not had any prosecution under that law at all in the last 6 months. The very fact that the Frazier-Lemke Act is on the statute books is a means of preventing creditors from the early exercise of all their legal rights. There is not anyone arguing against the right under a contract; that was settled by the courts of this country years ago; but this law tries to hold up proceedings until the farmer can get a chance to pay back. You know the situation in 1932 and 1933. In my section of the country wheat was selling for 34 cents a bushel, and I saw a sign down in South Dakota that read: "Oats, 6 cents a bushel; corn, 8 cents less."

Mr. GILCHRIST. Eight cents a bushel?

Mr. BURDICK. Eight cents less; that is what the sign said.

Mr. GILCHRIST. It was 8 cents a bushel in my county.

Mr. BURDICK. There is an historic background to this Frazier-Lemke Act. Do you not want these farmers to handle their business in a constitutional way? Or do you want a holiday association in every county of the country? I visited 53 farmers this summer in North Dakota who had either taken advantage of this Frazier-Lemke Act or had been supported by a holiday association and foreclosures were prevented by public consent and public opinion. Everyone of these 53 farmers had paid their obligations and had money in the bank.

It so often happens that creditors seeing they have a right to, desire to foreclose. If they would just wait a little, just take it easy, they would get their money and everybody else would get his money. Just because a few have been exploiting this law is no sign that you ought to be against the law. I think North Dakota is capable of handling her own situation.

I remember during the years from 1931 to 1940 in my section of the country there was not a thing green except the trees along the Missouri River; there was not a bunch of green grass within a hundred miles of where I live, not a bunch. Livestock in my country at that time was being kept alive only by food shipped in. How do you expect us to pay our obligations when we cannot get a crop and when we do get a crop wheat drops to 34 cents a bushel?

There was a reason for this law. The law ought to be continued. I will give you my experience. If you owe enough you are safe; if you owe a little you are not. When I owed $10,000 but had property worth $30,000, they knew I would have to pay. I never had any disposition not to pay because I am a descendant of a lot of those whittling Yankees of New England who do not know anything else except to pay their obligations. I inherited that one good quality.

But when I owed more than I was worth and my creditors knew it, I was called "Mr." and not molested. It took me just 24 years to pay these debts and I finished the job in January 1944. I was left alone, however, because I was hopelessly unable to pay except as I made the money monthly. The farmers in North Dakota are coming out of the sea of debt—their assets are more than those debts, but they need more time to work out. I am afraid that if this law is not renewed, that many farmers, who will finally pay out, will be the victims of forced liquidation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds the gentleman that time on the minority side is under control of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the passage of this bill, the principal purpose of which is to extend for an additional period of 2 years the time within which petitions may be filed under the farm mortgage moratorium law.

Mr. Chairman, I came to Congress with the sound of bawling cattle and squealing hogs in my ears, cattle and hogs that were destroyed by thousands because there was no feed with which to keep them alive in spite of the fact that in some parts of our country and the world people were looking for something to eat. It was the age of the destruction of food. It was the time when farmers lost their homes.

I favor the extension of this law because it brought confidence to the farmers in my State, confidence perhaps that Congress was interested in the family-sized farm and interested in having farm families stay on the farms and eventually own homes.

I believe legislation like this has been very helpful and I am glad I have had the opportunity to support it and other pieces of legislation which have been of inestimable value to the farmers. Droughts may come to us again some day and there may again come times when this law will help farmers to keep their homes. We should keep the law on the statute books for times of emergency. We pray we will never again see the days which forced an exodus of farmers from their homes. So we must continue improving our farm legislation in order to give to the producers of our food the same opportunities that are enjoyed by industry and labor.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his statement. The gentleman will recall that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] spoke about the interest of the agricultural districts of California in favor of this legislation. Coming from one of the great metropolitan districts of California, I want to say that the people in the cities of California are also very much interested in the passage of this legislation. I shall vote for it.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his support and contribution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom I dare raise my voice here against my good friend the gentleman from North Dakota[Mr. BURDICK], but when he said our corn was selling for whatever he said it was selling for he did not tell you the whole story. I want to state my own experience. We live in a rather cold climate up there in Iowa; it snows and it sometimes gets below zero. Corn was so cheap that we burned it in our homes to keep warm instead of selling it down at the market and hauling back the coal. The bankruptcy law has done a great deal to remedy that condition. It is not doing so much now, but, even so, I want to see it continued for another 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has 10 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Illinois, 5.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, if this farming business and the history of what we have gone through in the 10 years between 1930 and 1940 has not done anything more, it should have taught every one of us as Members of this House the responsibility that we have to look ahead, not only to the end of the war but to the future, so far as agricultural legislation is concerned and the welfare of our country is concerned. A lot of these troubles that we have had could have been largely avoided if we had approached the problem in a proper manner. Though temporary in nature, this support program we hear so much about, in my opinion, will find a permanent place in the agricultural picture of the future. I say that for the reason that during the last few years we set up wages-and-hours legislation, to which everyone subscribes, for one great group of our society. We do not guarantee them a job but we do say the maximum hours they shall work and the minimum wages they may obtain. A support to agriculture can be on a comparable basis. Support prices cannot be too high for the reason you would accumulate surpluses that might be embarrassing, but we should look forward to some kind of a floor to give another great group of society something comparable to the wages-and-hours legislation that has been given to the laboring people of our country. The price of a loaf of bread is practically the same when wheat sells for 60 cents per bushel as when it sells for $1 a bushel.

In connection with this whole matter we are going to see, in my opinion, a more constructive approach toward farm cooperatives. More and more all of us can see that a farm cooperative is very comparable to a labor union and that one of the greatest assistances rendered by a farm cooperative is its ability to engage in collective bargaining as far as their own interests are concerned. A continuation of these discussions brought about by the Frazier-Lemke bill during the last 10 years has made us conscious of the opinion that the people in these communities want to see the real rural people stay on the land. This law has been implemented somewhat by State laws. It is rather disheartening to see a family of two or three generations on a piece of land lose the farm and then scatter all over the world. If the Frazier-Lemke bill has not done any more than keep a large number of these people on the farm, it has lived up to expectations. In my personal observation I have seen hundreds of people who were compelled

to lose their farms. In 1939 more farms were foreclosed in Wisconsin than in any year in the history of the Federal land bank. We do not have to go back to 1932. We can come very much closer and take 1939. Most of us now present were here at that time.

In 1939 wheat sold for 54 cents. Now, there is not much difference between that and 34 cents except you get out of your misery quicker at 34 cents than you will at 54 cents. You will get brushed off anyway. That is what wheat averaged in 1939 before this war came along. After 10 or 15 years, regardless of party and with all the machinery and mechanics we had in trying to lift these prices, we did not make a very constructive approach. Now we are right in reverse. We see various agencies trying to use the same machinery and trying to hold prices down. It is a difficult thing in the face of additional production cost to keep agricultural prices or any other prices down.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is a great agricultural statistician. He has given a great deal of study to the farm question and I am very glad to hear him say something about a floor under the prices of farm products. Does the gentleman agree that if we had a floor under farm prices at the time we had this great depression in our agricultural economy we would not have had to have some of this legislation?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We would not have had to have it.

Mr. STEFAN. Our fight for 10 years has been to get cost of production for the farmer plus a fair margin of profit. If we had had a floor under the prices of farm products we would not have the conditions that now exist. Does the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I want to call attention to Oklahoma last year. I am going out of my own State to show how these things can happen any place in the United States. In 1942 they planted 3,800,000 acres of wheat and they did the same in 1943. In 1942 they produced 57,000,000 bushels of wheat. In 1943 from the same acreage they only produced 31,000,000 bushels of wheat. This demonstrates that there are factors over which no one has control that must be taken into consideration. Floods, bugs, and dry weather caused this enormous decrease in production. Consumers have a right to expect food at a reasonable price, and the producers should be entitled to the same constructive legislation that is provided other groups of our society.

If interested you can find that the large acreage increase took place after World War No. 1. Wheat, as an example, has been in an embarrassing position ever since. Wool today is becoming embarrassing with the storage, imports, and domestic 1944 production in the picture. My observations lead me to believe that one of the greatest desires of labor is the assurance of permanent employment. My observation convinces me that the farmer is most interested in a fair, steady return for his product and realizes he is harmed by a feast or famine approach for his efforts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, some Members have said that there were not many cases in their State. I challenge the accuracy of those figures that have been given, but I shall not do so in detail at this time. I shall not question where they got them from. I presume they got them from official authority but that authority, I am satisfied, is not entirely correct. If there had been but very few cases in any particular State I would be interested if the Member would then tell us how many farm homes have been lost in that State because the farmers did not know enough to make use of this act and save their farms, or because you Members were negligent and silent and did not inform them that they had an opportunity to save their homes by using this act.

That is about the only reason that North Dakota had more than others; that is, the farmers in North Dakota are wide awake, they were informed, they know their business and they know how to protect themselves, otherwise they could not have existed during all the years of drought, grasshoppers, and low prices. They have been up against the real thing. In fact, we lost 119,000 of our population. That should settle the question as to why North Dakota has had more cases than some other States.

The former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. WALLACE, testified before the Agricultural Committee when I was a member of that committee, some 3 years ago—so did Mr. Black of the Farm Credit Corporation—that in western North Dakota they had mortgages on their land amounting to twice what it was worth. That should give you some idea of the situation. There have been plenty of foreclosures elsewhere.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. There appears to be some objection to the gentleman's bill on the ground that the necessity for it is not now apparent in many sections of the country. Is it not true that even though the necessity for this bill is not now so apparent, no one can foretell just what the future holds; also that this bill has served a very salutary purpose in the period when it was necessary and it would be a grave mistake to take it off the statute books and fail to extend it now in face of the fact that no one can foresee what the situation may be in the post-war as affecting agriculture?

Mr. LEMKE. The gentleman is absolutely right. Many of us in our local communities consider everything according to our own locality. But the United States of America is a great Nation and there are some localities every year throughout the Nation in which whole counties are wiped out by drought, grasshoppers, or hailstorms. That was the case last year in my State when we had such an abundant crop, yet several counties were practically wiped out by hail. These farmers are now at the mercy of the mortgagees. They need the Frazier-Lemke Act.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that in many States, such as the State of Wisconsin, which I have the honor to come from, they have legislated on the question of moratoriums and that many of the problems of the farmers have been handled in the local court under State laws which made it unnecessary for the farmers to go into the Federal court and apply for relief under the provisions of the Frazier-Lemke Act? This had a tendency, did it not, to cut down the number of applications for relief under the Frazier-Lemke Act?

Mr. LEMKE. The gentleman is correct. And in addition, in some States where there were only a few cases that situation was brought about because the local courts could not read English. They could not understand the Frazier-Lemke moratorium. They were too corporation minded. I appeared before the Supreme Court at least 18 or 20 times in such cases. The first time was in connection with the Virginia Wright case (*Wright* v. *Vinton*, 300 U. S. 440), in which I went to the Supreme Court. Then there was the Indiana Wright case (*Wright* v. *Union Central*, 311 U. S. 273, and *Wright* v. *Logan*, 315 U. S. 139), in which I represented the farmer with local counsel in the Supreme Court two or three times before we could get the local court to understand the English language. Then there was the Bartels case (*John Hancock* v. *Bartels*, 308 U. S. 180), from the great State of Texas, which was only one of a hundred that is filed in that State and hundreds that went up from there to the Supreme Court. Then there was the Borchard case (*Borchard* v. *Bank*, 310 U. S. 311), from California in which I appeared in the Supreme Court. Then there was the Adair case (*Adair* v. *Bank of California*, 303 U. S. 350), from California. There was the Wragg case from Alabama, then the Amelia Wright case from Illinois. In all of these cases the Supreme Court had to tell the lower court that the farmer had a right to redeem his property at its value and that was all the creditors are entitled to when there is a bankruptcy proceeding. A bankruptcy case is a financial wreck and you cannot get more than there is left of the wreck.

The trouble with my friends generally is they do not realize that because this act is not used in every case it nevertheless prevented hundreds of thousands of foreclosures.

I repeat, however, it is very essential and necessary because it has saved hundreds of thousands of homes from foreclosure where there would have been foreclosure, but for it.

Mr. CRAVENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. Assuming there is no pressing need for this law, does the gentleman see any harm in having it on the books, and if it is not needed it will not be used, but, if it is needed it will be available to the farmers?

Mr. LEMKE. I absolutely agree with the gentleman. The situation is the same as with the Railroad Reorganization Act, which nobody has objected to, or the Corporation Reorganization Act, or even the Municipal Bankruptcy Act. Nobody objects to these, but every time we talk for 32,000,000 farmers, there are always some who say there is something wrong. I agree with my colleague the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] that there may have been abuses of this law, but there have been abuses of the General Bankruptcy Act and there have been abuses in the Railroad Reorganization Act and in the Corporation Reorganization Act.

Why do my colleagues always try to pick on the little fellow, on the farmer? Is it because he is not sufficiently organized and because he has not the wherewith to make trips to Washington to present his grievance to different Members of Congress personally?

There are prosecutions in North Dakota. These cases are pending. There is a difference of opinion as to the cause of these prosecutions. Part of the press, at least, claims that they were frame-ups. They refer to them as terrorizing the farmers by the F. B. I. and the Federal land bank. I shall have something to say sometime about these prosecutions—whether it be persecution or prosecution—when the time comes and the courts have disposed of these cases. I refuse to be dragged into that while the cases are still pending.

Let me read you a letter from a supervising conciliation commissioner, Garfield R. Jones, of the United States District Court, Southern District of California. He writes:

When I saw Commissioner McDonald in Fresno last week, he advised me that he made a careful computation of a number of cases he had handled in which farmers were rehabilitated, and he gave me the figure of 87½ percent of the cases handled that were rehabilitated. Four or five years ago I made a similar statistical review of all the cases pending in the southern district of California—about 1,200 or 1,300.

These figures ought to be large enough to convince you that the law is being used. They are even larger than in North Dakota.

As I recall, at that time I figured out that over 80 percent of these proceedings were successful.

Now I feel very definitely that a good many of these people who are opposing section 75 are not aware of such results as these. Doubtless there have been instances of abuse here and there, but taking it by and large, the results have been very commendable.

I will read you just a short letter from the National Farmers Union, dated February 24, 1944:

The National Farmers Union urges renewal of the Frazier-Lemke Act as a necessary protection to hundreds of thousands of working farm families. The mere fact that the law is on the statute books as recourse for them will prevent mortgage holders from attempting to grab farms in a rising market for less than their value. Renewal will permit later consideration of amendments needed to strengthen the act. We urge adoption of H. R. 4166.

Right there I want to say that I introduced a bill over a year ago to correct some of these evils, but unfortunately it was not considered because of lack of time.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. In justice to the gentleman I think this statement should be made. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] pointed out that the bill we are now considering was introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota only on February 10, 1944. As the gentleman from North Dakota has just said, he introduced a bill on February 17, 1943, which was designed to make this permanent legislation and to cure some of the defects that are admitted to exist. I know the gentleman has in mind, if this act is extended, as I am sure it will be, introducing a bill to get some of the difficulties ironed out as quickly as possible.

Mr. LEMKE. I certainly will be glad to, and I will be glad to work with the Judiciary Committees of both the House and the Senate. There is no more reason to object to making this legislation permanent than there was to making permanent any other part of the Bankruptcy Act. If you are against all bankruptcy acts, all right, let us repeal them all, but do not single out the farmers. When he has become a financial wreck he is entitled to bankruptcy the same as the businessman.

May I state further that District No. 50, consisting of both mining and farming people has endorsed this bill and asked for this extension of time.

Now let us go a little further on the same proposition.

Any bankruptcy proceeding is a matter of salvage. Only a financial failure is a bankrupt—failure always precedes bankruptcy. When it comes to that, you are not concerned with profit or with interest, but with salvage—what you can save out of the wreck.

May I say further that Justice Parker of the Circuit Court of Appeals of North Carolina has stated that this bill has done more to conserve real estate values than any other act of Congress, or words to that effect.

There is nothing new about this law. Years ago the mortgagor was given 1 year in which to redeem after foreclosure. The Frazier-Lemke moratorium extends this time for 3 years. During this time the farmer pays the reasonable rental to the conciliation commissioner for taxes, upkeep and payments to the creditors.

The Frazier-Lemke moratorium simply extends the bankruptcy law to the farmer. It does not take any property from the creditors. It gives them all of the past earnings and accumulations of the debtor, his family and children. It does, however, prevent the creditors from taking their future earnings and accumulations. It gives to the farmer and his family a new start in life. No honest person can object to that.

The Frazier-Lemke moratorium is a conservation act. It conserves property and value. Nobody loses anything. At the end of 3 years, when the farmer redeems, he pays the then value of the property to the creditors. That is all they are entitled to. The agricultural wealth of this Nation can and will be preserved in the hands of those who created it—the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 75 (a), 75 (b), and 75 (c) of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 75. (a) Every United States district court of bankruptcy shall appoint not more than 20 persons in any 1 State to be known as conciliation commissioners. One such commissioner shall be appointed from each division or for the territory served by the city where terms of court are held. The court shall designate the territorial district of each such commissioner. A conciliation commissioner's term of office shall be 4 years, but he may be removed by the court if his services are no longer needed or for other cause. No individual shall be eligible to appointment as a conciliation commissioner unless he is a resident of the district, familiar with agricultural conditions therein and not engaged in the farm-mortgage business, the business of financing farmers or transactions in agricultural commodities, or the business of marketing or dealing in agricultural commodities or of furnishing agricultural supplies. In each judicial district the court may, if it finds it necessary or desirable, appoint a suitable person as a supervising conciliation commissioner. The supervising conciliation commissioner shall have such supervisory functions under this section as the court may by order specify.

"75. (b) Upon filing of any petition by a farmer under this section there shall be paid a fee of $25 to be transmitted to the clerk of the court and covered into the Treasury. The conciliation commisssioner shall receive as compensation for his services a fee of $25 for each case submitted to him, to be paid out of the Treasury when the conciliation commissioner completes the duties assigned to him by the court. A supervising conciliation commissioner shall receive, as compensation for his services, a per diem allowance to be fixed by the court, in an amount not in excess of $10 per day, together with subsistence and travel expenses in accordance with the law applicable to officers of the Department of Justice. Such compensation and expenses shall be paid out of the Treasury. If the creditors at any time desire supervision over the farming operations of a farmer, the cost of such supervision shall be borne by such creditors or by the farmer, as may be agreed upon by them, but in no instance shall the farmer be required to pay more than one-half of the cost of such supervision. Nothing contained in this section shall prevent

a conciliation commissioner who supervises such farming operations from receiving such compensation therefor as may be so agreed upon. No fees, costs, or other charges shall be charged or taxed to any farmer or his creditors by any conciliation commissioner or with respect to any proceeding under this section, except as hereinbefore in this section provided. The conciliation commissioner may accept and avail himself of office space, equipment, and assistance furnished him by other Federal officials, or by any State, county, or other public officials. The Supreme Court is authorized to make such general orders as it may find necessary properly to govern the administration of the office of conciliation commissioner and proceedings under this section; but any district court of the United States may, for good cause shown and in the interests of justice, permit any such general order to be waived.

"75. (c) At any time prior to March 4, 1948, a petition may be filed by any farmer, stating that the farmer is insolvent or unable to meet his debts as they mature, and that it is desirable to effect a composition or an extension of time to pay his debts. The petition or answer of the farmer shall be accompanied by his schedules. The petition and answer shall be filed with the court, but shall, on request of the farmer or creditor, be received by the conciliation commissioner for the county in which the farmer resides and promptly transmitted by him to the clerk of the court for filing. If any such petition is filed, an order of adjudication shall not be entered except as provided hereinafter in this section."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "State" and insert "district."

Page 2, line 5, strike out "four" and insert "two."

Page 2, line 8, after "is", insert "eligible for appointment as referee and in addition."

Page 4, line 4, strike out "1948" and insert "1946."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURDOCK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4166) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, pursuant to House Resolution 449, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein letters and tables from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

(Mr. SHAFER and Mr. MUNDT asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written to the R. F. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Washington Post of yesterday, and in the other to include an address I delivered in New York on Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PENTAGON BUILDING PROJECT

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter written by General Somervell to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], dated May 7, 1942, a letter written by the Under Secretary of War to me, dated February 25, 1944, and a letter written by Mr. MacDonald, commissioner of roads, dated February 22, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, 1942, I made a report and spoke on the floor of the House giving certain facts pertaining to the Pentagon Building project. The building at that time was incomplete. I now desire to make another report inasmuch as the project is practically complete. This report will necessarily contain some of the language, figures, and facts contained in my first report and will be a complete résumé of all the facts as far as I have them brought up to date.

FIRST NEW WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

Prior to the erection of the Pentagon Building, Congress authorized and there was built the first new War Department building, completed in 1941 at a cost of $9,504,441. A large apartment house said to be valued at $3,000,000 was wrecked to make room for this building. The building was located on Virginia Avenue not far from Constitution Avenue and was later found, according to Army officials, to be too small.

TEMPORARY BUILDING PROPOSED

At the beginning of the war emergency it was obvious that additional office space would be required to house war personnel. The War Department proposed that temporary buildings be erected at a cost of approximately $6,500,000; that such buildings would meet their requirements. These plans for some reason were later abandoned.

AUTHORIZATION AND APPROPRIATION FOR A NEW WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING, NOW KNOWN AS THE PENTAGON BUILDING

On Tuesday, July 22, 1941, and subsequent thereto, the War Department officials including Brig. Gen. (now Lt. Gen.) Brehon B. Somervell, Chief of Supply, Brig. Gen. (now Maj. Gen.) Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, Col. E. H. Householder and G. E. Bergstrom, architect, appeared before a joint meeting of the Deficiency Subcommittee and the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and proposed a second new War Department building. The testimony, which I am quoting here together with a committee report, is in my judgment conclusive evidence that the committee was assured that the cost of this building with all appurtenances, roads, and so forth, would not exceed $35,000,000. While I was opposed to this building from the first, the joint subcommittees, basing their recommendation upon the testimony, brought out a report recommending that $35,000,000 be appropriated for the construction of this building, on the condition that a million dollars for paving a parking area be absorbed in the amount. This action was adopted by the full Appropriations Committee.

COMMITTEE REPORT

The Appropriations Committee acting on this recommendation submitted a report under date of July 24, 1941, which reads in part as follows:

The cost of the structure, including all incidental and appurtenant costs, is $35,000,000. The committee was advised that in addition to this sum, approximately $1,000,000 would be required for fill, grading, and paving a parking area for 10,000 automobiles. The committee has inserted a provision to require the cost of the parking area to be included within the $35,000,000.

The building would contain a gross area of 5,100,000 square feet. After deducting space devoted to corridors, cafeterias, files, etc., there would be available approximately 4,000,000 square feet of office space. It will house a personnel of 40,000.

One hundred square feet of net space per employee.

The report was adopted by the Congress and became, therefore, the action and mandate of the House of Representatives. Based on this report and argument that the cost would not exceed $35,000,000, this House voted the appropriation.

TESTIMONY UPON WHICH COMMITTEE BASED ITS REPORT

The committee based its report and recommendation, at least in part, upon the following testimony found on pages 504 and 505 of the committee hearings:

Mr. WOODRUM. What will be the cost?—

Of what is now the Pentagon Building—

General SOMERVELL. $35,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will that complete the project, covering everything, including the utilities?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. Including the grading, sidewalks, streets, beautification, and so forth?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir. It does not include the parking area, which we have not been able to prepare estimates on.

Mr. LUDLOW. It includes the cost of the building complete, with the grading, sidewalks, and so forth?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

Continuing on page 508:

Mr. TABER. You say that you figure that 1,000,000 square feet of this would be for records and 4,000,000 for help?

General SOMERVELL. That is not quite correct, sir. There would be about a total of 5,100,000 gross, of which we figure about 4,000,000 for office space.

Mr. TABER. Four million for office space and the rest for records?

General SOMERVELL. And the rest would be machinery space, halls, and other auxiliary spaces.

On page 513 General Somervell testified:

Mr. WOODRUM. There has got to be some filling done there?

General SOMERVELL. There has got to be a considerable amount of filling. Probably some of that $35,000,000 can be squeezed in there. We will be glad to try that, on the understanding that you will permit us to come back.

Mr. WOODRUM. Would there be any additional costs to round out this project except what you have included here?

General SOMERVELL. No, sir.

Mr. TABER. What will be the additional cost for the roads and pavements along there?

General SOMERVELL. None, sir. I went over this with Mr. McDonald the other day, and this new road, the Richmond road, and the treatment shown on the map, is already provided for in the plans of the Bureau of Public Roads. We have conformed to their lay-out.

PLANS FOR TEMPORARY BUILDING ABANDONED

Based on this testimony, the committee report, the arguments made and assurances given that the total cost would not exceed $35,000,000 the committee and House abandoned the plans for a temporary building and voted to appropriate $35,000,000 for the erection of another and second new permanent War Department Building.

COMPLETE PROJECT WILL COST $86,000,000 INSTEAD OF $35,000,000

This project will cost approximately $86,000,000 when completed instead of $35,000,000 as represented to the committee. In other words, we start with a proposal to spend $6,500,000 for temporary War Department buildings and end up with an expenditure of $86,000,000, if we include access roads in that area. It will be argued that some of those roads would have been built if the Pentagon Building were not there. This may be true, but it seems to me that a few hundred thousand dollars judiciously spent would have built the required roads for other buildings in that area. I am including herewith a complete breakdown of each item of cost as taken from the records and furnished me by the various departments. I shall also include the name of each contractor, the type of work he did or material furnished, the amount paid him, and the fee.

LAND PURCHASES

When the War Department first came before the committee it was represented that 67 acres of land known as the Agricultural Experimental Farm would be adequate without the purchase of additional lands, providing it could have 146 acres known as the old Hoover Airport for a parking area. We now find that they have purchased, or are purchasing, some 400 descriptions of land at an estimated cost of $4,547,084, of which $3,877,301 has already been marked as expended. I have not completed my investigation on these rights-of-way but shall make a supplemental report as soon as I do.

SITE

The site originally proposed was directly east of the main gate to Arlington Cemetery. It was moved about 1 mile south on recommendation of the Parks and Planning Commission, without congressional approval or consent. It is now stated that this change was responsible for large additional expense. The following table shows the cost of utilities as proposed on the original site and the cost as actually incurred by the War Department in building the Pentagon Building, without crediting any part of it to any other building. It will be noted that the actual cost of utilities exceeded the original estimate by almost $4,000,000.

Comparative cost of 2 sites

	Cost, original site	Cost, present site	Excess cost, present site
Water mains	$250,000	$572,478	$322,478
Boiler plant, utility tunnel (refrigeration plant)	2,100,000	4,123,217	2,023,217
Electric distribution	20,000	787,748	767,748
Sewage disposal	263,000	570,397	307,397
Sewage and storm sewers	100,000	599,931	499,931
Total	2,733,000	6,653,771	3,920,771

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING

The Pentagon Building, as its name implies, is a five-sided structure. The building including a 6-acre court in the center, covers 42 acres. The upper stories of the building are divided into concentric wings of which there are five, in other words, there are five buildings, each within the other. The exterior side of the building is completely faced with limestone. The other building walls are formed out of concrete. Each of the five sides is 986 feet long and the building is almost a mile in circumference.

I have included in my remarks a complete break-down of the floor space as proposed in 1942 and as actually constructed. This table gives the floor space in terms of square feet. I think it would help us to see the picture better if we talk of it in terms of acres of floor space. There are 143 acres of gross office space in the building, of which 83 acres is net office space or actually devoted to office purposes. The other 60 acres is devoted to the following purposes:

Five acres for storage purposes.

One and eight-tenths acres for garage.

One and nine-tenths acres for bus terminal.

Over 2 acres for concourse.

Nearly 6 acres is devoted to kitchen, cafeterias, and beverage bars.

It took over 20 acres for corridors, ramps, entrances, and stairs.

It required 10 acres to furnish housing for mechanical equipment.

Eight acres for walls, chases, and so forth.

While over 3 acres were required for toilets and janitors' closets.

COMPARATIVE COST OF PENTAGON AND OTHER PUBLIC BUILDINGS

It is difficult to determine the exact cost per square foot of the Pentagon Building. If we take total cost of the building, site, grounds, utilities, and so forth, which is $86,000,000, we are charging against the project an amount that should be charged against other buildings in the area which are being serviced by the roads and utilities. The amount to be charged against these other buildings is hard to determine and indefinite. If we take the $49,000,000 figure as the building cost, we are not charging against it utilities, land purchases, roads and bridges and parkways which should be charged against the project. However, I am giving you the over-all figure:

First. Charging the entire $86,000,000 against the project and taking the War Department figures of 6,240,000 square feet of gross space, we find the cost is $13.80 per square foot of gross office space. Taking the War Department figures as 3,634,489 square feet of net office space, we find the cost is $23.66 per square foot of net office space.

Second. If we charge against the project only the building cost as set forth in exhibit C, which does not include land purchases, roads, bridges, outside utilities, and taking the same net and gross figures furnished by the War Department, of $49,736,654 which are obviously too low, we find that the gross office space cost is $7.97 per square foot and net office space cost is $13.70 per square foot. While the former figures may be too high, the latter figures do not give a fair picture because there should be charged against this office space the amount the project actually cost the taxpayers.

Third. The following gives the cost per gross square foot of office space of either other buildings and the date of completion. It will be realized, of course, that costs have varied considerably since some of these buildings were erected.

Per square foot cost of other public buildings

	Cost per gross square foot	Date of final completion
1. Social security	$7.478	Mar. 13, 1942
2. Railroad Retirement		
3. General Federal Office Bldg. No. 1	5.384	June 8, 1941
4. New War Department Bldg., District of Columbia	8.122	[1] Oct. 28, 1941
5. National Archives	8.944	Mar. 16, 1938
6. South Interior	9.204	Sept. 28, 1938
7. Labor Department and Interstate Commerce Commission	9.132	Sept. 4, 1935
8. Department of Justice	10.974	Sept. 5, 1935

[1] Last inspection.

FLOOR SPACE

The original report given me October 1, 1942, showed that the gross area, including the fourth floor of the third intermediate rings and the mezzanine between the subbasement and ground floor, was 6,619,938 square feet and net office space less potential corridors, 2,362,580 square feet. The report made on December 23, 1943, shows gross space of 6,240,000 square feet with net office space of 3,634,490 square feet. The following is a comparative statement showing the difference between the report of 1942 and the report of 1943:

EXHIBIT A

Item	1943 figure [1]	1942 figure [2]	Difference, 1943 minus 1942
NET RENTABLE			
Office	3,634,489	2,362,580	[3] +1,271,909
Storage	253,778	861,256	[4] −607,478
Garage	78,663	77,254	[4] +1,409
Bus terminal	82,998	83,411	[4] −413
Concourse	88,288	75,624	[4] +12,664
Kitchens, cafeterias, and beverage bars	257,663	243,878	[4] +13,785
BUILDING SERVICE			
Corridors, ramps, entrances, and stairs	879,521	856,329	[5] +23,192
Toilets and janitors' closets	135,571	122,252	[4] +13,319
Mechanical equipment	430,565	281,316	[4] +149,249
Covered interior roads	55,476	37,300	[5] +18,176
DEAD SPACE			
Walls, chases, etc	342,988	273,066	[4] +69,922
Gross space	6,240,000	[6] 6,131,077	[5] +108,923

[1] As actually constructed.
[2] As estimated prior to the completion of final plans and construction. (Nearest equivalent to the 1943 figure on the same line.)
[3] Explained in detail in memorandum of Jan. 19, 1944.
[4] Caused primarily by differences between the 2 independent classifications, measurements, and estimates.
[5] Caused by additional construction (top story) and reassignment of areas, as well as by differences between the 2 independent estimates.
[6] 5,776,352+354,725 (top story addition, referred to as "Fourth floor intermediate—3 rings"). The mezzanine listed under "Future additional space" has not been built

The corridors are arranged in such a way that the distance between any two points in the building will not exceed 1,800 feet. The cafeteria will seat from 6,000 to 8,000 at one time. Seven and one-half months after construction began on this building war workers moved in at the rate of 1,000 per week.

CONTRACTORS

The prime contractors were John McShain, Inc., Doyle & Russell, and Wise Contracting Co., Inc. I am including in the following table the name of the contractor and subcontractor of both fixed-fee and lump-sum contracts, the subject matter of the contract, and the expenditure under the contract, including fee and the fixed fee. These are the original contract figures, not the final figures, as additional work was done on some of the items.

EXHIBIT B

Name	Subject	Expenditures under contract, including fee	Fixed fee
Prime contractor: John McShain, Inc., Doyle & Russell, and Wise Contracting Co., Inc.	General contractors	$28,056,728.92	$614,270
Subcontractor, fixed fee:			
Potts & Callahan	Excavating, grading, and landscaping	5,594,152.28	106,274
Harry Alexander, Inc	Interior electrical	5,799,738.18	94,400
Baker, Smith & Co., Inc., Mehring & Hanson Co.	Heating and ventilating exclusive of power plant.	11,272,057.44	163,562
Fred Brutschy Co., Inc	Plumbing	4,511,210.17	78,700
Carlson Bros. of Michigan, Inc	Mechanical equipment, powerhouse	1,979,145.77	64,020
Geo. A. Ford Electric Co	Exterior electrical	849,881.61	25,386
Kenmar Steel Construction Co	Placing reinforcing steel and mesh	1,052,727.53	35,390
McNulty Bros. Co., Kraft Murphy Co	Lathing and plastering	3,747,299.58	74,090
Edw. W. Minte Co., Inc., Van Florence Co	Interior and exterior painting	771,202.18	15,600
Roman Mosaic & Tile Co., Columbia Mosaic & Tile Co.	Interior tile and terrazzo work	414,287.35	18,000
Subcontractors, lump sum:			
Air Compressor Service, Inc	Demolition	2,662.50	
Armstrong Cork Co	Refrigerators	54,893.68	
Fidelity Window Cleaning Co	Window cleaning	15,092.26	
Fingles Co	Sheet-metal work, power plant	9,712.00	
Hires-Turner Glass Co	Structural and glass partitions	6,135.64	
Howat Concrete Co., Inc	Hauling ready-mix concrete	450,191.98	
Lamson Corporation	Pneumatic tube system	150,365.00	
Marshall Flooring Co	Flooring	1,878.00	
Montgomery Elevator Co., Inc	Freight elevators	134,743.72	
Morse-Boulger Destructor Co	Incinerator	5,855.55	
Otis Elevator Co., Inc	Elevators and escalators	512,262.47	
Overly Manufacturing Co., Inc	Slate roofing and sheet-metal work	329,595.22	
Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co	Glass and glazing	331,479.49	
Irvin Prickett	Dampproofing	925.24	
Raymond Concrete Pile Co	Concrete piles cast in place	1,810,933.89	
N. Snellenburgh & Co., Inc	Asphalt tile flooring	347,743.92	
Vermont Marble Co., Inc	Stone stairs, bases, etc	46,081.23	
Warren Ehret Co	Composition roofing	196,411.17	
Warsaw Elevator Co	Elevators and dumbwaiters	10,632.00	
Total		68,456,965.17	1,289,692

EXHIBIT C

BREAK-DOWN OF MAIN BUILDING COST

Following are the estimated amounts as furnished me by the War Department of the various items which make up the total cost of the main building. I was unable to get the actual cost from the War Department:

Item:	Cost
Excavation and fill	$582,190
Piling	2,130,206
Foundation work	*1,076,237
Structural steel	41,468
Water and dampproofing	76,602
Concrete	*13,729,833
Brick and tile masonry	*946,064
Limestone and granite	*1,229,156
Stair treads and precast stone, etc	*309,379
Miscellaneous iron work	*795,611
Roofing—built-up and slate	731,447
Hollow metal doors and windows	*333,420
Glass and glazing	413,140
Rough carpentry	*359,980
Finished carpentry and hardware	*709,416
Lathing and plastering	4,052,549
Tile and terrazzo work	494,031
Miscellaneous metal trades	**467,405
Painting	539,649
Plumbing	2,977,610
Heating, ventilation, and miscellaneous mechanical	10,626,294
Electrical work	5,541,147
Elevator work	775,705
Tile floor—asphalt	398,395
Window shades	95,363
Miscellaneous items	**304,357
Total	49,736,654

Work done by prime contractors: The work on the main building done by the prime contractors, John McShain, Inc., Doyle & Russell, and Wise Contracting Co., Inc., is indicated in the list by asterisks, as follows:

*Work done by the prime contractors.

**Work done in part by the prime contractors.

EQUIPMENT

The appraised value of the equipment was $2,993,851, of which $2,372,793 was Government owned and $621,058 was owned by contractors. All equipment was recaptured under recapture clause with the exception of the equipment owned by Potts & Callahan, grading contractors, the value of which was $203,744 and who received $161,565 in rentals, and the prime contractor, John McShain, the value of whose equipment was $100,017 and who was paid $53,587 in rentals.

ENGINEERING AND OVERHEAD

The architect-engineering—designing and planning—cost was $1,600,000. All engineering was done by the Army with the exception of mechanical engineering, which was done by Charles S. Leopold, of Philadelphia, on a fixed-fee basis. This included the air conditioning, heating, and the ventilating. The fixed fee was $74,708.

LANDSCAPING AND TERRACING

The landscaping work was performed by A. D. Taylor who received a fixed fee of $14,000. According to the report made on December 23, 1943, "All landscaping has been kept in simple form." This report shows "landscaping, trees, shrubs, top soil, and seeding $385,000." The progress sheet given me on June 15, 1942, shows that $2,372,041 was being spent in landscaping and terracing. A photostatic copy of the Field Progress Report of April 1943 shows an item of $253,000 for storing and spreading top soil and planting grass seed and $135,000 for planting trees and shrubs. The following explanation is given:

All landscaping has been kept in simple form. It has been confined to grading and

the planting of small trees and shrubs and grass. The grading was limited to the minimum required for safe road shoulders and the planting to that required to prevent erosion and protect structures. No large trees have been installed. The lagoon near the building was not developed solely for landscaping purposes, but resulted from the excavation of large quantities of material required for road and parking area fill. If this material had not been used, an equal amount of material would have had to be hauled from points 4 miles farther away.

I have before me a report from the Under Secretary of War's office dated January 6, 1944, showing the name of each contractor and subcontractor, the type of work his contract covered and the expenditure under the contract, including his fee. This report shows that subcontractors Potts & Callahan were paid $5,594,152 for excavating, grading, and landscaping. From this statement, it is apparent that some of the work that Potts & Callahan did was landscaping and was not included in the $385,000 which the Chief of Engineers reported as having been the total amount spent for landscaping.

DRAINAGE

Records indicate that a total of $1,278,-721 was spent for drainage or drainage structures on the site. This figure includes storm water as well as sanitary drainage, and drainage work done for the Public Board of Administration.

RAILROAD RELOCATION

Eighty-two thousand five hundred dollars—the $82,500 covers the relocation of the Pennsylvania Railroad trackage.

BOILER PLANT

Cost, $4,123,217.

WATER MAINS

Four hundred and forty-one thousand five hundred and thirty-four dollars—this is the cost of all water mains constructed in the vicinity.

LABOR

Approximately 13,000 men were employed on the job while at its peak, of whom 4,600 were carpenters building concrete forms and performing other carpenter work. The crews were organized, under a general superintendent and an outside superintendent, into 5 sections. Each section had a section superintendent and a night superintendent. Each section superintendent had a labor foreman and a carpenter foreman. The labor and carpenter crews were broken up into small groups of 15 to 25 men, each with a pusher for each group. The contractor states that carpenters were actually carpenters.

RATIO OF LABOR TO MATERIAL

The ratio of labor cost to material cost on this job as of June 15, 1942, was: Labor 56 percent and material 44 percent.

CLOSED SHOP

The John McShain Co. has always operated—and operated on the Pentagon job—under a closed shop. Doyle & Russell and the Wise Contracting Co., I am informed, were not operating under a closed shop. Mr. John McShain informed me that he hires or fires as he sees fit, that he collects no dues, and that there is no check-off system. No labor trouble of any consequence has existed to date on the job.

LABOR SHORTAGE

Some delay was caused by the fact that there was a certain shortage in field labor. The contractor stated that he was about 50 percent short of the required crew on steel-rod setters; that he got about 12 steam fitters out of 200 asked for; that he was about 25 percent short on electricians and 34 percent short on plumbers. About 15 to 25 percent of the delay on the job was due to the shortage of skilled labor. There was no shortage of common labor.

LUMBER

Twenty-three million one hundred and ninety-eight thousand board feet of lumber were purchased, at a cost of $8,360,500. The average cost was $37.22 per thousand board feet. In comparing the cost of this lumber per thousand, it must be remembered that the larger portion of this lumber was common shiplap lumber used for concrete forms. Practically no expensive lumber, such as siding, flooring, and so forth, was used. Lumber was inspected as to moisture content, grade, and quantity by both contractor and construction quartermaster. There was very little waste lumber on the job. Concrete forms were hauled from site to site and rebuilt. Very little waste remained.

COST OF ROADS, BRIDGES, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY IN THE PENTAGON AREA

According to a report submitted to me by Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, dated December 30, 1943, there has been expended or commitments have been made for road, bridges, and rights-of-way for a total of $16,966,000; of this, $6,326,000 was furnished by the War Department from War Department funds. The $16,966,000 includes $3,226,000 construction expenditure by the War Department proper. The following is a detailed account and break-down of the expenditures of the $16,966,000 and the source of the funds:

Expenditures:	
1. Grading and paving	$3,917,774.93
2. Bridges	3,880,882.60
3. Rights-of-way	3,877,301.36
4. Slide removal, top soiling, erosion control	250,000.00
5. Signs, sidewalk, detours during construction, etc	81,312.76
6. Plans, surveys, testing materials	295,905.31
Total	12,303,217.26
Commitments:	
1. Construction	592,000.00
2. Rights-of-way	669,782.74
3. Equipment and maintenance	175,000.00
Total	13,740,000.00
War Department construction expenditures	3,226,000.00
Total for major road system	16,966,000.00
Funds of War Department	[1] 6,326,000.00
Taken from Acess Road funds by Public Roads Commissioner	10,640,000.00

[1] This amount is included in the War Department report of expenditures.

In attempting to justify this huge expenditure in such a small area, the Commissioner of Public Roads enclosed the following statement as to population, traffic count, and so forth:

TRAFFIC COUNT AND BUILDING CAPACITY

Work on main highway approaches in Virginia to the Highway, Memorial, and Key Bridges, by the Public Roads Administration.

This system serves the Pentagon Building, the Navy Office Building No. 2, the Army Signal Corps station at Arlington Hall, the Navy radio station at Arlington, the Arlington Cemetery and Fort Myer, as well as the large civil population in Arlington and Fairfax Counties.

The traffic problem at the Virginia approaches to Washington for many years has been to carry the large volumes of through and local traffic to and away from three bridges: the Highway Bridge at Fourteenth Street, the Memorial Bridge, and the Georgetown Bridge.

In January 1934 the Capital Park and Planning Commission approved a system of roads to provide for the Virginia approaches to these bridges which incorporated all of the roads which have now been built. The location and scope of the Army and Navy building developments required enlargement in detail of design, location, and rights-of-way of the planned system as approved in 1934.

At the present time the daily traffic over these bridges leading into Washington amounts to approximately 84,600 vehicles. The Highway Bridge carries 37,400, Memorial Bridge 26,400, and Key Bridge 20,800. There has been a large increase in the population of both Fairfax and Arlington Counties since the adoption of the road plan in 1934. The census reports show increases in Arlington of 30,000 and in Fairfax of 15,000, between 1930 and 1940, and the population of each is much greater now in 1943 than the total of 106,969 people as shown by the 1940 census. In the area of the old Arlington Farms, there are now approximately 35,000 at work in the Pentagon, about 7,500 in the Navy Building, and about 7,000 occupying the women's dormitories recently completed. These alone total 49,500.

It should be noted, however, that the Roads Administration is not justified in including the 7,000 persons occupying the women's dormitories in its count, since a great majority of these women are employed in the Pentagon or Navy Buildings and hence have been included there. To count them both at their place of work and their nearby dormitory residence is to make two persons out of each of them, and I think we will agree that the increase in population in that area has been sufficient without resorting to such tactics. It is interesting to note, too, that while there are 35,000 workers in the Pentagon Building according to this statement, the Roads Administration and the War Department are charging $6,326,000 to the Pentagon Building, and while 7,500 are said to be working in the Navy Building, they are charging $10,640,000 against that project.

ROOF CHANGES AFTER CONSTRUCTION BEGAN

The Pentagon Building consists of five rings or buildings each inside the other. The inner and outer ring were constructed as five stories—originally called four stories and basement—the three intermediate rings were originally constructed as four stories (originally called

three stories and basement. After the building was practically complete and 40 percent of the roofs of the three inner rings were on, it was decided to tear off the roof that had just been put on and add another story. So the roof which had just been completed on 40 percent of the three inner rings was demolished and another story added. I attempted to obtain the additional cost to the Government of wrecking this roof and replacing it. The engineer at first told me that 30 percent had been wrecked and the total cost was $24,000. After insisting upon a complete report, I was informed that when the top story was initiated, it was estimated that the demolition cost would be $107,000 and the roof work $24,000. The Under Secretary of War's letter states that "nothing occurred during the construction to indicate that these estimates were not reasonable and adequate." Total of 354,725 square feet of space was added because of this new top story. Forty percent of this is 141,790 square feet of roof which was demolished and rebuilt. It seems to me absurd in view of the cost of other items in this building, that you could rebuild 141,790 square feet of roof on this building for $24,000. If this is true, then the roof on the entire three rings would have cost $60,000.

This statement is made to appear all the more ridiculous when one takes into consideration the fact that the War Department statement in the cost of the main building shows that "Roofing, built up and slate," cost $731,447. See exhibit C. I think the figures speak for themselves.

COMMENT ON COST

A comparison of the break-down furnished me by the War Department of the building cost of exhibit C and the amount of the contract on exhibit B shows that while the total excavation, grading, and landscaping by Potts & Callahan amounted to $5,594,152.28, only $582,190 was charged against the building for excavation and fill. Exhibit C shows that the heating, ventilating, and mechanical equipment costs were $10,626,294, but the contract price of heating and ventilating, excluding the power plant, was $11,272,057.44. While the plumbing contract was for a total of $4,511,210.17, the amount charged against the building was only $2,977,610. While the interior electrical contract was $5,799,738.18 and the exterior electrical contract was $840,881.61, the amount charged against the building was $5,541,147. While the contract for interior and exterior painting was for $771,202.18, the amount charged against the building was $539,649. In addition, the building costs included in the $49,736,000 are only for the actual building itself. These are some of the discrepancies which can be seen by comparison.

CONFLICTING WAR DEPARTMENT REPORTS ON COSTS

I have before me the following reports: Photostatic copies of the field progress reports made to me by the Army engineers, dated June 15, 1942; August 31, 1942; and April 24, 1943. In addition to this, I have a report on the comparative cost of utilities dated July 11, 1942, taken from the records by Henry E. Walker, chief recorder of the United States Engineering Office. I also have before me what purports to be a final report made by the Office of the Chief of Engineers dated December 23, 1943, in which he attempts arbitrarily to allocate to other projects a number of the costs incurred. It is interesting to note that the photostatic copy of the progress report of June 15, 1942, shows the entire project cost at $58,0C6,319, whereas a photostatic copy of the field progress report 46 days later on August 31, 1942, gives the entire project cost at $49,194,440. It is further interesting to note that the progress report of August 31, 1942, did not include three items which were included in the report made 46 days earlier on June 15, 1942. These three items thus omitted aggregate $11,712,395 and are itemized as follows:

1. Terracing and landscaping	$2,372,041
2. Parking lots and access roads	8,641,410
3. Grading and excavation for building	698,944
Total	11,712,395

This does not include other amounts spent by the Roads Division. It is rather difficult to explain why this amount was included in the report of June 15, 1942, and excluded in the report of August 31, 1942. Every report made seems to conflict with a previous report in a way that cannot be explained away by stating that they were revised figures.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Following is the source of funds used by the War Department and Public Roads Division to construct the Pentagon Building project including roads, bridges, and rights-of-way:

1. National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942	$35,000,000
2. Special lump sum furnished by the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee to the Secretary of War to expedite production of equipment and supplies	24,747,500
3. Special lump sum furnished the Chief of Engineers for engineering service	16,141,856
Total funds furnished by War Department	75,889,356
4. Moneys taken by Commissioner of Public Roads from access road funds	10,640,000
Total funds available	86,529,356

From these funds the following expenditures were made, according to the War Department report:

1. The Pentagon construction, main building	$49,736,654
2. Outside utilities	12,309,300
3. Architect-engineering	1,600,000
4. Special and technical changes and additions resulting from tenant requirements	4,239,550
5. Other construction in the vicinity not related to the Pentagon	1,010,072
6. Roads, bridges, rights-of-way	$16,966,000
Amount remaining unspent which it is expected will be returned	667,780
Total cost of project, including area, roads, bridges, and rights-of-way	86,529,356
Assuming that the above unspent sum is not spent deduct	667,780
This leaves a net project cost of	85,861,576

JUSTIFICATIONS, IF ANY

On May 7, 1942, General Somervell wrote the following letter to the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, attempting to justify the action he took:

MAY 7, 1942.

HON. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CANNON: On July 22 I appeared before your committee and requested the sum of $35,000,000 for the purpose of erecting a War Department Building in Arlington, Va. Our estimate was based on the use of a site which had been carefully selected both from the standpoint of usefulness and of economy in construction.

As you are aware, it was necessary to use another site which has proven even more difficult and expensive than we had anticipated when we stated to your committee that, although it was impossible to give any accurate figures on the increased cost of construction resulting from the change in site, it would be at least $5,000,000.

The change in site not only complicated the construction problems, but also compelled a different architectural treatment. Our prepared plans had to be abandoned and the building had to be redesigned to meet the difficult foundation conditions and other peculiarities of the site as well as to develop appropriately the southern entrance to the Nation's Capital. The difficulties were further increased by the requirement that the building had to be suitable for record warehousing after the expiration of the war.

The sudden outbreak of the war and the immediate demand for more space for war activities further added to the cost. It was at once apparent that a maximum of office space in the new building would have to be provided and that, as rapidly as possible in order to insure more efficient operation of the War Department as well as to avoid the expense and construction effort involved in providing millions of square feet of temporary space. Instructions were issued to expedite the work in every possible way.

A million square feet of office space are now available and an additional half million will become available in June. Progress on the job has been outstanding in the construction field. Our present schedule promises the remaining space in sizeable increments until the building is completed next fall.

It was our understanding that the Public Buildings Administration would provide those items of operating equipment such as that for cafeterias which in War Department buildings are normally supplied from maintenance funds. This was not done and to avoid delay in occupancy, the War Department is purchasing those items.

Because of the increasing demand for space, it also became necessary to abandon any plan to reduce the originally contemplated size of the building. It was found that record stor-

age space could be added in the lower levels at a cost comparing favorably to that of providing storage space in our depots. The part of the structure which extends over the old Washington Airport was particularly adapted to this purpose, 650,000 square feet of storage space being added.

It was considered advisable to approach the utility problem from the long-range viewpoint in order to insure the maximum ultimate economy to the United States. The water-supply and sewage-disposal systems are able to take care of all existing governmental installations in and around Arlington with some spare capacity for future expansion. The wisdom of this decision, which added to the first cost, has already been borne out by the considerable saving that will accrue to the United States by reason of the fact that the utilities to the dormitories, now about to be construction on the originally proposed site, can be taken care of by our lines.

Originally it was planned to purchase electric power at the using voltages. Later it was found that by buying power at a higher voltage the ultimate cost to the United States would be less, although the first cost for transformers and auxiliary equipment would be some $800,000.

By reason of these additions and the accelerated rate of construction demanded after Pearl Harbor, it is now expected that the work will cost about $14,250,000 above the appropriated figure. We are now, however, asking the Congress for additional funds, as the amount is being obtained from unexpended balances of other War Department construction projects. It is hoped that the above procedure meets with the approval of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

BREHON SOMERVELL,
Lieutenant General, Commanding.

Attention is called to the fact that while General Somervell appeared before our subcommittee on July 22, 1941, this letter was not written until May 7, 1942, or nearly 10 months after he appeared before our committee, 8 months after the building was commenced, and 6 days after employees began moving in. He did not ask for instructions, but was merely trying to explain why he had violated the mandate of the committee and House, which instructed him that he must keep his costs within $35,000,000 for 4,000,000 square feet of net office space.

JUSTIFICATION FOR THE USE OF FUNDS

Believing that the Under Secretary of War, who has had charge of construction, and the Commissioner of Public Roads, who allocated the road funds for the Pentagon Building, should be given an opportunity to justify the transfer of funds which were transferred to the Pentagon Building, and in order that this report may be complete, on February 9, 1944, I wrote the following letters to the Honorable Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, which are self-explanatory.

The following is the letter written to Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson:

FEBRUARY 9, 1944.

Hon. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War,
War Department, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In order that my report on the Pentagon Building may be complete, I want a written statement justifying the use of the following funds used to build the Pentagon project and on what you base your opinion that Congress, in the face of the evidence before it and on the committee report, intended these funds to be used for that purpose:

1. $24,000,000 taken from the lump sum appropriation given the Secretary of War to expedite equipment and supplies.

2. $16,000,000 taken from the funds that Congress gave the Chief of Engineers for engineering service.

I want to make this letter a part of my report so that if the question is raised, the justification will be in the report in your own language.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

On February 27 I received the following reply:

FEBRUARY 25, 1944.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ENGEL: Your letter of February 9, 1944, requesting a statement justifying the use of expediting production and engineer service, Army, funds in connection with the Pentagon project, has been received.

The authority of the War Department to use the funds for expediting production and for engineer service, Army, as appropriated in the Military Appropriation Acts of 1942 and 1943, as amended for construction of the Pentagon, is to be found in the acts themselves.

The pertinent provisions of the Military Appropriation Act of 1942 relating to the fund for expediting production are as follows:

"EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

"Expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense: To enable the Secretary of War, with the approval of the President, and without reference to sections 3709 and 1136, as amended, Revised Statutes, to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for emergency national defense purposes, including all of the objects and purposes specified under each of the appropriations available to the War Department during the fiscal year 1942, for procurement or production of equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of equipment and material and the use and operation thereof; and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of War are desirable in expediting production for military purposes and are approved by the President, $1,271,896,000, of which amount not to exceed $771,896,000 shall be for payments under contracts authorized under this head in appropriation acts for the fiscal year 1941" (Public Law 139, 77th Cong., 1st sess., approved June 30, 1941)."

The necessity for obtaining the approval of the President was eliminated by amendment cited as title III, Military Appropriation Act of 1942, as follows:

"Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the national defense for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1942, and June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, namely:

"TITLE I—WAR DEPARTMENT

"MILITARY ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 101. For additional amounts for appropriations for the Military Establishment, fiscal year 1942, to be supplemental to, and merged with, the appropriations under the same heads in the Military Appropriation Act, 1942, including the objects and subject to the limitations and conditions specified under said heads respectively in that act, except as otherwise provided herein, as follows:

* * * * *

"EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

"For expediting production of equipment and supplies for national defense, $388,000,000: *Provided,* That expenditures from appropriations under this heading may hereafter be made until June 30, 1943, without securing the specific approval of the projects by the President." (Public Law 353, 77th Cong. 1st sess., approved December 17, 1941.)

Additional funds for expediting production were appropriated in the Fourth and Fifth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Acts, 1942, for the same purposes and subject to the same limitations and conditions.

It would appear from the above-quoted language that the appropriation for expediting production in the Military Appropriation Act of 1942 covers such a purpose as the construction of the Pentagon Building. The building is necessary for the expeditious accomplishment of our production effort, and the "erection of structures" is specifically authorized by the act. The increase in the efficiency of the procurement agencies of the War Department, as a result of the construction of the building, is a purpose clearly within the purview of the appropriation for expediting production. That increased efficiency was a controlling factor in the decision to construct the building is evidenced by the testimony before the appropriations subcommittees of the Senate and the House and in the report by the House Appropriations Committee on the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942. The provision of centralized executive office space for the War Department to promote efficiency of its procurement and production activities is certainly as vital to the expedition of production as is the provision of office space in a munitions plant or aircraft plant.

The War Department has never had any question as to the propriety of employing these funds in the construction of the Pentagon. You, and the other members of the subcommittee who were present, will recall that in his testimony before the House Appropriations subcommittee on June 15, 1942, General Groves stated that expedition production funds would be used for completion of the building and that no further action by the Congress was considered necessary. (House Appropriation, Subcommittee hearing—Military Establishment appropriation bill for 1943, p. 220).

The Engineer Service, Army, funds used for the construction of the Pentagon were taken from appropriations under this heading in the Military Appropriation Acts of 1942 and 1943.

The pertinent provisions of the Military Appropriation Act of 1942 are as follows:

"Engineer Service, Army.

* * * * *

"Military construction, defense installations: For construction, installation, maintenance, and repair of facilities required for military use at locations to be approved by the President, and for each and every object and expense connected therewith, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, including housing, storage, fortifications, airdromes, piers, roads, railroads, and communication, water, sewerage, and electric systems, and other utilities connected therewith, and also including the acquisition of leasehold and other interests in land, and temporary use thereof, without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended (10 U. S.

C. 1339; 40 U. S. C. 267)." (Public Law 139, 77th Cong., 1st sess., approved 30 June 1941.)

The pertinent provisions of the Military Appropriation Act of 1943 are as follows:

"Engineer Service, Army.

* * * * *

"Military posts: For construction and installation of buildings, utilities, flying fields, fortifications, and appurtenances thereto, or other facilities required for military use and for each and every object and expense connected therewith, including (a) housing, storage, interior facilities, fixed equipment, piers, roads, railroads, communications, water, sewerage, and electric systems." (Public Law 649, 77th Cong., 2d sess., approved 2 July 1942.)

It is difficult for me to visualize any language which Congress could have used to indicate more clearly its intention that these funds were available for the construction of facilities to house the headquarters of the War Department General Staff, the Army Air Forces, and the Army Service Forces.

Your assurance that this letter will be included in your report on The Pentagon is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

The following is the letter written to Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads:

FEBRUARY 9, 1944.

Mr. THOMAS H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads,
Federal Works Agency,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MACDONALD: I have before me a statement submitted by you some time ago stating that $16,966,000 had been spent or was being spent for the major road system in and around the Pentagon Building area. Six million three hundred and twenty-six thousand dollars, according to the statement, were funds furnished by the War Department and $10,640,000 was taken by the Public Roads Division from access road funds.

In order that my report on the Pentagon project may be complete, I respectfully request that you give me a written statement justifying the expenditure of this sum in that area and for what purpose and upon whose orders the work was done and the obligation incurred.

I would like your statement in order that anyone reading the report who may be disposed to criticize the expenditure of this money will have your justification and can consider both sides of the case. I shall include this letter in my report together with your reply.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBERT J. ENGEL.

On February 27, 1944, I received the following:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY,
PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION,
February 22, 1944.

Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. ENGEL: I have your letter of February 9, 1944, requesting a statement concerning the expenditure from War Department and access road funds of $16,966,000 for the major road system in and around the Pentagon area in Arlington County, Va. This work was undertaken under the authority of the Defense Highway Act (Public Law 295, 77th Cong., approved November 19, 1941). In accordance with that act the project was approved by the Public Roads Administration after certification by the Secretary of War to the Federal Works Administrator that the project was important to the national defense.

More than 10 years ago traffic conditions on the Virginia side of the bridges across the Potomac River and the general development of Arlington and Fairfax Counties demanded major improvements of the arterial highway routes in that area. As the result of a report by me to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in January 1934, a plan was prepared showing a suggested layout of arterial highways to be used as a basis for a progressive program of improvements. This plan, a copy of which is attached, was approved by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission in 1934. There were three major objectives in the then proposed program of improvements. The first was relief from increasing traffic congestion which costs road users such vast sums and wastes the time of so many of our citizens. The existing facilities were inadequate to provide for the increasing number of vehicles traveling between the bridges across the Potomac River and points in Arlington County, Fairfax County, the city of Alexandria, and beyond. A second objective was the improvement of the southerly and westerly approaches to the Nation's Capital. With no control of roadside development on arterial routes, the roads were lined with gas stations, hot-dog stands, and other businesses—in one case a fat rendering plant—of a character undesirable on the principal approaches to the Nation's Capital. These conditions and the narrow rights-of-way of the existing roads created not only a bleak and drab appearance but also highly congested approaches that retarded, delayed, and confused traffic. A third objective was the expansion and protection of the Arlington National Cemetery. At that time it was felt that the cemetery should expand easterly to the Potomac River and take over the area formerly occupied by the Arlington Experimental Farm. Arlington Ridge Road, which ran along the easterly wall of the cemetery, was to be eliminated entirely and a heavy-duty bypass road constructed, as shown on the 1934 map, to take its place.

Through the years these objectives became increasingly important. By 1941 the average weekday traffic across the 3 major bridges, Highway, Memorial, and Key, had reached an average weekday total of 118,000 motor vehicles with a peak hourly load close to 11,000. The bridges were not the critical points of congestion. The bottlenecks were the approaches which were wholly inadequate to accommodate these loads; and the improvements, contemplated a decade earlier, were sorely needed. The first step in these improvements, namely, the construction of Lee Boulevard, had already been completed except for a bridge across Boundary Channel, and a revised general lay-out was prepared in keeping with the demand for free-flowing facilities. A print of this plan, dated March 1941, is attached. Note that the general lay-out was not materially different from that on the earlier plan, but several grade separation structures were added, and a connection to a new route to the south was shown. This new route was needed to bypass both Alexandria and expanded Fort Belvoir and in general relieve existing United States Route 1, which was not susceptible of major improvements on existing right-of-way.

While, as above noted the first step in the improvement program recommended in 1934 had been completed, nothing had been done to carry out any of the remaining recommendations, and as a result the condition of southerly and westerly approaches to the National Capital were deteriorating rapidly. The closeness of this area to the heart of metropolitan Washington was in itself creating economic pressure for the rapid and undesirable development of the property along the roads. The Arlington National Cemetery, with the imminence of war in 1941, called for expansion and protection more than ever before. In its ultimate development I can envision the inclusion of all of the area bounded by Lee Boulevard on the north and the through roads of The Pentagon network on the west, south, and east; with Memorial Avenue, connecting the cemetery with the shrine to Abraham Lincoln, taking its intended place as the primary approach.

The construction of the Navy Annex Building, which was ultimately to house 7,500 workers, had been undertaken in December 1940, and houses in Arlington County to accommodate workers in the Washington metropolitan area were being constructed rapidly. It was thus apparent at the beginning of 1941 that the roads of the area, already loaded greatly beyond their capacity, would be called upon to accommodate still greater traffic loads. When, in August 1941, the act of Congress authorizing the construction of The Pentagon was approved, it was obvious that the addition of the traffic of some 30,000 to 35,000 additional people would create traffic problems in this area, which could be solved only by carrying out simultaneously the long-range plan of road improvements previously developed, expanded as necessary to provide for greater traffic volumes than had been originally envisaged. To have failed to provide for an adequate road system would have defeated the purpose of the Congress in authorizing the construction of the building, since the building, as well as the other governmental activities in the area, could not have functioned with the utterly hopeless condition of traffic congestion which the additional population would have imposed upon the existing roads in the area.

In order to meet these new conditions, and to insure that the needed road improvements would be ready to carry the new traffic loads resulting from the occupancy of Pentagon in addition to that of other Government buildings and housing in Arlington County, it was necessary for the design of the arterial routes and of the service roads of Pentagon to proceed simultaneously and for certain construction operations to overlap. Accordingly the work was carried out and expenditures were made in accordance with a joint agreement between General Somervell and myself. It was found necessary to expand the plan of 1941 to provide for greater capacity and continuous movement of traffic by providing somewhat wider pavements and constructing more grade separation structures than originally contemplated and to provide flexibility in choice of routes in the event of difficulty at a river crossing. It is interesting to note that the original plan did not need major changes in its broad conception. Some modification of the lines and elaboration of the method of providing interchange between the various through routes to insure free movement and flexibility and to provide connections to the Federal buildings, their appurtenant service roads and parking areas were the principal changes in the broad outline. Thus the expenditures about which you inquire were used for improvements in the arterial road system which, for the most part, were already needed in 1941, before the outbreak of the war, but which, in the normal course of events, doubtless would have been spread over several years.

Regarding the cost of right-of-way, the purchase at the time of all the rights-of-way necessary for these arterial routes not only saved a large sum in the ultimate cost but made it possible to provide adequate right-of-way for the needed facilities. The improvement of land in Arlington County in private ownership was proceeding rapidly in 1941, and with the advent of war the economic pressure for housing and other facilities in an area so close to downtown Washington accelerated the building pace so that if the program of arterial highway improvements had been spread over several years right-of-way widths for these roads would have had to be reduced to an undesirable minimum and the narrower widths of right-of-way paid for at considerably increased

cost. As it is the right-of-way is of sufficient width so that these roads, instead of deteriorating by undesirable roadside developments, as has happened in the past, will increase in economic value and aesthetic appearance with time so that they will always remain creditable approaches to the Nation's Capital. In addition the conversion to highway purposes of several districts adjacent to the Arlington National Cemetery, particularly an area which had become one of the worst slums in this vicinity, will make it possible to expand the National Cemetery in an environment worthy of a shrine which to an increasing degree will be so sacred to such a large number of our citizens.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

[Enclosure.]

FURTHER REPORTS

I have not completed my investigation into the land purchases and operating costs. When I do so, I shall make a detailed report on that phase of the Pentagon project.

The statement was made by the War Department through a press release that the Pentagon Building was paying for itself. I have asked for a complete report on the operating expenses of the building including the number of tons of coal burned, the price per ton, the amount of the lighting bill, repair and up-keep, total number of maintenance employees, the number in each type of employment, including the number of janitors, guides, and so forth, and all other operating costs. I have also asked for information as to the rent that is being paid by various concessionaires and the revenue derived from the building through rentals, concessions, and so forth. I asked particularly for the amount of rent the tenants are paying, and the square feet of space rented. As soon as I receive this information I shall report it to the Congress. If the War Department runs true to form, I expect the Public Relations Division will give this information to the public while it is going through channels and before I receive the Under Secretary of War's report.

CONCLUSION

CONFLICTING REPORTS

It is absolutely impossible to reconcile the many conflicting reports made by the War Department on the cost of the Pentagon project. I have before me the following documents and estimates made by the War Department as to this project cost:

First. A copy of a letter which I am including in my report dated May 7, 1942, written by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding Services of Supply, to the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives. This letter states that because of certain conditions the cost of the project will be $14,250,000 above the $35,000,000 appropriated. This would make the total cost $49,250,000.

Second. A photostatic copy of the Field Progress Report made by the district engineer to the Chief of Engineers, dated June 15, 1942. This report gives the project cost at $58,006,319. The same day the district engineer gave report, the Chief of Engineers testified before the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee that the total cost would be between forty-nine and fifty million dollars.

Third. A photostatic copy of the Engineering Field Progress Report dated August 31, 1942, giving the project cost at $49,194,442. This progress report omits $11,712,395 contained in the June 15, 1942, report. This sum is itemized in the June 15 report, as follows:

Terracing and landscaping	$2,372,041
Parking lots and access roads	8,641,410
Grading and excavation for building	698,944

Fourth. A photostatic copy of the Field Progress Report of April 24, 1943. This report gives the entire project cost at $63,454,583.

Fifth. On December 23, 1943, the War Department furnished me what purported to be a complete and final report on this project.

(a) On page 1 in the foreword we find the cost of construction of the building and its outside utilities as of December 1, 1943, given at $62,045,954. Anyone who reads merely the foreword is given the impression that that is the entire project cost.

(b) On page 7 of the same report we find that they have added $1,600,000 architect-engineering cost which they omitted from the foreword, bringing the project cost up to $63,645,954.

(c) On page 9 in accounting for the source of the funds and the expenditure of funds for this project, at my insistence we find that they had available from the sources there given, not including highway funds $75,889,356, all of which except $667,780 was spent so the cost according to that part of the report would have been $75,222,000. All of these reports were given to me at the time of my request.

A still further examination of the report shows that this amount of $75,222,000 includes only $6,326,000 of the $16,966,000 spent for roads, bridges, and rights-of-way in this area, another $10,640,000 having been taken by the Commissioner of Public Roads from the access road funds. The access road funds, if I remember correctly, are provided by Congress to build secondary roads. This brings the total amount of money available to $86,529,356, of which $667,780 it is claimed was unspent on December 23, 1943. Deducting this amount we find the net cost of the Pentagon project to be $85,861,576. This includes, of course, all moneys for roads, bridges, and rights-of-way in that immediate area.

Sixth. On January 13, 1944, I requested and received a break-down, from the Office of the Chief of Engineers, of the main building cost—see exhibit C. This building cost is given at $49,736,654.

An examination and comparison of these various reports is rather interesting. From the facts, it is obvious that the district engineer did not have General Somervell's letter of May 7 before him giving the project cost at $49,250,000 when he made his field progress report of June 15, 1942, giving that cost at $58,000,000. It is also obvious and apparent that his attention must have been called to that letter when he made the field progress report of August 31, 1942, giving the project cost at $49,194,442 and that the August 31 report was made to conform with the letter of May 7. He was determined to make it conform to the amount given by General Somervell to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], even though he had to drop $11,712,401 that appeared on the June 15 report for terracing, landscaping, parking lots, roads, and so forth. It was a close race, but the district engineer got under the May 7 wire by $56,000. I might suggest that he could have gotten below the $35,000,000 estimate had he omitted the concrete, electrical, and plumbing work and a few other items; $49,000,000 must have been a charmed figure because his building cost report to me on January 13, 1944, was again $49,736,654. Anyone must be a wizard to follow the ouija-board methods that the War Department must have followed, in trying to arrive at a figure which is below the figures given the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the May 17 letter by General Somervell.

INTENT OF CONGRESS

Congress being charged by the Constitution with the responsibility for appropriating funds and guarding those funds is and should be in the final analysis the authority as to how these funds should be spent. Departments and bureaus in spending these funds should and are in duty bound to follow the intent of Congress. Where Congress is compelled, because of wartime conditions, to trust the President or the Secretary of War or Navy with the expenditure of large lump sums, the President and Secretaries are under an obligation to redouble their efforts in confining the expenditure of such lump sums to the purposes Congress had in mind. This is true of every department and bureau. To the extent that the department or bureau head fails to follow the intent of Congress, to that extent the department or bureau destroys the confidence that Congress has in them. It is, of course, ridiculous to argue in the face of the facts that Congress intended the Secretary of War to use nearly $41,000,000 of the lump sum given him to expedite production of equipment and supplies and for special engineering service to erect the Pentagon Building. In determining the intent of Congress the following questions are pertinent factors:

First. Would Congress have appropriated $86,000,000 to erect the Pentagon project, including roads, bridges, rights-of-way, and so forth? The answer is an emphatic "No."

Second. Would Congress have authorized the expenditure of $4,547,000 for rights-of-way in addition to the lands we then had? The answer is "No."

Third. Would Congress have authorized the erection of a building with a heating, ventilating, and power plant cost of $13,251,203? The answer is "No."

Fourth. Would Congress have authorized the erection of a building where the inside and outside electrical equipment cost is $6,640,600? The answer is "No."

Fifth. Would Congress have authorized the erection of a building where the excavating, grading, and landscaping

cost is $5,594,152; plumbing cost $4,511,210, and lathing and plastering cost $3,747,299? The answer is "No."

Sixth. Would Congress have authorized the expenditure of $16,966,000 for roads, bridges, and rights-of-way in the Pentagon area in which $10,640,000 was spent by the Commissioner of Public Roads out of access road funds, supposed to be used for secondary roads? The answer is "No."

Seventh. Would Congress have accepted Lieutenant General Somervell's letter of May 7, 1942, as an explanation or justification for the expenditure of these sums when the letter was written 10 months after he appeared before the subcommittee, 8 months after the building was commenced, and 6 days after employees began moving in? The answer is "No."

Eighth. Would Congress have authorized the Secretary of War to take $40,889,356 out of a special lump sum given him by Congress, to expedite production of equipment and supplies and for special engineering service and to spend this sum to erect the Pentagon Building? Again the answer is "No."

Ninth. Would Congress have authorized the expenditure of $4,239,550, or nearly one-fifth of the amount contemplated, for "special and technical changes and additions resulting from tenant requirements"? The answer is "No."

Tenth. Does the action by the War Department in the face of the above facts show an utter disregard in this instance for the wishes of Congress and the subcommittee charged by the Constitution with responsibility of guarding public funds? The answer is an emphatic "Yes."

ROOF CHANGES

Special attention is called to the War Department report that after 40 percent of the roof was on the intermediate three rings of the building, they ordered the roof torn off and another story added. The report from the War Department to me is very indefinite. The total cost of the roof was given in their statement to me at $731,447. The demolition cost of the 40-percent new roof just completed was given at $107,000, while the cost of replacing the roof was given at $24,000. In view of the fact that the total roof cost of the entire building was $731,447, this statement is absolutely absurd and ridiculous. If replacing 40 percent of the three inner rings cost $24,000, then the total cost of the entire three rings would have been $60,000, so according to their figures, the cost of constructing the roof on the inner and outer rings was $671,447, while the three inner rings was $60,000. They would have us believe that that was the proportionate cost.

RESPONSIBILITY

The question naturally presents itself and the Congress and taxpayers are entitled to know who is responsible for this outrageous waste of the taxpayers' money in violation of the intent and action of Congress. I asked the question of numerous Army officials without a reply. I drove over to the Pentagon Building. On the left side of the mall entrance, I find carved into the stone the names of those who claim credit for the building and who are responsible for this waste of the taxpayers' money. We find there the names of those who are responsible for the expenditure of this $86,000,000, the money which has been borrowed, money which will have to be paid back in interest by the sweat of the brow of millions of servicemen when they come back from a war they have won. Heading the list of names we find Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding the Services of Supply. While we find other names there, the above are the names of those who are responsible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Andresen, August H.	Fulmer	Morrison, La.
Andrews	Furlong	Mott
Angell	Gale	Murphy
Baldwin, Md.	Gallagher	Myers
Barden	Gamble	Norton
Barry	Gavin	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Gifford	O'Hara
Bland	Goodwin	O'Leary
Bolton	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Toole
Brumbaugh	Harness, Ind.	Patman
Buckley	Hartley	Pfeifer
Burchill, N. Y.	Hébert	Philbin
Byrne	Hill	Pracht, C. Frederick
Canfield	Hobbs	Ramspeck
Cannon, Fla.	Holifield	Rees, Kan.
Celler	Holmes, Mass.	Rivers
Chapman	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scanlon
Chiperfield	Jones	Shafer
Clark	Kearney	Sheridan
Cole, N. Y.	Kee	Short
Cooley	Kelley	Slaughter
Costello	Kennedy	Somers, N. Y.
Cravens	Kerr	Starnes, Ala.
Cullen	Kinzer	Stockman
Curley	Kleberg	Sumners, Tex.
Dawson	Knutson	Tolan
Dickstein	Lane	Towe
Dirksen	Larcade	Treadway
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	McMurray	Weaver
Drewry	Maas	Weichel, Ohio
Eaton	Maloney	West
Fay	Manasco	Whelchel, Ga.
Feighan	Marcantonio	Winter
Fellows	Merrow	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fitzpatrick	Monroney	Woodrum, Va.
Fulbright		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and nineteen Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the genteman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Rabbi Moshe Davis.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, after the disposition of legislative business and other special orders, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes immediately following the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the select committee appointed to investigate the Federal Communications Commission and its activities. I rise to denounce the White House, the Department of Justice, the Federal Communications Commission, and other New Deal officials and advisers, past and present, for obstruction, intimidation, and underhand tactics in a continuous attempt to sabotage the work of the committee. I rise to report charges of political coercion or blackmail. I rise to condemn the action of the majority members of the committee in the absence of the minority members in postponing indefinitely hearings on Station WMCA and preventing the facts in that case from being made known to the public.

For years, Mr. Speaker, charges of the most serious character have been leveled at the Federal Communications Commission and its activities. These charges have included inefficiency, political favoritism, illegal action, corruption, and dictatorial domination of the air.

They have involved the whole question of freedom of speech over the air, a fundamental cornerstone of the Bill of Rights, a fundamental cornerstone in the so-called "four freedoms," a fundamental cornerstone in democracy. For no democracy, Mr. Speaker, can live if freedom of speech be denied.

These charges have come from within the industry, from outside the industry, and even from within the administration itself. A list of 24 charges leveled at the Commission will be found on page 8, part 1, of the hearings before your select committee.

For years I have advocated congressional investigation. For years I have felt that the charges made should be proved or disproved. For years I have felt that investigation was imperative with a view to remedial legislation in the national interest.

Several years ago a resolution of investigation actually reached the floor of the House. It was defeated at the last moment by White House intervention. Even in those days it seems the White House feared the investigation. The Democratic Member sponsoring the resolution was defeated at the next election.

About a year ago the Congress finally appointed a committee to investigate the Federal Communications Commission and its activities. I was designated a member of that committee. I have served on it since its creation. My desire at all times has been for an honest, thoroughgoing investigation, letting the chips fall where they may.

The committee, Mr. Speaker, had a right to expect cooperation from the Federal Communications Commission and the administration generally. If there were no foundation for the charges, the investigation should have been welcomed. If any Member of this House were head of an agency with a clear conscience and nothing to conceal, surely he would welcome an investigation. Surely, he would demand that the investigation be thoroughgoing in order to disprove any charges. Truth never seeks the dark shadows of secrecy. Fraud invariably finds comfort in the cloak of concealment.

Has the select committee received the cooperation of the administration? It has not. On the contrary, it has met with constant obstruction, intimidation, and underhand tactics in what appears to be a desperate effort to hamstring the work of the committee and to suppress the truth.

I shall attempt no detailed statement at this time, Mr. Speaker. I may cite in passing, however, the following examples:

Under date of June 25, 1943, your committee through its counsel requested the appearance of 10 Army officers and 20 Naval officers; it requested also the production of documents in some 20 categories from the Army and some 25 categories from the Navy. The letter stated specifically that the examination would not call for the disclosure of any secret military information whatsoever. It detailed the facts which it was desired to inquire into and stated that these facts had been substantially established through investigation by the committee.

These requests, Mr. Speaker, were denied in their entirety by direction of the President on the ground, and on the sole ground, that production of the testimony requested would be "incompatible with the public interest." All originals and copies of papers referring to the Federal Communications Commission in the files of field offices of the War and Navy Departments were ordered sent to two departments in Washington.

By what authority, Mr. Speaker, does the President thus interfere with the legislative functions of the Congress and determine without one word of justification that evidence sought is or is not "compatible with the public interest"? Carried to a logical conclusion, no committee can investigate, no Congress can obtain the facts necessary to legislate.

On July 9, 1943, the testimony and documents requested from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget were also denied by direction of the President. The files had apparently been rushed from the Bureau of the Budget to the White House for safekeeping.

On July 9, 1943, testimony and documents requested from Mr. James Lawrence Fly were denied by alleged direction of the Board of War Communications, of which he is Chairman.

Recently the testimony and documents requested of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation were denied by alleged direction of the President. Even the text of the Presidential directive in question was denied by Attorney General Biddle on the ground that it was confidential.

In every instance it was made clear that the committee had no desire for the disclosing of any military information whatsoever.

Income-tax returns have been made available to other committees. Income-tax returns requested almost a year ago by this committee have been denied by the President.

These are but examples. Generally speaking, the full force of the administration has been thrown against the work of the committee. The subservient portion of the press, extreme left-wing organizations, and every direct and indirect means available have been utilized in this connection.

When the present chairman of the committee was appointed, it was reliably rumored that the White House had sent instructions to whitewash the investigation and fold up the committee. I brought this story to the attention of the chairman personally with the warning that I for one did not propose to be a party to any whitewash.

Since his appointment there has been continuous difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory arrangement with the Federal Communications Commission with a view to obtaining for the committee staff essential documents and data. It has seemed at times as if no move could be made without consulting the Commission.

Little or no investigation has been conducted in the field of the major licensing functions of the Commission, although these in all probability constitute the most important aspects of the investigation.

Only after the threat of public criticism on the floor of the House was it possible to obtain consent to begin hearings in this field in respect to Station WMCA.

Hearings on this station were held on February 8 and 9. Startling testimony was presented alleging conspiracy and coercion to deprive a station owner of his frequency by past or present officials of the New Deal.

On February 10 the hearings were necessarily postponed to the following week. On the following week they were abruptly terminated and indefinitely postponed by action of the three majority members of the committee, one of whom had arrived by airplane from Attu the day before the meeting. Neither minority member had any information as to the purpose of the meeting. One minority member had no notice of the meeting whatsoever until after it had been held. Both minority members were absent at prearranged meetings of other committees.

The action taken and the pretext for the action can only be interpreted as a determination to yield to administration pressure and to suppress indefinitely unsavory facts said to involve high administration officials and advisers, past and present.

Following upon this action, Mr. Eugene L. Garey, counsel for the committee, and three of his associates resigned. His resignation had been sought, desired, and plotted by those who apparently felt that their sordid activities cannot stand the light of an honest investigation.

In tendering his resignation Mr. Garey wrote to Chairman LEA the following letter, which I quote:

FEBRUARY 25, 1944.

HON. CLARENCE F. LEA,
Chairman, Select Committee to Investigate Federal Communications Commission, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At your express direction public hearings were opened in the

investigation into the sale of radio station WMCA.

I am now in receipt of what purports to be a copy of the minutes of an alleged meeting of the committee from which it appears that a majority of the committee have determined to discontinue further hearings in this matter. No other communication or notice of such action has been received by me from you.

The pretended reasons advanced for such action are puerile. I am sure they will not fool anyone, because they rest on shadow and not on substance. They ignore the paramount public interest, which far transcends any private interest that might be claimed to be involved. They create a dangerous precedent in respect of the legislative function whereby the essential constitutional investigatory powers of the Congress always can be thwarted merely by adopting the same subterfuge which you are putting forward as a basis for your action in this matter. To such a patent fraud on the Congress and the public I cannot and will not lend my aid.

A year ago I was requested to serve as general counsel to the committee. I was persuaded to act only after I was convinced that the investigation was in the public interest and only after I was assured that it would be conducted without fear or favor and free from political interference. During your chairmanship, I regret to say that has not been the situation.

Despite the many efforts to frustrate, interfere with and discredit the work of the committee, the committee's public record contains conclusive evidence respecting the arbitrary and unlawful functioning of the Commission and the high-handed manner in which it has abused its powers and usurped authority. The great mass of the material gathered has not yet been made public. It seems to be the evident purpose to conceal, by one means or another, this material from the Congress and the public.

While the conclusion reached in this letter became crystallized by your action in the WMCA matter, it has long been under serious consideration. From the beginning of your chairmanship your hostility to the investigation and its purposes has been clear to me. You have repeatedly ignored the mandate of the House, stymied the staff in its work, and converted the investigation to a sheer whitewashing affair, wholly responsive to political pressures and dominated entirely by political expediency. To continue as counsel to the committee in these circumstances would serve no useful public purpose, would merely produce waste and futility, and would end in shame and dishonor to the Congress.

Since I and my associates, Messrs. Fred R. Walker, Ambrose V. McCall, and Milton I. Hauser, who share these views, are unwilling to contribute our support in aid of your objectives, I now submit in their behalf their respective resignations, together with my own.

Very truly yours,

EUGENE L. GAREY.

But this is not all, Mr. Speaker.

Every Member of the House is familiar with the methods used to bring about the resignation of the former chairman of the committee. The methods used were both brutal and shameful. They were without justification whether or not the chairman was to continue in office.

Are we to assume that these methods continue? Can it be that counsel for the committee has also felt the fires of coercion?

Statements in the public press indicate that Mr. Garey's resignation was demanded under threat of criminal action, not against himself but against a friend and associate. I quote from the Washington Times-Herald of February 19, 1944:

The same tactics are being pursued that caused the original chairman of the committee, Representative Cox, Democrat, of Georgia, to announce his resignation in a dramatic floor speech last September 30. The Justice Department is said to have been enlisted in the campaign, bringing pressure upon one of Counsel Garey's associates to persuade him to give up the thankless task of exposing Fly and his dictatorship methods which have reduced the radio industry to terror.

If these facts are true, Mr. Speaker, that is dirty ball. If these facts are true, it is coercion or blackmail by the executive branch of this Government in attempting to obstruct the proper functioning of the legislative branch of the Government in the interest of the people. It is difficult to believe that the Attorney General or the Assistant to the Attorney General or any other responsible person in the Department would lend himself to such tactics of the gutter.

The allegations made in the public press should be investigated. The people of the Nation are entitled to know how the Department of Justice is operating under the Roosevelt administration.

What is the President afraid of, Mr. Speaker? What is his administration afraid of? What is it that they fear to expose to the light of day? What can there be that is so wrongful or damaging as to lend to this obstruction, intimidation, and political coercion or blackmail?

I demand an end of these tactics. I demand cooperation with the Congress and with all its duly appointed committees. I demand that the New Deal permit the people to have the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in this investigation or stand convicted of wrongdoing on a plea of guilty before the bar of public opinion.

I demand that the majority members of the committee resume hearings on Station WMCA at the earliest practical moment. I demand that they take immediate steps to insure the production by the Federal Communications Commission of essential documents and data. I demand that they permit the orderly conduct of this investigation without fear or favor. I demand that they comply with the mandate of this House regardless of pressure from the administration or any other source.

If the present chairman is unwilling to comply with these demands he should immediately resign from his position and permit the appointment of a fearless successor who will not bow to Executive domination.

The people are entitled to the truth. That truth they must and will have. If it is impossible to obtain the truth now, the truth will assuredly be obtained when a new and fearless Congress demands a complete investigation—a complete investigation which to date has been impossible as a result of obstruction, intimidation, and underhand tactics by the Roosevelt administration.

Mr. Speaker, I await the further action of the majority members of the committee. For the time being I withhold further comment.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend wholeheartedly the courageous statement of my colleague and assure him that I am backing him 100 percent.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time that on Tuesday of next week I may address the House for 30 minutes after the legislative business of the day and other special orders on the subject of the Federal communications.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows I am a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices which handles appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission. A very unusual thing happened to me this afternoon. During the call of the House immediately preceding the gentleman's speech I was called by long-distance telephone from Aberdeen, S. Dak., the call being placed by Harvey Jewett, who is the owner or principal owner of a small radio station there, and who also happens to be the National Republican committeeman for the State of South Dakota. Mr. Jewett told me that he had a letter which he had received from the head of a broadcasting association of which his station is a member, which asked him to get in touch with me. He read a letter to me over the telephone.

The letter, as nearly as I can recall, said that the writer had been in telephonic communication that morning, the morning of the writing of the letter, with Mr. James L. Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in which Mr. Fly told him that FRANCIS CASE, a Republican from South Dakota, was a member of the committee that was trying to deny the Federal Communications Commission a proper appropriation. The writer of the letter suggested that Mr. Jewett kindly do what he could in the matter and further suggested that a copy of any communications showing what he did in the matter be sent to Mr. Fly in Washington.

Mr. Jewett said that he knew nothing about the matter other than what was in the letter and had called up to find out what the score was. He did not attempt to tell me what I should do but merely asked me what it was all about.

I told Mr. Jewett that it was very interesting, that some interesting statements were expected to be made on the floor this afternoon with regard to the Federal Communications Commission, and that I hoped that he would send me a copy of the letter. I advised him that the appropriation matter was now before the

Senate, that the withholding of the appropriation by the subcommittee, and the House, was taken as an action of the committee in which there was only one member of the subcommittee who opposed it; that the action was taken upon testimony before the committee that the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, in writing, had made a specific recommendation to the President, urging on grounds of military security that certain functions of the Federal Communications Commission be transferred to the Army and the Navy; and, that to accomplish that transfer, the subcommittee decided not to recommend appropriations to the Federal Communications Commission for those functions.

In some paragraph or sentence of the letter read to me the suggestion was made that the reason that the committee was acting was because of some misleading information brought before it by the special and select committee. As the RECORD will show at the time that appropriation was under consideration here on the floor and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts knows, the action of the subcommittee was taken on the basis of a specific recommendation by the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported by a field study, by the opinions of the theater commanders, and endorsed and transmitted to the President by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in a strongly worded letter accompanied by the text of a proposed Executive order.

I have made this statement, under the indulgence of the gentleman from Massachusetts, because this incident happened within the hour, and when the gentleman spoke of political intimidation, it occurred to me that this attempt to get the owner of a small station in South Dakota, who happens to be the national committeeman of my party in my State, to influence my position in an appropriation matter taken with members of both parties on what we deemed to be its merits, was perhaps a little evidence in point.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Not today, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I have listened naturally with a great deal of interest to the address that has just been read to the House by my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. He has made a number of accusations against agencies and officials of the Federal Government. I disavow any knowledge as to whether the accusations are true or false. If they are true I join heartily in condemnation of the activities which he has so forcefully complained of.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, of the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Missouri, both minority members of the Select Committee Investigating the Federal Communications Commission, that it has been a very pleasurable experience to have served on that committee with them, and that so far as I have been able to observe their conduct as members of that committee has been marked by a fairness and a frankness that are admirable and leave no cause for complaint on the part of majority members. What I rose to speak about particularly today, Mr. Speaker, was not the address delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but the resignation as counsel of the committee which was submitted by Mr. Garey on Friday last. That letter already has been read into the RECORD by the gentleman from Massachusetts and everybody has heard its contents.

Mr. Garey's letter may be divided into two principal parts: First wherein he condemns the action of the select committee in postponing further hearings respecting the sale of radio station WMCA by Mr. Donald Flamm to Mr. Edward J. Noble until such time as the Supreme Court of New York, wherein an action is pending relating to that same transaction and involving the same parties, shall have had a reasonable opportunity to dispose of the issues involved. The second part consists in certain strictures leveled by Mr. Garey against the alleged conduct of the present chairman of the select committee. The chairman is present. I understand he has reserved time for this afternoon. I therefore shall address myself solely to the first part of Mr. Garey's communication.

In narrating the facts which lead up to the action of the select committee which Mr. Garey so vehemently deprecates I hope I shall succeed in avoiding the intemperateness of language which Mr. Garey has employed, an intemperateness which reflects his personal pique and a high degree of that puerility which he has imputed to the committee. Let me say I am not at all concerned with Mr. Garey's opinions respecting the view which the select committee has taken respecting the impropriety of holding further hearings at this time with respect to the sale of radio station WMCA. It was I, Mr. Speaker, who urged that such delay be had. It was I who suggested that the committee be called together in order that such a delay might be discussed and duly considered. These things I did upon my own responsibility. Except for certain conversations with gentlemen of the press and a telegram which I shall later insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks, I received communications with respect to my proposed course from nobody except one person and I myself communicated with nobody except that same person. That person was Mr. Garey. Mr. Garey needs no permission from me to disclose, if he chooses, the nature of those communications. I apologize for nothing, I defend nothing. I have merely taken this time out of a decent respect for the opinion of the House to explain the facts which induced the committee action which has led Mr. Garey to such violent breast beating and to such a blatant show of simulated indignation.

Station WMCA first received the attention of the select committee in executive hearings held in June 1943. The testimony in those hearings, so far as I know, has never been printed. At that time my able friend, the gentleman from Georgia, was chairman of the select committee, and I am glad to take this opportunity of saying that I have never known a finer gentleman. His life is animated by high moral qualities and there is no one who really knows him who would doubt for a moment the integrity of his mind and his heart and his soul.

The testimony taken at those hearings in executive session was truly inconclusive of anything. Public hearings were begun by the select committee in July 1943. The subjects of inquiry at those first public hearings were the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service and the Radio Intelligence Division of the Federal Communications Commission. Before hearings had been completed on these subjects the summer recess of the Congress had overtaken us and then by appointment of the gentleman from Georgia, the gentleman from Massachusets and myself sat as a subcommittee in New York hearing testimony relating to the operations and the conduct of radio stations which regularly, although not completely, broadcast in foreign languages. Inquiry into that subject was then and there concluded.

The hearings then shifted to Washington, where a subcommittee, consisting of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER], held 2 days of hearings on the draft-deferment policy of the Federal Communications Commission. That subject of inquiry was then and there concluded.

After the Congress reconvened hearings by the full committee were resumed in Washington, and the inquiries that had begun in July into the operation of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service and the Radio Intelligence Division were then and there concluded.

Mr. Speaker, when I say that these subjects of inquiry had been concluded, I mean only that Mr. Garey, counsel for the committee, indicated to the committee that he had no further testimony to present on any of these several subjects. In reality they were far from concluded because despite repeated demands on the part of representatives of the Federal Communications Commission who were in attendance at the hearings that they be heard in refutation of charges already in the record and leveled against that agency, despite repeated promises made by the committee in open hearings that they would be heard and despite what I believe to be the unanimous feeling on the part of the membership of the committee that they ought to be heard, they have not actually been heard down to this very day and hour.

Let me refer to some of these demands and some of the promises. At the very

outset of the public hearings in July 1943, in a statement made to Mr. Denny, general counsel of the Federal Communications Commission, who had endeavored to interject himself into the hearings, Chairman Cox had this to say:

The general counsel of the Federal Communications Committee ought to know enough about proper procedure to know that he has at this time no place in this picture and I am wondering why he persists in his impudent effort to get before the committee. If the general counsel will wait he will in due time be heard by the committee.

Passing on, we come next to the hearings in New York. Again Mr. Denny attempted to interpose. He asked whether a certain release could not be put in the record at that point and the record shows on page 240 this reply:

No; later on when we get to you and Dr. Leigh, you will be heard.

Those hearings were not the New York hearings but the hearings held in Washington before the summer recess.

Again on page 256 of the printed record of the hearings Mr. Denny said:

I appreciate the opportunity. I feel I would not be doing my duty as the Commission's counsel unless I made that offer.

The Chairman said:

If later you want to testify, you will be given the opportunity to take the oath and testify.

Then at the hearing in New York Mr. Denny again sought an opportunity to participate in the hearings. I was presiding at that time and stated as follows:

That will be off the record, Mr. Denny. You will have an opportunity to testify later on.

Again in the New York hearings Mr. Denny said:

I think Mr. David ought to be permitted to answer that.

Mr. GAREY. Mr. David will be permitted to answer that, Mr. Denny, when we reach it in due course.

Mr. David himself a little later on the same page, 554, said:

Mr. Chairman, can I be heard on this? These are very serious charges. There has been a lot of talk around here about attacking people's character.

I, as the presiding officer, replied:

You have not been given any permission to make a speech. All I can say is that I hope you can be heard on it and heard on it at length, but I think this is not the proper time to be heard.

Then later, on the same day, Mr. David and Mr. Denny again were active in attempting to be heard and as presiding officer I said:

I hope Mr. David will be given a free and full opportunity to make explanation of the reasons that impelled him to make that release. The committee will conduct its proceedings as it pleases and the F. C. C. may conduct its own business as it pleases, subject to whatever penalties there may be involved if they violate the law.

It was further stated by me:

No further words will be entered in the record at this time. I do not intend to have the F. C. C. controlling the proceedings of this committee any more than any governmental agency might control the proceedings of any other congressional committee. I hope that the F. C. C. will be afforded a full and free and fair opportunity to answer any charges that may be in the record against them and we do not assume to say that any such charges are the conclusions of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, there are other instances that I have not the time to read at this time wherein the demand was made and the promise was given that in due time the Federal Communications Commission would be given an opportunity to reply to the charges made against them. Those charges occupy more than 1,300 printed pages in this first volume of the committee's hearings. Despite those demands and despite those promises, the Commission has never yet been given an opportunity to reply to a single accusation that appears in the record.

On February 2, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the select committee, Mr. Garey, and I had a conference, and during the course of that conversation Mr. Garey asked when it would be suitable to the committee to undertake an inquiry into the sale of WMCA. At that time I adverted to a newspaper item which had appeared a few days previously in the New York Times relating to this very transaction, and I then stated that I thought it would be highly improper to proceed at this time in that matter, again insisting that the Federal Communications Commission be given an opportunity to reply before any new matters were taken up by the committee. Mr. Garey stated it was a matter of utter indifference to him whether or not the committee proceeded with WMCA or whether the committee preferred to proceed to hear the Commission. When that conference concluded it was agreed that the Commission would be the next party to be heard. I was not surprised at Mr. Garey's indifference in the matter, because in the hearings of the committee on December 16, 1943, Mr. Garey called attention to the work that his staff had completed and asked the direction of the committee as to what subject of inquiry the committee desired to enter upon next. He stated there that he was ready to proceed with matters relating to WMCA, WORL, WAAB, and at least 10 other stations; and if the committee would indicate such preference as it might have with respect to the order in which it would like to take testimony, he would be pleased to comply.

Nothing was said at any time by Mr. Garey about there being any urgent necessity for the presentation of this matter pending in a court of competent jurisdiction at this time.

Next day the chairman spoke to me and, for certain reasons which he stated, he suggested that instead of hearing the Commission we go forward with the inquiry into WMCA. I reluctantly agreed. Mr. Donald Flamm, the former owner of WMCA and the complainant in the court action in New York, came and took the stand. He occupied two full sessions of committee hearings. He charged that he had been compelled under coercion to sell radio station WMCA for a sum far less than it was worth and less than he had previously been offered by others. His testimony involved not only Mr. Edward J. Noble, the purchaser of the station, but the law firm of Dempsey & Koplovitz, Mr. Thomas Corcoran, Mr. Leslie Roberts, Mr. David Niles, and perhaps others.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the consent of those who have special orders succeeding the gentleman from New Jersey, I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly the fact that I have overstepped my time. I simply was not watching the clock.

I offer no comment on the truth or falsity of Mr. Flamm's testimony. For my purpose, that at present is entirely beside the point. But Mr. Flamm, having concluded it, was resolved to call Mr. Edward J. Noble, the purchaser of the station and the defendant in the court action in New York, to the stand.

I had been of the belief from the beginning that such a proceeding would be improper. I was still of that belief. I believe that to have called Mr. Noble, the defendant in this action, involving the same transaction, involving the same parties, and, under the force of the process of the committee and under the force of the oath to which he would have been subjected, to have compelled him to disclose on the witness stand before our committee the defense of the suit pending against him, involving a huge sum of money, would have been highly improper per se, an abuse of power, an ignoble perversion of the function of a congressional committee, an injustice to Mr. Noble as a defendant, and an affront to the court of competent jurisdiction which will soon be called upon to hear the evidence and to deliver a just verdict upon the facts and upon the law.

Feeling as I did, I approached the chairman of the committee. I requested that he set down a time for the committee to meet, and advised him of my purpose to propose that hearings into this subject of inquiry be delayed until the New York Supreme Court should have had an opportunity to dispose of the litigation. A meeting was called. I made my motion and explained the reasons therefor. The chairman suggested a modification of the language so that instead of postponing the matter until the court should have actually disposed of the case, the motion should read that it should be postponed until the court had had a reasonable opportunity to dispose of the issue. I accepted the modifying language and the motion was adopted.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HART. If the gentleman will permit me to complete my statement, and if I have time, I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I just wondered if there was any objection by any member of the committee to the gentleman's motion.

Mr. HART. There was no objection by any of the members present.

That is the plain, unvarnished tale of the events leading up to the committee action in postponing further hearings at this time into the subject of the sale of WMCA. I realize that it is a very pedestrian narrative, because I have tried studiously to refrain from argumentation in stating these facts. That is the sum and substance of the situation which has drawn forth from Mr. Garey a diatribe utterly unworthy of his talents. For his eminent ability as a lawyer I have a high regard. For his undoubted character I have a deep respect. But for the balderdash which is contained in his letter of resignation I have nothing but complete disdain.

He charges us with having subordinated the paramount public interest. I repel that charge. I deny that the paramount public interest is involved. The use of that high-sounding phrase by Mr. Garey is simply a legal locution wherein he seeks in this instance to advance the doctrine that the end justifies the means. It is a gross misapplication of the principle of public interest.

Does the public interest require that a plaintiff in an action pending in a court of competent jurisdiction shall be permitted to take the stand and exploit a congressional committee for his own private ends? Does the public interest require that a defendant in an action pending at law shall be subpenaed to appear, placed under oath, and compelled to testify before a committee, and thus prematurely disclose his defense and risk his rights?

Mr. Speaker, the perversion of the doctrine of public interest has reddened the earth with blood. Ask Stalin about the doctrine of paramount public interest and he will tell you that it justified the deliberate starvation of millions of Russian farmers. Ask Hitler about the doctrine of paramount public interest and he will offer it as justification for the annihilation of millions of harmless, unoffending Jews. That doctrine can be found at the end of every Jap bayonet and in the muzzles of the murdering guns of the secret police.

Mr. Garey has also charged us with having perpetrated a fraud upon the Congress and the public. Mr. Speaker, I scorn to reply to that charge, to that monstrous misrepresentation. Certainly I could not do it in moderate language. I shall be content to oppose to Mr. Garey's opinion the view of an eminent member of the New York bar as stated in a letter which he addressed to me, a gentleman, by the way, whom I have never seen, whom I have never known.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that his letter, together with a telegram I received from him at an earlier date, and the letter which I forwarded to him in reply thereto, be included at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The documents referred to follow:

NEW YORK, *February 19, 1944.*

Hon. EDWARD J. HART,

Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of February 16 last advising me of the action of your committee in agreeing to postpone further hearings relative to the sale of Station WMCA in January 1941, until the New York Supreme Court where the present suit by Donald Flamm against Edward J. Noble regarding this sale is pending "shall have had a reasonable time in which to dispose of the litigation." This action by your committee shows a very fair attitude toward both the litigants and the court and assures both parties of their day in court without the possible prejudice of prior hearings and attendant publicity regarding the same subject matter without impairing the right of your committee further to investigate the matter after the litigation is determined and the possibility of prejudice to either party no longer exists.

The attitude demonstrated by yourself and the majority of your committee in this respect is so obviously proper and fair to all concerned that I am very much at a loss to understand the reported statements in the press on the part of the minority members of your committee, who happen to be of the same political party as myself and my client, that there is any impropriety involved or any effort to hush up anything. The fact that the subject matter of Mr. Flamm's testimony before your committee to date is the same as that of his pending lawsuit in the New York court can hardly be denied, and both the public trial of that action and the reserved right of your committee to examine further into the transaction involved after the court has had a reasonable opportunity to determine the litigation proves that there is not and cannot be any effort to hush anything.

Secondly, as far as the subject matter is concerned, Mr. MILLER of your committee may not be fully familiar with it, but Mr. WIGGLESWORTH was a member of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee which held hearings on this same matter in January 1941, at which time the same rumors of White House influence were made and exploded, as shown by the following excerpt from the minutes of those hearings:

"Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Was there any indication to any of the Commission, through Colonel Watson or Mr. Foster, that the White House was particularly interested in having this transfer approved?

"Commissioner CASE. Mr. Foster called me and said that any rumors to the contrary notwithstanding, the White House was not interested in this, in any way, shape, or manner, whatsoever."

There was and is no plausible supporting rationale as to why the White House should desire to in any way aid the sale of this station to an avowed supporter of the opposing candidate for the Presidency. The charge is not only false but simply does not make sense.

In his testimony before your committee on February 8, 1944, Mr. Flamm again stated that such a rumor was reported to him by his employee Roberts at the time of the sale, to the effect that—

"This thing is greased from the White House down." (Minutes, p. 5523.)

A few minutes later in his testimony that day he stated (p. 5531):

"I subsequently found out that everything Mr. Roberts told me was untrue, especially with reference to his innuendo that the Chairman had anything to do with this transaction."

It is difficult in these circumstances to see what political capital can be made out of this transaction and particularly out of the current acquiescence by the majority of your committee in compliance with my protest to adjourn further hearings in this matter until the court has had a reasonable opportunity to determine the issues before it.

I again wish to express the appreciation of my client and myself for the very fair and unpartisan attitude taken by the majority of your committee, and wish to take this opportunity to assure you that as soon as the pending litigation can be disposed of I shall be glad to cooperate with you and your committee in every way possible to facilitate inquiry into any phases of the transaction in question which your committee considers relevant to its investigation.

Very truly yours,

FRANKLIN S. WOOD.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 10, 1944.*

Hon. EDWARD J. HART,

Select Committee to Investigate the Federal Communications Commission, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

As attorney for Edward J. Noble, defendant in the pending suit by Donald Flamm in New York County Supreme Court regarding radio Station WMCA, I wish to renew the protest made in my letter dated February 5 to Chairman LEA against the use of hearings before your committee as a forum and to gain publicity for charges made by him in and forming the basis of his personal law suit which he himself is reported in the Radio Daily of February 3, 1944, to admit do not in any way involve the Federal Communications Commission. His testimony before your committee as reported in the press today repeats the charges made by him in his complaint and affidavits in the above action appearing on pages 5, 14, and 45 of the printed record on appeal in said case left by me with Chairman LEA last Saturday, and likewise repeats his charges widely publicized in December 1940 and January 1941 as shown by exhibits at page 102 of the above record on appeal, and his charges considered at the hearings of the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on independent offices appropriations bill in January 1941 set forth at page 84 and following of the above record. I again submit that his case and any justifiable complaint he may have is pending before a court of competent jurisdiction able to do complete justice between the parties, and I again formally protest against his abuse of your committee's public position for his private purposes.

FRANKLIN S. WOOD.

FEBRUARY 16, 1944.

FRANKLIN S. WOOD, Esq.,

Counselor at Law, New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIR: Reference is made to your telegram of February 10 wherein as attorney for Edward J. Noble, defendant in an action at law filed in the New York County Supreme Court by Donald Flamm, you protested against the continuance of hearings before the Select Committee of the House of Representatives Investigating the Federal Communications Commission and relating to transactions had between Mr. Flamm and Mr. Noble and others. While there are certain statements in your telegram which are not in accord with the facts, nevertheless, I sympathize with your general point of view. The select committee today resolved to postpone any further hearings relative to WMCA until the court wherein the action is pending

shall have had a reasonable time in which to dispose of the litigation.

Very sincerely yours,

ED J. HART.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, with the exception of being willing to answer any pertinent question during the balance of my time, that is all I wish to say.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, seldom has the House listened to a more adroit, clever, and apparently convincing argument than that just made by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART]. But it was not an answer to the charges made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. There is not a Member of the House, no not one, but who has the utmost confidence in the integrity and the ability of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] or who doubts the accuracy of his statements. His charges, as made here today, were broad, and they were general. He does not speak often but when he does we all know that we can rely upon his statements. The substance of those charges, as made by him, was that the special committee of the House has refused to investigate the Federal Communications Commission's part in the sale of a radio station and the Commission's refusal to give aid or information to a select committee of the House. In reply to that charge, and the gentleman from Massachusetts was specific in his statements, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART]—we cannot say sets up a man of straw—but he takes one specific instance and argues quite convincingly and with some degree of logic that in that particular instance because the courts had under consideration some of the questions, some of the facts, which the committee might be investigating, therefore the committee should go no further for the present with their investigation. Now, that appeared to me, as I listened, to be a reasonable proposition, a reasonable argument for postponing the investigation. Then, to my surprise, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] rose, and he told us, and undoubtedly it is a fact, that before the suit was started—am I correct?—the gentleman nods affirmance—the committee had started this investigation and that during the course of their investigation they had called one party to that suit and that that party to the suit had been required to disclose over a 2-day period what he knew about the situation.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. HART. I think the gentleman is under a misapprehension. The fact of the matter is the committee had begun this private investigation through its investigators into the situation before the suit was filed.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes?

Mr. HART. The committee had not held any hearing and had not called any of the parties to testify publicly until after the suit was filed, which was in August of last year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HART. The first witness having been called through this committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. During all of this time the gentleman from New Jersey was a member of the committee, was he not?

Mr. HART. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But the gentleman from New Jersey did not think of the impropriety of the committee calling one party to the suit until Mr. Noble was called, did he?

Mr. HART. If the gentleman from Michigan will read what I said, he will see that I protested against calling anybody or beginning the inquiry at all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman from New Jersey protest before Mr. Flamm was called down?

Mr. HART. I protested to Mr. Garey before any hearing in the matter had been set down.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that appear in the record of the hearings?

Mr. HART. It appears in my statement, not in the record of the hearings.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, it appears in the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HART. The gentleman is at liberty to doubt what I say if he wishes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not doubt what the gentleman says at all. I have served on one of the committees of the House with the gentleman. I would not for one moment, and I do not want any misunderstanding about this, I would not for one moment question anything that the gentleman from New Jersey says. I would accept it as true. I accept his statement as true. But the fact still remains, while the gentleman from New Jersey was a member of the committee, one party to the action was examined by an investigator of the committee. Later that party was called by the committee and testified. Then, why not call the other party to the suit? The gentleman's answer to that is that the public interest did not require it. Thousands of men have died in this war, good Americans, because the public interest required that they be drafted and sent across to fight. The individual interest of each was sacrificed to the public good. I can see no reason why one party to a suit having been called and required to testify, because the public good demanded it, the other party to that suit—to the transaction the committee was investigating—should not be called and be given the same consideration, no more, and required to make the same sort of disclosures—give his explanation of the sale.

But that is not the issue in this case. The argument made by the gentleman applies to just that one little phase of it—the sale of a radio permit. The controversy here and between the executive and legislative branches of the Government is whether or not the committees of this House and the committees of the body at the other end of the Capitol can require the members of the executive departments to disclose to us information which we deem to be necessary, which are deem to be vital to legislation which has to be considered. We have had the executive department say to us, "We want so much money." In one instance the President said, as I recall, that he wanted 10 times $10,000 for additional secretaries. We gave him the money. He hired them. If the newspaper reports are correct, in the other body yesterday one of these hired men that our constituents are paying had the effrontery to tell the Congress which appropriates the money that it is none of its business what they are doing, or what they are saying, nor what they have done, how they are spending the taxpayers' money which we gave them, nor how they propose to spend future appropriations.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. DIES. I want to say to the gentleman that the most serious charge made by the gentleman from Massachusetts was his statement that the committee had been denied access to certain documents and data from the executive department. This is becoming an extremely serious matter. As chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities I caused to be served on a Government agency some subpenas. In all probability those subpenas will be refused. If they are, I propose to make a test on the floor of the House, because I submit that if investigative committees are denied access to vital information that does not in any sense affect the war effort, they might as well fold up and cease their activities. So I think the most pertinent issue raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and the one that should be answered here, is whether or not the Federal Communications Commission and other agencies can refuse to make available to the committee vital information necessary to an intelligent investigation of this subject matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, the gentleman has just restated the point which I was trying to make. The question raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is the old, old one of whether or not this Congress, when it furnishes the money, passes legislation, shall have the right to know what its hired men are doing. If I had my way about this matter, I would just enact, so far as the House is concerned, and send it over to the other body, a little bit of legislation recapturing into the Federal Treasury all of the unexpended balances appropriated for the employment of the 10 private secretaries, give the President no more money until they got ready to come up and tell the House what they were doing and answer, without any reservation, except as to war activities, the questions on which the various committees of the House sought information. The executive department would get no more money until the President recognized the existence of Congress. It is the same issue that was up here when the tax-bill veto came up. Are we a coordinate branch of the Government or are we just to appropriate the money, pass demanded legislation, and let those down at the other end of the Avenue spend it

and tell us to "go to." That is the issue. I speak only for myself—not for the Republicans—I would say to the majority leader—but just as one Member of the House to another—if we are going to pay the bills, I would make them talk, and if they would not talk, I would cut off their pay checks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have been listening to the gentleman with a great deal of interest.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Whether the gentleman from Massachusetts was listening or not, I knew he was here. I thank the gentleman for being here.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, your message to me is a little message of friendship?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; friendship, surely, but I hope some day it will be something more than friendship and that we can look forward to help from the majority in reestablishing the power of the Congress before your party passes out of power and a people's Congress really begins to work on these fellows down at the other end of the Avenue, for work them over someone surely must if the Government is to be restored to the people and their chosen Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], chairman of the special committee, is to follow me. I know that some of the Members are waiting to hear the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] with reference to this very important matter this afternoon. So, Mr. Speaker, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from California, I will be glad to yield my time to him and I will follow him, to speak on a matter that is entirely aside from this question that is in issue this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] for his courtesy in giving me this opportunity to take his time at this late hour in the day.

Many years ago I learned what I regard as the futility of attempting to solve public problems through personal controversies. Ill-tempered remarks, distorted statements, and personal animosities that spring from such controversies can contribute little to the solution of our serious problems. For more than 20 years I have attempted to deal with legislative problems in this House in disregard of personal controversies. I regret, to some extent, at least, I must today depart from my practice of these long years.

I endeavor to look at problems not from the mere standpoint of the present but from that viewpoint that time will give when we can look back more dispassionately and with better judgment as to what may occur on this fleeting day.

This investigation started about 1 year ago. Criticism soon developed about the way the investigation was conducted.

As time went on the principal charge against the investigation was that it was conducting unfair, compulsory, "star-chamber" examinations of witnesses by the committee staff without the presence of a committee member. This became the primary basis for the outcry against the investigation.

One set of critics declared these private examinations were outrageously conducted. The staff and its counsel claimed they were fairly conducted.

One thing is true, without weighing the particular circumstances of any case the general public reached the conclusion that it was an unfair method of procedure and should not be followed in a congressional investigation. The general public conclusion, regardless of how the examination may have actually been conducted, was that it was a method that so yielded itself to abuse that it could not commend itself to the public. The final result was that this method of investigation gained widespread disrepute and caused demand for a change.

As a result, I was appointed to the chairmanship. The old staff remained. I did not appoint or seek to appoint a single member of the committee staff, and I have not up to this time.

Those who had been working on the committee staff were familiar with the work, and if a proper cooperative basis could be established, there was an argument for their retention.

Shortly after I became chairman, the committee adopted rules of procedure under which the old star-chamber method of compulsory examination of witnesses outside of committee hearings was eliminated. The rules provided for committee hearings in executive sessions where circumstances warranted, and all prospective witnesses were subject to subpena and required to testify under oath.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Will you cite the Congress to one single star-chamber session?

Mr. LEA. I am referring to private, not public hearings. I am not passing on whether they were or were not properly conducted.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman from California has not examined this entire record he should have done so. If he has performed that duty will he tell this House if he has found anything in the record that could be construed as having been unfair treatment of anybody, that was summoned to appear before anybody?

Mr. LEA. The hearings complained of on this ground were in private and in the main do not appear in the record of the public hearings.

Mr. COX. Let us be frank. Let us be courageous about it. Can the gentleman point his finger to a single item in the entire record which he, as an honest man, condemned as having been unfair?

Mr. LEA. I have not read the whole record, but I would not say that in the published record itself I found that fault. I do not say that for what may have occurred in private records. I have not seen those records.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LEA. I must proceed if you will permit.

I and the majority of the committee were very strongly committed to this rule of procedure. Its adoption was deeply resented by some. I was repeatedly upbraided by those who seemed unable to see any reason for eliminating the so-called star-chamber examination except as a means of thwarting the investigation of the staff and favoring witnesses who might refuse to voluntarily appear. The adoption of this rule of procedure did not relieve anyone from compulsory attendance before the committee.

I regarded this rule of the committee as one of decency and necessary to relieve the committee of the practice that had heretofore brought the investigation into disrepute.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. We took the position that this examination should not only be right, but conducted under a method that the public would recognize was right.

The support of this rule by me, with the best of intentions, was made the vehicle for an attack on the ground that I was whitewashing the investigation. There was not the slightest justification for that criticism.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I must proceed.

From that day to this there has been no instance in which a subpena requested by the chief counsel for a reluctant witness was refused. The committee was always willing within a reasonable time to hear the testimony of any witnesses that might be required.

I desire to recite one or two instances as illustrative of the attitude of the chief counsel to the chairman.

Shortly after my appointment, Mr. Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, called me up on the telephone and in substance stated that if there was any information wanted they could give, they would cheerfully furnish it at any time, that he desired to cooperate with the committee in furnishing any evidence needed which the Commission could supply. I thanked him and expressed my appreciation of his offer to cooperate. Within 2 or 3 days after this conversation, some distorted version of it was current on the basis that I was going over the head of the staff in making some improper arrangement with Mr. Fly, and ignoring the committee staff.

It seemed to me that the mere fact that I had engaged in conversation with Mr. Fly was presented as an inference that there was something wrong about it.

As a matter of fact I have not seen Mr. Fly for about a year and a half now. The contact I had with him was when he called up by telephone, not at my invitation. He, or the Commission, did not

dictate the committee program in the slightest particular. The Federal Communications Commission as far as I am aware has not controlled any part of the work that has been done by this committee.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Is the gentleman disposed to yield for a question?

Mr. LEA. I yield briefly.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Will you state whether or not you got in touch with Mr. Fly on the very day you were selected as chairman of this committee?

Mr. LEA. I got in contact with him only by his calling me on the telephone. I did not call him. I have not called him since I have been a member of this committee.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Will you state whether or not you have, behind closed doors, talked with Mr. Charles Denny, counsel for the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. LEA. I have talked with Mr. Denny. He is counsel for the Commission.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Will you advise the Congress as to whether or not you have repeatedly, when witnesses were sought to be subpenaed, asked the names of those witnesses and what they were going to testify about as a condition precedent to the issuance of the subpena?

Mr. LEA. As far as I remember, only in one instance did I request what the witnesses were being subpenaed for. I thought, as chairman of this committee, there was certainly no impropriety in asking the names of witnesses or for what they were wanted. It is a very strange frame of mind in any man who wants to be fair, to suggest that the chairman issuing a subpena, has not the right to know who the witness is and for what purpose he is called. I am unable to understand the attitude of a man who takes that position.

These insinuations reflect an attitude that has confronted me as chairman since the first day I took over the job.

I want now to refer to that conversation with Mr. Denny. Recently an article appeared in a local paper referring to an action the committee took a few days ago to temporarily suspend the hearing. The article said:

> The fantastic nature of these proceedings was enhanced by the appearance of Charles R. Denny, chief counsel of the Federal Communications Commission, the agency under investigation, in LEA's office for nearly an hour before a formal statement was issued.

It is strange how some people's minds work. The fact that the attorney for this Commission called at my office is cited as indicating that I was doing something wrong. All my life I have been glad to hear from both sides. I am chairman of this committee and I am willing for any respectable man to come to my office whether he is for or against what I am doing and for him to tell me whether he thinks I am right or wrong in what I am doing. Anyway that fact was seized upon, to add to a smear campaign against the chairman. There is an amusing phase to this if you realize what was behind it. The day before I had met ex-Senator Dill here on the floor and he told me about a recent order of the Commission which required divestment of ownership of one, in case of dual ownership of stations within certain areas, within 6 months. He complained about that. It seemed to me it was an unreasonable rule of the Commission that so limited the period for divestment. So I told Mr. Dill I would talk with Mr. Denny, the attorney for the Commission on that question. I called up Mr. Denny. He was not there. His clerk made a note that I had called. Next day he was at the Capitol attending a hearing, I believe, in the Senate. After the meeting was over he came to my office and I asked him then about this divestment order and pointed out where I thought it improperly limited the divestment period. That is why Mr. Denny was there. He had no more to do with that statement than you did, and yet the extreme partisanship or puerility, or whatever it is that makes men act this way attempts to draw some improper inference and asserts that the chairman is attempting to whitewash the Commission, or there is something wrong. A crooked man distrusts others. I have been used to dealing with honorable men, men I could trust and I did not suppose my character was so questionable that I could not even be seen in the presence of a man like Mr. Denny, without reflections being cast upon my motives. Out of such minds mountains are built out of molehills.

In this connection I might state that when Mr. Denny first came to my office after my appointment as chairman I told him I would favor giving the Commission a full opportunity to present its case. I also said to him that I will grant you and your organization every proper courtesy, but I want it distinctly understood that I am going to play no favorites in this investigation, and that when it comes to filing a report I am going to present the facts so that Congress will actually know what they are. That expresses my purpose, and in no instance have I deviated from that purpose.

I have no obligation to this administration, or any of those whose names are charged with doing these things that for one moment will divert me from the purpose of following these facts to where they lead. If anybody has been guilty of any wrongdoing, they themselves are responsible for it, and I do not for one minute propose to take upon my shoulders the responsibility for shielding them.

When I accepted this appointment the one condition I specified was that I should be free to follow the facts to the real bottom and present the truth to this House. In no instance have I deviated, nor do I intend to deviate, from that purpose.

Reference is made to Mr. Garey's letter. It is a ridiculous letter. If my 27 years of service have not answered the charges of that letter, then nothing I can say here today will answer them. I have the utmost contempt for a man who will write such a letter with so little foundation for his statements.

It was suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts that he had understood that the President had sent down word that the investigation was to be whitewashed. If the President ever sent such word, he did not send it to me.

You can be dead certain that Franklin Roosevelt knows enough about me to know that if he sent such a message as that it would be the thing that would most deeply cause my resentment. He will not tell you for one moment that he has such an opinion of me, that I am so subservient or so pusilanimous that any such statement would affect my conduct. The broad truth is that I do not believe there is a word of truth in any such report. Nothing has come from the White House, nor has anybody who represented the White House ever said anything like that to me or requested me to do anything in this situation.

I want to talk about Mr. Garey for a little while. I would not be candid with you if I did not confess that I have been unable to find a basis of confidence and respect under which as chairman I could cooperate with him as chief counsel. Within three days of my appointment, almost before I had started my work as chairman, information came to me indirectly that he had initiated or started to create distrust and undermine me as chairman of this committee. As time went on reports came to me which I could not ignore as tending to confirm these earlier reports. In repeated contacts he treated me with an insolence that I had never before seen displayed by an employee of any Member of this House. My experience has convinced me that he is vindictive to an extreme degree. As an investigating attorney he has the fault of being an inveterate hunter of headlines and too frequently by the smear route to that end. I know I have a bias that might unduly prejudice my viewpoint, but I trust I am giving you as nearly as I can a correct appraisal.

A charge of attempt to whitewash has been made against the members of this committee. Let us consider the situation. It is the duty of members of the committee to do two things: They conduct hearings and they finally report their findings to the Congress. A whitewash must be accomplished, if at all, by failure to secure the facts or writing a report that is not faithful to the facts. This committee has not reached the stage of a report; it has made no reports. When, therefore, a charge of whitewashing is made, to be sustained against the committee members it must be shown that they have refused to hear the facts. In this case every witness called has been one suggested by the chief counsel.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of those who have succeeding special orders I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from California be extended 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I beg the gentleman's pardon but I shall have to proceed.

The committee has not refused to call any witness. Counsel has never been denied the right to ask proper questions of any witness. The committee has always been ready to subpena any member of the Commission personnel in case there was any refusal to attend or testify at a committee hearing.

It is charged however that three members of the committee met on February 16, discontinued the hearings as to the sale of Station WMCA at New York and that thereby we were suppressing information, whitewashing the investigation. The committee did not vote to discontinue that hearing, but on the contrary voted only that the hearing be postponed until the court having jurisdiction of a private controversy involving the facts on which the investigation was being made should have a reasonable opportunity to dispose of the case. There was no disagreement of the three members as to the fact that the transaction involved should be investigated. We were also in agreement that the further hearing of the matter at this immediate time was not warranted. I believe we did the right thing, but this is true, that if we made any mistake it was not that of refusing to hear the matter but only as to the time the hearing should be held.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman spoke of postponing the hearing until the court had a reasonable time to dispose of the case. What did the gentleman mean by "reasonable time"?

Mr. LEA. That matter was discussed at the meeting and the suggestion was made naturally enough that the court might take so long that it would not be practical, that would amount to a discontinuance and therefore we put in the word "reasonable" with the specific understanding that we would finish it in any event. We were together on the proposition that we would finish it before we got through. We were in no sense agreed that we would wait indefinitely.

Mr. CHURCH. What does the gentleman mean by the word "reasonable"? How long did the gentleman think the case might be before the court?

Mr. LEA. If the court did not finish with the case soon enough we would proceed.

Mr. CHURCH. But the case might be before the court for 2 years or 3 years.

Mr. LEA. In that case it was definitely understood that we would proceed with the matter. It was discussed and we specifically agreed that we would not stand for any such delay as that.

Mr. CHURCH. Did you discuss 30 days, 60 days, or some such time?

Mr. LEA. A period of 6 weeks was mentioned. The committee did not bind itself to 6 weeks. We thought the court might need that much time.

Newspaper reports have stated that the meeting of the 16th was a secret meeting of which the other members of the committee were not notified. That statement is not true. On the afternoon of the day prior to the meeting I requested the clerk to notify members of the meeting. When the hour of 10 o'clock arrived and the two minority members were absent, I asked the clerk to check up the offices of the members and see if they were coming. The clerk reported that the ranking minority member knew of the meeting, but was attending another meeting and would not be present. He reported that the other member of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER], had not received the notice he attempted to give the day before, whereupon he got in touch with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER], who, we were informed, stated he was attending another meeting and would not come. Thereupon, after having waited 35 minutes for the appearance of the minority members, the meeting was called to order and we proceeded to the consideration and adoption of the motion by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] temporarily postponing the hearing.

Mr. HART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HART. The gentleman will recall that the message received from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] stated that he was tied up with persons from back home and would not be able to attend the meeting for at least 2 days.

Mr. LEA. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEA. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman does not mean to imply that either minority member had any notice of what was to be considered or done at this meeting?

Mr. LEA. We sent the protest on which the meeting was based to each member of the committee the night before.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In what form?

Mr. LEA. In the form of the telegram from Mr. Wood who made the protest.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There was nothing to indicate, as far as I know, to either minority member what was contemplated to take place at that meeting.

Mr. LEA. I took it for granted when this protest was made and the meeting called that that would be the object of it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We were entitled to notice and reasonable notice as to what the meeting was to be about and when the meeting was to take place.

Mr. LEA. You were given notice the previous afternoon.

I want to refer briefly to the meeting of the 16th.

This special committee was created to investigate the organization of the Commission, its personnel and its activities to determine whether or not the Commission is acting in accordance with law and the public interest.

The question as to the organization of the Commission is one primarily of legislation. I am of the opinion that legislation is needed to improve the legal procedure in conducting meetings before the Commission. The recent Supreme Court decision gave the Commission wider authority than I think was in contemplation when the act creating the Commission was passed. I am one of those who believe the Commission in its administration had been inclined to reach out and exercise powers that Congress did not intend to give it. I think the Supreme Court decision has made it more desirable than ever that we should have legislation which would more clearly define the powers of the Commission, more definitely limit and restrain its activities, and that would also give a greater degree of stability to the broadcasting industry instead of leaving it so largely in the discretionary control of the Commission. I believe also that legislation should be enacted to improve the procedure and methods of handling matters before the Commission. Those things, however, are primarily matters of legislation. This committee was invested with the power to inquire into the personnel and activities of the Commission to determine whether or not they were acting in accordance with law and the public interest. This means the investigation covers a broad field, but limited to the purpose of determining whether or not those activities are in accordance with the law and public interest. The activities involved are as numerous as the matters coming before the Commission, but the problem of determining the propriety of the conduct of the Commission is not fundamentally a complex one. It covers a consideration of many facts, most of which, however, are matters of record. The Commission has presented to the committee, it is claimed, over 4,000 separate matters. Many of these matters are routine, while others are of importance and contain signboards indicating whether or not the Commission is performing its activities in accordance with the law and the public interest. This work requires industry and a commonsense analysis as to how well the Commission is properly functioning.

The investigation has been surrounded by continuous and destroying dissention, bitterness, and vindictiveness. There has developed an atmosphere of suspicion, distortion, and exaggeration that detracts from the possible value of the whole investigation. I confess I have been much disappointed that greater progress has not been made in eliminating this handicap to a successful investigation. I cannot prophesy with assurance, but it is true in my judgment, that the staff which had charge of the investigation has been the storm center of the controversy and I had hoped that a new beginning with a staff disassociated from this long-standing bitterness might, to a very substantial degree, help solve the problem. The present situation may make the trial of this method possible.

DIFFICULTY AHEAD

Now, the problem of this investigation will rest in the hands of those who may have the responsibility for its completion. At best the work is rather a thankless task and still harder than would be the case if the investigation were starting anew. Wild, irresponsible, and reckless

criticism, whether inspired by malice or overzeal can play no useful part in lessening the burden of those who may carry the future responsibility of this committee.

For my part, if those who carry this burden for the future do it even fairly well they will have my support.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in a terrifying war. If we lose, God knows what will become of America. We did not seek this war, and I am not so sure it was forced upon us as some would have us believe. But the fact remains we are engaged in the most terrible war of all times. We cannot back out of our commitment. We must win.

Up in my district in northern Michigan, we have met every challenge. Over 32,000 of our sons and daughters are today in the uniform of Uncle Sam, baring their breasts to the enemy. We are just as proud of those kids as they are of the country whence they came. They love our north country, and they and we hope they will return to it ere long.

We on the home front in northern Michigan have met every challenge in support of those youngsters. Those who could be spared from our farms or local war industries have gone to the larger cities to contribute their energies to the war production effort. Those of us who stayed at home have done their utmost on the neighborhood home front, meeting every challenge that has been hurled their way, whether it be for the collection of scrap iron, scrap rubber, scrap paper, or their hard-earned dollars through the purchase of War bonds of the several categories offered. Mr. Speaker, as has been true in so many districts of this country, we have during our time enjoyed in parts of our district some measure of wartime prosperity. We did not seek it as fool's gold, but, in company with everyone else, it would be absurd to say we did not enjoy it when we had it.

In Sault Ste. Marie in my district, Mr. Speaker, are located the famous Soo locks. They can well be called the main artery of our war effort because through that artery flows 90 percent of our Nation's raw iron ore supply which goes into the manufacture of every shot and shell, tank or submarine, tank destroyer or destroyer escort vessel, battleship or cruiser, airplane or antiaircraft gun; it can equally well be called the jugular vein because that iron ore spells poison to Hitler and Hirohito.

The fact that the Soo locks have been dubbed as our No. 1 air target by our own air force was not unknown nor unrecognized by Adolf Hitler when long before Pearl Harbor he had a special aerial task force practicing its bombing technique on a target outline of the Soo locks laid out in a large northern Norwegian fjord. As a matter of fact the inherent vulnerability of the Soo locks has for the past 2 years been advertised by an exhibit that has been there all these days and weeks and months in the lobby of the Old House Office Building, whereon if you will look you will find on this display this description of "sacrifice bombing"—"It is possible to send a large bomber carrying a load of highly destructive bombs of great size on a sacrifice mission to destroy a concentrated target which is deemed of sufficient importance to justify the certain destruction of the expensive plane and the highly trained crew. Such a raid could be carried out at distances which approach the ultimate one-way range of the fully loaded plane which is almost twice the radius of a bomber returning to its base." And the illustration used, Mr. Speaker, is a direct air line from Stavanger, Norway, to Sault Ste. Marie as the No. 1 air target of this country.

Immediately after Pearl Harbor, for a long time on the floor of this House, and in committees, and in personal representation to various Army officials, I fought for adequate protection of these Soo locks. Eventually I was rewarded and very fortunately for this Nation and for the entire United Nations, when early in 1942 adequate antiaircraft defensive forces of all categories were sent to protect the locks. Not only were these defense forces sent up there but a number of defensive airport installations were either constructed or tremendously improved so that for a long time we in northern Michigan, and we in this Nation and in the United Nations, could rest secure against a successful enemy bombing attack on these Soo locks.

The city of Sault Ste. Marie not only enjoyed local prosperity from having its population suddenly doubled overnight, but it found its wartime prosperity further enhanced due to the construction of a new lock at that point. Possibly the finest corps of marine contractors and their associates that was ever assembled in this Nation went to work to construct this lock under the most difficult conditions in record-breaking time. This new $14,000,000 lock, greater than anything in the Panama Canal or anywhere else in the world, was opened to navigation last July 11, upon the completion of a world-record construction program viewed from whatever angle, and was named after a former United States Army engineer, whose own personal feats of achievement will go down to posterity in one of the most glorious pages of our national history—Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we from northern Michigan feel humbly grateful for the fact that our military victories achieved on the far-flung battle fronts of the entire world—and made possible by the almost miraculous achievements of American industry, of American labor here at home, plus the united effort of our citizens everywhere—have now so changed the fortunes of war as to make it possible—and I dare say advisable—to remove from Sault Ste. Marie this greatly augmented military guardian force. As of today we can all rest secure in the belief that we of the United Nations are now so far engaged on an offensive warfare as to no longer require any defensive forces remaining here on these shores. We rest serenely in that sense of security.

On the other hand we of northern Michigan refuse to be unmindful of the fact that we live in northern Michigan; we pay our taxes in northern Michigan; we buy our bonds in northern Michigan. Our children have been acclimated to northern Michigan; our young folks from northern Michigan are now serving Uncle Sam all over the world. We hope most of them will be returned in the best of physical health, doubtless wiser for their experience of having served their Nation; but we also recognize that unfortunately some of them will come back to us maimed by wounds received in action; others will come back broken in health by reason of the rigors of training and combat service; others no doubt will come back suffering from diseases contracted due to an ill-advised policy mistakenly adopted in the last war and mistakenly repeated in this war, whereby for some unknown reason our military authorities think it advisable to take our youth from northern Michigan, where their blood is thick, where they are accustomed to enjoying cold weather, and place them in training, and then fight them, in climates where they invariably suffer from the heat. Their first move is to take them down in the semitropics of Alabama and Mississippi for maneuvers. At the same time let me point out that the very first troops which were sent to Sault Ste. Marie were Alabama and Mississippi Negroes, whose blood was thin and who were the last people in the world least fit to stand the rigors of northern Michigan winters. No, Mr. Speaker, we have not forgotten that our boys when and if they come back crippled or maimed or sick, desire from the bottom of their hearts to come back to our country which they left, to come back into northern Michigan where they feel at home, and above all where their parents can drive to them even under gasoline rationing in a relatively short time. Our soldiers and sailors are entitled to it; they expect it and we back home expect it.

Now, what is the purpose of all this? Mr. Speaker, when Uncle Sam augmented the facilities at Sault Ste. Marie, he expended about $10,000,000 building hutment barracks, mess halls, recreational halls, chapels, and a hospital—all sufficient to accommodate many thousands of troops. True, these were of a temporary construction. Lord knows, we up in the Soo area never wanted them to be permanent.

Furthermore, we sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Army is not overconfident in its decision that there is not now, and for the duration of the war will not be, any further danger of an enemy bombing raid on the Soo locks.

On the other hand most of us in that country are unanimous in feeling that the Army is not acting wisely when it engages as it is at the present time in a mad race to declare all these augmented facilities excess or surplus, is advertising them for sale and is disposing of them just as fast as possible. So far Uncle Sam is realizing a salvage value of approximately 8 percent on its initial cost, and that is not very much. And if the fortunes of war should suddenly change, and the troops again found needed at the Soo, we should again have to indulge in a mad rush to restore these facilities at enormous expense.

The worst feature of this matter as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, and I want to caution every other Member of this House, is the fact that for a number of weeks I had been unable to get any authoritative information from the War Department here in Washington as to just what was being declared surplus, just what was being disposed of, and how much was being offered for sale and torn down. As a matter of fact, based directly on information which I received from the War Department, as late as February 5, I advised the Sault Chamber of Commerce as follows:

Within the past few days I have had several communications, including a telegram, from Mr. Ernest Wieneke, as president of your chamber of commerce, and also have noticed several articles in the Sault Evening News all dealing apparently with some rumor to the effect that the Army was about to tear down the new base hospital constructed for the augmented facilities at Fort Brady a year or two ago, and further that it was likely that they would tear down all the other facilities which had been constructed at the same time.

As far as I can tell from repeated calls to various high officials in the Army down here, nothing could be further from the truth, and certainly none such rumors have any foundation in fact.

However, Mr. Speaker, I had so much correspondence coming in from the Soo on this matter and so many rumors, which it seemed must be based on some facts not otherwise apparent so far as I could ascertain here in Washington that on February 19 I took advantage of our legislative lull down here and personally went up to the Soo and there inspected the facilities with the commanding officer of Fort Brady. I might say right here that this officer had just assumed that command and told me his orders read distinctly that he was to command and maintain Fort Brady proper and to furnish the necessary military guard for the locks. Furthermore, he was charged with the responsibility of surveying the augmented facilities and determine which of them were surplus or excess as far as his responsibility was concerned. Very naturally in accordance with his orders everything outside of the fence surrounding Fort Brady proper was excess, including this new million-dollar base hospital. The hospital was on that very day being evacuated, and all the patients and such of the equipment as the Army sets out as standard for a 50-bed hospital was being removed to the old post hospital on Fort Brady proper. Several carloads of the remainder of the equipment and supplies of all kinds had already been moved out consigned to some medical supply depot. Even some of the locks were being taken off the interior doors and moved over to the post hospital. As of today less than 3 carloads of equipment and supplies remained to be shipped.

I personally inspected this complete hospital facility, which is in a good state of repair and which I was told by the surgeon in charge could with its immediately adjacent buildings be readily converted into a 500-bed hospital. This hospital was constructed on what the Army calls a 5-year temporary construction plan. Consequently it is a wooden frame structure laid out in a series of wings for fire protection and other security reasons. It is most complete with all administrative quarters, two operating rooms, X-ray rooms, and complete laboratory, large storehouses, beautiful kitchens, large mess halls for patients and attendants, and even has a large size prison ward with adjoining enclosed exercise yard for the prisoners. The walls are double throughout. The building is equipped with double windows throughout. The entire structure is steam heated from a beautiful new modern three-boiler stoker-fired central heating plant. I was informed by the boiler room engineer that he estimated it would take at least 30 days to lay up those boilers and drain the plumbing and heating facilities .

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the War Department policy, as of that date to be in such haste to dispose of any of these augmented facilities at Fort Brady and certainly I cannot agree with the present probable intention of dismantling and tearing down for salvage this splendid hospital.

I have contended right along that even though there may never come a bombing attack on the Sault, nevertheless, these facilities can and should be used for the hospitalization of our returning veterans. If we can believe the estimates of the expected casualties incident to any frontal assault on Germany, to say nothing of our reasonably expected casualties from the Pacific theater of war, then it seems certain that our medical authorities will have to greatly increase their present facilities all over the country; and why in the name of heaven tear down what the taxpayers have already paid for and construct elsewhere, and especially at this time when we are faced with a critical shortage of both manpower and materials for new facilities construction?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That was true after the last World War. They disposed of property and tore it down, property that was needed very much.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. That is true and I think that is going to happen this time unless we watch it carefully and stop needless or untimely waste.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very important to watch it.

Mr. POULSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that we have heard a great deal of demagoguery about renegotiation of contracts and that there will be just as many millions made over the salvage business by the salvage industry as there has been on the contracts, yet we do not hear any comment about that?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. There is no question about that when you are found selling valuable property like that for 8 cents on the dollar. It is high time the taxpayer and the patriotic War bond buyers get a fair break. Because of the urgency of wartime we may not always be able to be too circumspect or too careful of our emergency purchases. For 18 years I was a purchasing agent and I realize that all too frequently in emergencies any buyer may get his fingers burned but the exigency of the case might make a higher-than-market price justifiable at the time. But when it comes to salvage sales—where is the emergency justification? To get one's fingers burned there borders on criminal carelessness or possibly collusion. And, mark my words, wherever and whenever a facility like augmented Fort Brady is to be salvaged at 8 cents on the dollar you watch these vultures swoop in for the kill and equally as unreasonable profits as accumulated by some of those so properly renegotiated out of their excess profits.

Certain it is that if that practice should continue in Fort Brady, the people would be justified in asking, as many of them in the Soo are today, why they should continue to buy War bonds in the face of such wanton waste of money. Happily I have faith in our War Department, and I cannot conceive of their continuing to make such a grievous mistake. For the time being I have been assured that will not be done. This morning every member of the Michigan delegation received the following letter from Mr. Clifford D. Everett, a resident of Sault Ste. Marie, who is commander of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars, which was sent under date of February 25—and I quote:

An estimated million dollars was spent here about a year and a half ago in the construction of the Fort Brady Hospital. As you are aware from our recent conference in Washington, Michigan is desperately in need of veterans' hospital facilities, and the immediate future holds grim possibilities for the need of every single bed and probably thousands more than are now available.

Word has just come through from the Sixth Service Command that this new 350-bed Fort Brady Hospital is to be sold for salvage within the next 15 days. This would be a gross waste of the taxpayers' money and smells to high heaven when hospital facilities for returning veterans are so badly needed at this time here in Michigan.

Will you please take action to stop this wanton destruction of a new, costly hopsital facility sorely needed by veterans now, not to mention its certain terrible necessity in the immediate future?

I am glad to report that Mr. Everett's letter was not founded entirely on fact. On Friday last, following my repeated requests and insistence on obtaining definite and factual information as to the future intentions of the War Department, I had a very pleasant conference with Brig. Gen. Edward W. Smith, deputy chief, Legislative and Liaison Division of the Office of the Chief of Staff, who was able to clarify the atmosphere considerably, and which information then given me he confirmed by letter dated February 26, which I read into the RECORD at this point:

Pursuant to your request of February 26 with reference to buildings and improvements adjacent Fort Brady, which have been or will be declared surplus by the War Department, I am pleased to advise you that the War Department has not yet declared the hospital or adjacent buildings surplus and does not at this moment contemplate offering that part of the installation for sale. However, you may be assured that in event this property is declared surplus and is offered for sale, the State of Michigan will be given an opportunity to negotiate for its purchase. I have requested that no disposition be made of this property for a period of at least 60 days, pending final action by the State of Michigan.

I regret that I am unable to secure for you before Monday a list of the other properties that have been declared surplus and have been sold, the sale price thereof, the party to whom sold, and the cost of the installations to the War Department. However, I have requested this information and as soon as it has been secured, I shall be pleased to furnish it to you.

Please be assured that we desire to cooperate with you fully in making available to you any information with reference to Sault Ste. Marie and Fort Brady and trust that you will unhesitatingly call on us.

It is my understanding that at the recent special session of the Michigan State Legislature, provision was made for the establishment of a State Office of Veterans' Administration. I sincerely hope that if the Federal Government decides not to continue the operation of this hospital that the State of Michigan itself might find it possible and advisable to utilize those splendid facilities. And I might suggest to other Members of this House that in the event your own States have not as yet set up machinery whereby they may find it possible or advisable to take over some of our abandoned Federal war properties before they are disposed at scrap prices to professional wrecking concerns that they might look into the matter quickly because the situation at Fort Brady is typical of hundreds of other similar cases which will develop day after day, and immediately.

In closing and for the information of the membership, may I say that General Smith this morning outlined to me the procedure being followed in the case of Fort Brady. The immediate commanding officer, Col. Basil D. Spalding has, in accordance with his orders, certified to the Sixth Service Command that everything outside of Fort Brady proper is surplus or excess. The Sixth Service Command in Chicago in turn has passed the certification on to the Corps of Engineers, Army Services of Supply, here in Washington. This organization will in turn address inquiries to the various other branches of the Army and to the Navy and should they fail to find any immediate need for these facilities in these branches, they will in turn offer them to the Public Works Administration and through them to the Veterans' Administration.

Finally, if none of the Federal authorities has any need or prospective need for these facilities same will then be offered for disposal to the public, but in this case it is distinctly understood that the State of Michigan will be given an opportunity to acquire those properties before disposal to the general public. This, I believe, is a perfectly fair, wise, and prudent program for disposition and is certainly a tremendous improvement over the mad haste program that I saw well under way at the Soo on February 19.

I do hope fervently that these facilities can be used, and will be used, for the hospitalization or the convalescent care of our own northern Michigan boys, not only so they may be brought closer to home and more readily accessible to visits from their parents but also so that they may enjoy our healthful northern climate to which they have been accustomed all their lives and I sincerely feel that if we are careful to pursue the present program of disposal of these properties, our people in northern Michigan will continue to feel fully justified in proudly carrying on patriotically as they have so far by oversubscribing every bond quota ever requested of them.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of the legislative business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time I have may I say that since we have had confessionals here today, possibly some facts that have not been brought out about this special committee of which I am a member should be brought out. I attempted to get hold of the written speech made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, but the official reporters have taken it downstairs, for I wanted to be sure of his exact words. I want to quote him correctly. If I am wrong in stating the gentleman's words I hope he will correct me.

As I understood the gentleman from Massachusetts, he said, in effect, that since the new chairman of the committee has taken over there has been a studied or studious attempt to whitewash this investigation. At least that was the inference I received.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. What I said was there has been continuous difficulty in arriving at any satisfactory arrangement for obtaining essential data and documents from the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I stand corrected. I understood the gentleman's inference to be that the present chairman of the committee was probably attempting to whitewash this whole business.

Mr. Speaker, all this simmers around the counsel employed by this committee. Let me say frankly—and the gentleman from Georgia is in the back of the room and the other gentlemen who are and were members of the committee at all times—that I have been always more or less opposed to Mr. Garey. I say that frankly. I do not think he has conducted the investigation properly. I have said so many times, both publicly and privately, and the record will bear out that on one or two occasions at the meetings I strongly protested the manner in which he was proceeding.

Mr. Garey was hired by the former chairman of the committee, Mr. Cox. Mr. Cox called all members of the committee to his office immediately after his appointment as chairman and submitted the names of several people. He asked us first if we had any suggestions. We did not have any because it is customary for the chairman of a committee to select his own counsel. Mr. Cox submitted two of three names of New York lawyers, I believe, but, unfortunately, he told us at a subsequent meeting he was unable to procure the man he wanted, a Mr. Montague. Later Mr. Cox submitted to us the name of Eugene Garey. Some discussion was had of Mr. Garey's qualifications. We were told briefly of his background and he was appointed counsel.

The investigation went on for some time before I raised my voice in protest against the type of investigation that I believed Mr. Garey was conducting. I wanted to be sure of the tenor of the staff. However, we went into the summer recess. Other events occurred which led to the gracious action of the gentleman from Georgia in resigning.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] was then appointed chairman. Mr. LEA discussed with me on one or two occasions regarding Mr. Garey, and I think he discussed Garey's position with other Members.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Discussed what?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The position of Mr. Garey.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. LEA discussed that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. LEA discussed it with me.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have no recollection of it being discussed with me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not know. I am saying he discussed it with me. I told him frankly that I thought we should have a new counsel. That was my position. Mr. LEA said that he thought that we allow Mr. Garey, who was familiar with the record, to continue and he felt the investigation could proceed in a proper manner with proper guidance. Further, that he knows all these pages and pages of the record and that we ought to keep him, at least to the

extent that he would clear up and modify the record and submit to us a synopsis of what had gone on because many of us had not appeared at all the hearings. That was some months ago.

Mr. Garey, in my opinion, continued his practices; as an example he continued to call witnesses into the investigating committee room when no member of the committee was present after we had agreed there should always be a member of the committee present while witnesses were being examined.

I bring this out, Mr. Speaker, to point out that the distinguished gentleman from California at no time has ever attempted to undermine the counsel of the committee. As a matter of fact, over my protest, Mr. LEA said he ought to stay.

Let me discuss another point.

The gentleman from Massachusetts made some reference in his prepared speech to the fact that one of the Members came all the way from Attu for this meeting.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I stated that one of the Members arrived only the day before.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, I arrived the day before. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I arrived from Attu by course of my home district of Seattle, and I arrived here to perform my duties as a Member of Congress. I am still a Member of this Congress. The inference, however, is that there is something sinister or something suspicious about the fact that I happened to show up in Washington a couple of days before the meeting.

So that I can get the record clear again, I was up in the Aleutians for the Committee on Naval Affairs. I came to Seattle approximately a week before I came here. I called my office, which most of us do, and I asked my secretary what was happening. I said, "I would like to stay in Seattle a few days." I had some business there. She said, "There are several people looking for you. The Democratic whip is looking for you because some important votes are coming up in the House momentarily. The chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee is looking for you because they are going to have meetings on important matters shortly. The Federal Communications Select Committee has been meeting." I was informed. So I said, "Well, I will be back there in 3 or 4 days," and I came.

Much has been made of the fact that Mr. Denny has been in the office of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and talked to him. He has talked to Mr. Fly on the phone. That is a terrible thing, an awful thing, that you cannot talk on the telephone to people you know without someone impugning your motives.

There has been something said by Members of this House about the fact that after I arrived here I ran into the fabulous Tom Corcoran in the Shoreham Hotel, where I live, and had breakfast with him. I have had several breakfasts with Tommy Corcoran in the many years I have been here, and I hope I will have some more. I like him. As a matter of fact, I have had several breakfasts with men on both sides of this controversy. I suspect that I have had breakfast with the gentleman from Georgia as many times as I have with any man in this House or in Washington. And, like Mr. LEA, I cannot place anything suspicious about that. All of us talked to all interested parties in preparing legislation. How else could we arrive at the facts?

After all, I have not done anything on this committee except say what I thought and what I believed. I have done nothing to thwart the committee investigation. As a matter of fact, I have concurred in many things in which I did not believe, hoping it would help expedite this bitter controversy to some conclusion.

Look at this record. The gentleman from New Jersey brought it out, but I will say to the Members of the House that it is not 1,300 pages, it is 1,800 pages; 13 months of investigation of a governmental body. I do not know whether it, the F. C. C., is right or wrong. The reason I do not know is because nothing has ever been presented on one side of the case.

Mr. Speaker, my idea of a congressional investigation is that it is for the sole purpose of determining certain general and specific facts, mainly general facts, upon which to base proposed legislation. Half of this volume is the words of the counsel of the committee and his conclusions, even before the other side has appeared. Any Member of the House can read it. I think it is time that we heard all sides of this issue, and let the chips fall where they may.

If there is any legislation to be proposed, any just criticism of the Federal Communications Commission that this Congress can correct by legislation, you are going to have my vote, for one, and I know the vote of the majority members of this committee, as well as the vote of the two minority members.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I regret that the letter of resignation of Mr. Garey has given offense to anyone. Particularly do I regret that it gave offense to my friend and Mr. Garey's friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART]. I cannot find it in my heart to combat what the gentleman from New Jersey said. He was wounded. It was apparent to everybody that he was giving expression to the feeling of resentment that he has.

I am partly, maybe mainly, responsible for bringing Gene Garey down here as the counsel for the committee set up to investigate the Federal Communications Commission. I say to you that no committee has ever brought to Washington to do work of this character a lawyer of greater ability, of purer character, or of greater industry.

I made a careful survey of the entire country in an effort to find somebody to propose to the committee as its general counsel. I interviewed literally hundreds of people. The result was that the name of Mr. Garey was brought to my attention, and I asked him to come down for an interview. I had never met him before. He came. He reluctantly agreed to undertake the work, that is, to serve as the counsel for the committee.

I say to you that he was not down here looking for a job. His being down here has cost him hundreds of thousands of dollars, and that is not an exaggeration. He is a lawyer of very large practice. All that he waived and put aside in order that he might be true to the trust that had been reposed in him. He did a lawyerlike job.

Mr. Garey was not here for a week before the drive started against him to force him out of the committee as its counsel. The libeling and blackmailing of me was intended to restrain him.

I would not consent to his leaving the committee.

The letter of Mr. Garey resigning as counsel of the committee expresses strong feeling on his part. He wrote that letter under very trying and difficult circumstances. His leaving the committee was not an easy thing for him to do. He is not a quitter and did not want to give anyone excuse to make the accusation.

I do not have the time to defend the committee. I will have something to say about this later on. The gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] in making his presentation referred to the alleged star-chamber proceedings of the committee. Nobody connected with the committee ever did anything that justified any such criticism. The committee followed normal procedure. The representatives of the committee would go out and interview people before bringing them in to testify. They would take statements from individuals, some under oath and some not under oath. It was because of the damaging character of the testimony that was taken that the protests arose and the campaign against me and the committee started.

As regards WMCA, I must say that when I was on the committee every possible influence was brought to bear on me to keep the committee's hands off this station. It was because of the persistent insistence of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the committee started the inquiry, started the investigation, and there must be something terribly bad in it or else all this effort to smother the inquiry would not be put forth.

I want to say to you and through you to the country that powerful influences have been brought to the aid of the Federal Communications Commission. There seems to be a feeling that it must be saved at all cost and used as a weapon to combat the influence of the free, conservative, and independent press. There has never been an agency of the Government that has treated with greater contempt the Congress of the United States than has this Commission and its Chairman, but it is now on the defensive. This discussion is going to continue. The story of the tyranny of this Commission over communications is going to be told. If this Congress expects to function as a coordinate and coequal branch of the

Government, it must meet the challenge now offered to its authority by this Commission. That is the issue that is before us now. It is my feeling that the work of this committee is at an end, but that the F. C. C. will be thoroughly investigated there is no doubt.

When Garey left this committee the committee's effectiveness as an agency of this House, inquiring into the bad behavior of this creature of the Congress, came to an end. He is the man that the Federal Communications Commission is afraid of. He is the man that these bureaucrats downtown dreaded, and it is unfortunate for the committee and the country that he was compelled to leave the committee. It involves a tremendous loss. He has made a careful study of the whole subject of communications. There is not a man in the country who knows it any better than he. He has spent from 16 to 18 hours every day since he came to the committee as its counsel doing the work that he had in hand. Again I want to say that it is a pity he is gone; and I must say, for no man can accuse me of having ever run away from a friend, God never created a nobler or finer man. He is a man of very great ability, and I am proud to call him my friend. He is not only a great lawyer but he is also a great American, and I give that to you as the testimony of one who believes he has the capacity to measure the worth of men.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. MALONEY, for 10 days on account of official business.

To Mr. GOODWIN, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. LARCADE, for several days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2912. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; and

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

The SPEAKER also announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; and

S. 1633. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1943, so as to provide for the full participation of institutions of the United States in the program for the training of nurses, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on February 25, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 85. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1927, entitled "An act granting pensions to certain soldiers who served in the Indian wars from 1817 to 1898, and for other purposes";

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids;

H. R. 480. An act for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli;

H. R. 1047. An act for the relief of the State of Oregon, Department of Forestry of the State of Oregon, and certain organized protection agencies in the State of Oregon for protection of unappropriated public-forest lands intermingled with Oregon and California lands from July 1, 1938, to June 30, 1939;

H. R. 1594. An act for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis;

H. R. 1637. An act for the relief of Fred Hunter;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the estate of Frederick Lee Littlefield; and

H. R. 2131. An act for the relief of Henry Angell.

THE LATE SENATOR CHARLES L. McNARY

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and move its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY, a Senator from the State of Oregon, and minority leader of the Senate.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee to attend the funeral: Messrs. MOTT, ANGELL, STOCKMAN, ELLSWORTH, DIRKSEN, COSTELLO, and HOLIFIELD.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the balance of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m., on Wednesday, March 1, 1944, on H. R. 4140, H. R. 4238, H. R. 4250, and private bills.

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 1, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the public-health subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 1, 1944.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 3379, a bill to codify the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 1, and Thursday, March 2, 1944, in the caucus room of the old House Office Building, for the consideration of post-war planning.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, investigating the shortage of steel, at 10 a. m. Friday, March 3, 1944, in the Patents Committee room, 416 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1236. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $526,560.06 (H. Doc. No. 458); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1237. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the Treasury Department for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, covering a judgment rendered in a United States district court, amounting to $840 (H. Doc. No. 459); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1238. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $5,985 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 460); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1239. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims (H. Doc. No. 461); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1240. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of $9,934.70 (H. Doc. No. 462); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1241. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of judgments rendered against the Government by

United States district courts amounting to $47,617.24, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 463); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1242. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $17,355.51, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 464); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1243. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $716.78 (H. Doc. No. 465); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1244. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of $3,589.30 (H. Doc. No. 466); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1245. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the United States Coast Guard, in the sum of $4,110.85 (H. Doc. No. 467); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1246. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the Treasury Department for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $373.92 (H. Doc. No. 468); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1247. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a record of judgment rendered against the Government by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in a special case as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of $54,282.06 together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 469); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1248. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation amounting to $2,761,776.10 to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent establishments (H. Doc. No. 470); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1249. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $27,368.86 (H. Doc. No. 471); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1250. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 10, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Boston Harbor, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 2, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 472); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

1251. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 26, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of the following streams which form the Merced County stream group in the San Joaquin Valley, Calif.: Bear, Black Rascal, and Mariposa Creeks in Merced County, and Canal, Fahrens, Black Rascal, Bear, Miles, Owens, Duck, Mariposa, Little Deadmans, Big Deadmans, and Burns Creeks, California. This report is submitted in compliance with an act of Congress approved on May 6, 1936, and the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936 (H. Doc. No. 473); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 4278. A bill to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. S. 555. An act for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; without amendment (Rept. No. 1197). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2334) to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 4281. A bill to authorize the disposition of excess Government food stocks and related products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4282. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4283. A bill to provide ballots for electors absent on war duty; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 4284. A bill to provide for promotion of American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4285. A bill to extend to enrollees in the United States Maritime Service and to cadet-midshipmen in the United States Merchant Marine Cadet Corps the privilege of free mailing and of exemption from the tax with respect to the transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4286. A bill to relinquish the title of the United States to certain lands in the county of Los Angeles, State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 4287. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the city of Duluth, Minn.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 4288. A bill to authorize the disposition of excess Government food stocks and related products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 4289. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4290. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 4291. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4292. A bill to amend section 12 (b) of the act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 4293. A bill to exempt fishermen's associations from taxation under subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U. S. C. sec. 101 (12)); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 4294. A bill to exempt certain long-distance telephone calls made by members of the armed forces of the United States from the tax with respect to long-distance telephone calls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4295. A bill for the relief of Moses Hoffman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 4296. A bill for the relief of Michael Ioannis Vagianos; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:
H. R. 4297. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Salierno; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:
H. R. 4298. A bill granting an increase of pension to Wesley S. Walden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGEHEE:
H. R. 4299. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V-3 at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 4300. A bill for the relief of Square D Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PRICE:
H. R. 4301. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Mrs. Hortense Coleman Arnow, Julian M. Rogers, and Mrs. Willie L. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RABAUT:
H. R. 4302. A bill for the relief of Walter Steward; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:
H. R. 4303. A bill for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCHWABE:
H. R. 4304. A bill for the relief of the estate of J. Earl Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TREADWAY:
H. R. 4305. A bill for the relief of Henry Clay Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:
H. R. 4306. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5082. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Niagara Falls, N. Y., Builders' Association, having to do with the disposal of unoccupied Government housing, and urging that they be sold on a salvage basis and the materials made available to relieve the shortage of building materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5083. Also, resolution adopted the B'nai B'rith Girls, League No. 7, of Buffalo, N. Y., urging immediate action by the Congress to insure the withdrawal of the Palestine white paper of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5084. Also, resolution adopted by the Frontier Post, No. 259, of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, appealing to the President of the United States to use his influence to bring about abrogation of the white paper of 1939 and the fulfillment of the Balfour Declaration granting unrestricted immigration of Jews into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5085. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition protesting against the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5086. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition of 484 residents of the Third Congressional District of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5087. By Mr. BISHOP: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Benton, Ill., regarding international air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5088. By Mrs. BOLTON: Petitions of 808 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5089. By Mr. BUSBEY: Petition of Andy Sebby and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the consideration by Congress of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5090. Also, petition of Frank J. Wetzel and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war, and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5091. Also, petition of William B. Piacenti and other citizens of Chicago Heights, Ill., and Third Illinois District, protesting against the consideration by Congress of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war, and all such proposed legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5092. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the St. Louis Junior Auxiliary of the Jewish Consumptives' Relief Society, submitted by M. J. Silverstein, of St. Louis, Mo., urging the passage of House Resolutions 418 and 419 providing for the abrogation of the British white paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5093. By Mr. DEWEY: Petition of R. B. Marsh containing names of approximately 186 people from the city of Chicago who have signed petitions protesting against prohibition legislation discriminatory against the boys in uniform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5094. By Mr. FERNANDEZ: Petition of the Bataan Relief Organization, favoring investigation to determine responsibility for negligent conduct on the part of high ranking officers during Pearl Harbor attack, and for trial and punishment of such officials; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

5095. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of 2,000 Zionist Youth Leaders of the Young Zionist Actions Committee of New York, urging the passage of the Compton-Wright resolution (H. Res. 418-419) for the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5096. Also, petition signed by I. Rosenthal, of Mount Vernon, and a number of other residents of Mount Vernon, N. Y., urging the enactment into law of House Resolutions 418 and 419 which provide for the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5097. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to the granting of permits to competing transcontinental air lines, in order that New England communities may have adequate service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5098. Also, memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to free mail privilege and half-fare transportation privileges for trainees in the merchant marine service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5099. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the Civil Aeronautics Board to give consideration to the subject of the granting of permits to competing transcontinental air lines in order that all communities in New England may have a rightful place in the air world; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5100. Also, petition adopted by a group of Americans of Polish origin in the Church Hall, Woonsocket, R. I., in protest of any partition of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5101. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 51 members of the Methodist Church of Petrolia, Butler County, Pa., requesting the enactment of House bill 2082, which would stop the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and during demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5102. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of 30 residents of Washington County, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5103. Also, petition of 515 residents of the fifteenth district of Ohio, opposing the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5104. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of W. C. Raugust and 21 other residents of Odessa, Wash., urging support of Senate bill 637 and House bill 2849, since the schools of the Nation are in desperate need of additional financial support; to the Committee on Education.

5105. Also, petition of Mrs. E. D. Heimbigner and 15 other residents of Odessa, Wash., favoring Federal aid legislation, namely Senate bill 637 and House bill 2849; to the Committee on Education.

5106. Also, petition of Mrs. L. H. Comp and 11 other residents of Chelan, Wash., favoring legislation to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5107. Also, petition of F. E. Bayles and 28 other residents of Wenatchee, Wash., protesting against the passage of legislation designed to bring about prohibition under the guise of a war measure or otherwise and request Congress to vote against such legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5108. Also, petition of K. E. Randle and 27 other residents of Wenatchee, Wash., protesting against the passage of legislation designed to bring about prohibition under the guise of a war measure or otherwise and request Congress to vote against such legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5109. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of R. R. Lutrick, president, and J. L. O'Hearn, secretary, American Society of Civil Engineers, Dallas, Tex., favoring House bill 3058; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5110. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions containing the signatures of 66 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District of the State of New York, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5111. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of G. Sahrmann and 29 petitioners of St. Louis, Mo., to determine why the Inland Waterways Corporation operating Federal barge lines have refrained from serving the public in the handling of package freight referred to as less-carload and carload freight; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5112. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5113. Also, resolution of the Shrine Club of Philadelphia, endorsing the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5114. Also, resolution adopted by District Association No. 1, Pennsylvania State Nurses' Association, referring to the Wagner-Murray-Dingle bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5115. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the San Francisco Congress of Industrial Organizations Council, with reference to pay of Federal workers endorsing the Scanlon bill, H. R. 198; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5116. Also, petition of the San Francisco branch of the National Maritime Union, asking that all proceedings of Congress be radiocast; to the Committee on Rules.

5117. Also, petition of the Pile Drivers, Bridge, Wharf, and Dock Builders Local Union, No. 34, regarding food subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5118. Also, petition of the San Francisco Council of Churches, favoring the abrogation of the Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5119. Also, petition of the Pile Drivers, Bridge, Wharf, and Dock Builders Local Union No. 34, favoring the Green-Lucas soldier vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5120. By Mr. SCOTT: Petition protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5121. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of 1,106 residents of the Sixth Congressional District, protesting against the passage of any such prohibition legislation as the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5122. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Clara B. Emery and 103 other citizens of Knox and Waldo Counties, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082 for greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants and also that men in training camps may be better protected from the effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5123. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition of 800 various residents of the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5124. By Mr. WILLEY: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5125. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Fair Play Committee, Schuyler County, Watkins Glen, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the dairy feed subsidy program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5126. Also, petition of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, Springfield, Mass., with reference to the soldier vote bill; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend James A. Fitzpatrick, O. P., chaplain of the United States Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Ineffable Creator, who, out of the treasures of Thy wisdom, hast designed the three angelic hierarchies and hast placed them with admirable order in the height of heaven; Thou who hast disposed the portions of the universe with such elegance of art; Thou, indeed, who art truly named the very fountain and supereminent principle of light and wisdom; bend down to strike our shadowy intellects with a ray of thy clarity and destroy the double darkness of sin and ignorance in which we have been born. Thou who givest eloquence to the mouths of babes, teach the truth to our tongues and pour out upon our lips the grace of Thy blessing. Give us intelligence to penetrate the truth and the strength to retain it in a firm grasp. Give us method and speed to learn it. Give us wisdom to explain it. Give us an abundant grace of oratory to make it known to our fellowmen. Help us to begin; guide our progress; and complete our work. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS H. CULLEN

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I sadly announce the death of THOMAS H. CULLEN, who served in this body for 24 years. For 20 of those years, I enjoyed, through him, one of the sweetest intimacies and beautiful friendships my memory can conceive.

This is truly a difficult moment for me. I feel coursing through my veins an emotion that just stifles speech. My friend is gone—a man who for 20 years has guided me. At that time, coming into this House, I was young. I had all the ideals of Americanism that a blessed mother could instill in youth, without any of the experience; and I turned to one man, to the man who signified my conception of true statesmanship. I turned to one man for guidance and for help. At this moment I can truthfully say never in that time was I disappointed; never in that time did I have reason to regret my confidence in him.

Today, Mr. Speaker, he is gone. In his death I, too, feel as if I have died a little, for now my only contact with him will be in nebulous and vague memories that are inadequate; that somehow do not satisfy the wistfulness of a longing heart. In his passing my State has lost a most faithful and worthy servant. And I have lost a friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], who served with Mr. CULLEN as his chairman on the Ways and Means Committee for more than 10 years.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, and my dear colleagues, when the Angel of Death on last night removed from this body our dear friend and beloved colleague, THOMAS H. CULLEN, or, as he was affectionately called, TOM CULLEN, there was removed from our midst one of the finest, ablest, truest, noblest, and purest men it has ever been my privilege to know. No words at my command can adequately express my deep sense of personal loss at his passing. I feel as though I had lost a yokemate, one by whose side I have labored for 14 years on the Committee on Ways and Means. Certainly no one in the last 14 years has made a greater contribution or rendered more useful service to the committee of which he was so long a member than Mr. CULLEN. He was diligent, patient, considerate of the views of his colleagues, also a man of great force and conviction. Nothing on earth could swerve or cause him to deviate from what he conceived to be his duty. He was true to his country, loyal to his friends, devoted to his church and his God. He was simple in his habits, unassuming in his manner, and emphatically a man of the people. He was loved and trusted by his people as few men have ever been for the reason that he loved, trusted, and served his people.

Mr. CULLEN remained at his post of duty long after his physical strength had waned and nothing but his high sense of duty could have caused him to continue his work in his feeble condition. His last work in the House was as one of the conferees on the tax bill. He attended the sessions of the conference regularly. We all realized at that time that he was undoubtedly shortening his life or risking his life in doing so.

TOM CULLEN will ever live in the hearts and affections of those who were privileged to know him. My acquaintance with him will ever be one of the outstanding and treasured memories of my life. Our country can ill afford to lose a man like Mr. CULLEN in this hour when such momentous problems face our Nation's future.

It was of such as THOMAS H. CULLEN, our beloved colleague, that the inspired writer must have had in mind when he delivered the sublime tribute:

> Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord; they henceforth shall rest from their labors and their works do follow them.

I have never served with a man, have never known a man more lofty in his conceptions of public duty, more devoted and consecrated to what he conceived to be right, a more true, loyal, and devoted servant of his people than THOMAS H. CULLEN. I shall miss him greatly. His place on our committee cannot be filled, neither myself nor anyone else could fill it; and I cannot adequately express my own deep personal loss at his passing. To his widow and family I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement, and trust that a kind, compassionate Providence will comfort them in their great sorrow.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked by the death of TOM CULLEN, whom I have known for over 35 years. He was the dean of our delegation and I am sure he guided the delegation at all times for the best interest of the American people. TOM CULLEN spent most of his life serving his country. He served for over 20 years in the legislature of my State, where he was the chairman of the important committee on ways and means. He made a splendid record in the State legislature and came to this body in the Sixty-sixth Congress, where he remained continuously from that date on. During all his service in this House he has been a friend and adviser not only to the members of the New York delegation but to every new Member who needed the advice and guidance of an experienced legislator.

New York State has lost a great citizen, the country a good Representative, and we in Congress a valuable and respected colleague, one who always placed his country before anything else. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues and myself I wish to extend our deepest sympathy to TOM CULLEN'S widow and their three children. Their loss is also our loss.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, TOM CULLEN was admired and loved on both sides of the aisle, equally by Republicans and Democrats.

Not only have I had the honor, Mr. Speaker, to serve with Mr. CULLEN in this House for 24 years, but my association with him goes back far beyond that. He was a member of the New York State Assembly in 1895 when my father was speaker. He was a friend of my father and afterward it was my happy privilege to carry on that personal friendship which grew over the years. He was also a friend of my father-in-law, Hon. Alfred C. Chapin, who was the Democratic mayor of Brooklyn in 1890, when TOM CULLEN entered politics, and he often spoke to me about those days.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that TOM CULLEN has served continuously in public life longer than any elected official in the United States. Since 1895 he has been elected and reelected continuously to office, either to the Assembly or the Senate of the State of New York or to the Congress of the United States.

The people of his district had faith and confidence in TOM CULLEN and that is why they reelected him. They wanted him to represent them. He was a man of the highest character, integrity, and patriotism. He was a credit to Brooklyn, to his own congressional district, and to the Democratic Party, of which he was one of the recognized leaders. He was a credit to the House of Representatives, in which he served for so many years with honor and distinction. His half century of public service and statesmanlike record will long endure. He was a credit to the Nation and he will be remembered by his many friends in the Congress of the United States for many years to come.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have had the privilege and honor of serving many years with this eminent legislator. Although it has been my good fortune to serve with many, many men in this honorable body, I cannot recall one who was more selflessly devoted to his onerous and important duties than TOM CULLEN.

TOM CULLEN was a Democrat, but frequently he would say to me: "You know he who serves the country best serves his party best."

I had admiringly observed TOM for many, many years in his many important activities on the floor and in the committees. He was an upright, honest, sincere, able, modest, unassuming gentleman. His main aim in life was to demonstrate to his people and to the country his worth as a representative of the people who elected and honored him for so many fruitful years, and at the same time evince practical devotion to the whole country that he loved so much and whose high traditions he upheld with singular success.

Mr. Speaker, I have not the words at my command to express the sorrow which I feel at his passing. Following the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the able chairman of the great Committee on Ways and Means, I cannot add anything of real meaning, and it is hard for me to adequately express myself on an occasion of this kind. I always feel my lack of ability under these circumstances to express my true sentiments at the passing of a good man with whom I have served with much satisfaction and pleasure, a man who was so intelligently and painstakingly devoted to good of country and who served with such distinction to his district, to his State, and to the Nation. His good work, of enduring value, on the Committee on Ways and Means will ever remain one of his highest monuments.

We shall all very much miss the genial countenance and the helpful counsel of Mr. CULLEN. He has gone to that land from which nobody returns, but he has left an enviable reputation as citizen and public benefactor which should be a worthy inspiration for all desirous of serving their fellowmen thoroughly and effectively.

I join the entire membership of this body, as well as a myriad of others, in expressing profound compassion for the beloved family and the kinsmen of this outstanding American.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY].

"TILL TIRED HE SLEEPS AND LIFE'S POOR PLAY IS O'ER"

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, a true warrior has just been called by his Master to answer the final roll call. His life has been a full one. A service of over 50 years in public life is the best testimonial of the high regard in which the people of his district held him. TOM CULLEN often boasted that he continued to live on the same spot where he was born.

TOM CULLEN served in the New York State Assembly, New York State Senate, and finally was elected to Congress in 1918. In that year he was the only Democrat elected from Brooklyn, in fact the only one out of eight candidates elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress from that borough. He was a real family man. There was a bond of friendship and love existing between them and him that continued until his death. He believed that happiness was found at one's fireside and not in another's garden. The loving care and sympathetic attention given him by his devoted wife and family, particularly during his recent illness, is an example for all of us to follow. He had a heart of mercy, a sense of shame, a sense of courtesy and respect, a sense of right and wrong.

He was a true friend to all of us, and we shall miss him greatly.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the passing of my dear friend and colleague, TOM CULLEN, is not only a loss to this body but a personal loss to myself. From the very first day I arrived here in the latter part of 1928 as a Member of the House of Representatives our late colleague and my dear friend took a very personal interest in me. During the years that followed up until the present moment I looked upon him as a sort of a father.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years after I entered this body I was elected by the Democratic caucus as a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee, and for 12 years I served on that committee until my election as majority leader. During all of this time I sat at the knees of both TOM CULLEN and the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of that great Ways and Means Committee.

As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] spoke I tried to look into his mind in order to read his real innermost thoughts, knowing of the very close association between our late friend and the gentleman from North Carolina. I know how inadequate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] felt in his expression of the feelings he possesses at this moment on the passing of such a wonderful friend and character. His innermost thoughts are the thoughts possessed by me, incapable of adequate expression at a time like this, but thoughts and feelings which profoundly move me. This feeling of friendship will be separated temporarily until I receive the call myself and take the final journey, at which time it is my hope that I may have a reunion with such a dear friend.

I saw TOM CULLEN within the past few months sitting at the very seat to which I am pointing. We saw him withering away, those of us who knew him and had served with him. The new Members did, too, but they did not know the TOM CULLEN in bygone years as we who have been in this body for an appreciable period of time. Every one of us, without regard to the side on which we sit, saw him wither away. You know what your thoughts were as you would meet him, see him, or pass him from time to time. I know what my thoughts were.

TOM CULLEN was a sincere, loyal individual. There was no finer or more lovable person I have ever met in my journey through life than our distinguished late colleague. He died as a legislative soldier. We have heard the historic phrase that Custer died with his boots on. There are men in this body who also die with their boots on. TOM CULLEN, ill and sick as he was, stayed in this body and performed his duty until it was physically impossible for him to carry on any longer. As I stated, he died with his boots on. He died as a legislative soldier.

He was trusted by all of us because we knew he was trustworthy. He was honored by all who knew him because everyone who knew TOM CULLEN knew that he was honorable.

To his widow, sons, and daughter I extend my profound sympathy and I know I speak the sentiments of all of my colleagues in extending to his widow and to his family the sympathy of each and every Member of this body. TOM CULLEN was one of the outstanding men in this body during the years of his service here. He has made his impression upon the legislative history of our country. He

takes the journey into the Great Beyond recognized as one of New York's greatest contributions to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, if our dear friend, the dean of our New York delegation, Representative THOMAS HENRY CULLEN, had lived but 1 month more, he would have lived to his seventy-seventh birthday. Born in the old city of Brooklyn, now part of Greater New York, it was quite natural that Mr. CULLEN, having completed his work at St. Francis College, should enter the steamship business. He was born in a neighborhood on the water front. Those of us who have chatted with him about his district would be told about old Brooklyn and the docks and the sailing vessels that tied up to the piers in his district.

Tom sailed in his youth. He knew the ports of the world from personal visits and realized the important part shipping played in the development of the United States. He frequently visited with men who came here from every part of the world. As a result of his sailing and business activities he acquired a knowledge of the affairs of men and of places that was most useful to him in his work as a Representative in Congress and particularly as a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Long before he came here in 1919, back home in our State legislature, beginning in 1896, the Congressman, then a member of assembly, devoted himself to a legislative program of general welfare proposals for the people of the city of New York. In my opinion, he did more than any man in this House today to advance the interests of the shipping industry and the men who go to sea. He was constantly alert to their problems and brought to their solution an intimate knowledge based on many years of actual business and law-making experience. He was a leader in every movement to improve the hours, wages, and working conditions of his people.

A sympathetic man, he could understand and appreciate problems of the other man. He was always tolerant. Certainly he was most gracious to all of the men from the State of New York. I am certain he did more in his fatherly way to keep us on the right path than any other person in Washington. He devoted a lot of time to "his boys" explaining the intricacies of legislative procedure and counseling on the merits of pending bills. He was intensely partisan but always put the interest of his country first in deciding all questions before the Congress.

I first met TOM CULLEN in 1913 at the first inauguration of Woodrow Wilson. I had the privilege of serving on a committee with him in connection with inaugural ceremonies. I liked him at once and since that time he has always treated me with the greatest kindness and respect. Through the years I have enjoyed his friendship and I have been inspired by his enthusiasm and sincerity.

So, today, I join with my colleagues, from the entire country, in paying tribute to the life, service, and character of our departed friend, THOMAS CULLEN. He was steadfast in his devotion to his congressional duties and steadfast in all those things that mean so much to God and country. He was one of those fine citizens that always stand four square for honesty and justice.

I mourn the passing of THOMAS CULLEN as a colleague and a friend. We have lost a skilled legislator, a great humanitarian, and a true Catholic gentleman. Of him it may be said, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith."

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, it was with a sad heart indeed that we learned of the passing of our good friend and colleague, TOM CULLEN. Coming inexperienced to this body from Idaho some years ago, I found a wonderful and helpful Member in the gentleman from the great city of Brooklyn in the State of New York. He was kindly and helpful. He gave advice and help to the young Members. He was one of the most gentle and fine men I have ever had the pleasure of knowing.

Mr. CULLEN, in his impartial and fine way of handling the business of this House when he acted as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, has impressed us all with his fairness and won our hearts. America and the great State of New York have suffered an irreparable loss in the passing of TOM CULLEN.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, we were born to die and we die that we may live. This is the whole philosophy of human existence. I dare say that the passing of our dear friend, TOM CULLEN, will be just that, and his memory will be eternal.

A man possessing the soul of wit, an Irish gentleman such as our dear friend, was bound to have many, many loving friends. I am very happy to think that I could be considered in that category.

Even before I had the opportunity of taking my first oath in this House 10 years ago, and upon my election, he called at my office. Being a young man, realizing that he had an abundance of knowledge and experience, I was indeed proud to know that he would suffer himself to come to my office and offer me the benefit of his experience in this great body.

Yes, his voice has been stilled, but I am sure that I speak not only for myself but for the other Members of this House and his friends when I say that his very kindness, his memory, will linger in our hearts forever.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on another occasion we will more fittingly and appropriately pay our respects to our departed colleague, the late THOMAS H. CULLEN.

Those of you who have served with him know the loss that is the country's, and his colleagues from the State of New York have given some indication of the loss that is that State's. But I beg leave of you to attempt, incapably, as I know I shall, to describe briefly the great loss that is the city of Brooklyn's in the passing of our dear distinguished colleague.

For 50 long and continuous years, a lifetime, he was the duly elected representative of the people of his community. He spent those years in the service of that community. In addition to being a faithful public servant, he was a leading member of his party there. There is no man in public life in Brooklyn today whose entry into that life was not under the guidance and with the help of our departed colleague. His life was spent in helping others.

Especially to the Members elected from Brooklyn was he a tower of strength and a guiding beacon, ever willing to counsel and advise with them, ever ready to afford them the benefit of his long and broad experience, and ever unselfish and loyal in his allegiance to causes that won his support.

We who mourn his passing can hope that we can follow in his footsteps and aim to approach the perfection that was his. My prayer is that he has and will have the rest and peace that he has so richly earned. My prayer, too, is that his family will be consoled by the fact that his life was well and faithfully spent. I extend to them, and especially to his faithful and loving wife, my deep and sincere sympathy.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DELANEY). The gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] is recognized.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the country can ill afford the loss of her elder statesmen, death has again stalked the House to capture the soul of our colleague the dean of the New York delegation, THOMAS H. CULLEN. We of the New York delegation knew him affectionately as Uncle Tom. We looked to him for guidance. We asked his opinion. We appreciated the counsel that he gave us, that came from the deep well of experience which was his. I had the pleasure to serve with him in the constitutional convention in New York in 1938. At that time he was looked upon as one of the outstanding legislators of New York, who had served in the assembly and in the senate, and who also served as a delegate to the constitutional convention of 1915. I renewed our acquaintance here in 1940, when I became a Member of the House, and then, of course, our contacts became closer, especially as members of the Committee on Ways and Means. I look back now, and of course I shall always remember him in the various phases of life in which I saw him, as a kindly gentleman, and yet as a leader of the delegation, one who was always interested in the welfare of the members of that delegation. I recall most distinctly now, at the moment, the occasion of the other day when in the course of a vote in this House, seated in his seat, he answered the call, and voted. Then, fearful lest his weakened voice did

not carry to the Clerk, he came down the aisle, escorted by his very close friend, Congressman FITZPATRICK, who feels so badly about the death of his close associate that he is unable to speak here this morning, to see that the Clerk had heard and had recorded his vote. He went back to his seat with tottering step, but with a look of grim determination, yet complete satisfaction on his deeply lined countenance. I thought then to myself, if ever a soldier died on the field of battle, TOM CULLEN will die on the field of battle in the legislative halls as a Member of this body. For the past year he seemed consumed with one overwhelming desire. It was to continue to the end to be a Member of the Congress of the United States. It was his whole desire, and he was a man of strong and firm convictions. Robust physically, he was strong in character, strong mentally. He was the kind who would work all day and then meet with his associates in the evenings to consult and advise with them. There was scarcely a time when a man in the New York delegation was taken ill that it was not Uncle Tom who first visited him in the hospital. So we from New York have suffered a distinct loss in the death of Mr. CULLEN, a loss that goes deeply to the hearts of each and every one of us; the State and the country have lost in the death of Representative CULLEN a real statesman, and a loyal American.

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of my beloved friend and colleague, TOM CULLEN, is a great shock to all who appreciate a true servant of the people. Not only has Congress lost a distinguished Member but the Borough of Brooklyn has suffered the loss of one of the most able members of the Democratic organization.

Congressman CULLEN and I were both Democratic district leaders in Brooklyn, and this fact, combined with our service in the House of Representatives, made us very close.

Tom was a member of the New York State Senate for many years before he came to Congress. Since he was a young man, he conscientiously devoted himself to the highest principles of public service. He is sadly missed and will be long remembered.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was not until late this morning that I learned of the death of my dear friend, Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN. I was deeply grieved. I have viewed with amazement the courage of the man during the last few weeks. It so happens that he served on the conference committee on the tax bill. It was one of the most moving things I have ever seen; one of the greatest examples of fidelity to duty that I have ever witnessed. There were items in that tax bill that deeply concerned the welfare of his constituents. That conference lasted for some time, and it was a strenuous one. Day by day I watched with trepidation my good friend, Hon. THOMAS CULLEN, with the aid of one of the employees, work his way to his chair at the conference table. He watched every item in that tax bill with a degree of alertness that was simply astounding. I sometimes wonder if people back in the districts realize how earnest and devoted some men are to their public duty. I have never seen a man more devoted than THOMAS CULLEN in the discharge of his duties. He was a grand and glorious character, one of the kindliest of men. We came to Congress at the same time. Each of us has served almost 26 years in Congress, and I want to say to those Members who were not acquainted with him in those days, they never saw the real THOMAS CULLEN. He was a man of many moods, but always kind; one of the most vigorous fighters. When he was called upon to preside in Committee, he was a man of extraordinary dignity and great ability in the discharge of that function. There are so many things that I would like to say about my dear friend, because I love the men with whom I serve, regardless of their politics. I do not know but what it can be said properly in the words of Phillips Brooks, which I think would apply to TOM CULLEN:

> Bad will be the day for every man when he becomes absolutely contented with the life that he is leading; with the thoughts that he is thinking; with the deeds that he is doing; if there is not forever beating at the doors of his soul some great desire to do something larger which he knows he was meant and made to do.

I believe that there was forever beating at the doors of TOM CULLEN'S soul a desire to do something larger which he knew he was meant and made to do. In conclusion, as a tribute to my friend, I would read this poem of appreciation:

IN APPRECIATION

Rose and gold on the hills
To greet the blue of the sky—
And we know that a sunset rolls
To the land of mystery.

But what is the light on the hills,
That is cast by the setting sun,
To the glory that floods and thrills
When a beautiful life is done?

Morning and noon well spent
In the battle for truth and right;
For him no eve of content,
But toil till the closing night.

Thanks to the God of Life
For the prophet fire that glowed
Through years of labor and strife
To brighten the common road;

For the kindling thoughts that soared
From a spirit sane and strong,
Waking the living word
'Gainst empires of sham and wrong.

Only a part is said
Of the reverent love we bear;
But we'll cherish the flame you fed
And kindle our torches there.

—*Ernest J. Bowden.*

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is with very deep emotion and a feeling of genuine sorrow that I raise my voice in brief, but sincere, tribute to the life and character and public service of my warm friend and distinguished colleague, Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN, of New York. It was his good fortune to live a long and useful life in the service of his God, his country, and his fellow man. Certainly no higher service could come to any man. He was a man who possessed the very highest character; a man of unimpeachable integrity; a man who possessed those attributes that endeared him to all who had the privilege of knowing him and coming in contact with him. I trust that I may make brief reference to a personal experience I had with him. Very early in my service here I had the opportunity of rendering him a favor. He paid me back a thousandfold. He seconded my nomination in the Democratic caucus when I was elected a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Our association throughout the years has been most cordial and friendly. For years we worked shoulder to shoulder and sat side by side in endeavoring to discharge the duties resting upon those of us who had been privileged to serve on that important committee. He was a man devoted to public service, a man of outstanding ability. He was a Democrat in the broad application of that term. His heart beat in tune with the welfare, and every fiber of his being was dedicated to the best interests of the masses of the people. He was a man of devoted patriotism to this great country of ours and of demonstrated devotion to the people whom he was privileged to serve. His wise counsel, his kind and gentle spirit will be missed by those of us who endeavor to carry on during these important days in the history of this great Nation of ours. I feel that we express our true sentiment and feelings when we extend our deepest sympathy to his dear wife and loved ones. Mr. Speaker, we shall always cherish his memory and endeavor to emulate his high character and his noble life.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Congress in January 1935, I was advised by my friends in New York to seek the counsel and friendship of TOM CULLEN. The very first day I got here I went to see him. He befriended me and since then he has been one of my sincerest friends in the House. His counsel, his good advice, and his personal warmth I shall miss for many, many years.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am more than moved by the incident that brought about the occasion for these remarks today. I knew TOM CULLEN as I have known few men. He was one of the truest and one of the best men that God ever put the breath of life into. Knowing him as I did, I know that when he was called to met his Maker face to face, Tom was ready.

Today, out there somewhere, where good, fine, and great spirits dwell, when his approached, it was received as an equal with the greatest of them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the silver cord is loosed, and the golden bowl is broken. The spirit of another friend has taken its flight; TOM CULLEN is no more.

His familiar figure, his gentle voice, his smiling face, and his friendly greeting will not be here to cheer us onward in the great struggles in which we now find ourselves engaged.

But the lingering memories of his manly example, the sacred recollections of his encouraging words, the ever-recurring reflections on his deep sincerity, his unfeigned friendship, and his patriotic devotion to the cause of his country will remain as lasting inspirations to us, his sorrowing comrades, who

still linger "along this bank and shoal of time."

It seems but yesterday that I first entered this House and was introduced to our distinguished, and now departed, colleague from New York. From that day to this my esteem and admiration for him has grown steadily, and especially as I have seen him in the throes of those ordeals that "try the souls of men."

Some new Member will take the seat he occupied in this House, but no one can fill his place. He has so indelibly written his name on the hearts of his fellow Members that time and trial cannot erase it.

TOM CULLEN was a Christian gentleman. He lived a Christian, he died a Christian, he has gone to a Christian's reward.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, the death last night of THOMAS H. CULLEN, of Brooklyn, removed one of the landmarks of Congress. He became a Member on March 4, 1919, and, had he lived 3 days longer, would have completed 25 years of continuous service as a Member of this House.

During his entire service, he has been one of the outstanding Members of the House, and for many years was the leader of the Democratic delegation from New York.

He was a man of fine ability, of noble character, and devoted to duty. He was benevolent and kind and considerate of others, and won the friendship of the entire membership of the House. During my service here, I had grown to know him and have an affectionate regard for him.

For the past few years he had been in failing health, but his devotion to duty was such that he continued faithful in his attendance on the sessions of the House, almost to the end.

His district, the State of New York, and the Nation have lost an able and faithful public servant, and I shall always revere his memory and prize very highly the privilege of having known him and served with him in this body.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it was with a great feeling of sorrow that I learned of the passing of our distinguished colleague, TOM CULLEN.

Truly there is little one can say on an occasion of this kind. All we know is that never again shall we enjoy the presence of this kindly, friendly personality.

Although he was dean of the New York delegation, he never permitted his great and long experience in the Congress from interfering with his desire to mix with the newest comer in the House in order to render every assistance.

I recall with great pleasure his acts of kindness to me when I first came to the Congress. All of us have had the experience of the newcomer. There is much to learn and how grateful we feel toward the experienced Member who takes us in tow and tries to help us in learning the preliminaries.

Indeed, we shall miss him greatly here, but I doubt that we shall miss him more than the people of his own district. They had learned to rely on him so much in the many years of his service that it will be difficult to adjust themselves to his absence. He was adviser and counselor to all of them.

To the family of our departed colleague I extend my deepest sympathy.

May the Great Judge of us all grant eternal rest to the soul of our late friend.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late THOMAS H. CULLEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 456), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of 31 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following committee: Mr. BLOOM, Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. DOUGHTON, Mr. REED of New York, Mr. FISH, Mr. CELLER, Mr. DICKSTEIN, Mr. TABER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. BARRY, Mr. BUCKLEY, Mr. MERRITT, Mr. O'LEARY, Mr. PFEIFER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. KEOGH, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. O'TOOLE, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BALDWIN of New York, Mr. CAPOZZOLI, Mr. HEFFERNAN, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. FAY, Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mr. BURCHILL of New York, and Miss STANLEY.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 2, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 2, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 2, 1944, in the caucus room of the old House Office Building, for the consideration of postwar planning.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, investigating the shortage of steel, at 10 a. m. Friday, March 3, 1944, in the Patents Committee room, 416 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1252. A letter from the Chairman, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting in accordance with section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, report covering the administration and operation of the said act for the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1253. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1254. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a copy of a letter addressed to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, certifying that the Post Office Department is within the quota set by that Bureau under date of January 25, 1944, for each of the appropriation units involved; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1255. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a copy of the estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries for the quarter beginning January 1, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1256. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1257. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 96 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1258. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the list of 18- through 37-year-old registrants deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on December 15, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 1207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment

(Rept. No. 1208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 1210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1211.) Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GALE: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 872. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GALE: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2085. A bill to provide for the disposition of tribal funds of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe of Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 1214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3259. A bill to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 1215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 176. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; with amendment (Rept. No. 1199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou; without amendment (Rept. No. 1202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 1203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 634. A bill to provide for the advancement of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of vice admiral; without amendment (Rept. No. 1204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 2337. A bill for the relief of John Joseph Defeo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3247. A bill for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker; without amendment (Rept. No. 1206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 242. A bill for the relief of Capt. Malcolm K. Beyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4307. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 4308. A bill to provide for the presentation of duplicate military decorations to mothers of certain deceased members or deceased former members of the armed forces entitled to such decorations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 457. Resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 52; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 4309. A bill for the relief of Ros Lee Foreman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 4310. A bill for the relief of J. P. Kerr and Robert P. Kerr; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5127. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of sundry citizens of Rome, N. Y., and vicinity, protesting against enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5128. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 15 residents of Beaver County, urging the enactment of House bill 3917 covering the American Legion's legislative proposals for a bill of rights for the veterans of World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5129. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions containing the signatures of 766 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District of New York State, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5130. By Mr. KUNKEL: Two petitions from Harrisburg, Pa. (one containing 56 names and the other 31 names) protesting against the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5131. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Secretary of the Tucson Chamber of Commerce, Tucson, Ariz., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the world-wide aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5132. Also, petition of the general president, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Kansas City, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Service Act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5133. Also, petition of the president, Oriental Benevolent Association, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Randolph naturalization bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5134. Also, petition of the Independence Committee of Puerto Rico, Caguas, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the independence of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5135. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Tyler, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to freight-rate matters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who fillest the uttermost parts of the earth, who art the source of all good counsels, in these fateful days we beseech Thee to lead us in thoughtful moods and conclusions. Grant that each life may take on that dignity and calmness which are the possessions of those who put their trust in Thy eternal goodness, as unwearying and divine, and as patient as motherhood.

Heavenly Father, in every age Thou hast been the refuge of Thy children, of the aged, of those in the prime of strength, of those in need and those in the wrong; do Thou glorify Thyself among men so that they shall stand in wonder and in praise. O Sun of life and Star of hope, in these tragic scenes of this world make us equal to our responsibilities. Bring all to the highest self-realization for those things which make for peace and unity. Blessed Lord, inspired by Thy nature and Thine example, make us strong to bear the infirmities of the weak; give us courage to be candid and magnanimity to be merciful and intensify our faith so that in difficulty and disappointment we shall have delight in unselfish toil. Reveal unto us, O Father, that as sacrifice was the mark of a slave and of a victim, Thou hast exalted it to those altitudes of power where loftiness of thought and feeling are our best defense. Use us in enriching the lives of others and by our ministry bring them to the heights. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as this is an important anniversary involving very wholesome lessons for our observance in these times of stress, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas on the theory that this is an unusual day and of very great interest to a great many people. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the important epoch of our history which I wish

briefly to discuss is by no means one of mere provincial concern. It has brought to us all a great American heritage.

In the early part of the nineteenth century Moses Austin, of Connecticut, had a dream of American colonization in Texas, then a part of Mexico, and he formed a plan for its fulfillment. On a visit to that vast domain he met with much discouragement and feared frustration of his purpose until his ardor was renewed by meeting a distinguished gentleman of Mexican descent, who, in sympathy with his cause, offered his valuable aid to the project.

Moses Austin passed away before the fruition of his plan, but his illustrious son, Stephen F. Austin, of Virginia, appropriately called the father of Texas, carried the dream to realization. These colonists came from every State of the American Union as that Union then existed. Many were the hardships suffered by their leader, this sturdy young son of a worthy sire, including long incarceration in a Mexican prison, but his dauntless spirit would not yield.

In that unfortunate period of Mexican history the colonists were subjected to the terrors of tyrranical rule and to despotic indignities which freemen could not long endure. They determined to declare and establish their independence, and for that purpose the brave little band of delegates assembled in convention at the village of Washington—note the name—on the Brazos. They met in a rude, unfinished building. The window openings were covered with cotton cloth which but partially excluded the cold, inclement air. There, under such rigorous circumstances, on the 2d day of March 1836, they announced to the world that Texas was a free and independent State. That declaration was drafted by George C. Childress, of Tennessee, and the provisional government which was formed had as its president David G. Burnett, of New Jersey.

Kentucky also had its part in the initial stages of that struggle. When it became necessary for San Antonio to be taken, it was Ben Milam, of that State, well advanced in years, who stood boldly before his little group of compatriots and inquired: "Who will go into San Antonio with old Ben Milam?" He did not lack for followers, but in that conflict he gave his life for liberty.

It was also early in that war of unequal forces that William Barrett Travis, of North Carolina, waged his heroic struggle at the Alamo. While there was still an opportunity to get a messenger through the walls, though the fortress was surrounded by overwhelming numbers of the enemy, he sent forth a letter addressed to all Americans in the world. It is still preserved in the archives of the Lone Star State. It has been my pleasure to gaze upon it and peruse it and absorb its thrilling inspiration. In my judgment, there is no more memorable document in the annals of American history. I want you to listen to its stirring words:

Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna. I have sustained a continued bombardment for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise, the garrison is to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the summons with a cannon shot and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender nor retreat. Then I call upon you in the name of liberty, of patriotism, and everything dear to the American character to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily, which will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. Though this call may be neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and to die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country. Victory or death.

When we contemplate those stirring words and the attestation of their sincerity when every one of his little band of fewer than 200 made the supreme sacrifice, it is enough to make our blood tingle with pride as it courses through our veins that we may say, "This is our own, our native land."

It was there that James Bowie, the originator of the Bowie knife, perished. It was there that David Crockett, of Tennessee, who had served as a Member of this distinguished body and whose personal motto was, "Be sure you're right, then go ahead," fell amid the many of the enemy slain by his trusted rifle, Old Betsy, which had been presented to him by the Young Men's Club of Philadelphia. Surely it has been appropriately said, "Thermopylae had its messenger of defeat; the Alamo had none."

To Sam Houston, of Virginia, as the commander in chief of that valiant little band of American patriots, fell the lot of carrying on to victory. His career is without a parallel in American history. He fought in the Indian wars, he was the Governor of two States, he was a Member of the United States Senate, he was the commander in chief of an army which established the independence of a republic, and he was president of that republic. In his arduous campaign he was aided by the Texas Navy which was so effective in its service that along that vast expanse of the Gulf coast line not a single Mexican vessel was able to make a port. On the 21st day of April 1836 at San Jacinto, against overwhelming odds, Sam Houston and his dauntless little army of Americans achieved the victory which established the coveted independence. Santa Anna, the self-styled "Napoleon of the West," became the prisoner of this intrepid Texan conqueror.

Texas then became a Republic and remained so for 9 years, with its constitution, its Presidents, its congresses. Four foreign nations authorized the sending of representatives to it. The old French Embassy building, with much of its hardware and fixtures imported from France, still stands in the city of Austin.

One of our Presidents, and a distinguished one, was Mirabeau B. Lamar, of Georgia, who established our system of public education. One of his sayings is today the motto of the University of Texas and it is well worthy of our meditation:

Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy; it is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire.

Those of you who serve in this body from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts may be interested in this bit of your history, unfamiliar I dare say to the great majority of your people. The last President of the Republic of Texas, and the man, in my judgment, most responsible for the annexation of that vast area to the United States, was Anson Jones, of Massachusetts.

So, Mr. Speaker, this important history has very general American significance, and this, therefore, is an anniversary in which we may all take pride. Naturally, we of Texas feel that we have a double heritage. Two countries are ours, two flags are ours, two glorious histories are ours. We may add to the glamor of Lexington and Concord the glory of the Alamo and San Jacinto. We know that the fires of patriotism burned in the breasts of Washington and Israel Putnam and Anthony Wayne and other famous chieftains of their day, but we know also that the cause of freedom had worthy advocates in the Austins, in Houston, in Bowie, in Travis, in Crockett, in Lamar, and the scores of others who have made resplendent the pages of our Texas story.

And I am sure we are all proud on this anniversary that a beloved and distinguished son of that Lone Star State now presides with dignity, with ability, and with fairness over this great deliberative body. I am sure also that it is gratifying to us all that the descendants of the pioneers and patriots who made Texas free are now on many foreign fronts, true to the type of the fighting stock of their fathers, writing their fame with their deeds.

This is our history; this is your history. This anniversary is a day for our remembrance and for our proper observance. Let us purpose in our hearts anew that, as worthy successors of these illustrious sires, we will all prove true to this wonderful heritage of freedom.

MARSHALL W. PICKERING

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, too often, in our busy and worrisome days, we fail to stoop and pluck the flower as we pass along the path of life and only note its absence when the withering touch of frost takes it from us.

Today, I am happy to inform you, marks the thirty-fifth anniversary on Capitol Hill of Marshall W. Pickering, minority clerk of the House, who came to Washington as a House employee at the same time that William Howard Taft arrived to prepare for his inauguration as President of the United States. Many players have passed across the stage of congressional activities during this period of three and one-half decades; only the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], now serving his nineteenth term, was a Member of the House at that time, and there are no present Members of the Senate who were here when young Pickering first took up his duties

Well do I remember 10 years ago when, a complete stranger to Washington and the Congress, I first took office as a House Member that the first welcoming voice that I heard and the first helping hand that was offered to me, were the voice and the hand of "Pick," as he is affectionately known by his friends. I have constantly been grateful for that and for his continued advice, cooperation, and assistance which he has so freely and willingly given to me. Although Mr. Pickering is a resident of the city of Ithaca in my congressional district, I am certain that the same courteous treatment accorded to me is no greater than that which he has given to any Republican Member, both new and old, throughout all these years. Hundreds and hundreds of us and those who have gone before us have benefited by his ready aid, have been enriched by his warm friendliness, and have profited by his wise counsel.

Mr. Speaker, in the name of those many hundreds, I salute Marshall Pickering, congratulate him upon his many years of loyal devotion to duty and public trust, express gratitude for his aid and kindness and wish for him continued health, happiness, and opportunity for public service for many, many years to come.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to join my distinguished colleague from New York in this deserved tribute to Marshall W. Pickering; 35 years is a long period of time to serve in any capacity and particularly in a position which require tact, patience, and good judgment. He has served faithfully and efficiently all of the Republican Members through this long period of time in charge of the minority room. On his anniversary, may I, in behalf of all who have been associated with him, wish him continued good health and a long period of further service in his responsible berth.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, would like to testify as to how enormously helpful Mr. Pickering has always been to every one of us and to me personally; also I would like to add that he seems just as vigorous, eager, and anxious to serve as efficiently and as courteously as I am sure he did 35 years ago.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to endorse every word that has been said with reference to my dear friend, Marshall W. Pickering.

I remember away back in 1898 how thrilled this country was when it learned of the sailing of the *Oregon* from San Francisco around Cape Horn to the coast of Florida, a distance of 15,000 miles at an average speed of 10.7 knots an hour, soon to attack the Spanish fleet.

Great praise went to Captain Clark, as was quite proper, and to the men above the decks. But that feat also impressed a lesson upon me because the orders were to coal that boat heavily before they left on this long voyage.

Who, after all, drove that boat around Cape Horn in record time and sent it where it was needed? It was the men stripped to the waist, below the water line, men in a position where they seldom received the praise or plaudits of anybody. Those sometimes are the forgotten men.

I have known Marshall W. Pickering and his service ever since I came to Congress and long before. I might tell a humorous incident as to how we became acquainted. I was a freshman in Cornell University when he came along driving an express wagon. It was one of those high ones. I was up on the seat with him. We became engaged in conversation and forgot our environment, when suddenly we heard a deep bass voice in rather profane language reminding us that we were driving over his new concrete pavement. When that big Irishman bore down upon us, we thought it was a whole Irish brigade. That was the time when we had to join forces to defend ourselves, and from that day on we have been fast friends.

I do not know of any man who has rendered a more unselfish service to this House than Marshall W. Pickering. His work may be somewhat obscure from the eyes of the public but, after all, it should be appreciated. I am glad to stand here and pay tribute to the great service he has rendered.

But that is not all that I can say about Marshall Pickering. You men do not know his record as well as I do, and he would be embarrassed to have me tell it, but here is a man who long before Christmas time searches out the poor people that the ordinary organizations and individuals fail to remember. He sees to it that the children have their presents and the people have their food. I can say further that many a man, because of misfortune who has become almost a derelict has been clothed and put in a gainful occupation through the thoughtful kindness of "Pick." He has carried on a Christian service all of his life. I wish for him long life and prosperity, and I express the gratitude of myself and, I hope, of the other Members of the House for his 35 years of excellent, unselfish service to his Government and to his fellow men.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COX addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by the head of the metal-trades department of the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and in one to include an address delivered by Robert Gemmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

(Mr. FORD and Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Columbia State carrying a resolution passed by the South Carolina Legislature on the race question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief on the Tennessee-Tombigbee Canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address by Chester Bowles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Easton (Pa.) Express.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Commissioner Harry W. Bashore of the Department of Reclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

BUDGET BUREAU REVIEW REPLACES NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, a great many committees of the Congress are interested in the problem of post-war planning. A great many Members have been concerned with the work that was done by the National Resources Planning Board and its discontinuance.

This morning I received a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget which bears on these things, and from that letter I want to read one sentence, together with a paragraph from an Executive order that accompanied the letter. The sentence reads:

> With the discontinuance of the National Resources Planning Board, that Executive order was revoked and has been replaced by Executive Order No. 9384, dated October 4, 1943, a copy of which is enclosed herewith.

From that Executive order I read paragraph 4:

> Before any department or establishment shall submit to the Congress, or to any committee or member thereof, a report relating to, or affecting in whole or in part, its advance programs, or the public works and improvement projects comprising such programs, or the results of any plan preparation for such programs or projects, such report shall be submitted to the Bureau for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President. When such report is thereafter submitted to the Congress, or to any committee or member thereof, it shall include a statement of the advice received from the Bureau.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this has a bearing on so much legislation, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the communications which he attached thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Yukon Adventure," regardless of the fact that it exceeds the amount permitted under the rule and will cost $105.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CONSUMER SUBSIDIES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in a broadcast on February 29 at 10:15 p. m. over the Blue Network by the O. P. A. Administrator, Chester Bowles, we heard these words, and I quote from his speech, received this morning:

> Last week Congress, by a joint resolution, extended us the right to use subsidy money needed to keep your food costs from rising.

On hearing this broadcast I immediately called Chester Bowles and pointed out the fact that it was my understanding that on two separate occasions the Congress by an overwhelming majority denied the O. P. A. the right to pay consumer subsidies. He apparently had forgotten all about our vote. The mere extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation was done because it had some good features. It was not for the purpose of continuing consumer subsidy payments.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, most of the subsidy payments are now being financed out of the R. F. C. I bring this quotation from Mr. Bowles' speech before the House and the country because I wonder if the remarks constitute a deliberate attempt to misinform and mislead the public? Mr. Bowles should know better.

WHEEL CHAIRS FOR WOUNDED AND DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been advised by competent and credible persons that there is a truly shocking lack of wheel chairs for wounded and disabled veterans in some of our veterans' hospitals.

In the case of one hospital, it has been reported to me that there are only two wheel chairs to each ward where very many disabled veterans are hospitalized. At this particular hospital, I am reliably informed, there is a distressing shortage of wheel chairs. People in the community where this hospital is located, observing the absence of an adequate number of wheel chairs, have moved to try to correct the situation by private subscription.

Commendable as these efforts are, to my mind, providing these chairs for our wounded and disabled is not the obligation of private charity. Obviously, the Government should supply these chairs in adequate numbers for all our disabled soldiers who return wounded from the battlefields and oceans of the world. The Government should also provide every comfort, convenience, and need of these brave boys.

I am amazed to learn that there should be any evidence whatever of disregard or negligence with respect to this basic imperative obligation of the Government and, accordingly, I have brought the matter to the attention of appropriate Government officials. I hope there will be no delay in providing suitable accommodations for the boys who are now in Government hospitals.

All important accessories, as well as the best possible care and treatment, must be supplied in adequate measure for those who have tendered their very all to their country and who have returned after their dreadful experiences in combat, shattered in mind and body.

I am sure I am speaking for every Member of this House when I say that this matter must be dealt with at once.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted in Chicago on a bill of rights for World War No. 2 veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein two resolutions, one adopted by the board of directors of the Aeronautics Association of Boston, and the second adopted by the City Council of the City of Boston, having to do with air service to Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business today and any other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two articles on the race question, one from the Washington Post, and the other from the Charleston News-Courier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement made by me with reference to the taxation of religious gifts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table, and the business of the House, together with such other special orders as may precede

mine, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARY LOVIS ELLIOTT

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have replaced on the Private Calendar H. R. 1643, reported from the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, in respect to Mary Lovis Elliott. I have consulted with the leadership, both the minority and the majority sides, and they are in accord with this request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a short editorial from the Missouri Farmer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the chairman of the board of the St. Louis Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SGT. JAMES J. GAFFNEY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a report of a committee on post-war economics by the California State Chamber of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and include an editorial on the work of the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address which I delivered before the American Legion a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. BERNARD BARUCH

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks, and include an article that appeared in yesterday's Washington Star by Dorothy Thompson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BERNARD M. BARUCH

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in defense of Bernard Baruch, one of our best-informed elder statesmen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly to differ with my colleague from Mississippi and to defend a man whom I consider a very great American, and who recently has submitted a report to the Congress on post-war economic problems. This report on war and post-war adjustment policies has unquestionably been received by the public and the Congress as a most helpful and constructive document and program to solve those very serious and difficult problems with which we will be confronted after the war has been won. Mr. Baruch is a firm believer in and advocate of our American system of free enterprise as opposed to collectivism and totalitarianism. I have just been informed today that Mr. Bernard Baruch is a sick man and has been taken from his place in South Carolina by special train or airplane to New York City. I could not remain silent and listen to a bitter attack or any unfair charge made against Mr. Baruch to the effect that he was responsible for the last depression. Mr. Bernard Baruch, in my opinion, is an exceedingly able man and is as great an American as exists in this country and has only one object in view, and that is, what is best for America and the American people. Mr. Baruch can be depended upon at all times to uphold our representative and constitutional form of government and its mandate providing for three separate and independent departments of government.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, of course I get no pleasure out of disagreeing with a colleague of mine, especially when that colleague is from my own State. I know that in a democracy like ours all people are entitled to their own opinions, but I hope that my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]—and he is my friend—in an extension of remarks, which he has received the privilege of making, will give us a better solution for these post-war problems than Mr. Baruch has given, and I am sure that we will all be glad to study his plan.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. To say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I tried that in 1930–31–32–33, when we were trying to work out a program here, when Mr. Baruch came to the Capitol and lobbied against that and prevented our doing something that would have relieved the depression, instead of our having to go through what we have gone through in the last 10 years.

Mr. COLMER. And I have heard my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], on many occasions attribute that depression to the gentlemen on the left side of the aisle—Republicans—rather than to Mr. Baruch.

Mr. RANKIN. But Mr. Baruch was with that side then.

Mr. COLMER. But be that as it may, the gentleman knows that I have a very high regard for him but that I am expressing my own opinion as the gentleman has expressed his. He knows further that we are all trying to work out a program that will prevent another depression. And, personally, I think that Mr. Baruch, together with Mr. Hancock, has made a remarkable contribution as a starter to this end. Unlike my colleague from Mississippi, I have a very high regard for Mr. Baruch. He is, in my opinion, a gentleman and a patriot, and one who is unselfishly devoting much time and thought to the solution of the problems that face us in the post-war era.

ROBERT P. SICK

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1874) for the relief of Robert P. Sick, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from Broadcasting magazine on the perplexing and pertinent problem of maintaining a free radio in a free country.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MACARTHUR BOULEVARD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 1554, to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain the nature of this measure?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, replying to the gentleman from Ohio, of course, I desire to explain all three measures when they are up. This measure has passed the Senate unanimously. It simply would rename Conduit Road from Foxhall Road in the District of Columbia to Great Falls in the State of Maryland, to MacArthur Boulevard in honor of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. This legislation was requested by citizens groups and is agreed to by the Commissioners and also by the State Roads Authority of Maryland. We believe it is an honor becoming this great American general.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the highway now known as Conduit Road extending from Foxhall Road in the District of Columbia to Great Falls in the State of Maryland shall hereafter be designated MacArthur Boulevard in honor of the gallant defense of the Philippines by Gen. Douglas MacArthur."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY INCREASE IN COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND WHITE HOUSE POLICE FORCE.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of S. 1658, to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia government and the White House police force."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain this measure?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, S. 1658 simply provides for the continuance for 1 year of a temporary increase which has been granted to police, firemen, and school teachers of the District of Columbia, in line with the increase which has been given to Federal employees. At this time, I wish to call attention to the fact that the police and firemen are on 24-hour duty and are subject to call on their days off. Certainly the increase cannot be considered sufficient.

I might also indicate for the information of the House that these men, because of the importance of the service they render the public, have been by agreement prohibited from joining the armed forces.

It is my belief too that the salaries of the school teachers in the District of Columbia should be studied with the view to making them adequate.

As I stated before, this bill is merely to bring their temporary increase in line with that of other Federal workers.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of Public Law 22, approved April 1, 1943, be amended to read as follows:

"This act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall terminate on June 30, 1945, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe."

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BURIAL PERMITS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 3619, to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from West Virginia explain this measure?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3619 was reported unanimously by the Committee on the District of Columbia. It would give to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia the right to designate certain deputies who would have the power to take care of interment and removal of human dead bodies in the District of Columbia. At the present time only the Health Officer of the District has that power. There are times when the health office is closed or the District Health Officer is not in the city, and no one can act. The second part of that measure would allow burial permits from other jurisdictions, such as Maryland and Virginia, to be honored in the District of Columbia and no reissuance of a permit would be made.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia", approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1296), be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 675. Removal of dead bodies: No dead body of any human being or any part of such body shall, in said District, be removed from place to place, interred, or in any manner disposed of without a permit for such removal, interment, or disposal granted by the Health Officer of said District, or by the proper municipal, county, or State authorities at the place where the death or disinterment occurred, except that permits for the removal of dead bodies from place to place within the District of Columbia may be issued by any deputy duly appointed as hereinafter prescribed. No human body or any part of such body shall be removed from place to place, interred, or in any manner disposed of otherwise than in accordance with the terms of said permit. Permits issued by the Health Officer or any duly appointed deputy for the removal, interment, or disposal of such dead body or part thereof shall be issued only upon the presentation of a proper death certificate, signed by a physician registered at the Health Department of said District, who has attended the deceased during his or her last illness, or by the coroner of said District or his deputy. No body shall be disinterred in the District of Columbia without a permit granted by the Health Officer. Permits for disinterment (including permission to reinter or transport the body disinterred) shall be issued only upon the written application of the nearest relative or the legal representative of the deceased. No superintendent or other person in charge of any cemetery in said District or other place for the disposal of dead bodies shall assist in or assent to or allow any such interment, disinterment, or disposition to be made in such cemetery or place until permit shall be given as aforesaid. It shall be the duty of the Health Officer of the District of Columbia to furnish all superintendents or other persons in charge of cemeteries in the District of Columbia with a currently correct list of all municipal, county, and State officials authorized to issue burial or removal permits in adjoining States. It shall be the duty of every such superintendent or other person who shall receive any such permit aforesaid to endorse thereon the date of the interment, disinterment, or disposal and to sign and forward the same before 6 o'clock postmeridian of the Saturday following the day of burial, disinterment, or disposal to the Health Officer of said District.

"SEC. 675. (a) Appointment of Deputies to Issue Removal Permits: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, upon recommendation of the Health Officer, may appoint a reasonable number of District of Columbia and United States employees as deputies who shall be authorized to issue permits for the removal of dead human bodies from place to place within the District of Columbia, in accordance with the provisions of section 675 of this code. Such deputies shall be furnished with a currently correct list of names of physicians registered at the Health Department of the District of Columbia to enable them to ascertain the authenticity of death certificates.

"SEC. 676. Conveyance through the District: No dead body or part of the dead body of any human being shall be in any manner carried or conveyed from, in, to, or through said District by any person, or by means of any boat, vessel, car, stage, or other vehicle, or by any public or private conveyance, without a permit therefor first granted by the Health Officer of said District, or any duly appointed deputy, or by the proper municipal, county, or State authorities at the place where the death or disinterment occurred: *Provided*, That bodies or parts of dead bodies aforesaid, except such as have died of Asiatic cholera, yellow fever, typhus fever, smallpox (including varioloid), leprosy, the plague, diphtheria, or scarlet fever, may be brought into said District, carried through the same in transit upon a permit of the proper authorities, and whenever the remains of any

deceased person have been conveyed, transferred, or removed beyond the limits of said District it shall be the duty of the person or agent or officer of the corporation having charge of such conveyance, transfer, or removal to detach, date, sign, and return to the Health Officer the permit authorizing such conveyance, transfer, or removal before 6 o'clock postmeridian of the Saturday following the day of such conveyance, transfer, or removal of said remains."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABSORPTION OF EXCHANGE CHARGES

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 452).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3956) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interests on deposits. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule would make in order the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3956) from the Committee on Banking and Currency, dealing with the question of exchange charges. It is an open rule. It will do no more than make this legislation in order for consideration under the general rules of the House, providing for 2 hours of general debate. It has never been my practice in presenting a rule, to undertake to discuss the merits of legislation, particularly when it comes from a great committee like the Committee on Banking and Currency. I do want to say, however, that in one period of my life I had the privilege of serving as chief executive officer for a country bank. Therefore I do know something from personal experience about the question of exchange. It is a practice that has been well recognized in banking circles for a long, long time.

I think, effective January 1 of this year, the Federal Reserve Board issued what is known as regulation Q, by which it undertook to eliminate the absorption of exchange by nonmember banks. It undertook to do this by construing an act of Congress, passed in 1933, and amended in 1935, which forbade the payment of interest as an inducement for carrying demand deposits in the bank. The Board took the position that the absorption of exchange charges, which is an entirely different proposition, constitutes an indirect payment of interest, or has that effect. The practice is that outlying banks, or what I may call country banks, of which I believe there are some 2,500 or 3,000 in this country, usually carry their demand deposits with some city bank. In return therefor or in consideration of that deposit, the city bank will clear the items of the country bank at par. Thus the customers of that country bank may send their checks all over the United States, they will be accepted at face value, and be eventually charged back to the depositor's account at face value without a reduction of anything, the exchange charges being absorbed by the city bank with which the country bank carries a deposit. That cannot be done if this regulation of the Federal Reserve Board is to stand. These exchange charges can no longer be absorbed by the banks and will have to eventually be paid by the depositor of the country bank.

We hear a great deal of talk about small business, and we are concerned about small-business men. We appoint investigating committees to go out and investigate. Many hundreds of subjects are being investigated but we do not get down to anything practical about it. In my judgment the enactment of this bill will be something direct and practical in behalf of the small-business man. The small country banks are his institutions. The relationship between depositors in the small country banks throughout the country and their depositors should not be disturbed. This exchange charge has always been absorbed without cost to the depositors, and we should sweep aside this fantastic regulation of the Federal Reserve Board and let the situation continue as it has heretofore.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman has stated that these charges would come on the depositor. It would not be the depositor, but it would be the man who received the check at the point who would have to pay this charge. There would be no charge on the depositor.

Mr. CLARK. In my judgment, this exchange charge has to be paid somewhere, and if regulation Q stands and exchange charges may not be absorbed as heretofore the result of it will eventually be that the small country bank will charge it back to the man who deposits the money in the small country bank.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the discussions and directives of the past few days with relation to the necessity of additional war manpower, one extremely vital situation has been entirely disregarded. I speak of the compelling necessity of a definite policy by the War Manpower Commission and Selective Service, designed to retain in our plants producing war materials those technically trained and highly skilled men without whose continuing service in production the supply of our fighting fronts would be wholly inadequate.

It is as important to victory to have the weapons with which to fight, have them promptly, of the highest quality, and in sufficient quantity, as it is to have the men to use them. Victory cannot be ours and the sacrifice of our soldiers will have been in vain, unless those who are responsible for establishing our war policies recognize now, and without further delay, that there be established and maintained a proper balance between battle line and production line.

I have for a considerable time sought to impress upon my colleagues and officials the seriousness of this situation. I say to you now that, unless those in manpower authority promptly abandon a piecemeal program and establish an over-all and definite policy whereby these technically trained and skilled workers who cannot be replaced shall be kept in production projects, we shall witness such a disintregation of plant capacity resulting in diminution of production as may clearly approach the criminal in relation to the sacred duty we on the home front owe our boys on the battle front.

For one, I am not willing to accept responsibility for what must inevitably result unless effective action be taken in this vital matter, and taken now.

I ask that the Military Affairs Committee of this House immediately commence hearings on this vital question. Without delay, representatives of industry, General Hershey, Mr. McNutt, and others should be brought before the Military Affairs Committee and the whole question of absolute deferment of skilled men be thoroughly gone into. Otherwise, I feel that we at home are doing the men on the front a disservice.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am intensely interested in this bill. I know of nothing that has gone out of Washington in the past decade—and there have been many regulations and directives to go out—which has caused more concern to a segment of our people than has this regulation Q issued by the Federal Reserve System. The small bankers of the country—and, of course, most of our banks are small—are very much worried and concerned over this regulation. I shall defer the question of the discussion of the details of the proposed legislation to those gentlemen on the Banking and Currency Committee of this House who have given so much study and thought to the legislation. As a member of the Rules Committee, I have been active in

seeing that this legislation came here to the floor of the House today for the consideration of the membership. I should like, however, to go on record to the effect that my study of this matter has resulted in two definite conclusions:

First. That the definition of "interest" arrived at by the Federal Reserve Board in its bulletin of September of 1943 is unjustified when they attempt to interpret the absorption of exchange charges by its member banks into a payment of interest on demand deposits.

Second. I am convinced that the whole matter has gotten down to a fight between the big banks and the small banks.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] has so ably pointed out, it is inconceivable that the Members of this Congress who have concerned themselves so much in recent months in behalf of small business could consistently oppose this legislation. For certainly this is legislation in the interest of small business. If this bill is not passed another long step will be taken in the direction of the consolidation of all business into big business, and consequently such lack of action would be inimical to small business. Many of you have within the past 48 hours been the beneficiaries of propaganda from the big banks as opposed to the small ones in the interest of defeating this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we are all alarmed at the continuous trend toward the centralization of business in a few hands at the expense of the small-business man and the public. This tendency runs hand in hand with that other evil which many of us here are constantly trying to avoid—namely, the centralization of all governmental affairs in Washington and the subsequent regimentation of our people. If you oppose one you should oppose the other.

It is interesting to note in this connection that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has taken a firm stand against this interpretation of the Federal Reserve Board of what constitutes payment of interest. And in this connection, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to herewith insert copy of a letter from the able Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Mr. Leo T. Crowley, to a distinguished banker of my district, Mr. F. W. Foote, president of the First National Bank of Hattiesburg, Miss. The letter follows:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, October 20, 1943.

Mr. F. W. FOOTE,
President, First National Bank,
Hattiesburg, Miss.

DEAR MR. FOOTE: We are in sympathy with the viewpoint expressed in your letter of October 9 regarding the country bankers and the effect upon them of the Board of Governors' recent interpretation of the definition of interest in its regulation Q.

As you know, regulation Q, which applies only to banks members of the Federal Reserve System, has been in effect since 1933. A similar regulation (regulation 304) was first issued by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation in 1935 and relates to insured banks not members of the Federal Reserve System. The issue with respect to regulation Q arises out of the interpretation of the definition of interest published on pages 817 and 818 of the Federal Reserve Bulletin for September 1943. That interpretation holds that the absorption of exchange charges by the member bank in question "constitutes a 'payment of interest' within the meaning of the general law and is therefore a payment of interest on demand deposits in violation of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act and of the provisions of the Board's regulation Q."

To the extent that this interpretation has general applicability it relates only to banks members of the Federal Reserve System. This Corporation has issued no comparable ruling or interpretation applicable to insured banks not members of the Federal Reserve System nor does it propose to do so. We have expressed repeatedly to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System our opinion that Congress did not intend to have interest so defined. While the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System did discuss their proposed interpretation with us they are not required by law to give consideration to our viewpoint and we have no legal power of review over any of their lawful regulations, rulings, and interpretations.

The information which you request regarding the earnings of banks will be found on pages 37, 94, and 95, of our annual report for 1942, a copy of which is being forwarded to you under separate cover.

Very truly yours,

LEO T. CROWLEY,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this resolution will be adopted and that the House will pass this legislation sponsored by the great majority of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House. It will mean much to a continuation of our country banking system. And I might add that its defeat will contribute to the liquidation of these fine, if small, institutions.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I really feel that it is unnecessary for me to say anything as to why this rule should be adopted and the bill passed. After having heard my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK], who has had a broad and penetrating experience and who has been at all times intensely interested in legislation in the interest of the people, I feel it is unnecessary for me to say anything further. However, I do know that the small banks need this small income, because we all know how severely they suffered during the last panic. We know that hundreds of them were put out of business and forced to close their doors. Not only the stockholders but the little depositors who deposited their savings in the small banks lost nearly everything. Therefore, I am for anything and everything to properly help the small banks as well as the small-business men.

ROOSEVELT AIDED THE BANKS

I recall, Mr. Speaker, that we made a large loan of $95,000,000 to one of the banks in the city of Chicago, of which a Republican ex-Vice President of the United States and a former Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was the head. It was understood that some of the small banks would be assisted by this loan, but the promised help failed to materialize. Following the granting of this loan, 42 of the small distressed banks in my city had their doors closed. If one-quarter of the amount that was loaned to General Dawes' bank had been allotted to those 42 small banks, their closing would have been prevented.

I know about the thousands of banks that were closed throughout the Nation due to the Republican crash in 1929 and resultant conditions which affected the banks in 1930, 1931, and 1932.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wonder if the gentleman agrees with the Honorable CARTER GLASS, senior Senator from Virginia, when he says that this practice results in the concentration of huge sums of money in metropolitan banking areas?

Mr. SABATH. What practice?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The practice which we seek to eliminate by this bill.

Mr. SABATH. The contemplated order of the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might explain to the gentleman that he should be for this bill because it would aid the metropolitan banks tremendously.

Mr. SABATH. I am not certain about that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not blame the gentleman from Chicago for being for this bill under those circumstances.

Mr. SABATH. I am for the bill because it will permit member banks of the Federal Reserve System to continue their long-standing practice of absorbing the expense of exchange and collection charges imposed by other banks on check clearings, which a recent ruling of the Federal Reserve System proposes to outlaw and which would deprive the small banks of that little income needed by them to continue in business. A surcharge should not be considered a payment of interest within the prohibition of the law.

I am for the smaller banks notwithstanding it will not help any of those large banks in my own city, but I have the interest of the whole country at heart; I have at heart the twenty-five hundred-some-odd little bankers all over the United States who have been discriminated against and who were ruined by some of the big bankers of New York and even of Chicago when they in 1929 siphoned all the deposits of country banks with the promise the small banks would get their money back any time they desired, but when the time came they could not get the return of a dollar, which utterly destroyed, as I said, nearly all the small banks and depositors in the country. I appreciate that the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has my interest at heart and feels perhaps that it might be well if I were in fact against the large banks. Well, you know the large banks and bankers always have been able to take care of themselves pretty well and they do not need nor do they receive my assistance. I want to do something really effective for the small bankers, because the small man, the small-business man, very seldom has anybody to speak for him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I know there may be some Members who might be influenced by the letters that have been sent out by some of the large, influential bankers. That is nothing unusual. They always think they can control and influence the action of Congress, but, by the eternal heavens, I think we have reached a point where we should not be influenced by these big boys. We know what happened to the country due to the manipulation of these bankers in 1929 and how this country suffered in 1930, 1931, 1932 and even up to 1933, when President Roosevelt, finally, with the aid of Congress, saved the country and restored the confidence and business of the United States. For that reason I am for the bill and shall support the resolution making the bill in order. I hope there will be no vote against it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], a big banker, to answer the charge that the small bankers are being discriminated against.

The SPEAKER. How much time?

Mr. FISH. Such time as he may desire.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to know about what time the gentleman intends to yield.

Mr. FISH. We will start with a 5-minute allotment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to correct the statement of my distinguished colleague from New York as being solely interested in big banks. I was at one time connected with a middle-sized bank which has the reputation of being the solidest bank in the city of Chicago, and I was at another time the organizer and chairman of the board of a very small bank that went to the rescue of about 30,000 poor Polish people who had their savings tied up in a little bank that due to the conditions that occurred in our United States had to close its doors.

In regard to a statement that was made by my esteemed fellow citizen and colleague that this bill is only in the interest of the big banks——

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I said it was for the protection of the small banks so that they could exist.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman for the correction—for the protection of the little banks. Then it must be admitted that the so-called par banks which will not need the protection of this bill because they are par banks must all be big banks. As I look at some charts which will be presented to you much better than I can explain them by a very distinguished member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I am surprised to note that in the State of Connecticut there are 116 banks, all of which must be large banks because all of them par checks and do not need the protection of this legislation. Then I go on to Maine, with 66 banks, all of which must be large banks because all of them par their checks and do not need the protection of this legislation. In Maryland all are big banks, by the same argument. Then we go out to the West—Nevada, with 10 banks. All of them must be large banks because they do not need the protection of this legislation. And observing another section here is Ohio, with 681; all must be large banks because all par their checks.

It is not a question of large and small banks, it is a question of good banking. My father used to be a clerk in one of the first national banks in Ohio. He used to tell me that as he wandered about the country in those early days he had to carry a little book with him. The book was supposed to be kept current. It gave the relative values of the currencies issued by the different States and the different banks of the different States. One never knew otherwise the exact value of currency. One had to check to find out the relative value of the money of the State of New York, for instance, as compared to the money of the State of Indiana or of Massachusetts.

That condition, which was upsetting to all of the people of this country, existed until during the Civil War, when our national currency law was enacted and we taxed all of that State and State bank currency 10 percent and drove it out of existence. Since then the new national currency has had the same value in everybody's hands, in everybody's pocket, whether in the State of New Jersey or the State of Maryland, or in California, or Maine, it made no difference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DEWEY. I cannot with only 2 minutes left; I am sorry.

Law and custom has instituted instead of the State currency and as supplemental to our national currency our check currency. If we are going to start permitting those checks to be clipped, depending on the place issued and the bank on which drawn we are reverting to something like the old State currency and again may upset our national currency system, because the check has become part of our currency.

The Federal Reserve System stands ready and willing to par the checks of any bank that is a member of the Federal Reserve System. Out of the 14,500 banks of the country only 2,500 are not par banks.

Over 4,000 of the 14,500 are non-member banks but nevertheless choose to par their checks.

The real danger is that if banks begin to bid for deposits by offering to absorb the exchange, that absorption will cost that bank some money and if they get the compensating deposits, it means they have got to invest them at some rate of interest that will pay them back their exchange fees and give them a profit on top of that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, that being the case, it puts into effect what I think is bad banking practice and may lead to speculation by these banks. We have had speculation happen before by some banks and it has been injurious to the entire banking system.

We need a sound banking system during the period of reconversion. When that blessed time comes to this country and to the world, when we reconvert our industries from war production back to peacetime production we want sound deposits where they belong, close to their owners and not scattered about over the country, brought there by speculating bankers and probably invested in speculative investment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois, the eminent financier who was adviser to the Polish Government at the time they were trying to put through and make popular the use of zlotys, these coins made out of brass to look like gold, has given us a very novel proposition here. I have no quarrel with the banks of this country. The banker performs a service just the same as the butcher or the storekeeper. He performs a great service to the community. He is a depositary for the surplus funds of the community. He takes surplus money in and lends it out and puts it into use to finance the industry and business of the community. He must judge the integrity of the people who borrow and use this money. The banker serves his community in a great many ways. For the gentleman to stand up here and tell us that the accumulation of these deposits that are lent from day to day into the channels of commerce is not good banking practice, does not make sense to me. He is a financier from the great city of Chicago. I wonder as you go down through that big financial district with those tremendously large buildings how the big banking buildings there were ever financed and came into existence? I wonder how these tremendous cash surpluses in the big banks throughout the country were accumulated and what distressing financial conditions have overtaken this country if we have to pay a little nuisance charge on every exchange check.

Back in the days of the N. R. A. out in the great State of Idaho I received a check from the railroad company to pay for a steer that had been killed on the track. I went down to my bank as I always have and filled out a deposit slip and handed in the check. The banker took it over to the calculating machine and commenced to figure interest. I asked him, "What has that got to do with me and my check?" "Oh," he said, "we have got to charge you interest from the

time this check is deposited until we collect the money from the railroad headquarters and get the money back again." I said, "Never mind. Do not credit me with the amount of that check until you get the money. I do not need it. I have a balance here." "Oh, no," he said, "the N. R. A. has ruled that we have got to charge you interest on any check until the money is collected and in the bank." I said, "Hand me back the check." That check said on its face that it was payable by the treasurer of the railroad company or any station agent when in funds and that banker could have stepped across the street and got the money in 10 minutes. But no, he had to send it on this long trip to the distant town of St. Paul, bring back the money, and charge me interest for all that time.

That is the proposition which this eminent financier from Chicago is recommending here when we just simply want to protect the integrity of the checks of this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

SOME OBSERVATIONS IN REGARD TO THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the soil-conservation programs under the U. S. D. A. have been under the leadership of two agencies: One, the soil-conservation program which has been quite largely devoted to the nonerosion, humus increasing or maintaining, under Dr. Bennett; second, the soil program of the A. A. A., where not only constructive soil practices have been advocated as far as the physical condition of the soil is concerned but also the distribution of mineral fertilizers, largely lime, phosphate, and potash. As I have stated on previous occasions, if the A. A. A. has awakened the American people to the importance of maintaining the fertility of our soil and the conservation of our soil, it will have been a worthy and justifiable expenditure.

The following table shows the estimated yields per acre and the A. A. A. soil-building payments in millions of dollars:

The effect of soil-building activities promoted by the A. A. A., including expansion in the use of phosphates, is reflected in crop yields per acre obtained in the United States during recent years. These increased yields represent the principal means for expansion of war food production. Comparative yield data, together with the amounts expended by A. A. A. for soil-improvement practices, are as follows:

Crop yields per acre (B. A. E. index; 1923–32=100):	
1919–23	100
1924–28	101
1929–33	98
1934 (drought)	81
1935	101
1936 (drought)	87
Crop yields per acre (B. A. E. index; 1923–32=100)—Continued.	
1937	118
1938	114
1939	114
1940	120
1941	122
1942	137
A. A. A. soil-building payments (million dollars):	
1936	60
1937	90
1938	93
1939	115
1940	115
1941	122
1942	167

Source: Mr. N. E. Dodd, Chief, A. A. A., November 6, 1943.

The following table gives the amount of expenditures, by years, for superphosphate, potash, and limestone:

Estimated payments for applying superphosphate, potash, and limestone, 1936–42 agricultural conservation programs

[In thousands of dollars]

Program year	Superphosphate or equivalent [1]	Potash or equivalent [1]	Limestone [1]
1936	1,340	24	6,730
1937	3,220	85	9,280
1938	4,407	147	9,346
1939	5,536	91	10,776
1940	7,497	148	20,338
1941	9,373	218	22,178
1942	15,448	1,012	39,523
Total	46,821	1,725	118,171

[1] Insular region not included.

Source: Division of Special Programs, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Nov. 1, 1943.

You will note that the largest expenditures by far have been for limestone. This step is approved by anyone familiar with farm fertility problems.

The following table shows the number of tons of the various fertilizers that have been distributed:

Application of phosphate, potash, and limestone under agricultural conservation programs, 1936–42

Program year	20 percent superphosphate or equivalent [1]	Muriate of potash or equivalent [1]	Ground limestone or equivalent [1]
	Tons	*Tons*	*Tons*
1936	121,000	2,000	3,620,000
1937	290,770	6,995	4,989,840
1938	397,398	12,056	5,016,439
1939	509,509	7,415	5,791,959
1940	748,874	9,283	12,001,133
1941	909,319	13,390	13,523,838
1942	1,173,046	34,006	18,971,484
Total 1936–42	4,149,916	85,145	63,914,693

[1] Does not include insular region.

Source: Division of Special Programs, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, Oct. 23, 1943.

There were 8,177,000 tons of complete fertilizer used in the United States in 1937, 8,387,000 tons in 1941, and 8,777,000 tons in 1942. The supply in 1944 is estimated at 10,000,000 tons. Part of this increase in supply comes as byproducts of war industries. This complete fertilizer distribution is not a part of the A. A. A. program, and is handled through commercial channels.

When one realizes that over two-thirds of the food marketed comes from about one-third of the farms, and when one realizes that a comparatively few States produce enough food for the consumption of their present populations, this soil fertility and conservation problem becomes a public problem and a question of public interest. A dozen States with Chicago as the food capital of the world produces a large percentage of the food of the Nation. Two States, Iowa and Illinois, produce one-third of the corn, one-third of the pork, of the Nation. In fact, these two States produce 55 percent of the corn used for commercial purposes. Wisconsin produces 13,000,000,000 pounds of milk of the country's total of 98,000,000,000 pounds. Minnesota with its large dairy and livestock production is one of the leading food-producing States. Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan are other central States that make large contribution to the food production of the Nation. The food production in this great area largely determines the amount available for our armed forces, lease-lend, and the amount needed for domestic consumption.

The productivity of all soils is important but the productivity of the soils in this Midwest is of particular importance at this particular time.

The following programs were promoted in 1942 by the A. A. A.:

Practices, 1942:	
Application of limestone ____tons__	18,971,484
Application of 20 percent superphosphate to soil conserving crops____tons__	1,073,304
Green manure and cover crops____acres__	17,342,697
Contour listing pasture or range land____acres__	8,000,000
Protected summer-fallow ____acres__	[1] 14,105,000
Strip cropping____acres__	[2] 8,404,000
Range land reseeded by deferred grazing____acres__	19,378,000
Artificial reseeding pasture and range____lbs. seed__	[2] 9,923,000
Construction of dams and reservoirs for stock waters____cu. yds__	43,865,000
Seedings of grasses and legumes ____acres__	38,311,557
Planting trees____do____	60,714

[1] Does not include summer-fallow protected by strip cropping.

[2] Mr. N. E. Dodd, Chief.

Source: A. A. A.

The allocation of funds may be subject to criticism.

The average amount per hour of labor from Government payments from 1935 to 1943 was winter wheat, 15 cents per hour; wheat-corn, 8¾ cents per hour; wheat grain and sorghum, 16¾ cents per hour; hog-dairy, Corn Belt, 2⅝ cents per hour; cash grain, Corn Belt, 6⅝ cents per hour; hog-beef raising, Corn Belt, 3½ cents per hour; central New York, dairy, —1 cent per hour; southern Wisconsin, dairy, 1¼ cents per hour; two-mule Georgia, cotton, 2⅜ cents per hour; Mississippi Delta, cotton, 3 cents per hour; Texas, cotton, 3½ cents per hour.

In fairness it should be pointed out that the wheat farmers worked less hours than the other groups, and that wheat growing in some of these areas is a risky enterprise.

The above statistics were obtained from the study by Dr. Wylie Goodsell of the United States Department of Agriculture and show the wide variation in hourly receipts from Government payments. They also indicate that cotton as a crop had a large total payment although it did not trickle down to the man who raised the cotton—the family-sized cotton farm.

Regardless of the arguments as to allocation and distribution the fact remains that a large percentage of the appropriations have found their way to the pockets of the landowners and farmers and that the amounts used for personnel have been in keeping with efficient administration.

One reason for this is the fact that many employees are paid only for the days they work. This is especially significant when township committeemen and county committeemen are considered.

The following letter from Mr. N. E. Dodd, Chief of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, shows the distribution of the appropriations:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1944.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: The following table contains the data which you requested yesterday.

Estimated expenditures under 1943 agricultural conservation program

	United States	*Wisconsin*
Net payments to farmers	$372,946,260	$10,415,000
County association expenses	19,509,000	473,686
Other administrative expenses	10,403,281	189,895

I am enclosing a copy of a statement entitled "Effectiveness of an Agricultural Conservation Program Which Offers Assistance in Conservation to All Farmers." This is a statement which I mentioned to you yesterday, and I am sure you will find it of considerable interest.

Sincerely,

N. E. DODD, *Chief.*

All soil specialists realize the tremendous loss of mineral elements such as phosphorous, calcium, and potassium in the soil that is taking place each year. According to the United States Department of Agriculture Yearbook, "Soils and Men" and statements made by C. J. Chapman, soil specialist, college of agriculture, University of Wisconsin, there is an annual loss of twice as much phosphorous and nine times as much potassium as is being applied. When these facts are considered it is apparent that the soil problem becomes a public problem and one deserving of every possible consideration.

The controlling factors of food production outside of the weather are the manpower and machinery problem in addition to the fertility problem of our soils. Millions of acres in our State and country are not being cultivated or used to produce additional food, and the principal reason why we are not set to obtain maximum food production is because of the lack of providing the necessary factors to produce it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table from the Agricultural Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not appear before the House in the capacity of a banker of any kind, big or little, but merely as a Member of the House representing my own district. Most of the bankers from my district are very largely what might be termed moderate sized or small bankers and are apparently opposed to this bill which legalizes the absorption of exchange and collection charges. They believe that this law will open the door wide for concentration in the big banks of New York City of the wealth of the country and discriminate against them. I presume later on when we get into the Committee of the Whole, at which time the merits of the bill will be discussed more in detail, the opposition to the bill will be brought out fully. The fear prevails that if this bill is enacted into law and you repudiate the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve Board who have a reputation for sound banking and if you repudiate their decision by an act of Congress and what they have been trying to do, you will open a way for the concentration of wealth and create a monopoly in favor of the big banks, which is exactly opposite to what the proponents for the bill claim it will do.

Mr. ROLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. May I say to the gentleman that we held hearings on this bill for weeks and at no time did one single representative from the State of New York representing the big banks or the small banks ever appear before our committee.

Mr. FISH. That is just it. The New York State banks are par banks. Every single one of them is a par bank.

Mr. ROLPH. They are not interested in this legislation.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is wrong in saying that they are not interested in this legislation.

Mr. ROLPH. So far as they themselves are concerned.

Mr. FISH. Here is a telegram from the Orange County Bankers Association, signed by James E. Igoe, president, which speaks for itself:

Representing 28 banks in Orange County, we protest against any change in regulation Q.

That is the whole matter contained in the bill. They believe in the sound recommendations of and have confidence in the Federal Reserve Board and its directors.

Here is a telegram from the National Bank of Middletown, in my district:

Being interested in good sound banking as consistently fostered by the Board of Directors of the Federal Reserve System, we desire and herewith record our objection to the legislation now pending in Congress to legalize the absorption of collection charges and we respectfully request your voting accordingly thereon.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FISH. No. I have not finished yet. The gentleman has made a statement about the bankers in New York State. I am speaking only for my own district. I do not know anything about the attitude or sentiment of the bankers in any other district. I am just reading telegrams that came to me today and yesterday. I did not know anything about this proposal. I did not attend your hearings, but I have read both the majority and minority reports.

Mr. ROLPH. If the gentleman had, he would have studied this bill.

Mr. FISH. I have and know it thoroughly. This telegram is from the Columbus Trust Co., of Newburgh, where I now reside:

We protest against any change in regulation Q.

Here is another telegram from the Cornwall National Bank. Cornwall is a small town in my district:

We strongly oppose the present proposed legislation to change the Federal Reserve Board regulation Q.

Now I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am surprised that those banks, if they are so much interested in this legislation, did not at least send a representative down here to appear before our committee, or ask the gentleman from New York to appear, so that we could have questioned him on the reason they are opposed to this legislation.

Mr. FISH. I may say to the gentleman that he well knows, because he is a distinguished Member of this House and has been here for a number of years, that the people back home do not know everything that is going on before certain committees of the House. Most Members of the House did not even know about this bill until it was brought up here today. They cannot follow the meetings of every single committee of the House. It is physically impossible. If we cannot do it, therefore, of course, the people back home cannot be expected to do so, and it is not a justifiable criticism of the moderate bankers and the small bankers in my district or in any other district to expect them to know about every hearing before the gentleman's Committee on Banking and Currency.

The trouble I am getting into here is that I am discussing, under the rule, the merits of this bill, which will be discussed in detail by experts such as the two gentlemen from Michigan, who are distinguished members of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], and others. I do not want to get involved beyond expressing the views of the bankers in my own district and my own views. I sat at no hearing, and I do not know what happened at your hearings. I am opposed to this resolution, and most of my bankers are opposed to it. They believe that if this bill goes through deposits will pour in and gravitate to the big city banks be-

cause of intense competition, and that some big banks will offer more inducements and more on these exchange charges than others and that they can absorb them more easily and give more benefits and advantages, so that more wealth and deposits will be siphoned into the bigger banks, which can afford to do more than the smaller banks.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman said he did not appear before the committee?

Mr. FISH. Certainly not.

Mr. ROLPH. Is not the gentleman tremendously impressed with the fact that the committee members, who did attend the hearings, voted this bill out by a vote of 16 to 5?

Mr. FISH. Let me say to the gentleman that I sat up last night and burned the midnight oil to read both the majority and the minority reports. In all fairness, and I can only express my own views, I was much more impressed with the soundness and logic of the minority report than with the majority report.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to my distinguished colleague from New York, who is generally sound in his views, but not on this particular issue.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman has a fundamental misconception on this matter. This is not a new practice that this bill is attempting to initiate. The practice of exchange absorption has been going on for more than a quarter of a century. What we are trying to do now is to correct an abuse of power by the Federal Reserve Board, which issued a directive not founded on basic law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The gentleman is correct, except that the Federal Reserve Board has the power given it by Congress to do this very thing. It was discussed a number of years ago on the floor of the Congress. They were given this power specifically, and they acted because they thought it constituted sound banking and was in the interest of American banking.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I read from the law of 1933, which was restricted in 1935:

> No member bank shall, directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand

The law specifically denied the right asked for by this bill, and this bill would have us repeal the law so that a benefit can be given by the Federal Reserve Banking System to a nonmember bank which it cannot give to a member bank of its own system.

Mr. FISH. More important than all is that this bill is against the specific recommendation of the directors of the entire Federal Reserve System. After all, they are in charge of it, and they ought to know more about it than some Member of Congress who has some ax to grind. They represent all the banks, they represent the whole System. I would rather take their recommendation on this subject than I would that of my distinguished friend from Queens County, who is very generally sound on legislative matters.

Mr. BARRY. Does the gentleman subscribe to the theory that a bureaucrat can issue a directive without authority of Congress? And that is exactly what this is.

Mr. FISH. I do not agree at all. My position on bureaucrats and bureaucratic government is well known. I think or I know that the Federal Reserve Board had specific power to do this, as stated by section 19, by act of Congress, and by the discussions previously held in Congress. I do not have the time because I want to discuss some other matters and I do not think it is my duty to debate further the issue involved in the pending bill. It would not be fair to the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency who will go into that in detail and show where the Federal Reserve Board was given the power, where it was discussed in the House, and where they had specific power to do this thing.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is not the gentleman familiar with the fact that the question that is now before the House arises out of an administrative interpretation by the Federal Reserve Board as to what the general interest means in the substitute law?

Mr. FISH. Exactly, but under the authority granted by an act of Congress.

Mr. KEEFE. And that the law applicable to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is practically identical with that which applies to the Federal Reserve Board, and that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has taken a diametrically opposite view as to whether or not the word "interest" includes the absorption of collection and exchange charges?

Mr. FISH. That distinction will be gone into in detail by members of the committee, as stated in the minority report. I am not going to take the time of the House to repeat it. It is all in the minority report, which clearly sets forth the power and authority of the Federal Reserve Board, which acted within that legal authority.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman stated that the Federal Reserve Board has the right to regulate all the banks of the country.

Mr. FISH. All the banks under the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order during the few minutes remaining to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, although the Republican candidate for Congress, William Bennet, failed to be elected from the Twenty-first Congressional District of New York in Tuesday's byelection, he increased the Republican percentage from 2 years ago from 33 to 47 percent and lost out by only 1,500 votes. In the last 3 elections this congressional district has gone Democratic by more than 2 to 1.

This is more than a moral victory. It means repudiation of President Roosevelt and the New Deal. The 14-percent increase is greater than in any of the byelections held since 1942. If the same increase prevails 8 months from now—when a President and a new Congress are to be elected—the Republicans will carry every State north of the Mason and Dixon's line, and most of the border States, and elect a Republican majority of approximately 2 to 1 in the House, or at least 100 majority. I anticipate the election of 6 or more Republican Congressmen from New York City. That is why I say, without reservation, that the vote on Tuesday was a terrific Republican victory, and a repudiation of Roosevelt and the New Deal, and if the trend continues it will mean an overwhelming Republican victory in November and the election of not only a Republican President but of a majority in both the House and Senate.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon the gentleman from Ulster County, N. Y. [Mr. LEFEVRE] and I visited by appointment the Honorable Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, to ask that the discrimination in the milk subsidy payments between New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey be abolished.

At the present time the dairymen of Orange, Sullivan, Delaware, Rockland, Putnam, Dutchess, and Columbia Counties are receiving subsidy payments of 40 cents a hundred pounds on their milk, whereas just across the line in the States of New Jersey, Connecticut, and Massachusetts the dairy farmers are receiving 50 cents a hundred pounds subsidy from the Government.

There is no valid reason for this discrimination, as the dairymen in New York State have to buy their feed grains largely from the Middle West and pay the same amount for it, the transportation costs are the same, and their labor costs are the same. Consequently, there is no justification for this discrimination against the New York State dairymen along the Hudson River Valley.

Mr. Vinson was cooperative, and promised to have an immediate investigation made to ascertain why this discrimination should not be eliminated. The War Food Administrator, the Honorable Marvin Jones, is reliably reported to be in favor of abolishing or doing away with this difference in subsidy payments between the milk producers in New York and in adjoining States.

I shall wait a reasonable time for favorable action to be taken, and if it is not forthcoming will follow up on it through the appropriate committees of Congress, and continue to protest publicly against this unfair and senseless discrimination against the dairymen in New York State.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain communications at the point where I spoke.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Angell	Gallagher	Merrow
Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Miller, Pa.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gavin	Morrison, N. C.
Barden	Gifford	Mott
Bates, Mass.	Goodwin	Murdock
Blackney	Grant, Ind.	Newsome
Bolton	Harness, Ind.	Norton
Bonner	Harris, Va.	O'Hara
Brooks	Hébert	O'Leary
Buckley	Hendricks	O'Toole
Burch, Va.	Herter	Pfeifer
Burchill, N. Y.	Hill	Pracht,
Busbey	Hobbs	C. Frederick
Canfield	Hoch	Ramspeck
Cannon, Fla.	Holifield	Reece, Tenn.
Cannon, Mo.	Holmes, Mass.	Robertson
Celler	Jackson	Rowe
Chapman	Jenkins	Scanlon
Chenoweth	Johnson,	Sheridan
Coffee	Lyndon B.	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Kearney	Slaughter
Costello	Kefauver	Smith, W. Va.
Dingell	Kelley	Starnes, Ala.
Domengeaux	Kleberg	Stearns, N. H.
Douglas	Knutson	Stockman
Drewry	Lea	Taylor
Ellsworth	LeCompte	Towe
Feighan	Luce	Vinson, Ga.
Fellows	McKenzie	Vorys, Ohio
Fernandez	Maas	Vursell
Ford	Magnuson	Welchel, Ohio
Fulmer	Maloney	Weiss
Furlong	Manasco	Winter
Gale	Mason	Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 327 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein parts of a speech by the president of the Chicago & Southern Air Lines.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial and a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ABSORPTION OF CERTAIN EXCHANGE AND COLLECTION CHARGES

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3956) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3956) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has an hour and the gentleman from Michigan an hour.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, while this bill has excited a very great and general interest amongst the smaller banks of the country it does not involve a great sum of money.

Ever since the inception of banking in the United States the practice of absorbing exchange and collection charges by the clearing banks of the cities for the country banks who keep their reserve deposits with the city banks has been an established one which has gone on uninterruptedly until the present time. This bill does not change existing conditions as they have gone along for almost a century, but it prevents a radical change in the law, I think an unwarranted change by the Federal Reserve Board.

The Banking Act of 1935, reenacting the act of 1933, provided that the payment of interest on demand deposits either directly or indirectly or by any device whatsoever was prohibited. At that time the absorption of exchange and collection charges was a well-established practice. The Congress knew about it, every banker knew about it. In the debates on the Banking Act of 1935 not a word was said about absorption of exchange and collection charges. In the reports nothing was said about exchange and collection charges, and so far as I have been able to observe there was not a word said about the absorption of exchange and collection charges in the hearings of either the Senate or the House.

The absorption of exchange and collection charges continued uninterruptedly until almost the present time. I do not know the exact date.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I believe it was 1937.

Mr. SPENCE. The Federal Reserve Board attempted to construe this act as prohibiting the absorption of exchange and collection charges. I say that was an unwarranted construction. I contend that the Congress never intended to delegate to the Federal Reserve Board this power which in its essence was legislation. The construction of the laws belongs to the courts.

While we are generous in delegating legislative powers, the courts are jealous in preserving their jurisdiction. I believe that if this case were to go to the courts, notwithstanding the decision of the Federal Reserve Board, the courts would assume their jurisdiction and say that the exercised power of the Federal Reserve Board has never been delegated. And so I say, in the light of the rules of interpretation, the Federal Reserve Board never had this power. There is an ancient rule of the law coming down from the common law that is expressed in a Latin phrase: "The inclusion of one is the exclusion of the other." Lord Coke wrote decisions upon it, and that rule applies to this very case. If the Congress had intended to prohibit the absorption of exchange and collection charges, the Congress would have said so. Repeal of statutes by implication is not favored, yet here was the destruction of a long-established practice—a practice which meant the very life of the little banks of the country, destroyed by the ipse dixit of this Board.

It seems to me the fundamental question here is whether we now intend to affect the result that the act of 1935 accomplished. I believe this bill does so. This practice has grown up over the years. The little banks came before our committee and said they could not exist without it. The big banks were offered an opportunity to appear. The representatives of the American Bankers' Association were there but they did not take the stand. I believe in encouraging these little institutions. I do not believe there is any substitute for the little banker who knows the people of his home town, who makes character and reputation worth something.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. Would the gentleman make plain just what is meant in his discussion by "the little banks" and "the big banks"? Where, approximately, would the line be drawn?

Mr. SPENCE. The little banks are the country banks which deposit their reserves with the city banks. When they clear their checks upon which charges are made, as they are by most of those little banks, instead of the charge going back to the little bank the big bank in consideration of the deposits it holds absorbs those charges. "Little banks" means most of the banks I imagine in the gentleman's section; it means the little bank in the little city. When the man in the little town wants accommodation he does not go to Wall Street or some center of population, he goes to the little

bank on the corner or the little bank down on Main Street. That is the bank we are endeavoring to protect; that is the bank that has come before our committee in great numbers and said that unless we pass this law they will be destroyed.

There is another significant thing. The opponents of this legislation place great weight on the fact that the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System are opposed to the bill. The Federal Reserve Board has expressed its views against this bill, but the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which takes these little banks under its wing as the old hen takes her brood and nurtures them, which has to pay the depositors if there is a failure, was overwhelmingly in favor of it. Mr. Crowley appeared before our committee and spoke most earnestly in favor of the passage of this bill, because, he said, it meant something to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to keep these little banks in business. I believe he was thoroughly justified by the position he took.

Mr. BYRNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BYRNE. Is not the little bank represented by a maximum deposit of $2,000,000?

Mr. SPENCE. I believe it is somewhere along there. I do not know that you can make any hard and fast rule, but it is the bank in the country that gives to the local people the accommodations that they need. It is not only a local business but a local institution. It is the basic little business in America and one of the things that has made America great. The little bank has helped little business and little business through the vision and genius of the American people has grown to be big business. Little business was here before big business and little business deserves consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I am in full support of the gentleman's bill. Does not the present practice of the banks result in discrimination in favor of the big banks and against the small banks?

Mr. SPENCE. I am sure all the big banks are not opposed to this bill. I do not think that the prohibition against the payment of interest on demand deposits could by the widest stretch of the imagination be considered as embracing the absorption of exchange and collection charges. The big bank cannot regulate the amount of the collection charges. They could regulate the amount they pay as interest. The reason that the payment of interest on demand deposits was barred was because there was real competition in it and because it not only applied to interbank deposits but applied to the deposits of the ordinary depositor of the bank. They did compete for the deposit of the individual depositor in the bank. I remember an incident where a bank agreed to give a city 4 percent on its average deposits and lend it money at the rate of 3 percent. The city could have borrowed money from the bank and placed it back in deposit and made 1 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the issues are not nearly as complicated as they might seem. This bill I believe will induce some loose policies and practices which might affect the whole stability of banking and credit in the United States.

The Banking Act of 1933 prohibited the payment of interest on demand deposits by any bank whatever, directly or indirectly or by any device. Regulation Q seeks to interpret that and says that the absorption of exchange by correspondent banks will be considered as the payment of interest prohibited under the Banking Act of 1933.

I think the rule which must be applied is whether the absorption of the exchange is in consideration of the deposit. If the absorption of the exchange by the correspondent bank is in consideration of the local bank leaving its account or leaving its deposits in a correspondent bank, then it very clearly violates the purpose and intent of the prohibition in the Banking Act of 1933 in respect to the nonpayment of interest.

Let us go back just a little while and see what a great American financier and statesman had to say about this practice. I quote from page 16 of the hearings, a former Secretary of the Treasury, coauthor of the Federal Reserve Act, a man who is reputed to know more about these questions than perhaps anyone in the United States or at least did when these statements were made on May 19 and 25, 1933. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator CARTER GLASS had this to say in respect to the practice:

> Then another provision of the bill in which I should like to enlist the interest of the Senate particularly is a prohibition against the payment of interest on demand deposits by commercial banks. There are various reasons for that, some of them I think compelling. The payment of interest on demand deposits has resulted for years and years in stripping the country banks of all their spare funds, which have been sent to the money centers for stock speculative purposes.
>
> Who is for the little man and who is for the big man in this fight?
>
> Bankers are the only people on earth that utterly disregard the law of supply and demand. They have their standard rates and stick to them, and would rather send their surplus funds to New York to be used for stock-gambling purposes at a wonderful rate of 2 percent, reduced now, I think, to 1½ percent, than to loan to their merchants and businessmen at less than their standard rates. So that this payment of interest, particularly on bank demand deposits, has resulted in drawing the funds from the country banks to the money centers for speculative purposes, to be polite about the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the absorption of an exchange charge by correspondent banks, I think it will develop in the debate as we go along, is in consideration of the deposits of the local bank's funds in that particular correspondent bank and invites the bidding for these accounts and at least does not remove the objections which Senator CARTER GLASS had in 1933 to what he thought to be a very vicious practice.

Even if the issue had never been presented to the Congress before as to whether absorption of exchange should be considered interest, the issue is here today. So it does not make any difference whatsoever what the intent of Congress was in 1933, it does not make any difference what the intent of the Congress was when regulation Q was formulated and announced. If it is in agreement with congressional policy that we discourage concentration of wealth in large metropolitan areas to the prejudice of local banking, local industry and agriculture and business, then this bill is a vehicle by which we can express our intention but by the enactment of this bill you not only condone these very vicious practices but you encourage an expansion of them all over the United States.

Where are the little banks that they talk about? Look at the chart on page 174 of the hearings. How many big banks do you find in Idaho, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Oklahoma? There are probably some large banks there, but the majority of the banks in those States are small banks, and there is not a nonpar bank in those States. Somebody in those States must have come to the conclusion that it was better to have par clearance and not clip their checks, than to have nonpar clearance, to the prejudice of sound banking.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I cannot. I am sorry. I do not have the time, because we have so many Members who want to speak against this bill.

There is no relationship between this bill and a service charge, let us make that clear. This bill does not prohibit or interfere in any way with the service charges for issuing checks by making entries on your account. It only prevents their correspondent banks from paying them through this device and absorbing exchange charges so that the account which the bank has in a correspondent bank is increased by the absorption of those charges which would otherwise be passed back to the local bank.

For individual cases, I refer you to pages 174 and 175 of the hearings, and also to the charts on pages 201–202, and the following pages, which give you a break-down of the earnings of the banks in the different classes. You will find that these little banks which are par banks make just about as much money as the little banks which are nonpar banks, because they have been compelled to accept and adopt sound business practices and sound banking practices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, in New York State we have no nonpar banks, so I can speak impartially about this issue.

I knew nothing about this subject until I sat on the committee and listened to a good deal of the testimony. The evidence produced there indicated to me that in 1933, when the banking law was enacted and the prohibition was passed which forbade payment of interest on demand deposits, there was no discussion whatever about exchange absorption being considered as interest. As a matter of fact, the testimony revealed that ever since the history of banking began interest and exchange have been two separate and distinct things. The practice of paying interest on demand deposits was carried on by the same banks that absorbed exchange for nonpar banks. So when we specifically prohibited the payment of interest, we meant that, and when we said "device" we meant some device that would be used in lieu of that and not exchange absorption, which was a custom in the banking business for over a quarter of a century and was going on at that time. I say this because I also found out that the late Mr. Steagall and the majority of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency knew and believed and understood at that time that exchange was not to be regarded as a device for paying interest.

I cannot escape the conclusion that when the Federal Reserve Board issued its regulation it did so to evade going before the Congress and bringing the issue squarely before it as it is brought here today by the bill introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. As a matter of fact, if the congressional intent had been followed, the bill introduced by the gentleman from Georgia would not be necessary. The Federal Reserve Board says, "If you put your blessing on this practice of absorbing exchange, then the par banks in the other States or the entire Federal Reserve System will start to break up." May I point out, as I tried to point out to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], this morning, that this practice has been going on for years, and this practice was actually never forbidden by Congress. The banks that are par banks today became that way competing with this sort of practice.

The amount of money involved here today, according to the testimony, is about $8,000,000, which is the total of the exchange absorbed by member banks for nonpar banks.

Mr. KEEFE. Out of $100,000,000,000 of transactions.

Mr. BARRY. This thing cannot run wild like the payment of interest, as my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] suggests, as in the old days of competing by paying higher interest charges, because the entire amount is limited by the deposits of two-thousand-one-hundred-odd small nonpar banks. So there is no danger that this competition which has been going on for over a quarter of a century is going to disturb our banking system at all.

Insofar as I have been able to ascertain, the New York banks are completely indifferent about what we do on this issue. No New York bankers, as a matter of fact, came here and testified either for or against this bill. The American Bankers Association took a completely indifferent position insofar as appearing before the committee was concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of H. R. 3956, known as the Brown bill. I wish I might have the opportunity to vote for a bill like this every day. The reason I like it so much is because it seeks to free industry from political control instead of imposing additional political control over it. There has been so much legislation in recent years to put industry in the shackles of Federal control that it should make us all feel good to have this opportunity to vote for a measure which would relieve it from such domination.

The bill before us has to do with the banks of the Nation and concerns particularly the smaller banks. It seeks to set aside a ruling made by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve called regulation Q. This regulation prohibits nonmember banks from absorbing exchange charges. It was issued on the ground that absorption of exchange charges by banks is an indirect way or device for the payment of interest on demand deposits, which latter is prohibited by law.

So far as I have been able to learn the Banking Act of 1933 which prohibited member banks from paying interest on demand deposits contained no provision which could be construed as defining absorption charges as the payment of interest on deposits. It is true that act provided for the prohibition of payment of interest on demand deposits "directly or indirectly by any device whatsoever." As far as I can learn, there was nothing said in connection with the passage of the 1933 Banking Act either in the hearings or debate which would indicate that it was the intention of Congress to define absorption charges as payment of interest. Since the practice of absorbing exchange charges had been carried on in general in various sections of the country for many years when the law was passed prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits, it seems Congress would at least have said something indicating that such charges might be defined as payment of interest if it had intended that such should be the case.

Under the 1933 Banking Act the board was called upon to make a number of rulings as to the interpretation of interest as used in the law and as to whether or not the absorption of exchange charges and out-of-pocket expenses constituted a payment of interest. Mr. George B. Vest, assistant general counsel to the Federal Reserve Board, in discussing the subject of absorption charges in this February 1940 Federal Reserve Bulletin said in respect to this question:

> No satisfactory solution of the problem was found, however, and the Board recommended to the Congress certain changes in the law which it was hoped might be helpful in connection with this and other questions regarding the payment of interest on deposits.

From this it is evident that the Board itself was not convinced that the 1933 Banking Act included absorption charges in its definition of interest.

Now the prohibition against the payment of interest on demand deposits contained in the 1933 Banking Act applied only to member banks. Then the 1935 act required the Board of Director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to prohibit by regulation the payment of interest on demand deposits in insured nonmember banks.

Under the 1935 Banking Act the Board of Governors included in a revision of its regulations regarding the payment of interest on deposits a definition of the term "interest," which provided that—

> The absorption by a member bank for a depositor of exchange and collection charges which involved out-of-pocket expense was a payment of interest.

This definition was adopted in the regulations of November 1935 to become effective January 1, 1936. At the same time, however, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was about to issue regulations regarding the payment of interest by insured nonmember banks, to become effective on the same date—

> including a definition of interest which did not refer to the absorption of exchange and collection charges.

Thereupon—

> The Board deferred the effective date of the definition of interest in its regulation so that an opportunity would be provided to consult with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with a view to harmonizing, if possible, the provisions of the two regulations governing the payment of interest on deposits by member banks and by insured nonmember banks.

From this it would appear that the Board of Governors still were not sure of their ground.

Subsequently representatives of the Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation discussed the matter and not until more than a year thereafter came to an agreement. The two agencies amended their respective regulations simultaneously, to become effective February 11, 1937. The agreement was that each agency should amend its regulations so as to include the same definition of whatever was to be defined. This is what emerged:

> Within this regulation, any payment to or for the account of any depositor as compensation for the use of funds constituting a deposit shall be considered interest.

The Board now receded from the position it had previously taken when it included absorption charges in its definition of interest payment. This to me is significant.

If we are to judge by some of the testimony given by the representatives of the Board before the committee, the absorption of exchange charges is a most vicious practice and has more than potential possibilities of undermining the banking structure. It seems to me that if they were as sure of the existence of this danger as they apparently have indi-

cated they would not have hesitated to retain the term "absorption charges" in their definition of interest payment. Indeed, if they were so convinced of such a danger they should have strengthened their definition instead of weakening it. Does this conduct not indicate that the Board was either hesitant because of some unstated reason or uncertain of its position or unwilling to assume its responsibility, or possibly a combination of these?

We ought to be realistic about this matter and look at the facts. It is well known that the Federal Reserve Board has for many years been striving to eliminate nonpar banking and to put all banks on a par-clearance basis. There can be no doubt that the underlying purpose of this is to force all banks into the Reserve System. In substantiation of this assertion, let me read to you from a book entitled "Banking Studies," which was written by members of the Staff Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, published August 1941. On page 273, under the caption "Deterrents to membership in the Reserve System," it is stated:

> The effectiveness of the Federal Reserve System is dependent largely upon the extent of its membership.

Then under the heading "Positive deterrents to membership," on page 276, we read the following significant statement:

> Par clearance: One of the reasons why many State banks do not join the Federal Reserve System and why banks occasionally withdraw from the System is that member banks are not permitted by Federal statute to make exchange charges on checks forwarded to them by the Federal Reserve Banks for payment. However, nonmember banks can become insured without giving up the practice of making such charges.
>
> None of the State laws prohibits banks from charging exchange for the payment of checks. In seven States—Mississippi, Louisiana, North Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, Florida, and South Dakota—the laws specifically authorize such charges.
>
> The Federal Reserve System maintains a list of banks that are willing to pay the full amount of checks drawn on them, without deduction for exchange, and these banks are known as being on the par list. As of December 31, 1939, as many as 2,629 nonmember commercial banks were not on the par list and presumably, therefore, were charging exchange. Of these, 2,398 were insured.
>
> The geographic distribution of nonpar banks is shown below. It will be observed that in 29 States there are one or more banks of the kind that may be members of the Reserve System which are not on the par list, and that there is an especially heavy concentration of such banks in the South and the Middle West.
>
> To many smaller banks exchange charges are a source of substantial revenue they are reluctant to do without, and, in many instances, state they cannot do without. In view of these facts and the differences in Federal and State laws with respect to par clearance, it is clear that the requirement that checks be paid in full by member banks is an important obstacle to membership in the Reserve System, particularly since no such requirement is applicable to nonmember insured banks.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What is the date of that?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. August 1941. In this connection permit me to quote from the testimony given to the committee by Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, who, it should be mentioned, was strongly for the Brown bill and opposed to regulation Q:

> have always rejected and deeply resented regulation by legal interpretations of administrative laws, and I think that is what this is, and I want to put myself on record as being in favor of the Brown bill. And I think you men, if you vote this bill out, will be making a very, very definite contribution to free enterprise and to the rights of management, and you definitely will serve the necessities of the banking system supervisors of this country; for they have no right to step over the foul line by interpreting legislation in an administrative way, without first coming to Congress and letting them discuss this thing on its merits.
>
> In the beginning, they said the thing involved in this was the question of absorption of exchange. Later, as you men went on, you could see that definitely linked to this is the question of par clearance. Now for 25 years they have been trying to get par clearance through this committee and through the courts; in some way, to force par clearance on the banks of this country, but neither your committee nor any other committee has ever been willing to do it.

From this I do not see how it is possible to escape the conclusion that the issuance of regulation Q was motivated in substantial measure by the desire on the part of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to force all banks into its System. It seems to me the Board is attempting to do this by indirection rather than by direction, the very thing it is accusing the nonpar banks of doing when it claims that they are indirectly resorting to the practice of paying interest on demand deposits by absorbing exchange charges.

I was deeply impressed with the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before our committee in favor of this measure. They were forthright in their statements and expressed a deep conviction that the Brown bill was essential for the preservation of their interests, aye, their very existence. Yes, they expressed more than that. They made a plea to our committee to be allowed to use their God-given talents to run their own business and not be told by an all-powerful Federal agency what they can and cannot do. To me it is a veritable tragedy that a situation like this has come about in the United States which forces bankers along with practically every other industrial segment of our economy to come here to Washington and beg of the powers that be the right to carry on in their natural ways.

But the unkindest cut of all came when the witnesses against this bill told us that the bankers who are affected by it could resort to the courts to redress their grievances if they believed regulation Q to be illegal. Think of it. What possible chance would the small banks, especially the smaller country banks, have in the courts against the powerful Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System? They could not afford to go to court. They have no money to spare for such an undertaking. Furthermore, banking is as everyone knows a highly sensitive business, and every banker is aware that he might have a run on his bank if his depositors found out that he was about to go to court to answer charges made by the Board of Governors that he had been carrying on illicit practices.

What else can these 2,600 banks, which include the smallest banks, do but discontinue the practice of absorbing charges and accept whatever consequences that may result, even if it means the closing of the doors of many of them unless this bill is passed. I grant some evils may result from the practice of absorbing exchange charges, but I have not been convinced by any of the testimony given in opposition to this bill that such practice is so general and so extensive as to warrant the Board's promulgation of regulation Q. I came to Congress for the specific purpose of doing what I could to free private industry from political control and not to further enslave it. I want to see the State banks maintain their independence. I want to see our banks freed from that Federal control which I believe is inimical to the sound banking practices and I believe there now exists a vast amount of such Federal control.

I repeat, this is a good bill. It is the very kind of legislation that is required to restore our country to the traditions that made America the greatest nation on earth.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a brief preliminary statement in answer to my good friend and colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], and say to him with full sincerity that if this bill passes, and this practice continues, the small banks of the country are not going to be subservient to Washington, but they are going to be chattels of their correspondent banks, and will have to do what the correspondent bank tells them with reference to the volume of deposits and the amount of exchange which the correspondent bank will absorb, which absorption, in my judgment, constitutes interest.

Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that I have to dissent from the decision of a majority of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee in reporting this bill to the House.

I certainly do not agree with the argument that the Federal Reserve Board is exceeding the authority granted by Congress in its promulgating regulation Q, which regulation defines the absorption of exchange by member banks, in return for a compensating balance, as a violation of the Federal Reserve Act.

In support of this contention, I quote from section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, which reads as follows:

> No member bank shall, directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is authorized, for the purposes of this section, to define the terms "demand deposits" to determine what shall be deemed to be a payment of interest, and to prescribe such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section and prevent evasions thereof.

This language is, as I interpret it, a clear and precise authorization to the Board to determine when a bank, through any device whatsoever, is attempting to evade the law. The absorbing of exchange by a member bank is not forbidden unless it is clearly shown that the amount of the absorption is based on a compensating balance kept on deposit with the member bank by the country bank.

Where this condition is found to exist and it becomes clear to the examining authorities that the member bank is absorbing exchange for the country bank, this sort of transaction comes within the definition of a device to attract deposits and the Federal Reserve Board in attempting to prevent this type of evasion is merely carrying out the explicit directive of Congress as clearly expressed in the Federal Reserve Act and amendments.

SOME COMMENTS

CARTER GLASS writes:

This bill is rankly discriminatory and lacking in frankness. Its enactment could have vicious and far-reaching effects upon the Federal Reserve System, both in the number of member banks and in the perpetuation of a par clearance system which has saved the Nation's industry, commerce, and agriculture millions upon millions of dollars. I am unalterably opposed to the bill.

The First National Bank of Cornelia, Ga., telegraphs:

H. R. 3956, by Mr. BROWN, will open up the way for unsafe and unsound banking on a Nation-wide scale. The movement for this bill originated close by, and we know its dangers. Enacted into law, it will lead to inflation of bank deposits and stimulate bank investments in unsound assets.

F. M. REEVES, *President.*

The Bank of Forest, Miss., telegraphs:

We are very much opposed to the passage of H. R. 3956. It is narrow and provincial. If passed, it will allow 17 percent of the banks—all small banks in the United States—to control the policy of 87 percent of the larger and more progressive banks. Have run a country bank in Mississippi 49 years. Ten years ago, in seeking a safe place for our reserves, joined the Federal Reserve System. Since then we have demonstrated to our entire satisfaction that a country bank in Mississippi can be successfully run without charging exchange on its own checks coming to it through the mails, and without depending on a gift gratuity grant or subsidy handed out by a paternalistic State or Federal Government, or by having the R. F. C. as a stockholder. The term "absorption" is a misnomer. If the country bank will, it can collect its nonpar items at less cost, net cost, if it will invest its excess reserves instead of keeping its excess reserves with its city correspondents and be lulled to sleep by a long word, "absorption," the correct definition of which is interest.

J. R. MCCRAVY,
Chairman of the Board.

LEGAL DEFINITION OF "INTEREST"

In *Deputy* v. *Dupont* (308 U. S. 488), January 8, 1940, the Supreme Court of the United States held that "in the business world 'interest on indebtedness' means compensation for the use or forbearance of money."

Most of the support for H. R. 3956 has come from the smaller exchange charging banks of the Southeast. Actually, the testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee of the House disclosed that the principal parties at interest are the larger city banks that absorb this exchange. They would be the true beneficiaries of the Brown bill because again the testimony has shown that a city bank absorbing exchange for a small country bank does so only on a basis that is profitable to the city bank. While smaller banks profess to believe that their independence would be threatened if exchange were not absorbed, the fact is that they have become vassals of the larger city banks, dependent on the largess that the city banks are willing to pass back to them. They are, in large measure, duped into supposing that they are the beneficiaries when, in truth, they are victimized by this process.

The Federal Reserve System has constantly contended for the right of the smaller banks to live independently of the larger banks. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has publicly opposed unnecessary competition of Federal Government lending agencies in all fields of credit. It was responsible for establishing the present plan whereby country banks are enabled to invest their funds fully in Government securities, with the assurance that the funds so invested will be the equivalent of cash. As pointed out in testimony of the Board, economies in operation, full investment of funds, and the installation of modern service charges will best assure the country banks of the independence they desire. A studied effort has been made, with more political cunning than sincerity, to make it appear that the Reserve System is indifferent to or less interested in the welfare of the small, independent bank than in the big city bank.

The truth of the matter is that 87 percent of the deposits of all commercial banks of the country are in member banks of the Reserve System and that three-fourths of these banks are the smaller banks. If there is any bias in a system so representative of all banking institutions of the country it is in favor of the smaller banks which are such a preponderant majority of system members. It is not the small, independent bank that is the real object of the solicitude of the proponents of the Brown bill. The real beneficiaries of this bill are a handful of banks, by no means small, which have grown fat and are growing fatter at the expense of small, independent banks. The small banks have been made the front for a concerted drive by certain banks that absorb exchange but do not and legally cannot charge exchange. What they seek are inordinately large country correspondent bank balances, whicl they use to their own profit, at the expense of the smaller banks, which they are using as a smoke screen to try to make it appear that small business and independent banking will be protected by the Brown bill. This measure merely means a wider spread of the evils of exchange charging across the Nation, most of which is now free from them.

The testimony shows that there is another group that would continue to benefit if the Brown amendment is adopted. Strangely enough, we again find that there is nothing small about this group of beneficiaries. They are those large corporations that can carry balances huge enough to induce some unsoundly managed bank to absorb the exchange that the banks the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] favors want to charge. Can the little depositor get this favor? He cannot. His balances are not large enough.

We thus find the real beneficiaries of the proposed legislation not the little bank, not the little depositor, but the bank swollen by the unsound interbank balances it has gained by a distorted interpretation of the act prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits and the corporation large enough to carry balances that will induce a bank to absorb exchange. Little banks and large corporations used as a front for unsound banking—a sorry picture, indeed. This measure merely means, as I have said before, a wider spread of the evils of exchange charging across the Nation, now largely free from this ancient curse. Every effort has been made to disguise the real result of this legislation if passed. No Member should vote for it without realizing the banking evils involved.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CREDIT MEN,
New York, N. Y., February 29, 1944.

H. R. 3956, S. 1642

To Members of Congress:

This organization, consisting of 20,000 manufacturing, wholesaling, and banking members, has throughout its half century of existence sought in every way to develop a sound national currency and banking system.

Our membership, officers and directors are seriously alarmed over the probable consequences of favorable action on the two pending bills.

Our opposition to these bills is based upon the following factors:

We believe that in the present situation section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and which reads: "No member bank shall directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand," to be a sound provision, and in furtherance of sound banking. As long ago as 1933 the Honorable Senator CARTER GLASS stated that one of the real objectives of section 19 was to try to promote the further utilization of bank funds in the area in which they were located, and to prevent the excess accumulation of country bank funds in large financial centers where they were vulnerable to speculative purposes. We believe these companion bills, if passed, would defeat the objective of section 19. We believe it quite probable that the practice of charging exchange and of the absorption of exchange charges, both now very limited, would materially expand, and that this resolution would drive the opening wedge for the absorption of various charges in lieu of interest payments.

We believe the passage of this resolution would eventually nullify section 19, and by subterfuge permit a compensation for demand balances which, irrespective of how such compensation was disguised, is tantamount to the payment of interest.

We respectfully call to your attention the fact that national banks or members of the Federal Reserve System, be they State or National, are not permitted to make exchange charges. Among this group of banks are many smaller institutions which compete, in some sections, with the limited number of State banks which do make exchange charges. We also desire to call your attention to the fact that these smaller members of the Federal Reserve System, be they State or National, are profitably operated without benefit of these charges.

The practice of permitting banks to absorb exchange charges insofar as it affects commerce and industry, will not as some contend, inure principally to the benefit of smaller business institutions, since in practice the total amount of these charges absorbed is related to the size of the customer's deposit. This is class legislation for the benefit of relatively few banks located in relatively few States.

Our interest in this legislation is not a selfish interest. Many of our members are now benefiting from the absorption of exchange charges but they recognize the eventual consequence of this practice and are favorable to its discontinuance.

We wish particularly to emphasize the great hidden danger to our national currency that could develop from the passage of this resolution.

Bank checks constitute the principal currency of our country. In fact, the ratio of bank checks in use to actual currency is better than 10 to 1. The practice of charging exchange for the clearance of a bank check strikes at the very fundamental of a free par circulation of this Nation's currency. Do not confuse exchange charges with service charges. Service charges are made against the bank's own customer. Exchange charges are made against the individual or organization to whom the bank's customer has given a check. When an individual or organization accepts a check in payment of a bill, he feels he has the right to assume he will receive the amount of money or credit called for on the face of the check. In most instances he does receive the exact amount. In certain areas, and in a limited number of banks, an exchange charge is made and he does not receive the face amount of the check. When he does not, it is tantamount to discounting the currency of the United States, for we repeat, in this country bank checks constitute our primary currency.

We are particularly concerned over these companion bills because their passage indirectly could—

1. Further expand the objectionable practice of making exchange charges;

2. Since members of the Federal Reserve System cannot make these exchange charges, unfair advantage would accrue to nonmember banks, and perhaps promote the withdrawal of member banks from the Federal Reserve System;

3. Cause a reversion to the old practice of circuitous routing of checks in order to find some bank along the line of collection which would be willing to make the check worth 100 cents on the dollar;

4. In practice it is not inconceivable that the value of a check would depend upon the bank upon which it was drawn, thus destroying the par acceptance and free circulation of our bank-check currency; and

5. Develop further hoarding of cash.

This organization recognizes that the banking industry must have satisfactory earnings if it is to be maintained in a solvent condition. We therefore have never objected, and never will to proper service charges as distinguished from exchange charges. We do, however, recognize that in matters of service charges the law of competition comes into play. The banking business in this sense is like any other business, in that there must be a sound need for the institution and a fair charge for its services. It cannot escape meeting these standards of value.

Finally, we desire to emphasize that although these bills deal directly with the question of an interpretation of section 19, their inherent danger is in the consequences of an interpretation that the absorption of exchange charges is not tantamount to interest. Such a conclusion will tend to destroy the function of our national currency, bank checks.

We repeat, our primary interest is in a sound banking system and the maintenance of a sound national currency. This has been our interest since we joined in an effort years ago to procure the Federal Reserve System. It is our only interest today. As previously stated, our viewpoint, if maintained, may temporarily bring added cost to some of our members, but our position we believe to be in the public interest.

We respectfully submit for your consideration these views as representing our best judgment based on 50 years of experience in the field of banking and credit.

Thank you.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CREDIT MEN.

EXCERPTS FROM LETTERS RECEIVED FROM SMALL PAR BANKS

We are a small country bank and our earnings are scarce and we could use additional income but we sincerely feel that it is fundamentally wrong in practice and principle to make any charge in paying checks drawn on your own bank by your own customer. We have yet to find anyone to offer or recommend any good reason for doing so. * * * Our hope is that within a very short time all banks in the United States will clear their checks at par—why shouldn't they? If they need the revenue, and we know all banks do, then that revenue should be derived from the maker of the check in the proper form based on the analysis of the account and not be absorbed in a mysterious manner somewhere along the line in transit. (Orville M. Streiff, vice president and cashier, Highland National Bank, Highland, Ill., February 21, 1944.)

I am quite disturbed by the fact that very little effort is being made to controvert the great quantity of testimony presented directly and by implication indicating that the practice of nonpar clearance is as highly respectable and altogether proper as the charging of a reasonable rate of interest or a reasonable fee for other services rendered. The simple truth of the matter is that there should be no controversy regarding absorption because there should be no exchange charges to absorb. * * * I have probably made it clear that I regard the practice of charging exchange as unfair, unethical, unjustified, and as far as the banking system as a whole is concerned, distinctly unprofitable. (J. H. Peters, president, First National Bank in Loveland, Loveland, Colo., February 4, 1944.)

I think that the depositing bankers and the depositary banker believe that in an adverse market one can get his money out quick enough, and the other can convert his securities quick enough. Well, some of us have lived long enough to know that in practice this does not happen. This bill would open the door to such banking. I believe that the members of the committee, which approved it, have not had such matters called to their attention. They should remember that such deposits are the cash resources of the banks who own them. It is a dangerous pyramiding of bank reserves. It was happening before the Reserve Board directive. If Congress now puts its approval on such banking, it seems to me it would be a funny direction for Congress to go. * * * All of the banks which are discounting their items in the form of this exchange are not cooperating with the underlying and declared banking system of the United States. They are all going through a revolving door on the other fellow's push. If Congress believes they are right, there will be a lot of other banks to join the nonpushers. (J. E. Mitchell, president, First National Bank, Carbondale, Ill., February 17, 1944.)

The condition that confronts us is a question of clearing our checks on the smaller banks, the charges for which has almost developed into a racket, and discriminates very greatly against the Federal Reserve member banks, who, of course, are compelled to par all items drawn on them at par through the Federal Reserve bank. (H. W. Woosley, cashier, National Bank of Commerce, Paragould, Ark., October 20, 1943.)

This matter of exchange charges is nothing but a gouge, a kind of racketeering against the depositors of banks, and against the commerce and industry of the Nation. * * * if the Congress proposes to continue the extension of this privilege to State banks, then it should be fair and extend to national banks the same pernicious privilege. It is time to discontinue discrimination against one class of banks, and in favor of another. (F. M. Reeves, vice president, the First National Bank, Cornelia, Ga., January 25, 1944.)

While this ruling of the Board of Governors is a step in the right direction, much more important is the indefensible practice of allowing nonmember banks to discount their checks when presented by mail. Nothing more or less than a fleecing operation. (J. R. McCravey, chairman of the board, Bank of Forest, Forest, Miss., October 26, 1943.)

Frankly, we do not feel that these are proper charges, if for no other reason, because there is in them an element of duplicity. In the last analysis, they should be classified as charges by a bank against its own customers for paying his checks. Whereas, the cleverness of them, and the real basis for them, consists of the fact that people do not understand, that they are concealed from the customer himself by indirection. (W. Wright Abbot, president, First National Bank, Louisville, Ga., February 1, 1944.)

The whole mess is due to the fact that a certain element insists that the law be used to force a great number of banks to do an unsound thing for the hidden reason that a small group of banks have not the business courage to do a sound thing of their own accord. In other words they want the city bank to collect or pay the exchange for the fact that the drawee bank and the payee's bank haven't the courage to collect the exchange from either of the two parties who are responsible for the existence of the exchange. (C. L. Hufsmith, the First National Bank, Palestine, Tex., February 5, 1944.)

If the banks get the Federal Reserve Board to permit the absorption of out-of-pocket expenses, in a short time they will regret their action. Another era of buying accounts will begin. And the next step will be the direct payment of interest on demand deposits and unsound banking will follow in its wake. (William F. Hofmann, vice president and cashier, the First National Bank of La Grange, La Grange, Tex., October 19, 1943.)

There is no question whatsoever but that the absorption of exchange by member banks has been made the consideration for soliciting bank accounts. We have had our account solicited on that basis and very frequently such solicitation comes from banks which would not be normal channels for items and where such routings would only mean a longer collection period. The practice of absorbing exchange leads to distortion in routings of items and in geographical location of balances. (F. C. Heneman, president, First National Bank of Mason City, Mason City, Iowa, January 29, 1944.)

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, I am one of the 16 who voted 16 to 5 in favor of Congressman PAUL BROWN'S bill. I earnestly and enthusiastically support this measure for the following reasons:

First. I propose to help small business in every way possible.

Second. I resist any further centralization in Washington.

Third. I oppose so much Federal interference in business. This business policy has a decided tendency to destroy initiative and enterprise.

Fourth. I am for the people in the areas affected. If the case was reversed I would expect my colleagues to be guided by the views of my constituents.

Fifth. Congress is constantly complaining that many bureaus downtown are administering law contrary to what we intend. The latter practice is causing untold friction. For example, consider price control. Almost everyone is for price control. On the other hand almost everyone complains bitterly of the way it has been administered. While the situation is much better recently, so far as price control is concerned, we all know our previous experiences.

As a matter of fact, the Departments of Government most affected by this legislation have divergent opinions. The Federal Reserve System is against and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is for the bill. Mr. Crowley came before our committee and spoke most enthusiastically in advocating its passage. This proposition was brought to a head after years of discussion between the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by the action of one bank out of a total of almost 2,500. This case appeared in the Federal Reserve System Bulletin of September 1943, at page 817. You may find an account of the entire proposition on pages 18 and 19 of the committee hearings of December 15, 1943.

I want to refer to page 11 of the minority report, in connection with the single bank which started the whole business. Quoting "One outlying suburban bank, by using the device, spread its business into several States, and ran its deposits from $800,000 to $8,000,000 in less than a year. Eighty-two percent of this $8,000,000 was represented by correspondent bank accounts." Mind you this is 1 bank out of almost 2,500.

Now, I want to read further from the minority report:

> Another bank has become the largest bank in any city with a population of 110,000 or less; but of its total deposits $90,000,000 are deposits of banks as against $38,000,000 of other individual deposits.

The minority report of the committee then goes on and refers to a bank in Palm Beach and a bank in New Orleans, stating that there is something strange, because the business of these banks has increased. As a matter of fact, how is it possible for any bank in a community doing war work not to have its business increased since we, ourselves, have increased the indebtedness of the United States many, many fold? I also refer to the last bank referred to in the report, which reads as follows:

> Finally, a bank in National Stock Yards, Ill. (an incorporated town of 244 across the river from St. Louis, Mo.) has built its bank balances up to $473,750,000.

Anybody who knows anything about that territory knows East Chicago and all that territory adjacent to St. Louis is one of the busiest war sections in the United States and I do not see anything strange in the fact that this bank's business has increased.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROLPH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have received information within the last 2 or 3 days that this bank that the gentleman from California has mentioned, the National Stock Yards Bank in Illinois, which is directly across the river from St. Louis, is taking accounts out of St. Louis.

Mr. ROLPH. The bankers in National Stock Yards, Ill., evidently are pretty good businessmen to get the accounts away from St. Louis. St. Louis is a very live town and if the businessmen of this bank can get their accounts away from them, I give them credit for it.

Mr. COCHRAN. What practices do they use that the St. Louis banks do not use which enables them to take business away from St. Louis banks?

Mr. ROLPH. For goodness sake, why do not the St. Louis banks find out? Why do they have to come to Congress to find out how to do business in that territory?

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me ask the gentleman from California one question about his section. How does the great chain of banks out in his section view this bill?

Mr. ROLPH. The great chain of banks and the many banks in my district have not said a word about this bill one way or the other. They want to help small business. As a matter of fact, those chain banks you refer to have done everything in the world to help small business in my section. That is the reason I am for this bill. I want to help small business. The banks of my State are doing everything possible to help small business and I am proud of the splendid results they are achieving.

Mr. COCHRAN. So are we in St. Louis. We are for small business. Seventy-three million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars in bank balances surely is not small business.

Mr. ROLPH. Now, I want to read another item from the minority report:

> If Congress, in the Banking Act of 1933, had not provided that "no member bank shall, directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand," no question would have arisen.

As a matter of fact in the minority report, I find that certain of the Members who signed this report were in the House at the time mentioned. I ask the question, Did any of those gentlemen at that time have any idea that absorption of exchange or collection charges was payment or a form of payment as interest on credit balances? I also ask this question, If so, why was not the provision written clearly into law?

Banks and bankers have always been held up as citizens of sterling character. My own father was with a San Francisco institution for 50 years. Out our way we have the utmost confidence in our banks and bankers. I am at a loss to understand how the minority report can contain these words, and I quote from page 9:

> We add also that the devices and tricks which the minds of men had devised were manifold and none of them were enumerated in the statute.

The above statement, in my opinion, is most unfortunate. It reflects on a group of business people who, in my opinion, are doing an outstanding job. The bankers of this country are all-out for the war effort. Due to the low interest rates and the easy-money market, plus curtailment of installment buying, the banks have been hard hit to make any money. The curtailment in installment buying was sponsored by the Federal Reserve System as a measure of price stabilization.

Banks are under enormous expenses in handling sales of bonds and handling ration coupons. They are to be commended.

The title of this bill reads as follows:

> To amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits.

The only group that so defines "interest" is the Federal Reserve System. By referring to page 18 of the committee hearings of December 15, 1943, we find these words:

> The Board's regulation Q defines interest as "any payment to or for the account of any depositor, or compensation for the use of funds constituting a deposit."

This definition is intended merely as a declaration of the general rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ROLPH. No dictionary carries such a definition. No witness offered any such definition. Books issued by the Federal Reserve themselves, and I have them right here, not only have no definition but make absolutely no mention of exchange at all.

If the Congress means what it says when we express our desire to help small business, we will pass this bill which helps small banks and small communities. This is our opportunity to effectively go on record in favor of small business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, during the discussion on the rule my esteemed colleague on the Committee of Banking and Currency asked me to yield and I was unable to do so during the time. I have asked for these 2 minutes in order to extend the courtesy I was unable to extend at that time.

Mr. ROLPH. I have two questions I would like to propound to my distinguished colleague with whom I had the honor of sitting on the Committee on Banking and Currency. The gentleman stated that his father had been in the banking business for many years in the city of Chicago.

Mr. DEWEY. No; in Ohio.

Mr. ROLPH. At any time did your father say that the absorption of exchange was in any way connected with the payment of interest on credit balances?

Mr. DEWEY. My father, unfortunately, died before this controversy came up, but if I recall correctly, the Banking Act of 1933 stopped the paying of interest on demand deposits because it was not considered good banking, and it caused bidding for deposits. I consider myself that the absorbing of exchange on the clearing of checks is a means of circumventing that law.

Mr. ROLPH. The other question is this: The gentleman has the honor to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means and he knows how many hours they devote to hearings and how many witnesses are called. Is not the gentleman impressed with the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency voted this measure out by a vote of 16 to 5?

Mr. DEWEY. Naturally I have the highest esteem for all members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I know that they work hard and consider every phase of legislation. I still reserve to myself the right to have my own opinion, after a period of about 30 years in the banking business in a practical way. I still maintain that the bidding for deposits is not good banking. That is the reason I am opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON].

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I am supporting H. R. 3956 for the reason that I think it is necessary to make clear the intent of Congress under the Banking Act of 1933, with respect to the absorption of exchange or service charge by member banks of the Federal Reserve System.

The recent ruling made in August 1943, in my judgment, makes this legislation necessary in order to clarify and carry out the intent of the original act of 1933.

In a ruling of the Federal Reserve Board, August 1943, the Board rules that the absorption of exchange or collection charges by member banks is a device for the payment of interest, which in my judgment is contrary to the intent of the law, as at the time the 1933 Banking Act was under consideration no one ever suggested so far as I know that a collection charge or absorption of exchange would be the payment of interest.

Interest in the legal and accepted term of the word so far as banking is concerned, or as relates to money matters, is a price or premium per annum that is paid by a borrower for the use of borrowed money and charge for services rendered by a bank has no relation whatever to interest charged for the use of money.

Now, what relation does a service charge or the absorption of exchange have to the payment for the use of borrowed money? It takes the wildest stretch of the imagination to bring about any connection between paying for the use of money and charges for services rendered.

This ruling by the Federal Reserve Board is clearly reading into the law something that never was intended. If it had been intended or proposed I am sure the law could never have been passed. No one ever dreamed such a thing. The suggestion was never made, and it was not until 1937 after the law had been in force for 4 long years that the Federal Reserve Board ever discovered that it had not been able up to that time correctly to interpret the law.

I heard no suggestion, no intimation, that the absorption of collection and exchange charges could by any stretch of the imagination be considered the payment of interest. I say if there had been anything of that kind in mind it would have been definitely expressed, and if it had been expressed it certainly would not have been adopted. It was not, as I say, until 1937 that the Federal Reserve Board promulgated such order. When they did, the late lamented Henry Steagall, then chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Senator WAGNER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency at that time, and about 50 of us took the matter up with the Federal Reserve Board and asked them why they were placing such a construction on this act which was never intended, or never dreamed of. I believe the President himself intervened. The Federal Reserve Board backed away and we heard nothing more about the matter until 1943, when Congress was not in session, when we were all away home in recess trying to rest from our arduous labors. Then they began to agitate the matter, a matter that for 11 long years they have allowed to sleep or during which time they had not known what the real intent of the law was or if they had known were derelict in the discharge of their duties.

The banks of the country as a whole are functioning smoothly, safely, and satisfactorily, and under the management of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is definitely opposed to the rule of the Federal Reserve Board and favors the enactment of the bill now under consideration.

The people of the country have absolute confidence in the banks and their security. Bank failures are almost a thing of the past, or at least too negligible to create the slightest alarm. And now, when the banks are so busily engaged in war work and rendering so much necessary service in the sale of bonds and other work incident to the war, I think it is most unfortunate that this monkey wrench, the order of the Federal Reserve Board, in my opinion without legal sanction, should have been thrown into the banking machinery of the Government.

The small banks throughout the country, as everyone knows, serve a useful and necessary purpose and if deprived of this source of income will be forced to close their doors.

It appears to be the policy of the Federal Reserve Board to choke out and destroy small banks and substitute therefor a system of branch banking by the large banks of the country.

My friends, this bill clarifies the situation and should be overwhelmingly passed, thereby saving the lives of the small banks of the country and teaching the Federal Reserve Board that it is not a policy-making body.

I cannot think of a worse thing that could be done to small towns, and the communities which do business in small towns, than to permit the rule of the Federal Reserve Board to stand.

The small banks are having a hard time anyway, although fewer of them are failing than large banks in proportion to number, and I understand the Federal Insurance Corporation has sustained greater losses by the failure of large banks than small banks.

My friends, let us not give a monopoly on banking business to the large banks of the country but preserve our present system, which gives the small banks an opportunity to survive and continue their usefulness to the communities they serve.

From whence cometh this demand anyway for this change in our banking policy? Certainly not from the people; not from those banks which are absorbing the exchange; not from any serious results that have resulted from the policy, but from some imaginary evil in the minds of the Federal Reserve Board.

Let us let well enough alone and teach the Federal Reserve Board to attend to its own business.

By its own ruling it admitted, if its contention is correct, which I am sure it is not, it has been permitting and tolerating a violation of the law for 11 years. So its own inconsistency, if nothing else, should be enough to justify the enactment of this legislation, which I think is not only important but most necessary to the financial economic well-being of communities served especially by the small banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I do not attempt to speak as an expert on this subject. I did attend several hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency when the matter was brought up. I intend to support this bill and I am animated by one consideration. For a great many years the law prohibiting the payment of interest on deposits has not been so construed as to prohibit the absorption of these charges. In the meantime small banks have built up their businesses and their practices in reliance upon this interpretation, and to

change it at this time with no great reason given therefor I am afraid would cause a dislocation and hardship in the case of these businesses which have been relying upon it. In the absence of any showing therefor or any reason for changing the interpretation I think it is better to continue the interpretation of the law which has been current for so long.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEAN. I yield.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to explain this matter over again rather carefully because I find from inquiries that a great many Members of the House do not yet quite understand what this is all about.

The Banking Act of 1933 provides that "no member bank shall directly or indirectly by any device whatsoever pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand."

Congress, in the Banking Act of 1935, authorized the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System "to determine what shall be deemed to be a payment of interest."

Today we have before us this bill which would say that what the Board has ruled is "a device for paying interest" is not "a device for paying interest."

Contrary to the general custom of most of the 14,000 banks in the United States, some 2,500 banks situated almost entirely in the South, and a few States in the Middle West, make a charge when checks on their banks are presented to them by mail from out-of-town sources. These are called nonpar banks. The justification for this charge is that they are rendering a service to the holder of the check for making available these funds. The charges are customarily one-eighth or one-tenth of 1 percent.

In the normal course of banking practice, these checks are not sent by the holder directly to the bank on which they are issued, but are deposited by him in his local bank and reach the bank on which they are issued through correspondent banks.

It is the custom in many cases for an intervening bank where the nonpar bank maintains a deposit to absorb these charges, so that the receiver of the check receives 100 cents on the dollar and the nonpar bank receives its fee which is really paid by its corresponding bank. If this were done by the bank for all customers, there would be no question of their right to do so. But the practice has grown up by which the correspondent bank will do so only for those customers who keep a sufficient balance with them to insure their making a good profit out of the account after they have absorbed these collection charges.

The Federal Reserve Board feels that in cases where the amount of absorption of charges is definitely related to the balance maintained in the bank, this absorption is without question "a device for paying interest," and have so ruled.

It has been asked why this matter is of moment today when it has lain fairly dormant since the passage of the Banking Act 10 years ago. The reason is this:

For a great many years short-term money has been very cheap and banks have not been especially interested in increasing their demand deposits. However, today the short-term money market has strengthened and banks are beginning to look around for these kinds of funds. Some have therefore entered into hot competition for them.

For instance a bank in Palm Beach, Fla., by offering to pay this kind of interest has increased its deposits from other banks from approximately $1,000,000 to $10,000,000 in 3 years. Another bank in New Orleans has increased its interbank deposits through the same promises by 625 percent. A bank in National Stock Yards, Ill., from thirty-two million to seventy-three million in the same period.

These are only a few examples of the competition which has arisen for these deposits by banks agreeing to absorb these collection charges if a large enough balance is maintained with them by the nonpar bank.

Now some competition is, of course, advisable; but banking funds should as far as possible be placed in cities where their checks naturally come for collection in the normal course of trade.

It is pretty obvious that Palm Beach, Fla., is not the normal place for large funds of the smaller Florida banks, nor is it normal for these deposits of small nonpar banks to all find their way to National Stock Yards, Ill., instead of nearby St. Louis, as mentioned by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Much has been said about the necessity of keeping small banks in business. With this I am heartily in accord. I believe in the dual banking system. I believe that small independent banks which are locally owned render a great service to the people and to local industry, for only they have the true interest of their community at heart. It has been said that many of these small banks cannot exist without these exchange charges. Perhaps this is so, but there is nothing in the present law, and nothing in the Board's interpretation thereof, which in any way would prevent these small banks from continuing to charge exchange.

Some may say that customers will not deal with these banks if exchange is charged. This is not so for in most of these small communities the nonpar bank is the only bank and the public must deal there. In fact, according to Mr. Crowley, 2,200 of the 2,415 insured nonpar banks operate in centers where there are no competing par banks.

In opposing this bill I do not in any way wish to interfere with the practice of the small banks in shaving checks if they wish to do so. But I think it would be a great mistake for us to encourage a competitive scramble for deposits of the smaller banks through legalizing this indirect method of paying interest.

We still should remember 1932. Those banks which were competing for deposits through high interest rates and other devices were the first to fail. The stronger banks do not need to use these methods. Should we through this legislation encourage our small institutions to keep the funds of their customers in the weaker and more speculative banks?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman stated that some of these correspondent banks that had absorbed exchanges had considerably increased the amount of their deposits. The record shows that they have increased in practically the same proportion that the other banks have in the same community. The record shows that in Mississippi. The evidence also shows that in 11 years of operation under the law prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits, only 7 banks out of 14,000 have been criticized for soliciting people to make deposits on a promise to absorb the exchange. That is since 1933, when the law was passed. Only 7 banks out of 14,000 have received the Federal Reserve Board's criticism. I ask the gentleman if that is not a good record?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG].

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Chairman, in discussing H. R. 3956, "A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act as amended to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits," I will make no effort to touch upon its economic consequences to the banking system, but will stress the need for this clarifying amendment.

According to the Federal Reserve Board, the question as to whether absorption of exchange was a payment of interest first came before them on June 22, 1933, just 6 days after the passage of the Banking Act of 1933. Altogether, between the passage of the Banking Acts of 1933 and 1935, the Federal Reserve Board received at least 27 formal inquiries on this question—House hearings, pages 340–341—yet in the hearings on 1934 banking legislation, and on the Banking Act of 1935, not one word was said to Congress about this problem. On the contrary, Governor Eccles, in testifying before the House committee, stated with regard to part III of the act, that—

> Title III of the bill contains a number of sections proposed by the Comptroller of the Currency and by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Sections in which the Federal Reserve Board is interested are in the nature of technical improvements of a noncontroversial nature of the same general character as those contained in the so-called omnibus banking bill which was reported favorably by the Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses of Congress in June 1934, but failed of enactment in the closing

days of the Seventy-third Congress. (Hearings before House committee, p. 185.)

Provisions in title III, as well as in title II, are still being studied and improvements and modifications in technique and phraseology are being developed. I shall, therefore, appreciate an opportunity to submit to the committee for its consideration a number of amendments to the bill before final action is taken. It would also be helpful if the committee would permit the Board's counsel to cooperate with the committee's counsel in the final perfecting on the phraseology of the bill. (Hearings before House committee, p. 186.)

It was part III of the Banking Act of 1935 which contained the amendment under which the Federal Reserve Board has insisted that it was compelled to rule that absorption of exchange is an illegal payment of interest.

Late in 1935 the Federal Reserve Board submitted their proposed revised regulation Q to the F. D. I. C. for comment, together with the suggestion that the two agencies should issue identical regulations. The Federal Reserve draft defined absorption of exchange as interest. The F. D. I. C. refused to adopt their definition and after some conferences the two agencies issued their respective regulations, effective about January 1, 1936. The protests against the Federal Reserve Board's definition of interest, coupled with the refusal of the F. D. I. C. to adopt a similar definition, caused the Federal Reserve Board to defer the effective date of their definition. The Federal Reserve continued to press F. D. I. C. to change its definition of interest. Under date of January 20, 1936, F. D. I. C. sent a letter to the Reserve Board refusing to adopt their definition and setting forth its position. Examination of this letter would reveal that at that time the F. D. I. C. did not question the legal authority of the Federal Reserve Board to define "interest" in the manner in which they chose. In fact, they gave little consideration to that phase of the matter, being concerned chiefly with its efforts to induce F. D. I. C. to adopt a similar definition, which the F. D. I. C. felt was in excess of their own legal authority. After the controversy broke out anew, the F. D. I. C. reexamined the whole matter and reached the conclusion that the Federal Reserve Board's position was wholly lacking in legal merit. I will discuss this in the closing paragraph of my statement.

Finally, in 1937, as a result of protests of a large number of bankers and the intervention of Members of Congress, the Federal Reserve Board postponed adoption of their definition indefinitely. The Federal Reserve Board then proposed that the F. D. I. C. and the Board should jointly revise their regulations. F. D. I. C. was satisfied with its own regulation and saw no need for revising it. The importunities of the Federal Reserve, however, prevailed upon F. D. I. C. to go along with them on what was considered to be minor changes. I am informed that the F D. I. C. did this solely with a view to enable the Federal Reserve Board to "save face" after it was forced to retreat from its original position on exchange absorption.

Common legislative purpose may be found in the laws prohibiting the payment of interest on demand deposits administered by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System applicable to member banks of the Federal Reserve System—section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act as amended by section 11–B of the Banking Act of 1933 and section 324–A of the Banking Act of 1935—and the laws applicable to nonmember insured banks administered by the F. D. I. C.—section 12–B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, subsection V, paragraph 8, section 101, of the Banking Act of 1935. Although there are some differences in the two laws, it seems evident that Congress used the word "interest" in the same sense in each provision. The absence of legislative standards circumscribing the power of the Federal Reserve Board to determine what shall be deemed to be a payment of interest makes the delegation of legislative power to it, insofar as any broadening of the common legal meaning of the term is concerned, of doubtful validity.

Under decisions of the Supreme Court, such as *Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293 U. S. 388), January 7, 1935, the Court said that executive regulations "become, indeed, binding rules of conduct, but they are valid only as subordinate rules and when found to be within the framework of the policy which the legislation has sufficiently defined"—page 428. Therefore, the law under which the Reserve Board operates is necessarily placed on a parity with that governing the F. D. I. C., which contains no such delegation. Regardless of the validity of the delegation, the Federal Reserve Board has not currently exercised its power to define "interest" as including the practice of the absorbing of exchange. It has issued a ruling in a specific case and has published general discussions of the subject, which constitute administrative "case law" on the issue of absorption of exchange applicable to member banks. Although these rulings are applicable only to member banks, the adverse impact thereof operates directly and almost exclusively upon nonmember institutions, since member banks act principally as clearing or collecting agents, or city correspondents, for the nonmember banks—2,529 in number—which charge exchange on out-of-town remittances.

I think it cannot reasonably be said that Congress, in passing this legislation, could have had any intention of prohibiting the long-established banking practice without some mention having been made of the problem in the debates, in the reports on the bills, or in the testimony upon which the congressional committees acted. The extensive hearings recently concluded before our committee have demonstrated the importance of absorption to many country bankers and the intensity of their opposition to any restrictions of the practice which was well known and which was separate and distinct from the payment of interest.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I want to open my remarks by stating, in contradiction to the statement to the effect that there is only $8,000,000 involved in this proposition, that there are involved in this argument an estimated 50,000,000 individual bank depositors in this country, over 14,000 banks, and the entire Federal Reserve System, upon which we depend to finance this war and the international commitments which we have made. Now permit me to refer to these charts here. Of these 14,000 banks, about 11,500 are par clearance banks; that is, they do not snip or clip the checks which are drawn on them by their customers. In these 11,500 banks we have about $94,000,000,000 in deposits and about 48,000,000 depositors, as against about 2,500 banks which are nonpar clearance banks, with about two and one-half million depositors and $2,200,000,000 of deposits. The green line shows the par clearance banks. The red line shows the nonpar clearance banks.

Where you have a blank State such as Colorado, Iowa, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and all of the New England States, those are par clearance areas, where the banks clear their checks at par.

It is estimated about 90 percent of the business of this country is done by checks. Why we have a doctrine still left, that those checks should be snipped, that somebody should pay a burden, in this day of quick transportation and communication, is beyond my imagination. I just simply cannot understand why anybody would stand on this floor and advocate that we use the same banking methods now that we used 50 or 100 years ago. That is why we have these Government agencies to a great extent, because too many of the banking fraternity have not revised their minds and their policies incident to proper banking so that they provide for the people the banking service to which they are entitled, and by that I mean the farmers, small businessmen, and so forth.

I thank God that some of the bankers are getting their minds open, as illustrated by the statement of Mr. Wiggins, the head of the American Bankers Association, only a few days ago, in which he pointed out some of the things to which I am now referring.

If the little banks in Colorado—and I have lived in that State—and in Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Idaho, Michigan, Iowa, Ohio, and these areas up here, can get along without this kind of a snipping process, and if the little banks in these areas can compete with those who do the snipping, you tell me why the banks that do the snipping have to have that process to get along today.

I can show you in this area down here—and I have the statements in my pocket—that some of these banks which are represented on this floor here today netted only 41.5 percent this last year, and are paying from 12 to 15 percent cash dividends, in addition to expanding their reserves. They cannot make me believe they must have this snipping process to carry in their earnings, because the banks who compete with them and who are on a par clearance basis, who show up in this line, are getting

along pretty well. You study these two lines here if you want to see the status of your State with reference to par clearance and nonpar clearance.

As has been pointed out here three or four times, the Congress in 1933 and 1935, looking forward to the program that was going to be put forth in this country, laid down the law that banks shall not pay interest on demand deposits.

As has been pointed out numerous times, the Congress authorized the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue the rules and regulations incident to that substantive law. And we sit here today and criticize a Government agency for administering a law which the Congress laid down. Why do we spend our time criticizing agencies for administering a law? If we do not like that law, why do we not repeal it? But with your Treasury out here creating demand deposits at the rate of three or four billion dollars a month, you know as well as I do that you are not going to come right out and squarely face the issue and create the payment of interest on demand deposits. You know that would break every bank in this country. It would cause the 50,000,000 depositors in these banks to lose their $100,000,000,000 of deposits, or a substantial amount thereof, through another bank debacle such as 1929–33 and we know one of those is enough for a single generation to go through. You would have another bank debacle such as that which brought in the New Deal. I say to you on this side that you are not fooling with chicken feed here today, you are fooling with a banking system upon which you are betting the lives of your sons and daughters and sweethearts and husbands and uncles and aunts and nieces and nephews.

The banks of this country are the fiscal agents of the United States Government. Every time we fail to pass a tax law that raises revenue, or fail to go out there and buy these bonds as individuals, we throw the burden over on the banks of this country, and they have to carry the balance that we fail to put up. You had better think about that, incident to this bill.

This bill has been brought in here without due discussion or hearing, and only this very day the author of this bill suggested to me that we ought to have some additional hearings on the matter of exchange. I ask the gentleman, is that correct or not?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman to answer the question. Did the gentleman make that statement? Did the gentleman suggest that we hold additional hearings on the matter of exchange?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman said on par clearance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I say on exchange.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. On exchange we have already had all the hearings we need.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Did the gentleman not say to me this morning that he thought we should have additional hearings on the matter of exchange?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No, on par clearance. The gentleman from Michigan is mistaken. The gentleman wanted to put an amendment in here about par clearance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, does not par clearance involve the question of exchange?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Par clearance means that the banks do not charge any exchange on checks issued by their customers on that bank. You have seen the line-up of the banks; you have seen the territorial distribution, as shown by this map. Here is the line-up of the nonmember banks. This goes into a lot of your little banks, your nonmember banks, and the par and the nonpar banks. You have nonpar banks, 2,529, insured and noninsured. And you have par banks, 4,783—that is, nonmember banks, par and nonpar—and you argue now that this bill is against the little banks of this country. What about those little banks? And let me say to you that some of the very large chain banks are in this nonpar group. I tried to get 4 hours for the consideration of this bill, so that we could develop this case, because the Government is interested in these 50,000,000 depositors, but the great Rules Committee saw fit to give only 2 hours, so we are not going to be able to develop the case at all. Let me show you the mechanics of this thing. My friend sitting here draws a check on a nonpar bank. He sends it to the payee over in some city, and the payee deposits that in his bank. I draw a check on a par bank and send it to the same payee, and he deposits it in the same bank, and that bank has to dispose of those checks. The nonpar bank has to take this check in these same communities back to the bank on which it is drawn, and the par-clearance goes over to the Federal Reserve, and goes to a par bank. There is no chiseling, no snipping, anywhere at all.

This bill will permit this bank to do some absorbing, some paying of interest contrary to the law, by an indirect method, by a subterfuge, in the form of absorption of exchange. If this bill is passed you are asking the Federal Reserve System, if you please, since this is an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act, to do something for a nonmember bank that it cannot do for its member banks. Just imagine a ridiculous situation like that, if you will, and consider what that means. This bill moves in the direction of destroying the whole Federal Reserve Banking System. I do not think the Federal Reserve System is perfect, but I think it can be improved. But while we are carrying the burden of financing this war I am not going to be a party to destroying it. I ask you to read the testimony from the bankers, both members and nonmembers, on this issue.

You are creating a professional absorbing correspondent bank. That is big business. I am sorry my friend from Missouri is not here. I would like to help him out in his situation. I could tell him why the big St. Louis banks are losing their customers to the little fellows across the river there. That is very easy. It is because there is a professional exchange absorbing bank which, in my honest opinion, is violating the law that the Congress passed in 1933 and again in 1935.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire if the gentleman makes that statement as a statement of fact?

Mr. CRAWFORD. So this bank then proceeds to absorb, and by absorbing it gives certain benefits in the form of interest, as it has been defined under these rulings, to the big customers in St. Louis, which the banks in St. Louis do not feel they can do and keep within the law. So naturally the customer wants the benefit of that and he sends his bank deposit to the bank, the name of which has already been introduced in the RECORD. So here is one of the professionals. Now then, if this fellow wants to do the absorbing and get into the involvements of the law, he can absorb and shoot the check directly to the nonpar bank and save this.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield for a question with relation to the point just discussed.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would like to know whether or not if this bill passes, the bill itself will relieve the small banks who are nonmember banks from having to pay their exchange charges while members of the Federal Reserve System will have to pay them?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Federal Reserve System, or rather, the members of the Federal Reserve System, are par clearance banks. They do not have to pay any exchange on this. Let me answer in this way.

Mr. HINSHAW. What is the difference between the two set-ups? That is what I would like to know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me answer in this way. Here is something you do not know about. I sat on a little bank board so I happen to know about this. We analyze your accounts. Some of these accounts have only $150 on deposit. We analyze business accounts that may have $10,000 average daily deposits. That is what we call an account analysis. We know whether or not we are making money on an account. So we come along here and credit you for your daily balance and we know what we can earn on that money which you keep in the bank. We charge you certain charges for servicing your account and if at the end of the month the revenue we earn is less than expenses, we send you a little debit memorandum. Did you ever get a debit memorandum from a bank? Did your wife ever get one on her account? My wife got one the other day and told me about it. She said, "I have to have more money to keep my account up; either that or pay a service charge."

Now then, coming down to personal accounts. Here is a case where you, the depositor, are charged for the service on your account. Now, give me a good reason why, after going through mechanics of this kind, you issue a check that is sent down here and somebody else has to pay a double snip on that proposition? You just cannot justify that.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield for a question only.

Mr. BARRY. Is it not true that this custom of absorbing exchange from nonpar banks has existed along with the Federal Reserve System since the Federal Reserve Act was put into law?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from New York is a grand lawyer. I am not. He can read the law and understand it. I suggest he read the law which was passed by this Congress in 1935.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois for a question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Some of our bankers called us 2 days ago who were at first in favor of this bill and asked to be recorded against it in Illinois, because, they said, along the point just mentioned, that since this bill mentions exchange or collection charges, this would actually, or might be, construed to give the Federal Reserve bank more power and include the situation you mention.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If this Congress is afraid of the Federal Reserve System, why does it not kill it? If my people are going to keep their money deposited in banks and in savings accounts, if they are going to keep their blood money in banks, I am going to insist that the Federal Government have some supervising authority over them.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. These people are against that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not going to get lost in the bulrushes on the question of Government interference. There are some things that the Government is entitled to say something about, and that is bank deposits.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was just trying to point out that is their reason for being against it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me read a letter handed to me by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP] which I think supports this. This is from one of the small banks out there in your State, if I may say to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

The letter reads in part as follows:

This bill is so illogical to every purpose and fundamental of the Federal Reserve System that I can only believe that the committee's action is the result of pressure of nonmember banks, void of any hearing of member banks. There is perhaps also the animosity of Congressmen against some act of Federal agencies in general. If, for one, am very much in sympathy with such animosity. However, these committeemen have picked the wrong thing by which to express their indignation.

We have a carry-over from what happened here the other day. I know that. I do not need a psychiatrist to tell me that.

We can assume we will operate under it. This bill starts to undermine the system and to tear down about the only thing which, in practical deposit banking operations, offsets opportunity for profit which the individual banks might have if the system did not exist.

The system gives you a service. Do away with the system and you can have cutthroat competition and the destruction and failure of banks which we had in prior years.

The letter reads further as follows:

As a practical banking proposition it opens the field to a few bank managers (extreme optimists or egotists)—

Get that—

who imagine they can take a large volume of very volatile bank deposits, pay for the use of them by the absorption of exchange, and make money in the investment of these deposits. Their acts create a very wide spread of capital to deposit liability.

There is your danger, right over here in this situation that we mentioned a while ago, down here on the river. I am not smart enough to go out and absorb exchange and pull unnatural deposits into my bank and manage my portfolio so as to meet your demand call when you come along nor are any other bankers smart enough for that. We come along here and license and sanctify and bless a rotten practice that this country knows precipitated the bank debacle of 1933. What in the world is the matter with us?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, down in the South one of the philosophers and logicians we worship most is Uncle Remus. On one occasion Uncle Remus had the hounds chasing a rabbit. He was right after him and they were in a close race. The little boy was listening, his little soul all intent on the story. Then Uncle Remus said, "And then, son, br'er rabbit clumb a tree."

"Oh," the little boy said, "Uncle Remus, don't you know br'er rabbit cannot climb a tree?"

"Oh, son," he said, "you do not understand. Br'er rabbit was just ' 'bleeged' to climb a tree."

Tnis interpretation of Mr. Eccles and the Federal Reserve Board had to be made. They were in just about the same fix as Uncle Remus and the little boy found the rabbit in. He was " 'bleeged" to make it. It had never been made before. No court in all the world ever declared that a bank charge on account of another bank doing business with it and keeping some deposits with it, cleared its checks and absorbed the exchange for it, constituted interest. Mr. Eccles and his predecessors interpreted it differently. For years, as has been pointed out to you, it has been interpreted to the contrary, not in direct formulated expression but by his actions, which speak "louder than words," as we are told. He interpreted it as we interpret it, and then when he got where he had to do this thing he just wanted to do it anyhow. He knew very well he would not get Congress to do it, so he hunted up a statute which he interpreted to the contrary, according to the well-nigh immemorial custom of the bankers of this country. He made an interpretation in that way because it was the only way on earth that he could get the power that he assumed.

Interest? Who said so? Nobody but him, and for 10 years he had said what he now says was not so. Where is your authority? What harm does it do? The idea of anybody who wants to be fair and who is not driven by some compulsion to accomplish some objective that he cannot accomplish directly, interpreting this kind of transaction to be interest. It was not interest when the law was enacted. It is not now, and Eccles cannot make it interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not have any small banks in the district I represent. I represent a district in a large city. I have heard no great protest and have received no great amount of communications protesting the passage of this legislation.

I am going to address my remarks to those who represent districts similar to my own. I believe this bill has great merit. I believe it will mean something for the banks in the rural communities of America to enable them to carry on their functions for the good of their communities. I do not think it violates the spirit or letter of any previous legislation passed by Congress relating to the Federal Reserve System. We all know that in connection with the exchange facilities most of the small banks maintain large reserves in the banks in adjacent large communities. Heretofore those banks in the large communities have absorbed these exchange-service charges. It has not been any great burden to them, because the reserves, which the small banks have maintained in the larger banks, have always been a great deal larger than the amount of money needed for the transaction of their particular business. The big banks have actually made money on those accounts.

When the Congress passed the Federal Reserve Acts of 1933 and 1935 and placed in them a prohibition against interest on demand deposits, it did not intend that it would apply to the absorption of service charges by banks in the larger communities. Since 1933 up until last fall, all of the big banks absorbed such charges. So if the Federal Reserve System was so concerned about the administration of the laws as passed by Congress, why did they wait all these years to issue this regulation against the absorption of exchange charges and place a different interpretation on the law today than was done for so many years?

Actually those exchange charges amount to about one-tenth of 1 percent of the principal amount of the check or transaction involved. There is nothing in the pending legislation which makes it mandatory upon any bank to absorb those charges if it does not wish to do so.

I do not see anything wrong in the legislation. I intend to support it, because I believe it will simply clarify a situation regarding a practice of many years, which Congress never intended to prohibit in the first place.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I really asked for 3 minutes because I do not conceive myself to be a financier or an expert on banking. I wish to tell the members of the Committee, however, how this bill came before us and why it came before us.

In August or September of last year a definition of regulation Q was proposed by the Federal Reserve Board. This came back to the smaller banks of the United States. Perhaps there were more of those in the Southern States and in the Middle Western States than in other territories, but that is not important, because we are Members of the House of Representatives of the United States.

I like very much the observation made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], who just preceded me, when he told you that he is interested in this subject notwithstanding the fact that he does not suppose there are any small banks in his district, particularly. But when notice was given that this interpretation was to be given "You are notified that the absorption of exchange or collection charges is hereafter prohibited under the act of 1933, as amended by the act of 1935, and you cannot any longer absorb those exchange or collection charges or any part of it except by violation of the act prohibiting the payment of interest on deposits payable upon demand," this matter came forcibly to their attention.

We go back in the history of the matter and we become fearful that the banks are about to inaugurate that which we say contributed largely to the failure of banks in previous years. I think that is a fear that is not well founded or justified by the facts as far as it relates itself to the absorption of exchange and collection charges. What was being done then, and what perhaps did contribute to the break-down of the banks, was the payment of interest, free and aboveboard, 1 percent, 2 percent, 3 percent, and 4 percent on deposits payable on demand. That is not akin, when you come to measure actual relationship, to the practice of absorbing exchange collection charges, that has obtained for 50 years and nobody has said anything about it, and nobody had conjured up the idea that this was another way of paying interest on deposits payable upon demand.

It is true, and I come down to my own community, that my bankers, who do not belong to a chain, who are not branch bankers but who maintain banks of various sizes—none of them particularly large—none of them with great capital, and none of them with a powerful amount of deposits on hand—are operating in those communities for one thing, and I suggest one of the main purposes and objectives is to serve the people of that community. There was a time when the lending of money was possible and profitable even at a legal rate of interest. But now we have come to the point where in my town, loans in both of the banks there have dropped more than 50 percent. They have kept on dropping, until finally they do not have many loans. There is no interest payment coming in. They have been having this exchange absorbed for a long time, and it is a source of revenue that they cannot well give up. Of all times to press this regulation this seems to me the most inopportune.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am speaking in behalf of the Brown bill, because I believe it seeks to do something that all Members of this Congress actually want to do. If there is one thing in this Nation that I am sure business wants, it is that business wants to be left alone.

Business, and in this case I mean 2,500 small banks, has found a way through its own initiative to service their communities without calling on the mighty United States Government for help, financial assistance, or special favors. They have worked out, under a system of free competition, a way of staying alive. If you will look at the areas where most of these small banks are located, you are forced to admit they are in the economic depression areas. Now, because they are able to get along, because they are able to meet expenses and stay alive and service the accounts in their districts, the farmers and the small business people that have to rely on them for their necessary banking service, we now find the mighty Federal Reserve System—their competitor, if you please—coming in with regulation Q to discontinue a practice that they have used for more than a generation.

I do not think that Congress wants to put the stamp of approval on such a practice. I especially do not believe that Congress wants to put the stamp of approval on such a practice that is brought about solely by Government regulation rather than by legislation.

We hear much in the well of this House about agencies and bureaus extending and going beyond the scope of their authority granted them by Congress. Well, the action in passing regulation Q by the Federal Reserve Board far exceeds any item that has been called to my attention in this House in many, many months. The Federal Reserve Board arrives at it in a way that has been discussed here, through some superline of reasoning.

They interpret that the absorption of exchange amounts to interest. To get to that point you have to go a long way around. You have to stretch a great many legal points. In the first place, no bank that is having its exchange absorbed can know exactly how much, from month to month, it will profit from this absorption of exchange.

Therefore, the net income from the deposits in that correspondent bank is determined strictly by the number of items they have for collection. No city bank, therefore, can possibly use the absorption of these exchange charges as a method of bidding for deposits, because, after all, all that a small bank can profit from the absorption of its exchange charges is on the number of items that it clears through the correspondent bank. I cannot see, therefore, any line of legal reasoning, I cannot see any line of common sense that would indicate that this is not an attempt by the Federal Reserve Board to do by regulation and indirection that which the Federal Reserve System was afraid to attempt to do by direct legislation.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], I believe, stated the issue today inadvertently perhaps in his statement when he said that the Federal Reserve Board has the right to regulate all the banks of this country. Mr. Chairman, if we do not pass this bill to confine the power of the Federal Reserve Board they will regulate all the banks of this country, and by "all" I mean the State banking systems as well as their own. We have had a dual system of banks in this country that worked out pretty well, and now we come along to find a regulation which, if this Congress consents to by failure to pass this bill, will at long last place the Federal Reserve Board in control not only of the Federal Reserve System member banks but of the State banking system as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill seeks to amend the Federal Reserve Act of 1933. One paragraph of one section of that act made it unlawful for banks to pay interest on demand deposits directly or indirectly. That law has been on the statute books since 1933. It was amended in 1935 to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to define interest. Define interest how? Define it within the statutes.

This bill of mine amends paragraph 12 of section 19 in this way:

> This paragraph shall not be deemed to prohibit the absorption of exchange or collection charges by member banks.

That is all there is in the bill.

For 10 long years the Federal Reserve System has not put into operation their construction of this law. The banks have been going on all these 10 years absorbing exchange where they wanted to until recently. Last fall the Federal Reserve Board announced that they were going to put into operation on the first day of January 1944 an order prohibiting

the absorption of exchange and collection charges; that if after January 1 of this year they absorbed such charges they would be guilty of a crime. We are now forced to amend this act to carry out the original intention of Congress.

Let me call the roll on those who opposed this bill. First let me state again that the Federal Reserve Board has now construed the law to mean that it is a crime to absorb exchange charges. Who else says so? They called out the Federal Advisory Council. Who are they? They are bankers, one from each Federal Reserve district, selected by the directors of the Federal Reserve banks; they are a part of the Federal Reserve System. They opposed the bill. The record shows that the Federal Reserve Board is relying upon a man by the name of Spahr who wrote a book some years ago. They claim that Spahr said that to absorb exchange charges was to pay interest. Then five minority members wrote the minority report and inserted practically everything that the general attorney for the Federal Reserve Board had testified to and contended for and rested their case upon the claim that Spahr had said that absorption of exchange was interest. Here is what they say:

W. E. Spahr, in a book published in 1926, devotes many pages to a discussion of the absorption of exchange charges clearly indicating that the practice was just another name for paying interest.

I received a letter from Mr. Spahr the 11th of February 1944 stating to me that my interpretation of the law was correct. I replied to his letter, and received another in return in which he said:

I agree entirely with the last paragraph of your letter.

The last paragraph of my letter reads as follows:

My understanding of your letter is that you do not believe that the absorption of exchange is interest, even though the exchange may be charged for remittance to a distant point in settlement of clearance. This is the issue in these hearings, and the testimony has been overwhelming that inasmuch as absorption of exchange was a practice separate and distinct from payment of interest, Congress never intended to regulate absorption under the guise of interest regulations, even though a bank agreed to absorb exchange for a correspondent on its forwarding to a nonpar bank, provided the correspondent kept a balance sufficient to justify its doing so.

This is the issue in these hearings. I have these letters here and can show them to anyone who wants to see them. I am quoting from the main witness they rely upon to build their case; he repudiates the Federal Reserve Board's position, and says that the interpretation of the Federal Reserve Board is wrong—wrong when he wrote the book, and wrong today.

Furthermore, this afternoon the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] received a letter, 5 minutes ago, from Mr. Spahr, quite a lengthy letter, in which he says that the Federal Reserve Board is entirely wrong and got off on the wrong foot. I cannot understand why they still consider this practice to be prohibited under the law of 1933 as amended in 1935 as the payment of interest.

What more evidence do you want? Ninety percent of the lawyers of this land who understand this bill say that the absorption of exchange charges is not the payment of interest. I call upon the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], who sits on the left here, a man whom every Member of this House regards as one of the most able lawyers in Congress. He states that absorption of exchange is not the payment of interest on demand deposits.

Now, who appeared in support of this bill? In effect, every State in the Southland, the 13 Southern States, and five or six Western States appeared. Not only did they appear, but from twenty-five to thirty men from each State came to Washington to represent their associations in support of the bill. We did not have time to hear them all. Some of them left statements, but they were represented and I have right here in my files statements from bankers in the State of Georgia, a State having nearly 400 banks. At the meeting of their State association composed of big banks and little banks and members of the Federal Reserve System, too, a resolution was adopted supporting this bill. A pitifully small number, only 3, of bankers in the State of Georgia were against the Brown bill. I challenged Mr. Ransom, the clever member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, who started all this fight. Mr. Ransom came from Atlanta, Ga., and I come from Georgia. I am told that out of the 348 banks, both national and State, big and small, only 3 opposed the resolution endorsing the bill and they said that many of the banks in the State would go out of existence if the interpretation of the Federal Reserve Board was correct and its ruling was allowed to stand.

What else? Every Member of this House from Georgia is for the bill.

Let us go to Omaha. Omaha, Nebr., is the headquarters of a member of the Federal Reserve advisory council. Every Congressman from the State of Nebraska knows the need to help these little banks and everyone of them is for the Brown bill.

The importance of this measure cannot be stressed too greatly, since it preserves the independence of some 2,500 small locally owned banks in the Middle West and South which are now threatened with extinction because of a sudden reversal of position by an administrative agency. The Federal Reserve Board has recently ruled that a certain type of service charge which these banks make against other banks in connection with the transfer of funds can no longer be absorbed as an operating expense by member banks of the Federal Reserve System. To outlaw the practice of absorbing exchange, the Federal Reserve Board has suddenly decided to use a law passed more than 10 years ago, in spite of the fact that for 10 years the Board has concurred in an interpretation which permitted this age-old practice.

This ruling requires member banks of the Federal Reserve System to pass these expenses back to their customers. Thus, these expenses become compulsory service charges which the public must pay. Solely as the result of the Federal Reserve Board's ruling, these service charges must be paid by the depositing public, regardless of the profits which the Federal Reserve member banks derive from the balances which their depositors maintain.

To illustrate what I mean I refer you to page 483 of the hearings, where you will find an analysis of an account carried with a city correspondent bank, a bank in my district, the Georgia Railroad Bank of Augusta, the oldest and one of the best banks in the State of Georgia, and a member of the Federal Reserve System. This form of analysis is now almost universally kept by banks to show whether they are making or losing money on handling the deposits of their customers. In this case the customer or depositor is another banking institution which uses the Georgia Railroad Bank to handle the collection of checks issued by depositors of other banks in its area. In the box at the foot of page 483 you will see that the Georgia Railroad Bank credits its customer with the estimated earnings on the loanable balance in the customer's account. This earnings credit, 1 percent of the loanable balance, amounts to $376.45 for the month of December 1943. On the opposite side it charges $260 for the expenses of handling the account during that month, leaving an estimated net profit to the Georgia Railroad Bank on this particular account of $116.45. As the result of this computation the city correspondent bank does not wish to charge its country bank customer any service charge for handling the account during this month for the simple reason that it made a business profit out of the balance which the depositor carried more than sufficient to offset the expense. On examining this analysis slip you will observe that part of the expense is described as "cost of collecting nonpar checks, $231.24." This means that the Georgia Railroad Bank paid out service charges of this amount to other Georgia banks.

Now, the Federal Reserve ruling requires the Georgia Railroad Bank to charge its little country bank customer the $231.24, merely because the expense is for service charges of other banks by way of exchange. Prior to the change in the ruling, banks using the account-analysis form charged a customer only where they would otherwise sustain a loss in handling the accounts. Where the bank makes a profit it does not want to make a service charge.

The result of this ruling is that the Georgia Railroad Bank's profit on this account is increased from $116.45 to $347.69—more than doubled—and the little country bank with its customers take it on the chin for the difference. I am not worried about the Georgia Railroad Bank and it is not worried, but I am worried about the little country bank—and there are hundreds of them in my own State. Since the small banks cannot afford to stand this expense, they

will find it necessary to charge it back to their own customers. Thus the farmers and merchants of Georgia will be forced to bear an added expense which they should not have to bear because the Georgia Railroad Bank is ready and able to pay this expense and, in fact, wants to pay it, as it has been doing for its country-bank customers for a century or longer.

The Federal Reserve Board holds that unless its member banks compel their depositors to pay these service charges, they are violating the law which was passed in 1933 prohibiting banks from paying interest on demand deposits. Their theory is that a city bank should not pay these charges as part of its operating expenses, but should charge the cost to its depositors. They say it is all right for banks to stand the expense of all other costs connected with handling their depositors' business, but they cannot stand the expense of these little service charges. The Federal Reserve says that these service charges for exchange are out-of-pocket expenses and this is the reason they cannot be paid. Personally, I do not know of any expense which is not out of pocket. But certainly if exchange service charges are out-of-pocket expenses, so are the personal property taxes which are levied by some States, such as Michigan, Indiana, Kentucky, and California, against bank depositors on their bank accounts, and yet this same Board has ruled that banks can pay these taxes against their depositors and absorb the expense without violating the law. Now, I ask what the difference is between a dollar paid out to a little country bank for transferring money to a distant point to collect a check for a depositor and a dollar paid out in settlement of the depositor's intangible personal property tax. It is a dollar paid out in connection with a depositor's account in each case and the only difference is in who gets it—the country banker or the tax collector. If it is not interest for the bank to pay the depositor's own tax liability, it certainly cannot be interest to pay the bank's own operating expense merely because it happens to be identified with a depositor's account.

I ask you, Why does the Federal Reserve Board defy the will of Congress to hold that absorption of exchange is interest—only exchange—while at the same time holding that all other expenses connected with collecting a depositor's money, cashing his checks, and keeping his accounts are not interest? The insured banks of this country paid out total operating expenses—exclusive of interest on deposit—of about $1,000,000,000 in 1942, according to the annual report of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for that year, page 92, and the hearings on this bill show that the total exchange charges made by these 2,500 small country banks does not exceed eight or nine million dollars annually. Nine million out of a billion—the nine million is interest, says the Federal Reserve, but the rest of the billion can be paid out without violating the law. This $9,000,000 is not much in a banking system that today has deposits of over $100,000,000,000 and grosses almost $2,000,000,000 from its operations. It is not much to the banking system, but it is two-thirds of the operating profits of 2,500 small bank businesses—2,500 independent, locally owned banks serving our country communities, run by men who make their livelihood by providing banking service to people who are the backbone of our Nation, men who make their living by harvesting the fruits of the soil and of God's eternal sunshine. These are the people who make our cities thrive because they supply the food and raw materials the cities use, and if you take away their financial institutions you weaken our foundation. Even our mighty city institutions realizing this have come to their succor against this outrageous "blow below the belt" which the Federal Reserve has struck while our Nation is waging the greatest war in history.

The real reason the Federal Reserve Board has made this preposterous distinction—without a difference—is because the Board still pretends that it is charged with the duty of eliminating the practice of charging exchange and instituting the so-called par clearance system, notwithstanding the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States more than 20 years ago, speaking through its great Justice Brandeis, in the case of *Farmers & Merchants Bank of Monroe* v. *Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond*, reported in 262 United States 649, held that—

> The contention that Congress has imposed upon the Federal Reserve Board the duty of establishing universal par clearance and collection of checks through Federal Reserve banks is irreconcilable with the specific provision of the Hardwick amendment to section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act—

And that—

> The right to make a charge for payment of checks, thus regained by member and preserved to affiliated nonmember banks, shows that it was not intended, or expected, that the Federal Reserve banks would become the universal agency for clearance of checks.

But the Federal Reserve Board apparently is no more willing to abide by the interpretations of the law by the Supreme Court relating to par clearance, than it is to follow the more recent act of Congress which prohibits payment of interest on deposits but which does not prohibit member banks from absorbing exchange charges as part of their operating expenses.

As late as 1941 in the volume entitled "Banking Studies," published by the Federal Reserve Board, they say—at page 277—that the Board's par clearance requirement "is an important obstacle to membership in the Reserve System" and in a letter written on October 14, 1942, to the Comptroller of the Currency, pertaining to the proposed ruling here involved which was issued in September 1943, and which appears in the hearings on this bill at page 592, they say that—

> the problem of exchange absorption * * * is only part of the whole question of par clearance with its many involved and related questions.

I have in my hand a circular dated February 15, 1944, sent out to all of the banks in a nearby State by a banker who correctly interprets the motive underlying the Federal Reserve's ruling—he says:

> If all banks will cease absorbing exchange charges, it is predicted that it will only be a matter of time until all banks throughout the United States will be on a par clearance basis.

Now we commence to see what the real reason for this ruling was. It is just another effort to force these 2,500 independent country banks to discontinue charging exchange, which is another way of saying to go on a par clearance basis. This pretense of enforcing the interest statute is fakery. It is just a feint to cover up the real scheme and to throw Congress off the track. Although the United States Supreme Court has said that the Board is under no duty of establishing universal par clearance of checks, the Board thinks otherwise. It not only goes contrary to Congress—it goes contrary to the highest court in this land which spoke through a great jurist. On what meat have these Board members—these financial Caesars—fed that they have grown so bold—so indifferent to the law?

Now we know why member banks may absorb taxes for their depositors with the blessing of the Federal Reserve, but not exchange charges—the difference being that taxes have no bearing on the pet hobby of the Federal Reserve—par clearance.

The gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] charges that absorption of exchange is a bad practice. To this I say that Congress has not called this practice bad; on the contrary, Congress has placed upon the statute books a provision expressly authorizing exchange charges to be levied by all banks, including member banks of the Federal Reserve, the only restriction being, first, that the exchange charges may not exceed one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount of money being transferred, and second, that no exchange charges may be made against the Federal Reserve banks.

And thus the Member from Michigan is again wrong when he says that member banks of the Federal Reserve System cannot charge exchange. Under the Federal law all banks including member banks of the Federal Reserve are free to levy exchange charges on transfers of money through commercial banking channels. This provision of law is found in section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act. It has been on the statute books since 1917 and states that—

> Nothing in this or any other section of this act shall be construed as prohibiting a member or nonmember bank from making reasonable charges, to be determined and regulated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, but in no case to exceed 10 cents per $100 or fraction thereof, based on the total of checks and drafts presented at any one time, for collection or payment of checks and drafts and remission therefor by exchange or otherwise; but no such charges shall be made against the Federal Reserve banks.

Exchange charges are as old as the banking business itself. The history of this well-known banking practice is discussed in an article by an Assistant General Counsel for the Federal Reserve Board appearing in its Bulletin for February 1940 which states at pages 89–90:

> When banks were few in number and industrial centers relatively few and far apart,

and when transportation facilities were in a comparatively undeveloped state, considerable time and expense were necessary in order to transmit funds from one part of the country to another. It was then that the custom of making an exchange charge for the remittance of funds had its origin.

This article further states:

Under the common law (i. e., in the absence of statute or agreement to the contrary) a bank is obligated to pay in cash checks drawn upon it when presented at the bank, but is not obligated to remit the proceeds to distant places. When checks were sent in through the mails from distant places, therefore, it was generally felt that the banks in remitting the proceeds in cash to such places performed a service which they were not obligated to perform and for which they were entitled to compensation. It was for this service that they deducted the so-called exchange charge.

The article further states:

At about the time of the Civil War it appears that the cost of domestic exchanges was sometimes as high as 1½ percent, or $15 per thousand. As the transportation facilities of the country improved, as the country became more thickly settled and the flow of goods between the various sections became larger and more constant, it was possible to settle balances through the medium of bank drafts without involving the shipment of currency in such large amounts, and exchange costs declined steadily. By 1913, when the Federal Reserve Act was enacted, $1 per thousand dollars was the maximum charge in some sections of the country where charges were made, although in some of the less thickly populated sections higher rates obtained.

The article further states:

Regardless of the person upon whom such a charge may ultimately fall, it is made in the first instance against the bank which sends the check to the drawee for payment, and, if not absorbed by this bank, is passed back to the person or bank from which it received the check. In order to avoid the necessity of paying such charges, many rural banks receiving checks for collection adopted the practice of establishing credit balances with correspondent banks in the financial centers, as it was the custom of many such banks in the larger centers to absorb exchange charges on items sent to them for collection by banks which maintained balances with them. As a result these larger banks became in effect clearinghouses for the country banks. Arrangements were sometimes made between individual banks under which banks that customarily charged exchange on checks sent to them for payment did not make such charges when these checks were received from certain of their correspondent banking institutions. Also, there were arrangements by which a city correspondent would send to a country bank checks drawn on another bank in the same town and these would be presented by the country bank over the counter of the drawee bank for payment at par.

All of this appears in the Federal Reserve's own lawyer's article and is published in the Board's own official bulletin for February 1940.

From these references it will be seen that exchange charges are a perfectly legitimate banking charge and I stress this because an attempt has been made to becloud the real issue before Congress by snide and invidious references to the practice of charging exchange, which imply that there is something wrong about the practice.

The substance of my position is that exchange charges have never been criticized or outlawed by any act of Congress, but on the contrary have been expressly authorized by Congress, and I do not believe we can condone an attack by a Government bureau against a practice which Congress has expressly authorized. If we do this, then Congress may as well abdicate its functions to the bureaus and stop pretending to legislate. Wartime is no time to open an issue of this kind. The Banking and Currency Committee simply decided that as long as exchange charges are an orthodox banking practice of a large number of country banks, and have not been outlawed by Congress, that it would not permit them to be outlawed by an agency that has attempted during each of our two great World Wars to break up the practice. The last attempt has been disguised under the pretense of prohibiting a payment of interest. I think there is no doubt that the members of the committee are fully convinced that there is nothing wrong about a bank charging exchange any more than there is about it charging other reasonable service charges.

To reject H. R. 3956 would be to place a premium on arbitrary administrative rulings and this, I am sure, no one is prepared to do.

Exchange charges are service charges. Exchange charges are no different from other types of service charges, except that they are older in origin and are levied against banks instead of against the public. The Federal Reserve Board does not like the fact that their member banks are paying these service charges, and it is attempting to outlaw them by forcing the banks to pass them back to the public. I say that the service charges should be paid by the institutions for which the service is performed, and these are the member banks who enjoy the benefits of the money transfers and their profits from the business of handling correspondent accounts are more than ample to enable them to pay these costs without unloading them on the public. A lot of dust has been thrown in the air in an effort to show that exchange charges are not service charges but something different. But I have here in my hand a copy of the Federal Reserve Bulletin for February 1940, in which an assistant general counsel says—page 95—that—

Exchange charges in the form of remittance deductions are, of course, only one type of service charge, except that other service charges are generally imposed on customers, whereas remittance deductions are usually paid by other banks or their customers.

Now the reason that efforts have been made to show that exchange charges are not service charges is this: The Federal Reserve Board has held in a formal ruling published in its January 1944 Reserve Bulletin, that member banks may absorb the service-charge costs connected with clearing checks of depositors in direct proportion to the varying size of the balances maintained by these depositors, and that this is not a payment of interest.

I am sure you are all familiar with the service-charge systems as they affect your individual accounts, but in case you are not I have in my hand a printed service-charge schedule of one of the biggest banks in Washington, D. C., which is typical of those which are in vogue all over the country. These schedules allow depositors a certain number of checks per month without service charge and the number increases directly as the size of the depositor's balance increases. With modern cost-accounting systems banks can determine to the penny their costs of clearing a depositor's check and the Federal Reserve holds that for the banks to absorb these service charges in direct proportion to the amount of the depositor's balance is not a payment of interest, but for them to absorb the exchange charges is a payment of interest. It is ridiculous to attempt to say that the one is not interest and the other is. Neither is interest in my opinion, but in order to bolster up its position the Federal Reserve tries to show that exchange charges are not service charges and this is the reason you could not absorb them, although they expressly O. K. the absorption of all other service charges and expenses.

The essence of this bill is to permit banks to carry on perfectly normal business arrangements with other banks and to continue to do what they have been doing for at least a hundred years.

The hearings on this bill extended over a period of 13 days and numerous witnesses were heard. The House Banking and Currency Committee did not receive an adverse comment from a single bank commissioner and many bank commissioners wrote in letters supporting the bill without qualification. Only one banker testified against this bill and he was a banker who was a member of the Federal Advisory Council, an organization of large city bankers appointed by the Federal Reserve banks. The only function of the Federal Advisory Council is to advise the Federal Reserve Board on questions which the Board refers to it. This notwithstanding that every banking journal and financial newspaper gave full publicity to the hearings while they were being held.

Thus, his testimony is to be interpreted as coming from a spokesman for the Federal Reserve rather than from an independent banker.

Although the Federal Reserve Board piously contends that it is enforcing the prohibition against absorption of exchange only because it is under a congressional mandate to prevent the payment of interest on demand deposits and that it has no other motive than to carry out the law, it is significant to note that it made a false start in 1937 to outlaw the absorption of exchange. This early ruling was promptly withdrawn after consultation between the Reserve Board and Chairman WAGNER, of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Chairman Steagall, of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and Chairman ROBERT DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, and other Members of Congress. These three prominent Members of Congress all informed the Federal Reserve Board that Congress never intended to give the Board any

right to regulate or affect the practice of absorbing exchange under the guise of an interest regulation. And these three Members of the Congress which passed the law certainly should have known what the Members of Congress intended at the time. The Board was apparently reconciled to this view from 1937 until 1943 since it took no action to affect the practice of absorbing exchange which was generally engaged in by banks all over the country during this period.

The only conclusion I can reach is that the Board decided that it was not expedient to reopen this question and they bided their time until it would be more expedient to put their long-deferred plans into effect. When we were up to our necks in the war, they concluded the time was ripe to act.

In the meantime, they had been making preparations. In the year 1936 they asked the Federal Advisory Council, their private banking advisory group, whether the enforcement of regulation Q against the practice of absorbing exchange would have a detrimental effect on membership in the Federal Reserve System. The Council answered in the negative because, I assume, there were several members on that Council who had been trying to put over this program for many years to serve their own selfish interests. They wanted to make the public pay these service charges instead of paying them out of their own operating revenues. In other words, their interest was a selfish one. They wanted to make the public pay through the nose an expense which properly should be paid and always has been paid by the banking system.

If the Federal Reserve were truthful in explaining that they are enforcing this ruling merely because of the mandate of the law, why did they ask the Federal Advisory Council what effect the enforcement of the regulation would have upon membership in the Federal Reserve System? It looks as if these Board members were being expedient after all, because I am forced to assume that had the Federal Advisory Council reported that in its opinion the enforcement of this interpretation would have had an adverse effect on membership in the Federal Reserve System, the Reserve Board might have taken a different view of the law. As I see it their decision on what the law was, was being governed by their feeling of the pulse of their membership rolls. All of this matter is reported in the 1936 Annual Report, Federal Reserve Board, at page 233.

The Federal Reserve Board has frequently been forced to reverse its position on the absorption of exchange because it always ran into "hot water" and "rough going" every time it attempted to enforce one of these outrageous rulings. Back in 1934 it made a long-ruling dealing with the question of absorption of exchange in which it held that a bank could absorb any amount of exchange charges for its own depositors without violating the law as long as the depositor maintained a balance of $1,000 or more. However, in this same bulletin it ruled in another case that if the bank absorbed exchange for its country correspondent banks it was an indirect payment of interest. In other words, it was all right for member banks to maintain their own individual customer relationships in good order by absorbing exchange where the depositors maintained a balance of $1,000 or over, but they could not absorb exchange charges where their correspondent banks benefited. This simply means that the Federal Reserve did not want the little country banks to get the benefit of exchange absorption by the member city correspondent banks.

In this same ruling the Board held that exchange charges could be absorbed without violating the law as long as they were omitted from an analysis of the depositor's account. In other words, as long as the bank did not know whether it was making a profit or loss in handling the depositor's account it could absorb exchange, but the moment it tried to keep its expenses under control by including the exchange absorbed in an account analysis it was violating the law. I have this ruling here and I will be glad to show it to anyone who is interested in reading it. It contains more condensed confusion on a simple question than any ruling of a Government department that I have ever read. But two significant things stand out—one of these is that the Board says banks cannot absorb exchange for other banks and the other is that you cannot absorb exchange and at the same time keep track of what you are doing. If this kind of a ruling does not foster bad banking practices, then I am unable to understand the English language.

Although this ruling was adopted in 1934, in 1937 the Board withdrew this interpretation from its formal interest regulation and left all banks free to absorb exchange. In fact the banks had never been asked to comply with the 1934 ruling, it was simply a kind of advisory opinion. The fact that banks all over the country continued to absorb exchange until this latest campaign against the practire started in 1943, is evidenhe that the Federal Reserve Board had again reversed itself.

The Board is now trying to return to the position which Congress forced it to abandon in 1937.

My friends, I could continue this discussion for the rest of the afternoon and tell you a great deal more about this controversy, but I do not wish to prolong my remarks. The issue before Congress is a simple one. The question is whether 2,500 small independent banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System are to be protected against an unlawful regulation or whether they are to be put out of business. The great majority of the members of the Banking and Currency Ccmmittee have agreed that the Federal Reserve Board's interpretation of the law is wrong, and I challenge any lawyer to stand here and say that he believes that the practice of absorbing exchange is interest as a matter of law.

We have heard a great deal of discussion on this floor about doing something for the small businessman. Here, my friends, is an opportunity to do something which costs the Government nothing and which costs the public nothing. Give the little man a break—give the public a break. Let the banking system continue to absorb these expenses for the independent banker just as the Federal Reserve banks absorb these expenses for their members. I think there can be but one answer and that is to vote in favor of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the twelfth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (relating to the payment of interest by member banks on demand deposits), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That this paragraph shall not be deemed to prohibit the absorption of exchange or collection charges by member banks."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment which is on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the twelfth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, (title 12, U. S. C., sec. 371a) is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'No member bank shall, directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as prohibiting the payment of interest in accordance with the terms of any certificate of deposit or other contract entered into in good faith which is in force on the date on which the bank becomes subject to the provisions of this paragraph; but no such certificate of deposit or other contract shall be renewed or extended unless it shall be modified to conform to this paragraph, and every member bank shall take such action as may be necessary to conform to this paragraph as soon as possible consistently with its contractual obligations: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall not apply to any deposit of such bank which is payable only at an office thereof located outside of the States of the United States and the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That until the expiration of 2 years after the date of enactment of the Banking Act of 1935 this paragraph shall not apply (1) to any deposit made by a savings bank as defined in section 12B of this act, as amended, or by a mutual savings bank, or (2) to any deposit of public funds made by or on behalf of any State, county, school district, or other subdivision or municipality, or to any deposit of trust funds if the payment of interest with respect to such deposit of public funds or of trust funds is required by State law: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall not be deemed to prohibit the absorption of exchange or collection charges by member banks. So much of existing law as requires the payment of interest with respect to any funds deposited by the United States, by any Territory, District, or possession thereof (including the Philippine Islands), or by any public instrumentality, agency, or officer of the foregoing, as is inconsistent with the provisions of this section as amended, is hereby repealed.' "

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment being offered as a committee amendment. I understand it has been offered as a committee amendment. I make the point of order it is not a com-

mittee amendment and should not be so offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky offer it as a committee amendment?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I did not think anyone would object to it. This was done as a suggestion of the Committee on Rules that it is good parliamentary practice to reenact the paragraph. It makes no change in the bill. Instead of introducing a bill that merely states the changes, it reenacts the paragraph. There is absolutely no change in the legal effect of the bill as introduced. This was done at the suggestion of the Rules Committee, which said they thought this would be better parliamentary practice.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing to prevent the gentleman from Kentucky from offering the amendment, of course, in his individual capacity.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want it understood that the committee has not acted on this amendment, and, so far as I know, no member of the minority has been consulted with respect to it.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. As I recall, the gentleman was present.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I was not.

Mr. COX. I believe the gentleman was not present. Anyway, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] raised the point that the committee should offer the amendment which has now been proposed. In other words, it was insisted on by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], as suggested by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], that this would be better parliamentary procedure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It may be proper parliamentary procedure, I do not know; but the Rules Committee, which is not a legislative committee, should not tell the Banking and Currency Committee, which is a legislative committee, how it should write its laws.

Mr. COX. This amendment makes no additional changes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I cannot object to the gentleman from Kentucky introducing it on his own responsibility, but I do object to its being introduced, and I make a point of order against it being introduced in a committee amendment, because the committee has never passed on the amendment. If committee amendments are going to be offered merely on the suggestion of the Rules Committee that they are not in proper form, then the Rules Committee is perhaps usurping the prerogatives of a legislative committee. I certainly think the minority on the Banking and Currency Committee should have been consulted before the suggestions of the Rules Committee were followed.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this was done at the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. At the time he made the suggestion, I am quite sure that some of the Republican Members were present.

Mr. ROLPH. I was there.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] was there, and I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] was there at the time. It is not introduced because of any advocacy on my part. It was introduced to comply with the request. If the gentleman objects, I shall not insist on it; I will withdraw the amendment; it does not make any difference to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending measure. It permits member banks of the Federal Reserve System to continue their long-standing practice of absorbing exchange and collection charges imposed by other banks on check clearings. I have discussed it with both big and little bankers in my State and they are unanimous in their insistence and in their opinion that it is necessary to continue in existence and in operation a large number of country banks, banks that are not large in deposits but banks which are solvent and banks that serve the interest and contribute to the welfare of their respective communities. They serve the little fellow.

We hear much these days about doing something for little business and helping the little fellow through this emergency. It is for these reasons that the larger banks wish to absorb these exchange and collection charges that they have been absorbing until the Federal Reserve Board undertook to legislate or by construction to amend the law. This act should be passed to get rid of the ruling of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System that absorption of exchange or collection charges by member banks is a device for the payment of interest.

The twelfth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, added by the Banking Act of 1933, section 11b, provides—with certain exceptions—that no member bank shall, directly or indirectly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is supporting this measure. The officials of this great governmental agency which guarantees the deposits of the banks that will be helped and in many instances saved by this act, endorse the proposed measure. The claim that the absorption of these exchange and collection charges is the payment of interest is far-fetched and unjustified.

I heartily favor this measure. I know the little bankers want it. The largest bank in my city has deposits of more than $40,000,000 and it is one among a number of the larger banks that extend from Chattanooga to Johnson City, throughout all of east Tennessee. They are in favor of this bill. Our entire delegation is a unit in support of this measure because we believe it to be for the benefit of the smaller banks and the little fellow in business.

This is a hard time for them. It is hard for them to get by. I am of the opinion personally that the bookkeeping operations incident to the putting in force of the proposition of those who oppose this measure will cost more than it will to absorb the charges.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Twenty banking commissioners of the Nation have sent in a letter here in favor of this bill. Of course, some of those bank commissioners come from States that do not absorb the exchange, but they take the position that if the Federal Reserve Board can go this far and define this as interest on demand deposits, then they can go further into any kind of service charge.

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes. The Federal Reserve Board will become a legislative body. That is one of the things we are fighting all down the line, to keep Federal agencies from making what they call administrative law. I attended a bar meeting of Government attorneys the other day. One of them got up, he held up his hands, Judge SUMNERS, in holy horror and said that there was now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the House a measure designed to define the limitations to which these fellows could go in promulgating and enforcing administrative law. He said, "We are all against that. It will put us all in a strait jacket." It occurred to me that it would be a fine thing if Congress could put a strait jacket on all of these bureaucrats down here who are legislating in the various departments of this Government. Right now is a good time to put one on the Federal Reserve Board and keep these little banks alive.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Tennessee has made another very fine Republican speech here, but unfortunately he has the wrong ingredients in the cake. This is not a fight against the Federal Reserve Board. This is a case where the Congress passed a law in 1935 which prohibited the payment of interest on demand deposits. I am going to use my efforts to keep my good friends on the Republican side from getting confused on the issues because it will not help us in the coming campaign. Fifty million depositors and their more than $100,000,000,000 of bank deposits are worthy of consideration here today. Let us look at Tennessee for a moment.

Mr. JENNINGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me make one or two remarks on Tennessee first.

Mr. JENNINGS. Just for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman surely would not expect me in my attitude toward the bankers of my State, both Democrats and Republicans, on the merits of this measure to be influenced by

what might happen in the next campaign?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly not. Down in Tennessee we have 166 nonpar banks. We have 128 par banks. We can understand my good friend's position right there. That explains the situation.

But let us go to pages 201 to 203 of the hearings and notice the earnings of the small banks. You will notice that they are getting along quite well. My friend is going to support this bill and here is exactly what he is going to support. Listen to this. In the State of Tennessee there are 166 against 128, as I have just pointed out. Often in the same town equally small national banks or a State par bank is doing business perhaps just across the street from a nonpar bank. Those who support this measure fail to properly consider the significance of this fact. After this bill becomes law, then what is to happen to this unique situation? He has indicated he is going to support this bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. There is no indication about it. My mind is made up.

Mr. CRAWFORD. His mind is made up, and I cannot change it. He is going to support a bill which for all practical purposes proposes that member banks, that is, members of the Federal Reserve System, be authorized to absorb the exchange on nonpar banks, when those member banks cannot do the same thing on their colleague member banks. That is what this bill does. You had better do some amending here or recommit this bill and get it in shape if we are going to go out here and do things like that. That is perfectly unreasonable.

I want to say to my good friend from Wisconsin, who is interested in this thing from a legal standpoint and from the viewpoint of good banking practice, on account of the condition up in his State, that I want to share his mind on that particular thought for just a few minutes and figure out some way to help him out of that mudhole.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman explain what there is in this legislation or any legislation, if this bill passes, that will prohibit a member bank from indulging in the same practice as a nonmember bank?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The member bank can pull out of the Federal Reserve System any time it pleases and go on a nonpar basis. There is certainly no law against that, if I am not misinformed.

Mr. KEEFE. What is there in the law that prohibits a member bank from absorbing exchange?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The only prohibition on these matters I recall at the moment is the law we have been reading here this afternoon, that you shall not pay interest on demand deposits.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly; and if this law passes and we say to the Federal Reserve System, "You shall not interpret the word 'interest' to include the absorption of exchange," then, will the gentleman explain, how under the law are the members of the Federal Reserve System barred from indulging in the practice?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not understand that the bill does correct the situation at all and this because the member banks must clear at par and there is no exchange to absorb, as they do clear at par. I refer the gentleman to the Hardwick amendment—you just cannot snip checks drawn on member banks as they, in clearing through Federal Reserve banks, must be paid in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in this country we have a dual system of banking—federally chartered national banks and State-chartered State banks. All national banks are members of the Federal Reserve System. The Federal Reserve law permits the inclusion of State banks. There are approximately 2,500 State banks that are not members of the Federal Reserve System.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures both national and State banks. The Banking Act of 1932, section 11b, provides—with certain exceptions—that "no member bank shall directly or indirectly by any device whatsoever pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand."

Under the Banking Act of 1935, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was required by regulation to prohibit the payment of interest on demand deposits in insured nonmember banks. The Federal Reserve Board in interpreting the provision of its regulation Q has ruled that the absorption of exchange or collection charges by member banks is a device for the payment of interest within the provisions of the Banking Act of 1933, which prohibits any member bank from paying interest on demand deposits. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has issued a ruling that absorption of exchange charges is not a device for the payment of interest, and hence is not prohibited under its regulations. The net result of this conflict in ruling and interpretation between the Federal Reserve Board and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is obvious. Members of the Federal Reserve System are prohibited from absorbing exchange charges. Nonmember banks insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are, under the rulings of the latter, permitted to continue the absorption of exchange charges. The purpose of the present bill is to permit members banks of the Federal Reserve System to continue the absorption of the expense of exchange and collection charges imposed by other banks on bank clearings.

Generally speaking, exchange charges are service charges imposed by banks for remitting funds to other banks in settlement of checks and drafts forwarded to them for collection or payment where settlement is necessary at a place other than that at which the remitting bank transacts its business. Collection charges are service charges imposed by banks for handling the collection of commercial instruments. The usual charge has been at the rate of one-eighth or one-tenth of 1 percent of the face amount of the checks or drafts presented for payment. There are approximately 2,500 banks in the United States which derive a substantial portion of their operating revenues from exchange charges. They are principally located in small communities and are in most instances locally owned, independent banks. They may be classified as small business but are the financial institutions which serve local enterprise in small communities. Such banks for years have maintained legal reserves and surplus cash funds on deposit with correspondent city banks. Such city banks, acting as collecting or clearing agencies for country banks, have for many years maintained the custom of absorbing the exchange charges deducted from checks clearing through such banks. The city correspondent banks have felt that they could afford to absorb such exchange charges because they realize a profit through the use of the funds deposited with them by the small country bank.

It should be noted that the law specifically prohibits the payment of interest on demand deposits. Thus, if the absorption of exchange charges by a correspondent bank is determined to be the payment of interest, then the time-honored custom indulged in in the banking business of this country will have to stop. The hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency clearly demonstrate, in my humble judgment, that the small country banks would lose a very substantial revenue and many might be forced to close their doors as a result.

To better visualize the exact picture, let me illustrate: John Jones lives in a small agricultural community and is a depositor in the Farmers State Bank at Larsen, Wis. This is an independent locally owned institution catering exclusively to the residents of the village and the farmers residing in the immediate vicinity. Mr. Jones buys some equipment from Sears, Roebuck at Chicago for $50. He sends his check in that amount to Chicago and receives the merchandise. Sears, Roebuck deposits the $50 check with its bank in Chicago, receiving credit to its deposit account for $50. At this point, for all intents and purposes, Mr. Jones and Sears, Roebuck have concluded their transaction. The remainder of the transaction is wholly a banking function of which perhaps both Jones and Sears, Roebuck are completely ignorant. The Chicago bank transmits the $50 check to its correspondent, the First National Bank of Milwaukee, with instructions to collect the check and credit the proceeds. The Milwaukee bank acts as correspondent not only for the Chicago bank but for many other banks throughout the country for the purpose of collecting checks drawn on banks in Wisconsin. The Milwaukee bank sends the $50 check together with other checks drawn upon the Farmers State Bank of Larsen, to the Farmers State Bank for payment. The Farmers State Bank re-

mits to the Milwaukee bank by a draft drawn upon an acceptable point, probably Milwaukee, and charges exchange at one-tenth of 1 percent. Thus, the draft executed and mailed to the Milwaukee bank is in the amount of $49.95. Five cents is retained by the Farmers State Bank of Larsen as an exchange charge for this service. It should be noted that if the Milwaukee bank presented Mr. Jones' check at the counter of the Farmers State Bank at Larsen, the check would be cashed at par. The Milwaukee bank credits the deposit account of the Chicago bank with $50 and absorbs the 5 cents exchange charge as part of its operating cost. It feels that it is able to do this because it has made profitable use of the earning power of the deposit which the Chicago bank maintains with the Milwaukee bank.

If the present regulations of the Federal Reserve Board are enforced the Milwaukee bank will no longer be permitted to absorb this exchange charge. Having received only $49.95 from the Farmers State Bank of Larsen, the Milwaukee bank will be able to credit the Chicago bank only with the amount it has collected on the check, namely, $49.95. The Chicago bank not being able to absorb any charges in relation to the account of Sears, Roebuck can only notify Sears, Roebuck that having received a net credit of only $49.95 from the check of Mr. Jones, they must remit an additional 5 cents in order to obtain deposit credit for the full amount of $50. Sears, Roebuck will then demand the remittance of 5 cents from the original maker of the check, Mr. Jones. Under these circumstances, Mr. Jones will undoubtedly step into his small, locally owned bank and demand that it remit the 5 cents and no doubt would threaten the shifting of his business to a so-called par bank, where the exchange charge would not be imposed but where the expense would be absorbed by the Federal Reserve System as over-all banking expense. The result would be a shaking disturbance of a depositor relationship that has been satisfactorily in existence for a long time.

Communications in my files indicate that this is not an idle prophecy, because it has already occurred. It impresses me that if this bill is not passed so as to permit the Milwaukee bank to absorb the exchange deducted by the little Farmers Bank of Larsen, Wis., it will give to the Milwaukee bank an additional profit at the expense of the small Farmers State Bank of Larsen. We have already indicated that this will no doubt occur, because the Milwaukee bank will be able to keep the entire profit realized through its investment of the deposit account maintained with it by the Chicago bank. I have telegrams from many of the small country banks in my district, all of whom are exceedingly interested in the passage of the pending bill. Typical of these wires is one from Mr. T. G. Frentz, president of the New American Bank at Oshkosh, Wis., a State-chartered institution. I quote:

> The continued independence of small banks in this State can best be safeguarded by the enactment of H. R. 3956, which will permit the practice of charging exchange and collection charges when such is deemed expedient. The present interpretation of regulation Q is designed to enforce par clearance on all banks, and to this we are definitely opposed. We believe this bill deserves your support.

I note that in the hearings on this bill Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, gave it most vigorous support. It seems passing strange to me that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation could take such a positive attitude with respect to this legislation unless the legislation is deemed to be in the interest of a sound banking structure through the maintenance of our dual system of banking. It was exceedingly refreshing to me to read the testimony of Mr. Crowley. On page 501 of part 13 of the hearings, Mr. Crowley states:

> I have always rejected and deeply resented the regulation by legal interpretations of administrative laws, and I think that is just what this is, and I want to put myself on record in favor of the Brown bill. I think you men, if you vote this bill out, will be making a very definite contribution to free enterprise and to the rights of management.

Further on, and on page 509 of the same hearings, Mr. Crowley said:

> Let me say right there, I won't have a friend left around Washington at all when I get through testifying on this bill. It is a strange situation for a bureaucrat to come up here before this committee and be arguing about regulation. As a rule, we are up here arguing for more power, and I am trying to preserve for the small banks of this Nation the right to determine their own destiny that they may have some elbow room to run their own institutions. We are the fellows who insure these banks, and if something happens to the banks we are the ones who are going to pay their losses. Let me say this to you, deposit insurance will never suffer enough loss in dollars and cents in these banks to be particularly hazardous to the financial position of Federal Deposit Insurance. In my judgment, Congressman PATMAN, the very backbone of your whole small business structure in this country is your small bank.

Again, on page 523 of the same hearings, Mr. Crowley said:

> I think we have a lot of evidence that we will be glad to show this committee some time, when you are studying the banking system, that a lot of men in this Government in the banking business are trying to nationalize this branch banking system, and are trying to extend branch banking, and are trying to control interbank balances.

Again I want to say that such testimony coming from the head of a Government institution such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation displays a very refreshing attitude toward the small business of this country. Mr. Crowley's testimony clearly sets up a danger signal with respect to the underlying philosophy that is behind the opposition to this bill. He and his Board can see no threat to the stability of the banking structure of this Nation if this legislation passes. Quite clearly from his testimony, he can see a very definite bureaucratic threat to the small banking business of this country if the attitude of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in making law through interpretative regulations is to be permitted to prevail.

As one committed to the philosophy of preserving to the fullest extent the dual banking system of this Nation and the preservation of the small home-owned independent bank, I shall support this legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that this bill is promoted by the branch banks of the southeastern section of the United States?

Mr. KEEFE. I am not aware of any such thing. I am aware of the fact that this bill is supported by the small banks of my State, and I have heard from all of the small banks in my district. It is not opposed even by the big banks. I have not found a big bank in my State or in my district that opposes this legislation.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. Does not the gentleman think that this legislation merely continues present banking practices throughout the rural districts and in the small towns of the United States?

Mr. KEEFE. That is all it does. It continues a practice that has been in vogue for years and years and years. If I had time to trace this thing through, I could demonstrate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I hesitate to take up the time of the Committee with further discussion of a bill brought in by one of the great committees of the House and already explained. As I understand the situation, the Federal Reserve Board in recent months is exercising a power over banks which, if it possesses now, it has had for a long time. The Board is prohibiting banks from absorbing exchange or collection charges. The language of the law under which this power is claimed to arise is as follows:

> No member bank shall directly or indirectly, by any device whatever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand.

It seems to me that anybody who can read words, knows that that language does not have anything do to with charges for collecting checks. That is not paying "any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand."

It is a service charge, pure and simple. It is not a payment of "interest on any deposit which is payable on demand." That is the thing prohibited by the law. If this power sought to be exercised obtains under the language just quoted, or if the Board can do this thing without any law, what is to prevent the Federal Reserve Board from dealing with the other service charges now being made by banks for cashing checks and safe

keeping the money of their depositors, charges recognized as necessary in order to keep banks going in these times when their vaults are full of idle money? The question that is presented to this House is far greater, it seems to me, than that which is immediately involved in this situation. There is nothing unusual about this sort of thing here in Washington now. It is characteristic of the sort of government we are coming to be. We have got to decide soon what sort of government we want. We cannot blow hot and cold on these matters, favor ignoring the law when that is to our advantage and then appealing for the protection of the law when we need its protection. As I understand the position which the House should take in this matter, and others, if we are to have a government by law instead of a government by men and directives, and that is my position, if the Federal Reserve Board believes this sort of thing ought to be done which it is doing and which the language of existing law does not authorize, it seems clear to me it ought to submit its views to the Congress and ask for legislative authority. I am not making these observations in criticism of the Federal Reserve Board or its personnel. They are fine people. That is the sort of government we have come to be, in no small measure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have two questions, but I shall ask the last one first. Does not the gentleman think that the issue has been pretty well crystallized in this bill after days and days of hearing on that question? We have a bill before us today which presents that issue before the House. We can settle it today just as well as we can 6 years from now. The next question is, Does the gentleman understand what is meant by the language in the act which prohibited the payment of interest on demand deposits? Why was that put in there?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I suppose because Congress wanted to stop that thing.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What thing?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Paying interest on deposits. I know what they meant. I was here.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All right, and I was here, too.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I cannot yield any more.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, the gentleman should yield, inasmuch as he yielded to me to ask him a question.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But not to answer it. I cannot yield any further now. I was here and the gentleman was here. The banks of the country were being stripped of their money, which was sent to New York, loaned on call at fabulous interest, to be used in gambling on the New York Stock Exchange. There was almost no money left in the banks throughout the country available at a reasonable rate of interest for legitimate purposes. That is exactly why this provision was enacted; it had nothing to do with service charges. Banks were paid far more interest on these demand deposits in New York than they could get on a legitimate transaction, and everybody knows that. I yield to anybody now to challenge that statement. Nobody challenges it; that is the fact. That is the whole thing, and there is no doubt of it. To correct that situation and leave needed money in the communities, it was enacted by Congress that "no member bank shall directly, by any device whatsoever, pay any interest on any deposit which is payable on demand." That is all the law there is. Entirely beyond the law as it reads the Board prohibits the banks from absorbing collection charges.

The contention seems sound, if words mean what they say, that no authority has been delegated to the Federal Reserve Board to do this thing with regard to this service charge which they now are doing. By this proposed legislation the Congress is undertaking to prevent them from doing what the Congress has not authorized them to do. The country is having some disposition to return to constitutional government, to government by law instead of government by directives. In behalf of the people whose Representatives we are we have a chance and, as I see it, the duty right here to tell not only the Federal Reserve Board, but all the other boards, bureaus, and commissions that if there is something which, in their judgment, ought to be done, which they have not authority to do, they should come to the people's Representatives in Congress and ask for authority, and not stretch the law beyond all recognition in order to govern the people as they think the people should be governed. They might be right about it in a given situation, but experience in government shows that is a mighty dangerous way to proceed. It is not in nature that an agency of government not directly responsible to the people can possess that sort of power and not sooner or later tyrannically exercise it. I am not referring to the members of the Federal Reserve Board specifically. I have great respect for them. We cannot much longer postpone determining in America the kind of government we shall have. The fact is we are in process now, though we may not realize it, and we are not moving in the right direction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Federal Reserve Board came before our committee in December and did a remarkable thing. They advised with us concerning the effectiveness of this regulation Q. And advised us that unless Congress, contrariwise, made no opposition to it, regulation Q would take effect December 31, and that is why this legislation is here.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. They must have realized they did not have authority to do this thing. That is why they went to your committee. I do not see how they could avoid it. The language of the law is plain. Nothing obscure about it. I am not criticizing the Board. There is nothing unusual about the action of this Board. The Congress and the country, we are all responsible for the fact that we have been changing the distinctive character of our system of government from a democracy to a bureaucracy, and more and more are being governed by directives rather than by law. This is no time for criticism or abuse. We must all share in the responsibility for the devastation which we have wrought in our system of government. We are all responsible. We have a big job ahead of us. We must all join in the joint undertaking of reestablishing the normal functioning of the machinery of democratic government. The normal functioning is that the Congress shall have the job of enacting the laws and the executive agencies shall have the job of executing them. The sooner we each get on our own side of the fence the sooner we will have harmonious, efficient, democratic government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to come to some agreement about closing debate on this.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman move to close debate?

Mr. SPENCE. I move that debate on the bill and all amendments close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky to close debate on the bill and all amendments thereto in 25 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Chairman, I wish I had an opportunity to discuss this matter for a longer time than the 3 minutes which have been allotted to me, because during my 10 years of service in this House I do not think that anything has come before this body, having to do with one branch of our economic system, that was as important as the matter before Congress today. I happen to be connected with a little country bank, and have been for some 25 years. I think I know something of the problems of the small banks, and I know that if the Congress defeats this bill, the effect it will have on literally thousands of those little banks throughout the country will be disastrous.

I appreciate the concern of some of my good friends who have spoken. The principal opposition seems to have come from my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Michigan. Yet before the committee during the hearings the supervisor of banks of the State of Michigan filed a letter with the committee approving of this legislation. There are literally thousands of little banks throughout this country whose principal income is received from exchange, exchange absorbed by their correspondent banks. These small banks, in the ordinary course of their business, must maintain in the larger centers of the country, large banks to clear through. Those large banks clear through them at par or absorb exchange, which inures to the benefit and increases the profits of these small banks. If I had the time I could give you illustrations of several little individual banks in my own State, not only in my own State, but in several other sections of the country, where these small banks would not be able to pay salaries and exist. They would have to close their

doors in the event that their correspondent banks did not absorb this exchange for them. What would that mean? It would mean the larger banks of the country then would establish in those little communities where the small banks would close, their branch banks.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in my humble opinion the interpretation of the amendment to the Federal Reserve Act, passed by Congress in 1933, by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board is for the purpose of destroying the little institutions of this country so that the larger institutions who are members of the Federal Reserve can establish their branch banks. We can certainly appreciate and realize the inconvenience the people in these small communities would be placed in doing business through a branch bank, with all matters having to be referred to the parent bank.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly in favor of the passage of the bill before us today. For almost 10 years the banks of my area and of the Nation have operated, I believe, satisfactorily. Now we find once again a governmental agency, 10 years after the passage of an act, placing an entirely new construction on that same act, so as to upset the entire workings of the banking practices in the Nation to serve their own purposes.

Mr. Chairman, we have had too much of that. Until this matter came to my attention, I thought such strained construction was the misguided acts of various new agencies. Since some of those agencies seem to have gotten by with such practice, now we find the Federal Reserve following the same methods of carrying into effect their desires.

They do not come to the Congress as the Representatives of the people and ask for legislation to cure the situation which they say exists, but by their own act attempt, in effect, to read into the law a new provision. I am opposed to the making of law in that way.

To justify their action one of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System has seen fit to charge, wrongly, I think, one of the banks in my district with circumventing their new interpretation of the act to the detriment of the banking system, and thereby creating an unsound banking situation. I have looked into that case and believe the House should know how inaccurate and unfair were those charges. With the indulgence of the House I would like to present the facts in that case.

On February 1, 1944, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] inserted into the record of the committee hearings on H. R. 3956 a telegram from the Hon. W. D. Cook, president of the First National Bank in Meridian, Miss., dated January 31, supporting the bill. Mr. Cook is also a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. In an apparent effort to make an object lesson of a banker who would speak out in opposition to them, Mr. Dreibelbis of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on February 8 publicly cited this bank before the same committee as an example of a bank which had been using absorption of exchange as a device to secure interbank deposits to a degree which had resulted in an unsound situation. Mr. Dreibelbis stated that deposits of other banks with this bank had increased by 312 percent between 1940 and 1943, whereas its other deposits increased by only 83 percent and interbank accounts in the country as a whole had increased by only 7 percent. He charged that the large growth was due to the fact that the First National Bank in Meridian was bidding for accounts by agreeing to absorb exchange.

Inasmuch as a bank is at a very great disadvantage in defending itself from public accusation of a supervisory official and inasmuch as Mr. Cook is a distinguished citizen of my district, and held in high respect not only throughout Mississippi but throughout the South, I have taken it upon myself to investigate the public charges of this Federal Reserve official. I find them to be wholly without justification or support. Here are the facts:

Deposits of other banks in this institution increased by $1,000,000 between 1940 and 1943. Half of this increase was in 11 new accounts and half of it was in long-standing accounts. The growth in balances in the old accounts carried by 18 banks was $500,000 and compares with a growth in total deposits in those 18 banks of $34,000,000. The balances in the 11 new accounts in 1943 also amounted to $500,000 and compare with a growth in total deposits in these 11 banks of $26,000,000 between 1940 and 1943. The growth between 1940 and 1943 in total deposits in the 29 banks which carry balances with the Meridian bank amounted to $60,000,000. Balances of these banks with the Meridian bank increased by $1,000,000, one-sixtieth of the growth in total deposits. The growth of bankers' balances in a banker's bank should be measured against the growth of deposits in the depositing banks and not against the growth of deposits of individuals in the banker's bank. The comparison made by Mr. Dreibelbis reminds me of the famous rabbit stew made by a cook in one of our southern restaurants. When asked for the recipe he said that he mixed it 50–50, one rabbit and one horse.

Of the increase of $60,000,000 in deposits of the 29 banks, $1,000,000 was deposited with the First National Bank in Meridian, $17,000,000 was deposited with other banks, a small part was kept in the banks' own vaults, and $41,000,000 was invested in United States Government securities. These banks are supporting their Government and the war effort. The growth in business of these banks is typical of banks throughout the South.

The charge that the growth in bankers' deposits in the First National Bank in Meridian is unsound is a charge against the conduct of correspondent banking in Meridian. I propose, therefore, to give you a picture of the economic background of that city.

Meridian, the second largest city in Mississippi and county seat of Lauderdale County, is the commercial center for the surrounding area which has been enjoying greatly increased prosperity over the past 3 years. The transportation facilities are excellent. Rail transportation is provided by 6 trunk line railways and highway connections are provided by three transcontinental highways. Meridian is also an industrial city of some importance. Its manufactures include hosiery, fertilizer, creosote, shirts, cottonseed oil, bricks, and other products connected with the lumber and textiles. The population has increased from 23,399 in 1920 to 31,954 in 1930, and further to 35,481 by 1940 and present estimates place the population at 40,000. The city contains three insured banks, the First National Bank in Meridian, the Merchants and Farmers Bank, and the Citizens National Bank.

It is only natural that the small country banks in the surrounding trade area which includes several counties in Alabama should carry correspondent balances in Meridian. Both the Merchants and Farmers Bank and the First National Bank in Meridian have substantial interbank deposits. At the close of 1943 the interbank deposits in each of these banks amounted to about $1,500,000. In 1940 the First National Bank in Meridian held correspondent accounts for 20 banks in Mississippi. In 1943 it held correspondent accounts for 20 banks in Mississippi and 9 banks in Alabama.

Did the First National Bank secure these new accounts from banks in western Alabama by bidding for them? Not at all. They came to the bank out of courtesy and good will. On August 15, 1942, this bank employed an assistant cashier who had been with an Alabama bank and who for years had served as secretary of the West Alabama Clearing House Association with a membership of 26 banks. When this able banker entered the employ of the First National Bank in Meridian a number of accounts followed him because of his popularity and repute, and because of his ability to give their accounts individualized service. Included among these accounts was one deposited by the bank with which he had formerly been connected. These Alabama bankers were interested in this man, wished him well, and placed their business with him because they liked him, trusted him, respected him, and liked to see him progress. This is the very essence of banking relationships. If this is unsound, then practically every bank in the country is also engaging in unsound practices when it secures new business through the ability and competence of its staff.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us should be passed and the Federal Reserve System held to the law as it has been understood for 10 years.

NATIONAL STOCK YARDS NATIONAL BANK

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the case of the Federal Reserve System is based more or less on a bank in my district, I desire to offer an explanation.

On February 8 and 9, 1944, before the House Committee on Banking and Currency, an official of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System made public charges against the National Stock Yards National Bank of National City, National Stock Yards, Ill. Mr.

Dreibelbis, of the Board of Governors, charged that this bank accumulated large interbank balances by agreeing to absorb exchange and that this was leading to unsound results. He stated that this bank was in a little town across from St. Louis with a population of 244; that it had interbank balances of $73,754,000 in June of 1943, an increase of 124 percent over 1940, while other deposits amounted to only $19,000,000, an increase over 1940 of 87 percent.

The public charges of the Board of Governors are not in accord with the facts. National City, Ill., is in my district. It is a separately incorporated city immediately contiguous to and a part of the metropolitan area of East St. Louis, a city of more than 75,000 population. It is served by the same utilities as East St. Louis. The same water lines, the same gas lines, the same electric power lines, the same sewers, the same telephone lines, and the same bus lines serve East St. Louis and National City, Ill. A stranger cannot tell when he is in East St. Louis and when he is in National City. The only differentiating characteristic of National City is that the St. Louis National Stock Yards are there. These are one of the largest stockyards in the United States. A tremendous volume of livestock passes through these yards. This livestock comes chiefly from the States of Missouri, Illinois, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Mississippi. The money value of receipts has increased tremendously in recent years increasing the volume of business handled by the bank.

The Federal Reserve ought to know that every important stockyard is served by a stockyard bank. Banks are established at the more important stockyards in order to facilitate the transfer of title to incoming stock shipments, to collect the proceeds of the sale of such stock from the commission brokers, and to remit or credit the proceeds to the country bank serving the shipper.

Speed in handling shipping documents is essential, for any unnecessary or unusual delay results in loss of weight and thereby loss in dollars to the shipper. Consequently, direct relationships between country banks located in stock-producing or feeding areas and stockyard banks are necessary in order that bills of lading covering stock shipments may arrive at the yards' banks not later than the arrival of the stock. The conventional transit facilities of the Federal Reserve System would not meet the needs of either the shippers or the yards because speed and expertness of handling are the essence of this specialized business.

A stockyard bank performs many valuable and expert services for the distant shipper who is seldom personally known. For instance, a shipment may have been delayed in transit due to some fault of the railroad with consequent shrinkage in weight, the stock may have developed disease or suffered injury by accident, or otherwise; in such event the stockyard bank will take such steps as are advisable to protect the shippers' rights and interest under the circumstances. It also will interest itself in the grading of shipments should such action be warranted.

Stockyard banks also facilitate the sale and shipment of rough stock to the finish-feeding areas which in effect is the reverse order of handling this business. Its services are drawn upon extensively for the purpose of placing finish feeders in touch with brokers who can supply rough-fed stock and vice versa.

These banks, in furnishing a highly specialized service, have seldom exploited the other phases of commercial banking and it is perfectly natural that they should have a large country bank business in relation to their local deposit business. Also, the disproportion in such relationship will vary in direct proportion to the yards' activity.

The National Stock Yards National Bank of National City, had deposits of other banks, who have to keep balances there in order to serve their local customers, amounting to $33,000,000 on June 30, 1940, and to $74,000,000 on June 30, 1943. These deposits were in 622 accounts in 1940 and 643 accounts in 1943, an increase of only 21 accounts. The total amount of exchange absorbed by this bank in 1943 was $22,000, equivalent to one thirty-sixth of 1 percent on its interbank deposits. This was less than the amount of exchange charged back to customer banks and was only $7,000 more than the exchange absorbed in 1940. It is ridiculous to charge that a return of one thirty-sixth of 1 percent has led to an unsound accumulation of bank deposits. It is equally ridiculous to charge that an increase of $7,000 in exchange persuaded more than 600 bankers to increase their balances by more than $40,000,000. That is a rate of return of less than one five-thousandth of 1 percent. The bank has written that—

> The country banks have maintained accounts with this institution for years, and, of course, this was brought about by the fact that the shipper in the country who ships to this market has the proceeds of the livestock shipments deposited in our bank for the credit to the country bank on date of sale. * * * It has never been our practice to solicit bank accounts on a basis whereby we would absorb all of the exchange. We have never solicited any dumping accounts from any banks in the large centers in order to increase our deposits.

A well-managed and well-run institution in my district operated by distinguished constituents of mine has been subjected to public attack by a supervisory agency without one shred of evidence to support that attack. I cannot understand the meaning of this attack. But if it means that any stockyards bank, upon which is imposed increased business by reason of unprecedented wartime runs of livestock to the yards, is to be similarly attacked, the livestock yards in Missouri, Kansas, Illinois, Nebraska, Indiana, and elsewhere will be affected. The Federal Reserve System has been repeatedly charged with having pursued such a restrictive credit policy in 1920 as to drive many farmers to the wall and many country banks into bankruptcy. Is the Federal Reserve System again taking the attitude that increased marketing of livestock and other farm products and increased farm incomes are unsound developments? Or is the Federal Reserve System seeking to interfere with normal livestock and agricultural financing practices in order to achieve reforms according to their own ideas and without benefit of legislation?

Because I do not like to see business, banking, and agriculture interfered with arbitrarily by administrative agencies, because I object to the misrepresentation which has been indulged in, and because I believe actions as sweeping as the one attempted by the Federal Reserve should have specific legislative authority in order to maintain the constitutional balance among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, I support H. R. 3956 and urge its passage by the House.

Mr. Chairman, in further refutation of the unfair charges made by this member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, I ask permission to place in the RECORD at this point letters received by the Stock Yards Bank from several of its customers.

BANK OF SIKESTON,
Sikeston, Mo., February 24, 1944.

Mr. J. W. MINTON,
Vice President, National Stock Yards National Bank,
National Stock Yards, Ill.

DEAR MR. MINTON: With reference to the current controversy over the construction placed on regulation Q by the Federal Reserve Board, it is noted that a bank was mentioned in the hearing before the congressional committee by the attorney for the Federal Reserve Board as "a little bank across the river from St. Louis in a town of 244 people" whose interbank deposits of $73,754,600 on June 1943 were acquired in consideration of its absorption of exchange.

As I know of no such little town with a bank of that size along the Mississippi River except it be National City, Ill., which is actually a small segment of the city of East St. Louis, I assume that yours is the bank referred to.

Maybe it has occurred to you that while the statement made to the committee is true it is only a half-truth, and apparently no pains were taken to explain that your bank is no less a St. Louis bank than any other similar institution located, like yours, only 10 minutes from the city of St. Louis' business district. Your bank is in a unique and fortunate position due to its location in the center of the stockyards district by which a large portion of the State of Missouri and western Illinois is served, and in close proximity to the St. Louis financial district just across the river.

Our bank opened its account with your institution in 1935 because of the factors mentioned in the above paragraph. Practically all livestock shipped from this point goes to National Stock Yards, and is paid for by drafts on your bank. After our account was established with you we found that your facilities enabled us to get as prompt and efficient service on our St. Louis items as we could get from banks located in the St. Louis city limits, and in some instances better.

Absorption of exchange was not a consideration in the establishment of business relations between our banks; as a matter of fact, practically all collection costs on our nonpar items were borne by our various city correspondents in St. Louis and elsewhere prior to October 1941. At that time your bank as well as all others of our correspondents began passing such charges back to us. This was, of course, due to the extremely low interest rates and the consequent lessened value of our balances.

I mention these things merely out of a sense of fairness toward your bank and in the hope that you may not have left unchallenged such incomplete statements of fact as appear to have been made before the congressional committee. If your business has been built

up by absorption of exchange, the same may be said of your competitors across the river. My first contact with your institution, to the best of my recollection, was in 1922. You had at that time a large volume of country-bank business, and the St. Louis banks, no less than our own, were absorbing all exchange incurred in collection of cost items for their country correspondents and, in addition, all of you were paying interest on daily balances.

The above is all perhaps unnecessary, but I just want you to know that we appreciate the service you have always given us equally as much as that given us by our friends in St. Louis, and I see no present prospect of any change in our business relations, with or without the provisions of regulation Q.

With kind personal regards and best wishes, I am,

Very truly yours,

LEROY C. LESLIE, *Cashier.*

COTTON EXCHANGE BANK,
Kennett, Mo., February 26, 1944.

Mr. J. W. MINTON,
Vice President, National Stock Yards National Bank,
National Stock Yards, Ill.

DEAR MR. MINTON: One of our directors, ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, a Member of Congress, recently sent me a copy of House bill 3956.

In reading the bill, I notice the testimony before the committee of an individual, listing certain banks in the United States, quoting the population and growth of these banks. I presume his testimony was an attempt to prove that the unusual growth of the banks was in some way connected with a special service they might have rendered to their customers, contrary to the general practices of other banks.

I am not familiar with any of the banks set out in the report of this bill, as shown on page 11, other than the National Stock Yards National Bank, National Stock Yards, Ill. However, if he is as far from the truth, insofar as other banks are concerned, as he is in your particular instance, God help the committee.

The gentleman giving this testimony, insofar as your bank is concerned, is not misinformed, but ignorant in the matter, or he made a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. While it is perhaps true that your bank, legally speaking, is confined to an unusually small incorporated town, any man with the sense of a 6-year-old child is thoroughly familiar with the fact that you are, industrially speaking, a part of East St. Louis, Ill.; it being impossible to tell when one leaves East St. Louis and enters National Stock Yards, Ill.

I don't know that your institution cares to reply to this unfair statement, but, should you, I would be only too pleased to have you use such portion of this letter that you might see fit.

Our institution was incorporated in 1900, and it has done a continuous banking business in this town since its incorporation, save and except during the bank holiday caused by proclamation of the President in 1933, opening at the end of the holiday without restrictions.

During our forty-some-odd years of banking we have used several St. Louis, Memphis, Chicago, Kansas City, and New York banks as our correspondent. In 1932 our board of directors decided that your bank was perhaps more familiar and understood rural banking problems better than the other banks in this area, and for that reason we transferred our account to you. We have never been offered, nor have we received, any inducements from your institution that were not extended us by our previous correspondents, save and except, in our opinion, more prompt, intelligent, and better service.

If this distinguished witness before the House committee had contacted the numerous rural banks that use your bank as their correspondent, I feel certain that his testimony would have been—provided, of course, that he wanted to be fair—just the contrary to what it was: That your unusual growth was due to the service you rendered and the intelligent understanding your officers have with agricultural problems.

It may be that you have not seen this testimony, but I cannot let it go unchallenged, so far as we are concerned, and I am taking the liberty to state the facts to not only Congressman ZIMMERMAN but both our Missouri Senators.

With kindest personal regards, I am

Very truly yours,

R. IRL JONES,
President.

THE CITIZENS BANK,
Springfield, Mo., February 25, 1944.

Mr. JOHN W. MINTON,
Vice President, National Stock Yards National Bank,
National Stock Yards, Ill.

DEAR MR. MINTON: It is my understanding the National Stock Yards National Bank, in testimony offered before the House Banking Committee at hearings conducted in regard to House bill 3956 pertaining to Federal Reserve regulation Q on absorption of exchange, was mentioned as an institution located in a small community having an extremely high volume of deposits, which deposits were secured and kept mainly for the reason that you were absorbing exchange for your country bank customers.

This must be an erroneous impression on the part of the person or persons who might have made a statement to this effect. During the many years we have maintained an account with your bank and from our experience and the experience of others, we know your institution has been built on sound banking principles and that your volume of business has been secured because you have given the proper kind of service to your customers in line with good banking practice and that such service has been rendered not only to your country-bank customers but to your commercial and industrial customers both in your own and outlying territory. We have no reason to believe that your volume of business has been secured on any other basis.

We sincerely trust any such impression gained by anyone to the contrary may be corrected.

Very truly yours,

JAMES A. JEFFRIES,
Executive Vice President.

THIRD NATIONAL BANK,
Sedalia, Mo., February 26, 1944.

Mr. J. W. MINTON,
Vice President, National Stock Yards National Bank,
National Stock Yards, Ill.

DEAR MR. MINTON: Replying to your letter of February the 23d regarding a Mr. Dreibelbis' testimony before a House Banking Committee on February 8, 1944, in regard to House bill 3956 on the absorption of exchange by banks that are members of the Federal Reserve System, stating that a bank located in a small town had deposits of over $73,000,000 on June 30, 1943, due to the fact they were absorbing exchange for country-bank customers.

I am sure that this gentleman is not very familiar with the banking business or he would not have made that statement, especially so with reference to your institution. You could not have increased your banking business to the extent that it has been increased simply by absorbing these exchange charges.

In my opinion, your bank has been built through the excellent services you have rendered to your bank clientele. Your bank's officers consist of men who are thoroughly familiar with the country banking business and you are always more than willing to cooperate in any way you can with your customers.

Of course, I have no way of telling just what the absorption of exchange by you amounts to, but the fact that you have been able to build your capital account in the past 10 years over $4,000,000 out of earnings, while paying your regular dividends, is ample evidence of the fact that the absorption of this exchange was not prohibitive and did not affect your earnings to a great extent.

We are maintaining a balance with you of around $400,000 and have for several years. We would not do this unless we were thoroughly satisfied with the way you are handling our business and cooperating.

With best regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

H. R. HARRIS, *President.*

MACON-ATLANTA STATE BANK,
Macon, Mo., February 26, 1944.

Mr. JOHN W. MINTON,
Vice President, National Stock Yards National Bank,
National Stock Yards, Ill.

DEAR JOHN: It has now been 9 years since we moved our bank from Atlanta to Macon, during which time and for at least 20 years prior thereto we have maintained an account with your good bank.

Our relationship, from our standpoint, has been highly satisfactory, and your outstanding service to us is thoroughly appreciated. I consider you have rendered an unexcelled service to the country banks for many years past. When country banks were having such hard going a few years ago I know of numerous instances wherein you were of inestimable help to them.

While you have given this outstanding service it evidently has proven to be sound and profitable business on your part as is reflected in your increased capital account by way of earnings.

We take this means of thanking you for your services and assure you of our profound appreciation. If we can ever be of assistance to you on any occasion, please call upon us.

Very truly yours,

PAUL L. JONES, *Cashier.*

BANK OF TROY,
Troy, Mo., February 24, 1944.

Mr. JOHN W. MINTON,
Vice President, National Stock Yards National Bank,
National Stock Yards, Ill.

DEAR MR. MINTON: I read with much interest the testimony of Mr. Dreibelbis, attorney for the Federal Reserve Board, made before the House Banking Committee, in regard to absorption of exchange by banks that are members of the Federal system.

I certainly cannot agree with him in the reference to your bank. I have had the pleasure of doing business with the National Stock Yards National Bank since 1924; from 1924 to 1935, as cashier of Peoples Bank of Hawk Point, Hawk Point, Mo.; from 1935 to the present time with Bank of Troy, Troy, Mo. Our deposits at Hawk Point were $125,000,000 and at present our deposits in Bank of Troy are $1,000,000. During that time, no service has been too small or too large for your bank to render, in a prompt, courteous manner.

I recall that during the trying period of 1929–30, when most of the metropolitan banks of St. Louis were referring their correspondents to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, your bank called upon us and offered us credit, should we need it.

As I see it, absorbing exchange is just one of the many services offered by your bank, and is definitely not the sole reason for depositing with you. We, and most country

banks, appreciate the friendly, personal attention given our transactions without having to look up a certain regulation to see if you can do it.

If you care to use this letter to convince Mr. Dreibelbis of the error of his statement, you have our permission to do so.

Yours very truly,

R. H. BROWN,
Vice President and Cashier.

CITY BANK & TRUST CO.,
Moberly, Mo., February 29, 1944.

Mr. J. W. MINTON,
Vice President, National Stock Yards National Bank,
National Stock Yards, Ill.

DEAR JOHN: I have been informed that Mr. Dreibelbis, attorney for the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, made an appearance before the House Banking Committee on February 8, and made a statement concerning your institution setting out the fact that it was located in a town of 244 people and through certain maneuvers on your part had built the deposits up to over $73,000,000. To date I have been unable to secure a copy of the records to see just what he did say in his appearance at this meeting; however, I would like to get a copy of the official statement. I think if I had it I would take the liberty to write him a letter direct giving him my ideas concerning your situation instead of writing you.

I am going to set out some facts as I see them and if you care to do so you may use this letter or a copy of it in any manner you see fit.

First, let me go back some 9 years ago. As you recall I came to Moberly with the idea of organizing a bank to succeed the old Bank of Moberly, which at that time was operating under restrictions. After conferring with the local people of Moberly the officials in charge of the Bank of Moberly suggested that I contact you personally with the view of trying to work the situation out. This, as you recall, I did, and to make a long story short it was through your untiring and individual efforts that I succeeded in completing this organization and securing a charter from the State banking department who was very reluctant to issue the charter for some reason. During the period of time I was working on this organization I naturally came in contact with a number of other bankers over the State and I found that the National Stock Yards National Bank, and especially yourself, was an outstanding figure among the country bankers with whom I came in contact and in every case this good will on your part had been built up due to services rendered or services offered during the trying times in the early thirties.

I have had various bankers tell me that your cooperation with them enabled them to weather the storm and come through in good shape. In the approximate 9 years since our organization your bank has served us as city correspondent for the St. Louis territory along with the First National Bank of St. Louis and I am happy to say that this service has been highly satisfactory, during which time the question of exchange charges on checks has never been discussed, in fact, they have been of such minor consequence that we didn't consider it worthwhile. We have only had, as you know, three small nonpar banks in our community and the deposits of all three probably wouldn't equal one-half million dollars so that the question of exchange was of no consequence to us. Let me say in this connection, too, that during my contact with the other banks over the State who have been doing business with you the question of exchange charges has never been given as their reason for using you as their city correspondent or for their doing business with you. I mention these things especially due to the fact that it seems as though that was in the mind of Mr. Dreibelbis and was the reason that you accumulated these deposits. Again, I say this without having seen the official statement that he made. As you, of course, know we have kept our principal account with you since our organization and during a major portion of this time we have been a member of the Federal Reserve Bank System but even while checks could be sent direct to the Federal Reserve bank for credit we have sent all of our checks except those, generally speaking, drawn on the First National Bank of St. Louis, to you in one cash letter by express, this for two reasons. First, economy from the standpoint of postage or express, the other that direct credit was received the day received by you and collected through the Federal Reserve the same day just as though it had been forwarded direct. Along with this the drafts on your bank have been acceptable in all parts of the country.

I think some definite form of information should be submitted by you to the proper authorities which show that the town of National Stock Yards, Ill., is in reality within, if not surrounded by, the town of East St. Louis. This town evidently was incorporated for a specific purpose, that is an industrial purpose as its name implies. I think if Mr. Dreibelbis would study the name that would clarify itself.

The absorption of any exchange which may have been done by your institution for us, and frankly I think it has been of a very limited amount, has not been recognized by us as a service charge and we have never taken it into consideration in valuing the service which you have rendered our institution in the past. As I have stated before the volume of nonpar items has been so limited that we considered it of no consequence whatever. I mention this again to emphasize it and I want to say to you that if there is any information or facts which we can compile or put forth to the Federal Reserve Board or anyone else to clarify this issue insofar as you are concerned I shall be very happy to do so.

Hope this matter may be cleared up to your entire satisfaction and I think you should follow it through to that end.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. BACH, *President.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, involved in the legislation today is one of the big fundamental issues confronting our country in these times and that is the whole question of overcentralization of authority and overcentralization of power in the hands of men in the Capital City of the land.

This resolution before us today does not change in any way the existing banking practices which now occur throughout the country. It simply would countermand an order by a bureaucratic organization which would bring additional centralization of authority into the Capital City, not only of political authority, but in this case also of economic authority over the life stream of the country's finances as it passes through the banks of America.

These small banks in the country towns of this country render a tremendous service, a service which is essential for the small towns if they are going to continue to exist and function. You can pick up any of the country newspapers coming to your office, as I am sure they do come to the office of every Member of the House, and there you find that the people who are heading up the War bond drives are usually the bankers of the community, they are taking an active part in raising funds for the U. S. O. and for Red Cross. They provide a focal point of the financial community of the small town. The elimination of profit-making opportunities would make small-town banking in a community impossible. When you make small-town banking impossible, you make small-town merchandising impossible. Gradually you would direct the flow of business out of those smaller communities to the larger towns of the districts and the larger towns of the State and eventually to the larger corporations and the larger cities of the country.

I hope that the Members will approve and endorse this legislation, because it is essential in the first place if Congress is going to maintain its postion by countermanding the orders of bureaucrats which are not based upon law, and secondly, if we are going to do our part in the direction of States' rights and home rule, both from the standpoint of political principle and from the standpoint of the economy of this country.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation is supported and endorsed by those who best know and understand banking operations in our smaller American communities. It has the support of the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee. It has the endorsement of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as was brought out during the hearings. This is natural since the F. D. I. C. has the responsibility of protecting depositors and must therefore be interested in keeping banks solvent. To keep them solvent, banking must be kept profitable. The enactment of this resolution will restrain the Federal Reserve Board from enforcing a ruling which it was not authorized in law to make and which would go far toward making banking unprofitable in hundreds of small banks in this country.

Many of these banks in my State have been in communication with me, Mr. Chairman, about this legislation. They are asking Congress to approve it. They realize the importance of maintaining an independent banking group in this Republic and they recognize the necessity of Congress stepping in to prevent boards and bureaus from writing edicts and enforcing mandates which go beyond the letter and spirit of the legislation which we pass. Mr. Chairman, Government without benefit of congressional legislation has gone too far and grown too fast in this country the past decade. Here is one place that Congress can apply the brakes. If it ever becomes necessary or wise to write such a regulation as the one at issue today, let it be written by Congress and not by the Federal Reserve Board seeking to double in brass for a legislative body. Let this Board, Mr. Chairman, and all other bureaus, boards, commissions, and agencies of the executive department realize that there are more utilitarian methods of writing legislation than by

submitting regulations as an ultimatum to Congress as in the case in point. This "unless you stop us we shall do it" method of issuing directives having the semblance and substance of law is neither a proper nor prudent procedure by which bureaucrats should operate in their administrative tasks. Today is as good a time as any—yesterday or a year or 5 years ago would have been better—to let the executive agencies understand that the best time to approach Congress with suggested measures is before rather than after an attempt has been made to put them into force by Executive decree or bureaucratic mandate.

Mr. Chairman, out in South Dakota we have in the person of Erling F. Haugo, of Sioux Falls, a State superintendent of banks who has become recognized as one of the outstanding authorities on the subject of our country banks. By actual banking experience in a typical small bank, by a supplementary experience as a farmer and a businessman, by his educational background and by his years of administrative experience as State superintendent of banks, Mr. Haugo has had an opportunity to study and observe the needs of our smaller banks and the principles and policies essential to their successful operation. Logically, therefore, on the measure before us, I sought his counsel and it is his conviction—and I share it now with all Members present—that the best interests of our country banks can most effectively be served by the passage of this law which will set aside the recent ruling of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and once again permit some 2,500 banks in the United States to operate on the basis which has been traditionally accepted for many, many years of our national banking history. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, I urge you to support H. R. 3956 by your voices and your votes today.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in endeavoring to interrupt the gentleman from Texas at the time the distinguished gentleman from Michigan was telling about the appearance before the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Governor of the Federal Reserve Board and some of his agents was for the purpose of explaining that the Governor did appear before our committee only a few days before the holiday recess, when there was no time to take up any extended hearings of the subject of regulation Q. I was on the committee at the time. I heard the discussion. I want to say to the Members here that the Governor did not come to ask us; he did not come to make any inquiries; he came to tell us that the Federal Reserve banks were going to put this thing over. When some members of the committee desired to have it postponed for a longer period so we could look into it that request was not even put to a vote. That was the situation so far as informal appearance before the committee was concerned.

I hope this resolution passes by an overwhelming vote. We have had many discussions here regarding bureaucrats overriding the will of Congress, and misinterpreting the will of Congress, making laws by their interpretation and regulations. In the few years that I have been a Member of Congress I do not know of any instance where there has been a more violent perversion of authority by any board or the making of law by regulations than in this instance.

The issue here is very simple. In 1933 the Congress did not authorize "absorption of exchange charges as payment of interest. No such language appears in the statute. Nobody appeared publicly to claim that that was the meaning of the statute until last September, when the Federal Reserve banks met and put regulation Q into the law by their own interpretation of the law, some 10 years after the act was passed. Congress never passed such a law, and the purpose of this resolution is to override the bank-made regulation.

It does seem to me that now is the time to let the Federal Reserve banks know that the little banks of this country are entitled to a hearing and are entitled to consideration. I hope that by the passage of this resolution by a large vote we will serve that notice on them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I am for the provisions of the bill. The object of the bill is very simple. It is contained in the title. It is "to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits."

I was particularly interested in the argument of the two eminent gentlemen from the great State of Michigan, Mr. WOODRUFF and Mr. CRAWFORD. They reminded me of a clever lawyer in a railroad damage case, whereby they are trying to convince the jury that a man who had his leg cut off has not lost anything. We have a name for that kind of argument and it is called sophistry. The time of this Congress has been taken this afternoon, with Members sitting on the floor waiting to be heard, by a long discourse of a few members of the committee trying to put over groundless arguments. Those gentlemen have taken time away from Members not on the committee—people who have learned something about the way banks do business by dealing with the banks—Members who have been sitting here waiting all afternoon to discuss the provision of the bill and vote on this measure while these gentlemen were taking the time and refusing to yield for an open discussion. I am wondering how the Congress can deliberate under any such system.

The banks are never satisfied they have the use of tremendous cash reserves made up of depositors money which they are lending out at interest as authorized by law. Read any bank's statement and you will find the free use of millions of depositors' money on which they are collecting interest and now they want to chisel on the checks passing through their banks without taking into consideration their income and big profits gained in using other peoples' money. The charge proposed to be levied is arbitrary and in excess of the cost of service performed in putting through checks crediting the account of the depositor. I am opposed to the practice and will support the bill. I hope the Members that review this debate as presented in the RECORD will turn to the Appendix and read my letter on constitutional money on page A1062.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this bill helps to perpetuate private business, helps small business, and also helps to curb the bureaucrats. That is reason enough to induce anyone to vote for it. The bill has been necessary by the Federal Reserve Board overstepping its powers and undertaking to place in the existing law a meaning which Congress never intended. The present law forbids the payment of interest on demand deposits by members of the Federal Reserve System. The Board has recently interpreted the law so as to bring the absorption of exchange or collection charges by member banks within the definition of interest. This is a very strained construction and militates against small banks and small business in general.

Small business is having a hard time now to survive. Small banks are also experiencing great difficulty. This ruling of the Federal Reserve Board strikes down the custom long existing to absorb these charges by member banks. The ruling hurts the South particularly and plays into the hands of the large city banks in the North and East. The ruling not only affects the small banks but every other small businessman and the community in general.

This is just one of many things the bureaucrats have been doing—writing laws by edict. The passage of this bill will not only be very beneficial to our people but will serve as a notice that Congress will call the hand of the bureaucrats and it will be a warning to them in the future. I think it is a very meritorious bill, and I am for it and hope that it is speedily enacted into law.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill because I am convinced, on the basis of the debate this afternoon, that the passage of this bill and its enactment into law will mean a small step toward preserving independent banking in America. I am convinced that this bill moves in the direction of preserving a little individuality in the banking of the country.

In my district we have some very fine group banks and they have some very fine branch banks. Nothing that I say is intended to minimize the excellent service they give. Ours have been outstandingly successful, I think, because they have contained many men who have grown up in the communities that they serve and have combined that character with the strength of the group.

As I interpret this bill, it means giving a better opportunity for the small, independent banks to survive in these days of change, banks which are always manned by people who have grown up

in the communities which they serve. Something important will be lost in America if they disappear.

Mr . McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I am always pleased to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that the argument advanced by the gentleman impresses me very much—the necessity of enabling our small banks to compete in this strongly economic area. It seems to me that this bill is a step in that direction, and, without being severely critical of the Federal Reserve Board, it is also my opinion that the existing law does not warrant the issuance of the ruling which this bill attempts to combat, the ruling which says that the absorption of the small service charge constitutes interest within the meaning of the organic act.

For those reasons I intend to vote for the passage of the bill.

Mr. CASE. I think the very fact that the Federal Reserve Board thought it was necessary to come up and justify its position is evidence of the fact that they thought there was some question about them having the authority under the intent of the original law. Certainly, if this means a little better opportunity for the independent banks of America to survive, we ought to pass the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, this legislation involves the power of the Federal Reserve Board to issue regulation Q. The fact that the Board did not undertake to make such a regulation for 10 years is probably the best evidence that could be cited that the Board was without any such power.

I favor the pending bill because I believe that under the guise of a ruling or regulation the Federal Reserve Board is undertaking to legislate. Only the Congress of the United States can legislate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired. All time has expired. Under the rule, the Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3956) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits, pursuant to House Resolution 452, reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit, and I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAWFORD moves to recommit the bill, H. R. 3956, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Thirty-four Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my own remarks and include therein certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative program for the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE RATIFICATION OF TREATIES

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, it is not the purpose of this discussion to reflect upon the character or integrity of the United States Senate. It is the purpose of this discussion to condemn a provision of our Constitution which may have been responsible for the present World War, and which, if not changed, will probably destroy our future peace and security. I refer to that part of our Constitution which requires the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators in the ratification of a treaty. This has often been referred to as the greatest mistake made by the founding fathers in the writing of the Constitution. I have introduced a resolution proposing to change this provision of the Constitution and to provide for the ratification of treaties by a simple majority of both Houses of Congress. Many similar resolutions have been introduced in the Congress from time to time; a number are now pending. But nothing has ever been done about any of them, largely because of the opposition of the Senators themselves.

First, let us consider a little of the history of the two-thirds rule, then how it has worked in practice, and, finally, what the probable future consequences of this rule may be.

The two-thirds rule was written into the Constitution as a matter of compromise between the large-State group and the small-State group. Of the 13 States then in the Union, 7 of them had only a fractional part of the entire population, and felt this provision a matter of defense against large-State domination. Within 25 years after the enactment of the Constitution this reason for the rule ceased to exist. The reason the House of Representatives was denied participation in the ratification of treaties is given by Alexander Hamilton, one of the editors of the Federalist, in this language:

> Accurate and comprehensive knowledge of foreign politics; a steady and systematic adherence to the same views; a nice and uniform sensibility to national character; decision, secrecy, and dispatch are incompatible of the genus of a body so variable and numerous.

Thus it was thought to remove treaty ratification from popular control, to place it in a body not so responsive to public will as the House of Representatives. If this undemocratic reasoning were ever sound, it is no longer supportable. In fact, there are some who now contend that the power to ratify treaties should be left exclusively to the House, without Senate participation whatsoever, for the reason that the House is closer to the people and would reflect the popular will, and for the further reason that, under the rules of the House, delay and filibuster are impossible while in the Senate a small minority can talk and filibuster a measure to death, even when it has the overwhelming support of Senate membership.

But now to the record of how the two-thirds rule has worked in practice. A treaty annexing Texas to the Union was defeated in the Senate. President McKinley was unable to secure the annexation of Hawaii by treaty.

The annexation of both Texas and Hawaii was effected by joint resolution instead of through treaty ratified by the Senate. Under the two-thirds rule it is possible for 17 Members of the Senate to defeat the ratification of a treaty, since ratification requires two-thirds of those present. As a practical matter, much fewer than 17 could and have defeated the ratification of treaties, as will hereafter be shown. As a matter of fact, it is possible for Senators, say, from the States of Montana and North Dakota, having a combined population of approximately 1,200,000, being less than 1 percent of the American people, to defeat the ratification of a treaty.

From President George Washington to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, from

Secretary of State Jefferson down to Secretary of State Hull, all Presidents and all Secretaries of State have had heartbreaking experiences with the two-thirds ratification rule in the Constitution. All would doubtless testify that no good, and much harm, has resulted from this rule, and that it has always been a source of irritation and embarrassment to this Government. In 1899 our treaty with Spain, in which we took much and gave little, was ratified by the slim margin of one vote. At that time Secretary Hay had this to say of the requirement of Senate ratification by a two-thirds vote:

A treaty of peace, in any normal state of things, ought to be ratified with unanimity in 24 hours. They wasted 6 weeks in wrangling over this one, and ratified it with one vote to spare. We have five or six matters now demanding settlement. I can settle them all honorably and advantageously to our own side, and I am assured by leading men in the Senate that not one of these treaties, if negotiated, will pass the Senate. I should have a majority in every case, but a malcontent third would certainly dish every one of them. To such monstrous shape has the original mistake of the Constitution grown in the evolution of our politics. You must understand it is not merely my solution the Senate will reject. They will reject, for instance, any treaty whatever, on any subject, with England. I doubt if they would accept any treaty of consequence with Russia or Germany. The recalcitrant third would be differently composed, but it would be on hand.

In 1904 Theodore Roosevelt abandoned entirely the submission of nine treaties of arbitration because of his fear of the United States Senate. In 1897 the so-called Olney-Pauncefote treaty which provided for the arbitration of disputes between this country and Great Britain, although it received a vote of 43 ayes and 26 nays, failed of ratification in the United States Senate and resulted in much hard feeling between this country and Great Britain. In 1927 a treaty of amity and commerce between this country and Turkey received a vote of 50 ayes to 34 nays and failed of ratification. In 1935 a multilateral treaty for our adherence to the World Court received a vote of 52 ayes and 36 nays and hence was defeated. But the all-time classic example of the futility of the two-thirds rule, the one about which whole libraries have been written, is the Senate consideration of the Versailles Treaty and of the League of Nations at the end of World War No. 1. Because of the shrewd and determined opposition of one or two men in the United States Senate during the fateful years of 1919–1920, America refused to ratify the Treaty of Versailles and also refused to join the League of Nations.

Senator Watson, of Indiana, describes in a book a conversation he had with Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, at that time. Watson told Lodge that 80 percent of the people in America were in favor of adherence to the league, that 80 percent of the ministers of America were advocating it from their pulpits and that the League could not be defeated. To this Senator Lodge replied that he did not expect to defeat the League by frontal attack but by an indirect method of reservation and delay. After many months of debate Senator Lodge was able to hook on to the proposed treaty 14 separate and distinct reservations, and on March 19, 1920 a final vote was taken in the Senate. Forty-nine voted aye, 35 voted nay.

Students of the Senate debate on the Versailles Treaty generally agree there were four major reasons why a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification of the Treaty could not be secured. Incidentally, these are continuing reasons, and because of them one can safely predict that Senate ratification of any treaty of great consequence cannot be obtained.

These four major reasons, categorically stated, are: First, politics; second, senatorial pride and prerogative; third, hatred of the President; fourth, desire to return to isolation. Now none of these necessarily impugn the character or integrity of the individual Senator; all could be absolutely sincere in these matters. A Senator may represent a district populated with persons of a particular nationality. A few Senators could be found that would perhaps despise, if not hate, any particular country with which we might seek to treat. Under senatorial pride and prerogative comes their effort to get along with each other and their jealousy of the dignity and power of the United States Senate. A treaty ceding the Isle of Pines to Cuba was held up in the Senate for 21 years, although urged by all Presidents, although frequently reported favorably by the Foreign Relations Committee, although favored by the overwhelming majority of the Senators, simply because first one Senator, then another, would ask for further investigation and would receive the same as a matter of senatorial courtesy. When any President has been long in power a distrust of and a dislike for and sometimes a positive hatred of such President will grow up in the hearts of a number of Senators. Again, in a group of 96 Senators there will always be 1, 2, or more who perhaps sincerely believe in isolation and who want this country, ostrich-like, to stick its head in the sand and have nothing whatsoever to do with the other countries of the world.

A majority of the Congress can declare war. Why should not a majority of the Congress be able to declare peace? There are many who think that the Senate action, or failure to act, in 1920 helped to cause the present World War. Certainly it did nothing to prevent the present war. Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that relative world peace following this war, that the prevention of a third world war, is dependent upon American collaboration in some sort of world association or league following this war. If and when this proposition is put up to the United States Senate we will face almost exactly the same situation faced in 1920. A repetition of the debacle of 1920 is not only possible, it is highly probable. The same causes will produce the same results.

Mr. Speaker, when the shooting stops abroad the debate in the Senate will begin. Thousands of goblins will then be discovered along every suggested road of travel. It will then be too late to change the rules of procedure. Whoever the President is, whoever the Senators are, if the two-thirds ratification requirement has not been changed, history will repeat itself and America will again have broken the heart of the world, to say nothing of the hearts of her children yet unborn.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PRODUCTION CREDIT SYSTEM

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most insidious attacks ever made against American agriculture has been under way in this country since last July. It is so important to the future welfare of our farmers that I am increasingly surprised that greater publicity has not been given to it in the press and on the floor of this House. I refer specifically to the attack which has been launched by the American Bankers Association against the production-credit system. Under date of July 22, 1943, this association sent out to its member banks the following letter, which I quote verbatim and ask to have inserted in the RECORD at this point:

THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., July 22, 1943.

To the Member Banks:

Please give this letter to the officer of the bank who is most interested in:

1. Federal legislation.
2. Government competition with private credit.
3. Preserving private enterprise.
4. Direct personal action on the legislative front.

"DEAR SIR: There has been a lot of talk among bankers in recent months about what Congress ought to do or not to do. Most of this talk has been among ourselves. The time now has come for bankers to do some talking directly with the only people who can do anything about these matters—the Members of Congress, your Representatives in Washington and your Senators.

"Congress is in recess for the summer and most of the Congressmen are at home. They are at home for two purposes: First, to get away from the strain and turmoil of Washington; and, second, to get the viewpoint of the people at home. That gives us an opportunity and a responsibility. The only question is whether we will perform this duty and utilize this opportunity now to give our Washington representatives facts about banking and our views on legislative matters.

"The A. B. A. can do certain things in Washington such as: Secure the introduction of bills; conduct hearings and investigations; plead the cause of chartered banking before congressional committees, administrative agencies, etc. There is one thing it cannot do—it cannot contact a majority of the 435 Representatives and the 96 Members of the Senate on a legislative proposal. That is a job that only the folks back home can do. On banking legislation it is a job that only you and the other bankers can do.

"The winter session of Congress probably will witness a show-down on the question of Government subsidized and socialized credit. How your Senators and Representatives vote on legislation involving these issues may be determined by the information and viewpoint that you and other bankers give them this summer.

"As chairman of your committee on Federal legislation, I am calling on you to perform that service for chartered banking and to do it now.

"Two major fights in the field of agricultural credit are just ahead. One is to compel the production credit system to pay its own way. This should be done by eliminating the Government subsidy it now enjoys to the extent of the income on $120,000,000 of Government funds which it has been using for the past 8 years. The P. C. A.'s use $3,000,000 of income per year from these funds to make artificially low interest rates on loans and to pay expenses and losses.

"Private capital naturally cannot compete with such credit that is subsidized by the Government. Furthermore, other Government agencies and employees help drum up business for the P. C. A.'s. All of this is at the taxpayers' expense. Advertisements for loans are deceptive and untruthful, claiming a rate of 4½ percent when the actual cost to the borrower is usually 6 percent or higher. If a private business followed such a practice it would quickly feel the hand of Government prosecution.

"The second fight is in the field of socialized credit—United States Treasury disbursements under the guise of loans through the R. A. C. C., the Emergency Crop and Feed Loan Office, and the Farm Security Administration—three separate agencies, three Nation-wide governmental organizations, using hundreds of millions of dollars of Treasury funds now sorely needed in the war effort, while billions of dollars of bank deposits are starving for opportunities for employment. The least the Government should do is to consolidate these agencies, reduce expenses and costs, and lay down conditions for loans by act of Congress rather than to give Administrators free rein to determine loaning policies. Then set up simple machinery whereby the money may be provided by banks and other private credit agencies under an arrangement similar to Commodity Credit Corporation loans.

"Most bankers know the facts about the operations of these agencies in their own States. It is highly important to know the facts before you talk to your Congressman. Tell him something about the job banking is doing in the war effort—selling bonds, making war loans, handling ration banking. Tell him some of the problems of banks, particularly of country banks.

"This is your task as a banker and as a citizen. Talk the matter over with a few other bankers, then make an appointment and call on your Representative and your Senators.

"Their vote might decide the issue. Your effort might determine their vote. A great responsibility is yours.

"Yours very truly,

"A. L. M. WIGGINS,

"Chairman, Committee on Federal Legislation."

You will note, among other things, that Chairman Wiggins closes his letter with these significant words: "This is your task as a banker and as a citizen. Talk the matter over with a few other bankers, then make an appointment and call on your Representative and your Senators. Their vote might decide the issue. Your effort might determine their vote. A great responsibility is yours."

Translating this statement into the language of political action, Mr. Speaker, it means that starting as of July, last year, Congress was to be lobbied and pressured into voting to eliminate various aspects of our Farm Credit Administration; that there was to be launched a concerted campaign to sway the Members of this House and of the Senate toward doing away with governmental agencies which have back of them some of the brightest records in our history, records which show more vividly than I can describe here the wonderful job that these associations have done for our American farmers.

There is ample evidence that this initial attack of the American Bankers Association has been followed up; many letters and statements have reached me on this subject from banker organizations all over the country. There is not time to go into them in detail here, but I should like to refer briefly to one or two of them.

Under date of January 27, 1944, the Nebraska Bankers Association wrote me opposing the production-credit association and enclosing a series of questions and answers about so-called subsidized banking. Their basic argument was that "the bankers of Nebraska oppose subsidized lending, not primarily because it is harmful to small bankers, but because we believe it is fundamentally unsound and un-American." I digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to ask the Members of the House these questions: Is it un-American to save thousands of American farms from foreclosure? Is it un-American to keep the ownership of American farms in the hands of the small farmer rather than to permit increasing concentration of land ownership in the hands of industrial farmers, banks, and mortgage companies? Is it un-American to cooperatively manage loan associations which bring about these ends? I respectfully submit that what the Nebraska Bankers Association refers to as un-American is the very essence of Americanism, namely, cooperation between individual and Government to save individual ownership of property.

The Pennsylvania Bankers Association has turned out a much prettier little brochure than the Nebraska one—one that is printed instead of multigraphed—but it covers very much the same ground. The same old arguments are dished out—Government credit constitutes a great threat to free enterprise—"it is directly contrary to the principles of democracy for the central government to use taxpayers' money to engage in business as a direct competitor with free enterprise. Taxpayers' associations and leagues are opposed to the continued used of taxpayers' money to subsidize Government-controlled lending agencies operating in competition with privately chartered taxpaying banks." At the end of this interesting little brochure are the following instructions to the member banks of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association if they would help to drive out the specter that is our production-credit association. In order that the Members of the House in particular and the entire American people in general may know what is taking place, I quote directly these instructions:

1. Get to know your Congressman and Senators better.

2. Acquaint your Congressman and Senators with various phases of the menace of subsidized lending by Federal Government agencies and with any other factors that are driving loans out of country banks.

3. Ask your Representatives in Congress to aid the program advocated and advanced by the American Bankers Association.

4. Bring the question before your board of directors and acquaint them with its seriousness.

5. Review your bond portfolio to see to what extent you may be supporting this competitive system through your own bank's investments.

6. By your own efforts and the efforts of your directors, solicit the desirable farm-production loans in your community. Your farmer patrons and others will welcome this interest on the part of the bank. The method is left to each individual bank or group of banks for self-determination. In some counties the county bankers association can best formulate an equitable plan for placing desirable production loans with the farmer's neighborhood bank.

7. Have your county banker's association or the local credit exchange survey the records at the county courthouse to ascertain what production loans are actually being made to the farmers in your county, and by whom.

One cannot help but wonder what might be some of the possible implications of this last particular bit of advice.

These illustrations of the drive against production credit are from a Midwestern and an Eastern State, respectively, I am a Californian, and I hasten to add that some bankers in my State likewise appear to be following the line of the American Bankers Association. I should like to quote from the Salinas Californian of November 23, 1943. Salinas is a city in my own Eleventh District; the Californian is its daily newspaper, and an excellent one, too. I quote:

The fight against subsidized credit, led by A. C. Hughes, president of the California Bankers Association and president of the Monterey County Trust and Savings Bank, will be joined again tonight in San Francisco. Hughes is one of a list of speakers who will address the association. Following a series of talks throughout the State on the unfair competition of Government loaning agencies with private banking, Hughes has had an impressive lot of fan mail supporting his fight to preserve the banks from socialization. * * * "I believe the next 12 months will be the most critical year in our economic history," Hughes will tell the assembled bankers at the Commercial Club dinner tonight, as he rallies them to preserve the fundamentals which have made America the freest and economically the soundest country in the world. "This is the greatest challenge the banks of America have faced," he has told audiences throughout the State. "All socialized credit is a step toward state socialism. This trend is accentuated by the war emergency. While private enterprise has been devoting its entire time and energy to the war effort, and accomplishing the impossible, the Government has been driving toward a socialistic post-war economy. * * *" is a part of Hughes' message.

One might elaborate upon the details of this fight against production credit, but I think that the examples already cited are sufficient to illustrate the goals, the techniques, and the implications of the war that is being waged against the American Farm Credit System by the bankers' association. It might be pointed out that already legislation has been introduced into this House which is in harmony with this program; H. R. 3395, for example, a bill to provide for the repayment to the United States of the revolving fund created for the establishment of the production credit corporations. I am sure that we shall all be vitally interested in the recommendation which the Committee on Agriculture makes in regard to this bill.

What is the background of the cooperative organization which has created such a furor? Perhaps it would be wise to review briefly its history. The Farm Credit Administration had its origin in 1916 during President Woodrow Wilson's administration, when the Federal Land Bank System was established. This System, consisting of 12 banks, was established specifically for the purpose of helping American farmers get credit—to get credit when such credit could not be obtained from private institutions. At that time a chance was offered to private capital, a chance which has since been offered whenever the rural credit system has been expanded, to finance the system privately. As is stated in the February 15, 1944, issue of the National Union Farmer:

> It ended with the Treasury subscribing most of the money. This has occurred repeatedly since—private investors and banking interests refusing to join the Government as partners in various extensions of the Farm Credit System, yet demanding that the Government "get out of the banking business" and allow private bankers to resume their old monopoly.

It should be mentioned in passing that the constitutionality of the Federal Land Bank System was challenged, but was upheld by the Supreme Court.

The principal additional steps in the building up of our National Farm Credit Administration were as follows:

Federal intermediate credit banks	1923
Bank for cooperatives	1933
Regional agricultural credit corporations	1932
The production-credit system	1933
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	1934

Duplication among these doubtless occurs, but such duplication appears to have been kept at a minimum, from all the evidence available. It is to the fourth one of the agencies listed above, the production-credit system, that I have referred in the earlier part of my discussion and to which we again turn after this very brief historical background, made for the sake of perspective.

The Farm Credit Act of 1933, authorizing the establishment of a cooperative production-credit system for agriculture, came about as a result of the extremely hard times that the American farmer, together with all other Americans, was then facing. It is difficult for us now, in the midst of this artificial war boom, to recapture the depression scene. It is difficult for us to think back to those dark days when more than one-fifth of our people were out of work, when we had bread lines and apple sellers in such great numbers, when over a million Americans were hoboing their way around the country, and when the principal help that had been given to the country up to that time was the pollyannaish advice "that prosperity was around the corner." Starting in 1933, such inane words were replaced by action, and serious efforts were made toward a comprehensive program of helping the American people to help themselves. For the farmer, adequate credit was the principal need. The seasonal character of his work, long production periods, low return on investment, hazards of weather and of the market, all combined to make credit the big problem. The Farm Credit Act of 1933 was the result.

Following this step, production-credit associations, that is, local cooperative organizations of farmers authorized to make loans for general agricultural purposes, began to spring up throughout the Nation, chartered under the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration. Twelve production-credit corporations were established, 1 in each farm-credit district. These corporations organized and provided the initial capital for local associations of farmers known as P. C. A.'s. Today there are 523 such associations, scattered throughout the length and breadth of America, serving more than 300,000 farmers. I intend to include in my remarks at a later point some of the letters which have come to me from farmers in my district, testifying to the value of these associations and paying tribute to their accomplishments. I cannot refrain from inserting here, however, a brief statement made recently at the tenth anniversary of the production-credit association of San Luis Obispo County, Calif. This statement was made by Mr. John Ruskovich, a supervisor in that county, a 10-year member of the association, and one of the outstanding citizens of the community. Mr. Ruskovich stated that—

> If it had not been for the production-credit association I would have been out of business in 1934. It was impossible for me to borrow money from the banks at that time; although they seemed friendly enough, they were unable to loan me any money. My pears would have rotted on the ground if I had not been able to obtain production-credit funds. Since that time I have not always needed to borrow, but if I had, I would have used the production-credit association.

Mr. Speaker, this type of statement and this type of case could be illustrated over and over again. Not only were the pears of San Luis Obispo County, Calif., rotting on the ground because farmers could not get credit to harvest and market them; all over America, in every one of our States, farmers were desperate in 1933 because our financial system was unable to meet the crisis of the most severe depression that the country had ever known. The production-credit associations were a literal lifesaver to many thousands of these people. It is this system which the American Bankers Association is now denouncing as socialistic, and is asking its individual members to lobby against with Members of this House. Such action as this really amounts to sabotaging the small farmer of America under the pretext of fighting socialism.

Let us analyze for a few minutes the contemporary situation in regard to the production credit associations. I submit here the high-lights of the 1943 operations of these agencies. I think that these statistics, dry as figures may be in the abstract, tell a story of achievement, of cooperation, and of sound management which it will be very difficult indeed for anyone to refute.

A SUMMARY OF 1943 OPERATIONS OF PRODUCTION-CREDIT ASSOCIATIONS

First. The tenth year since organization of the production-credit system was closed on December 31, 1943.

Second. The number of farmer-stockholders of the 523 production credit associations on December 31, 1943, was 338,139.

Third. Loans made in 1943 totaled more than $501,000,000, of which 17 percent represented renewals.

Fourth. Peak loan volume outstanding in 1943 was approximately $259,000,000.

Fifth. Average cost of loans to members in 1943 amounted to 5.24 percent per annum.

Sixth. Paid-in capital of the associations amounts to approximately $105,000,000, of which farmers and stockmen own nearly $24,500,000, or 23.4 percent.

Seventh. Legal reserves in the associations exceed $28,000,000.

Eighth. Association income from membership sources in 1943 was $1,313,378 more than total expenses and losses.

Ninth. Dividends were declared and paid by 24 associations in the year 1943.

Tenth. More than 100,000 farm people, including 18 percent of the total membership, attended 1943 annual meetings of production credit associations.

Eleventh. The total losses on association loans since organization amount to less than one-sixth of 1 percent of the $2,523,000,000 cash advanced.

Twelfth. The book value of the capital stock of all the 523 associations exceed the par value.

Thirteenth. The net worth of the corporations and associations combined amounts to $182,000,000.

Fourteenth. The investment of $120,000,000 by the Federal Government in the production-credit system is intact and invested in Government bonds.

A large number of farmers borrowing in 1942 were able to conduct their operations without the use of credit in 1943. This is well illustrated in a study which was made after July 1, 1943, comparing the lists of borrowers in 97 production-credit associations on July 1, 1943, with the lists as of July 1, 1942. These 97 associations, constituting nearly one-fifth of the total number, were widely scattered throughout the 12 farm credit districts and were representative of the total operations of the system. In these 97 associations, of the 47,542 borrowers on July 1, 1942, 13,936, or 29.3 percent, were not borrowers July 1, 1943. Of the 47,542 individuals having loans July 1, 1942, 8,864, or 18.6 percent of the total number, were still farming but not using short-term credit from any source on July 1, 1943. In other words, nearly one-fifth of those borrowing July 1, 1942, were continuing their farm operations a year later but were not using credit. Of the other 10.7 percent of 1942 borrowers not borrowing from production-credit associations on July 1, 1943, 3,028, or 6.4 percent, were no longer farming; 1,449, or 3 percent, were obtaining their financing from other sources; and 595, or 1.3 percent, were not borrowing from the associations for reasons which it was impossible to determine. In view of the fact that nearly 20 percent of the borrowers on July 1, 1942, were not borrowing from any source on July 1, 1943, I think it is remarkable that the total number of borrowers this year is only slightly smaller than it was a year ago. This indicates that a considerable number of new members have been brought into the system.

Of the 1,449 who on July 1, 1943, were financing their operations from sources other than the production-credit associations, slightly more than one-half were borrowing from banks.

Such figures give us the facts of the picture; life is breathed into these facts when we hear the statements of human beings. The following are a few of the letters which have been coming into my office for the past few months on this subject—letters which portray very vividly the old fears of the depression years and the new fears which the drive against production-credit associations has engendered. As we listen to some of these letters and realize the sincerity and depth of feeling which prompts them, it seems to me that we have our answer to the silly, stupid, selfish charges of the American Bankers Association that these associations are un-American. I ask the Members of the House to listen for a few minutes to some of these letters.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to my good friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does not the distinguished gentleman from California think that those facts which he has just given us in terms of the number of people involved and dollars involved have added up to the greatest continued production of food for this war that we have ever had and that they are pertinent facts when we consider it is our job not only to feed our own armed forces, the greatest we have ever had, our allies all over the world, but at the same time provide a very adequate diet for the workers and others at home?

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his remarks and in reply I should like to say that it is my judgment that the production-credit associations have been instrumental in helping to build this tremendous achievement on the part of the American farmers. I may say further that it has been only a few months since we heard the dire predictions of certain people as to what a terrible year the farmers of America would have, while the statistics show that they have constantly increased production during the last 2 or 3 years over those they have ever known before.

Mr. McMURRAY. May I say further to the gentleman that those are exactly the facts I want to bring out. These agencies which have been built up over the last 10 years have been thrown into this effort for the production of food and have borne results. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OUTLAND. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman would not want that to stay in the RECORD exactly as he stated it because it could not be verified by the facts. The increase has come not through man-made factors but has come because we happen to have had 3 years in succession of the best weather conditions we have ever had in this country. The agricultural people do not look forward in 1944 with the same assurance so far as weather is concerned that we have had during the last 2 or 3 years. So if we did have these tremendous food supplies we have had them largely on account of the weather conditions that have prevailed.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is correct so far as he goes but he does not go far enough. Weather conditions have been favorable and certainly would have to be listed among the important factors in production. However, along with the favorable weather has been a more adequate credit system which has helped to stimulate production. While the work of the production-credit associations cannot take the whole credit, at the same time they have to be given a considerable portion of it. Of course, I hope the prediction of the gentleman that we are not going to have a good year this year will not be borne out.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That was not my prediction. I said that was the contention of the Department in the preparation it was making for this year and Mr. Jones, Food Administrator, has asked for 380,000,000 acres instead of 240,000,000, anticipating a less-per-acre yield because he realizes the conditions over which no one has control may be such as to cut down the per-acre production. I can give the gentleman a concrete example. Take the State of Oklahoma. That State had 3,800,000 acres during the last 2 years in wheat. In one year they averaged 60½ and the next year only 9½. This difference was due to bugs and so forth, and it turned out that later in the season there was also a drought. There is the same acreage with the difference between 54,000,000 and 31,000,000 bushels of wheat. No living person had any control over that. That is one of the risks that we take in connection with this. As the gentleman says, the credit-facilities organization is one of the man-made institutions that can help increase this production.

I think there is another point the gentleman brought out that is important, and that is that we had a stock pile 2 years ago that we do not have at the present time, and with the backlog of food, the wheat and corn we had under storage at that time, under loan, they were seeking there to go ahead and make their contribution toward this wonderful production that has taken place in the last 2 years.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think we would both have to join in paying tribute to the achievement of the American farmer himself in fighting both the hazards of weather and of inadequate credit. Had we not had the production-credit system, I doubt that our record would have been so fine.

The statistics which I gave a few moments ago need the human touch. Such human touch can be added by literally dozens of letters that have reached me from people throughout California bearing testimony to the importance of the production-credit association in helping not only to stimulate production but to save their farms. Some of these letters follow:

SANTA YNEZ, CALIF., *September 21, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: My attention has been drawn to the fact that a movement seems to be under way to kill the production-credit association. This would be a real calamity to the producer and a step backward rather than forward, I believe.

I was born and raised a farmer and have a background of about 20 years in the poultry business. I am 59 years old, and I can't remember a time, until the production-credit association came into operation, that I could find any place to finance my kind of operations, for more than several hundred dollars on my note, or small amounts on chattel mortgages.

Production credit has made it possible for the producer, especially the small one, to borrow on his wealth, which is his product. It has made it possible for him to have the cash to purchase feed, supplies, pay labor, and in general meet the bills that his business demands while his product is being made ready for market.

Without this help most of us would be working and investing, all year, just to pay the other fellow in the fall; for the things we purchase come through strongly organized channels which keep prices at about all one could meet if interest rates were high, and purchases were made "on time."

Many lines of business have special ways of being financed, and it seems perfectly fair to me that the grower or producer should be granted the same right. Production-credit association money is not Government money, and if given a fair chance each production credit unit will own its own association, in which only borrowers are allowed to vote, and only actual producers are members.

This gives a person a chance, who has shown he is capable and honest, to safely carry on his business in a manner to keep some profit for himself, which one should be entitled to. Many producers are tenants and cannot give property as security, but still make up a large part of the population that grow the food for the Nation. Also, most of them would work hard for a chance to own their own place.

Just because money is plentiful now should not bring about the mistake of killing the very thing that will avert disaster to one class of us when money becomes scarce again.

Several years ago I would have been forced to quit because of these things I have mentioned, but production-credit loans made it possible for me to continue until now I am an asset to my country, rather than a liability, and have an independent old age to look forward to instead of a pension.

I do hope you will help to keep the production-credit system in existence.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SANTA MARIA, CALIF.,
September 13, 1943.

Hon. GEORGE E. OUTLAND,
Washington, D. C.:

I am a farmer in the Santa Maria area and operate a 450-acre farm; 200 acres beans, 200 acres barley, 50 acres of tomatoes. I understand the Bankers Association is making every effort to legislate the production-credit association out of existence. The production-credit associations are necessary to agriculture and its operations, and I wish you to do all in your power to maintain this cooperative.

Yours, ——— ———.

BUELLTON, CALIF., *September 17, 1943.*

DEAR MR. OUTLAND: * * * having met you personally am taking the liberty to write

you. There is a determined effort on the part of bankers to knock out the production-credit associations, so for God's sake be on your toes and do all you can to keep these production credits rolling along. They picked us up when times were hardest, and now we are on our feet and able to do our bit in this war. These chain banks * * * had me on the ropes and nearly knocked out, but now thanks to production credit and the Federal land bank I can tell them to go to hell. It would be a national calamity to hamper the production-credit associations. We, the producers, own our own stock and have a say in the management. We are grateful for what this good organization has done. It has kept real ranchers and farmers going. These are part of the backbone of this country. * * *

Sincerely,

——— ———.

SOLVANG, CALIF., *September 29, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: I am a small farmer and stockman who has been benefited by being able to borrow from the production-credit association. I was very surprised to learn that there is talk at the present time of discontinuing that organization.

As I am paying for my home, I find it difficult to accumulate enough cash to carry me through the hardest time of each year. At this time I appreciate very much being able to borrow enough to meet labor, feed, harvesting, and various other bills. For these reasons I think the production-credit association is a fine organization and should remain in operation.

Respectfully yours,

——— ———.

SANTA YNEZ, CALIF.,
October 7, 1943.

DEAR MR. OUTLAND: I am a member of the production-credit association and I have been informed that there is a movement on to cancel its charter. I feel that the Production Credit has financially aided ranchers and farmers in many ways. The two outstanding good features of production credit are the loaning of money to farmers where banks and other financial institutions have rejected requests for loans and the low interest rates that have been made available on loans.

I feel that in all sincerity the production credit has done and is doing a splendid job and feel very strongly that it should be retained.

Sincerely,

——— ———

TEMPLETON, CALIF.,
October 10, 1943.

HONORABLE SIR: I am a farmer and shareholder in the production-credit association which is helping the farmer so much. I wish to ask you to use your influence and vote to have this corporation continued as it surely seems the banks are trying to put them out.

Respectfully,

——— ———

PASO ROBLES, CALIF.,
October 18, 1943.

DEAR GEORGE: Enclosed please find a clipping from my farm paper which I hope you'll find time to read. It made me so mad when I read it. Even though the farmers may not be using all these Government agencies we do not want them destroyed, because the day will come when we need them bad again. It's better to have a fire engine and never use it than to need it and not have it. I've seen the time when neighbor farmers here with ten to fifteen thousand dollars worth of property could not borrow a dime from our so-called free enterprise banks to finance crops and production. "So sorry, we are not loaning money now—just calling it in." And now they have plenty of money they want to loan but they prefer loaning it to gamblers who make quick turn-overs instead of to farm families. * * * No, George, don't retreat an inch on any of these farm-credit agencies at the instigation of the Bankers Association. This is one place where Congress should make an El Alamein or Salerno stand. We saw what happened before and we don't want it to happen again.

Yours truly,

——— ———

SANTA MARIA, CALIF., *October 18, 1943.*

DEAR MR. G. E. OUTLAND: I have been informed that the bankers association would like to see the production-credit association discontinue loaning money to farmers. I am a cattleman and have been doing business with the production-credit association for 3 years and find it very satisfactory and would not like to see the association discontinued for myself as well as for other farmers and cattlemen. For many reasons, one, because their rate of interest is lower; secondly, they are more lenient; therefore, you have a chance to run your business to a better advantage. Three years ago, before I started doing business with the production-credit association, the banker threatened to foreclose on me.

So I beg you gentlemen to do all that is in your power to see that the production-credit association is not discontinued.

Thanking you, I am

Yours truly,

——— ———.

SAN MIGUEL, CALIF., *November 11, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: I am writing to ask you to please oppose any legislation which would eliminate the production-credit system. It is the best thing in the county for us hard-working farmers. I have that feeling, "Well, if I have to, I can get a little help from the credit-production company." Please do help us keep it.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

SHANDON, CALIF., *November 16, 1943.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OUTLAND: I, a rancher, am writing you in support of the production-credit association. This association has during hard times loaned us money when other sources of credit refused to do so, and at a lower rate of interest than that charged by other financial institutions. It has been one association that has never failed the farmer, a friend in need as well as one in plenty.

I am asking you as my congressional representative to oppose any legislation which will tend to eliminate the Production Credit Association, and in so doing not deprive the farmer of an ever ready, sure source of financial assistance.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

PASO ROBLES, CALIF., *November 16, 1943.*

DEAR SIR: Please oppose any legislation that would eliminate the production-credit system, as it would certainly hurt the average farmer.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

PASO ROBLES, CALIF., *October 28, 1943.*

YOUR HONOR: I understand there is a movement going on by the bankers to do away with the production-credit corporation. I wish you would do all you can to keep P. C. C. in force; it is a real help to the farmer in need.

Yours respectfully,

——— ———.

SHANDON, CALIF., *November 29, 1943.*

MY DEAR SIR: I take the liberty of writing you in regard to the production-credit association and sincerely hope you will oppose any legislation detrimental to its interests. It is an economical and dependable source of credit at interest a farmer can afford.

I am speaking from experience when I say the Federal land bank and the production-credit association have been a home saver—I may say, a lifesaver—for me.

Yours most respectfully,

——— ———.

These comments might be multiplied many times, and while those I have read come from only one congressional district in California, I have no doubt that every congressional district in America would bear similar testimony to the effectiveness of the production-credit associations and the necessity and importance of continuing them.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not think there is any attempt to get rid of the P. C. A. I am sure my colleague would be interested in knowing that we had that hearing very extensively a while ago, and there was no attempt made to get rid of the P. C. A. The only thing they asked was that they not be subsidized by Government money. That is being worked out. All the strong P. C. A.'s are able to take care of themselves in that particular field. I do not think there is anything in the picture at all that is going to lead one to believe that the P. C. A.'s are going to be eliminated from the picture.

Mr. OUTLAND. I wish I were as optimistic as my friend from Wisconsin. I should like to say this in reply. I am fully familiar with the bill which is now pending before the Committee on Agriculture to take away the $120,000,000 that has been loaned to the P. C. A.'s on the basis of $12,000,000 a year for 10 years. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. As I recall it, that is right.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman realizes that the interest on that money is what is helping to breathe lifeblood into the production-credit associations throughout this country. While it is quite true that there are a great many production-credit associations that can now stand on their own two feet, there are others that have not yet reached that stage of maturity. I am sure that if the gentleman will peruse the literature that is being sent out by the American Bankers Association he will find cause for genuine alarm that while the statement is frequently made that "we only want to get rid of the subsidy," in the long run the real aim is to get rid of all Government agencies that are granting credit to the American farmers.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It may be the aim, but I do not think there is any disposition on the part of Congress to yield to such a situation.

Mr. OUTLAND. I will say to the gentleman in reply that in the short time I have been here I have seen Congress kill many agencies which were doing as valuable a piece of work as the production-credit associations; meanwhile the contention was being made

that they were not to be killed. For example, I think if the National Resources Planning Board, which was doing an excellent job, were in existence today, it would make a mighty contribution to our post-war planning. I am very fearful that while the statement may be made that it is not now the aim to kill the P. C. A.'s in the long run that is what would be finally accomplished.

There are certain elements in this drive to kill the farmers' production-credit system which should not be overlooked. It is part of a broad attack, aimed at liquidating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Farm Security Administration, and at crippling the whole cooperative movement in this country. We should not forget that only a few years ago the production-credit associations, and other federally financed credit institutions, were a bulwark to thousands of private banks through their refinancing of loans held by these banks. The production-credit associations played a large part in bailing out thousands of private banks during depression years by taking loans out of their portfolios which were slow in being repaid, or otherwise did not measure up to standards of liquidity set by bank examiners. The thanks which the production-credit system now gets is the drive to eliminate it.

When the production-credit associations, along with the Federal Land Banks, the H. O. L. C., and the F. S. A., were refinancing nonliquid bank loans, and at the same time saving thousands of families from bankruptcy and the loss of their homes, they were acceptable even to the most conservative bankers' associations. Now, however, when we have a period of temporary and wartime prosperity, they suddenly become branded as socialistic, as un-American, holding a loaded gun at the head of free enterprise. Mr. Speaker, there is irony in this situation, which I am certain the great mass of the American people readily understand. I shall not attempt here to picture the amount of aid which our Federal Government has given to the private banking system of this country. I cannot refrain from mentioning, however, the obvious fact that our Government many times has thrown the cloak of protection around private banks through such measures as the Federal deposit insurance legislation and large R. F. C. loans.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, we should not forget that there are many areas in the country where private bank loans to farmers still bear interest rates running as high as 8 or 10 percent annually. Although this situation is not characteristic in the district which I represent, it is nevertheless an important point which the House should bear in mind. Furthermore, we have in some sections credit merchants who charge phenomenally high time prices for feed, fertilizer, and general farm supplies. There are thousands of loan sharks scattered over the Nation who are charging farmers as much as 3 percent per month interest on operating loans. Rather than fight such a worthy movement as the production-credit system, it would be more dignified and more valuable for the American Bankers Association sponsor legislation courageously lead the fight against such time merchants and loan sharks. Let the Bankers Association sponsor legislation which would eliminate the lender who is charging 3 percent interest per month, rather than pressuring the members of Congress to destroy the production credit associations. In such a fight, I am certain that they would find Members of Congress giving them unyielding support.

I am anxious that my remarks not be taken as an attack upon American banking. Banks are as essential in our complex economic society as are other institutions, and they have performed and are performing a necessary service. We need banks, but we also need production-credit associations. The two are complementary and should be of mutual assistance, rather than in conflict. I am certain that many of our outstanding bankers recognize the excellent work that these associations have done. Work that in many cases the banks themselves could not have done. I am certain too that many leading bankers oppose the move of the American Bankers Association to eliminate the production-credit associations. I know, for example, that 4 of the original 20 signers of one particular association in my district were directors of local banks.

I cannot close without referring to the three associations in my own congressional district—those of Ventura, Salinas, and San Luis Obispo, Calif. Like others throughout the Nation, these associations have recently celebrated their tenth anniversary, and the inventory of accomplishments taken at that time as well as the hearty endorsement of the farmers of the area, are proof of the value of these associations in their communities. To their boards of directors, and to their hard-working field representatives and secretaries credit must be given for the truly remarkable records they have established. They have been genuinely cooperative in the best sense of that word, exemplifying cooperation between farmer and farmer as well as between farmer and Government.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly about this matter. It penetrates to the very foundations of our American system. At a time like this when we are engaged in the most gigantic production effort in our history, when we are asking our farmers to expand their food production to the very utmost, and when at the same time we are using billions of dollars to construct plants for private industry to operate on a cost-plus basis, I cannot bring myself to believe that there is any justice or soundness in the attempt on the part of the American Bankers' Association to take away from the farmers of this country their cooperatively owned and democratically controlled production-credit system.

If we are to keep America American we must do everything in our power to prevent the encroachment of monopoly. We must protect the interests of the small-business man, the interests of the professional man, and the interests of the small farmer. Our production-credit system is one of the most important safeguards our farmers can have, and to lessen its effectiveness in any way is to strike a severe blow at American agriculture; it is to sabotage the farmer. As Tom Kleveland, agricultural editor of the Santa Barbara News Press has so succinctly stated:

> The farmers' well-being is unalterably tied up with the cooperate movement. With its success he can maintain his rightful place in American society. With its failure he can be reduced to the status of a peasant.

Mr. Speaker, as long as I am a member of this House, I intend to do everything in my power to see that the American farmer is not reduced to the status of a peasant but that he remains free to own his own land, free to manage his own farm, and free to form his own cooperative credit association.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sure that my colleague from California is going to be interested in another situation right before us, between now and July 1, and he will not be able to bring out any bogeyman on this one, because it happens to be one of our own credit agencies doing it. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on July 1, the Farm Credit Administration plans on allowing the farm-interest rates to go back up to 4 percent on the Federal land-bank loans, and 5 percent on the Commissioner loans. In other words, that is an increase of 42 percent, as far as the land bank and Commissioner loans are concerned. When we realize that there are a half million Federal land-bank loans, and almost as many Commissioner loans, and further that the insurance companies will be influenced by this rate, I am sure the people of his district will find that they have something in volume away ahead of the P. C. A. loans, because there is something that will run up to $100,000,000 a year in the whole United States.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank my friend from Wisconsin for bringing out this important point. Certainly the Federal land banks have made one of the most important contributions to the well-being of our farmers; in my district in California they have saved dozens of farmers from losing their property. There is no logical reason why the interest rates on their loans should be permitted to rise to the figures he states, and I am in hearty agreement with what I assume to be his point of view in opposing such a move. Like the P. C. A.'s, the Federal land banks have been literal life-savers to thousands upon thousands of our farmers and ranchers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WICKERSHAM). The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] may extend his own remarks in two particulars, and include other material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] for 15 minutes.

THE GOVERNMENT'S RESPONSIBILITY TO RETURNING SOLDIERS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, war brings many responsibilities, and none of them is greater than the responsibility of a Nation to its returning soldiers. They are the people who make the real sacrifices. They are the ones who gave up jobs and forfeited opportunities. They are the ones who risk injury and disease and brave death on far-flung battle fronts to bring a ruthless and powerful foe to his knees. They make possible a continuation of the American way of life.

In its gratitude, the Nation will not hesitate to acknowledge this responsibility. But I urge that time be not lost in mapping the program by which we propose to fulfill it. Already there are many who have fought the good fight—almost a million have been discharged from the armed forces. Many of them know the real horror of war, and they will carry its marks all the days of their lives. Some of them have reason to doubt their Nation's gratitude for the sacrifices they made. Only a short time ago, the Military Affairs Committee, of which I have the honor to be a member, made a thoroughgoing inquiry into the causes of delays in the handling of veterans' disability cases, with results which, I believe, are highly beneficial to disabled American veterans.

But the time has come for the enactment of a full program of aid for the returning soldier. Hospitalization, rehabilitation, and job-placement plans should not be delayed until the end of the war. Blueprints are not enough in this case. The completed structure should be ready when the soldier comes home. A program for the orderly demobilization of 12,000,000 men and women and their readjustment into a normal, happy life will require the most careful workmanship. The Nation owes those 12,000,000 men and women the certain knowledge that they will come back to a land which has preserved for them a place at the family hearth and which has not overlooked them in planning for future national security and happiness.

Already we can say with honest pride that no other nation has provided for the veterans of its wars as well as the United States has done. Our system of providing for the returned soldier and his dependants has not an equal. However, there are some inequalities yet to be adjusted and some legislation for which there is a need, particularly in the fields of rehabilitation and job placement.

There are many provisions for medical care of veterans. Free hospitalization, medical and surgical care, and artificial appliances are available to veterans of this war through the Veterans' Administration, which is authorized to furnish care and treatment for practically any veteran who needs it. There are pensions for every veteran who incurs a 10-percent or greater disability in line of duty and compensation for the veteran totally disabled not in line of duty. There is Government insurance available to the veteran, and there are benefits to help provide for his family. There is free vocational training for the vocationally handicapped, and help is given toward meeting the cost of vocational training for other veterans. Aid is provided in securing jobs, the veteran has preference in Federal jobs and in his old job. If the veteran wants a new job he has the help of a special Veterans' Employment Service in getting it and in some cities private organizations to see that he meets the people who can give him the job.

Mustering-out pay is one hundred to three hundred dollars in comparison with a flat payment of $60 in World War No. 1. And the question of adjusted-service compensation is yet to be considered.

In pressing for these benefits we in Congress have sought prompt, generous, and sympathetic treatment for America's war veterans. Yet we realize that the job is not complete, and I urge in strongest terms that it be completed speedily. I know that the money which the soldier or his family is paid is no criterion of his services. The job done by the men and women in uniform is greater than any reward can compensate. But I know, too, that Congress does want adequate care and safeguards for them, and Congress should proceed immediately to insure these things.

Job procurement is of very great importance and the necessity for improving the job procurement machinery stands out. Jobs for discharged war veterans are essential to the return of normal peacetime operations. Post-war economic planning should dovetail with plans for the demobilization of the armed forces. We should face the fact that when the war is over and at the very time the soldiers will want to come home, our war industry will be in the process of reconversion to peacetime operations. Very probably the conversion period will be a time—at least temporarily—of lessened employment. Certainly industry will be going through a period of tremendous change with possible far-reaching effect on the Nation's workers. Consequently we must be prepared to face all eventualities. If it becomes necessary to supplement the operations of industry, we shall provide post-war construction programs for public buildings, highways, waterway, and port development, and other meritorious and useful projects. The important thing is that the able-bodied veteran be given work, and I do not mean relief. It will be a wise precaution, however, to provide unemployment compensation for veterans unable through no fault of their own, to find work. There has been discussion of a program to assist veterans to buy a farm or to start a small business. Already there are provisions for helping veterans who left their own farms or business to get back on their feet. And finally there is the question of college or trade school training.

So the demobilization plan must include, in addition to a gradual direct release of men for civilian work, a program of training for those who can benefit from it—academic training for men and women who went to war before their educations were completed, trade training for many others and retraining for some who have grown "rusty" during their absence from the job. The training program will have the advantage of keeping the trainees temporarily off the labor market, as well as of preparing them for better jobs when they are ready and the jobs are open.

So I say again, a sound Federal program of veteran rehabilitation is absolutely essential if we in America are to properly discharge our obligation to the men who bared their breasts to enemy fire. But in demanding a Federal program of veteran rehabilitation we should not lose sight of the fact that there are things to be done for our returning soldiers which the Government—be it Federal, State, or local—simply cannot do. They are the things that the older veterans—the men who fought before—can do, and the things that the friends and neighbors of the returning soldiers can do. These are the people who can provide the warmth and the quiet understanding, the help and friendship, that is found best between neighbors who stand ready to help each other because they are neighbors. The inescapable problem of readjustment can be made easier with their help.

But it is our job here in Congress to remember that the great task of orderly demobilization is one of grave importance to each of those who will return to take his or her place in a normal private life, and likewise it is of grave importance to the economic security of the Nation. It is our job to act wisely and promptly on those facts. We must insure plans for the rehabilitation of each returning veteran to a full and useful life. What we are doing, and what we plan to do for them are of vital consequence to every person in the Nation. It is far better that we put these good Americans on their feet when they return home than to have them fall through our neglect, and then require our help.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. CAMP, for a few days, on account of official business in his district.

To Mr. TOWE, for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. VORYS of Ohio, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. BALDWIN of New York, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. LEFEVRE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. KELLEY (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), indefinitely, on account of serious illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 3, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Friday, March 3, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

There will be a meeting of the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, investigating the shortage of steel, at 10 a. m. Friday, March 3, 1944, in the Patents Committee room, 416 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 8, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2687, a bill relating to excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1259. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 31, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Missouri River, for flood control along the main stem from Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 13, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 475), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2040. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2038. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2039. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; with amendment (Rept. No. 1218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 2037. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1675. A bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay; without amendment (Rept. No. 1223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3942. A bill to eliminate pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1643. A bill for the relief of Mary Lovis Elliott; with amendment (Rept. No. 1220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1046. A bill for the relief of David B. Turpel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4311. A bill to authorize the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 4312. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4313. A bill to extend to June 30, 1944, the automatic $5,000 insurance protection provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GWYNNE:

H. R. 4314. A bill to facilitate the administration of government and improve the quality of justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4315. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act with respect to premiums on war-damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4316. A bill providing for the rendering and publication of opinions by the Attorney General with respect to Executive orders of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4317. A bill to make it unlawful to sell certain railroad, bus, and airplane tickets at prices in excess of the published rates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 4318. A bill to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 4319. A bill to adjust the basis of compensation for overtime service of certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4320. A bill relating to the computation of interest on contributions to the civil-service retirement fund returned to employees upon their separation from the service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4321. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. J. Res 246. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 458. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "A Study of the Legality of the Annexation of Austria by Germany Under International Law, and Austrian Constitutional Law and the Policy of the United States Toward the Annexation," as a document; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 4322. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Floyd M. Adair, Evelyn Louise Adair, Cora Ann Adair, Betty Floyd Adair, and Ernest Dean Adair; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 4323. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Wikle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5136. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Oscar L. Hamlin and 11 others, N. H. Young and 24 others, Nora E. Hamlin and 36 others, and Mrs. Nettie Heath, of Milo, and 20 others; G. Emery Pratt, of Derby, and 13 others; and Mrs. John G. Johnson, of Crouseville, and 21 others, all of the State of Maine, favoring enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5137. By Mr. LEFEVRE: Petition sponsored by E. D. Stannard, of Kingston, N. Y., and 44 others, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5138. Also, petition of R. B. Van Gaasbeek, of Kingston, N. Y., and 60 others, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5139. Also, petition sponsored by A. Kelder, of Rosendale, N. Y., and 30 others, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5140. Also, petition sponsored by Ralph H. Bradford, of Eddyville, N. Y., and 28 others, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5141. Also, petition sponsored by Michael Qualters, of Kingston, N. Y., and 41 others, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5142. Also, petition sponsored by Peter Zembo, of Hudson, N. Y., and 30 others, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5143. Also, petition sponsored by Frank T. Johnson, of Livingston, N. Y., and 26 others, protesting against the enactment of legislation by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5144. Also, petition sponsored by Joseph Tesora, of Kingston, N. Y., and 17 others, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5145. Also, petition sponsored by George Dawkins, of Kingston, N. Y., and 15 others, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5146. Also, petition signed by Francis L. Steenkin, commander, Lamouree-Hackett Post, No. 72, American Legion, Saugerties, N. Y., and others, supporting the American Legion's proposal for a bill of rights for the veterans of World War No. 2, as pending in House bill 3917 and Senate bill 1617; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5147. By Mr. LANE: Resolution of more than 1,000 persons at a meeting February 13, 1944, at South Boston, Mass., under the auspices of the United Committee of Lithuanian Americans of Greater Boston, appealing to the Government of the United States and of Great Britain to assure the liberation of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5148. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of Roscoe C. Berman, of St. Louis, and 15 petitioners, to determine why the Inland Waterways Corporation operating Federal barge lines (sec. 6, Public, No. 107, 65th Cong., Federal Control Act approved March 21, 1918, act of June 3, 1924), and other common carriers on the inland waterways in the Mississippi Valley have refrained from serving the public in the handling of packaged freight referred to as less-than-carload and carload freight; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5149. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of the South Barre (Vt.) Grange, No. 467, opposing the continuance of the subsidy program of the United States on the ground that the entire program has proven a failure and that its continuance would result in serious injury to the welfare of the American farmer and also to the American public in general; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5150. By Mr. SCOTT: Petition of 19 residents of Philadelphia, opposing the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5151. By Mr. WHITTINGTON: Concurrent resolution of the Mississippi Legislature, memorializing Congress to authorize and direct the issuance of a security for sale to the States, providing for a reasonable interest rate and call provision with notice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5152. By Mr. WILLEY: Seven petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, opposing the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082, or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5153. Also, two petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware, favoring House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5154. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the metropolitan water district of southern California, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the expenditures from Colorado River Dam fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, with whom there is neither dawn nor dark yet who sendest us the alternating ministries and mercies of the day and of the night, teach us so to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom; to lengthen our brief working day by intensity of living, to fill with mighty deeds the precious hours hurrying on in ever frightening pace. There is no light but Thine, without, within. As Thou liftest the curtain of night from our darkened homes take also the misty shadows from all our hearts, rise with Thy morning upon our souls, quicken all our toiling and our aspiring; and though all else passes as a dream away, let the noontide of Thy grace and peace rest in benediction upon our pilgrim days that, even at evening time, it may be light. So may we walk while it is yet day in the steps of Him who with fewest hours finished the divinest work. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, February 29, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

THE LATE SENATOR McNARY, OF OREGON—CONDOLENCES OF THE FREE PALESTINE COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from Peter H. Bergson, Washington, D. C., expressing on behalf of the Free Palestine Committee and himself the deepest feelings of grief and condolence on the occasion of the death of the late Senator Charles L. McNary, of Oregon, which was ordered to lie on the table.

CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATOR BARKLEY BY TOWN HALL COMMITTEE OF WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask that the telegram I have received from the Town Hall Committee of Wichita, Kans., notifying me that they have extended congratulations to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] on his stand against the President's tax veto be printed in the RECORD. I am in accord with the sentiments expressed by this committee with respect to the stand taken by the Senator from Kentucky.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WICHITA, KANS., *February 23, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator, State of Kansas,
Washington, D. C.:

We are wiring Senator BARKLEY today congratulations on his stand against the President's tax veto. Such courage on the part of a public leader deserves the commendation of every thinking citizen.

TOWN HALL COMMITTEE OF WICHITA,
E. C. MORIARTY, *President,*
L. B. BROWN, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of February 25, 1944,

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on February 26, 1944, he had signed the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 26, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A JOINT RESOLUTION AND A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolution and act:

On February 28, 1944:

S. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.

On February 29, 1944:

S. 1140. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. Charles L. McNary, late a Senator from the State of Oregon.

The message also communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. Thomas H. Cullen, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; and

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia government and the White House Police force."

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1874) for the relief of Robert P. Sick.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2912) to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge.

The message also further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3619. An act to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3956. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the

absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits; and

H. R. 4166. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor;

S. 1633. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1943, so as to provide for the full participation of institutions of the United States in the program for the training of nurses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of Robert P. Sick;

H. R. 2912. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; and

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

NATIONAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT PRODUCTION EXPOSITION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at the request of the Secretary of the Senate and for the information of the Senate I ask that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an announcement concerning the First National Labor-Management Production Exposition which is now being shown in the Department of Commerce auditorium.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFORMATION ON THE FIRST NATIONAL LABOR-MANAGEMENT PRODUCTION EXPOSITION

What: See attached marked copies of descriptive material, including full-page advertisement from the Washington Post of February 28.

When: Open daily from 10 a. m. to 10 p. m. today and every day up to and including Saturday, March 11.

Where: Department of Commerce auditorium.

Who: Invitations for the preview were sent to all Mermbers of Congress and their secretaries. (See copy of invitation attached.)

Those who were unable to attend the special preview for Members of Congress last Tuesday evening, February 29, or one of the other preview evening showings are invited to visit the exposition at any time during the period mentioned.

The National Labor-Management Production Exposition, which is open to the public next Friday, is sponsored by the War Production Board to pay tribute to the American war workers and industry managements who, by means of more than 4,000 labor-management committees in war plants have saved millions of man-hours and greatly accelerated output of war supplies. A further purpose is to stimulate still greater production during the current year. More than 60 of these plants are participating in this exhibit. The production show will visualize many sorts of war products, the methods by which they are kept pouring from the factories, and the manner in which some of these materials are used on the fighting fronts. The methods and results of industrial teamwork will be demonstrated, and outstanding examples of ingenious labor-saving and safety suggestions made by workers will be on display. There will be movies, dioramas and other exhibits of general interest. The exposition will be held in the Department of Commerce auditorium, Fourteenth Street between E and Constitution Avenue, free to the public March 3 through March 11, including Sunday, from 10 a. m. to 10 p. m.

WELCOME

I am happy to join with Mr. Nelson in extending you a most cordial invitation to attend a preview of the Labor-Management Exposition to be held in the Department of Commerce auditorium.

It is a pleasure and privilege to cooperate with the War Production Board in this splendid demonstration of what goes on behind the scenes of America's great war production job. I know that you will find the exposition inspiring and enlightening.

JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary, Department of Commerce.

NEW WAR TAX RATES (S. DOC. NO. 158)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to offer some matter for the RECORD, but first to make a very brief explanatory statement.

From official sources in the Treasury Department I have secured the specific war excise tax-rate increases under the new revenue law which go into effect March 26 and April 1. The new war rates are shown in comparison with the same items as carried in the old revenue law.

It will be especially noted that first-class postage rates on local letters are increased from 2 cents per ounce to 3 cents per ounce; air mail from 6 cents per ounce to 8 cents per ounce; and various increases on registered and insured mail and money orders, and so forth. These rates take effect March 26, 1944.

The new rates on other items of general use, such as distilled spirits, wine, cosmetics, electric-light bulbs, and so forth, are set forth in this comparative statement.

In the income-tax rates, there is clearly shown the increase between the old law and the new as it applies to single persons, married persons, and married persons with dependents.

Mr. President, I ask that these comparative tables as set forth in the data I offer, be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks. In order to give greater publicity I also ask that they be printed as a Senate document. The time is comparatively short before these new rates become effective. I know we are all anxious that the public be fully informed as to the changes so there will be as little confusion as possible in the enforcement of the increases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter presented by the Senator from Georgia will be printed in the RECORD and also as a Senate document.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The Post Office Department is taking steps to insure that all of the 50,000 post offices, stations, and branches will be fully prepared to put in effect the postal provisions of the new revenue act when they become effective March 26, 1944, Postmaster General Frank C. Walker has announced.

Mr. Walker made public the new rates on mail and special services and disclosed that formal orders are being prepared for publication in the Postal Bulletin, setting forth all changes made by the revenue act.

Already, Mr. Walker disclosed, the Bureau of Engraving and Printing is processing an 8-cent domestic air-mail stamp. The design is that of the 6-cent stamp, but the color will be different. Every post office will have a supply when the new rate becomes effective.

Mr. Walker announced that the rate on air mail to and from the armed forces stationed outside the continental United States, which he reduced to 6 cents a half ounce, on December 23, 1941, remains unchanged.

Postal personnel are to be informed of the following changes:

The local rate will be increased from 2 cents to 3 cents an ounce at letter-carrier offices.

The domestic air-mail rate will be increased from 6 cents to 8 cents an ounce.

Every parcel sent by parcel post will require at least 1 cent more in postage than is now required. The new law requires that the increase be 1 cent or 3 percent, whichever is greater. Detailed tables are being drafted and will be inserted in the Postal Bulletin, so that complete information will be available in all post offices on the effective date of the new act.

The money order rates are increased as follows: 1 cent to $2.50, increased from 6 cents to 10 cents; $2.51 to $5, increased from 8 cents to 14 cents; $5.01 to $10, increased from 11 cents to 19 cents; $10.01 to $20, increased from 13 cents to 22 cents; $20.01 to $40, increased from 15 cents to 25 cents; $40.01 to $60, increased from 18 cents to 30 cents; $60.01 to $80, increased from 20 cents to 34 cents; $80.01 to $100, increased from 22 cents to 37 cents.

Fees for registered mail are increased 33⅓ percent, and additional fees (surcharges) are increased 33⅓ percent. The following figures list the indemnity limitations and the fee changes: $5, from 15 cents to 20 cents; $25, from 18 cents to 25 cents; $50, from 20 cents to 25 cents; $75, from 25 cents to 35 cents; $100, from 30 cents to 40 cents; $200, from 40 cents to 55 cents; $300, from 50 cents to 65 cents; $400, from 60 cents to 80 cents; $500, from 70 cents to 95 cents; $600, from 80 cents to $1.05; $700, from 85 cents to $1.15; $800, from 90 cents to $1.20; $900, from 95 cents to $1.25; $1,000, from $1 to $1.35.

Insured and C. O. D. fees will be doubled under the new schedules.

The fee for services in effecting delivery of collect-on-delivery mail upon terms different from those originally stipulated at the time of mailing is increased from 10 cents to 20 cents. The charge for demurrage on domestic collect-on-delivery mail, now 5 cents a day, is increased to 10 cents. Mr. Walker pointed out that no change is made under the new act in C. O. D. fees on sealed domestic C. O. D. mail of any class bearing postage at the first-class rate.

On restricted delivery mail, the fee for effecting delivery of domestic registered, insured, and C. O. D. mail, delivery of which is restricted to the addressee only, or to the addressee or order, is increased from 10 cents to 20 cents.

Mr. Walker said that the existing supply of 6-cent air-mail stamps will not be recalled. Armed forces air mail is so heavy, he said, that printing of the 6-cent stamp will have to be continued in quantity. The armed forces now absorb the total production of 6-cent air mail stamped envelopes. Eight million air mail stamped envelopes are being used weekly by the armed forces. Eight-cent stamped envelopes will not be printed for the time being, Mr. Walker announced.

Principal individual income-tax provisions of the Revenue Act of 1943 compared with prior law

Item	Prior law	Revenue Act of 1943
INCOME TAX		
Earned income credit	10 percent of earned net income, but not in excess of 10 percent of net income; maximum $1,400 (first $3,000 of net income is deemed earned).	Repealed.
Deduction for Federal excise taxes	Allowed as a deduction to the taxpayer upon whom the tax is legally imposed.	Disallowed, except where the tax paid is a business expense.
Special deduction for blind	No deduction	$500 allowed as a deduction from gross income; individual's status for purposes of the deduction determined as of July 1 of the taxable year.
Exclusions from gross income: Mustering-out payments for military and naval personnel.	No exclusion	Excludes from gross income amounts received during the taxable year as mustering-out payments for service in the military or naval forces of the United States.
Cost-of-living allowances paid to civilian officers and employees of the Government stationed outside continental United States.	do	Excludes from gross income amounts received as cost-of living (or post) allowances by (1) clerks or employees in the Foreign Service of the United States; (2) Ambassadors, Ministers, diplomatic, consular, or Foreign Service officers; and (3) other civilian officers or employees of the Government of the United States stationed outside continental United States.
Date determining marital and dependent status	Taxpayer required to prorate exemptions and credits if his status changed during the taxable year.	July 1 of the taxable year (or last day of taxable year if July 1 not included).
Back pay attributable to prior years	No provision	If back pay exceeds 15 percent of gross income, the maximum tax attributable to such back pay shall be the tax resulting from inclusion of such amounts in the income of the taxable years to which the back pay is attributable. Back pay is defined to include (*a*) remuneration deferred due to a variety of causes, including bankruptcy or receivership of the employer, litigation, and lack of funds where the employer is a government, (*b*) retroactive pay increases recommended or approved by a Government agency, and (*c*) payments arising out of violation of laws pertaining to fair labor standards or practices.
Limitation of deductions attributable to business operated by individuals at a loss of more than $50,000, for 5 consecutive years.	No limitation	Provides that such deductions (other than taxes and interest) shall be allowed only to the extent of $50,000, plus the gross income attributable to such trade or business, and the net operating loss deduction attributable to such trade or business shall not be allowed. Requires redetermination of the tax for each affected taxable year, but not for taxable years beginning prior to 1944.
VICTORY TAX		
Base and rate	5 percent of "Victory tax net income" of every individual after allowance of a fixed exemption of $624; "Victory tax net income" is gross income (excluding capital gains and losses and partially tax-exempt interest) minus deductions for (*a*) business and trade expenses, (*b*) other expenses incurred in the production of income and (*c*) alimony.	Rate reduced to 3 percent.
Credits against Victory tax	The following amounts of Victory tax: Single person—25 percent or $500, whichever is less. Married person—(1) if separate returns are filed by each spouse, 40 percent or $500, whichever is less, or (2) if a separate return is filed by one spouse and no return is filed by the other spouse, or if a joint return is filed, 40 percent or $1,000, whichever is less. For each dependent—2 percent or $100, whichever is less.	Repealed.
CURRENT TAX PAYMENT ACT OF 1943		
Additional increase in 1943 tax where income is substantially increased in comparison with income for base year (so-called second anti-windfall provision).	Where the surtax net income for 1942 or 1943 exceeds by more than $20,000, the highest surtax net income received in any one of the base years (1937 to 1940, inclusive) the tax forgiveness is limited to an amount not in excess of a tentative tax for 1942 or 1943 whichever year had the lower tax liability (without regard to the Current Tax Payment Act) computed on the amount of surtax net income for the base year plus $20,000.	Repealed.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Feb. 28, 1944.

TABLE 1.—*Single person—no dependents*

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Amount of tax [2]		Effective rate [2]	
	Prior law [2]	Revenue Act of 1943	Prior law	Revenue Act of 1943
			Percent	*Percent*
$500				
$600	$17	$20	2.8	3.3
$700	40	43	5.7	6.1
$800	62	65	7.8	8.1
$900	85	87	9.4	9.7
$1,000	107	110	10.7	11.0
$1,200	153	154	12.8	12.8
$1,500	220	221	14.7	14.7
$1,800	288	288	16.0	16.0
$2,000	333	333	16.7	16.7
$2,500	446	445	17.8	17.8
$3,000	574	571	19.1	19.0
$4,000	829	825	20.7	20.6
$5,000	1,105	1,098	22.1	22.0
$6,000	1,401	1,391	23.4	23.2
$8,000	2,052	2,028	25.7	25.5
$10,000	2,783	2,765	27.8	27.7
$15,000	4,968	4,931	33.1	32.9
$20,000	7,626	7,548	38.1	37.7
$25,000	10,644	10,525	42.6	42.1
$50,000	28,058	27,543	56.1	55.1
$100,000	69,665	68,040	69.7	68.0
$500,000	441,863	431,348	88.4	86.3
$1,000,000	[4] 899,500	888,015	[4] 90.0	88.8
$5,000,000	[4] 4,499,500	[4] 4,500,000	[4] 90.0	[4] 90.0

[1] Victory tax net income assumed to be ten-ninths of net income shown in stub.
[2] Excludes unforgiven tax for 1942 or 1943.
[3] Maximum earned net income assumed.
[4] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 90 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Feb 28, 1944.

TABLE 2.—*Married person—no dependents*

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Amount of tax [2]		Effective rate [2]	
	Prior law [3]	Revenue Act of 1943	Prior law	Revenue Act of 1943
			Percent	*Percent*
$500				
$600	$1	$1	0.2	0.2
$700	5	5	.7	.7
$800	8	8	1.0	1.0
$900	11	11	1.2	1.2
$1,000	15	15	1.5	1.5
$1,200	21	21	1.8	1.8
$1,500	79	88	5.3	5.9
$1,800	144	155	8.0	8.6
$2,000	188	200	9.4	10.0
$2,500	297	312	11.9	12.5
$3,000	405	423	13.5	14.1
$4,000	647	671	16.2	16.8
$5,000	894	924	17.9	18.5
$6,000	1,173	1,209	19.6	20.2
$8,000	1,780	1,828	22.3	22.9
$10,000	2,467	2,527	24.7	25.3
$15,000	4,533	4,617	30.2	30.8
$20,000	7,100	7,184	35.5	35.9
$25,000	10,035	10,119	40.1	40.5
$50,000	27,075	27,060	54.2	54.1
$100,000	68,584	67,459	68.6	67.5
$500,000	440,747	430,732	88.1	86.1
$1,000,000	[4] 899,000	887,399	[4] 89.9	88.7
$5,000,000	[4] 4,499,000	[4] 4,500,000	[4] 90.0	[4] 90.0

[1] Victory tax net income assumed to be ten-ninths of net income shown in stub.
[2] Excludes unforgiven tax for 1942 or 1943.
[3] Maximum earned net income assumed.
[4] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 90 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Feb. 28, 1944.

TABLE 3.—*Married person—2 dependents*

Net income before personal exemption [1]	Amount of tax [2]		Effective rate [2]	
	Prior law [3]	Revenue Act of 1943	Prior law	Revenue Act of 1943
			Percent	*Percent*
$500				
$600	$1	$1	0.2	0.2
$700	4	5	.6	.7
$800	7	8	.9	1.0
$900	11	11	1.2	1.2
$1,000	14	15	1.4	1.5
$1,200	20	21	1.7	1.8
$1,500	29	31	1.9	2.1
$1,800	39	41	2.2	2.3
$2,000	58	67	2.9	3.4
$2,500	159	179	6.4	7.2
$3,000	267	290	8.9	9.7
$4,000	485	517	12.1	12.9
$5,000	730	770	14.6	15.4
$6,000	979	1,027	16.3	17.1
$8,000	1,553	1,618	19.4	20.2
$10,000	2,208	2,289	22.1	22.9
$15,000	4,207	4,323	28.0	28.8
$20,000	6,693	6,820	33.5	34.1
$25,000	9,574	9,713	38.3	38.9
$50,000	26,392	26,577	52.8	53.2
$100,000	67,803	65,578	67.8	66.9
$500,000	439,931	430,116	88.0	86.0
$1,000,000	[4] 898,800	886,783	[4] 89.9	88.7
$5,000,000	[4] 4,498,800	[4] 4,500,000	[4] 90.0	[4] 90.0

[1] Victory tax net income assumed to be ten-ninths of net income shown in stub.
[2] Excludes unforgiven tax for 1942 or 1943
[3] Maximum earned net income assumed.
[4] Taking into account maximum effective rate limitation of 90 percent.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Feb. 28, 1944.

Principal corporation tax provisions of the Revenue Act of 1943 compared with prior law

Major provisions	Prior law	Revenue Act of 1943
INCOME TAX		
Rates:		
Normal tax:		
If normal-tax net income is not over $25,000:		
First $5,000	15 percent	No change.
Next $15,000	17 percent	
Next $5,000	19 percent	
If normal-tax net income is over $25,000	24 percent	Do.
Notch provisions: Alternative tax	$4,250 plus 31 percent of excess over $25,000 but not over $50,000.	Do.
Surtax:		
If surtax net income is not over $25,000	10 percent	Do.
If surtax net income is over $25,000 but not over $50,000:		
First $25,000	do	Do.
Next $25,000	22 percent	
If surtax net income is over $50,000	16 percent	Do.
EXCESS-PROFITS TAX		
Specific exemption	$5,000	$10,000.
Excess-profits credit:		
Invested capital method:		
First $5,000,000 of invested capital	8 percent	8 percent.
Next $5,000,000	7 percent	6 percent.
Next $190,000,000	6 percent	5 percent.
Over $200,000,000	5 percent	Do.
Income method: Percentage of average earnings in base period 1936-39	95 percent	No change.
Rates	90 percent	95 percent.
Post-war refund	10 percent of excess-profits taxes	No change.
80-percent limit	Total normal tax, surtax, and groos excess-profits tax not to exceed 80 percent of surtax net income (before deducting taxable excess profits).	Do.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Feb. 28, 1944.

Excise taxes and postal rates

RATE CHANGES, NEW TAXES, AND EXEMPTIONS

Article or service	Prior law	Revenue Act of 1943
EXCISES		
Distilled spirits	$6 per proof gallon (draw-back of $3.75 per proof gallon on nonbeverage alcohol).	$9 per proof gallon (draw-back of $6 per proof gallon on nonbeverage alcohol).
Floor stocks		$3 per proof gallon.
Imported perfumes containing distilled spirits	$6 per wine gallon	$9 per wine gallon.
Fermented malt liquors	$7 per barrel	$8 per barrel.
Floor stocks		$1 per barrel.
Wine:		
Still:		
Not over 14 percent alcohol	10 cents per wine gallon	15 cents per wine gallon.
Over 14 percent, not over 21 percent	40 cents per wine gallon	60 cents per wine gallon.
Over 21 percent, not over 24 percent	$1 per wine gallon	$2 per wine gallon.
Sparkling	10 cents per half pint	15 cents per half pint.
Other	5 cents per half pint	10 cents per half pint.
Floor stocks		Rates equal to tax-rate increases.
General admissions	1 cent per 10 cents or fraction thereof	1 cent per 5 cents or major fraction thereof.
Lease of boxes or seats, etc	11 percent of charge	20 percent of charge.
Cabarets	5 percent of charge	30 percent of charge.
Club dues and initiation fees	11 percent of charge	20 percent of charge.
Bowling alleys, billiard parlors:		
Rate	$10 per alley or per table per year	$20 per alley or per table per year.
Exemption	Only tables in private homes	Also tables in hospitals if no charge is made for their use.
Transportation of persons	10 percent of charge	15 percent of charge.
Communications:		
(a) Toll service	20 percent of charge	25 percent of charge.
(b) Domestic telegraph, cable, or radio dispatches	15 percent of charge	Do.
(c) Leased wires, etc	do	Do.
(d) Wire and equipment services	5 percent of charge	8 percent of charge.
Local telephone service	10 percent of charge	15 percent of charge.
Jewelry	10 percent of retail price	20 percent of retail price (10 percent of retail price on watches retailing at not more than $65 and alarm clocks retailing at not more than $5). Exempts silver-plated flatware.
Fur and fur-trimmed articles	do	20 percent of retail price.
Luggage, handbags, wallets, etc	10 percent of manufacturers' sales price on luggage only.	Do.
Toilet preparations	10 percent of retail price	Do.
Electric light bulbs and tubes	5 percent of manufacturers' sales price	20 percent of manufacturers' sales price.
Vacuum cleaners	10 percent of manufacturers' sales price	Repeal.
Playing cards: Exemption	When exported to a foreign country	Extends exemption to cards exported to a possession of the United States (or to a Territory during the period of the national emergency if for use of members of the armed forces of the United States).
Transportation of property: Payments by or to the War Shipping Administration.	Taxable under some circumstances	Exempts all payments by or to the War Shipping Administration for transportation by water from one point to another in the United States except points on the Great Lakes.
POSTAL RATES [1]		
First class, local	2 cents per ounce	3 cents per ounce.
Air mail	6 cents per ounce	8 cents per ounce.
Fourth class	Various	Increased by 3 percent of present rate, or 1 cent, whichever is greater.
Registered mail	15 cents to $1 per article	20 cents to $1.35 per article.
Insured mail	5 cents to 35 cents per article	10 cents to 70 cents per article.
C. O. D. mail	12 cents to 45 cents per article	24 cents to 90 cents per article.
Money orders	6 cents to 22 cents per order	10 cents to 37 cents per order.

TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS

Effective date of excise changes:		
(a) Manufacturers' excises, retailers' excises, admissions, alcoholic beverages, long distance telephone messages, telegraph and cable dispatches, transportation of persons.		Apr. 1, 1944; however, the increase in the cabaret tax becomes effective at 10 a. m. on such date, and the communications tax increase is applicable only to amounts paid for services rendered on or after such date.
(b) Billiard and pool tables; bowling alleys		July 1, 1944.

[1] For exceptions and details see accompanying statement by Postmaster General Frank C. Walker.

Excise taxes and postal rates—Continued

TECHNICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE AMENDMENTS—continued

Article or service	Prior law	Revenue Act of 1943
Effective date of excise changes—Continued.		
(c) Leased wires, wire and equipment services, local telephone service.	----------	Services for which bill is rendered, and for which no previous bill was rendered, on or after May 1, 1944. When bill rendered on or after May 1, 1944, includes charges for services previously rendered, increased rates do not apply to services rendered more than 2 months before May 1, 1944.
Effective date of postal rate increases	----------	Mar. 26, 1944.
Articles classifiable under more than 1 section	----------	Where articles subject to retail excises are classifiable under more than 1 section, only one tax applies. If the rates of tax differ, highest rate prevails.
Fur and fur-trimmed articles: Articles made from pelts furnished by customers.	Articles made from pelts furnished by customer not subject to tax.	Persons making fur article from pelts furnished by customer shall collect tax on fair retail market value of such article if it is not for resale by such customer.
Tires and inner tubes: Scope of term "rubber"	Tax applicable to tires and tubes made wholly or in part of rubber.	Term "rubber" amended to include synthetic and substitute rubber.
Sales to Federal Government:		
(a) Taxability	Tax-exempt	Taxable. Secretary of Treasury may authorize exemption with respect to retail excises, manufacturers' excise and import taxes, transportation and communications excise taxes, if he determines that the imposition of such taxes will cause substantial burden or expense which can be avoided by granting tax exemption and that full benefit of such exemption will accrue to the United States. Exempts articles sold under contracts entered into prior to effective date of changes, outlined in section (b) below, or under any agreement supplemental to such contract bearing the same contract number. Exempts payments by Red Cross for communications services, transportation of property, and transportation of persons.
(b) Effective date of changes:		
(1) Manufacturers' excises (except radios, phonographs, etc.), retailers' excises, electrical energy, long-distance telephone messages, telegraph and cable dispatches.	----------	Sales made or messages and dispatches originating on or after June 1, 1944.
(2) Pistols and revolvers; firearms, shells, and cartridges; radios, phonographs, etc.	----------	Sales made on or after the 1st day of the first month beginning 6 months or more after termination of hostilities.
(3) Leased wire, wire and equipment services, and local telephone service.	----------	Amounts paid pursuant to bills rendered on or after June 1, 1944, provided no previous bill was rendered for such service.
(4) Transportation of property and persons	----------	Amounts paid on or after June 1, 1944.
Termination of changes:		
(a) Excise and postal-rate changes and new taxes (except special tax on billiard tables and bowling alleys).	----------	First day of first month beginning 6 months or more after termination of hostilities.
(b) Billiard and pool tables and bowling alleys, special tax.	----------	June 30 next following the first day of the first month which begins 6 months or more after termination of hostilities.
Leases, conditional sales, etc.:		
(a) Increased rates of retailers' and manufacturers' excise and import taxes.	----------	Where lease conditional sale, etc., was made and delivery was made and a part of the consideration was paid before effective date of excise rate increase, tax rate is that in force before effective date of increase.
(b) New tax: Retailer's excise tax on luggage	----------	Where lease, conditional sale, etc., was made, delivery was made, and part of consideration was paid before effective date of new tax, no tax is imposed.
Existing contracts	----------	If contract made before effective date of tax increase or imposition of new tax for sale of article after such date does not provide for adding tax to contract price, but does not prohibit such addition, vendee shall pay such tax in lieu of vendor.
Floor stocks taxes on alcoholic beverages:		
(a) Returns	----------	Due on or before May 1, 1944.
(b) Payment of tax	----------	Due on or before July 1, 1944. Payment may be extended to not later than Feb. 1, 1945, upon filing of approved bond.
Drawback on distilled spirits used in nonbeverage products:		
(a) Spirits to which increased rate of drawback is applicable.	----------	Spirits upon which $9 per proof gallon tax is paid.
(b) Time of eligibility for drawback	When products are sold or otherwise transferred for use.	When distilled spirits are used in manufacture of such products.
(c) Time for filing claim for drawback on distilled spirits used prior to effective date of excise changes.	----------	Products on hand upon Apr. 1, 1944, are to be regarded as sold or used during the quarter beginning Apr. 1, 1944.

Treasury Department, Division of Tax Research, Feb. 28, 1944.

ROBERT NORHEIM (S. DOC. NO. 157); MRS. ANNA RUNNEBAUM (S. DOC. NO. 155); VETO MESSAGES—LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. A letter has been addressed to the President of the Senate by the Secretary of the Senate, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, March 3, 1944.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President of the Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Friday, February 18, 1944, the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the Senate presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills, duly signed by the Presiding Officers of the two Houses: S. 199, an act for the relief of Robert Norheim; and S. 949, an act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum.

The Senate on Tuesday, February 29, at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m., took a recess until 12 o'clock noon today. On Wednesday, March 1, the President of the United States transmitted to my office two messages addressed to the Senate, returning without approval the foregoing bills, together with his objections thereto.

That being the last day under the Constitution for action by the President on the bills in question, in order to protect the interests of the Senate I accepted the messages under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the Wright case, delivered on January 17, 1938, under an identical situation, and herewith present same to you to be formally laid before the Senate.

Sincerely yours,

EDWIN A. HALSEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 199, a bill for the relief of Robert Norheim.

The enactment would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Robert Norheim, of Dickinson, N. Dak., the sum of $202.68, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for sick leave which had accrued while he was employed by the United States Department of Agriculture, his request for substitution of sick leave for annual leave, during an illness which was contracted after his resignation had been submitted but before the effective date thereof,

having been denied because the Department of Agriculture had not approved the revocation of such resignation prior to its effective date.

There is no general provision of law authorizing payment to Government personnel of the commuted value of leave not taken by them before separation from the service. The leave acts of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161 and 1162), consistently have been construed as making a grant of leave in kind only, that is, as conferring a right to be absent from duty for a prescribed period without loss of pay, only when the employee retains during that period a status as one of the "civilian officers and employees of the United States."

In view thereof, I do not think I would be justified in approving this legislation which would confer upon a particular employee a benefit which has been denied to many other former employees similarly situated.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1944.*

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 949, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Runnebaum.

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $4,000 to Mrs. Anna Runnebaum, of Axtell, Kans., in settlement of her claim against the United States by reason of the death of her son, Ralph Joseph Runnebaum, who died as the result of injuries sustained in an automobile accident on October 12, 1941, while in the employ, as stated in the bill, of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

It appears that the deceased was, in fact, an enrollee of the National Youth Administration; that on the date in question one of the enrollees at the mechanical training section, Wabaunsee Lake, near Eskridge, Kans., was, under proper authority, driving five youths in a Government-owned truck back to camp after a Sunday evening visit to the nearby town of Eskridge; that the truck went off the road on a curve and all of the occupants of the truck were injured; and that young Runnebaum sustained a broken back as a result of which he died on October 17, 1941.

I am advised that the applicable provisions of the Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, do not authorize payment in this case, had the enrollee been killed in line of duty, in excess of $1,920.

While the death of young Runnebaum was most unfortunate and elicits sympathy, I do not feel that I would be justified in approving the bill since it would pay to the mother of this enrollee an amount of $2,080 more than has been paid in a number of cases where enrollees of the National Youth Administration have met with their death while in an active-duty status.

I would be glad to give my approval to a bill which would provide payment to the mother of this deceased enrollee of an amount not in excess of $1,920.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1944.*

PHOENIX-TEMPE STONE CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 156)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval S. 375, Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled "An act for the relief of the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co."

This enactment would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co., of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $1,000 in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for damages arising out of rental by the Civil Works Administration in Arizona of a paving-mixing plant owned by said company under a contract numbered CWA-234, dated January 5, 1934.

From the facts set forth in Senate Report No. 235 and House Report No. 1055, accompanying the bill, it appears that the amount claimed, for the most part, is based on the loss of earnings or profits which the Phoenix-Tempe Stone Co. anticipated at the time it entered into the contract, such loss resulting from the fact that the equipment was not used as the contractor thought it would be used. It appears to be recognized by the Congress that the Government is under no legal liability to pay the amount claimed; and while the bill contemplates the granting of relief on equitable grounds, the claim does not, in my judgment, contain such elements of equity as to justify payment of the amount involved to the claimant. While it was doubtless anticipated that the amount of material to be mixed and paid for under the contract would greatly exceed the amount actually mixed and paid for, it is clear that the Government was required by the contract to use the plant only as its needs demanded and the claimant was to be paid accordingly. The possibility of a limited period of operations was expressly recognized in the contract. It appears, moreover, that operations were delayed by the fact that certain necessary parts were missing when the plant was received, a circumstance for which the Government was not responsible.

Inasmuch as the allowance provided by the bill appears to be based on a faulty premise, it is unnecessary to consider whether the claimant is entitled in equity to be compensated in a smaller sum as claimed for the cost of replacing certain essential parts that were missing from the mixing machine when it was returned to the claimant by the Government.

It has not been the general practice or purpose of the Government in connection with its contracts to insure contractors against loss or to afford relief to them in the event their contracts do not prove to be as profitable as contemplated; and the circumstances of the present claim are not such as would justify preferential treatment of this claimant.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 28, 1944.*

PROGRAMS OF MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND COOPERATION WITH FOREIGN NATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Acting Secretary of State with an accompanying memorandum, to the end that the act approved August 9, 1939, entitled "An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American Republics," may be amended to permit the development of similar programs of mutual understanding and cooperation with other nations of the world.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 29, 1944.*

[Enclosures: Report, memorandum.]

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE (H. DOC. NO. 456)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report of the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to provide in the present emergency, and for so long thereafter as may be necessary, for the appointment, with the consent of the Senate, of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 29, 1944.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO GRADING AND CLASSIFICATION OF FOREIGN SERVICE CLERKS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which

was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the foreign service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 29, 1944.*

[ENCLOSURES: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Draft of proposed bill.]

PHYSICIANS' REPORT ON REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION TO THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Chief Clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the commission of physicians appointed to examine the requirements of admission to the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

In addition to this report there are three rather voluminous appendixes. These, of course, should be made available to Senators and Representatives and any other persons wishing to obtain the information there.

I think that this report and these studies will be of definite interest to all.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 29, 1944.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY ON STATE OF THE FINANCES

The annual report, submitted pursuant to law, of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Finance.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 96 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

OIL AND GAS LEASES EXTENDED DURING 1943

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a tabulation prepared by the General Land Office listing the oil and gas leases, the terms of which have been extended under the provisions of law during the calendar year 1943 (with an accompanying table); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Administrator of War Food Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, three statements constituting a report with respect to the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CLAIM OF THE SQUARE D CO. AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Square D Co. against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

REGISTRANTS DEFERRED BECAUSE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, list of 18-through-37-year-old registrants deferred because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on December 15, 1943, containing the names of 130,605 registrants, of whom 123,957 were registered with local boards in the continental United States (with an accompanying list); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ON DISTRIBUTION METHODS AND COSTS ON SEVERAL PRODUCTS, APPLIANCES, ETC.

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of the Commission on Distribution Methods and Costs, Part IV—covering petroleum products, automobiles, rubber tires, electrical household appliances, and agricultural implements (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting an estimate of the number of employees for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries for the quarter ending March 31, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the executive director, national legislative committee, the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, for filing with the Senate Finance Committee copy of the audit of the finances of the American Legion for the year ended December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (6), Navy, and Interior (2); United States Civil Service Commission (2), Office of Censorship, and Tennessee Valley Authority (4), Federal Security Agency (Social Security Board), National Housing Agency, United States Maritime Commission, War Production Board (2), and the Selective Service System which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter from James H. Howard, chairman, conference of Boulder power contractors, Los Angeles, Calif., transmitting a statement signed by Mr. Howard, entitled "Statement of California Boulder power contractors with respect to report of expenditures from Colorado River Dam fund incurred in the construction, operation, and maintenance of Boulder City, filed by the Secretary of the Interior pursuant to the proviso contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944 (57 Stat. 451)"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from the Schuyler County Fair Play Committee, Watkins Glen, N. Y., transmitting a petition, numerously signed, of citizens of Schuyler County, N. Y., praying that Congress take steps to correct the situation in connection with the procedure followed in the removal of the Schuyler County A. A. A. Committee and the alleged denial of an open hearing in the matter by the chief of the A. A. A.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution by the Aviation Commission of Tucson, the Tucson Chamber of Commerce, the aviation committee of the Tucson Chamber of Commerce, and the board of directors of the Tucson Chamber of Commerce, in the State of Arizona, favoring the adoption of five principles set forth in the resolution constituting a declaration of worldwide aviation policy; to the Committee on Commerce.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Herman K. Schafer, of Omaha, Nebr., praying that the Senate override the Presidential veto of the revenue bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter and telegrams from Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; William Green, president, American Federation of Labor; Thomas Conner, chairman, legislative and political action committee, Walter McManamon, business agent, and Paul Cusic, president, Local No. 43, I. U. M. S. W. A. (C. I. O.), Baltimore, Md.; Local No. 1716, U. O. P. W. A., New York City, N. Y.; and the Minneapolis Building and Construction Trade Council, W. T. Leeper, secretary, in support of the Presidential veto of the revenue bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution by Van Norman Industrial Union, Local No. 213, U. E. R. M. W. A. (C. I. O.), of Springfield, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation providing a wartime method of voting for members of the armed forces; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution by the board of directors and members of the Oriental Benevolent Association, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., favoring the enactment of the so-called Randolph naturalization bill granting American citizenship to Filipinos; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TOBEY:

A letter in the nature of a petition from officers of the American Citizens Club of Polish Descent, of Newmarket, N. H., praying that the borders of Poland may be maintained as of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the B'nai B'rith Women of Montgomery County, Silver Spring, Md., favoring the Jewish colonization of Palestine and establishment of a Jewish national home therein as a democratic commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 85

"Joint resolution memorializing the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give consideration to the subject of the granting of permits to competing transcontinental air lines in order that all communities in New England may have a rightful place in the air world.

"Whereas New England is today being unwittingly discriminated against in the issuance of transcontinental air-line certificates; and

"Whereas this situation is working to the detriment of New England's commerical and industrial development: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this general assemly now demands that the Civil Aeronautics Board shall grant permits to competing transcontinental air lines and thereby bring all communities in New England up to an equal footing with all other comparable communities in the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution, signed by the Governor, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, be transmitted by the secretary of state to each member of the Civil Aeronautics Board and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States stating the wishes of the General Assembly in the matter of the granting of such permits in order that Rhode Island, as well as other New England communities, shall be accorded a rightful place in the air world and respectfully urging the members of said Board and said congressional delegation from Rhode Island to make every effort to have such permits granted to competing transcontinental air lines.

"J. HOWARD MCGRATH,
"*Governor, State of Rhode Island, and Providence Plantations.*

"PROVIDENCE, *February 26, 1944.*"

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

"Senate Resolution 56

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States to use their best efforts to have the same franking privileges for mail sent by men and women of the armed forces and the same privileges of half fare in the matter of transportation upon public utilities extended to trainees of the American merchant marine service while said trainees are going through their 'boot' training

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are respectfully requested to use their best efforts to have the same franking privileges for mail sent by men and women of the armed forces and the same privileges of half fare in the matter of transportation upon public utilities extended to trainees of the American merchant marine service while said trainees are going through their 'boot' training; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Resolution 741

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their best efforts to have enacted into statute a bill now pending before Congress, namely, S. 1617, entitled 'A bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans'

"Whereas there is now pending in Congress a bill, namely, S. 1617, entitled 'A bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans; and

"Whereas every citizen of this State should be in accord with the wish to expedite and complete plans and programs for the speedy readjustment in civilian life of any such returning World War No. 2 veteran: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to use their best efforts to have enacted into statute a bill now pending in Congress, namely, S. 1617, entitled 'A bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state is hereby requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

METHODIST MOVEMENT FOR WORLD PEACE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred letters typical of considerably more than a thousand I have received recently supporting the drive by the Methodist bishops for world peace after the war is over. No one is stronger for world peace than am I. Needless to say, I shall support any program that promises a just peace to the people of the United States and the rest of the world.

I am in favor of the United States cooperating with other nations of the world to obtain a just and lasting peace. However, it is only fair to say that it will be necessary for other nations to cooperate with the United States to attain a just and lasting peace: also, that the other nations cooperate with each other. I sincerely hope that this will be attained.

In connection with these letters received by me, I ask also unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement circulated among the Methodists of the United States, asking that these letters to Members of Congress be written in the cause of peace.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR PART IN THE CRUSADE FOR A NEW WORLD ORDER

WHY?

Why a crusade? To make sure that our own country will assume its share of responsibility for assuring peace in the future.

While Congress has already taken definite steps toward world collaboration, this is not enough. We must go even further and do our part to assure the kind of world living that will change the conditions that give rise to war.

This will have to be accomplished by our Government, by the administration, and by the Congress whose Members are elected by the people. Therefore, it will have to be accomplished by the people.

YOUR PART

The first step toward this end is for you to write immediately to your representatives in both Houses of Congress. Say briefly in your own words and on your own writing paper that you expect your representatives in Congress to support and vote for those measures that will enable our country to cooperate with the other nations of the world in constructive plans for the prevention of conditions that permit aggression and war.

Say to them that you know that the United States alone can neither prevent war nor keep war away from its own shores, once it has begun; therefore, it must cooperate with other nations, regardless of the expense involved to its citizens; that you are willing to make the necessary personal sacrifices to insure peace.

DO NOT FAIL

The aim is at least one letter to your Senators and to your Representative from every Methodist home. More letters will give added impetus to the movement.

Remember that the future of the world may rest with the mobilization of church people to secure and enforce that peace. Methodists, as followers of the Prince of Peace, are under divine imperative to use every means to establish a world order in which peace is possible.

THE STATE EXCHANGE BANK,
Mankato, Kans., February 9, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The average citizen is probably too inarticulate in regard to matters of national import and consequently I take this opportunity to express my ideas on certain matters.

Our first duty is to carry the war effort to a victorious conclusion. Before that is accomplished, however, some foundation must be laid for a permanent peace, and it is the factors relative to peace that I wish to speak about briefly:

1. Some temporary protective organization must be set up to keep the outlaw nations from again arising.

2. The theory of isolationism as practiced by our Nation after the First World War must be abandoned forever.

3. Some permanent organization must be developed over the period of time through which nations can act for peace instead of war.

4. In the permanent organization the principles of the Christian brotherhood of man should prevail.

Assuring you that I appreciate your work in the Senate and hoping that this war may be concluded by a victory and peace that will not call our young men to war in another generation.

Very truly yours,

LEWIS H. STAFFORD.

IMMANUEL METHODIST CHURCH,
Otis, Kans., February 19, 1944.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am writing you in behalf of the peace that shall be made after our sons (I have only two and both are in the service) have defeated the enemy; when our leaders and those of other nations shall meet together to write the treaties.

I have given a lot of thought and study to the matter, and I am thoroughly convinced that unless men are guided by Almighty God, the situation is hopeless so far as any enduring peace is concerned.

I am sure our Nation can never again live in isolationism. Just as no man can be entirely independent while living in an ordered community, so no nation can be entirely independent in any ordered community of nations. The problem calls for the fullest cooperation of our Nation with the other nations of the world, if any satisfactory solution of present and future economic and social problems is to be found.

We are paying heavily for this war, both in men and money, but it is all a tragic waste unless we can win the peace. If we are willing to pay heavily to win a war, we ought to be willing to pay heavily to form a peace that will prevent the recurrence of war. I feel that our Nation must cooperate to the fullest extent in any measures that will insure peace, regardless of the expense involved.

As soon as we have vanquished our enemies, we must feed their starving, heal their sick and wounded, and rehabilitate their homeless along with our needy friendly nations. We must educate the children of our enemies in the principles of our democracy. We must show the enemy that our democracy works. All this will cost vast sums of money, but I, for one, am willing to make all the necessary sacrifice possible to insure the future peace of the world.

I do not know who will be chosen to represent the nations at the peace table, nor how they will be selected. But I think the best brains and the highest Christian idealism and the most widely traveled and informed persons in the world, regardless of race, creed, or color, should be among that number.

I am counting upon you as one of my Representatives in Congress to support and vote for those measures that will enable our country to cooperate with the other nations in the forming of such international organization as may be necessary to establish world law and order based upon justice and brotherhood.

Yours very truly,

VIRGIL M. HAYES.

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
ULYSSES, KANS., *February 3, 1944.*

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I am deeply concerned that world wars will not become regular habits and hobbies, so I am writing you as my senatorial representative, to ask that you use every influence possible, both in the preliminary planning as well as in the coming peace conference itself, to help bring about a just and lasting peace. From past experience, we learned that such terms did not come about without our definite participation in the planning. I personally feel that we cannot be isolationists at such a time, nor that we can permit the stronger nations to dictate a policy for the weaker ones, that is unjust and un-Christian, without the natural result of hatred and resentment that will soon breed rebellion on another world scale.

Our youth and our country already has most of the cost of two wars to pay for, largely because un-Christian ideals drafted the international policies at the close of World War No. 1.

Please be assured, Senator CAPPER, that the men and women who have gone from this community into the armed forces, as well as all our civilian life who are in an all-out program of production and defense, want a Christian spirit of justice to undergird the thinking and expression of those who are in a position of responsibility and high privilege, in the planning and drafting of a peace policy that shall be enduring. To this end, I pray God shall bless you and guide you in these most terrifically trying times.

Sincerely,

MAURICE E. RICKARD.

THE METHODIST CHURCH,
South Hutchinson, Kans.,
February 2, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: For several months, I have been thinking and praying about the future of great Republic of ours. Peace is the matter uppermost in my mind. I believe that the future holds greater possibilities than some people dream.

Mr. CAPPER, I want to thank you for any part that you have had in bettering world conditions and showing sympathy toward stricken peoples in this war. U. N. R. R. A., I assume, is one evidence that we want to help the world. Thank you for believing in it and helping with it.

The problems and tasks of the near future will be heavy ones for you. Concerning the subject of peace, I want you to remember that as a Christian, I am against isolationism. I believe that we ought to cooperate with the rest of the world. Christians for a long time have been promoting a program of missions. That, it seems to me, shows that we are world-minded. I favor a program of world collaboration. Please, Mr. CAPPER, do everything within your power to make this settlement this time a Christian one. I want you and all our other Representatives in Washington, to know that I am behind any move which is necessary, so long as it is Christian. I want, and I believe others likewise want a fair, just, righteous, and lasting peace this time.

I am praying that God will give you enough insight and wisdom to stand by a durable and lasting peace, when this war is over. And I want to be courageous enough to stand with you. God bless you. I shall keep on praying for you and others in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

RAY B. BRESSLER.

STAFFORD, KANS., *January 30, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Feeling that a personal expression of opinion, as to post-war plans, would not be offensive to you, we will briefly set forth what the writer thinks would be conducive to world peace and security.

First. I believe a full measure of cooperation with other nations, at least those with high ideals like our own, is absolutely necessary.

Second. I hold that one of the best measures to prevent future wars is an ample supply of fighting material, kept constantly up to the minute, a full-sized Army and, particularly, the strongest Navy in the world. All this without regard to cost of upkeep, because even that is cheap compared to recurrent wars, which are sure to come if we are unprepared to fight them.

Third. It strikes me that an international police force will be absolutely necessary to carry out such a program.

If these measures can have your support, it would please the writer.

Respectfully yours,

F. G. SMART.

KINGMAN, KANS., *February 4, 1944.*

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We have oftentimes heard it said that the eighteenth amendment to our Constitution would not have been repealed if those of us who were deeply anxious that it remain a law, had not neglected our duty in writing the lawmakers concerning the matter.

Now another important matter is in the offing as we think, and that is the peace that will be entered into after this awful war is over.

As one of your constituents and a loyal Republican, I am hoping that you will do all in your power that an enduring peace may come to pass.

I feel that what happened after the last peace conference was that the Germans started right in planning for another war just as the Democrats did after the last election to win this coming one. I better not elaborate on that, for you perhaps are too busy to listen to me.

But trusting you will do your utmost to help secure a Christian world where peace will be the rule and war an unknown affliction.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. NELL H. WALTER.

WICHITA, KANS.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I want to let you know that I am back of you in your efforts to make sure that our country will assume its share of responsibility for assuring peace in the future.

There is an economic war before every war of lives which must be understood and solved if possible, by all nations.

Yours truly,

RUBIE M. JOHNSON,
Johnson's Poultry & Egg Co.

SALINE COUNTY BOARD OF
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Salina, Kans., February 10, 1944.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: In your position as one of the national representatives of the United States, you are aware of the present world crisis.

With the continued coordinated effort of the Allies, it now appears that within a reasonable time the terms of peace can and will be dictated by the present Allies.

The Prince of Peace, with His well-known principles as set forth in His teachings, should be at the right-hand side of each of our present-day men who will draw the terms of peace for the world to live by.

Justice, such as religious freedom, economic cooperation, which will allow freedom of exchange of merchandise, education that will enable all peoples regardless of race or color to live a more healthy life and to produce a greater abundance of agricultural products.

It should be borne in mind that small nations who do not have the power to protect themselves from aggression can start turmoil that engulfs all the nations of the world.

Jesus Christ with His principles as outlined 2,000 years ago, can and will keep the peace if allowed to be present at the peace table.

Yours very truly,

H. S. CURRIER,
Mrs. H. S. CURRIER.

FIRST METHODIST CHURCH,
Phillipsburg, Kans., February 10, 1944.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: We appreciate your attitude in seeking to put our country in the lead of

securing a just and durable peace for the world.

In this we want to encorage you. We hope that a world organization may come forth from our present collaboration in war with the United Nations that will result in a collaboration for peace finally with all nations.

Such a cooperation, to be successful, must be based upon true brotherhood. That spirit is so essential that we hope you will always use your good offices and influence to promote those Christian principles that are necessary to bring it about.

We believe that the world is in this catastrophe now because of two great lacks—the lack of world organization and the lack of conformity to the moral order that underlies all of life. These lacks must be met if we are ever to have a successful peace.

Most sincerely yours,

Rev. GEO. A. KRAFT.
Mrs. GEO. A. KRAFT.

HALSTEAD, KANS., *February 10, 1944.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: You have been in Washington in the interest of the people of Kansas ever since I can remember, but this is the first time I have written my thoughts to you about any question. This question of world peace is so close to us all that I must write.

The most shameful thing that could come to our Nation at the end of this war would be, in my opinion, to have our boys come home doubtful in their minds if the peace terms were worth all they sacrificed.

It is very important that you vote on every question with a clear, Christian viewpoint. Two generations are far too many to give their blood for the same cause. The third must not have to do likewise. Our country must cooperate with other countries in building a new world wherein all this cannot happen again.

Sincerely,

Mrs. MILDRED A. DUGAN.

HADLEY MEMORIAL METHODIST CHURCH,
Hutchinson, Kans., February 11, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: While our country is engaged in a terrible war involving all her citizens and particularly affecting those nearer and dearer to us than life itself, we realize we must begin to prepare for peace, for peace will come again, please God. We hope and pray that out of this greatest tragedy of all time may come a free world, and an enduring peace. We pray it may not be too far away.

We know, too, that you who are our representatives in Washington are having to look forward and plan for the kind of a treaty which will insure the greatest possible measure of justice to all concerned, and which will make impossible a recurrence within the next generation—and please God any generation—of this titanic disaster. As a Christian citizen, interested in the welfare of all mankind, I am writing you as my spokesman in Washington, to urge you to use all your powers—as I believe you will do—to see that our great country shall go on record as favoring some form of international cooperation which will insure a just and durable peace. We truly believe that such a treaty can only be based upon the Christian principles of justice instead of self-seeking, and liberty rather than tyranny.

We must not permit ourselves by a program of selfish isolationism to lose the peace which shall have been won by the bloody sweat and tears of our youth of this generation. We must find a way through international cooperation to do away with those conditions which permit aggression and war. We must take a determined stand against all tyranny of any nation or people such as has produced our present situation.

I wish to assure you that I and my family, as Christians and citizens of a nation which supports the Christian principles and teachings, stand ready to support with whatever influence we may possess and by such sacrifices as may be entailed in such a cooperative movement to seek to bring "liberty and justice for all." Also, we assure you that our constant prayers are for your divine guidance as you plan and work for a better day.

Sincerely,

LYNN M. CANFIELD.

THE RISING COST OF LIVING—MEMORIAL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred, a letter in the nature of a memorial adopted by the City Teachers Association, of Augusta, Kans., expressing their protest against rising living costs.

There being no objection, the letter in the nature of a resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, KANS., *February 21, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, the undersigned members of the Augusta City Teachers' Association, wish to express our concern over the need for holding the line against rising living costs. We urge that a gallant and consistent stand against rising costs of living be taken by each and every Member of our Congress.

The educational system of our country must be maintained at its pre-war standard, if we hope to continue as a representative government of the highest type. This goal cannot be attained under the present condition of our schools. Too many members of the educational system are accepting employment in positions where salaries are keeping pace with the rising costs of living. No group of people in our country stand to lose more than school teachers as costs continue to rise faster than salaries are increased.

Let's hold the line against rising living costs. May we count on your support in opposition to any and all measures that tend to move the inflation spiral upward?

Yours truly,

Frank E. Wilson, Nina Lamoree, May Gruver, Jeanne Johnston, Ruth Morgan, Mildred Brown, Winifred Ketch, Edna Zuercher, Edith P. Seely, Tressie Porter, Vera M. Clark, Edna Chapin, J. Ned Morgan, Le Nora Tony, Norma Waits, Margaret Parker, A. R. Self, Margaret Norman, Alice McTaggart, Roberta Brown, Bonnie Selanders, Evelyn Caldwell, Mamie Terrill, C. W. Gustafson, V. W. Hayes, Chlola Windsor, Iva Mae Myers, Margery Hanson, Margaret E. Morton, Annetta Davis, Ruby E. Harness.

CONSUMER FOOD SUBSIDIES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a statement from the officers of the Pomona Grange, of Coffey County, Kans., expressing their opposition to the consumer food subsidies.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURLINGTON, KANS., *February 21, 1944.*

Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The Coffey County Pomona Grange and the Grange membership of Coffey County desires to commend you and express our appreciation for your work in opposition to the consumer food subsidies.

Yours sincerely,

JAMES W. INGWERSEN,
Master.
Mrs. ROVILLA DOUGLASS,
Secretary.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY LAW—MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a letter, and resolution, which I have received from Mr. Fred Schwarzkopf, city clerk of Bridgeport, Conn. The resolution urges immediate amendment of the Federal laws relating to social security to enable inclusion of municipal employees within their provisions, on a basis that is fair and equitable.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF CITY CLERK,
Bridgeport, Conn., February 23, 1944.

Hon. FRANCES T. MALONEY,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: The attached resolution, which is self-explanatory, was adopted by the Common Council of the City of Bridgeport at its meeting of February 21, 1944.

Very truly yours,

FRED SCHWARZKOPF,
City Clerk.

Whereas under Federal social-security laws municipal employees are excluded from the benefits and protection provided thereby; and

Whereas such exclusion constitutes an injustice to municipal employees and an unwarranted and unfair discrimination against them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Bridgeport hereby recommends immediate amendment of the Federal laws relating to social security to enable inclusion of municipal employees within their provisions on a basis that is fair and equitable; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to all Members of Congress and Senators from the State of Connecticut and that they be urged to initiate and support immediate action looking to early accomplishment of the objective herein endorsed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CHRISTIAN WORLD ORDER

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to offer for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter and resolution which I have received from Mr. R. H. Martin, president of the National Reform Association, Pittsburgh, Pa. The resolution or petition was adopted by the Woman's Society of Christian Service

of the Asbury Methodist Church, Forestville, Conn., and is addressed to the Senate. It urges the establishment of a Christian world order.

There being no objection, the letter with the petition or resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL REFORM ASSOCIATION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., February 25, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: Enclosed is a petition for a Christian world order adopted by the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Asbury Methodist Church, Forestville, Conn., which has been sent to our office to send on to Washington. It is addressed to the United States Senate. I am therefore sending it to you as one of the Senators from Connecticut with a request that you present it to the Senate.

This petition was drawn up by the board of directors of the National Reform Association and represents their convictions as well as the convictions of the above group which has adopted it as to what is essential in the setting up of the new world order if it is to bring peace to the world.

I trust it will receive careful and sympathetic consideration.

Very respectfully yours,
R. H. MARTIN, *President.*

PETITION FOR A CHRISTIAN WORLD ORDER

To the Senate of the United States:

The undersigned, citizens of the United States, deeply concerned that the United Nations shall win the peace as well as the war, present for your consideration the following, which we believe essential to a just and durable peace:

I. THE ESTABLISHING OF A CHRISTIAN WORLD ORDER

Only a Christian order can bring peace. It calls for a Christian charter embodying the fundamental principles of Christian government, such as these:

Nations are subjects of the moral government of God, and owe allegiance to Him. His laws for their government are found in the Bible. Their highest expression is in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and Ruler of nations. Of Him, the divine lawbook for nations declares:

"The government shall be upon His shoulders; His name shall be called * * * Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end."

If we would have peace let us build the new world order upon Him as its foundation according to the basic laws of His kingdom—righteousness and human brotherhood.

This Christian charter should also contain a "bill of rights" for mankind implementing these basic principles, such as:

(a) Religious, intellectual, and economic freedom for all peoples.

(b) Equality of opportunity for all men regardless of birth, race, or nationality.

(c) The right of the people under colonial governments to be governed justly and to prepare them for self-government.

(d) The right of security against war.

II. THE ESTABLISHING OF AN INTERNATIONAL OR WORLD GOVERNMENT

Within nations we have established government and enacted laws for the peaceable settlement of disputes. In the "no-man's land" of international relationships we as yet have failed to establish government. So long as this international anarchy continues, in this shrunken world we will have constantly recurring global wars.

To save civilization we must establish a government over nations, clothe it with authority at least sufficient to enact laws to suppress international brigandage and lawlessness, and with power sufficient to enforce obedience to them.

Our forefathers in 1787 adopted this principle of federal government. Its success on a continental scale warrants the conviction that it is valid for the world.

III. AMERICA'S PARTICIPATION IN ESTABLISHING A CHRISTIAN WORLD ORDER AND GOVERNMENT

For our participation there are compelling reasons:

(a) No world order with hope of peace can be set up without our help.

(b) Our national interest demands our participation. The alternative to international cooperation in establishing the reign of law, justice, and peace in the world, is international anarchy, the maintenance of huge national armaments, and the recurrence of global wars involving our Nation.

(c) As a Christian people we have obligations to humanity which can be fulfilled only by our collaboration. The Christian law of life, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" requires America to seek the safety and welfare of other nations to the same extent she seeks her own. Besides, America is a chosen nation, chosen of the Lord and blest, not for her own sake, but for the sake of the whole world. We now face our greatest opportunity to fulfill this world mission.

In this appeal for a Christian world order we are realists, not impractical idealists. Anti-Christian principles in the international realm have proven unrealistic and impracticable. They have drenched the earth with the blood of unnumbered millions of its choicest manhood. The Christian way of life for nations is the realistic way. It alone will work. We call upon you, our representatives, to set it to work in the new world order.

Adopted by Woman's Society of Christian Service, Asbury Methodist Church, on January 19, representing approximately 20 persons.

Signature and address of officers:
MRS. CARL JOHANSEN,
President.
MRS. LELAND COBB,
Secretary.

Or signed by individuals:
ARTHUR C. BROWN,
Pastor, Forestville, Conn.

LIBERTY OF THE REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a letter which I have received from Mr. V. A. Brynga, chairman, and Mr. Joseph Leonaitis, secretary, the Greater Hartford American Lithuanians, Hartford, Conn., transmitting a body of resolutions unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Greater Hartford American Lithuanians, commemorating the twenty-sixth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence—February 16, 1918. The resolutions urge the liberation of the Republic of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the letter with the petition or resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOLY TRINITY SCHOOL HALL,
Hartford, Conn., February 20, 1944.

Hon. Senator FRANCIS MALONEY,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE AND DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor and privilege to transmit herewith a body of resolutions unanimously adopted at a mass meeting of Greater Hartford American Lithuanians commemorating the twenty-sixth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, February 16, 1918:

"Whereas the American Lithuanians are proud of their sons and brothers, husbands and sisters who are devotedly doing their part, whether on the battlefields in action against the enemy, on the high seas, or at the assembly lines on the home front; and

"Whereas hundreds of thousands of citizens of Lithuanian descent look up to you, honorable Senator, as one of the great champions and representatives of freedom in our time for the benefit of the common man and small nations; and

"Whereas the American Lithuanians have not forgotten their old country in Europe and had watched with a natural feeling of simple human pride the steady progress there in every field of human endeavor until the smothering of independent life in Lithuania by cruel aggressors; and

"Whereas the American Lithuanians of Greater Hartford at least are deeply grateful to Your Honor for the American Government's unflinching determination not to recognize acts of aggression in Lithuania as expressed by responsible officials of the American Government; and

"Whereas we are further convinced that the crushing of the enemies by the United Nations will bring to Lithuania, to use the words of the Atlantic Charter, 'the restoration of sovereign rights and self-government' in the same measure as it will to the other enslaved small nations of Europe and as proclaimed in the Atlantic Charter: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we American Lithuanians appeal to you, Mr. Senator, to use your good offices to liberate the Republic of Lithuania, and we are confident that our Government will never deviate from its traditional principles of ever championing the cause of justice and the rights of the unjustly oppressed."

Ever confidently yours,
V. A. BRYNGA, *Chairman.*
JOSEPH LEONAITIS, *Secretary.*

Mr. DANAHER, by unanimous consent, presented a letter signed by the chairman and secretary of a mass meeting of Greater Hartford (Conn.) American Lithuanians, commemorating the twenty-sixth anniversary of Lithuania's declaration of independence, embodying a resolution adopted by the meeting, which letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. (The letter and resolution are identical with the foregoing matter presented by Mr. MALONEY.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1722. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; with amendments (Rept. No. 725).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2440. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy; without amendment (Rept. No. 726).

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 16 OF REPORT NO. 10 OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent from the Committee on Printing to report an original concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the annual report of the so-called Truman committee, and I request its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 10, pt. 16, current session) of the select committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a complete study and investigation of the operation of the war program, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the select committee, 1,000 for the use of the Senate document room, and 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of what the Senator seeks to accomplish by the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Truman committee has submitted its annual report, and desires additional copies of the report to be printed. If the resolution is agreed to the additional copies can be obtained by the run of the press without going back to press.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

ANNUAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—AUTHORITY TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS (PT. 16 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. TRUMAN. I ask unanimous consent for permission to file the annual report of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, of which I am chairman, while the Senate is in recess after today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF WAR DEPARTMENT — AUTHORITY FOR THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I understand that when today's session ends it is contemplated that the Senate adjourn or recess until Tuesday. Committee action on the War Department civil functions bill has been completed save for marking up the bill. That will be done tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that permission be granted to report the bill from the committee during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1742. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 1743. A bill to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war food production program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1744. A bill to provide for the more efficient utilization of the agricultural resources of the Nation during peace and war; to regulate the production and distribution of margarine, a product of certain agricultural commodities, in interstate commerce; to remove certain obstructions to the distribution of such product in interstate commerce; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1745. A bill to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1746. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario, a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1747. A bill to further define the number and duties of criers and bailiffs in United States courts and regulate their compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1748. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, to continue it in effect; and

S. 1749. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1750. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for voluntary retirement of postal employees after 30 years' service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1751. A bill for the relief of the estate of Capt. Guy B. McArthur, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1752. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to remove the restriction which provides that the total benefits payable for a month with respect to an individual's wages shall not exceed twice the primary benefit of such individual; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1753. A bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of State for Air; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1754. A bill for the relief of William W. McGregor, Perry Shilton, Louie Hess, Jack Wade, and Owen Busch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to provide for a reduction in numbers of governmental agencies and personnel; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating the second Sunday in October as Old Folks Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3619. An act to amend sections 675 and 676 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, regulating the disposal of dead human bodies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3956. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

POSTHUMOUS COMMISSION AS MAJOR GENERAL FOR THE LATE COL. WILLIAM MITCHELL—WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Friday I entered a motion to discharge the Committee on Military Affairs from further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes. This morning I was privileged to appear before the committee. We had a very amicable session in relation to the joint resolution. I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion will be withdrawn.

INVESTIGATION OF MARKET CONDITIONS AFFECTING HOG PRICES

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 260), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized sub-

committee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to market conditions affecting hog prices with a view to ascertaining whether packers are depressing such prices by refusing to buy hogs to which support prices are applicable, basing such refusal upon a lack of processing and storage facilities, and buying instead hogs which are above or below the weight range with respect to which support prices are payable. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to employ such clerical and other assistants; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 2 OF REPORT NO. 539, RELATING TO THE CANCELATION OF WAR CONTRACTS, ETC.

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 261), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 15,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 539, part 2, current session, submitted by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, pursuant to Senate Resolution 102, relative to the "cancelation of war contracts, disposition and sale of surplus property, and industrial demobilization and reconversion," be printed for the use of said committee.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1944

Mr. GREEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 263), which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, from States in which no Senator is to be elected at the general election in 1944, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to—

(1) the extent and nature of the expenditures made by all candidates for the office of President, Vice President, and United States Senator in 1944 in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office;

(2) the amounts subscribed and contributed, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available (including personal services, and the use of billboards and other advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobiles, and other transportation facilities), by any individual, group of individuals, partnership, association, or corporation to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign, or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any primary or general election, or at any convention, held in 1944, at which a candidate for President, Vice President, or United States Senator is to be nominated or elected;

(3) the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress with a view to determining whether any such funds have been or are being expended by any department, independent agency, or instrumentality of the United States, by any State or political subdivision thereof, or by any instrumentality of any State or political subdivision thereof, in such a manner as to influence the votes cast or to be cast for any such candidate at any such primary or general election or convention;

(4) the use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates; and

(5) such other matters relating to the election of President, Vice President, and United States Senators in 1944, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the Senate in enacting remedial legislation or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the Senate.

SEC. 2. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee, under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof.

SEC. 4. The committee by majority vote may authorize any member of the committee, or any member of a duly authorized subcommittee, to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any member so authorized may hold public hearings, issue subpenas, and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, administer oaths, and take testimony.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may authorize any one or more persons to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any person so authorized may hold such public hearings, issue such subpenas, and provide for the service thereof, require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, and take such testimony, as the committee, or any such duly authorized subcommittee, may from time to time authorize.

SEC. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate on the first day of the next regular session of the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS—REMARKS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH RELATIVE TO THE ANNUAL CUSTOM OF READING THE ADDRESS (S. DOC. NO. 159)

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the Public Library of Des Moines, Iowa, which refers to the scholarly address by Senator THOMAS of Utah in connection with the annual reading of Washington's Farewell Address in the United States Senate. In the letter it is stated:

> The Senator's commentary and analysis of Washington's famous document contains so much that is timely and of value that I wish it could be preserved in more permanent form.
>
> Would it be in order for a book to be printed as a special Senate document containing both the Farewell Address and the address of the Senator?

I ask unanimous consent that the commentary and analysis by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], as they appear in the RECORD in connection with his reading of the Farewell Address, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRODUCTION OF LIQUID FUEL FROM COAL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LANGER. May I ask the distinguished temporary majority leader just what the difference is?

Mr. HATCH. The House made amendments, one of them relating to agricultural products to which I understand there is some objection. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the chairman of the committee, is ill and not able to be present. This morning I talked to him on the telephone and his thought was that the bill should go to conference, where the differences could be ironed out quickly.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know what the differences are?

Mr. HATCH. I do not.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator is this the bill proposing to appropriate $30,000,000 for demonstration plants to experiment in the production of liquid fuels from coal and other substances?

Mr. HATCH. This is the bill which the Senator has in mind. My motion is that the Senate disagree to the House amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, requesting a conference with the Senate thereon, and appointing conferees.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, agree to the conference asked by the House and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of fthe Senate.

SECOND REPORT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Second Report of Selective Service under section 6 of Public Law 197, Seventy-eighth Congress, has been submitted to the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs by Col. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., on behalf of Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey.

It contains information concerning the present and contemplated size of the armed forces, classifications, deferments, inductions of nonfathers and fathers, rejections of IV–F's, use of limited-service personnel, discharges, reemployment of veterans, and other matters which I believe are of interest to my colleagues.

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs will question General Hershey or Colonel Keesling at an early date concerning the various items in this report and also concerning the recent order of the President tightening up on occupational deferments and the recommendations of the President's five-man medical board that the standards for induction remain the same and that no increased volume of limited-service personnel be inducted.

The First Selective Service Report, filed under Public Law 197, appears at pages 155–166 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 14, 1944.

So that the information contained in this report may be available to the Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND REPORT OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM TO THE COMMITTEES ON MILITARY AFFAIRS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE, UNDER PUBLIC LAW 197, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

SIZE OF ARMED FORCES—HOW SELECTIVE SERVICE PLANS TO FILL CALLS

The net strength which the Army and Navy plan to attain on or before July 1, 1944, is 11,300,000. Their net strength as of February 1, 1944, was approximately 10,600,000—a difference of 700,000—which number, together with an additional 500,000 which Selective Service estimates as the attrition from the armed forces from all causes during 5 months ending July 1, 1944, gives a total of 1,200,000 which Selective Service must furnish, or which must be enlisted. The 1,200,000 will require average calls and enlistments of 240,000 per month.

In meeting that requirement, Selective Service estimates that it will induct 420,000 out of the 1,500,000 in class I–A. It is estimated that of the 2,600,000 registrants in class III–A, approximately 860,000 will, upon reclassification, be placed in class I–A, of whom approximately 250,000 will ultimately be inducted. It is estimated that between 65,000 and 70,000 men will either enlist at age 17 or be inducted through Selective Service upon reaching 18 each month, giving a total of approximately 325,000 during the 5 months ending July 1, 1944. (See exhibit A for break-down of classes and method of determining the number which will be obtained from them and from the 17-year-olds.) That gives approximately 1,000,000 men that we may expect to get prior to July 1, 1944, leaving a balance of 200,000. These must be obtained from registrants occupationally deferred or physically rejected. Most of these should come from nonfathers of the younger-age brackets.

There were approximately 3,204,000 registrants in classes II–A and II–B, deferred in occupations other than agriculture, and approximately 1,630,000 in classes II–C and III–C, deferred in agriculture, a total of approximately 4,900,000 deferred by reason of their occupations. Class IV–F, those rejected from military service for failure to meet armed forces' standards, contained approximately 3,485,000.

No appreciable numbers will be obtained from class IV–F under existing standards and the application thereof which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the War Department and the Navy Department. Therefore, the men must be obtained from the occupationally deferred classes.

There were 900,000 men (nonfathers) in the occupationally deferred classes between 18 and 26 years of age. Only about 500,000 of them would pass the physical examination. If we are to meet our requirements from that group of nonfathers, we would consequently have to take 2 out of every 5 of those who were physically qualified. (See exhibit B for break-down between agricultural and nonagricultural occupational deferments and between the 18 to 21 and the 22 to 26 age groups.)

We must meet the calls made on us by the armed forces. It is obvious that occupational deferments must be restricted and must be curtailed to the extent necessary for us to meet calls on time. War industries and agriculture, therefore, together with the Government agencies which have been given responsibilities in the field of industrial and agricultural manpower procurement, must obtain replacements from the IV–F's, the overage, and women.

To carry out the mandate of Congress that we scrutinize occupational deferments and endeavor to get as many nonfathers as possible with which to fill each of our calls before using fathers, we have taken the following actions:

1. We arranged for appeal board where man is working to review an occupational deferment granted by a local board outside that appeal board area. This has required creation of numerous appeal board panels to industrial areas to carry the increased burden.[1]

2. We restricted occupational deferments of registrants under 22 years of age.[1]

3. We curtailed by special restrictive quotas the deferments of civilian students. This does not include students under War and Navy Department college programs.[1]

4. Tightening up on farm deferments. (See exhibit C.)

5. Provided for the granting of more liberal deferments to pre-Pearl Harbor fathers over 21 years of age than to nonfathers. To do that, replacement schedules provide for the release of nonfathers before fathers engaged in essential war work. (See exhibit A for the number of nonfathers and the number of fathers in each selective-service class. See exhibit B for the number of fathers being placed into the various deferred classes and the number of nonfathers being removed therefrom.)

6. Based on best available information, we allocate calls to the States and have States, in turn, allocate them to their local boards, so that the available nonfathers will be used in filling each monthly call to the extent they are available before using fathers.[1]

Under Public Law 197 the President appointed a five-man medical board charged with the responsibility of reviewing and recommending with respect to standards for admittance to the armed forces and the use of limited service personnel within the armed forces. Up to the time this report was drafted, no recommendations of that committee have been made public.

Public Law 197 also requires Selective Service to report on rejections and discharges. As of February 1, 1944, there were approximately 3,500,000 persons in class IV-F who were for the most part rejected under standards fixed and applied exclusively by the armed forces. The principal causes of rejection of the total number of class IV-F registrants are set forth in exhibit D. Exhibit E sets forth an estimate of the principal and also the secondary causes for rejection of registrants rejected during November 1943, and illustrates that many of those rejected for illiteracy, mental, or other reasons would have been rejected for another defect had illiteracy, mental, or one of the other standards been lowered or abolished.

Information concerning the 1,150,000 persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability is set forth in exhibit F. The standards for such discharges are, of course, fixed and applied exclusively by the armed forces.

The War and Navy Departments have contended they are utilizing the maximum number of non-general-service personnel they can use without impairing their present or future efficiency. The Army continues to take limited-service personnel from Selective Service at the rate of 5 percent of each monthly call. The Navy has not been taking any limited-service personnel from Selective Service. Both the Army and Navy are enlisting small numbers of WAVES and

[1] See first report, pp. 155–166 of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 14, 1944.

WAC's each month. No appreciable number of men over 38 is being taken. Exhibit I contains a statement of the Navy Department concerning use of non-general-service personnel. A statement of the War Department concerning the use of non-general-service personnel appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 4, 1943, at page 8022.

The procedure for preinduction physical examination required by Public Law 197 was explained in the first report. This procedure has been in full operation since February 1, 1944, and gives the registrant at least 21 days from the date notice of passing the examination is mailed to him.

The armed forces have been inducting some men with past criminal records. The standards for acceptance are fixed, applied, and come exclusively under the jurisdiction of the armed forces. See exhibit G for further details.

Section 8 (g) of the Selective Service Act charges Selective Service with the responsibility of aiding veterans in getting their former jobs or new jobs. See exhibit H for further detailed information.

EXHIBIT A

Approximate classification of registrants, ages 18 through 37, as of Feb. 1, 1944

Classification	Total	Nonfathers	Fathers
Total living registrants	22,198,297	15,310,925	6,887,372
I-C. Furnished to armed forces (this does not include nonregistrant enlistees who were under age or over age at time of enlistment, or who were women; it does include a certain number of registrants who died or were discharged for disability following induction)	9,351,886	9,190,643	161,243
IV-F. Disqualified from service with the armed forces for physical, mental, educational, or moral reasons	3,486,338	3,210,429	275,909
I-A.[1] In process of classification, examination, and induction	1,497,887	635,555	862,332
Unclassified	110,850	110,850	
II-A. Deferred as necessary in civilian activity	1,037,965	251,351	786,614
II-B. Deferred as necessary in war production program	2,166,431	782,830	1,383,601
II-C. Deferred as necessary in agriculture	728,321	710,500	17,821
III-A.[2] Deferred for dependency	2,593,020	42,945	2,550,075
III-C. Deferred for dependency and as necessary in agriculture	961,137	189,170	771,967
III-D. Deferred for dependency hardship	102,999	58,879	44,120
IV-B-C-D-E. Deferred specifically by law (public officials, neutral aliens, ministers, and students of religion) or under authority of law (conscientious objectors)	153,050	120,460	32,590
Other and unknown	8,413	7,313	1,100

[1] 420,000 will be eligible for induction. The balance will be eliminated by reclassification into deferred classes on appeal, reopening of cases, or as a result of failing to pass standards of the armed forces.

[2] 860,000 will go into class I-A after the balance have been placed in deferred classes. Of those put in class I-A, 250,000 will be inducted after the balance have been reclassified into deferred classes on appeal, reopening of cases, or as a result of failing to pass standards of armed forces.

Computation of enlistments of 17-year-olds and induction of 18-year-olds each month

Attain 18 each month	105,000
Already enlisted before reaching 18	15,000
Register with Selective Service each month	90,000
Placed in deferred classes other than class IV-F	17,000
Placed in class IV-F	18,000–23,000
Inducted	50,000–55,000
Number of 17-year-olds who enlist each month	15,000
Total enlistment of 17-year-olds and induction of 18-year olds each month	65,000–70,000

EXHIBIT B

Part I.—Classification actions of registrants 18 through 37 years of age during December 1943, continental United States (estimated), all registrants

Previous class	Total actions	New class												
		I-A, I-A-O	I-A-O-L and I-A-L	I-C inductions	I-C enlistments	II-A	II-B	II-C	III-A	III-C	III-D	IV-B, C, D, and IV-E	IV-F	Other and unknown
Total	1,743,520	581,740	13,280	193,160	8,260	242,160	443,310	20,520	4,760	52,100	11,910	2,890	163,990	5,440
Unclassified	83,280	61,980	10	1,020	3,220	1,480	1,460	7,120	70	110	120	610	3,940	1,140
I-A and I-A-O	480,080	[1] 300	10,840	185,250	1,860	49,890	72,330	7,530	1,360	9,390	5,650	690	133,850	1,140
I-A-L and I-A-O-L	7,090	190	(1)	4,540	10	200	520	50	(1)	20	10	(1)	1,540	10
I-C Inductions	6,760	1,650	20		70	210	410	460	60	100	220	20	3,370	170
I-C Enlistments	1,720	720		150		90	220	50	20	10	30	10	380	40
II-A	35,600	25,390	40	160	390		5,230	1,150	820	1,100	170	140	940	70
II-B	92,140	74,770	110	250	690	11,700		220	1,260	530	380	240	1,790	200
II-C	25,830	20,110	20	90	20	460	220		10	3,980	50	60	710	100
II-A and III-B	921,460	323,530	70	460	1,190	175,050	357,930	1,980	[2] 380	36,360	5,190	940	16,790	1,590
III-C	10,840	7,370	(1)	20	(1)	1,030	760	710	540		40	40	260	70
III-D	6,690	4,530	(1)	10	10	600	1,310	30	30	50		10	100	10
IV-B, C, D, E	1,780	950	(1)	30	130	130	140	80	20	40	10	[2] 40	180	30
IV-F	68,640	58,120	2,170	1,130	640	1,240	2,720	1,120	180	400	40	80		800
Other and unknown	1,610	1,130	(1)	50	30	80	60	20	10	10	(1)	10	140	70

[1] Less than 5 actions.

[2] Class actions shown here are the result of grouping several classes.

The nonfathers, 18 through 25 years of age, mentioned in the report may be broken down as follows: Agricultural deferments (18 through 21 years of age) 394,400 and (22 through 25 years of age) 168,400; occupational deferments other than agriculture (18 through 21 years of age) 121,000 and (22 through 25 years of age) 227,100.

EXHIBIT C

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1944.

LOCAL BOARD MEMORANDUM NO. 164—ISSUED NOVEMBER 17, 1942—AS AMENDED FEBRUARY 14, 1944—SUBJECT: CLASSIFICATION OF REGISTRANTS IN AGRICULTURE

PART I—GENERAL

1. Class II-C: (a) As provided in section 622.25, Selective Service Regulations, local boards shall immediately reopen in sequence of order numbers the classifications of all registrants now in Class II-C, and those registrants who, under this memorandum and section 622.25-1, Selective Service Regulations, qualify for deferment into Class II-C shall be continued in such class.

(b) Under section 622.25-1, Selective Service Regulations, Class II-C deferments shall hereafter be for a period of 6 months or less. However, so long as a registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort and until a satisfactory replacement in such agricultural occupation or agricultural endeavor can be obtained, the registrant shall be continued in Class II-C at the end of each successive period for which he has been deferred in such class.

(c) In determining whether a registrant who is a father is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort, section 622.25-1, Selective Service Regulations, and the applicable provisions of this memorandum and other applicable instructions will be liberally construed. A father who is regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort is usually a steady worker and, if other factors are equal, will normally be accorded deferment into Class II-C in preference to all nonfathers.

2. Class III-C: Section 622.31-2, Selective Service Regulations, has been been amended to provide that hereafter no registrant shall be placed in Class III-C. As soon as the local board has completed the reopening and reconsideration of the classifications of all registrants now in Class II-C as provided in subparagraph (a) above, the local board shall reopen in sequence of order numbers the classifications of all registrants who at that time are in Class III-C and such registrants shall then be classified anew. In reclassifying these registrants, the local boards will first consider whether they should be placed in Class II-C. Any of such registrants who, under this memorandum and section 622.25-1, Selective Service Regulations, qualify for deferment into Class II-C shall be so classified.

PART II—WAR BOARDS

1. Use of War Boards and information in their possession: Local boards should utilize the services of the United States Department of Agriculture County War Boards in securing necessary current information as to the agricultural activities of registrants who are in or are being considered for classification into Class II–C. Information in the files of the County War Boards also is available to the local boards and should be used.

2. War Board may request deferment in certain cases: The County War Board may file requests for deferment of registrants whom the War Board considers necessary to and regularly engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort. Such requests should be supported with full information concerning the registrants' activities.

3. War Board may appeal from certain local board decisions: The County War Board may appeal from local board decisions denying registrants classification in Class II–C in cases in which the War Board has filed a request for deferment.

PART III—REGISTRANTS LEAVING AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION

1. Consequences of leaving agriculture: As provided in section 622.25–1 and section 622.31–3, Selective Service Regulations, a registrant in Class II–C or Class III–C who leaves an agricultural occupation or an agricultural endeavor essential to the war effort without first securing from his local board a determination that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to do so shall be reclassified into Class I–A, Class I–A–O, or Class IV–E. A registrant in Class II–C or Class III–C may at any time file with his local board a written request for such a determination.

2. Appeal from determination: As provided in section 627.51, Selective Service Regulations, the registrant may appeal from the determination of his local board made pursuant to the written request of the registrant for a determination that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave his agricultural occupation or agricultural endeavor for other work.

PART IV—REGISTRANTS RETURNING TO AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATION

1. Registrants returning to agriculture may be reclassified unless in Class I–A, Class I–A–O, or Class IV–E: A registrant who is experienced in agriculture who, prior to the time the local board has mailed to him a Notice of Classification (Form 57) stating that he has been classified in Class I–A, Class I–A–O, or Class IV–E, returns to an agricultural occupation or endeavor and becomes necessary to and regularly engaged in such agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort may be considered for deferment into Class II–C.

PART V—WAR UNITS

1. The war units plan—essential farm products: The Department of Agriculture has formulated and the Selective Service System has adopted the war units plan as a method of measuring agricultural activity and labor. Essential products have been listed and appear under Group 1 of the attachment. Those products less essential to the war effort are listed under Group 2 of the attachment. Local boards may assign such war unit values to farm products not listed on the attachment as they deem reasonable.

2. Sixteen war unit production minimum: In determining whether a registrant engaged in the production of essential farm products qualifies for classification into Class II–C, the local board should give consideration to the number of war units produced through the registrant's own personal and direct efforts. From November 1942 to the present, deferment of a registrant because of his agricultural occupation or agricultural endeavor was to be considered if he produced 8 or more war units. During that time a 16 war unit production was the national objective. The minimum of 8 war unit production was suggested so that all registrants engaged in agriculture would have an opportunity to increase their production of essential war units to the 1943 national objective of 16. It is now believed that the deferment of any registrant in Class II–C who produces less than the 16 war unit minimum each year is unwarranted. Therefore, a local board should not place or retain a registrant in Class II–C unless by his own personal and direct efforts he produces 16 or more war units each year. The war unit measure is not an inflexible rule, and local boards may take into consideration the age, health, any misfortune, or any other compelling circumstance which may affect the registrant involved. Since in many localities 16 war units are less than the normal production of a man engaged full time in an agricultural occupation or an agricultural endeavor, the State Director is authorized to recommend to local boards in his State a variation upward of the 16 war unit minimum.

3. Registrant working on more than one farm: A registrant who does not produce a sufficient number of war units of essential farm products on a particular farm to warrant deferment, but whose efforts wherever applied and on any number of farms result in an aggregate number of war units of essential production to justify deferment should, nevertheless be given consideration for classification in Class II–C.

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Director.

EXHIBIT D

Estimated principal causes for rejection of registrants 18–37 years of age in class IV–F, as of Feb. 1, 1944 (preliminary)

Principal cause for rejection	Number	Percent
Total	3,517,000	100.0
Manifestly disqualifying defects	369,700	10.5
Educational deficiency [1]	371,100	10.5
Physical and mental defects	2,734,000	77.8
Mental disease	515,800	14.7
Syphilis	293,500	8.4
Musculoskeletal	261,100	7.4
Cardiovascular	225,600	6.4
Hernia	208,500	5.9
Neurological	191,000	5.4
Eyes	186,600	5.3
Ears	136,100	3.9
Mental deficiency [1]	116,800	3.4
Tuberculosis	91,700	2.6
Underweight, overweight, and other	70,700	2.0
Lungs	58,700	1.7
Feet	42,500	1.2
Abdominal viscera	40,900	1.2
Kidney and urinary	37,000	1.0
Genitalia	35,700	1.0
Varicose veins	35,400	1.0
Teeth	35,200	1.0
Endocrine	34,900	1.0
Nose	22,500	.6
Neoplasms	21,700	.6
Skin	21,300	.6
Gonorrhea and other venereal	16,200	.5
Hemorrhoids	14,000	.4
Mouth and gums	10,100	.3
Throat	3,500	.1
Blood and blood-forming	3,500	.1
Infectious and parasitic	3,500	.1
Nonmedical	42,200	1.2

[1] Includes registrants who failed to meet minimum intelligence standards from June 1, 1943, on. Some of these registrants have been reported as educationally deficient, others as mentally deficient.

EXHIBIT E

Principal defects and other disqualifying defects of registrants rejected at induction stations because of physical and mental reasons, November 1943 [1] (preliminary)

Principal cause for rejection	Total rejected [2]	Number with no other disqualifying defect	Registrants with more than 1 disqualifying defect		Total	Eyes	Cardiovascular	Musculoskeletal	Syphilis	Feet	Hernia	Ears	Tuberculosis	Other
			Number of registrants	Number of disqualifying defects										
Total	128,700	90,700	38,000	48,200	100.0	17.0 (8,200)	9.9 (4,800)	9.4 (4,500)	8.8 (4,200)	8.4 (4,100)	4.3 (2,100)	3.9 (1,900)	3.6 (1,700)	34.7 (16,700)
Musculoskeletal	10,400	8,100	2,300	2,800	100.0	22.0	12.3	----	10.1	2.5	4.0	2.2	4.3	42.6
Tuberculosis	4,400	3,400	1,000	1,300	100.0	20.3	7.3	8.9	16.3	4.9	2.4	4.9	----	35.0
Syphilis	3,200	2,500	700	900	100.0	17.4	10.8	9.8	----	9.8	3.3	3.3	4.3	41.3
Ears	5,400	4,100	1,300	1,600	100.0	21.0	4.5	8.9	5.1	10.2	6.4	----	5.1	38.8
Feet	3,000	2,300	700	800	100.0	9.5	11.9	4.8	15.5	----	8.3	1.2	4.8	44.0
Hernia	3,900	2,900	1,000	1,200	100.0	18.8	7.7	6.8	11.1	8.6	----	5.1	3.4	38.5
Cardiovascular	10,500	7,500	3,000	3,800	100.0	19.1	----	8.2	10.6	10.6	2.2	1.9	3.3	44.1
Eyes	5,300	3,800	1,500	1,900	100.0	----	5.2	13.4	11.1	6.4	5.2	5.2	4.1	49.4
Lungs	2,800	1,900	900	1,100	100.0	21.6	7.2	15.5	2.1	8.2	3.1	4.1	5.2	33.0
Neurological	4,500	3,100	1,400	1,800	100.0	24.5	8.4	15.5	3.2	8.4	3.2	2.6	4.5	29.7
Mental disease	36,800	24,900	11,900	15,400	100.0	17.2	11.6	10.5	7.2	6.9	3.1	5.1	3.5	34.9
Mental deficiency [3]	21,100	13,400	7,700	9,800	100.0	14.1	12.9	9.6	11.6	12.0	7.0	4.5	3.9	24.4
Other	17,400	12,800	4,600	5,800	100.0	18.6	9.7	9.3	8.4	9.1	4.8	2.7	3.0	34.4

[1] Defect distribution based on a 10-percent sample of DSS Forms 221 for registrants rejected at induction stations during November 1943.
[2] Does not include 4,400 registrants rejected for administrative reasons and 9,900 registrants found acceptable for limited service but not inducted during November 1943.
[3] Includes rejections for failure to meet minimum intelligence standards.

NOTE.—There were 176,900 principal and secondary defects among the 128,700 rejectees, as follows: Musculoskeletal, 14,900; tuberculosis, 6,100; syphilis, 7,400; ears, 7,300; feet, 7,100; hernia, 6,000; cardiovascular, 15,300; eyes, 13,500. Lung defects, neurological disorders, mental disease, and mental deficiency were usually recorded as the principal cause for rejection only, and the small number of these recorded as secondary defects are included in the 16,700 other disqualifying defects shown in the final column.

EXHIBIT F

Separations of inductees and enlistees to civil life from all branches of armed forces, Dec. 7, 1941, to Feb. 1, 1944[1]

Cause:	Separated to civil life[2]
Special order[3]	431,000
Disability	550,000
Inaptitude	65,000
Undesirable	38,000
Bad conduct	11,000
Dishonorable	6,000
Deserted	32,000
Retired	3,000
Released	2,000
Total separations	1,138,000

[1] Cause of separation from Army during January 1944, estimated.

[2] Excluding deaths, men missing or captured, and those separated to reenlist, accept commissions or appointments.

[3] Includes certain cases of separations due to dependency, unsuitability, age, convenience of government, man's own convenience, psychiatric or neuro-psychiatric conditions, and for the Army, certain limited-service discharges.

EXHIBIT G

STATEMENT CONCERNING PROCESSING AND INDUCTION OF MEN WITH CRIMINAL RECORDS

The Selective Service System is not at present in a position to give the actual number of men now in the Army who have been convicted of felonies; however, on January 19, 1944, Brig. Gen. Russel B. Reynolds, Director, Military Personnel Division, War Department, stated in a memorandum to the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1:

"1. While men are not being paroled from prison for the specific purpose of being inducted into the Army, the Army does accept and induct recently paroled men who are otherwise qualified. Close cooperation is maintained between the War Department, Federal and State prison authorities, and the Selective Service System to the end that registrants with prison records other than those convicted of heinous crimes are accepted for service in the Army, if otherwise qualified.

"2. During the past 6 months more than 1,200 prisoners paroled from correctional institutions have gone directly into the Army without spending a probationary period in the community. While accurate figures are not available a conservative estimate of the number of men now in the Army who at one time had been convicted of a felony is well over 100,000. The foregoing are exclusive of violators of the Selective Training and Service Act who are inducted direct from custody.

"3. The Army treats enlisted men who were former prisoners in the same manner as any other individual. Parole and custody by any other agency is either suspended for the period of time the individual is in the Army or terminated completely. He will be discharged from the service the same as any other individual and, so far as the Army is concerned in the case of honorable discharge, he will be a freeman."

A survey is now being made of each State as to the number of men who have been convicted of a felony and who have entered the armed forces (1) after the expiration of their sentences; (2) while on parole, conditional release, probation, or suspended sentence; and (3) directly from institutions.

The following chart is a recapitulation of reports received from special panel local boards established in Federal and State institutions, indicating the action taken by such boards and the results accomplished. As some of these reports are several months old, it is logical to assume that several hundred more have been inducted to date:

Number of special local boards established	124
Reported	105
Not reported	19
Number of prisoners reported:	
Age 18–37	72,758
Total	113,409
Classifications reported:	
I–A	5,799
I–A–O	20
IV–E	34
IV–F	21,191
Waivers from civil custody:	
Requested	3,114
Granted	1,808
Refused	928
Pending	388
Waivers from Army:	
Requested	3,190
Granted	1,066
Refused	1,869
Pending	246
Number of men sent to induction station	2,162
Number of men inducted	1,108
Number of men rejected for general reasons	580
Number of men rejected for mental reasons	364

Under the provisions of Executive Order 8641, violators of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, at any time after commitment may apply for parole for induction into the land or naval forces for either combatant or noncombatant service, for assignment to work of national importance under civilian direction, or to a special service established under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. The following chart indicates the action taken upon all applications for parole forwarded to the Director of Selective Service by the Attorney General:

1. Number applications submitted to Director of Selective Service for recommendation	845
2. Number recommendations denied by Director of Selective Service	54
3. Number recommendations for parole:	
For combatant service	558
For noncombatant service	41
For work of national importance	158
For special service	34
Total	791
4. Disposition after recommendation:	
(A) Number inducted for combatant service	286
Number inducted for noncombatant service	12
Number assigned and reported to work of national importance	91
Number released for a special service	9
Total	398
(B) Number rejected for combatant service	128
Number rejected for noncombatant service	2
Number rejected for work of national importance	3
Total	133
(C) Number applications withdrawn or parole refused by prisoner	35
(D) Number denied by Bureau of Prisons after recommendation of Director of Selective Service	21
4. Disposition after recommendation—Continued.	
(E) Number released on general parole, conditional release, or at expiration of sentence before action taken on recommendation of Director of Selective Service	73
(F) Final disposition pending	131
Total	845

EXHIBIT H

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE VETERANS' ASSISTANCE PROGRAM OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, the Director of Selective Service is required by law to establish a Personnel Division, with adequate facilities to render aid to returning veterans (1) in securing reinstatement in their former positions and (2) in securing new positions.

Veterans entitled to such aid include all persons, male and female, who subsequent to May 1, 1940, entered upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States, whether by induction, enlistment, commission, or otherwise, and who have satisfactorily completed such service.

At the request of the War Shipping Administration, the Selective Service System has also assumed the responsibility of assisting former members of the United States merchant marine in securing their reemployment benefits granted by Public Law 87, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 23, 1943.

The Director of Selective Service has established a Veterans' Personnel Division (formerly Reemployment Division) in national headquarters of the Selective Service System. In carrying out that portion of his responsibility which requires him to aid veterans to secure new positions, the Director of Selective Service is utilizing the existing facilities of several departments and agencies of the Federal and State Governments. Among these agencies is the Veterans' Employment Division of the United States Employment Service. The utilization by the Director of Selective Service of the service of these various agencies is not a delegation of the responsibility of the Director of Selective Service for placing veterans in new positions but it is the acceptance of presently available facilities for carrying out the duty imposed by law upon the Director of Selective Service.

Reemployment functions as well as other Selective Service functions are carried on in the several States through the Governors and the State directors of Selective Service. Such organization and supervision must be consistent with the policies and procedures as may from time to time be prescribed by the Director of Selective Service. The State director of Selective Service maintains liaison with the Veterans' Employment Division of the United States Employment Service, War Manpower Commission, for the purpose of working out cooperative action at the State and local level for (1) referring veterans for placement in new positions, and (2) seeing that such veterans are placed in new positions.

The responsibility at the local level for rendering aid to veterans in securing reinstatement in their former positions is placed in the local board. All of the facilities of the local board are available for carrying out this responsibility. In executing this responsibility, the local board uses the reemployment committeemen.

The State director, upon the request of the local board, recommends for appointment a sufficient number of reemployment committeemen to carry out the program of assistance to veterans. Members of the local

boards, members of advisory boards for registrants, Government appeal agents, or local board examining physicians or dentists may be appointed as reemployment committeemen in addition to continuing in their present assignment. Compensated employees of the Federal Government engaged in wholly unrelated activities may also be appointed as reemployment committeemen. Under no circumstances, will persons employed by private employers to handle Selective Service matters be appointed as reemployment committeemen.

In October 1942 representatives of certain national organizations formed a committee to meet "* * * the problem of finding jobs for men when they return from service with the armed forces * * *." The committee known as the National Clearing House Committee consists of representatives of the following organizations:

American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Legion, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Disabled American Veterans, Kiwanis International, Lions International, National Association of Manufacturers, National Exchange Club, National Farmers Union, National Grange, Railway Labor Executives Association, United States Chamber of Commerce, United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Rotary clubs may serve at local levels.

The Director of Selective Service has received the cooperation and advice of this committee in carrying out his obligations to returning veterans. The Director of Selective Service has designated this committee as a national veterans' advisory committee and will continue to avail himself of its cooperation and advice.

At the time the national clearinghouse committee was organized it was planned that it would sponsor State clearinghouse committees in each of the States. In some cases State clearinghouse committees were organized. It is within the discretion of each State director to utilize such State clearinghouse committees as have been organized as State veterans' advisory committees. If no committee has been organized within a State, and the State director wishes to organize a State veterans' advisory committee, he may take such action as he deems necessary for this purpose.

In order to avoid duplication of effort, each State director, so far as it is within his control, brings about the coordination of the activities of all outside committees and agencies seeking information from the Selective Service System and offering cooperation to the Selective Service System in placing veterans in jobs. Through such coordination, the local board and the State director avoid the necessity of furnishing the same information to many agencies, and each agency seeking to cooperate is able to receive the same assistance and information.

The State director of Selective Service also establishes and maintains liaison between the Selective Service System and representatives of the several agencies which have been established to serve returning veterans. These agencies and their functions are as follows:

(a) The Veterans' Administration: This agency adjudicates pension claims of all honorably discharged persons who served in the active military or naval service after December 7, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present war. It provides, in service-connected cases, hospitalization, if necessary, and domiciliary care, disability, pensions, and vocational rehabilitation of all types, such as shop, commerce, university, etc., and cooperates in eventual placement with the United States Employment Service. Domiciliary care and hospitalization, if beds are available, are provided in non-service-connected cases.

(b) The United States Employment Service: This agency operates under the War Manpower Commission and carries out the policies of the Commission in channeling employment to essential occupations and handles the releases of those transferring from one occupation to another, with the exception of honorably discharged veterans who have the right to reemployment in their old jobs.

(c) The Veterans' Employment Service: This agency has a State employment representative appointed to supervise the Veterans' Employment representatives attached to each local office of the United States Employment Service, through which the actual placements are made. They are responsible for the employment interests of all veterans registered with the United States Employment Service, except those veterans who desire reemployment in their old jobs.

(d) The Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency. This agency, in connection with the State department of education in each State, operates vocational training in non-service-connected cases. It will assist in the training and education of those men who must learn a new trade or profession before returning to a civilian occupation and who do not come under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

(e) American Red Cross. The home service of the American Red Cross in every community will assist veterans and their families in solving their personal problems. It is familiar with processing the necessary papers involved with the Veterans' Administration, if this has not been done at the discharging point.

(f) Civil Service Commission: The reemployment committeemen should inform any veteran who is seeking a Federal civil service position that he may obtain information regarding such positions at any post office or civil service office.

(g) United States Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wis.: This agency will undertake to provide records of courses taken by military personnel while in service, for submission to civilian educational institutions, employers, and other properly interested agencies, and will, on application, give to military personnel and those recently discharged special examinations which will serve as a basis for the granting of academic credit by civilian schools and colleges.

(h) Veterans' Organizations: The American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other recognized veterans' organizations, through their service officers and advisory committees, have rendered and are prepared to render aid to veterans in many matters concerning their welfare. The aforementioned organizations have been authorized by the Veterans' Administration to file, on behalf of a veteran, all necessary papers in connection with claims, etc.

The Director of Selective Service recognized at an early time that with the great demand for manpower necessary to maintain war production, the problem of veterans' reemployment would not be difficult so long as war production is maintained at or near present volume. The problem, however, of securing employment for disabled veterans was recognized immediately. Accordingly, the Selective Service System, under directives issued by the Surgeons General of the Army and Navy, arranged with the American Red Cross that it would interview the men subject to disability discharges at the Army and Navy hospitals, and notify the Selective Service System of the approximate date of discharge, and a brief outline of physical handicaps, if any. Upon receipt of this notice, national headquarters of the Selective Service System, through the State directors, notifies the reemployment committeemen attached to the local board in which the veteran was registered, or the local board having jurisdiction over the area in which the veteran desired employment, of the veteran's prospective return to civil life. It becomes the duty of the reemployment committeeman, upon receipt of such notice, to determine whenever possible, if the former position of the veteran is available. If the veteran upon his return is not interested in his former position, the reemployment committeeman takes him to the veterans' employment representative attached to the local office of the United States Employment Service office, for placement in a new position. If the veteran seeks neither his old nor a new position but hospitalization, rehabilitation, domiciliary care, etc., he is taken to one of the above-named agencies, as hereinbefore set forth.

At the local level the responsibility for securing a veteran's reinstatement in his former position is vested in the local board and its reemployment committeeman. In carrying out this responsibility the local board calls, not only upon its reemployment committeemen, but on the lawyers, doctors, and all others who are associated in selective-service work in any capacity. The local board, with the assistance of the above-mentioned volunteers, constitutes itself into an advisory committee or "labor clinic" for the guidance of the veteran. If the veteran desires reinstatement in his former position, the initial contact may be made by the veteran himself. In many cases contact has been made by the local board immediately upon notice of the soldier's prospective discharge even before he returns to his home. If the veteran experiences any difficulty in securing reinstatement, the employer is interviewed by a representative of the local board or by the reemployment committeeman. If necessary, the assistance of outside agencies, such as representatives from the local chamber of commerce, veterans' organizations, labor unions, manufacturers' associations, churches, and other organizations, is sought for the purpose of inducing the employer to reinstate the veteran.

If the veteran desires a position other than the one he occupied at the time he left to enter the service, or if, because he was a student, or for some other reason, he had no position, the veteran is taken to the veterans' employment representative in one of the War Manpower Commission's 1,500 United States Employment Service offices. In this office he is interviewed, his qualifications and limitations determined, and he is there fitted into the most advantageous job opportunity.

If, upon the veterans' return, he is unable to accept either his former or a new position because of physical disability, the local board and its reemployment committeemen have been trained to direct the veteran to such governmental or civic organizations which can render him the greatest assistance. If he is in need of hospitalization, domiciliary care, or rehabilitation of any kind to fit him for prospective employment, he is either taken in person, or pursuant to an appointment made, is directed to the nearest office of the Veterans' Administration. If he desires educational opportunities and rehabilitation and vocational training, even though he has no service-connected disability, he is advised of the opportunities offered by the Vocational Rehabilitation and Training Division of the Federal Security Agency.

As hereinbefore mentioned, the Selective Service System from the inception of its veterans' assistance program, recognized the immediate need of seeking reemployment for the physically handicapped. As a result of the program formulated with the Red Cross the Selective Service System has processed about a quarter of a million cases of men who were separated from the service on certificates of disability for discharge. In only one case was the Selective Service System required to institute suit against a private employer who denied to the discharged veteran

his right of reinstatement. In that case, before the trial the employer reinstated the veteran with his entire back salary of approximately $650.

Some difficulty is being experienced in the reinstatement of veterans in the positions they occupied in the United States Government service. The situation in this respect is better on the part of private industry.

It is estimated that about 20 percent of the physically handicapped, discharged from the hospitals, were reinstated in their former positions. The other 80 percent either sought new positions or were not employable or are taking advantage of hospitalization, vocational training, and rehabilitation offered by other government agencies.

In addition to the notice of separation from service, which the American Red Cross gives of those in hosiptals, notice is given to the Selective Service System, at the time of their discharge, of all persons. Under the procedure now in use by the War Department, the separation of all persons from active service is accomplished by a Report of Separation, War Department, AGO Form 53. One copy of this form, known as the posting copy, is forwarded to the Adjutant General's Office. A copy known as the soldier's copy is given to the discharged soldier. This copy contains information for the soldier concerning his duties, rights, and benefits. The third copy, the insurance notice, is forwarded to the Veterans' Administration. Another copy, the board of registration copy, is sent to the State director of selective service in the State in which the discharged soldier was registered. This copy is forwarded by the State director to that local board. Another copy, known as the reemployment committeeman copy, is sent to the State director of selective service for the State in which the veteran will seek employment. This may or may not be the same local board with which the soldier was registered at the time of induction. Under this system, therefore, the reemployment committeeman in the local board to which the veteran will report when he is separated from the service, will have a full record of the veteran's service and notice of his homecoming.

Another copy is sent to the State veteran's employment representative of the War Manpower Commission through the State director of selective service in the State in which the veteran intends seeking employment. A copy of this form is attached herewith.

It is estimated that as of February 1, 1944, the total accumulated separations from the armed forces to civil life was 1,148,141.

The above figure does not include those separated because of death, capture, acceptance of commissions, transfers, reassignments, and reinstatements.

Appended hereto is a list showing separations to civil life of Army inductees and enlistees, month by month, from November 1940 through November 1943.

The local board, upon receiving notice of a soldier's discharge, makes every effort to contact him upon his return home. It is endeavored to secure for him his right of reemployment or new job opportunities or to render assistance to him in seeking advantage of all the opportunities offered by industry or by the Government. Every man and woman honorably discharged is interviewed, unless by his or her own action such interview is made impossible.

1. A veteran is entitled by law to reinstatement in his former position, or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay:

(1) If such position was in the employ of a private employer, the United States Government, its Territories or possessions, the District of Columbia.

(2) If such position was not a temporary position.

(3) If he left such position subsequent to May 1, 1940, in order to enter upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States.

(4) If he satisfactorily completed his period of training and service and received a certificate to that effect.

(5) If he is still qualified to perform the duties of such position.

(6) If he makes application for reemployment within 40 days after he is relieved from service.

(7) If such position is in the employ of a private employer the employer's circumstances have not so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to reinstate the veteran to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

If such position was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is "the sense of Congress that such person should be restored to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay."

2. Rights after reemployment: A veteran who is restored to a position in the employ of the Federal Government or a private employer, as provided in paragraph above, dealing with reinstatement rights, is entitled by law to the following additional benefits:

(1) He shall be considered as having been on furlough or leave of absence during his period of service;

(2) He shall be restored without loss of seniority;

(3) He shall be entitled to participate in insurance or other benefits offered by the employer bound to establish rules and practices relating to employees on furlough or leave of absence in effect with the employer at the time such person entered military or naval service;

(4) He shall not be discharged from such position without cause 1 year after such restoration.

3. Right to court action and assistance of United States attorney: If any private employer fails or refuses to grant a veteran the rights set forth in the act, he may obtain relief in an appropriate case by filing suit in the district court of the United States for the district in which such private employer maintains a place of business. Such veteran is also entitled to have the United States attorney, or comparable official if reasonably satisfied that the veteran is entitled to such rights, appear and act as his attorney in the amicable adjustment of his claim or in the filing of such suit without cost to the veteran. Before the veteran brings such a suit on his own behalf or makes application to the United States attorney for his assistance, it is highly desirable that the Selective Service System do everything it can to obtain the reinstatement of the veteran. In no case is the local board to send the case to the United States attorney, or institute any legal action on behalf of the veteran. This must be left to the discretion of the State director, who will keep the local board advised of all further action taken on the case. The local board shall stay with a case until final disposition, at which time it will make a report to the State director, in accordance with policy to be established by the State director.

Despite the manpower shortage, many situations have arisen in which the qualifications of a veteran to perform the functions of his former position were questioned. Other situations arise as to the circumstances and conditions of the employer, and in practically all of these cases where the questions have arisen the local boards and reemployment committeemen, through moral suasion and appeal to the patriotism of the employer, have succeeded in securing the veteran's reinstatement. However, cases in which the Federal Government is the employer are still pending, and some have been long delayed. Too much credit for the success of this program cannot be given the veterans' organizations, civic, fraternal, employers, labor, and postwar planning bodies.

The Selective Service System has in operation at this time 6,439 local boards. To each of these boards is attached at least one, but in some cases two or three, reemployment committeemen. As the number of men demobilized increases it is estimated that at least one reemployment committeeman will be appointed for every 15 or 20 veterans returning to the local board. At present the number of volunteers engaged in the Selective Service System's veterans' assistance program numbers about 14,000 reemployment committeemen, and about 175,000 local board members and associated volunteer unpaid workers, all of whom are either actively engaged in the immediate veterans' reemployment problem or are subject to call for consultation and professional and other advice and assistance. As aforesaid, this number will be increased as the load increases.

In the process of integrating veterans in the economic, industrial, agricultural, and social post-war economy all of these volunteers have given and have expressed their intention and determination of giving their fullest assistance and cooperation. They represent the cross section of every community in the United States. In meeting the problem of veterans' employment the Selective Service System is throwing its gears into reverse, and with the aid of the public it is hoped will reach its objective of full employment for veterans.

It was inevitable in the early stages of the program that in the enthusiastic desire to assist veterans, there would be some overlapping or duplication of effort between the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission, through its United States Employment Service. However, under an existing agreement between Selective Service and the United States Employment Service a satisfactory operating relationship and proper coordination have been attained.

Despite the efforts of all of these volunteers it is inevitable that some veterans may feel themselves deprived of their rights. In every case investigated by the Selective Service System, where complaint was made that a veteran had been deprived of his rights, it was found that such veteran had failed to take advantage of the service of the local board and the reemployment committeemen but had attempted to solve his own problem. While this individualism is not condemned, it is hoped that veterans will all at least be made acquainted with the privileges to which they are entitled, information concerning which appears on the reverse side of the soldier's copy of W. D., A. G. O. Form 53, which unfortunately many soldiers fail to read. Several cases have appeared in the newspapers of veterans who claim they were deprived of their rights. In each of these cases, on investigation, it was found that the veteran, after his case was undertaken by the Selective Service System, was either reinstated, if that was his right, or was given another position of equal seniority status and pay as required by the law. In innumerable cases the veteran who has forfeited his right, or who had no right under the act was reemployed by reason of the efforts extended on his behalf by the members of the local board and the reemployment committeemen.

Unfortunately, many veterans have not sought the assistance of the Selective Service System nor have they requested reinstatement from their employers until after the 40-day period allowed by the law has elapsed.

In carrying out the Veterans' Assistance Program, the Director of Selective Service sent to the Governor of each State a letter substantially as follows:

"Subject: Veterans' Assistance Program

"DEAR GOVERNOR ———:

"As the number of veterans being returned to civilian life increases, and the war-production program enters a period of readjustment, our Nation's leaders are beginning to perfect their plans to meet these problems.

"You, as chief executive of your State, are preparing to meet these problems and the scope of your planning necessarily encompasses the welfare of nonveterans as well as veterans.

"Among the duties which the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, imposes upon the Director of Selective Service is that of rendering reemployment assistance to veterans. In meeting this problem the Governors generally have delegated their responsibility to the State directors of selective service.

"In this connection, I am enclosing herewith for your information copies of State Director Advices No. 260, 260-A, and 260-B, which have been issued in connection with the veterans' assistance program.

"I offer you the fullest cooperation of the Selective Service System in carrying out the reemployment program in ———.

"Sincerely yours,

"———— ————,

"Director."

In every case except one the State Governors accepted the program and have expressed their intention of extending full cooperation to the Selective Service System in carrying out its program. In the one case, that of a newly elected Governor, the response was noncommittal.

The Selective Service System is cognizant of the many difficulties which will be met in carrying out the responsibilities reposed in it by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Some of these problems are already beginning to appear. They will present themselves in even greater volume and variety as the number of returning veterans increases and the demand for war production decreases.

One of those problems is that dealing with seniority rights acquired by members of labor unions in relationship to the seniority rights possessed by members of the armed forces prior to and subsequent to their period of training and service as those seniorities are affected by the veteran's reemployment rights granted by Congress. Other problems are those dealing with women employees who have been encouraged to enter industry and who now recognize their industrial strength and economic freedom.

Many problems of the future have already been met in one form or another in the multitude of cases which have already been processed by the Selective Service System. As others arise they will be met with a view of protecting the veteran's interests, the employers' rights, and with a proper regard for the over-all national picture.

EXHIBIT I

THE NAVY'S ATTITUDE ON THE FEASIBILITY OF USING LIMITED-SERVICE PERSONNEL

1. Existing physical standards: The history of reduction of physical standards during the war will show that the Navy has progressively been forced to acquiesce in lowered standards in order to obtain the numbers it requires from the ever-decreasing manpower pool. In spite of this, however, the Navy has always insisted that the granting of a No. 1 priority on the remaining manpower resources, both as to quantity and quality, to the armed forces constitutes the most effective measure to shorten the war. It is believed that the point has been reached where no further reductions in physical standards can be accepted without resulting in decreased performance, which would certainly be hazardous in view of the stern task ahead.

The peculiar conditions and requirements of naval life at sea will always make it imperative that personnel be of the highest physical qualifications available. Living conditions on board ship are totally different from on shore and require higher physical standards to perform this duty for extended periods. Men must be able to withstand all the rigors of a seagoing life and not be unduly handicapped should they become separated from regular medical attention for extended periods of time, as is very likely to happen in every type of sea duty. Disabled individuals on fighting ships are far more detrimental to performance than they would be on shore because of the impossibility of securing a replacement at sea and because an additional burden is necessarily thrown upon the remaining members of the crew.

Moreover, crews of combat vessels must be versatile in their ability to perform combat duties under conditions requiring a high degree of coordination and teamwork as well as their ordinary and routine daily tasks. Regardless of a man's specialty rating in the Navy, all men on board ship are potential lookouts or potential members of gun crews under battle conditions. The storekeeper, who has an administrative job doing bookkeeping work on board ship, may have a battle station requiring a high order of vision and hearing. A machinist's mate who stands a watch on the throttle, may at any time when off watch be required to man a gun or act as lookout. It may be that particular jobs at sea temporarily can be performed by men of lesser physical qualifications, but since the final and ultimate test must be made under battle conditions which will require the highest performance attainable by physically qualified men, the day-to-day needs will be fixed by the requirements of a few brief moments. Nothing short of perfect performance can be tolerated at such a time. We must be constantly mindful of this unless we are prepared to trust the crews of combat vessels to the uncertain performance of individuals who cannot do better in such a test because of the physical handicaps which they suffer.

2. Limited service: Much thought has been given to the increased use in the Navy of men of lowered physical standards, comparable to the former Army limited-service standards. It will be freely admitted that in the shore establishment of the Navy in the continental United States many of the billets are of such nature that no undue physical hardships are involved, routine is less severe than on board ship, and regular medical attention is always available. If no other considerations were involved, these billets could be filled by men of lowered physical standards. On the other hand, the Navy is limited in its authorized strength and all such limitations on total numbers presuppose a high degree of flexibility in assignment between shore and sea duty. Based on current estimates for June 30, 1945, a large number of billets for enlisted personnel in the Navy in continental United States will be filled by WAVES and men physically or otherwise disqualified for sea duty. The best estimate now available indicates that 23.2 percent of all shore billets (3 percent of the total Navy), will be available at that time to be filled by men who became physically disqualified for sea duty as a result of combat and by men who must be available to relieve those who have been in active combat areas for extensive periods of time.

The program which the Navy has planned for the rehabilitation of its battle casualties and for the rotation of its personnel between sea and shore imposes definite limitations upon the possibilities of inducting those who have only limited-service potentialities. All those who have received battle injuries must be utilized to the extent that such physical handicaps will permit, and in the great majority of these cases they can no longer be sent to sea. A rotation program which will permit the periodic transfer of men from sea to shore duty must be carried on for the prevention of physical and mental break-downs which often result from long periods of duty in active combat areas. Therefore, the limited number of shore billets which must be available if these programs are to be carried on cannot be filled in advance by limited-service personel because the men going out to take the places of those relieved must be physically qualified.

Individuals who have had extensive sea duty can be more profitably used in the shore establishment than newcomers to the service who are unfamiliar with the operating Navy and its needs. Aside from the obvious merits of the rehabilitation and rotation programs, a constant flow of personnel between fleet and shore activities permits a desirable exchange of ideas and a better coordination of shore and sea activities which both must be directed toward the same ultimate goal. It has been found most conducive to progress in naval warfare for those who have been involved in planning phases of naval activities to be able to observe actual performance, particularly during this period when so many new developments are being tested. At the same time those returning from sea duty are often able to make substantial contributions to naval planning. These desirable results would be largely vitiated if the shore activities were to be manned exclusively by individuals who could not be sent to sea.

CIVILIAN BLESSINGS IN WARTIME

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, from the New York Times of February 26, I have secured a very wholesome, American editorial entitled "Count the Blessings."

Let me say that compared with the rest of the world we certainly have many blessings on the credit side of the ledger. Of course, all of us have felt the restraint of limited butter, sugar, gasoline, and a few other necessities. The editorial says that we must take these limitations in our stride. All good Americans will. The sacrifices of today should be accepted willingly, in the humble knowledge that they are small when set beside the sacrifices of our men who are on the fighting fronts.

Count our blessings, yes, and when we add them up we will find that they are so much in excess of our restrictions that we will have a great balance in our favor.

I ask that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNT THE BLESSINGS

Not all Americans are as yet resigned to the self-denial that the war requires of everyone. Butter still creeps into parlor conversation, that dearth of porterhouse steak is good for at least an hour of grousing, and when these subjects are worn thin there is always the gasoline shortage.

Yet consider three revelations of the wartime hardships of our British cousins found in the news of a single recent day. First, the British don't expect milk to be plentiful before 1948, eggs, tomatoes, and candy before 1949, and meat and butter before 1950. Moreover, British men, doctors, lawyers, merchants, all kinds of them—their womenfolk and their servants gone to the war factories—are learning to cook. Boards of education arrange instruction classes for them in the art of preparing such food as they have. Finally, little Princess Elizabeth, royal debutante though she is, has had only one new dress this winter. She has no coupons left for another.

If there is ever a time for us to count our blessings, this surely is it. To enumerate them will at least relieve the gloom of brooding over unobtainable pipe cleaners, pot

scratchers, dipped chocolates, and nylon stockings. Some of our blessings would indeed make fine subjects of discussion when neighbors meet. Coffee, for instance. True, there is little heavy cream to go with it. Still we have all the coffee we can drink, and a Brazil dispatch in the same paper that reports the privations of the British assures us of more coffee coming, shiploads of it.

For a change why not forget butter now and then and talk about coffee instead?

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHANDLER AT MEETING OF WESTERN MINING WAR CONFERENCE

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator CHANDLER before the Western Mining War Conference, at joint meeting of Colorado Mining Association and Western Division American Mining Congress, Denver, Colo., on January 29, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

JACKSON DAY ADDRESS BY PAUL V. McNUTT

[Mr. JACKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, at the Jackson Day Dinner, Des Moines, Iowa, February 26, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

USE OF CIVILIAN FLYING SCHOOLS—ADDRESS BY R. McLEAN STEWART

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of use of civilian flying schools in aviation training for war and peace, delivered by R. McLean Stewart, executive director of training, C. A. A., at Oklahoma City, Okla., January 28, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS—STATEMENT BY MISS MABEL BOARDMAN

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement concerning the American Red Cross, made by Miss Mabel Boardman, and published in the Washington Post of March 1, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATION'S FISHERY RESOURCES—ADDRESS BY CHARLES E. JACKSON

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Charles E. Jackson, Assistant Deputy Coordinator of Fisheries, delivered before the Consultants of the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries on February 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MICA WEALTH OF NEW ENGLAND—ARTICLE FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Mica Wealth of New England Has Been Strangled," written by Bill Cunningham, and published in the Boston Herald of February 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREE ENTERPRISE—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. PETERSBURG (FLA.) TIMES

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Is 'Free Enterprise'?—A Florida Senator's Answer," published in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times of February 27, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR IN JAPAN

[Mr. O'DANIEL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Mrs. Merle Clark, president of the Lost Battalion Club, of Abilene, Tex., relative to American prisoners of war in Japanese camps, and his reply thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

BRUMIDI IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ROOM—POEM BY H. C. CARLISLE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Brumidi in District of Columbia Room," written by Horace C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

A PROGRAM FOR THE RURAL SOUTH AFTER THE WAR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a program for the rural South after the war, prepared by the general office of the Southern Tenant Farmers Union, Memphis, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM-MORTGAGE-MORATORIUM LAW

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there has just been messaged over from the House H. R. 4166, a bill to extend the life of what is known as the Frazier-Lemke Act. The message and bill are now on the desk.

Senate bill 1722 was dealt with by the Committee on the Judiciary during the past week. It is also a bill to extend the life of the Frazier-Lemke Act, and is identical with the bill which passed the House and is now on the clerk's desk, except for one word, that is, in line 5, on page 2 of the House bill, the word "four" is changed to "two."

I now ask unanimous consent that the House bill be taken up and considered and passed. The reason for the request is that tomorrow, the 4th of March, I am advised, the Frazier-Lemke Act as it now exists will expire. It is the desire of both Houses of Congress that the principle and spirit of that act be extended for 2 additional years.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House bill 4166, and that it be placed on its third reading and final passage, and that Senate bill 1722 be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the distinguished Senator has correctly stated the situation as I understand it to be. I further understand that there is no controversy whatsoever concerning the bill. It is really necessary that the Senate act today, and under the circumstances as stated I think the bill should now be passed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as a member of the subcommittee which considered the proposed legislation during the past week, and as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which has agreed to the action of the subcommittee unanimously, I concur with the Senator from Nevada in his request. I believe that the emergency justifies immediate action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 4166) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was read twice by its title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 1722 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary accompanying House bill 4166.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1127) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4166) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The principal purpose of the bill is to extend for an additional period of 4 years the time within which petitions may be filed under the farm-mortgage-moratorium law. An extension of the law was made in 1940 for a period of 4 years (Public Law, 423, 76th Cong., approved Mar. 4, 1940).

GENERAL STATEMENT

Section 75 of the National Bankruptcy Act was enacted into law in 1933. It was designed to relieve distressed farmers who were in default in their farm mortgages and to relieve agriculture from the effects of the deflation in land values resulting from the depression. Subsection (s) of the act was enacted in 1934. It permitted a scaling of secured debts and an extension of same by agreement. Failing agreement, it gave to the farmer an absolute stay, the right of retention of the mortgaged property during the stay period, and permission to repurchase the property at an appraised value. By its terms the act expired on March 3, 1938. Subsection (s) of the act was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in 1935, and the law was amended to overcome the objections pointed out in the decision of the case of *Louisville Joint Stock Land Bank* v. *Radford* (295 U. S. 555). Subsection (s) was reenacted in amended form in the Seventy-fourth Congress. The Supreme Court in the case of *Wright* v. *Vinton Branch Bank* (300 U. S. 440), decided March 29, 1937, declared the amended subsection (s) to be constitutional. In 1938 the Congress amended the act (1) by providing for the reinstatement of cases arising under the act which had been dismissed on the erroneous assumption or holding that subsection (s) was unconstitutional, and (2) by modifying the provisions of the act affecting the time and the amount of payment of compensation to conciliation commissioners. At the same time Congress extended the act until March 4, 1940.

CASES UNDER THE ACT

From statistics furnished the committee by the Administrative Office of the United States courts, in the fiscal year 1943, extending from July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1943, 892 cases were filed under section 75 of the Bankruptcy Act, and 1,451 were terminated, and the number of cases pending was reduced from 4,680 at the beginning of the year to 4,121 at the close. Of the 892 cases filed, 471 were filed in the district of North Dakota, and the only other districts in which 20 or more cases were filed were the western district of North Carolina with 20, the eastern district of Missouri with 36, the northern district of California with 21, and the southern district of California with 33.

The number of cases filed in the first half of the current fiscal year, extending from July 1 to December 31, 1943, was 172. If the

same rate is continued throughout the year, the number filed will be 344, as compared with 892 in the previous year, or less than half. The number of cases terminated in the first half of the present fiscal year was 547, as compared with 172 filed, so that the number of cases pending on July 1, 1943, of 4,121, was reduced to 3,746 on December 31, 1943.

In the first half of the current year the only districts in which 10 or more cases were filed were the district of North Dakota with 90, and the southern district of California with 12. In many districts no cases were filed. If the rate of filing in the district of North Dakota for the first half of the current fiscal year continues throughout the second half, the number of cases filed in that district in the year will be 180, as compared with 471 in the previous fiscal year, a decrease of more than half.

While the statistics set forth demonstrate a very sharp decline in the use of the statute, it is still substantial benefit in some localities and may be of greater benefit after the war. Proponents of the legislation have urged upon the committee the desirability of making the law a permanent one, but the committee maintains the position which it has heretofore taken that it should not recommend the act be made a permanent part of the bankruptcy statute. The committee gave consideration to the fact of our engagement in war and the thought that the existing law may be of further use and benefit, and therefore recommends an extension of the law for a 4-year period.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Subsection (a) of section 75 has to do with conciliation commissioners, who administer the law. Present law requires the appointment of a conciliation commissioner for every county having 500 farmers, according to the latest census. It requires that an individual, in order to be eligible for appointment as a conciliation commissioner must be qualified to be a referee in bankruptcy. This means that he must, first, be a member in good standing of the bar of the district court of the United States in which he is appointed; second, that he shall not hold any office of profit or emolument under the laws of the United States or of any State, other than commissioner of deeds, justice of the peace, master in chancery, or notary public; and third, that he be not a relative of any of the judges of the courts of bankruptcy or of the justices or judges of the appellate courts of the district wherein he is appointed. It is required further that he be a resident of the county, familiar with agricultural conditions therein, and that he be not engaged in the farm-mortgage business, the business of financing farms, or transactions in agricultural commodities, or the business of marketing or dealing in agricultural commodities, or furnishing agricultural supplies.

It has been found impossible in many instances to execute this section of the present law because in some agricultural counties there can be found no person at all who meets all the qualifications of those specified, and in many others there can be found no qualified person who is willing to undertake the arduous and lengthy labor required of a conciliation commissioner for the small compensation allowed by the law of $25 per case.

In the Seventy-seventh Congress the House passed a bill with respect to appointment of conciliation commissioners (H. R. 7356) in an effort to improve the conditions, however, no action was taken on the measure in the Senate.

Under the provisions of the present bill the district courts may appoint not more than 20 persons in any 1 State to be known as conciliation commissioners. Obviously in many districts where there are no cases under this section of the law there will be no persons appointed. Present law, as stated above, provides for the appointment of 1 or more conciliation commissioners for every county having 500 or more farmers. The term of the commissioner is increased from 1 year to 4 years. He may, however, as under present law, be removed by the court if his services are no longer needed, or for other cause. The requirement that a conciliation commissioner have the qualifications of a referee in bankruptcy has been eliminated in order that the court will not be too strictly limited in its selection of the best immediately available person to serve.

Subsection (b) changes the law to require the farmer upon filing a petition to pay a fee of $25 in lieu of $10 as at present. The entire $25 fee to the conciliation commissioner will thereby be paid by the farmer filing a petition.

The per diem allowance to supervising conciliation commissioners is increased from a present maximum of $5 per day to $10. Following are figures submitted by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts relative to amounts paid to conciliation commissioners:

Fiscal year 1942	
Fees paid to conciliation commissioners	$40,990.00
Compensation paid to supervising conciliation commissioners	30,654.75
Expenses of supervising conciliation commissioners	4,721.28
Total	76,366.03
Fiscal year 1943	
Fees paid to conciliation commissioners	$28,996.00
Compensation paid to supervising conciliation commissioners	31,049.60
Expenses of supervising conciliation commissioners	3,493.08
Total	63,538.68
Less amount received by Government from $10 fee paid by persons filing petitions	14,510.00
Net cost to Government of section 75 cases terminated in fiscal year 1943	49,028.68
Number of cases terminated in fiscal year 1943	1,451
Cost per case	$33.78

Subsection (c) is the present law except that the date has been extended from March 4, 1944, to March 4, 1948.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"SEC. 75. (a) [Within 30 days after June 7, 1934, every court of bankruptcy of which the jurisdiction or territory includes a county or counties having an agricultural population (according to the last available United States census) of 500 or more farmers] *Every United States district court of bankruptcy* shall appoint *not more than 20 persons in any 1 State* [one or more referees] to be known as 'conciliation commissioners,' [one such conciliation commissioner to be appointed for each county having an agricultural population of 500 or more farmers according to said census: *Provided further*, That where any county in any such district contains a smaller number of farmers according to said census, for the purposes of this paragraph such county shall be included with one or more adjacent counties where the population of the counties so combined includes 500 or more farmers, according to said census. In case more than 1 conciliation commissioner is appointed for a county, each commissioner shall act separately and shall have such territorial jurisdiction within the county as the court shall specify.] *One such commissioner shall be appointed from each division or for the territory served by the city where terms of court are held. The court shall designate the territorial district of each such commissioner. A conciliation commissioner's term of office shall be 4 years, but he may be removed by the court if his services are no longer needed or for other cause.* [A conciliation commissioner shall have a term of office of 1 year and may be removed by the court if his services are no longer needed or for other cause.] No individual shall be eligible to appointment as a conciliation commissioner unless he [is eligible for appointment as a referee and in addition] is a resident of the [county] *district*, familiar with agricultural conditions therein and not engaged in the farm-mortgage business, the business of financing farmers or transactions in agricultural commodities or the business of marketing or dealing in agricultural commodities or of furnishing agricultural supplies. In each judicial district the court may, if it finds it necessary or desirable, appoint a suitable person as a supervising conciliation commissioner. The supervising conciliation commissioner shall have such supervisory functions under this section as the court may by order specify.

"(b) Upon filing of any petition by a farmer under this section there shall be paid a fee of [$10.] *$25* to be transmitted to the clerk of the court and covered into the Treasury. The conciliation commissioner shall receive as compensation for his services, a fee of $25 for each case submitted to him [when a composition or extension proposal has been effected and confirmed, or $10 in each case submitted to him in which there is no confirmation,] to be paid out of the Treasury [upon final disposition of each case] *when the conciliation commissioner completes the duties assigned to him by the court.* A supervising conciliation commissioner shall receive, as compensation for his services, a per diem allowance to be fixed by the court, in an amount not in excess of [$5] *$10* per day, together with subsistence and travel expenses in accordance with the law applicable to officers of the Department of Justice. Such compensation and expenses shall be paid out of the Treasury. If the creditors at any time desire supervision over the farming operations of a farmer, the cost of such supervision shall be borne by such creditors or by the farmer, as may be agreed upon by them, but in no instance shall the farmer be required to pay more than one-half of the cost of such supervision. Nothing contained in this section shall prevent a conciliation commissioner who supervises such farming operations from receiving such compensation therefor as may be so agreed upon. No fees, costs, or other charges shall be charged or taxed to any farmer or his creditors by any conciliation commissioner or with respect to any proceeding under this section, except as hereinbefore in this section provided. The conciliation commissioner may accept and avail himself of office space, equipment, and assistance furnished him by other Federal officials, or by any State, county, or other public officials. The Supreme Court is authorized to make such general orders as it may find necessary properly to govern the administration of the office of conciliation commissioner and proceedings under this section; but any district court of the United States may, for good cause shown and in the interests of justice, permit any such general order to be waived.

"(c) At any time prior to March 4, [1944] *1948*, a petition may be filed by any farmer, stating that the farmer is insolvent or unable to meet his debts as they mature, and that it is desirable to effect a compcsition or an ex-

tension of time to pay his debts. The petition or answer of the farmer shall be accompanied by his schedules. The petition and answer shall be filed with the court, but shall, on request of the farmer or creditor, be received by the conciliation commissioner for the county in which the farmer resides and promptly transmitted by him to the clerk of the court for filing. If any such petition is filed, an order of adjudication shall not be entered except as provided hereinafter in this section."

ANNUAL SALARY BASIS FOR FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BUCK conferees on the part of the Senate.

INCREASED COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BUCK conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE POSTAL WORKERS

Mrs. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly about a great group of Government employees who deserve the attention of the Congress. I refer to the postal workers of the Nation. They have made a fine record, not only in peacetime but in war as well. They have done their part and more by every standard that can be applied to them.

There are pending in the Congress for their benefit a number of bills which I think should be given prompt and sympathetic attention. The Senate recently passed a bill to aid the 25,000 postmasters in fourth-class offices. Their compensation ranges from a few dollars annually to a maximum of $1,100, depending upon the business of their respective offices. I really preferred the House bill over the one the Senate amended and passed. All postmasters, not only in the fourth-class but other grades, have had additional work placed upon them.

Overburdened by the growing demands of wartime, they have absorbed the added tasks without complaint and without asking additional help during the period of manpower shortage. The volume of mail transported and delivered has risen by about 4,000,000,000 pieces, or nearly 15 percent, in the last 2 years. Yet there has been practically no change in the number of employees in the Postal Service. The extra tasks have been performed by this faithful group, working longer and harder hours, without diverting manpower from our war industries.

They have done more than merely absorb extra work; they have actually sent 32,000 postal employees into the Army and Navy, replacing them with less skilled new employees, with women, with elderly persons, with young boys and girls. Many of the 32,000 are now employing their skill to insure good mail service at Army and Navy post offices all around the world.

While contributing all these able workers to the armed forces, the Postal Service asked practically no deferments. Until the law providing preference for pre-Pearl Harbor fathers was enacted, the Post Office Department asked no draft deferments whatever except for a handful of highly skilled post office inspectors.

Efficiency has been promoted by every possible means, and untold hours of overtime worked to make the present good mail service possible.

Postal employees have sold to the public millions of dollars' worth of War bonds and stamps for the Treasury; and they have subscribed liberally themselves in the War Loan campaigns. They registered, photographed, and fingerprinted enemy aliens for the Department of Justice; they handled, as just one passing task, the huge job of delivering 120,000,000 copies of ration book No. 3, one for every civilian man, woman, and child in the United States; they distributed millions of circulars for the Office of Price Administration; they hauled scrap rubber and scrap metal in the salvage campaigns, and performed many other tasks outside regular postal work.

They transported and delivered the record-breaking volume of 1943 Christmas mail in a manner so expeditious and orderly, in the face of such extraordinary handicaps, that the Postmaster General said:

> It is difficult for me to find words to express my appreciation and my pride in your accomplishment.

The Postal Service has had to meet the problems of depleted forces, inexperienced personnel, gasoline and rubber restrictions, restricted air and railroad services, economy measures and other difficulties; but still it has performed its job without placing any embargoes or priorities on letter writing, advertising, or parcel post. It delivers the mail and carries on the special services—money orders, special delivery, postal savings, and so forth, all of which have been greatly increased since the war, in the same manner as in times of peace.

And in the face of all these difficulties, the Post Office Department in the fiscal year 1943, under the able direction of Postmaster General Frank C. Walker, showed a surplus of revenues over expenditures for the first time in 24 years.

The men and women of the Postal Service are doing their work well. Under the most extraordinary handicaps, they are maintaining the efficiency of the communications system, which is a vital factor in assuring the success of our arms production at home and in sustaining the spirit of our fighting men at the battle fronts. They are maintaining the reputation of their service as the "messenger of sympathy and love," the "bond of the scattered family" in days when that bond is more important than ever before—days when American families are scattered by war to the far corners of the earth.

Mr. President, in closing, I wish to quote the following inscription which appears on the facade of the Washington, D. C., Post Office, which I think is a great tribute to a great organization—the United States Postal Service:

> Messenger of sympathy and love,
> Servant of parted friends,
> Consoler of the lonely,
> Bond of the scattered family,
> Enlarger of the common life.
>
> Carrier of news and knowledge,
> Instrument of trade and industry,
> Promoter of mutual acquaintance,
> Of peace, and of good will
> Among men and nations.

DECLINE IN THE CONSUMPTION OF COTTON AND PRODUCTION OF COTTON GOODS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on Monday of last week I submitted a resolution requesting an investigation by a committee of the Senate of the use of cotton and the production of cotton goods throughout the United States. The subject is of vital importance to the cotton farmer, the textile worker, the textile producer and all those connected directly or indirectly with the cotton industry and the textile industry. Since that time I have received many letters and telegrams and many personal calls dealing with the subject matter. I desire at this time to read an article under the date line of Charlotte, N. C., February 25, dealing with a meeting held in Charlotte on that day in connection with the War Production Board's statement that a shortage of textile goods is inevitable. The article is as follows:

TEXTILE GOODS TO BE SCARCE

CHARLOTTE, N. C., February 25.—Cotton textile manufacturers were told today by the chief of War Production Board's cotton fabrics branch that a shortage of textiles is inevitable.

The continuing increase in essential war demand for fabrics, J. M. Withrow said, assured a shortage for civilian Americans.

He warned, too, that a "business as usual" policy at the expense of the other fellow would bring far more stringent regulations to the industry.

EIGHT HUNDRED EXECUTIVES MEET

Withrow spoke at a meeting here of 800 cotton-mill executives from 11 States, called

by the W. P. B. to assist the industry solve its difficulties with existing regulations.

Regulation of the industry by the W. P. B. so far, he said, has been held to a minimum since "we believe the more goods we leave free the less difficulties will be experienced by all."

"We have come to the time when military demands are on the increase," he said. "The offensive war in the Pacific is requiring much more cotton textiles.

"The offensives to come in Europe will further greatly increase the demand."

LONGER-HOUR DRIVE

He said the mills put on a drive for increased production in 1942 through longer hours, but could not keep it up. He pointed out there was a further drain on supplies by lend-lease, economic warfare, and other export needs.

Mr. President, of course we all feel that the Army and the Navy should have, first, last, and always, whatever textiles they may need; but one of the things that is concerning me about the situation is that I am told that even the Army and Navy themselves cannot at this time obtain sufficient textiles of certain types. I am also advised on reliable authority that Lend-Lease is having greater difficulties; and all of us know from our own experience the difficulties the civilians are having.

I bring this matter again before the Senate because only yesterday I noticed that the price of cotton itself again made quite a severe decline. Last week I talked with the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Mr. Hutson; and again he reminded me that much of the cotton was going under loan. Again I remind the Senate that the loan on cotton is based upon 90 percent of parity and, therefore, the farmers' cotton is piling up on loan at prices which could not, I may say, be satisfactory to them for the production of another large crop.

Mr. President, it seems to me that, with the O. P. A. regulations, the War Production Board regulations, the Manpower Commission regulations, and many other regulations through other agencies, something will have to be done in the interest of the war effort, insofar as textiles are concerned, if we are to produce more goods for the war effort, produce more goods for the civilian front, and insure the cotton farmer a reasonable return on his cotton production.

I wish to make these few remarks today, Mr. President, because day by day, in my judgment, the situation grows worse in the largest industry we have in the Southeast, and in connection with the largest production of an agricultural commodity which the South itself has.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. Does not my colleague believe that the production of cotton calls for more manpower than does any other crop which is grown?

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with my colleague. I may say, in connection with the question of production, and I feel certain my colleague agrees with me, that, at present, prices are so low, for December cotton the price being 19 cents, cotton is not as attractive to plant now as some other commodities may be, particularly considering the increased prices the farmer has to pay for everything he buys.

Mr. SMITH. It is the only crop, despite all the ingenuity of inventors which does not permit of the use of any kind of machinery in its gathering.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. And it is the only major crop, I believe—and I should like to ask my distinguished colleague to verify the statement—for which for next fall prices are away below parity.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MAYBANK. In fact, the prices for next fall are almost 20 percent below parity, if we consider the carrying charges.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; and the increased costs decrease the production. In fact, when the increased cost of labor is included it becomes almost impossible to produce the necessary fiber for the use of civilians and the armed forces.

Mr. MAYBANK. Furthermore, Mr. President, I know my distinguished colleague will agree with me in the statement that when the fiber is not produced there is a consequent failure of production of the byproducts of cotton, such as cottonseed, and so forth, which in themselves in the war effort are even more essential than is the main product.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. President, I wish to refer to the efforts of my colleague to remove the tax imposed on oleomargarine. In 1911 the elder Senator Lodge and I were on a committee to investigate the cost of living. The question of oleomargarine arose. I asked Dr. Wiley—and my questions are in the record—about the palatableness, the wholesomeness, and the use of oleomargarine as an edible fat. I asked him if it was not as good as butter. I asked him other questions, which are also in the record. Dr. Wiley replied that it was equal to butter. He made that reply in response to every question I asked. He answered my questions categorically. Whereupon Senator Lodge turned to me and said, "The Senator from South Carolina does not pretend that this miserable vegetable product is equal to good Elgin butter, does he?"

I said, "Well, I feed my cow on cottonseed meal and cottonseed hulls; and, through the chemistry of the animal, the milk from her udder is the product of the cottonseed. Now science has discovered a plan by which it can be run through a machine, and thus get the butter. I am voting for the machine; because the cow may have some disease, but the machine does not. It is exactly the same thing."

If my colleague will excuse me for taking so much of his time, I should like to say that I think it is one of the greatest crimes against the American consuming public to put a tax on olemargarine, until it is proven deleterious.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to address my question particularly to the senior Senator from South Carolina, although I hesitate to interrogate him in the time of the junior Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is quite all right.

Mr. STEWART. Is it correct to say that the surplus supply of cotton we have had in this country is at this time diminishing?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; the surplus supply of the real, available grades of cotton is diminishing.

Mr. STEWART. I refer to the cotton which has been under Commodity Credit Corporation loans, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH. I am informed that all the real cotton, from the Low Middling grade up, has been used. The cotton which is held now a decent rat would not build a nest in. I have not investigated it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I assure both the Senators from South Carolina that I am very sympathetic to what they have to say about cotton, and I am sympathetic with them because the price of cotton is below the parity price. However, let me say that I believe they are approaching this matter from the wrong angle. I know the Senators from South Carolina are very sympathetic to all forms of agriculture. The senior Senator from South Carolina has said so upon this floor many times. In the Northwest wheat is selling at a price far below parity, and the price of beef is below parity. I, for one, desire to serve notice that I believe a great many Senators from the Northwest will object to passing legislation relating to cotton alone in an endeavor to increase its price toward parity unless beef, wheat, and possibly some other farm products are also considered.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say for the benefit of the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that my remarks were not directed toward any particular resolution. The resolution which I submitted related not only to agriculture, but also to production, particularly with respect to textiles. One of the great troubles with the textile industry is the constant drain on its manpower. Manpower is continually leaving the textile industry to go to Government factories where it is paid much higher wages. Wages in the textile industry are low. I believe they should be adjusted in some way in keeping with the ceilings on textiles, so that the whole program of the manufacture of textiles may be smoothed out, and better use may be made of available manpower, not only for 40 hours a week, but for 48 hours a week.

My reference to cotton was in connection with this program. Last month the consumption of cotton declined 100,000 bales. The production of yard goods declined in January by 800,000,000 yards. In my judgment, from what I understand from men engaged in the textile industry, this reduction will continue unless we can iron out the whole program in relation to price ceilings, War Production Board orders, and cooperation between the Manpower Commission and other Government agencies, which are

not, in my opinion, working together as well as they should be.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The manpower problem in the South is no different from that confronting the farmers of the Northwest, is it?

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not say it was, but ours is bad.

Mr. LANGER. Many of our young people have gone west to work in aircraft factories.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no intention of making any statement about the Northwest. I frankly admit to the Senator from North Dakota that I do not know as much about the Northwest as he does; but I believe I know something about the textile industry. I believe that the problem can be handled a little better than it is now being handled. If the Senator from North Dakota has any plan which he believes could be satisfactorily put into operation in the West, naturally I will do the best I can to assist.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. How much cotton is being imported at the present time?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not believe that any appreciable amount of cotton is being imported at this time. There may be some Egyptian and Indian cotton being imported. That is used for a specific type of tire manufacture.

Mr. LANGER. I may state for the benefit of the junior Senator from South Carolina that wheat is being imported into the United States from Canada, in competition with wheat produced by farmers in the Northwest; so our problem is even more serious than his.

Mr. MAYBANK. The farmers of the Northwest may have a more serious problem than we have. I am not suggesting that our problem is impossible. My thought is that the situation is bad, and that if we can do something to improve it and make a greater contribution to the war effort, it should be done.

POST-WAR INTERNATIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate in relation to a phase of our foreign policy which I think it is important for us to consider.

Mr. President, we are informed by the press that Britain is no longer shipping supplies to Turkey. We also read in the press that Russia has suggested terms for Finland which are far less harsh than those which were first given out to the public. That augurs well for the future. I trust that before long Finland will be out of this war.

The other day I heard something to the effect that, while Russia insisted that the German army corps which are in Finland should be interned, there was not one chance in a thousand that that could be accomplished, because already Germany had looked ahead and had created military roads running into the section of Norway which she now occupies. It is undoubtedly the hope and prayer of all America, which loves the Finnish people for their integrity, their bravery, and their ability, that Finland will come through this war and remain a nation.

In recent radio talks I have stressed the hopeful pattern of post-war international relationships which has emerged as a result of the Moscow, Cairo, and Teheran Conferences.

The pattern was first laid down by the Moscow Conference, which was held October 19 to October 30 last fall. It was laid down by the American Secretary of State, the British Foreign Minister, the Soviet Commissar of Foreign Affairs, and the Chinese Ambassador to the Soviet Union.

It formally recognized the necessity of establishing at the earliest possible date "a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states and open to the membership of all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

This broad pattern was later confirmed at the Cairo Conference by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek of China. It was also confirmed at the Teheran Conference by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Marshal Stalin, Premier of the Soviet Union.

I have pointed out that the pattern is a hopeful one because it proposes to build a system of post-war security around the principle of the equal sovereignty of all participating states. It is hopeful because such definite statement of post-war purpose should close the door against all utopian nonsense about a world superstate and a world superpolice force. It is hopeful because it does not dedicate this great country and its major allies to some impossible grandiose world-wide system of superplanning in which we as Americans would lose all our dear-bought freedoms and most of our hard-earned cash. It is hopeful because it proposes to build definitely and realistically on the solid foundation of equal sovereignty.

When we think of bleeding Poland, which was attacked on both sides and went down, and the contribution which Poland is making to this war, we must realize what the terms of that understanding mean to the nations which have gone down under the heel of Hitler. It is for us to see that the expression "sovereign equality" is made vital.

But I should like to point out again that however hopeful this pattern may be, it is still only a pattern. It is still only a broad declaration of purpose. After we have decisively defeated Hitler and his Nazis and Tojo and his war lords, we must then work out the many definite and difficult problems which will demand solution before any system of post-war security is possible. We must work out these problems not en masse, but one by one. We must see to it that they are worked out within the broad framework of equal sovereignty. We must see to it that our broad but very definite statement of purpose and principle is not twisted, either by men or by events, into some contrary purpose, sanctioned by some conflicting principle.

I should like to stress this point with utmost urgency. We can be sure we will build on the broad but definite principle of equal sovereignty only if we entrust our post-war efforts to men who sincerely believe in the principle of sovereignty, who have an unreserved dedication to American sovereignty, and an equally unreserved faith in our American social, economic, and political system.

Too often in the past, here in America, we have seen broad statements of worthwhile purpose twisted into some other purpose. Too often we have seen definite declarations of dedication to our traditional American principles perverted into sly attempts to impose utterly un-American principles.

We can be certain of a realistic and constructive post-war organization only if we can be sure that our American plenipotentiaries are sincerely dedicated to the task of building the sort of post-war world security system that the overwhelming majority of Americans want to help build.

But, as I pointed out in several radio talks on this subject, Americans will join unreservedly in helping to build a post-war world security system only if they are first reasonably assured of their own security.

As I have pointed out previously, in demanding such reasonable security, Americans are demanding no more than they are willing to concede to others. They are demanding no more than others of our own allies, and particularly our major allies, are demanding for themselves.

In previous remarks, I pointed out that Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and China took steps at the Cairo and Teheran Conferences to assure each its own reasonable security in the far Pacific. I insisted that the United States, as a measure of reasonable security, should demand and receive special recognition in that region. I stressed particularly a major American interest, namely, the fate of the Marshall, the Caroline, and Marianna Island groups, which the Cairo Conference proposed to take from Japan.

It has since been suggested that there was a tacit agreement at Cairo that these three island groups should definitely be given to the United States. I sincerely trust that that is so. Our men are fighting and dying there today.

I trust that our foreign policy implies that those outer ramparts shall be ours forever. I shall continue to urge at every opportunity our special and vital interest in these strategic stepping stones across the wide Pacific.

In previous talks, I also urged paramount American interest in the island stepping stones of the Atlantic. I remember back in the days before the war when on the floor of the Senate I said that I thought it was the function of those who were in command to make sure that the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands, which form our outer chain of ramparts, did not fall into the hands of the enemy, and that we should obtain possession of them.

I repeat that in previous talks I urged paramount interest in the island stepping stones of the Atlantic. I also repeat that from the standpoint of ordinary prudence, our interests in those Atlantic outposts must be recognized and established.

It is in no spirit of criticism that I point out that in demanding that our reasonable security be recognized and established in the Pacific and Atlantic, we are demanding no more than our allies demand on their part under the sanction of their own reasonable security. Nor are we demanding more than we should be willing to concede to our major allies.

It is most hopeful for the continued close collaboration of the United States, Great Britain, the Soviet Union, and the Chinese Republic that each can achieve a reasonable security without jeopardy to the reasonable security of any other.

Moreover, it is entirely reasonable that since the four major states in question must carry the major burden of postwar world security, each should be given every reasonable assurance of its own security. It is mere common sense to insist that only when a great state is reasonably assured of its own security can it join with proper loyalty and earnestness in supporting a world-wide system of security.

This is particularly true when a great state can achieve reasonable security without expense to any of its major allies. It is still true even when a great state finds its security needs in conflict with the reasonable and proper security, or perhaps the existence, of smaller states.

The United States can achieve reasonable security in the Pacific without expense to any nation, large or small. In the Atlantic, the United States can achieve reasonable security only through frank and forthright negotiation with Denmark, Portugal, and Great Britain concerning Iceland, Greenland, the Azores, and Bermuda. That subject, Mr. President, should have the prompt and earnest consideration of our State Department. Several years ago we lost an opportunity. We accepted 99-year leases. We were not playing fairly with those who are to come after us. We want no more economic, political, or international Pearl Harbors on this continent. It is our function to see to it that the servants of the people make sure that in the future those ramparts shall be American, and ready to guard America against any onslaught which may come.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WILEY. I shall be through shortly and shall be very happy to yield at that time.

Mr. BALL. I wish to ask a question on the point which the Senator was making.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. BALL. I am very much interested in the Senator's proposal that the United States should acquire island ramparts which are located several thousand miles out in the Pacific and from 1,000 to 2,000 miles out in the Atlantic. What puzzles me a little is this question: If those islands, several thousand miles away from the continental United States, are necessary for our security, how will the peoples of Asia feel about the United States having islands and fortified bases only 1,000 or 2,000 miles from the mainlands of their countries, and how will the peoples of the countries of Europe feel about the United States having fortified bases in the Azores and in Iceland? Iceland is much closer to England than it is to the United States.

Mr. WILEY. I think the Senator has asked a very fair question. It might take an hour to clarify the situation, but I shall try to do so in a very few moments.

The islands which we are occupying in the Pacific, for the fortification of which we are spending many hundreds of millions of dollars, are stepping stones in the trade channels of the world. Some of those islands—I cannot go into detail about them—are outer ramparts against future attacks on South America and North America. Those islands are nothing but stepping stones. They would provide outer ramparts. A number of the islands in the Marianas and in the other group were mandated to Japan. She agreed not to fortify them. We found out, at the cost of hundreds of lives, the value of possessing those islands. There should be no trouble with respect to them. Our allies should agree that the title thereto shall be in us when the war is over, because we have taken them. The islands in the other group which we have captured were mandated to Australia after the last war. The Japs took them. We have taken them back. I am sure that we shall not have any trouble with Australia. What we need is assurance that at the pivotal bases of the earth our flying ships will have rights equal to those of our allies. I do not claim that we should reach out into someone else's backyard. Reference to the map will show that many of those islands are midway between Asia and America. Many of them are closer to South America than they are to Asia. But this war is demonstrating that they are most important for America to hold and control.

In relation to Bermuda and to our bases in Newfoundland and in Iceland, we have taken no precaution, except as to certain of them we have 99-year leases. We will have no trouble with the British Empire. The very life of Britain in the centuries to come will depend upon America. Most Britishers are realists in that respect. But we should not again fall asleep and refuse to recognize what might happen.

Speaking in New York a few months ago to a gathering of men of consequence, I heard a great engineer, one of the ablest men in America, say that every airplane which is now built, every fighter we have, is out of date compared with the blueprint of the coming airplane. What does that mean? It means that our airplanes in the future will be traveling 500, 600, 700 miles an hour. What does that portend? It portends that America will not be as it was in the years past, even in the First World War, days and weeks away, but that America will be only a few hours away from potential enemies of the future. Recognizing that fact, we do not want any brass hats in our Army and Navy and our Air Force to fall asleep to the challenge we may face, as they did when Billy Mitchell, of Wisconsin, after the last World War called the attention of the American people and the world to what the bomber and the airplane could do, and was crucified for his pains.

Now, I say, is the time for us to reach out and get possession of those things we need, not to deprive others, not to become a threat to them, but in order that we may secure our beloved country against any more mistakes. That is the idea I am expressing at this time.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Is not that the same basis on which Hitler has grabbed Austria and Czechoslovakia, that such action was necessary for Germany's security? It merely occurs to me that if the United States and Russia and Britain start playing the game of grabbing everything they may consider necessary to their security, the other nations and peoples of the world will find it a little difficult to distinguish between what we propose to do and what the Axis was trying to do.

Mr. WILEY. I cannot permit the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota to put words in my mouth. I never used the word "grab," nor did I suggest such an idea. The suggestion I made was that when we are spending billions to keep the lifeblood of other nations flowing and to preserve them alive and free, it should be a two-way street, and we should ask our allies, "Will you not kindly, in consideration of so much, sell to us that which we need and which you need not?" We do not want Bermuda, but we want the air base there in perpetuity. We want the air bases in the Caribbean. We have dealt with Denmark before and, when Denmark gets on her feet, we can deal with her again. When we know that after the last World War France owed, and still owes, America billions of dollars and that we are going to save France once more so that through the streets of Paris there will be heard again La Marseillaise, the national anthem of France, sung by American doughboys, and when we know that American sons will be rotting in the sod of France, am I to be told, sir, that I am advocating anything in the nature of grabbing? When it comes to dealing with those people to whom we have given so much in blood and treasure and from whom we have received so little, should we hesitate to ask from them the necessary outposts which are our defense at present against any enemy attacks on the Panama Canal? They should be glad to give those islands to us, or a part of them, in order that adequate defense may be provided against any future contingency. I do not want America again to fall asleep.

Mr. President, in a few moments I shall finish. When I speak of reasonable security in the Atlantic, I am not speaking of security against attack by any of

our present allies, either directly or in combination with other European states. We have nothing to fear, I am convinced, from Great Britain so long as Great Britain continues to be the homeland of a great empire and commonwealth. But I should like to point out that the events of 1930 and 1940 are much too recent for us to take any European situation for granted. As a matter of brutal truth, not one of us knows what the Europe of 1950, 1960, or 1970 will be like; none of us knows what the Asia of 10 or 15 years from now will be like; but I do know that when we go into Europe we will probably go in on many fronts. We will have to take over the feeding of people who by the thousands are dying of starvation every day, who are filled with the poison of hate which in many instances has unbalanced them—and I blame them not—because of the atrocities that have been committed upon them. There is the problem. I do not know what Europe will be 10 years from now; I want to know what the United States of America will be 10 years from now, and I want to get these outer ramparts in our hands in perpetuity.

That Great Britain is deeply concerned about her own security in relation to post-war Europe is readily understandable. Until the advent of the bombing plane, the narrow English Channel enabled the British Fleet to guarantee the actual physical security of the British Isles under almost any possible circumstances. That is not so today. With all due credit to the gallant Royal Air Force, it was the existence of a great British Fleet, more than any other factor, which prevented Hitler from attempting a really formidable invasion of the British Isles in the bleak months immediately after the fall of France.

But the British—and I have talked to them and have done so recently—are not so sure that the fleet will be sufficient next time, if there should be a next time. The extraordinary development of the bombing plane has changed the traditional British situation entirely. That British leaders are acutely conscious of the problem posed by air power is eloquently attested by a recent, though little publicized, speech of Prime Minister Jan Smuts, of the Union of South Africa, to the United Kingdom branch of the Empire Parliamentary Association in London. What he said stirred men's minds into action. After Jan Smuts finished speaking they began to think above the din of the present; they looked ahead and saw what might happen.

Mr. Smuts is not only Prime Minister of the Union of South Africa, he is a member of the British War Cabinet. He spoke on November 25, and so important was his address that it was not made public until a week later. It has not been made public in full to this day.

Mr. Smuts frankly faced the European situation as it will exist at the end of the war, when hostilities cease. He pointed out that three of the five great powers of Europe will have disappeared. Of course he meant Germany, Italy, and France.

Let us stop for a moment to consider that situation. Here is a man who is recognized not only as a great statesman, a great general, a great philosopher, but as one of the leaders in the British Empire, one of its colossal thinkers. He says Germany, Italy, and France are out of the picture.

He further said, "Russia will be mistress of the continent." Not only that, but the Japanese Empire will also have ceased to exist; so Russia will be freed of any check in the far Pacific. That will put Russia in a position unique in European history, he declared.

Mr. Smuts admitted that some of his ideas might be regarded as explosive. I have waited 4 months before bringing his thought to a sober America. I believe he is thinking straight.

Mr. Smuts admitted that some of his ideas might be regarded as explosive, but these are explosive times, he insisted, and need forthright treatment. This British War Cabinet member said that after the war America, Russia, and Britain would hold world power and must retain leadership in peace, a peace which he predicted would come very slowly.

In this new trinity of power, Mr. Smuts said, Great Britain, with "a glory and an honor and a prestige such as no nation ever enjoyed before" would be very poor indeed in this world's goods, would rank as a poor third in the trinity. We are living in a changing world, when one of the leading statesmen of the British Nation puts Britain third in the post-war period.

Here is the important point of Premier Smuts' great address. Listen to this. To compensate for her economic weakness, Mr. Smuts suggested that Great Britain should seek more intimate association with those small democracies of western Europe "which by themselves may be lost as they are lost today and may be lost again." Those are his words.

"Surely," he said, "they must feel that their place is with the British member of the trinity. Their way of life is with Great Britain, their outlook and their future is with Great Britain and the next world-wide British system."

Mr. Smuts was pointing his remarks, of course, at Denmark, Norway, Belgium, and Holland. These small states have a total population of more than 23,000,000 people. Norway has, or had, a substantial merchant marine which England was glad to take over. Belgium, and particularly Holland, have important overseas possessions. Together they would not only fit nicely into a world-wide British system, but would completely dominate Africa and the East Indies. Should a reborn France, of some 40,000,000 people, join this group it would not only constitute a powerful western European block of more than a hundred million people, it would combine the vast British, French, and Dutch Empires into one gigantic world system.

I am not citing this possibility, which is still only a possibility, as something to cause us alarm here in the United States. On the contrary, Mr. President, I believe the United States should welcome and encourage such a development.

Let me divert from my prepared remarks to say that in 1939, sitting with the King of Norway in his own chamber in his own palace in Oslo, I made the same suggestion to him. I recall him as he sat there tired, worn, worried. I was there as a representative of this Government, one of four Senators representing the Government of the United States at the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union in Oslo. That was just a week before Hitler went into Poland, and as I sat in the Storthing, Norway's parliament, where the conference was held, telegrams would come to the representatives of the nations telling of the approaching storm. Germany was not represented there, and Italy was not, nor was Japan, but all the other nations were represented. Those were really hectic days. I had an audience with the King, and I asked him then why these small nations should not get under the wing of the British Empire. "Oh, no," he said. War was only a week ahead. "No," he said. "The Kaiser respected our neutrality. We are sure Hitler will."

Ah, what a mistake. Those small but great nations had solved their economic problems; they were living in peace, they had spent little on war preparations, and they are the ones that are suffering now, because the world had not learned the lesson of international cooperation and collaboration. But, as Mr. Smuts said, they undoubtedly will look now to some unifying force. Will that force be Britain? Where else can they go? With Russia taking part of Finland, where would the Finns go?

Mr. President, I have a suggestion as to that. Why not invite the Finnish people, all who are willing, to go into Alaska? They would make Alaska an empire worth while, not that it is not now, but it would be an empire fully developed, magnified in wealth. That is the place for them. They know how to take care of countries such as Alaska. Before the war they were furnishing a great deal of the pulpwood used by America and Britain. The nations on the Scandinavian Peninsula are the ones that pay their bills and settle their debts. With little Norway occupied, her bonds are still selling at 96, and every dollar of the interest is paid. They know what credit means. That is the kind of stock we want, to build Alaska and make it strong. I repeat, if an agreement is made between Russia and Finland, and Finland has to give up territory, let us offer to those fine people a home in Alaska, where they would build an empire which would be an outer rampart on the skyways of the world.

Now, I return to the subject I was discussing. Surely, if a member of the British War Cabinet can urge such a dramatic and epochal plan in the interest of British security, Americans have a right to think and talk realistically of their own security. Let us get back to the point. General Smuts talks about nations like Norway and Sweden and Denmark and Holland, and even France, coming in under the wing of Britain and the United States. Remember, when the Germans were going through France in 1940, it was Churchill who first proposed an eternal partnership between France and England, and France, to her shame,

turned the suggestion down. But conditions have changed. Millions of the sons of Europe will rot in her soil, and nations will go down. I repeat, if a member of the British War Cabinet can urge such a dramatic and epochal plan in the interest of British security, Americans have a right to think and talk realistically of their own security.

Surely, if Americans are to play a major part in the building of a post-war world of order and law and decency, they have a right to take whatever prudent measures they may believe necessary in their own behalf. They not only have the right to do so but I say, Mr. President, that we of this day and generation have the duty to do so, and if we fail in performing that duty we shall fail those who in after years may say we were asleep. I do not think we will be asleep.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I was interested especially in what the Senator said in his opening remarks. He emphasized the Moscow Agreement, and the Senate resolution of 4 months ago in which emphasis was placed upon the fact that we should, at the earliest practicable date, establish an international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of those taking part in it, for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. I am sure that in emphasizing that doctrine of sovereign equality the Senator felt it was thoroughly consistent with the formation of such an international organization as was proposed in the Senate resolution. I take it, therefore, the Senator feels that if we form such an international organization it is quite possible within that organization to maintain our sovereign equality, while also assuming as a member of the organization obligations placing responsibilities upon us which we otherwise would not have, but which would contribute to our peace and stability. Adherence to the agreement by other parties likewise would contribute to our stability and in turn our adherence would contribute to theirs.

Does the Senator from Wisconsin agree that a doctrine of mutual agreement for the purpose of establishing and maintaining our peace and security is thoroughly consistent with the formation of an international organization and the maintenance of our sovereign equality at the same time?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I could answer that question categorically "Yes," but I wish to amplify my answer. I wish to say that when we talk about an international association, an international authority, an international get-together, we must not assume that the mere constituting of such authority or association will do the job. The formation of such an organization would simply be similar to the passing of a law by Congress.

Mr. President, there was in existence for a number of years the League of Nations. The League of Nations was in being; it functioned. It was an organization built primarily for the purpose of being an antidote to the festering sores of war in Europe. But the nations who joined the League did not carry out their obligations. After the establishment of the League of Nations the Locarno Pact was entered into. On top of that a peace pact was entered into. It almost makes one laugh now to think that such a pact was entered into; but the Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw war was formulated, and America joined in that pact. We outlawed war by a pact and thought the job was done, as if war could be outlawed by means of an instrument or a pact or a treaty.

No, Mr. President, there must be back of all pacts or treaties or organizations not only the desire to carry on, not only the desire of like-minded peoples and like-minded public officials to cooperate, but there must be the will to carry through the mandate, the pact, the treaty, the purpose, whatever it may be.

Mr. President, I receive hundreds of letters from people all over the country in relation to this international proposal. One would think from reading them, or from hearing speakers over the radio, or from reading comments in the newspapers, that all that is necessary to be done is to create an international authority to bring a few countries together on paper.

Ah, but do Senators remember what the Kaiser did with treaties, and what Hitler has done with treaties? The point is, Have the contracting parties, the different nations, arrived at a position where they will act not only as "square shooters" but will do as the fathers of old did when they formed this country, and dedicate their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to carry out the purposes for which an international organization is formed? If the time has come when two or three or four of the large nations will do that, we shall have world peace. But if nations begin double dealing, if they begin playing international politics, if they begin to sell each other out and fail to keep faith with each other, then all the ten commandments in international law will not result in the peace being kept.

Wars have never made for peace. This war will not make for peace. That is why I spoke of the need of the outer ramparts belonging to America. I would have them so. I feel that the statesman of the present who fails to see that need and fails to comply with that need is selling America short.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask another question along the same line. I take it then the Senator feels that the primary obligation which faces us, both from the point of view of domestic stability and that of our international relations, is our obligation to find some means of maintaining our peace and security at the close of the fighting, whenever that may be. On the day when the armistice is signed, we will have, at least, momentary world-wide military stability because the United Nations will have defeated the greatest attack upon the world in the history of civilization. Therefore, does it not become vital, essential, and elemental that in order to maintain our peace and security we must make sure that the United Nations remain united in peace as well as in war?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad to answer that question. We must see to it, of course, that nations of kindred mind remain united. The United Nations have demonstrated almost a superhuman effort at unity. The peoples who compose the Republic of China have shown a wonderful unity. Russia, with her 80 nationalities, has achieved a wonderful unity. The British Isles and the Dominions show a wonderful unity. The story of cooperation of the peoples forming those unions is the most magnificent in the history of the world. There are a few exceptions of course, but the history of the collaboration between these peoples and what they have done omens well, sir, for the very thing you and I hope for, a unity of purpose in the post-war period which will carry us down through the ages resolved upon finding the answer to war.

Mr. President, we know we will not find the answer unless we continue to collaborate and cooperate as we have done during the war years. All the agreements, all the authorities, all the understandings or pacts mean nothing by themselves. I repeat what I said before, that many people are thinking synthetically about these things, as if a pact or an agreement by itself ipso facto can create peace. All the pacts and agreements which can be imagined will not give us peace unless in the heart and the soul of mankind there is the desire and the hunger and the purpose and the will to achieve peace.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Emphasizing that point of unity, is it not, then, the Senator's feeling that in this critical year 1944, critical in the war and in our generation, the primary obligation we have is to make sure that there shall be a spirit of unity within the United States and among all our allies? It seems to me that the only chance the enemy may have to win the war and to defeat us will be to devide the Allies from one another, or to bring about a division within America or within some other one of the great Allies. To gain this spirit of unity for which we look in the future, is it not a fact that we must rise immediately above all things which would interfere with unity within America or among the Allies in order that we may have a united front in the war and maintain it in the peace?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think the answer is self-evident, but perhaps I should elaborate a little on it, because unity in the large sense does not always mean that we will refrain from constructive criticism or that we will not find fault with one another. Real unity calls for laying everything flat on the table, exposing your hand and your heart and your mind. Between these nations there should be no reservations. Between these nations there should be no back-door dealings. Between these nations there should be no sabotage—mental, physical, or spiritual—of one or an-

other's effort. That is apparent. The only question is whether poor humanity and its leaders will measure up to the task. But it is the function of every one of us to exercise some leadership. I wish to say parenthetically that leadership is not necessarily found in Washington, on this floor. It is found in the hinterlands; it is found on the farmsteads, in the villages, the homes, and the cities where the men and women of America sit down and think things through. If they keep their heads, if they see to it that first things are looked after first, they will realize that the first thing is the maintenance of the unity of which we speak. Then we shall not permit any mental sabotage or any termiting of our united war efforts. I agree with the Senator 100 percent that there must be no vital differences which would in any way disunite our united efforts.

Mr. BURTON. I would like to ask one further minor question, so as to clear up a point which possibly may be obscure in the record. Referring to the Senate resolution of November 5, 1943, in which reference was made to an "international organization" in which sovereign equality would survive and continue, and having in mind the fact that in the United States we have 48 sovereign States which are represented equally in the Senate, but quite differently in the House of Representatives, does the Senator feel that the phrase "sovereign equality" in the resolution by any means makes it necessary that in whatever body may be developed, each one of the sovereign and equal nations must have precisely the same representation? May not that representation be varied proportionately, according to whatever the circumstances may make advisable at the time?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I think I understand the purport of the Senator's question. To me, the very existence of a national sovereignty may be dependent upon doing what I suggested to the King of Norway that his Nation should do. If at that time Norway had done what I suggested today she would be a free nation, and she would not have her sovereign rights invaded by the Hun.

Mr. BURTON. That is to say, Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin suggested that Norway use her sovereignty for her own self-protection, in an appropriate and intelligent manner.

Mr. WILEY. Yes. There is no question in my mind that in the British Empire Canada in every respect exercises her functions with sovereignty equal to our own. The Canadian people are free, and that is true of all dominions. Of course, when we get into the field of sovereignty, it is like many other things in life; it is a matter of definition. What we understand by sovereignty, of course, is that nations shall remain free, that under each nation the rights which are domestic shall be looked after by the legislative and executive branches of that nation.

As I said in the beginning of my remarks today, the world has been contracted. Going along with that contracted nature, in order to preserve sovereignty there necessarily must be a unification as between nations—unifications of spirit, of mind, of soul; yes, unifications of their economics and their social ideals.

To speak of the point in question—sovereignty—undoubtedly it may be necessary to have some form of unification in respect to a world-wide policing system. That in itself would not destroy sovereignty. It might be apportioned. Washington police look after Washington. New York police look after New York. Today the United States Fleet is policing the Pacific. That is our job. The British Fleet is policing the Indian Ocean. The British Fleet is looking after Britain's home sea lanes on the Atlantic. In a sense, America and Britain are policing the world.

Mr. BURTON. Accordingly, "sovereign equality" is, rather, an equality in status; and the fact that, in any association we might have, loose or close, some nations might have more votes than others in a council, would not destroy the principle of sovereign equality. As I understand the matter, we can have differences in representation and still have sovereign equality; and the resolution which was passed by the Senate did not mean that every nation or group which joined it would, therefore, have precisely the same votes in the council or meeting.

Mr. WILEY. I should say that is correct. Let me say that the question of votes is not so much involved as is the question of authority or the field of authority which is given to the international organization.

Mr. President, I have reached the conclusion of my remarks. I simply close by expressing the original concept, which is that I trust that from now on not only this body but the executive branch of the Government will see to it that the outer ramparts become American.

THE LIFE LINE OF 8,000,000 FIGHTING AMERICANS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, my remarks today are on a subject close to the heart of every Member of the Senate, for more than half the Members of the Senate have boys on the fighting fronts of the world. The sons of three Members of the Senate—the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]—already have given their lives in the supreme sacrifice for their Nation. Therefore, the subject I wish to discuss very informally today is one which will interest not only all Members of the Senate but everyone in America, for today in 11,000,000 homes in America there are empty chairs at the breakfast table, the dinner table, and the supper table—empty chairs which indicate an interest in the boys on the various fighting fronts.

I wish to pay high tribute to our fighting men throughout the world, wherever they may be. I say with great pride that our men and women in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps are living up to the highest traditions of their respective services. Every American is proud of them and of the fine and capable officers who lead them.

Daily we read in the headlines of our victories, of spectacular bombing raids, of heroic landings on far-away shores, of desperate land engagements. These outstanding phases of this war we fully appreciate, and to these heroic men we pay full honor.

Today I wish to tell the Senate and, through the vehicle of the Senate, the people of the Nation, a very vital and colorful story, a story of one of the least publicized branches of our armed forces, the Quartermaster Corps.

One of the several supply services of our Army, the Quartermaster Corps, is the one closest to the soldier, the one closest to your boy. The food he eats, the clothing he wears, the shoes in which he covers the terrain he is taking from the enemy every day are but a few of the contributions of the Quartermaster Corps to our ultimate victory.

All this may sound prosaic. Today, however, I am going to point out how the job of getting the supplies through, and on time, is one of the outstanding jobs of the entire war. It is a most inspiring story. Our people know little about this necessary job. Without its performance, no task force could move, no battle could be fought, no army could be organized and maintained.

It is important that the public should know the comprehensive and varied responsibilities of the Quartermaster Corps and the great task it has accomplished. It will continue to accomplish this great task—to care for and supply our soldiers at home and on every far-flung battle front until victory.

The Quartermaster Corps consists of more than 400,000 fighting men. Its chief is the quartermaster general, Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory. Let me give an insight into the spirit and purpose of this splendid organization, within our Army, by reading a quotation from a recent speech by this efficient chief of our world-wide supply organization:

> Let me make this simple promise to the American people. The Quartermaster Corps will never fail your boys. We will deliver the goods. Wherever they go—to whatever point American fighting men penetrate—quartermasters will be by their sides to keep them rolling to victory.

That is a sincere pledge from the lips of General Gregory, a pledge which voices the philosophy and solemn promise from the heart of the fighting quartermasters.

One other pledge made by General Gregory which deeply affects our national economy is this:

> The Quartermaster Corps in its purchasing of the tremendous quantities of food, of clothing and supplies, is deeply conscious of its responsibilities—not only to our armed forces—but also to our civilian population. We will conscientiously protect and consider our civilian economy in all of our operations.

The term "fighting quartermasters" is no euphemism. It has been aptly given the supply troops who are soldiers first, but who have been trained in the technical services so essential to the successful prosecution of war.

Armed with rifles, carbines, grenade launchers, and all the other lethal weapons, and trained to use them effectively, the fighting quartermasters also are armed with such weapons as baking ovens, trucks, laundry equipment, and the equipment necessary to handle mountains of supplies. They are trained to use these, too, but they much frequently wrest from the enemy the ground on which their establishments are set up, and as frequently must defend them, and their long supply lines, against the Nazis and Japs.

In 2 years of total warfare the quartermaster soldier has emerged a fighting piece of human machinery; the various Quartermaster outfits have developed into efficient combat organizations. No longer is the quartermaster a supply man only. Today he is a fighter first—a supplier second. His job is to deliver the goods—if need be, over the dead bodies of Japs or Nazis he has killed.

The job of supplying food and clothing, operating laundries, repairing shoes, and carrying gasoline has none of the glamour of operating a Flying Fortress or a Sherman tank, but it is a job that comes ahead of all others. If it is not done the war is lost. The Army that does it best wins.

Americans learned much about the importance of quartermaster supply during the early days of the Japanese sneak attack. We learned the hard way, for the Japs cut off our troops in the Philippines and we witnessed the slow strangulation of American garrisons on Bataan Peninsula and Corregidor Island. Denied new supplies, cut off 12,000 miles from their homeland, they went down fighting to the end—the end that came when there was nothing left with which to fight, nothing to eat, and no supplies of any kind.

The Philippine campaign, however, gave the Nation a new term to honor and revere. It produced the fighting quartermasters, who not only fought to the last drop of blood but also displayed an ingenuity probably never before equaled in the history of warfare.

Quartermasters died in the debris of warehouses and repair shops, mercilessly bombed by enemy aircraft, while they fed the Army from hopelessly inadequate supplies of food, kept trucks and scout cars going when only a miracle kept them from falling apart. They furnished food by personally threshing the meager rice crop they bought in its entirety from local native farmers. They slaughtered water buffalo to get meat, even resorting in the last desperate days to killing the Army's horses and pack mules. They built fish traps, and distilled sea water to obtain desperately needed salt. In improvised coffee pots, made from oil drums, they boiled and reboiled the tiny supply of coffee until the very grounds were white.

Quartermaster duties are without end. They supervised swelling groups of refugees, which they had to feed with food sorely needed by our fighting troops. They obtained land for airports, and issued special clothing to Japanese prisoners of war. They supervised the burial of the dead, maintaining cemeteries after a fashion, closely keeping track of death records and saving valuables to be forwarded to the next of kin.

This country's first taste of total war proved at the very outset that the quartermaster had to be a total soldier. Bataan and Corregidor proved that he is a total warrior.

The pendulum of military success swung far in Japan's favor in the early days of the war—days when American troops were fanning out to the fighting fronts of the world, and the United States began what has proved to be the biggest logistics operation in world history.

The tides of war shifted, however, as time went on. The quartermaster soldier found himself fighting and supplying a delaying action, at first, then a retreat, then a counteroffensive, until today he is the heart and nerve center of an American offensive around the world.

The Quartermaster Corps scored a major military logistics triumph in the invasion of north Africa in November 1942. So skillfully was the supply program handled that German intelligence, completely baffled, deduced that the invasion would land in Norway.

Many new items, now standard equipment for invasion and other task forces, were introduced by the fighting quartermasters in north Africa. Halazone tablets, which quickly make swamp or stream water safely drinkable, were issued to soldiers to help combat the ever-present problem of water supply in a region where drinking water was notoriously scarce.

Here, too, the Army's new delousing bag got its baptism-of-battle test and came through with flying colors. The bag was simple, but devising a way of supplying men with methyl bromide, the killing agent which boils at the low temperature of 40 degrees above zero, was a real problem. It was finally solved by a special glass container allowing plenty of space. As a result, soldiers stormed the beaches and invaded the interior with boiling chemicals in their pockets, without danger.

The barter bag made its debut at this invasion—a bag loaded with items attractive to the natives with which the soldier could purchase good will, labor, and services in a land where paper money had no value and hard money was little better because of the scarcity of goods for sale.

Two items supplied by the Quartermaster Corps were a dead give-away of the locality of this operation—sandfly bars, successors to the well-known mosquito netting, and havelocks, neck cloths to protect the soldier from wind-blown sand. Only in north Africa would soldiers need both these items. One hint to the enemy that hundreds of thousands were being supplied, and the surprise element would be destroyed. So carefully was the supply handled that even the soldiers themselves did not know they were to receive them until they actually neared the shores.

The north African invasion was the biggest amphibious landing operation in world history. It embodied the biggest convoy of ships ever used at one time—the greatest variety of supplies and the largest quantities of food. In that one operation, the fighting quartermasters showed the world that in the battle of supply, the Axis could take plenty of lessons.

Already in this war, the fighting quartermasters have pushed beyond frontiers which were uncrossed and unexplored by white men as recently as 1927. This happened as the fighting raged only a short distance west of Port Moresby, the great Allied Nations base on southern New Guinea. Making good on General Gregory's proud pledge—"we will deliver the goods"—quartermaster soldiers hacked and clawed their way through mud and muck with supplies on their backs. They jammed the stuff through by truck, by jeep, by boat, and by barge. The graves of many of them mark the route of victory, but the comrades of the fallen carried on.

When the fighting shifted to northern New Guinea, the quartermasters were forced to set up a wholly new line of supply, and it had to be made of the resources at hand—principally the brains and the brawn of quartermaster soldiers. First, a sub-base was established at Milne Bay, and small cargo ships were unloaded there. Small boats, ranging from 50 to 500 tons, transshipped this cargo and started toward the nearest small harbor on the road to Buna. Next, another transfer was made, this time to small boats and barges carrying as little as 10 tons at a load. These were finally unloaded on bare beaches, by night, and in spite of pounding surf. These supplies were landed on alternate nights and moved forward on alternate days, on the backs of soldiers and natives, until they finally reached their destinations.

Here 2,000 miles from base, the quartermasters improvised storage facilities against the incessant rains and the terrible humidity. They created refrigeration units, primarily for the Medical Corps needs, and mounted them on their own chassis. They fought off incessant Jap attacks, and they delivered the goods. There were no rules for doing this job in the worst of all green hells, and it was here that the American soldier demonstrated his superiority. The Japs were great fighters; all admitted that. But the supply problem licked them. Once they got almost within sight of Moresby, only to be driven clear out of Papua. Behind them they left dead, dying, and starving men. They simply could not get the stuff through to sustain their armies.

At Guadalcanal supplies were landed in lighters on bare beaches under incessant aerial attack. Three landing points were operated, stretching along a scant 4 miles of beach. Sharp coral and incessant rain and humidity took a terrific toll of soldiers' shoes, and thousands of replacement pairs had to be rushed to virtually inaccessible locations by native boys. Also thousands of gallons of insecticides and insect repellants had to be brought ashore and transshipped to their destinations to protect the health of the front-line fighting men.

Under constant enemy fire one bakery platoon operated 9 ovens and produced

enough bread to supply 20 pounds per day for each 100 men.

In New Caledonia, the Quartermaster Corps established canning factories, packing plants, machine shops, laundries, repair units, and virtually all the units necessary to the prosecution of a global war.

We know of the Sicilian landings; we know of the hell of Salerno Beach; we know of the huge successful amphibious operations recently in many places. In each and every one the fighting quartermasters played an important part—landing their supplies—their own guns blazing, doing their job. Yes, Mr. President, it is a thrilling story of heroism, sweat, and exhausting work, and I am deeply honored by this opportunity to tell but a small part of it to the Senate and to the American public.

Today, the world around, the fighting quartermasters are in there pitching. They have solved seemingly unsolvable problems. They have developed the God-given American ingenuity for improvisation to its ultimate peak. They have given of their blood, their sweat, and their tears—to deliver the goods. Hundreds of them have been decorated for valor.

I have long been aware of the great job being done throughout the world by the Quartermaster Corps. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I obtained a detailed account of their operations. This uncovered a story so vast, so thrilling, and so packed with human interest that I should like to take Senators behind the scenes with me for a few moments. I should like to show the sinews of war, the planning, the development of the items, and the problems of procurement, and to honor particularly that division of the corps called storage and distribution. They are responsible for getting all food, clothing, and personal equipment to the boys wherever they may be. They have done a remarkable job.

Three years ago we had but a token army. Today we have nearly 8,000,000 men under arms, to be supplied by the quartermaster. This tremendous, unprecedented expansion, in record time, meant building a broad, sound foundation, meant an expansion in quartermaster military personnel from less than 100,000 in 1941 to well over 400,000 as of today. The planning, the procurement, and the tabulation facilities had to keep pace and at the same time function smoothly. The expansion in storage and distribution facilities was fantastic. The handling of this expansion of personnel from a basic group of a few trained Regular Army officers and men is a story of business efficiency unparalleled in history. Global problems were upon us. We had no precedent and no formula. We had nothing to guide us but our World War experience, and that was wholly inadequate. The comparison of shipping all supplies to one front, landing on friendly shores, with unimpaired docking and warehousing facilities waiting and ready was a simple problem in comparison. To feed, equip, clothe, and transport many millions of men to hostile shores, to hundreds of places, to every conceivable type of climate, with practically no facilities for handling these mountains of supplies at many destinations, presented a problem so vast, so complicated, so difficult that it was a challenge to the resourcefulness, and to the courage and ability of any man. General Gregory faced it. He analyzed it. He went into action.

He combed the Army for outstanding men. He surveyed the Reserve lists. He checked the records of retired officers. He went into the fields of industry, of science, of transportation. He left no stone unturned. He gathered together an organization of experts—hard-hitting, hard-working men—and welded them into a smoothly functioning organization. The successful performance of this group is a great tribute to the organizing genius of the Quartermaster General.

The heart and soul of this organization, the very lifeblood itself, is the division responsible for the distribution to the soldier. To provide the necessities with which to feed, clothe, and equip the boys in the fox holes of the Marshalls, the mountainsides of Italy, or in the camps in our country, in the jungles, the deserts, or the Arctic, is the responsibility of this division, headed by Maj. Gen. Frank F. Scowden, a very able and outstanding man.

The pulse beat of Quartermaster Corps operations, the tingling day-by-day integration of logistics, with tactics and strategy, the split-second exactitude of meeting D-day and H-hour with the right load of supplies has become a matter of daily routine with the Storage and Distribution Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General.

The division performs as its name implies. Behind flat-topped desks, the plans are laid for mountains of supplies, to be delivered to our boys. From dry stacks of statistics are boiled out the factors of a fast-moving amphibious landing of supplies on a hostile beachhead.

If the Quartermaster Corps stores an item, the Storage and Distribution Division is affected; if the Quartermaster Corps distributes an item, the Division is concerned. Whether it be tent pins on Tarawa, or mattresses for Mignano, at some phase of the operation of supply will the pipe line travel through the Storage and Distribution Division.

Behind the headlines that name this war as one of supply, the Storage and Distribution Division has developed a functional organization to utilize America's vast supply resources to their utmost.

When additional storage space became a necessity, the Division expanded its available space in strategic domestic locations from less than 8,000,000 to more than 40,000,000 square feet; when items of supply began to be multiplied by millions instead of hundreds, Storage and Distribution Division experts devised a new system of stock control, or as more closely defines it, distribution control.

At the outbreak of hostilities it was not known exactly to what theater of operations supplies might be shipped. Yet these supplies had to be immediately available for shipment anywhere. It was essential to develop packing which would provide protection for supplies shipped to the tropic, temperate, and frigid zones. These supplies were subject to open storage, the heat and humidity of the tropics, insect infestation, extreme cold, rain, and snow. It was essential that they be packed in sizes which would permit handling by one man, under battle conditions with no material handling equipment available.

Officers were sent overseas to gain first-hand information of the condition upon arrival of supplies and the conditions encountered in these operations. Civilian experts were brought to Washington as advisors. One man who had been in charge of packing and crating for a large mail-order house for 35 years; another who had been in charge of similar work for a corporation which does a tremendous amount of export business; a third expert had been chief engineer for one of the largest fiber-box manufacturing companies in the country, charged with that organization's research and development; still another who had been employed for a great many years with a company whose business is to devise and develop improved containers for the leading industrial concerns in the United States.

Out of the pressure of wartime necessity the Quartermaster Corps has developed a new-type box 15 times stronger than the nailed wood and weatherproof solid fiber container—a box which conserves critical material yet withstands the rigors of warfare.

A container which is completely waterproof and which will float in water over an extended period of time.

A camouflaged container in conjunction with the Corps of Engineers—camouflaged, not by the troops in the field, but actually during manufacture—packaging methods which have reduced the consumption of critical metal strapping by approximately 60 percent.

The importance of baling all compressible items was soon recognized because of the saving in space of from 33 to 50 percent. To accomplish this vital saving, the total quantity of bales produced each week has increased a minimum of tenfold. There is now being produced an average of 100,000 bales per week in all depots, each bale covered with only 75 percent of the amount of material once used.

All warehousing operations within quartermaster depots have been standardized, and a continuous program of employee training on the job has been developed and actuated in each of the depots. Hundreds of women have been trained as fork-lift operators, warehouse-tractor operators, packers, balers, markers, and checkers. By early adoption of the mechanical materials handling system, and the employment of women, the Quartermaster Corps was able to replace the heavy losses of men to the armed services, without interruption of operations or loss of efficiency.

In July 1943, after approximately 1 year of operational experience, the Space Control Section developed a new plan for

the use by the War Department of commercial storage. This plan, informally known as the Cleveland plan, has recently been approved by headquarters, Army Service Forces, and is now being placed in use throughout the country.

Under the Cleveland plan, commercial warehouse officers are appointed at each of the 15 regional depots and act through the commanding officers of such depots as representatives of the Quartermaster General for the purpose of contracting for commercial storage and its control. Under this plan, contracts are made with all commercial warehouses in a city whose facilities are found suitable after inspection on an individual basis, thereby permitting free, unrestricted competition. Use of storage under this plan permits greater dispersal of supplies, increases the amount of storage space available to the War Department without cost except when actually used, and allows wider use of railroad in-transit privileges.

The problem of storage was being met. Space for storage was being enlarged, the supplies were arriving in good condition. The flow in and out of depots was under efficient mechanical control. The supplies were moving. But were they moving in the right amount? The flow was being syphoned into some 1,100 posts, camps, and stations.

Such diversified items as flags, money bags, blankets, asbestos mittens, rubber boots, tent pins, lanterns, axes, typewriters—they were all needed, these and many more, to make a division self-sustaining under all conditions.

Once a unit is outfitted, the quartermaster cannot stop and say, "My work is done." His work is just beginning. For as the new unit moves through its training program, show-down inspections are held, inspections at which all the equipment of all the men is on display. Each item is rigorously inspected not only by unit commanders, but by inspectors from Washington, and as shortages are discovered, rush calls go out for replacement, which means the quartermaster must find more equipment, and quickly. Finally comes word that the unit is to prepare for movement to a port of embarkation area ready to go across. It is "alerted." And the inspections of equipment are "sweated out" by officers and men alike. A new factor enters the equipment problem. Items which are completely serviceable for training may not be adequate for combat. And those items have to be sorted out from the thousands upon tens of thousands of pieces of equipment in the unit. The men who furnish our troops with quartermaster supplies put in motion their vast machinery to find such replacements as are necessary.

Not only is the supply of these items of clothing and equipment necessary, but the "chow line" is equally important, for food is ammunition and it must be used wisely. The soldier must eat, and the civilian must eat. And it is the responsibility of the quartermaster to see that a balance is maintained, that food supplies are controlled and distributed carefully, and that they are bought under strict supervision, stored under the most modern methods of preservation, and cooked according to the highest standards of kitchen skill and sanitation.

In the American Army the responsibility for supplying the Army's food rests with the Subsistence Branch, Storage and Distribution Division. Like other branches of the far-flung Quartermaster Corps organization, it has its headquarters in Washington, but operates through numerous field installations that honeycomb the United States and extend to all areas where our Army troops are stationed.

The activities of the Subsistence Branch begin with a predetermination of requirements, in pounds of food, for every anticipated circumstance of Army operation. When required, new foods and new methods of processing or packaging are developed. The branch procures, inspects, transports, stores, and issues the Army's food supplies; prepares regulations covering the accounting for sales, issues, and losses; prepares and defends the subsistence budget; prepares menus upon which Army meals are based; trains bakers, cooks, mess sergeants, mess officers, mess supervisors, and food-service program officers; writes specifications for foods and containers; initiates conservation measures; and maintains a constant check on all food operations from beginning to end.

Some idea of the size of this undertaking from the procurement angle alone may be gleaned from the Army's procurements. It is necessary to supply approximately 5 pounds of food per soldier per day. This represents the actual procurement, processing, storage, and delivery every 24 hours of approximately 37,500,000 pounds of food for immediate consumption. Simultaneously, additional millions of pounds must be similarly handled for reserve for future consumption.

The problem of planning meals to meet the nutritional needs of active, hard-fighting young men—the one group in our Nation representing the biggest eaters—is tremendous. Nearly 8,000,000 different appetites to be satisfied add additional complications, since it is necessary not only to furnish food that is healthy and strength-building but also food that is sufficiently appealing to be eaten.

In continental United States, the ration service in the mess halls is known as field ration A. This is the regular daily ration of three meals, cooked, prepared, and served to the troops. Overseas, outside the actual combat zone, the ration generally used is field ration B, which is similar to A except that it utilizes nonperishable foods. Both rations are served in mess halls or temporary mess tents. Soldiers beyond the reach of such facilities receive packaged field rations, the main ones being the C, the K, the 10-in-1, the life-raft ration, and the D.

The C ration—first to be developed in the national emergency preceding our entry into the present war—consists of six cans of food. There of these known as B units, contain biscuits, hard candy, sugar, and either powdered coffee, lemon juice powder, or cocoa, all readily soluble in hot or cold water. The other three contain a meat combination, usually meat and vegetable stew, meat and beans, or meat and spaghetti, and are known as M units. One M and one B unit make a complete meal. At least one of the B units also contains cigarettes.

The C ration is designed to present a full-scale meal in as compact a form as practicable; one that can be carried by a soldier in his pack; that can be eaten either hot or cold, and is so packaged that vast quantities also can easily be delivered to troops in the fighting zone. While it is compact, it is not a concentrated ration and a soldier realizes that he is eating a full-fledged meal.

The K ration, on the other hand, is a condensed ration which supplies a maximum of nourishment in a minimum of space while still supplying three meals per day. Furnished in three oblong paper-packaged units weighing an aggregate of a fraction over 2 pounds, the K ration was originally developed for use by parachute troopers as a substitute for the C. It was found so valuable, however, that it soon was expanded to function as a regular combat ration for all field troops.

Individual packages, all designed to withstand long periods of storage without appreciable change in flavor, texture, consistency, and appearance, are supplied for breakfast, dinner, and supper, but may be interchanged at the will of the individual soldier.

Each K ration unit contains two types of biscuits; a beverage in the form of soluble coffee, lemon juice powder, cocoa, or beef bouillon; a principal canned dish such as meat, cheese spread, canned ham and eggs, and so forth; sugar cubes or hard candy, chewing gum, cigarettes, and either a dried fruit bar or a concentrated chocolate bar. This ration supplies more than 3,500 calories per day, which is only slightly less than that provided in the regular mess hall meals.

The uses of the K ration are virtually universal. It is carried in the soldier's pack and eaten by him in fox holes and pillboxes. It fits easily, in fair quantities, in so small a vehicle as the quarter-ton jeep, or in the crowded space of a tank. It can be rapidly supplied in quantities by truck, barge, or pack mule, and is probably the most versatile all-purpose individual ration used by any army in the world.

For the information of the Senators present I will say that the other day rations of the K type, for breakfast, dinner, and supper, were distributed to their offices. It is the hope of the Quartermaster's division of the War Department that each Senator will use the rations for a day in order that he may know at first hand what the soldier in the front lines in various parts of the world is furnished in the form of sustaining food.

The Subsistence Branch began research on dehydration several years before the outbreak of the war. In 1941 the Department of Agriculture was informed of the dehydrated items in which the Army was interested, and early in 1942, the Quartermaster Corps conducted

an extensive survey of dehydration facilities in the United States, which resulted in establishment of a comprehensive food dehydration program. Here also the policies are determined, requirements estimated, procurement directives issued, research initiated on many problems, specifications written in cooperation with other offices, and other activities administered and supervised.

The Quartermaster Corps is waging an unceasing campaign to prevent and eliminate food waste, with a view to putting every ounce of Army food to gainful use and to take from the Nation's food supply only so much as is absolutely necessary. Many of these efforts are now consolidated on an Army-wide scale through the new Food Service Program. However, the Quartermaster Corps began its conservation activities more than 2 years before this program was put into operation.

Under the direction of Major General Scowden and the chief of the branch, the Subsistence Branch has played an important role in the continual battle to save time, shipping space, critical materials, food and money, but its major achievement has been supplying the best-fed Army in the world.

The new-packaged field rations probably represent the greatest forward step in Army feeding in world history. For the first time, real meals with wide variety and excellent taste appeal are furnished to the men in the fighting zone. Even that great American breakfast favorite, ham and eggs, has been put in cans.

There is no denying that the huge food requirements of the Army have an important bearing on civilian food supplies. However, the tendency to attribute any and all food shortages to Army buying is unfounded.

During the calendar year 1943 the Army consumed a little more than 12,000,000,000 pounds of food, compared with more than 163,000,000,000 pounds by civilians. Even in the case of canned fruits and vegetables, which are absolutely indispensable in theaters of operations, the Army procured 18 percent of the total annual pack.

The Army procured about 2,750,000,000 pounds of meat during the year—about 12 percent of the total production. Other Army requirements include about 8 percent of the sugar, 7 percent of the potatoes, 15 percent of the coffee, and 11 percent of the butter. If the Army used no butter at all, each civilian would have only about half an ounce more a week.

The Subsistence Branch is endeavoring faithfully to serve two masters—the Army, to whom it owes the obligation of providing food, and the civilian for whom it is endeavoring to save as much food as possible while at the same time properly feeding the civilian's sons, brothers, husbands, and fathers in the Army. To the Army it pledges the right kind of food, in sufficient quantities, at the right time and place. To the civilian it pledges the world's best-fed Army and the utmost cooperation in stabilizing the Nation's food supply.

The Clothing and Equipage Branch presents some amazing figures. Including garments of all kinds for men and women, for all climates, this branch stocks and distributes 500 different clothing items in 6,500 sizes, and 186 separate items of personal equipment. Their excellent handling of this exacting problem is attested by the spic and span appearance of our men and women in their well-fitting uniforms, and the high standard of health prevailing in our Army.

When we consider the complex problems of having clothing for the Arctic, the jungle, the desert, the moderate climate, for rain and snow, for paratroopers, ski and mountain troops, for nurses, for WAC's—with shoes and boots for every purpose—we begin to realize what a great job the men and women have accomplished in this clothing and equipage branch.

Between 4,000 and 4,500 carloads of clothing and equipage items are distributed monthly, and in November 1943, 83,911,706 items were distributed, including:

Socks, wool, light	6,640,754
Socks, cotton, tan	6,495,264
Drawers, cotton, shorts	4,118,337
Trousers, H. B. T	2,145,300
Undershirts, summer	2,138,878
Shirts, cotton, khaki	2,119,911
Trousers, cotton, khaki	2,112,470
Jackets, H. B. T	1,947,727
Shirts, wool	1,665,001

In a recent month, issues of equipage included:

Blankets	1,551,600
Canteens	786,100
Knives	687,900
Canvas cots	332,300
Cartridge belts	348,700

How do all these items of clothing and equipage find their way into the hands of American fighting men at the right time and in the right amount? It is no accident, and it is no haphazard job. The clothing and equipage branch of the storage and distribution division is behind every move that is made.

One other very important subject, I should like to touch on only briefly. If the enemy should ever use gas against our troops—and God forbid—he will find that we are ready! Protective clothing is ready and waiting at every point of contact with the enemy—protection from head to foot for every American man and woman. We are completely prepared for such a situation on every front where American troops are fighting.

Supplying our forces overseas is a major problem of distribution. Not only are the supply lines much longer, but the utmost secrecy must surround all movements of supplies lest future operations be revealed. When plans were laid for the invasion of north Africa, the services of 34 civilians and 3 officers were required to collect the necessary supplies at ports of embarkation, but at no time prior to the actual landing of our forces in north Africa did any of the persons involved have any idea of the ultimate destination of their supplies.

Overseas supply is further complicated by sudden demands resulting from local climatic conditions or from tactical considerations. Thus, one theater of operations called for 300,000 pairs of shoes immediately. They were packed, marked, and delivered to the port of embarkation within 48 hours from the time the request was received. Again, a request was received for 5,000 pairs of boots which had never before been built in this country. They were designed, built, and at the port within 6 days. In March 1943, in response to requests from overseas commanders, the nurses' winter uniform was changed from blue to olive drab for overseas theaters, effective July 1, 1943. In 3 months, patterns and designs were changed and the uniform was ready for issue. For nurses going overseas, the new uniform was available in staging areas, and large quantities have been sent abroad to replace blue uniforms.

And there are other examples! In the summer of 1943 shipments of white items to overseas bases was stopped for camouflage reasons. Since time immemorial, the Army towels have been of the white commercial type, and the productive capacity of the towel industry was not sufficient to change overnight to the new olive-drab shade. So, a method of dyeing a portion of the white towels on hand was developed in the Office of the Quartermaster General and approximately 500,000 towels were dyed by small war plants which were sorely in need of Government contracts. White underwear also had to be changed, and it was necessary to set up two entirely different programs for the storage and issue of underwear—one for white and one for olive drab—with the overseas troops given preference for the new shade.

No far-flung organization, no matter how carefully its operations are planned, nor how efficiently they are supervised, can continue to operate indefinitely on a single pattern. Circumstances alter cases, and operations and procedures must be changed to conform with new needs and new developments.

This is more than ever true in the case of an organization whose operations have been expanded so rapidly as have those of the Quartermaster Corps. Growing pains are to be expected. When these are experienced, the Inspection Division makes the diagnosis and often suggests the cure.

Although it is the smallest staff division of the Office of the Quartermaster General, its activities are nevertheless far-reaching in their effects. Not only does this division "inspect" field installations of the Quartermaster Corps in the accepted usage of the word. Its activities are constructive. Its representatives go into the field with a different objective. Their mission is not merely to find something wrong and report. Rather they look for things which can be done better, with greater efficiency.

Someone had to perform reclamation work for the Army—an enormous undertaking. Shoes, clothing, and other critical items had great salvage possibilities. The task was delegated to service installations, and now a large-scale reclamation program is in full operation, saving millions of dollars to taxpayers.

The Army had to have horses and mules. The Service Installations Division is seeing to it that the Army gets

them. The Army had to have war dogs. The Division sees to it that the Army gets them—and well trained at that.

Let us take a look into another money-saving program inaugurated by the Quartermaster General through the Service Installations Division. The project is now a function of the Army Service Forces and until its recent transfer from Quartermaster jurisdiction was known as the Salvage Branch. Its accomplishments, wholly in the Quartermaster General's Office, are reviewed to October 1943.

A reduction of edible refuse by approximately one-half through improved mess utilization was accomplished by the Quartermaster General in the fiscal year 1943.

Segregation of refuse food discarded from messes is another noteworthy step in the Army's economy program. Garbage for feeding is segregated from greases, bones, and meat scrap for rendering, thereby bringing higher prices from breeders of pork and renderers. In the fiscal year 1942 total sales of this type refuse amounted to $400,000. A year later eight times this amount was realized from the sale of refuse food when total sales for the fiscal year 1943 amounted to $3,200,000. Of course, the Army had grown in size. It is estimated the annual return in cash from this source for the fiscal year 1944 will be $6,000,000.

Activities of this salvage group did not stop here. Many foods are packed in cans. Why could not these cans be salvaged? They could be and they were, with inauguration of another program which resulted in salvaging two-thirds of Army cans in the fiscal year 1943. The remaining cans were donated to War Production Board Committees or sold to small detinning plants, shredders, and bottle-cap manufacturers.

Varied as they are, the activities of the Quartermaster Corps do not overshadow each other in importance. All are equally important and equally necessary to maintain an army. Just as it is necessary to feed and clothe the armed forces, so it is necessary to care for the dead. And so, this sad task is delegated to the Quartermaster General, who handles it with delicate and dignified thoroughness.

The Memorial Branch keeps records of all deaths in the Army and sees that the bodies of our fallen heroes are properly prepared, shipped, and interred in accordance with the wishes of the next of kin. In wartime, when it is not feasible to return the remains from overseas battlefields, the Branch makes record of the place of burial. It sees to it that graves are properly marked and that identification is accurate. That proper and dignified honors are paid to the deceased is insured, since this branch is charged with that work. Caskets are draped with a flag and remain so until the moment when the remains are about to be lowered to their final resting place. Then the flag is removed and, following the impressive ceremonies, the flag is given as a memorial to the next of kin.

Even after this has been done the Branch does everything possible to ease the sorrow of the hero's loved ones. It erects, upon application, a Government headstone inscribed with name, rank, organization, and date of death over the grave. If interment is made in a private city or village cemetery, application from next of kin is necessary. If burial is in a national cemetery, steps are taken to have the Government stone erected at the grave without application from the next of kin.

An important and interesting subject is gasoline and oil supply. Army vehicles from jeeps to tanks, now smashing the Axis on a world-wide offensive, are powered by gasoline supplied by the Fuels and Lubricants Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General.

In can and drum, in tanker load, and rail car, the white lightning that keeps mechanized equipment moving flows out to the fighting fronts in a never-ceasing stream.

Gasoline, Diesel fuel, kerosene, lubricating oil—250 different petroleum products, are the lifeblood of modern-day mobile warfare. Against the vehicles they power, World War No. 1 weapons are as bows and arrows against guns and cannon.

The activities of the Fuels and Lubricants Division are as varied as they are complicated. It buys, stores, and distributes more than 10,000,000 tons of coal a year to heat Army barracks and power Army industrial equipment in all parts of the United States as on battle fronts on the other side of the world.

World War No. 2, now variously titled total war, global war, blitzkrieg, and quartermasters' war, may well be titled by future historians as the great petroleum war. The soldier of today, whether he wears the uniform of the Allies or of the Axis, is so totally dependent on petroleum products in some form that the entire measure of an Army's success can virtually be gaged by reference to its petroleum supplies. The report of the five Senators who visited the various theaters of war in their trip around the world indicated the importance of petroleum, not only in this war but in other possible engagements in the years to come.

The American war machine, resting as it does on the foundation of the country that leads the entire world both in petroleum resources and mechanical production, is proportionately the most highly mechanized in the world. As a result, its success or failure is inextricably bound to the adequacy and efficiency of its petroleum supply. Mighty armored tanks burn gasoline; so do one-pound ski tent stoves. American soldiers and their material move by railroad, truck, and transport ships. They present an insistent demand for gasoline, motor oil, grease, and other lubricants.

The Quartermaster General, under directions to accomplish definite gasoline storage reserves at strategic points throughout the continental United States, has received the cooperation of industry to provide these reserves as an integral part of their reserve working levels, rather than accomplish direct purchases and pay rental charges on storage facilities. Under this arrangement the gasoline so earmarked is regularly used and replaced by industry and not left idle to deteriorate in quality. This working agreement will net an annual saving of more than $3,000,000 and relieve the War Department of all responsibility for physical protection.

Mr. President, a comprehensive study of the Army's requirements with the present methods of delivery has disclosed an improved method for inviting bids and awarding contracts which will save the War Department more than $200,000 a year on transportation for gasoline alone. A similar saving in a lesser amount is expected when the new method is applied to fuel oil deliveries.

Procurement of necessary food and equipment is, of course, a major function of the Quartermaster Corps. Procurement of materials is effected through 22 Quartermaster Corps and Army Service Forces Depots located all over the United States. Procurement of food is effected through 37 gigantic marketing centers and 20 field buying offices distributed in relation to their proximity to troop concentrations and sources of perishable foods. These centers are linked by teletype with the coordinating office in Chicago. Through this organization Army experts are immediately in touch with all of America's markets, and are able to take advantage of every possible factor to insure the steady and adequate flow of food to the troops.

At the same time this distribution of the buying activity tends to cushion its impact upon the market and makes for stabilization of production and prices.

Once clothing, equipment, or non-perishable foods have been procured, the Quartermaster Corps is faced with the great problem of transportation, warehousing, and storage. The size of this problem is simply illustrated by the fact that each soldier eats approximately 5 pounds of food a day. To be sure that he will get that 5 pounds of food the Quartermaster Corps has to keep on hand a daily food load of about 10,000,000,000 pounds. To this must be added millions of tons of equipment, which must be stored, protected, and finally delivered to the soldier in training or at the front.

Actually the Procurement Division must work about 270 days in advance, and the ration which the fighting soldier at the front is eating today started with him as its objective 9 months ago. The reason for this is as follows: A supply of food adequate for Army needs for 15 days always is in transit to depots, and hence unavailable for immediate consumption. Similarly a 65 days' supply is always in storage at depots or ports of embarkation awaiting transshipment to theaters of operation. A 30-day supply is afloat, on the way to the troops abroad. Food for American troops fighting the world around is sent to several strategically located points in Allied territory, where facilities for its storing and handling are adequate. From these central points it must travel to the theaters of immediate operation, and a 92-day supply is always in storage or transit abroad. At the front, where danger of encirclement of troops or of their temporary inaccessibility to supply lines exists, a supply

sufficient for 45 days always is held in reserve. Finally, to compensate for inevitable food losses due to enemy activity, a 25-day extra supply is necessary. This will explain, then, why the Quartermaster Corps has to be nearly a year ahead of the front line troops in its operations.

A slightly different but equally important condition exists in the matter of supplying clothing and equipment as well as nonperishable foods. This is a global war characterized by lightning operation. Commanders are constantly on the lookout for weak points in the enemy's defenses, and now that our troops are on the offensive and conducting an invasion, sudden developments may and do make it necessary to rush great masses of fighting men to entirely new theaters of war virtually overnight.

When such a contingency arises, the important thing is to get the troops to the place where there is fighting to be done in the shortest possible time. Transportation facilities simply cannot be burdened with the task of moving huge quantities of food and equipment at the same time they are moving the troops. To meet this problem the Quartermaster Corps has vast reserves of every conceivable kind of food and equipment stored all over the world. These concentrations are, of course, located at strategic points where they can be rushed to any area in which they are needed.

The story of the research and development activities of the Quartermaster Corps is fabulous. Few who hear these words will be the fortunate possessors of a million dollars, but if they had fifty millions they could not buy or hire the brains, scientific training, experience, and "know how" which go into providing the American doughboy with the finest, safest, most comfortable, and most efficient equipment in the world.

Many times the Quartermaster Corps is called upon to produce something which does not exist and which must be invented.

One of the first of these invention problems was to provide the men in the Arctic with sleeping bags. It was easy for the occasional explorers who went into these frigid areas to get nice warm sleeping bags, filled with down, because they needed relatively few of them. But there was neither enough fur nor enough down to make the hundreds of thousands of lightweight and warm sleeping bags needed by American soldiers.

The problem has been solved. A scientist, cooperating with the Quartermaster Corps, put some feathers into a ball race. This is a machine in which steel balls roll again and again at high speed over the feathers, reducing them to tiny particles. He then took the powdered feathers out of the ball race and by employing air under pressure freed them from the relatively heavy and useless stems. The result was a highly efficient down which had requisite lightness, would keep the men comfortable, and which could be produced in almost any desired quantity.

While this was happening, other experts were concentrating on solving problems arising from jungle warfare. Leather shoes or boots simply wore out. In the constant steaming heat and moisture of the jungle, shoes of leather would rot off the soldier's feet in a couple of weeks.

As a result of experimentation, a special jungle boot is supplied to the American soldier today. It has a rubber sole and a canvas top. It successfully resists destruction by climatic conditions, allows the soldier's foot to "breathe," thus contributing to his comfort and safety, and makes him an efficient fighting man in an element which was strange to him only yesterday.

The inventions and developments which have come from the Quartermaster Corps are legion. Today's soldier has an all-purpose soap with which he may bathe, wash his clothes, shave, do the dishes, and, if he desires, brush his teeth. And it is efficient in hot or cold water, fresh or salt, hard or soft. He has a little waterproof match case with a compass set in the top, so that he can find his way if separated from his unit. He carries a solid fuel tablet with his emergency rations, and can prepare a hot meal anywhere. The tablet gives high heat value, will burn in a fair wind with little visible flame, and does not generate toxic gases or smoke.

Cleanliness is vital to the soldier. It is of superimportance in areas of extreme weather. To meet this problem the Quartermaster Corps operates more than 200 fixed laundries, 57 of them having dry-cleaning facilities. In addition, it operates hundreds of mobile laundries and mobile bathing units. These mobile units follow right behind the advancing troops, hook up their water systems with a convenient river or well, and wash the clothing while the soldier waits. This field service is, of course, free, but even when stationed on post in a noncombatant area any soldier may have his laundry done for a flat price of $1.50 a month, regardless of how much or how little he sends.

In all wars, of course, vermin have been a constant threat to the troops, spreading disease and robbing them of rest. In the modern American Army, wherever possible stations are maintained where clothing may quickly be freed of infestation. But for troops deep in the jungle or high on glaciers, these stations are inaccessible. For their use, therefore, the Quartermaster Corps furnishes a waterproof bag and a small ampule of chemicals. The soldier puts his clothes in the bag along with the glass ampule, seals the bag, and then breaks the ampule by hitting it with a rock or striking it on the ground. This releases the chemicals, which form a gas. A half hour later he can take his clothes out, air them briefly, and put them on again secure in the knowledge that all vermin have been destroyed.

Other activities in the field that operate under the direction of the Office of the Quartermaster General include inspections, manpower problems, Army-Navy E and Agricultural A awards, and similar responsibilities.

The Fiscal Division determines the funds required to carry out the programs decided upon, makes its presentation to higher authority in the War Department, and joins other divisions in explaining requests for appropriations to congressional committees.

All Quartermaster Corps staff work rests with the office of the Quartermaster General. As the staff officer of the Commanding General, Army Service Forces, the Quartermaster General also directs and supervises the Army food-service program, and many of the Army's schools for bakers and cooks.

The streamlining of organization and the elimination of everything not necessary to ever-increasing production and supply for our Army has been an objective of the Organization, Planning, and Control Division ever since it was added to the office of the Quartermaster General as a staff group.

Today the Quartermaster Corps is rounding off its organization. Like the rest of the Army, the Quartermaster Corps has nearly completed its building-up job. With many Herculean jobs already behind it the men of the corps now turn to the main job of knocking out the enemy. Men of the Quartermaster Corps are equipped to combat and work just as well as they are trained to staff and supply. They look forward with confidence to whichever job they may be called on to do at any time.

There are scores of special service schools under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General, including many that are sponsored by leading industrial firms at their plants throughout the country. Also, schools at leading colleges and universities, civilian-trade schools, and many special courses in numerous Quartermaster installations, all contribute importantly to the knowledge and efficiency of the Quartermaster Corps.

One of the most important and interesting phases of military training in the present conflict is the widespread and intensive program of training dogs for military use.

The Quartermaster Corps, in cooperation with Dogs for Defense, Inc., instituted a program in 1941 for the training of war dogs to perform specialized duty. Selected animals were trained to act in one of six ways, sentry, messenger, sledge, pack, scout, or first aid.

After completing their training, the dogs are utilized by all of the armed forces, including the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Marine Corps, and in war production plants.

War dog reception and training centers were established at San Carlos, Calif.; Fort Robinson, Nebr.; Rimini, Mont.; Beltsville, Md.; Gulfport, Miss.; and Front Royal, Va.

Before any dog was accepted by the Army for military training, the animal was given a thorough investigation and examination to ascertain his fitness for service. If the dog was acceptable, he was inducted and processed through the military organization in much the same manner as men who were chosen through the Selective Service System. The dog upon arrival at the dog reception center would be given an Army serial number, close medical care by experienced veterinarians, inoculations, and a period of

confinement to make certain that there would be no chance of possible disease.

After this preliminary processing, the dog would be trained by one man, who from then on would be his master. Training was simultaneous for both man and dog in order that they would get to know each other's habits and idiosyncrasies, and would form a perfect team. These splendid animals have performed magnificently under fire and great hardships.

The Quartermaster Corps has become the largest purchaser of athletic and recreational equipment in America. This equipment is being used by the Special Services Division of the Army Service Forces for the entertainment and relaxation of soldiers in camps at home and overseas. The Quartermaster Corps is now procuring about 95 percent of all types of athletic equipment now being produced in the country at the rate of about $12,000,000 a year and is buying more specific types of athletic equipment than was ever before produced in the history of the industry.

The morale of the American soldier is unsurpassed! As an aid to this high standard, the Quartermaster Corps is indispensable. Good food and plenty of it, proper clothing, good shoes and good equipment on time, and the soldier is bolstered for the difficult job ahead. The quartermaster does not stop there, however, in the unceasing effort to keep the morale high. One million K rations, now being distributed, are wrapped in a small booklet entitled, "Hymns from Home." Twelve nondenominational hymns and the Twenty-third Psalm are in this folder. These fighting men will enjoy these familiar church hymns, selected by a committee of chaplains from the Chaplain Corps.

The soldier must also have books and magazines in colossal quantities, and that is a project of the quartermaster, as purchasing agent for Special Services. A Council on Books in Wartime, a nonprofit organization, has been organized to handle the publishing of special editions of popular books. With the assistance of this new organization, approximately 18,000,000 small editions of popular books are being purchased yearly at an average cost of only 8 cents per book for novels which normally sell for $2.50 and $3.

I have given a brief synopsis of some of the functions of the Quartermaster Corps. I hope I have conveyed to the Senate some of the human drama and the personal service this splendid Corps provides in its extensive operation. I hope that when my colleagues hear the expression that "the Quartermaster General is both father and mother to the boys in our Army," this talk will have given them a deeper appreciation of the importance of this branch of our Army to all the boys wearing khaki.

That is the story of the Quartermaster Corps; a fine, capable fighting organization whose imperishable record of achievement in this global war is one in which virtually every American has shared, and one of which every American can be proud. The Corps has a tremendous job to do in the days ahead, and I am confident they will "take it in stride." They will continue to deliver the goods, whatever the obstacles before them. To quote again from the pledge of General Gregory—"Wherever they go—to whatever point American fighting men penetrate—quartermasters will be by their sides to keep them rolling to victory."

Mr. President, in these remarks I have presented a brief picture of the work of the Quartermaster Corps, which to my mind is a life line of 8,000,000 fighting Americans all over the world. The story is not an exciting one; perhaps in the eyes of some it is not a dramatic story; but it is a story of something which affects the lives and the welfare of your boy and mine.

As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, more than 50 percent of the Members of the Senate have boys in the armed services. They are on all fronts. The Senate is a cross section of America. The sons of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] have made the supreme sacrifice in their Nation's cause.

We have a very definite interest in this matter. The public is interested. Homes all over America from which boys have gone are interested. Those who follow the story will have a close-up of how their boys live, and how the necessities of life are provided for them.

This story is an inspiration to me, and in my opinion it is something which should have been told. As I read of the dramatic activities of the war effort today, and about all the more publicized branches of the Army, they have my highest commendation, they are doing a great job, but, in my judgment, the "Fighting Quartermasters" in a less dramatic way are contributing their bit to the success of the fighting forces all over the world. I pay them this tribute on the floor of the Senate.

I have stated facts which I have ascertained as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, and the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having to do with War Department appropriations.

Let me say again, in conclusion, that a day or two ago Senators were furnished some K rations, breakfast, dinner, and supper. I hope all will take them home and live on them for a day, so they will have an idea first-hand of what the American soldier is living on at the fighting fronts today.

NONE SHALL ESCAPE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the indulgence of the Senate for a few words preliminary to a resolution which I shall submit.

The tide of battle has turned against a ship of evil state. We, in America, shall one day witness the foundering of that vessel of infamy which we know by the name of world fascism. Today, as the lightning of retribution strikes, now in one place, now in another, there is enacted on board that doomed ship an old scene.

The rats, it appears, are getting ready to leave.

From the capitals of world fascism the lines already are reaching out. Already the guilty, those who set in motion and led the deadly march upon the lands and homes of others, have made preparation for flight. With the foresight of dishonor they have shipped funds beyond the borders of their own country. But the peace-loving nations, looking to the future, must declare, "None shall escape."

Already through their emissaries they have purchased secluded villas, out-of-the-way havens. They have planted old accomplices in new places of refuge. And already their collaborators, those who have tried to keep alive the running sores of this infection in our own and other free nations, are looking out for the safety of the master carriers.

The rats, it appears, are getting ready to nest anew in the dark crannies of a war-weary world.

Mr. President, it is germane to the very meaning of our terms of unconditional surrender of the enemy powers that their leaders and the craven underlings who have perpetrated great crimes in this war be brought to justice before the world. It is implicit in the ultimate victory of freemen over the murderous generals of slavery, Mr. President, that from the steady, even hand of freemen's justice, none shall escape.

But they will try. For all Fascist leaders and their lieutenants the world over, there will be one last retreat according to plan—according, Mr. President, to a great many well-laid plans.

It is an old formula for the defeated in war. Kings abdicate. Erstwhile tyrants, unseated by their enemies, take flight in the hope of living out their days quietly in exile.

And these usurpers, these bloody fingered caricatures of ruling power, see no reason why they, too, should not be allowed to pack up their medals and their gold braid—yes, and their revolvers and hangman's gear—and make for peaceful places where, so they hope, the awful burden of their own guilt will not overtake them.

We, in America, cannot see history repeating itself. We are inclined to look at the question of a proper disposal of these Fascist leaders from especial angles which they themselves may have forgotten.

When we think of our imperial enemies across the Pacific, we look at the question by way of Pearl Harbor.

When we wonder what should be done with Emperor Hirohito and with Premier Tojo and their colleagues, should they become our prisoners of war, we cannot strike from our minds the recollection of certain executions of American aviators who had once become their prisoners of war.

And printed in our history books, and graven forever in our hearts, will be another picture given us by Tojo and his nation. It is an incident of the war which we have captioned the "March of death." Our men were the marchers. Our men died. It is natural that this picture should remain with us.

Hideki Tojo and his men have made a place for themselves in our most vivid memories. There they will live long. They shall be dealt with justly. They shall be accorded their just due.

When we think of our enemies across the Atlantic, we remember Rotterdam and Warsaw, and a thousand other scenes which have been made memorable by Adolf Hitler and his assistants.

We are not able to erase from our minds those French and Dutch and Belgian hostages, noncombatants, who were shot down, a hundred for one.

We often think of Lidice.

We think of the gruesome sights that greeted the Russian armies returning to liberate the cities and towns of their homeland.

From all Europe, we have seen the smuggled photographs and we have heard the tragic accounts. We know the Germans, the fascists, are being remembered by others, too. We know that others, too, have resolved none shall escape.

When men bespeak their longing for the return of a just world, Mr. President, when they are beset with a longing for decency among nations and for government free of treachery to its own people, then they think of Norway. When we think of Norway we think of a man called Vidkun Quisling, who gave us something to remember him by when he betrayed his country to the Fascists. We have perpetuated his name in our dictionaries. He has already attained hateful immortality.

So with the others, the collaborationists, the camp followers of fascism, wherever they may have sold themselves into the service of this international underworld.

So with the gauleiters and the thugs in uniform—Elias in Belgium, Brauer in Crete, Roatta in Yugoslavia, Lyosz in Hungary, Panev in Bulgaria.

So with those who have risen to power in neutral countries through the evil offices of fascism and have paid the debt by subverting freedom's cause. They will have yet another account to settle; they have earned for themselves something more than mere oblivion.

So, too, with the smaller fry in this unsavory skillet, the corporals of crime, the amateur rapists, the apprentices in mass murder. It is well that we keep the record complete. It is well that we are resolved, when the day of reckoning comes, to leave no case on that record untried, to see that none shall escape.

America must do her full part not only to win the war but to punish international crime and to keep world law, order, and peace.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask consent to submit a resolution, which I shall read as follows:

Whereas the time has come when international brigandage which has brought on the present wars and been responsible for the perpetration of unspeakable crimes upon prisoners of war and innocent civilians must be suppressed; and

Whereas such international crime can never be effectively suppressed unless stern justice is dealt out to those who have committed such criminal acts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the United Nations shall make due arrangement and provision for the trial and punishment of those responsible for the war crimes of military aggression and private wrong committed during the war: And be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate of the United States that the Government of the United States shall take its full part in working out and executing plans concurred in by the United Nations for the trial and punishment of those guilty of the crimes of military aggression and atrocities committed during the war upon prisoners of war and civilians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 262) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DISPOSITION OF POST-WAR SURPLUS PROPERTY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, for a considerable time now the people of the United States have been deeply concerned with the post-war problems which our Nation shall be called upon to face. They are particularly hopeful that the Government will develop, and have ready for prompt application, appropriate and effective plans to deal with these various problems as they arise.

In this connection, Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has for more than a year been considering House bill 2795, which is directed toward the solution of one of our major post-war problems, namely, the controlled disposal of surplus wartime commodities.

This measure, after full and careful consideration, was passed by a substantial majority in the House of Representatives on June 9, 1943. Introduced in the Senate on the same day, the bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which committee, after proper hearings and careful study, reported the bill favorably to the Senate on February 1, legislative day, January 24, 1944. The bill has remained on the Senate Calendar since that time.

This bill is concerned with an urgent matter, Mr. President, and it is the consensus of your committee that the Senate should take early action on it, if a proper legislative basis for this program is to be prepared in time for its practical application.

The Baruch-Hancock report, dealing with a number of outstanding post-war issues, was released to the public on February 19, 1944, and that report has served to stimulate greatly the public interest in these important problems.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to discuss certain aspects of House bill 2795 upon which your Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has favorably reported.

On Saturday, February 19, the President released to the press a report submitted to him by Bernard M. Baruch and John M. Hancock, which deals at length with the numerous and complex problems which must be dealt with in the post-war era. These men with a competent staff have devoted considerable time and careful study to the compilation of this report, and their services to the Nation in this respect should be properly recognized.

The report itself covers the whole gamut of problems involved in demobilization and in the restoration of our peacetime economy. It provides a complete and comprehensive prescription of just what should be done and how it should be done not only by the executive branch of the Government but by the Congress as well.

It recommends:

The creation in the Office of War Mobilization of a new, most-important post which, for want of a better title, we would call a work director to unify the forces of the executive branch and to work with Congress on the whole human side of demobilization.

This new official would have complete authority in the fields of restoring to peacetime employment our demobilized war veterans, both sound and disabled, and of meeting the special employment problems involved in the great war industries where peace will bring mass displacement of workers.

The report next takes up the problem of settlement of terminated war contracts, and recommends that this phase be handled under a joint-contract termination board under rules or guiding principles which the report sets forth in considerable detail.

The report next recommends the immediate creation of a surplus property administrator in the Office of War Mobilization, to be appointed by the head of that Office, with full responsibility and adequate authority for dealing with all aspects of surplus disposal, and recommends that there be created to serve this new administrator, purely in an advisory capacity, a policy board composed, in addition to the administrator as chairman, of 12 representatives of various executive departments and agencies. It further recommends that surplus consumer goods be disposed of by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, that capital and producer goods, including all types of industrial property, plants, equipment, materials, and scrap, be disposed of through a corporation subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, that surplus ships and maritime properties be disposed of by the Maritime Commission, and that surplus food be disposed of by the Food Administrator.

The report next recommends a general tightening of the entire Government war machine for both mobilization and demobilization.

Based upon the assumed defeat of Germany on X-Day, it is proposed that the armed services and the War Production Board cooperate in the immediate preparation of an X-Day reconversion plan.

The prompt extension of war powers vested in the President is urgently recommended. Among such powers are those under the price-control law, the powers on which the functions of the War Production Board rests, and the requisitioning power of the President.

Numerous additional recommendations are contained in the report, among

them one for the earliest possible relaxation of governmental controls upon our civilian economy, another for special attention to the requirements of small business, and another for public-works programming.

I think that none of us would quarrel with the objectives set forth in the Baruch-Hancock report. They may be briefly stated as Victory first, and an orderly demobilization second. I wish to call particular attention at this time to only one segment of the report, namely, that dealing with the disposal of surplus war property.

I understand that the President has already issued an Executive order carrying out in full the Baruch-Hancock recommendations with respect to surplus war property, creating the new surplus war property administrator, surrounding him with a board composed exclusively of officials in the executive branch of the Government, and giving him the broadest of powers over the disposal of the tens of billions of dollars' worth of property in the possession of various Government agencies which will, soon we hope, be found surplus to their operating needs.

The report contemplated that the surplus property administrator would report to Congress as soon as possible on legislation that is needed, basing his recommendations on actual experience with the problems.

It would seem that the report and the indicated Executive action upon it overlook the fact that the Congress, in which the Constitution has vested complete control over the property of the United States, has for many months been engaged in serious and exhaustive study of the surplus property problem, and that legislation designed to deal with this problem is already far advanced in the legislative process.

On January 31, 1944, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported to the Senate, House bill 2795, the Property Management Act, 1944. This bill is No. 668 on the Senate Calendar.

House bill 2795 originated in the House of Representatives in the fall of 1942. The work upon it was, in fact, initiated by a report of a Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations headed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]—Senate Report No. 1554, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, July 22, 1942—which emphasized the inefficiency of executive management the inefficiency of executive management of equipment and supplies throughout the Government, the urgency of situations then already developing from critical supply shortages, on the one hand, and curtailment or termination of such programs as those of the Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, and Works Project Administration, on the other. On November 30, 1942, the President, in a special message to Congress, urged legislative consideration of these problems and of the problems likely to arise in connection with surpluses at the termination of the present war.

After several months of extensive hearings, the House committee summed up the situation as follows:

> Efficient executive management of the Government's great and growing investment in equipment, materials, and supplies, and the control of the Congress over the use and disposition of such property are seriously handicapped by the lack of comprehensive legislation. The essential foundation of management standards in determining what and what quantities should be bought, and similar standards to govern utilization are conspicuous by their absence. Although the accrual of surpluses is an inevitable feature of the active operations of Government, the determination and release of such surpluses is entirely within the discretion of thousands of widely scattered executives. * * * Even under normal conditions the results of such a situation are apparent in excessive stocks, unnecessary duplication, lack of maximum utilization, unauthorized augmentation of congressional appropriations by free transfer of cash equivalents from one to another, heavy direct losses to the Treasury, and waste in other forms.

Upon this basis the House passed H. R. 2795 in a form designed to deal thoroughly with the continuing problems of management of equipment, materials, and supplies, and provided in section 4 of the bill for further exploration of the war surplus problem by a joint committee of Congress.

In the course of several additional months of study, including numerous public hearings, the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments determined that the war surplus problem had already become so acute that the approach contemplated by the House committee, namely, through a joint congressional committee, could not meet the needs of the situation; it therefore struck out the section providing for this joint committee and in lieu thereof wrote into the bill carefully prepared sections providing the essential mechanisms for determining the extent and character of war surplus property, for bringing to the President and to Congress the questions of policy arising therefrom, and for guiding the use or disposal of such property under the authority of existing or subsequently enacted statutes in complete coordination with the general program of personal property management throughout the executive branch.

The bill as reported to the Senate therefore deals with two intimately related but nevertheless quite distinct problems. Section 1 treats comprehensively the continuing problem of efficient management of equipment, materials, and supplies throughout the executive establishment. Section 2 permits the President to waive application of this broad property-management program to the War and Navy Departments in whole or in part until after the war. Section 3 deals with the use and disposal of the huge surpluses of property, real, personal, and mixed, in the hands of the Government, which are likely to accrue and in fact are already accruing from the current war.

The two major problems treated in the bill are unusually urgent.

The need for a comprehensive legislative framework clearly fixing responsibility and establishing sound operating principles for management of the Government's heavy investments in equipment, materials, and supplies has long existed, will always be with us, and, in the light of the great expansion of Government activity in recent years, is now imperative.

The urgency of the war-surplus problem is obvious. It is given widespread attention in the public press, on the air, and in general public discussion. It is the subject of numerous legislative proposals placed before the Congress.

In his message transmitting to Congress the Budget for the fiscal year 1945, the President saw fit to include the following paragraph:

> The disposition of war surpluses should be closely coordinated with the permanent management of Government property. To provide a foundation for such coordination, I hope that machinery for the permanent management of Government property can be established in the very near future.

The bill as it is now before the Senate is designed to accomplish this clearly desirable purpose as expressed by the Chief Executive. The program which it establishes can be effectuated without delay, with minimum disturbance of existing organizations and procedures, and the lowest possible expense.

Section 1, pages 1 to 15, inclusive, adds a new title II–A, comprising sections 251 to 264, inclusive, to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921. In brief, it provides through the Bureau of the Budget for the establishment and maintenance of property inventories throughout the executive branch. Such inventories are, of course, the primary essential of sound property management as well as of disposal of the surpluses which inevitably accrue. It requires the establishment of standards for the stocking and utilization of property; the fullest possible utilization of property by agencies in order to avoid unnecessary commercial purchases; and current and complete reports to the Congress.

The bill carefully protects and preserves the integrity of congressional appropriations by requiring that when property is transferred from one appropriation purpose to another, the receiving appropriation shall pay for such property into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. A program of equipment and supply utilization, launched about a year ago cooperatively by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of the Treasury, with the same general objectives has, although severely limited by lack of legislative authority, not only greatly stimulated widespread management of equipment and supplies throughout the Government but also has returned to the Treasury many millions of dollars which otherwise would have been needlessly dissipated.

This section of the bill provides for the disposal in orderly fashion of the surpluses which normally accrue from the continuing operations of the Federal Government. It gives priority in the disposal of such property to State and local tax-supported organizations, on the premise that since all Government—State, Federal, and local—is supported by

the same general body of taxpayers, their governmental institutions at whatever level should have first opportunity to secure at lowest possible cost any Federal property no longer needed for Federal purposes. It provides for recovery of maximum values by the Treasury; for the fullest consideration of consumer needs; for preference to war veterans; and to small business.

In this permanent section of the bill no material substantive changes have been made by the Senate committee as compared with the House version. The enactment of this program into statutory law will provide a comprehensive and specific mandate to the executive branch with respect to its service of supply which will unquestionably operate as a continuing and powerful force toward better business management of the Federal Government.

In order to avoid any change or interference with the war effort, section 2 of the bill provides the President with the authority to waive application of this general management program to the War and Navy Departments upon affirmative showing of necessity by either of those departments.

Section 3 of the bill, as now before the Senate, establishes definite mechanisms for dealing with the problem of war surplus property.

The committee is of the opinion that neither the Congress nor the Executive is prepared at this time to specify in detail the policies to be used in disposing of these war surpluses. No one can tell today just what these surpluses will be in aggregate volume or by categories of property. It is known only that they are likely to be great and likely to consist of a very wide range of both real and personal property. Specific disposal policies and procedures must necessarily be evolved as factual data become increasingly available, and with constantly changing circumstances. As the committee sees the problem the essentials are first, unity of action in both the Congress and the executive branch, and close contact by the Congress with the problem as it develops in order that appropriate congressional controls may be exercised and the responsibility of Congress with regard to property of the United States may be met.

The committee is convinced that there is no necessity or justification for creating within the executive branch any new agency to take custody of war surplus property and effect its orderly disposal. There already exist within the executive branch several agencies well qualified to handle various major segments of the disposal problem, among them notably the corporations in the Department of Commerce, the Procurement Division of the Department of the Treasury, and the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The great needs are to insure effective coordination of the disposal activities of the various executive agencies involved and to see that sound disposal policies are currently developed and authorized by Congress as the changing situation will demand.

Surpluses accruing from contract terminations, design and program changes, and agency retrenchment or liquidation are already reaching new high points in quantity, variety, and value. The unfortunate and unsatisfactory disposal methods evident after the close of World War I are reappearing. Various executive agencies are disposing of surpluses through independent programs, with speed apparently the dominant feature. Speculative buying is becoming evident and several sales have already inspired wide public criticism of the Government's methods.

The matter is, therefore, extremely urgent, and the committee believes it can be successfully met through the mechanism and under the preliminary policy guides which would be established through the bill now on the calendar and ready for action.

In brief, it is proposed to establish an over-all policy board or board of directors comprising five top-flight executives from the executive branch of the Federal Government, and one representative each of labor, agriculture, industry, and the general public. The board will have a life of 3 years unless extended by act of Congress.

It will be the duty of this board to assemble currently all pertinent facts pertaining to the war-surplus-property problem, digest these facts, develop and clarify for the benefit of the President and Congress the questions of policy arising from the facts, formulate essential detailed regulations under the authority of this and any other existing or subsequent legislation, coordinate and direct the disposal activities of all executive agencies under such regulations, see to it that the existing executive facilities are fully and effectively utilized in the disposal activity, report frequently to the Congress covering all operations in this field, and recommend such additional legislation as appears necessary.

Title II–A of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by the bill, will provide affirmative and comprehensive legislative authority for the executive branch to dispose of surplus personal property. The existence of such authority, an obvious essential of executive management, has been implied for many decades, but it has been exercised loosely, haphazardly, or not at all. The affirmative authority conveyed in this legislation is carefully drawn, the methods of disposal to be followed are clearly outlined, and the authority is centered in the Chief Executive, where it will be exercised through the Bureau of the Budget as the staff arm of the President in the field of financial and business management of the operations of the Government.

The board established by section 3 of this bill is in no sense a new agency. It is given no direct authority whatever, but is simply designed as a further staff implementation of the Presidency to assist in this temporary but tremendous task of dealing with war-surplus property. It is to find the facts, bring questions of policy to the President and Congress, formulate regulations and, upon their approval, guide and direct the operating agencies in execution of the program.

The legal authority for disposal of property must be found in the act referred to and in numerous acts of Congress dealing with property, both real and personal. The board must operate under these statutes, and the regulations and directives which it may formulate for Presidential approval must be carefully kept within the letter and spirit of such laws and others which Congress may see fit later to enact. The Board's functions are essentially those of coordination and guidance on an over-all basis. Such functions cannot be vested in any single department or agency. They must be vested in some coordinating authority at the top level of executive organization.

The board would have a mandate so to guide the disposal of these war surpluses as to protect the national economy and the interests of the Nation's taxpayers, prevent profiteering, protect and foster development of new industries, and protect private enterprise from unfair Government competition.

No interference or conflict with the existing legislative committee structure of the Congress would be involved. The language of the bill assures intimate congressional contact with and knowledge of the steps taken or proposed, and our various standing committees would remain free to explore and recommend legislation with respect to the segments of the over-all problem within their respective fields.

In formulating this section of the bill the committee has given careful consideration to studies and conclusions of other committees of the Senate and House bearing upon the subject of this legislation.

Senate Resolution 195, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] referred to the Committee on Military Affairs on October 18, 1943, and reported from that committee on November 26, 1943, would request the President to investigate the surplus war-property situation and the adequacy of current inventory controls. Both these activities are definitely prescribed in the bill.

In Senate Report No. 539, the Senate Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] presented the following conclusions:

1. That it is urgently necessary that immediate steps be taken to set up machinery for the coordination of all of these problems and activities and for the furnishing of over-all direction.

2. That this should be done by a central agency whose functions would be the promulgation and supervision of over-all policies and the correlation of the activities of the various agencies handling the mechanics of the problems.

3. That the Congress should lay down the broad policies under which the problems should be handled.

4. That the various contracting and procurement agencies should be the operating agencies to accomplish termination of their respective contracts and to dispose of their respective surpluses according to policies established by Congress and by the policy-making central agency above referred to.

These conclusions are substantially embodied in section 3 of the bill as reported. Its enactment will translate them into a definite program of action.

The bill is also in apparent harmony with the views expressed on pages 7 and

8 of the report of the Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]—Senate Report No. 10, part 12, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session.

The committee feels that the enactment of the new section 3 of H. R. 2795 will constitute a thoroughly effective approach to the war-surplus-property problem, meet the needs of the immediate situation, and at the same time leave the way open for improvement of both policy and procedure in the disposal of war surpluses as warranted by changing circumstances.

Mr. President, I am entirely willing to admit that H. R. 2795, as it is now before the Senate, may be somewhat improved and strengthened through the processes of further amendment. I feel sure that my fellow members of the committee will welcome any such constructive amendment. I submit, however, that this bill (H. R. 2795) is the logical legislative medium through which the Congress should prescribe the action which it wishes the Executive to take with respect to surplus war property as well as with respect to putting in order and keeping in order its permanent management of equipment, materials, and supplies into which the funds which we appropriate are so largely converted. The needs of this situation have been most earnestly explored and studied in both Houses of Congress for many, many months. Unquestionably, as the war moves toward its conclusion, new facts and circumstances will arise which will necessitate further legislation by the Congress to cover all important aspects of the surplus disposal problem. The bill before the Senate, however, substantially meets these needs so far as they can now be seen. It furthermore provides that as fast as new facts can be gathered, as fast as these new circumstances arise, the Congress will be kept fully informed, and it imposes upon the board established by the bill the primary duty of currently reporting its activities to Congress, pointing up the questions of policy which will require further resolution, and leaves wide open to each and every standing legislative committee of both Houses their respective fields for development of any additional necessary legislation.

With respect to this problem of surplus war property, there appears not the slightest justification for resort to government by Executive order. The Congress has been and is proceeding with all reasonable dispatch in the formulation of the policy and procedural guides for Executive action. The legislative action should not be stopped or sidetracked.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to point out that the distinguished chairman of this committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has devoted himself sincerely and completely to the problems which this bill contemplates. He has been fair and cooperative with all the members of the committee, and he has demonstrated a keen interest in all the various proposals which have been brought before us. I only regret that he could not be here in person to describe, in his own good fashion, the full merit of this proposed legislation which the committee and I are now urging the Members of the Senate to consider.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DAVIS. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to say, Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator says he yielded the floor, that we have on the pay rolls at the present time nearly 3,000,000 Federal employees. As I understand the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, the bill to which he has referred would create a new board. I presume that means more salaries, and also a great flood of employees. Am I right in that respect?

Mr. DAVIS. The Senator is wrong.

Mr. LANGER. Then, what does it provide?

Mr. DAVIS. It provides that the Bureau of the Budget shall do the work with its present staff.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has been referring to a board during the course of his remarks. Of what would that board consist?

Mr. DAVIS. It would consist of members who are now in the executive departments, top-flight officials who are already on boards or upon the pay roll.

Mr. LANGER. And there would be no new salaries?

Mr. DAVIS. There would be no new salaries, to my knowledge, but I presume the directing heads, one or two of whom may have to be provided, would be called in from other departments of the Government.

WAR PROFITS AND PROFITEERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on the 25th of February at the time this body voted upon the veto of the tax bill by the President I made the following statement on the floor of the Senate, as appears on page 2057 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

When the people of this country finally sift out the truth about this tax situation they will eventually learn, if they do not already know, that never in the history of this country have the wealthy made greater profits, more money after paying taxes. It will finally sink into the consciousness of the people that while their sons and daughters were bleeding and dying on the field of battle, the rich were getting richer and richer, and profits were going ever higher and higher, and when the people realize the truth, I feel certain they will arise en masse in support of the President who had the courage, the fortitude, and the duty to forcibly lead this fight in behalf of the people.

Further along on the same page I said:

Mr. President, I voted against this war—with HIRAM JOHNSON, I walked out of this Chamber rather than vote for a measure to send our youth to the slaughter on Europe's battlefields, just us two—but I kept my pledge to the farmers, laborers, and the people of North Dakota who relied upon my campaign pledge so to vote. But I have wholeheartedly supported the President in this war once we got into it, and I agree with the President that the time to pay for this war is now while war profiteers are reaping billions—now while money is being made out of this war, and I support the President in his determination to protect the people's rights and to prevent the creation of thousands of millionaires out of the blood and sorrow of the American people.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post of yesterday morning Mr. Drew Pearson cited examples of profits that some of the profiteers have made. I desire to read them to the Senate. He gives certain examples:

1. Jacobs Aircraft of Pennsylvania, which made no profit before the war, netted $11,400,000 in 1942, of which $3,000,000 was left after paying taxes.

2. General Cable of New York averaged $850,000 profit before the war, but made $19,400,000 in 1942.

3. Lima Locomotive Works, of Lima, Ohio, averaged $60,000 in the base period before the war, but made $10,000,000 in 1942.

4. Grumman Aircraft of Bethpage, L. I., averaged $540,000 profit before the war but made $22,500,000 in 1942.

5. Beech Aircraft of Wichita, Kans., made no profit before the war but $16,000,000 in 1942.

6. Bell Aircraft of Buffalo made $43,800 before the war but in 1942 its profits had multiplied 528 times, to $23,000,000. Even after paying taxes it had a profit left of $5,403,000.

7. Not merely war factories but textile companies made lush profits, too, as indicated by the American Woolen Co., which made no profit during the base period before the war, but knocked off an operating profit of $36,574,000 in 1942.

8. Again Edward G. Budd, of Philadelphia—

A company which, the author of the article says, one of the distinguished Senators upon this floor championed so lustily during the Senate tax hearings—

came in for a juicy profit. The Senator referred to—

Says the author—

for a time threatened to vote against renegotiation because he said the Budd people had been treated unfairly by the Navy. However, the Truman Committee found that Budd had made a profit of $18,650,000 in 1942, compared with $350,000 before the war. Later the Budd company complained because the Navy insisted on renegotiating its profits down to $3,796,000, even though this latter figure was 10 times its average profit before the war.

Mr. President, in the great Progressive newspaper published by the La Follettes in Wisconsin, I find, in the issue of February 28, page 7, a letter written by Mr. C. B. Ballard, of Appleton, Wis. In that letter it is stated that Mr. John B. Hawley, Jr., of the Northern Pump Co., Minneapolis, Minn., had a salary in 1939 of $15,000. In 1940 his salary was $35,000. For the year ending June 30, 1942, his salary was $442,000.

In further substantiation of what I said on the 25th of February, when I backed the President, particularly in view of the fact that one of my colleagues rose on the Senate floor at the conclusion of my speech and said that my facts were not accurate, I quote the American Federationist, the official paper of the American Federation of Labor, in which there appears an article by Mr. Nathan Robertson. This article shows that in 1917, that is, during World War No. 1, profits after taxes, were $7,700,000,000. In 1918 the net profits, after all taxes, amounted to $4,500,000,000. In 1919 they amounted to $6,900,000,000. In 1929, commonly conceded to be the most prosperous year

in all our history, the net profits, after taxes, amounted to $8,100,000,000. In 1939 the net profits amounted to $4,040,000,000. But last year, 1943, after all the high taxes about which we have heard so much, the corporations made more money than they ever made before in all history, because profits, after taxes, are estimated at $8,550,000,000.

Mr. President, I wish now to read Mr. Robertson's article into the RECORD.

BUSINESS DOES NICELY

(By Nathan Robertson)

Industry propaganda is making much of the fact that corporations today are paying the highest taxes in history. The huge tax figures—and they are huge—are being used to convince the public that corporations are bearing a terrific tax burden. The figures need a little analysis.

Corporations today are paying terrific taxes because they are making terrific profits. Corporation profits, subject to taxes, are four times higher than they were in the last peacetime year—1939. They are two and a half times what they were in that famous boom year of 1929, the year of fabulous profits. They are more than twice as big as they were in the biggest profit year of World War No. 1—1917.

For the corporations to complain about the taxes they are paying, as compared with past years, is like my rich friend who is always complaining about his personal income taxes. I tell him that he wouldn't have to worry about those taxes if he were willing to get along on a more moderate income—that the only reason he has to pay so much is because he is making so much.

What has happened is that the corporations have boosted their incomes faster than the taxes have gone up—in an effort to pass their tax load on to others. Some corporations have admitted that this was their purpose—though not in those words. They said they counted their income taxes as part of their cost of doing business, and increased prices to cover the increased taxes. However, it is stated, it adds up to the same thing—passing the burden along to someone else. Someone else in this case usually happens to be Uncle Sam, because he is the one who is paying for most of our wartime production. The Government actually is paying the taxes for the corporations.

That this is so is proved by the figures on profits left to the corporations after they have paid their taxes. They have more than twice as much left, after taxes, as they had in the last peacetime year—1939—which was a pretty good year for corporations. So what the corporations have done is not only pass their tax burden on to the public but to double their profits in addition. In other words, the Government's effort to control profits and make the corporations bear their share of the war cost has totally failed.

Millions of individuals are paying higher taxes, because of the war, on the same incomes they had before the war. Not so with the corporations. Their tax rates have been raised, too, but every time their taxes have gone up a dollar their incomes have gone up $2.

The corporations, of course, don't tell the story this way. They ignore profits before taxes entirely and talk only of profits after taxes. Then they compare these profits with the volume of business they are doing to show that profits per unit of production haven't risen. Then they compare this with the way total wages have risen.

This completely ignores the fact that the wages are divided among millions of additional workers who are putting in many more hours of work each week. But the profits, despite the increased volume of production, are going to just about the same number of people with just about the same total investment they had in their businesses before the war. Most of the additional capital has been put up by the Government.

Profits are supposed to be the reward for the risk capital takes. Capital is risking much less in this war period than ever before in history. It has an assured market for everything it can produce. Much of the production is on a guaranteed cost-plus-a-profit basis.

So, while profits before taxes have risen four times, and profits after taxes have more than doubled, wage rates per hour of work have risen only about 32 percent, according to War Labor Board estimates, and that figure is for manufacturing industries alone where there have been more increases than elsewhere. The figure for labor generally would be much lower. Industry's profits are figured after all expenses. If labor's wages were measured the same way, increased living costs would eat up the increases, and then some.

Here is a simple table showing how profits this year compare with profits in 1939, 1929, and the First World War years, according to Treasury figures:

	Profits before taxes	Profits after taxes
1943 (estimated)	$22,000,000,000	$8,550,000,000
1939	5,272,000,000	4,040,000,000
1929	9,300,000,000	8,100,000,000
1919	9,300,000,000	6,900,000,000
1918	7,700,000,000	4,500,000,000
1917	10,000,000,000	7,700,000,000

You won't find in either column a profit figure as fat and juicy as the figure for the year of 1943, the year of great war sacrifice when the Nation is fighting for its very existence.

Look at those figures for the last war—and remember that they resulted in the creation of a crop of 23,000 new millionaires.

That refers to World War No. 1, and as I remember the statistics, for every two soldiers who died, a new millionaire was created. The article continues:

The country was so shocked that it promised never to let it happen again. Both major parties—

That is, the Republicans and the Democrats—

pledged themselves against it. Scores of bills were introduced in Congress to prevent it from happening again.

When this war started, President Roosevelt promised that a new crop of war millionaires would not be permitted. He tried to carry out that pledge. But his tax proposals were slashed to pieces in Congress. The result is that it is happening again, even though most newspapers don't mention the subject. The full extent to which it is happening again won't be known until long after the war is over. You can name your own figure now, but you can be sure the Nation will again be shocked.

One thing that has helped to fool the public this time is that, unlike the last war, dividends have not zoomed to new heights. The corporations are playing a cagey game with their profits. They know that big dividends and a speculative stock market would inflame the country. So they are holding on to their profits.

The result is that even many stockholders don't realize how much the corporations are making because their dividend checks, by and large, are about the same as before the war. As a matter of fact, dividend payments for all corporations are somewhat lower than they were in 1936 and 1937, and only slightly higher than in 1939.

But the dividends are no measure of profits. Only about half of the profits are being paid out in dividends. The lush stock bonuses will be held until after the war. How lush they will be can be seen from the fact that from 1941 to 1943, inclusive, undistributed profits of almost $12,000,000,000 were piled up by the corporations. This is the melon the stockholders are waiting to divide after the war is over.

FIGURE IS DECEPTIVELY LOW

Actually, even this is a deceptively low figure. Some corporations are still losing money, and this is the net increase for all corporations including the money losers. The money makers alone have piled up $16,000,000,000 in the 3-year period, and about $19,000,000,000 since 1939. The Securities and Exchange Commission recently reported that the corporations have $33,000,000,000 in quick, liquid assets.

Some people find it hard to believe such astronomical figures in the face of a 90-percent excess-profits tax. But they don't know all the loopholes Congress has provided in that tax for the corporations. First of all, they get a 10-percent refund out of the 90-percent tax, so the net tax is only 81 percent.

But more important is the method Congress has provided for measuring the excess profits that are subject to the 81 percent tax. A corporation can choose either of two very lenient yardsticks for measuring its excess profits. That's a special little trick provided for the corporations which no other taxpayers enjoy. An individual has to pay what he is told to pay, but a corporation is given a choice.

If the corporation was making a lot of money before the war, as many companies were, it can use that volume of profits as the measure of its exemption from excess-profits taxes. Thus, if the corporation was making a profit of 30, 40, or even 100 percent on its invested capital, it can continue to do so today without paying any excess-profits tax. Many corporations are escaping their share of excess profits through this loophole.

On the other hand, if the corporation has a big invested capital as compared with its profits, it can measure its exemption on the basis of this invested capital. Many huge corporations, like the steel and railroad companies, have millions of dollars invested many years ago and long since thrown away, on which they are entitled to collect profits now without paying excess-profits taxes. An investment trust which milked the public of $100,000,000 and tossed it away on the stock market can earn a very high return on its real value today without paying excess-profits taxes by measuring its profits against the original investment of $100,000,000 long since lost and forgotten.

These are only the most obvious of the loopholes. There are many more and the tax lawyers are devising new ones every day.

Even those lush profit figures in our table don't reflect a lot of real profits the corporations are realizing from their wartime booms. Some of them are covering up profits in their depreciation and depletion reserves. Most of the war manufacturers have been virtually given new plants by the Government during the war. They are buying about $5,000,000,000 worth of new plants and equipment from their war profits in addition to the figures already shown. Furthermore, the Government has built about $14,000,000,000 worth of plants with its own money, which the corporations have options to buy after the war and will probably get for a song.

Beyond all of this, those huge taxes the corporations are paying are not total losses to them by a long sight. They still have a claim even on the taxes. Congress has kindly provided that if they have losses after the war, they can go back and get refunds from the Treasury on their war taxes. If the war

should end by the end of next year, the corporations would have a $26,000,000,000 reserve piled up out of which they could demand refunds for any losses sustained. This is a virtual guaranty to them of normal profits for 2 years after the war. Before his recent resignation, Commissioner of Internal Revenue Guy Helvering warned that the extent of these refunds would shock the public.

Despite all of these profits and all of these tax concessions, the corporations are putting on a drive in Congress to repeal or modify the contract-renegotiation law which permits the Government to revise war contracts in order to recover grossly excessive profits. Government contracting officers admit that in the rush to get war production under way they made many bad contracts that allow indefensible profits. As a result Congress enacted a law to permit such contracts to be revised on the basis of experience to a more moderate figure.

THEY TELL CONGRESS SAD STORIES

The corporations have tried to convince Congress that they were facing ruin and wouldn't have enough left after the war to continue in business. Some of the most sensational testimony on war profits came from their reluctant lips and from the testimony of official witnesses in connection with that hoggish drive for more profits.

Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, usually pretty much of a conservative, did most to expose the ludicrous position of the corporations which were pleading poverty. He testified that by the end of next year the money-making corporations would have the equivalent of a post-war reserve of more than $42,000,000,000.

This sum is bigger than the entire national income in the last year of the Hoover administration. It is bigger than the huge public debt that the corporations were screaming about at the start of the war, when it was being used to feed and clothe unemployed. Yet sensational as this figure was, it was ignored by the newspapers which had devoted so much space to the poverty stories of the corporation spokesmen.

Actually, Patterson was conservative in his estimate. Revising his figures on the basis of latest estimates, the total turns out to be somewhere between $55,000,000,000 and $70,000,000,000, depending upon how much the corporations eventually realize out of the war plants the Government has built for them during the war. Here are the total reserves and collateral benefits the corporations will have by the end of 1944 from their war business in addition to the dividends paid:

Post-war refunds from excess-profits taxes	$2,000,000,000
Undistributed profits, 1941–44	22,000,000,000
New plants financed out of profits	5,000,000,000
New plants financed by the Government	14,000,000,000
War taxes available for refunds	26,000,000,000

Still more profits have been hidden by calling them salaries. The salaries of corporation executives have skyrocketed. Patterson emphasized this by saying that increases in corporation salaries from $5,000 to $50,000 were a very common thing.

"We find salaries going up from $5,000 and $10,000 to $100,000," he said, "and the men who get them think they are worth it. But I say the soldiers are serving for $50 a month. If that be demagoguery, make the most of it. I don't think we need to allow such salaries."

The position of the corporations was well summarized by the Treasury in the recent tax hearings. It reported that they were piling up during the war excess profits equal to 5 years of peacetime profits. Referring to the provisions for refunds of war taxes, it said that "even under quite pessimistic assumptions, wartime income of corporations in the aggregate is sufficient to absorb most of the conceivable post-war losses if they occurred in the first two years after the war."

"Estimated aggregate net income after taxes of all corporations for 1943 is higher than it has ever been," the Treasury said.

Despite such testimony by the Treasury, all backed by facts and figures, the House Ways and Means Committee turned down the request for the levying of another $1,100,000,000 in corporation taxes. It limited the increase to $616,000,000, and in return gave the corporations some concessions on the contract renegotiation law. The corporations are driving for still more concessions in the Senate and probably will get them.

The pledge of no new war millionaires has been forgotten

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table at the end of the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With workers it's deficits

	Heavy industries		Light industries		Retail trade	
	January 1941	August 1943	January 1941	August 1943	January 1941	August 1943
Worker's yearly income	$1,660	$2,580	$1,178	$1,788	$1,120	$1,351
Taxes:						
Federal income		78				
Federal Victory		59		35		22
Social security	17	26	12	18	11	14
Total taxes	17	163	12	53	11	36
War bonds (10 percent)	166	258	119	179	112	135
Left for living expenses	1,477	2,159	1,047	1,556	997	1,180
Adequate budget (family of 4)	2,124	2,204	2,124	2,204	2,124	2,204
Deficit	647	45	1,077	648	1,127	1,024

The table shows the yearly income of typical groups of workers under wartime conditions at January 1941 and August 1943 wage levels.

Heavy industries include most war industries, lumber and stone industries, metal industries; heavy industries' income is typical for war workers. Light industries include manufacture of clothing, food, tobacco products, leather, paper, chemicals. The average worker's income in retail trade is typical for a number of service industries where workers receive much less than in manufacturing.

The adequate budget for a family of four is the wartime budget of the Heller committee, University of California, adjusted to average prices in the United States (consumption items only).

The Heller wartime budget omits $405 worth of goods normally bought by a worker's family in peacetime; these are goods now off the market and voluntary reductions in family buying.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, what is stated in this article furnishes one of the reasons why I voted to sustain the President's veto of the tax measure when we came to consider it on the 25th day of February this year. We were told at that time that never before in the history of America had any President ever vetoed a revenue bill. We were told that what was then done was something entirely new. Members of Congress were going to "show" this President, who dared for the first time in history to veto a revenue measure. But, Mr. President, what are the facts?

All this has happened before. This is nothing new. I know what some of the columnists have said. I know that it has been generally advertised that this is the first veto of a revenue bill by a man who sat in the White House.

But that, Mr. President, is not true. Just a little more than a hundred years ago, another courageous President, John Tyler, vetoed a revenue bill. That was on August 9, 1842. At that time in our history the revenue of the Government was derived not from income taxes or taxes on corporations or commerce but from the tariff and sales of Federal lands.

At that time, also, Henry Clay, who was running the legislative end of the Government, put through Congress a tariff and land-money bill on the 27th of June. He presumed it was too late for the President of the United States to veto the bill, for the fiscal year ended on June 30, and Clay reasoned that the President would simply have to sign the bill, whether he approved of it or not, because the alternative was to leave the country without revenue.

Let me quote a paragraph from Hugh Russell Fraser's Democracy in the Making—page 262:

John Tyler had exactly 3 days to make up his mind. He could fall into the trap that Clay had prepared for him or he could leave the Nation without revenue.

But was this the only alternative? The President thought not. The Whigs were now to get a surprise. Tyler called on Attorney General Legare for an advisory opinion, and Legare ruled that even if a new tariff bill was not passed by June 30, the old rates would continue in effect.

Let me say at this point that the reason for President Tyler's veto was that the Whigs, his own party, wanted to give to the States the Federal money collected from the land sales at a time when there was little money in the Treasury. Tyler had vetoed a separate bill to provide for this. Then his own party tied it to a revenue-tariff bill, thinking he would not dare veto that, but he did.

Then what happened? John Quincy Adams, a leader of the Whig Party in the House, took the floor to denounce the President of the United States, also a Whig. Mr. Adams said very much the same thing about President Tyler then as our distinguished majority leader said about President Roosevelt the other day.

Yet we are told this is the first time anything like this has happened! Again I say, Mr. President, it is about time we read our own history. But the record is also interesting from another viewpoint. Who came to the defense of the President of the United States in 1842? Who stood on the floor and challenged his colleagues on that veto? Was it a member of his party? It was not, Mr. Presi-

dent. It was a Democrat, a member of the opposite party, and you will be interested to know that the name of the Democrat who took the floor of the House to present a minority report on the veto of the revenue bill was Representative James J. Roosevelt, of New York, one of the members of the Roosevelt family, and a member of President Tyler's official opposition party.

And so, Mr. President, I stand on the floor of the Senate today as a Republican, technically a member of the opposition, and defend the President of the United States, exactly as Representative James J. Roosevelt, of New York, defended President Tyler on the 9th of August 1842.

Mr. President, I now desire to quote the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. Before I do so, however, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the statement made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on the 25th day of February at the time I voted to sustain the President's veto. The junior Senator from Wisconsin stated as follows:

> Mr. President, we have listened to a very remarkable speech made just now by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]. I trust the majority leader will analyze the speech, and give us the facts as I think the facts are.

So, Mr. President, I looked up the facts and I found that in my speech made upon the Senate floor I made one small misstatement, and I wish to correct it now.

On page 7933 of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 8, 1942, appear certain remarks made by me. I read the plank of the Democratic platform relative to the matter of tax-exempt securities. I shall read it again. In 1940, when the Democratic Party met in convention, it adopted the following plank in its platform:

> To encourage investment in productive enterprise, the tax-exempt privileges of future Federal, State, and local bonds should be removed.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Was it the Senator's purpose to request unanimous consent to make a correction in the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. If so, I wish to have it noted, Mr. President, that I have no objection.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much. I wished to refer for a moment to the statement I made, and then ask unanimous consent to have the correction made.

Mr. President, as I have said, on the 25th of February both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party had similar planks in their platforms. I wish to have the RECORD show that as a matter of fact the Republican Party did not actually adopt the plank. On page 7933 of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 8, 1942, it is shown that the Republican Party did not adopt the exact language, but on the contrary the fact was that the Republican program committee headed by the late Dr. Glenn Frank, in its report to the Republican Convention, used the following language:

> We favor elimination of all tax exemptions of future issues of Federal, State, and municipal securities.

So, Mr. President, I wish to request unanimous consent to make that correction in the RECORD, and to show that, instead of the fact being that the Republican Party actually adopted that plank, as a matter of fact, although it was presented by the committee headed by the late Dr. Glenn Frank, it was not actually adopted. As I understand the matter, Mr. President, it was defeated by a very small vote on the part of the Republican Party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The permanent RECORD for 1942 has long since been printed, but the correction will be noted.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in conclusion I merely wish to say that I regretted very much that I was the only Republican to vote to sustain the President's veto of the tax bill. Nevertheless, I wish to point out that from the hundreds of letters and telegrams I have received I am satisfied that the public at large, the taxpayers, are already perceiving that the President of the United States was right when he vetoed that tax measure; and I am just as confident as I am that two and two make four that the people of this country, if they could vote upon the matter, would vote in favor of what both the Democratic and the Republican campaign speakers said after the last war, that "If ever we have war again, if ever we go into another war, we will draft money, just as we are drafting the soldier boys."

Mr. President, I also believe that if the people of the country could vote on the matter of tax-exempt securities, they would not vote to permit men to make from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000 a year by clipping coupons of tax-exempt securities, but on the contrary would make them pay taxes on the millions of dollars they are taking out of such securities.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to quote from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. I quote from his remarks appearing on page 7945 of the permanent CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 8, 1942. At that time he said the following, and I wholeheartedly agree with it:

> Mr. President, we have not hesitated to interfere with the lives of individuals in this war. We have exercised the plenary power which government possesses. We have reached into every home in America, and by the long arm and power of the Government we have taken the flower of the young manhood of America and put it into uniform. We are sending it overseas to die on foreign shores, on 42 fronts. Did we inquire, Mr. President, whether we were taking any privileges away from those young men? We did not. We assured them, however, that they were being sent abroad to fight for the fundamental principles upon which this Government was predicated. Those principles include the principle of equality among men.

Later in his speech the senior Senator from Wisconsin said:

> Mr. President, I speak with feeling. I hope that I am not exceeding the bounds of propriety in debate, but I feel deeply on this question. I feel deeply because I think the time has come, if this democracy is to survive, when we must demonstrate that we have the courage to strike down special privilege at a time when young men by the millions are about to be asked to die for the preservation of this Government. Do you think the young man coughing up his guts on the Sahara Desert feels that he is getting a square deal when one man can get $750,000 of tax exemption from a special privilege?
>
> Mr. President, I fear this will be a long war. The question of the morale of the people will ultimately determine whether or not this Government survives. The only way we can maintain morale when the casualty notices descend upon the homes of America like snow in a Montana blizzard is to maintain equality of sacrifice so far as it is humanly possible under the circumstances.
>
> I will give up anything I have in this world to maintain democracy, to maintain this Government, and I think the young men of this country are ready, willing, and anxious to give up everything they have. However, in all fairness they should know that those who are here on the home front—the soldiers of democracy in positions of power—have the courage to insist that in this war there shall be equality of economic sacrifice as well as of flesh and blood.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HATCH. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, are there any postmaster nominations from North Dakota?

Mr. HATCH. No.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Richmond K. Turner to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, as I understand, it is the purpose of the Senator from New Mexico shortly to move that the Senate take a recess until Tuesday.

Mr. HATCH. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that several Senators from the Committee on Naval Affairs are necessarily absent, I respectfully ask that the Senator from New Mexico not press for action on the confirmation of this nomination. There is no reflection whatever upon the individual nominee. I have not the slightest doubt that he is entitled in every respect to the promotion which has been suggested.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, so far as I know, there is absolutely no objection to the confirmation of this nomination. However, in view of what the Senator from Connecticut has said, inasmuch as he has stated that he has no desire to object to the nomination in making his request, I am glad to accede to the request of the Senator from Connecticut, and ask that the nomination be passed over.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to have it noted that there is no objection on my part to the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS H. CULLEN

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 456) from the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

March 1, 1944.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of 31 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably detained from the Senate, and is attending an important conference. In his behalf I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 264) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the president of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, in behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Tuesday, March 7, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 3 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George L. Brandt, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

C. Porter Kuykendall, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

John F. Stone, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Henry N. Graven, of Iowa, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Iowa, vice Hon. George C. Scott, retired.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the District of Delaware, vice J. Leslie Ford, term expired.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERALS

Maj. Gen. Courtney Hicks Hodges, Chief of Infantry, now invested with rank and title of lieutenant general by virtue of his assignment to command the Third Army.

Maj. Gen. Richard Kerens Sutherland (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. Raymond Albert Wheeler (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Maj. Gen. John Clifford Hodges Lee (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Charles Love Mullins, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Paul Ramsey Hawley (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edmund Bristol Gregory, Quartermaster Corps, now the Quartermaster General, with rank of major general.

Brig. Gen. Junius Wallace Jones (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edmond Harrison Leavey (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Hugh Johnston Knerr (lieutenant colonel, United States Army; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Carl Chauncey (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Leslie Richard Groves (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. William Moses Goodman (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Howard Arnold Craig (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. David Goodwin Barr (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Howard Kendall Loughry, Finance Department, now Chief of Finance, with rank of major general.

Brig. Gen. James Millikin Bevans (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Battey McClure (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Bennett Edward Meyers (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Clark Dunham (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Roderick Random Allen (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Cecil Ray Moore (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. George Jacob Richards (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Robert Wells Harper (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Noce (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Hugh John Casey (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Whitfield Putnam Shepard (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Everett Ernest Brown (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Jones Twitty (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Russell Alger Wilson (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Clement McDonald (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Royal Bertrand Lord (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Jesse Auton (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Morris Williams Gilland (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Orval Thrasher (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Murray Clarke Woodbury (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ewart Gladstone Plank (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Franklin Battley (lieutenant colonel, Chemical Warfare Service), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Yawkey Banfill (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Reuben Goodrich (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Wharton Anderson (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Ray Henry Clark (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Theodore Morrison Osborne (major, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Albert Daniel Smith (captain, United States Army; temporary major, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Isaac William Ott (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States), Army of the United States, Air Corps.

Col. Frank Otto Bowman (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Arthur Thomas (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Fremont Byron Hodson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Horace Hobson, Infantry.

Col. Francis Hopkinson Griswold (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Pearre Cabell (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Michael Powers (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Edison Roderick (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Condon Carlton McCornack, Medical Corps.

Col. Harry Briggs Vaughan (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. Norris Brown Harbold (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Pescia Sullivan (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Duncan Grant Richart, Cavalry.

Col. Lewis Andrew Pick (lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

Col. August Walter Kissner (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr. (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Terence John Tully (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Aubry Lee Moore (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Arthur John McChrystal (major, United States Army), Army of the United States.

Col. John Franklin Egan (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Duane Knapp (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Stanhope Bayne-Jones (lieutenant colonel, Medical Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Bartlett Beaman (major, Air Reserve; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Clarence Lemar Burpee, Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942.

Capt. Forrest B. Royal, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 27th day of October 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Holland M. Smith to be a lieutenant general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 28th day of February 1944.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Paulina-Mae Pittori, Betteravia, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Don. M. Benedict, Tarzana, Calif., in place of E. L. Holmquist. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

COLORADO

V. Lester Finch, Springfield, Colo., in place of H. H. Davis, resigned.

DELAWARE

Alton L. Brittingham, Lewes, Del., in place of W. O. Martin, resigned.

John E. Mayhew, Milford, Del., in place of J. E. Mayhew. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

FLORIDA

S. Gary Turnley, Fort Meade, Fla., in place of J. W. Watson, resigned.

Howard M. Daniels, Havana, Fla., in place of E. S. Fletcher, retired.

Robert Neil Durrance, Sebring, Fla., in place of O. L. Godwin, removed.

GEORGIA

Fred S. White, Hartwell, Ga., in place of W. G. Hodges, deceased.

HAWAII

Victoria K. Burke, Honokaa, T. H., in place of S. C. Burke, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Joseph B. Lager, Albers, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Esther Cherry, Arrowsmith, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mildred E. Harder, Atwood, Ill., in place of P. F. Harder, deceased.

Louis P. Baron, Beaverville, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Seth D. Abbott, Big Rock, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Oscar C. Stehr, Bonfield, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Florence I. Reising, Cabery, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Minnie A. Ralston, Caledonia, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edmond Lovel, Cambria, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Naomi C. Reiter, Cherry, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Verda Malone, Chesterfield, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Victor L. Strawn, Dana, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Saidee A. Bowling, Dowell, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Anna Holshouser, Frankfort Heights, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jessie M. Hickman, Good Hope, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ella M. Watson, Harvel, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Anna Kirk, Ina, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George L. Campbell, Kingston, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter C. Howe, Latham, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary G. Lawless, Loraine, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John E. Cornelius, Lyndon, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jeanette O. Perry, Martinton, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John H. Keest, Jr., Middletown, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

E. Floyd Crockett, Neoga, Ill., in place of A. T. Ellis, transferred.

Joseph Leonardo, Palos Heights, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Eloise N. Morgan, Payson, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary C. Guest, Reddick, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katherine Hake, Tovey, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

J. Amelia Crichton, Towanda, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ambrosia E. Walker, Vergennes, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Francis H. Greene, Wapella, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lea J. Orr, Wilmette, Ill., in place of H. L. O'Connell, deceased.

INDIANA

Harry M. Collins, Dugger, Ind., in place of E. V. Spinks, resigned.

Robert E. Wilhelm, Hammond, Ind., in place of J. F. Winkler, resigned.

IOWA

Bernard E. Fraley, Albion, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

L. Pearl Beans, Camanche, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Laurel L. Krieger, Mount Union, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dale Fichter, Randolph, Iowa, in place of D. A. Wilson, removed.

John M. Slattery, Waterville, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KANSAS

Bernard May, Colwich, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mary Agnes Lane, Delia, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John O. Larrick, Edgerton, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Dale Graves, Healy, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

David H. Clare, Holcomb, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Francis A. Brinkman, Olpe, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KENTUCKY

Lester B. Young, Fredonia, Ky., in place of E. C. Crider, resigned.

Charles H. Jones, Highsplint, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Rema R. Harper, Lakeland, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Claude L. Clayton, Morehead Ky., in place of W. E. Crutcher, resigned.
Thomas F. Hatcher, Wayland, Ky., in place of C. V. Tingue, resigned.

LOUISIANA

Harry R. Mock, Baskin, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Lillian Causey, Bonita, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Annie M. Pyron, Collinston, La. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1943.
Ethel Barry, Grand Coteau, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Charles Williams, Many, La., in place of J. Wiley Miller, retired.
Frank C. Bertrand, Paradis, La., in place of T. F. Landry, transferred.
Lillian Boyett, Sarepta, La., in place of J. T. Boyett, removed.
Mary Irma Jenkins, Tickfaw, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Lizzie J. Chase, Mount Vernon, Maine, in place of L. N. Redonnett, retired.
Emma T. Allen, New Gloucester, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Henry G. Swett, Weld, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
J. Vinal Hunnewell, Woolwich, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MARYLAND

James J. Hadaway, Chestertown, Md., in place of W. B. Usilton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
John W. Hager, Damascus, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.
Mary K. Sharpless, Kitzmiller, Md., in place of Frank Vodopivac, Jr., resigned.
Marjorie H. Pearce, Monkton, Md., in place of J. M. Pearce, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles L. Bevans, Harwich Port, Mass., in place of C. P. Bearse, retired.
Carl O. F. Swanson, Rehoboth, Mass., in place of F. G. Cleasby, Jr., removed.

MICHIGAN

N. Kenneth Zeigler, Brimley, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Harry Keithan, Ceresco, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Elmer Brogan, Emmett, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Reatha M. Linke, Filer City, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Charles B. Jenkins, Fostoria, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Emma R. A. Stevenson, Gaines, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Guy H. Fowler, Goodells, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Stella B. Paul, Gulliver, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Ernest Belville, Mesick, Mich., in place of L. M. Kohn, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Evelyn E. Boyer, Beltrami, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Edwin O. Benthagen, Borup, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Lloyd F. Jensen, Darwin, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Judd R. Grout, Elbow Lake, Minn., in place of E. R. Anderson, transferred.
Aida B. New, Floodwood, Minn., in place of K. O. Finnila, resigned.
Joseph T. Samuelson, Grasston, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Marvin T. Giles, Holland, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Edward A. Roser, Kandiyohi, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Ida A. Gonsolin, Kelly Lake, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Alice Gillespie, Kilkenny, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Clarence D. Zillgitt, Lake City, Minn., in place of C. S. Nygren, deceased.
Earl D. Wills, Nassau, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Arno C. Jenner, Nerstrand, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Clarence I. Jonason, North Branch, Minn., in place of O. W. Alvin. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.
Harry S. Matteson, Olivia, Minn., in place of A. F. Lane, resigned.
Emma V. Berglund, Pennock, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Herman O. Hoganson, Perley, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Henry C. Moe, Ranier, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Frank C. Erkel, Rockford, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Marguerite Linquist, Springpark, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Frank B. Clarine, Tamarack, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSISSIPPI

Reid R. Williams, Arcola, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Sidney B. Spencer, Bogue Chitto, Miss., in place of F. E. Brister, removed.
William C. Sharbrough, Holly Bluff, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Nell T. Liddell, Learned, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Helen Persell, Madison Station, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Carey G. Raborn, Magnolia, Miss., in place of C. E. Bilbo. Incumbent's commission expired February 14, 1940.
Harriett G. Shirley, Money, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Judson S. Defoore, Sidon, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSOURI

Etha M. Word, Amoret, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Calvin Clay, Augusta, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Hazel Quick, Camden, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
John C. Goodwin, Fair Grove, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Raymond L. Whited, Flemington, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Florence B. Browning, Hermitage, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Harry L. Epperson, Hurdland, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Miles M. O'Neal, Jamestown, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Dwight E. Whitten, Peculiar, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Velda G. Guidicy, Pevely, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Brownlee E. Rainey, South Kinloch Park, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MONTANA

Ruth E. Hewett, Flaxville, Mont., in place of R. W. Dorwin, resigned.
Keith G. Carpenter, Sidney, Mont., in place of G. T. O'Brien, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Luise A. Zaiser, Avoca, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Charles E. Furman, Danbury, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
John P. Moran, David City, Nebr., in place of M. C. Tomek. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Walter Nowka, Glenvil, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Eva L. Denney, Lyman, Nebr., in place of D. O. Campbell, resigned.

NEVADA

Gladys P. McMichael, Gabbs, Nev. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Frank Archibald Farrell, Allendale, N. J., in place of J. J. Kelly, resigned.
Margaret A. Bernard, Gloucester Heights, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Orrin C. Whaites, Hanover, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW MEXICO

Daniel Moreno, La Mesa, N. Mex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW YORK

Joseph A. McKenna, Albion, N. Y., in place of D. W. Hanley, retired.
William H. Porter, Jr., Ancram, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Katherine L. Downs, Aquebogue, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Hanna A. Williams, Belleville, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Samuel E. G. Harris, Brushton, N. Y., in place of J. A. Holland, resigned.
Laurence E. Clark, Chenango Bridge, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Charles F. Driscoll, Clay, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Edward J. Drumb, Ebenezer, N. Y., in place of R. A. Switzer, removed.
James T. Hunter, Galway, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Margaret C. Flood, Gorham, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Luther C. Empie, Guilderland Center, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Matilda Whitney, Henderson, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Hattie R. Ballard, Holmes, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Henry B. Goodell, Irving, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Charles E. Denison, Niskayuna, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Claude L. Wright, Painted Post, N. Y., in place of H R. Phelps, removed.
Colletta W. Potter, Port Crane, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Beatrice F. Skinner, Portland, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Hope C. Conneely, Richburg, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Thomas J. Riley, Seneca Falls, N. Y., in place of W. A. Flanagan, retired.
Jay W. Cook, Verona, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
McIntyre P. Sampson, Yorkshire, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH CAROLINA

Pearl L. Ennett, Swansboro, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH DAKOTA

Bernice K. Gustafson, Alexander, N. Dak., in place of C. L. Arildson, resigned.
Ralph S McConn, Fairmount, N. Dak., in place of F. M. McConn, resigned.

OHIO

James L. Collins, Cleveland, Ohio, in place of M. F. O'Donnell, retired.
Earl D. Richardson, Lisbon, Ohio, in place of J. A Gilmore, resigned.
Joseph H. Landrum, Wilmington, Ohio, in place of M. D. Barns, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Daniel H. Blair, Clayton, Okla., in place of J. W. Blair, retired.
Otto L. Badgley, Keyes, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

OREGON

Maude H. Sitter, Myrtle Creek, Oreg., in place of Bryan Dieckman. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

PENNSYLVANIA

Frank X. Harmuth, Bridgeville, Pa., in place of O. K. Bingham deceased.

Francis J. Plocinik, Gilberton, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Mary E. Angley, Glen Olden, Pa., in place of C. E. W. Curry, retired.

Dorothy K. Eagen, Jermyn, Pa., in place of J. M. Eagen, resigned.

J. Ralph Mingle Mifflintown, Pa., in place of E. D. Parker, removed.

Leo A. Clavin, North East, Pa., in place of A. S. Knepp, retired.

Michael V. McFadden, Summit Hill, Pa., in place of Kathryn Yorke, resigned.

Emma R. Eakins, Wynnewood, Pa., in place of E. R. Eakins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rosa R. Rountree, Buffalo, S. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John E. James, Summerton, S. C., in place of J. M. Nelson, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Minnie M. Dyer, Byington, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

Mamie L. Taylor, Asherton, Tex., in place of R. W. Taylor, resigned.

Maude M. Woods, Burkeville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Theodore E. Duncan, Chillicothe, Tex., in place of C B. Haynes, resigned.

Ben O. Sanford, Covington, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Katie H. Sharp, Crandall, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Henry F. Priesmeyer, Garwood, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Lena Griffin, Goodrich, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alex E. Jungmann, Lacoste, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Joseph E. Pate, Omaha, Tex., in place of J. R. Thigpen, transferred.

Tony G. Bonano, Stafford, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Frank M Bell, Tyler, Tex., in place of R. C. Owens, deceased.

James W. Allen, Wingate, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ethel Gill, Winnie, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VERMONT

Sergio Pasetto, Barre, Vt., in place of E. J Owens, deceased.

Wright E. Rives, Barton, Vt., in place of Cornelius Buckley, retired.

Catherine G. Hoag, Grand Isle, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edgar J. Chapman, North Springfield, Vt. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Charles F. Simpson, Arlington, Va., in place of W. A. Coates, retired.

William C. Pulman, Fort Belvoir, Va., in place of D. J. Garber, retired.

Margaret V. Reid, Triangle, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Edmond Paul Hennessey, Everett, Wash., in place of T. E. Skaggs, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Elizabeth A. Barker, Mona, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Thelma F. Settle, Page, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WISCONSIN

Robert R. Taylor, Brokaw, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edgar Leissring, Butler, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edward B. Morse, Mount Hope, Wis., in place of F. W. Krohn, transferred.

Carol P. Buehler, Nekoosa, Wis., in place of A. F. Boles, resigned.

Herman H. Eberhardt, Newton, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bernice P. Lampman, Plover, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Celia Stapleton, Ridgeway, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ben A. Bittner, St. Cloud, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Jossie Loescher, Salem, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John A. Heinzen, Whitelaw, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Martin G. Tonn, Wilton, Wis., in place of J. E. O'Leary, transferred.

WYOMING

Harley G. Murphy, Thermopolis, Wyo., in place of R. W. Hale, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 3 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be passed assistant surgeons

Nunzio J. Carrozzo — Carl Enna
John L. Lincoln — Joseph A. Moore

To be surgeons

David C. Elliott
Benton O. Lewis

To be dental surgeons

Oscar Mikkelsen
Mark E. Bowers

To be senior dental surgeon

William C. Parker

To be temporary passed assistant sanitary engineer

Kaarlo W. Nasi

To be temporary sanitary engineer

Franz J. Maier

To be medical directors

John F. Mahoney
Marion F. Haralson

To be senior surgeons

Edwin H. Carnes — Franklin J. Halpin
Gregory J. Van Beeck

To be temporary surgeon

Dale C. Cameron

POSTMASTERS

LOUISIANA

Charles R. Dupleix, Youngsville.

MINNESOTA

Cora E. Thorson, Echo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 3, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Infinite Spirit who hast promised us grace to forsake our sins, we pray for charity to see the good in others, for faith to trust the things of God, and for strength that braces us for the tasks ahead. Bless us with those qualities which will cause others to trust and cooperate with us; our acts follow us and what we have been make us what we are. Wilt Thou sanctify our tendencies and so direct us that our ambition to rule shall be supplanted by the passion to serve.

We commend to Thee those who are asking for light to shine on their path each common day that they may tread firmly in faith seeking the unrevealed treasures of the future. Be with us as we walk solemnly on the doubtful road to our Emmaus and without prejudice through some despised Samaria, and help us to make every earthly pool our Bethesda. O pass by our imperfections and our limited vision and hold our expectant faces toward Thy light. Crown us with absolute confidence in Thy wisdom and guidance and gear us to high purposes which shall never be defeated as we bring to Thee warm hearts and happy spirits. In the name of St. Mary's holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ALNEY E. CHAFFEE AND LEWIS DESCHLER

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes on a matter which I believe is of interest to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of the anniversary of one's birth is always an occasion for felicitations and the expression of good will and best wishes. Today this is rendered doubly so by the fact that two of the most respected, trusted, and useful employees of the House of Representatives celebrate their respective natal days. I refer to Mr. Alney E. Chaffee, one of the reading clerks of the House, who has served in this capacity since December 1919, or nearly one full quarter of a century, and to Mr. Lewis Deschler, the Parliamentarian of the House, who has likewise served in this office since January 1928, prior to which time he had been Assistant Parliamentarian and also assigned as a clerk to the Speaker's table in December 1925.

Probably no two men contribute more to the orderly procedure and the dispatch of business in this great parliamentary body than do these two men. By the very nature of their work their duties are dissimilar in character, yet they blend in complete fulfillment of the will of the House.

Inasmuch as it is out of the ordinary to have two such important men celebrate their birthday on the same date I have asked permission to address the House for a few minutes in recognition of their worth, their service, and their ability, particularly inviting the attention of the younger Members of the House to the records of these two men.

Mr. Chaffee was born March 3, 1867, at Granville, Addison County, Vt. He received his early education in a typical country schoolhouse in Vermont, and his higher education in the Fremont, Nebr., Normal School, Iowa City Academy, and the State University of Iowa. While Mr. Chaffee's services as reading clerk began in 1919, prior thereto he had been in charge of the telephones. He first entered on these duties in December 1905. He was appointed reading clerk during the same time that the

Honorable Frederick H. Gillett, of Massachusetts, became Speaker of the House, and it has been his honor and privilege to serve under the following Speakers: Hon. Joseph G. Cannon, Hon. Champ Clark, Hon. Frederick H. Gillett, Hon. Nicholas Longworth, Hon. John Nance Garner, Hon. Henry T. Rainey, Hon. Joseph W. Byrns, Hon. William B. Bankhead, and yourself, the Honorable Sam Rayburn. However, there is one melancholy fact in connection with this celebration—not a present Member of the House was serving at the time of his first appointment. In other words, with but few exceptions every Member who represented the various congressional districts at the time of his appointment in 1905 has now passed to the Great Beyond and for them all time has expired.

Should time and space permit, it would be interesting to speculate on the changes that have occurred in our national life since the date of the birth of this man but the limitations of time and the exigencies of the moment forbid any lengthy dissertations along these lines. Suffice it to say that here is a man who has seen such instrumentalities as the telephone, the electric light, the automobile, the radio, the airplane, the submarine, the tractor, and the moving picture come into action since the date of his birth. What a marvelous review of the inventive and mechanical progress of this Nation this has been.

I have asked Mr. Chaffee to single out one outstanding occurrence that occurred during the time that he has served in this body and he very graciously has selected as that notable event the consideration of the Norris resolution in the Sixty-first Congress, second session, beginning March 18, 1910. Obviously, I will not read the RECORD now but I do invite every Member of this House to read this narrative as one of the remarkable episodes in the history of this great body.

One of the outstanding occurrences was the consideration of the Norris resolution in the Sixty-first Congress, second session, beginning March 17, 1910.

"House Resolution 502

"*Resolved*, that the rules of the House be amended as follows:

" 'The Committee on Rules shall consist of 15 members, 9 of whom shall be members of the majority party and 6 of whom shall be members of the minority party to be elected as follows: The States of the Union shall be divided by a committee of 3, elected by the House for that purpose, into 9 groups, each group containing, as near as may be, an equal number of members, belonging to the majority party. The States of the Union shall be likewise divided into 6 groups, each group containing, as near as may be, an equal number of the minority party.

" 'At 10 o'clock a. m. of the day following the adoption of the report of said committee each of said groups shall meet and elect one of its number a member of the Committee on Rules. The place of meeting of said groups shall be designated by the committee of 3 in its report.

" 'Each of said groups shall report to the House the name of the Member selected for membership on the Committee on Rules.

" 'The Committee on Rules shall select its own chairman.

" 'The Speaker shall not be eligible for membership on said committee.

" 'All rules or parts thereof inconsistent with the foregoing resolution are hereby repealed.' "

Mr. Dalzell made a point of order against the resolution that it was not privileged. Debate on the point of order continued throughout the 17th and 18th without adjournment or recess, although eight roll calls were had without success. Notwithstanding the fact that when it was discovered it was without a quorum there was failure to order a call of the House.

On the seventh roll call which was on a motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call, there were yeas 24, nays 96, present 31, and not voting 237. This was on the legislative day of March 17 and the Calendar day of the 18th. The Speaker pro tempore, Hon. J. Hampton Moore, declared that a quorum was present. This was somewhat of a star-chamber proceeding inasmuch as the roll call just before developed 237 not voting. This was following the example of Speaker Reed, who declared a quorum present although men slipped out for the evident purpose of breaking the quorum.

Until 4:30 o'clock on the 18th, after failure to dispense with further proceedings under the call, when 237 Members failed to vote, they adjourned viva voce vote at 4:50 p. m. until 12 noon on the 19th. The Speaker sustained the point of order. From his decision appeal was taken and the decision of the Chair was overruled, whereupon Mr. Norris offered a substitute for his own resolution as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Rules of the House of Representatives be amended as follows:

"1. In rule 10, paragraph 1, strike out the words, 'on rules to consist of five members.'

"2. Add new paragraph to rule 10 as follows:

" 'Paragraph 5. There shall be a Committee on Rules elected by the House, consisting of 10 members, 6 of whom shall be members of the majority party and 4 of whom shall be members of the minority party.

" 'The Speaker shall not be a member of the committee and the committee shall elect its own chairman from its own members.'

"*Resolved further*, That within 10 days after the adoption of this resolution there shall be an election of the committee and, immediately upon its election, the present Committee on Rules shall be dissolved."

The resolution and substitute were debated throughout the day and the first roll call to succeed was on the previous question. Thereafter a roll call was had on the adoption of the resolution which was agreed to.

The Speaker took the floor and made a caustic speech in which he disavowed any attempt ever to exercise any power other than to enforce the rules of the House, that he had followed the precedents of Speakers since Reed and that the resolution just passed broke the precedents of 60 years standing and since the majority had become the minority by this action he would be inclined to resign the speakership were it not for his duty to help carry out the pledges of his party, but that he would entertain a resolution from any Member to declare the speakership vacant and proceed to an election to fill the vacancy, whereupon Mr. Burleson, of Texas, offered the identical resolution which was debated briefly and defeated on the sixteenth roll call during the consideration by a substantial vote.

The features of this remarkable 3-day-and-2-night session were the 2 days of debate on a point of order and the fact that 95 Members participated in the debate, which was at all times spirited and at times vociferous.

Further interest attaches to this memorable occasion because the Members of the Sixty-first Congress included 2 Members that were afterward candidates for President, 1 who was elected Vice President, 8 who were elevated to Cabinet positions, and 1 is still a Cabinet member, 1 former Speaker, 6 future Speakers, 6 known defeated candidates for Speaker, 11 became Senators, and 5 were future floor leaders in addition to the 2 floor leaders serving at the time. Lindbergh, father of the great aviator, was a Member of this Congress and Hamilton Fish, father of our present HAMILTON FISH, was also a Member. Richard Pearson Hobson, of Spanish War fame, was also among the many distinguished Members.

The total membership of the Sixty-first Congress, second session, was 391, consisting of 219 Republicans, 170 Democrats, and 2 vacancies.

There was a little chuckle in the proceedings when, after the Speaker had been authorized to issue writs, he instructed the Sergeant at Arms to arrest and bring before the bar of the House absent Members. After a continuous session of 2 days and nights this order became effective on the eve of the second day and between 4 and 5 o'clock in the morning of the third day, a Deputy Sergeant at Arms brought in a Member from Ohio who was disturbed in his slumbers at his lodgings and was, therefore, temporarily red-headed and when presented to the bar of the House asked to know who had perpetrated this outrage, and when advised that it was the Speaker, he replied that he knew Joe Cannon never did such a small thing and went away doubting the veracity of his informant.

Mr. Chaffee was an eyewitness to all these transactions, having arrived at the House at 11 o'clock on Friday morning and his next exit was on Sunday morning at 9 o'clock.

Our gifted and able parliamentarian, Mr. Deschler, was born March 3, 1905, in Chillicothe, Ohio. His education was secured at Miami University, at Oxford, Ohio, and later completed at George Washington University in this city. He has also attended the National University and was admitted to the bar of the District of Columbia in the year 1934 and to the Supreme Court of the United States in the year 1937.

He was first appointed a messenger at the Speaker's table in December 1925, later Assistant Parliamentarian in January 1927, and to his present position as Parliamentarian in January 1928.

He likewise has served under the following Speakers: Hon. Nicholas Longworth, Hon. John Nance Garner, Hon. Henry T. Rainey, Hon. Joseph W. Byrns, Hon. William B. Bankhead, and Hon. Sam Rayburn.

Mr. Deschler is the editor of the House Rules and Manual, that very valuable work that is indispensable to every Member of this body and which is conducive to the harmonious working of our daily routine.

Mr. Speaker, in honoring these two faithful servants of the House, we honor ourselves. They have given of their time, of their ability, of their learning, and of their services to the perfection of the legislative processes of the House of Representatives. Every Member present here today is their debtor and, therefore, how eminently right, proper, and just that we accord to them the full measure of our appreciation for the invaluable service they have rendered, not only to the House of Representatives, but to the Members thereof and their

constituencies throughout the United States.

[From the Nebraska City Daily News-Press]

FORMER OTOEAN OLDEST EMPLOYEE OF THE HOUSE—ALNEY E. CHAFFEE HAS SEEN THE GREAT ONES PASS BEFORE HIS EYES

(By J. H. Sweet)

Alney E. Chaffee, who began his business career in Otoe County as the son of a Vermonter who thought Nebraska would be a good place to live, has the distinction today of being the oldest employee of the House of Representatives in Washington.

The courtly, well-informed, and industrious reading clerk of the House unobtrusively observed an anniversary recently by remarking that "being here is a privilege as well as a means of livelihood."

The oldest Member of the House is ADOLPH SABATH, the rotund little man from Chicago, chairman of the potent Rules Committee. Chaffee was there 2 years before him.

In his home Chaffee has a wall filled with autographed portraits of Speakers, dead and living, and the visitor notes that they are in each case accompanied by remarks of commendation and loving kindness.

In his 38 years as a House employee, Chaffee has known and consorted with such great leaders as Uncle Joe Cannon, Nick Longworth, Rainey, of Illinois, the elder Joe Byrns, of Tennessee, Champ Clark, the lamented and scholarly William B. Bankhead, father of Actress Tallulah, and Sam Rayburn, popular and industrious man from Texas, who now sits in the chair.

OTOEAN TO START

Otoe County is proud of "Earle" Chaffee, as his wife, the former Fanny Pendleton, of Otoe precinct, calls him, because he started here as a farmer, one who, some old timers say, had his head so full of progressive ideas about livestock raising that they aroused the risibilities of some neighbors who, by the way, long since have passed from the scene of action.

Chaffee was born in Vermont and in his make-up carries all the stubborn and praiseworthy attributes of a granite-hilled New Englander. But don't mistake—no man is more progressive in his notions.

Chaffee was the first man I met, aside from the Clerk of the House, whom I had to meet for technical reasons, in Washington. It gives me pride to recall that he was my constituent. To say that he was helpful is beside the point—he was helpful in a thousand ways and it was my good fortune to see him visit the office whenever his busy day would permit, to visit in his home where he and his estimable hausfrau were wonderful hosts, to meet his charming daughter and her equally charming husband, a Washington businessman, and two of the most interesting youngsters I've ever known.

HELPED TO SELECT HIS AIDE

Last year Mr. Chaffee was ill for a long time. House Members immediately missed the musical voice which reads bills, motions, orders, and helps call that long roll of 435 names, and on occasion "Mr. Speaker."

He has a colleague, of course, but on him devolves the responsibilities of senior reading clerk, and on one occasion the Speaker and Clerk of the House left it to him to try out applicants until one was found whose voice could stand the strain—29 roll calls in 3 days, once, I recall—and who could meet the other requirements.

One reading clerk is a Republican; the Vermonter-Otoean fits into that category—and the other a Democrat, George J. Maurer, Easton, Pa., recently appointed, but they are brothers-at-arms when it comes to the job, and I've heard Mr. Chaffee describe with tears in his voice the record of a man who served with him a long time and whose death occurred only a few years ago, Patrick J. Haltigan, of New York; since then another has come and gone, Roger M. Calloway, of Thermopolis, Wyo., who died December 4, 1943.

If, as an Otoean, you should go to Washington, I recommend that you meet this man Chaffee. He'll be glad to see you. He has a warm spot in his heart for Otoe County. He know a lot more about us and our habits and customs than you'd think, because he is a regular subscriber to the News-Press and the Syracuse Journal-Democrat. He votes in Syracuse precinct, and, as he told me once, "Mother and I still have pride in our residence there."

One day, as I suggested once, he may write a book about the long and brilliant line of men and women who have passed through the corridors and occupied seats in the "greatest deliberative body on earth."

I hope so, but I think he'd better hurry while his photographic memory is able to transmit his recollections to paper.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a short editorial from a newspaper and the statement prepared by Mr. Chaffee as to the episode referred to in the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will do the very unusual thing of speaking from this place, and will state the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] with reference to Mr. Chaffee and Mr. Deschler have my heartfelt approval.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CONDITIONS OF AMERICAN INDIANS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (H. Res. 166, Rept. No. 1225), a resolution to create a select committee to investigate conditions of American Indians in the United States, for printing in the RECORD.

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation to determine whether the changed status of the Indian and the conditions under which he now lives require a revision of the laws and regulations affecting the American Indian and to prepare recommendations to Congress for the enactment of any needed legislation to improve the status and advance the opportunity of the American Indian.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation and changes of policy and program as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member deignated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report (H. Res. 459, Rept. 1226) on the bill H. R. 4278, a bill to control the eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday will be the Consent Calendar. Then, following that, will come the bill on which a rule has just been reported, the bill coming from the Committee on Agriculture (H. R. 4278), authorizing certain appropriations which in past years have been made without authority of law, and which we are anxious to have passed so that the Subcommittee on Agriculture, which is now considering the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, may proceed with the consideration of the appropriation in connection with it. I understand it is desired to have the authorization for the appropriation enacted into law.

Then, on Tuesday, will be the Private Calendar. Following that, the Mundt resolution—the resolution just reported from the Rules Committee in relation to the investigation of the Indians.

On Wednesday and Thursday will be the first deficiency appropriation bill. The bill will be reported out on Tuesday, I understand, and it will be taken up for general debate on Wednesday and probably under the 5-minute rule on Thursday. However, I am assigning it for Wednesday and Thursday.

Then, of course, the conference report on the armed forces vote bill, which has to be acted upon first in the Senate. It is impossible to state now just where that is to fit in.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman will give everybody at least 1 day's notice before calling up that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly. That will be done, so that there will be at least 1 day's notice to Members of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], that the conference report on the soldiers' absentee voting bill, which was agreed upon by the House and Senate conferees on yesterday will be reported on next Monday. It will probably be taken up in the Senate on Tuesday. However, there are several Senators away, attending the funeral of Senator McNary, and it is entirely probable that the Senate will want to wait until they return, which will be the latter part of the week, before this conference report is taken up in the Senate. There are also several Members of the House absent on the same mission who are tremendously interested in the proposition, one of them being the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH], who is one of the conferees. With the calendar crowded as it is now, as stated by the majority leader [Mr. McCORMACK], it will probably be the last of next week and in all probability the first of the following week before the managers on the part of the House will be in a position to present the conference report to the floor of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has agreed to give ample notice in any event.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is probably better acquainted with the probabilities as to when the conference report will come up in the House, and I appreciate his contribution. In any event, the Senate will act first and there will be ample notice given to Members of the House so that they can be present.

I might state there may be other matters such as unanimous-consent requests, but if any matter comes up changing this program, I will confer with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and give the House ample advance notice.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

SOLDIERS' VOTE LEGISLATION

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to know what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] saw in the paper, but I want to assure him that the members of the conference committee were quite as patriotic as the gentleman from Missouri. They labored diligently to work out a bill that would meet the test of constitutionality, that would protect the rights of the States and afford an opportunity for every member of the armed services to vote by absentee ballot.

There may be some things about this conference report that I should like to have changed, but I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri, and to the Members of the House, that if this conference report goes through as it is written and its provisions are carried out, every single person in the armed forces of the United States who is entitled to vote in his home State will be given an opportunity to vote in a constitutional election.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Washington, Ga., First of That Name," which appeared in the Atlanta Journal of February 22, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include several newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. COCHRAN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject Campaign Facts, Not Campaign Oratory.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the New Jersey Morning Call.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Marvin Jones and some excerpts from a letter from constituents on livestock conditions in Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Toledo Times under date of March 2, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial from the St. Mary's Daily Press.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Governor Langlie, of Washington, and letters from Mr. John Carroll, chairman, executive committee, Association of Washington Cities; Hon. Herbert G. West, mayor of Walla Walla; and Mr. L. R. Durkee, regional engineer, Federal Works Agency.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by Hon. G. Mason Owlett, president of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association, at this organization's annual meeting on February 22, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REVERSE LEND-LEASE

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I undertake as a Member of the House to give all attention possible to everything that engages our interest, but I am particularly interested from a standpoint of the highest necessity in the progress of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an article that appeared in Collier's Weekly which I ask leave to read, regarding contributions made by our allies. We talk about lend-lease as though we were at one end of it altogether. That is not true. I read you this:

The people of Australia and New Zealand, whose total number is only three-quarters that of the population of the metropolitan area of New York City, lent the United States

troops stationed among them $247,000,000 worth of food and other supplies in 1943.

The same can be said of our other allies. I do trust we appreciate the great sacrifice they are making in men and materials to preserve our freedom as well as the freedom of the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two instances: In one to insert two resolutions from the General Assembly of South Carolina, and in the other to insert a statement from the Department of Commerce which shows that we drank and consumed $6,000,000,000 worth of liquor last year.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE EXECUTIVE AND THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. COX addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL LAND BANKS AND LAND BANK COMMISSIONER

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a statement in regard to the activities of the Agricultural Credit Agencies.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PACE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Ernest Lindley which appeared in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Teamwork for Victory."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PLIGHT OF THE INDEPENDENT OILMAN

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DISNEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GARNISHMENT, EXECUTION OR TRUSTEE PROCESS OF WAGES AND SALARIES OF CIVIL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 453, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2985, a bill to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] the usual 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this Resolution 453 provides for the consideration of H. R. 2985 and allows 2 hours general debate. It is an open rule. It involves the garnishment, execution, and trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States.

Up to a little while ago no officer or no employee of any Government corporation could be garnisheed; but the Supreme Court a short while ago decided that officers and employees of Government corporations and other similar instrumentalities, which are authorized to sue and be sued, could be garnisheed.

Broadly, the bill proposes to subject wages and salaries of all civil officers and employees of the United States, its instrumentalities and agencies, and employees of the District of Columbia to the remedies of garnishment, execution, and trustee process in the same manner and upon such conditions as may be applicable in the case of wages or salaries due from private employers in the State or Territory in which is located the court wherein such remedies are sought.

The bill, if enacted into law, would not be retroactive, but would be effective on and after its passage.

Only one garnishment a month would be answered against a debtor.

I think the bill goes too far.

It is important to know that practically all Government departments and agencies are against this bill.

The principal complaint by Federal agencies is that the bill would cause a great deal more administrative work answering writs of garnishment. No doubt this proposal, if enacted, would be the source of much annoyance and expense to the Government.

And it should be remembered that at present there is remedy for bona fide creditors. When complaint is made against a Government employee on account of alleged failure to pay his debts, that complaint is referred to the employee with request for a statement. If the employee denies the debt, the Government simply requires that the validity be established by a court of competent jurisdiction and then the Government will force liquidation of the debt or discharge the employee. If the employee admits the indebtedness, he is directed to make arrangement to liquidate it, under penalty of dismissal for failure.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that this bill goes far afield—and I cannot come to the conclusion that it is legislation which should receive favorable consideration—it has been my policy and that of the Committee on Rules for many years to allow the House to determine whether controversial legislation should pass or not. In this instance, the Committee on Rules, by a majority vote, has reported the rule, and therefore the House has the right to pass or defeat the bill.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am rather disposed to agree with the gentleman in the view that he takes in reference to this resolution. I think it is going to throw credit wide open and that it is going to provide a device for the little shyster around town pursuing every Government employee when somebody has extended a credit to him upon the assurance that in the end the Government will be compelled to pay.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For many years civic, welfare, and religious organizations, as well as men in public life, have tried to discourage buying on the installment plan because it puts the workers of this country in a very serious situation. If we pass this bill we put our O. K. on the many loan sharks and racketeers who are now advocating, "Walk into my store, you do not need any money, pay 50 cents a week, and make the purchase now of anything you wish."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am happy to hear the Chairman of the Rules Committee make the statement he has just made. In my opinion, too, this is a very bad bill, and it should not pass the Congress. It will have a much more far-reaching effect than was ever intended, and the remedy sought, in my judgment, in the final outcome, will be overshadowed and overbalanced by the injury produced.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman. This bill has been reported by the great Judiciary Committee of the House, and naturally the Committee on Rules does not wish to refuse the House the opportunity to consider a bill reported by that

great committee. We of the Committee on Rules are sometimes overruled; however, we feel that we have a duty to perform in familiarizing the House with the provisions of any legislation which might have passed through a legislative committee without the consideration that the Committee on Rules feels it is entitled to.

Mr. Speaker, one reason why I do not approve of the bill is because I am fearful that it will aid certain so-called easy-payment merchants and loan sharks who do not at all times employ fair play, notwithstanding the glaring advertisements as to how easy it is for people to obtain money and merchandise. Conditions change when the people have extensively obligated themselves and signed on the dotted line, and many of these people who lack strong wills remain the debtors of such merchants and loan companies for many years. That is why I deny approval of this bill. I feel it will encourage the so-called easy-payment advocates. I have some friends in Chicago who feel that it is needed; they feel that this legislation is necessary because frequently Government employees, the same as others, are not anxious and desirous to meet their obligations. I feel that if the country were in a diffent condition than it is today, as it was we will say in 1931, 1932, and 1933, when people were without funds and needed credit, there might be some little justification for this bill; however, never before has there been so much money among the people, never before have the people had more money than they have now and, therefore, I cannot quite understand why Government employees should be buying on time-payment plans and thereby paying perhaps 50 percent more for the things they buy; and with the incentive offered by merchants of all kinds, Government employees also buy things that are not absolutely necessary. They buy fancy clothes, they buy this and that, and before they know it they are in debt over their heads, and I feel if they cannot pay cash now they never will be able to do so. I think it affects their efficiency, because of the annoyance and the trouble that they have later on to meet the payments.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I am wondering if the gentleman, who believes that the Federal Government employees need protection after they have incurred debts, is of the opinion that if they have got sense enough to work for the Government, then they have got sense enough to handle their own financial affairs in an honest, decent way?

Mr. SABATH. They should have.

Mr. MASON. Then there should be no objection to the garnisheeing of their wages like garnisheeing the wages of any other person who is working.

Mr. SABATH. Why should it be necessary for the Government to guarantee their liabilities or their indebtedness? That I cannot understand.

Mr. MASON. The bill does not so provide.

Mr. SABATH. A merchant or other bona fide creditor has two protections, namely, knowing a Government employee may not be garnisheed, he may refuse such employee credit; and he may collect a just debt by the process I have outlined. I am fearful that if we pass this bill, we will create in addition to the things I have mentioned a very serious and lasting confusion within the departments. If the various departments are obliged to answer all these garnishee actions, it will require additional help. The Treasury Department will be called upon to answer. Although the bill provides that it is not necessary for them to answer personally, that it can be done in writing, nevertheless, it will require a great deal of work, and I am fearful it will cost a great deal of money.

Some of you may say, "You are reporting the rule and are speaking against it." I want to be understood. I am reporting the rule to give the House the opportunity to vote upon it. Ever since I have been in this House I have taken the position that the Members should not be deprived of the right to pass upon any legislation which is of general interest to the people.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the gentleman familiar with the provision of the bill which states that the person holding the judgment must file a sum of money—$2.50 if the judgment is less than $100 or $5 if it is more than $100—at the time he requests the garnishee proceedings? That is for the purpose of paying the cost of making answer.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I understand that; but it will not fully compensate. Of course, that cost will ultimately fall upon the debtors and it is an additional burden that invariably is quite hard for them to meet, because in most instances they overbuy.

As to the loan companies, for years I have been trying to effect legislation that will restrict these loan companies taking advantage of the unfortunate people who are obliged to get small loans. I think we have been guilty to some extent for a failure to protect these unfortunate people, because in nearly all cases they have been imposed upon by these loan companies to such an extent that I feel any self-respecting person or any legislator could not condone the practice, and should give relief to these people and put a stop to that practice.

We at one time said we were going to reduce the interest that has to be paid on these loans. Unfortunately, where that was done, the loan companies found a way to collect certain fees in addition to the legal rate, or they removed their places of business just beyond the District line, with the result that many of these unfortunate men and women never will get out of the clutches of the loan companies. I know there are some large and even small companies that may not be guilty of excessive interest charges, but even those companies, I am told, are not so liberal and not so genteel with their clients as they might be or as they should be.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I appreciate the concern he justly shows for those individuals who are preyed upon by the small-loan companies. The gentleman, as well as other Members of the House, will recall that several years ago the District Committee brought legislation to the floor which would have set up within the District of Columbia a workable small-loan law, which would have counteracted the excessive rates which are now being paid by District of Columbia residents on loans consummated in Maryland and Virginia. We lost that measure here in the House. I have often believed—and I say it very kindly—that the Members made a grievous error in turning down that legislation. We do know that the companies operating in the jurisdictions of Maryland and Virginia gain a large part of their business from District of Columbia residents, and, of course, that, in many instances, means Federal employees.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; they have set themselves up right around the border of the District of Columbia. There are many offices there. Some of them even do business right here, but they do not conclude the business in the District of Columbia because they are avoiding the law, and the final papers are executed in Maryland or Virginia.

I think I have said enough on the rule and on the bill. I have felt it my duty to familiarize the House to the best of my ability, as I always try to do in my humble way.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I call attention to a letter from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A1002. If the Members would read that letter, I think it might clarify some of the questions the gentleman has so ably presented.

Mr. SABATH. If I am not mistaken, the officers and employees in that agency are subject to garnishment proceedings now, and so are others, but why we should enlarge this law and make it applicable to all the old-established departments, I do not know.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As the gentleman has said, the employees of governmental corporations, such as the T. V. A., the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Federal Housing, and some 35 or 40 other of these corporations, are now subject to garnishment just like the employees of private industry. They are paid on the same wage scale and they are under the same rules and regulations. I wonder what reason the gentleman can give for allowing them to be subject to garnishment, so that all of them will have to pay their bills, whereas the employees of the

Treasury or other Departments are not subject to it.

Mr. SABATH. I have said that the Supreme Court recently subjected officers and employees and similar instrumentalities, which are authorized to sue and be sued, to garnishment. I myself cannot give any reason, except that there is a Supreme Court ruling that the officers and employees of these Government corporations and similar instrumentalities, which may sue and be sued, are subject to garnishment. As I do not control the actions of our courts, and most of the time do not stand very well with them because of questioning some of their decisions, naturally I do not think I would be in a position to change their opinion as to the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. In further answer to the gentleman's question, may I say that one legislative wrong or injury does not justify another.

Mr. SABATH. That is a well-recognized principle.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would be well for the Members to read the statement of Mr. Allen from the Disbursement Office, stating what it would cost the Government and the trouble it would put the Government to, if it should become a collector for the money sharks of the country.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield with pleasure 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and I know he will use that time to enlighten the House, as he always does.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. This is not a new measure. It has been in Congress, I think, in every session since I have been here. I do oppose the bill. I do not oppose the rule. I do not oppose the bill primarily for most of the reasons given by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee. I oppose it at this time entirely on the ground of administration. It is true that these corporations, quasi-public corporations like the T. V. A., operating as corporations, incorporated under State laws, are not exempt from garnishment, but the Federal Government is. The Supreme Court of course has held that the only reason those institutions may be garnisheed is because they are, in a way, private corporations, and that the law preventing the Government being sued does not apply to those corporations, because in their charters they provide that they may sue and be sued, and they do sue and they are sued in the courts.

I presume this bill will pass, because the membership of the House does not take any particular interest in it. They say that people should pay their bills. I agree with them. One gentleman from Pennsylvania came to me a little bit ago and said, "I am for this bill; I am for it because I was in the retail business in Pennsylvania for a number of years and I know that a lot of people do not pay debts in Pennsylvania, and I want some law to garnishee them." I said, "Why do you not use your State law?" He then said it was because they have no garnishment law in the State of Pennsylvania and that that State will not enact a garnishment law. Then my answer to him is—if that is true—this law will not apply in any State except where the State has a garnishment law. So I say to the Pennsylvania Members who are going to vote for this, because their own legislature will not give them a garnishment law, do not vote under a misapprehension of the facts. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] knows that fact, and he is not the man who asked me that question.

I am primarily against it because every single department in the Government is opposed to it now. We are at war. We are short on money and manpower. I ask you Members to turn to pages 38, 47, 52, 58, and 66 of the hearings, and there you will find that the Treasury Department and all the other departments, the War Department, the Navy Department, are all against it. Why? Because they say it cannot be enacted now without interfering with the war effort.

We have gotten along for 150 years without this kind of a law, and why now enact a law which must add to the Federal pay roll? We have too many employees now. No later than yesterday the Secretary of War, Mr. Henry Stimson himself, showed such interest in this bill that he sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary a letter vehemently protesting, and I shall read one short paragraph from that letter:

> An additional staff would have to be employed to keep records to take care of continuous changes in pay rolls and disbursing operations, and to conduct a correspondence that undoubtedly would be involved with employees scattered throughout the United States. Our pay-roll employees would be required to familiarize themselves with the garnishment laws of each State.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall take 5 minutes more. May I also call attention to one or two paragraphs from the Attorney General's letter protesting against this proposed law. Who is the Attorney General? He is the chief law officer of the Nation. He is the man who advises other departments when the President so desires. The Attorney General says among other things after first discussing the merits of the bill:

> On the other hand, the administration of a system of garnishment or attachment of Government salaries would be difficult and costly to the Government, because of the number of Government employees and the degree to which they are scattered. A unit would have to be established in every agency to receive and record such process and to keep an account of all attachments and garnishments received, as well as to conduct the great volume of correspondence that would undoubtedly be involved. It is easily conceivable that taking the Government as a whole, thousands of garnishments may be pending at any one time. In addition, it would be necessary to check every name on each pay roll before each pay day to make certain that no attachment or garnishment is outstanding against it.

There are 3,000,000 people on the pay roll of the United States. Is this Congress going to pass a law which the chief law officer of the Nation tells us will require a rechecking of every check before every pay roll. O you people who have been talking about economy, who have been talking about reducing the number of persons on the pay roll, what are you going to say? Are you going to say that we agree with the collectors who are all for this bill—all of the collecting agencies, the Morris Plan Bank, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia? And who is against it? Every department of the Government charged with carrying on the war. I am not controlled in what I do here by endorsements. In addition, the labor organizations are against it.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. If the gentleman says that tens of thousands of dead beats are on the pay roll of the Federal Government, does he not think it is about time that something be done about it?

Mr. MICHENER. No. I think it is more important to win the war now. I think it is more important not to put nonessential, additional people on the pay roll for the purpose of effecting any reform. I for one am taking the position here that we should limit the Federal employees, and we should not carry on these reforms regardless of how beneficial they may be to the country in normal times. We should get this war won first, and then there should be a general reappraisement of the financial condition of this country and of the laws of the country, and make those laws fit the conditions as they are at that time. I have just read what the Attorney General said about the additional work that would be required. It was said to our committee that there would not be many of these garnishments if we had this law.

Of course, I adopt the old philosophy that in passing a law we should always provide for possibilities and not probabilities. But it is interesting to note, on page 66 of the hearings, a Mr. Doherty, an attorney in the District, a collector, who appeared before the committee and spoke in favor of this bill. Among other things he said:

> And in my files today I have approximately 4,000 judgments against people who work in the Government, not low-paid employees that they speak about, but up in the higher brackets, $3,600 and $4,200—that I cannot collect.

My friend from New York, the distinguished ranking member of the committee, wants to help that man collect those 4,000 judgments. You and I know, although, of course, we want those people to pay their debts, that it is going to take just what the Attorney General says it is going to take to handle those 4,000 judgments alone that will be coming into the Department. It is just a question of

administration to me. I want these people to pay. I am not opposed to this law because I am opposed to garnishments. We have a garnishment law in Michigan. It works well. We like it. We use it. You have one in New York, also. The people who know about it know that it takes a lot of work in the municipal or justice court. It takes a lot of time and work on the part of the garnishee defendant. I was talking a little while ago with a Member from a State who was a presiding officer in a municipal court and he told me of the vast volume and amount of work that this will entail. He hoped that it would not be passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] spoke a while ago about having dead beats on the Federal pay roll. Should not the man who is extending credit find out to whom he is extending credit and not try to use the Federal Government to collect every bad debt that he has made?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to go into that, because that goes into the philosophy of garnishments everywhere. I do not want to yield further along that line.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan, whom I greatly admire, used Pennsylvania as an illustration and stated that some of the people in Pennsylvania do not pay their debts. I was just wondering if he was trying to infer that the people of Michigan all paid their debts.

Mr. MICHENER. Oh, no.

Mr. GAVIN. And I was just wondering why my State was singled out as an illustration.

Mr. MICHENER. I just used Pennsylvania as an illustration. I did not mean to cast any reflection on the people of Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

May I answer the gentleman further. I did not mean to cast a reflection on your State. But one of your good colleagues came to me and was for this bill under a misapprehension of facts.

Mr. GAVIN. When the gentleman from Michigan was citing us as an example, I was just wondering what the conditions were in Michigan; however, I know quite well he intended no reflection on the people of my State.

Mr. MICHENER. The conditions in Michigan are such that we have passed a garnishment law to get the fellows who will not pay. If you want to do that in Pennsylvania, certainly you ought not to come down to Washington and ask the Federal Government, even if it can, to pass a law to permit grocers to collect their grocery bills and have the accounts audited and all the expense paid by the Federal Government, and with additional employees in the District here at this time, while Pennsylvania has no State garnishment law.

Mr. GAVIN. Evidently we have fine people in Pennsylvania and it was not necessary to have garnishee legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure the gentleman has.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to see if I understood the gentleman correctly. Would this statute be applicable in a State where the employees of a State, county, or municipality could not be garnisheed, although the employees of a corporation or an individual can be garnisheed?

Mr. MICHENER. My understanding is that this bill has a provision providing for State exemptions and if you have no garnishment law in a State, then this law would not apply.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the point of my question, with all deference to the gentleman, is this: There are garnishments in many States applicable to individuals and corporations, but the State's governmental subdivisions are exempt from garnishment. My question is whether or not under the terms of this bill this statute would apply to those States where Government employees and employees of States and other local subdivisions may not be garnisheed?

Mr. MICHENER. I am not prepared to state.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not think that is clear from the language of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. This bill merely makes the laws of a State apply to the citizens of the State, even though they are Federal employees. It does not change the law of any State whatsoever except to make Federal employees subject to the law of the State where they are domiciled.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But you have the anomalous situation of garnisheeing the salaries of Federal employees and not being able to garnishee employees of the State's governmental subdivisions.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from New York has answered precisely the question asked by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not seem to understand that.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who is possibly for this bill notwithstanding the things I have said.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, I expect later to discuss this bill.

Within recent years there has been created in the Federal Government a multitude of bureaus, special tribunals, authorities, corporations, agencies, and so forth. Some were set up by law and others by Executive order. Many of these organizations exercise executive, legislative, and judicial functions. Through their rules, regulations, directives, and orders they do more legislating than the Congress. They try many more cases than all the Federal courts put together. And yet in many respects they operate in complete disregard of those principles of orderly procedure and due process guaranteed by the Constitution.

To remedy this situation I have introduced a bill, H. R. 4314, known as the Fair Government Practices Act. Its objects are to improve the relations between private citizens and governmental authorities, to facilitate the administration of justice, to protect civil rights, and to preserve the form of government guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States of America.

It is a bill to designate and make uniform those administrative practices and procedures which are generally recognized as fair and equitable to the citizen and essential to orderly and efficient government.

This bill therefore would:

First. Make available to the public complete information regarding Government rules and regulations so that citizens affected by them can be fully advised of their rights and obligations under the law.

Second. Protect the public against "fishing expeditions" by limiting the growing flood of investigations, reports, and questionnaires to the minimum requirement of law enforcement and efficient Government administration.

Third. Prevent the invention by Government agencies of new or special penalties or restrictions not expressly authorized by the Congress.

Fourth. Prevent penalizing the citizen for the faults of Government, whether arising from delays in ruling on conduct requiring Government approval or from sudden changes in the applicable rules.

Fifth. Restate the basic rules covering the availability and scope of judicial review so that the citizen may readily determine the nature and extent of his right to his "day in court" to contest the arbitrary or unlawful acts of administrative officials.

Sixth. Attempt to guarantee impartial, unbiased decisions by Government agencies by requiring the separation of functions of "prosecutor" and "judge."

Seventh. Undertake to create a better understanding between the citizen and his government by giving the citizen a better opportunity to have a voice in the making of rules and regulations which affect his welfare and livelihood.

Eighth. Protect the citizen against any "star chamber" proceedings by restating the oft-forgotten principle that a man is innocent until proved guilty and by requiring due notice and a full opportunity to be heard and to meet any evidence against him before any judgment or decision can be rendered.

Ninth. Require that administrative decisions be reached on the basis of evidence—not surmise or conjecture—and only after an unbiased appraisal of all the evidence and an impartial exercise of judgment and discretion.

Tenth. Permit more intelligent judicial review of administrative action by clearly distinguishing those Government practices which are compatible with good government and due process of law from abuses which can only undermine public confidence and jeopardize our constitutional system.

MILITARY FUNCTIONS

While these are the basic objectives of the legislation, the bill has been meticulously drawn to avoid any interference whatever with the successful prosecution of the war, by excluding any military, naval, or diplomatic functions from its provisions. In the past, exemption of military and diplomatic activities has been attempted by exclusion of specific departments or agencies. This bill meets the problem much more realistically in the light of actual wartime developments. The requirements of total war have resulted in transfer of military and diplomatic functions to many emergency agencies which are not part of the Military or Naval establishment or the Department of State. To assure that these "war" activities, wherever exercised, would in no way be affected by this bill, the legislation is drafted to exempt the function rather than the agency. Therefore any military, naval, or diplomatic function is carefully excluded from sections of the bill requiring publication of rules, regulations, or orders and from sections requiring minimum standards of notice, hearing, and public participation in the formation of rules and regulations. On the other hand, if other emergency agencies performing military or diplomatic functions also exercise judicial functions under statutes requiring public hearings, this bill does not relax any requirements of due process which Congress has imposed in existing statutes.

EMERGENCY AGENCIES

Emergency agencies which have regulatory powers, but which do not perform any military, naval, or diplomatic function are covered in this bill. Again, however, it should be stated emphatically that the bill has been drafted to avoid imposing procedures or requirements which in any way could seriously interfere with the efficient functioning of these emergency agencies. They are required to give full public information regarding their rules, procedures, and regulations. Most such agencies already follow the practice in some measure, either because required by statute or because full public information has been found desirable to obtain maximum public cooperation and compliance.

Emergency agencies, like regular departments or independent commissions or boards, would also be subject to certain minimum requirements affecting rule-making. These include reasonable notice of proposed regulations with an opportunity afforded to persons to be affected thereby to submit views or facts and arguments. However, no public hearing would be required prior to issuance of such regulations unless such hearings are already required by statute. In those cases where public hearings are already required by law, the bill would establish uniform procedures to govern such hearings. These uniform procedures, however, are carefully constructed to avoid delays and to permit emergency action. Minimum standards are imposed to assure impartial hearing officers, to make certain that vital policy decisions shall be based upon fact, not theory or surmise, and to give all parties an opportunity to appear and present evidence.

While the bill refrains from placing Government administration in any rigid pattern or strait jacket, it nevertheless grants much-needed and long-overdue protection to the citizen whose affairs and livelihood are affected by these agencies of Government.

If the war emergency should come to an early end, these emergency agencies will not be handicapped by anything in this bill. If these emergency powers are continued for any extended period, then experience already shows that public understanding, which is so essential to widespread acceptance of wartime controls, will be greatly stimulated by the orderly and equitable practices required by this legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I did not know the gentleman from Iowa intended to speak out of order. The gentleman has just suggested a very timely subject. It is thought-provoking, and I do hope we will all give heed to it. May I at the same time hope that since the gentleman has finished with that, that he will now give thought to the bill that is before us, and when he does give his usual study to this matter I cannot help but feel that the gentleman will vote against this bill.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said about the number of additional employees the Federal agencies would have to put on if this bill were passed, and that great confusion would be caused in some of the agencies if they had to answer all the garnishments. I believe it is true that the Treasury Department, the Interior Department, and the War Department have written letters saying that it would place some burden on them, but I submit that this is about the case: Those Departments have had so much correspondence from creditors complaining about people in the Departments who would not pay their bills that they have an idea that if this law were passed they would have as many garnishments as they have letters and complaints about people in their employ.

The truth of the situation is they would not have to increase their staff at all. As a matter of fact, they all have sections that do nothing but answer these letters of complaint and call upon the employee and see why he has not paid his bill, and try to arrange a plan for liquidation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I only have a few minutes. If the gentleman will grant me more time I will be glad to yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. I yielded back the remainder of my time, 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent to reclaim those 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. I now yield the gentleman from Tennessee 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has just stated, as I understood, that additional personnel would not be required. Is that the gentleman's conclusion or does he agree with every department which appeared before the committee, either in writing or in person, that it would require additional work.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is not my conclusion. It is based on very good evidence which I am sure would be persuasive to the gentleman. The department heads who testified have never had experience with any law like this. They have had so many letters and complaints that they think it will take a great deal of time, as is shown by the record. My statement is based upon the experience of Government agencies whose employees are now subject to garnishment. I call your attention to a letter from Mr. Henderson, Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I shall take the rest of my time to read that letter, which is a complete answer to the gentleman from Michigan:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, November 13, 1943.

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: Reference is made to your letter of November 9, 1943, with which you enclosed copy of H. R. 2985, which, if enacted, will permit garnishment of the salaries of Federal civil officials and employees.

Prior to February 12, 1940, when the Supreme Court decided *Federal Housing Administration* v. *Burr* (309 U. S. 242), it was the opinion of our counsel that R. F. C. was not subject to garnishment, but the creditors of R. F. C.'s employees continually harassed the Corporation by having writs of garnishment served upon it. Much of the time of one lawyer was occupied in caring for such cases. The decision in the Burr case, holding that Government-owned corporations which can sue and be sued are subject to garnishment, settled the rights and liabilities of all parties, and, we believe, was advantageous to R. F. C. so far as personnel administration is concerned.

Before the decision in the Burr case, the Corporation kept no record of the number of writs of garnishment served upon it or of the number of letters received from creditors of employees requesting assistance in the collection of amounts due them by employees.

Since that time the number of writs of garnishment served, in my judgment, has not

increased and the volume of correspondence relating to debts of employees has almost disappeared, due to the fact that creditors of employees now have a certain remedy.

The following figures may be of assistance to you and your committee. They show the total number of garnishments for the periods stated and the number of garnishments per hundred employees:

Period	Number of garnishments	Number of garnishments per 100 employees
Feb. 12 to Dec. 31, 1940	82	4.6
Dec. 31, 1940, to Dec. 31, 1941	37	1.5
Dec. 31, 1941, to Dec. 31, 1942	75	1.4
Dec. 31, 1942, to Nov. 1, 1943	58	1.0

These figures apply only to the Washington office. We have been advised of only 20 garnishments served upon the managers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's 32 field offices. These figures indicate to us that employees, now thoroughly conversant with the fact that they must pay their bills or have their pay checks tied up by writs of garnishment, have decided that the better course is to honor their contract obligations.

The handling of writs of garnishment when they are served is quite a simple matter. The general counsel advises me that the procedure briefly is as follows:

The marshal serves the writ upon an assistant secretary, who promptly advises the Treasurer and the pay-roll section of service of the writ and refers it to one of our lawyers. The lawyer communicates with the debtor and tells him that if he does not arrange with his creditor for a release of the garnishment the Corporation must file an answer in court and that his next pay check will be withheld. If the debtor obtains a release, that ends the matter. If he does not, the Corporation, after 7 or 8 days, sends a brief answer to the clerk of the court stating the amount of salary or wages then due the debtor. Thereafter the court enters a judgment of condemnation for the amount due the creditor. The clerk of the court advises Reconstruction Finance Corporation that the judgment of condemnation has been entered and the Corporation, pursuant thereto, issues a check to the creditor for the amount of the judgment.

When the procedure has once been set up the amount of work entailed is negligible.

We trust that the foregoing gives you the information which you desire. With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES B. HENDERSON,
Chairman.

Then I wrote Mr. Henderson on February 29, asking him two specific questions. I asked him in the first place whether R. F. C. had to put on any new employees to handle garnishments after the employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation became subject to garnishment. I also asked him whether anybody had to know about the garnishment laws of the various States, in order to handle the matter. I received this letter from Mr. Henderson, dated March 1, which I will now read:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, March 1, 1944.

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KEFAUVER: Reference is made to your letter of February 29, 1944, regarding our letter to you of November 13, 1943.

Generally, garnishments are handled by the Litigation Section of the Legal Division of this Corporation in the same manner as any other item of litigation. The service on the Corporation, the filing of the answer, and final disposition thereof is confined to the Secretary's Office, the Litigation Section, and the Pay Roll Section of the Treasurer's Office, respectively, and each phase should not exceed 30 minutes. We have not found it necessary, however, to increase our personnel in this connection.

Our experience with garnishments has disclosed that it is unnecessary to have an intimate knowledge of the exemption laws since this Corporation, being merely the garnishee, files an answer stating the amount of funds it holds for the benefit of the employee. Any claim for exemptions is a plea that must be made specially by the judgment debtor and not by the garnishee. Of course, it is necessary for us to be familiar with the garnishment laws in order that the interest of this Corporation may be fully protected. Our records indicate that approximately 80 percent of the garnishments served on this Corporation are released prior to the time for filing an answer because of arrangements made between the judgment debtor and judgment creditor.

For your information there is a total of 8,029 people employed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, of which 340 are without the limits of the continental United States, 3,612 are stationed in or about the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia, and 4,077 are in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation agencies and in the field.

Sincerely,

CHARLES B. HENDERSON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, the experience of the Government agency whose employees have become subject to garnishment shows that it does not substantially increase the amount of work of that agency, because, as stated by Mr. Henderson, they do not have all the letters of complaint and inquiry. There is a settled way for creditors to collect their debts. He says when that is known to the employees, the employees make settlements without any difficulty. When it first went into effect they were served with 4 garnishments for every 100 employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. After it went into effect, the number has decreased until now it is down to less than 1 percent, and is still decreasing.

This goes to show that when there is a legal remedy, and when the employees understand that there is a legal remedy, there is less bother to the Department, the employees pay their debts, they get settlements made, they get adjustments made; and as is shown by Mr. Henderson's letter he has not had to add one employee to his staff to handle such suits.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it then that the gentleman would advise the House to accept the statement of this Mr. Henderson in one agency as against the request of every department in the Government no later than day before yesterday that this bill be killed.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman that the R. F. C. has had experience; these other agencies do not know because they have not had experience. Mr. Henderson may have had the same idea before the Burr case was decided.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the R. F. C. is in the loan business. I can therefore understand the community of thought they may share with the loan companies in having this bill enacted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I cannot yield yet.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no proof that this bill is in the public interest. It is very plain that the public interest in relation to the employees of the Government is that their Government functions be performed for the whole Nation; and if they are to be harassed by suits, unnecessary suits, and by garnishments, it is conceivable that their services for the benefit of the whole Nation might be impaired. There is where the public interest lies.

The enactment of this measure, Mr. Speaker, would encourage the bringing of suits against Government employees. Government employees already have unusual incentives to pay their debts. Their appointment to the Government service in the first place, their tenure of office or position, their promotion from one grade to another depend largely upon the rectitude of their personal conduct. They have every incentive to be up to date in the payments of their just debts. But this bill if enacted would encourage the bringing of unnecessary suits against them. Government employees everywhere would be pressed to become accommodation endorsers of these notes for the loan companies.

The Government cannot be sued in tort. But a Government employee, for instance, the driver of a truck, can be sued at the present time, but cannot be garnisheed. Pass this bill and he can be garnisheed and judgment collected against him, and that will be an incentive to start such suits against Government employees. There is nothing in this bill which gives any added protection to the Government employee providing him with defense in such suit brought against him. Under like situations existing in private employment his employer, as well as he, would be the defendant and the employer would bear the brunt of the defense. There is no defense provided in this bill for a Government employee who is sued in tort, a tort which is equally the responsibility of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to address my remarks primarily to some of my colleagues from Pennsylvania. As you undoubtedly know, in Pennsylvania we have had a settled policy against the garnishment of wages and I have not heard that it has interfered with our industry, or business, or our prosperity. We have even gone so far that when some of our railroad men used to run beyond the counties that border upon Ohio and West Virginia and were met with attachments from the courts of those States, our Pennsylvania Legislature went so far as to make it a criminal offense for a Pennsylvania creditor to go without the confines of Pennsylvania to attach the salaries of Pennsylvania residents. I do not think it is necessary at this time to extend this garnishment process. I was very much impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan that its enactment would cause confusion and a great amount of unnecessary work on the part of the Government agencies. I also would like to remark to my colleagues from Pennsylvania particularly that we have recognized in our court decisions that even the funds of a municipality cannot be attached for a debt for the reason that it would unnecessarily embarrass the municipality in the functions of government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2985) to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2985) providing for the garnishment of salaries of Government employees with Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has 1 hour, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] has 1 hour.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid a lot of imaginary objections have been raised to this bill, but I believe that after the bill is fully explained and the situation looked into, many of the objections will turn out not to be real.

What is the present situation throughout the country and in the Federal Government with reference to garnishment? One of the basic parts of the free enterprise system is credit. America to a great extent was built on credit. Our great railroads, our great industries, our cities were not paid for in cash; the great part of American business is done on credit; even individuals do business largely on credit. Yet our system of credit, which is a fundamental ingredient of free enterprise breaks down unless there is some legal way to enforce the collection of a debt. If there is no legal way then you cannot have credit. In recognition of this fact all except three of the States of the Union have passed laws which after allowing exemptions which I think should be generous, subject salaries and wages to garnishment if people do not pay their debts. If they get services, of course, they ought to pay their debts. If they get into a situation where they cannot pay their debts laws have been passed which give them relief. Section 13 of the Bankruptcy Act allows a salaried person to make an adjustment without going into bankruptcy. That is applicable to Government employees. They also have their exemptions; and, of course, if they get in a very bad situation they can avail themselves of the Bankruptcy Act and wipe the slate clean.

Why did all but 3 of the 48 States pass laws allowing garnishment? Because they recognized that that was a part of our American system. I want to call attention to the fact also that 39 of of States have now passed laws which authorize the garnishment of salaries and wages of employees of State, county, city, and municipal governments—any State government employee.

Thirty-nine of the States have passed those laws. Mr. Chairman, why should the employees of these 39 State governments or the employees of private industry have a different rule applied to them? Why should not the same rule apply to the employees of the Federal Government? Will you say that the employees of the Federal Government are less intelligent? Will you say they are less able to take care of themselves? Will you say that they are more apt to be the prey of the pawnbroker and of installment buying? Will you say their salaries are less? No. As a matter of fact, you will have to say that the employees of the Government, because of civil-service requirements, are supposed to be more intelligent than most of the similar type of employees in private industry.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. The gentleman from Michigan a moment ago made mention of the fact that this bill if passed would be for the benefit of loan sharks and pawnbrokers. That ought to be answered and that allegation should be killed right now.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. I call attention to the fact that the bill specifically provides garnishment shall not be had on a judgment which includes interest in excess of 6 percent per annum computed on the original indebtedness.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HANCOCK. This bill gives no aid or comfort to loan sharks.

Mr. KEFAUVER. No; any person who charges interest in excess of 6 percent per annum cannot benefit by this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am interested in the gentleman's statement that 39 of the 48 States have passed laws permitting garnishment of the salaries of the employees of States, municipalities, and counties. I am wondering if the gentleman at this point will indicate when those laws were passed, because generally 25 years ago there were few, if any, such laws.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not have a copy of the hearings before me. I appreciate the gentleman's question. Most of these laws have been passed recently, which shows a trend definitely toward making employees of the Government bear the same responsibility that employees of private industry do.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I judge from page 13 of the hearings that these laws have been passed within the last 15 years or so.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes; on page 13 the list is shown. Even since the hearings on this bill Ohio and Missouri have passed laws subjecting their employees to the same obligations that employees of private industry are subjected to.

Mr. SASSCER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. The gentleman just referred to a section which stated in substance that if the interest rate is over 6 percent the creditor could not get the benefit of the provisions of this bill. Does that mean as to the interest over 6 percent or does it mean that it applies to the whole debt? In other words, if there was a high rate of interest could they come in and collect the debt and the legal interest or could they not come in at all?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman that would be determined by the law of the State where the judgment is secured. In some States you may waive your excess interest and sue for the principal. In other States I understand if it constitutes usury you cannot collect anything. That would be determined by the laws of the State where the judgment is entered.

Mr. SASSCER. Suppose a loan permitted 24 percent or 30 percent or whatever the rate may be in some of these States and judgment were obtained in a State which permitted that high monthly rate of interest; could that judgment be filed in the District and collected under this bill or under that section could they only collect the debt and legal interest or could they collect none of it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The answer to the gentleman is that if the judgment actually has any interest in excess of 6 percent none of it can be collected. He could reduce his claim and sue. He could only

sue for the principal or the principal and 6 percent. If he can do that under the State law he could come within the provisions of this act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The objection has been made that this bill is in a way of benefit to those who practice what we call supersalesmanship, people who induce others to enter into contracts for things either that they do not need or on which a small payment is made. Is there anything to that objection? What weight, if any, should be given to it?

Mr. KEFAUVER. In answer to the gentleman may I say that I cannot see why the employees of the Government need any more protection from supersalesmanship than the employees of General Motors or of any other corporation. It seems to me that they should be equally well equipped to take care of themselves.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is one other question I should like to ask. Under this bill will the Federal Government be required to come into court in many instances?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Definitely not. On page 3 of the bill, lines 13 and 14, it is stated that in no event shall a person so served be required to leave his office to testify in proceedings hereunder.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Where there is a garnishment and a dispute as to the amount which may be due, would the Government be required then to come in?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I take it the only dispute would be between the judgment creditor and the employee. That is a dispute that would have to be ironed out between them. The Federal official would not have to go into court.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. My friend from Pennsylvania has referred to the fact that the State of Pennsylvania and perhays other States have State laws which do not permit the garnishment of the wages of laborers. Now, would it be the intent and purpose of this act to permit a greater right against Federal employees of a given State than the State itself permits?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. By virtue of lines 7, 8, and 9 on page 1, if garnishment against employees in a State is not permitted, such as in Texas, then a Federal employee there enjoys the same privilege. If the State does not permit garnishment the resident Federal employee could not be garnisheed under this act.

Mr. BROOKS. Suppose a garnishment is not permitted, we will say in the State of Texas, and then suppose a Federal employee stationed in Texas and working in Texas and therefore under your bill not subject to garnishment, should go then on a trip over into Oklahoma where a different law prevails in the State of Oklahoma, could you then garnishee him in Oklahoma whereas you could not in Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, under the rule of conflict of laws the place where the judgment is rendered is the place that would govern; so regardless of the fact he may originally have come from Texas, if they get a valid judgment in some other State, and if that State permits garnishment, his salary could be reached.

Mr. BROOKS. The right against that employee would be the same wherever he may reside in the United States?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Wherever he is.

Mr. BROOKS. Suppose the State law permits an exemption of we will say $100 or any sum; does this bill permit the same exemption from garnishment?

Mr. KEFAUVER. He has the same exemption as he would have under the State laws.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the bill properly protected so that veterans' compensation and other payments not strictly made for employment cannot be garnisheed?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is properly protected by lines 15 to 17, page 3, that any deductions made by law shall not be included as a part of the wages subject to garnishment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am wondering if we may not be getting into trouble, perhaps, on veterans' benefits.

Mr. KEFAUVER. May I read the language on page 3 to the gentleman:

Provided, That there shall be deducted from such amount to be so certified such deduction from such wages or salary as may by law be made.

Mr. CRAVENS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAVENS. In answer to the gentleman from Oklahoma, it provides in the very first part of the bill that this covers only the wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States. This bill would not touch him if he were not an employee of the United States.

Mr. COCHRAN. But suppose he was.

Mr. KEFAUVER. This does not apply to anybody in the armed service or anybody who is just drawing benefits. He must be a civil employee of the United States Government.

Mr. MONRONEY. The language is such that I thought perhaps it would be broad enough to bring in others.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. As has already been said, we have a law in Pennsylvania which protects our working people and forbids garnishment against them. We also have a law in Pennsylvania which provides that a citizen of Pennsylvania who is employed by the Federal Government, for example in the District of Columbia, remains a citizen of Pennsylvania, and he has the usual privileges of a citizen of that State; but if he comes down to Washington and works as a Federal employee, he is not protected by the laws of the State of Pennsylvania forbidding garnishment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If they get a judgment against him here, he will be subject to the law applicable to the District of Columbia, under this law.

Mr. SCOTT. So that if he happened to work for the S. E. C. now stationed in Philadelphia he would not be subject to garnishment, but if he happened to work for a branch of the S. E. C. which kept him in Washington, his wages could be garnisheed. Is not that right?

Mr. KEFAUVER. The process follows State law.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I want to take a little time to analyze the bill, if I may, because I think that will answer a good many of the questions.

In the first place, let me say that in 1940 the Supreme Court decided in the Burr case that employees of governmental corporations—and there are about 40 of them—were subject to garnishment. Those corporations have had very little trouble with their employees not paying their bills, and they have not had any difficulty with correspondence since that case was decided. Why should the employees of these governmental corporations be subject to one rule when the employees of the Interior Department or the Treasury Department are not? They are on the same salary schedule, they are both under civil service, and they have to meet the same educational and other qualifications.

The bill applies to all civil officers and employees of the United States Government. This includes not only employees of the executive departments but also employees of the judicial and legislative branches, Members of Congress and their secretaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 additional minutes.

It does not apply to anyone in the armed forces. It does not apply to those working for the governmental corporations, because they are already subject to garnishment.

Section 6 of the bill provides—and this is very important—that everybody starts with a clean slate. It does not apply to any indebtedness incurred prior to the date of the approval of this act, so anyone who purchases anything after the approval of this act will know that he is going to be subject to garnishment if he does not pay. But as to old debts, they cannot be touched.

The next protective provision is that the garnishment must be based upon a final judgment, there cannot be any ancillary judgment, and it must be based on personal service, so there cannot be any judgment based upon publication or constructive service. The employee must be served personally, and there must be a final judgment against him

before any garnishment can be recognized under this act.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. What about alimony, on a personal judgment for alimony?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not know. Some States allow garnishment in that case and some do not.

The employee is allowed the same exemption granted to him under the State law where the judgment is rendered.

In lines 14 and 15, on page 2, the judgment of the creditor must be that of the original creditor. In other words, there cannot be any assignment or purchase of claims against Government workers under this act. It must be the original creditor.

Then, as has been pointed out, the judgment must not contain interest in excess of 6 percent.

As a further protection, the judgment creditor must pay the Government $2.50—which he must pay and cannot charge over to the debtor—if the claim is $100 or less, and $5 if the claim is $100 or more.

Only one garnishment can be answered in any one month, and the head of the department answers the first one presented. A certified copy of the garnishment must be sent to the head of the department. The department head cannot be called upon to appear and testify anywhere.

That is the bill, and I think it is drafted in the most equitable way possible.

I want to say also that on page 3, line 15, it was intended that the employee shall not have to pay over any amount that may be withheld for social security, for taxes, or for bond purchases under any plan that is agreed upon. I am going to offer an amendment to make it clear that this covers bond purchases.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. The hearings on this bill, H. R. 694, were held on March 24, 25, and 30 of 1943.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. WELCH. If the proposed law is of such great importance, why was it permitted to slumber for a whole year?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It has been before the committee and it has been considered a great deal. Many changes have been made since the original bill was filed. It is a matter of importance that we wanted to work out carefully. The bill was reported to the Committee on Rules more than a month ago. We have tried to work it out as best we could.

Mr. WELCH. The fact still remains that the hearings were held a year ago.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I do not think that is material. We have done the best we could with it. There has not been any sleeping on the job.

Mr. WELCH. The gentleman is stressing the importance of the bill, regardless of the fact that it was permitted to slumber for nearly a year.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It has not slumbered. We have been working on it all the time.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the date upon which the amount is found to be due is not fixed. It should be fixed as to whether it is the date the garnishment summons comes into the office of the head of the department or at the end of 60 days or some fixed period, so that there would be a definite date fixed, and that would coincide with the laws of most of the States, namely, the date of service.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It is the intention to fix it as of the time the garnishment is served.

Mr. SCRIVNER. It should be in here definitely.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I thought it was in here definitely. Anyway, that is the intention.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Why do you provide 60 days before the head of any division is required to answer to the court?

Mr. KEFAUVER. To give the employees a chance to work out an arrangement for payment with his creditor; also, to give the department head sufficient time to answer.

Mr. DONDERO. I assume the gentleman is a lawyer like myself. Usually 15 days is the limit in the ordinary civil procedure.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It was suggested by some of the men in the departments that they have 60 days.

This bill will be of benefit to Government employees. Ninety-nine percent pay their bills promptly. The refusal of a few to pay casts a reflection upon all. That reflection will be erased. Employees will be more careful in making purchases after this bill passes. The great majority of Federal employees want to be treated like other employees. They do not want special exemptions or immunities.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I think it has been very carefully drawn. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] has done a service to the country in bringing it in here.

In ancient days, you know, the king could do no wrong. That is what the king said. A relic of that doctrine has come down to us in the general notion that the Government cannot be sued without its consent. From time to time the Government has given consent to be sued in certain cases. All we are doing in this bill is giving consent to be sued as a garnishee defendant in a certain type of case, to wit, a case where judgment has been secured against a civil employee.

The bill is very moderate. There is no reason, of course, why a judgment against a Federal employee should be put on a different basis than a judgment against an employee of some private corporation. Even this bill retains for the Federal employee certain advantages that do not obtain so far as the employee of a private corporation is concerned. Let me call your attention to a few of them. A Federal employee has an exemption from garnishment if he is the head of a family, as obtains in the State court, from which the garnishee is issued in the case of a private employee. In the second place, there can be no garnishment except on final judgment, there can be no attachments, there can be no judgments in rem. Third, the judgment must be in the name and must be enforced in the name of the original creditor. That is one provision which would rule out many collection agencies, for, as is well known, many of them follow the practice of going about the country and securing claims, having them assigned to the agency, and then bringing the suit. Next, the judgment must not contain interest on the original indebtedness more than 6 percent, which would very effectively rule out the claims of many small-loan concerns; and, finally, the law applies only to indebtedness incurred prior to the approval of this act.

In addition to the advantages given by this law to the Federal employee, the bill gives to the Government as the garnishee defendant certain benefits, certain advantages, that do not obtain generally in respect to the ordinary garnishee defendant. In the first place, the officer of the Government garnisheed cannot be required to appear in court. Second, he cannot be required to answer more than one garnishment in a month. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] mentioned an objection that can be fairly urged against this bill. I think in his zeal, however, he greatly overdid it. I do not think it is true that this bill will cause undue trouble or undue expense to the Government for several reasons. In the first place, an employee who now does not pay his bills is a source of annoyance and nuisance to his employer, even if the employer be the Government. It is a practice followed in many bureaus and departments, if complaint is made to them that an employee is not paying his bills, to bring pressure upon him to make him pay them, and that takes up time, and some annoyance to the Federal Government.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Would there be any comparison with the amount of time taken up by garnishment? Garnishments in our State are so complicated and technical that it requires the services of a special kind of a lawyer.

Mr. GWYNNE. The duties put on the Government are very simple. The procedure in this bill, so far as the plaintiff is concerned, is somewhat complicated and expensive, and, therefore, I think this bill will not be used in the ordinary case. It will be used only in the case where some employee has deliberately and willfully failed to pay his debts, and he must be proceeded against under this

law. In addition to that, in every garnishment case there is provided a fee for the Government of $2.50 as a minimum and $5 as a maximum, which it seems to me should pay all the expense the Government is put to under the act. Coming to the question asked by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER], here is how simple the procedure is so far as the Government is concerned. Take a concrete case of a man employed in the Department of Justice. Judgment is secured against that man, say, in Illinois. He is a resident there and served personally there. A writ or summons is sent down to the head of the bureau, together with a certified copy of the judgment, and a letter covering the 6-percent interest information. It is a very simple matter then for the head of the bureau to determine how much money that man had coming to him on the day that the garnishment was served.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. He has to be very sure that the judgment is correct.

Mr. GWYNNE. Oh, no; he is not. He is not required to do that any more than any other garnishee defendant. He has served on him the writ or summons of the State of Illinois, and there is a certified copy of the judgment, and he is not required to go beyond that any more than any garnishee defendant is required to go beyond it. He should see to it, of course, that the letter that accompanies the writ sets out that there is no interest above 6 percent.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman discuss the 60-day procedure. Why is the Government given 60 days in which to answer a summons in garnishment?

Mr. GWYNNE. I think it is too long.

Mr. DONDERO. We have a great deal of criticism now leveled at procedure in the courts of the country over the law's delay, and every lawyer in court hears that more than any other thing that comes up.

Mr. GWYNNE. I agree with the gentleman and I think we have given too much time. Of course the thought was to give the head of the bureau sufficient time to determine the question of how much money is owing on the day the garnishment is filed. We have heard talk about how difficult and expensive this will be to the Government. If the Attorney General needs in his department to establish another unit to enforce the operation of this simple law, then I say that we need a new man down there. You give this law to any railway company or big corporation and allow them to function as easily as the garnishee defendant would function here, and they would carry on without additional employees, and would actually make money out of it on the $2.50 and $5 payment.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Michigan just mentioned the 60-day provision. I might say to the gentleman that in many of the justice of the peace courts and the municipal courts where many of these actions will undoubtedly be brought they have some 30 days in which to appeal. Is it not the gentleman's idea that this longer period of time may have been fixed in order to cover also the contingency of a person making an appeal?

Mr. GWYNNE. It might help out. In my State where there is that right of appeal we do not give the garnishee defendant any 60 days in which to answer. He has much less time. All he has to do is to answer how much money he owes, and turn the money into court.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Assuming that in Michigan the period is 30 days and we make it 60 days here. The Michigan law would control in a court proceeding in Michigan and I take it that we could do nothing here to add or to take away from the Michigan jurisdiction. If we permit a class of garnishment cases, where the time of return is different from what it is in the State law, what will happen?

Mr. GWYNNE. I would say that the answer to that is very simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. GWYNNE. Of course, the Federal Government cannot be sued without its consent. Nothing could be done by the State of Michigan to require the Federal Government to appear in any court. Under this bill we are consenting to be sued in a certain type of case, and we lay down the conditions on which we will be sued.

Mr. DONDERO. Answering the gentleman from Indiana as to why this provision is included, is it not true that only garnishment proceedings can be had against the Federal Government upon final judgment from which there is no appeal, and what objection would there be to cutting the time down to 30 days?

Mr. GWYNNE. I would rather the gentleman would take that up with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. Personally I would have no objection to cutting it down to 30 days.

Mr. FELLOWS. Do not the States usually provide for an appeal from judgment in garnishment?

Mr. GWYNNE. Yes.

Mr. FELLOWS. On an appeal from the finding of the court, the man could be held as a trustee.

Mr. GWYNNE. There is a difference there, let me say to the gentleman. In ordinary garnishment cases you can bring the garnishee defendant into court and controvert his answer. Here you cannot bring him into court, nor can you controvert his answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, how the gentleman from Texas, who usually thinks clearly and expresses himself logically, can be so muddled in his thinking on this bill is beyond my comprehension. He says, and he is undoubtedly correct about this, that we have in this city a class of people who, when they should not, will buy on credit. His remedy is to let them escape payment of all the debts that they contract to pay. That does not seem to make good sense. If these chronic credit purchasers exist in such large numbers and if they need protection, why not have some law prohibiting credit purchases? Why let those who abuse the confidence extended to them hide behind a Federal pay roll? Why not get at the evil by prohibiting credit purchases unless a substantial down payment is made? Why by legislation say, "Buy all you can. Pay as little down as possible, and then pay nothing more. You can escape payment as long as you are on the Government pay roll." Then there is another answer to the argument and that is that if we let these people become a favored class, that is, those in the Government employ, escape all responsibility after a judgment has been rendered or encourage them in their buying, we encourage credit buying. I cannot understand why, if a man is working for any private agency or for the State or for a city or a county, he may be reached by garnishment, but if a man is working for the Federal Government he can hide behind the Federal Government; he can draw his salary, need not pay his debt.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; you cannot reach the funds coming to them from the Federal Government.

Mr. COCHRAN. You certainly can.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Time and time again I have had people in small communities write and ask if there was not some way by which those on the Federal pay roll, that is, their incomes, could be reached by garnishment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Post Office Department and the Treasury Department, the two outstanding employers of the Government, will discharge a man who does not pay his just debts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; they will not. They may sometimes, but not always. I just happen to know they do not always discharge them. I have had them in my own district where they have not discharged them and where they did not put any pressure to bear to make them pay.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the hearings he will find the regulation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I know what they say they will do, but like many other Government agencies and so many in the administration higher up, they do not keep their promises. They do not follow up the policy that they say they will follow.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Might this not be a fair view to take of the matter, that if this law goes into effect, that class of our people who are easy buyers may buy with greater caution if they know that their salaries may be garnisheed?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly. If they know they must pay, they will be more careful what they buy, to what extent they buy. If we continue to exempt all those who purchase for a dollar down and a dollar a week, when they should not, the number will increase all the time.

Mr. DELANEY. As a matter of fact, they raise the prices on these things when they know they are going to be bought on credit.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If purchasers on credit need protection against excessive and unwise buying, if they are prone to contract debts which they cannot pay, then the proper remedy is either legislation restricting credit sales or bankruptcy proceedings by the debtor.

They should not be encouraged to buy beyond their ability to pay or to refuse to pay a just debt while continuing on a Federal pay roll spending their salaries for additional purchases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I rise with unusual reluctance to oppose H. R. 2985, because of the personal regard I hold for the author of the measure, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]. I feel, however, the provisions of the proposal are inherently bad. I believe the administration of the law would be impractical and that a further enlargement of Government red tape and confusion would result.

We know the Treasury officials have held that if this measure becomes law it would have a tendency to retard administrative operations and raise the cost of government. It was pointed out in the hearings that experience proves that changes in pay rolls and disbursing operations must be reduced to a minimum, especially in war, if maximum economies through the use of labor-saving machinery are to be secured.

In the colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], there was a difference of opinion as to just what departments or agencies could do in the way of compulsion on an employee to pay an honest debt. I think the statement of the Treasury officials in calling attention to Department Circular 645 clarifies the matter. It says this:

> Employees who, without specific and sufficient cause, persistently refuse or habitually neglect to pay necessary personal and family expenses incurred while in the employ of this Department will be dismissed from the service.

That is the gentleman's position [Mr. COCHRAN], and he is correct in it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Post Office Department makes it more mandatory than that.

Mr. RANDOLPH. What one department or agency has done can, and should, be done by others. Federal employees are subject to this ruling. Let it be exercised.

The concluding words of the circular are these:

> The presentation to the Department by the creditor of a judgment of a court of law will be accepted as conclusive evidence in cases of indebtedness for necessary personal and family expenses.

The proposed legislation would set a congressional precedent for authorizing attachments of other Government obligations, such as contract liabilities, pensions, or other benefits. This, in my opinion, would divert Federal funds from the purpose for which they were specifically appropriated, and would seriously obstruct the efficient administration of Government business. This disruption would outweigh the benefits anticipated from the enactment of the bill offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows that Government employees have all the safeguards thrown around the individual, such as exemptions and things like that. Does not the gentleman think that is enough? The exemptions that a Government employee has are the same as any other individual, if this bill is passed.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not believe the bill is necessary. It will be difficult of enforcement, and it will create unnecessary trouble.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Of course, in the State of Texas we do not permit the garnishment of wages, and it has had a most salutary effect in curbing this easy-credit money. The effect has been splendid in that direction.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Recently I talked to two credit stores, and they say the credit of the Government employees is very bad. I wonder if we would not be doing those employees a distinct service by making it possible for them to pay their bills?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I disagree with the statement, Federal workers are a bad credit risk. The stores in Washington welcome this trade. We know that to be true.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The employees of the Hecht Co. are subject as much to this installment buying as Government workers, are they not?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; I would not think so. They are familiar with merchandising blandishments practiced by some sources urging purchase.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I know the gentleman would be interested to know that the Hecht Co. has 2,200 employees, and they only had 30 garnishments served on them.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In reviewing the hearings, I was sobered by the statement of the Chief Clerk of the Treasury Department, who indicated in the overall employment of 25,000 persons by departments in the District of Columbia, that the total number of communications of every description, relative to credit, numbered 700.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. But he goes on and says it includes 50,000 in the field; 75,000 altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I intended to cover the point brought out by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Seventy-five percent of those investigated concerned bills that had been brought to the attention of the Department before and were notices that the employee had not yet fulfilled his obligation. He further pointed out that in the last 2 years they had but one case where an employee had to be discharged under the regulations governing debts and their payment. The regulation provides that employees will not be retained in service when, without specific reason, they habitually neglect or persistently refuse to pay their necessary and personal and family expenditures.

A suggestion was made in the hearings by a Treasury Department representative that some method would be devised whereby there could be a central spot of adjustment, a small claims court, a kind of arbitration court, a place where the employees could come and delineate all their obligations; to whom they are indebted, the amounts and so forth could be verified. I believe it is possible for those who have imagination and authority to establish some kind of a central clearinghouse.

Government agencies are not and should not be considered a collection agency. This measure would provide that the wages and salaries of all civil officers and employees of the United States would be subject to the remedies of garnishment, attachment, execution, or trustee process in the same manner and upon such conditions as may be applicable in the case of wages and salaries due from private employers in the State or Territory in which is located the court wherein such remedies are sought, where, by the laws, the wages or salaries of officers or civil employees of such States are subject to such remedies.

Another section of the bill covering process provides that the process shall be served personally or by registered mail upon the head of employing agency. By implication this means that provision for administration must be established; this will be difficult and costly because of the number of Government employees and the degree to which they are scattered. A unit would have to be established in every agency to receive record for such

process and keep an account of all attachments and garnishments received as well as to conduct the great volume of correspondence that would undoubtedly be involved. It would also be necessary to check every name on each pay roll before each pay day to make certain that no attachment or garnishment is outstanding against it.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call to the attention of the members of the committee the provisions of this bill. At the very outset, in reading it, you will discover that this measure applies only to wages and salaries of civil employees and officers of the United States.

The question was raised a little while ago that this legislation might apply to compensation paid to a soldier. Of course, it could not apply in that respect. This applies to wages or salaries only, of civilian employees in the United States Government. It will not apply to any soldier, sailor, or marine.

In my State we have, as we have in 39 of the States, a garnishee law. I want to relate some of the experiences we have had with reference to that garnishee law in my State. We have civil Federal employees in that State. Every man and every woman who is on a wage or salary is subject to garnishment under the laws of Indiana. Under the present law garnishment proceedings do not apply to civilian employees of the Government, because the United States cannot be made a party for that purpose. Therefore all Government employees in my State simply refuse to give any consideration to our courts respecting the collection of debts. They know the Government cannot be made a party in garnishee proceedings, and they merely push creditors aside and laugh at the lawyers. They find themselves in a highly preferred class respecting the payment of their just and honest debts. Yet, every laboring man must respond to his debts, and he must respond in garnishment proceedings.

This measure now before the House simply puts civilian employees of the United States Government in the same position as every other American citizen.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the law of Indiana, which permits quasi garnishment of public employees permit, in case of a judgment rendered against the Government employee and failure on the part of the employee to respond to the judgment and refusal to recognize the lawyers and the courts, as the gentleman says, supplemental proceedings incident to execution or attachment on execution, and the appointment of a receiver to receive the pay of that employee and to collect it and to apply such portion as is not exempt from execution, to liquidation of the obligation?

Mr. SPRINGER. In my opinion you could not reach a person under those circumstances because the person to whom the gentleman refers is an employee—a civilian employee—may I say, of the Government, and you cannot make the Government a party in garnishment proceedings. If he has an estate, or property, within the limits of the exemption, then he could not be reached at all.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; you do not have to make him a party, but could you not have a trustee appointed or a receiver appointed for the employee with power and authority on the part of that receiver to receive those wages? I just wonder if that could not be done.

Mr. SPRINGER. That course might be pursued, but I doubt the result. However, if the property owned by the individual is exempt under the law, that procedure would avail nothing. However, generally, may I refer you to the author of this measure for his observation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Section 13 of the Bankruptcy Act has a provision for adjustment with wage earners.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not have reference to that.

Mr. KEFAUVER. It would be applicable to Government employees.

Mr. KEEFE. I did not have reference to that.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to proceed a little further with reference to this particular piece of legislation. I cannot yield further. In the first place, there must be a final judgment; that is the positive provision of the bill; and when we speak of final judgment—that means that the judgment must be entirely final. That means that all appeals must be disposed of. It means that the judgment is the final conclusion of the courts, that the matter is finished, and that the same is the final judgment in the case. That must occur before the garnishment proceedings can be commenced, and before the Government can be served. That is provided in this measure.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. SASSCER. There are several classes of final judgments. I wish the gentleman would explain in reference to that the provisions of this bill. Suppose there is final judgment of alimony. That is case No. 1. Suppose there is a judgment in a State, final, not contractual but in tort, in which a bankruptcy court would not discharge; and, third, suppose you have a foreclosure of a $5,000 mortgage and the party bids it in for $500 and then gets judgment in personam against the debtor for the $4,500 balance: Would those three cases come under the bill? I am in accord with the principle of trying to help collect personal expenses and family bills, but it seems to me this legislation takes in a much wider field.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the bill is amply safeguarded. Those questions—and there are three of them—will throw little light upon this discussion. I desire to speak of the safeguards thrown about this measure. One of the safeguards thrown about this bill is that the creditor himself must institute suit. This provision eliminates the question of these collecting agencies going about and buying up claims, having them assigned, and then bringing action upon these particular claims and debts. There is also a provision in the measure which limits the bringing of an action, within the province of this bill, where there has been interest charged exceeding 6 percent. That eliminates these chattel-loan companies which have charged unconscionable rates of interest; they are completely out under this provision, because they cannot come within the purview of this particular legislation. If they exceed the rate of 6 percent interest, then this legislation offers them no relief.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem that it would work a particular hardship during the war because Government employees are practically forced to buy bonds by the heads of their departments and in some cases they are directed to give to the Red Cross? And as the gentleman undoubtedly knows there will be about $125 that most of them will have to pay as income tax, an unexpected amount this year.

Mr. SPRINGER. About the only answer I can make to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is that every person, we assume, wants to pay his or her debts. We assume the civil employees of our Government want to pay their debts. This measure will not injure any person who pays their debts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They should, certainly.

Mr. SPRINGER. It simply means that people must watch their budgets, be careful of the contracts they make, and guard their own financial standing; they must use care to avoid becoming involved under circumstances whereby this proceeding shall be necessary.

I might say that in my State we have had many instances where Federal employees, who are not brought within the garnishee proceedings, under our law, have stood back and laughed when we attempted to enforce garnishment proceedings against them. On the other hand, when we have taken up the matter of their debt with their superiors, discussing the matter of their duty respecting the same, we have conferred on the matter of possible discharge. However, none of them were discharged but all were continued on the job, and in practically every instance payment was not made of the indebtedness which they were facing at that time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my good friend.

Mr. DONDERO. I think an answer to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is that about 25 percent of the purchasers of bonds of a certain designation, E, F, or G, I forget which, are cashing their bonds in immediately the 60-day limitation has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is entirely correct. I have heard many instances of that kind within the last few weeks.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. It occurs to me in view of the fact that this legislation will apply only to future debts, that it would be a great deal simpler, cause practically no expense to the Government, and be much more fair to the employees if, instead of having this garnishment bill, you brought in a wage-assignment bill so that if the seller did not feel that the man's credit was good he could simply ask for a wage assignment. That would eliminate all this trouble and possible expense and at the same time you would not have the employee under judgment, all too often in garnishee cases, illegally.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is a question I will refer to the author of the bill, the gentleman from Tennessee. Perhaps he can disclose to the gentlewoman why he presented this type of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two other matters I wish to call to the attention of the Committee before I leave the floor. My distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] mentioned certain letters which had been received, and he referred especially to a letter from the War Department dated February 9, 1944. I want to refer to one of the early sentences in that particular letter, in which the War Department says to this committee:

> The principle involved in this measure cannot be questioned.

In other words, a civilian employee of the Government should come within the same rules as an employee of a private concern; they should come within the same provisions of law as every other American citizen; they should pay their debts. Provision should be made by which Federal employees would be compelled to respond to those debts just the same as others who are employed by private concerns. There should be no difference respecting their contractual obligations.

Another thought I want to express is this: The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the author of the bill, read a letter outlining the experiences of the F. H. A. under a court decision making employees of that organization subject to garnishment proceedings. The only agency which has written letters, and which have been placed in the RECORD, that has had any experience with this provision is the F. H. A. They found as a result of their experience that it has been an incentive to the payment of debts by those whom such provision of law reaches. And the further experience expressed by that agency is that there has been no additional cost under the garnishment proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to direct the attention of the House and to place in the RECORD facts concerning a situation in my particular congressional district which I intend laying before General Hershey, the Administrator of the Selective Service Act.

Most of the draft boards in the city of Philadelphia are doing a good job. The members of those boards are rendering a service at great personal sacrifice, but in some instances conditions have developed which are justifiable cause for severe criticism. In some cases members of the draft boards in the city of Philadelphia and throughout Pennsylvania, and those attached to the boards, were appointed by Governor James in the preceding Republican administration of Pennsylvania. In many instances the appointments were made on the recommendation in the city of Philadelphia of Republican ward leaders.

The particular board that I refer to in my own district is local draft board No. 6, which comprises the eleventh and twelfth wards in the city of Philadelphia. The Government appeal agent for that board is Mr. Herman J. Tahl, who is a member of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, a Republican member, by the way, and a candidate for reelection in the forthcoming election in November. Anyone can easily see the great temptation it is to place in the hands of a man running for office the responsibilities of a Government appeal agent for a local draft board. I understand the duties of an appeal agent are to intervene on behalf of the Government in connection with any deferments which have been granted.

The eleventh and twelfth wards of the city of Philadelphia constitute a section where intimidation and coercion with respect to the exercise of the franchise exists on a scale that is not paralleled in any part of the United States. I say that wthout any equivocation or reservation. It is the common practice to intimidate and coerce people in those two wards during campaigns and on election day.

I think that any man who is running for public office if he properly evaluates the effect on the public mind of his holding such a position would himself, if he were interested as a real American citizen in maintaining good morale in his community, decline such appointment. The morale in this particular community has been shattered with great damage to the war effort because of the feeling which exists in connection with a man running for public office being given this power.

I am going to ask General Hershey to make an investigation as to how he was appointed to this position and of all actions which he has passed upon and to take steps to see that he is immediately removed from this position for the public good and for the improvement of morale in this section of my congressional district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, first may I say that I do not think any Member of this House condones the act of any Government employee who refuses to pay an honest debt. I say that because I read in the hearings where one witness charged that a member of the committee said that anybody who opposes this legislation is a crook, and I do not want to be placed in that class.

This legislation is not retroactive. In other words, any debts that have been incurred up to the time the President signs this bill will not be subject to the provisions of the law. I repeat what I said to the gentleman from Michigan, and I know what I am talking about, coming from a great metropolitan district in which we have many thousand Federal employes. No man in the Post Office Department or the Treasury Department can hold his position if he does not pay his just debts. I have known this to be a fact for many, many years and the regulations of those Departments are being carried out in that respect. I want to point out to the members of the committee that you will not find one outstanding Government agency that endorses this legislation, and, further than that, it has no clearance by the Bureau of the Budget, it carries no provision for an authorization for the expenditure of money for the increase in expenses which the Treasury Department says will result. If you are going to pass a law why not pass a law that can be properly administered and provide the funds with which to administer it.

Mr. SASSCER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. What would be the position of a man who had a judgment against him which was not dischargeable in bankruptcy, who has a Federal job, a garnishment is placed against his salary, he quits; then the War Manpower Commission comes along and says, "No, you are frozen in your job and cannot quit."

Mr. COCHRAN. I assume if the judgment had been rendered prior to the time the President signs this bill, if it is passed, it will be outlawed.

As I stated, no Government agency, including the Bureau of the Budget, approves this legislation. I know there is a tendency on the part of the Congress and probably properly so, not to let the departments downtown write legislation, but where it directly affects the operation and the administration of the laws that we have heretofore passed, and it is necessary for those departments and agencies to carry out the mandate of the Congress, then I feel it is the duty of the Congress to pay some attention to the testimony of those who are charged with that responsibility.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman made reference to communications from the various departments. I have run through the hearings rather hurriedly and I do not see anything from the General Accounting Office. The gentleman is familiar with the fact that after checks are drawn they finally go to the General Accounting Office. The gentleman may remember the testimony brought out during hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill to the effect that the General Accounting Office is now 2½ years behind, or would be this year, in its audit of pay checks. If in addition to their audit of all of these checks they have to be sure they have not violated any garnishment proceeding, what does the gentleman think would happen in the General Accounting Office?

Mr. COCHRAN. I was informed the other day that due to the inability of the General Accounting Office to get competent help they are 5 years behind in auditing.

Mr. CASE. The testimony that we have had on appropriation bills was that with the increase in Federal employment this year they would be behind, I think, 145,000,000 checks again this year and worse than that before the year is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the time of this Congress can be better employed if it will take an interest in all the people of the United States. The various States provide for a cause of action against an individual or a corporation for personal injuries and property damages. However, one cannot sue the Government without its permission. It seems to me that the hour has arrived in this country when we should make proper provision for the citizens of this country to have the opportunity to sue the Government for personal injuries or property damage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, from my own experience and observation I am in favor of the pending bill. Government employees enjoy enough privileges now in addition to those enjoyed by ordinary citizens, therefore I do not see why they should be exempt from paying their bills the same as anybody else.

I know of many cases in the western section of our country where a man gets a job working for the Government on some of these war projects, he moves into town with his family and has to be supported by the businessmen of the community; then in many cases he just simply refuses and neglects to pay for the advances that have been made to him in good faith. That situation should be remedied and this bill is an instrument designed to cure that evil. For these reasons I am in favor of the legislation.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself not in agreement with some of the other members of the committee on this bill. I do not think it is necessary. In the end it would mean the creation of other bureaus in the Federal Government and add to the more than 3,000,000 Federal officeholders. I have been somewhat surprised to note the zeal of some of my friends who have denounced the bureaus and bureaucratic control here in Washington, but who now propose to establish others and have your Uncle Sam go into the collecting business.

I believe in people paying their honest debts, and I believe it so strongly I have never brought myself to believe in the bankruptcy law.

Is this measure necessary? We have a statement here from Mr. Birgfeld, chief clerk of the Treasury Department. They are handling these matters in the various departments and will handle them better and more satisfactorily than if you pass this bill. He states that we now have 75,000 employees in the Treasury Department here and in the field. They have this regulation on the books. Department Circular No. 645, 1940, provides:

> Employees who, without specific and sufficient cause, persistently refuse or habitually neglect to pay necessary personal and family expenses, incurred while in the employ of this Department, will be dismissed from the service.

That regulation has been in effect in the Treasury Department since 1940. Mr. Birgfeld said they had 75,000 District of Columbia and field employees, but in the last year they have had only 700 complaints, and have handled these complaints in such a manner that they have all been taken care of except 100. No doubt most of these 700 complaints were made in cases where the employees were not able to meet their obligations because of illness in the family, and so forth. Only 1 person has been discharged for failure to pay his debts of the 75,000. I do not believe that would justify us in embarking upon this broad field and creating thousands of additional officeholders.

Mr. Bell, Secretary of the Treasury Department, stated:

> Since the disruption of the orderly administration of Government affairs would far outweigh the benefits anticipated from the proposed legislation, the Treasury Department recommends against the enactment of H. R. 694.

That bill was a similar bill introduced in an earlier session.

> The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

The Attorney General, in a letter to our committee, dated March 22, 1943, stated:

> On the other hand, the administration of a system of garnishment or attachment of Government salaries would be difficult and costly to the Government, because of the number of Government employees and the degree to which they are scattered.

Why should we place this additional unnecessary load on the backs of the taxpayers—increase our national debt—when we need more men for war efforts—and at the same time hold up necessary work in the departments?

Twenty-five years ago tomorrow I was sworn in as a Representative. I encourage my people to write to me, and they can and do write. But to this day I have never had a single complaint from any merchant or other person in my district that some postmaster or deputy postmaster or clerk or other person employed by the Government would not pay a debt, and that covers 25 years. This experience dovetails into the statement submitted by Mr. Bell, of the Treasury Department.

Back when we had the W. P. A., I got complaints from two or three merchants that men with families, working on W. P. A. and perhaps drawing twenty-five or thirty dollars a month, occasionally drew their pay and did not settle with the merchants. This bill would not reach that case, anyhow, because the exemptions would more than take it up.

Do not tell me that to administer this law would not require more employees and more work and more expense, at a time when we are short of manpower here. Every time one of these garnishments would come up, what would have to be done? You would have to look up the law of the State and find out whether the man has a wife and whether he has one child, two children, or a dozen children, before you could determine the exemption to which he would be entitled.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has discussed the regulation issued by the Treasury Department. If that regulation is in force in that one Department, what reason is there why it should not be put in force in other departments?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. They have it in the Commerce Department and in the other departments, and they are handling the situation most satisfactorily.

Mr. DONDERO. If it were in force in every department, there would be no occasion for this legislation to be here.

Mr. MICHENER. They have it in every department.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I think they have it in every department.

If you will refer to the hearings, you will find that Mr. Birgfeld says that nearly all the complaints come from right here in the District of Columbia. Why? Every night I hear people advertising over the radio saying, "Come in, you do not have to have any money, your credit is good. Come in and open up a credit account here. You do not need to pay down a dime. You can pay so much a week." They are just herding a lot of young people into buying things they do not need. Let these merchants here in the District of Columbia exercise more judgment in selecting their debtors and you will not have any trouble.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman made reference to the question of expense and quoted from the record. May I call his attention and the attention of the House to page 53 of the hearings, where Mr. G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer of the Treasury Department, in outlining the detail of what would have to be done, stated just what the advantage would be, and then said:

> You see, with the Addressograph plates, we can reduce the cost of clearing a check, including all of the accounting that goes with it, to 4 cents per payment, whereas, if you do it another way, it will cost 8 or 9 cents per payment.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Every time one of these garnishment cases comes, they have to look into the man's pay, and recheck and double check him before they can make out a report. Here we are, borrowing a lot of trouble. Either let us defeat this bill or quit talking about bureaucracy and bureaucrats in the city of Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, listening to this discussion, I have been utterly amazed that the House of Representatives should spend a whole afternoon to protect "dead beats." That is all that this opposition amounts to. It is to protect "dead beats," because an honest person will pay his debts, and a "dead beat" will not, and the "dead beat" is the only one who is protected under existing law. This bill is nothing particularly new. We have had a law of this kind in Wisconsin for 15 years.

Some reference is made here to a check, that if you run through a check after this proceeding has been instituted, it will cost you 8 or 9 cents instead of 4 cents. Do not you know that the judgment creditor has to file $2.50 with his judgment, if it is under $100, and $5 if it is over $100? This bill prescribes that. He must do that. The whole long and short of it is simply this. Is there any reason you know of why a Federal employee should not pay his bills? I know of none. Very well, let us make him pay his bills. I was told yesterday of an instance where a Federal employee went to one little neighborhood grocery store and run a bill for a month and when they tried to get some money out of him he quit, and went to another one for a month, and when that grocer tried to get some money out of him he quit and went to another store. And that man was working for the Federal Government.

We have heard a lot about bureaucrats. We do not have to create any additional offices. In Wisconsin, after we instituted this law, we did not have to. We have today about 3,000,000 employees of the Federal Government, or had the last time I heard anything about, and over 2,551 various Government agencies. We could serve a very useful purpose if we would bring about a reduction of one-half of these agencies, and succeed in getting fired one-half of the 3,000,000 Federal employees. Then we would make some headway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have for many, many years been of the opinion, and I have a very firmly fixed conviction, that all men should be equal before the law. The section hand who works on the railroad and keeps the road in such condition that trains can be operated over it, and every other employee of every railroad company in the country, every man who works for a salary or for wages, be it little or much, is subject to the process of garnishment. If in the hands of his employer there can be caught by this process money that he has earned by hard labor or faithful service, then that money is subject to the payment of his debt, after he has been allowed the exemptions allowed him by his State law, and those exemption laws in all of the States are liberal, because it is the policy of the law to permit a man who is the head of a family to take care of his wife and children first. That is a social obligation that transcends the rights of creditors. Why should an employee of the Government, when they now have become thicker than the leaves in Vallombrosa and as numberless as the sands of the seashore, more than 3,000,000, and possibly 4,000,000 by this time, be free from this process of garnishment? Uncle Sam is a good paymaster. He pays when he has agreed to pay and he pays at stated intervals. Why should this preferred class of our citizens be put on a plane where they cannot be reached when the humblest laboring man or woman in the country must be subject to that process and be forced to pay their debts? And, in fact, this law will be but little used, because the great majority of our Federal employees pay their debts.

What is the result when a man goes and buys things and fails to pay, as suggested by my good friend from Wisconsin? He works both sides of the street, from one end to the other, and thereby augments his salary to the extent that he can defraud somebody who has trusted him. If he is working for $200 a month and he can go in debt from $50 to $100 a month and not pay, then he has increased his salary to the tune of $50 or $100 per month.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. And I would like to add there that the fellow who gives him the credit is taxed to pay that man's salary.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is right. I have known of instances where widows in business, where people who are barely able to keep their heads above water, have extended credit to the extent of hundreds of dollars to people who were immune from execution, and these creditors were left to hold the bag.

This will be the practical operation of this law. Human nature is so constituted that it takes a lot of anchors to windward to help even the best of folks do right and discharge their obligations, and when they know that if they get into debt and do not pay their obligations they can be reached by the process of law, then they hesitate to resort to that sort of practice, and it will be a good thing as a moral proposition. It will have a salutary effect on these people who habitually get into debt without any intention of meeting or discharging their obligations. One of my good friends here said it cost the Government all of 8 cents for one of these processes to be served on a fellow who did not pay his debts. That creditor before he can have any processes at all, if his debt is under $100, will pay $2.50 into the Treasury and if it is over $100 he will pay $5 into the Treasury. I think that everyone ought to pay his debts, and if they have something that belongs to them, above the exemptions allowed them by law, it should be handed to their creditor. This is even-handed justice and common honesty to which no man should object.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House should be able this afternoon to see at least one serious affliction that ails our country. One of the prime functions of government is the enforcement of contract and to apply the same principle of law to all citizens alike. Up to the present time Federal employees, including Congressmen, have been exempted by Federal statute from being sued for the collection of debts on their salaries, while the great bulk of persons in private employment are subject to being sued for the payment of their debts.

The bill which we are considering would remove this discrimination and place Federal employees in the same class with private citizens. How it is possible to conceive an honest argument against the passage of this measure I cannot comprehend. Not so long ago a bill slipped through this House which provided for pensions for Congressmen. We all know the reaction of the whole Nation to that procedure. Now, the fact is that the same principle is involved in the bill before us as was involved in the law that granted pensions to Congressmen. I feel it my bounden duty to vote for this bill from that standpoint. How can I go back to my district and say to my people that I voted for a bill which put me in a special class, where I would not have to pay my debts?

Who is objecting to this measure, and why? Certainly only those who would be affected by it, which represents a comparatively few people on the Federal pay roll. Surely those Federal Government employees who pay their debts, which includes the vast majority of them, do not object to the passage of this bill. It cannot be that they want to be set off as a separate privileged group and be exempted from the payment of their debts. Indeed, I venture to say that every Federal employee who pays his debts will welcome the passage of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS].

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure a great many of the members of the committee are concerned and interested, as has been indicated here by some of the questions and some of the remarks made here as to the effect this legislation will have upon the average Government employee. I think there can be no question about the fact that Federal employees are, as a whole, and as a class, perfectly honest and have an absolute abiding intention to discharge their obligations in just about the same proportion as you would find in any other class of our citizenry. The fear that apparently exists in the minds of some gentlemen here that this bill is going to work hardship and that this legislation is going to harass Government employees, or put it within the power of their creditors to harass Government employees is, in my judgment, wholly and completely unfounded. In the first place, very, very few Government employees do not sincerely intend to pay their just debts. When they create an obligation they, like most other people, intend to discharge that obligation and to do so as quickly as they can.

The reason that they cannot and will not be harassed as a result of this legislation, if it is adopted, is that you know and everyone else knows who has had any experience in collecting debts, that a creditor does not resort to litigation and does not resort to attachments and garnishment proceedings except as a very last resort. So long as any Government employee, whether he can discharge his obligations in full or not at a particular time, or today or tomorrow or the next day, as long as he evidences the slightest bit of good faith with his creditors and convinces them that he is not only willing to make an honest effort to meet his obligations, but makes even the minutest payment on those obligations, then that type of person and that type of Government employee need not be concerned that they will be harassed by this bill or any other kind of legislation of the character now under consideration.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman state whether the language he has just used is the language of the bill or the gentleman's own hope or wish as to the recourse or action that creditors might take when they have the implement of this bill?

Mr. CRAVENS. I will answer the gentleman this way. We do not have to theorize about it. That is my own impression about it, of course. There is nothing, of course, in the bill that says what attitude a creditor may assume, but let me answer the gentleman by calling attention to what has actually happened under similar circumstances. There has been no charge or claim made here or elsewhere that the employees of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or that the employees of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation or of a great many other corporations in which the Government owns all the stock and the employees of which are in reality Government employees, and who are subject to garnishment proceedings have been harassed or intimidated or taken advantage of in any way by their creditors.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Then I think it is about time at this stage of the debate for the gentleman or someone to demonstrate the public need for this legislation.

Mr. CRAVENS. The public need for this legislation is the same as the public need for any legislation which seeks to protect the members of the public against the small minority of the public who would take advantage of them if you have not something to force them not to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is there not a general order applicable to all Government departments which calls for the dismissal of an employee who fails to pay his personal or family costs?

Mr. CRAVENS. Yes; and let me tell you my experience with that.

I have had in my office for some time, letters from a constituent who has a judgment against an employee of the Government, rendered pursuant to the verdict of a jury, after trial, after the employee had his day in court, in which he had been represented by a lawyer. A judgment was rendered against an employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in Washington. Commencing in 1939 I filed that judgment under these rules to which you gentlemen have referred, where the Treasury Department claims it will compel employees to pay their debts. Here is a case where my constituent has a judgment against a man, rendered in due accord with the law, after trial, and that judgment filed with the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and they will not lift their hands to make him pay a cent of it. Yet you come in here and cite this rule or regulation of the Treasury Department as an effective way to deal with the problem. They have the regulation, but the Treasury Department will not enforce it, even where there is a judgment rendered against one of its employees.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is this a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. CRAVENS. I am not sure. No minority report, however, has been submitted and if any of the Judiciary Committee opposed the bill they have not so stated of record or stated the basis of their opposition if any they have.

Mr. DONDERO. It is quite evident to the House that in spite of the communications from the departments of Government that they now invoke the rule that will dismiss a person if they do not pay their debts, it was not sufficient to persuade your committee that the law was unnecessary.

Mr. CRAVENS. For the reason that Members have had experience exactly like I have had, where you have a constituent who has a judgment and you file it with the department involved, and every 2 or 3 months take it up with them and try to get that employee, who is making a rather good salary, to pay something on the judgment, and they come back and say they regret they cannot take any action.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. GWYNNE. Is it not true that many of the large corporations and railways have similar rules requiring their employees to pay their debts, yet there are garnishments against those employees, nevertheless? Is that not true?

Mr. CRAVENS. There is no question about that. The experience of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and these other Government corporations discloses the fact that where a man knows when he incurs a debt he has got to pay it, he is more careful in incurring that obligation.

A previous speaker suggested that this was a bill for the protection of loan sharks and for those that go out and lure people into making contracts to buy goods beyond their ability to pay. I believe if a person knows when he makes an obligation that he will have to pay that debt, he will be a great deal more careful when buying than he would if he knew he had a cave of Government immunity into which he could crawl and ignore the just claims of his creditors.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The bill provides that nobody who charges more than 6 percent can take advantage of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. CRAVENS. That is true.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That cuts out the loan shark right there.

Mr. CRAVENS. As far as the loan shark is concerned, I do not know of any of them who charge a rate of interest that small, but, even concerns which do not charge interest at all—for instance, if you go out and buy a radio, or washing machine, or what not, you will be more careful in making that purchase if you know you are going to have to pay for it.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I have wondered how the departments are going to determine whether or not there is embodied in the judgment rendered in a State, an interest charge of more than 6 percent. A justice of the peace, especially, just renders judgment. He does not go into detail as to the rate. If that is true, just what would happen?

Mr. CRAVENS. As far as I know, all judgments carry a rate of interest, either expressly or as fixed by statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This is merely for information about the bill.

He has to take an oath when he makes his application for a writ, that the interest does not exceed 6 percent.

Mr. CRAVENS. In addition to that it has to be based upon a judgment, and all judgments that I have ever seen, either by their terms bear a specific rate of interest, or in the absence of a specific rate of interest, then the stautory rate applicable under the statute is automatically applicable.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. With a copy of the judgment there is also to be sent a copy of the writ. In my State that would show whether it was 6 percent or what percent was charged.

Mr. HAYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I have been impressed by the number of complaints I have received from professional men and business institutions regarding isolated abuses of the privilege that Federal employees have enjoyed. I have been further impressed by the fact that I have not received any protests against this legislation from the employees. Is the gentleman aware of any opposition from that source?

Mr. CRAVENS. As I said a moment ago, I think the majority of Federal employees are honest and aboveboard and intend to meet their obligations. I do not think the majority of them have any objection to this bill. It it not the intention of this bill to harm in anyway that kind of employee but like many other laws, it is aimed at a small portion of the total, who must be forced to recognize and respond to their obligations.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAVENS. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman think this bill is a protection to the honest Federal employee, and that they should welcome such action at the hands of this body? Since I have been here I have had many letters from businessmen, grocerymen, druggists, tailors, and others, complaining that they could not collect the honest and just debts of Government employees. Most of those people feel very bitter toward their Government because the Government seems to tolerate such conduct. I say to you it would do a lot to command respect for our Government if we enacted some legislation like this. I think it will protect the honest Federal employee who should welcome such protection and see that these people who are not honest, are made to pay their debts.

Mr. CRAVENS. The gentleman should bear in mind also, I think, that unless remedied by this bill that situation to which the gentleman refers is going to become more aggravated as time goes on and as the number of Federal employees increases in the various States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is not any doubt about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I favor the enactment of this bill. The Committee on the Judiciary gave this matter thoughtful consideration. I favor it because it is based upon a principle that all persons shall have equal treatment under the law.

There has been considerable speculation and some misunderstanding as to the mechanics of its operation. Perhaps I am more competent to tell you more as to how it will work in my own State than I could as to any other State. I am going to illustrate this in the case of a humble employee. For instance, we will say that here in my State of Illinois, is a man by the name of Jones. He is an employee of the Federal Government. He is a janitor in the post office. He is the head of a family. He goes to his grocer and he orders groceries from day to day and from week to week, and he fails to pay his bill until it reaches the amount of $100. What happens? Grocer Smith, being unable to collect the debt, starts suit in one of the courts of our State. Mr. Jones is served with a summons and has the opportunity to come in and defend the claim. After a hearing, judgment may be rendered against Mr. Jones in the sum of $100. He then has the opportunity to appeal from that judgment. If he fails to appeal or if, on appeal, the issue is decided against him, an execution issues out of the trial court commanding the sheriff to take sufficient goods and chattels of Mr. Jones to satisfy the judgment. But suppose Mr. Jones has no property subject to execution, what then happens? If he is working for a private employer the judgment creditor, Mr. Grocer Smith, can come in and garnishee his wages. In this case, however, he is working for Uncle Sam as janitor in the post office. Under present conditions, Grocer Smith is all through and can only charge off the debt on his income tax. What will he do if this bill becomes a law? First, he will serve him with a demand in garnishment and that demand must be made not only upon Mr. Jones, but it must be made upon the Government itself—the agency that pays him. After the demand has been made, he will then come in and sue out a writ as provided in this bill. The writ will be served upon the agency of government that pays this janitor, and it will be required to come into the court and advise it as to the wages due Mr. Jones at the time of the service of the writ. The Government is not required to come in personally; it cannot be brought into court by a subpena; it merely sends a statement to the court or to the officer who has the writ that on that particular day Mr. Jones has so much money coming to him as compensation for services rendered. We will say, in our hypothetical case, that the writ is served after the month of February and before Mr. Jones has been paid for that month. There are 4 weeks in the month of February. The statement that is delivered to the officer and by him to the court shows that Mr. Jones has exactly $100 coming to him as salary for the 4 weeks of February. Then what happens? The court determines under the law of Illinois the exemptions to which Mr. Jones is entitled. Under the law of our State, his wages are exempt up to the amount of $20 a week. For the 4 weeks of February, this would amount to $80. Therefore, an order is entered by the court that the Government pay to Grocer Smith the sum of $20 and that they pay to Mr. Jones $80, which is the remainder of his salary not subject to garnishment under the law of our State.

It has been said by some Members that this will create a great bureaucracy in our Government. That I am unable to comprehend. There would be no necessity of setting up any group or groups of attorneys to examine into the laws of every State in the Union in order to properly advise Government officials in regard to these classes of cases. The pending bill merely provides that the paying officer of the Government shall send to the officer who has the writ a statement of the amount that is due and owing to that Federal employee. The State court will determine the law of the State and the amount of the exemption that is due the employee. The Government merely takes the judgment of the State after the garnishment proceedings are disposed of. In that connection, far from this being an aid to those who practice the disreputable business of loan sharks, this bill in my judgment will absolutely discourage those practices because it is provided that accompanying the judgment which is served upon the Government there must be attached thereto a statement under oath that the amount of money recovered in that judgment was for a sum in which not more than 6 percent has been added to the original principle. The loan shark is entitled to no more than the original amount of his indebtedness plus 6 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. With respect to the necessity of having someone in the Government service in each department pass upon the question of this so-called garnishment, does not the law as set forth on page 2 require somebody in each agency to determine whether or not the final judgment which is made the basis of the garnishment was obtained in the State by personal service? Somebody has got to determine that part, has he not?

Mr. REED of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. That is going to require somebody in each agency to pass upon and determine that question; is not that true?

Mr. REED of Illinois. A certified copy of the judgment would contain that information.

Mr. KEEFE. It might or might not depending upon the character of the certification of judgment that comes down to Washington; that would determine it. It might not contain that information in all cases. Take the case of a justice court judgment transcript coming from my State; I doubt very much whether there

would be any showing on the transcript at all as to the manner of service of the process which was the institution of the suit upon which the judgment was based. Am I correct in that?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I take it that the Government agency which must respond to this suit should require that the judgment itself show whether or not there was personal service.

Mr. KEEFE. One other question if the gentleman will permit. Administratively, if Grocer Smith, we will say, sold groceries to a clerk in a ration board in the gentleman's town in Illinois and brought suit against that clerk and obtained a judgment which was not paid after execution issued and that judgment had to be sent down here to Chester Bowles, head of the O. P. A., does the gentleman understand that scattered throughout this country are disbursing agents from which checks are issued and that the disbursing agency in Chicago, Ill., before the 60 days are up during which investigation can be made by Chester Bowles the disbursing agency of O. P. A. in Chicago may have already paid this clerk out there in the gentleman's local rationing board for the very month that is subject to garnishment. Is not that true?

Mr. REED of Illinois. In my judgment, it would be no more difficult for the Government to solve this problem than it is for the various railroads and large corporations who have had to deal with garnishment proceedings for many years and have done so successfully.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Committee to the situation that exists with respect to Federal employees in the several States. Those employees under existing law occupy a preferred status with respect to garnishment of their salaries. This is a serious matter in the respective States of each Member of this House. In my State, Ohio, the total number of State employees administering the State government is but 25,000, yet a year ago there were 93,000 Federal employees in Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. At the present time it is 111,000.

Mr. LEWIS. I was just going to say that my latest information is that it was 110,000. Possibly it has gone up since day before yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, this is a serious situation. Shall the House vote against this pending bill and thus continue this preferred class of garnishment-exempt and judgment-proof employees of the Federal Government when they so greatly outnumber our State employees? I grant you they are as honest as the common run of mankind, but no more honest.

Every State is being faced with this serious question, and it is about time, it seems to me, that the Congress make those who are dead beats in the Federal Government service liable to judicial processes for the collection of their just debts as other citizens are liable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the wages and salaries of all civil officers and employees of the United States, its instrumentalities and agencies, except such Government-owned or controlled corporations as are subject to suit, shall be subject to the remedies of garnishment, execution, and trustee process in the same manner and upon such conditions as may be applicable in the case of wages or salaries due from private employers in the State or Territory in which is located the court wherein such remedies are sought, but said right of garnishment, execution or trustee process shall be limited to and based upon a final judgment only after personal service upon the debtor and the writ, summons and other process shall be accompanied by a certified copy of such judgment. The writ, summons, or other process shall be served personally or by registered mail upon the head of the department or agency in which the debtor whose wages or salary is sought to be subjected to the remedies aforesaid is paid and the said writ, summons or other process shall be accompanied, in addition to said certified copy, of said judgment, by a statement under oath of the judgment creditor suing out such writ, summons or other process that he is an original creditor of the debtor in such proceeding and that the judgment upon which such process is sought does not include interest in excess of 6 percent per annum computed upon the original indebtedness. The said writ, summons, or other process shall likewise be accompanied by the sum of $2.50 if the judgment is $100 or less and $5 if in excess of that amount to be paid by the judgment creditor at the time of the service of said writ, summons or other process to the head of the department or agency so served for and on account of the United States and to be converted into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. It shall be the duty of the head of the department or agency so served as herein provided or such officer or employee of such department or agency as may be designated by him, within 60 days from the service thereof, to respond to said writ, summons or other process, by causing to be delivered by registered mail or in person to the party designated, or to the officer specified in said writ, summons, or other process, a certificate stating the amount, if any, of the wages or salary due such officer or employee, which amount shall be held subject to the further order of the court. Said certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the facts therein stated but in no event shall a person so served be required to leave his office to testify in any proceeding hereunder: *Provided, however*, That there shall be deducted from said amount to be so certified such deductions from such wages or salary as may by law be authorized to be made. It is further provided that said head of the department or agency so served or the officer or employee of such department or agency so designated by him shall not be required to respond to more than one such writ, summons or other process in any one calendar month in respect to the wages or salary of any debtor and that in the event more than one such writ, summons or other process is served within such calendar month upon such head of the department or agency in respect to the same debtor it shall be the duty of such head of the department or agency to respond to the first of the writs, summons or other process so served.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer several committee amendments which are at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 5, strike out "except such Government-owned or controlled corporations as are subject to suit."

The committee amendement was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments offered by Mr. KEFAUVER:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "agency", insert, "or in the case of the officials or employees of the Legislative or Judicial branches of the Government, the writ, summons, or other process shall be served upon the officer by or through whom the debtor's wages or salaries are paid."

Page 2, line 24, after the word "agency", insert "or officer."

Page 3, line 3, after the word "agency", insert "or officer."

Page 3, line 4, strike out the words "of such department or agency."

Page 3, line 10, after the word "employee", insert "on date of service thereof."

Page 3, line 17, after the period, insert a new sentence as follows: "There shall also be deducted from said amount to be so certified such amount as the debtor may have designated for the purchase of War bonds under the plan of the departments, the agency or organization in which the debtor is employed."

Page 3, line 18, after the word "agency", insert "or officer."

Page 3, line 19, strike out the words "of such department or agency."

Page 4, line 1, after the word "agency", insert "or officer."

Page 4, line 3, after the word "agency", insert "or officer."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, these are clarifying amendments which I think should be adopted. Particularly I call attention to page 3, line 17. The provision there is supposed to take care of any deductions for social-security tax or any other kind of tax and also any amount that may be designated for the purchase of War bonds. Some question arose as to whether the language was sufficient, so one of these amendments makes it clear that any amount designated for the purchase of War bonds, along with any social-security tax or any other deductions of that kind, shall not be reported or be subject to garnishment.

The rest of the amendments are simply clarifying amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. There is one more committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 1, after the word "be", strike out the word "converted" and insert the word "covered."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, those are all the committee amendments I have to the first section.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I want to voice my protest against the passage of this bill and in doing so I am inspired by and old adage that it is good to let well enough alone.

In my State wages and salaries are exempt from execution of any kind. It is a fund considered sacred to the household, a fund thought of in the light of a means of livelihood made by the provider of the home in order that the wife and the children might have something to eat and something to wear, a fund that the business world knows in its transaction is exempt from all execution. We do not have much trouble with this matter.

In expressing my opposition to the passage of this bill I do not do so because I am in any way against people paying their honest debts. I have always felt that honesty is the only course to pursue by any person. There are exceptions, of course, to every rule, but I will say that about 85 percent of the American people were not born with a silver spoon in their mouth and were not raised on a silver platter. They have had to earn their living in a Biblical way by the sweat of their brow. Sometimes the destiny of a man is such that adversities reach him along life's pathway, where by reason of bad luck, sickness, and so forth, he may become for the time being unable to meet his honest obligations. This does not mean in any way that he is dishonest, that he does not mean to pay his bills. I expect that 75 percent of the Members of this body have somewhere down life's pathway found themselves in a condition where, if a creditor had been so minded under an obnoxious, harsh, and hard rule, he could have made it hard for them. That is exceptionally true in my case. But I am in favor of everyone paying his debts when he can.

There are organizations in the United States—I am going to a banquet of one of them tonight—known as the Retail Merchants Association. Each and every one of us has our credit rating and our standing on file with these associations, and any merchant or any business concern can in a few minutes get information as to our financial standing and our honesty, integrity, and willingness and ability to pay. All they have to do is call. So there is as much duty upon the seller to look before he leaps as there is on the innocent buyer, who sometimes is overcome by the arts and wiles of the professional salesmen and is talked into buying commodities for which he has no earthly use and could do without. But when the time comes that a man living under the Biblical instruction to provide for his household goes through adversity or hard luck and is not able to meet his obligations, and you come along and sue him and garnishee his wages, those wages are garnisheed until the final determination of that ancillary suit and the judgment is rendered on it. At the time that judgment is entered, the garnishment extends unto that date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Does this bill apply to the resident of a State where the State has no right of garnishment against wages?

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the gentleman mean no law for or against it?

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. No law providing for garnishment in the State.

Mr. RUSSELL. My opinion offhand is that this bill, if passed, would apply to that State, but it would not apply to a State that has exemptions. This bill would have to comply with the State exemption laws in a State wherein the party was employed or where this law was sought to be enforced.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. In my State we cannot issue a writ of garnishment against a man's wages.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then it would not be applicable to the gentleman's State under such conditions.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Our State of Texas also has a law like that mentioned by the gentleman from North Carolina, that current wages are not subject to garnishment. If a Federal employee residing in the gentleman's own home town—and for illustration say he is working for the Immigration Service or the Post Office Department—is delinquent in the payment of his debts, under this bill, if it becomes law, is that man's current salary subject to garnishment, in spite of the fact that the laws of Texas state that current wages are not subject to garnishment in Texas?

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill says not. This bill, if valid, which I do not think it is, would not affect that condition in our State at all, nor in the State of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. MORRISON].

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. It just comes under the law of the State in which the man is resident?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right, where there is no law against it in the State.

Mr. THOMASON. If this bill becomes law, then, would not great confusion arise in communities where there are Federal employees whose wages are subject to garnishment as against the local people whose wages are not subject to garnishment?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly. Not only that; they would be attempting under this law to supersede and say that it was over and above and would override the State law.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I think he ought to clear up the matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The gentleman knows, of course, that this would not apply to Federal employees in the State of Texas, because under the laws of Texas they are not subject to garnishment.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the way I construed it, and so stated.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I did not know if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] understood it that way or not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I further stated that in my opinion the shysters would be trying to enforce it in Texas upon the theory and pretext that the Federal law was paramount and overrode the State law.

My friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] spoke a while ago about the judgments of the loan sharks, and stated that interest of over 6 percent was not permitted. I judge by that that my beloved friend from Illinois has not had any experience with the loan sharks. They charge from 15 to 40 percent interest and take it off at the time they make the loan to you, and yet make the loan cover all of it, and therefore charge you the whole amount of your debt, and then they can come in under this bill and get the interest of 6 percent plus that 40 percent that they collected before any interest was ever due.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Does the gentleman, then, contend that when he makes a statement under oath he would be able to get by by omitting the part that he had already received?

Mr. RUSSELL. If he shows that the 6-percent interest was on the promissory note or whatever instrument he had, where would he violate any law?

Mr. Chairman, I want to finish the remarks I intended to make a few moments ago. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has raised a very important question, with reference to this bill. It occurs to me that a correct analysis of the situation, as illustrated by his remarks, would lead us to be believe that this bill, if it becomes law, is going to cost the Government during these trying times and at a time when every dollar should be saved for the war effort, more money than it will be of benefit to the shysters and loan sharks and those who would take advantage of it.

There is another serious question in my mind as to this bill and that is this: The gentleman raised a question with reference to Mr. Chester Bowles, who is an agent of the Government. A suit in garnishment is an independent suit and yet it is ancillary to the main suit, but it is docketed in my State and in most other States, under an independent number and name of the suit, as Jane Doe versus Chester Bowles, an officer of the Government, in garnishee, with a new number. Will someone please tell me how you are going to get authority out of this legislation to make the Government which you are doing, a party to a little, insignificant suit, without direct and explicit authorization by the Congress for such purpose, and that specifically specified?

Mr. CRAVENS. Will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. RUSSELL. When I get through I will yield.

Mr. CRAVENS. The gentleman asked a question and I thought he wanted an answer.

Mr. RUSSELL. All right. The gentleman can get his time and answer it later. I want to talk a little bit now.

In my opinion, if you were to sue Mr. Chester Bowles and serve him, he could sit back and give you the haw-haw and that would be the end of it. It would be an idle gesture because, being an agent of the Government, he would not have to answer unless the Congress specifically, in a bill, so provided for that purpose in order for it to be valid and legal. He does not have it in this case, and in my opinion, as I said in the beginning, in the passage of this bill you are going to make bad matters worse. You had better let well enough alone.

I was amused at my distinguished friend from Ohio, Dr. SMITH, when he was talking about the Government helping to enforce contracts. My dear doctor, most of the contracts sought to be enforced through this legislation from the sharks that would take advantage of it, when analyzed and put to the test, would fail by reason of the many, many provisions in the contracts, that would vitiate and destroy them.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman deny that one of the fundamental functions of government is the enforcement of contracts?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I would not deny it, yet I would not admit it. I would say that one of the fundamental functions and duties of government is to pass such legislation as to protect and enforce the obligations of contracts. I would say that.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And the Government merely gives the agency the power to do this?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 3, line 5, after "within", strike out "60" and insert "30."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take the 5 minutes because it is not necessary. The amendment speaks for itself.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The committee has no objection to the amendment offered, I think.

Mr. HANCOCK. I do not know why 60 days was put in. I assume that there was some good reason for it—probably to enable the various paymasters to rearrange their pay rolls.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say in answer to that statement, that in most States, at least in my State, the usual return day on the ordinary summons is 15 days. This bill provides four times that length of time. If a department of Government was served today in Washington, and this bill was the law, no return would be required until the 3d day of next May. One of the criticisms of legal procedure in the United States is the law's delay. Even Shakespeare spoke of that centuries ago. For that reason I think we ought to shorten this to 1 month by adopting my amendment. That will allow double the time for return of summons in most States.

Mr. MICHENER. Even if it is shortened the gentleman does not believe that a justice of the peace in Michigan could render judgment on any proceeding set up here in Washington unless the State law creating him, giving him his powers, his jurisdiction, and his direction so provided?

Mr. DONDERO. The garnishment is not served in Washington until after judgment has been rendered in Michigan and all those questions have first been answered.

Mr. MICHENER. Oh, no.

Mr. DONDERO. Oh, yes.

Mr. MICHENER. When judgment is rendered on principal judgment, it then goes to Washington, and Washington makes a report back to the justice, who carries out the rest of the Washington law. Otherwise would not the justice in Michigan lose his jurisdiction when he had exceeded the jurisdiction provided him by the State law under which he functions?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not see the point that the gentleman is trying to make. I am trying to prevent the law's delay. I believe 30 days is ample time in which any Federal officer should make return on a garnishment summons.

Mr. GWYNNE. Do I understand that in the case of any railroad system or any gigantic chain-store system or corporation, in respect to garnishment, in the State of Michigan, that 15 days is the time which answer shall be made?

Mr. DONDERO. Fifteen days in which to answer after the summons has been served.

Mr. GWYNNE. That is correct, and I believe with the gentleman that 30 days should be sufficient for the Government in a somewhat similar situation to answer the only question it has to answer, and that is how much was due and owing this employee at the time the garnishment was served.

Mr. MICHENER. The law provides in Michigan, and I think in every railroad corporation and in every large corporation of the country it is so set up that the local agent may receive service, like a railroad company and may make return. It is done up where I garnishee in the little town of Adrian, Mich., in the case of the Wabash Railroad Co., which has offices in St. Louis. St. Louis wires back to the railroad station agent, and he makes the return, whereas under this procedure, you have to send all this matter down to Washington and you cannot do it in less than 60 days.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. Is any estimate made of how much the Department of Justice would have to be augmented to meet this increased legal responsibility?

Mr. DONDERO. No evidence has been offered, but the bill provides for the payment of $2.50 if the judgment is under $100 and $5 if it exceeds that amount.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. If this bill passes it seems as if you will have to quadruple that organization so as to look after the Government's interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. It seems to me that there are one or two questions involved in this proposed legislation that have not received very serious consideration from this House this afternoon. The committee has seen fit to interpose an amendment on page 3, line 10, after the word "employee," by inserting the words which limit the return of the head of an agency or bureau to the day upon which the garnishment proceeding or affidavit or writ is served on the head of the department. That is a good amendment, but let us see how this thing will work out administratively, in line with the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. There is not a Member of Congress who does not have a local rationing board in his or her district. I say that because they are quite common. The employees of the local rationing board in my town are principally local people. Very well. One of this rationing board, a Federal employee, owes some money and a local merchant sues that employee and obtains a judgment, and then under the provisions of this law that judgment creditor goes into a justice court, or whatever court renders the judgment, and commences garnishment proceedings on that judgment pursuant to the law of my State. On those garnishment proceedings, which are ancillary to execution and subsequent to judgment, the writ is issued, directed to the head of O. P. A., directing the head of O. P. A. to report back to that court the amount of wages due and payable to that employee on the day the writ was served. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, then, that brings us to the administrative problem which, to me, is the serious problem in this legislation. I believe I am correct in saying that the disbursing office that handles the pay rolls for the O. P. A. employees in my State is located in the city of Chicago. Those checks are made out to the employees of that local rationing board in Chicago. Due to the thousands of employees in that area, those pay-roll checks and the pay-roll vouchers have to be made out long in advance of the time of their delivery to the actual employee. Now, we have this situation. Mr. Bowles, the head of O. P. A., gets this writ from a court out in Wisconsin telling him to report within 30 or 60 days, depending upon whether you accept the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan, how much the Government owes this employee in the local rationing board on the day the writ was served on Mr. Bowles. What is Mr. Bowles, as the

head of that agency, going to do? He has to have somebody set up in his agency to handle the situation for him. Clearly, he is not going to be able to do it himself. How is he going to do it? He has got to communicate with Chicago to find out whether there is such a person by such a name on the pay roll out of the thousands of people employed by the O. P. A. He has to get the disbursing or pay-roll office in Chicago to figure out whether or not on such and such a day this girl had any money coming to her. It may be administratively, before Mr. Bowles can get that information from clear out in San Francisco, or Portland, Oreg., or some other place, that the local disbursing agency will have issued a pay check to this employee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. It may be that that pay check has already been issued to this local employee out there in my town of Oshkosh, Wis. When Mr. Bowles makes his return, he has to return the amount that was due on the day the writ was served upon him. If the local disbursing office out in San Francisco or in Chicago or some other place has already paid that girl, and she has got her money, what is he going to do? I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to tell us.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I appreciate the gentleman bringing this up.

Mr. KEEFE. May I interrupt just to say that is administratively the very objection that the chief of the disbursing agency of the Treasury Department says makes this bill administratively impossible of operation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The chief of the Treasury Department has not had any experience with it. The R. F. C. and other governmental corporations have had experience with it and this bill sets it up administratively the very way that they have.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think he means exactly that. The R. F. C. and none of the other agencies have had experience with this particular bill. They have had experience due to the fact that under general law they are subject to garnishment which is quite a different thing than the Government corporations which are subject to garnishment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. What I am saying to the gentleman was that the R. F. C. and other agencies handle it administratively as this bill sets it up to be handled administratively. If the gentleman would read the letter from the R. F. C. he will see they have not had any difficulty with it.

Mr. KEEFE. I have carefully read the testimony in the hearings of the agency that is charged administratively with the actual disbursing, writing out, and transmitting of 550,000 Government employees' accounts. That testimony tells you the manner in which those checks are written, the manner in which the pay rolls are prepared, and the tremendous administrative difficulty that will be involved in actually working this matter out administratively. I will say to the gentleman that so far as the broad, general principles are concerned in this bill and the objectives that you are seeking to get at, I fully approve of them. I see no reason why, if it is possible to be done, you should not subject Federal employees to garnishment as well as quasi-garnishment proceedings against State employees in my own State. But we are at war and I told the people of my State I will not vote to place any more people on the Federal pay roll. That is all there is to it. I know just as well as I am standing in the well of this House that, if this bill passes, every agency of Government will use it as a means of coming before the Committee on Appropriations and saying, "We have got to have so many more employees in order to handle the work involved in this situation." With the Nation at war and with manpower as short as it is, and with no real need as shown in the record, and no real crisis shown that calls for the enactment of this legislation at this time, I feel that it would be unwise to enact it at this time and impose this additional burden on the agencies of the Government, who are now overburdened in their efforts to handle these great pay rolls of nearly 3,000,000 employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri: On page 1, line 3, after the word "employee", insert "including Members of the Congress, the judiciary, and all other elected and appointed officers."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I said in the beginning, this is intended to and in fact does include all officers and employees of the Government, including executive, judicial, and legislative, except men and women in the armed services.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I do not belive that is clear from the wording of the bill. However, the committee amendment that was inserted after the word "agency" in line 8, on page 2, provided for the enforcement in the various departments with the exception of elected officers. I refer to the executive branch of the Government as well as the legislative branch.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I will say to the gentleman that the language in line 3, page 1, "wages and salaries of all civil officers and employees of the United States," and so forth, is intended to include elective officials. Elective officers are civil officers within that definition.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Then would the gentleman have any objection to my amendment which would merely clarify the situation so that there would be no doubt as to it including both officers and employees in all three branches of Government, that is, the executive, the judicial, and the legislative?

Mr. KEFAUVER. As I say to the gentleman, we intended to do that. I think the gentleman's amendment is superfluous.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I do not know. All I can say to the gentleman is that I have been practicing law for many years in Missouri and I cannot see that the words "civil officers and employees" include those whom I desire to include in this bill.

Mr. KEFAUVER. If the gentleman has any doubt about it we will accept his amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this amendment would take in the Federal judiciary?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. It will take in all branches of the Government. It inserts, if my colleague will permit me to say, after the words "wages and salaries of all civil officers and employees," the words "including Members of the Congress, the judiciary, and all other elected and appointed officers" of the United States, its instrumentalities, and agencies.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Constitution provides that you cannot reduce the salary of a judge during the term of his office. Would garnisheeing his wages and taking part of his salary away be looked upon as being a reduction of his salary and therefore would it not be in violation of the Constitution?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would hardly think so.

Mr. COCHRAN. It seems to me that it would.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I think a member of the judiciary should be forced to pay his debts just the same as any other individual in these United States.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; but the judiciary is protected specifically by the Constitution so far as a reduction in salary is concerned. The thought, I presume, of the forefathers being that if the Congress does not like a Federal judge they could reduce his salary to a dollar a year.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Yes; but a judgment creditor collecting his debt would not be reducing the salary of that judge.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, you are taking away from him part of his salary which he receives from the Federal Government.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman please explain this phenomenon? If, as has been said, the passage of this legislation will increase the number of employees or increase the bureaus down here, why are certain governmental agencies now opposing this bill if it will do that? Because it is so contrary to all

their policy in the past. I would like the gentleman to explain that, if he knows the reason why.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I am not prepared to explain that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In connection with the question raised by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], is it not a fact that you could not first obtain a judgment against a judicial officer such as a judge of a court, so therefore it could not possibly have any effect upon the salary or wages received by a judge or a Federal officer of the Supreme Court?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I know of no law that prohibits a suit or a judgment against a Federal judge or a judge of our United States Supreme Court.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman from Michigan does not mean that you cannot sue a Federal judge on his debt, does he?

Mr. DONDERO. I think the question raised by the gentleman from Missouri was about Supreme Court Justices.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The Supreme Court Justice owes his grocery bill and if he does not pay you can sue him.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, I think he should pay.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If it is obviously a breach of the Constitution against reducing salaries, so is the income-tax bill which is passed every year.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. Mr. Chairman, I can think of no reason why any judgment debtor in any civilian branch of our Government, be he or she a Member of the Congress, a Federal judge, Judge of our Supreme Court, elective official, member of the executive department, or President of the United States should not be subject to execution and garnishment as provided in this bill. My amendment makes this possible and it should be adopted.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Did I understand the lady from Illinois, to say——

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I agree it is unconstitutional, but so are the income-tax laws.

Mr. COCHRAN. But only Federal judges who have been appointed since the income-tax law was amended, are subject to the income tax. The old judges who were appointed prior to the time that amendment was adopted, are not subject to the income tax as far as their salaries are concerned.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. Does the learned gentleman from Missouri contend that judges are constitutionally immuned from the payment of ordinary debts?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I do not.

Mr. HANCOCK. Then what is the point of the gentleman's inquiry?

Mr. COCHRAN. I was just raising the question as to whether or not you would be reducing the salary of a judge, and whether or not it would be a violation of the Constitution.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The constitutional amendment applies to Congressmen, does it not?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. That is O. K. with me. But the Congress included an amendment in a revenue bill which provided that thereafter, judges appointed would be subject to the tax, and therefore the Congress provided that their salary was reduced before they were appointed.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Did I understand the gentleman, in response to the question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], to say that he was not raising the question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I was only raising the question as to whether or not the amendment, including the judiciary, was a violation of the Constitution.

Mr. MICHENER. What I want to understand clearly, Is the gentleman's argument intended to be entirely academic?

Mr. COCHRAN. You can look at it that way if you want to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The head of the department or agency served as provided in section 1 shall cause to be delivered and paid over the amount of any wages or salary due any such officer or employee aforesaid, in accordance with the order of the court or justice having jurisdiction in such proceeding, and any payment so made shall constitute a complete and valid acquittance of the United States for the amount of the wages or salary of any such officer or employee of the United States so paid.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer two clarifying amendments, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. KEFAUVER:

On page 4, line 5, after the word "agency", insert "or officer."

On page 4, line 7, after the word "due", insert "after deductions as provided in section 1."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the said right of garnishment, execution, or trustee process shall apply not only to civil officers and employees of the United States, its instrumentalities and agencies, except such Government-owned or controlled corporations as are subject to suit, but also to employees of the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 16, line 17, after the word "agencies, strike out the remainder of the line down to and including the word "suit", in line 18.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of Missouri: After the word "employees", in line 16, on page 4, insert "including Members of the Congress, the judiciary, and all other elected and appointed officers."

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, that simply carries out the amendment which the gentleman offered to section 1.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. That is correct. That is the only purpose of the amendment.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The committee accepts the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. That the term "Territory", as used in this act, shall include political subdivisions of the United States of America.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of line 22 insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. This act shall not affect, curtail, or in any wise limit the right of garnishment against officers or employees of Government owned or controlled corporations as such right now exists."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

"SEC. 6. This act shall take effect immediately but shall not apply to indebtedness incurred prior to the date of its approval."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 3, strike out the figure 5 and insert the figure 6.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2985) to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States, pursuant to House Resolution 453, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania) there were—yeas 61, noes 44.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 158, nays 114, not voting 155, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—158

Abernethy	Gorski	Miller, Conn.
Allen, La.	Gossett	Miller, Mo.
Andersen, H. Carl	Graham	Miller, Nebr.
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ala.	Mills
Anderson, N. Mex.	Grant, Ind.	Monroney
Andresen, August H.	Green	Mundt
Arnold	Gregory	Murdock
Auchincloss	Griffiths	Murray, Tenn.
Barrett	Gwynne	Murray, Wis.
Bates, Ky.	Hale	Newsome
Bell	Hancock	Norman
Bennett, Mo.	Harless, Ariz.	Norrell
Boren	Harris, Ark.	Outland
Boykin	Hartley	Pace
Brehm	Hays	Peterson, Fla
Brooks	Heidinger	Peterson, Ga.
Brown, Ga.	Herter	Phillips
Brown, Ohio	Hess	Ploeser
Bryson	Hoeven	Priest
Burch, Va.	Hoffman	Rankin
Camp	Holmes, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.
Cannon, Mo.	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Carlson, Kans.	Horan	Rizley
Carrier	Izac	Robertson
Carson, Ohio	Jackson	Rockwell
Church	Jarman	Sadowski
Clevenger	Jeffrey	Sauthoff
Cole, Mo.	Jennings	Schiffler
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Scrivner
Cooper	Johnson, Anton J.	Sheppard
Courtney	Johnson, Calvin D.	Sikes
Cravens	Johnson, Okla.	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Johnson, Ward	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Jones	Sparkman
Dilweg	Jonkman	Springer
Dirksen	Judd	Stanley
Disney	Kean	Stearns, N. H.
Dondero	Kefauver	Sumner, Ill.
Dworshak	LaFollette	Sumners, Tex.
Elston, Ohio	Lambertson	Tarver
Engel, Mich.	Landis	Talle
Engle, Calif.	Larcade	Walter
Fellows	Lea	Wasielewski
Fernandez	LeCompte	Weaver
Fuller	Lewis	Welchel, Ga.
Gathings	McCord	White
Gibson	McGregor	Whittington
Gilchrist	McMurray	Wickersham
Gillette	Magnuson	Willey
Gillie	Mansfield, Mont.	Wilson
Gordon	Martin, Iowa	Winstead
Gore	Mason	Wolfenden, Pa.
		Woodruff, Mich.
		Zimmerman

NAYS—114

Beall	Fisher	Mahon
Beckworth	Fitzpatrick	Martin, Mass.
Bishop	Flannagan	May
Bloom	Fogarty	Michener
Bonner	Folger	Morrison, N. C.
Bradley, Pa.	Forand	Myers
Brumbaugh	Gavin	O'Brien, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Granger	O'Brien, Mich.
Burdick	Hagen	O'Brien, N. Y.
Burgin	Hare	O'Konski
Canfield	Harris, Va.	O'Neal
Carter	Hart	Patton
Chiperfield	Hoch	Philbin
Cochran	Hull	Pittenger
Compton	Johnson, Ind.	Poage
Cooley	Johnson, Luther A.	Poulson
Cox	Keefe	Rabaut
Crosser	Kerr	Ramey
Curley	Kilday	Randolph
D'Alesandro	King	Richards
Delaney	Lane	Robsion, Ky.
Dies	Lanham	Rodgers, Pa.
Durham	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Eaton	Ludlow	Rohrbough
Eberharter	McCowen	Rolph
Elliott	McGehee	Rowan
Ellis	McLean	Russell
Ellison, Md.	McMillan	Sasscer
Elmer	Madden	Schwabe
Fenton	Shafer	Scott
	Simpson, Ill.	Sullivan
	Smith, Maine	Talbot
	Smith, Wis.	Thomas, Tex.
	Snyder	Thomason
	Spence	Tibbott
	Stefan	Troutman
	Stevenson	Vincent, Ky.
	Stewart	Wadsworth
		Welch
		Wene
		Whitten
		Wigglesworth
		Wolcott
		Wolverton, N. J.
		Worley
		Wright

NOT VOTING—155

Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Morrison, La.
Andrews	Gerlach	Mott
Angell	Gifford	Mruk
Arends	Goodwin	Murphy
Baldwin, Md.	Gross	Norton
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Connor
Barden	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Hara
Barry	Halleck	O'Leary
Bates, Mass.	Harness, Ind.	O'Toole
Bender	Hébert	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Blackney	Hendricks	Plumley
Bland	Hill	Powers
Bolton	Hinshaw	Pracht, C. Frederick
Bradley, Mich.	Hobbs	Pratt, Joseph M.
Buckley	Holifield	Price
Buffett	Holmes, Mass.	Ramspeck
Burchill, N. Y.	Howell	Reed, N. Y.
Busbey	Jenkins	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Johnson, J. Leroy	Rivers
Byrne	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Cannon, Fla.	Kearney	Rogers, Calif.
Capozzoli	Kee	Rowe
Case	Kelley	Sabath
Celler	Kennedy	Satterfield
Chapman	Keogh	Scanlon
Chenoweth	Kilburn	Sheridan
Clark	Kinzer	Short
Clason	Kirwan	Simpson, Pa.
Coffee	Kleberg	Slaughter
Colmer	Klein	Smith, W. Va.
Costello	Knutson	Somers, N. Y.
Curtis	Kunkel	Starnes, Ala.
Davis	LeFevre	Stockman
Dawson	Lesinski	Sundstrom
Day	Luce	Taber
Dewey	Lynch	Taylor
Dickstein	McConnell	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	McCormack	Tolan
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Towe
Doughton	McWilliams	Treadway
Douglas	Maas	Vinson, Ga.
Drewry	Maloney	Voorhis, Calif.
Ellsworth	Manasco	Vorys, Ohio
Fay	Mansfield, Tex.	Vursell
Feighan	Marcantonio	Ward
Fish	Merritt	Weichel, Ohio
Ford	Merrow	Weiss
Fulbright	Miller, Pa.	West
Fulmer	Monkiewicz	Winter
Furlong		Woodrum, Va.
Gale		
Gallagher		
Gamble		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Satterfield for, with Mr. McWilliams against.

Mr. Kinzer for, with Mr. Vinson of Georgia against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Robinson of Utah against.

Mr. Gale for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Short.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Busbey.

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Fay with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Manasco with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Bland with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Hill.

Mr. Feighan with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Monkiewicz.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reed of New York.

Mr. Furlong with Mr. Stockman.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Rowe.

Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Taber.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Chenoweth.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Baldwin of New York.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Day.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Celler with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Butler.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. LeFevre.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. Davis with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Costello with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4166. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report of the Select Committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a complete study and investigation of the war program.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2836) entitled "An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BUCK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 324) entitled "An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR,

Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. BUCK to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) entitled "Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization;" disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1243) entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes;" requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURDOCK, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following agencies:

1. Federal Security Agency (Social Security Board).
2. National Housing Agency.
3. Selective Service System.
4. United States Maritime Commission.
5. War Production Board.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department and agency:

1. Department of War.
2. Tennessee Valley Authority.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Office of Censorship.
5. Tennessee Valley Authority.
6. United States Civil Service Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 264):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. THOMAS H. CULLEN, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the conclusion of the legislative program and any previous special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REVENUE ACT OF 1943 (PUBLIC LAW NO. 235)

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report an original privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 70) authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law No. 235, current session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1943," and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 48,000 additional copies of Public Law No. 235, current session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1943," of which 40,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 3,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A STUDY OF THE LEGALITY OF THE ANNEXATION OF AUSTRIA BY GERMANY, ETC. (H. DOC. NO. 477)

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report (Rept. No. 1228) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 458) authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "A Study of the Legality of the Annexation of Austria by Germany Under International Law and Austrian Constitutional Law and the Policy of the United States Toward the Annexation," as a document, and I ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "A Study of the Legality of the Annexation of Austria by Germany Under International Law and Austrian Constitutional Law and the Policy of the United States Toward the Annexation" be printed as a document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted, after the special orders for today, to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the Conservation Director of the Conservation Department of the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Daniel M. Kidney.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] may extend his own remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] may extend his own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSTRUCTION OF DEMONSTRATION PLANS TO PRODUCE LIQUID FUEL FROM COAL AND OTHER SUBSTANCES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, with House amendments, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WORLEY). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE FIGHT FOR FREEDOM ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, ever since the New Deal administration came to power 12 years ago, there has been a continuous and carefully planned drive by a clique in the White House to upset the checks and balances of our free constitutional government, and to concentrate absolute power in the person of the Chief Executive. Three bold and insolent attempts have been made to execute a coup to accomplish this nefarious purpose. The first attempt was when the President demanded of the Congress the right to appoint six additional judges to the Supreme Court, which would have enabled him to at once control that Court. Not many of you listening to me have forgotten how, in his attempt to influence the Congress, the President contemptuously referred to the splendid members of that Court as "those nine old men," inferring, of course, that these men were too old to properly discharge the responsibilities resting upon them. In his unholy attempt to destroy the independence and the power of our Court of last resort, Mr. Roosevelt stated that the work of the Court was so far behind that these proposed new Justices were needed in order to bring the work up to date and to keep it there. Great must have been his embarrassment and confusion when it was promptly disclosed by the records of the Court that never in all its history had the work been more completely up to the minute than it was at that time, completely refuting every insinuation and every reason advanced by the President in support of his demand. This attempt by the Executive to destroy public confidence in the Supreme Court and the splendid Justices then on the Supreme Court bench, and to pack that tribunal with men of his own selection who would construe the Constitution in the way Mr. Roosevelt wanted it construed, and thereby change our Government by judicial decree, was the most brazen attempt to destroy our tripartite system of government ever attempted by a President of the United States.

Outraged by such a brazen attempt to destroy the very fundamentals, and to tear asunder the very pillars upon which our free government was founded, even the President's own supporters in the Congress were compelled by sheer patriotism and devotion to principle to oppose him. He sought to destroy these patriotic members of his own party in the following election, when he staged his attempt to purge his party and the Congress of all who had dared to defy his mad ambitions.

As a companion measure to the court-packing plan, the White House clique, through the Chief Executive, endeavored to compel the Congress through the pressure of patronage, punishment, and persuasion to empower the President to reorganize the Government in such a way as to leave the legislative branch impotent. Again, outraged by these bold and insolent attempts to transform our Government into a government by men, Democrats and Republicans alike, without regard to partisan lines, rose up and stopped that attempt.

It is true that through the mutations of time and the frailty of mortals, Mr. Roosevelt was enabled to pack the Supreme Court to the tune of 8 to 1, and he has appointed a majority of the lower Federal courts as well, with politicians of his choosing whom he felt sure would construe the Constitution as he wanted it construed. He was not greatly disappointed.

The third, and perhaps the boldest and most insolent attempt to transform the Government into a political oligarchy, while millions of our heroic men and women are absent on the fighting fronts, came in his series of vetoes of measures recently passed by the Congress. So long as he restrained himself to the act of the veto, he was well within his proper rights and functions as the Chief Executive. But in his veto of the tax bill, he not only broke another precedent—which Mr. Roosevelt delights to do—but he went beyond the exercise of his veto power, and in an abusive and insulting message to the Congress, sought to tell this House of Representatives what kind of a tax bill it should pass.

There is no function of the Congress more clearly defined in the Constitution than that of raising revenues, which action must originate in the House of Representatives, the branch of the Congress considered closest to the people. His message on the tax bill was exactly in line with his other insulting messages, notably his remarks concerning the bill to provide ballots for absentee service people, in which he accused the Congress of attempting to perpetrate a fraud upon the soldiers and the people and indulged in the palpable inference that the Congress was either crooked or stupid, or both. He proposed a ballot to be sent to our armed forces which, unless the legislatures of the States first legalized the same, could not legally be cast in a single State of the Union. He, of course, was aware of this fact.

Mr. Roosevelt, in his tax message, as in his remarks concerning the absentee-ballot bill, did not hesitate to depart from the facts and indulge in misstatements so grossly erroneous, so maliciously untrue, that in anyone lacking the dignity of the Presidency such action would have been characterized by a harsher term than any American wants to use in connection with the Chief Executive. So gross, so wanton, so unfair, and so dangerous was Mr. Roosevelt's action and his language in gratitously insulting the Congress in his attempts to discredit the legislative branch in the confidence of the people that all but a mere handful of his own supporters in both the House and the Senate rose up and, as with one voice, repudiated his action in the most startling and remarkable rebuke a Chief Executive has received at the hands of the people's representatives in Congress in perhaps 100 years, certainly, at least, in the last 50 years.

There can no longer be any question in the mind of any clear-thinking person that the White House clique, intriguing for a dictatorship of life tenure for Franklin D. Roosevelt under the guise of a Presidential election and pseudo-democratic processes, is endeavoring to overturn constitutional government in their mad and frantic efforts to achieve their objective, regardless of its effect upon our war efforts, and of the death or injury which they may cause to be brought upon thousands and even hundreds of thousands of our men and women in the armed services locked in bitter struggle with the foreign foe. It is shameful, it is wicked, this deliberate attempt to destroy the confidence of the people in the Congress as a coordinate, independent branch of the Government because the Congress refuses to render itself subservient to the dictates of the man in the White House.

Patriots, earnest men and women on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of the Congress, realize fully what a statesman of another day, Elihu Root, put into words when he said in 1913:

> If whatever great officer of state happens to be the most forceful, skillful, and ambitious, is permitted to overrun and to absorb to himself the powers of all other officers and to control their actions, there ensues that concentration of power which destroys the working of free institutions, enables the holder to continue himself in power, and leaves no opportunity to the people for a change except through revolution.

This latest and most brazen attempt by the White House cabal, through the Chief Executive, to break down our constitutional government, to destroy the checks and balances so carefully provided by the founding fathers, has put the American people on notice that if Franklin Delano Roosevelt and his White House clique can achieve a fourth term, free government will be so far gone in this Nation that it will be a question of whether or not the people can rescue it without a revolution. It will constitute a betrayal of the men and women on the fighting fronts. It will constitute a loss of the peace after we win the war, because it will mean the loss of free government in the United States of America.

The American people have begun to realize that the interference by British politicians in our internal political affairs is of a piece with these brazen and wicked attempts by the White House gang to break down constitutional government under cover of the Nation's peril and our struggle to win the awful conflict in which we are engaged. Never in the history of this Nation has it been more strikingly demonstrated that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty in America than has been the case for the last 12 years under this New Deal administration. The people are being compelled to recognize that it has never been a "New Deal" administration, but that it has been an administration which for 12 years has plotted and schemed and worked to give the people the oldest deal in civilization—a deal of despotism. It has endeavored to throw American progress back 200 years and to set up again in this country the very sort of tyranny that the men and women of Bunker Hill

and Brandywine, of Yorktown and Valley Forge suffered and died to drive from the continent of North America.

This attempt of betrayal of our fighting forces behind their backs in this effort to break down their constitutional government, is so utterly wicked and contemptible that it is no wonder the President's own spokesmen in the Congress had to revolt and denounce him and his works. It is a dreadful thing to have to happen in wartime and the blame for it lies directly on Mr. Roosevelt's desk in the White House.

The men and women who are plotting this wicked scheme, if they could accomplish it, if they could succeed in overthrowing our constitutional government of checks and balances, and in setting up a political autocracy in this Nation, while the people are fighting and struggling and sacrificing to repel foreign aggression, would be traitors beside whom Benedict Arnold would appear a patriot.

The American people may well thank benign providence that in this crucial hour, principle and patriotism blotted out partisanship and caused the men and women who love their country to rise in their places in the Congress of the United States and to strike down this third bold attempt to destroy free government in this country.

It is up to the American people, and I for one have no doubt the Members of the American Congress will meet their responsibility in overwhelming numbers, to defeat the next bold and brazen attempt to overthrow free government in this country by defeating the proposed universal draft act, under which every man between the ages of 18 and 65 and every woman between the ages of 18 and 50, will be regimented and controlled by some iron-fisted bureaucrat in Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

U. N. R. R. A. PROGRAM

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on October 7, 1943, I stated on the floor of the House that the American people were being taken for the damnedest financial sled ride the world has ever known. I further stated that our Capitol had become the headquarters for the "Order of the Empty Satchel" where delegates assembled in answer to urging of starry-eyed globats who coursed the world, making lush and ridiculous promises of American goods and American dollars.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate those charges and submit this schedule as proof. This schedule contains the farm machinery program of U. N. R. R. A. It is the brain child of these crystal gazers whose heads are in the clouds and whose hands are in our pockets. Herein is contained a list of farm equipment, approximately 500,000 items, each representing an essential and necessary piece of machinery for which American farmers have been pleading ever since Pearl Harbor. They propose to distribute machinery among approximately 15 nations of Europe, every one of which is at present occupied wholly or in part by Axis forces, and yet these Utopian dreamers demand delivery of portions of this equipment by August 1, 1944.

Thirty thousand tractors are to be sent to parts of Europe, where in many instances the intended recipient has never seen one.

Thirty thousand plows are to be scattered all over Europe and paid for with American dollars.

Thirty thousand separators, 50,000 mowers, 17,000 reapers, 22,900 horse-drawn hay rakes, 40,000 harrows and harrow-sections, and 12,000 binders, every item of which Members of Congress have endeavored to obtain for needy farmers.

Thirty thousand pieces of machinery to the Netherlands whose cash reserves in this country are enormous; 15,000 pieces of equipment to Belgium and Luxemburg; 14,000 to Czechoslovakia; 21,000 to Denmark; 212,000 to France; 8,900 to Greece; 12,000 to Norway; 115,000 to Poland; 36,000 to Yugoslavia; 20,000 to the Baltic States; and 10,000 to Italy. In addition there is listed 13,000 tons of spare parts to repair machinery in Europe while our American farmers are using baling wire to hold their equipment together.

If this is the farm-machinery program of U. N. R. R. A., what are its other programs? How many hidden skeletons of this kind does it have in its closet? Let us bring them forth.

Mr. Speaker, our country has been called upon, through lend-lease, to contribute our wealth and our energies to an embattled world. No Member of this House begrudges the allocation of war materials to any nation that is actually engaged by participation in the war. I do, however, most vociferously protest the use of our funds for building a railroad in Mexico, draining swamps in Venezuela, paying Peruvians to reduce cotton acreage, and the squandering of $78,000,000 in the jungles of Brazil on a rubber project that has given no returns. Our country has been called upon to furnish 73 percent of the sons to be used in the invasion of Europe. Through our energies and productivity, we have become the arsenal of democracy while global planners, whose pipe dreams have never been equaled in world history, have spread our wealth as a lush green carpet over the entire earth. We continue rationing of meat, Canada discontinues it. We play the role of Santa Claus to the entire world, forgetful of the American taxpayers who, for generations to come, will pay with sweat and sacrifice for this folly.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for America to take its head out of the sand and face the reality that a group of starry-eyed globats are scattering to the four winds of heaven the substances accumulated by this Nation through 150 years of sweat, toil, and blood. How much longer, may I ask, are we to follow, as gullible children, these crystal-gazing Pied Pipers who lead us onward toward bankruptcy?

Agricultural machinery programmed by U. N. R. R. A. for European distribution

	Belgium and Luxemburg	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	France	Greece	Netherlands	Norway	Poland	Yugoslavia	Albania	Baltic States	Italy	Total
Plows:													
Moldboard, walking				5,000	2,500	2,300		5,000	10,000	200			25,000
Moldboard, tractor (total)													30,000
2-bottom, drawn	250	550	800	7,395	25	870	600	2,300	200		850	265	14,105
2-bottom, mounted	30	100	100	1,200	50	130	50	700	50		150	175	2,735
3-bottom, drawn	70	350	300	5,020	25	500		3,700	250		750	195	11,160
4-bottom, drawn				500				1,500					2,000
Extra shares—2 per bottom	1,540	4,700	5,400	68,500	450	7,000	2,600	46,200	2,500		8,500	2,930	150,320
1-way disk plow with seeding attachment				3,600								100	3,700
Grain drill:													
3-7 disk					150								150
Fertilizer						50							50
Plain	100		250	4,900		250	200	11,575	200	25		100	17,600
Planters, hand	250												250
Fertilizer distributors	500					1,250							1,750
Harrow sections:													
Spike	180	1,200	200	6,000	300	530	100	4,100	2,300		300		15,210
Spring	170		1,000	8,600		970	800	4,100		50	1,450		17,140
Harrow, disk with tandem	100	200	400	2,475		715	325	3,000	50		250	635	8,150
Binders:													
Ground-drive	965		3,500	4,445	150	550	200		500			315	10,625
Power take-off	70		230	400		150		415					1,285
Rollers								1,200					1,200
Cultivators, 1-horse								2,000					2,000
Field cultivators	200	350	800	5,102		300	250	1,048	50				8,100
Mounted toolbar		150		800	75		75		100		250		1,450
Power sprayers						1,000							1,000
Hand sprayers	2,300				4,500	2,500			13,500	200			23,000

Agricultural machinery programmed by U. N. R. R. A. for European distribution—Continued

	Belgium and Luxemburg	Czechoslovakia	Denmark	France	Greece	Netherlands	Norway	Poland	Yugoslavia	Albania	Baltic States	Italy	Total
Reapers								6,500					6,500
Potato diggers	50			400		50	50	175					725
Beet lifter	150			500		150		350					1,150
Mowers, ground-drive	5,000	1,965	4,000	26,400	200	4,000	2,000	2,000	800		3,000	635	50,000
Tractors:													
Under 30 horsepower	280	650	900	8,280	75	1,000	650	3,000	250		1,000	500	16,585
30 horsepower and over	70	350	300	5,520	25	500		5,200	250		750	450	13,415
Trailers, farm, 2-wheel	350	1,000	1,200	13,800	100	1,500	650	8,200	500		1,750	950	30,000
Separators:													
Under 250 pounds		2,000	800	13,800	200	1,500	1,500	2,500	1,000			1,800	25,100
Over 250 pounds			200	2,000		1,500	500	500				200	4,900
Incubators							150		300				450
Parts for—													
New machinery (tons)	230	253	492	4,063	49	540	219	2,597	289	1	430	258	9,421
Present machinery (tons)	297		45	3,331		230	7					45	3,955
Rakes:													
Sulky dump	1,000	485	800	12,000		1,000	1,000		200		1,500	315	18,300
Combination side-delivery	200			3,900		500							4,600
Reaping attachments—mowers	1,000		535	2,300	50	100	200	450	50			315	5,000
Threshers:													
Power	120				50		100	250	100		50	100	770
Hand									3,000				3,000

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. KLEIN, for 2 weeks (at the request of Mr. FITZPATRICK), on account of illness.

To Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland (at the request of Mr. D'ALESANDRO), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. FULBRIGHT, for 1 day, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of Robert P. Sick; and

H. R. 4166. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1874. An act for the relief of Robert P. Sick;

H. R. 2912. An act to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; and

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, March 6, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Saturday, March 4, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the public-health subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 7, 1944.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 3379, a bill to codify the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 8, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2687, a bill relating to excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 9, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 4099, entitled "A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913," which was introduced by the chairman, Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1260. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1261. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of records to be disposed of by the Archivist of the United States; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1262. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting report of the Federal Trade Commission on distribution methods and costs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1263. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1264. A letter from the national service director, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the last national convention of the Disabled American Veterans, held in New York City, September 17–20, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 476); to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 166. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the conditions of the American Indian in the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1225). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 459. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4278, a bill to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1226). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law No. 235, current session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1943", without amendment (Rept. No. 1227). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 458. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled

"A study of the legality of the annexation of Austria by Germany under international law and Austrian constitutional law and the policy of the United States toward the annexation" as a document; without amendment (Rept. No. 1228). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4257. A bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading the military and naval service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1229). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4271. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 1230). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4140. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156-1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); without amendment (Rept. No. 1231). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4324. A bill to amend the act approved August 9, 1939, entitled "An act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4325. A bill to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of The Alaska Railroad for services rendered from May 1, to September 30, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4326. A bill to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war food-production program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4327. A bill to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 4328. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. R. 4329. A bill to assist the armed forces to provide manpower for harvesting, timbering, canning, and other essential activities in seasonal emergencies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 4330. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. Res. 460. A resolution to establish a select committee on post-war military policy; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 461. Resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Resolution 460; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COMPTON:

H. R. 4331. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Armstrong; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURLEY:

H. R. 4332. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Mahoney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4333. A bill for the relief of Bertha LeFrance; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5155. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition of the New Jersey Farm Bureau, the largest farmers' organization in the State of New Jersey, urging the abrogation of the White Paper and the reconstruction of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5156. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of W. H. Schwietert and 94 citizens of High Hill, St. Louis and other towns in Missouri, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5157. Also, petition of H. C. Griffith and 78 citizens of Charlotte, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5158. Also, petition of Rev. Paul F. Erickson and 94 other citizens of Jamestown, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5159. Also, petition of George E. Fuhrman and 513 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5160. Also, petition of Mrs. G. M. Nourse and 115 other citizens of Fresno, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5161. Also, petition of Jacob W. Pfleeger and 68 other citizens of El Paso, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5162. Also, petition of Rev. Robert Louis McGaha and 118 other citizens of Honea Path, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5163. Also, petition of Rev. George G. Hunt and 125 other citizens of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5164. Also, petition of Mrs. C. P. Kerran and 92 other citizens of Thomas, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5165. Also, petition of Daniel Hockenberry and 523 other citizens of Martinsburg, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5166. Also, petition of Mrs. R. C. Baker and 113 other citizens of Fresno, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5167. Also, petition of Mrs. Elmer Larson and 100 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5168. Also, petition of Mrs. Fred Luther and 141 other citizens of Salisbury, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5169. By Mr. CHURCH: Petition of Joseph Giefert, of Chicago, Ill., and 24 other citizens of Illinois, protesting discrimination against members of our armed forces in the guise of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5170. Also, petition of Edward B. Dwyer, of Chicago, Ill., and 15 other citizens of Illinois, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5171. Also, petition of George Matthews Lucie, of Chicago, Ill., and 14 other citizens of Illinois, protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5172. Also, petition of Frank Waryck, of Chicago, Ill., and 25 other citizens of Illinois, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5173. Also, petition of Mrs. M. Ringbauer and 22 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5174. Also, petition of Ralph Keitel, of Glenview, Ill., and 51 other citizens of Illinois, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5175. Also, petition of Edward Beerheide and 28 other citizens of Chicago, Ill., protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5176. Also, petition of Frank J. Wetzel, of Chicago, Ill., and other citizens of Illinois, protesting against enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5177. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, relative to Senate bill 1617, a bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5178. Also, memorial of a group of Americans of Polish origin assembled in Woonsocket, R. I., on February 20, 1944, resolving to defend the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," as well as the sacred rights of the Polish Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5179. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of the Warshaver Aid Society of St. Louis, Mo., Joseph Lapidus, president, and Nat J. Gordon, secretary, urging the passage of House Resolutions 418 and 419 to provide for the abrogation of the British White Paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5180. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting enactment of Senate bill 1617, entitled "A bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5181. By Mr. FULMER: Concurrent resolution by Joe E. Berry, submitted by James H. Fowles, clerk, State senate, Columbia, S. C., to memorialize the Congress of the United States to place proper restrictions and safeguards about the sale by the United States Government of its obsolete and damaged war materials; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

5182. Also, concurrent resolution by the Senate Agricultural Committee submitted by James H. Fowles, clerk, State senate, Columbia, S. C., asking the Office of Price Administration, and other agencies, to relieve dairy farmers from the disastrous effect of present price ceilings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5183. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Mrs. James Joldersma and other members of the Young Women's Guild of the Maple Avenue Christian Reformed Church, Holland, Mich., recommending the provisions embodied in House Joint Resolution No. 117; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5184. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the legislation proposed in the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5185. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition of 660 persons, protesting against the consideration by Congress of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5186. Also, petition concerning more simplified tax requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5187. By Mr. POULSON: Petition of William Hewell Kersey and others, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082), prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquor in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5188. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the Web Pressmen's Union, No. 4, of San Francisco, urging support of President Roosevelt's seven-point program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5189. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of the City Council of Chicago, endorsing the American Legion's bill of rights for World War No. 2 veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5190. Also, petition of Harold Davies and 61 others from Chicago, favoring enactment of House bill 4063; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5191. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John L. May, petitioner, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the United States Veterans' Administration facility, of Wood, Wis.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in Thy holy presence we wait in the name of Him who was greatest, yet He suffered for the least; who was richest, yet He paid the price for the poorest; who though sinless, laid down His life for the guilty. Dear Lord, in our great tasks, our many problems, we pray Thee to preserve us from miscarried purpose as we labor for the widelying needs and hopes of men; and that which we cherish shall live again.

O Prophet of time, with Thy spirit brood over this frightened, grievous world and redeem Thine own from those who seek the shackle and destroy the human spirit. Plundered with unspeakable crime, silence is tragic when the fate of civilization is hanging upon the unhallowed conquest of the sword. Across the gulf of the years we hear the clarion voice of history: "It is righteousness that exalteth a nation." O help America as she rests beneath the clouds of some Sinai. O help her to keep the faith through anxious days and lonely nights when things seem wrong and lost. O help her to keep the faith, rejoicing that there is but one great, royal fellowship in our land—the noble living and the noble dead. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 3, 1944, was read and approved.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT NO. 10, PART 16, OF SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND INVESTIGATE OPERATION OF WAR PROGRAM

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 10, pt. 16, current session) of the select committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a complete study and investigation of the operation of the war program, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the select committee, 1,000 for the use of the Senate document room, and 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests: One to extend my own remarks and include therein a statement relative to the operation of the St. Louis post office, and the other to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks and include excerpts from a Senate report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. COCHRAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Daily Oklahoman dealing with labor costs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Arkansas Democrat.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Post on post-war problems.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. NORMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

UNION DUES DEMANDED OF NAZI PRISONERS

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CASE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Kansas City Star.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FOREIGN-LANGUAGE PAPERS VERSUS AMERICAN PAPERS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a letter I received from a constituent.

LONGFORD, KANS., *March 1, 1944.*

DEAR MR. LAMBERTSON: Through the mails I get the following publications with regularity:

Netherlands News Digest.
Czechoslovak News.
Belgian Information Bulletin.
News of Britain.
News of Norway.
A monthly periodical from India. (This is quite a book or magazine.)
Australian News.
Pulaski Foundation Bulletin.

But I am unable to purchase a subscription to the Kansas City Star and Times, a newspaper I have taken for the past 20 years. I have sent my check in twice for a renewal, but have had the check returned and a polite letter regarding paper shortage each time.

This morning I find that I am unable to renew my subscription to Collier's.

I would much prefer to read the Kansas City Star and Collier's to these foreign publications.

I think we should do something to keep our own newspapers going.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK H. DIETER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a Layman's Day address by Mr. Bowles, of Nashville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech by Rear Admiral Cochrane, head of the Bureau of Ships, given before the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech by a former Member of the House, the Honorable Martin Smith, now on the Board of Immigration Appeals, in reference to the acquisition of citizenship in the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTED SERVICE PAY BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, there are several bills before the House regarding adjusted service pay for veterans. Many Members have been very diligent in working on the subject and I suppose in time these ideas will correlate themselves into one bill. However, the Army and Navy Union, the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Regular Veterans Association have prepared a proposed bill for adjusted service pay. Because of the importance of this I ask unanimous consent that I may include a copy of the proposed bill in the RECORD and also a letter from the commanders of these organizations, as well as a very brief summary regarding the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HAGEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the regular order of business has been disposed of and any other special orders that may heretofore have been agreed upon, I may address the House for 20 minutes on the subject Why We Should Change Horses Now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

ADJUSTED SERVICE PAY BILL

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I too, was asked by the various veterans' organizations to put in the hopper a similar bill for adjusted compensation to which the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] referred. It will serve an extremely useful purpose, it will be of untold help to the veterans, and in the long run, I believe, will save the taxpayers money.

This is a very just measure and I believe there will be no difficulty in securing its passage. Many of the benefits which the veterans should have received have not been given to them as yet. This will ameliorate some of the inequalities to which the veterans have been subjected. This will be helpful in giving them some money now if they want to use the coupons and will insure that they have money at a later date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two letters and to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, not long ago an able Member of this body resigned an honored seat in this House in order to offer his services to the Nation in one of the active theaters of war, the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, of Pennsylvania, who has a brilliant military record, achieved in World War No. 1. He is a great American. Any man who is willing to yield a seat in the House of Representatives and accept the rigor and danger of war at the battlefront is a great American. It is an exhibition of patriotism and devotion to country and home which is an inspiration to all of us.

He has written two letters to me, which I have just obtained permission from the House to include in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend them to the reading of every Member of this body in order that you may see this war as it looks or as it is seen through a Congressman's eyes somewhere in the unknown reaches of the South Pacific.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] may insert in the RECORD three short speeches.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include an article from the Courier Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

DUES DEMANDED BY UNIONS OF GERMAN PRISONERS IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the statements of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], that the Army is not paying dues demanded by the A. F. L. union when German prisoners work in America, I have not seen any denials that the A. F. L. unions demanded and collected dues from soldiers when they worked in the harvest fields to aid farmers in salvalging crops which they were in danger of losing because of a lack of labor to harvest them.

Members received letters from Mr. Murray of the C. I. O. this morning or yesterday advising us how we should vote on the so-called soldiers' vote bill. I suggest to Mr. Murray that instead of telling us how to vote he just end the practice of charging men for the privilege of working in order to obtain money to buy bonds and to support their dependents.

A little more consideration for the right to work—and work a man must if he would live—and a little less concern for the collection of union dues which Mr. Murray and his C. I. O. would require of everyone who wishes to hold a job in war industries might lead some of us to believe that Murray was less interested in collecting the soldier's dollar to be used in part in the C. I. O.'s campaign for a fourth term for the President than he is in the serviceman's right to vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to waive the special order which I have on the calendar this afternoon and instead I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after all other special orders and the regular business on the Speaker's desk have been disposed of, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include therein a letter in connection with each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

REPUBLICAN PARTY ISOLATIONIST IN TIMES OF PEACE AND INFLATIONIST IN TIMES OF WAR

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House at this time for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note that the distinguished and able minority floor leader in the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOSEPH MARTIN, of Massachusetts, has given out a public statement, which has been widely published, to the effect that as minority floor leader he believes that price control should be continued for at least another year. Since he indicated in his statement there were certain amendments he would like to have adopted to the Price Control Act in the revision of the act before its renewal, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House that will doubtless soon consider this important legislation, I would like to ask the minority leader the amendments that he and his party are proposing to this important law. Does he mean "emasculation" when he says "revision"?

WHAT ARE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS?

Is it proposed by the popular minority floor leader that a vote for the extension of O. P. A. will be sufficient without implementing the law with an adequate appropriation for its enforcement? Does the minority leader believe there should be substantial changes? If so, he will be rendering the Congress and the country a great service by disclosing them.

Certainly he is not going to wait and try to find out where the most complaints are coming from and then join in the chorus of opposition. Evidently his place of leadership enables him to know now the amendments he and his party will insist upon. Therefore, I humbly request that he make them public at once, especially through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and before hearings on the extension are commenced.

REPUBLICAN PARTY CLAIMING TO BE FOR PRICE CONTROL AGAINST MEANS OF ENFORCEMENT

I have not forgotten that most of the Republicans in the House voted for the Price Control and Stabilization Act. However, when the appropriation bill came up, providing for sufficient money to enable the President to enforce the very law that Congress passed and directed him to enforce, our distinguished minority leader led his group in opposition to an adequate appropriation for its enforcement and succeeded in slashing the appropriation to the extent that proper enforcement has not been possible.

Further, the Office of War Information was doing a magnificent job teaching the people the evils of inflation and how to avoid it. When the appropriation bill came up on the floor of the House, the appropriation for this particular division of O. W. I., providing for $6,000,000 to continue the fight against inflation, was absolutely eliminated in a fight led by the distinguished minority leader.

PRICE CONTROL SAVING TAXPAYERS $50,000,000 A DAY ON WAR COST ALONE

The price-control and stabilization program is saving the taxpayers of our country $50,000,000 a day on the cost of the war alone, yet our distinguished minority leader has continuously attacked the program by fighting appropriations for the governmental agencies charged with the duty of enforcing the program and by opposing a vital part of the program embodied in the use of subsidies through the Commodity Credit Corporation. Will he again try to torpedo the program in another misguided attempt to prohibit subsidies?

MINORITY FLOOR LEADER TAKES ABOUT FACE

I congratulate the minority leader on his statement, which I shall accept as indicating his about face on the road he has been traveling toward ruinous inflation. In other words, it is pleasing to me to note that the leader of the minority is trying to throw off from the Republican Party the well-earned and recognized reputation of being isolationists in time of peace and inflationists in time of war.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

REVISION OF O. P. A. ACT

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that he first get his own bill into the committee. We have a right to see what the administration will recommend so we may have the advantage of their experience before we make suggestions. I am sure we can improve upon the present law.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Assume that the bill is just to extend as is, we would like to ask the gentleman what he proposes to offer in the way of amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman from Texas should make up his mind as to what he is going to do first before he asks the minority as to their views. We believe this act should have some amendments and we will be very glad to offer them when the gentleman gets the bill before the committee and on the floor of the House, and we hope there will be early action.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

CASHING OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CHECKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House, especially the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs, as well as the War and Navy Departments, to a situation that now exists. I have just learned that in New York City there are many soldiers and sailors each day who wish to cash Government checks but there is no place for them to get the checks cashed. The hotels cannot take care of them. For instance, the Astor would probably have 600 applications a day—not guests of the hotel. There has been set up some private agencies which charge a man 1 percent, we will say, if his check comes from North Carolina or 5 percent if it comes from California or one of the other Western States. This situation applies no doubt to other large cities.

Something should be done by the Government to take care of these men who are absolutely in need of money, many of them just about to leave for foreign duty. I am calling this to the attention of the House so that the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs may look into the situation and see what can be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, one of the bases for the tax bill that was passed was estimates as to possible Government expenditures. I call attention to the fact that the Budget estimates sent up here in connection with the consideration of the tax bill estimated an expenditure of $112,000,000,000 for this fiscal year, and they finally got down to $98,000,000,000. I further call attention to the fact that for the first 8 months of this fiscal year the expenditures ran $60,400,000,000, or at the rate of $90,600,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944, indicating that the Budget did not know what they were talking about when they made their estimates to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRICE-CONTROL BILL

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the attitude of the minority is that the price-control bill should not be emasculated by delay. Unless the majority introduces a bill within the next 7 days, I propose to do so.

May I tell the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that, speaking on my own responsibility, I have at least two suggestions as to corrections in the bill which I think will facilitate the control of prices. The first is granting the right of recourse to the Federal courts for persons and concerns claiming injury by unfair operation of the price-control program. The second is a "spelling out" of the provisions of the act, including the authority to correct "gross inequities," so as to permit less latitude for liberal interpretations of the law by those who administer it.

Then, of course, we cannot dodge the fact that there is going to be an endeavor to insert in the new bill a section outlawing consumer food subsidies.

There are many other possible corrections, but I think the gentleman should have those in mind. Unless some action is taken very shortly, I am going to introduce my bill so that it will not be necessary to continue price control under its present set-up after June 30.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "High Wages for Merchant Seamen?—Read the Truth."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PALESTINE AND ARABIAN PROTESTS—THE VOICE OF JACOB BUT THE HAND OF ESAU

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CELLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of Sunday, March 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PIPE LINE ACROSS ARABIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Post of Sunday, March 5, which editorial opposes the present agreement for the construction of a pipe line across the Arabian subcontinent for precisely the same reasons which I gave to the House in my speech of February 21 for my own opposition to this project as presently constituted. I most earnestly urge Members to read the Post editorial and to ask themselves after having done so whether this is not obviously a matter which at the very least should be most carefully considered by the Congress and the State Department before our country becomes irrevocably committed to what, under present circumstances, can be little more than a venture in commercial imperialism.

May I also point out that the Petroleum Industry War Council in expressing its opposition to this agreement has flatly stated that it cannot possibly be considered a war measure but must be regarded purely as a commercial proposition. And yet official after official has made the statement that it was approved by this, that, or the other governmental department only because it was a war measure.

Mr. H. D. Collier, president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, is reported to have made the statement to the Petroleum Industry War Council that this matter was an accomplished fact and there was no use discussing it. My appeal is that Congress should see to it if necessary that it is not an accomplished fact. At least not unless and until our Government is in a position to actually control the policies to be pursued and unless and until there is granted by these major oil companies a substantial interest and degree of control of policies to be pursued with regard to the exploitation, distribution, and handling of this oil.

I ask the question once again as I did in my speech of February 21, why, if this matter is a war measure, it was not undertaken over a year ago at which time all the facts now known about it were available. And I submit that when all the evidence is in it will be found that the only reason it was not brought forth sooner is because the agreement was not entered into until after our Government had retreated from the position originally taken, in which our Government was insisting that before it committed itself to far-reaching international obligations clear on the other side of the world and to the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars on this pipe line, it should be given the right to purchase a substantial interest in the oil itself—thus putting itself in a position where it might conceivably guard the future peace of our country, live up to the Atlantic Charter, prevent cartel control of this oil, and see that it was used for the promotion of peace instead of international friction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at two points in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain communications and extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

DEVELOPMENT IN PERU OF HOME FOR JEWISH REFUGEES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I am keenly interested in the subject discussed by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. I think we should try to help these persecuted Jewish people find a home in the Western Hemisphere. I have in mind a wonderful country, a fertile country, one of the finest countries in the world. The only trouble with it is that there is no water on the land. It is the coastal plain in Peru on the Pacific coast. The weather there is modified by the Humboldt Current, one of the finest climates in the world. If we assist these people to go in there, and put in a transcontinental diversion and bring the waters of the Amazon out on that wonderful country, 200 miles square, they could find a homeland in the Western Hemisphere and could get away from all the political entanglements that are bothering them and the other nations now in connection with the Jewish settlement of Palestine.

The transmountain diversion of water is practical. The Bureau of Reclamation is building a big project and excavating large tunnels through the Continental Divide in Colorado to irrigate land on the opposite side of these mountains. These committees seeking to enlarge the Jewish settlement in Palestine should investigate the condition and possibility of reclaiming the arid lands of northwestern Peru and providing these persecuted people a home in the New World.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the Missouri River program which is presently before the House Committee on Flood Control, and include therein a resolution passed by the Madison Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America in support of that program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a transcript of my remarks before the Committee on Flood Control in support of the Missouri River program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement signed by the representatives of five veterans' organizations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, as a critic of the Office of Price Administration, I take this opportunity to say a word of praise of that Administration. It is their custom to have business firms file balance sheets and operating statements and a great deal of supplementary information pertaining to the operations of the firms in question. Today I received from Mr. Bowles exhibit A and exhibit B. They have done one of the grandest jobs of simplifying certain kinds of forms to be filed by business firms that I have ever known any Government agency to do. I have sent them a letter of congratulation, and I hope some of the other agencies will follow their example.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem from the Calvert Independent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAYMENT FOR LAND ACQUIRED DURING THE WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, S. 919, to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PUBLISHING OR DISTRIBUTING OF POLITICAL STATEMENTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2973, to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political statement relating to a candidate for election to any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have looked at this bill since the last call of the Consent Calendar. It seems to me that the wording of the bill is too broad. I am in sympathy with the objectives of the bill which I understand is to reach people who assail the character of others without disclosing their identity. I do not believe, however, we should pass any bill which would require, say newspapers enjoying second-class privileges, for instance, to have a signature over every article referring to the record of a candidate for a political office. If the authors of this bill want to place an amendment on the bill to reach people who are passing out circulars and sending them through the mails, attacking individual candidates, without disclosing their identity, I will be in favor of it, but I am not going to be in favor of a bill as broad as this one.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Let me cite this example: Three great metropolitan dailies of St. Louis just before every primary and every election, for the benefit of the public, have articles giving the records of candidates who seek public office. In some instances the article is very favorable to the candidate, in other instances they point out where the candidate has supported certain legislation which they feel is objectionable. Of course, everyone knows who runs the newspapers, because the names of the editors, and sometimes the owners, are printed on the editorial page every day. That article, of course, is written by a reporter and I do not see why that reporter's name should be at the top of the article before it should be published unless the editors want it there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

FOREST-FIRE PROTECTION

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 45, to amend section 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653; 16 U. S. C. 566).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. KEAN, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEEDS, FERTILIZERS, ETC., BY THE GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3405, making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COOPERATIVE SUSTAINED-YIELD UNIT AGREEMENTS WITH FOREST OWNERS AND OPERATORS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 250, to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill, which would have very far-reaching effects in changing the sale of timber in public forest areas and which would propose a very new thing in the operation of private forest lands, should not be passed without debate by the House. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SURVEY OF FOREST RESOURCES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3848, to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 537, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, APPROVED MAY 2, 1942

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2908, to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

WAR SHIPPING FIELD SERVICE

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 182, to create the war shipping field service.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 77, to establish a board of visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, 2 years ago the Congress created a new Merchant Marine Academy and this bill seeks to establish a board of visitors to supervise the operations of the academy patterned much along the same line practiced or followed with reference to West Point, Annapolis, and the Coast Guard Academy. But the provisions of this bill limit the membership of the board of visitors to those who are selected by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, rather than those selected by the Speaker of the House. It also does not provide for any membership on the board of visitors from outside sources, such as is true with West Point and Annapolis. I raise the question to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries if there is any particular reason why outsiders were excluded?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned I think it would be salutary to have the membership appointed by the Speaker as is the case with the Coast Guard Academy. In the case of the Coast Guard Academy we have three appointed by the chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the same number appointed by the chairman of the Senate committee, and I think two appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. COLE of New York. And there are no members of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy other than from the Congress?

Mr. BLAND. None other than from the Congress. Of course, there is this in the case of the Coast Guard Academy, there is a feature that does not obtain in either the Naval Academy or the Military Academy and I think it is very salutary. We have an advisory board that is appointed of skilled educators and men from the outside. That advisory board takes a great deal of interest in the academy. On it are the heads of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a member from Yale and a member from Harvard, and, I think, someone else besides. They take a great deal of interest in going over the curriculum and in working it out.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The Chair should be consulted before resolutions like this are passed. The Chair knows the gentleman from Virginia certainly would not have anything like that in mind. The Chair does think before a board of visitors or an investigating committee or any other party is authorized by the House, where the Speaker usually makes the appointment of the board of visitors and special committees, that the Chair should be consulted. The Chair has that desire.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia was not aware of that desire or he would surely have consulted the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CASH AWARDS TO MARITIME COMMISSION AND WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION PERSONNEL FOR USEFUL SUGGESTIONS TO IMPROVE ADMINISTRATION

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 161, to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Senate resolution is not in the language of the House joint resolution. The Senate resolution does not contain the amendments that were recommended by the Bureau of the Budget whereby the maximum amount shall be a certain amount. The Senate resolution also has some amendment in it that provides that these awards when they are made shall be referred to the chairman of the House committee and Senate committee before final approval. That just appears to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to be out of the question. I do not know anything about these suggestions, and I do not know whether Senator BAILEY knows anything about these suggestions. They are stricken out in the Senate resolution. I thought they were in the Senate resolution. Of course, if the House resolution is passed, I want to ask unanimous consent to strike out all after the resolving clause in the Senate resolution and substitute the language of the House resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute Senate Joint Resolution 78; and if that permission is granted, I will offer an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the provisions of House Joint Resolution 161.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read Senate Joint Resolution 78, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to pay cash awards for suggestions submitted to it by any of its officers or employees, including officers and members of crews employed on United States or foreign-flag vessels as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration, in cases where the suggestion, in the opinion of the Commission or of a committee designated by it, would, if adopted, make for substantially increased efficiency, economy, or general improvement in carrying out the duties, powers, or functions of the Commission. Such suggestions shall be submitted and such awards shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, including provision for transfer to the United States of all rights or interests of the officer or employee in the suggestion. The provisions of this section shall apply in like manner to the War Shipping Administration and its officers and employees, and for the purpose of this sentence the terms "United States Maritime Commission" and "Commission" shall be deemed to refer to the War Shipping Administration: *Provided*, That any such cash awards shall be ascertained and reported to the Committee on Commerce of the Senate and the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives for approval or disapproval or modification prior to payment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the provisions of the House resolution, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the provisions of House Joint Resolution 161 as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House resolution (H. J. Res. 161) was laid on the table.

EXTENDING THE TIME WHICH THE STATES OF MONTANA, NORTH DAKOTA, AND WYOMING MAY NEGOTIATE AND ENTER INTO COMPACT OR AGREEMENT FOR DIVISION OF THE WATERS OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3522, extending the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Montana, the author of the bill, whether if this bill is passed, giving the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming and North Dakota to enter into a compact for a division of the waters of the Yellowstone River and its tributaries, whether or not he thinks this will afford protection for the States of North Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming against any claim for the use of the water of the Missouri River into which the Yellowstone River flows downstream? The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Flood Control and is aware of the flood-control report that is now pending before that committee and he is also aware of legislation proposed by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors pertaining to the 9-foot channel below Sioux City. In view of the gentleman's acquaintance with these proposals, does not the gentleman think the passage of this bill will effectively protect the interests and rights of the three upper-basin States against any preemption of that water for use downstream?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota that these Northwestern States, and I might say, including the gentleman's State of South Dakota, were and are very much concerned about a greater draft being made upon the upper reaches of the Missouri River Basin and its tributaries with reference to water there now used for irrigation and reclamation purposes, and the hope of a greater use of them in the future. Owing to pending legislation before the Committee on Flood Control and likewise pending legislation before the House from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and, of course, if any greater draft was made on the waters of the upper reaches of the Missouri River and its tributaries, we, of course, would be practically throttled so far as increasing our irrigation and reclamation projects in those States.

Answering the gentleman's question I believe that this will go a long way in preventing interfering with those waters. I will also say that the Federal courts generally look with favor upon compacts of this kind for the reason that it will obviate the necessity of litigating the various rights of the States and residents of each State, in determining their water rights.

I feel sure the gentleman would have no objection to the passage of the bill, but on the contrary I believe the gentleman would favor it.

Mr. CASE. The gentleman is correct in the last supposition. I have no objection to the passage of the bill. I want it passed. However, the gentleman has said that this will go a long way toward protecting the rights of the three upper States. It seems to me that if this bill gives the consent of Congress to the three States to enter into the compact for a division of the water, the gentleman should say it goes all the way. I do not see, when this bill is passed and becomes law, how the States downstream could then object to any use that the upper States might make of the waters of the Yellowstone River.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman is absolutely right, but I am always a little modest in my claims. I feel that once this compact has been approved by the Congress, that no longer can the lower States interfere with the waters as they are now used or will be used in the upper States.

Mr. CASE. It is self-evident that the State of South Dakota and the States below that where the Missouri River flows, carrying the waters of the Yellowstone, are not objecting to the passage of this bill, and did not object to a like bill which has previously passed the Senate, but I would like to have the gentleman's statement in the RECORD, which he has now given, that he believes this bill establishes the rights of the upper States to the Yellowstone River and that the passage of this bill should settle the controversy and confusion that has been apparent before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Flood Control Committee and through the press of the Northwestern States.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is right.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does not the gentleman think this bill is the proper procedure, for the Congress to give its consent to entering into such a bargain, and then ratifying that compact by congressional action? Does not the gentleman think that ought to be done in all of these cases?

Mr. CASE. I do not say that it should be done with regard to all rivers, because no action would be taken on a great many river systems, because it would be impossible in the gentleman's lifetime and mine to get an agreement between all of the States concerned with some of them.

Mr. WHITE. We have sanctioned these compacts on the Colorado River and other rivers, and this is a step in carrying through that policy and that program.

Mr. CASE. I should like to state in conclusion that it should be understood that the States of the Northwest are hereby given the consent of the Congress to enter into an agreement among those three States for the use of the Yellowstone River and its waters and its tributaries, and that this should be notice to the people who have been confused and disturbed about the pending proposals before the Flood Control Committee and the Rivers and Harbors Committee that no objection has been entered by the downstream States to such compact, and that consequently they should feel themselves protected and should have no further fears over the passage of appropriate flood-control legislation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I feel the gentleman is right.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to offer the suggestion that the gentleman read a recent decision by Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court with reference to the subject matter now under discussion.

Mr. CASE. I think possibly I have read the decision to which the gentleman refers, but I assume that whatever decisions may have been made on past statutes, if a new act of Congress be passed as we are now proposing to pass with reference to a specific stream, that that would be controlling insofar as the waters to which it refers are concerned.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. As I gather it the purpose of the resolution is to protect the water rights of the three Northwestern States mentioned in the compact, and the approval of this compact will give a degree of legality, which very likely will not be questioned because of the acceptance of other compacts by the Supreme Court.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If it becomes an act of Congress I am sure it will be accepted.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], the author of this resolution, for the fine work he has done in looking after the interests of our State.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1387, which is a bill having the same purpose that this bill has, similar in character, and differing only in a recitation of the acts sought to be amended, be substituted for H. R. 3522.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we understand then that the Senate bill is identical with the wording of the House bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is, except that in the Senate bill the acts are set forth which are sought to be amended by this bill. If the gentleman will observe, the only amendment that is in this bill is to strike out "June 1, 1943" and insert in

lieu thereof "June 1, 1947." That is the amendment written into the Senate bill, S. 1387.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the Senate bill do more than change the date from June 1, 1943, to June 1, 1947?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No.

Mr. COLE of New York. It does no more than that?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; it does no more than that.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The title of the bill H. R. 3522 says it is a bill to extend the time for the three States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming. In the report on the bill, in compliance with the rules of the House, the changes in existing law are set forth, and the only change, shown at page 3, is the date. The act of August 2, 1937, which is shown as existing law, does not mention the State of North Dakota. Is it provided for elsewhere?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota that that bill was later amended by including the State of North Dakota. The original act was amended to include the State of North Dakota in the next amendment. This is the second amendment to the act of 1937.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River," approved August 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 551), as amended and extended by the act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River," approved June 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 399), is further amended by striking out "June 1, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 1, 1947."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 3522) was laid on the table.

CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN SERVICES PERFORMED BY SEAMEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3259, to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (i) in section 1 (b) (1) of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes," approved March 24, 1943 (Public Law 17, 78th Cong.; 57 Stat. 45), is amended by inserting before the period thereof a comma and the following: "but shall not include any such service performed (1) under a contract entered into without the United States and during the performance of which the vessel does not touch at a port in the United States, or (2) on a vessel documented under the laws of any foreign country."

SEC. 2. Subsection (o) (1) in section 1 (b) (2) of the said act of March 24, 1943, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "but shall not include any such service performed (1) under a contract entered into without the United States and during the performance of which the vessel does not touch at a port in the United States, or (2) on a vessel documented under the laws of any foreign country."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "amended" and before the word "by", insert a comma and the following: "effective as of the effective date or dates of said subsection (i)" and a comma.

Page 2, line 5, after the word "country" and before the quotation mark, insert the following: "and bare-boat chartered to the War Shipping Administration."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "amended" and before the word "by", insert a comma and the following: "effective as of the effective date or dates of said subsection (o) (1)" and a comma.

Page 2, line 13, after the word "country" and before the quotation mark insert the following: "and bare boat chartered to the War Shipping Administration."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes all the bills on the Consent Calendar that are ready for consideration at this time.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 459, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order H. R. 4278 and provides for general debate of 1 hour. It is an open rule and the bill would be taken up under the 5-minute rule for amendment.

Nobody opposed the granting of a rule.

This bill has been reported by the Committee on Agriculture because the Committee on Appropriations, before consideration of the Agriculture Department appropriation bill, at the last session requested a special rule waiving points of order on many of the provisions in that bill. At that time I served notice on the Committee on Appropriations that we would not again grant a special rule to waive points of order against these many objectionable provisions in the bill.

Acting upon the suggestion, the Committee on Appropriations, I understand, urged the Committee on Agriculture to report a bill authorizing these various appropriations so that they would not again be subject to a point of order.

I understand the bill would affect about 95 items in the Agriculture Department appropriation bill, but some of these are repetitions. I admit I did not have time to study all of the provisions in the bill, which is quite technical, and I am therefore relying upon the fact that the great Committee on Agriculture would not report a bill authorizing appropriations unless they were justified by the various bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. As an explanation of the complexity of this bill, I will say that it goes back as far as the organic act of May 15, 1862. All told, about 13 different laws are involved.

The rule was granted by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules. I have felt, and still feel, that the provision relative to school lunches should be included, and, in a measure, I was assured it would be included, but after granting the rule I found it was not in the bill. That would be the only provision that to a considerable degree would be helpful to people residing in the urban areas, although it will be beneficial to school children all over the United States. I, therefore, hope that when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule, in accordance with the assurance that was given to me and in view of the need for the legislation, an amendment, which will be offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], will be approved so that this much-needed and beneficial authorization may receive favorable consideration.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. The committee has considered that item and appreciates the interest the gentleman from Illinois has shown in it. We are prepared to offer a committee amendment which I believe will be acceptable to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman, knowing full well that he at all times endeavors to be helpful, especially in matters of agricul-

ture, which he understands so well and expounds so lucidly. I know he realizes that in the entire bill of 95 provisions for authorizations there is not a single one that would very materially benefit or be helpful to the people residing in our urban centers. Consequently, I again urge that when the amendment is offered the committee will agree to it and that there will be at least this one provision in the bill beneficial to the people whom I, in part, represent.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does this bill provide for any additional functions or programs to those which have been carried out heretofore?

Mr. SABATH. To be perfectly candid, I am obliged to say that I do not know. I gave this rule to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] to handle. He is ill today, unfortunately, and I am obliged to call it up. I relied on him to present the facts, knowing that, as usual, he, if here, would acquaint the House with all its provisions.

I may say, however, that there is no opposition to it, and there cannot be from anybody representing a rural section. As I have said many times, we who represent the city districts always cooperate and are helpful in matters of agriculture. I therefore know there will be no opposition from that side, and we will cooperate in effecting favorable consideration and passage of the bill.

For the gentleman's information, I am going to yield later to the chairman of the subcommittee which drafted the bill and reported it, knowing full well he will be able to give the gentleman the information he is asking of me. I regret to be placed in the position I am this afternoon. As a rule I try to thoroughly familiarize myself with bills before they are heard by the Committee on Rules, especially those I am to call up, but, as I say, this bill was referred to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and his office notified me within the last few minutes that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is ill and would not be able to attend our session this afternoon. I have not given this technical matter thorough study; but I am informed, however, there are some new authorizations in the bill.

I hope that when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule, if there be any unwarranted authorizations, they will not receive the approval of the House. I do not know whether all or any of these provisions should be authorized.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Perhaps the gentleman will want me to get this information from the chairman of the subcommittee, but does the gentleman know what additional cost, if any, is involved in this bill?

Mr. SABATH. There was no evidence before the Committee on Rules as to the additional cost of this bill, if any, if adopted.

It may be said that the changes in existing law are, in accordance with the Ramseyer rule, shown at page 24 of the committee report.

I am especially interested in clarifying appropriations for the Rural Electrification Administration, because I believe that agency is of great benefit to the farmers. I am desirous that the farmers get adequate cheap electric power and more light, because I am sure that with "more light" on agricultural and other matters they will be in position to really appreciate what this great New Deal has done for them nothwithstanding the efforts of some, especially on the minority side, at criticism as to cost and minimizing the beneficial achievements of this administration in its far-sighted providing of this much-needed utility. Despite these jibes and criticisms of the New Deal, I am confident that the greater part of agricultural America will ultimately realize it is to its advantage to support the New Deal.

Seeing that everybody is ready to vote on the rule, I am not going to detain the House longer, but will yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. Before doing so, however, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], he being the only member of the Committee on Rules on the minority side that I observe. Perhaps he is in better position to explain the need for this rule and why it should be adopted. I now yield, with pleasure, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] 30 minutes, and reserve to myself the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPARKMAN). The gentleman from Illinois reserves 20 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes but I doubt if I use all the time.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee has right well stated the purpose of this legislation. As he pointed out, for years certain items have been included in the agricultural appropriation bill which have not been sustained in the substantive law. By reason of that fact those items have been subject to points of order unless the Rules Committee granted a special rule waiving points of order. As the gentleman from Illinois pointed out, the Committee on Rules last year insisted that the necessary legislation be enacted to support the items in the appropriation bill. What this bill really seeks to do, therefore, is to provide legal authorization for the items for which appropriations have been made in years past.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] inquired of the chairman of the Committee on Rules as to whether or not the bill contained any items other than would come within the category of subjects heretofore covered by agricultural appropriations.

I think the report states there are such items. As far as I am concerned, I have not gone through the bill carefully enough to point them out but I think that in the time granted for general debate the members of the Committee on Agriculture, who are familiar with the provisions of the bill, should point out to the House the items that are new and should be prepared to answer any questions that any Member of the House raises with reference to such items.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Of course, the committee will be glad to explain any item. At this stage, however, I might mention that beginning on page 25, sections 708, 709, 710, and 711 are authorizations which the subcommittee and the full committee thought necessary. They are of minor importance, and the committee will explain them.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes. Of course, as we all understand and know, there is a continuing responsibility in the Appropriations Committee to determine whether or not money for any of these items shall be appropriated and made available.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. The gentleman and I were both members of the committee that created the R. E. A. and wrote the original R. E. A. Act. I am sure the gentleman agrees with me that the principles of that act are very sound and are a proper program for our Government. However, I want to make an inquiry, although it might not be the gentleman's province as a member of the Rules Committee to answer and, if not, the question can be left for speakers from the committee sponsoring the bill hereafter to answer. May I inquire if there is any possibility under title V of this bill that the R. E. A. might be given any license to buy electrical facilities in towns in excess of 1,500? The gentleman will recall that in the original act we wrote a specific provision prohibiting that sort of thing and in spite of that specific provision the R. E. A. has been guilty of a rather widespread practice outside that provision of law and in defiance of it. A casual reading of title V of this act has caused the question to occur to me and I am wondering whether it was discussed before the Rules Committee.

Mr. HALLECK. That item was not discussed before the Rules Committee. I see the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] on his feet. He is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and I yield to him if he can throw any light on the inquiry addressed by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As far as the sections of the bill referring to R. E. A. authority are concerned, it does not in any manner change existing law nor does it authorize the acquisition of properties to which the gentleman has referred in communities over 1,500.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I would like to supplement what has been said by the gentleman from Minnesota by saying that a request was made to the committee to increase the size of the communities wherein the

R. E. A. could operate. We were requested to extend that to communities having a population not in excess of 10,000. The subcommittee unanimously disagreed with that request and no provision is contained in the bill for it. It is the feeling of the subcommittee and the entire Committee on Agriculture that R. E. A. was established as a program to extend a service to the farmers of the Nation. I may say that the Committee on Agriculture is unanimous that it would not favor the R. E. A. going into any community in excess of 1,500 so long as there is a single farmhouse in the United States without this R. E. A. service.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. These R. E. A. cooperatives are entirely independent and they have a right to purchase electric facilities wherever they have funds with which to do it. I most heartily disagree with any suggestion that it handicaps the farmers for the cooperative power associations to acquire facilities in towns because my experience is that it enables them to pay out and extend these lines to farmers more rapidly and more easily.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. I think the question I have raised, for which I asked the gentleman from Indiana to yield, has been adequately answered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], the latter two members of the Committee on Agriculture. May I say that that removes any doubt I have about this bill. Personally I am very strong for the R. E. A. Every nickel that we can provide for the farmers with which to electrify the farms and farmhouses should be provided. I have been generally interested in the program and I am glad to see that the committee has acted as it has in specifically refusing the extension to which I referred. I commend the bill and the committee's action. I just want the farmers to get the money appropriated for them and not having it go other places.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Was the language in lines 5 and 6, page 24, of the bill, discussed by the Rules Committee so that the gentleman can give us any information as to why the committee recommends a salary of $12,500 for the War Food Administrator?

Mr. HALLECK. That was not discussed before the Rules Committee, and I am not informed about it. I take it that the gentleman can secure that information when the members of the committee present the arguments for the bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be helpful to the House if I would take this 5 minutes to explain why this legislation is here. It may be interesting to some of you to know that although you have been voting for appropriations for 35 years, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, for the treatment of Bang's disease, tuberculosis in cattle, and so forth, those programs have never been authorized by the Congress. There are some items carried in the annual agricultural appropriation bills which, I am advised, have been carried there for as long as 40 years and were never authorized by the Congress.

It was felt that the time had come when the Congress should either authorize or disapprove those items, so the entire subject matter was referred to a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture, of which I served as chairman. We spent a considerable length of time in study, research, and investigation. For any Member who is particularly interested in any item, I have here in my hand an analysis of the 1944 agricultural appropriation bill. Each item about which there is question of legislative authority is identified and the lack of legislative authority is indicated. Therefore, the bill that is brought to you today covers the 99 items in the last annual agricultural appropriation bill which have never been authorized by law and which have been previously subjected to points of order.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Does this bill in any way increase the per diem allowance or the salaries of anyone in the Department?

Mr. PACE. Yes; it does.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Over and above the amount allowed by the appropriations bill?

Mr. PACE. The annual agricultural appropriation bill has picked out isolated officers. I forget how many years we have had this situation. Of course, it will be taken up section by section. For instance, Dr. Tolley, head of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, has been carried in the appropriation bill for several years with a salary of $10,000.

Someone else in there has had a special salary of $9,300. What the subcommittee did was call upon the Department for a complete statement of the entire salary schedule, and we made a study of it. We first treated with those that were carried in the annual agricultural appropriation bill, but in order to equalize it we had to place one or two other officers in the same classification. Therefore, under title VII of the bill you will find that we have treated with, I think, five officers and with the War Food Administrator.

A question was asked a moment ago about the War Food Administrator. I might explain that. Mr. Marvin Jones, who is now the War Food Administrator, is drawing no salary as such. He is on leave from his judgeship, and draws his salary of $12,500 as a judge. However, the committee felt that while that is perfectly agreeable to Mr. Jones, if for some reason Mr. Jones should return to the bench, whoever would then occupy the position of War Food Administrator should receive a salary of $12,500, particularly in view of the fact that the salary of the Secretary of Agriculture is $15,000. So the language in the bill at the moment means nothing as far as Mr. Jones is concerned, because he does not even draw the salary; but we do feel that a man of that importance, called upon to feed the Nation, our allies, and our armed forces, should have a salary of that amount.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. How much is he now allowed for per diem? This bill provides for $10.

Mr. PACE. We will explain each one of those items when the bill is read for amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In section 102, on page 4 of the bill, provision is made for authorizing the appropriation of funds to take care of certain insects of one kind or another that affect agriculture and forestry. I note that these various bugs are specifically listed. This being an authorization measure, authority is given to appropriate money for the eradication of those insect pests which are specifically listed in section 102. My attention has been called to the fact that there has been an infestation spreading through the Northern States which affects the pine and hemlock forests of this country, there being involved a type of insect pest which is not included in this list. I understand you propose to raise points of order on the appropriation bill against items which are not included in this list. Am I then correct in saying that unless it is listed here we cannot appropriate any money for the eradication of that pest?

Mr. PACE. I would be very glad to give the gentleman the committee's view on that. We felt that in view of the job we had to do we should not go too far afield from the appropriation bill. That is what we were seeking to correct. Then we thought that we should specify the items for which Congress has appropriated and that, if a new pest or disease arises, the Department should come to the appropriate committee and secure authorization for that appropriation. We did not feel that we should give the

Department of Agriculture blanket authority to indulge in any program they might think was necessary, without any consideration.

This bill is broken down into five parts, each assigned to a member of the subcommittee. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has been assigned title I. I believe it would be helpful if the gentleman from Wisconsin would delay his questions until the gentleman from Kansas explains title I. He has been assigned that job.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask this general question? Am I correct in the assumption that if the attitude of the Committee on Rules is maintained, as announced by the chairman on the floor, namely, that they would not approve waivers of points of order on future appropriation bills with regard to agriculture, then, if we do not have the authorization in this bill authorizing an appropriation to be made for the eradication of forest pests, that attitude of the Committee on Rules would prevent any appropriation being made for that purpose?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in looking over this measure I find it authorizes any number of appropriations so that a point of order will not be sustained in the future if an appropriation is brought in on an appropriation bill to carry out these various activities. They have been carried in appropriation bills, some for many years, although an authorization was never provided by legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about the New Deal.

Every week we hear about this and that New Deal project.

In this bill I find authorizations to provide appropriations for many projects that have been set up by the so-called New Deal in the last 11 years. When our Republican friends vote for this legislation today, as they will, they will be endorsing many projects inaugurated by this administration where appropriations to assist agriculture in the last 11 years have been made without authorization from the Congress. So remember that in your speeches in the future when you talk about the New Deal admit, so far as the items in this bill are concerned, you approved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my remarks to the language on page 24, lines 5 and 6, wherein, as I understand from the gentleman from Georgia, this authorization proposes to raise the amount of salary of the War Food Administrator.

Mr. Speaker, may I say emphatically that I am opposed to a $12,500 salary for that job created by Executive order and a temporary one, and I shall give one or two reasons for it. In no way do I refer to the very able and present occupant of that position. I am not interested in that phase of it at all. I do not propose to horse trade between a Federal judge who leaves the bench and goes on to a job, and try to match the judgeship salary just because he occupies a Food Administration position at the present time; neither would I take the position that a War Food Administrator is entitled to $12,500 per annum simply because the Secretary of Agriculture, a Cabinet member, draws $15,000 per annum.

May I ask this question of the gentleman from Georgia: If $12,500 per annum is paid to the War Food Administrator, does he not also enjoy a cost-of-living bonus of $600 or $700 a year?

Mr. PACE. It is $628.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. Here we are in the ridiculous situation of proposing to vote for a bill which authorizes an increase in salary, in addition to which there is a cost-of-living bonus, if I understood the gentleman from Georgia correctly to say that the salary is increased by that much.

Now, what authority has the War Food Administrator? The War Food Administrator operates under the direction of Mr. Byrnes and Judge Vinson, and it is a secondary position. In other words, as I understand the situation, he is about three points lower than a Cabinet member. The Members of this House know the duties that they have to perform. Our salaries are $10,000 per year, and we do not have any increased cost-of-living bonus. I am not asking for one. I do not want any, and I would not vote for one, but I see no reason whatsoever why we should, under the conditions which prevail in this country, come along here and start increasing the salary of the War Food Administrator, and I do not propose to vote for the bill in its present form, as much as I would like to see the other situation corrected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. PACE. The committee has no deep-seated desire for this amendment. This is the fact. There is quite a number of people working under the War Food Administrator whose salaries amount to $10,000 a year. The committee thinks that there should be some balance in the salary schedule. We felt that we must either take all of the salaries and cut them all to pieces, after the Congress has from year to year approved these salaries, or else have the man sitting at the top get a couple of thousand dollars in excess of the subordinates under him. Whether that is bad practice or not, this House must decide. In the appropriation bill, one man has received about $9,500 and another has a salary of $10,000, and here is the War Food Administrator with the same salary, and we have tried to balance the thing out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A few days ago I took the floor here in a similar situation and objected to an increase of salaries for the Under Secretaries of the Department of the Interior. I am not going back home to my district and tell my people, who are making contributions to this war through taxes and otherwise, that I am down here every few days voting for an increase in salaries for administrators, and at the same time voting against roll-back subsidies in order to prevent inflation. I think we have wages and salaries high enough in this country; and if we have not yet reached the top, then God help us when we come into the post-war period and start to mobilize for peace and are forced to adjust our affairs to world conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to answer the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and to say to him that a great many of these appropriations that this Rules Committee is now legalizing are 10 and 15 and 20 years old, many of them, long back of the New Deal's time entirely.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The Rules Committee is not legalizing these things. The Rules Committee is not doing anything of the kind. It is simply permitting a bill to come before the House in order that the House may legalize these things.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I stand corrected, technically. I say to the House that the big thing that is left out of this bill is the Farm Security Administration—the whole proposition. The big thing that caused the big fight in the last 2 or 3 years is the Farm Security Administration, and it is entirely out of this bill. They left it out because they wanted this bill to be as good as possible, and as easy to pass as possible. F. S. A. is going to be brought in in a separate bill, and when the Farm Security does come here with its name changed, I hope you will beat that bill, take it out entirely. That bill will follow this one, and that is the thing that has been the bone of particular contention. But most of the items are the generosity, or whatever you may call it, of the Committee on Appropriations in meeting exigencies that have come before the country from time to time, the outcropping of devastations and bugs and disaster of one kind and another. We have made them without any legality, and we were criticized very severely a year ago for doing it. My chairman will substantiate me in this, that we are not here legalizing any innovation of the New Deal that I know of, but they are things which we did because the country needed it to be done, long before the New Deal came here. The big thing that the New Deal did set up through Executive order is the Farm Security Administration, and you will have that in a separate bill, and I hope that you will kill it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes also to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations met with the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture which formulated this bill and, after reviewing the work of the subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations decided that insofar as we could determine the bill substantially authorizes the same type of appropriations which we have been carrying year after year without statutory authorization, with the exception of the appropriations for the Farm Security Administration and for the school-lunch program, the authorizing legislation for which, we understand, is to be brought before the House at an early date, so that if possible it may receive the consideration of the House prior to the presentation of the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945, which should be ready within 2 weeks.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. PACE. The committee will offer an amendment during the afternoon to this bill to authorize the school-lunch program.

Mr. TARVER. Very well. I think that is a very important subject matter which should be definitely determined by the Congress at the earliest possible moment. I further think that the same reasoning is applicable to the Farm Security Administration program. I believe that a program for the Farm Security Administration should be authorized by law, but if the Congress does not so believe, the matter should be determined at the earliest practical moment and the House should assume its responsibility to consider that subject matter, too, as soon as it may be done. I was interested in the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] with reference to forest insects and whether or not the authorization contained in the pending bill is sufficient to authorize an appropriation for the spruce budworm upon which we have had considerable evidence before our subcommittee at its recent hearings. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the act of May 9, 1938, which reads as follows:

> The Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with authorities of the States concerned, organizations or individuals, is authorized and directed to apply such methods for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, including grasshoppers, mormon crickets, and chinch bugs, as may be necessary.

Appropriations are authorized to carry out these provisions. I think that authorization is amply sufficient to justify and authorize appropriations of sums to combat the spruce budworm under the circumstances which have been detailed to our subcommittee in its recent hearings. I would not, so far as I am concerned, be antagonistic to an amendment which would specifically authorize an appropriation for the control of forest insects, but I think so far as the spruce budworm is concerned, that authorization is unnecessary and is carried in the language of the act which I quoted.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. In that same connection, under the general language of the authorization statute just read by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, is he of the opinion that it is broad enough to include the eradication of the so-called spittle bug, which was also included within the hearings, as I understand it, before the gentleman's committee?

Mr. TARVER. If the evidence with reference to any pest shows an incipient or emergency outbreak of that pest, that would be true; but I think that is essential.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of announcing to the membership of the House that I was authorized this morning, as acting chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to offer an amendment authorizing an appropriation for school lunches. The school-lunch program which has been successfully carried on in a good many localities has been financed chiefly in the past by funds raised under what is known as section 32. Under section 32 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act, 30 percent of customs receipts have been set aside to move farm surpluses. When the matter was brought to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture that section 32 funds have been diverted and carried over to finance the school-lunch program, we thought that it was time to call a halt; that those funds having been impressed by the Congress with a trust, namely, for the removal of agricultural surpluses, that they should be used for that purpose and for no other purpose. I will offer the amendment at the proper time which provides for the use of section 32 funds for the purpose of purchasing surplus foods used in connection with the program, and authorize a direct appropriation to take care of the balance, and I hope it will be the pleasure of the committee to adopt the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4278, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as has already been explained in the discussion on the rule, this legislation is made necessary because of the fact that for a number of years past the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill has contained certain items which were of recognized merit but which had never been authorized by a legislative committee. Some of those items went back as far as 1887 and over most of them there has never been any controversy.

I am going to discuss in the few minutes that I shall take title I of this act, because as has already been explained to you by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], the subcommittee which worked on this bill assigned each individual member of the committee certain items for study and consideration. As a member of that subcommittee I was given the items embraced in title I, which cover appropriations for animal diseases and parasites, and insect pests and plant diseases.

When the organic act establishing the Department of Agriculture was passed it gave the Department authority to conduct investigations along the lines of plant pests and diseases, and animal diseases, but no authority was given to conduct eradication campaigns. No authority has ever existed in the Department along that line, except in 1938 we did pass legislation which authorized the Department in the case of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect infestations to carry on an eradication campaign. Aside from that there has never been any authority to carry on these eradication campaigns.

Your committee, in drafting this legislation, has very carefully studied all of the items which have been included in previous Department of Agriculture appropriation bills. In this legislation we have specifically authorized appropriations for all of the items which have been carried in all recent Department of Agriculture appropriation bills covering animal diseases and parasites and plant pests and plant diseases. This included, among other things, tuberculosis, Bang's disease, cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, scabies in sheep and cattle, and dourine in horses. Then we have also added a provision to the effect that where the Secretary of Agriculture finds that an emergency has arisen out of the existence of contagious and infectious diseases of animals, such as the

foot-and-mouth disease and other contagious and infectious diseases, that there might be authorized appropriations to cover eradication campaigns.

In the case of plant diseases and insect pests destructive to plants we have covered the items of the Japanese beetle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, citrus canker, gypsy and brown-tail moth, Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, corn borer, and pink bollworm and thurberia weevil.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I understand that in the list the gentleman has just read, two pests that have been the subject of special appropriations for a number of years are not included. I refer to grasshoppers and Mormon crickets. As the gentleman knows, the Congress has made appropriation for those, and I would not want those subject to a point of order if need came for further appropriation.

Mr. HOPE. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. It is true that appropriations have been made for those purposes in recent years, and those appropriations have been made under an act of Congress which became law on May 9, 1938, giving the Department of Agriculture authority to suppress incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests. That legislation being on the statute books, the committee did not feel it was necessary for us to include such authorization in this bill.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to have that made a part of the record.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the same rule apply to chinch bugs?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. The same rule applies to chinch bugs or any incipient or emergency outbreak of insect pests destructive to plants.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Is there anything preventing "fourth termites"?

Mr. HOPE. I think that is a matter which we will leave to the gentleman's committee.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. Was there any provision left in the bill for the authorization of appropriations for Farm Security, or like objects that may be necessary to establish farmers on their feet?

Mr. HOPE. No. I will say to the gentleman there is nothing in this bill pertaining to Farm Security, but the committee now has under consideration a bill which has been approved by the Cooley committee, which has been investigating Farm Security, as the gentleman knows. It is understood that the Committee on Agriculture will take action on that bill in the near future. We have it under consideration now.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TARVER. I am wondering if in conference in your subcommittee you may have overlooked the matter of whether or not barberry eradication is authorized. I note an authorization for cereal rust, which I assume was intended to cover the work which has heretofore been carried on for the eradication of the barberry bush. I am wondering if the gentleman believes that language is sufficiently definite to authorize a continuance of the barberry appropriation?

Mr. HOPE. Yes. I think it is. I may say, if the gentleman will refer to the report on page 7, it reads as follows:

> Cereal rusts (barberry eradication)—

Then it goes on to say—

> Funds which have been provided for this purpose heretofore have been utilized in the eradication of the black stem rust, and the methods of combating the disease usually consist in the eradication of barberry bushes, which are the host of the disease during part of the year.

It was the thought of the committee that the cereal rust is actually the disease we are trying to eradicate, and the method, of course, is to destroy the barberry bushes.

Mr. TARVER. I simply wanted the record to show that it is the intent of the legislation to authorize that type of appropriation.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. I will state to the gentleman that is the intent.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has referred to section 148 of title VII, which is the authorization to the Secretary of Agriculture to apply such methods for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs, as may be necessary. Does the gentleman understand that that section of the statute, which is a general authorization law, is broad enough to include incipient or emergency outbreaks of spruce bud worms or spittle bugs, testimony concerning which has been before a subcommittee on appropriations with reference to the pending bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I will say to the gentleman that the language in the act of May 9, 1938, to which the gentleman refers, is very broad and very sweeping, and in my opinion would cover any incipient or emergency outbreak of any plant pest or disease.

Mr. KEEFE. If that is true, would the gentleman have any objection as a member of the committee that prepared this bill, to including as an amendment to the pending bill, language which would make it definite and certain that authorization is given to appropriate money to control this particular pest?

Mr. HOPE. I may say to the gentleman I do not believe this bill would be the proper place to insert such an amendment. I think the authority very clearly exists under another statute, but I do not see the necessity for including an item in this bill which has not been considered by the committee and which undoubtedly is covered in other legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. But clearly you cover other specific bugs in this particular authorization. That would certainly be covered by the general language of the statute referred to.

Mr. HOPE. No; I think there is a distinction between the work that is being carried on for the eradication of insects like the Japanese beetle and diseases such as cereal rusts and the Dutch elm disease and that which is classified as incipient and emergency outbreaks. Those are things that might run over a long period of years. But if the infestation the gentleman describes is an emergency and incipient outbreak, then I think it clearly comes under the other statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman will recall a couple of years ago when the first appropriation was made for the control of Dutch elm disease there was a lot of discussion here on the floor as to how that disease was infecting the elm trees of New England and was sweeping over the whole country. That appropriation has been continued from that time until this very day. I assume they are attempting to put it under control. Now, we in the North, in the pine, hemlock, and spruce areas, are confronted with a bug that is just as severe upon those trees as the Dutch elm disease was on the elms, and it will continue for a long period of time. I do not believe that you can consider this to be an incipient or emergency outbreak that just springs up overnight, that can be controlled in 2 or 3 weeks or months.

Mr. HOPE. I think in a situation of that kind the gentleman and others interested should come before the Committee on Agriculture and secure an authorization for funds to combat this pest.

Mr. KEEFE. By that time the pest has done its work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, title II of the bill, beginning on page 6, deals largely with the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture. All of the items in this title have been carried in appropriation bills in the past without specific legislative authorization. Your committee unanimously recommends the adoption of the legislative authorizations in title II, which are discussed in the following sections of the committee report:

SECTION 201. REWARDS; PROTECTION OF NATIONAL FORESTS

This section provides authority for the payment of rewards for information leading to the arrest and conviction of persons violating laws and regulations relating to the management and protection of the national forests. A similar provision was inserted in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1920 and has been continued each year since that time.

SECTION 202. IMMEDIATE MEDICAL SUPPLIES AND SERVICES FOR WORKERS ON NATIONAL-FOREST AREAS

This section provides authority for the purchase by the Forest Service of necessary first-aid supplies for use in camps in national-forest areas, and for the cost of transporting injured workers from such areas to points where medical and hospital facilities are available. In most localities on the national forests, the usual sources of medical supplies and services are not immediately available. Provi ion for this purpose first appeared in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1915 and has been continued to the present time.

SECTION 203. FOREST SERVICE WAREHOUSES

This section will authorize the Forest Service to continue operating central warehouses or supply centers for the sale and distribution of supplies and equipment to other Government activities, and to State and private agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire-control work. Provision for central warehouses was first inserted in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1933 and has been continued each year since that time. Language permitting the Forest Service to sell to State and private agencies which cooperate with the Forest Service in fire control was first included in the Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1940. Supplies and equipment furnished State and private agencies are generally of specialized Forest Service design not readily available in the commercial market. This authority is essential in order to make available supplies and equipment to other fire-control organizations which in many cases protect Federal lands under cooperative agreements, and State and private lands intermingled with or adjacent to the national forests.

SECTION 204. RENTAL OF FORESTRY EQUIPMENT

The purpose of the first sentence of this section is to facilitate the pooling of equipment on the national forests and to permit the equitable division of the cost of maintaining such equipment to all projects and appropriations which share in its use. This makes it possible to utilize the Forest Service equipment to its full capacity. The second sentence of this section provides for the rental of Forest Service equipment to cooperators in fire control during fire emergencies. While much of the land protected by States and timber protection associations is intermingled with and adjacent to the national forests, in many cases such areas are not sufficiently large in themselves to warrant the purchase of the larger and more expensive items of special equipment. Thus, the fortifying of the fire-control effort of these outside agencies by means of Forest Service equipment lessens the danger to the national forests from outside fires.

These provisions first appeared in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1942 and have been continued for the last 2 years.

SECTION 205. CONTRACTS FOR USE OF AIRPLANES IN FIRE-CONTROL WORK

The use of airplanes for observation work and for the transportation of men and supplies over national forest territory is important in the control of forest fires. The Forest Service has found that to obtain the types of planes best suited for this work and which have the necessary special equipment, it is essential to assure contracting companies that the work will continue beyond 1 fiscal year. This section provides authority for the Forest Service to renew such contracts annually, not more than twice, without additional advertising and competitive bidding. A similar provision was included in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944.

SECTION 206. GRAVES OF FIRE FIGHTERS

The purpose of this section is to provide authority for the care by the Forest Service of graves of fire fighters who have lost their lives while in the employ of that Service. At the present time, graves are being cared for at St. Maries and Wallace, Idaho, and Newport, Wash. The graves at St. Maries, Idaho, suffered neglect during the period from 1910, when the disastrous fire occurred in northern Idaho, until 1924, when provision was first made in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the care of graves at both Idaho locations. This provision was enlarged in the fiscal year 1928 to provide for the care of fire fighters' graves at Newport, Wash. Until the fiscal year 1943 this proviso carried an annual limitation of $200. In that year the limitation was removed and the reference to the three specific locations was eliminated upon a showing by the Forest Service that it had not utilized the full amount of the limitation in 3 of the preceding 5 years.

SECTION 207. FOREST FIRE COOPERATION WITHOUT MATCHING OF FUNDS

Because intensified forest fire control efforts have been necessary during the war on critical forest areas in State and private ownership, there was inserted in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1944 a provision which would permit the expenditure of $2,300,000 of the funds appropriated for carrying out the Clarke-McNary Act of June 7, 1924, without participation by State and private owners in the cost of protection. This section will provide authority to continue this special wartime protection, but will reduce the amount which might be expended without matching to a sum not to exceed $1,000,000 in any one year.

SECTION 208. STATE FUND MATCHING IN FARM AND OTHER PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

This section requires the matching by States or others of funds expended under the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act and sections 4 and 5 of the Clarke-McNary Act. Such a provision first appeared in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1939, but was ineffective during that year since the act as finally passed provided funds only for carrying out the provisions of section 4 of the Clarke-McNary Act which requires such matching. However, the provision, which has been repeated each year, became effective in 1940 when appropriations were made for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act which does not contain the matching provision.

SECTION 209. CONTRACTS FOR PROCUREMENT OF NURSERY STOCK

This section provides legislative authority for the Forest Service to continue to enter into contracts with commercial nurseries for the future delivery of trees and other nursery stock, with assurance that funds will be available to pay for such nursery stock when delivery is made in a subsequent fiscal year. A similar provision was first included in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941 and has been continued each year since that time.

SECTION 210. PRIVATE SCALING SERVICES

This section provides authority for accepting reimbursements for services by Forest Service timber scalers, which are furnished operators either in the form of additional scaling on Forest Service timber, or in the form of scaling services on timber cut from adjacent private lands and being scaled at the same point. Considerable economies result both to the Forest Service and the private operators from this practice. Provision for this reimbursement has appeared in appropriations for the last 2 fiscal years.

SECTION 211. ADMINISTRATION OF LANDS IN PROCESS OF ACQUISITION OR TRANSFERRED TO THE FOREST SERVICE

To permit the Forest Service to protect and manage lands in process of acquisition, a provision similar to the first clause of this section was first inserted in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1913. The Agricultural Appropriation Act has also carried, since 1939, a provision permitting the Forest Service to use moneys appropriated to it (for national-forest protection and management) to administer lands transferred to the Forest Service by the Secretary of Agriculture from the Resettlement Administration, and of lands transferred under the authority of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. As to the latter type of transaction, this section as proposed will permit the Forest Service to expend funds available for national-forest protection and management for the protection of any lands transferred to it under existing authority.

SECTION 212. DETERMINATION OF TIMBER VALUE IN CONNECTION WITH STATE PARTICIPATION IN FOREST REVENUE

This section provides in effect, for a distribution of the revenue from sales of timber for the purpose of the distribution of a portion of such revenue from the national forests under the acts of May 23, 1908 (16 U. S. C. 500), and March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501). Under this language the receipts from sales of timber which will be available for percentage distribution under these acts will be limited to the value of uncut stumpage, which appears to have been the purpose of the original legislation, and such revenue will not include receipts based upon the expenditure of Government funds for converting the stumpage into certain other forms. Provision to this effect was first inserted in the Agricultural Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1940 and has been continued to the present time.

SECTION 213. WATER RIGHTS ESSENTIAL TO NATIONAL FOREST ADMINISTRATION

This section provides legislative authority for a provision which has appeared in the Agricultural Appropriation Act since 1937, enabling the Forest Service to take such steps as are necessary to establish water rights essential to the protection, management, and utilization of national-forest lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, title 3 of this bill involves certain amendments to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act. The first section expressly provides that the Government may pay in advance for such materials as fertilizers, legume seeds, lime, trees, and perennial plants that are to be used in carrying out soil-conserving practices over a period of years. Payments may be made in advance of the completion of the practices. That has been the rule for a good long time. It enables the Department of Agriculture to advance the money that is necessary to secure the stock. The Department is protected, of course, in that it retains a lien upon the soil-conservation payments that would be due to the cooperator at the end of the season.

but by providing this advance payment it makes it possible for many people to cooperate with the practice who could not otherwise cooperate. It simply enables the Government to advance the funds necessary to get the needed supplies to carry out the practices that are set up under the soil-conservation program.

I hope that after we have enacted this into law that the Department will pay all costs incurred by State or political subdivisions, including inspection costs.

Subdivision (b) provides simply that where individuals are carrying on farm operations, either as tenants or sharecroppers, on land owned by the United States Government, they shall be able to engage in the soil conservation program on the same terms and conditions as if they were farming on privately owned land and that they may receive the same payments for the soil-conserving practice that they carry on as if they were operating on privately owned land.

Section 302 relates to the ability of the Soil Conservation Service to make contracts for nursery stock and allows the Service to enter into contracts for trees that may not be available for 3 years, in short, making the appropriation available for a period of 3 years. The purpose of that is to enable the Soil Conservation Service to buy trees from a nursery. Of course, it takes time to grow those trees and if the Service cannot guarantee that it will have the money to pay for the trees so grown they cannot get the nursery to grow them. For this reason the Appropriations Committee has been putting this in the bill in the past and we write into the law the same provision that the appropriation bills have had because it is necessary if we are going to enable the Service to contract for the growth of those trees.

Subsection (b) of that same section relates to the maintenance of warehouse facilities by the Soil Conservation Service that incidentally affects other governmental agencies by allowing them to store material that belongs to other governmental agencies and to allocate the cost thereof to the proper agency of Government.

Title IV of the bill relates first to the sale of grade samples by the Government. The Government has established certain standards and provides certain grade standards for the quality, the staple, and the grade of agricultural commodities. The establishment of those grades would be of little practical value to the people of the Nation unless they were able to have the samples available in various sections of the Nation. The preparation of those samples from which the individual out in the country can determine whether he meets the proper grade or not is a matter that involves some expense over a period of years. This authorizes the Department to sell those grade samples. It simply lets them establish the standards, send out a carton of cotton to show the exact length and staple or a box of wheat to show the grade, so that the public as a whole may get the benefit of the establishment of those grades and the Department may be reimbursed for the expense that it is out.

Subsection (b) relates to the universal standards of cotton classification and is necessary because our law requires all cotton transactions to be carried on in accordance with the standards established by the Department, but some of those transactions are carried on across the seas, particularly at Liverpool. For a number of years we carried this identical provision in the appropriation bills because the Liverpool exchange raised a question about the legal authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into contracts under the Cotton Standards Act and this provision is put in here to allay any fears on the part of the foreign cotton buyers that when they enter into a contract under the terms of this act it might not be binding. This makes it plain that the Department has the right to enter into such contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one-half minute.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like the gentleman to state whether or not under title IV with respect to cotton standards and the other qualifications, any new practices except those that have been provided for in the annual appropriations are made?

Mr. POAGE. None at all. These powers were originally enacted in 1917 in an emergency bill that was not renewed. They were later placed in the annual appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is that statement applicable to subparagraph (b) under travel?

Mr. POAGE. Travel does not relate to cotton standards. That relates to all of those who work in cities and it fixes their mileage at 3 cents per mile.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. None of title IV changes the present practices?

Mr. POAGE. Not in regard to cotton standards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GRANT].

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, my statement applies to title VII, which commences on page 21.

Section 701 provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend the funds available for agricultural consideration, adjustment, and land-use programs, for the share of the United States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events. That has been carried in the annual appropriation acts for a number of years.

Section (b) of the same section has been carried since 1925. In 1944 the appropriation under this section was for the sum of $250.

Section 702 provides that the head of any department or independent establishment of the Government requiring inspections, analyses, and test of food and other products may transfer to the department for direct expenditure such sums as may be necessary for the performance of such work. They may contract that this work can be done by outside organizations. I might say that in the past very little of that has been done and where it has been it was principally with State agencies. The first time this appeared in an appropriation act was in 1931 and it has been carried ever since.

Section (b) of that section provides that not to exceed 7 percent of the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any bureau, division, or office of the Department of Agriculture may be interchanged. That was first included in the appropriation act for the fiscal year 1910. At that time it was 10 percent. In 1939 that limited clause was changed to 5 percent and in 1943 and since that time it has been 7 percent, which is incorporated in this bill.

Section 703 provides that the Department of Agriculture is authorized to erect, alter, and repair such buildings and other improvements as may be necessary to carry out its authorized work, but they will have to make out a case before the Appropriations Committee and the cost is limited to not in excess of the limitation prescribed therein.

Section 704 authorizes the Department of Agriculture to subscribe for such newspapers as might be necessary, and again they have to make out their case for such subscriptions before the Appropriations Committee as they have done in the past.

Section 705 provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to delegate to such officers as he shall designate the authority to expend such contingent funds as may be appropriated to the Department. I may say that at this time any funds so expended have to be O. K.'d by the Secretary when, as a matter of fact, the recommendation upon which he acts is made by some subordinate. This relieves the Secretary of the duty of personally approving these purchases. It has been carried since 1930.

Section (b) provides that the Department of Agriculture is authorized to contract for stenographic reporting services. I may say that deals primarily with services out in the field where they do not have Government stenographic services.

Subsection (c) provides that employees of the Department of Agriculture stationed abroad may, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, enter into leases for official quarters. I may say that the customs in a good many of the foreign countries where we have representatives of the Department of Agriculture provide that rentals must be paid in advance. That is the reason for placing this section in the bill.

Section 706 provides for salaries for the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and other officers.

It is stated that the War Food Administrator shall be compensated at a salary of $12,500 annually. The reason this provision is made is that the War Food Administrator and others have at the present time in the departments in which

they are Administrators men drawing the same or higher salaries than the men at the head of the departments.

Subsection (b) provides that the Department of Agriculture is authorized to pay actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their homes. This provision has been carried in the appropriation bills for some time.

Section 707 provides that the present act authorizing cooperative extension work shall be increased from $300,000 to $555,000. I may say that this has been carried in the appropriation bills for the last 3 fiscal years.

Section 708 provides that the Secretary of Agriculture and the library in the Department of Agriculture can give films and other photographic reproductions of books and library supplies to people who buy them on the outside, and the money received therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the applicable appropriation.

Section 709 provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may delegate to such officers as he shall designate the authority to employ personnel in the Department service wherever located. At the present time, if a man in the field employs a person, before that can be O. K.'d it has to go back to the Secretary of Agriculture. This merely provides that when this man is so charged in the field by the Secretary of Agriculture he can give final approval to the employment of that particular person.

Section 710 provides that the Secretary of Agriculture may delegate to such officers as he shall designate the function of authorizing payment of expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees on change of official stations. The Department of Agriculture carries out that provision at this time, but, as in the case of the preceding section, it has to be O. K.'d by the Secretary. This merely provides that the Secretary can authorize someone else to do it.

The final section, 711, provides that unless otherwise provided herein or by other statute the measure and character of cooperation authorized herein on the part of the Federal Government and on the part of the cooperator shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary. In brief, that simply means that this bill contains authorization for work on the eradication and control of several animal and plant diseases. Some of these provide for cooperation. In some cases the measure and character of cooperation on the part of the Federal Government and the cooperator is not specifically prescribed. This section authorizes the Secretary to prescribe such measure and character of cooperation where it is not prescribed by statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, my assignment covers titles V and VI of the bill. One has to do with rural electrification, and the other has to do with the Farm Credit Administration. I believe I will take up title VI first.

There are now under the jurisdiction of the Farm Credit Administration about 20 joint-stock land banks, which are in process of liquidation, also the Federal land banks, the national farm-loan associations, banks for cooperatives, Central Bank for Cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit banks, 12 production-credit corporations, and about 500 production-credit associations. All of these are under the general jurisdiction and supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. They have their own individual set-ups, their own offices, and their own administration. What the Farm Credit Administration does is to examine and supervise them.

Some time ago the Agricultural Appropriations Committee adopted the practice, which this committee thinks is wise, of letting these different branches of the general Farm Credit Administration contribute their part of the expense of being examined and supervised.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. It certainly is a desirable aim to make it possible for these component agencies to contribute to the expense of examination and supervision. I notice that in the committee report it is stated that the intent of these paragraphs is to carry out the provision that was started by the appropriation bill for 1944. In reference to that, I note that when the funds are collected they are to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States under the miscellaneous receipts title, and then be disbursed in payment of such salaries and expenses under appropriations duly made by Congress. However, the language in the bill before us would make these moneys available for expenditure without appropriation.

Mr. PACE. In collaboration with the gentleman, who brought the matter to our attention, the committee will offer an amendment making them available for appropriation, in keeping with the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. CASE. That will be offered as a committee amendment?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. CASE. I am glad to have the gentleman's assurance of that, because it seems to me that under the language now before us it would clearly be an appropriation subject to a point of order, and would be a bad legislative practice.

Mr. PACE. We appreciate the gentleman's position on that.

Section 601 (a) on page 18 provides that when the Farm Credit Administration sends its auditors and examiners to audit and examine the books of these different agencies I have enumerated, they shall have a right to assess against a particular organization its expense, so that it shall be charged with its pro rata share of the cost of general administration.

I may say to the House that it is estimated by the subcommittee that this will effect a saving of about $2,000,000 a year. It is estimated that that is the total examining and administrative expense borne by the Farm Credit Administration. Instead of its being borne by the Treasury, each of these individual units will be required to bear that cost out of its own profits.

That covers in full the material portions of title VI.

Title V is the Rural Electrification section. Rural Electrification was set up about 8 years ago. The original act provided that for the first 2 years the Rural Electrification Administration should secure its funds by loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and that for the remaining 8 years the Congress was authorized to appropriate an amount not in excess of a stipulated sum. While the direct appropriation from the Treasury was authorized, most frequently the Agricultural Appropriations Committee has seen fit to permit the funds to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. For that reason, that appropriation has been subject to a point of order.

One of the reasons it is desired to borrow funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, instead of getting appropriations direct from the Treasury, is that the Rural Electrification secures the funds, and in turn lends them to the R. E. A. co-ops, to be paid back. Therefore, it has been felt that it is more orderly, that it is not properly a charge against the United States Treasury, and should not be. Therefore, as presented to you, the bill authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend these funds to the Rural Electrification Administration. To allay any fears that any Members might have—and one Member did have such fears in speaking to me—that does not mean that the R. E. A. has unlimited authority to borrow money from the R. F. C., or that the R. F. C. has unlimited authority to lend to the R. E. A., but each year they must come to the Congress, and through the agricultural appropriation bill the exact amount is to be stipulated. So that there is no unlimited authority whatsoever in this provision.

In this section also the committee has stipulated the interest which the R. E. A. must pay to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, then the interest which the R. E. A. may charge to its co-ops. The committee feels that it is very desirable that a definite rate be fixed for the interest charges against the co-ops. At the present time there is no interest rate fixed, and we found that the different co-ops in different parts of the country are paying different rates of interest, and the same co-ops sometimes paying different rates, depending upon the particular month and the year during which the loan is secured. They are paying from 2.3 percent to as high as 2.8 percent. The committee feels definitely that all of the co-ops should pay the same rate of interest, and that the same rates of interest should prevail throughout the year.

Consequently we stipulate in this amendment the rates which the R. E. A. shall pay to the R. F. C., and which the R. E. A. shall charge the co-ops. In that connection I would like to say for the information of the House that reports made to us indicate that the Rural Electrification co-ops are all in good

condition. It appears that many of them are paying in advance their installments on the principal and interest. It appears that some of them, I believe particularly in the State represented by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], have paid their loans in full years and years in advance. So it is felt that the Rural Electrification Administration is not only providing the farmers of the Nation what I regard and the committee regards as one of the greatest blessings that ever went to the farm, but is doing it in a sound way, without substantial loss to the United States Government.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I lean particularly on the gentleman for information in this respect, because I have great faith in him, and ask him if this in any way injures the production credit associations of my district which have been doing such a splendid job in loaning on a sound basis funds to needy farmers?

Mr. PACE. It does not change the status. The item in this bill has heretofore been carried in the annual agricultural appropriation bill, and we simply bring it in now in legislative language, to save it being subject to a point of order.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. KERR. In the investigation of this matter, did the committee find that there was any insolvency in regard to these local co-ops?

Mr. PACE. None was brought to our attention.

Mr. KERR. And they were all solvent, complying with their contracts?

Mr. PACE. All complying with their contracts, and in fact the average have paid 200 percent of their maturities.

Mr. KERR. Does not the gentleman think this is one of the most constructive pieces of legislation, so far as the country people are concerned, and all the people, that has ever been passed?

Mr. PACE. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I believe this contributes more to life on the farm than anything that has been done in a generation. I think it is one of the greatest blessings that have ever come to the farmers, and it will make a great contribution in keeping the young people home on the farm, as it provides them with modern improvements.

If there are no further questions, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That,

TITLE I

SEC. 101. (a) The act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, is further amended by adding a new section thereto, to be designated section 11:

"SEC. 11. The Secretary of Agriculture, either independently or in cooperation with States or political subdivisions thereof, farmers' associations, and similar organizations, and individuals, is authorized to control and eradicate tuberculosis and paratuberculosis of animals, avian tuberculosis, Bang's disease of cattle, southern cattle ticks, hog cholera and related swine diseases, scabies in sheep and cattle, dourine in horses, and contagious or infectious diseases of animals (such as foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, and contagious pleuropneumonia), which in the opinion of the Secretary constitutes an emergency and threatens the livestock industry of the country, including the purchase and destruction of diseased or exposed animals (including poultry), or the destruction of such animals and the payment of indemnities therefor, in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe. As used in this section, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions of the United States."

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with State authorities in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture upon application of any exporter, importer, packer, or owner of, or the agent thereof, or dealer in, livestock, hides, skins, meat, or other animal products may, in his discretion, cause to be made inspections and examinations at places other than the headquarters of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants, who may be charged for the expenses of travel and subsistence incurred for such inspections and examinations, the funds derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from which the expenses are paid.

(d) The Secretary of Agriculture may purchase in the open market from applicable appropriations samples of all tuberculin, serums, antitoxins, or analogous products, of foreign or domestic manufacture, which are sold in the United States, for the detection, prevention, treatment, or cure of diseases of domestic animals, test the same, and disseminate the results of said tests in such manner as he may deem best.

(e) Fees shall be charged for all diagnoses in connection with rabies, except those performed for agencies of the United States Government, in such amounts as the Secretary shall prescribe, and such fees shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(f) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend appropriations for meat inspection for the purchase of printed tags, labels, stamps, and certificates without regard to existing laws applicable to public printing.

(g) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 15, strike out the word "constitutes" and insert "constitute", and in the same line strike out the word "threatens" and insert the word "threaten."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have familiarized myself with this agricultural appropriation bill and am glad that the long-established practice of financial support to agriculture shall be continued.

I do feel more effort should be given to the control and elimination of the corn borer. It is probably our most destructive pest, attacking our most important farm crop, and it is rapidly spreading and will soon cover the entire corn-producing areas of the country. Perhaps some natural enemies could be developed. In eastern Pennsylvania we now have two broods of the pest annually, and in many cases single corn stalks have as many as 10 borers per stalk. They seriously damage the crop, even to the extent of reducing production as much as 20 bushels per acre and making ensilage corn extremely difficult to handle.

If we could get rid of the corn borer and the O. P. A., life for us farmers would really be brighter. In southeastern Pennsylvania right now there are probably a half dozen farmers and auctioneers in jail for simply following our long-established practice of holding their farm sales and selling their livestock and equipment to the highest bidder. In most of these cases the farmer who sold a tractor or manure spreader at public sale for what the O. P. A. considered above the ceiling price has probably never had an opportunity in his life before to sell any equipment at a good price. After all, the purchaser in any case was not compelled to buy. In every case, if the purchase price was above the established ceiling price of the O. P. A., the purchaser could have gone to the clerk after the sale, paid the ceiling price, and legally claimed his purchase. But in no case was this done, which is conclusive evidence that the purchaser was willing to pay the price for which it was knocked down to him.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture either independently or in cooperation with States or political subdivisions thereof, farmers' associations, and similar organizations, and individuals, is authorized to carry out operations or measures to eradicate, suppress, control, or to prevent or retard the spread of Japanese bettle, sweetpotato weevil, Mexican fruitflies, citrus canker, gypsy and brown-tail moth, Dutch elm disease, phony peach and peach mosaic, cereal rusts, corn borer, and pink bollworm and thurberia weevil: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to cooperate with the Government of Mexico or local Mexican authorities in carrying out necessary surveys and control operations in Mexico in connection with the eradication, suppression, control, and prevention or retardation of the spread of Mexican fruitflies, and pink bollworm and thurberia weevil. In performing the operations or measures herein authorized, the cooperating foreign country, State, or local agency shall be responsible for the authority necessary to carry out the operations or measures on all lands and properties within the foreign country or State other than those owned or controlled by the Federal Government and for such other facilities and means as in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture are necessary. As used in this section, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia and the Territories and possessions of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and regulations and use such means as he may deem necessary to provide for the inspection of domestic plants and plant products offered for export and to certify to shippers and interested parties as to the freedom of such products from injurious insect pests and plant diseases according to the sanitary requirements of the foreign countries to which such products may be exported.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of this section. Unless otherwise specifically authorized, or provided for in appropriations, no part of such sums shall be used to pay the cost or value of property injured or destroyed.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 4, line 19, after the word "weevil", insert "spruce budworm, hemlock borer, and spittle bug."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am not the author of the term "spittle bug" or any of these other names that are applied to the various types of bugs. The reason for this amendment is quite obvious. The contention has been made that, according to existing law, authority is granted to make appropriations to eradicate those types of bug and insect pests that are incipient and emergent in character. It is contended that the spittle bug and the spruce bud borer, and so on, fall into that classification, and, therefore, it is not necessary to specifically name them in this particular authorization act.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE. Of course, if we are going to specify, we ought to specify a few others, too. I wonder if the gentleman would have any objection to including ips in there?

Mr. KEEFE. No; I would not have any objection to including ips.

Mr. CASE. It is an insect that attacks the ponderosa pine.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. I want the western pine beetle considered also, which attacks the western ponderosa pine.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I do not know anything about ips nor do I know about the ponderosa beetle. But I do know something about the effects of the three particular pests the names of which have been inserted in this list. There has been testimony offered before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of which the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, is the chairman. It may be that existing law is broad enough to authorize an appropriation for the eradication of these pests. If the existing law is broad enough, then certainly no harm could be done by specifying these three bugs in the amendment which I have offered to show the intent of Congress is that authority shall be given to appropriate money for eradication of these particular pests. The people of New England and the people in the Northern and Western States are very apprehensive about the prospective outbreak of pests which are destroying the pine and hemlock timber. It seems to me that we should not have to come before the Committee on Agriculture of the House after this pest breaks loose and ask for a specific authorization at that time in order to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate money. The question might resolve itself into a very technical question: Is this an outbreak of incipient character? Is it an emergency? If not, then there is no authority in the law to provide an appropriation. The purpose of this amendment is to allow the authority in this act just as you have done in the Dutch-elm disease and these other insects and bugs, so that there can be no question about it. Certainly the Subcommittee on Appropriations will not appropriate any money for the expenditure unless it is quite clear and apparent that there is a condition which demands eradication. In order that there may be no question as to the intent of Congress to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to provide funds for the eradication of these particular pests, I have offered this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: After the word "weevil", on page 4, line 19, insert "and other insect pests attacking agriculture, including forestry."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is probably not fair to insert in this authorization only the names of the three additional pests which are suggested by the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. There are other pests which from time to time become a serious threat to agriculture, and it seems to me that when that condition arises, there ought not to be any question as to the authority of Congress in connection with a bill providing for appropriations to the Department of Agriculture to make such provisions as Congress may want to make for the purpose of dealing with those pests.

As far as the spruce budworm is concerned, I think it is probable that the appropriations could be made under the language of the act of May 9, 1938, upon the theory that there is an incipient or emergency outbreak. On the other hand, the evidence before our subcommittee, which, of course, is confidential until the report of the committee is submitted to the House of Representatives, but which I feel justified in reporting under the circumstances that now exist, does not indicate as yet an outbreak of this pest in the United States. There was an outbreak a number of years ago in the State of Maine. There has been discovered one spruce budworm in the State of Maine recently. However, there is a very dangerous outbreak in Canada and within such proximity to the forests of the northern part of the United States as makes it extremely probable that there might be infestation of our forest areas; and if we wait until that infestation occurs, then we will probably not be able to prevent very serious damage. So it seems to me that the appropriation for the spruce budworm ought to be specifically authorized; but I see no reason for stopping there. There are other pests which from time to time become a danger to agriculture, and certainly the Congress may be trusted not to provide funds for anything which does not constitute a danger. So I see no harm in authorizing in this bill appropriations to combat any insect pest which might threaten agriculture or threaten forestry, which is a branch of agriculture.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. CLEVENGER. We have in the sugar-beet area this attack of black root, which could well be handled under the amendment which the gentleman has offered, which has caused the abandonment of thousands of acres of sugar beets annually.

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman is correct. I do not believe the Congress should tie its hands and say, "If there is an outbreak of some particular kind of pest that we did not think about in passing this bill, we still are not going to make any appropriation until those interested get a statute passed by legislative procedure to authorize us to deal with it."

After all, this is just an authorization to Congress itself to do what it may think to be wise.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I personally have absolutely no objection to the substitute amendment suggested by the gentleman from Georgia. In fact, the amendment which I proposed, and had originally drawn, incorporated the very thing that the gentleman has seen fit to interpose as a substitute. I hope the substitute offered by the gentleman will be agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Has the gentleman's committee planned to make an appropriation with regard to control of the pest working on the giant cactus in the Southwest? There is such a need.

Mr. TARVER. I do not recall any evidence before the subcommittee with reference to that particular pest at this session of Congress. There has been such evidence at preceding sessions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

It seems to me we are confronted with this situation: We have, under the rules of the House, various legislative committees and the Committee on Appropriations. It is the function of the legislative committees to handle all authorizations. The practice always has been, and I think it is sound, that when a situation arises which seems to demand remedial action, the sponsors of that particular legislation go before the legislative committee having jurisdiction over the subject matter. If they make out a case, the legislative committee reports legisla-

tion, and if it is passed by the House and Senate, it authorizes an appropriation. Then the sponsors of that legislation are in a position to go before the Committee on Appropriations and ask for an appropriation. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is wide open. It simply says we are authorizing here today—without having any idea of the particular pests which may arise at any time in the future, or whether any case is made out for a campaign of eradication against them or not—we are authorizing today, without knowing anything about it, appropriations for any item relating to insect control and eradication that anyone may think deserves an appropriation at any time in the future.

The committee very carefully considered giving this blanket authority, but we felt that, following the rules of the House and the custom that has always prevailed in the House that when any particular situation came up, those who believed that there should be legislation should appear before the proper legislative committee and make out a case.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] mentioned three different pests which he says are prevalent in Wisconsin. He has never been before the Committee on Agriculture. He has never asked the Committee on Agriculture to consider legislation authorizing appropriations to combat those pests. I am sure if he would come before the committee and make out a case, the committee would be glad to report legislation authorizing an appropriation to combat those particular pests.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Has anyone ever appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, and where is the evidence to support the authorization legislation, for the Japanese beetle, the Dutch elm disease, the Mexican fruitfly, the citrus canker, the gypsy moth, and all that sort of thing? Have you ever held hearings in the Committee on Agriculture on any of those pests?

Mr. HOPE. I will say to the gentleman the subcommittee has considered for weeks and weeks the items that are contained in this bill. As a result of that consideration we have reported this bill covering these particular items.

The gentleman mentioned the Japanese beetle. That has been carried in every appropriation bill for the Department since 1920. The Congress has passed on that question at least 23 times, because it has been in every bill, and now the gentleman comes in with a bug that none of us has ever heard of. He may have a strong case, but this House does not know and has not had an opportunity to make an investigation as to what should be done. I invite the gentleman to appear before the legislative Committee on Agriculture and present his case. It seems to me that is the proper place where he should appear and make out his case.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand the gentleman correctly that what he is chastising the gentleman from Wisconsin about——

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman is mistaken. I am not chastising the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the question, please. Involves the suggestion that I should draft legislation providing for an authorization of appropriation for control of the three bugs named in the gentleman's amendment, and then I should file that legislation and then come to the legislative committee and ask for a hearing before that committee; the committee would then consider it; it would have to pass the House and go to the Senate and be signed by the President, and, in the meantime, the trees that we are seeking to protect are gone? I do not think the gentleman means that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. If the gentleman did as he suggests, he would be proceeding in accordance with the rules of the House. If the rules of the House should be changed in that particular, let us change them. But that is the procedure that is used under the rules of the House. However, I call attention to this fact also, that we have on the statute books today legislation specifically designed to take care of the emergency situation, if that is what is confronting the gentleman in his State. It is the act of May 9, 1938.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman he does not need to read that statute to me. I referred to it myself when I spoke a few moments ago.

Mr. HOPE. I know the gentleman is familiar with it but I want the House to be familiar with this provision. I think if the gentleman will give a little more thought to it, perhaps he would agree that this would take care of his situation.

I am reading now from the act of April 6, 1937, as amended by the act of May 9, 1938:

> The Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals, is authorized and directed to apply such methods for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs as may be necessary.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman willing to say, out of the great knowledge he has on the subject of agriculture, that the infestation of the forests of this country by the spruce-bud worm constitutes either an incipient or emergency situation?

Mr. HOPE. I understood the gentleman to say that it did constitute an emergency situation.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the gentleman did not hear my statement when I spoke of this proposition before, and he has not been paying attention to the questions which have been asked.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman just told me a moment ago that the trees would be gone by the time the committee on agricultural legislation could get around to passing a bill. If that is the situation, I think it is an emergency, and I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Knowing the speed with which some of these committees act, I still stand on the statement I made before.

Mr. HOPE. If that is true, then I say it constitutes an emergency. That would be my answer to the gentleman's question.

The gentleman from Georgia a little while ago said that so far as one of these particular pests was concerned the evidence before his committee showed that one bug had been found in the United States. I doubt whether that is a sufficient reason for us to authorize appropriations here in a blanket sort of way to take care of this one bug that so far has been found in the United States. I know just a few years ago we had what was said to be an outbreak of Mediterranean fruitfly down in Florida, and we spent millions and millions of dollars which, if my recollection is correct, was not authorized by the Committee on Agriculture but was appropriated as an emergency proposition by the Committee on Appropriations. To this day no one knows for sure whether there was ever a single Mediterranean fruitfly in Florida, yet we spent millions of dollars eradicating it under an appropriation made by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. While there is no evidence of the infestation of the forests of northern United States with this spruce bud worm, there is evidence that many millions of dollars worth of damage is being done just across the line in Canada. Does the gentleman believe we should defer making any efforts to protect our own forests until they have actually become infested? It may not then be possible to save our forests. When we see this threat approaching should we not stop it before it is actually in our own forests?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I agree with the gentleman 100 percent. That is the reason I think the gentleman from Wisconsin as soon as he learned of this should have gone before the Committee on Agriculture and presented his case and asked for an authorization for an appropriation. May I say further that if this bug is active just across the line in Canada it would undoubtedly constitute an incipient outbreak under the statute I have just read and I think that the committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr TARVER] would have the authority to go ahead and make the appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure you will realize that you are now presented with a problem that has rocked the Congress for 50 years. Whatever you do with it suits me. As most of you know, formerly the legislative committees not only legislated but they appropriated. That was found to have been carried to extremes and was changed. Then the Congress set up a special Committee on Appropriations and provided that before that committee could appropriate funds the Congress would have to authorize it to do so. We have here two of the most distinguished Members of this House, members of the Committee on Appropriations. They come to you this afternoon and say they do not want any strings tied on them; they want to be given blanket authority to do what they please as to reporting appropriations for insects, and they want the Department of Agriculture given blanket authority as far as insects are concerned.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Not now.

That is the amendment; it says any insect, any kind, anywhere, that we want to appropriate for. That is the blanket authority they want. If you want to do it I have complete confidence in my colleague from Georgia and I have complete confidence in the gentleman from Wisconsin. There are not two men in this House in whom I have greater confidence. So far as I am concerned I am willing to give those two men the blanket authority because I know they will not abuse it, but they will not be here forever, I regret to say. If you want to write such a provision into the law it will have to be your responsibility.

Whether the subcommittee did right I do not know, but after studying this matter for a long time we decided that the safe course for us to follow was to have language that would take care of any emergency that could not otherwise be taken care of but to write into this bill the specific insect eradication programs which have been investigated through the years and found to be sound. We felt with this language in the bill that should an emergency arise they could come before the Congress with the project, present it to the Committee on Appropriations, and get an appropriation. If that is wrong, if we have pursued the wrong theory in your judgment, then you should adopt this blanket authority that my distinguished colleague from Georgia proposed here. We do not think it is safe. The distinguished gentleman from Kansas has spent years and years studying this; he is the leader on our subcommittee on this subject. We assigned him this task. We concurred in his judgment and that of the gentleman from Minnesota and other members of the committee that the thing to do was to authorize those programs we knew were sound and include in the bill a provision that would take care of any emergency that might arise. Then if it develops that if it is more than an emergency they could come to Congress and get the authority like everybody else.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman speaks of the gentleman from Wisconsin and myself being unwilling that any strings shall be placed upon the Appropriations Committee. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the Appropriations Committee is without authority to appropriate any money. Any action of that committee to be effective must be approved by the Congress.

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. What the gentleman wants to do is to tie the hands not of the Appropriations Committee but the hands of Congress and to say that the Congress shall not appropriate for whatever it may deem necessary to be done in this field unless his committee has first authorized it.

Mr. PACE. I will not be here very long and the gentleman from Georgia will not be here so long. This thing was settled by Congress years ago in a very fundamental way, and we thought it was settled and that authorizations must be secured before appropriations could be made. It relates to every other department in the Government; but if you want to give blanket authority here although you have the emergency power, our committee is not going to be disturbed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wish to say that throughout the discussion by the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], it has seemed to me they and others speaking this afternoon have overlooked a rather practical detail. We have a Department of Agriculture, of which the Division of Forestry is a part. In a great many years' experience with actual infestations, I have observed that each time an infestation starts, information has always been brought to the Department of Agriculture, and if emergency work was required, it was started by them without the necessity of such an amendment as the one proposed today. In other words, the emergency provision of the general statutes covers an emergency until time can be had to bring it before the appropriate committees of the Congress. I have an idea that in the discussion we have seemed to imply that such a problem would come to the Congress, when as a matter of fact it comes first, as a rule, to the practical people working in the field. I, myself, do not favor the general amendment but would much prefer naming the insects. I doubt if either is entirely necessary at the moment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] what arrangement we have to take care of an emergency case? If the gentleman from Georgia or the gentleman from Kansas would kindly inform me, I would like to know what arrangements we now have for taking care of an emergency in case it is of great urgency and whether any money is immediately available to handle it?

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I want to call the gentleman's attention to section 148, title VII, in the United States Code, 1940 edition, which reads as follows:

> The Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, organizations, or individuals, is authorized and directed to apply such methods for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests, including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs, as may be necessary.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman, but I am yet in doubt. Does that carry a provision for any funds to take care of the matter immediately?

Mr. HOPE. It authorizes the Appropriations Committee to make such appropriations as may be necessary, and I may say that the appropriations we have made in the last few years for grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs have all been made under this provision. I think the gentleman is familiar with those appropriations, because I know he has been interested in some of those items.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman. Yes; I have been very much interested in pest controls. May I say I made inquiry a moment ago regarding taking care of a new pest which is a parasite on the suguaro or giant cactus plant, native to my home State. The giant cactus may not have a commercial value, but it has another kind of value, great historical and sentimental value, and I want to see the pest controlled.

There is another point which does touch on commercial values. Recently a great yellow pine forest around Prescott, Ariz., was afflicted with twig blight. Nobody seemed to know what to do about it. It looked for a while as though the magnificent pine forest might be destroyed. Luckily, we had at that time C. C. C. camps available, so the tree blight was controlled by cutting down and burning all trees or parts of trees affected. But suppose we had not then had the C. C. C. camps? Was any fund available for immediate action? I maintain that the sudden striking of that blight was of such a nature that there ought to be some funds available without waiting for hearings before a committee to handle the case. I feel such is a matter in point.

Now, I trust the Agricultural Department, and I would like to see them given blanket authority and funds to handle such cases. There ought to be an authorization or a special fund to strike at all such harmful beginnings of pests, plant diseases, and so forth. I think that is the sentiment expressed in the amendment offered by the gentleman offering it and, if I correctly understand it, I approve of his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 19, noes 46.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE to the amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: After the words "hemlock borer", insert "ips, western pine beetle."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, the argument against the amendment which has just been rejected was that the amendment should be specific. This is a specific amendment and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is a specific amendment. It limits the authorization to the three or four specific insects he designated and the two which I have added. One of them I suggested and the other was suggested by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

It seems to me in the interest of getting a clear-cut decision on this matter that this amendment of mine should be added to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, then let the vote come on the four or five specific insects.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Has the gentleman any serious misgivings in his mind about the emergency provisions of the present law being adequate to take care of any outbreaks for the emergency period until it can be authorized by the Congress?

Mr. CASE. I may say to the gentleman that the insect I have mentioned is recognized as one of the pests we have to fight in the forests in my section of the country. We have two large national forests in the Black Hills and "ips" are said to be the worst insect foe.

Mr. PACE. If it has prevailed for a long time, does not the gentleman think he should come to the Congress, make out his case, present his evidence, and let the Congress act intelligently on the question?

Mr. CASE. I am not complaining about what has been available in the past, but simply do not want to be cut out if appropriation objects are to be limited to what is specifically stated in this bill. I assume that the gentleman from Georgia would not want to take from the general membership of the Congress the right of debate or right of consideration when a bill is brought before us. I have never felt that when a committee brought in a bill here that it should not be subjected to deliberative consideration. If the position is to be taken here that whenever a bill comes here from any committee it cannot be changed, then deliberation in the House of Representatives does not mean very much.

We have endeavored here to be specific in offering these specific insects for inclusion. The Committee on Agriculture has brought in a bill designed to be a basic bill providing specific authorizations for agricultural appropriations. The gentleman from Wisconsin and myself have brought this matter out, as well as the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], in a deliberative way, not because of the committee of which we may be members, but as representing our districts.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact it has been the practice in the Congress for many, many years for these matters to be handled by amendment or provisions in an appropriation bill and that this proposed law is to provide a general authorization?

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. We have here a whole list of bugs that have heretofore been taken care of by appropriation machinery. The only place where hearings have heretofore been held has been before the House Committee on Agriculture and a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Hearings have been held before that committee this year extensively on these various bugs.

If this appropriation bill came in this year in the ordinary way in which it has come in heretofore, there would be an appropriation to take care of this particular situation that involves the specified bugs I included in my amendment. Now we are charged with dereliction of duty because we have not adopted some new process and gone before the House Committee on Agriculture, which to my knowledge has never held a hearing or taken testimony on this matter.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he seems to think this is something new, but, as far as the rules of the House are concerned, this is something which has existed since 1921, when the House adopted the Budget and Accounting Act and separated the legislative and appropriation committees. It is not anything new. Maybe the rules have been more honored in the breach than in the observance, but what we are trying to do is to go by the rules of the House and provide that matters of this kind shall be authorized when properly presented by the legislative committee.

Mr. CASE. I am not quarreling with the gentleman from Kansas. I think the rules should be observed, and we are observing the rules here, when there is an authorization bill before us, in presenting specific amendments. I hope that my amendment to the amendment will be agreed to, so that the vote may come on the completed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee which worked on this legislation and drafted the bill communicated, after it had completed its work, with the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handles agricultural appropriations. We told them we would like to have the benefit of their suggestions. We supplied them with advance copies of the bill. They all read the bill. We then had a conference, attended by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and myself. We went over the bill with them. They offered suggestions for additions to the bill. I think I am correct in saying that every recommendation the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations made to us was accepted and is now in the bill.

It is, therefore, strikingly singular to me that, if extensive hearings were held, and I have no doubt they were held, and if those hearings before the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee demonstrated any merit, no mention was made of the items in which the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from South Dakota, and the gentleman from Washington are now interested, when we had this conference about 10 days ago with the members of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. They did not ask that these items be included in the authority. They did add language here and language there, and our subcommittee readily agreed with them. If they had requested that the item in which the gentleman from Wisconsin is interested be added, our committee would immediately have conducted such investigation as was possible to determine whether or not it should have been added. We took our bill to the members of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, and we said, "Here is our handiwork, gentlemen."

Mr. CASE. The gentleman certainly wants to have this matter clear?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Neither the gentleman from Wisconsin nor I are members of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. PACE. I agree to that.

Mr. CASE. These amendments have been offered this afternoon in our individual capacities. The gentleman from Washington, the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I, representing our districts, have a legitimate concern in these matters. We are not offering these as members of the Committee on Appropriations but as Members representing our districts, who have a legitimate concern that when you bring in a general authorization bill it cover the various conditions throughout the country. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the action the Committee on Agriculture has taken in bringing in this authorization bill. I am glad you have done it. I am interested in agriculture. The gentleman knows I have tried to help protect the agricultural appropriation bill under various circumstances. I do not think the impression ought to be given that this bill was ever presented to the gentleman from Wisconsin or to me, just because we happen to be members of the Committee on Appropriations, for we are not on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Mr. PACE. Oh, no; I tried to say "subcommittee."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, I wish to express my appreciation to the committee that prepared this bill for their courtesy in consulting with us.

Let me point out that in a bill of 26 pages it is not anything extraordinary that after first consideration there may

be found some provisions in the bill with regard to which members of the subcommittee might desire to make a suggestion. I have frequently changed my opinion of my own handiwork, and certainly I see nothing wrong with changing my opinion with regard to one small item of the handiwork of the gentleman's committee. I can see nothing wrong, where a suggestion occurs that did not occur at the time of the conference, in making that suggestion. I do not understand the gentleman's criticism.

Mr. PACE. I am trying to make this point, that the gentleman from Wisconsin said extensive hearings had been held before the Committee on Appropriations on these identical bugs we are talking about, but if there were extensive hearings and they had merit, why is it the gentleman from Georgia did not ask that they be included in the bill?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in response to the challenge of the gentleman from Georgia that we have had extensive hearings on all these bugs, may I say that we have not taken any action. This subcommittee has not acted on our hearings. We begin tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not think that any subcommittee, even the full committee, can anticipate all the bugs that arise in this administration so as to make provision for eradicating them?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think they can comprehend enough of them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You would have to do away with the whole thing.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. My sympathies are with the policy committee right now. Last year I was mad that they challenged us on points of order on all these items that we had been appropriating for during the 10 years I have been on the committee and for the 10 other years before that since we have had a Budget.

I did not hear the remarks of my distinguished chairman as I was out of the hall on a new deficiency matter, but since this thing has gone this far and the committee have decided to have legislation for all this sort of thing, I think we should stay with them. As a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and one who is for economy, I think it is in the interest of economy to curtail our scope and have legislation for all of these items.

The policy committee, the Committee on Agriculture, are acting perfectly consistently today with their action of a year ago when they challenged us on all these items. Now they are standing by the proposition that all these items should be legislated for. They are perfectly consistent.

If there is anything that should come up as a real emergency, they can meet and bring out an amendment to the authorization. We have a Subcommittee on Deficiencies that is meeting every 2 or 3 months. We will bring in three or four deficiency bills this year, the first one day after tomorrow, and you will have a deficiency bill about every 2 or 3 months through the whole year. We can follow up this matter, if it is an emergency, with an authorization from this policy committee and then a deficiency. So today I am standing by the policy committee on these points.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Can the gentleman tell us any time since the 4th of March, 1933, when the country has not been in a state of emergency?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is right.

I was really conservative when I said the Deficiency Subcommittee met every 2 or 3 months. The Deficiency Subcommittee is in session half the time, and Congress is in session four-fifths of the time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. In regard to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] does the gentleman recall any emergency arising in 1929?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is all. I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOPE) there were—ayes 19, noes 89.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is not very often that I take the floor to discuss some of the problems of the National Government, but on this occasion I rise in defense of a situation that has arisen in the Bureau of Animal Industry. I have known for several years that the salaries of the veterinarians in the Bureau of Animal Industry were too low; are a good deal lower than in other departments.

Therefore I rise to bring this matter to the attention of the House, and see if it cannot be corrected. I think the veterinarians in this group should have another classification. Their classification should be raised, so that they will come more nearly getting a salary in proportion to other groups in same classification. If the veterinarians are to take care of all of this important work in connection with the Bureau of Animal Industry, and in connection with safeguarding livestock of our country, and the eradication of diseases that affect livestock, and the protection of human life, I regard this matter as one of the first importance. I feel that a gross injustice is being done to these employees and to the veterinary profession in general, by maintaining the low salary scale which now exists. In the present curriculum in the recognized veterinary colleges, 5 years of intensive work are required to obtain the degree which is essential for employment in the service. The salaries of these men in Bureau work are not comparable to those in other professional groups in the Government. If this condition is maintained, many of the good men in the employ of the Bureau will be forced to leave this service, and many have left already. There will also be no inducement for capable graduates of veterinary schools to seek employment in the Bureau service. Only those who cannot be successful in more lucrative work will apply and retain these positions, and the efficiency of the service will as a result decline.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman says about the veterinarians. They are a highly skilled group and they are contributing their skill to the fulfillment of the food program.

Mr. GILLIE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I also agree with that statement, but suggest that this differential is not a new thing. Ten years ago they were underpaid.

Mr. GILLIE. Yes. I think it is high time now that they should be given more careful consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, the morale of the Meat Inspection Division never was much because of the low salaries, the low promotions, and the wretched personnel administration. I do not think it ever was so demoralizingly low as of late. Even though assured of good personnel administration under the new set-up in the Food Distribution Administration, until the inspectors can be assured of receiving a living salary within a reasonable period of service, of receiving increases in salaries commensurate with increases in responsibilities, and of obtaining, some time before the end of their career, at least the entrance salary of other similarly placed employees of the Government, until then there can be no semblance of morale. We all know how essential to efficient operations and pleasant relationships is a healthy esprit de corps.

The proposed reclassification of the meat inspectors does not raise the salaries of this group, although the basic salaries of $1,620 for nonprofessional inspectors and of $2,000 for professional inspectors are clearly and definitely out of line with those paid other inspectional forces of the Government. It merely provides just and mandatory increment in salaries as the inspectors advance in experience and knowledge and assume greater and higher responsibilities. It provides that the inspector receive the money that goes with the job. It enables

the inspector to reach a living salary within a reasonable time. It will help to retain within the service the trained, experienced, and capable inspectors and attract new personnel of equal or higher potentiality.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The matter that has been discussed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] is one which will soon have to be passed on by the House in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1945. I think it advisable at this time to give the House the benefit of some of the impressions that I have had in connection with the hearings that we have had on the bill. All of us are being strongly propagandized at the present time to support this proposed reclassification of certain field employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry, amounting to 2,472 in number, upon the idea that it is an action which they have been entitled to for a long period of time and does not amount to a salary increase.

According to evidence which has been adduced on the subject, it will, as I recall, bring about a very considerable increase in the salary of each one of those employees. All of them have had, under the provisions of the Overtime Pay Act of 1943, an increase of 21.6 percent, amounting on the average to $452 per year. So that the question which will be presented to you when the bill comes before the House and the gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, as he probably will, to provide for an increased appropriation to pay the salaries of these employees whom he desires to have reclassified, will be whether or not you want to provide for an increase in compensation to these employees out of proportion to that which has been accorded to all other employees of the Federal Government. Furthermore, there will be involved the question of whether or not you can do this for a segment of the federally employed personnel without inviting the employees in private industry throughout the country to seek further increases in their wages without regard to the provisions of what is known as the Little Steel formula.

They can say to us, "You have increased the annual income of 2,472 employees of the Federal Government, not merely 21.6 percent, as you have all other employees, but you have provided in a roundabout way for increasing their incomes further by an average of $289 per year each. So why should not we as employees in private industry seek further increases in our compensation to take care of this increased cost of living which is looked upon as justifying further increases in salaries of Federal employees?"

The Bureau of Animal Industry has come in before the Committee on Appropriations for this appropriation with the argument that if you do not increase the salaries of those men who are so essential in the meat-inspection program of the Government at this time, they are going to quit and they are going into other more profitable employment. But when a farmhand down in my country or in yours wants to leave the farm and go into private industry and get a job at perhaps two or three times as much as he is able to earn on the farm, the Government says to him, "You cannot do that unless you get a certificate of availability from one of our United States employment offices." Yet here in this case we are being threatened on behalf of a large segment of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, that they will quit and will permit to become neglected the work of such an important part of the Federal Government at this time as the meat-inspection services of the Bureau of Animal Industry unless in addition to this increase of 21.6 percent which we gave them last year, we give them a still further increase by approving reclassification which they say they have been entitled to for 10 years, but only insist upon at this particular time. I cannot believe that those who undertake to speak for those employees correctly represent their position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute in order to answer the question of the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. GILLIE. I am glad that the chairman of the subcommittee has given this some consideration because I think it is vital. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: In spite of the fact that the salaries are very low for the veterinarians, and a good many of them are leaving the service, would it not be better if that was corrected and if their salary was corrected so we could keep the good men in the Bureau here?

Mr. TARVER. When you correct their salaries, as you say, or increase their salaries beyond the 21.6 percent, you are going to issue an invitation to every other organization in the Federal Government to come in and say, "You have done this for employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry; do it for us also. We are entitled to the same consideration they have had." It just means it is the beginning of a spiral which will reach every employee in the Federal Government before you are done with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia have another minute, inasmuch as I would like to ask him a question along the same line.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. TARVER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to congratulate the gentleman for his statement. I agree with him. Is it also not a fact that we cannot get the wages raised for men who are producing commercial fertilizer for our farmers in order to grow these foodstuffs we are asking them to grow? And if we are going to get anybody increased wages I think we ought to provide for necessary labor producing commercial fertilizers for our farmers.

Mr. TARVER. I think there are a lot of people entitled to more consideration as far as increased wages are concerned than these employees of the Federal Government who have had good jobs during the lean years, when a lot of people did not have employment at all, and who have been satisfied, and notwithstanding the conditions under which they worked have not sought to bring about any reclassification until this time of emergency.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. The Secretary of Agriculture may propagate bee-breeding stock and distribute by sale stock surplus to research needs: *Provided*, That the rates at which such sales are made shall be fixed by regulations of the Secretary and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 104. The Secretary of Agriculture may purchase from applicable appropriations cultures in the open market for use in connection with soil and fertilizer investigations.

SEC. 105. Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act (7 U. S. C. 427–427g) is hereby amended by adding a new subsection to section 5 to read as follows:

"(c) In order to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural populations, $63,708 of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year and available for the purposes of this section shall be available for allotment during the fiscal year in the same amount and to the same States and Territories which received allotments from such appropriation in the fiscal year 1942."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, just as a change of topic, I want to read this letter, dated March 3, 1944. Several Members received identical letters.

KESSLER FIELD, BILOXI, MISS., *March 3, 1944.*
Congressman HOFFMAN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I notice that you are one who in the secret teller vote, voted against the Federal ballot bill which would permit soldiers to vote.

It is not exactly clear to me why you are opposed to a bill which is drawn in such manner as to permit a soldier to vote. Are you afraid he will not vote according to your desire; is it that he will be politically ignorant and therefore unworthy to express his judgment?

These questions call for an answer and you, sir, had better have a good one.

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES L. AUSTIN,
Chaplain, United States Army.

During the latter part of this week we will be called upon in the House to vote on the conference report on the question of how the soldier vote will

be taken. I cannot understand why a man who is a chaplain in the United States Army should be so misinformed as the letter indicates. I just wrote on this letter as follows:

Don't be so silly, the Federal ballot would let service men and women vote for just three candidates. The State ballot, if adopted, would permit voting for county, State, and Federal candidates. Also there were two roll calls. Again, don't be silly.

Now, how a man who presumes to write to the people's representative can get the idea after the publicity there has been on this subject that there was not a roll call and that the Members did not go on record, that the vote was secret, seems more than passing strange. To me it indicates that some people would rather give advice without learning the facts than to inform themselves, and again they seem to be interested primarily in their construction of an issue.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Referring to the gentleman who described himself as a chaplain in the United States Army, if it was a secret teller vote, how does he know how you or any other Member voted? It strikes me that the knowledge he reveals belies his contention that there was anything secret about the vote.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As the distinguished gentleman from California well knows, neither the vote on the Worley bill nor the vote on the adoption of the so-called States' rights ballot was secret. The roll of the Members was called on each and the RECORD shows that the vote was not secret, and it shows how each Member voted, if he was present and voted. Just as in this statement of Philip Murray which came to our desks yesterday and today telling us how we should vote.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. What was the phrase that Murray used with reference to it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not remember it. Do you?

Mr. RABAUT. "Confused technically," I think it was.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps he did use that expression. If he did, he is not confused at all about the interests of his union.

Mr. RABAUT. Does not the gentleman think he is right?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not. He is greatly concerned about whether the soldiers should vote, so he writes, but his organization or affiliates of his organization have the gall, and they did last fall, to charge soldiers, men who are in the enlisted service, union dues when they went to work overtime to produce food. The C. I. O. was then deeply interested in getting 25 cents from the soldiers for a work permit. Think of that, charging a man who had been inducted into the service, who was subject to call for combat duty abroad, 25 cents for a permit to work here in his homeland. Now he is greatly worried about their votes. He wants them to vote but they cannot work under the C. I. O. rule—work to make the guns which they carry into battle—until they pay the C. I. O. dues, unless they pay tribute to his organization. I will say to the gentleman from Detroit [Mr. RABAUT] that the gentleman—Mr. Murray—seems more interested in what used to be called the filthy dollar as long as it is coming toward his treasury than he is in the right of the soldier to vote; and as John Lewis said, "It is about time that the C. I. O. got the Communists out of their organization." And John told them the same thing back in 1924.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of Agriculture may pay rewards from appropriations available for the protection and management of the national forests, under such regulations as he may prescribe, for information leading to the arrest and conviction for violation of the laws and regulations relating to fires in or near national forests, or for the unlawful taking of, or injury to, Government property.

SEC. 202. Appropriations for the Forest Service shall be available for medical supplies and services and other assistance necessary for the immediate relief of artisans, laborers, and other employees engaged in any hazardous work under the Forest Service.

SEC. 203. The Forest Service may sell and distribute supplies, equipment, and materials to other Government activities and to State and private agencies who cooperate with the Forest Service in fire control under terms of written cooperative agreements, the cost of such supplies, equipment, and materials, including the cost of supervision, transportation, warehousing, and handling, to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, equipment, and materials are procured for warehouse stocks.

SEC. 204. Appropriations for the work of the Forest Service available for the operation, repair, maintenance, and replacement of motor and other equipment may be reimbursed for use of such equipment on projects of the Forest Service chargeable to other appropriations, or on work of other Federal agencies, when requested by such agencies, reimbursement to be made from appropriations applicable to the work on which used at rental rates fixed by the Chief Forester based on the actual or estimated cost of operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment management control, and credited to appropriations currently available at the time adjustment is effected. The Forest Service may also rent equipment for fire-control purposes to State, county, private, or other non-Federal agencies cooperating with the Forest Service in fire control under the terms of written cooperative agreements, the amount collected for such rental to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time payment is received.

SEC. 205. The Forest Service may provide for the maintenance and operation of aerial fire control by contract or otherwise, with authority to renew any contract for such purpose annually, not more than twice, without additional advertising.

SEC. 206. Appropriations for the Forest Service shall be available within such limitations as may be prescribed therein for the expenses of properly caring for the graves of persons who have lost their lives as a result of fighting fires while employed by the Forest Service.

SEC. 207. Section 2 of the Clarke-McNary Act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 565), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "*Provided*, That for each fiscal year during the existing emergency the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize expenditures not to exceed $1,000,000 from appropriations made pursuant to this act for preventing and suppressing forest fires on critical areas of national importance without requiring an equal expenditure by the State and private owners."

SEC. 208. No part of any appropriation which is available for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act (16 U. S. C. 568b) and sections 4 and 5 of the Clarke-McNary Act (16 U. S. C. 567–568) shall be expended in any State or Territory unless the State or Territory, or local subdivision thereof, or individuals, or associations contribute a sum equal to that to be allotted therefrom by the Government or make contributions other than money deemed by the Secretary to be the value equivalent thereof.

SEC. 209. Appropriations for carrying out the Cooperative Farm Forestry Act (16 U. S. C. 568b) and sections 4 and 5 of the Clarke-McNary Act (16 U. S. C. 567–568) and acts supplementary thereto allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than 3 fiscal years.

SEC. 210. The Forest Service may accept money from timber purchasers for deposit into the Treasury in the trust account, "Forest Service cooperative fund," which moneys are hereby made available for scaling services requested by purchasers in addition to those required by the Forest Service, and for refunds of amounts deposited in excess of the cost of such work.

SEC. 211. The Forest Service may expend funds available for national-forest protection and management for the administration of lands under contract for purchase or for the acquisition of which condemnation proceedings have been instituted under the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 521), and the act of June 7, 1924 (16 U. S. C. 471, 499, 505, 564–570), and lands transferred to the Forest Service for administration.

SEC. 212. The sixth paragraph under the heading "Forest Service" of the act of May 23, 1908, as amended (16 U. S. C. 500), and the fourteenth paragraph under the heading "Forest Service" of the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 501), are each amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In sales of logs, ties, poles, posts, cordwood, pulpwood, and other forest products the amounts made available for schools and roads by this act shall be based upon the stumpage value of the timber."

SEC. 213. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure by the Forest Service such sums as may be necessary for the investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the paragraphs which have just been read, we heard the name of the late Senator McNary. I take this occasion to say it was my privilege to be cosponsor with Senator McNary of legislation which is now pending in the Congress to continue the forest survey of the United States. That measure has been on the Consent Calendar in the House and has been passed over without prejudice and then

objected to on February 23. The reason, as I understand, is not because of basic objections to the legislation, but only that it would require practically $3,000,000 to complete the survey of the forest resources of our country. I trust the Committee on Rules will find it possible to bring the measure before the House for debate, and, I trust, favorable action.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, the bill to which I refer is H. R. 1456. It concerns to section 9, of the McSweeney-McNary Act of May 22, 1928, which authorizes a Nation-wide forest survey in the United States and provides for an authorization for appropriations to continue the work.

Unlike other sections of that measure, section 9, to which this amendment refers, contains restrictive financial limitations. Under the proposed bill we would remove this restriction and place this section on an identical basis as the other sections of the act, thereby making it possible to complete the forest survey of the Nation.

In West Virginia the forests have not yet been inventoried. Work was started in 1930 on a limited scale, but the total forest land is not yet checked.

In the United States our forests cover more than 600,000,000 acres, or about one-third of our continental domain. The survey would study all forest land and I believe, in view of the heavy demand for forest products in the prosecution of the war, that the work has progressed too slowly. It is necessary that information to a sound, basic forest policy be gathered now, and it will be especially valuable for post-war work.

In my statement in behalf of this measure, before the Committee on Agriculture December 7, 1943, I said:

After more than 300 years of settlement this country is still forced to rely on estimates or guesses about a national resource which keeps numerous industries going and paying wages which support five to six million persons. In addition, woodlands help support 2,500,000 farm families. The Government spends millions to collect information on the production of soil crops other than timber, and I think the farmers are entitled to the same consideration regarding their woodlands which make up one-third of our commercial forest land.

Forest lands supply game with food and shelter and millions of Americans with opportunity for recreation. Forests conserve water and help prevent floods and erosion.

Forests are one of our most important renewable natural resources. They must be managed, not mined. This resource must be perpetuated and made secure for the people. And I would like to paraphrase my prepared statement at this point by saying that certain scientists and research experts in America today believe that it is very possible that within 40 or 50 years from now we will be thinking very definitely in terms of the production of fuels from wood products, and so I would like to attempt to reinforce what I have said here on the other values of forest products from the standpoint of a possible source of fuel in the future.

To set up this type of program we must make it perpetuating, and we must bring it to the people in a manner which will cause it to be secure. To set up policies and programs to do this requires authentic information such as the forest survey is obtaining on the extent, location, and condition of forest land and the timber on it, the rate of depletion, and the present and prospective requirements of the country for the forest products which we know will be increasingly used.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III

SEC. 301. (a) Subsection (b) of section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590h (b)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Appropriations are hereby authorized for the purchase in advance of the program year for which the appropriation is made of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in programs under this act, as amended; for the reimbursement of any Federal, State, or local government agency for fertilizers, seeds, lime, trees, or other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, furnished by such agency; and for the payment of all expenses necessary in making such grants, including all or part of the costs incident to the delivery thereof."

(b) Subsection (e) of section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C., 590h (e)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Persons who carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of this act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

SEC. 302. (a) Section 6 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590f), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph, to read as follows:

"Appropriations for carrying out this act allocated for the production or procurement of nursery stock by any Federal agency, or funds appropriated to any Federal agency for allocation to cooperating States for the production or procurement of nursery stock, shall remain available for expenditure for not more than 3 fiscal years."

(b) The Soil Conservation Service may sell and distribute supplies, materials, and equipment to other Government activities, the cost of such supplies and materials or the value of such equipment (including the cost of transportation and handling) to be reimbursed to appropriations current at the time additional supplies, materials, or equipment are procured from the appropriations chargeable with the cost or value of such supplies, materials, or equipment.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to sell samples, illustrations, practical forms, or sets of the grades recommended or promulgated by him for farm or food products, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, and the receipts therefrom shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts.

(b) The United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 51–65) is hereby amended by changing section 6 to section 6 (a) and by inserting thereafter a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to effectuate agreements with cotton associations, cotton exchanges, and other cotton organizations in foreign countries, for (1) the adoption, use, and observance of universal standards of cotton classification, (2) the arbitration or settlement of disputes with respect thereto, and (3) the preparation, distribution, inspection, and protection of the practical forms or copies thereof under such agreements."

(c) Market-inspection certificates issued by authorized agents of the Department of Agriculture shall be received in all courts of the United States as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained.

(d) Officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture who, under proper authorization, use privately owned motor vehicles in the performance of official travel within the corporate limits of their official stations for the purpose of inspecting and grading farm and food products and the supervision thereof at points located within the said corporate limits may be reimbursed for such travel at a rate not to exceed 3 cents per mile.

Mr. FLANNAGAN (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill may be dispensed with and the bill printed in the RECORD at this point; and that amendments may be in order to any section of the bill that has not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CLERK. With the following committee amendment:

Page 13, strike out all of lines 4 and 5.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 402. Applicable appropriations available to the War Food Administration current at the time services are rendered or payment therefor is received may be reimbursed by nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments (by advance credits or reimbursements) for the actual or estimated costs, as determined by the War Food Administration, incident to procuring agricultural commodities for such nongovernmental agencies or foreign governments.

TITLE V

SEC. 501. (a) Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), is amended by striking out the words: "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon his request approved by the President, not exceeding in aggregate amounts $50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, with interest at 3 percent per annum" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator, upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, in such amounts in the aggregate for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary, with interest at a rate of 1¾ percent per annum. Interest rates on the unpaid balance of any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to a rate of 1¾ percent per annum.

(b) Subsection (a) of section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), is further amended by the addition of the following language: "The amount of the notes, bonds, debentures,

and such other obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof."

(c) Subsection (e) of section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), is amended by striking out the words "*And provided further*, That no loans shall be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Administrator after June 30, 1939," and by changing the colon following the word "Territories" to a period.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 15, line 13, after the word "annum," add the following: "And by changing the colon immediately preceding the first proviso to a period and inserting thereafter the following."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct a typographical omission; I ask unanimous consent that in line 13, page 15, after the word "annum" and before the comma that quotation marks be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has just made a correction I was going to call attention to.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] a question: In the event that the cost of obtaining funds on the part of the R. F. C. or the Treasury, we will say, should materially increase, what would be our situation under this language on page 15?

Mr. PACE. The subcommittee's thought on that was that they are so handy to Congress that they could ask us to make such adjustments in the rate as any substantial change in the cost might justify. I may state that the evidence is that the R. F. C. is securing this money for 1 percent. We are requiring the R. E. A. to pay 1¾ percent for it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, the real intent, then, is that so long as the money market is as favorable as at the present time and funds can be obtained at such low rates, there is no reason why a higher rate than 1¾ percent should be charged.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman is correct. We cannot now, of course, anticipate what might develop.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The point I want to raise to the gentleman from Georgia is this: If the individual subscriber enters into a 35-year contract, how can you change the terms of the contract?

Mr. PACE. I do not think you can change it as to outstanding loans. It would have to stand as to all loans made, but as to loans made subsequent to that time you could put in a provision taking care of it. Yes; that could be done, but this increases the time of liquidation from 25 to 35 years.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us see, then, if we understand the situation. A cooperative, we will say, under R. E. A., would make a 35-year contract with R. F. C. and obtain funds on the basis of 1¾ percent interest. Then the R. F. C. would be obligated to meet that rate for the length of that contract.

Mr. PACE. It is our opinion that that would be a binding contract for the term of the loan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It would seem to me we are getting on very dangerous ground if we start legislating in that way, for this reason: Sooner or later a tremendous refinancing operation will have to occur in this country incident to the war debt. We are kind of caught in the squeeze, you might say. If interest rates go up very materially, it seems to me that the price of bonds will have to decline in order to adjust the earning rate of bonds then outstanding to the increased rate that would be paid on the refunding or new issues; so I do not know that I would want to favor a situation like this unless there are clauses inserted which would enable the R. F. C. to adjust its interest obligations as to rate to these R. E. A. cooperatives and various units and all to the money market.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of the decline of bonds. What is going to happen to the banks of this country when these Government bonds decline?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is just the proposition. I ask the gentleman to carefully look at the short-term nature of the present $187,000,000,000 debt. It is too heavy from a short-term viewpoint. It should be financed on a long-term basis. If the Federal Government has the power to force people to buy bonds with a given rate of interest and can for the next 25 to 50 years enforce a given rate, that eliminates part of the trouble incident to maintaining a bond market. We are going to have probably $125,000,000,000 worth of these bonds in our commercial banks, to say nothing about the bonds the insurance companies and other savings institutions will hold. The provisions of this bill could, under certain developments, resolve into a rather large subsidy for these cooperatives.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the same rule would apply, if I am correct, that it could not be changed later, would apply to all other R. F. C. loans. I wanted to read the gentleman this statement by the Treasury Department:

The Treasury has been advancing funds to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and other agencies at a rate of interest of 1 percent per annum.

So as to loans both agencies have made, the same rule would apply. We have nothing in this case, therefore, that does not now exist as to all the loans the R. F. C. has outstanding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the length of those contracts?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] whether under title 5 all limitations are stricken out as to the amount of funds that may be appropriated under this act for the R. E. A.? That is, does it strike out all limitations as to the amount authorized?

Mr. PACE. It leaves it entirely to the Congress from year to year to fix the amount that shall be advanced to R. E. A.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. There is no limitation in this bill as to the amount of the authorization.

Mr. PACE. None whatever.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is not good legislation. Indeed, it is in my opinion the very worst kind of legislation. Why should the amount that may be appropriated for R. E. A. not be limited in this measure as has been done heretofore? This bill would leave the whole matter wide open to the Appropriations Committee to appropriate any amount it might see fit.

Now, when the people throughout this whole country are petitioning Congress to do everything we can to stop the arbitrary exercise of governmental power and to place limitations on the amounts of funds that may be appropriated, certainly is no time to be passing legislation of this sort. What earthly argument could possibly be advanced in support of removing all limitations as to the amount that can be appropriated to R. E. A.?

There are other provisions in this bill which are objectionable. This measure would add more functions and programs to be undertaken by the agencies that are involved. That will cost more money, probably many millions more. How can we go back to our constituents and defend ourselves in voting for such legislation when they are already complaining that taxes are too high and that they are unable to buy any more bonds?

Legislation drawn up in this manner can do nobody any good. It would have the effect of injuring even the R. E. A. It is wrong. I want my record kept straight and am impelled to say to the House and to my constituents I must vote against it in its present form. There certainly should be a limit placed on the amount of funds that may be appropriated under this act.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had the time to go into the various subjects covered by this bill, but from what I have learned in the last half hour, it seems to cover quite a few subjects or will cover quite a few subjects before it is finally disposed of. May I ask the gentleman in charge of this bill whether or not the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in accord with the amendment whereby the interest rate is decreased from 3 to 1¾ percent on loans made to the Rural Electrification Administration?

Mr. PACE. I will have to answer the gentleman with a little explanation. The

original request was that this be 1¼ percent. The committee would not act upon it without the views of the Treasury Department, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Budget Bureau. They all had a conference attended by the Solicitor of the Department, and we were notified that they had approved a rate of 1¼ percent for the R. F. C. to charge R. E. A. The next day I received a letter from Mr. Jones, President of the R. F. C., evidently differing from his representative and attorneys at this conference, and he suggested a rate of 2 percent. From that and other evidence submitted to the committee, including the statement by the Treasury Department that it was providing funds at 1 percent to the R. F. C. and providing funds at 1 percent to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and others, we decided it would not be sound financing to make it 1¼. Therefore we raised the interest rate that R. E. A. would pay R. F. C. to 1¾ percent; then the R. E. A. charges the individual co-op 2 percent. The R. F. C. agreed to 1¼ percent, then Mr. Jesse Jones suggested 2 percent. The gentleman will have to reach his own conclusions as to how they feel about it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The question occurs to me whether or not it it is good policy to set forth in a bill before the House a particular rate of interest that shall be charged by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation with respect to a particular borrower. Why should not the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be compelled to exact the same rate of interest from any governmental agency to which it lends money? You have 56 different governmental agencies borrowing money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. You set forth in this bill that the loans to one agency shall be at the rate of 1¾ percent, then in some other bill the rate of interest shall be 1¼ or 2 or 3 percent, or whatever it may be. I do not think that is very sound policy to pursue and I would like to know whether or not the R. F. C. will approve the 1¾ percent not only so far as the R. E. A. is concerned but every other agency to which it lends money, and if the R. F. C. does not approve it why should a different rate of interest be charged to one agency than to another agency?

Mr. PACE. Our information is that R. F. C. is making loans without any interest charge whatever. From the conferences that were held, having previously agreed to the 1¼ percent, I believe that the 1¾ percent provided herein, which gives them a clear profit of three-quarters percent, will not be objectionable to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the gentleman, what is the percent now charged by R. F. C. for loans that it makes to these various agencies?

Mr. PACE. It varies from nothing up to at least 3 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 502. (a) Section 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), is amended by striking out the following words in the second proviso: "at a rate equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "at a rate of 2 percent per annum; interest rates on the unmatured and unpaid balance of any loans made pursuant to this section prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to 2 percent per annum, and the maturity date of any such loans may be readjusted to occur at a date not beyond 35 years from the date of such loan."

(b) Section 5 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), is amended by striking out the following words: "at a rate of interest equal to the average rate of interest payable by the United States of America on its obligations, having a maturity of 10 or more years after the dates thereof, issued during the last preceding fiscal year in which any such obligations were issued," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "at a rate of interest of 2 percent per annum; interest rates on the unmatured and unpaid balance of any loans made pursuant to this section prior to the effective date of this amendment shall be adjusted to 2 percent per annum."

SEC. 503. Sections 3 and 4 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), are amended by striking out the words "25 years" in each section and inserting in lieu thereof "35 years."

SEC. 504. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901–914), is amended by striking out the entire subsection, which reads as follows: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, and for each of the 8 years thereafter, the sum of $40,000,000 for the purposes of this act as hereinafter provided," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary for the purposes of this act as hereinafter provided."

SEC. 505. The Rural Electrification Administration is authorized to purchase such financial and credit reports as may be necessary to carry out its authorized work: *Provided*, That purchases under this authority shall not be made unless provision is made therefor in the applicable appropriation and the cost thereof is not in excess of limitations prescribed therein.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no one can appreciate or fully understand what the R. E. A. means to the farming people of this country more than one who has pioneered in new land and in a new country where roads were few and power equipment and things of that kind were hard to find. The R. E. A. not only has brought light and power to the homes of the people throughout the rural sections of the country but it has brought power to do the things that must be done on the farms. It is not too much to say, Mr. Chairman, that the R. E. A. has increased the value of farms, it has increased the value of farm products, it has increased the efficiency on farms. When a man is raising stock and must grind feed for his stock, it is mighty nice to have the power right on that farm so that he can convert the raw grain into ground feed for his cattle. You thereby increase the value of the cattle, you increase the value of your farm, and you increase the value of the whole economy of the United States.

I do not know of anything that the administration and this Congress has done since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives that has done more to advance the value of the country as a whole and the interests of the farmers than the R. E. A. The gentleman from Michigan took exception to the interest rate and the long terms. But let me remind the gentleman from Michigan that under the Federal farm-loan provisions the loan is made on the basis of a 32-year plan, and you pay 1 percent amortization. The loan is amortized and pays out in the 32 years.

The provisions of this bill and the plan proposed here are right along the lines that are being followed in financing farm mortgages. The people of my State are very much interested in this legislation. I was surprised to see that they are keeping such close track of what we are doing in Congress. I received today six or eight telegrams from rural districts over the State of Idaho, which I shall later ask permission to place in the RECORD.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In no way do I object to the interest rate. What I am interested in is having the paper that is issued all the way through run concurrently, so that no one is ruined by an increase or a decrease in the interest rate. In other words, if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation could issue obligations for a 35-year period that run concurrently with this period, and sell those obligations on the basis of 1 percent or 1¾ percent, that would be perfect, but if we make a contract running 35 years with the R. E. A., and go into the money market and borrow money on a 90-day note or a 2-year bond, and on the date of refunding that bond have to move up to 2½ or 3 percent, that is not a fair proposition.

Mr. WHITE. In the first place, I do not understand that the Government money used in this financing is borrowed on short-term bonds. I understand that they are long-term bonds. This is no different from the plan that was followed in financing the farm mortgages. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that when these farm-loan associations were organized and the Farm Credit Administration was established, the commercial rate was higher than the amortization rate. At the time those first loans were made—and I happened to participate in one of them—we were able to obtain money at 5 percent while private money was 8 percent. It was the element of security that went into the thing that made money reasonable. One percent annually repaid the amortization.

GRANGEVILLE, IDAHO, *March 6, 1944.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:
Our association urges your cooperation and support in the passage of bill No. H. R. 4278 in its entirety.
IDAHO COUNTY LIGHT AND POWER COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
FRANK H. ARNZEN, *President.*

SANDPOINT, IDAHO, *March 4, 1944.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:
Re H. R. 4278, title 5, coming up March 6. This association urges every effort be made secure favorable action by Congress this important legislation continuing rural electrification cutting interest rates and lengthening period for amortization.
NORTHERN IDAHO RURAL ELECTRICAL REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION, INC.,
A. A. HOLIEN, *President.*

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *March 4, 1944.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
Will appreciate your support on the passage of H. R. 4278, especially title 5 thereof.
P. J. MILLER,
President, Clearwater Valley Light and Power Association, Inc.

FAIRFIELD, IDAHO, *March 4, 1944.*
HON. COMPTON WHITE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
Your vote for R. E. A. bill No. H. R. 4278, title 5, will be appreciated.
PRAIRIE POWER COOPERATIVE.

COEUR D'ALENE, IDAHO, *March 5, 1944.*
COMPTON I. WHITE,
Congressman, First District,
Washington, D. C.:
We have been advised that H. R. 4276, which lowers the R. E. A. interest rate extends time of payment to 35 years and extends the R. E. A. It will be voted on Monday. We urge that you support this bill.
KOOTENAI RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ASSOCIATION,
JERRY RICKEL.

BURLEY, IDAHO, *March 4, 1944.*
COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:
In regards to H. R. 4278, title 5, hope you can see fit to give this bill your wholehearted support. We are in this business out here and think a lot of it and need any help financially or otherwise.
WALLACE WARD,
Raft River Area.

ASHTON, IDAHO, *March 5, 1944.*
HON. COMPTON WHITE,
Congressman, Idaho, First District,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
Respectfully urge you support bill H. R. 4278, title 5. Feel there is large unserved territory. Farm electrification not over 60 percent complete. Must have cheaper money to complete last thin area.
FALL RIVER RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
GEORGE AMEN, *President.*

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who represent the agricultural sections of the United States are very grateful for the many benefits which our Federal Government provides our farmers, and among those is electricity for the farms and the rural sections of our country. This has indeed been a blessing to our people on the farms, and it is generally admitted that this will contribute greatly to making our farmers more satisfied with farm life, to say nothing of being an incentive to keeping our boys and girls on the farm.

The Rural Electrification Administration has not only been a great success in my congressional district but throughout the entire United States, and the reports indicate that our Government has not lost 1 cent from the cooperatives who direct the program. My people appreciate this great convenience furnished through the beneficence of the Federal Government, and ask that I support the continuance of the program. I am pleased to say that I am in favor of the amendments contained in H. R. 4278, under title V, as relating to the R. E. A., and respectfully ask the support of my colleagues in the adoption of the same. As an evidence of the interest of my people, I am taking the liberty to read the following telegram received from my constituents who are responsible for the program in southwest Louisiana. The telegram follows:

LAFAYETTE, LA., *March 4, 1944.*
Hon. HENRY LARCADE,
Congressman from Louisiana,
Washington, D. C.:
House bill H. R. 4278, title V, relative Rural Electrification Administration, comes before House Monday morning. Adoption of this bill means much to Rural Electrification Administration projects throughout the country. You are familiar with the outstanding work being done by Southwest Louisiana Electric Membership Corporation and we wish to urge your favorable vote and support of this bill.
M. W. Scanlan, H. F. Young, Dr. E. Lafleur, Mrs. B. W. Spell, J. P. Gray, A. F. Arceneaux, Amadus Adams, M. C. Campbell, J. B. Angelle, Daniel Thibodaux, U. J. Gajan.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, for more than 10 years I have worked for a program of rural electrification for this country. I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] that I do not see how he can afford to vote against this bill because of this provision. I find that to date 74.4 percent of the farms in Ohio have been electrified. That is the greatest progress made in that State since we took it away from the Indians.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] speaks about the interest rate. Every dollar of this money will come back. We appropriate money here outright to build roads and to build harbors and to improve navigation, but here are the people upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility for producing the raw materials that feed and clothe the world, the struggling farmers of America. Yet they are not asking us to give them a dollar, and we do not give them a dollar, but merely make it possible to lend the money that they may build their own lines and get the benefits of electricity, the greatest natural resource in all the world outside of the soil from which we live.

This bill contains the three main provisions of the Rankin-Russell rural electrification bill. One raises the amortization period from 25 to 35 years; another one reduces the interest rate to these cooperative power associations to 2 percent, and the other takes off the restriction as to the amount that may be provided for rural electrification each year.

Extending the amortization period to 35 years and reducing the interest rate to 2 percent will enable these cooperative power associations to build a large number of short lines out to reach individual and isolated farmers. What we are trying to do is to reach them all. We have gone from 10 to 40 percent in electrifying the American farms in the last 8 years, but we want to reach them all and to make it possible for every farmer in America to enjoy these benefits.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] has had a great deal to say about permitting these co-ops to purchase the facilities in an incorporated town, as if that were any of our business. If they can pay for it, let them buy it.

I have before me a copy of the Daily Corinthiar, published at Corinth, Miss. Ten years ago, in 1934, I believe it was, the Cooperative Power Association of that county purchased the entire facilities in the county, including the city of Corinth, a town of about 7,000 or 8,000 people. They all became members of the co-op, just as the farmers in the rural sections did. It enabled them to build rural lines out to reach hundreds of farmers—probably thousands—that they could not have reached otherwise. Instead of becoming a burden the entire system paid for itself in exactly 5 years. Now, the T. V. A. has asked them not to reduce rates any more because that would increase the consumption. They are paying back to their customers this year a dividend of $38,000, which brings the cost of their electricity down to an average of around 1 cent a kilowatt-hour to the domestic consumers, who 10 years ago were paying 10 cents a kilowatt-hour.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Is Corinth a town of more than 500 people?

Mr. RANKIN. Corinth has 7,000 or 8,000.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Where is the law for it? I am for the R. E. A., but I am with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] on the law.

Mr. RANKIN. These facilities were purchased before the R. E. A. was created. They were purchased through the T. V. A.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Where did you get the law to go into a town of more than 500?

Mr. RANKIN. We had the law then, and you ought to have it now. These facilities were purchased, as I said, before the R. E. A. act was passed.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No, you do not have the law.

Mr. RANKIN. In Prentiss County, Miss., we did the same thing, and paid the system out in 8 years.

If the R. E. A. were permitted to follow this policy all over the country, we would soon have this country electrified from coast to coast, providing an abundance of electricity to every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it just breaks my heart to have my good friend from Mississippi—and I hope he will never do it again—jump on some of us on this other side. I do not know why he does it. We on this side have helped him out—the good Lord knows how many times—in his fights against the remakers of America, against vested interests, and all that, and why he should complain and charge us—and there is not a word of truth in it as far as I am concerned—with being representatives of the power companies or the railroads, I do not know. I just do not get it.

I have fought the Consumers Power Co., a subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern, just as long as the gentleman from Mississippi has fought them. I fought them through the local courts, through the State supreme court, through the United States district court, through the circuit court of appeals, and finally up here to the Supreme Court of the United States, and through eight special elections. We licked them and established our municipal light and water plant. That cannot be the record of someone who is interested in the power companies, but it is my record.

Here is the trouble as I see it—and I am for this rural-electrification amendment. I have always advocated a low rate of interest for the farmer, because, as has been so well said, he is at the bottom of the stack. I do not know why it is, but every time the New Deal gets hold of something, it makes no difference how good it is, they desire to rewrite or remake it in some way. If they could rewrite the Lord's Prayer, they would do it. They always want to do something to whatever they touch that will in the end ruin it. I have tried to grow apples. The apple trees every spring have a lot of suckers growing on them, and we have to cut them off. Then the scale comes on them; then there is the aphis. Then the worms come along, and we have to spray the tree for that, and put arsenate of lead on them. We have to poison the canker worm. You might say we almost have to disinfect them. Then, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] says of the R. E. A., there are some of those people down there on the R. E. A. who affect it as the scale, the aphis, the worms, the suckers affect and, if not controlled, ruin the fruit tree, and the R. E. A. should be trimmed and sprayed for the political parasites; and if the majority will come along with us, we will be able to clean up these parasites, and cut off these suckers, and kill off—figuratively speaking, of course—some of these bugs in there. Then we would be more active in our support of this organization, perhaps. I expect to vote for this provision to which the gentleman referred—to lower the interest rate for the farm users—but they have been trying to use that organization, the Federal money, the money of the taxpayers, for political purposes, and I guess the triple A also.

Mr. RANKIN. I was not charging the gentleman's side of Congress any more than anybody else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no? We—you and I—have been accused of being blood brothers, and so we better not get into a quarrel now—not at least until after the soldiers' vote bill is voted on.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that the R. E. A. is not trying to play politics.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I believe many things the gentleman says, but surely someone has slipped up on his blind side on this one. What is all this fuss about that we read about in the newspapers—about the administration of the R. E. A.?

Mr. RANKIN. That is a personal row between certain individuals in the R. E. A.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I say kick out the parasites. I gather from the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] that that is what he is trying to do, and he is a pretty good Member of this House. He usually knows what he is doing. I gather that there is somebody in the R. E. A. that is up to some mischief; that there have been dirty political doings at the crossroads at midnight.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I was trying to explain to the gentleman but the gentleman is wrong; that is, the gentleman from Oklahoma is wrong. The R. E. A. has no control over these cooperative power associations. They are independent.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then they better get some control over them if they are going to use our money. Somebody better look after them, and end the practices which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] points out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed. It has been our purpose to go down to the school-luncheon amendment and then to rise and take that amendment and others up tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. TABER. I reserve the right to object. There is an amendment to be offered by the committee, which has been suggested by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. PACE. I have that ready to offer immediately.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman intend to bring up the school-luncheon provision tonight?

Mr. PACE. No.

Mr. TABER. Then the school-luncheon amendment will not be offered tonight?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have just talked with the ranking member on the minority side of the Committee on Agriculture, and we have agreed to go down to section 712, and offer what is known as the school-luncheon amendment and then move that the Committee rise. I think the amendment should be put into the RECORD so that Members have an opportunity to study it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

(The remainder of the bill is as follows:)

TITLE VI

SEC. 601. (a) The Farm Credit Administration shall, prior to the first day of each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1944, estimate for the ensuing fiscal year the cost of examinations of the joint-stock land banks, Federal land banks, national farm-loan associations, banks for cooperatives, Central Bank for Cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, and production credit associations; shall apportion the amount so determined among the joint-stock land banks, Federal land banks, banks for cooperatives, Central Bank for Cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, and production credit associations on such equitable basis as said Administration shall determine; and shall assess against and collect in advance the amount so apportioned from the banks, corporations, and other organizations among which the apportionment is made.

(b) The Farm Credit Administration shall, prior to the first day of each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1944, estimate the cost to it for the ensuing fiscal year of the administrative supervision of the Federal land bank system, the banks for cooperatives, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit system; shall apportion the amount so determined among the Federal land banks, the banks for cooperatives, the Central Bank for Cooperatives, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the production credit corporations on such equitable basis as said Administration shall determine; and shall assess against and collect in advance from such banks and corporations the amount so apportioned.

(c) The amounts collected pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) hereof shall be covered into the Treasury, and credited to a special fund, which fund is hereby made available to said Administration for expenditure during each fiscal year for salaries and expenses applicable to examination and administrative supervision as set forth in the annual appropriation made for the same fiscal year for salaries and expenses of said Administration. As soon as practicable after the end of each such fiscal year, said Administration shall determine on a fair and reasonable basis (1) the cost of the examination services rendered during the fiscal year to each said bank, corporation, or other organization; and (2) the amount which fairly and equitably should be allocated to each bank and corporation as the cost during the fiscal year of such administrative supervision, and if the sum of these two items in any case is greater than the total amount collected from the bank, corporation, or other organization, the difference shall be collected from such bank, corporation, or other organization, and, if less, shall be refunded from

said special fund to the bank, corporation, or other organization entitled thereto.

(d) The eighth paragraph of section 3 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 657), and the act of June 26, 1930 (ch. 613, 46 Stat. 815), are hereby repealed, effective July 1, 1944.

SEC. 602. The Farm Credit Administration is authorized to purchase manuscripts, data, and special reports by personal service without regard to the provisions of any other act, and to employ persons, firms, and others for the performance of special services, including legal services: *Provided*, That expenditures under this authority shall not be made unless provision is made therefor in the applicable appropriation and the cost thereof is not in excess of limitations prescribed therein.

SEC. 603. All expenditures which under the accounting system prescribed for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation by the General Accounting Office are to be treated as capital investments, increasing the book value of acquired fixed property (real estate and chattel, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes of section 7 of the act of June 22, 1936 (15 U. S. C. 712a).

TITLE VII

SEC. 701. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to expend funds, available for agricultural conservation, adjustment, and land-use programs, for the share of the United States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like events or bodies concerned with the objectives of said programs, together with traveling and other necessary expenses relating thereto: *Provided*, That expenditures under this authority shall not be made unless provision is made therefor in the applicable appropriation and the cost thereof is not in excess of limitations prescribed therein.

(b) Section 415 of the Federal Seed Act (7 U. S. C. 1605) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Appropriations made under this authorization, within the limit prescribed in such appropriations, may be expended for the share of the United States in the expense of the International Seed Testing Congress in carrying out plans for correlating the work of the various adhering governments on problems relating to seed analyses or other subjects which the Congress may determine to be necessary in the interest of international seed trade."

SEC. 702. (a) The head of any department or independent establishment of the Government requiring inspections, analyses, and tests of food and other products, within the scope of the functions of the Department of Agriculture and which that Department is unable to perform within the limits of its appropriations, may, with the approval of the Secretary, transfer to the Department for direct expenditure such sums as may be necessary for the performance of such work.

(b) Not to exceed 7 percent of the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year for the miscellaneous expenses of the work of any bureau, division, or office of the Department of Agriculture shall be available interchangeably for expenditures on the objects included within the general expenses of such bureau, division, or office, but no more than 7 percent shall be added to any one item of appropriation except in cases of extraordinary emergency.

SEC. 703. The Department of Agriculture is authorized to erect, alter, and repair such buildings and other public improvements as may be necessary to carry out its authorized work: *Provided*, That no building or improvement shall be erected or altered under this authority unless provision is made therefor in the applicable appropriation and the cost thereof is not in excess of limitations prescribed therein.

SEC. 704. The Department of Agriculture is authorized to subscribe for such newspapers as may be necessary to carry out its authorized work: *Provided*, That purchases under this authority shall not be made unless provision is made therefor in the applicable appropriation and the cost thereof is not in excess of limitations prescribed therein.

SEC. 705. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to delegate to such officers as he shall designate the authority to expend such contingent funds as may be appropriated to the Department.

(b) The Department of Agriculture is authorized to contract for stenographic reporting services.

(c) Employees of the Department of Agriculture stationed abroad may, with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, enter into leases for official quarters, for periods not exceeding 1 year, and may pay rent, telephone, subscriptions to publications, and other charges incident to the conduct of their offices and the discharge of their duties, in advance, in any foreign country where custom or practice requires payment in advance.

SEC. 706. (a) The Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Forest Service, the Agricultural Research Administrator, the Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture shall each be compensated at the rate of $10,000 per annum. The War Food Administrator shall be compensated at the rate of $12,500 per annum and is authorized to employ personnel in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to the appointment and compensation of persons employed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. The Department of Agriculture may employ persons or organizations, on a temporary basis, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended: *Provided*, That no expenditures for such temporary employment shall be made unless provision is made therefor in the applicable appropriation and the cost thereof is not in excess of limitations prescribed therein.

(b) The Department of Agriculture is authorized to pay actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That such expenditures shall not be made unless provision is made therefor in the applicable appropriation and the cost thereof is not in excess of limitations prescribed therein.

SEC. 707. The act of April 24, 1939 (7 U. S. C. 343c–1), is amended by striking out the figure "$300,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$555,000," and by adding immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That the appropriations made pursuant to this authorization shall be apportioned to the States in accordance with the apportionment of the like sum in the fiscal year 1944."

SEC. 708. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make copies of bibliographies prepared by the Department library, microfilm and other photographic reproductions of books and other library materials in the Department and sell such bibliographies and reproductions at such prices (not less than estimated total cost of furnishing same) as he may determine, the money received from such sales to be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the applicable appropriation current at the time the materials are furnished or payment therefor is received.

SEC. 709. The Secretary of Agriculture may delegate to such officers as he shall designate the authority to employ personnel in the departmental service wherever located.

SEC. 710. The Secretary of Agriculture may delegate to such officers as he shall designate the function of authorizing payment of expenses of the transfer of household goods of employees on change of official stations.

SEC. 711. Unless otherwise provided herein or by other statute, the measure and character of cooperation authorized herein on the part of the Federal Government and on the part of the cooperator shall be such as may be prescribed by the Secretary, unless otherwise provided for in the applicable appropriation.

SEC. 712. This act may be cited as the "Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I hope the membership of this Committee will not allow any personal feelings for or against any official of the R. E. A. to influence their vote on a question that is of vital importance to the people. Those people who belong to these local R. E. A. cooperative associations away out in the country, those who are getting lights, who never would have gotten them otherwise, and who are getting power at a price no power company ever offered to sell it before, are getting services that enable them to continue farming operations that could not be continued without the help of the R. E. A. They do not know who the administrative officials are at St. Louis. They know that whoever they are they are doing a good job for the farmers. Most of those people are not interested in any kind of fight, as to whether somebody is going to stay on the pay roll or not. Most of them do not know whether the President has asked the Administrator to resign or not, and most of them do not care very much, but they are vitally interested and the Nation is vitally interested in the farms of America getting the benefits of electrical energy, to help produce food. This bill takes a long step in the way of providing rural electrification for all of the farms of America. It does it in a twofold manner, by reducing the interest rate and extending the period of time, so that lines can extend to these remote areas spoken of by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]. In these great wide open spaces we find the greatest need of the service. This bill simply gives these people the opportunity they need to pay back the money loaned to them. It is not like some of the programs, where we give something to somebody. It seems to me that we might well afford to fix such an interest rate as will not result in giving an unreasonable profit to any agency in the Government. Under the present set-up the R. F. C. has been getting 300 percent of what the money is costing it. It has been paying the Treasury of the United States 1 percent, and charging the R. E. A. 3 percent. If that is not as near a usurious operation as any Government agency could have, I do not know what it is.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. I am particularly interested in the point raised as to the difference in rates between the R. E. A. and the person who gets the money. Then there is this question. If we fix the rate

at 1¾ percent for a long period, and then call market money goes to more than that, where is the Government going to get the money to give the R. E. A.?

Mr. POAGE. There are two ways in which we could have handled that. One was to fix a variable rate and the other to give the R. F. C. a fixed amount, say one-eighth of 1 percent in excess of what the R. F. C. pays. The R. F. C. did not want a variable rate and asked for more than one-eighth of 1 percent spread. Mr. Jones asked for a full 1 percent spread. We tried to be generous. I think we were too generous. We finally gave them a spread of three-quarters of 1 percent, and that is large enough so that over a long period of 35 years, there will be ups and downs, and on the average you would get approximately the same result as though you fixed a variable rate. They get the advantage and the disadvantage of the ups and downs of the average, and you give them a large spread, three-quarters of 1 percent, which is 75 percent more than they are paying for their money. They are paying 1 percent, and we are giving them 1¾ percent for it.

I do not know that it is necessary to waste any sympathy on the R. F. C. They are letting private corporations have money without any interest whatsoever. I am sure that most of you have heard of the Shipsaw plant in Canada. This plant is to be constructed by the Aluminum Corporation of America. On page 71 of the third annual report of the Truman committee, you will find that the R. F. C., under contracts Nos. 3 and 4, advanced $68,500,000 without any interest whatever against further deliveries of aluminum. If the R. F. C. is able to do this for a little struggling business like the Aluminum Corporation of America, it seems to me that it might very well advance some money at a handsome profit to another Government agency for the development of food production in the United States. I think that the farmers are entitled to just as favorable consideration as is the Aluminum Corporation, but I simply do not have the brass to ask that our people be given this money for nothing. I do, however, believe that the farmers of America are entitled to a square deal, the R. E. A. is entitled to borrow money at a reasonable rate of interest from the R. F. C., and I think that the 75-percent profit that this bill gives the R. F. C. is to say the least a fair return.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 19, line 19, after the word "hereby," strike out the words "made available" and in lieu thereof insert the words "authorized to be appropriated."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I might say that this amendment is suggested by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. It is acceptable to the committee. It simply provides instead of the charges that the Farm Credit Administration makes upon the independent agencies remaining in the hands of the Farm Credit Administration, they must go back into the Treasury, and, of course, will be under the control of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to be known as section 712 and to be inserted on page 26 at line 7.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: Page 26, line 7, insert a new section 712:

"In addition to such sums as may be expended out of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, funds for the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities and their distribution through school-lunch programs, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts for the following purposes as may, when added to section 32 funds devoted to school-lunch programs, total not to exceed $50,000,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with and under the supervision of local school authorities, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed forms, and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further,* That benefits under this section to schools shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further,* That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further,* That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill at this point and that it is not germane to the bill. The bill relates to all sorts of control of insect pests and to the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities and to an amendment to the Farm Credit Administration Act and to the Rural Electrification Act. It does not in any place at all relate to or amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The title of the bill clearly does not cover such a proposition and it is beyond the scope and range of the bill. Therefore, I make the point of order that it is not germane at this point in the bill and it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides, among other things, for aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities. The amendment provides for the use of part of what is known as section 32 funds and authorizes the use of those funds to purchase surplus farm products used in connection with the school-lunch program. For that reason it seems to me that it is germane. As we all know, section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act sets aside 30 percent of the customs receipts to be used by the Department of Agriculture in removing farm surpluses. This amendment deals directly with the orderly marketing of those farm surpluses. One of the objects of the bill is as stated in its title—to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities. It does seem to me that the amendment comes clearly within the scope of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, section 32 does not relate to the orderly marketing of farm products. It relates to the disposition of farm surpluses by the application of certain funds collected through the tariff. On the other hand, this amendment does not relate to the orderly marketing of farm products. It relates to the disposition of a gratuity to certain of the schools of the country and it is clearly not within the scope of the bill. It is clearly not germane in any way to the provisions of the bill.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment is in order and is germane for the following reasons in addition to those presented by the gentleman from Virginia. In the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1944, there was carried a somewhat similar appropriation for $50,000,000 for the school-lunch program to be expended out of section 32 funds. The purpose of the present bill is to correct the items lacking legislative authority. Concerning this item the following was contained in the conference report of the House and Senate on the 1944 agricultural appropriation bill:

The House and Senate conferees are in agreement with respect to this authorization, that they will not favor the renewal of this authorization next year unless the same is specifically authorized by substantive legislation.

The purpose of the pending bill is to authorize items carried in the 1944 Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The pending amendment is supplemental to the section 32 funds, and I submit that that is exactly the purpose of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair wishes to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that this is a bill to provide for various matters connected with the Department of Agriculture. In the closing paragraph it is stated that this act may be cited as the

Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944.

The purpose of this bill, as the Chair understands it, is to provide for those matters which were subject to a point of order in the appropriation bill. The school-lunch program was in the appropriation bill of 1944 and was one of the matters to be considered.

The Chair therefore overrules the point of order and holds that the amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY to the amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: At the end of the amendment insert "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated for this purpose shall be expended by or on behalf of any school from which an application therefor has never been received by the Secretary from the governing board of said school: *And provided further*, That the authorization provided herein shall not be effective subsequent to June 30, 1945."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4278, had come to no resolution thereon.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statement by Chairman Harry A. Millis, of the National Labor Relations Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement made by Chairman Harry A. Millis upon submission of the annual report covering the work and accomplishments of the National Labor Relations Board during the last year. I call attention to this statement so that the Members of Congress may appreciate the important war job carried on by the N. L. R. B., efficiently and out of the limelight shared by other agencies. Crippled by appropriation cuts, imposed while Congress assigned to it new duties, the N. L. R. B. continues to remove from our industrial war program the explosive possibilities inherent in controversies arising out of unfair labor practices and questions concerning employee representation. To further ease employer-employee relations in our war plants the N. L. R. B. streamlined its procedures, protecting at each step the rights of parties, and cut down substantially the amount of time needed to handle and dispose of situations which might otherwise flare up and slow down our arsenals of production.

For example, I had recently called to my attention the experience of one of our largest manufacturers of flying transports and fortresses. Management in this case was confronted with the question as to who was entitled to represent its employees in collective bargaining. The N. L. R. B. thereupon went into action and held elections in which approximately 50,000 votes were cast. Upon completion of the tally, management commented:

We are grateful to the N. L. R. B. officials for efficient handling of the election and to our employees for orderly and harmonious determination of their rights under the law to select or reject a collective bargaining unit. * * * An investigation of the status of the various projects throughout the plant disclosed that no appreciable loss of production was suffered on either day. The time lost by individual voters was made up before the end of the day so that all positions throughout the projects were back on schedule before midnight.

May we express our appreciation and thanks for the advice and cooperation of (Board agent) Mr. Martin Zimring and his staff of representatives. Their efforts, and their expert handling, contributed greatly to the elimination of a production lag that could have been most serious.

Here is the statement of N. L. R. B. Chairman Millis surveying the work of the Board during the past year:

STATEMENT OF H. A. MILLIS, CHAIRMAN, N. L. R. B., ON SUBMISSION OF THE EIGHTH ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

I am gratified to report that the activities of the National Labor Relations Board during the past fiscal year emphasize the increasing acceptance of the principles under lying the National Labor Relations Act and the growing industrial custom of using the Board's machinery rather than the old-fashioned method of direct action and strike. Each of these two significant developments is borne out in outstanding fashion: During the past year the Board received fewer charges of employer unfair labor practices than in any of the 5 preceding years. During the last year more requests for secret ballot elections were presented to the Board than in any year since the Board's inception. This unprecedented recourse to orderly elections to determine collective-bargaining representatives is all the more noteworthy in light of the fact that more than 75 percent of all the elections were one-union situations, not involving contests between competing labor organizations. The total of 9,543 cases filed—of which 64 percent, or 6,140, were election cases and 3,403, or only 36 percent, were unfair-labor-practice cases—constituted the third largest number in the Board's history.

The special contribution of the Board's war-time functions and activities can be gaged and should be examined in relation to the abnormal economic and social conditions brought about by war. The impact of war—translated in terms of housing and transportation difficulties, diminishing supply of civilian goods, rising costs of living, and the continuous demand for unflagging effort and energy in the factory—created tensions in American industry which necessarily demanded the elimination of sources of friction and poor morale before they could develop into interruptions of production. In the employer-employee relationship, particularly, questions concerning employees' bargaining rights pointed up the explosive situations, often laden with threats of friction and outbursts of strife. As part of its task in preventing such interruptions of production the National Labor Relations Board made available, promptly and with the speed of perfected procedures, its time-tested and accepted machinery. This contribution to the safeguarding of the flow of production consisted in the elimination of unfair-labor practices which impede the acceptance of sound and mutually acceptable collective bargaining and in the prompt determination of disputes as to the choice of bargaining agents by employees. Throughout its war-time assignment the Board conducted itself with the full realization—and this is also a thought which recommends itself to both management and labor—that the right to select his own representative for collective bargaining is now deeply ingrained in the American worker. Any impairment of such right is fraught with the danger of industrial warfare unless the Government affords a legal and ready method of redress.

Thus, during the past year the Board received 9,543 cases and disposed of 9,722 cases, including cases from the 2,860 that were pending disposition at the beginning of the year. Or, to cite other figures, in conducting since Pearl Harbor more than 10 elections daily in the Nation's war plants, the Board has enabled more than two and one-half million workers to express their choice of bargaining agents. This acceleration in case handling reflects the Board's consciousness of its urgent role in the maintenance of stable labor relations and uninterrupted war production, and the resulting adoption by it of administrative improvements in procedure which emphasized speed in all phases of its case work. It cannot be gainsaid that concrete and creditable are the achievements flowing from the Board's improvements in procedure during the past year. The amount of time between the initiation of a case by a union, employee, or employer, and the opening of a formal hearing based on investigation was reduced 29 percent. The average period for the issuance of reports by hearing examiners following the close of hearings was lowered by 45 percent; this, despite the fact that the number of reports issued was the largest in the Board's history. The length of time required by the Board to render a decision, after issuance of the examiner's report, was steadily shortened from the beginning of the year until by the end of the year it had been cut virtually in half. This stress upon speed in the handling of employer-employee questions brought about a corresponding and substantial increase in the number of decisions issued in both unfair labor practice and election cases. Accordingly, the Board issued 405 decisions in unfair labor practice cases, a gain of 41 percent over the number of such cases decided in 1942. The 1,361 decisions in election cases accounted for less than 20 percent of the closed election cases, more than 3,000 representation questions having been settled by the mutual consent and agreement of the parties. Yet, the 1,361 decisions in election cases constituted a gain of 43 percent over the figure for 1942. This record becomes doubly significant when it is recalled that the number issued in 1942 was, itself, an increase of 28 percent over the record of the previous year, making a total gain of 83 percent during the past 2 years.

Further accomplishment in shortening the time involved in handling war cases has been blocked by cuts in appropriations, imposed despite the fact that the Board was given additional duties and functions under the War Labor Disputes Act and the Telegraph Merger Act. Also, the Board has been handicapped by a tremendous loss of experienced personnel. The loss of approximately 40 percent of the Board's employees to the armed services has been accentuated by a total reduction of staff, dictated by budgetary limitations, from 889 on July 1, 1942, to 736 on October 30, 1943. For this reason, while the Board has been able to shorten the time involved in handling individual cases, the number of election cases pending disposition at the close of the year showed an increase over the previous year.

Concerned as the Board is with the protection of the American worker's right to designate representatives of his own choosing and the avoidance of any unrest which might flow from frustrating this fundamental right, it is hoped that Congress will see fit to remove a recent restriction upon the Board's appropriation. While this restriction, in the form of a limitation to the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act of 1944, does not change the provisions of the Labor Act, it nevertheless operates as would a direct amendment to prohibit the Board from enforcing the principles underlying the free choice of bargaining representatives. This resulted from a restriction forbidding the Board to expend its current funds in any unfair labor-practice case arising over an agreement between management and labor which has been in existence for 3 months or more without a charge being filed.

The broad and unqualified language of the provision strikes at the heart of some of the basic principles of the National Labor Relations Act. The restriction operates to prevent the Board from taking any action in any unfair labor-practice case which involves an agreement which has been in existence for at least 3 months, wholly without regard to the illegality of the contract or the unlawful conduct which stems from it. Thus, the restriction throws a blanket of protection over discharges pursuant to a closed-shop contract, despite the fact that such contract may have been made by the employer with a company-dominated union, with a union which represents merely a handful of workers in an expanding war plant employing thousands, or with the connivance of one who fears the expression of majority choice through the secret ballot. In short, the limit on the Board's appropriation protects collusive action which overrides the democratic principle of majority rule and destroys the freedom of choice guaranteed employees under the act.

Pursuant to the mandate of the restriction, the Board suspended disposition of all cases covered by it. Affected were 56 cases, some of them the most important cases on the Board's docket. Affiliates of the A. F. of L. and C. I. O. had brought 49 of these cases to the Board, asking that the unfair labor practices be remedied; in the remaining 7 cases the charges were filed by unaffiliated unions and individual workers. Doubtful questions with respect to the coverage of the restriction have been submitted by the Board to the Comptroller General for decision.

Constituting as it does a restriction on the use of funds for the fiscal year, this clause will remain in effect until June 30, 1944. In view of the destructive impact of the restriction upon the basic principles of the act, however, the Board earnestly hopes that Congress will not find it necessary to continue the prohibition thus imposed.

The Board's emphasis upon streamlining its decision-making processes does not imply a neglect of its informal case handling. On the contrary, the Board is more impressed than ever with the desirability of disposing of cases informally, avoiding the issuance of formal directives. Thus, 78 percent of all cases closed during the past year were closed promptly in the informal stages. The significance of these on-the-scene adjustments may be seen in full perspective when the close relationship of the Board's activity to war production is kept in mind. This relationship is observed most clearly in the fact that 50 percent of the new cases were concentrated in 7 industries, all essential to the war—iron and steel, machinery, aircraft, food, shipbuilding, chemicals, and electrical machinery. Aircraft alone had 553 cases; shipbuilding, 475 cases; and iron and steel, 1,512 cases.

That unfair labor practices still exist appears clearly from the various remedies utilized by the Board in the past year. A total of 7,111 employees were reinstated after discriminatory discharges, while an additional 1,250 were reinstated after strikes caused by unfair labor practices. Back pay amounting to $2,284,593 was paid to 5,115 workers who had been the victims of discriminatory practices. Company-dominated unions were disestablished in 205 cases.

In carrying out its task of determining representatives for the purposes of collective bargaining the Board conducted 4,153 elections during the past year. Valid votes were cast by 1,126,501 workers. Unions received 82 percent of these valid votes. A union was chosen as representative for collective bargaining in all but 14 percent of the elections.

Affiliates of the A. F. of L. participated in 2,018 elections, winning 1,398 of them and receiving a total of 267,118 votes. Affiliates of the C. I. O. participated in 2,350 elections, winning 1,766 of them and receiving a total of 515,271 votes. Unaffiliated unions participated in 745 elections, winning 416 of them and receiving a total of 140,780 votes.

Court litigation involving Board decisions during the last year witnessed the continuation of the successful record of earlier years. The decline in the number of Board decisions set aside continued. Of 96 decisions issued by the circuit courts of appeals, 9, or 9 percent, set Board orders aside. Of the 4 additional cases that reached the Supreme Court, 3 were enforced in full and 1 was remanded to the Board for further action.

The fiscal year 1943 saw two added duties entrusted to the Board by Congress. In March, Congress amended the Communications Act of 1934 and gave the Board the responsibility of protecting the rights and privileges of telegraph employees which might be affected by the merger of the Western Union and Postal Telegraph companies. Further, with the passage in June of the War Labor Disputes Act, the Board was assigned the task of conducting strike ballots as provided in that act and certifying the results of such balloting to the President. From the date of the passage of the act to February 1, 1944, a total of 722 disputes had been filed. As of that date, 510 of the notices had been withdrawn before the end of the 30-day waiting period, and 70 cases were pending. Of the 142 cases in which ballots were conducted, 123 resulted in at least a majority of the employees voting "yes" to the standard question: "Do you wish to permit an interruption of war production in wartime?" As of October 15, 1943, by which time 58 strike votes had been conducted, in 19 cases, according to available information, had a strike followed an affirmative vote; also, as of October 15, 5 strikes occurred either before or after a strike notice was withdrawn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a column written by Robert L. Norton, which appeared in the Boston Post of March 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ROWAN and Mr. SHORT were granted permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at the point where I spoke in Committee of the Whole today and to include as a continuation, telegrams received in support of the R. E. A.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of H. R. 4220 and a copy of a letter I have received from Jesse Jones on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may have leave of absence for 1 week, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSON] be granted a leave of absence, on account of death in the family.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain extracts from the report on the bill under consideration today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Committee to Investigate Federal Expenditures the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE PENTAGON BUILDING

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on February 29 I made a report to the House on the Pentagon Building. This report did not cover operating costs. It will be recalled that some time ago, the Public Relations Division of the War Department sent out a press release telling the Nation how the Pentagon Building was going to pay for itself through the savings of rentals. The purpose undoubtedly was to sell the public the idea that it was a good investment.

PENTAGON UPKEEP REQUIRES 1,351 MAINTENANCE EMPLOYEES

In order that the taxpayers might have all the facts, I requested the War Department to furnish me a break-down of the cost of operating the project, asking specific information as to each item. I received recently from the Public Buildings Administration through the War

Department the information I requested, which I am submitting to the House herewith as exhibit A. The interesting items are the following:

The building manager of the Pentagon project has 1,351 employees on the pay roll, 1,326 of which are permanent, regular employees, and 25 per diem employees. The Pentagon Building burned up 28,750 tons of coal last year at a cost of $169,356. It used up 105,840,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical current at a net cost of $888,244. It cost $87,360 to replace 249,600 electric-light bulbs that were burned out last year at a cost of 35 cents per bulb. It is costing $75,000 a year to mow the lawns, $1,170,946 a year for cleaning and $337,260 a year to maintain and operate the heating, ventilating, air-conditioning, and refrigeration system. In addition to the $888,244 paid out for electricity, it cost $189,918 for maintenance and operation of the electric system, including the lamps. It cost $84,000 to change partitions last year, and although the building is new, $20,320 was spent for painting and decorating. The total cost of maintaining and operating the building in 1943 was $3,823,236.

COST MUST INCLUDE INTEREST ON BONDS ISSUED

We had to, of course, borrow the money and issue bonds to pay for this project. Using E bond interest rates of $2.90 per $100 borrowed and taking only $75,000,000 which the War Department agrees it spent on this project and eliminating for the sake of argument the $10,640,000 spent on roads, bridges, and rights-of-way by the Roads Division, we have a charge against this project each year of $2,175,000 for interest.

OPERATING COSTS MUST ALLOW FOR DEPRECIATION

In addition to the operating cost and interest charge, we must figure depreciation. In the foreword of the War Department report of December 23, 1943, we find the total cost of the building and its outside utilities given at $62,045,954. Figuring the life of the building and utilities at 50 years—and, of course, the life of the utilities will not be 50 years—a 2-percent depreciation charge-off would amount to $1,240,919 annually.

SUMMARY OF OPERATING COST

A public accountant figuring and determining whether the Pentagon Building was a paying proposition or not, would make a statement something like this:

Operating cost of the Pentagon project for the year 1943	$3,823,236.86
$75,000,000 E bonds, interest rate, 2.90 percent	2,175,000.00
2-percent depreciation on the building and utilities cost of $62,045,954	1,240,919.09
Total operating and carrying charge on the Pentagon project for 1943	7,239,255.95

COST $2.20 PER YEAR PER SQUARE FOOT OF NET OFFICE SPACE

Net office space of 3,634,489, deducting 363,448 square feet or 10 percent for vacancies due to change-over, leaves a net office space actually used of 3,271,041 square feet. Cost per square foot of net office space actually used, $2.20 per square foot per year.

WHAT IS THE NET RENTAL RATE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR OFFICES?

When the question of rentals came up before the Deficiency-War Department subcommittees of the Appropriation Committee on July 22, 1941, Mr. WOODRUM asked the following questions—page 502 of the hearings on the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1942:

Mr. WOODRUM. What rental do you pay?

Mr. REYNOLDS. We pay for rented buildings something over $4,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. What is the average rental? Is it about $1.25 per square foot?

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes, sir.

When the deficiency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee considered the appropriation for erecting Federal office building No. 1, known as the Census Building, Mr. Reynolds, of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, in charge of public buildings, inserted into the RECORD, at Mr. WOODRUM'S request, a detailed statement giving the description of each building leased by the Federal Government, the net square feet occupied, the number of people in the building, and the annual rental paid. This statement can be found on page 9 of the hearings on the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1939. The hearings on this particular part of the bill took place on January 16, 1939. We find there the following information—all costs are based on net square feet of office space:

The Agriculture Department leased 495,143 square feet at an annual rental of $468,383, or 95 cents per square foot per year.

The Commerce Department leased 30,500 square feet at an annual rental of $15,000, or 50 cents per square foot per year.

The Interior Department leased 316,586 square feet at an annual rental of $236,686, or 75 cents per square foot per year.

The Labor Department leased 71,756 square feet at an annual rental of $75,229, or $1.05 per square foot per year.

The State Department leased at that time 359,924 square feet at an annual rental of $443,425, or $1.20 per square foot per year.

The War Department leased 118,510 square feet of space for $81,223, at an annual rental of 72 cents per square foot per year.

The Federal Housing Authority leased 188,380 square feet for an annual rental of $261,238, at an annual rental rate of 39 cents per square foot per year.

The General Accounting Office leased 243,727 square feet at $160,450, at an annual rental of 70 cents per square foot per year.

The Works Progress Administration leased 259,793 square feet of space for $218,608, at an annual rental of 80 cents per square foot per year.

I have omitted some of the smaller agencies. However, there was leased that year 3,664,716 net square feet of office space for an average annual rental of $3,432,711, or $.94 per square foot of net office space per year. All this property was within the District of Columbia. This property was all under lease on January 16, 1939, so Mr. Reynolds' figure of $1.25 per square foot was approximately 32 percent higher than the rent rate paid on January 16, 1939. Rents were later supposed to have been frozen in the District of Columbia at 1941 rates. I am taking the rent rate of $1.25 per square foot per year, as the fair rent to credit the Pentagon project with.

PROFIT AND LOSS STATEMENT ON PENTAGON BUILDING

An accountant in reporting back to an owner of a building as to its investment value would make a statement something like this:

Total cost of operating and carrying charge of Pentagon project for 1943	$7,239,255.95
Credit rental on 3,271,041 net square feet at $1.25 per square foot per year	4,088,801.00
Net loss per year	3,150,454.95

COST OF FIRE INSURANCE AND OTHER INSURANCE NOT INCLUDED IN RENT CREDIT

Inasmuch as the Government carries its own insurance, the above figures do not include premiums on various types of insurance to protect the Government against loss by fire and public liability claims for persons injured, and so forth. Any damage by fire would have to be added to the cost. The same is true regarding claims for insurance. A businessman would, of course, include premiums on that type of insurance as a part of the operating cost of the building.

RENT CREDITED DOES NOT INCLUDE AMOUNT REQUIRED TO AMORTIZE LOAN

A good businessman would, of course, charge up against the building a definite annual amount to amortize his loan. As the building becomes older and depreciates in value, the security for the loan would depreciate, particularly so if we made a loan against it for 100 percent of the wartime cost. Under the rentals credited, at the end of 50 years we would still owe the $75,000,000.

WHERE WILL WE BE 50 YEARS HENCE UNDER THIS PLAN?

An accountant at the end of 50 years would make a statement something like this:

Still owing on the building in bonds	$75,000,000
Annual loss in operating	3,150,454
Operating loss during 50-year period (without interest)	157,522,500
Total cost of building at the end of 50 years, including loss	232,522,700

The above figures do not include the interest on the loss each year. In view of the fact that the President in his message stated that the national debt on July 1, 1945, would be $258,000,000,000, and that the national debt will undoubtedly reach $300,000,000,000, and in view of the further fact that it would require approximately $9,000,000,000 a year to pay the interest on and amortize $300,000,000,000 in 50 years, I think I am safe in saying that we will still owe this $232,000,000 at the end of that period. If we pay the annual operating loss of $3,150,454 each year from current taxes, it will leave just that much less to pay on the principal of the national debt, and we will owe just that much more each year. Thus at the end of the 50-year period, we will have added $157,522,500 operating loss to the $75,000,000 in bonds issued for this project and we will have increased the national debt by $232,522,700. In other words, when we are all through,

the Pentagon Building at the end of 50 years will have cost us this latter amount.

PENTAGON CONCESSIONS

Thirteen thousand square feet of space in the Pentagon Building is occupied by concessionaires. I asked the Under Secretary of War to furnish me with a detailed statement giving the number of square feet occupied by concessions, the purpose for which it is occupied, and who occupies the space. I am attaching this statement as exhibit B. I also have a letter from the Under Secretary of War which reads in part as follows:

In addition to the information requested regarding the cost of operation of the building, you asked for a statement of the income from rents, concessions, and the like.

Several mercantile establishments have been given space in the concourse of the Pentagon and operate there for the benefit of War Department employees and military personnel. These establishments pay no rent as such but are operated as concessions under contracts with the Pentagon Post Restaurant Council. These concessions are of two sorts. In the case of Walgreen's drug store, the Palais Royal department store, and Brentano's book store, the contracts with the restaurant council require that all receipts in excess of actual operating expenses, including a fixed allowance for general overhead, are to be paid to the council. The contracts with the newsstand and the Haggerty concessions for service facilities provide for the payment to the council by the concessionaires of varying percentages of gross receipts. Arrangements are included for regulation of prices charged by the concessionaires.

The Pentagon Post Restaurant Council is a nonprofit agency organized and operating under the provisions of AR 210–100. Its function is to operate the restaurants and beverage bars in the Pentagon for the benefit of all personnel working in the building. The contracts with the concessionaires were drawn with a view to assuring that profits from the operations would be used to reduce the cost of restaurant operations and thus accrue to the joint benefit of all Pentagon personnel. Of course, no profits accrue to the benefit of any individual War Department employee.

All profits from the concessions, as well as from the other operations of the restaurant council, are being used to repay a $325,000 Defense Supplies Corporation loan, arranged through the Army Exchange Service, which was incurred to provide the council with necessary equipment and working capital. This load had been reduced to $195,000 as of December 31, 1943.

It will be noted that the Pentagon Post Restaurant Council is a nonprofit agency. Its function is to operate the restaurant and beverage bars in the Pentagon for the benefit of all personnel working in the building. The contracts with the concessionaires were drawn with a view to assuring that profits from the operations would be used to reduce the costs of restaurant operations and thus accrue to the joint benefit of all Pentagon personnel. The Under Secretary of War states, "Of course, no profits accrue to the benefit of any individual War Department employee." The profits are being used to reduce a $325,000 loan made by the Defense Supplies Corporation to provide for the necessary equipment and working capital. While I have no objection to furnishing free rent, lights, heat, and so forth, to the Pentagon restaurants on the same basis as is being furnished other Government restaurants, I can see no reason why we should take profits from the Walgreen drug store, Palais Royal department store branch, Brentano's book store, or the newsstand which are housed in the Pentagon Building and which are being heated, lighted, and serviced at public expense to reduce the food cost in the cafeterias of the Pentagon Building. The concession money, outside of the restaurant proper, should be paid into the United States Treasury.

CONCLUSION

The statement issued by the Public Relations Division of the War Department to the effect that this Pentagon project would pay for itself in a short time, in the face of the facts of the case, certainly was inexcusable. It was either issued with the deliberate intention of misleading the public and giving misinformation out to the people or those issuing it made no attempt to ascertain the facts in the case. In either event, the officers issuing that statement should be relieved from duty and relegated back to private life to prevent them from sending out similar misinformation to the general public in the future. I am not a certified public accountant and have had no training along those lines. I would suggest that the War Department issue its statement, or the statement of some certified public accountant, telling the public how it arrived at the conclusion that the Pentagon project was paying for itself. As will be readily evident, I am here discussing solely the question of whether or not the Pentagon project, as a permanent project, is a good investment from a business point of view.

EXHIBIT A

OPERATING COSTS, PENTAGON BUILDING, JAN. 1–DEC. 31, 1943

(a) Number of tons of coal used per year and price paid per ton:

Jan. 1–June 30	15,375 tons at $5.88	$90,405
July 1–Dec. 31	13,375 tons at $6.50	86,937
Total, 28,750 tons		177,342

This is the gross cost of coal which is $7,985 more than shown in statement (g), the difference representing cost for steam for the cafeteria operation.

(b) The amount of electric energy used per year and amount paid therefor:

Jan. 1 to Dec. 31, 105,840,000 kilowatt-hours gross:

Cost	$809,732.98
Deduct amount reimbursable for cafeteria electricity	3,488.54
Net as shown on statement (g)	888,244.44

(c) The number of employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of the building and heating and refrigeration plant is as shown on the organization charts attached.

(d) Two hundred and forty-nine thousand six hundred electric light bulbs are used during the period of 1 year at an approximate cost of $87,360 (average cost of lamp $0.35).

(e) The Public Building Administration does not employ guides in the building.

(f) The maintenance cost of lawns, drives, parkways, etc. adjacent to the building is estimated at $75,000 a year for the 220-acre area. The sum of $54,610 was expended for this work during the calendar year 1943.

(g) Detailed statement of operating cost for 1943 and for December 1943:

	Amount	December
Cleaning	$1,170,946.80	$99,198.45
Protection	647,073.46	48,682.31
Elevator operators' salaries	18,459.94	1,470.10
Maintenance and operation, heating, ventilating, air-conditioning, and refrigeration systems	337,260.92	33,050.77
Maintenance and operation—electrical system (includes lamps)	189,918.11	14,876.32
Maintenance of elevators	11,289.92	788.21
Maintenance of plumbing system	49,160.49	5,410.87
Maintenance and repair—other (including lawns, roads, etc.)	117,899.07	11,211.71
Painting and decorating	20,320.69	2,210.75
Alterations	85,589.67	180.33
Partitions	84,085.33	6,633.20
General expense (overhead from district office, superintendent's office, but not labor or mechanical supervisors)	83,155.71	8,635.85
Electric current	888,244.44	63,905.35
Coal	169,356.72	32,441.22
Gas	475.59	21.407
Total	3,823,236.86	328,716.51

EXHIBIT B

Space occupied by and revenue derived from Pentagon restaurant concessions

Description	Space occupied, square feet	Paid to restaurant council during period indicated	Period	Estimated annual payments [1]
Retail merchandising:				
Walgreen Pentagon Drug Store	6,429	$76,131.09	May 22, 1943, to Dec. 31, 1943	$124,657
Palais Royal Department Store and Shopping Center.	3,250	11,945.22	Dec. 4, 1943, to Dec. 31, 1943	159,263
Brentano's Book Store and rental library.	1,230	7,935.77	Oct. 18, 1943, to Dec. 31, 1943	39,142
H. Aronson newsstand (5–6 percent)[2]	200	1,876.16	June 7, 1943, to Dec. 31, 1943	3,881
Service facilities:				
Hagerty concessions [3]	1,892	4,954.86	May 1, 1943, to Dec. 31, 1943	7,433
Shoe shine stand (15 percent) (322)				
Shoe repair shop (10 percent) (180)				
Parcels checkroom (10 percent) (300)				
Laundry and dry cleaning agency (10 percent) (1090).				
Total	13,001	102,843.10		334,358

[1] Based on operations in 1943 projected on an annual basis.

[2] The newsstand pays 5 percent of gross receipts up to $5,000 per month and 6 percent on receipts in excess of that amount.

[3] Percentages represent percent of sales paid to the restaurant council.

NOTE: In addition, the War Department Exchange, with main store at No. 2127 C Street NW., operates a branch exchange on the Pentagon concourse in space originally designed for that purpose aggregating 2,414 square feet, to which has been added 1,676 square feet of rough space in adjoining areas occupied by mechanical equipment which it was found impossible to utilize for a cleaning and pressing shop. In addition to the usual sales store, there is a barber shop and tailor shop with cleaning and pressing facilities. This is a typical post exchange operation, with sales restricted to uniformed personnel.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

TODAY ON TOMORROW WILL BE YESTERDAY

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been listening to testimony by high-ranking officials of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, by which I have been more than ever convinced that we are taking too much for granted, and that there is too much loose talk about post-war planning, at a time when we really have not commenced to fight.

Too many think the war is won.

On the contrary, the consensus of opinion of the military and naval men seems to me to be that the earliest possible date when we have any right to expect the shooting war may end will not be earlier than 2 years after the unconditional surrender of Germany—if, and when that may happen. Do you know when that may be?

I am satified that this is not to be a short war. So as I see it everything that is said or done to give the American people an idea to the contrary is harmful, tends to postpone victory, prolongs the war, loses us money, sacrifices precious lives of more American boys, none of whom we can spare on the altar of ignorance, loose talk, and complacency. That must be stopped now.

The people should be disabused of the notion that the war is won, or that it will soon be over. Why do they think the Navy needs a $29,000,000,000 appropriation, and the Army is asking for a $52,000,000,000 appropriation at this time, if the war is almost over? That does not make sense.

Of course, there should be consideration of how to effectuate a lasting peace after the war is won, but with due deference to all concerned, the "cradle to the grave" program of the National Resources Planning Board and the last report called Baruch are all too comprehensive; too prematurely promulgated; too good to be true as blueprint plans for a post-war program before anybody can know what is going to happen anyway, with ultimate victory so far away and so many contingencies to be considered. You cannot draw a blueprint on the basis of thin air and wishful thinking.

The truth is we are spending too much time living in the future, forgetting the past, ignoring the present.

POST-WAR PLANNING

Instead of listening to and being diverted by, and distracted and swerved from our objective to win the war at the earliest possible date, the hundreds of other premature propositions submitted by every "crackpot," misguided, squirrel-caged but well-intentioned theorist, whose post-war plan seems to them to settle everything for all time—if not to eternity—we should live in the practical present, save ourselves and posterity, concentrate to win the war now. I submit that this is the first essential to any worth-while post-war planning.

We should not be misled into complacency. We should back every effort to shorten the war. We should support our fighting men, both abroad and at home, while we do our duty of today at home. That obligation is paramount, our duty imperative and urgent. It is compelling and continuous.

Moreover, it is pretty well established that at least some of the propaganda involving post-war planning is political. Some of it deliberately is planned and planted and spread by enemies of ours, who thereby undertake to divert our attention from our giving all we have toward winning the war. We should be too smart and too American to let that happen here. We must not. We will not.

SCANDALS

Mr. Speaker, attempted sales of so-called surplus property at this time way below cost when the Government is asking for bids on the making of the same type and class of property, furnish food for thought and are the basis of awful post-war scandals—all across the country. Who knows we have surplus properties and why, as against a long war—and why the tremendous surpluses; and why the sale at so great a loss? It is a bad mess already. Half never will be told. It reacts on the public morale. The public thinks the war is over. The black market is out in force. The wolves are collecting. The public is aroused—why not? Anything which makes it appear that the war is over is destructive. The whole situation with respect to so-called salvage surpluses stinks to high heaven already, destroys confidence, devastates and overbalances all efforts to sell bonds to win the war.

The taxpayer is again the forgotten man and he is no fool. We should tolerate no such frauds as are being attempted and have been perpetrated.

Read your newspapers. Listen to your radios if you wish to know what is being done to the taxpayer, to the bond buyer, to the people at home, and to those who are fighting for us.

It is indefensible. The bigger it gets, the worse it will be, bad as it is now.

And another thing, Mr. Speaker, and this, though incidental, is important; wherever the responsibility may rest, it cannot be denied that those responsible for war publicity released to press and radio have painted so favorable and such a pretty picture of our ability and achievement that the people have been misled to believe we have won the war already. That is not so.

Finally, for this time, Mr. Speaker, those responsible for the abrupt breaking of training contracts with the colleges have done the country a very great disservice, again practically wrecking the morale of the students as well as the colleges themselves, as in World War No. 1 days, by ignoring the inviolability of a contract. This program so promulgated has also induced the people to believe, and this is the worst part of the picture, that the war is almost over, for, say they, the people, such action would not have been taken were that not so. It does not necessarily follow that is true, for it is not.

In my opinion the program referred to, both as conceived, executed, and operated was most ill-considered, not justified, and it is the opinion of the public, and mine, that it was almost reprehensible, as evidenced by public reactions too many to be here enumerated.

PRESENT WAR WINNING

We should all realize that, according to Prime Minister Churchill, never in the history of mankind have so many owed so much to so few.

On the other hand, we should also appreciate the truth, according to Commander Lerews of the fighting forces in a desperate military situation, calling for help, who said, "Never have so few received so little from so many."

Anyway, our No. 1 job is to step out, and lively at that, to win this war before it is everlastingly too late.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. JONKMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. MILLER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; and

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia government and the White House police force."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 7, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 7, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the public-health subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 7, 1944.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 3379, a bill to codify the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 8, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2687, a bill relating to excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 9, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 4099, entitled "A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913," which was introduced by the chairman, Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1265. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting drafts of two proposed bills with regard to habeas corpus procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1266. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture transmitting copies of the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for each of the departments reporting for the quarter ending March 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 4163. A bill to amend section 2 of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Virtudes Torres Steere; with amendment (Rept. No. 1233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 3434. A bill for the relief of Joseph Mrak; with amendment (Rept. No. 1234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1235). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4334. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4335. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 4336. A bill to amend the Customs Administrative Act of 1938; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4337. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARLSON of Kansas:

H. R. 4338. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4339. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4340. A bil to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 4341. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 4342. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 4343. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to assist local police authorities in apprehending perpetrators of acts of violence for political reasons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 462. Resolution directing the House Committee on the Judiciary to inquire into the facts concerning the treaty entered into between the United States and the Republic of Mexico with regard to the disposition of certain waters of the Colorado River; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. Res. 463. Resolution to designate the week of March 14, 1944, as Amphibious Forces Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of Puerto Rico, with reference to the tax on rum; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Deputies of Iraq, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to pass the resolution relative to the opening of the doors of Palestine to unrestricted Jewish Immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 4344. A bill granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Carroll and others; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 4345. A bill for the relief of Luther Marcus Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5192. By Mr. BURDICK: Petition signed by 522 residents of North Dakota in Beach, Carson, Dickinson, Glen Ullin, Lefor, Leith, Mandan, Mott, New England, Rhame, Richardton, South Heart, Taylor, and surrounding areas against House bill 2082, the Bryson bill—so-called prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5193. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition signed by 53 employees in Sioux City, Iowa, of the meat inspection division, formerly under the Bureau of Animal Industry, but at present under the Food Distribution Administration, urging support of reclassification of Bureau of Animal Industry and Food and Drug Administration inspectors and veterinarians; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5194. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Maj. W. F. Long, president, Dallas Aviation School and Air College, Dallas, Tex., opposing House bill 3491; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5195. By Mr. MERROW: Petition signed by seven ministers of the Portsmouth (N. H.) Ministers Association, pleading that the United States intercede and help avert a cruel and indefensible blow which now threatens the Jewish people in their own national home, Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5196. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, approving the President's veto of the tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5197. By Mr. SHAFER: Petition of Philip Payne, of Eaton Rapids, Mich., and 17 other citizens of that State, requesting enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5198. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Ella E. Jones and 28 other citizens of South China, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082 for greater efficiency and less absenteeism and the better protection of men in camps from the effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5199. By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia: Petition of 80 residents of the Sixth Congressional District of West Virginia, urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose ways are mercy and truth, in the morning let our prayer come before Thee. Dispel our darkness,

for in the brightness of Thy countenance is eternal day that knows no night. Thou who dost search and cleanse the hearts of men, grant unto us, during these holy weeks over which is the shadow and splendor of the cross, to know ourselves as we truly are and to amend the ways that thwart Thy will for us. Give us to pass this day in gladness and peace without stumbling and without stain. May the stature of our spirits heightened by vision and courage rise to meet the trying tasks of this epic day. Keep our faith steady lest from any wavering on our part we lose what Thou dost intend for Thy children in this prophetic time. When we are separated from those we love Thou art the presence that unites us in bonds that no distance can sever nor even death can break. Grant us, above all, grace and endurance to follow without fear wherever light may lead—giving ourselves in glad dedication, if needs be even unto death.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 3, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 3, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; and

S. 1633. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1943, so as to provide for the full participation of institutions of the United States in the program for the training of nurses, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 7, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1000. An act to reserve certain public-domain lands in the State of Arizona for addition to the Havasupai Indian Reservation, and for other purposes;

S. 1386. An act making it a misdemeanor to stow away on aircraft and providing punishment therefor; and

S. 1633. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1943, so as to provide for the full participation of institutions of the United States in the program for the training of nurses, and for other purposes.

SERVICES IN MEMORY OF THE LATE SENATOR McNARY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Members of the Senate that as soon as there has been opportunity to confer with the majority leader an appropriate time will be set apart for the Members of the Senate to pay their tributes to the memory of the late Senator McNARY.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HENRY N. GRAVEN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT, IOWA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on the 15th day of March, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room upon the nomination of Henry N. Graven, of Iowa, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Iowa. At that time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make representations.

ELEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S FIRST INAUGURATION

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in the category of outstanding events for the American people the serving of one man as President of the United States for 11 years is the most unusual administrative incident. Saturday, March 4, 1944, marked the eleventh year of the service of Franklin Delano Roosevelt as President of the United States. Those 11 years have brought about, in my opinion, the greatest progress in the history of the American people.

In this time there has been a transition from "a tragic era," borrowing the title from one of the books of the distinguished Ambassador to Chile, Mr. Claude Bowers, to that of a glorious decade. Our President on taking over the helm March 4, 1933, found the country at its lowest ebb economically after 12 years of Republican rule. Immediate and drastic measures were necessary for stabilization, and the President courageously put into enforcement stringent laws that effectively brought order out of chaos and prosperity and contentment to our country.

From the desperation of eviction from homes and standing in bread lines, the people have been made, by their own ingenuity, home owners, happy, and well fed. The impoverished farmer has become the prosperous farmer. Instead of bankrupt banks we have banks of bounty. From a state of unemployment we have come to the day of full-time work at prosperous wages. Economically speaking, from turmoil we have come to tranquillity.

But for the unspeakable act of treachery by Japan which forced us to war, in all probability we would have been enjoying the greatest period of prosperity and peace this country has ever known.

While the happiness of our people is disturbed by the war and the lives of our loved ones endangered, politically we have been given one of the greatest periods of administration in the history of administrative government. The service of the President is unprecedented and unparalleled—unprecedented in that no man has ever previously enjoyed such extended confidence on the part of the people, and unparalleled in the achievements attained in and for the Nation's interests.

Mr. President, I cannot let the day pass without reminding the American people how fortunate they have been under the administration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I am happy also to note by the American press that the President has stood well these strenuous years, and that his physical condition is excellent for a man of his years and considering the demands upon his time and energy. To indicate that the President feels that he has been fortunate through the years and that he leans upon divine guidance for his inspiration, I offer not only an article about his physical health but a news article relating to his spiritual activities on the eleventh anniversary of the beginning of his administration. The writer of the Herald Tribune story joins some of the disillusioned leaders of the Republican Party and indulges wishful thinking when the claim is made that a good chance is seen for the Republicans to return to power.

I offer these articles for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star of March 4, 1944]

ROOSEVELT, FEELING FIT AT 62, BEGINS TWELFTH YEAR IN OFFICE

Franklin D. Roosevelt attained another anniversary in the Presidency today, feeling fit at 62 after 11 action-studded years encompassing domestic and international upheavals. He begins his twelfth year in the White House facing grave problems.

His personal physician, Vice Admiral Ross T McIntyre, described him as in good shape physically, considering his long tenure in office and his recent attack of influenza. The President showed up relaxed and freshly attired in a gray spring suit yesterday for his news conference.

Last night he and Mrs. Roosevelt were hosts at a Cabinet dinner, an annual affair, to commemorate his first inauguration on March 4, 1933. His record-breaking third term has less than a year to run, ending January 20 under the constitutional amendment eliminating the "lame duck" short session of Congress and setting up the inaugural date.

Whether Mr. Roosevelt will stand for a fourth-term nomination is a question which most party spokesmen say will surely be answered in the affirmative at convention time.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 5, 1944]

TWELFTH YEAR OPENS FOR ROOSEVELT IN WHITE HOUSE—PRESIDENT AND HIS AIDES PRAY FOR PEACE AT SERVICE TO MARK 1933 INAUGURATION

WASHINGTON, March 4.—President Roosevelt, his family, and friends, prayed for peace at religious services in the White House today, commemorating the eleventh anniversary of his inauguration.

Rain, which has deluged inauguration crowds nearly every 4 years, pattered on the windows of the East Room as the gathering joined in a plea for heavenly guidance for

"Thy servant, Franklin" * * * and to "save us from all false choices."

This was the setting as the tradition-breaking third-term President embarked on his twelfth year in office, a year that bids to be one of the gravest ever confronting an American leader.

It is a year which some of the more optimistic see the fall of the Nazis, gateway to the final blow at enemy Japan. It is a year when many politicians see Mr. Roosevelt willing to strive for yet a fourth term, for his more recent messages deal more and more with post-war problems. It is a year when many Republicans believe they see a good chance to return to power.

Some of Mr. Roosevelt's closest associates in office joined with him in the Episcopal service, which has been an annual rite on this fourth day of March since 1933.

The President sat in a front-row chair near Mrs. Roosevelt, Mrs. John Boettiger, a daughter, and her son, John; Frederic A. Delano, an uncle, and Miss Margaret Suckley, a cousin.

Also attending were Crown Princess Martha and Crown Prince Olav, of Norway; Vice President Henry A. Wallace and Mrs. Wallace, Cabinet members, Supreme Court Justices, heads of the armed forces, and other Government officials.

Conducting the services were the Reverend Endicott Peabody, former headmaster of Groton School in Massachusetts, where the President was a pupil; the Reverend Howard S. Wilkinson, rector of the family church of St. Thomas in Washington; the Reverend John G. Magee and the Reverend Howard A. Johnson, both of St. John's Church, Washington.

The lesson was from St. Matthew vii: 21, "Not everyone that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in Heaven." The choir of St. John's sang "Get not far from us, O God; cast us not away in time of stress."

This is the second year the service was held at the White House.

POST-WAR AVIATION POLICY

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, for several weeks, or even months, last past, the subcommittee on aviation of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate has been conducting hearings, which up to this time have been in executive session, with a view to formulating a policy for post-war aviation. The subcommittee has now arrived at a point where it has been able to formulate the questions which are to be determined, and will in a very short time start public hearings upon those questions.

There have been so many inquiries from the public and the press as to the scope of the prospective inquiry that I believe it would be helpful to print in the RECORD the agenda, so to speak, prepared by the subcommittee, and I ask unanimous consent that this outline of the questions to be considered be included in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the outline was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUTLINE OF SOME QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE AVIATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE IN FORMULATING AN AMERICAN AVIATION POLICY FOR THE POST-WAR PERIOD IN THE INTERNATIONAL FIELD

The issue at this time is to determine what steps are best calculated to permit the United States to retain the leadership in international air transportation which it had attained before the war and to which its resources entitle it and to extend American activity in this field as one of the most important influences in the preservation of peace.

The issue may be divided into two parts:

I. The international phase.

II. The national phase.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The committee's survey should include:

1. The legal basis for international air transportation—the principle of sovereignty of the air, embodied in the Paris Convention of 1919, enacted by the United States in the Air Commerce Act of 1926, embodied in the Havana Aviation Convention of 1928, and reaffirmed by the United States in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

2. The development in the United States of our domestic air transportation (including air transportation to Canada).

3. The nature and extent of the development of the international air transportation of the United States under the Foreign Air Mail Acts of 1928 and 1929 and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938—the routes and countries served; the method whereby operating rights have been secured; the development of foreign airline companies associated as feeder services; the financial position and resources of the existing American flag carriers—Pan American Airways, Pan American-Grace Air Ways and American Export Airlines.

4. The organization of international air transportation before the war in Great Britain, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Russia, Italy, Japan, and other nations.

5. The form which the organization of international air transportation will take in the other great trading nations after the war.

I. THE INTERNATIONAL PHASE

Should the United States abandon the principle of sovereignty of the air and the method of securing operating rights in foreign countries under which our international air transportation has been conducted up to this time, in favor of attempting to secure international agreement on some general formula such as "freedom of the air" or "freedom of innocent passage" or a practice of obtaining all operating rights by governmental agreement?

A. Evaluation of the present system whereby operating rights have been secured generally in the form of unilateral franchises issued to the United States air line by the foreign country and, in exceptional cases (such as the trans-Atlantic service) through bilateral franchises issued by each of the respective governments to the air line of the other.

1. Complete control of extent of foreign flag flying to the United States—important both for traffic and for national defense considerations and prevention of dilution of traffic on American trade routes, such as existed in the case of our ocean shipping.

2. Consideration of suggestion that this system is outmoded and cannot be practiced in future because all countries will demand equal rights.

B. Evaluation of the suggestion that the United States should completely abandon the existing system in favor of a proposed international agreement for "freedom of the air."

1. Meaning of "freedom of the air"—any air line of any nation has the right to engage in business anywhere in the world, except possibly as to the carriage of traffic originating in and destined to a point within the same foreign country (cabotage).

2. What countries have favored "freedom of the air" in the past, and why.

3. "Freedom of the air" from the standpoint of the United States.

(a) Questions of national security.

(b) Questions of competition with cheap-labor countries.

(c) The possibilities of "freedom of the air" as enabling the defeated Axis nations to reestablish themselves in aviation through companies formed under the laws of European neutrals or Latin-American republics or Asiatic satellite powers.

(d) The effect of "freedom of the air" on subsidy cost to the United States.

(e) The likelihood that "freedom of the air" would lead to subsidy wars and international friction.

(f) The inconsistency between "freedom of the air" for foreign-flag carriers and a requirement of certificates of convenience and necessity for American flag international operations.

C. Evaluation of the suggestion of abandoning the existing system of obtaining operating franchises wherever possible by application by the American flag air line to the foreign government, in favor of a practice whereby all operating rights are secured by our Government through executive agreements.

1. Practical effect of this suggestion—when a foreign government is approached by our Government rather than by an American flag air line, it must demand reciprocity as a matter of national principle and prestige.

2. Consideration of the effect of reciprocity in diluting American flag traffic, particularly on routes traversing a number of foreign countries.

3. Consideration of the effect of reciprocal agreements on the development of pseudo-foreign air lines—air lines organized under the laws of various countries but actually financed and controlled by Axis or other European capital, or by United States capital desiring to be free of United States economic and safety regulations and wage standards.

4. Questions of competition with cheap-labor countries, of subsidy cost and of the possibility of subsidy wars, similar to those listed above under "freedom of the air."

5. Analysis of claim that this method of securing operating rights would have to be adopted if the United States should determine to have competition between American flag lines on foreign trade routes—what interests favor this method and why.

D. Evaluation of the suggestion that the United States should seek an international agreement for "freedom of innocent passage."

1. Meaning of "freedom of innocent passage"—the right of any foreign air line to fly over any foreign country and to land for purposes of refueling or repairs or emergencies but not for purposes of loading or unloading traffic.

2. The comparative unimportance to the United States of "freedom of innocent passage" as compared with the right to load and unload traffic.

3. What nations favor "freedom of innocent passage," and why.

4. The probability of later obtaining world-wide adherence to "freedom of innocent passage" by other great nations—an analysis of the interests of various foreign countries.

5. The risk that "freedom of innocent passage" would lead to "freedom of the air."

II. THE NATIONAL PHASE

Through what agency or agencies should the United States seek to maintain its position in international air transportation?

A. General considerations affecting the desirability of competition in international air transportation.

1. The danger that one American company will be played off against another by foreign governments and/or their national air lines—the analogy of the problem encountered in the communications field.

2. The need of concentration of the American effort as against foreign competition—congressional recognition of this need in the case of foreign trade in the Webb Act.

3. The extent to which foreign competition will supply any necessary incentive to progress.

4. National defense considerations.

5. Subsidy considerations—the wisdom of subsidizing two American companies to compete against each other.

B. Special considerations as to competition by the two groups now desiring to engage in international air transportation.

1. The domestic air lines.

(a) The historic separation between domestic operations (including service to Canada) and operations to overseas possessions and other foreign countries.

(b) Evaluation of the advantages of "one company service" from interior points to points abroad as compared with service from gateways via all domestic carriers.

(c) Competitive advantages which a domestic air line reaching sources of traffic in the interior would have over the existing American-flag international air lines which do not proceed beyond the gateways.

(d) Difficulties in determining how 16 or more domestic air lines are to be permitted to expand internationally.

(1) The three transcontinental lines and transocean services to the principal foreign-trade areas.

(2) The problem of the big domestic lines versus the little lines.

(e) The fact that a domestic air line which had not been permitted to extend to a certain area abroad would necessarily establish preferred traffic connections with a foreign-flag air line as against a competitive domestic air line which had been permitted to extend to the same foreign area.

2. The steamship companies.

(a) Historic policy of Congress against one method of transportation participating in another—the Panama Canal Act of 1912, the Motor Carrier Act of 1935, the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

(b) The problem of numbers—five American-flag steamship companies in the Caribbean and Latin-American area, etc.

(c) Consideration of the claim that American steamship companies must be allowed to engage in air transportation because foreign steamship companies are or will be allowed to do this.

(d) Consideration of the claim that steamship companies will lose much of their passenger business to the air and that these losses can be offset by permitting them to own and operate air lines.

C. Evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of the establishment of a system of two or three regional monopolies.

1. To what extent does this avoid the objections raised to a single American-flag international air line?

2. To what extent is there validity in the argument that such regional monopolies would provide "yardsticks" for testing economy and efficiency of operation?

3. To what extent would such a scheme of organization fail to have the advantages of a single American-flag national air line?

(a) Difficulties in delineating zones.

(b) Complications as to the transfer of equipment and personnel in connection with seasonal traffic fluctuations.

(c) Difficulties in dealing with foreign national monopolies and resulting complications at home.

(d) National defense considerations.

D. Evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of a single American-flag international air line or community company.

1. The historical precedent of all other trading nations.

2. National defense considerations.

3. Risk of lack of technical initiative.

4. Comparative resources for research.

5. Advantages and disadvantages in dealing with foreign governments—permitting continuation of the franchise system.

6. Advantages and disadvantages in dealing with foreign-flag air lines—consideration of greater or less risk of being forced into international cartels.

7. Advantages and disadvantages in respect of reserve aircraft and in the transfer of personnel and equipment on account of seasonal traffic fluctuations and to meet national emergencies.

8. Advantages and disadvantages in enabling our Government to place its resources and influence squarely behind the one American-flag company.

9. Advantages and disadvantages in the coordination of air transport and national policy from time to time.

10. The problem of bigness—comparison of the probable size of a single American-flag international air line with companies such as the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., most of the class I railroads and other public utilities, and many large industrials.

E. If the national interest requires a single national company, how should it be owned and regulated?

1. Evaluation of advantages and disadvantages of Government ownership both at home and abroad.

2. If the company is to be privately owned, what interests should be admitted to ownership in it? Assuming that the present stockholders in the air lines now engaged in international air transportation would receive common stock in the new company in proportion to the value of their present holdings, to what extent would it be desirable to provide for special series of stock, entitled to representation on the board of directors as such but not amounting to control, which would be made available for subscription to the whole American transportation industry, including the domestic air lines, the railroads, and/or the steamship companies.

3. If the company is to be privately owned, what other methods of governmental regulation, if any, should be adopted in addition to regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board (whose orders with respect to granting or denying certificates for new routes are subject to approval by the President)? Should there be Government directors or advisors? Should there be a policy board to advise the Civil Aeronautics Board on international relations and defense questions? What specific amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act would be required to implement such a policy and provide more effective regulation in the national interest.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 31 OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1146) to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, which were, on page 2, line 5, after the word "has", to insert the article "a"; and on the same page, line 5, after the word "or", to insert the article "an."

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

Mr. WHITE. Before any action is taken may we not have an explanation?

Mr. WAGNER. It is a very simple bill. The article "a" was left out in one place and the article "an" in another place; no changes were made in the substance of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Senator's argument is convincing.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES (S. DOC. NO. 160)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the president of the National Academy of Sciences, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of that Academy for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed in accordance with law.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A memorial of sundry citizens of Cranford and vicinity, in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation relating to governmental aid in medical care; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the National Convention of Americans of Lithuanian Descent at New York City, N. Y., favoring full restoration of the independence of the Republic of Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present petitions of citizens of Cheswold and Harrington, Del., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States. I request that the petitions be referred to the appropriate committee and that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures, as follows:

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned citizens of the State of Delaware do respectfully petition you to defend the United States of America by defending the health and morale of the youth called out by your action under the Selective Service Act, from what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money," the trade in alcoholic beverages including beer; and from the danger of venereal disease incident to prostitution, by passing S. 860.

PROTEST ON THE ISSUANCE OF MILITARY DECORATIONS AND CITATIONS TO ANIMALS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a resolution adopted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars located at Miami, Okla. The resolution protests the practice of issuing citations to dogs. I think it is very important, and I ask that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD and that thereafter the resolution be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Government of the United States has, by proper law and regulation, adopted and set forth certain military decorations, including the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, and the Purple Heart, and other decorations to be awarded to men

and women of our armed forces who have performed acts of heroism beyond the call of duty, and these decorations for bravery are the highest tribute our Government can bestow upon the men and women of our armed forces in combat areas; and

Whereas during World War No. 2 several dogs attached to our armed forces have been awarded decorations, medals, and citations for bravery and acts of heroism in line of duty. In some instances citations only have been issued, and in other instances both citations and medals have been awarded to dogs attached to our armed forces; and

Whereas many of our decorated veterans of previous wars and men and women of our armed forces in the present war have lost their esteem for decorations because animals are receiving the same kind and character of decorations; and

Whereas it is the intent of our Government originally to bestow the military decorations only upon the men and women in our armed forces; and

Whereas we do not object to the awarding of citations and decorations to animals but it is our opinion that said citations and decorations awarded said animals should be a type and design suitable to animals only: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Miami Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States of America, That it protests the issuance of our present military decorations and citations to animals and requests our War Department to stop this practice, and we further request the War Department to create medals and citations for animals only for their acts of bravery and heroism in line of duty.

Dated at Miami, Okla., this 21st day of February 1944.

RAYMOND E. ALEXANDER,
A. N. CHRISTIANSON,
LON GRISSOM,
AL J. COOK,
Resolutions Committee.

FILED DURING RECESS—THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM (PT. 16 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Under authority of the order of the 3d instant,

Mr. TRUMAN, on March 4, 1944, from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, submitted an additional report (pursuant to S. Res. 71, 77th Cong., and S. Res. 6, 78th Cong.), being the third annual report of that special committee.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 1755. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'DANIEL:

S. 1756. A bill for the relief of William Luther Thaxton, Jr., and William Luther Thaxton, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 1757. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 1758. A bill to amend section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1759. A bill to amend the Expediting Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. REYNOLDS) introduced S. 1760, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1761. A bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; to the Committee on Immigration.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. KILGORE and Mr. TRUMAN) introduced S. J. Res. 120, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

ADJUSTED SERVICE PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill dealing with adjusted military pay, and to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement by various organizations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1760) to provide adjusted service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. REYNOLDS) was read twice by its title.

The statement by several organizations presented by Mr. REYNOLDS is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1944.*

To Whom It May Concern:

The undersigned, duly authorized representatives of five national veteran organizations wholeheartedly endorse and request early Congressional consideration and favorable action on an adjusted service pay bill—for services rendered—which will provide adjusted service pay credits of $3 per day for home service and $4 per day for foreign service, with a maximum of $3,500 for home service and a maximum of $4,500 where foreign service was had; plus an extra credit of $500 if wounded by an instrumentality of war in the hands of an enemy, to all who serve honorably in the present war. Payments to be made in bonds, with coupons, issued by the Treasury Department upon certification from the War or Navy Departments.

THE ARMY AND NAVY UNION,
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
WARREN E. MILLER, *National Commander.*
REGULAR VETERANS ASSOCIATION,
W. M. FLOYD, *National Commander.*
DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
MILLARD W. RICE,
National Service Director.
MILITARY ORDER OF THE PURPLE HEART,
FRANK HALEY,
National Legislative Representative.
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
OMAR B. KETCHUM,
National Legislative Representative.

Uniting on a measure designed to provide a tangible, earned reward for all who serve honorably in the present war, 5 national veterans' organizations, having a membership of approximately 600,000, today joined forces in asking the Congress to enact an adjusted-service-pay act of 1944. The 5 organizations concerned are the Army and Navy Union, U. S. A., Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Regular Veterans Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The bill would provide a credit of $3 per day for home service and $4 per day for overseas service, with an extra credit of $500 for those wounded by an instrumentality of war in the hands of an enemy. A maximum of $3,500 for home service only, and $4,500 where overseas service was had, would be established except where the $500 credit for wounds applies, in which case the maximum allowable would be $5,000.

Upon application to the War or Navy Departments by the veteran at the time of, or after discharge, the respective Departments would certify to the Treasury Department the amount due in each case and the Treasury would issue bonds in the highest multiple of $50, according to amount due, with five serial coupons attached to each bond. Where the amount due any applicant is less than $300, it would be paid with check by the Department honoring the application.

The bonds would bear simple interest at 3 percent for the first 5 years and compound interest at 3 percent for a second 5 years, after which interest would cease. They would be nonnegotiable, tax free, and not subject to liens. The bondholders could withdraw one-fifth of the face value of the bond each year during the first 5-year period by cashing coupons, or could retain all or part to draw prescribed interest for the full 10-year period.

The purpose of the bill is to adjust, in a measure, the difference between the pay of those serving in the armed forces and civilians employed in war industry. Spokesmen for the five groups pointed out that the estimated average yearly pay of all members of the armed forces, including the value of food, shelter, clothing, and medical care, is less than $2,300, and the addition of the adjusted credits in the bill would not be out of line when compared to earnings and freedom of war workers.

It was further pointed out the reward is measured in proportion to length and type of service and could be distributed with a minimum cost of administration and the resulting savings could be applied in paying the veterans, rather than in salaries to increased Government personnel. The reward would be paid to those who earn it, or their estate, and could be used without bureaucratic supervision or interference with State rights.

A reasonable safeguard is set up against hasty and unwise use by limiting withdrawals to one-fifth of total reward each year for 5 years. The rate of interest provides an incentive to save.

Proponents of the bill explain that it rewards all honorable service from the lowest to highest rank and does not discriminate against disabled veterans who may be in receipt of other benefits by reason of handicaps incurred in service.

In answer to the question whether it would not be better to defer adjusted service pay until the close of the war, spokesmen pointed out that over a million persons had already been discharged, that others are being discharged at the rate of 30,000 per month, and it is possible that as many as 3,000,000 would be discharged long before hostilities cease.

BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE-PAY BILL—FOR SERVICES RENDERED

A credit of $3 per day for home service and $4 per day for foreign service, with an extra

credit of $500 where wounded by an instrumentality of war in the hands of an enemy, would be allowed all who serve honorably in the armed forces of the present war.

A minimum credit of $100 for any home service, and of $500 where any foreign service was had, with a maximum credit of $3,500 for home service only, and $4,500 where foreign service was had; and where the extra credit of $500 for wound applies, a maximum allowable of $5,000.

Upon application by the veteran to the War or Navy Department, the respective Secretaries would certify to the Treasury Department the amount due, and the Secretary of the Treasury would issue bonds in the highest multiple of $50, according to amount due. Where the total amount due any veteran is less than $300, payment with check would be made by the Department honoring the application.

The bonds will bear simple interest at 3 percent for the first 5 years and compound interest at 3 percent for a second 5 years, after which interest would cease. The bondholder would have the option to withdraw one-fifth of the face value of the bond each year during the first 5-year period by cashing the attached coupons, or could retain all or part of such coupons to draw the prescribed interest up to the full 10-year period.

The bonds would be nonnegotiable, tax free, and not subject to liens, and would be a property right, reverting to the veteran's next of kin or estate in case of death. Where the veterans' death occurs prior to application, the application may be made by his next of kin or his estate.

EIGHT REASONS IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL

1. This adjusted-service-pay method would provide a tangible, earned reward for all who serve honorably—from buck private or apprentice seaman to four-star general or admiral, inclusive.

2. The reward would be measured according to length and place of service, proportionate to the service rendered and the sacrifice made.

3. The reward belongs to those who earn it, or their estates, and would be usable without bureaucratic control, or interference with State rights.

4. Determination and distribution of the reward would require the very minimum of administration and creates no new agencies or supervisory boards.

5. A reasonable safeguard is provided against hasty and unwise spending, by permitting a withdrawal of only one-fifth of the total reward each year for a 5-year period.

6. An incentive to save is extended by applying 3 percent simple interest for first 5-year period and 3 percent compound interest for the second 5-year period.

7. The over-all cost to the Nation would be less than the cost of 4 months of actual war expenditures in 1944.

8. This earned-reward method would be the American way.

SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS CONCORNING THE ADJUSTED-SERVICE-PAY BILL—FOR SERVICES RENDERED

Question. What is the purpose of this bill?

Answer. To adjust, in a measure, the difference between the pay, including food, clothing, shelter, and medical care of those who serve in the armed forces of the present war and civilians who work in war industry.

Question. Aren't the adjusted credits of $3 and $4 per day allowed in this bill rather high?

Answer. No, not when you consider the pay of those in the armed forces compared to civilian war workers. The average yearly pay (365 days) of all persons in the armed forces, including the value of food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, is estimated at less than $2,300, or approximately $6 per day. Would the addition of the credits provided be unreasonable when compared to the earnings, comparative safety, and freedom of civilian war workers?

Question. Would a veteran who is eligible to receive pension, hospitalization, and vocational training because of service-connected disabilities, also be entitled to the adjusted-service pay?

Answer. Yes, certainly. The other benefits are granted because the veteran actually suffered disability or vocational handicap in line of duty, and they have no relation to pay adjustments.

Question. Why not wait until the close of the war to make pay adjustments?

Answer. Already over a million persons have been discharged, many with combat disabilities, and others being discharged at a present rate of 30,000 per month. It is entirely possible 3,000,000 persons may be discharged long before hostilities cease. Why should they wait for their pay adjustment? The knowledge this adjusted pay will be available should be a decided morale factor.

Sponsored by: Army and Navy Union, Disabled American Veterans, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Regular Veterans Association, and Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President a few moments ago, on behalf of myself and the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. REYNOLDS], I introduced a bill on the subject of adjusted compensation for members of the armed forces. At this time I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it is always extremely painful to me to disagree with the Senator from Colorado, who is one of my most intimate friends and whom I regard most highly, but I cannot permit this request to go unchallenged.

This bill deals with the subject of adjusted compensation. It has to do with a most far-reaching program, one calculated to cost the Government $30,000,000,000. Bills of this nature, from the very first one of them immediately after the last war, have been handled by the Committee on Finance of the Senate and by the Committee on Ways and Means of the House. There has never been any question of the jurisdiction of the committee; and, useful as the services of the Military Affairs Committee have been throughout this struggle, I must insist that, under the practice of the Senate, the bill should be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator will recall that the Military Affairs Committee handled the family dependents allotment bill, the mustering-out pay bill, and the adjusted military pay bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, there has never been any question as to the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee in those matters. The subject of pay of soldiers naturally falls within the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Why would not the subject of adjusted pay come under the jurisdiction of the same committee?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The subject of allotments to dependents of soldiers also falls within that committee's jurisdiction. The bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado has to do with what happens to a soldier after he gets out of the service. It has to do with his civilian capacity when he becomes a veteran. It seems to me there can be no question as to the jurisdiction of the two committees. Because I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Finance Committee which handles veterans' affairs, a great many persons write to me and talk to me about the matter of allotments. I have always been very much interested in such bills, and have been as active on the floor as I could possibly be in their consideration and passage. But it never occurred to me that bills having to do with compensation of men while in the military service should be handled by the committee dealing with veterans' legislation; nor does it occur to me that this subject should not be handled by the Finance Committee. It clearly falls within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. After all, while we call it compensation, it is generally known as a bonus, and has to do with gratuities which will be given to the soldier after he completes his military service. It is not mustering-out pay but is something over and above, to compensate him in his civilian status.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If I have the floor I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. My recollection is that we had a soldiers' bonus after the First World War. What committee handled the legislation providing for it?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was handled by the Committee on Finance throughout its entire history and in all its variations.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is my recollection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The legislation was handled by the Finance Committee in the Senate, and there was never any question about its jurisdiction, nor the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee in the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not want to get into a jurisdictional dispute with the Senator from Missouri, or with any other Senator. I am a member of the Finance Committee and I have confidence in that committee, and all the other committees of the Senate. I have great confidence in the Senator from Missouri, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Finance Committee handling veterans' legislation. However, inasmuch as the Military Affairs Committee handles pay problems, I naturally supposed that it would handle adjusted-pay problems.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It depends on whether the man is in the service or is a veteran. I do not think there is any dispute as to the jurisdiction of the committees. Allow me to say to the Senator from Colorado that I would have the greatest confidence in his handling of the matter. The only reason I raise the point is that I feel it is my duty, as chair-

man of the subcommittee of the Finance Committee, which handles such matters, to assert its jurisdiction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado wish to make a motion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not wish to make a motion and have it come to a vote. I do not wish to ask that the proposed legislation go through other than the regular channels. Perhaps I misunderstood the situation. I felt, as I have already stated, that, since the Military Affairs Committee handles legislation pertaining to the subject of pay, it might very well handle legislation pertaining to adjusted pay. The bill which I have introduced does not impose any duties upon the Veterans' Administration. The duties would be performed by the War and Navy Departments, and the Treasury would make the payments. In connection with previous legislation, the Army and Navy made recommendations, and the Veterans' Administration made the payments. I do not know whether that is an important point; but it seemed to me that, since the Military Affairs Committee had handled all the pay bills of the Army, the subject of adjusted pay would naturally be handled by it. I do not care to make a motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC COLLABORATION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in behalf of myself, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution and request that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In connection with the joint resolution I also ask that there be printed as a part of my remarks a joint statement concerning the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received, printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the statement referred to by the Senator from Utah will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 120) on international economic collaboration, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. TRUMAN), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Joint resolution on international economic collaboration

Resolved, etc., That:

1. Economic collaboration among the United Nations has demonstrated its effectiveness in mobilizing the resources of member nations for the prosecution of the war.

2. Continued economic collaboration among member nations, promoting the fullest and most effective use of their resources, is essential, not only to the winning of the war but equally to the establishment and maintenance of an enduring peace.

3. Such economic collaboration requires an increasing expansion of the trade of the United States with friendly nations and is a recognized need of American business, labor, and agriculture to the end of maintaining full production and employment.

4. The Congress advises that the President of the United States take the initiative in calling a meeting of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of considering the joint measures and the international organization by which the resources of member nations can be most effectively developed in friendly collaboration with one another.

5. A Foreign Economic Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) be established to provide the President and the Congress with information and recommendations respecting the opportunities for and means of continued participation of the United States in international economic collaboration. The Commission shall be composed of (a) a chairman, who will be designated by the President of the United States; (b) the following Members of the Senate: the President, majority leader, and minority leader of the Senate, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; (c) the following Members of the House of Representatives: the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader of the House, and the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House; (d) the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, and the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration; (e) and 12 public members to be appointed by the President, 3 of whom shall be appointed as representatives of agriculture, 3 as representatives of labor, 3 as representatives of industry, and 3 as representatives of the consuming public: *Provided*, That each of the members under (d) and (e) above may designate an alternate to sit and act for him on the Commission in his absence.

6. It shall be the duty of the Commission to make a full and complete study and investigation of the opportunities for and the means of foreign economic collaboration in relation to the maximum use of the economic resources of the United States, through expanded foreign trade, stabilization of monetary systems, removal of trade barriers, interchange of economic and technical data, joint development and use of facilities and resources, and through other means.

7. For the purpose of this resolution, the Commission is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress and ensuing Congresses; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony it deems advisable.

8. The Commission shall have power to employ and fix the compensations of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary for the performance of its duties. The heads of the executive agencies shall detail and/or engage personnel temporarily to assist the Commission upon the request of the chairman. The Commission may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as it may deem necessary. The Commission may utilize the services, information, and facilities of the departments and agencies of the Government.

9. The Commission shall, at intervals not exceeding 3 months, transmit to the President and to the Congress reports of the studies and investigations carried on by it, together with the findings and recommendations of the Commission.

10. The Commission shall, by a majority vote of its members, determine its rules of procedure, and the powers conferred upon the Commission by this joint resolution may be exercised by a majority vote.

11. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000. The Commission may make such expenditures as it deems advisable, within the limits herein authorized.

The joint statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, on behalf of himself, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. TRUMAN, is as follows:

As we prepare to strike the enemy with the decisive blows of the war we must also prepare the firm economic foundation for an enduring peace. These means are already at hand in the international economic collaboration developed during the prosecution of the war. On the continuance and expansion of such collaboration rests the hope of any lasting peace.

The United States cannot, nor does it wish to, shirk leadership in post-war economic collaboration. Our own industrial accomplishments have nominated us as the Nation that must assume a position to guide others in the pathway of peaceful production. And our own national needs and economic welfare dictate that we apply ourselves to this work at once.

To this end, we are introducing a resolution intended to foster and promote such international collaboration. The Congress, in the Connally and Fulbright resolutions, has taken a clear stand for international post-war cooperation among members of the United Nations. The present resolution advises that the executive branch of the Government begin immediately to explore with other nations the basic economic understanding upon which we must act to create a prosperous and progressive future for ourselves and for the world at large.

We have held at Hot Springs a great international meeting on food problems of the world. We have held at Atlantic City a great international meeting on problems of relief for those who have suffered from the blight of Axis occupation. The time has come to broaden the scope of such discussion among the United Nations to the post-war economic relations of all countries.

At the same time we are asking Congress to initiate a coordinable exploration of these problems by setting up a Foreign Economic Commission to study these vital questions. In advocating a joint legislative-executive-public commission, we seek to set up a clearing house for the many diverse opinions and thoughts which are now being formulated on foreign-economic policies. There is a rising clamor of voices, each seeking some end, many at cross purposes. It would be the major function of this Joint Commission to bring some order out of this welter of opinion. We seek a joint study by the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and we seek a mechanism whereby the legislative and executive branches, acting in unity, will bring into counsel with them representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, and the consuming public. If, as all of us hope, the end of the war is to usher in an era of cooperation and unity among nations, then we must establish unity among ourselves which will enable us to invite across our threshold other nations with a common will to preserve the peace so costly won.

Working through a single medium, and building in an atmosphere of hope, the representatives of business, of labor, and of the public, as well as the representatives of the Government can open up new horizons for the advancement of the economic progress of our own and other nations. The representatives of industry, labor, agriculture, and the consuming public will have an opportunity to be heard, and their potential contributions to the common goal can be assessed and recommended as a part of a national policy that is openly arrived at by both Congress and executive agencies.

The aggregate of facts and recommendations, called forth from the best minds in an effort to solve the most basic economic questions of our time, cannot fail to have great and abiding value to the President and to the Congress in working out our Nation's fundamental foreign-economic policy.

The future peace depends on the abandonment of political nationalism and economic imperialism and autarchy. Our policy before the war of making reciprocal trade agreements with individual countries was good policy, for us as a nation and for those countries with which we have made most-favored nation treaties. Only by expanding such a good-neighbor policy and by doing it quickly can we forestall the growth of areas of economic disaffection which eventually enlarge into world wars.

The future peace depends on an economically healthy United States, and we cannot have economic health without a volume of foreign trade above and beyond anything we have ever had before. A large volume of foreign trade will contribute to the peace by insuring full production and full employment at home. It will contribute to the general peace because it will insure a basis for friendly collaboration between nations all over the earth.

Our annual national output now equals $200,000,000,000, or twice that of 1940 when measured in dollars and cents, and more than 50 percent more in actual production, when the total is corrected for price changes. Taking the period from 1935 to 1939 as an average, at 100 percent, our industrial production stood at 110 percent in the so-called boom year of 1929. Today we are producing at the stupendous rate of 250 percent of the base period. Our production of durable goods is three times what it was in 1929 and four times what it was in 1939.

We have made all these gains in wartime with 10,000,000 of our best men and women in the armed forces. After their return from the conflict, and with the adjustments that will follow, we can increase our national output very materially if we embark upon a national program that will insure full employment and full production. Add to these new forces the production techniques developed during the war, and it is soberly within reason, 2 years after the war, to realize a national output of $250,000,000,000.

With this unparalleled productive apparatus, it becomes all the more incumbent upon this country, in our own interest and for the future of nations, to lead the world into a great era of productive peace. No other nation can match our preeminent responsibility, not Great Britain whose industrial output is only one-fifth that of ours, nor Russia with its reconstruction and growth before it.

We cannot help but be sobered when we realize, on the basis of present facts, that this country has within its grasp a leadership which will determine the happiness and prosperity not only of our own one-hundred-and-thirty-odd millions but of hundreds of millions of people in the years to come, that we can control a destiny which if unwisely used may bring depression and ruin, hunger, and death to great numbers of the world's people.

In the late 1920's our highest export business totaled only four to five billion dollars a year. This can be increased many fold.

Consider the case of China, which has laid out a program of planned development for the next 5, 10, and 25 years. China has no interior transportation network of roads, canals, railroads to compare with that of the United States. But, with the help of the great productive facilities of the United States, particularly of our airplane industry, China can vault across the stages of transportation which took America 100 years of invention, improvement, and development. China can leap literally from the oxcart stage to the airplane stage. Given a strong development of transportation, which is vitally needed in a nation with the vast geographic extent of China, that country can develop industrially at a faster pace, purchase more from us as she develops more, and thus in a very short time operate with the United States on a basis of reciprocal development and reciprocal economic relationships. The same is true for other countries.

This is one of the possible perspectives, and the purpose of the commission proposed by this resolution is to explore such new perspectives.

The author of Ecclesiastes said in his wisdom many years ago that 'the profit of the earth is for all." We have an opportunity now to implement this bit of ancient wisdom, making the earth and the fullness thereof a boon instead of a war-causing burden upon the back of mankind.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT—NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 8, line 25, after the word "repealed" and before the period, insert the following: *"Provided,* That the provision contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942 (55 Stat. 320), concerning the acquisition of mineral rights owned by the Osage Tribe in lands to be acquired for the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project is hereby amended by adding the following: *'Provided,* That if just compensation cannot be agreed upon the Secretary of War may institute proceedings to condemn said mineral rights pursuant to existing laws: *Provided further,* That the construction of the dam may be commenced at any time after the institution of such proceedings.'"

On page 8, line 25, after the word "repealed" and before the period, insert the following: *"Provided further,* That food is hereby declared to be a war necessity: *Provided further,* That whenever, during the period of the present war, the War Food Administrator determines that there exists or threatens to exist a shortage of agricultural commodities which are essential to the successful prosecution of the war, the War Food Administrator shall investigate any irrigation project or flood control or joint irrigation and flood-control project, which is under construction or the construction of which has been authorized, and for which funds have been appropriated, to ascertain if the completion of such project will increase the production of such agricultural commodities. If his investigation, in the light of the available manpower, material, and equipment, discloses that the project is feasible and the amount of increased production of agricultural commodities will warrant its completion, he shall make a finding to that effect and shall recommend, in the case of a project under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Reclamation, or, in the case of a project under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, to the Chief of Engineers, that such project be constructed or completed: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding the provisions of law or of any order or directive heretofore or hereafter issued under existing law, including, but without limitation by this enumeration, laws, Executive orders, directives, or regulations relating to maximum or minimum prices, rationing, allocations, priorities, preference ratings, or wages or affecting in any respect the obtaining of services, materials, or supplies upon receipt of a recommendation made by the War Food Administrator, as provided herein, the Commissioner of Reclamation, or the Chief of Engineers, as the case may be, shall proceed as provided by law with the completion or construction of such project: *Provided further,* That the question of the availability of manpower, materials, and equipment shall be determined as follows: The availability of manpower, materials, and equipment shall be determined by the Commissioner of Reclamation or the Chief of Engineers, as the case may be, and such questions shall be determined in the affirmative if a surplus of manpower and supplies are found to exist, or if the needed manpower may be secured and the supplies may be produced in quantities over and above the amounts requested, allocated, and contracted for by any other agent or agencies of the Government: *Provided further,* That the War Production Board, the Office of Price Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, and any other agencies now existing or which may be created hereafter and which have or shall have jurisdiction over services, materials, equipment, supplies, or facilities shall, on the request of the Commissioner of Reclamation or the Chief of Engineers, as the case may be, forthwith issue such orders, directives, preference ratings, or priorities as shall be adequate to enable said Commissioner of Reclamation or said Chief of Engineers to obtain, within the time when delivery thereof is required, services, materials, equipment, supplies, or facilities needed, in the judgment of the Commissioner of Reclamation or Chief of Engineers, for any project recommended by the War Food Administrator: *And provided further,* That all agencies, departments, and bureaus of the Government are authorized and directed to assist the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers in all matters with respect to the completion or construction of any such project, to the end that the maximum supply of agricultural commodities may be produced at the earliest practicable date."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR McNARY

Mr. WHITE (for Mr. HOLMAN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 265), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. CHARLES L. McNARY, late a Senator from the State of Oregon, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

WAR POWER VESTED EXCLUSIVELY IN CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AUSTIN

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, a radio address on the subject War Power Vested Execlusively in Congress, delivered by him March 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR'S CHALLENGE TO FORESTRY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR RUSSELL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an address entitled "War's Challenge to Forestry in the United States" delivered by Senator RUSSELL before a joint meeting of the Mississippi Legislature and the Mississippi Forestry and Chemurgic Association at Jackson, Miss., on February 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LT. COL. H. H. RICE TO GRADUATING CLASS OF ATHENS COLLEGE, ATHENS, ALA.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address to the graduating class of Athens College, Athens, Ala., delivered by Lt. Col. Heber H. Rice, on March 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S GREATEST FARM CROP—ADDRESS BY T. C. RICHARDSON

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an address on the subject America's Greatest Farm Crop, delivered by T. C. Richardson, associate editor of Farmer-Stockman, at the Oklahoma Farm Bureau annual convention in Oklahoma City, November 1, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENT OF TOPEKA DAILY CAPITAL ON ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial from the Topeka Daily Capital of February 24, commenting on an address delivered in Topeka by Senator TRUMAN, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSTANTS IN RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM THE NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Constants in Russian Foreign Policy" published in the magazine The Nineteenth Century and After, of London, England, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITION OF THE FARMERS—LETTER FROM FRED ATER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Fred Ater of Rudyard, Mont., relative to the condition of the farmers, which appears in the Appendix.]

CORPORATE CONTROL—ARTICLE BY MERLO PUSEY

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Corporate Control," written by Merlo Pusey, and published in the Washington Post of March 7, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR OWN FIRST—LETTER FROM RESIDENTS OF LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by a group of residents of Los Angeles, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

STATUS OF POST-WAR GERMANY—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Frank C. Waldrop, appearing in his column entitled "Looking Ahead," published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

DELAY IN DELIVERY OF STATE BALLOTS—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Airman Gets Ballot Overseas 3 Months After State Election," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 1, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WEST VIRGINIA—POEM BY HOMER H. ANDREWS

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "West Virginia," written by Homer H. Andrews, of North Charleston, W. Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1387) to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1243) authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shale, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SOMERS of New York, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2985. An act to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; and

H. R. 3259. An act to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 7,000 additional copies of the report (Rept. No. 10, pt. 16, current session) of the select committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a complete study and investigation of the operation of the war program, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the select committee, 1,000 for the use of the Senate document room, and 1,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 70), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 48,000 additional copies of Public Law No. 235, current session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1943," of which 40,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 3,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942;

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia Government and the White House Police force"; and

H. R. 4166. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2985. An act to provide for the garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3259. An act to clarify the application of section 1 (b) of Public Law 17, Seventy-eighth Congress, to certain services performed by seamen as employees of the United States through the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on Commerce.

FRANK T. HINES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HILL submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is hereby authorized to appoint any former officer of the Regular Army, who, after active military service of more than fifteen years, has resigned his commission and who subsequently served for a period of more than fifteen years either as Director of the Veterans' Bureau or as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or both, an officer on the active list of

the Regular Army in the grade held by him at the time of such resignation and thereafter immediately place him on the retired list of the Army in that grade and with the retired pay thereof.

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any such person may be so appointed and retired while holding civil office, and may continue to hold, or be appointed to, civil office to which compensation is attached, but, while entitled to receive the pay or compensation attached to any such civil office, shall not be entitled to receive active or retired pay by virtue of his military status."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide retirement benefits for certain persons who serve as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs."

And the House agree to the same.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this is the conference report on a bill passed by the Senate permitting Gen. Frank T. Hines to retire as a brigadier general of the Army when he completes his present service with the Government. The conference made clear that General Hines would not have to retire from his position as Director of the Veterans' Administration at this time, but that he could retire at a later date, and retire as a brigadier general of the Army.

Mr. WHITE. Was the report agreed to by the minority members?

Mr. HILL. It was agreed to by the minority members, both of the Senate and the House. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT APPROPRIATION BILLS AND TO FILE MOTIONS TO SUSPEND RULE 16

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are two or three appropriation bills which we think can be reported from the Committee on Appropriations within the next 2 days, and I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have authority to report them during the recess between this time and the next session of the Senate, which I understand is to be Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in connection with these bills I may have to file motions to suspend Senate rule XVI in one or two cases, and I request that I may have unanimous consent to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PEACE FOR FINLAND

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we are hearing a great deal about peace for Finland. What has occurred and what is to occur in this connection will have an important bearing the world over, because it will be the first instance of a small sovereign nation being called upon to submit its own interests into the hands of the guarantors of the integrity of such states.

Finland is a democracy as pure as any nation. She is at war because she was attacked. It is generally felt that her only aim was to keep her boundaries intact and carry on her trade—export and import—with the other nations of the world in an orderly manner. She has never allied herself with the Axis Powers, but she feared Russia more than she did Germany. She has repeatedly declared that she wants peace as soon as peace can be had in conformity with the purely defensive position which she has taken.

We now know the armistice terms that the Soviet Union has handed to Finland. Finland is invited to risk a new war without being informed about the final peace which would be negotiated in the future and only after Finland has fulfilled the other conditions of the armistice. Among them are the probably impossible ones of interning a German army of over 100,000 men and of giving up places in parts of her country vital to Finland's own defense. The terms indicate, too, that Finland may have to cede once more at least the territory of which she was forcibly deprived in 1940. What further she will be forced to cede, of course I cannot tell. It also appears that Finland may be forced to give up the only ice-free port she has on the Arctic Ocean.

It is not hard to see why a nation should hesitate to talk herself into an unpredictable situation without any complete or final knowledge of the peace she would get after these acts.

Now is the time for greatness in nations and peoples. Justice and fairness demand that Finland be allowed to make an honorable peace.

Finland is a nation that has displayed character and integrity. She has stood out among all nations in honoring her obligations to this country. She very recently made an interest payment on her debt.

Finland's case is a test case. If Finland is "sold down the river," it will set a precedent for all nations and all peoples in the future. It will mean turning our backs on the principles of the Atlantic Charter. It will confirm the already deepening fears of some that Russia has intentions other than have been publicly revealed.

When the Atlantic Charter was written, I was one of those individuals who was highly elated that we had put into words, backed by great nations, a charter which held out hope and justice to the peoples of all nations.

As the months have gone by, I have seemed to sense a gradual drifting away from the principles of the Atlantic Charter, but I hope the first test case will show that we still stand for its principles.

Mr. President, I wanted to make these remarks on the floor of the Senate today to call attention to Finland's case, which is a test case. If we are looking ahead to peace in the world, and a post-war era of peace, then we want now to start showing greatness. Now is the time to speak up in Finland's behalf, to see that she receives justice and a fair peace, so that the small nations and the weak peoples of the world may be assured that we meant what was in the Atlantic Charter, and that we mean what we say today when we give lip service to the cause of peace.

I hope that when the facts are known, and when the peace is known, we will know that we have not turned our backs completely on the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. REYNOLDS subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago I listened with great interest to what the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] had to say with regard to the plight of Finland. Relative thereto, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the end of his remarks a very appropriate article from the pen of Mr. William Philip Simms entitled "The Little Fellows," in which he speaks of the small nations of the world, and concludes his very excellent article by the following sentence:

> To sacrifice the Atlantic Charter and similar pronouncements, however, on the altar of temporary expediency could hardly be said to be in that category.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire, in view of the fact it relates to one of the small countries.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LITTLE FELLOWS

(By William Philip Simms)

A sizable gap exists between Washington on the one hand and London and Moscow on the other with regard to the treatment of small nations. Whether the gap is bridgeable remains to be seen.

London has made it plain that, so far as she is concerned, Russia has pretty much of a free hand in eastern and southeastern Europe. Apparently the Atlantic Charter does not strictly apply to the Soviet Union. The Curzon Line—which Russia herself as late as 1934 officially abandoned in a pact with Poland—now has Prime Minister Churchill's blessing, likewise the project to "compensate" Poland by giving her East Prussia and other slices of Germany.

Washington does not exactly approve of all this. Washington may find it expedient to go along with what it can't prevent, but it doesn't relish it just the same. If the Atlantic Charter is something that members of the Big Three can take or leave to suit themselves, but which the smaller nations must accept whether they like it or not, the announced war aims of the United Nations become a shabby business.

Recently, Representative JOSEPH MRUK (Republican, New York) wrote to the President saying:

"If Russia * * * is permitted to hold eastern Poland, as is the announced plan of Stalin * * * this war will have been lost by us * * * morally * * * even before we win it militarily." In reply, the President said this Government "will not rest in its efforts to free all victims of aggression and to establish a just and enduring peace based on the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, large and small."

Assuredly the President's statement is hardly categorical. He leaves a wide bridge behind in case he is forced to retreat. But as a reply to Mr. MRUK, it can only mean that he is opposed to partition by force, and that

is the only way it can be brought about, whether the compulsion is open or camouflaged.

A similar conflict exists over Yugoslavia. To begin with, London backed King Peter and his field commander, General Mihailovich. His instructions from the Allied high command were to conserve his strength and maintain his organization intact against the day when the Allies would invade the Balkans and need his help.

Then the Communist leader, General Brozovich (Tito) appeared. His instructions from Moscow were the opposite of Mihailovich's. His job was to make as much trouble for the Nazis as possible.

Now London has virtually dropped Mihailovich, if not King Peter, and is giving all possible aid to Tito. "Our feelings," Prime Minister Churchill told the House of Commons, "follow the principle * * * of striving without prejudice or regard for political affections to aid those who strike for freedom * * * and inflict the greatest injury upon the enemy."

Washington, certainly, is prepared to go a long way on that ticket. The formula has already saved much time for the Allies, and many thousands of lives. It has been successfully employed without sacrificing fundamental principles. To sacrifice the Atlantic Charter and similar pronouncements, however, on the altar of temporary expediency could hardly be said to be in that category.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Following the article, Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement from Hon. William Randolph Hearst, which was published in many American newspapers, answering some charges which had been made against him through certain newspapers.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American of February 27, 1944]

Marshal Stalin, in his controlled press, calls me a gangster journalist and a friend of Hitler's.

These accusations have their amusing side, coming from a gentleman who is the head of the Communist press—the only gangster press I know.

And who was the closest and dearest friend Hitler had until that traitorous ally betrayed him and threw him over and refused any longer to divide the spoils of war with his eager partner?

Does not the Communist press continually and consistently advocate the Communist principles of defiance of law and order, of the violent overthrow of established government, of the extinction in blood and brutality of the well-to-do classes?

Would you not call that a gangster press, the gangster press, and is it not the only press advocating violence and lawlessness and robbery and murder which is permitted to publish?

Was not the estimable Marshal Stalin, until most recently Hitler's best beloved friend and buddy, his accomplice in the invasion of the Baltic republics, his pal in the rape of Finland, his partner in the plunder of Poland?

Is not the genial marshal—although assuming an air of superior purity and probity since his break with pal Hitler—still trying to steal Finland and absorb the Baltic republics and reravish Poland?

A leopard does not change his spots, although deserted by his former hunting companion and dearest friend.

As for me, I never saw Hitler but once in my life, and that once was to interview him for my papers.

The interview was published widely in the English press and in the American press, and is available to anyone who wants to read it.

There is nothing pro-Hitler in it; on the contrary, it is critical.

Hitler on his part has been equally critical of me.

He said in a speech, as recorded in Houghton, Mifflin Co.'s book Der Fuehrer:

"A gigantic organization of press lies was built up, and again it was a Jewish concern, the Hearst press, which laid down the tone of the agitation against Germany."

All of which utterance of Hitler's is as childishly false and foolish as Marshal Stalin's untruthful statements.

As a matter of plain and simple fact and procedure, I make a habit of interviewing the conspicuous men in all the countries I visit.

I do this for the benefit of my readers, who are apparently interested in the thoughts and statements of such notabilities.

To be sure, I have never interviewed Marshal Stalin. But, then, I have never been in Russia.

I am reserving the Stalin interview for my last interview.

And from what I know of the amiable marshal, I imagine it would be.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF FEDERAL SOLDIERS' VOTE LEGISLATION—OPINION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from time to time during the discussion of the soldiers' vote bill the statement has been made on the floor of the Senate that there could be no question as to the unconstitutionality of the so-called Green-Lucas bill. The grounds on which that statement is based are the same as the grounds for any claim that might be made as to the unconstitutionality of existing law, Public, No. 712.

During the long-drawn-out conferences between the conferees on the part of the Senate and the conferees on the part of the House the same statement has from time to time been made, and it has been made more specifically in connection with the upholding of the constitutionality of the existing law in the State of Virginia. The statement has been made that, in spite of the fact that the attorney general of Virginia has given an opinion that the existing law is constitutional, yet he has given several opinions, of which that was one, and that that opinion did not flatly declare it to be constitutional. In consequence of such statements having been renewed at the meeting of the conferees yesterday, I telephoned to the office of the attorney general of Virginia and was assured that the attorney general had given only one opinion. I asked that he send me a copy of it, and he has done so. I received it this morning. I read it with great satisfaction, because it is a very clear exposition of the constitutional law involved. It is short, and for that reason it occurs to me that it might be well to read it on the floor of the Senate, and not merely ask to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where so much is buried and left unread.

The letter is dated October 17, 1942. It is addressed to the Honorable Wilmer L. O'Flaherty, who is secretary of the Richmond City Electrical Board, 1134 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va. It reads as follows:

DEAR MR. O'FLAHERTY: This is in reply to your request for my opinion upon the question raised in your letter of October 7, which I quote in full as follows:

This is the letter addressed to the attorney general:

"On September 16 the President of the United States approved Public Law 712 to provide a method of voting in time of war by members of the land and naval forces.

"Under this law members of the land and naval forces are given the right to vote in the coming general election on November 3, 1942, for a United States Senator and a Member of Congress without the payment of poll taxes and registration as required by the Virginia election laws.

"There will perhaps be some confusion and doubt on the part of the election officials at our November general election as to how these ballots should be handled.

"These election officials take an oath to perform their duties according to law. Some officials may feel that this oath would require them to comply with the Virginia election laws, which would not permit members of the land and naval forces to vote unless they had complied with the Virginia election laws and paid their required poll taxes and registered. This would result in denying a vote to a member of the land and naval forces who had not complied with the Virginia election laws as to the payment of poll taxes and registration.

"In order that I may be in a position to advise properly our Richmond election officials, I shall appreciate it if you will give me your opinion on these points."

That concludes the letter addressed to the attorney general, and what follows is the attorney general's comment and reply:

The Federal act referred to dispenses with the necessity for registration by those in the armed forces in all of the States which require registration as a condition precedent to the right to vote, and I am informed that almost every State does have such a requirement. This provision, therefore, affects nearly all the States, including those in the South, while the provision dispensing with the payment of any tax as a prerequisite to vote affects, so far as I know, only the eight Southern States which require payment of the poll tax. If the provision with respect to registration is valid, the other must be likewise so held, since they involve the same constitutional principle, yet I have not heard of the authorities in any State failing or refusing to give effect to the Federal act in the coming November elections.

It is my opinion that article I, section 2, and the tenth amendment of the Federal Constitution undoubtedly reserve in the States the exclusive power to prescribe the qualifications of voters for these officers in time of peace. The reasons for this conclusion I recently stated at length before the Judiciary Subcommittee of the United States Senate in connection with other proposed permanent legislation now pending, which is not restricted to persons in the armed forces. The subcommittee, in its report to the full committee, has sustained this view. But even though this be true, the act you refer to raises an entirely new and different question. It is by its terms operative only in time of war and is applicable only to the land and naval forces. The Constitution (art. I, sec. 8) confers on Congress the power to "declare war, * * * to raise and support armies, * * * to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces"; and to "make all laws which

shall be necessary and proper for carrying into effect the foregoing powers."

During the First World War, Congress passed what was known as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1918, providing for the suspension in both State and Federal courts of legal proceedings against members of the armed forces, or their dependents, while engaged in active service. Although this legislation would have been clearly unconstitutional in peacetime, as an invasion of the State's recognized powers to establish its courts and prescribe the proceedings therein, yet it was sustained as a valid exercise of the war powers by the highest courts of all the States before which it came for consideration and bly the United States Circuit Court of Appeals of several circuits. (See annotation to *Morse* v. *Stober* (9 A. L. R. 81).

During the present war Congress has passed another similar statute which is much more comprehensive and which protects those in military service by provisions for the postponement of suits, judgments, attachments, garnishments, evictions, mortgages, foreclosures, repossessions, payments under installment purchases and conditional sales, income taxes, real estate taxes, all statutes of limitations, etc. Protection is also extended to life insurance, endorsers, sureties, guarantors, property rights, homesteads, mining claims, mineral leases, etc. The Selective Service Act, now in force, provides for restoration to selectees of their positions held in private employment. I have not heard of any question being raised as to the validity of any of these provisions as an exercise of the war powers of Congress. The Supreme Court sustained the drafting of civilians into military service under this power (245 U. S. 366).

The act you refer to undertakes to protect those in the armed forces from loss of their right to vote for these Federal representatives by reason of failure to comply with registration and poll-tax-payment requirements while absent in the service.

It is well settled that an act of Congress, passed in the proper exercise of a power delegated to it by the Constitution is the supreme law of the land and supersedes any State constitutional or statutory provisions in conflict therewith (U. S. Constitution, art. VI, sec. 2; see also 11 Am. Jour., p. 649).

It follows, therefore, that if the protection which the act in question purports to afford to the voting privileges of absentee soldiers and sailors is a valid exercise of the war powers of Congress above referred to, the provisions of the act eliminating State requirements of registration and poll-tax payments are valid and should be given effect by Virginia election officials.

In view of the apparent similarity in the nature of the protection provided for in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act and in the act here under consideration, and recognizing the well-established rule that every statute is presumed to be constitutional until the courts declare otherwise, I am constrained to the view that in the election to be held on November 3, 1942, the judges of election and other State authorities should count as valid votes all ballots cast in accordance with the provisions of the said act of Congress (Public, No. 712).

Sincerely yours,

ABRAM P. STAPLES,
Attorney General.

That letter is equally appropriate to the Green-Lucas bill which is now in conference, and has been under consideration by the conferees, having been passed by the Senate and by the House. All the constitutional objections which could be raised to it can be raised to the prior law. For that reason, inasmuch as the statement on the part of the highest legal authority of the State of Virginia is such a concise and lucid one, and inasmuch as his opinion was acted upon, and in accordance therewith votes were cast, as to the legality of which no appeal has been made, it is of importance in connection with the consideration of this matter by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to take the time of the Senate first to congratulate the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] for reading into the RECORD the opinion of the attorney general of the State of Virginia upon the validity and constitutionality of Public Law 712 under which the country has been operating since September 1942. I should like to observe, in view of the fact that the Senator from Rhode Island has seen fit to read the opinion into the RECORD, that undoubtedly under the opinion rendered by the attorney general of Virginia all votes which were cast under Public Law 712 by soldiers, sailors, and marines were counted, canvassed, and recorded in that State, and what was true in the case of the State of Virginia is true in the case of every other State in the Union unless it was the State of Maryland. In other words, there was not a single election official in the United States of America who in the 1942 election refused to count the vote of the man or the woman fighting at that particular time in the armed forces of his or her country. Every State in the Union, through its attorney general, apparently, recognized the validity of the act at that time, and recognized the constitutionality of the act, and in no way raised any question about it in the important off-year elections of 1942.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that during the last week the majority of the conferees considering this important question have agreed upon some kind of a Federal ballot for the men overseas—some bobtailed ballot of the kind which has been described as unconstitutional by Members of the Senate, Members of the House of Representatives, and Governors of States who are opposed to legislation of this type. Yet I am informed that now the majority of the conferees wish to submit for approval by the Congress of the United States a report calling for a Federal ballot which all the Members of the Senate who voiced objections to the Lucas-Green bill in its original form have said was unconstitutional. Mr. President, the report of the conferees has not as yet been submitted; but if I correctly understand what that report will be by the majority of the conferees who are now in favor of the Federal ballot, it will be so hemmed in with conditions, restrictions, and obstacles that we might just as well not have a Federal ballot. Probably more soldiers and sailors will vote under the present law, Public, No. 712, than will vote under the proposed new compromise which will be so restricted and will have so many conditions and contingencies placed in the way of voting by the soldier overseas that, as Ernie Pyle said, when it comes to him he will consider it as just so much red tape, and will say "Nuts" to it all.

My God! Why is it that the Congress cannot send the man overseas, who is fighting for your life and mine as well as his own, a simple uniform Federal ballot which would make it as easy as possible for him to vote? I confess that it is beyond my understanding or comprehension that Members of this great deliberative body, the last great citadel of representative liberty in the world, will not take such an attitude as will assure to the members of our armed forces a simple ballot which will make it easy for them to vote. It is beyond me. I cannot understand it.

While I am on my feet I should like to read a letter from a boy overseas in Italy. He writes to me as follows:

How would you feel if after having been away from home fighting for democracy on foreign soil for well over a year, a United States Senator, elected through democratic procedure and therefore naturally expected to defend, nay, to champion, democratic rights, told you that your vote was not wanted, that a plan offering you a chance to vote was another W. P. A., and a plot to march millions of servicemen to the polls?

It is said in the Senate that the soldiers and sailors in Italy do not know what is going on. The argument has been made in the House of Representatives that men serving overseas would not have correct information as to how they should cast their votes. It is said that they do not know what is occurring in America. Yet here is a sergeant who knows what was said on the floor of the Senate with respect to the plan which was offered being another W. P. A. and a plot to march millions of servicemen to the polls as though they were slaves, as though they were under some tyrannical and despotic power—the very thing, Mr. President, that we are fighting.

The writer of the letter continues:

Senator TAFT has assailed the President's vote message in just such terms. Are we Hessians fighting for gold? Or are we United States citizens who have taken up arms to defend our right and privilege to elect our leaders through the medium of the ballot, rather than having them selected for us by privileged minorities, or installed by force and bullets?

We're quite capable of choosing our leaders, Senator TAFT, just as we are quite capable of winning this war. George Washington has said: "When one puts on the uniform, one does not lay aside the citizen." If you want only a certain minority to vote, Senator, you're on the wrong side of the lines. The other guys over here who think like that also want to deny us our vote. That's why we're shootin' at 'em.

Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio is afraid of having millions of servicemen marching to the polls. That's democracy in action, Mr. TAFT, and if you're afraid of democracy in action, you've got a lot of company in that respect within a few minutes ride from here. Goin' north, toward Rome.

If we are afraid of democracy in action, we have company over there, on the other side of Rome, as our boys march toward their objective. As this sergeant says, they are marching to meet the foe which is battling democracy.

The sergeant continues:

If you're not able to block this servicemen's vote bill, Senator, perhaps you could introduce a poll-tax bill that would discourage our voting. Having already classed us with the W. P. A., your next step might possibly be to declare us propertyless undesirables, or something like that. But poll tax or not,

Senator, we want a voice in the Government we're defending and advocating. Do you mind?

Mr. President, that is all that the Lucas-Green bill ever provided—the right of those men serving in the military forces to participate in the simple functions of government in this great crisis and to make it as easy for them as possible. Those who say that the States can do it are taking issue with the Army and Navy, who know whether or not it can be done. Representatives of both the Army and Navy have testified over and over again that they cannot do it. Who is there to rightfully and honestly challenge these men who are doing such a magnificent job in the prosecution of this total war?

Mr. President, weeks have gone by since we finally voted upon this measure in the Senate, and many days have been consumed by the conferees of the House and Senate; and yet here we are, almost where we were in the beginning.

Mr. President, we have not heard the last of this simple uniform Federal ballot. The people of the country are aroused. The parents of the boys, such as the one who wrote to me, understand exactly how they will feel in the election next November. This letter is only one of hundreds which are being received from every section of the fighting fronts, protesting the action of Congress in a matter which involves a sacred right of representative government.

I have said time and time again, and I now repeat, that it is not a Democratic issue. It is not a Republican issue. It is no issue at all, although leading Republicans of the North have tried to make it a Republican issue. It involves a fundamental privilege and right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REVENUE ACT OF 1943

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 70) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed 48,000 additional copies of Public Law Numbered 235, current session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1943," of which 40,000 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 4,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room, 3,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 copies for the use of the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate agree to the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, does the concurrent resolution provide for the printing of the tax law?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. For how many copies?

Mr. HAYDEN. It provides for printing 40,000 for the House document room, 4,000 for the Senate document room, 3,000 for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and 1,000 for the Committee on Finance of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

CASH AWARDS TO PERSONNEL OF MARITIME COMMISSION AND WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities, which was, to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to pay cash awards for suggestions submitted to it by any of its officers or employees in cases where the suggestion, in the opinion of the Commission or of a committee designated by it, would, if adopted, make for substantially increased efficiency, economy, or general improvement in carrying out the duties, powers, or functions of the Commission. Such suggestions shall be submitted and such awards shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, including provision for transfer to the United States of all rights or interests of the officer or employee in the suggestion. The provisions of this section shall apply in like manner to the War Shipping Administration and its officers and employees, and for the purpose of this section the terms "United States Maritime Commission" and "Commission" shall be deemed to refer to the War Shipping Administration. The total amount of cash awards made under this joint resolution in any fiscal year shall not exceed $5,000 for each such agency, and the amount paid for any one suggestion shall not exceed $250 for any one suggestion, except in case of a patentable idea, it may be not more than $1,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the amendment of the House has been considered very carefully. It is satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CARE OF VETERANS, ACTIVITIES OF U. N. R. R. A., AND POST-WAR TERRITORIAL ADJUSTMENTS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has today introduced a bill providing for adjusted-service compensation for veterans of World War No. 2. I joined him in the introduction of the bill because I wanted to afford the best possible opportunity to provide for the veterans of this war.

At least a year before we entered this war I introduced a bill providing that the veterans of World War No. 2, if and when we should become engaged in it—I was sure, from the tremendous amount of propaganda, that we were going to be dragged into it—should have care to the same extent afforded the veterans of World War No. 1.

The bill which the Senator from Colorado has introduced, and in which I joined, has been very appropriately described in an article by the International News Service published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 6, 1944. Instead of taking the time of the Senate to read the article in reference to the bill which the Senator from Colorado has today introduced, I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIVE VET GROUPS BACK SERVICE-PAY MEASURE

Five veterans' organizations today began a drive for bonus payments up to $5,000 for soldiers of World War No. 2, and urged that the Nation's fighting men be put on a salary par with civilian war workers.

Sponsored by the Army and Navy Union, Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, Regular Veterans Association, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the requested legislation would provide a credit of $3 per day for home service and $4 a day for overseas duty.

The veterans' group urged Congress to enact promptly an "adjusted-service pay act of 1944" which would also grant $500 to servicemen wounded in action.

MAXIMUMS SET

"A maximum of $3,000 for home service only and $4,500 where overseas service was had would be established except where the $500 credit for wounds applies, in which case the maximum allowable would be $5,000," the organizations said in a statement.

They asked that upon or after the veterans' discharge, the Treasury Department issue bonds for payment. Where the amount due is less than $300, the Government would pay by check.

These bonds would bear 3-percent interest for the first 5 years and compound interest at 3 percent for a second 5 years, after which time interest would cease.

In calling for prompt action by Congress, the organizations pointed out that over a million persons already have been discharged from the services and predicted as many as 3,000,000 "will be discharged long before hostilities cease."

NOT "OUT OF LINE"

Present rate of discharge, they said, is at 300,000 per month.

"The purpose of the bill is to adjust, in a measure, the difference between the pay of those serving in the armed forces and civilians employed in war industry," it was explained in a statement.

Spokesmen for the five groups held that the present estimated average yearly pay of all members of the armed forces, including the value of food, clothing, and medical care, is less than $2,300, and the addition of adjusted credit in the bill "would not be out of line when compared with earnings and freedom of war workers."

"The reward would be paid to those who earn it, or their estates, and could be used without bureaucratic supervision or interference with States' rights," the spokesmen declared.

"A reasonable safeguard is set up against hasty and unwise use by limiting withdrawals to one-fifth of the total reward each year for 5 years," they continued, adding that the rate of interest would provide an incentive to save.

Under the requested legislation, the bonds would be nonnegotiable, tax free, and not subject to lien.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I wish to state that I am of the opinion that the enactment of the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado and payment under the

terms prescribed therein probably in the long run when all the payments thereunder shall have been made will call for an expenditure of approximately $30,000,000,000. I ask the Senator from Colorado to provide me with an observation on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I cannot furnish the Senator with information on that point. I have been told several times this morning that this is not an opportune time to bring into the picture an adjusted-compensation bill. I think it is an opportune time; I think the time when this bill should have been introduced was before we got into the war. I recall that the Senator from North Carolina and a good many others of us—I think probably a majority of the Senate—tried very diligently to keep from taking that step. Some of us perhaps went to extremes in that direction; but that was the time when the adjusted-compensation bill should have come before the Senate and the country. When we got into the war it would be unthinkable that we should not take care of our veterans, and take care of them generously. If we commit any fault along that line it should be the fault of being overgenerous rather than not being generous enough. That is one of the terrible costs of war. War costs immense sums of money. Modern wars are so costly that they are certain to bankrupt any country indulging in them. That is something we should have thought of before we became involved in the war, and while steps were being taken that made it impossible for us to keep out of the war. But now when we are waging war it seems to me to be a poor time to be holding back and saying we must cut down on the cost of caring for the men who carry on the war.

I do not know whether the amount involved would be $30,000,000,000 or $10,000,000,000; I do not know what the cost of the bill would be. I imagine it would involve a considerable sum of money. I know that there are other bills now pending before the Senate Finance Committee and before the Senate, rehabilitation bills, education bills, bills providing for loans and other benefits for the men of the armed forces, and I think now is the opportune time and the proper time to consider this matter. I think if anything we have been a little late in introducing the measures to provide adequately for the veterans of the war. It should be a part of the picture, it should be a part of the consideration that the Congress is giving to the problem of the care of the veterans as one of the terrible costs of war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am entirely grateful to my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for his most appropriate and timely observations, and I thoroughly agree with everything he has said.

I repeat that prior to the time when we became involved in the war I persistently insisted upon the passage of legislation that would guarantee to the veterans of World War No. 2 at least the same care as was provided for the veterans of World War No. 1. I then talked about it because I recognized that we were catapulted into this war. Desperately as the Senator from Colorado fought to keep us out of the war and desperately as I fought to keep us out of the war at all hazards, in the face of our being called Nazis and Fascists and rattlesnakes and traitors, and almost everything else, and in the face of the energy that we expended to keep us out of the war, yet war came. Now, since we have not an Adjusted Compensation Act, we should not wait until after the end of the war to pass it, because before the end of the war, I venture to say, that nigh onto 1,000,000 men who have been in uniform will have been legally and properly discharged, and the date of their discharge is the date when they will need aid from the Government they served.

Furthermore, I may say—and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado—that, insofar as I am concerned, I am willing now to vote $30,000,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of America for the benefit of our heroes of World War No. 2, and not only am I now ready and willing to do that, but I am insisting, respectfully, that I be provided the opportunity now to vote $30,000,000,000 for the soldiers and sailors of this war, because, unless we vote that money for them now and it is earmarked they will never get it. Why? Because we are giving away billions of dollars and wasting billions of dollars. I speak now as does the Senator from Colorado, in behalf of those men and women in uniform who are serving gloriously and courageously our country. I now yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand that more than a million men have already been discharged from the Army, and, insofar as they are concerned, the war is over. I understand, furthermore, that from 75,000 to 90,000 are being discharged from the Army each month, and the war is over for them. It is high time, it seems to me, that we should be considering legislation such as was introduced this morning, and the so-called G. I. bill, sponsored by the American Legion, and at the present time pending in the Finance Committee.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I spoke ultraconservatively when I said that before the expiration of the war more than a million men would be discharged, when we know that more than a million have already been discharged, and that for them, to use the words of the Senator from Colorado, the war is over, insofar as wearing the uniform and fighting on foreign shores is concerned.

Mr. President, I repeat that I am anxiously awaiting the opportunity to vote money for the benefit of the veterans of this war now before we have given all our money away to other countries of the world. In other words, I believe in taking care of the sick and the distressed in my own home before taking care of the unfortunates in another part of the block. I believe in taking care of our own soldiers here before taking care of the men and women of any other country upon the face of the earth. I am for America first; I am for America first and not for America last, and I am for our boys and girls, men and women, who wear the uniform of the country and who are fighting for the "four freedoms" on 72 fronts.

Mr. President, I revert to the U. N. R. R. A. resolution. A distinguished American columnist says:

> Looking backward a little: The American people know nothing as yet as to what "inside" agreements were arrived at at the recent international food conference at Hot Springs, Va. Was there something agreed on that committed the United States of America to that which the people oughtn't to know about?

He is referring to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, in connection with which only about 10 days ago we virtually voted $1,350,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, to be given to 44 countries of the world. I opposed the joint resolution and voted against it. I should have liked to vote for the soldiers' bill, even if it required the appropriation of $30,000,000,000, before we gave $1,350,000,000 away, and I hope we can vote on the adjusted-compensation bill of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], a measure for the benefit of our soldiers, before we pass out other billions of dollars of the money of the taxpayers of the United States.

This distinguished writer continues:

> I have a hunch that in that star-chamber conference the United States of America made pledges to feed the world, but that the political powers in Washington are afraid to unveil the news to the American public.
>
> We are now feeding Sicily, part of Italy, and north Africa. Why shouldn't the people with "smart money" in those parts of the world be compelled to feed their own? There are billions of dollars hidden and saved in Europe.
>
> Compel the rich Germans, the French, the Norwegians, the Chinese, the Dutch, the Belgians, the Italians, etc., to shell out when the time comes for rehabilitation.
>
> Make each country feed its own as far as possible. Bring money out of its hiding places. If they want a bit of communism, that's a practical slice of it. Why should we 135,000,000 Americans, after expending billions in money and human lives to free the countries of the world from their own incompetency and stupidity be compelled to feed and clothe them so long as there is an immense amount of hoarded money in those countries?

And there is plenty of hoarded money in all those countries—gold, and much of it.

> Germany once before fooled the United States by playing "dirt poor."
>
> Are we Americans to pay reparations for winning the war? Are we Americans to be levied on to the point of starvation as a reward for victory? Are we Americans to put the world on its financial and economic feet so that it can plunge again into more wars and stone us if we don't ruin ourselves in trying to drag them out of their own witches' broth?
>
> Preposterous, isn't it? But that's exactly what the American philanthropoids (those who give away other people's money) are up to.
>
> And, by the way, who do you suppose is going to feed and clothe us if we should go boom? Snap out of it, Americans.

Mr. President, by the Washington Star of Sunday I was advised that the Truman committee had issued another report. The article, which I hold in my hand, was headed:

> Truman group urges rise in civilian output. Reports production battles won. Hits labor draft plan.

The first paragraph of the article I read:

Declaring "the major war-production battles have been won," the Truman committee called last night for greater output of civilian goods and hit at administration proposals for a universal manpower draft.

Reading further down, I have underlined with red pencil a statement from the Truman committee report, and I want to read it to the Members of this body, because all of us have great confidence in that committee, one of the finest this body has ever organized. The Truman committee said:

Unless new farm machinery and replacement parts for both farm machinery and trucks are made the injury to our economy will be serious.

Mr. President, I wish to read now portions of one brief chapter of the third annual report of the Truman committee, released on March 5, 1944. The title of the chapter is, "Farm Machinery and Equipment."

I was particularly interested in that, Mr. President, and it struck me with great force, for that in recent months I have received hundreds of letters from farmers in my State and in other States making inquiry as to whether I could be of any assistance to them in securing much-needed farm machinery. In addition to the hundreds of letters I have received from farmers in my State of North Carolina and other States, here at the Capitol I have been approached by four different individuals who are farming in Maryland and Virginia, who wanted to know whether or not I could be of any assistance to them in getting them much-needed farm machinery and farm equipment. I distinctly recall that one gentleman said that he wanted and must have a steel-tooth harrow, and another was particularly interested in obtaining a planter. Later I saw the gentleman who was interested in getting the harrow, and he told me he had spent one whole day in driving over his section of Maryland endeavoring to buy a harrow, a second-hand harrow, or half of a harrow. He could not buy a new one, a second-hand one, half of one, nor could he induce anyone to lend him one. We all realize and believe that millions of farmers are hampered in their work by lack of farm machinery.

Mr. President, I now read some excerpts which I have prepared from the chapter entitled "Farm Machinery and Equipment" of the third annual report of the Truman committee:

In January 1943, the committee submitted to the Senate an interim report on farm machinery and equipment. In that report, the committee stressed the importance of allocating sufficient materials to manufacturers of farm machinery and equipment so that it would be possible for farmers to obtain the supplies of machinery and equipment that were necessary in order to achieve the goals of food production that had been set up.

Many farmers have pressing unfilled requirements for farm machinery which they will need if they are to produce the amounts of food requested by the War Food Administration.

An important portion of the farm machinery program is now behind the production schedule set up by the manufacturers in accordance with quotas set forth by order No. L-257. In some instances, especially tractor components, the lag in component production is due to the fact that the farm machinery programs requiring them are in direct competition with military, truck, and other vehicle programs. As a direct result, the farm machinery and domestic-truck programs, both of which in the opinion of the committee are essential to the war effort, are suffering. The tractor situation is expected to be aggravated by a further request for tractors by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and by the military.

In other instances, the manufacturers are behind schedule because the cost of producing the items approaches and sometimes even exceeds the sales price. Naturally, the manufacturer gives first attention to the production of items on which he has a better profit margin.

Similarly, manufacturers sometimes do not boost items which are not generally identified with them. For example, spike tooth harrows are all alike and are not generally associated with any particular firm.

Current schedules are not being met in the production of manure spreaders and walking plows because of the short supply of seasoned wood. Walking plows require very strong handles made from seasoned white oak, while manure spreaders require a substantial quantity of hemlock.

Manufacturers of walking plows are also having difficulty in obtaining sufficient quantities of malleable frogs because of the shortage of manpower in foundries supplying this item.

Some items of spring planting machinery which will be needed at an early date are behind schedule. For example, the shortage of link chain has especially slowed production of corn planters, potato planters, fertilizer distributors, and manure spreaders.

Manufacturers of fertilizer drills are behind schedule, at least partially so, because of the shortage of gray iron castings. This again stems from a short supply of manpower in foundries supplying these castings.

In general, the manufacturers of farm machinery have experienced the most difficulty in obtaining sufficient manpower. In many instances, this is due to the fact that the industry generally has a relatively low rating of essentiality, which places it at a disadvantage in obtaining workers. Manufacturers of farm machinery generally believe that the industry is entitled to a higher rating of essentiality.

The difficulties which farmers have experienced in obtaining farm machinery have been increased further by the disarrangements in the distribution system caused by the war.

Mr. President, I refer again to that sentence in the report which mentions directly the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration:

The tractor situation is expected to be aggravated by a further request for tractors by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and by the military.

Mr. President, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is under the direction of former Governor Lehman, of New York. Governor Lehman is vested with authority to distribute in goods or money, $1,350,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of America, the goods to be composed, among other things, of farm machinery. The goods and money are to be distributed to people in foreign lands of the world. I protest against the sending by our country of thousands upon thousands of pieces of farm machinery to foreign lands, to alien farmers, when our own farmers in America are in dire need of them and must have them if they are to produce the stuff that will be used in feeding the world. Perhaps I am going a little too fast. I ask myself this question: Does Governor Lehman, or does the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, propose to send any farm implements to foreign countries when our own farmers here do not have them and cannot make the required crop without them? I let the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration itself answer that question.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of a paper which I have secured, entitled "Agricultural Machinery Programed by U. N. R. R. A. for European distribution, one-fourth to be delivered by August 1, 1944, and the balance within 1 year." What is it that Governor Lehman, the world director of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, has programed in farm machinery to send to all the peoples of the world outside the United States, at a time when our own farmers are begging for farm machinery and farm equipment?

I will read some of the items. Plows—moldboard, walking. Mr. President, they cannot be bought in Maryland. I do not know that they can be bought anywhere in the United States. Plows—moldboard, walking. The $1,350,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of America is to be used to buy 5,000 such plows for France, but not one for the American farmer. Two thousand three hundred are to be bought for the Netherlands. We buy them and give them away, but not one is procured for the American farmer. We buy them and give them to the Netherlands, when the Netherlands have billions of dollars in gold stored away. It is proposed to buy 2,500 such plows for Greece, 5,000 for Poland, and 10,000 for Yugoslavia. The guerillas of Yugoslavia are already fighting over the spoils before the war is ended, and we do not know whether the Yugoslavian Government will be a Fascist government, a Communist government, or what. Yet in the face of the fact that the American farmer cannot obtain a single plow, we are sending 10,000 plows to Yugoslavia. To Albania we are sending 200. That makes a total of 25,000 moldboard, walking plows to be sent to foreigners, to Europeans, but not a plow for an American.

Thirty thousand moldboard, tractor plows are to be bought and shipped to foreign countries. Fourteen thousand one hundred and five 2-bottom drawn plows are to be scattered all over Europe. In addition thereto, 11,160 other plows are to be scattered all over Europe. Two thousand other plows are to be scattered all over Europe, yet not a plow is provided for the American farmer.

Mr. President, I am skipping some of the items because I do not want to consume too much of the time of the Senate, but when I shall have completed my reference to this document I shall ask that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

Other farm machinery: One-way disk plow with seeding attachment. France

is to get 3,600 of them, and Italy is to get 100 of them, or a total of 3,700.

Grain drills: Greece is to get 150.

Grain drills—fertilizer: The Netherlands is to get 50.

Plain grain drills: Belgium and Luxemburg are to get 100, Denmark is to get 250, France 4,900, Holland, 250, Norway 200, and Poland 11,575. Why send so many drills to Poland? Judging from all the information we are receiving about the disagreements over Poland, little Poland, over which the war began, the plows may be changed into weapons of war the minute they land there.

Yugoslavia is to have 200 of these grain drills; Albania, 25; Italy, 100. A total of 17,600 grain drills will be sent by us to foreign countries, but not one for the American farmer.

Hand planters: Belgium and Luxemburg are programed to receive 250.

Fertilizer distributors: Belgium and Luxemburg, 500; Netherlands, or Holland, 1,250; a total of 1,750.

Spike harrow sections—the kind of steel-tooth harrow I mentioned a moment ago, that farmers came to me to see about getting, and could not buy half of one, and could not get the loan of one—spike harrows: Belgium and Luxemburg are to have 180; Czechoslovakia, 1,200; Denmark, 200; France, 6,000; Greece, 300; Netherlands, 530; Norway, 100; Poland, 4,100; Yugoslavia, 2,300; the Baltic States, 300; a total of 15,210 steel-spike harrows, although a farmer residing near Waldorf, in Maryland, 20 miles from Washington, rode all over the country and could not buy, beg, or rent one, or buy half of one.

Spring harrow sections: Belgium and Luxemburg, 170; Denmark, 1,000; France, 8,600; Netherlands, 970; Norway, 800; Poland, 4,100; Albania, 50; the Baltic states, 1,450; a total of 17,140 spring harrow sections, but not a harrow for an American farmer.

Disk harrows with tandem: 8,150 are to go to those countries.

Ground-drive binders: A total of 10,625.

Power take-off binders: A total of 1,285.

Rollers: A total of 1,200.

One-horse cultivators: A total of 2,000.

Field cultivators: A total of 8,100.

Mounted tool bars: A total of 1,450.

Power sprayers: A total of 1,000.

Hand sprayers: A total of 23,000.

Reapers: A total of 6,500.

Potato diggers: A total of 725.

Beet lifters: A total of 1,150.

Ground-drive mowers: A total of 50,000.

Tractors, under 30 horsepower. Listen to this, Mr. President. Show me 1 out of 50 American farmers who has been able to buy a tractor or even a part of a tractor within the past 2 years, and I will eat the tractor. To these alien, foreign countries we are sending 16,585 tractors of under 30 horsepower, although there is not a tractor for an American farmer.

Tractors, 30 horsepower and over: We are sending 13,415 of them to foreign countries, despite the fact that the Truman committee report shows that the manufacture of these tractors for this international organization will interfere with the war effort.

Two-wheel farm trailers: A total of 30,000. Just try to buy a trailer, yourself, to use on a farm. You cannot do it.

Separators: A total of 25,100.

Other separators: A total of 4,900.

Incubators: A total of 450.

Parts for new machinery: 9,421 tons.

Parts for present machinery: 3,955 tons.

Sulky dump rakes, which have 2 wheels and are pulled by 1 horse: A total of 18,300 to be used in the fields.

Combination side-delivery rakes—the latest thing in farm machinery: 4,600.

Reaping attachments for mowers: A total of 5,000.

Power threshers: Belgium and Luxemburg, 120; Greece, 50 ; Norway, 100; Poland, 250; Yugoslavia, 100; the Baltic states, 50; Italy, 100; a total of 770 threshing machines.

Following that item is one showing a total of 3,000 hand threshers.

Mr. President, I will have one of the pages take the list to the official reporter, and I ask unanimous consent that the entire list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY PROGRAMED BY UNRRA FOR EUROPEAN DITRIBUTION

(One-fourth to be delivered by August 1, 1944, and the balance within 1 year.)

Plows (moldboard, walking): France, 5,000; Greece, 2,500; Netherlands, 2,300; Poland, 5,000; Yugoslavia, 10,000; Albania, 200; total, 25,000.

Plows (moldboard, tractor): Total, 30,000.

Plows (2-bottom drawn): Belgium and Luxemburg, 250; Czechoslovakia, 550; Denmark, 800; France, 7,395; Greece, 25; Netherlands, 870; Norway, 600; Poland, 2,300; Yugoslavia, 200; Baltic States, 850; Italy, 265; total, 14,105.

Plows (2-bottom mounted): Belgium and Luxemburg, 30; Czechoslovakia, 100; Denmark, 100; France, 1,200; Greece, 50; Netherlands, 130; Norway, 50; Poland, 700; Yugoslavia, 50; Baltic States, 150; Italy, 175; total, 2,735.

Plows (3-bottom drawn): Belgium and Luxemburg, 70; Czechoslovakia, 350; Denmark, 300; France, 5,020; Greece, 25; Netherlands, 500; Poland, 3,700; Yugoslavia, 250; Baltic States, 750; Italy, 195; total, 11,160.

Plows (4-bottom drawn): France, 500; Poland, 1,500; total 2,000.

Extra shares (2 per bottom): Belgium and Luxemburg, 1,540; Czechoslovakia, 4,700; Denmark, 5,400; France, 68,500; Greece, 450; Netherlands, 7,000; Norway, 2,600; Poland, 46,200; Yugoslavia, 2,500; Baltic States, 8,500; Italy, 2,930; total 150,320.

One-way disk plow with seeding attachment: France, 3,600; Italy, 100; total, 3,700.

Grain drill (3–7 disc): Greece, 150; total, 150.

Grain drill (fertilizer): Netherlands, 50; total, 50.

Grain drill (plain): Belgium and Luxemburg, 100; Denmark, 250; France, 4,900; Netherlands, 250; Norway, 200; Poland, 11,575; Yugoslavia, 200; Albania, 25; Italy, 100; total, 17,600.

Planters (hand): Belgium and Luxemburg, 250; total, 250.

Fertilizer distributors: Belgium and Luxemburg, 500; Netherlands, 1,280; total, 1,750.

Harrow sections (spike): Belgium and Luxemburg, 180; Czechoslovakia, 1,200; Denmark, 200; France, 6,000; Greece, 300; Netherlands, 530; Norway, 100; Poland, 4,100; Yugoslavia, 2,300; Baltic States, 300; total 15,210.

Harrow sections (spring): Belgium and Luxemburg, 170; Denmark, 1,000; France, 8,600; Netherlands, 970; Norway, 800; Poland, 4,100; Albania, 50; Baltic States, 1,450; total, 17,140.

Harrow (disk with tandem): Belgium and Luxemburg, 100; Czechoslovakia, 200; Denmark, 400; France, 2,475; Netherlands, 715; Norway, 325; Poland, 3,000; Yugoslavia, 50; Baltic States, 250; Italy, 635; total, 8,150.

Binders (ground-drive): Belgium and Luxemburg, 965; Denmark, 3,500; France, 4,445; Greece, 150; Netherlands, 550; Norway, 200; Yugoslavia, 500; Italy, 315; total, 10,625.

Binders (power take-off): Belgium and Luxemburg, 70; Denmark, 250; France, 400; Netherlands, 150; Poland, 415; total, 1,285.

Rollers: Poland, 1,200; total, 1,200.

Cultivators (one-horse): Poland, 2,000; total, 2,000.

Field Cultivators: Belgium and Luxemburg, 200; Czechoslovakia, 350; Denmark, 800; France, 5,102; Netherlands, 300; Norway, 250; Poland, 1,048 Yugoslavia, 50; total, 8,100.

Mounted toolbar: Czechoslovakia, 150; France, 800; Greece, 75; Norway, 75; Yugoslavia, 100; Baltic States, 250; total, 1,450.

Power sprayers: Netherlands, 1,000; total, 1,000.

Hand sprayers: Belgium and Luxemburg, 2,300; Greece, 4,500; Netherlands, 2,500; Yugoslavia, 13,500; Albania, 200; total, 23,000.

Reapers: Poland, 6,500; total, 6,500.

Potato diggers: Belgium and Luxemburg, 50; France, 400; Netherlands, 50; Norway, 50; Poland, 175; total, 725.

Beet lifters: Belgium and Luxemburg, 150; France, 500; Netherlands, 150; Poland, 350; total, 1,150.

Mowers (ground-drive): Belgium and Luxemburg, 5,000; Czechoslovakia, 1,965; Denmark, 4,000; France, 26,400; Greece, 200; Netherlands, 4,000; Norway, 2,000; Poland, 2,000; Yugoslavia, 800; Baltic states, 3,000; Italy, 635; total, 50,000.

Tractors (under 30 horsepower): Belgium and Luxemburg, 280; Czechoslovakia, 650; Denmark, 900; France, 8,280; Greece, 75; Netherlands, 1,000; Norway, 650; Poland, 3,000; Yugoslavia, 250; Baltic states, 1,000; Italy, 500; total, 16,585.

Tractors (30 horsepower and over): Belgium and Luxemburg, 70; Czechoslovakia, 350; Denmark, 300; France, 5,520; Greece, 25; Netherlands, 500; Poland, 5,200; Yugoslavia, 250; Baltic states, 750; Italy, 450; total, 13,415.

Trailers (farm, 2-wheel): Belgium and Luxemburg, 350; Czechoslovakia, 1,000; Denmark, 1,200; France, 13,800; Greece, 100; Netherlands, 1,500; Norway, 650; Poland, 8,200; Yugoslavia, 500; Baltic states, 1,750; Italy, 950; total, 30,000.

Separators (under 250 pounds): Czechoslovakia, 2,000; Denmark, 800; France, 13,800; Greece, 200; Netherlands, 1,500; Norway, 1,500; Poland, 2,500; Yugoslavia, 1,000; Italy, 1,800; total, 25,100.

Separators (over 250 pounds): Denmark, 200; France, 2,000; Netherlands, 1,500; Norway, 500; Poland, 500; Italy, 200; total, 4,900.

Incubators: Norway, 150; Yugoslavia, 300; total, 450.

Parts for new machinery (tons): Belgium and Luxemburg, 230; Czechoslovakia, 253; Denmark, 492; France, 4,063; Greece, 49; Netherlands, 540; Norway, 219; Poland, 2,597; Yugoslavia, 289; Albania, 1; Baltic states, 430; Italy, 258; total, 9,421.

Parts for present machinery (tons): Belgium and Luxemburg, 297; Denmark, 45; France, 3,331; Netherlands, 230; Norway, 7; Italy, 45; total, 3,955.

Rakes (sulky dump): Belgium and Luxemburg, 1,000; Czechoslovakia, 485; Denmark, 800; France, 12,000; Netherlands, 1,000; Norway, 1,000; Yugoslavia, 200; Baltic states, 1,500; Italy, 315; total, 18,300.

Rakes (combination side-delivery): Belgium and Luxemburg, 200; France, 3,900; Netherlands, 500; total, 4,600.

Reaping attachments (mowers): Belgium and Luxemburg, 1,000; Denmark, 535;

France, 2,300; Greece, 50; Netherlands, 100; Norway, 200; Poland, 450; Yugoslavia, 50; Italy, 315; total, 5,000.

Threshers (power): Belgium and Luxemburg, 120; Greece, 50; Norway, 100; Poland, 250; Yugoslavia, 100; Baltic states, 50; Italy, 100; total, 770.

Threshers (hand): Yugoslavia, 3,000; total, 3,000.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I say all that machinery is programed for export under the direction of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. It is my contention that we should first look after the interests of our own people at home, particularly the farmers, because the 2,000,000,000 people of the entire world are waiting for us to feed them; and when the war is over, the 2,000,000,000 people of the whole world will be waiting for us to put up the money of the taxpayers of this country to rehabilitate them; and when that is over, they will insist that we put them into business in competition with our own farmers and our own manufacturers. I do not like the attitude about this matter. I do not like it at all. In mentioning the attitude of the countries about which I have spoken, I desire again to bring to the attention of the Members of this body the fact that since the war broke out in Europe on September 3, 1939, more than 600,000 aliens from the lands I have just mentioned have come to this country, and are here now, and are going to stay here, and will never go back to Europe. They are here now, taking the jobs of our boys, now in uniform, who will want them when they come back. I protest against that situation, and I protest against the continued admission of foreigners from those lands, for whose countries our boys are bleeding and dying, while they bask here in the sunlight of safety and prosperity, and many of them are holding jobs which our boys and girls will want when they return from the war. Mark my words about that.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that today we observe one great nation, one of our most helpful allies in Europe, bidding for a tremendous amount of territory. I speak of Russia. We have heard our distinguished friend and, I might say, almost kinsman, Winston Churchill, say that he did not become Prime Minister of the British Empire for the purpose of liquidating that Empire. In view of that consideration, I have no hesitancy in calling to the attention of Mr. Stalin, who is looking out for the interests of Russia, and of Mr. Churchill, who is looking out for the interest of Great Britain, the fact, that in my opinion, by all laws of fairness and discovery, we should have one small piece of land in which I am vitally interested. I think that we should become the possessors of it.

In view of all the talk about lands all over the world, I feel at liberty to mention Wrangell Island. Wrangell Island is located in the Arctic Ocean. It is several hundred miles north of the northernmost tip of the North American Continent, where Will Rogers lost his life with Wiley Post a number of years ago. I happened to be on the Coast Guard cutter which carried the stone to mark the spot where he was killed.

Wrangell Island is about the size of the Island of Jamaica. If one were flying from New York to the Philippines he would fly directly over Wrangell Island. It will become one of the most important spots in all the world, because aviation will experience a phenomenal and fantastic development. For that matter, it has already experienced such a development; but particularly after the war, when large, high-powered planes are commercialized. Wrangell Island will become one of the most important spots on the face of the earth.

My recollection is that a number of years ago American citizens on a trip toward the North Pole, after unfortunately being wrecked, discovered Wrangell Island and placed the American flag thereon. They left, and my recollection is that a few years thereafter our Government sent about 12 Eskimos and 1 white man there. Later they were chased off by the Russians, and we have never heard anything from any of them since.

It is my contention that Wrangell Island belongs to the United States by right of discovery. We have stated that we do not expect to get a foot of land out of this war. I think that we might now negotiate with our ally, Russia, in regard to Wrangell Island, so I am resubmitting a resolution which I have submitted on several previous occasions——

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator made the statement that we have stated that we do not expect to get a foot of land out of this war. On what authority does the Senator base that statement?

Mr. REYNOLDS. The people of the United States have been repeatedly told——

Mr. BREWSTER. By whom?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am speaking only on the basis of what I have read in the newspapers. The people of the United States have been repeatedly told that we are fighting for the "four freedoms," fighting to liberate the peoples of the world, and that we are not fighting to secure any additional lands anywhere on the face of the earth.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator subscribe to that doctrine?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not.

Mr. BREWSTER. I was surprised when the Senator stated that we have repeatedly said that we do not expect to get a foot of land out of this war.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I have read that statement innumerable times in propaganda. It has been stated that we are fighting to liberate the peoples of the world, to take them out from under the heel of dictators and totalitarian powers which have subjugated them. I do not subscribe to that doctrine. I have my own ideas about our own national defense after this war is over.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it would be extremely unfortunate if substance were given to the idea that the United States is forswearing any claim of any character to any territory. Members of the committee which went around the world last year have publicly and repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate that there are very many islands in the Pacific which in our judgment are of great strategic significance to our country. We certainly do not expect to restore to Japan, after this war is over, islands which have been captured at the cost of the blood of American boys. I think that any suggestion on the floor of the Senate that the United States Government does not contemplate in some manner acquiring interests in that area would be utterly contrary to the thought of the Senate, and I think of the country. I say that with all due respect to anyone who may have a contrary view.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not subscribe to that doctrine; but for years propaganda has been broadcast throughout the country to the effect that we are fighting for the "four freedoms" and the liberation of peoples from the heel of totalitarian powers.

My position may be very easily and simply explained in a very few words. I was very enthusiastic about the proper defense of this country before we ever became engaged in this war. I said, "Let us build up our national defense. Let us so thoroughly develop our national defense that no power or aggregation of powers will dare to attack us. Let us stay here. If we are attacked here we will fight to the death."

Many persons said, "Oh, no; let us not do that. Let us go over there and do the fighting. If we do not go over there and whip our enemies over there, they will be here overnight." Lo and behold, we found that when Hitler and his legions arrived at that little ditch of muddy water, the English Channel, they could not even cross the English Channel. What chance would they have of crossing 3,000 miles of ocean? We would annihilate them.

I voted for every national defense measure. I voted for every dollar that we needed; and tried to get more for national defense measures. In 1938 I traveled all over Alaska. When I returned to the floor of the Senate, former Senator Schwellenbach, of Washington, now a Federal judge, and I tried our best to obtain increased appropriations for the fortification of Dutch Harbor, Unalaska, and the Aleutians. We could not arouse any interest in that project. That was in 1938.

I felt that we were going to be drawn into this war eventually. I wanted to prepare for it. In 1936 I introduced in this body a bill providing for the mandatory registration and fingerprinting of every alien in this country, so that if war should come we would know who our enemies were, and who our friends were. Years passed before such a measure was enacted. Representative HOWARD SMITH could not get it through the Immigration Committee in the House. He had it acted upon by the Judiciary Committee, and it came to the Senate. Our distinguished

and beloved friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] reported it from the Judiciary Committee, and the Senate finally passed it. If we had enacted such a law in 1936, when I said it should have been enacted, today we would not have to use 300,000 or more American soldiers to guard bridges, gas tanks, power plants, municipal utilities, and other properties which are important in the war effort.

I wish to take advantage of the opportunity which the Senator has afforded to me to let readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD know I tried to do everything to prepare this country for war before it came.

What did I do? During the existence of the C. C. C. camps they took care of 3,000,000 young men. I introduced a bill providing for simple military training in the manual of arms. At the time I introduced the bill I stated that if we should train those young men in the fundamentals of the manual of arms, if we got into war the opportunities of those poor boys to obtain commissions would be better than the opportunities of rich boys. However, it was said, "That will never do. The C. C. C. is not a military project."

Coming to the very point which the Senator from Maine mentioned, in order that I may make my position clear, for in many respects my position is the same as his, I thank God, for the American people, that the Senator from Maine was one of the five Senators who made the trip around the world. They provided us with information which we never could have obtained if they had not made the trip. I shall never cease to thank the five Senators who made the trip.

With respect to the question of islands, let me say that I wanted to build a band of steel around our portion of North America. I wanted to make our section of the world so strong that no nation or aggregation of nations would ever attempt to attack us on our shores. I wanted to do that instead of going to war over there. I wanted to stay here and fight for my own shores should we ever have to fight. As a result of that attitude, and being interested in building up fortifications in our hemisphere, I introduced a bill in the Congress of the United States authorizing the President of the United States to have the Secretary of State enter into negotiations with Great Britain and France for the purpose of turning over to us Jamaica, the Windward Islands, the Bahamas, and all the islands in the Caribbean, as well as Bermuda, which is 500 miles directly off the coast of my State of North Carolina. I introduced another measure which would give the President of the United States authority to negotiate with the representatives of France to give us two islands which I thought we then needed, Miquelon and St. Pierre, right off the coast of Newfoundland. I wanted those islands to be transferred to us. We needed them as outlying fortifications. I proposed that we would ascertain the value of the islands and credit their total value to the $11,000,000,000 owed us as a result of World War No. 1. However, it was not done.

Furthermore, I have repeatedly said that we should negotiate with Mexico, our sister republic to the south, to endeavor to get from her the peninsula at the lower end of California, because we need it. As the Senator knows, between that peninsula and the mainland of our country there are very deep waters, which are capable of hiding submarines, and, as a matter of fact, battleships, and certainly cruisers.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is referring to Lower California.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am referring to Lower California, which belongs to Mexico.

I also suggested that we negotiate with Ecuador, through its officials in the capital city, Quito, for the acquisition of the Galapagos Islands, which lie off the shores of Ecuador.

So the Senator and I see eye to eye on the subject of national defense.

How far we should go in endeavoring to secure the islands as flying bases cannot now be decided, for this reason: I am informed by those who are considered to be among the finest experts on aviation in the world, that a year or two after this war is over, certainly not more than 10 years after the present war is over, and I hope before the next one is started, it will be entirely possible for the tremendous bombers weighing many tons and carrying many tons, now capable of negotiating a total of say only a thousand miles, such as they are now doing from the British Isles to Berlin and return, to be based 3,000 or 4,000 or 5,000 miles away from their objective. That will be attributable to many features which have been mentioned heretofore by some of us.

Mr. TYDINGS. They fly now as far as 1,500 miles.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes. I think that before this war is over we should begin to prepare ourselves to defend ourselves, and to do so from our own shores. In order to do that we should keep away from our shores, as far as we possibly can, the potential enemies of the world who probably will have some things to say about us after this war is over.

Mr. President, I suggested that we build a band of steel around our portion of the northern hemisphere. Instead of fighting here at home we decided to go abroad and fight. We said we would go over there and fight, because if we did not go over there, 3,000 miles away, and fight them, they would come here. Since we have seen that the Germans could not get across such a muddy little ditch as the English Channel, what reason is there to believe that they could come across 3,000 miles of water?

The point I wish to make is that if we had spent in this country for the defense of the shores of the continental United States—and I mean by that, of course, from Canada down to the Panama Canal—a portion of what we have now been forced to spend, we could have placed machine guns a foot apart all the way around the United States. We could have made just one airport of every mile of land for that entire distance, and we could have bought all sorts of field artillery and antiaircraft guns and machine guns, and placed them so thickly that they would have been a foot apart for a mile back from the shores for the entire distance surrounding the United States of America.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. As a result of the experiences of the last few years would the Senator from North Carolina contemplate with equanimity the unification of the other four continents under any kind of control? Would the Senator feel that that would be the kind of a world in which we would be very comfortable?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I do not precisely understand the Senator's question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Suppose all the other continents should come under one control, it might be of one power or another, and suppose they should subscribe to one system of ideology, philosophy, and governmental association and control; would the Senator feel that that would be the kind of a world which would indefinitely leave us alone? I have great sympathy for the Senator's emphasis on the American point of view, as he well knows.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. But, on the other hand, I have also become very conscious that there is a lot of world scattered around.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say to the Senator that when campaigning I have frequently told my constituents from the rostrums in my State of North Carolina that this was a changing world, that the world is being shrunk, that it is shrinking hourly, that it is becoming smaller every day as the result of the development of transportation facilities. I took my audiences back to the old mule days or donkey days, the ox-cart days, and brought them up to the day of the airplane of the present. Speaking of the donkey and the airplane, as the Senator knows, in the Central South American countries there are people who never saw a train and never saw an automobile. They proceeded directly from the back of a burrow to a seat in an airplane. It is a changing world.

I wish to say to the Senator that I want peace. I want peace as much as anyone else in the world can possibly want it. My heart goes out in the deepest sympathy, particularly to the mothers of this war. We have not begun the great battles yet, as the Senator well knows. Some have described the struggles to date as preliminary skirmishes. We are doing well in those skirmishes in the Orient under the gallant leader MacArthur, and we are doing much in Italy under Eisenhower; but before this war is over we will probably have a million or more men wounded. There may be a million men killed. The people of this country who will be thinking about those million dead will be the mothers of the country. My heart goes out in sympathy to them. I am thinking always of the mothers, because a mother is the greatest institution that God ever created. A man can wander away from home, and regardless of what he does, though he may be a scape-

grace or a scavenger in the eyes of the world, when he comes back to the threshold of his home he will find that dear old mother there waiting to put her arms around her son, to comfort him and to inspire him, and to give him new hope for life.

I wish to God we could have peace; I wish to God we had never become involved in this war, for I know that it is going to break millions of hearts, the hearts of mothers who are the real builders of everything in America, and from whom we derive all through life the inspiration to accomplish all that we may achieve. I hope and pray to the great God above, in whom I believe, that this war may soon be terminated so that the sons of American mothers may return to their homes and be delivered again to the arms of the mothers who gave them birth and life. I hope that something may be worked out whereby peace may come, not for the present only, but eternally, to the people of America and to the people of the world, because a war of the magnitude and proportions of the one now being waged means not only death and sorrow and broken hearts and bankruptcy, but the destruction of civilization itself.

As to what my attitude will be in regard to a world-wide organization I cannot say. It will be a subject for discussion before us, and I dare say we will be debating that question on the floor of the Senate as soon as the President's bill to put into effect the world-wide neighborhood policy is acted upon by the Foreign Relations Committee and is reported to the floor. I have not read the bill, though I have read something about it. A newspaper man asked me whether I was going to support the President's world-wide good-neighbor bill. I said, "I do not know; I have not read it, but I have read something in the newspapers about it; I want to hear the evidence before the Foreign Relations Committee; but even if I am against it I shall vote to report it to the floor of the Senate, because I think it is a thing of such vast magnitude that it ought to be discussed here in this well of knowledge and thought and debate," and so I will. In the meantime I can only say to the Senator, as I said a moment ago, that I hope and pray we may work out some plan by which peace will come to this troubled world at the earliest possible date in order that sons may be returned to their mothers and husbands to their wives.

Before the Senator came in—I know he was in attendance upon a committee meeting, or he would have been here—I was speaking about our soldier boys, our soldier men, our soldier girls, our soldier women, and I was saying that I was in hope that Congress would promptly enact legislation providing adjusted compensation for them, so that we would be able to have the money to pay them when they come out of the Army. I suggested that a few billion dollars be set aside now to take care of our own boys, our own men in uniform, our own girls, and young women in uniform when they come back before we give it all away, as we may do, considering the rate at which we are spending money.

I probably ought not to talk about America first but I cannot help it. I love this country; everything that I have I owe to my country and to my mother. I love the United States of America as I could love no other country in the world. Probably the reason that I so love it is that I have seen so much of other countries, those to the north of us, those to the south of us as far as Buenos Aires, those in Europe, and India, Australia, New Zealand, Tasmania, indeed almost all of them. So I love America more than any other country or all other countries of the world combined and always shall because having seen so much of the other countries I have been provided the opportunity of comparing them with this country.

God bless America. May we here in this well of thought keep America American and save America for Americans.

JURISDICTION OVER WRANGELL ISLAND

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 266), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is requested to make a report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date with respect to whether or not the United States has a valid claim to sovereignty over Wrangell Island.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States nominating sundry officers in the judicial branch, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION IN THE NAVY

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there is only one nomination on the Executive Calendar, namely the nomination of Rear Admiral Richmond K. Turner to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service. I ask that, as in executive session, the nomination be confirmed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this nomination, as I understand, has been on the calendar for some days. So far as I know, there is no objection in the Senate to it. I hope the request of the Senator will be concurred in.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rear Admiral Richmond K. Turner to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from February 4, 1944.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, March 9, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 7 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Elwyn R. Shaw, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice Hon. Charles Edgar Woodward, deceased.

Walter J. LaBuy, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice Hon. William H. Holly, retired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Theron Lamar Caudle, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina. (Mr. Caudle is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 9, 1944.)

Timothy T. Cronin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin, vice Berthold J. Husting, term expired.

Brian S. Oden, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Texas, vice Douglas W. McGregor, resigned.

William R. Smith, Jr., of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana. (Mr. Tansil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 12, 1944.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Charles H. Cox, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia. (Mr. Cox is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 12, 1944.)

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 7 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Richmond K. Turner, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from February 4, 1944.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou whose eyes are upon the righteous and whose ears are open to their supplication, speak to us as we bow at Thine altar. We praise Thee for Thy word, glowing with vision and faith, and for the living and lasting assurance that Thy tender love doth shadow us each day. Make us strong to seek and to strive, never failing to live dynamically on the side of goodness. When the forces of evil are arrayed against the right, when the helpless are oppressed and the humble poor despoiled, enable us to serve them and thus find our lives by losing them.

O God, Thou who hast opened Thine hand in blessings rich and abundant, in the distemperatures of human life and in the evolution of human affairs, inspire us to lift ourselves and behold the God of wisdom and of power who is above all things forevermore. Lead us to check all jealousy, rebuke envy, and destroy selfishness in the sweetness of forbearance and gentleness toward one another. O Thou whose hand holds the scale of eternal justice, purge our vision and widen our horizon and fill us with a deep, sacred impulse that directs a wisely ordered life and with unquenchable devotion to public duty. In Thy holy name, O Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Nevada.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

INTERNATIONAL TREATY IN RE PALESTINE

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize briefly to the House this morning that every Member has been put under warning that he may not be given an opportunity for open debate on repudiation of an international treaty which involves national honor, because a few wealthy Arabs under British domination in Palestine, Syria, Irak, Lebanon, and Egypt have indicated their displeasure with Palestine resolutions now pending before this Congress.

It has become an all-too-frequent practice by persons and elements within this country to attempt to dictate to this Congress. We have, on occasion, resisted these attempts decisively and unequivocally. Now, however, it appears that elements outside the country have been encouraged to try to dictate to the Congress of the United States by advising us what questions we should discuss and what we should not discuss.

I refer, of course, to the public pressure being brought to prevent the Foreign Affairs Committees of the House and Senate from reporting out the bipartisan resolutions on Palestine introduced jointly in the House by me and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]. The pressure so far is coming from two known sources—Arab legislators in the countries under British control and from the War Department, which indicates a desire to appease this Arab minority even though such appeasement presents a challenge to our national honor.

I think it fair to ask who inspires this pressure for appeasement from our war leaders. Presumptious dictation from foreign legislators should be resisted and resisted unanimously. This country is honor-bound by its own signed covenant to prevent the British from closing Palestine to the suffering Jew in Europe as they now plan on March 31. I urge you to inform yourself of this by reading the convention we signed with Great Britain in 1925.

If we have no foreign policy of our own, I am against continuing to borrow from some other country. A question of national honor cannot be decided on the basis of the attitude of the legislators of some foreign country—nor on any policy of appeasement.

We can be a good neighbor and a stanch ally without submitting to dictation from 10 Downing Street.

ADDITIONAL SHIP FACILITIES FOR UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1668), authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill and also the reason for it being necessary to call the bill up at this time?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate bill. Hearings were held before the Committee on Naval Affairs and that committee has unanimously recommended that the bill be passed. It is reported to the House by the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], but it is impossible for him to be here this morning as he is attending a Naval Affairs hearing.

This bill authorizes an appropriation of $130,000,000 and the program for which authorization is sought contemplates the following projects at the estimated cost shown:

	Estimated cost
(a) 4 floating drydocks suitable for large commercial vesssels. The drydocks will be approximately 15,000 tons capacity	$16,000,000
(b) Conversion of 3 existing west coast shipbuilding basins for use as drydocks. These basins can be made available for conversion by transferring ship construction to existing yards less critically situated	4,000,000
(c) Installation of and supporting facilities for the 4 floating drydocks, item (a) above. It is proposed to install these docks at established repair or shipbuilding yards which will require a minimum use of critical materials and manpower, to provide supporting facilities, including berthing piers, dredging, temporary shop buildings, tools, weights-handling equipment, power, and other services	8,000,000
(d) Submarine overhaul facilities for the simultaneous overhaul of 10 submarines in the west coast area which is considered essential	10,000,000
(e) Additional development of the U. S. Naval Drydocks, Hunter's Point, Calif., and U. S. Naval Drydocks, Terminal Island, Calif. As these facilities are manned and experience is obtained in the operation of them, it will, unquestionably be necessary to round out such facilities to permit the establishments to undertake their ultimate work loads. For example, it is now apparent that provisions must be made for regunning battleships and cruisers at Hunter's Point; a plant break water is contemplated for Terminal Island; and at both establishments more berthing will be required	10,000,000
(f) Replacement of mobile floating repair units by installation of equivalent tools and equipment ashore. By providing these tools and equipment ashore, mobile units costing substantially more than the equivalent shore-based facilities will be made available to advanced bases or other locations where mobility is essential	1,500,000
(g) Additional repair facilities for continental amphibious craft activities. Because of the increase in amphibious training with the consequent increase in the number of amphibious craft requiring repairs, the facilities at amphibious training centers have become inadequate	1,500,000
(b) Authorization for additional appropriations to be made available for the following purposes:	
(1) To complete floating drydocks previously authorized which have exceeded original estimates of cost ($23,000,000), and	

	Estimated cost
(2) To furnish supporting facilities for drydocks previously authorized to the extent to which it has been necessary to divert funds originally requested for this purpose to other repair-facility projects more urgently needed at the time ($30,000,000)	$53,000,000

The act of Feb. 19, 1943 (Public Law 1, 78th Cong., 1st sess.), was intended to cover the construction of a total of 48 drydocks at a total estimated cost of $133,000,000, plus necessary supporting facilities having a total estimated cost of $77,000,000. Increases in the cost of labor and materials, and important design changes (principally in the way of expanding the size of the docks) have increased the cost of the construction of the 48 drydocks to a total of approximately $165,000,000. Of this total increase of $32,000,000 over the original estimate, $9,000,000 has been charged against existing authorizations to the extent available, leaving a balance of $23,000,000 for which additional authorization must be obtained if the program is to be completed.

While the $133,000,000 authorized for the construction of the 48 drydocks was immediately allocated to such construction, the $77,000,000 set up to cover the cost of the supporting facilities was not simultaneously allocated for this purpose since the supporting facilities were not to be required until some later date. In the interim period other more urgently needed repair-facility items arose for which the $77,000,000 authorization was the only one available. Use of the $77,000,000 fund to meet these items now makes it necessary to obtain additional authorization in the amount of $30,000,000 to cover the cost of the supporting facilities for which no existing authorization is now available.

(1) Reserve for contingencies consisting of 10 percent for possible increased costs and 15 percent for unforeseen requirements. Experience has demonstrated the necessity for providing a reserve for use in meeting items that cannot be anticipated under the changing conditions of war. For example, it may be necessary to provide additional emergency or replacement docks, or specific facilities may become essential for specific localities to service deployments of vessels concentrated to meet new strategic situations. Although the cost estimates used are the best obtainable, it is by no means certain that they are adequate	26,000,000
Total estimated cost of program	130,000,000

The Navy Department recommends enactment of the proposed legislation.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

These items have been considered by the Appropriations Committee which it is expected will be presented some time today in a deficiency bill. I understand that the Appropriations Committee has approved this expenditure in an amount of $120,000,000. The chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] requested me yesterday to see if I could not get the bill before the House today so that it will be strictly in order to include that item of $120,000,000 in the deficiency appropriation bill to be considered, probably tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I do not know as I have anything much to say. It seemed to us from the hearings that there is need for some of this money in connection with the Pacific campaign and undoubtedly the authorization should pass.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is a unanimous report?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes, this bill is unanimously reported by the committee. I may say that I filed an application before the Rules Committee for a rule. I intended to ask for a rule this week, but the urgency of the Appropriations Committee submitting the deficiency bill makes it necessary to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of this bill today.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think it should be brought out as a matter of interest that this authorization for ship repair facilities is to take care of repairs that are necessary on all the ships of our merchant-marine fleet.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. As well as our naval vessels.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This is an emergency proposition?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $130,000,000 for essential equipment and facilities at either private or public plants for repairing, altering, or converting any vessel operated by the Navy or the War Shipping Administration or being prepared for the use of either.

SEC. 2. The authority herein granted shall include the authority to acquire lands at such locations as the Secretary of the Navy may deem best suited to the purpose of the authority herein contained, erect or extend buildings, acquire the necessary machinery and equipment, and shall be in addition to all authority heretofore granted for these purposes.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy from time to time, but not less frequently than every 60 days, shall transmit to the Congress a full report of all acquisitions of land, by lease or otherwise, effected under the authority of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from former Senator Robert L. Owen, and a short excerpt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the report of the resolutions committee of the Federated Organizations for Bataan Relief, which was organized here in Washington on February 10, 1944, and also an announcement from this organization to the effect that their first convention will be held in my home city, St. Joseph, Mo., on May 4, 5, and 6 of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Public Printer explaining why an article submitted by me does not appear in today's RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Idaho Daily Statesman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on three distinct subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANSWERING SIDNEY HILLMAN ON SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, Sidney Hillman, the foreign-born radical, chairman of the national political action committee of the alien-dominated, Communist-infested, C. I. O., continues his smear attacks against the Congress of the United States—this time on the soldiers' absentee voting bill.

It is not strange that this alien-minded Trotskyite who has done so much to promote strikes, slow down production, and jeopardize the lives of our brave boys on the various battle fronts of the world, should now be attacking and smearing Congress, under the pretense of trying to enable the soldiers to vote, when what he wants is to get his loathsome fingers on the soldiers' ballots.

If every red-blooded American in the armed forces of this Nation were given the right to vote on the strike question, they would unanimously demand that these racketeers stop promoting these strikes, and cease their other subversive activities, or that they be stood against a brick wall and shot.

What our men in the service want is to win this war and come home, which they cannot do if these strikes continue.

These C. I. O. leaders have been whining to high heaven and smearing Congress in every way they could, because Congress overrode the President's veto of the tax bill which contained a provision to make these racketeers turn their pockets inside out and show the amount of money they have wrung from the helpless laborers of this Nation by standing guard at every factory gate, and every defense plant, and "shaking them down" before they could do a day's work in order to get bread with which to feed their families—denying them the first freedom, the freedom to work for their daily bread—without being robbed in advance.

Congress is all-powerful when it comes to protecting this Nation against these subversive elements; and the American people, including the soldiers, are demanding that we put a stop to these attempts to destroy the confidence in Congress and to this high-handed robbery of this Government, of the American people, and of the American workmen, by Sidney Hillman, and other such racketeers, who are now raising money in this way to try to defeat Congressmen who refuse to bow to their impious demands.

Our boys are paying with their blood today for these treasonable strikes that are slowing down the prosecution of the war and costing thousands of lives of the brave men who are fighting to save the very Government these subversive elements would destroy.

INCOME-TAX RETURN SIMPLIFICATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have had several conferences, including one this morning, with the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am indeed gratified to know that he and his committee are working to eliminate these impossible income tax return forms. I am informed that an effort is being made to aid all the bewildered small-income taxpayers. I have been earnestly advocating a simplified procedure for a long while.

I feel that we can properly eliminate the necessity of those who are earning less than $2,500 a year making a return, and we should also materially simplify the returns of those earning above that amount. The ordinary citizen cannot understand the intricacies of the income-tax law and independently execute the complicated form; and even many small-business men are obliged to employ accountants to make proper returns for them. Indeed it is said that very many revenue agents reach different determinations on the same state of facts. I feel, and shall insist, that those making tremendously large profits—whether corporations or individuals—shall carry the major tax burden and not unload it on those least able to pay.

This action of the great tax-gathering committee will, of course, be a pleasing reflection to each and every member because we all hear many complaints against the current procedure nearly every day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on ship production since February 1939, and to include therein a letter from Admiral Vickery, and a chart.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SOLDIER-VOTE BALLOTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] seems to be interested in the soldier-vote question.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I am.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Thomas Paper Co. has been indicted on 47 counts in the city of Chicago. I have been trying for months to have those indictments brought to trial. They have been operating a waste-paper black market. Recently that company was indicted in Detroit, and at least some of those indictments should be brought to trial.

I wonder if the gentleman thinks ballots for the soldiers should be printed on paper made by the mills that the Thomas company supplies with black-market waste paper—the gentleman knows to whom I refer.

Mr. SABATH. I have an idea.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; the gentleman has an idea all right enough. Does the gentleman think those ballots should be printed by the mills if the Thomas company is supplying the black-market paper? Does the gentleman think the Thomas Paper Co. should again be awarded the contract for the purchase of Government waste paper? I wish the gentleman would sometime take time to answer that.

Mr. SABATH. I will answer it now for the gentleman, and he will not like it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a talk by DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small Businessmen's Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Detroit News on Mass Production Called a Miracle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objectior to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

MRS. VOLA STROUD POKLUDA

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 272, for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,500 to Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, remarried widow of the late Lee Stroud who died as the result of personal injuries sustained when the automobile in which they were riding collided with an Army truck from Camp Wallace, Tex., on June 15, 1941, in the vicinity of the Galveston Causeway, Galveston County, Tex. This sum shall cover compensation for injuries sustained by Mrs. Pokluda and full settlement of her claim against the Government of the United States for the death of her husband: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$1,500."

Line 6, after "Pokluda", strike out the remainder of page 1, and on page 2 strike out down to and including line 4, and insert the following "; to pay the sum of $2,500 to Jesse M. Knowles; to pay the estate of Lee Stroud the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and the death of Lee Stroud sustained when the automobile in which they were riding collided with a United States Army truck, on June 15, 1941, in the vicinity of the Galveston Causeway, Galveston County, Tex.: *Provided*."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, Jesse M. Knowles, and the estate of Lee Stroud."

WINFRED ALEXANDER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 552, for the relief of Winfred Alexander.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Winfred Alexander, of Graysville, Tenn., the sum of $7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Winfred Alexander against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on September 16, 1938, when the motorcycle he was driving was struck on U. S. Highway No. 27, near the intersection of such highway and Liggett Road in Sale Creek, Tenn., by a truck in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Before payment is made under this act, Winfred Alexander is required to cancel judgment, together with cost of court, rendered against the driver of the Government truck, Hobart Wilson, in the Hamilton County Circuit Court, of the State of Tennessee, on February 22, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BROADUS D. BOLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1755) for the relief of Broadus D. Boland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Broadus D. Boland, of Batesburg, S. C., the sum of $750, in payment of expenses of Mr. Boland for hospitalization, medical treatment, and other items, brought about as the result of a wreck on December 10, 1941, when he was injured when the truck in which he was riding was run into by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof: "$500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as a result of an accident between the truck in which he was riding and a United States Army truck, on November 10, 1941, in Batesburg, S. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HAGAR SIMPSON AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2006) for the relief of Mrs. Hagar Simpson, Mrs. Nat Price, Jr., and Griffin Brothers Clinic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Hagar Simpson, of Odessa, Tex.; the sum of $5,000 to Mrs. Nat Price, Jr., of Graham, Tex.; and the sum of $1,452 to Griffin Brothers Clinic, of Graham, Tex., for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses incident to and sustained as a result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and a United States Army truck on Highway No. 67, near Graham, Tex., on August 2, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Strike out the sum of "$10,000" at the end of line 1, page 1, and insert "$5,000"; strike out the sum of "$5,000" at the end of line 6, page 1, and insert "$3,000"; strike out the following, after the semicolon, line 1, page 1: "; and the sum of $1,452 to Griffin Brothers Clinic, of Gresham, Tex."

Also, strike out the following, after the word "injuries" in line 9, page 1: "and medical and hospital expenses."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAE SCHEIDEL AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2008) for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mae Scheidel the sum of $1,500; to Mr. Fred Scheidel the sum of $500; to Mr. Charles Totten the sum of $150; and to Miss Jean Scheidel the sum of $250, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and an Army truck at East Milton Avenue, in the city of Rahway, N. J., at the intersection of Route No. 25, on February 27, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$500", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$100."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$150", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$25."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "$250". insert in lieu thereof the figures "$25."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O. W. JAMES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2303), for the relief of O. W. James.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to O. W. James, Fort Worth, Tex., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said O. W. James against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on November 21, 1942, by the said O. W. James, his wife, and his minor daughter, Juanice James, when the automobile in which they were riding on Highway Numbered 377, Denton County, Tex., was in collision with a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 8, after the word "of", insert "property damage and". At the end of bill, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET J. POW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2453), for the relief of Margaret J. Pow.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DANIEL BAKER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2497) for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Daniel Baker Co., Manchester, Clay County, Ky., the sum of $525.10, which sum represents the balance due the Daniel Baker Co. and is being withheld by the Government of the United States as part of the excess cost alleged to have been incurred by the United States by reason of the failure of the said Daniel Baker Co. to perform under contract No. Tps–40640, entered into on May 28, 1941, with the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department to furnish gasoline to certain governmental agencies during the period between July 1 through September 30, 1941.

It is further authorized and directed that the Daniel Baker Co. shall not be held liable or responsible on the claim of the United States against the said company in the amount of $101.21, or any part of it, which is alleged by the Comptroller General of the United States to be due the United States from the said company by reason of the alleged excess cost incurred by the United States due to the failure of the said company to perform under contract No. Tps–40640.

The said Daniel Baker Co. entered into contract No. Tps–40640, through its president, with the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department on May 28, 1941, with the mistaken impression that said contract only called for deliveries of gasoline to the governmental agencies included in said contract in Clay County, Ky., where the said company had a franchise from the Shell Oil Co., Inc., to sell and deliver their gasoline, and that the said company was unable at all times, including the contract period, to furnish gasoline elsewhere to fulfill the orders of the governmental agencies included in contract No. Tps.–40640: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AVID EVERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2648) for the relief of Avid Evers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Avid Evers, Cortland, Nebr., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Avid Evers against the United States on account of personal injury and property damage sustained by him when, on April 10, 1942, several airplanes, owned by the United States and en route to Canada under the lend-lease program, flying at a very low altitude over the farm of the said Avid Evers, terrified the 4-horse team which he was driving beyond all control, causing an accident which resulted in serious personal injury to the said Avid Evers, destruction of the disk pulverizer which the horses were drawing, and a substantial decrease in the value of the horses.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETE PALUCK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2689) for the relief of Pete Paluck.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States of America, for personal injuries sustained by Pete Paluck as a result of an accident involving a National Youth Administration vehicle on United States Highway No. 421, near Rocky Point, N. C., on October 18, 1941:

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, after the figures "$2,500", insert "to Pete Paluck, of Burgaw, N. C."

Line 7, after the word "injuries", insert "and medical expenses."

Line 8, strike out "by Pete Paluck."

At the end of bill, strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2736) for the relief of E. Sullivan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. Sullivan, colonel, Air Corps, Army of the United States, the sum of $1,613.25, such sum representing stoppage in his pay on account of the embezzlement by E. J. Barricklow, a civilian employee, of public funds for which said E. Sullivan was held accountable as agent finance officer at Kelly Field, Tex., from June 1927 to June 1928.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of bill, strike out the "period" and insert in lieu thereof ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LILLIAN W. TIMMERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2769) for the relief of Mrs. Lillian W. Timmerman, mother of Ann Timmerman, a minor, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lillian W. Timmerman, the mother of Ann Timmerman, a minor, deceased, the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for the death of Ann Timmerman, the minor daughter of Mrs. Lillian W. Timmerman, the said Ann Timmerman having been killed on September 8, 1941, when an automobile, driven by C. E. Wilson, who was at the time employed by the United States Government as a rural mail carrier, and who was at the time in the performance of his duties, ran over her in Covington County, Ala.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the name "Timmerman" and preceding the word "the", strike out the bill through the colon at the end of line 3, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof: "of Andalusia, Ala., the sum of $3,500 in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of her minor daughter, Ann Timmerman, who was killed as a result of being struck by an automobile driven by C. E. Wilson, a United States rural mail carrier, near Andalusia, Ala., on September 8, 1941."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JULIA BUBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2855, for the relief of Mrs. Julia Buby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Julia Buby, of Brown City, Mich., the sum of $10,560.86, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, John Buby, who was fatally injured on December 20, 1942, when struck by a United States Army vehicle near Disco, Mich., on Michigan State Highway M-53: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Mrs. Julia Buby" and insert in lieu thereof "the estate of John Buby."

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$10,560.86" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$7,975.86."

Page 1 line 7, strike out "her husband."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: At the end of line 6, page 1, strike out the sum of "7,975.86" and insert "$5,475.86."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of John Buby."

MRS. EVA M. DELISLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3102, for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Eva M. Delisle, of Worcester, Mass., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her son, Arthur A. Fenton, who died within 2 hours from injuries received when a United States Army jeep car, on which he was riding with William Northrop, a private in the United States Army and stationed at Fort Devens, Mass., overturned on Route 15, in Sturbridge, Mass., on January 21, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$5,335.75."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Fenton", and insert in lieu thereof "Fanion."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY ELLEN FRAKES, WIDOW OF JOSEPH A. FRAKES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3126, for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes, who was killed on the military reservation at Fort Thomas, Ky., on the 17th day of April 1943, through the carelessness and negligence of an enlisted soldier in the military forces of the United States serving as a guard at said military reservation.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the name "Mary Ellen Frakes", strike out the remainder of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof: "of Latonia, Kentucky, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of her husband, Joseph A. Frakes, who died as a result of being shot by a soldier on the military reservation at Fort Thomas, Ky., on April 17, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEN GRUNSTEIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3190, for the relief of Ben Grunstein.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ERNEST A. GROTTKE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3496, for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest A. Grottke, of the township of Fremont, county of Clark, State of Wisconsin, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him as the result of an accident involving an Army truck and a Ford coach in which he was a passenger on the Blackhawk Road (Kishwaukee Forest Preserve Road), near Camp Grant, Ill., on June 19, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,500."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert in lieu thereof "all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZEPHYR AIRCRAFT CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3596, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation against the United States.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Court of Claims of the United States be, and hereby is, given jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim, together with interest thereon, of the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation against the United States because of damage, injury, and losses suffered by the Lenert Aircraft Corporation, by the refusal of officials of the War Department of the United States to make a contract with the Lenert Aircraft Corporation, which is now known as the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation, after a design competition contemplating the procurement of primary training airplanes, which was projected by circular proposal 39-635, dated March 11, 1939, and in which competition the Lenert Aircraft Corporation submitted the lowest bid.

SEC. 2. The judgment under this act will cover all losses, damages, and injuries to the Lenert Aircraft Corporation, including prospective profits.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the passage of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, the form and content of protest and supporting papers or withdrawal thereof. Proceedings upon the determination of such claim and appeals from the payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM E. WIDBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3674, for the relief of William E. Widby.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

M. H. HARRIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3737, for the relief of M. H. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to M. H. Harris, of 2215 Northwest First Place, Miami, Fla., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the personal injuries sustained by him by the collision of a United States Navy station wagon with an automobile driven by John Andrew Godwin at the intersection of Northwest Seventy-eighth Street and Twenty-seventh Avenue, at Miami, Fla., on March 18, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW YORK INDEMNITY CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 776, to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States, for remission of liquidated damages assessed against such company as surety under the provisions of contract No. I–1p–129, dated May 12, 1928, between the United States and Greenwald and Tudor and E. Deffebach, for certain highway construction in Sequoia National Park, Calif.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and appeals from, and payment of any judgments thereon shall be had as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VERN M. STANCHFIELD

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1549, for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vern M. Stanchfield, of Wise River, Mont., the sum of $75, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the loss of his horse, which was destroyed because of injuries received by it while under rental to an employee of the Department of the Interior for use in the performance of his official duties: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. E. DOWDELL AND JUNE DOWDELL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1563, for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,700, to W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell, of 722 West Thirty-eighth Street, Houston, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damages sustained as a result of a United States Army airplane, bearing No. 41–16175 on the tail structure, crashed into their residence at 722 West Thirty-eighth Street, Garden Oaks, Houston, Tex., on February 7, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. GUY EVANS, GARLAND MINERAL SPRINGS, INDEX, WASH.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1589, for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,527.79 to C. Guy Evans, of Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the destruction by fire of his recreation hall at Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash., November 17, 1942, which was being used by personnel of the United States Coast Guard who failed to exercise reasonable care in the protection of the premises: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. PRIEST. I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: At the end of line 1, page 2, insert the following: "*Provided*, That C. Guy Evans and Garland Hot Mineral Springs, a corporation, execute documents satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury, releasing the United States from any further liability for the destruction of the recreation hall."

And change the word "*Provided*" at the beginning of line 2, page 2, to "*Provided further.*"

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALDROP HEATING AND PLUMBING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1061, for the relief of the Waldrop Heating and Plumbing Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. GRANT of Indiana, objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

WILLIAM E. SEARCH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1635, for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William E. Search, of Waveland, Ind., the sum of $5,000; to the legal guardian of Marion Seach the sum of $10,000; to the legal guardian of Pauline Seach the sum of $10,000; and to the legal guardian of Virginia Seach the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as a result of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Waveland, Ind., on June 24, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$2,673.50."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Seach" and insert in lieu thereof "Search."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,253.50."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Seach" and insert in lieu thereof "Search."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$4,487."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,037."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "injuries" insert ", medical, hospital expenses, and property damage incident thereto,".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN H. TAYLOR, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1682, for the relief of Edwin H. Taylor, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwin H. Taylor, Jr., De Funiak Springs, Fla., the sum of $6,779.21. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edwin H. Taylor, Jr., against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on October 2, 1942, in a collision with a United States Army truck which was on the wrong side of the road at Alligator Point, between Carrabelle and Tallahassee, Fla.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,779.21" and insert "$2,071.96."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "injuries", insert "medical, hospital expenses, and property damage."

Page 2, line 3, after the word "Florida", insert: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be final in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DONALD J. MUNSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2288, for the relief of Donald J. Munson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Donald J. Munson, Anderson, Ind., the sum of $1,708.32. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Donald J. Munson against the United States, including traveling expenses, arising out of damages to his aircraft in a forced landing on January 15, 1942, while on the return trip to Anderson, Ind., from Washington, D. C., after bringing such aircraft to Washington, D. C., pursuant to orders of the Commanding General, Ferrying Command, United States Army:

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "Army", insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be demed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE P. HALE, JR.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2405, for the relief of Clarence P. Hale, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence P. Hale, Jr., of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred as the result of a trip undertaken by him, from St. Louis, Mo., to Vallejo, Calif., to accept employment as helper, aircraft mechanic general, at Mare Island Navy Yard, Vallejo, Calif., upon authorization of a letter from the office of the manager, Fifth United States Civil Service District, Atlanta, Ga. Upon his arrival at Vallejo, Calif., Mr. Hale was informed that a mistake had been made in the appointment offered him, and such employment was not open to him: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", strike out "$500" and insert "$250."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE E. THOMPSON AND MRS. VIRGINIA THOMPSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2408, for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clarence E. Thompson and Virginia Thompson, of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $3,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred by them, and personal injuries sustained by Mrs. Virginia Thompson, as the result of the automobile they were riding in being struck by a Work Projects Administration truck, driven by a Work Projects Administration employee, on official Government business, on May 4, 1942, in the city of San Francisco, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MILDRED RING

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2846, for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Mildred Ring, who is alleged to have sustained injuries from undue exposures to low temperature weather and to have sustained injuries to her back while en route between Reno and Pyramid Lake, Nev., during the winter months of 1927–28, in line of her duties while employed as a field matron in the Indian Service, Department of the Interior, and her claim for compensation on account of all resultant, currently existing disabilities considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if she files such claim with the United States Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. Any monthly compensation which the said Mrs. Mildred Ring may be found to be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted, or such earlier date as the Commission, upon evidence submitted, may determine Mrs. Mildred Ring to be otherwise entitled to receive such compensation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUTH COE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3114, for the relief of Ruth Coe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth Coe, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, the sum of $302.78, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained when her automobile, while parked on the south side of Washington Street, in Burlington, Iowa, was struck by a Work Projects Administration truck immediately after the driver of said truck had succumbed to a heart attack, on the morning of January 12, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdeameanor and upon conviction thereof

shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C. C. EVENSEN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3668, for the relief of C. C. Evensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to C. C. Evensen, of Sacramento, Calif., the sum of $63.86, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for expenses on moving household effects from Oakland to Sacramento, Calif., on January 28, 1942, while serving as deputy clerk, United States district court: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. HOWARD C. BANTIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3724, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin, of 210 West DiLido Drive, Miami, Beach, Fla., $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin in a collision of a United States Navy bus with an automobile driven by Mrs. Howard C. Bantin at the intersection of Northwest Twentieth Street and Seventeenth Avenue, Miami, Fla., on August 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$580."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD POLAK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3301, for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Polak, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Edward Polak, a minor, the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses resulting from the injuries sustained by Edward Polak on October 7, 1941, when a United States post office mail box maintained in Cliffside Park, N. J., fell on him: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALMOS W. GLASGOW

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 555, for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Almos W. Glasgow, of Boise, Idaho, the sum of $2,800, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when the car in which he was riding was struck by a United States Army truck in Boise, Idaho, on August 21, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. McGREGOR:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "1942" and insert "1941."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,800" and insert "$2,300."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 176, for the relief of Austin L. Tierney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Private Law No. 99, Seventy-fourth Congress, an act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, is amended as follows: ": *Provided*, That compensation, retirement pay, back pay, or other benefits shall be held to have accrued and that this man will be entitled to the benefits, privileges, and rights conferred upon an honorably discharged sailor by reason of the passage of this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute therefor the following:

"That Private Law No. 99, Seventy-fourth Congress, he and the same is amended to read as follows:

" 'That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Austin L. Tierney, who served as a fireman third class, United States Navy, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States as a fireman third class, on April 25, 1918: *Provided*, That no compensation, pension or other benefits except mileage at the time of discharge, 4 months' active service pay lost after absence from duty, and adjusted compensation benefits shall be held to accrue to Austin L. Tierney by reason of this act for any period prior to its passage.' "

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK LECEL HAAS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 391, for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons honorably discharged from the United States Navy, their widows, children, and dependent relatives, Jack Lecel Haas shall be held and considered to have been discharged with a good discharge under honorable conditions on April 27, 1928: *Provided*, That no pension, pay, bounty, or other benefit shall be held to have accrued prior to the enactment of this act by reason of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM KOVATIS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 393, for the relief of William Kovatis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That William Kovatis, formerly of the United States Marine Corps, shall be entitled to medical care at Government expense at a facility of the Veterans' Administraton, until a finding by competent authority that no further improvement can be made by continued treatment, for the injury sustained at the Naval Prison, Portsmouth, N. H., on November 3, 1941. *Provided*, That no compensation, retirement pay, back pay, pension, or benefits other than benefits provided for herein shall be held to have accrued prior to or subsequent to the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this Act shall operate to change the nature of the discharge given to William Kovatis on May 18, 1942.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. (JR. GR.) SVEND J. SKOU

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 397, for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the retired pay of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou, United States Navy, retired, shall be three-fourths of the highest pay of his grade: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under the provisions of this Act prior to the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREGORY BOYINGTON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1427, to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington, a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Gregory Boyington, formerly a first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps, a first lieutenant on the active list of the Marine Corps, with the same date of rank and precedence held by him under such former commission: *Provided*, That the said Gregory Boyington shall be an additional number in the grade of first lieutenant, and to any to which he may hereafter be appointed: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed to entitle the said Gregory Boyington to any back pay, allowances, or other emoluments by reason of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADVANCEMENT OF REAR ADMIRAL EMORY S. LAND

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 634, to provide for the advancement of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of vice admiral.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to advance Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired, to naval constructor with the rank of vice admiral on the retired list.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN JOSEPH DEFEO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2337, for the relief of John Joseph Defeo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged sailors John Joseph Defeo, late of the United States Navy, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the naval service of the United States as a member of the United States Navy on the 2d day of April 1920: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "2d" and insert in lieu thereof "5th."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH LANGHORNE WALKER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3247, for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint Joseph Langhorne Walker, formerly an ensign, United States Navy (retired), on the retired list of the Navy in the grade of ensign with the retired pay of that grade: *Provided*, That, upon appointment, the said Joseph Langhorne Walker shall take rank from June 3, 1937, and shall be entitled to all retired pay which he would have received had his former status on the retired list not been terminated on November 13, 1942, by reason of his resignation which was accepted incident to an erroneous assumption that he was to be appointed to commissioned rank in the Army of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. MALCOLM K. BEYER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 242, for the relief of Capt. Malcolm K. Beyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Capt. Malcolm K. Beyer, the sum of $1,076, in full settlement of all claims against the Government by him for the loss of clothing and personal effects destroyed by fire at the officers' quarters at Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Breeze Hill, Wawayanda, N. Y., on April 3, 1937.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY LOVIS ELLIOTT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1643, for the relief of Mary Lovis Elliott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws the alien Mary Lovis (alias Lucko or Lutzke) Elliott, of Memphis, Tenn., whose husband is a citizen and a member of the armed forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted, at Detroit, Mich., on August 1, 1939, to the United States for permanent residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID B. TURPEL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1046, for the relief of David B. Turpel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers David B. Turpel, who was a member of Battery A, First Battalion Maine Heavy Artillery, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of that organization on the 24th day of February 1899: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA VIRTUDES TORRES STEERE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1715, for the relief of Mrs. Maria Virtudes Torres Steere.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

JOSEPH MRAK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3434, for the relief of Joseph Mrak.

Mr. PRIEST, Mr. MADDEN and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOMER C. CHAPMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 617, for the relief of Homer C. Chapman.

Mr. PRIEST and Mr. MADDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of the bills on the Private Calendar.

H. R. 1962

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have discussed with the majority leader and the minority leader the matter, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to restore to the Private Calendar the bill H. R. 1962, which has heretofore been objected to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF CERTAIN ANIMAL AND PLANT PESTS AND DISEASES

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 4278, to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the

orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 4278, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it now in order to offer amendments to the portion of the bill that was not read yesterday afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment now pending, to which an amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is also pending. After the pending amendments are disposed of, titles VI and VII are open for amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, before I proceed with my statement with regard to my amendment, may I state that the Committee on Agriculture at a meeting this morning directed me, as acting chairman of the committee, to accept the Rizley amendment which was offered yesterday, in the form in which it will be modified.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: Page 26, line 7, insert a new section 712:

"In addition to such sums as may be expended out of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, funds for the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities and their distribution through school-lunch programs, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amounts for the following purposes as may, when added to section 32 funds devoted to school-lunch programs, total not to exceed $50,000,000, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with and under the supervision of local school authorities, to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed forms, and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purposes of this program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with school enrollment, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further*, That benefits under this section to schools shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof delivered to the school as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further*, That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY to the amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: At the end of the amendment insert "*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated for this purpose shall be expended by or on behalf of any school from which an application therefor has never been received by the Secretary from the governing board of said school: *And provided further*, That the authorization provided herein shall not be effective subsequent to June 30, 1945."

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, in lieu of that amendment, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY to the amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: At the end of the Flannagan amendment insert:

"*Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated for this purpose shall be expended by or on behalf of any school until an application therefor has been received by the Secretary from the governing board of said school specifically requesting that said school be permitted to participate in said school-lunch program, and that the Secretary allocate funds for that purpose. Said application shall further advise the Secretary to what extent and the specific amount that said school will contribute to said program: *And provided further*, That the authorization provided herein shall not be effective subsequent to June 30, 1945."

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the committee has no objection to this amendment. If that is true, and if the committee accepts this amendment to the Flannagan amendment, I do not care to be heard on the amendment at this time.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that the Committee on Agriculture at a meeting this morning directed me to accept his amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I believe the gentleman is a member of the committee that reported this bill?

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask a question pertaining to the general amendment which the gentleman amends. If I understand this language correctly, this authorizes an appropriation, which, when added to the funds taken from the section 32 money shall not exceed $50,000,000, to be used for school-lunch purposes. Is that the meaning of the two amendments?

Mr. RIZLEY. That is the amount of the appropriation, yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What showing has been given to the committee that it is necessary to continue this school-lunch program among the school children in the rural areas or in any area?

Mr. RIZLEY. We had some hearings before the committee. I think I shall yield to the distinguished chairman of our committee to discuss that matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, by direction of the Committee on Agriculture, I introduced what is commonly known as the school-lunch-program amendment. For some years we have had a school-lunch program which has been financed chiefly from section 32 funds. Now, under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended, in 1935, it will be remembered we set aside 30 percent of the customs receipts for the purpose of aiding in the removal of surplus agricultural commodities. When it was brought to the attention of the committee that these funds had been diverted from the purpose for which the Congress had set them aside and were being used for financing school-lunch programs, we thought the time had arrived for us to call a halt. I would like to see the funds provided for under section 32 left to accumulate. If this is not done, I am afraid that we will have trouble in the future in removing surplus crops. Mr. Jones appeared before the committee urging that the school-lunch program be continued, and his testimony tended to show that in certain areas it was of great benefit to the school children. The committee at last agreed to sponsor the amendment extending the program for the period of 1 year and providing that the funds raised in section 32 could be used but only to the extent that they be employed to purchase surplus commodities. As we all know, there are very few surplus crops in this country today, and consequently, in my opinion, a very small part of these funds can be so used. We limited the authorization to $50,000,000, and from that will be deducted all of section 32 funds used in connection with the purchase of surplus crops.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I hope the chairman will explain that these funds, if not used for the removal of surplus commodities, revert back to the Treasury and are not carried for the purpose of removel of surplus commodities in the future. Until this Congress takes some action to make it impossible for those funds to revert back to the Treasury and keep them in this fund for that purpose in the future——

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Oh, I know what the gentleman has in mind; and I do want to state to the House that it is the opinion of the Committee on Agriculture that the law should be amended so as to provide for the accumulation of those funds to take care of surplus crops hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It strikes me that the gentleman's initial statement was correct, that it is evident that some of these funds are not being utilized, and will revert to the Treasury; but I want to ask the gentleman this question: Is it not true that this school-lunch program has just recently been fostered and paid for out of section 32 funds, it having been formerly provided for out of W. P. A. funds, or relief appropriations?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. For a time W. P. A. funds were used, but for several years section 32 funds, I understand, have been used.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Only to the extent that they were used in the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think the funds were diverted from the purpose for which the Congress intended they should be used when they were used in connection with the general financing of the school-lunch program, and for that reason the Committee on Agriculture thought the time had arrived to call a halt. We did not know about it until a subcommittee was appointed to look into this authorization, and when it developed, we decided to take action.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In the amendment printed in the RECORD I notice in subparagraph (b) the following language:

> The making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof.

Is that intended to limit that to school lunches for school alone?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The purpose of the amendment is to limit the funds to the school-lunch program.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And for no other purpose?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. For no other purpose.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. Will the gentleman state to the House the necessity for the continuance of this school-lunch program, under circumstances existing throughout the country?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am not in a position to give the gentleman accurate information on that question. From the limited hearings that we had on the school-lunch program it would seem that in certain areas there is a demand for a continuance of the program. The Rizley amendment, which the committee directed me to agree to at a meeting held this morning, limits that program to 1 year, and then it goes further and provides that the local school authorities shall make application to the Secretary for school-lunch funds, and that the local authority shall state in the application the extent to which the school itself will participate. Unless there is a real necessity for a lunch program, I do not believe that the local school authorities will agree to put up local money to match the Federal aid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 3 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to get before the House just what this amendment will do. It will continue the school-lunch program for another year. It will permit the use of section 32 funds to the extent of purchasing surplus farm crops, and no further. Then it provides that before a lunch program can be approved for any particular school, that the school authorities must make application to the Secretary of Agriculture for a school-lunch program, and that they should set out in the application the extent to which the local school authorities will participate.

Mr. LEWIS. If the gentleman will yield at that point. Does the gentleman know that the Government authorities in aid of this program are going around to the various public schools, seeking to induce the schools that have not been participating in this lunch program, to waive their objections and participate? In other words, the Government is trying to sell the schools on the idea of their engaging in this program.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I hope the gentleman will make sure that his information is correct before he makes such a statement. I would hate to think that we were trying to sell the school-lunch program and force it upon these school districts.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS. I just want to make this statement, that out in my district a school superintendent within the last 2 weeks has told me that very thing, and said that not once but on three different occasions, representatives of the Federal Government called upon him, seeking to induce him to change his stand on the free-lunch proposition and to provide free lunches for school children who are adequately cared for.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am sorry to hear that. I think we should have free discussion on this amendment. I think that the membership of the House should furnish all the information they are in possession of and we should have all the facts before we make a determination on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, at the request of some other Members I make the inquiry if, under the ruling the Chairman gave yesterday as to what was germane under this bill in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from New York, it would not be in order at the end of this bill to offer a repeal of the Agricultural Administration Act in this act, or a temporary abandonment of it for the duration?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot pass on any amendment until it is offered.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we should not adopt this amendment even as amended, but rather should take whatever steps are necessary to now eliminate this program—not only this program but many others like it. Mr. Chairman, it has been the generally accepted view in this country since the beginning of the Nation that the matter of relief was not primarily for the Federal Government. It is true that during a great emergency the Federal Government did get into it, and there was some justification, and, in fact, some necessity for taking that step. However, we should remember that the order of responsibility for any individual should be this: First, the individual himself; second, his relatives; third, his community; fourth, his State; and last, the National Government. Now, we have reversed the order. There is hardly a thing that happens in the country that the Federal Government does not get right in and offer money. Of course, as long as you offer money someone will take it. The attitude and the psychology is, "We must get our share of it, because we have to pay it back anyway." This program, Mr. Chairman, putting the Federal Government in charge, has resulted in making relief cost a lot more money to the people, although some of them think they are getting it for nothing. If you have any doubt of it, ask your community to figure up what they are getting and what they are paying back in taxes. Mr. Chairman, a program like this is rather appealing, but it seems to me the greatest legacy we can bequeath to these school children is to leave to them the thing we inherited from our fathers, and that is a sound Federal Government. With a national debt that will at least be $300,000,000,000, it seems to me our duty is plain. I do not know how much further we can go into debt, but I do know there must be a limit. I know this: I know any individual, any corporation, and any government that consistently spends more than it takes in and keeps it up long enough is going to come to disaster. I trust the whole thing will be voted down, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Apparently the gentleman has not read Stuart Chase's book, Where the Money Is Coming From. I recommend to the gentleman that he read that book, because there he will find that they have discovered a "potato money." Lord John Maynard Keynes has given us "green cheese money," now Stuart Chase has found a potato money, which will solve all this debt situation.

Mr. GWYNNE. I have not read the book, let me say to the gentleman, although I am familiar with the views of this alleged economist, Mr. Chase. But I submit I know where the money is coming from. It will come from the sweat and toil of our children. That is where it will come from.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of course.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Of course, the school-lunch program is a fine thing, but there is a question in my mind as to the responsibility for carrying out the program, whether it belongs to the Federal Government or to the State government or to the local subdivisions of our Government which is directly in charge of the school system. I feel that the committee is entitled to certain information in regard to the present program because once a policy is begun to establish a school-lunch program by the Nation, you surely should know the implications of it in order to form a correct opinion.

The Federal Government has not adopted the school-lunch program up to the present time. The Surplus Commodity Corporation of the Department of Agriculture has used section 32 funds to distribute burdensome surpluses in the United States. A part of that money to dispose of surplus commodities has gone to schools and the surplus foods have been used in lunch programs in some of the schools of the country. At the present time there are no agricultural surpluses of food. We have a temporary surplus in potatoes and eggs, but if we are to believe in what the administration tells us, most of these surpluses can be used in both the domestic and foreign markets to provide relief for people in other countries. Now I do not want to be charged with being either an isolationist or interventionist, but there are some of us who feel that we should take care of American people just as well as we have adopted a policy here to take care of foreign relief; at least we should take care of those Americans who are in need. But the proposal before the committee contemplates eventually the adoption of a permanent proposition rather than one of relief. So I am going to point out some of the essential factors with reference to the operation of the present school-lunch program as administered by the Department of Agriculture. There are approximately 30,000,000 school children in the United States between the ages of 5 and 17. At the present time between 4,500,000 and 6,000,000 school children out of the 30,000,000 are the beneficiaries of the school lunch program. The present costs for the Federal Government are estimated at around $50,000,000 a year to feed these 4,500,000 to 6,000,000 school children.

If 6,000,000 school children are entitled to the school-lunch program certainly the other 24,000,000 are also entitled to the benefits of the program.

Basing the cost upon what is now being paid, it will run around $300,000,000 from the Federal Government if we are to take care of and feed all of the school children and treat them all the same. So we should bear that in mind when we vote on this amendment.

There are approximately 238,000 schools in this country. Thirty thousand of the 238,000 are now under contract to handle the school-lunch proposition. It is said that 40 percent of those 30,000 schools are in communities of less than 2,500 people. The cost of the school-lunch program for the fiscal year 1944, which ends June 30, is estimated will be $86,595,000. Of this amount the Federal Government will spend approximately $43,300,000. Of the $43,300,000 it is said that around $5,000,000 is used for food purchased directly by the Federal Government and turned over to the schools. The other amount, or around $40,000,000, which the Federal Government pays, is used to indemnify the school authorities for the food that they purchase under the school-lunch program. I hope I have made myself clear on that.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain to the House what he means by "indemnifying the local school authorities"?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The local school authorities go out and buy the food and the Federal Government reimburses the local school authorities for what they have spent for such food.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman on the other side said that the local subdivisions would not match the money to request this help. That does not quite stand, in face of what the gentleman has just said.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. According to the information I have received from the Department of Agriculture the total cost of the school-lunch program for this year will be around $86,000,000. Of that amount the Federal Government will pay $43,300,000, which is approximately half of the cost. The other half of the cost is paid by the local school authorities. So that it is approximately on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, some communities have not solicited this program and therefore have not agreed to go along, and therefore they have not offered to match the amount that the Federal Government would put up. Is that the situation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, that is the situation, although we have had no specific evidence before our committee. In fact, we have not held full hearings upon this matter. We had hearings for 1 day, and representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Education appeared before our committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But the record does show that insofar as the program goes, generally speaking, the local authorities have matched on a 50–50 basis, the Federal funds?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is my understanding of it, that where they put the lunch program into operation in most instances the local community stood 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. There is nothing in the Rizley amendment or in existing law that requires that the fund be matched 50–50.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We leave that to the bureaucracies to determine who will match and who will not match.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Rizley amendment provides that school authorities must make application and in making that application they must advise the Federal Government how much they will contribute to the school-lunch program.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman advise the House what percentage of this school-lunch program is in the rural areas of the country where the communities are less than 2,500 population?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The information given to us is that better than 40 percent of the school-lunch money goes into communities of less than 2,500 population.

Mr. DONDERO. If it goes into rural communities where the food is raised, it is rather difficult to understand why it is necessary to have a school-lunch program there.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say to the gentleman that my district is noted as being one of the finest dairy districts of the country. Some of the authorities of the country schools there write me and wonder why milk should be delivered to their schools. It is hard for them to figure out why milk is being sent there by the Federal Government.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is the matching by local authorities actual matching by the expenditure of funds, or is it the use of teakettles and other things that are used in preparing the lunches?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, we have not had a break-down of it.

Mr. TABER. We ought to have that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know we should have it, but we have not been

able to get all of the information, although they have proposed that we should provide funds so that they can buy cups and saucers and plates and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. I might observe that it is true my amendment does not require the school district to match on a 50–50 basis, or any other basis, the amount of Federal funds. I patterned it somewhat after U. N. R. R. A. I noticed there were many gentlemen who were eager and willing to vote $1,350,000,000 for U. N. R. R. A., although I did not, and, as I recall, no one was matching those funds from any other places. As a matter of fact, we were putting up most of it ourselves. So I thought perhaps there might be some little school district that was unable to put up the 50 percent, and if we had this program they should not be denied the benefit of the program simply because they were unable to raise the money.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say to the gentleman I am in accord with what he has to say, because I think it is our first duty to take care of American children and American people before we go out to solve the problems and feed the entire world.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. As a school man of 35 years' experience and one who handled school lunches during the last 15 years he served as school superintendent, I see absolutely no need for a Federal school-lunch program. The gentleman from Iowa stated my position clearly when he said that the first responsibility is with the parents for these lunches; second, with the local communities; third, with the State; and last with Uncle Sam.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I think we ought to take into consideration the financial status of our country in passing upon all of these items. Many of them are good. They are fine things to have, but when we look to the future of our country and realize the tremendous debt that is being piled up it should give us occasion to stop, look, and listen to see whether or not we can continue all of these things which in the end may cause a complete break-down in the economic and financial structure of the country, which would mean ruin for all the people. Sixty-five million of our people have insurance policies. Many more have savings accounts. Unless we do something to straighten out the fiscal policy of our country we are facing bankruptcy, not only for the country, but for all of them.

Let me say in closing, that I believe there is a place for the school-lunch program. However, before beginning a permanent program for its establishment, we should carefully consider the responsibility of the Federal Government and local communities in paying for it. I believe that further study should be given to the proposal.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the financial problem of the United States is a very tremendous problem. I have had occasion to discuss it on this floor myself on more than one occasion. I am not going to do so now, except to say it is only when a program of help to the poorer people of our country comes up that we hear much about our financial problem, and except to point out, as already suggested by the gentleman from Oklahoma, that we have already authorized $1,300,000,000 for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Here is a chance to do a little bit for the health of the children of our own country.

The item involved in this amendment is not even $50,000,000 actually but a sum considerably less than $50,000,000 for the reason that a portion of these funds, that portion spent directly for the purchase of farm surpluses, is already available under section 32.

Mr. Chairman, it was true and it remains true that of those men rejected by the armed forces for physical defects, according to the testimony of Selective Service, more than one-third have physical defects that are directly traceable to undernourishment. Nor is that undernourishment exclusively confined to city communities. I did not bring with me today, but I could have brought with me a very substantial file of letters which I have gotten from school teachers throughout the length and breadth of this Nation and very largely from country school teachers telling about how after the introduction of this school-lunch program the attendance of their children increased 20 percent, 30 percent, sometimes 50 percent, and the scholarship records showed a definite improvement.

One of the Members a while ago asked what was the necessity for this program. This amendment is a move to put our country on a basis of fair rationing, it is a matter of simple justice. Great Britain has already put her children next after her armed forces. In any rationing program we say that no one shall get more than his share of scarce commodities. We should also say that at the bottom we are going to see that if there is milk and if there is food that the children who are the ones who need it most are going to get what they need first of all. And now from the point of view of agriculture in which I am sure this House is deeply interested.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Not at this point; I will yield a little later.

The truth is that last summer in my section there were serious surpluses of certain commodities, notably certain vegetables. It seemed to me that in view of the fact that the farmers who produced those vegetables did so at the request of the Government to produce them as war crops that it was no more than fair for the Government to sustain the income of those farmers and to see to it that the price did not fall to ruinously low levels which, however, they did, as a matter of fact. When I presented the desirability—indeed the simple justice—of making purchases of some of those commodities I was confronted with the statement that there were not sufficient outlets in which to dispose of them if they were purchased. It is utterly impossible, Mr. Chairman, with as great an agricultural-production program as we have in this country now, it is utterly impossible for that program to be carried on without local surpluses arising all the time. Farming is dependent upon weather conditions, upon the will of God, if you please, and as to agricultural production as a whole we simply cannot tell exactly how much is going to be produced of this, that, or the other commodity. If we are to make good on any kind of price-support program it is going to be necessary for the Government agencies and the Department of Agriculture to purchase farm surpluses from time to time. All right. What are you going to do with them after you have purchased them? Are you going to dump them into the sea? Are you going to give them away as relief directly to every Tom, Dick, and Harry? I hope not. I hope we are going to authorize a sensible, reasonable program whereby local school authorities who want to do it can apply for participation in a school-lunch program and receive from the Federal Government either direct food commodities themselves or else permission to buy those food commodities to use in those school-lunch programs on the understanding that the Federal Government will reimburse them for the cost of those commodities.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not a fact that industry has found a very practical connection between luncheons in industry and the production turn-out?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Indeed, they have; and I am very grateful to the gentleman for bringing that to our attention. I have a letter on my desk right now, this minute, about that very subject, which I hope every Member may have received.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another brief question?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not also a fact that this is the only way Congress has of attaching such a program to agricultural

surpluses rather than to make it a widespread program not connected with surpluses?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it is; and may I add that if in the future or today, Members believe in the idea of an orderly disposal of agricultural surpluses, if Members believe in the philosophy of section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, if they believe we ought not to permit the price of farm commodities to fall to ruinously low levels because of abundant farm production, then we have got to support some sensible, worth while means of disposal of the surpluses. This is the best way I know of.

The gentleman from Minnesota said that only $5,000,000 was spent for the purchase of surpluses. What he meant to say was that $5,000,000 was spent directly for the purchase of surpluses by the Federal Government, but that in recognition of the insistence of a number of gentlemen in this House, notably to my left, that local communities have control over this program and every other program wherever it is posible, they have put into effect within the last couple of years a system whereby, instead of the Federal Government making all the purchases, the local school districts purchase the commodities, on the understanding that they will purchase commodities which are in local surplus to the greatest possible extent. Somebody else was worried because some milk was delivered. Well, milk is not in surplus, it is perfectly true, but to the extent that milk is not in surplus, Mr. Chairman, I hope the milk that we do have is going to reach children rather than be drunk by adults; that is the only comment I have to make on that point.

The point has been made about matching these funds. The gentleman from Oklahoma has already answered that quite adequately, I believe. The reason you cannot ask every single school to match funds is precisely this: If you do require that, the school-lunch program will be in effect in all the wealthy schools of the country, and will not be in effect in the poor districts.

What we want to do most is to have this program in the schools where there is likely to be undernourishment; and, therefore, although I think it will be entirely proper to require funds from the States if you want to, or something of that kind, I certainly do not believe you can say to every single school that participates: "You have got to put up dollar for dollar." However, this amendment provides specifically that no Federal money shall be spent for anything except food purchases themselves, that all costs of every other kind involved shall be borne locally.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman to a large extent on the value of the program, especially from 1933 to 1941. The gentleman mentioned undernourished children. Does not the gentleman believe that the draftees who are being examined now were 8, 10, or 12 years old during the period when food was not plentiful? How does the gentleman justify it now?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. So we will not have another period of a similar sort; that is all. The gentleman, of course, may not have been one of those; I do not know whether he was or not, he may not have been one of those but there were Members of the House who felt that we could not stand increased taxes because the burden on a number of groups was so heavy they could not stand to pay any more taxes. I am one of those myself who believes that there is a certain group of fixed-income people in this Nation who are having to pay more than they should be called upon to pay under present conditions due to increasing costs of living; and let me say to the gentleman that there are a good many children in this country who are in need of this program if they are to have the nourishment they need to grow into robust citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to say anything against the school-lunch program as such—against a school-lunch program, perhaps I should say. I will agree with practically all the gentleman from California has said as to school-lunch programs. That is not the issue before us today; the issue is whether the Federal Government or local governments shall furnish the funds to carry on school-lunch programs in local schools.

The school-lunch program, as all of you know who have been here for any considerable length of time, began as a part of a program of surplus removal. We had surpluses of various agricultural commodities and under section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 authority was provided whereby those surpluses should be removed in various ways, both in the foreign and in the domestic market. One of the ways which was used in disposing of those surpluses was through the school-lunch program.

Section 32 is still in effect. Whenever we have agricultural surpluses, this year or any other year, those surpluses can be distributed to the schools which are carrying on a school-lunch program and I think it is a very good way to dispose of them when we do have those surpluses. But everybody knows we do not have any surpluses of agricultural products at the present time.

Representatives of the War Food Administration who appeared before the committee stated that for the program that is going on during the current year not more than 10 percent of the amount spent by the Federal Government would be spent in purchasing surplus food supplies. Those supplies are mostly items like cabbage, potatoes, or something like that where we have a temporary or local surplus. There is no reason why those commodities cannot be delivered to the local schools that are carrying on a school-lunch program, whether we pass this bill or not. Surplus removal will go on just the same.

The question is whether the Federal Government is going to finance this program or whether the local school districts will do it. I submit that at the present time, with the Federal Government in the financial condition in which it finds itself, 95 out of every 100 local school districts in this country are in a better position to finance a school-lunch program than is the Federal Government. That is the situation that confronts us, and that is the important thing we should keep in mind in voting on this amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota told you a little while ago that under the present program, which is costing this year $86,000,000, half of which are Federal funds, we are feeding about one-fifth of the school children of the country. If you are going to set up a great Nation-wide Federal system whereby we will feed all the school children, you can see how much more it is finally going to cost. The aim and objective, of course, of those who are sponsoring this program is to set up a Nation-wide program whereby at least half of the cost will be borne by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to that kind of a program, I am opposed to spending Federal money today in local school districts when those school districts are better able than the Federal Government to carry on such a program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is rather easy in listening to testimony to get some of the figures turned around and mixed up. I prefer to depend on the actual data which has been furnished.

I have before me a letter dated March 3, 1944, addressed to me by the War Food Administration and signed by S. R. Smith, Deputy Director of the Office of Distribution, in which the following is stated:

> Attached is a copy of a little table that we discussed. You will note that, among other things, this table indicates that about 67 percent of the schools and 54 percent of the participants in the school-lunch program were in rural areas.

I want to give you that information to counteract any information that has been given that might have been in error when the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] was answered. The letter goes on to state:

> This survey was made in October, when many of the rural schools had not yet opened. We believe that for the year as a whole the proportion of the total in rural areas will be substantially higher, including probably two-thirds of the children.

The letter further states:

> This is as of October 1, 1943, when all city schools had been in session for some time; however, many rural schools had recessed for harvesting; the actual participation in 1942–43 school year was 80 percent rural and 20 percent city schools, or 66⅔ percent of children taking part in school-lunch programs were from rural schools and 33⅓ percent of children taking part were in city schools (rural means schools in communities of 2,500 or less).

That is what we are talking about today, and it seems to me it is a small amount when compared with the sums that we are actually giving away through other methods. We have just voted one and a half billion dollars for U. N. R. R. A. This bill means 3⅓ cents for each child for each day 9 months of the year. There are 28 days in a month, 9 months in a school year, and there are approximately 6,000,000 children to participate in this $50,000,000.

Now, here is what happens: Those who are able to pay for their school lunches pay their nickel and those who are not able in any area to pay for their school lunches are given them. The folks who live in the various communities are the ones who determine that. You are worrying about 3⅓ cents a day going into the stomachs of those who need it most. A large part of these funds are funds which are surplus. May I say that 60 percent of the Federal expenditures for the program this year will be for food, of which 20 percent of the funds will be for dairy products, 22 percent for vegetables, 17 percent for fruits, 13 percent for meat, 8 percent for eggs, 8 percent for cereals, and 4 percent for fats and oils. This letter says:

> We are currently supporting the following commodities: Eggs, fresh vegetables, cabbage, potatoes, beets, carrots, and possibly snapbeans, sweetpotatoes, tomatoes, onions, and pork, of which there is a surplus.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close at 2:15 o'clock.

Mr. DONDERO. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have before us this afternoon a very much larger question than whether or not we shall spend $50,000,000 for lunches in the coming year.

As you look back over the history of nations you see again and again empires, autocratic dictatorships, and kingdoms lasting generation after generation, century after century, but, with the possible exception of the Republic of Switzerland, republics have been short lived. If you read history, and you have, you will agree with me that republics have died not because they have been invaded and conquered from without but because they have not properly managed their financial affairs from within.

It has always been true of republics that they have started out as strong nations, every family feeding its own children, every part of the nation looking not to the government for support and maintenance, but supporting the government.

Thomas Jefferson said:

> The duty of government is not to support the people. It is the duty of the people to support their government, in order that government may remain strong and maintain order and justice.

Here we are in the midst of the greatest war in all history. We are faced by the greatest debt that this or any other nation has ever faced. We are spending more money than any other nation has ever spent in all time. Today we are spending approximately nine times as much money as the great British Empire is spending.

This Congress has never hesitated a moment to appropriate any funds necessary for the carrying on and prosecution of this war, because we know that our whole national life depends upon the winning of this war; yet, with 130,000,000 people, every taxpayer among them digging down in their pockets and wondering where they are going to get the money to pay their taxes, and every little loan agency in America being flooded with applications today from people wanting to borrow money to pay that income tax that has to be met, here we are this afternoon frittering away our time talking about opening up the floodgates of expenses here and spending $50,000,000 for free lunches in America, at a time when the people of this country have thirty to fifty billion dollars more for spending than they have ever had before in all of our history, at a time when the economists are all agreed that the great problem that faces us today is what to do with this dangerous money—where they can spend it. Yet we are talking about feeding the children of the people of the United States, when God has placed upon every parent the duty of feeding his own children.

I recall that last year when this bill came up I had just been down in my district. They were having a sort of a reunion in the old district school where I had gone to school as a boy. Two or three hundred people gathered there one Sunday afternoon, and we had a very pleasant celebration and renewing of old acquaintanceships and friendships. Then the teacher took me down into the basement of the school. When I went to that school we did not have any basement. We had an old stove up in the one-room schoolhouse. He took me down in the basement and explained how the lady came out every day from the W. P. A. and furnished free lunches. That was in a neighborhood where, if there was anything on God's green earth that was plentiful, it was food. Every farmer had a cow, every farmer had his smokehouse filled with meat, every farmer had his vegetables put away for the winter. That is true generally in the farming sections all over the United States.

After I came up from the basement of the schoolhouse I walked over to a group of farmers standing out there talking. I said, "I understand we are having free lunches here now. Pretty nice, isn't it?" Without hesitation, half a dozen of them spoke up and said, "I don't know what you Congressmen are thinking of down here, spending money to have free lunches out in this sort of a country. We let our children eat the lunches because they are here and we want to go along, but we think you are mighty silly to be spending our money, that we have to pay back in taxes, furnishing free food, when we have our cellars full."

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this is a really serious question, because we are facing the time when the Treasury of the United States is not going to stand very much more borrowing. That time is coming. The old barrel some day will get empty, and when it does we are going to see this Republic go just as every other republic has gone before it that has followed the course we are following. So I say, let us spend our money to win this war and cut out this foolishness.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the committee amendment to perpetuate the Federal school-lunch program, by using section 32 funds. A Federal bureau once established never dies and never retires. There were local school-lunch programs before the depression and there will be local school-lunch programs after this bill is disposed of. It is not a question of authorizing the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities. This amendment is not necessary for that purpose. That authority is written into the law. It is not a question of aiding crops of which we produce an exportable surplus. Congress has looked after that matter and made provision as the occasion required.

I think it is fair to say that the Congress is committed to a reduction in the cost of government where it is possible and practicable. What is the concrete case that is before us? Under existing law these funds can be appropriated for the purchase of surplus commodities, and surplus commodities can be used for school-lunch programs, but the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] condemns this amendment with faint praise when he said that there were no surplus commodities. The Congress of the United States now, when we have an opportunity to reduce appropriations, is being asked to authorize an appropriation because the Congress is unable to spend the funds as previously authorized. The proposal is absurd. Do we mean what we have said to the American people, that we propose to reduce the cost of government where practicable? There is not a man or woman in this Chamber but believes in America first, and believes in feeding the hungry in America before feeding them elsewhere, including the conquered and occupied countries, and we propose to look after Americans first. Under the relief program, when there was widespread unemployment, when there was need, we provided a Federal school-lunch program, but now, when the national income is the greatest in the history of our country, when there are surpluses in State, county, and city treasuries, and when the people in the cities and the country have their highest income, higher than at any other time in the history of the Republic, we are asked to perpetuate a bureaucracy, under the guise of feeding hungry and needy children, when their parents are more able than ever before, and when States and counties are better able than ever before, to feed their own children. We either mean or do not mean what we

say when we say that we will reduce public expenditures whenever possible and practical. We have a chance here and now. There has been enough talk. It is time for action. I am ready to stand up and be counted.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might add to what the gentleman has said, that when this war is over and surpluses occur again, then section 32 funds may be used for that purpose.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And will be needed, probably as never before. I repeat that at a time when the local school Parent-Teacher associations and others who have provided heretofore for school-lunch programs, come to Congress and say that they are no longer able to provide them, that would be another question. Without a scintilla of such evidence before the Agricultural Committee we are asked to vote to perpetuate a program at the time of the greatest income and the widest employment in the history of the Nation. There is no justification for making the program permanent, because there is no present use for section 32 funds. If the program is sound it should stand on its own merits.

I extend to say that I thoroughly agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] when he stated that section 32 funds have been used for purposes not intended at the time the section was first passed. As originally passed, the section was to provide for a tariff in reverse for the benefit of cotton and other agricultural commodities of which the United States produced an exportable surplus. On such crops tariffs are not effective. They are effective on manufactures. Section 32 funds were to give cotton, wheat, and corn the equivalent of the benefits accorded manufactures by the tariff. Cotton price adjustments were made in 1935 and 1937. Export subsidies were provided.

Subsequently, as the chairman has well stated, there was a wide departure from the original intent. The purchase of surplus agricultural commodities was provided during widespread unemployment. There were no markets for the agricultural commodities. There was unemployment. There was need for relief. Then followed the food-stamp plan and other similar programs. When the reason for the departures ceases, the departures should no longer obtain.

The Federal school-lunch program was the result of the depression, of widespread unemployment, of the inability of parents, municipalities, and counties, or voluntary associations to continue the school-lunch program. Surplus commodities as stated were utilized.

The issue must not be confused. There is a place for school lunches. The issue here is whether the Federal Government shall now in the period of greatest national income, of least unemployment, of highest wages and salaries, continue as a Federal program a project that was urged during the depression. Formerly private contributions and local benevolent organizations provided for the programs. This policy obtains in normal times. The reason for the Federal program no longer obtains, and when there is no justifiable Federal reason, the Federal program itself should be discontinued.

The sponsors of the pending amendment do the school lunch program a disservice. Liberal and philantrophic citizens and associations that can provide for local children will not be encouraged to make such provisions. The wells of human sympathy are dried up. Citizens are encouraged more and more to look to the Government to do for them what they should do for themselves. It is said by the sponsors that the funds in section 32 will revert to the Treasury unless expended. What of it? No treasury ever needed funds more than the Treasury of the United States. The public debt at the end of the next fiscal year will be two-thirds of the estimated national wealth.

The school-lunch program, the surplus commodities program, the stamp plan are the product of the depression. Congress was urged to adopt these plans in the depression. Congress is now asked to make a depression or temporary policy a permanent program. There is a difference between the depression bureaus and the established agencies of the Government. The contrast is remarkable. The Army and the Navy have voluntarily reported to the Congress of the United States, at a time when the United States is waging war in all continents and in all seas, that they will return to the Treasury from twenty-eight to thirty billions of dollars. Not so with a bureaucracy organized in a depression and undertaking to extend in one direction and then in another, always in an effort to perpetuate itself. We have the sorry spectacle of an agency now asking for perpetuation and asking Congress to provide appropriations because they cannot be spent as originally intended, when the fine and patriotic course to pursue would be to urge that said funds be returned to the Treasury of the United States.

As I have stated, no change in existing law is required to provide for the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities. The amendment goes far afield. If only $5,000,000 worth of agricultural surplus commodities are available, it is urged that inasmuch as $50,000,000 has been spent for the Federal school-lunch program annually, then the remaining $45,000,000 may be spent not only for agricultural commodities but for the products thereof and to quote from the amendment, "or by such other means as the Secretary may determine."

Those who advocate authorizations and appropriations that cannot stand on their own merits while voting therefor, criticize the program for feeding the war-stricken and starving children and populations. The United Nations Relief Administration is criticized. The critics overlook the fact that the War Department is now feeding the destitute populations in conquered lands. The purpose of the United Nations Relief Administration, among other things, is to relieve the Army in occupied countries. The Administration was authorized. Appropriations have not been made. It remains for Congress to make the appropriation. I am among those who believe that Congress will not make appropriations for the starving populations in occupied countries until a careful investigation has been made and until there is conclusive evidence that the interests of America as well as the relief of human distress will be promoted by making appropriations, after having first provided for America's own.

The Work Projects Administration has been abolished. It took an act of Congress. The Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration have been abolished. It took an act of Congress. It is time for other depression agencies that have served their purpose to be abolished. The taxpayers are entitled to a break.

There will be need for section 32 funds for tobacco, wheat, cotton, and other commodities of which we produce an exportable surplus after the war. Warring nations will be unable to buy. The domestic market for the manufacturer will remain. There will be need for aid to agriculture when foreign markets are not available. America must put her house in order. We must prepare now for conditions following the war. Section 32 funds will be needed then for the purpose for which they were originally intended. It might well be provided that section 32 funds not now required should be available then to American growers of crops of which the United States produces surpluses.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] who made one of the best speeches today against this program, and who made it last year, and I congratulate him upon the high ground that he takes. I was touched by the statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] in admitting there were no surpluses now, but there would be a time coming when there would be, and it made me think of several things. There may be a time when we will need W. P. A., but we have abolished W. P. A., and there may be a time when we may need again C. C. C. and N. Y. A. and crop insurance. We have abolished them, at least we hope we have, and we hope that we will abolish Farm Security this year, when they bring in the other bill. What I want to emphasize is this, that we are asked to carry through some program with the idea that we will need it in the future. That brings me back to the parliamentary inquiry I made awhile ago, whether it would not be in order to offer an amendment to abolish A. A. A. at this time. The A. A. A. is a program of scarcity, something that some have shed crocodile tears about, when you killed the little pigs. That was the thing also that gave us wheat penalties, and that gave us an army of employees—all that idea of scarcity. This is the committee that is before you today, and you have the first chance in 10 years to offer an amendment of the kind I suggest. I think the Chairman cannot deny that it is in order, after the ruling last night, that the A. A. A. is not alone concerned, but that it is the whole Department of Agriculture, practically. I do not see any reason why an amendment

would not be in order to set aside the A. A. A. for the duration at least.

Think of Marvin Jones tearing his shirt today—the father of scarcity, trying to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before—think of the father of scarcity who today has thrown the thing wide open, yet clinging to the old set-up. Just as consistent to have given the Manpower Commission to the W. P. A.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. How could Congress justify its action of approving this, which would be a 50 percent subsidy for children, when a short time ago we rejected a subsidy to the parents on the matter of food?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. They could not, and I would say that it makes me think of the point that all of these children in their food programs are already being subsidized throughout the country, together with their parents, on milk to the tune of $20,000,000 a month. A lot of it is in the school-lunch program. If we are going to dispense with W. P. A., C. C. C., N. Y. A., farm crop insurance, then what is the sense of our continuing the A. A. A. in wartime, built on scarcity, when we are trying to produce all of the food possible. O. P. A. and Food Distribution are running agriculture today and not the Department. One theory is that maybe there will be another time when we will want this program. At least it ought to be set aside for the duration. I voted for A. A. A. as an emergency, but against it for a permanent farm program.

We are going to meet at 2:30 p. m. to begin marking up the agricultural appropriation bill. I do not know what we are going to do, but we know that there is a great big army in the A. A. A. more than they need, and more than they will need to carry on a substitute function for distributing, soil conservation, a little lime and fertilizer, and a few things that they are doing to help out the food program. There is no sense in our maintaining that over-all set-up of thousands of people, when, goodness knows, we need the manpower in other places.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

It is indeed amazing. Nearly every gentleman who addressed the House was in favor of legislation to take care of our surplus commodities; that is, to help the farmers put into the market at the best possible price their surplus products. Moreover, let it not be forgotten that some of you gentlemen opposing this amendment did not oppose the A. A. A. and soil-conservation payments of millions and millions of dollars to farmers. But when it comes to a question of feeding the undernourished children, we find they are all opposed to it. The amount authorized to be appropriated by this bill amounts to several hundred million dollars and is divided among 95 different matters. We are appropriating about $1,100,000,000 annually to aid agriculture, but, because there is an amendment offered to authorize the appropriation of the small amount of $50,000,000 to provide luncheons for school children, what a hue and cry is raised.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is manifestly unfair. I concede we are prosperous, but do you realize that more than 11,000,000 of our people are each earning less than $1,000 a year; that we have hundreds of thousands of wives of men in the armed forces, and thousands and thousands of widows of men who have given their lives in the fight for the preservation of our country, also underpaid, white-collar workers, whose children are undernourished? Do you not know we have hundreds of thousands of people who are existing on a small fixed income and who are unable to provide these lunches that we would by this bill authorize on a matching basis with States and subdivisions?

Why, surely, the Government is to be asked to appropriate, but it will cost the school districts two or three times the amount being asked of the Government to contribute toward taking proper care of these deserving children, the future men and women of our country. And, mind you, the majority of the children that have been taken care of, where we increased the attendance in all the schools, are not in the urban sections, but the majority of them are in the rural sections, the small towns, and the villages. Some forget that. Some here think this is applicable and beneficial to those people of the large centers alone, and that is the reason I think they are opposed to it. I really am sorry.

I regret that so much opposition is being raised against such a worthy cause. I cannot quite grasp the viewpoint of many of you otherwise well-meaning gentlemen. You are willing to vote for practically all of this great bill. You have voted, as I said, in the last 11 years $14,000,000,000 to aid agriculture, but you refuse to vote for this amendment because some of the children in large cities will benefit somewhat from it. I think this action is obviously unfair, unjust, and regrettable.

I observe that nearly all of you Republicans, and even a few on our side, are opposed to this amendment.

If this amendment should be defeated, it will be unfortunate; but you Republicans can claim credit for what you will call an accomplishment of economy, even at the expense of the undernourished children of the most needy people of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My philosopher friend from Illinois was greatly disturbed a moment ago. He said there were many things about this procedure and the attitude of Members which he could not understand. I must confess I, too, am discouraged. I am reminded of an ancient philosopher whom I regard as a very wise man. He was the man who went around the streets of Athens, in broad daylight, with a lighted lantern, looking for an honest man. However, he often made pointed remarks which appeal to me.

On one occasion he went into a neighboring part of Greece, in Corinth, and he found there that they had some prize sheep. The weather was a little chilly and he noticed that these sheep were wrapped up in blankets. He also noticed that the children were running around virtually naked. Old Diogenes then said, as he saw that spectacle, "In this place it is better to be a man's ram than his son." I have often thought of that saying when I find we are so solicitous about many things of a material, commercial value and less solicitous about our children.

We are engaged in a terrible war, the second in this generation. In the other World War, as well as in this World War, we find that about 25 percent of the men who ought to have carried guns and fought were disqualified, some of them for illiteracy, and yet, what have we, as a Federal Government, done toward remedying that situation? An astonishingly large percentage of these men in the First World War and even more in the Second World War, were ineligible because of illiteracy and more because of physical difficulties, mainly undernourishment. This Government needs the finest type of men, but how much do we do to help produce them?

We need capable men today to carry the flag and fight the battle, men who have been properly trained and who have been adequately nourished. Why do we not send out to fight our battles today, instead of our best boys, these "iron men" we talk about so tenderly and which we are trying to save. Why not put our dollars alone up against the Hitlerites and Japs and let the precious dollars do the fighting and let the more precious boys come home?

I have been a schoolman, and I know the problem from that angle. I was puzzled as a little fellow when I learned that the shoemaker's children usually are without shoes; and I could not at first understand why. I grew up on a farm, even in the great State of Missouri I know that undernourishment can exist in a farming community; and it undoubtedly does exist, as the figures show. Why should we be so solicitous about saving dollars here when it involves the nourishment and proper care of our children?

I know schools that give lunches. If they can do it at community expense, so much the better. I praise the schools for that element of care. The good women who thus minister to children are benefiting bodies, minds, and spirits. But I think we are picayunish when we hesitate to vote Federal funds to aid in that program. These are the boys and girls who will become the men and women, the pillars of our society, upon which the safety of our Republic depends in war and in peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, one tries to approach a problem of this sort viewing the many things that are put before you by statements made here in the well of the House, and at the same time listen to the mandate you feel you came to this Congress to follow. I am a little puzzled in this respect: we come here as representatives of political subdivisions, representing the people back home, thinking of those that we represent, and then, as was so graphically portrayed in the words of the gentleman from Mississippi, when a program to subsidize schools by purchase of farm surpluses is proposed, in some form or other, the people in political subdivisions from which we come pass out of the picture by natural circumstance in that there are no surpluses to buy. We then twist things around in some form that we may continue to appropriate money from the Treasury of the United States to support a new agency, that is, borrowed money, and, in turning the thing around, foist upon them, without their choice, the expenditure of this money to increase their debt. That is exactly what we are doing here.

I think we go to extremes in making statements to justify a reason in this proposed action, by holding up a starving and undernourished child. It appears much more unfair that many who voted to have U. N. R. R. A. passed now hold that up as a reason why we should go on spending for this school-lunch program. We ought to be honest about it at least. There is a difference in the appeal that was made for U. N. R. R. A., in that we are going into captured territories where children are actually starving, starving by the thousands and even by the millions, whereas here we treat with another group of children who are the beneficiaries of the greatest wealth the country has ever known, probably better fed than they have been at any time; and yet we hold up the spectre of those starving children under U. N. R. R. A. as a reason to appropriate money to feed our school children.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is one great difference in the amount in the two cases. In the next case, the gentleman will agree, I think, that the income of the country is not evenly distributed; and in the third place we do have a problem of disposition of our agricultural commodities.

Mr. ROWE. I think I can agree with the gentleman, but I would call your attention to this one thing, that as the graph line indicates the obligation or the debt of the Federal Government has risen continuously with tremendous rapidity, inversely the graph line for debt has gone down in the political subdivisions in the other direction. Now, admitting all the things you say are true, why should we, as a legislative body for the Nation, impose this whole program and deny a local subdivision the right to initiate those things if they are as badly needed as you say they are? If they do not initiate them, and we find the circumstances that you state are true, it is time then that we do as we did in 1934, to help the subdivisions. But, without their petitioning and with their being in better financial shape than they have been for a long time, we come here with appeals that are a little farfetched for the purpose we are trying to accomplish, and we foist upon them a condition and a debt that perhaps they do not want.

Mr. CARRIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment.

I am from a rural district. I represent 19 counties in the heart of Kentucky; over 280,000 people. I believe in the youth of our land. I believe we should take an interest in our school children. I have been pleased with the interest that this Congress has taken in livestock; how it has agreed to appropriate money; to rid cattle of ticks and other parasites; how it has spent Government money to print yearbooks to teach the people of our country how to keep livestock healthy. I am somewhat surprised when we talk of the youth today, and to find there is opposition to furnishing school children with hot lunches. At a time when there is great juvenile delinquency—a child crime wave; children violating the law because mothers are working in war plants and not able to properly care for the children—such a program is more essential than ever.

Some have said that the school-lunch program was good when we had a surplus. I say, Mr. Chairman, feeding the school children is just as essential when we have a scarcity. It is more important that the children get their share of the milk and bread that is to be divided if there is a scarcity.

I am opposed to subsidies in general, but if we are going to subsidize the beefsteak and fancy cheese that the rich man buys to the tune of 5 cents a pound, then I think we should be in favor of subsidizing the children who are to be the men and women of tomorrow, to the extent of 2 or 3 cents a day. These are American children. We are growing Americans in this country today. It is true this country is going deeply into debt, but I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in the years to come these little undernourished children down in Kentucky, and in some other great States, must be properly fed now so that in the years to come they may be healthy and strong and take our places here, and be able to bring America back to what it ought to be. I say it is important that we feed the youth of today in order to have strong men and women tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] leads, as so many of his arguments do, just to one end and that is regimentation. The gentleman bases his argument in support of the amendment upon two things. First, he says that children are hungry. Never was our population so well fed. Then he says there is a surplus of food in the country. Neither of those conclusions is true. As has been pointed out so many times during the course of this argument, people today are receiving higher wages than ever before. Our total income is greater than ever before. People have more money with which to buy food. If there is a surplus of food why is the Government urging the farmers to produce more and more all the time? Why are we paying subsidies for production of food? Because there is a surplus?

Mr. COLE of Missouri. And why are we rationed? The theory of rationing is so that each man can get his fair share.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, and because there is not enough, it is said, for all. Notwithstanding rationing everyone has enough to eat. The thing which the gentleman from California advocates is similar to the method we used in feeding poultry—capons, ducks, and geese. You take the head in one hand and you run a spout here, in the mouth; you put your hand on the crop, and you press the foot down on a lever and the feed is forced into the mouth and neck until the crop is full, and what do you get? You get a well-conditioned, fat capon, goose, or duck, but what is it good for? Nothing but for marketing. Certainly not for the perpetuation of the species. My contention is that the greatest possible harm you can do to the youth of America is to make it so easy for them that they will become dependent upon others and will not rely upon themselves at all.

The greatest favor my father and mother ever did for me was to let me go out, away from home, see that I did go out, learn to work, to earn, to save my money, and become independent. The greatest disfavor the parents of my boyhood chum with whom I went through high school ever did to him was to give him everything he wanted so that in the end when he became a young man he was still dependent and when he got married his wife had to support him. Why should we feed the children of those who are getting more per hour, more per week, more per month, than was ever earned by such people in the history of the country and pass the cost along to those who are doing the fighting? Give our children an opportunity to become men and women able to work, knowing how to work, familiar with the lessons of economy, with a knowledge of what thrift means, so that when their time comes if they are not called once more to be cannon fodder they can reestablish here in America the government which this generation and the next, if they do not take care, will lose or have taken from them. Give to the children of today an opportunity, an opportunity to earn their own living, to become independent as you and I were in our boyhood days. Why coddle and pamper? Why raise a nation of sissies and pantywaists? Give the boys and girls an opportunity to fight their way to independence by making them self-reliant, even as were our forefathers. The easy road, whether followed by the individual or nation, is always the road to softness, to idleness, to indolence, to waste, and, in the end, to decay and extinction.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make my position clear at the very beginning by saying that I am not opposed to school lunches if local authorities desire such a program. Mr. Chairman, I believe a complete answer to many of the arguments made on the floor this afternoon in favor of this amendment for $50,000,000 for school lunches rests in the fact that the Ways and Means Committee of this House voted to impose an additional tax burden upon the American people of no more than $2,300,000,000 and refused to accept a $10,000,000,000 program. They did it because they believed the people are paying about as much tax as they can possibly pay at the present time. They desired to protect free enterprise in this country and not tax it out of existence.

There is one law that we will never repeal in this Chamber, and that is the law of diminishing returns. That will always work 24 hours a day. Business can be taxed to death. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] would add another $50,000,000 to the ever-mounting national debt, and increase bureaucracy in Washington.

The total debt of the 48 States of this Union is a little more than $19,000,000,000. The total debt of the Federal Government is about $200,000,000,000. I doubt if there is a local political subdivision or unit in this country that is not better able to furnish school lunches for children than the Federal Government. We are fighting the most gigantic war in the history of mankind. Demands upon the Federal Treasury are colossal and without precedent. How long can the Nation continue public spending for every conceivable function before the precipice is reached and economic collapse overtakes us? It seems to me it is your duty and mine to see to it that the American Government remains solvent. One of the ways to do it is to stop unnecessary Federal spending. Federal spending and proposals to spend have reached the insanity stage. Unless we stop authorizing appropriations under this kind of an amendment, we will go on and on until a collapse comes, and when it does we stand a fair chance of losing the form of government handed down to us by our forefathers. I shall vote against the amendment and hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma to the Flannagan amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Before the Clerk proceeds the Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Ohio has reserved his time for this period, and 4 minutes is reserved for the Committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: After the Rizley amendment insert:

"No employee of the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administration or the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Federal body or agency shall by any means whatsoever directly or indirectly circularize or solicit any school authority to permit the use of so-called school-lunch program. The violation of this provision shall be punished by dismissal of such employee."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment and, I believe, a mighty good one. If there had been placed in every Federal law at the time it was enacted a provision containing the same principle the Federal bureaucracy today would be no more than one-tenth of its present size.

One of the greatest fallacies that has ever gripped the minds of men is that bureaucracy is something that comes about through the demands of the civilian population. The growth of bureaucracy did not result from public demand but, instead, resulted from political salesmanship and coercion. It is the political group that is primarily responsible for the inauguration and development of practically all Federal Government programs.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] to the Flannagan amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were—ayes 98, noes 63.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLANNAGAN) there were—ayes 54, noes 136.

So the amendment as amended was rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 23, line 25, after section 706, strike out all language down to and including the word "annum", line 5, page 24.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment for the purpose of striking from the bill the language which increases the salaries of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Forest Service, the Agricultural Research Administrator, the Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture.

If you will refer to the committee report on page 20 you will find where these increases in salaries are outlined. As I said yesterday afternoon in discussing this bill, I do not feel this is a time to raise the salary of these administrators. We should bear in mind that under a bill which the House passed some weeks ago these officials have received a substantial increase in salary to cover their increased cost of living, which, I believe, ranges around $628 each. I see no justification for these increases, in spite of what has been said in the report.

Mr. Chairman, following this amendment I have another amendment at the desk which would deny the increase in salary of $2,500 per year to the War Food Administrator, which is found in lines 5 and 6 on page 24.

So much has been said here about the cost of government, the status of the Federal debt, the burden of taxes, the difficulty of our people meeting all of these financial responsibilities, and so forth, that I hesitate to say any more; but in view of the debate yesterday afternoon I do want to call your attention to this fact: If you will take the March 1, 1944, analysis of the Federal debt by the Treasury Department you will find that out of a total debt of $187,000,000,000, $107,000,000,000 of that total sum is represented by short-term paper. Yet statements were made on the floor yesterday afternoon indicating that we had much of this debt financed on a long-term basis. We face such staggering refunding operations in the months to come that the Treasury of the United States has my sympathy. That is one job I would not want under the present administration or the administration which is to follow. Why we should continue to carelessly spend money and at the same time finance a debt on a short-term basis and to such a great extent on a call-loan basis I cannot understand.

I shall take no more time, asking simply for the approval of the amendment I have offered which refuses to further increase these administrative salaries.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. Chairman, I believe the Members will want to know before voting on this amendment what prompted the writing of this provision in the bill. There has been carried in the agricultural appropriation bill for the last several years an increase in the salary of Dr. Tolley, who is head of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. That was subject to a point of order and was one of the things we were directed to correct. Also written in the bill was an increase in the salary of Dr. Auchter, who, I understand, is one of the most valuable men in the Department. He is in charge of the entire research work. So when these questions came to the subcommittee, we called upon the Department to give us a survey of the entire salary schedule in the Department.

It developed that there were instances where the heads of departments were receiving less salary than subordinates working under them. That is due to the peculiar operation of the Classification Act. We decided that if Dr. Tolley, as this Congress has approved several times, is entitled to a salary of $10,000, then those holding comparable positions should be put on the same basis. Personally, I have no desire to raise salaries, but I think the gentleman from Michigan is approaching the problem from the wrong angle. What he should do is to go back, which our committee could not do, and rework the entire salary schedule. You have now numerous men in the War Food Administration drawing

$10,000 a year, many of them with far less responsible positions than those covered in this bill.

We definitely felt that if Dr. Tolley was going to be fixed at a salary of $10,000, which this Congress has fixed on several occasions through the appropriation bill, then the head of the Forest Service should have a comparable salary, and the others, five in all, covered in this amendment.

For instance, in this amendment is the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. He is chief counsel for the entire Department of Agriculture and for the entire War Food Administration. The present Solicitor gets $9,000, but if he should resign and another Solicitor should be appointed, under the Classification Act he would receive only $8,000, with subordinates under him drawing $9,000.

I can see where this probably will be a popular amendment, but I think it is a very unfortunate approach to say that all of these other officials of the Department should draw $10,000, and yet Dr. Auchter, Mr. Watts, and Mr. Shields, men who bear as great or greater responsibility than any of the others, should not draw comparable salaries. It is a problem that you must determine. Certainly the committee has the responsibility of adjusting the salaries covered in the agricultural appropriation bill, and we have undertaken to do that.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia has given you the viewpoint of the committee in presenting this section of the bill which provides for some slight increases in the salaries of a few of the most responsible officials in the Department of Agriculture. As was stated to you by the gentleman from Georgia, some of these items have been carried in previous appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture and have been approved by this House on those occasions.

I do not think there is any question but that the offices which are mentioned in this amendment are offices which demand $10,000-a-year men if they are to be properly filled. If you will compare the salaries that are being paid in other departments of the Government, I am sure you will agree with me on that point.

There is another matter I want to bring to your attention. In the Department of Agriculture there are already a considerable number of men who are drawing salaries of $10,000 a year. These men, in some cases, are not occupying positions of as great importance or carrying as great responsibility as those which the committee has selected for inclusion in this section of the bill.

Those who are getting these $10,000 salaries now are in many cases political appointees. The men who are included in this section are career men in the Department of Agriculture. They have made this their life work. Many of them have been in the Department for many years. Many of them are great scientists, like Dr. Auchter, or Dr. Watts, the head of the Forest Service. Others are men who could draw a much larger salary out in private life if they cared to leave the Government service.

The committee has exercised great care in making its comparison of these salaries with other salaries and determining what particular positions in the Department should have the salary range increased in order to bring them up to the level of others in the Department and in other departments of the Government. I do not believe that this is a time for increasing salaries generally, but I do believe in the particular positions covered by this bill, the increases are justified.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Kansas who has just addressed us whether or not these people, who are included in the proposed revision of salary, are now included within the classified service, which determines the salaries they are now receiving?

Mr. HOPE. I think all of them are in the classified service. There may be one or two who are not, but I think all of them are.

Mr. KEEFE. Then if they are in the classified service, as I understand the law, the salaries are fixed for positions within that classification. What we are doing is to pick out five men from the service of the Department of Agriculture who are under the classified service, and increase their specific salaries.

I wonder if the Members of Congress are aware of what may happen as a result of the action we propose doing here as suggested by the committee. What will happen in all the other departments of Government where you have exactly comparable situations to contend with?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. May I say to the gentleman that in most departments that has already been done. That is the reason the committee felt it was important to bring these offices up to the same level as those in the other departments.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not at all certain as to the full application of that last statement of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas. I do know that pursuant to Public Law 49 you passed a salary increase last year which you will have forcibly brought to your attention when the first deficiency appropriation bill comes before you tomorrow or the next day. You will then see what salary increases mean when spread over the broad field of public service. The total of it amounts, as I recall the figures now, to between eight hundred and nine hundred million dollars.

I think the burden of fighting inflation should be borne by all the people, and it should be borne equally. I cannot vote to establish a precedent of increasing the pay of Federal employees and Federal officials, when Mr. Vinson is busy every day denying the right of corporations to increase the salaries of their executives and denying the right of labor in many cases to receive much-needed pay increases. I think we shall be establishing a precedent here by the adoption of this provision, which actually takes these people out of the classification law and specifically increases their salaries. It will come back to haunt us sometime.

You wait until this deficiency bill comes before you tomorrow, and then you will see the truth of what I am trying to make apparent. I shall not vote to increase the salaries of any persons who are in the nine-to-ten-thousand-dollar salary ranges today, and who have already been given cost-of-living bonuses under the provisions of Public Law No. 49.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has proven the argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in that the gentleman from Kansas has said that we now propose the increases because somebody else got an increase. Likewise, if we make this increase all these other people can come in and say, "We want our cut of the pie, also," and the gentleman's argument is sound. We have no right to disturb the civil-service classification.

Mr. KEEFE. I wonder whether the gentleman from Kansas can answer me as to whether or not inquiry has been made of Mr. Vinson as to whether these proposed salary increases are compatible with the fight that he and the administration are making to prevent the occurrence of inflation? Has it been taken up with Mr. Vinson's office?

Mr. HOPE. It has not; but the great Committee on Appropriations of this House, of which the gentleman himself is a member, has in previous years increased the salaries of about half of those included in this section.

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman accurate in that statement? He is now stating that the Committee on Appropriations has increased the salary of one-half of these people. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] referred to only one man. Is the gentleman accurate, or is the gentleman trying to bolster his argument by an extravagant statement?

Mr. HOPE. In the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill for last year, the Solicitor, the Director of Research, and the Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics were given an increase of salary, and those are three who are included in this item.

Mr. KEEFE. And the gentleman approves of that action of the Committee on Appropriations?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I say to the gentleman that last year those items were stricken from the appropriation bill on a point of order as not being properly in the bill, because they were matters for the legislative committee to consider, but the Committee on Appropriations evidently

felt the increases were deserved, and for that reason included them in the bill. As far as Mr. Vinson's office is concerned, his office is daily increasing the wage rates of thousands and thousands of people in this country. If the gentleman will look at the indices showing the increase in wages and salaries throughout the country, he will find they are going up all the time. Why discriminate against Government employees?

Mr. KEEFE. There is certainly no discrimination against Government employees. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak in the remaining time out of order, and revise and extend the same.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in a letter just received from a marine in the South Pacific, there was enclosed a portion of a mimeographed sheet made up of A. P. press reports which are sent to all Navy stations for the purpose of disseminating the news. Among other items on this sheet is one carrying a date line Minneapolis, Minn. It reads as follows:

Chairman Robert E. Hannegan, of the Democratic National Committee, said Tuesday night: "The election of a Republican President in November would turn the Government over to unpracticed hands and bring inescapable confusion and indecision in winding up the war and planning the peace."

In his second major address since his election to the Democratic chairmanship, Hannegan told a Washington Day dinner: "What could hearten Hitler or the Japanese war lords more than tidings that the American people repudiated the administration of Franklin Roosevelt?"

My marine correspondent had this to say with respect to this item:

This item strikes at the roots of what America is fighting for—a free choice by election of whom we want for whatever elective office we want to elect him without anyone offering the cry of traitor, treason, mutiny, or sabotage. I want the chance to make a choice between Roosevelt and the other candidates, because that's a choice denied the people of Germany, Japan, Italy, France, and the conquered countries. While we're free, I want a free ballot, and I want Hannegan to have a free ballot, but I don't want either of us to tell the other that his candidate is a "Hitler-Tojo" candidate.

It isn't an issue and won't make any votes for them out here, but it is just plain ridiculous that a party after 12 years of the President want to run the show and steer the campaign on anything but those 12 years and the prospects of the next 4. Hitler and Japanese war lords will have more to hearten them if the American people don't have a free election, free of all international intimidation.

This letter clearly indicates the reaction of at least one marine to the sordid efforts of the new chairman of the Democratic National Committee to tie the candidacy of the fourth-term candidate to the ridiculous slogan that a vote against the fourth-term candidate is a vote for Hitler and Tojo.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Because of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] I should like to call to the attention of the Committee the duties performed by the Chief of the Forest Service. You have all heard of what the other administrators being considered in this measure have to do in the line of responsibility. Insofar as this particular amendment is concerned, it will be up to the Committee to decide whether to accept or reject it.

However, I do think that the members of the committee should know something about the duties of the Chief of the Forest Service so that they can understand the multitude of problems which confront him daily. These duties include the management and protection of the national-forest properties, which total 175,000,000 acres, with a timber stand of 520,000,000,000 board feet. Out of this total 3,250,000,000 board feet were cut this year. The Forest Service has also provided range for 10,000,000 head of livestock and has gathered in receipts amounting to $11,000,000 a year.

He is responsible for protection against forest fires of millions of acres of other forest lands, through cooperation with the States, and for the use of demonstration and other educational methods to prevent devastation of forest lands and of aid in placing them in productive condition.

He is the Director of the Forest Products Laboratory and 12 regional forest and range experiment stations, at which are carried on practically all the Federal research activities on which are based action programs to obtain the best use of some 50 percent of the land area of this country.

In addition to all this, he is the guiding head in, first, the guayule-rubber production program in California; second, the New England and Texas salvage program; third, the Alaska aircraft spruce production program; and, fourth, the access road-construction program, which has opened up so many vitally needed timber and mineral supplies needed in the war effort.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 80, noes 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: On page 19, line 13, after the word "corporations", insert "which are making use of United States Government funds either as capital or as paid-in surplus."

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered, and which has just been read, makes a slight change in subdivision (b) of section 601. Subdivision (a) of section 601 provides:

The Farm Credit Administration shall, prior to the first day of each fiscal year commencing after June 30, 1944, estimate for the ensuing fiscal year the cost of examinations of the joint-stock land banks, Federal land banks, national farm-loan associations, banks for cooperatives, Central Bank for Cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations and production credit associations; shall apportion the amount so determined among the joint-stock land banks, Federal land banks, banks for cooperatives, Central Bank for Cooperatives, Federal intermediate credit banks, production credit corporations, and production credit associations on such equitable basis as said Administration shall determine.

The subdivision (a) further provides that it shall assess against these various institutions in such manner as they think equitable the cost or expenses for examination. There is no complaint about that. That has been done, as I understand, for many years, and I am not seeking to make any change whatever in the cost of the examination incurred by the Farm Credit Administration in examining into these various institutions named.

Subsection (b), which I do seek to amend, provides that the Farm Credit Administration, after June 30, 1944, shall each fiscal year estimate the cost to the Farm Credit Administration for the ensuing fiscal year of the administrative supervision of all these various institutions that I have named. In other words, subsection (a) relates to the cost of examination, which has always been done, but subsection (b) relates to cost of administrative supervision, which is an innovation, and was only done last year by special act, but this would make that policy permanent. In other words, hereafter the Farm Credit Administration shall determine what the cost of administrative supervision shall be and then shall assess against these various institutions the part which it thinks each should pay.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that those institutions which have no Government capital invested in them have proven they have pretty good supervision and probably it will be not only a waste but a loss if we invested Government money in putting supervision over these people who have done a better job than the average?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank my friend for his support of my amendment and his convincing reason therefor. Here is what my amendment does: I am not seeking to eliminate the entire subdivision (b), which authorizes the Farm Credit Administration to assess the cost of supervisory administration against these institutions. My amendment simply exempts from that supervisory administration cost those corporations and those administrations which are making no use of Government funds either as capital or paid-in surplus. In other words, as the gentleman from Texas has so well said, these institutions that I am seeking to exempt from this cost are those institutions—land banks, production credit corporations, banks for cooperatives, and so forth—that have been so well supervised themselves that they do not have to operate with Government money, but they are operating

with the money of the farmers and the ranchmen. It strikes me it is unfair that the Farm Credit Administration in Kansas City shall say how much those agencies shall pay for supervision when they are not using Government money, but operating with their own. I think it is unfair because they cannot pass the cost on. They cannot tell how much to pass on to these farmers and ranchmen. I think those institutions that are operating now and which are not using any Government money or Government funds either as capital or as paid-in surplus, should not have to pay this large sum that will be assessed against them for supervision. That has not been done in the past until the last year, as I understand, and then we passed a temporary act by which it could be done. But this seeks to make that permanent legislation and before you make it permanent it strikes me that you should eliminate that discrimination which is imposed against these institutions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the different Farm Credit districts of the Nation have operated with varying success. The Federal Land Bank of Houston, Tex., and the Farm Credit district, which is made up of the State of Texas, have operated with singular success. I think the Federal Land Bank of Houston, rather than utilizing Federal money for its operation, now has in reserve something around $16,000,000 and a surplus of around $15,000,000. That bank is not utilizing Federal money. In this amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] has offered it is provided that banks or agencies of the Farm Credit Administration which do not utilize Federal money should not be called upon to pay for this supervision. This would seem to be somewhat of a reward for merit to those Federal land banks and those Farm Credit districts which operate in such an efficient way that they do not require Federal money. Yet under the law certain supervision must be maintained, but this cost should be kept to the very lowest minimum.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand. Are these institutions going to get supervision?

Mr. MAHON. Supervision of an extensive nature would not appear to be necessary.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Are you taking the position they ought not to be supervised?

Mr. MAHON. No; I am not taking the position they ought not to be supervised, within reasonable limits. But certainly a very limited supervision of these well-handled farm credit agencies is all that should be required.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does the gentleman not think that one reason why banks are well handled is because they are subject to supervision?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, there is no doubt about the necessity for some supervision of Federal land banks.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. That is the experience of all other banks, is it not? That has been our historical experience with other banks.

Mr. MAHON. I am not speaking of the examination which has been traditionally made of the land banks. That is still required. Certainly I am not advocating any slipshod administration of the land banks, rather the contrary; but I do advocate the elimination of unnecessary red tape, duplication, waste, and extravagance wherever it may be found.

I have not had full opportunity to study all of the implications of the proposed amendment. In fact, I should like to have a statement from the committee on Agriculture in regard to the proposal, as the members of that committee have had a better opportunity to study the matter than those of us who serve on other committees. My only interest is to assist in passing legislation which will be fair to all concerned—which will strengthen and improve the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I was impressed with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, but what I rose to ask is this: Would any supervision remain over these Federal land banks if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] is adopted?

Mr. MAHON. Of course, supervision would remain. Under the law our Farm Credit Administration is set up in such a way that various regulations must be complied with.

Mr. DONDERO. A simple examination, like State banks are examined?

Mr. MAHON. The examination would still be required under paragraph A of section 601.

Mr. DONDERO. And this would eliminate most duplication then?

Mr. MAHON. And there is no attempt made to eliminate examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I hope I may have the close attention of the Members because I think you would seriously regret the adoption of this amendment. If you adopt this amendment, this will mean one of two things: Either you must appropriate an additional $500,000 out of the Treasury, of the taxpayers' money, or else you must increase the assessment against the small production credit associations and the little, struggling institutions that are now having a hard time getting along. The law requires that the Federal land banks must be administered and supervised. That is the law. They were set up by the Farm Credit Administration, and they must be administered by it. But they now want to be exempt from all administrative cost and ask that the little production credit associations out yonder and the little co-ops out yonder pay the expense. They say they are too big and powerful, that you should not make them pay any of the expense of administering the Farm Credit System.

That is this amendment. There are 7 of them who now do not have any Government capital. In the past these 7 of the 12 Federal land banks have taken Government money, $125,000,000, and they have collected interest on bonds, and they have used Government money, and they have built up reserves under the administration and supervision of the Farm Credit Administration. Yet they come here and ask you to take it from the 500 little production credit associations out in the field; take it from the little farmer cooperatives that have to be supervised and make them pay all the expense, not only of supervising them but of administering the Federal land banks.

I do not believe that this Congress wants to say to the Federal land banks that in order to save them a little money we are going out and take $500,000 out of the taxpayers' money, or we are going to increase the assessments against the little credit production associations which are having such a job getting along.

If you take seven-twelfths of $891,000 you will get about $500,000. This amendment will exempt seven Federal land banks.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. My amendment, I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, does not relate to Federal land banks alone, but applies equally to production credit associations large or small and all other similar agencies which are not operating on Government money, but their own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIZLEY: At the end of the bill add a new section to be known as section 713 to read as follows:

"That all penalties collected by the United States under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution relating to wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended', approved May 26, 1941, as amended, with respect to the marketing of any wheat from the 1941 or 1942 crops of wheat shall be refunded to the persons who bore the burden of the payment of such penalties in the same manner and subject to the same conditions as provided in the case of the refund of penalties under section 372 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, except that claims for refund under this act may be filed within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY] is recognized.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close at 3:30 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I have an amendment to the bill. If I may have the privilege of speaking for 2 or 3 minutes on that amendment I shall not object.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] that he withhold that unanimous consent request until the ruling of the Chair is made on the point of order.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the request.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing at all complicated about the amendment I have offered. You will recall that about harvest time in 1941 this Congress, by amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act, changed the penalties on wheat from 15 cents a bushel to 49 cents a bushel.

The law as passed was retroactive, because at the time the wheat was planted, at the time the farmers put out the crop, every farmer in the country had the right to believe that if he exceeded his allotted acreage he would be required to pay only 15 cents per bushel penalty, but just about harvest time, when it was too late to do anything about it, the penalty was increased from 15 cents to 49 cents. That applied to the harvest of 1941. The law was still in effect in 1942. What happened? Under the act as passed the farmer could make disposition of the penalty in one of the following ways, either pay in cash or if he did not have the cash he could put up a bond with appropriate security which required that he would meet the conditions of the penalty. If he put up the bond he was permitted to proceed with the sale of his wheat. That provision prevailed until a few months ago, when the Agricultural Adjustment Act was in effect amended by the Department of Agriculture itself, at which time they removed all restrictions so far as wheat is concerned. The effect of that was to release these men from their bonds and penalties, but the poor fellow who had paid his penalty in cash was stuck. In other words, this amendment simply affords the same protection to the fellows who paid their penalties in cash, puts them on the same basis as those who put up a bond to cover their penalty.

In my opinion, my amendment will not require any new appropriation if it is accepted as a part of this bill. All we need is an authorization, and this is an authorization bill, so that the Appropriations Committee can authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to reappropriate this identical fund. It will not require any new money. Why do I say that? Because down in the Department of Agriculture they had a suspicion that sometime before these penalties were put into the general fund someone was going to raise the question, and I am informed that they have earmarked all these funds and kept them separate.

If my amendment is agreed to, I take the position that all that will then be necessary will be an authorization. It will be an authorization to the Appropriations Committee to reappropriate funds that are already on hand. It will not require any new money to meet the appropriation.

Certainly we ought to treat these wheat farmers all alike. If there is any justification for sticking the farmer who paid in cash, then the fellow who put up a bond ought to be required to pay the same amount. The man who put up the bond lost nothing; the man who paid in cash is stuck.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. This will give back to the farmer the entire 49 cents, not 49 minus 15, but the entire 49 cents.

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes; that is true under the amendment as proposed.

Mr. LEMKE. If the gentleman will yield, does the gentleman know that they are now hounding the farmer all over the Nation on his penalty?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the pending legislation is to set up legislative authority for numerous items heretofore carried in the agriculture appropriations bill which have not heretofore been authorized by law.

In the first place, there is no provision in the agriculture appropriations bill having to do or treating with the subject of refunding penalties that might have been invoked on any particular crop. This amendment seeks solely to authorize the refund of penalties on the wheat crop for 2 years.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, as was pointed out on yesterday, this bill is for the purpose of setting up organic law for the Department of Agriculture. Certainly there is no provision in this amendment and nothing organic in this amendment, as it relates to only one crop and for a period of only 2 years. It does not seek—if it did seek, I think the situation would be different—it does not seek to establish as permanent law that all penalties on all crops under certain conditions shall be refunded, but the amendment simply seeks to refund the penalties on a particular crop for a particular year. We insist, Mr. Chairman, that it is not germane to this bill and is not within the purview, purposes, and objects of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the amendment is germane to this bill. It is true that this is a bill which within its strictest construction is an authorization bill authorizing appropriations that have heretofore not been authorized by law, as I understand, for various and sundry matters pertaining to the Department of Agriculture. In addition to that we have so construed the bill as to take in new and extraneous matter when the Chair held on yesterday that the amendment relating to school lunches was germane. School lunches had never been authorized by law. By stretching the terms of the bill to include all items which might be subject to appropriation or reappropriation certainly under the terms of this bill my amendment would be germane.

As stated, this bill refers to the Domestic Allotment Act of 1938, part of which is included under the terms of my amendment. What this will do will be to authorize the Appropriations Committee not to make a new appropriation but to reappropriate this fund which has been collected as a penalty under the provisions of the Wheat Penalty Act. For that reason I believe the amendment is germane and that the House should have an opportunity to pass upon the merits of the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard briefly on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from South Dakota briefly.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that the title of the bill includes these words:

> To facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs.

The bill does that in that it attempts to create a position of equity in the application of the Domestic Allotment Act, which is a related program.

I further would invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that title 3 of the bill includes a section of page 12 which has nothing whatsoever to do with authorization of appropriations but reads:

> Persons who carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the conservation program * * * shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments—

And so forth. In other words, there is a title in the bill which relates to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

I wish to call the Chair's attention to the further fact that all of the provisions in title 7 of the bill are more or less miscellaneous in character and are not limited to any particular phase of agricultural activities but relate very broadly to all the functions carried on by the Department of Agriculture. Consequently, in view of those things and particularly because of the particular clause in the title of the bill the broad interpretations that have heretofore been given by the Chair, I submit that the amendment should be considered germane and held to be in order.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard very briefly on the point of

order in reply to the statement just made by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota contends that there is a reference in this bill to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act and that certain sections of the bill refer to that act. Because he has mentioned that fact I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the penalties which were collected and which the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma permits to be refunded are not a part of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act which was passed in 1936. That provision is a part of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and I do not believe there is any provision in this bill which relates to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

I submit, therefore, that that part of the argument of the gentleman from South Dakota would not be apropos to the pending changes under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is ready to rule.

This is another close question. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma seeks to refund certain payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The pending bill merely authorizes certain activities that have heretofore been carried in annual appropriation bills without specific authority or authorization at all.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma does not come within that category and, therefore, the Chair holds that it is not germane to the bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. The inquiry I should like to propound, Mr. Chairman, is whether or not if the amendment were offered as a new title to the bill, title VIII and section 801 thereof, would it then not be in order? And in connection with that I would like to call the attention of the Chair again to the title of the bill. The title is not limited to authorizations or appropriations, and is a very broad title, one of the broadest titles that has ever appeared on a bill pending before the House. It specifically states that it is to facilitate and to carry out various agricultural programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to the fact that merely making it another title in the bill would not make it in order because it still would not be germane to the pending bill.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, if a bill has only one title and only one section, it cannot be expanded under the general precedents of the House, but where a bill carries more than one section or more than one title it has generally been held that additional titles may be offered. This is a multiple-title bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Merely offering it as a new title would not affect its germaneness. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD: Page 24, line 5, after the word "Administrator", strike out all language down to and including the word "and" in line 6.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this bill and all amendments thereto close at 3:45.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD just prior to the remarks to be made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the Rizley amendment. The Federal Government has done one of the greatest injustices imaginable in penalizing farmers for growing wheat, making them pay 49 cents a bushel for growing an amount of wheat which Washington bureaucrats claimed was illegal. It is unfair and unjust for the Federal Government to in any event penalize farmers for growing anything. But here we see this injustice compounded. The 49-cents-per-bushel penalty was placed on all wheat grown in excess of a certain amount. Many farmers paid the penalty. Then before they could collect a penalty from other farmers who had also grown wheat in excess of the amount allowed by the politicians in Washington, the penalty program was abandoned. But the Federal Government refuses to refund the penalties which had already been collected. This is Government injustice with a vengeance.

If an amendment were in order to abolish the whole system of crop penalties as provided in the several agricultural acts, I should offer the same to this measure. I would like to see once and forever wiped off of our statute books all of the provisions which make such penalties as we are here considering possible.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, the language which I seek to strike out is found in lines 5 and 6, and reads as follows:

Shall be compensated at the rate of $12,500 per annum and—

This has reference to the salary of the War Food Administrator. As I understand from the committee, this item of $12,500 gives an increase in salary of $2,500 per annum to the War Food Administrator as, when, and if he begins to draw a salary as such. I think I am correctly informed that the present occupant of that position, Judge Jones, draws his salary as a Federal judge at the rate of $12,500 per year; therefore, he is not drawing a salary as War Food Administrator.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be adopted on two grounds: First, in my opinion, Judge Jones is likely to remain the War Food Administrator and at the same time retain his right to the judgeship perhaps as long as we need a War Food Administrator. Secondly, this is an increase in salary of $2,500 per year for a job which was created by Executive order, and I also assume it is a temporary job.

In line with my previous remarks this afternoon and yesterday afternoon, I personally have no disposition to support an increase in salary of $2,500 per year for an Executive order created job.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman feel that there may be a need for a new War Food Administrator after January 3 next year?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If by that question the gentleman means that the House will probably go Republican, may I say that if I am in the House at that time you will find me supporting the proposition that the War Administrator's work is such that he should not receive in excess of $10,000 a year, and I do not care whether he is a Democrat or Republican, because the War Food Administrator serves under the Secretary of Agriculture; he is also very largely dominated, if not controlled, by reason of the extraordinary power of the Economic Stabilizer, Mr. Vinson, and also Mr. Byrnes, and I think the War Production Board also has a great deal to do with what the War Food Administrator can do from the standpoint of furnishing mechanical equipment that the farmers use on their farms. So if men have such great desires to serve the public let them work for a reasonable salary. I think $10,000 a year is enough.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I have not seen a bill come out of the Appropriations Committee of this House for years that has fixed the salary of the regular directors of the agencies of the Government at more than $10,000 a year.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My job is just as important as that of the War Food Administrator and the work he does, and if you fellows who have lots of crust want to vote for an increase in your own salary try to justify it. I am not going to justify it because I do not want it. We are not supposed to make ourselves wealthy or raise our living standard out of this war, and we might just as well keep some of these salaries down.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by

the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. Chairman, I would like to give the House the thinking of the subcommittee on this proposition. Of course, if the pending amendment is adopted there will be no authorization in any law for any salary for the War Food Administrator, and we will have made a step backward from what we are trying to do in authorizing certain things that have never been authorized by law. There will be no authority for his salary and none can be provided in the event Mr. Jones resigns. There would be no salary fixed for the War Food Administrator and if a new man were appointed he would have to come in under the Classification Act. If a new War Food Administrator were appointed, he would draw, as I understand it, $8,000 under the Classification Act.

There are some 8 or 10 departments under the War Food Administrator, the heads of which departments are drawing $10,000; $10,628, to be exact.

If the House thinks that the man upon whom rests the responsibility of feeding this Nation, of feeding our armed forces, of feeding our allies, and of feeding the people in the liberated sections of the world, does not have a big job and that it is not a $12,500 job, I am not going to complain. I think it is. I think clearly the War Food Administrator, whoever he may be, should be paid a little more than those working under him.

The gentleman from Michigan said that the War Food Administrator worked under the Secretary of Agriculture. That is in a sense an accurate and an inaccurate statement. The truth of the matter, as you all know, is that the President has transferred to the War Food Administrator almost all the responsibilities and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture. I think Secretary Wickard today is in charge of research, probably, or something of that kind, and the War Food Administrator is running the Department of Agriculture.

The War Food Administration buys millions and millions of dollars worth of lend-lease material. It spends untold millions in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Jones now gets his judgeship salary of $12,500. He could not resign from that and take this job without a financial loss. But if you think it is not a $12,500 job, I am quite sure the subcommittee will be glad to yield to the views of this House.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Was the office of War Food Administrator created as the result of any action of Congress?

Mr. PACE. No; my understanding is that it was created by Executive order.

Mr. KEEFE. It is my understanding that it was created by Executive order. If it was created by Executive order, then the President has the authority to fix the salary of the Administrator, does he not?

Mr. PACE. I would say offhand that he has, but that it is not bad business for the Congress to do that instead of the President.

Mr. KEEFE. The fact of the matter is that this is a temporary office?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. It is one that has been created, as have many others, by the President. In creating these offices by Executive order, the President himself has fixed the salaries. Perhaps the only reason he did not fix it here is that he took Judge Jones from the bench. He was already getting $12,500, and he continues to draw it.

Mr. PACE. I had thought that the gentleman was in favor of bringing some of those acts back under the control of the Congress. This committee thought so.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not in favor of legislatively fixing a salary for a position that has been created by Executive order.

Mr. PACE. To be frank, I do not follow the gentleman's reasoning on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 74, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4278) to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 459, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CLEVENGER. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CLEVENGER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 24, line 19, strike out "$10" and insert in lieu thereof "$5."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed be permitted to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1239), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by Senator TRUMAN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein certain tables and information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

(Mr. GRANT of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following

any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do this to announce to the House that there will be no further legislative business today, that the Mundt resolution will come up on Friday next, if the deficiency appropriation bill is disposed of by that time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will this resolution be made the first order of business after the disposition of the deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. As I said, if the deficiency bill is disposed of.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And it will immediately follow?

Mr. McCORMACK. It will come up Friday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will immediately follow the deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. But not before Friday.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the conferees on the soldiers' vote bill have reached an agreement. The conference report has been signed, and it will be taken up in the Senate, I understand, on Thursday of this week, which probably will prevent its coming up in the House before the first of next week, or it might come up Friday, if we are then in session.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if it is disposed of in the Senate, this week, it will not come up in the House until next Tuesday.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, if it is disposed of this week in the Senate it will not come up before Tuesday of next week in the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. I am very glad to have that information because many Members of the House are absent.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to give that information to the Members of the House.

HOMER C. CHAPMAN

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on the call of the Private Calendar this morning, the last bill on the calendar, S. 617, for the relief of Homer C. Chapman, was objected to, and the bill recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. As I understand it, the objections have now been removed, and no opposition exists to its passage. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be reinstated on the calendar and that it may be considered in the House at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Do I understand that this is agreeable to the objectors?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes; the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] was the one who objected to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Do I understand that the Republican objectors are satisfied with this arrangement?

Mr. BROOKS. I spoke to them, and there is no objection on their part.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to say that when the bill was called, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and myself objected, but since that time on further consideration of the bill, all of our objections have been removed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana that the bill be reinstated on the calendar and considered at this time?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Homer C. Chapman, recruit, Infantry unassigned, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States for disability incurred in the service in line of duty.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar on Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] for 30 minutes.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on January 19, 1943, the House, through Resolution 21, created a select committee to be composed of five members to investigate the activities of the F. C. C., and in the language of the resolution, the committee of which I am one of the minority members, received the following mandate:

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the organization, personnel, and activities of the Federal Communications Commission with a view to determining whether or not such Commission in its organization, in the selection of personnel, and in the conduct of its activities, has been, and is, acting in accordance with law and the public interest.

That is the yardstick which measures my duties in this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, in pursuance of this order, an investigation was undertaken of the activities of the Federal Communications Commission. An honest and competent staff was organized and began its work. In due course the investigation revealed glaring instances of the abuse by the F. C. C. of its powers to reward its political friends and punish its political enemies; of the resort to reprisals against individuals who attempted to challenge its asserted powers; instances of terrorization by the Commission of the radio industry by placing it in an unremitting state of fear, thereby causing acquiescence in the caprice of the Commission; instances of willful refusal to follow the recommendation of the joint chiefs of staff, high-ranking members of the armed forces in taking steps in furtherance of the national security, and various other acts not in accordance with the 1934 communications law and the public interest.

My colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], in a ringing speech of righteous indignation last week pointed out in a general way the constant obstruction, intimidation, and underhanded tactics employed by the administration in its desperate effort to hamstring the work of the committee and to suppress the truth.

Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted me today, I shall devote myself to a factual recitation of the conduct of this investigation, and particularly with reference to Station WMCA and the mysterious manner in which the hand of secrecy silenced startling testimony.

Immediately following the selection of the present chairman of our committee my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and I, called upon him. We had received numerous reports that there were orders to fold up this investigation at the earliest possible date and whitewash the Commission of the charges resulting from the revelation of its activities. We repeated to the chairman the information that we had received and advised him that we would not be a party to such a proceeding but would consider it our duty to reveal upon the floor of the House any evidence of conduct indicating this design. I regret that subsequent events have established the basis for a firm belief that evidence does exist to stifle and fold up this investigation with an indefensible whitewash if possible. Following the appointment of the present chairman one of his first official acts was to confer in secret with the Chairman of the F. C. C., whose alleged conduct, and that of the Commission, was the subject of our inquiry and the object of the order of the Congress to investigate.

Thereafter occurred conferences, also in secret, between the Chairman and the chief counsel of the F. C. C. both preceding and after public hearings of the committee.

Apparently a studied effort was made to undermine the morale of the staff of our committee by veiled and frequent hints from the chairman to the members of the press that he, the chairman, had not decided what he was going to do about the retention of the staff and of

Mr. Garey as chief counsel for the committee.

Many weeks passed without a meeting being called or a hearing held, during which time began the slow but steady resignation of members of the staff.

Prior to the appointment of the present chairman, an arrangement existed between the chief counsel of the committee and the F. C. C. for the production of documents and witnesses in the routine course of the staff's work, but the present chairman directed that hereafter such intercourse between these agencies be carried on between himself alone and the chief counsel for the F. C. C. As a result, the F. C. C. completely ignored the prevailing practice and the requests of the staff for the production of documents and witnesses.

When the hearings were resumed and it was necessary to obtain subpenas to compel the attendance of witnesses, the chairman of this committee refused to issue subpenas until first advised of the names of the witnesses to be called and of a résumé of what they were expected to testify to.

It then became necessary, under a strained construction of one of the rules of procedure, to require the presence of a member of the committee whenever the staff sought to make a routine investigation of a witness. There was nothing in the rule adopted requiring such a needless waste of time or a crippling of the efforts of the staff. The rule in question related only to hearings before the committee. The absurdity of this practice is obvious to every lawyer, as it resulted in requiring the staff to place upon the stand at public hearings, witnesses about whose testimony nothing was known. No prudent lawyer would think of putting a witness on the stand without first knowing at least the substance of his testimony. As a result of this course of conduct, it seems evident that it was designed to undermine the morale of the staff and to produce only resentment and resignations. This has occurred after thousands of dollars have been spent in obtaining a mass of valuable information which is presently of little or no use to a new staff, when and if one is obtained.

Mr. Speaker, information came to me that an important witness in the WMCA case was planning to leave the country and to go to China. With the investigation of the strange sale of this station complete and ready for presentation for many months, the chairman insisted upon hearing the F. C. C. Under threat to expose on the floor of the House this obvious plan to keep from the public the facts in the WMCA case, the chairman reluctantly set this matter for a hearing. It was necessary to obtain subpenas to compel the attendance of important witnesses as well as former high public officials of this administration. And again the chairman insisted upon knowing what these witnesses would testify to before he would issue subpenas for their attendance. However, subpenas were finally obtained, but only after one important witness had left New York and was headed for California. I shall be glad to call witnesses before the committee in support of these assertions if desired.

Mr. Speaker, the public hearings regarding the sale of Station WMCA continued for only 2 days but the record reveals and justifies a finding of the following facts: That a Mr. Donald Flamm, of New York, the former owner of radio Station WMCA, alleged that, under pressure from high places and under what he had reason to believe was a real threat that WMCA's wavelength would be taken away from him by the F. C. C. unless he did so, was compelled in 1940 to sell the station to Edward J. Noble, who had resigned shortly before as Under Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Flamm testified that he was subjected to threats and duress by William J. Dempsey, who had recently retired as general counsel for the F. C. C. and who appeared as attorney for one who, at first, was represented to be a high official in the President's cabinet. It later developed that Mr. Noble was the real party in interest. Flamm asserted that he did not want to sell WMCA at all and that in fact he had recently refused an offer of $1,100,000 from Elliott Roosevelt, the President's son, but that he was finally forced to let Mr. Noble have the station for $850,000 in December 1940, under threat of having his wavelength taken from him.

Let the record show that in the course of these negotiations, Flamm was trying to bring counterpressure close to the administration to bear in his own behalf. He had Leslie Roberts, formerly in charge of W. P. A. radio programs, whom he had employed at the suggestion of David K. Niles, now an administrative assistant to the President, to intervene in his behalf. Flamm thought that Roberts might be the right man with just the right connection in Washington to assist in saving his station. But this proved to be a fallacy.

According to Mr. Flamm:

> He [Roberts] told me that the ways for this thing have been greased from the White House down. He said he had spoken to David Niles and had been told by him that this sale to Noble was to pay a political debt incurred by the administration. Roberts said he would be glad to straighten it out for me if he could, but it was too much for him.

Mr. Speaker, as the mystery of this New Deal drama unfolds, you will find moving mostly behind the scenes the significant name of Thomas J. Corcoran, once an aide to Mr. Roosevelt. It will be shown later on, that Mr. Noble employed the former chief counsel of the F. C. C. at the suggestion of Mr. Corcoran and that Mr. Corcoran was in the picture to the point where he may have shared in a fee estimated to run as high as $50,000. The evidence showed that Flamm repeatedly protested the sale to Noble, but rather than run the risk of losing his wavelength, signed a contract in blank transferring the station to Noble on December 2, 1940, and that the transfer was approved by the F. C. C. without a hearing just 2 weeks later.

On February 16 of this year, the Democratic members, constituting a majority of the committee, including Chairman LEA, Representative HART, and Representative MAGNUSON, met in the absence of the minority members and suspended the inquiry. The alleged reason for their action was that the New York Supreme Court ought to have a reasonable opportunity to dispose of a pending civil suit instituted for the rescission of this alleged sale, of WMCA, before the congressional investigation proceeded any further. In the civil suit, Mr. Flamm seeks to get his station back. In the meanwhile Mr. Noble sold the station within a few months at a very substantial profit and acquired the Blue Network.

Let it be said that Mr. Noble now looms large as a figure in the broadcasting industry.

Immediately following the suspension of further hearings in this case by the majority members of the committee, this action was denounced by the minority members as a "hush-hush move, pure and simple, to keep the unsavory facts from the public" and thereupon Mr. Eugene L. Garey and the remaining members of the legal staff associated with him as counsel for the committee, resigned.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. COX. The gentleman will pardon me for asking him to yield at this point but there is one thought I wish to develop. The inquiry of your committee into the sale of radio station WMCA was stopped upon the alleged ground that the committee did not want to pry into the transaction during the pendency of litigation which involved the legality of the transfer. But the committee proceeded with the inquiry to a point where they had made one of the parties to the litigation, Mr. Flamm, make a complete disclosure of his entire case to the committee and to the public, and the committee reached the point where it was to call upon Mr. Noble, the other party to the transaction, and the other party to the litigation; and then the order of the committee came down, stopping the inquiry upon the ground that it would be unfair to the litigants to have them make disclosures before the committee.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. It is correct that Mr. Flamm, while under the process of this committee testified for 2 days and revealed with great particularity the facts undoubtedly upon which he rests his suit for the rescission of this alleged sale. I might also mention that the investigation of radio station WMCA had long since been completed prior to the time that this civil suit had been instituted. The civil suit was instituted in August of 1943, whereas the staff hearings had been completed at least shortly before that time.

Mr. Garey is in a better position than anyone to tell of the conduct of this investigation, not only from its inception, but since the present chairman was appointed to the committee. I read to you the settled conclusion of an able lawyer and distinguished citizen regarding the conduct of this investigation in his letter of resignation addressed to the present chairman of this committee:

I am now in receipt of what purports to be a copy of the minutes of an alleged meeting of the committee from which it appears that a majority of the committee have determined to discontinue further hearings in this matter (WMCA). No other communications or notice of such action have been received by me from you.

The pretended reasons advanced for such action are puerile. I am sure they will not fool anyone, because they rest on shadow and not on substance. They ignore the paramount public interest which far transcends any private interest that might be claimed to be involved. They create a dangerous precedent in respect of the legislative function whereby the essential constitutional investigatory powers of the Congress always can be thwarted merely by adopting the same subterfuge which you are putting forward as a basis for your action in this matter. To such a patent fraud on the Congress and the public I cannot and will not lend my aid.

A year ago I was requested to serve as general counsel to the committee. I was persuaded to act only after I was convinced that the investigation was in the public interest and only after I was assured that it would be conducted without fear or favor and free from political interference. During your chairmanship, I regret to say that has not been the situation.

Despite the many efforts to frustrate, interfere with, and discredit the work of the committee, the committee's public record contains conclusive evidence respecting the arbitrary and unlawful functioning of the Commission and the high-handed manner in which it has abused its power and usurped authority. The great mass of material gathered has not yet been made public. It seems to be the evident purpose to conceal, by one means or another, this material from the Congress and the public.

While the conclusion reached in this letter became crystallized by your action in the WMCA matter, it has long been under serious consideration. From the beginning of your chairmanship your hostility to the investigation and its purposes has been clear to me. You have repeatedly ignored the mandate of the House, stymied the staff in its work, and converted the investigation to a sheer whitewashing affair, wholly responsible to political pressures and dominated entirely by political expediency. To continue as counsel to the committee in these circumstances would serve no useful public purpose, would merely produce waste and futility, and would end in shame and dishonor to the Congress.

May I invite your attention briefly to the testimony given by Mr. David H. Deibler on May 13, 1943. Mr. Deibler holds an important legal position in the Federal Communications Commission and is eminently qualified to shed some light on the details of the WMCA transaction from the viewpoint of one in the Federal Communications Commission and a witness to the interesting scene. He testified as follows:

Question. Dempsey & Koplovitz had waged the battle for Fly against newspaper ownership of radio stations?

Answer. Yes.

Dempsey & Koplovitz put that WMCA deal through in a hurry. Ruth Marvick asked me what I thought they were getting out of it, and I said I didn't know but that I would guess they were getting $50,000.

Question. Did Corcoran figure in that deal?

Answer. He probably did. He and Dempsey were very, very close.

Question. He was the "front" man for Dempsey?

Answer. Yes.

Question. Did the Commission ever get any information as to whether Corcoran got any money out of that deal?

Answer. They may have. I don't know. I guessed, in view of the pressure in that case, that the fee was $50,000, and later on I saw an item that sort of confirmed it. I did hear that Corcoran figured in it.

Question. How did they get that transfer through the Commission so fast? Was pressure exerted?

Answer. Yes. If you will look at the files, you will find I wrote a letter to Flamm, and it was a very embarrassing thing for Tel Taylor. Dempsey had just left the Commission—his seat was still warm—and Taylor was the successor to Dempsey. Dempsey saw that he was seated there.

I wrote this letter to Flamm, and on the same day we got an answer, not from Flamm but from Dempsey & Koplovitz. It pretended to be an answer, and it was stamped received the same day that my letter went out.

Question. Was your letter addressed to Flamm in Washington?

Answer. I think it was addressed to Flamm at New York. What happened, they delivered it to Dempsey & Koplovitz in Washington.

Dempsey & Koplovitz's reply came the same day, and Tel Taylor called me in and argued the sufficiency of the answer, which, obviously, was not an answer. It was argumentative.

Question. And Taylor insisted it was an answer?

Answer. He insisted it was O. K., and he proceeded to interline the opinion and put in some remarks that would seem to fit the case.

Question. Then did you rewrite the opinion?

Answer. He dictated it to the girl.

Question. Did you sign it?

Answer. I have a 50 percent doubt that I did. I think maybe Tel signed it.

Question. Is your original opinion still in the file?

Answer. It may be. If he took it out personally, it wouldn't be there. Otherwise, it would be in the case file without his remarks to grease the case. Then he went in, in my absence, and urged the Commission to approve it.

Question. Was he interested in it, or was someone on the Commission interested?

Answer. He would be interested, because Dempsey saw that he got the job.

Question. Weren't Corcoran and Fly pretty food friends, too?

Answer. Very good.

Question. If Corcoran was interested in it, Fly would be interested in it?

Answer. Yes; and he would take it up at a Commission meeting and see that it was taken care of .

Question. So Taylor was anxious to help Dempsey & Koplovitz, and Fly was anxious to help Corcoran?

Answer. Yes; and they could be sure there would be no trouble about it.

Mr. Speaker, the indefinite postponement of the WMCA case is not only most unusual, quite aside from the way and manner in which the postponement was considered and acted upon, but is without a parallel in legislative history.

Congressional committees and their staffs have been known to refrain from investigations and disclosures in matters wherein criminal prosecutions were known to be pending, and rightly so, it may be. But there is no record of any case where the mere pendency of a civil action has been made the pretext for stopping hearings once commenced on a matter between private persons. Such conduct is neither supported by reason nor justified by apology. And if there could possibly be any merit to the contention that continued hearings by the committee could prejudice either party to the Flamm-Noble suit, then Flamm has already been injured by the disclosures which he has been compelled to make, and the postponement obviously has benefited Noble and possibly injured Flamm. But in the final analysis the full facts of this deal have been denied the Congress.

It must be remembered that the committee's investigation of WMCA had been completed before Flamm filed his suit against Noble. Flamm's suit against Noble was not filed until very early in August, last, while the committee was holding hearings in New York concerning the F. C. C.'s activities in respect of foreign language stations and their personnel. The committee's investigation had been completed weeks before the Flamm suit was instituted, so far as the committee staff could complete the matter without open hearings before the committee.

Furthermore, many of the facts, circumstances, and conditions surrounding the Flamm-Noble transactions had long been public property in the hearings of the House Appropriations Committee on the bill for the fiscal year 1942. The public character of those facts constitute a most cogent reason why this committee should proceed with a thorough investigation of the WMCA matter. As the matter now stands, everyone knows the postponement was based upon considerations that could not be disclosed.

There had been executive sessions of this committee on WMCA long prior to the filing of the Flamm suit against Noble.

On June 2, 3, 8, and 10, 1943, after the committee's staff had completed most of the investigation of the sale and transfer of WMCA, executive sessions were held for the purpose of receiving testimony from one Charles S. Guthrie, pursuant to subpena duces tecum directed to him for the production of his records, papers, and documents, and particularly copies of his income-tax returns for certain years. Mr. Guthrie, it was known, had served as attorney for Mr. Noble in the settlement and closing of the sale of station WMCA to Noble. When Mr. Guthrie appeared at those hearings he was accompanied by his counsel, Mr. Corcoran, who, with the committee's permission, was allowed to make statements supporting Guthrie's opposition against the furnishing of his records and income-tax returns. Mr. Corcoran is the same gentleman who, but for the postponement of hearings in the WMCA matter would have been asked publicly to give additional evidence concerning the sale and transfer of WMCA. At the time of the postponement, Mr. Corcoran was under subpena for that purpose. At the executive sessions mentioned, Mr. Corcoran's support of Mr. Guthrie's claim of immunity from furnishing the committee with his, Guthrie's income-tax returns was based solely on the ground that they would disclose a partnership in the practice of law to have existed between Corcoran and Guthrie. I feel that I am violating no confidence in making that statement; and it will be recalled that Mr. Flamm testified before the commit-

tee before the hearing was postponed that Corcoran, along with the firm of Dempsey and Koplovitz, had participated in the sale and transfer of station WMCA and the settlement and closing of the sale by Guthrie, and it had been developed by Noble that Corcoran recommended the employment of Dempsey & Koplovitz.

It is common knowledge that Corcoran was at one time employed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as an attorney, and occupied other positions of trust and confidence in the Government, and served as confidential adviser to the President and others high in councils and affairs of the Government. It is also likewise well known that William J. Dempsey and William C. Koplovitz were, respectively, General Counsel and Assistant General Counsel to the Federal Communications Commission to a time rather close to their employment by Noble in acquiring radio station WMCA from Flamm.

Testimony given a few years ago by Mr. Corcoran before the Truman committee of the Senate reflects that he had received large sums in attorney fees within a short space of time after he left the R. F. C.—always in the guise and in the capacity of associate attorney, and not by direct representation of persons and concerns before the Government departments and agencies. In other words, he appears always to have recommended other counsel, as he did in this case, and then served clients as an associate, rather than to accept direct representation, as he told the Truman committee. Briefly, Mr. Corcoran's exploits and reputation are legendary, and it must be assumed that he and others high in the councils of the New Deal were the true objects of the protection afforded through postponement of the committee's hearings on the WMCA matter.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has admitted a breakfast conference with Mr. Corcoran on the morning of the meeting which resulted in the indefinite postponement of the WMCA hearing, and has gone to some length in describing the method of conveyance used in his return from Attu, Alaska, in his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 29, 1944, beginning at page 2122. Be all that as it may, the gentleman from Washington was on hand for the meeting, after a long absence, and despite he had attended but few prior meetings. And he confesses he likes Mr. Corcoran, and hopes to have other breakfasts with him, but there is no disclosure of the subject matter of their conversation.

Hence we have two unusual occurrences; first, the appearance of Mr. Corcoran before the committee last June, as counsel for Mr. Guthrie, when he made the objection to the production of his partner's income-tax return, and, secondly, the breakfast conference with a member of the majority of the committee just prior to the postponement of the WMCA case, which was the subject of the June executive hearings of the committee.

Is it not more than possible that Mr. Corcoran has been and is seeking protection for himself and others high in administration councils, past and present? And, whether that is true, the result is that he and they have been protected from disclosing their parts in this dubious deal.

Is Corcoran a political deity, seated on some remote Mount Olympus and hence not answerable to the will of Congress? Or is he so close to the throne of power that he can pull down the curtain of secrecy at will upon a scene in which he is one of the principal actors? How long shall the Congress sit silently by and watch the Executive will frustrate and paralyze the legislative process? Are we to see our constitutional form of government collapse and democracy wither and die before our eyes by Executive defiance, domination, and strangulation of committees created by this Congress and answerable only to this body? To do so would, in my judgment, be no less than treason to those who fight and die that this Government—the Government as we know and love it under the Constitution—may live.

Mr. Speaker, I have been privileged to discuss before you this afternoon certain matters dealing with the conduct of the committee investigating the F. C. C., but I would be less than fair if I did not draw certain conclusions born of my close attention to the details of these hearings.

A $50,000 bait hung out by Edward J. Noble to "Tommy the Cork" in a law case does not explain the vigor with which the New Deal so-called inner circle has tried to prevent disclosures in these hearings.

That Donald Flamm was flimflammed out of a radio station in a fast-moving business deal—and now wishes to recoup—does not explain the administration's violent efforts to put a stop to these investigations.

Indeed, I doubt that the administration is too concerned with actual revelations regarding the astute legal shenanigans of Corcoran, or the income of Guthrie, or the fulminations of Fly, or the duress of Dempsey, or even the future success or failure of Noble in the field of radio.

But there are things, other things, of higher interest to the administration. They are, Mr. Speaker, deeper secrets of the administration and the 1944 elections.

If we really study this shocking example of administrative refusal to let the people know what goes on under the darkening shroud of Government secrecy we see a blinding light.

May I suggest to you, as carefully as the English language will permit me, that the administration sees that if they permit this investigation to reveal even a small fraction of the corruption which must exist after 12 years of control of all of the departments of this Government, they will already have lost the election next November.

And worse, if this committee of Congress—of Congress, mind you—if this committee of Congress submits to this administrative gag, we will find that we have closed the door to the shady corridor which leads to the real truth about which men were really responsible for the horror of Pearl Harbor.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a news story from the Post-Gazette of Pittsburgh relative to the transportation of soldier ballots.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, last week I asked for time immediately following the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MILLER] because I had rather anticipated that in the unfortunate controversy that has been developing in the committee he might give to the House some additional facts that were not given by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] last week, and in doing so circumstances might require either elaboration or further reference so that the Congress might know what the facts were. The gentleman from Missouri has just reiterated what was said here last Tuesday or Wednesday. The matter was discussed then in great detail and answered in great detail by the majority members of the committee. The gentleman from Missouri devotes a great deal of time to the sale of a radio station in New York and to the fact the committee temporarily postponed hearings on the matter until such time as a New York court had decided the matter; the case now being before the courts in New York and not before the committee regarding the matter of whether or not there was any collusion or fraud or whether the sale was this or that. That is a matter of testimony and of course has nothing to do directly with the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I decline to yield. I will yield when I am through.

It is my understanding that at the proper time this matter will be further investigated and insofar as the iteration and reiteration of the so-called charges made by the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Missouri are concerned I believe the House was well satisfied with the very intelligent, forthright, and honest answer made to this House by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] on this subject.

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but it seems to me that the gentleman from Missouri is getting himself in a position whereby he is judging the case before the committee has had any opportunity to get all the facts in the matter and write a report to this Congress. Whether that report be minority views or the majority views it seems to me it ill behooves us to stand on the floor of the House and judge these matters beforehand. What the gentleman states may be correct; I do not know; but I do know, Mr. Speaker, that we have spent 13 months on one side of the case. There is a public record that any Member of the House or the

public may have of 1,600 pages, all of it on one side of the question. It seems to me that before any member of this committee stands on the floor of the House or issues long statements to the press that possibly he owes a duty to the House of Representatives to reserve judgment until all sides of the case are heard. Right now, however, the committee is in process of hearing portions of the other side of the case. The testimony in all these matters referred to will take many more weeks, and I understand the committee has been allotted by the House sufficient funds to make a complete investigation. That is the position we are in. The duty we owe to the country and the Congress is to see that before the jury goes out that the case is all in.

I do not know why we have to stand on the floor of this House and talk about the 1944 elections and a congressional investigating committee in the same breath. Maybe the answer to this lies in the gentleman's statements themselves in which he states that unless they proceed the way he wants them to proceed, unless they stand as they stand right now on the floor of this House and condemn things that are in the RECORD that have not been answered—maybe they deserve condemnation—unless they do that the poor Democrats are going to lose the 1944 elections. If that is the way the investigation is going, maybe I shall have to reserve to myself the right, Mr. Speaker, to wait until the second week in November to get all the facts. I hope that is not correct.

I think it unfortunate also that in the speech of the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Massachusetts the letter of resignation of the counsel of the committee was read to the House as part of the RECORD. Under the rules of the House, no Member could make those statements about another Member. They are a reflection upon the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. I have every respect for his integrity and no one can say, regardless of how I feel about this, that the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] is attempting any whitewash of this Commission or any other commission. For 28 long years he has been a Member of the House and insofar as I know every Member who has served with him during that time and I myself during the time I have served in the House have found him to be a model of integrity and fairness. I think it is unfortunate that we get into this type of personal controversy. If the people of the country need to do any comparing I am sure his record will stand up against that of anyone in this body.

Mr. Speaker, let us get all the facts in this case, let us hear all the witnesses, and I do not mind the minority Members bringing in all these witnesses they wish, but for goodness sake, let us do something and get started on both sides. We have spent 13 months, I say again, on one side. We started this morning on the other side.

Then, Mr. Speaker, after all the testimony is in if the minority Members wish to say that it has been this type or that type of investigation, that someone should be censured or not be censured, that is the time to report to this House. We have other matters that are more important than threshing out committee hearings on the floor of this House.

Everything that has been said here in the past week can be read in the testimony, in the records that are public property today. I hope, Mr. Speaker, in these trying times that both sides—including myself—will be more temperate in this matter and get at this subject and get at it correctly without personalities. I am sure we will ultimately and possibly when we are all through the conclusions of the committee, whether we agree with them or not, will lead to some serious and intelligent legislation that will set up the Federal Communications Commission in such fashion that it will always be a credit to the Congress and to the communications systems of this country.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. If this committee waits until the final determination of the Flamm-Noble suit in New York will that not be what we lawyers call res adjudicata and preclude any further investigation along that line?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman I do not know how the evidence in the matter involved in New York will impress the individual members of the committee. Congressional committees often rely for information on lawsuits and the testimony given in lawsuits. Lawsuits are quoted on the floor of the House. I do not know whether this lawsuit will sufficiently bring out all the facts. I have not delved into that. It is my understanding that the postponement of this matter was only for a reasonable time until we could take care of some other matters and if the courts have not decided the case, or if there are delays, we can go into it then. There is no objection to that. If in reading the case in New York I am personally impressed so that I can come to a conclusion, that I will do. Such is my prerogative.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Let me ask the gentleman another question. Is it not a fact that a congressional committee investigating any subject has much more power than the two sides of a lawsuit presenting the evidence that they can to the court?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think in some cases they have.

Mr. RAMEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. Because the integrity of one of the Members of Congress is questioned, this gives me some concern because the innuendo has gone back as far as the district I represent, hearing of it at home, that some threat was made against the counsel who has resigned that if he did not resign or did not do certain things some friend of his would be in serious trouble. Will that, too, be investigated by the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I hope it will be. I have heard some reports, but they are only reports. Before Members of Congress get up on the floor and pose reports as facts, or create innuendo, I think it is their duty to go into all the facts, then come to a conclusion and report.

Mr. RAMEY. The purpose of the question is to determine the fact.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand there have been lots of reports and charges made.

Mr. RAMEY. It is not fair that anything like that remain in suspension.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is not, and, as far as I understand it, we will go into these matters.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I share with the gentleman from Washington a considerable regard, a high regard, for the gentleman from California, the chairman of this special committee. I have been somewhat troubled in listening to the arguments this afternoon, which is about all I know in reference to the controversy. I would like to know about the responsibility of the committee to defer further examination of the so-called radio station by reason of litigation. I think the public interest and the right of Congress to go into that transcends any right of the litigants between themselves. Am I correct in understanding that further investigation into that matter has been postponed by the committee to await the adjudication of the action in New York?

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct, and the gentleman from New Jersey explained all the reasons. It is not a closed matter. It so happens that I personally have never sat in on any of the hearings on this particular item. I have read the testimony of the witnesses, and, of course, I do not recall all of it, but I understand that the matter does not directly involve any action of the F. C. C. to date. There is a lot of innuendo that somebody said this or that about and to Mr. Noble and Mr. Flamm. The gentleman from Missouri says that Mr. Noble has now become a power in the radio industry. Maybe the gentleman's objections to Mr. Noble becoming a power in the radio industry goes back to the time when he resigned in 1940 to campaign for Mr. Willkie. That is about as farfetched as some of the statements that have been made in these speeches.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. As a Member of Congress, I really feel that the committee's rights in a situation, if relevant to this investigation, are transcendent and are more important than the rights of the individuals, and it seems to me if they have one side of the case before them in fairness they should have both sides of the case.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the gentleman is correct. I do not know whether the case involves the matter of legislation or the basis for some future legislation that might be considered by this Congress for the purpose of perfecting the Federal Communications Act or not. It is like

all the other matters. I wish the Members of the House would take the time to read the testimony. Of course, you cannot read it all. We have gone into more extraneous matters and matters that are not relevant than on any committee I have ever served on, and I have served on many. This has to end somewhere, sometime, and the only reason we have for determining whether Mr. Flamm or Mr. Noble, or one, defrauded the other, is for the purpose of determining future legislation. Outside of that it is a matter for the courts of New York. Maybe some of the gentlemen do not have faith in the integrity of the courts of New York. I have.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Is it not a fact that the range of evidence that the committee can adduce at its hearings is much greater than the evidence that can be submitted in a court of law?

Mr. MAGNUSON. It may or may not be.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. In all fairness to Mr. Flamm, does not the gentleman think that Mr. Noble should be submitted to this committee's investigation, because Mr. Flamm has had to answer every question propounded to him without the benefit of objection or a ruling of a court as to whether or not it may be relevant? Does not the gentleman think Mr. Noble should be subjected to the same thing?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I have no reason to believe he is not going to be subjected to it.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. But the committee's action has precluded that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is the trouble with this whole business—it has not precluded anything. Now, we merely have some other matters that we want to settle in the meantime while this controversy has gone to New York. We said we would postpone it for a reasonable time. I do not know of any statement that has been made that these parties will not be called in if it is pertinent to a congressional investigation for the purpose of legislation, but we do not want to go to washing somebody's linen in New York.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Yes; but if the court in New York has finally determined that case, then cannot this committee say that it has already been adjudicated, that there is nothing for the committee to investigate or to inquire into because the courts of New York State have done that?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I suppose the committee could say that, but I have no information that it would.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand the committee's counsel and most of the staff have resigned; is that true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand it—the gentleman from Massachusetts may correct my statement—we had 10 or 12 employees on the staff and 6 of them have resigned.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. We had 19 at the peak and we have now 4, 2 of whom are stenographers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understood the gentleman to say the other day there were 10 or 11. Anyway I can tell the gentleman that the chief investigator remains, another investigator, and 2 of the stenographers.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman propose to proceed with hearings without the benefit of trained counsel?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No. That is not my information.

Mr. KEEFE. You are proceeding with your hearings now, are you not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. We are proceeding right now on some matters that we think we can proceed with, merely closing up some portions of the case and putting testimony in the record. The chairman of the committee, it is my understanding, is in conference with prospective counsel whose names I do not know. He will report shortly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. You are proceeding over the repeated protests and opposition of both minority members of the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; the two minority members of the committee voted not to proceed with the matters that we started today.

Mr. KEEFE. Will not the gentleman agree with me that perhaps it is not within the province or purview or the functions of this committee to determine the issues which may be involved in a recission action instituted by one of these parties up in New York, but, rather, the inquiry of this committee and the Members of Congress should be interested in investigating perhaps far beyond any issue that could be created in that action up in New York.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That might be.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, there is the question of influence, the influences if you please.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. KEEFE. I am asking the gentleman now whether or not he does not think the Congress and the people of this country are entitled through the action of this committee to go into facts far beyond any facts that could be gone into in a lawsuit and determine what the influences are of Government officers and agents and commissions that are perhaps being used in a manner that is not in the public interest, and thus suggest the possibility of legislation to correct that sort of situation?

I may say to the gentleman that I have great respect for the chairman of the committee, I have great respect for the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART] who made a fine speech the other day, and I have great respect for the gentleman who is speaking, but I do not believe the Congress or the people of this country are going to be satisfied with that sort of an excuse for failing to go on with this investigation now.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman asked me a question, and my answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes." I have no indication that we are not. The gentleman is merely coming to a conclusion about his own method of procedure.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Aside from personalities, and in those I do not want to indulge, the thing that disturbs me about this proposition is this, and I want to get the gentleman's reaction to it. It has been my privilege or responsibility, whatever you want to call it, to serve on some investigating committees. Those committees have been directed by the House of Representatives to inquire into the doings of a certain governmental agency. It has been my experience that when you start, immediately the agency under investigation wants to be in the investigation, it wants to be heard. It has been my idea that the investigation should proceed to its conclusion and then, when it is concluded, opportunity should be granted to the agency itself to come in with such defense or rebuttal or reply as it might seek to make. I do not know why this investigation has dragged along for 13 months. I voted for the resolution and I had hoped that it might be completed expeditiously. There has been terrific delay. But at the same time, and apart from the issue involved in the WMCA matter, it has seemed a little strange to me that particularly at this time, with the hearings not yet completed, with the job directed by the House of Representatives yet undone, in the middle of the proceedings, the agency under investigation should come in with its presentation of its side of the case.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say to the gentleman that, of course, I entirely agree with him. No one has expressed himself more than I about the delay in this committee. In my opinion, the delay in the committee has been due to the prior counsel. My proof of that is for you to read the hearings. Most of the time was taken up with conclusions of the counsel before he heard witnesses. You can judge for yourself. Read the hearings.

My further understanding is that a motion was made that we let the Commission proceed with their testimony. For 13 months charges have been hurled against them throughout the country. Let them testify as to those matters which we now have covered.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to have a committee hearing on this floor. I say it is unfortunate, and I hope that after today we can go ahead with the business the House has assigned to us.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. May I observe that if the committee proceeded to investigate all of the grievances of persons dealing in radio, your investigation would probably last 13 years rather than 13 months. Is not that true?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; and probably the personnel of the entire committee would be changed long before we would get through.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF MINORITY MEMBERS, REPRESENTATIVES WIGGLESWORTH, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AND MILLER OF MISSOURI, IN OPPOSITION TO RESUMPTION OF HEARINGS BY SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE F. C. C., TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 1944

Before the hearings begin, Mr. Chairman, Mr. MILLER and I desire to make a statement in protest against the unusual and unwarranted procedure about to be followed in this investigation.

During the last few days, Mr. Eugene Garey, chief counsel for the committee, has resigned together with the remaining members of the legal staff of the select committee investigating the F. C. C.

Allegations made in connection with Mr. Garey's resignation have been shocking. They have yet to be investigated. In addition, certain members of the investigating staff have also resigned. As a result, the committee's staff has been reduced from a peak of 19 to 4 at present, consisting now of a chief investigator, a second investigator, and two stenographers.

As soon as Mr. Garey resigned it was evident that the committee was hopelessly handicapped in proceeding with further hearings or the investigation of the F. C. C., Mr. Fly demanded a prompt hearing setting out specific subjects on which he desired to be heard and initimated that any present lack of legal personnel for the committee might be compensated for by the fact that the staff of the Federal Communications Commission would "carefully organize material to be presented."

This demand by Mr. Fly to be heard immediately is in striking contrast to his refusal to testify when called as a witness before the first public hearing at which testimony was taken by the committee in July 1943. Nevertheless the majority members of the committee have determined to proceed with immediate hearings over our vigorous and repeated protests.

We believe that hearings should be resumed at the earliest possible moment consistent with the employment of an adequate and competent staff, with a reasonable opportunity for preparation to present the full facts of the investigation as commanded by the Congress.

We have publicly condemned the obstruction, intimidation, and underhanded tactics employed by the administration with a view to hamstringing this investigation. We cannot, however, consent to the resumption of hearings at this time with the committee staff in its present crippled and undermanned condition.

We demand that the record set forth our complete conviction that to proceed with hearings under present conditions with the staff decimated and with no opportunity for adequate preparation in this far-reaching investigation of national importance is unfair to the committee, unfair to the Congress, and unfair to the country.

We cannot escape the conclusion that the decision to proceed with immediate hearings, in response to Mr. Fly's letter, is further and substantial evidence of the determination of the administration to whitewash the entire investigation.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] is recognized for 20 minutes.

OIL PRODUCTION

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an article from the Tulsa Tribune entitled "Government Regulation Biggest Stumbling Block in Way of Oil."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, the independent oilmen have recently been referred to as "God's frozen people." Their prices are frozen below all reason and in violation of all the rules of common sense as well as the necessities in times of war or, for that matter, in times of peace.

The independent oilmen have been bulldozed into accepting subsidies, pressured by starvation prices, by delay, by increasing costs, by spacing orders, and by bureaucratic stalling. Browbeaten into discouragement which has resulted in the sales of their property in prodigious quantities to the large oil companies which exercise a substantial monopoly, in cooperation with the Government, in the oil business. The O. P. A. has been quietly whispering about recently that if an independent oilman or group of men with stripper wells making less than 5 barrels a day should appeal to its omnipresence, it would graciously reach into the Treasury of the United States and take out enough money to pay the near-bankrupt oilman a subsidy of 30 cents a barrel. The oilmen are opposed to subsidies. The oilman resents the idea that in order to stay in business he must have a dole from the Treasury of the United States. But starvation and bankruptcy compel him to accept, and I surmise that hundreds of independent oilmen will be compelled to swallow their pride and their principles and accept the O. P. A. subsidy.

The administration professes concern about the necessity for oil, but in actual practice it appears that the bureaucrats would prefer to have subsidies than actually to have oil for the Nation's use and needs. The independent oilman, when he is in financial straits, has no market except the few major oil companies who exercise a practical monopoly in oil in the United States. The major oil companies apparently do not want higher prices. They make their money in the main from the refined products, so the cheaper the major companies can buy their crude oil, the more profitable business is to them. They have come lately to see the error of this position, but they got enmeshed with the whole theory of Government ownership and control before they saw their error.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the administration has not been playing the game with the independent oilmen, but with the major oil companies. Witness the waste of public funds in the ill-fated Canol project, which has been condemned by everyone who has had the facts. Now comes the visionary, dangerous, international scheme of a pipe line in Arabia to the tune of $135,000,000 at the outset. No claim is made that this is in aid of the war effort. No claim is made that the oil companies do not have the money to build their own pipe line. No claim is made that it can be completed short of 3 years. No claim is made that under competitive shipping the oil could not be transported by boat as cheaply as by the proposed pipe line. The real reason for this long step by Government into the oil business is to stabilize the concessions of the oil companies in the Near East—a commitment that implies force of arms when the time comes.

No effort is being made to develop our domestic fields, but that development is hampered by the Government. No apparent encouragement is offered by any proposal to assist the development in South America where oil and oil reserves abound.

Apparently, this group does not want oil for national defense and for civilian uses. They want subsidies, subsidies to already existing oil wells, and that out of the Public Treasury.

Is it a deliberate and calculated attempt to reduce the independent domestic oil-producing industry to impotency which has been responsible for the failure and refusal to grant the price relief which has been overdue for more than 2 years?

In the midst of the current shortage of supply for vital and essential civilian needs in the United States, no program is offered except the negative one of further rationing and subsidies.

The facts of the situation have been recited again and again. The House took action on the basis of the facts on December 13 when it passed H. R. 2887, which would be a directive, if you please, to the Office of Price Administration to get its head out of its metaphysical calculations and do something about the domestic supply.

The other branch of the legislative body has not acted on this bill which reached them more than 80 days ago.

The public mind has been confused by talk of huge projects in foreign lands, all of a post-war nature. Many have gotten the impression that some relief is being offered to the consumer by such proposals.

That impression should be removed speedily. The proposed venture into Saudi Arabia, for instance, offers no more help to this country in its time of emergency than does the Canol project.

We are on our own here at home. Any help in the way of increase in supply will have to come from the domestic fields. There will be no help from that source. Until and unless a price is paid for crude oil that will permit of expansion, the condition will get worse. We are producing a little more than 4,400,000 barrels of crude oil a day. There is a little excess producing capacity not now reached by transportation facilities, but without something to arrest declines elsewhere, the net gain from the excess-capacity fields will be negligible by the time the transportation is provided.

Every move and every policy of the war agencies has been of the type to restrain

oil field development. The price was frozen and the level at which it was frozen was subnormal. Materials were denied and manpower was taken away. It was expected, of course, that a large number of oil field employees would enter the armed services, but others were drained off by industries whose prices permitted them to pay wages which the oil producers could not meet.

The tragic results of this course began to appear months ago and are increasingly in evidence. Independent producers are selling out. They struggled against impossible odds for many months, begging, imploring, shouting for a chance to do their part in the war. They wanted to work harder than ever to find and produce the oil which is at the top of the list in the essentials of war. They were given, instead, a mandate to do less.

So they retire from the business, defeated by a policy that is creating monopoly. When that monopoly has reached the proper point, when the competitive element shall have been eliminated, full Government domination and even operation will be demanded and made easy of accomplishment. Let the big game eat up the smaller animals and then it is simple to kill or domesticate the big ones.

Was this thought of Government participation in the oil affairs of other nations, including the tangled mess that exists in the Middle East, present all the time in the thoughts of those who have controlled price of oil here? The domestic producer was made impotent. Next came the cry that little remained in this country. The oil fields had all been found and we must go abroad with the taxpayer's money and engage in an oil adventure of the W. P. A. order.

A shortage has been produced by the will of the bureaucrats. It is the function of the Congress to strike the shackles from the captive and let him work.

Those who fashioned the price policy profess great alarm at the thought of congressional action on oil prices. It is unseemly, they say, for Congress to act in this manner; it should concern itself only with broad policies and not with individual price matters.

My answer is that the will of the Congress has not been carried out. The O. P. A. was told to keep in plain view at all times in its regulation of prices the productive needs of the Nation. This it has not done as to oil. It has ignored all basic considerations in the matter. The Petroleum Administrator told the O. P. A. and he told Judge Vinson, in language that admitted of only one meaning, that the condition was a desperate one and that the way to get more oil was to pay more price.

Further, as oil is a resource that has been singled out for repressive treatment by the price controllers, it is appropriate that the Congress single it out for corrective treatment.

In the past few days the O. P. A. has let it be known that it is working on a plan to endow in some manner the owners of the little stripper wells of the Nation. Pernicious anemia is to be cured with a mustard plaster. The corpus of the producing industry has been starved until it totters as it walks and there is to be an attempt to keep it breathing a little longer—perhaps long enough to put into effect the policy of creating prosperity in the sands of Araby.

That is all a bonus on the small wells would do—keep them alive. It will not add to the total supply of oil. It may enable many of the worthy, hard-working owners of the wells to keep the pump rods moving up and down, but it would be a program so undependable as to preclude any expenditures. Ask the producers of copper and numerous other strategic metals how they have come out. They have learned that there is no permanency to a subsidy program and that a man is a fool to borrow money and spend it on expansion of production with the expectation of recovering it out of his subsidy price.

Oil finding costs have gone up fourfold since 1938. Costs of producing oil have gone up at least one-third on the most of the producing wells of the country. Labor costs, material costs, taxes, living costs—everything has advanced. The price of crude oil has been stationary since early 1941. There have been a few little dime-store raises affecting small amounts of crude oil, doled out after months of figuring and ciphering and usually with the proviso that the buyers of the oil, the refiners, were to absorb the increase. The public must be protected against any increase in the price of gasoline. So the effect has been to let the public keep its money and take away its oil supply. In that way, perhaps, there will be more tax money available with which to construct pipe lines in Canada and Arabia.

We have two large classes of reserves of oil that can be made available with the expenditure of money in sufficient quantity. One is the undiscovered reserves. We know they exist. They are somewhere. They are in Texas and Oklahoma and Kansas and others of the 26 States which now produce oil in some quantity. They are in States not now producing oil. The geologists think so and the producers want to test that belief. In the past few months 2 States entered the oil-producing column—Florida and Alabama.

Let's not worry about the exhaustion of oil-finding possibilities. Give the industry the conditions under which it can work and it will find reserves fully as great as those which have previously been found in all the history of the industry.

One of the most highly respected geologists of the Nation is authority for the statement that there are more than 10,000 linear miles of possible oil-producing wedge belts which have not been explored, drilled, or developed. These may not all produce oil, but every mile of these wedge belts is a potential oil field. How can they be developed at cost or less than cost? How can subsidies develop them?

We have another class of oil reserves—the already found and partly developed reserve. It consists of about 20,000,000,000 barrels. It is made up of wells which produce from an eighth of a barrel average per day to those which yield several hundred barrels. It is not producible at will or in any rate the demand for oil may dictate. Nature fights back when the operator tries to hurry along the yield and it costs money to overcome natural forces and natural inertia. But there are ways of increasing the yield, even in the oldest of the fields. Operators have methods known as secondary recovery methods. They cost money, but the stake is large. The Petroleum Administrator's office has just made up some figures. They show that in district 2, which includes Illinois, Michigan, Oklahoma, Kansas, and several other oil-producing States, the reserve of present projects under secondary recovery is 166,000,000 barrels; that with 25 cents more price the secondary recovery reserve would be increased to 505,000,000 barrels and a 50-cent raise would push it to 675,000,000 barrels. The oil is there and its location is known but it requires an investment in new drilling and equipment to get the oil to the surface. The figures reveal also great possibilities for additional oil in Pennsylvania. Not covered in the report are many fields in Texas and other oil-producing States which have definitely blocked-out reserves of oil in old fields which would yield to this form of rejuvenation.

I will not criticize the owners of the stripper wells if they finally yield to the rampant theory of subsidy payments. They are sinking for the last time and cannot be blamed for grasping at any log that comes floating by. They are worn out expecting the substantial life-raft that would be provided in the price increase which the House of Representatives voted to authorize on December 13, 1943, and which sleeps peacefully in the Senate, under the ban of the administration.

ROWLEY ON OIL

GOVERNMENT REGULATION BIGGEST STUMBLING BLOCK IN WAY OF OIL

A little thought will convince any reasonable person that practically all of the oil industry's troubles are caused by Government agencies. That being the case, the millennium could be achieved through abolishing those agencies. Can oil men remember the good old days when private initiative and individual enterprise were back of all oil-industry operations. When the natural law of supply and demand controlled prices. When a fellow could go out and block up acreage, go to a supply store and get whatever materials and equipment he needed, on credit, too, if he wished, and then drill his well on the site most attractive to him without thought of another fellow's spacing pattern.

Now the industry is in a turmoil over the matter of prices, established by the Office of Price Administration, a Government agency. For more than 2 years it has fought through Government agencies for a general price increase. Now it is divided over a proposal prepared by a Government agency to pay a subsidy in lieu of a general price increase. The policy of Government to resort to subsidies when it can't figure a realistic solution to a problem has been a thorn in the sides of oil men who now are confronted with the problem again.

The oil industry, the Nation as a whole, including President Roosevelt, and, in fact, other nations, now are involved in the matter of whether the United States Government should enter actively into the oil business as

it proposes to do through the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government agency. Oil men are confronted with Government competition in the business, which, unless checked, can only mean Government control eventually.

Under the Price Control Act, the term of the Office of Price Administration will expire June 30. Oilmen must be prepared quickly to present their view on this Government agency to Congress so that dictatorial powers assumed, but not authorized by Congress, shall be limited; and that authority assumed or otherwise, to act as prosecutor, judge, and jury in cases coming before it shall be abolished and such cases be turned over to the regularly constituted courts of the country where they belong. Also, that a specific, fixed rule or formula be set forth which must in every case be used as a basis for establishing price ceilings. And that policy-making powers assumed by the agency, such as its consideration of the profit factor, be abrogated.

Oilmen, in fact all businesses, do not even have the power to increase the pay of an employee who may be especially efficient. Workers are regimented into classifications. The days of employing a man to look after an oil-producing lease and letting him work on the lease whenever there was work to do there and permitting him to work on his garden or little farm when the lease did not require his attention, are gone under this regimentation of workers and business.

If this regimentation were a war measure and needed to speed victory, no one would have any kick. But much of it actually handicaps the war effort. It certainly is not aiding the war effort to force abandonment of small producing oil wells, because of low prices frozen at a subnormal level. The Nation now is suffering from a lack of crude oil in several areas and is losing daily vast quantities of oil which could be recovered over a period of years but which are being lost forever through abandonment of these small wells.

The Petroleum Administration for War is not helping the war effort by keeping in effect its 40-acre spacing rule for oil wells and 640-acre spacing for gas wells. That rule has resulted in the drilling of dry holes, whereas drilling on 10-acre offset locations, as had been the procedure of the oil industry prior to Federal regulations, would, in the opinion of scientists, have resulted in producing oil wells.

The Petroleum Reserves Corporation could not have been formed as an agency to aid the war effort, for it would require years for such an agency to develop oil production abroad and to construct plants and facilities for refining and transporting the oil. The $165,000,000 pipe line which Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Administrator for War and president of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation, proposes to build 1,200 miles across Saudi Arabia cannot be a war project, for it will require at least more than a year to construct that line after it is started and after all pipe, pumping equipment, and other materials are available in the Middle East. As it is the oil from the Persian Gulf, which would go through the 1,200-mile pipe line, is available by ocean tanker, it being only 3,035 miles to Haifa on the Mediterranean Sea.

And—most people seem to have lost sight of the fact—oil-producing properties in Iran and Iraq, with an output of 102,375,000 barrels of crude oil last year, already are connected with Mediterranean ports by pipe lines, making that quantity of oil available at the point where Ickes' proposed pipe line would have its terminus.

Consequently, the Petroleum Reserves Corporation cannot be other than a move by the Government to compete with private enterprise in the oil industry, and, with no taxes to pay and unlimited borrowing power from another Government agency, it would be the kind of competition which would shortly gain control of the whole business.

When Ickes says the P. R. C. is not designed to compete with private business, he is not kidding anyone. All know the Corporation is empowered to acquire and operate producing properties, refineries, and all transportation facilities, and it can even own stock in oil companies. It is time Ickes and his ghost writers learn oilmen are not as gullible as he seemingly thinks they are.

The nine-man special committee of the Senate to investigate the proposed Arabian pipe line and probably other phases of the P. R. C. activities and the oil situation in general is due to be appointed next week. Senator EDWARD H. MOORE, of Tulsa, already has been selected as a member, if the original plan is followed of having the chairmen of four Senate committees each name two members of his committee to the special committee, with Vice President HENRY WALLACE naming the ninth man. MOORE was co-author of the resolution calling for the naming of the special committee. Ickes had suggested that MOORE disqualify himself, stating MOORE already had prejudged the case. Ickes probably is afraid to be questioned by a man who knows the oil business.

A wire story out of Washington Friday stated WALLACE would appoint the nine-man committee. It probably meant he would name the eight men selected by the chairmen of the four committees and the ninth himself. If WALLACE selected the nine men himself, MOORE probably would not be on the committee.

Of unusual interest to the whole oil industry is the special meeting of directors of the Independent Petroleum Association of America to be held in St. Louis March 9 and 10, next week. A special committee of 12 experienced producers has been making a study of a Government proposal to pay a subsidy to oil producers in lieu of a general crude oil price raise. One such proposal, described first in the Tribune of February 25, would provide for a 30-percent increase in prices for crude oil produced from wells making 5 barrels or less a day, this increase, amounting to 35 cents a barrel for Mid-Continent crude of 36 gravity, to be paid by the Government.

The I. P. A. A. committee will report its views on this proposal and the directors will consider all ramifications involved. It is understood two other proposals also have been offered by the Office of Price Administration, one providing for a price incentive for wildcatting, as suggested by Fred M. Vinson, Director of Economic Stabilization, when he refused to approve a general crude oil price increase. All proposals are based on subsidies.

Oil men and oil trade associations are almost unanimously oppposed to subsidies. But when it is considered that 40,000 of the 54,000 producing oil wells in Oklahoma yield only 5 barrels or less a day and that about 65 percent of all producing oil wells in the United States are in that category, it can be seen that the proposal to grant a 30-percent increase in price to such wells will have a lot of support.

The selected group of oilmen to whom the oil-industry proposals were given for study were pledged to secrecy regarding the provisions of the proposals, according to statements made to the writer. But it is generally understood that out of these proposals and the views on them to be formulated by oilmen considering them, such as the St. Louis meeting, O. P. A. will formulate a recommendation for a price incentive, or subsidy, which it would be, for a general price raise is not contemplated at this time, and present such recommendation to Vinson for approval.

Vinson probably would approve a recommendation of O. P. A. for a subsidy or any price incentive short of a general price increase. Consequently, it appears probable an increase in crude-oil prices in the form of a subsidy may be approved by Government in the near future. Refined-oil prices, wholesale and retail, would not be affected.

O. P. A., with its term of existence expiring June 30, probably is anxious to appease oilmen and try to reduce opposition to itself. The Government must realize its stubbornness in regard to oil prices is largely responsible for the oil shortage and that the public will not take kindly to a further cut in values of gasoline ration coupons, something almost bound to come late this spring or summer, regardless of a crude-oil price raise. Hence, the sudden anxiety to get oilmen to consider some sort of a subsidy program.

So with the O. P. A., the P. A. W., the P. R. C., the Office of Economic Stabilization, the National Labor Relations Board, and other Government agencies, oilmen have their troubles.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. Yes.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think the gentleman has made a very fine statement and I commend him for his courageous leadership in this fight for a badly needed increase in the price of crude oil. I ask the gentleman whether or not he believes we can and should write into the ensuing O. P. A. bill a price formula for crude oil?

Mr. DISNEY. At least when we consider the needs of the Nation and the needs of the consumer, and all of the owners of oil products in the Nation, we are commanded to do that and I do not propose that there shall be any O. P. A. extension passed through this House, if I can help it, without the oil formula passed here in this House on December 13, 1943, being placed in that extension, if my colleagues feel the same way about it. I think it ought to be done, and common decency demands that it be done. These other things are whims, visionary ideas. A little rise in the price of gasoline! If you can get it. Where is the constituent who would not pay more for it, if it were necessary to raise the price of gasoline? It would be a mere bagatelle, less than a cent a gallon. The men of the country are not going to drill for oil at a loss any more than do men who raise cotton, wheat, or cattle desire to do that at a loss.

Mr. GOSSETT. Personally, I am somewhat alarmed over this Arabian pipe line. I understand already some of our boys have been killed guarding lines in existence in that area. As I understand the situation, if and when that line is constructed by the Government, it will be necessary for the Government thereafter to police it.

Mr. DISNEY. If the oil companies have been able to obtain concessions over there, and have spent a lot of money each year to maintain them, and now they could get the Government of the United States to build the line and furnish the money, and police it, they are getting a good deal.

Mr. GOSSETT. Should not some committee of the Congress go into that matter thoroughly at this time?

Mr. DISNEY. All we need to do is to go back to the constitutional form of government and let international agreements be ratified by a two-thirds vote in the Senate of the United States. We should get away from this new idea that

trade treaties and private agreements and near-private agreements and executive department plans in international matters can be free of Senate ratification. When the trouble comes in Arabia, where is the executive department going to go to get money and arms and supplies and forces to maintain this situation in Arabia? It will come to the Congress of the United States. So the Congress of the United States has something to say about the agreement at its inception if it will insist on its constitutional prerogatives.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. STEVENSON. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the owners of these stripper wells that produce about 5 barrels a day are granted secretly a 35-cent subsidy?

Mr. DISNEY. Not necessarily secretly. I understand that if you go hat in hand—that is, the independent oil producer and owner of stripper wells making less than 5 barrels—and if you show kindly and courteous consideration to the grand moguls of the O. P. A. and show that you are just a nice fellow, you may get 30 cents a barrel subsidy.

Mr. STEVENSON. My question is——

Mr. DISNEY. I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. STEVENSON. The total of these stripper wells would not amount to very much at a production of 5 barrels a day.

Mr. DISNEY. Oh, yes. There are thousands of wells making less than 5 barrels a day, and these independent operators are being bulldozed, blackmailed, and bankrupted in coming here for a subsidy, a subsidy never provided by Congress. A subsidy, in fact, which Congress opposed.

Mr. STEVENSON. What good would this small amount of subsidy do?

Mr. DISNEY. Well, 30 cents a barrel to a five-barrel well would help a little. It is the difference between losing the wells and keeping them. It is just a matter of life and death. It is a close call.

Mr. STEVENSON. I am not going to object to it.

Mr. DISNEY. I understand, neither am I. I cannot object about these small wells only producing five barrels a day.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. May I offer an observation that 15 percent of the total production of this country is coming now from wells that are classed as stripper wells. Thousands of them are being closed because they cannot continue in operation under present prices.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I understood the gentleman in his masterful address referred to the metaphysical calculus method of the O. P. A.

Mr. DISNEY. That was just a term I used in my feeble attempt to express my indignation.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. KLEBERG. I desire to congratulate my colleague for his very clear and well-expressed statement of indignation, justifiable indignation. I want to make the record perfectly clear as to the modus operandi. You did not say whether they went to the front or back door with their hat in hand and you did not say whether or not, when they got there, they have to say, "Please, papa."

Mr. DISNEY. I think they have to say, "Please, papa."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DISNEY. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. In view of the fact that the Congress of the United States has not set up any appropriation to meet this premium that they contemplate putting on the stripper wells, I wonder if the gentleman could tell me or whether he has any idea where they may find the money to put this premium on the stripper wells.

Mr. DISNEY. My understanding is and I expect to ascertain that definitely, that there is an appropriation under the Second War Powers Act which enables the President to do such things as he deems necessary for the national defense, but it is without specific suggestion or authorization by the Congress, but rather in the face of all the reflections that have ever come from this body as against subsidies. But, as I said, my people are being driven by desperation to take the subsidy offered. I cannot object, or blame the victims.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein some excerpts and some short letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. My record is an open book; upon it I stand. There is nothing hidden, and your examination of it is invited. During the past almost 20 years as your Congressman I have done all within my power to bring to you every possible protection and assistance from our Federal Government. Possibly mistakes have been made, because we all make mistakes, and probably none is without fault. I shall be satisfied, however, if upon examination of my record, you will give careful consideration to each vote cast and official acts which I have performed, place the good on one side of the scales and the errors on the other side of the scales, and vote for the side that weighs heavier. I have no fear of the outcome of such a ballot, because I feel certain that you will find in my record more merit and perfection than demerit and imperfection.

I have printed at my own expense and I am mailing to you this record in order that you may have the correct information concerning my record and my efforts as a Member of Congress. I trust also that you may see fit to request some of the Government publications as indicated on the enclosed list. These publications give the best obtainable information on the various subjects indicated. They are printed by the Government in an effort to be helpful to the citizens of our country. They are your bulletins because you are a part of the Government and the Government belongs also to you. I am sending the list to you in an effort to be helpful in this connection.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and these Government publications are mailed without postage. When the Congress was created, it established the right for the Government to transact its official business postage free. This was a wise provision because if Congressmen, Senators, and Government officials had to pay postage on the Government's publications, then this service would be open to millionaires only, because the average man would not be financially able to pay postage on the large volume of Government business required of such official. These publications, in most instances, were printed and ready for distribution before the war; therefore, you should order promptly if you desire any of them, because we are endeavoring to cut out every possible Government expense which is not of direct necessity for the prosecution of the war. Many of these publications may not be reprinted until after the war, even if then.

I favor the elimination of every possible Federal expenditure which is not directly needed for the success of the war effort. Newspapers and publications are given special privileges of mailing, the first zone being mailed postage free and the other zones with relatively small charge. If the publications in the country were to pay the same rate of postage you or I pay on private or business mail, the Government would receive, it has been estimated, as much as $150,000,000 annually in postage fees.

I am reliably advised that it actually costs the Government each year $83,000,000 to handle this mail of newspapers and other publications. I am satisfied that it costs the Government more to deliver your big daily newspaper in the home county of this daily newspaper than it does to carry the mail of the average Congressman for a whole year. The mailing privileges were given newspapers by the Congress to encourage the free press, and it is especially helpful to the small county newspaper which is not financially able to pay the regular business postal rates.

TO THE PEOPLE OF FLORIDA

I bring back to you the high office of Congressman without stain and without tarnish. I have endeavored since you first elected me in 1924 to be of all possible helpfulness to you. You have responded most nobly and have cooperated fully with me over this long period of time. You have helped me in all efforts

for the benefit and advancement of our State and Nation. You have trusted me and have been kind and good to me in every way. You have refused to heed the whisperings of the common enemy and you have stood with me on every occasion. For this confidence, trust, and goodness on your part, I am profoundly grateful. I hope that my services and conduct have merited your faith, and I assure you that I shall continue to do everything in my power for you and for the entire State of Florida, extending from the Perdido River on the west to the Florida Straits on the south. I shall depend upon you as my strength to carry our cause to all parts of Florida.

I have during the past almost 20 years at all times endeavored to represent here the best interests of our State and Nation. Uppermost in my mind has been the greatest good for the greatest number of people represented. The vote cast by me in the various committees and on the floor of the House has by me been considered as the vote of my people, and not as the vote of any individual.

Many things of helpfulness, I hope, have transpired as a result of these efforts. I served here during a portion of the Coolidge administration; all of President Hoover's administration; and, for the past 11 years, under President Roosevelt's administrations. I served through trying times of financial chaos from 1929 to 1934.

Along in 1932, business and industry were at their lowest ebb of the depression.

The Congress endeavored through legislative act to meet this situation and to enact helpful laws. Out of this chaos came legislation for the guaranteeing of bank deposits; an act to supervise through the Federal Trade Commission interstate traffic in investment securities; large appropriations for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; a gigantic public buildings program, and many other measures of helpfulness. I supported these measures as an attempt to meet the then economic emergencies. Some of these measures were of lasting benefit, while perhaps some were experiments which were in error. I believe, however, that if you had been in the Congress at that time you would have voted for these measures with the hope that help to the American people would come. It is my hope that probably 75 percent of these measures were good, and if such is the case, it was a good batting average.

The act which created the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and thus guaranteed the deposits in the banks of this country was in my opinion one of the greatest pieces of Federal legislation ever to be enacted. Since then, banks have managed to keep their doors open and to transact business. I voted for and worked vigorously for the enactment of this legislation. There is more money today in the banks of Florida than at any other time during its history.

We had recently requests from the small banks of our State for the repeal of regulation Q. They felt that this regulation was working a hardship against some. The gentleman from Georgia, Congressman BROWN, a high-ranking member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, introduced the Brown bill for this purpose. I appeared before his committee in support of this legislation, and I am glad to advise that recently we were able to pass this bill in the House. I supported and voted for it. As a result of my efforts in behalf of this bill, Mr. W. H. Nobles, president, Citizens State Bank, Marianna, Fla., said:

> I want to congratulate you on the splendid work you have done in behalf of the country banks and the Nation.

Along in this depression period we saw the total income of the American people drop to about $38,000,000,000. We have seen since then and prior to Pearl Harbor the total American income amount to $100,000,000,000. The total income now of the American people is $135,000,000,000. Along with this increase in income, of course, came increased bank deposits, and almost every avenue of business grew brighter.

BUILDINGS

In Florida during that period, the Federal Government expended vast sums for internal improvement. Primarily on W. P. A. projects in Florida, there was expended $362,942,424. These funds represented expenditures made, in the main, for permanent, useful and lasting improvements: Such projects as W. P. A. airports and airways, courthouses, city halls, schoolhouses, municipal water and sewer systems, streets, sidewalks, highways and bridges, sanitary disposal plants, and other facilities. An unusually large amount of these funds was expended in construction of permanent school buildings. The fact is, practically every community in Florida can find one or more permanent and useful facilities in which these funds were expended. In addition to this construction program, a public building program for Federal courthouses, post-office buildings, river and harbor improvements, and other non-W. P. A. construction was carried out. These huge Federal funds expended in Florida relieved the financial stress in our State and at the same time gave public improvements and buildings which will serve our people for generations to come.

Of course mistakes were made during this construction program, but may I ask you, as a fair-minded citizen, during this period what would Florida have done without these funds? And may I ask you the question now, without the expenditure of Federal war funds in Florida today, how would the economy of Florida stand? During the war period, the huge sums spent by the Federal Government in Florida have given employment, and, in fact, there are now more jobs than there are people to fill them. Practically everyone who is able to work is now employed at large salary or wages. How will the picture be after the war is over and when post-war problems are pressing? We cannot then anticipate expenditure in Florida of large Federal funds. The Federal Treasury will be far in debt and not able to embark upon State aid, county aid, city aid, and so forth projects and improvements to an appreciable degree. I shall not take your time to go into detail further concerning post-war matters because I desire to talk briefly concerning the present war.

WAR EFFORT

The global war in which our Nation is now so indelibly involved transcends in importance all things in the public and private mind. This war has already been brought, directly or indirectly, to every American fireside. Young men and women have left the security and the happiness of their homes to, in many instances, become in a few weeks directly engaged in actual combat. Millions of others are in training camps, feverishly engaged in training to prepare themselves to meet the most skilled and brutal enemies which America has ever had.

Millions of others have left their homes to engage directly in other capacities in furtherance of the war, while other millions are engaged directly or indirectly in the production of raw materials and in the actual processing of fighting equipment. It is quite natural that we are all first concerned in war matters because upon the success of our war effort and the outcome of this conflict depend not only American security but also the survival of civilization. It is amazing that the American people have been able to all-out mobilize so successfully and so effectively in preparation for their prosecution of this war; however, it has been my contention for a long while that the American people are, in fact, by and large, the greatest of all people of all ages. They have, in every case of emergency, been able to rise, meet, and cope with same to an extent more successful than that of citizens of any other nation. Great prowess and leadership have been for the past century or more attained and carried on in practically every field and instance by the American people. These attainments, I believe, by our people have been made possible by the freedoms existing under our American form of government, and above all of these freedoms, the freedom of religion has played the controlling and signal part.

From the tidal wave and ashes of Pearl Harbor, our Nation has risen to the greatest war production within the history of civilization. Some 6,700,000 new war workers were added to existing employed workers in our Nation. They have produced about 150,000 airplanes; 22,000,000,000 rounds of ammunition; 450,000 pieces of artillery; 28,000,000 deadweight tons of merchant shipping; and about 4,000,000 tons of naval shipping. We are now transporting well over 8,000,000 tons by water monthly, which is an amount seven times greater than the peak of the last World War. We have already produced more arms and ammunition for this war than has been produced by America for all previous wars. About 150,000 tanks and other combat vehicles, and about 1,300,000 military trucks have already been produced and much of it conveyed to the battle front. The Willow Run Liberator 4-motor bomber plant is one of the greatest centers of world production. The yard includes 90 acres, including minor buildings, and in the entire reservation there are 900 acres.

The Maritime Commission alone delivered for use in 1942, 792 ships, while in 1943, it delivered 1,896. It is expected that deliveries by it in 1944 will far exceed that made in 1943. It is expected also that production of practically all of the now essential weapons, equipment, and so forth of war in 1944 will show vast increases over 1943.

America has mobilized more than 7,000,000 men in the Army, about 2,225,000 in the Navy, and over 350,000 in the Marine Corps. Increases will occur during the remainder of 1944. The American fighting man is the strongest and best equipped on earth. He weighs about 10 pounds more than the average American soldier in World War No. 1, and stands about 1 inch taller on the average. His equipment exceeds in actual application and effectiveness that of any other soldier. He also in actual combat in the air, on the land, on the water, and under the water, has proven himself to be superior to any enemy met.

Preparation for this war has not been made without great expense and heavy tax. Fighting equipment costs much money. One Flying Fortress costs $450,000. A heavy tank, $145,000. One large antiaircraft gun, $125,000. One aircraft torpedo, $11,000. Other fighting equipment costs high in proportion. You know something of the cost and use of gasoline. Well, gasoline needs in this war are 80 times what they were in World War No. 1. One raid over Berlin by 1,000 American airplanes uses 1,600,000 gallons of high octane gasoline. You have read in the papers something about the number of raids and the number of airplanes which the Allies are carrying on every 24 hours over enemy territory. You can estimate for yourself the millions of gallons of high octane gasoline which are used every 24 hours by our Air Corps alone. A 12-ton tank consumes a gallon of gasoline every mile while well over 11,000 gallons of high octane gasoline are needed to fuel a squadron of 18 Navy dive bombers for an average day's operation. From 10,000 to 15,000 gallons of high octane gasoline are necessary to train 1 pilot. Enough high octane gasoline is used by the American Air Corps on one average 24-hour day operation against the enemy to fill the tanks in about 200,000 ordinary family automobiles in the State of Florida. Yes, gasoline is scarce in some parts of the United States.

The Allies, through their great strength, skill, and power, are whittling down and blasting the strength of the enemy, and it is indeed clear to me that the Allies will be victorious and that a Christian peace will follow; however, my friends, the war is not yet nearly over. Sacrifices, heartaches, disappointments, destruction, and toil lie ahead. Germany, with her vassal states, has a population of perhaps 300,000,000 people. Before recent losses, she probably had 400,000,000 people under her yoke. She probably has 16,000,000 war workers; some 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 of these are soldiers, prisoners, and laborers, forced or imported from occupied countries. Germany with her vassal states has a potential manpower of possibly 35,000,000 workers. Its soldier population is even today better fed than in 1918. Germany probably has more than 300 troop divisions. I judge that she has lost from 20 to 25 divisions on the Russian front alone, but she has soldier manpower to recruit from. In 1938, Germany produced 21,000,000 tons of steel. In 1943, she probably produced 42,000,000 tons of steel. She produced in 1943 more locomotive engines than we produced in the United States. The ever-increasing air strength of the United States and her allies is, however, having now a telling effect in destruction of Germany's production capacity. It is obvious that this bombing and other offensive destruction of Germany and her production and other resources will intensify and increase rather rapidly.

JAPAN

Japan in some respects differs from Germany. We have in the Pacific Fleet the greatest navy that has ever been afloat on any sea. It is carrying telling blows and destruction to Japan's shipping and Japan's air strength. Japan is losing over 100 tons of shipping where she builds replacements of 60 tons. We probably have three airplanes in the South Pacific where Japan has one. Japan still has under her control vast manpower and natural resources. Although we have been successful in blasting Japan to the bottom of the sea in such historic engagements as Tarawa, Attu, the Solomon Islands, New Guinea, Guadalcanal, the Gilberts, Midway, and many others, Japan still holds the portions of her new conquest which embrace the major portions of her newly acquired natural resources. Oil, iron, magnesium, tungsten, rubber, food, and other war essentials are in vast quantities in the portions of the new empire now held by Japan and which she stole from other countries during the first months of the war. Although Japan is well entrenched in her new possessions and complacent in her old possessions, we can and will blast her out and the American fleets and flags will eventually encircle her like the 36 State columns surround the statue of Abraham Lincoln. The task is not easy. Reflect for a moment that a single marine division requires 20,039 small-arms weapons, 1,133 machine guns, 162 pieces of artillery, 54 tanks, 557 jeeps, and many trucks, trailers, and engineer vehicles. This division requires 13 ships, each of 10,000 tons, for an overseas movement. This tonnage is the figure only for troop transports, and does not include warships, submarines, and other fleet air and surface units needed to provide safe convoy. I voted to fortify Guam and vigorously opposed sale of scrap iron to Japan.

FLORIDA'S PART IN WAR

Florida has been enabled to participate in a major way in this war effort. More new military and naval establishments and more Federal war expenditures have occurred in Florida than in any other State of twice its population. I am happy to have been placed in a capacity where I could perform at least some little part in making Florida the great American fortress of training and defense which she is. It is indeed the flying West Point of America and the flying Annapolis of America. Florida now plays the major role in air corps training for our Nation.

THE ARMY IN FLORIDA

Among outstanding military establishments in Florida are: Orlando Air Base; Dale Mabry Field, Tallahassee; Avon Park bombing range; Fort Barrancas, Pensacola; Sarasota Army Air Field; Camp Blanding, Starke; Boca Raton Army Air Field; Buckingham Army Air Field, Fort Myers; Carlstrom Field, Arcadia; Eglin Field, Valparaiso; Conners Field, Okeechobee; MacDill Field, Tampa; Dorr Field, Arcadia; Drane Field, Lakeland; Hendricks Field, Sebring; Homestead Army Air Field; Camp Gordon Johnston, Carrabelle; Key West Barracks; Marathon flight strip; Morrison Field, West Palm Beach; Drew Field, Tampa; Camp Murphy, Hobe Sound; Taylor Field, Ocala; Tyndall Field, Panama City; Venice Army Air Field; Atlantic Beach recreational area; Brandon Field, Perry; Breakers Hospital, Palm Beach; Fort Pierce; Harbor Defenses of Jacksonville; harbor defenses of Key West; Marianna Army Air Field; Miami Air Depot; harbor defenses of Miami; A. A. F. Redistribution Center No. 2, Miami Beach; Miami Beach A. A. F. Training Base; Orlando fairgrounds; harbor defenses of Pensacola; harbor defenses of Tampa; Montbrook Air Field; Brooksville Air Field; and Cross City Air Field. There are a large number of other smaller outlying fields and establishments.

Camp Blanding is recognized by Army men as one of the finest military-training establishments in the country. Many of them have told me that the representations which I made to the Site Selection Board in connection with this camp's establishment had proven well founded and that they appreciate thoroughly the wisdom of the War Department's having established this great cantonment at Camp Blanding. And, by the way, I did not make a single dime personally out of Camp Blanding or its establishment or any of the real-estate transactions of my own or that of anyone else in connection with it. I did not sell or desire to sell any lands which I had to the Government and did not aid anyone else in any of these transactions. These matters were left entirely in the hands of the individuals and the appropriate Government officials. Some 15 years ago, I purchased a small lot with a little summer cottage on the lake near Camp Blanding. I still have this little cottage, and it is occupied by an Army man and he is paying less rent than is paid by other persons there occupying similar cottages. My State, however, has greatly benefited through establishment of this major cantonment and the war effort through this establishment has been greatly advanced.

THE NAVY IN FLORIDA

The taking of the Army to Florida followed the leadership by the Navy of the United States. Pensacola was early established as a pilot-training center, almost half a century ago. The Navy,

however, became in fact dead earnest concerning Florida when we were able to persuade the establishment of the Southeast Naval Air Station at Jacksonville in 1939. I feel a degree of pride, justly, I hope, in having introduced H. R. 1654 on January 4, 1939, to establish this station. The establishment of this great fifty-odd-million-dollar giant sounded the signal for subsequent naval establishments which were carried out at Key West, Banana River, Barin Field, Boca Chica, Boca Grande, Bronson Field, Canaveral, Cecil Field, Cedar Keys, Coral Gables, Corry Field, Daytona Beach, De Land, Dinner Key, Dunedin, Eau Gallie, Miami, New Smyrna, Panama City, Port Everglades, Fort Lauderdale, Richmond, St. Augustine, St. Marks, St. Petersburg, Sanford, Saufley Field, Tampa, Tarpon Springs, Vero Beach, West Palm Beach, Whiting Field, Ellyson Field, Everglades, Fernandina, Fort Myers, Fort Pierce, Green Cove Springs, Hialeah, Hollywood, Jupiter, Lake City, Marathon, Mayport, and Melbourne. In addition to these major establishments, almost 100 outlying fields and minor establishments have been placed in Florida.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration cooperates with the Army and Navy in the development, primarily, of airfields and in pilot training. This Administration has been persuaded to understand the possibilities of such program success and training in Florida and has expended $29,380,217.

The Federal Works Agency has participated in Florida in the construction of war training essential facilities. They have come to the relief of war-congested communities in construction of such necessary facilities as school buildings, waterwoks, roads, schoolhouses, child care, U. S. O., hospitals, public buildings, and so forth. These funds have been applied in nearly every county in Florida for this necessary relief primarily of war workers and enlisted men and women. A total amount of more than $16,000,000 of these funds has been spent in Florida.

SHIPBUILDING

Florida has participated in a large way in the ship-construction program in this war effort. The Maritime Commission has let contracts for extensive operations at Jacksonville, Tampa, Panama City, and Arlington, Fla. Contracts in the amount of about $180,000,000 have already been let for construction at these places, as follows:

St. Johns River Shipbuilding Co., Jacksonville, Fla	$68,832,792
McCloskey & Co., Tampa, Fla	35,358,015
J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla	64,028,111
Arlington Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., Arlington, Fla	408,287
Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Tampa, Fla	10,322,999

Successful construction is going on at each yard and labor in Florida and adjacent States is performing a noble part and turning out the necessary ships to carry Florida's portion of the 8,000,000 tons monthly to our fighting forces across the sea.

The United States Navy has likewise been led to recognize the shipbuilding possibilities in Florida. It has placed $308,278,214 in shipbuilding contracts in Florida. These contracts are held by 17 contractors in 15 Florida cities. They call for construction of vessels ranging from lighters up to mine sweepers and submarine chasers. The largest contracts are those held by the Tampa Shipbuilding Co., $182,025,880; Food Machinery Corporation, $62,580,500; Gibbs Gas Engine Co., $27,990,850; and Miami Shipbuilding Co., $16,319,695.

Of special interest at this time is the work which Florida companies have done on amphibious tractors, the Navy's most versatile landing craft. Donald Roebling built the first amphibious tractors at Clearwater, and now the Food Machinery Corporation plant at Lakeland is one of the most important sources of supply.

TOTAL WAR EXPENDITURES IN FLORIDA

When we include funds spent in the war effort in Florida for such items as wages and employees' pay and allowances of service men and women, and so forth, the total war effort money expended in Florida up until this time in connection with the present war is about $1,225,000,000. And may I say in praise of this entire program in Florida, as huge as it is, it has been carried on without any interruption or serious disagreement existing between capital and labor. Both have performed a role most patriotic, courageous, efficient, and expeditious.

CAPT. COLIN KELLY

It has been necessary for the Government to expend in Florida considerable funds for necessary war aid, navigation and harbor improvements, military roads, and other essentials which are not included in the estimates given. My dear friends, I mention these things to give very briefly and in part the picture which Florida and her great citizenship have been permitted to carry on in this tragic conflict. Beyond and above and more important than anything mentioned is the large number of men and women who have gone with the armed forces and are now on each of the far-flung battle fronts of the world. I wish that time permitted me to mention the outstanding, heroic, and courageous achievements of so many Floridians in this war.

Capt. Colin P. Kelly, the first hero of World War No. 2, has had to follow him in heroic and outstanding achievements, Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell and many of his fellow men at arms from our great State. I am proud of the part played by Florida and her citizens in each and every one of the war achievements. They are performing their task nobly and courageously. Those left in civilian life are working diligently and are buying War bonds. They are paying their taxes, which are extremely high. As Florida has gone to war, so have the people in the other 47 States. This war is being carried on under a great caliber of leadership that has proved by actual results that it was worthy of the high trust we placed in it. This leadership is still proving its worth and we are winning the war.

American strength and the American mind can and will bring about peace which will bring security and justice. It is an easier task to convert from peace to war than from war to peace. Wisdom, not emotion and hate, must rule. Cool heads, not hot heads, must prevail. The American way of life can be maintained if selfishness is placed in the background and in the readjustment period can come improvements in our standards of life. The hope is for better health, wider educational opportunities, better homes, better living, and full-time employment. Employment and prosperity during the post-war period in the Nation is possible. It indeed is possible in the great State of Florida. Hope instead of fear should be held for the future. Security instead of unrest can, through proper management, well be anticipated. There is no need for a post-war depression in Florida. If its affairs are handled with competence, our adjustments here should be an adventure in prosperity. Our soldiers must not and will not be let down. We shall see to it that they are not.

The American people are during the war geared high to raw-material production. The American Government has expended over $30,000,000,000 in war factory production establishments. Through the war effort millions of workers are being trained. After the war is over, this same bent of mind for production will be present. The skilled workers will be on hand and factories can, through skill and prudence, be reconverted to peacetime production. There will then be a hungry market for practically all consumer goods. The American people, through the deprivations of war, have not been permitted to buy needed quantities of civilian goods. They will furnish a ready market for thundering wheels of vast factories to turn out consumer goods.

FLORIDA'S NATURAL RESOURCES

Proper management can avoid a post-war depression in the United States; however, here in Florida, we have even a brighter hope to avert a post-war depression. Our resources are different from the average State. Many of our post-war employment and production possibilities have been increased by war activities. Take, for example, our citrus industry in Florida. Great progress has been made during the war here for the production of feed yeast which contains vitamin B–1; also, the production of industrial alcohol; also, concentration of citrus marmalade base, thus reducing transportation space for this essential, important food product. Many other developments in processing, packing, shipping, and utilization of Florida vegetables and fruits have occurred during the war. The common commercial usage of dehydrated vegetables, fruits, and so forth, may come after the war. The development of and utilization of plastics, the discovery of and utilization of other building materials, the gains made in aviation development, and many other things of financial and industrial progress made during the war will be carried over for actual application and commercial common everyday use after the war.

COMMERCIAL AVIATION IN FLORIDA

Florida stands as the threshhold of world commercial aviation. At Miami,

Fla., has already been developed about half of American air-passenger business. Florida will serve as a central station for world air commerce. We have developed here by the Federal Government countless airfields. The use of any number of these will be relinquished by the Federal Government after the war is over. Our State through aggressiveness and prudence can gain these stations and open up these fields for actual commercial aviation use. Hundreds of thousands of pilots and other Air Corps trained and experienced men will revert from the Army to peacetime commercial aviation services. Thousands of airplanes which will be on hand at the end of the war can and will, with some modifications, find their way into actual commercial air transportation. Florida has the brightest commercial aviation picture of any State in the Nation, of any spot in the world. We can embrace this opportunity and develop this important industry within our State.

After the war, the Federal Government will in all probability carry on its peacetime development of rivers and harbors. In this, Florida will share greatly. As vice chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, I have been able to include in a bill recently reported by this committee and soon to be passed by the Congress, about 80 projects for Florida; also, about 150 additional projects to be surveyed, looking toward their feasibility for adoption and construction.

Among these projects are the great Virginia Key project for Miami; the completion to 8-foot depth of the Stuart-Fort Myers Canal; the continuing of the Intracoastal Waterway from Miami to Key West; and the dredging of the East Coast Canal to 12 feet, from Jacksonville to Miami. I have labored incessantly for these great projects and the House is expected to pass them into actual law in the next few days. This bill contains other projects almost as important to our State as the ones just mentioned. I regret that time does not permit me to give further itemized statement of these projects. We have also enacted legislation recently for a major flood-control program to be carried on in all parts of the country after the war. Florida will share well in this program, also. The Government will obviously carry on a vast road-building program. Anticipated Federal funds, combined with present and anticipated State funds in Florida, during the 4 years following the war, will probably amount to $200,000,000. These funds will develop in Florida one of the best highway systems in the world and at the same time will give employment and needed money for the general channels of trade in Florida. Florida will experience a great growth in population following the war. Some of its wartime industries can be converted to peacetime production and employment there given. Many service men and women who have received their training in Florida will eventually return there and take up permanent residence. They will be assets to the progress and the development of Florida. Thousands of civilians who have from one cause or another been unable to go to Florida during the war will then find their way into Florida. All in all, Florida will experience a growth in population and wealth following the war.

Much has been said concerning Federal rehabilitation, vocational education, general education, and general benefits for service men and women returning home from the war. The major portion of this burden will, of course, be assumed and carried out by the Federal Government. I, however, propose and plan for the State of Florida to do its part for its returning soldiers. I propose that State-owned lands be opened up under appropriate conditions for homestead by veterans of all wars. These lands will be by ex-servicemen taken over and developed into homesteads which will be a consolation and a real benefit to the ex-servicemen, and they will also, through this opportunity, have a chance to be an actual home owner and to be secure and self-sustaining.

Another long stroke toward stabilizing the economy of our State following the war will be to match existing Federal grants for the aged, the blind, and for dependent children. I have worked vigorously at all times for the appropriation of these funds for this purpose by the Federal Government and have worked diligently for passage by the Congress of a straight Federal pension for the aged, regardless of State matching. It will be wise economy for the State of Florida to match these Federal grants for the aged, dependent children, and the blind, and thus have, in strengthening our economy, the full effects of these moneys. It is always a good bargain when an individual can lay down one dollar and pick up two. The same law of economy applies to the State of Florida when it puts down $20 per month and picks up $40 per month for the aged of the State. I shall see to it that these funds are matched and that a straight pension of $40 a month in Florida is paid to the aged and that all offered and obtainable grants for the aged and the blind are matched and received. I shall also see to it that red tape in connection with these allowances is cut. The State welfare board will be instructed to qualify for these pensions and grants everyone who can possibly meet requirements of the Federal law rather than to try to keep the aged, the blind, and the needy children from receiving these grants. As worked in Florida today in this matter, the cart is before the horse. I shall see to it that the horse is hitched in front of the cart.

In the Everglades area of Florida, starch and cattle-feed production are beginning to claim attention. In all probability, this will be developed into a great commercial asset after the war. The dairy and livestock and poultry industries in Florida are in their infancy. Florida today ranks third among all States in the Union in the production of cattle. With some 20,000,000 of uncultivated grazing acres in Florida, through proper management, this industry can be lifted to No. 1 or No. 2 place among the States of the Nation. Forestry resources have always been a great asset to our State. The Naval Stores Experiment Station at Olustee, Fla., has done a great part in advancing reforestation and the turpentine and rosin industry of our State. I believe that I can be justly proud of having passed legislation to establish this, the first turpentine experiment station in the United States. The pulpwood industry is progressing in Florida, and in many other ways Florida's forestry possibilities can be carried forth to greater realization. Here the fishing industry and the sponge industry, with the proper cooperation, can be caused to produce added milions to the income of Florida and to the food resources of the Nation.

SCHOOLS

Florida's greatest possibility for economic advancement rests in the advancement of her educational opportunities. Her school teachers are grossly underpaid. Counties which are weak financially are unable to carry the present burden of public-school education and to compete with the richer counties. This competition should be eliminated by the adoption of a general school program which will bring to a high standard all schools in the State. Florida's Continuing Educational Council has made vital and important recommendations for this purpose. They should be and shall be carried out.

TOURIST TRADE

Florida has the greatest potential tourist trade of any place in the world. This possibility has been demonstrated in the past. This opportunity can be realized through proper advertising, proper facilities, wise and progressive management of State affairs.

FUTURE

I feel a deep and abiding native interest in our great State. I have the utmost faith in its future and its possibilities. My ancestors in Florida have lived under five flags. It has been my opportunity, I am thankful to say, to have lived there under only one flag. And may this great State never have any national flag over it except the Stars and Stripes. During my short span of years, our State's population has been multiplied by three or four. I predict that in the next 10 to 12 years, its population will swell from its present slightly over 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 bona fide residents. It has the greatest opportunities of any State in the Union and these opportunities are being recognized and appreciated by the people of all parts of the country.

Our citizenship is cosmopolitan and represents, I believe, the most solid and progressive citizenship of any State in the Union. New people coming from all parts of the Nation, settling in Florida, blend together their progressive ideas, thoughts, and action. The future of Florida is assured. I personally have every faith in the people of our State. It has been a pleasure to serve over this period of years for a constituency so loyal, so just, and so noble. I have endeavored to answer my mail promptly and in my feeble way to attend to the public business of my State. For 8 long years here, I never missed a single roll call of the House, which is an attendance record unsurpassed by any Member of my acquaintance over this period of 20 years. On one occasion, I left my bed

in a hospital to answer a roll call. Any duty worth performing should be done well. Robert E. Lee said that "duty is the most sublime word in the English language." I believe what Lee said, and hope that I may be able at all times properly to discharge such duty as may be my lot. I have tried to be a servant of the people because I believe in government for the people, of the people, and by the people. I firmly believe in the plain Jeffersonian principles of democracy, and perhaps my own struggles for existence in earlier days have caused me to be rather partial to the masses, and for the interest of the rank and file of our State. This I shall do as long as I live.

I cannot forget my own handicaps and struggles in trying to obtain an honest education. I picked cotton at the age of 4; plowed at the age of 8; hoed, dug ditches, chipped pine trees, dipped pine gum, and cut cross ties. I could do it again, if necessary. I believe in the dignity of labor and in the majesty of toil. There is no aristocracy except that of honor and no rabble save that of crime. I honor the man who earns his living by the sweat of his honest brow. I do not light my candle and place it under a bushel.

I deplore sectionalism, especially State sectionalism. I was born and reared and have lived all of my life in Bradford County, which is the very center of Florida. We can and will have a united Florida. Our cooperation and unity of effort will bring this about. During the present grave war crisis and period following the war, selfishness must be relegated to the background. Individual interest and personal ambition must give way to higher service for the common good. The task which lies ahead is a grave one. To meet and solve these problems will require the united and best effort of all. I am depending upon you, my friends. You have never let me down and have ever been loyal. My faith in you abides and with you, I shall keep the faith.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONCENTRATING ON WINNING THE WAR

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the Members of this body to the remarks delivered here yesterday by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] on the importance and urgency of our concentrating more heavily on the business of winning the war. From page 2292 of yesterday's RECORD, let me quote just one passage from his remarks:

> The truth is we are spending too much time living in the future, forgetting the past, ignoring the present.

I submit that this statement "hits the nail squarely on the head" and we would all do well to ponder it carefully and bear it constantly in mind until military victory is ours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from St. Mary's (Pa.) Daily Press on the soldier vote bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances, to include some remarks made by me concerning two matters, and also a citation relating to Seaman First Class Basil D. Izzy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on two matters and to include therein, with reference to the first matter, an oration delivered by Rev. Daniel T. McColgan, Ph. D., professor of sociology at St. Johns' Seminary, Brighton, Mass., and Regis College, Weston, Mass., and secondly to include an editorial which appeared in the Boston Daily Record, Tuesday, March 7, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 8, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 8, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the public-health subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 8, 1944.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 3379, a bill to codify the laws relating to the Public Health Service, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold a public hearing on Wednesday, March 8, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2687, a bill relating to excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 9, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 4099, entitled "A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913," which was introduced by the chairman, Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4238. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917; with amendment (Rept. No. 1237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4346. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 771. An act to provide for payment of pensions and compensation to certain persons who are receiving retired pay; with amendment (Rept. No. 1240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1962. A bill for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart; with amendment (Rept. No. 1236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 1232. A bill for the relief of Roscoe McKinley Meadows; without amendment (Rept. No. 1238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4347. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the fire department of District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4348. A bill to amend the act approved August 18, 1942, entitled "An act to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4349. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 4350. A bill to permit the naturalization of foreign seamen who serve on American-owned vessels for a period of at least 3 years while the United States is at war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 4351. A bill to provide retirement benefits for certain emergency officers of World War No. 1; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. J. Res. 247. Joint resolution on international economic collaboration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution relating to the marketing of Burley and flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5200. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition (submitted by Fred Joseph, of the United Automobile Workers of St. Louis) of 43 men in the armed forces giving their personal views on the right of the servicemen to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5201. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition to handle with the proper authorities for investigation at once of river carriers, with the view of putting this industry under proper management and to use this transportation system to its fullest extent to aid in the prosecution of the war effort; that schedules be maintained so the shipper will ship; that solicitors be put back in the field to acquaint the public with the fact that there is such an industry and a saving in freight rates, and they in the future can again depend on this transportation industry; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5202. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the San Francisco Chapter of Hadassah, urging the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affirs.

5203. By Mr. LANE: Resolution adopted at the Balfour Day meeting, New York, November 1, 1943, and approved at the meeting February 1, 1944, of the Lynn Hebrew School Association, Lynn, Mass., urging that appropriate action be taken to open the gates of Palestine to Jewish immigration and to establish a homeland there for the Jewish race; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5204. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the representatives of the churches of Grafton, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer was offered by Chaplain William F. O'Brien, United States Army, pastor of Sacred Heart Church, Texarkana, Tex.:

Our Father who art in heaven, we thank Thee for all Thy blessings, among which are liberty and representative government, which up to this good day Thou hast maintained for us.

We recommend to Thy throne of grace all who have contributed to our history, and at this time we are especially mindful of our valiant and heroic dead in this great world conflict, wherever their graves may be. Comfort their loved ones with the solace of that full knowledge that their sacrifice will not be vain as long as freedom obtains.

We ask Thee to bless the counsels of this great body and may their conclusions assist to hasten the day of a just and victorious peace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Shaner, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of Public Law No. 235, current session, entitled "Revenue Act of 1943."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (S. 872) entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by John O'Donnell in this morning's Washington Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PALESTINE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I called attention to the fact that the Members of the House were to be denied an opportunity for open discussion on Palestine resolutions because this administration has bowed to protests from foreign governments. Today I am compelled to focus attention on further evidence of a planned conspiracy to prevent public discussion of a matter that involves our national honor.

The early or "bulldog" edition of the Washington Post, that "independent" newspaper which carries the flag of the Federal Communications Commission—today carried a factual story on the Palestine situation by Mr. Drew Pearson which was withdrawn from all subsequent editions, but which I am inserting in the Appendix for your information. I would like to emphasize that I am by no means vouching for Mr. Pearson's accuracy and I call attention to his column only to show that here is another instance that there is a determined attempt right here in Washington to silence discussion on the Palestine resolutions. Each such attempt can be traced to the New Deal administration.

Strangely, the same edition of the Post gives considerable prominence to an Associated Press dispatch from Cairo voicing the protests of seven Arabic-speaking nations to our resolutions, but fails to carry a line on protests made right on the floor of the House yesterday against the policy of appeasement we are adopting to quiet noisy, but ineffectual Arabs. The House protests were carried in the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and most other newspapers which are not making too literal use of the words "freedom of the press" to suppress discussion of matters of genuine public interest.

There is one more point I would like to make: Gen. Jan Christiaan Smuts, whom we all know to be a realist, is quoted as favoring the Palestine resolutions. General Smuts has first-hand knowledge of the situation in Palestine and is not inclined, as our leaders appear to be, to appease the Arab minority which threatens violence.

I want to again emphasize that I do not vouch for the accuracy of Mr. Pearson's statements, nor am I interested in any differences of opinion which may exist between Mr. Pearson and his publisher, or between his publisher and the majority of Jews in the United States. I do think it is important, in determining the reason for the withdrawal of the Pearson column, to remember that the Post has not concerned itself previously with Mr. Pearson's attacks upon individuals or policies. I am not now seeking to give wider circulation to Mr. Pearson's column, but I am citing it, along with the fact of its withdrawal, to show further evidence of the planned conspiracy within the administration and among administration supporters to prevent the Members of the House and Senate from knowing or discussing the facts surrounding the mysterious decision to kill the Palestine resolutions.

The question we must decide is broader than that involved in the rights of the Jews in Palestine; it is a question of whether or not this Congress is to continue to submit to dictation from outside sources.

Here is Mr. Pearson's column for what it is worth:

Patrick J. Hurley's long séance with the President on the problems of the Near East is continuing to have repercussions in the War Department and on Capitol Hill. Especially, it has thrown a monkey wrench into Senator TAFT's and Senator WAGNER's resolution in favor of lifting restrictions on Jewish migration to Palestine and creating a commonwealth of Palestine.

Major General Hurley, who has had conferences with Arab ruler ibn-Saud regarding Saudi Arabia's vast oil reserves, reported to the President that the Arabs would revolt if further Jewish migration into Palestine were permitted. Arab-Jewish riots, he indicated, would cause trouble for British troops.

The President suggested that the former Secretary of War report on this situation to the present Secretary of War, Henry L. Stimson.

Hurley did. Apparently there was a prompt meeting of minds between the two Secretaries of War. Stimson already had sent a letter to Senator TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, regarding Jewish migration and, after Hurley's call, he sent Chief of Staff Marshall himself to testify secretly before CONNALLY's committee.

General Marshall was most emphatic in opposing the Taft-Wagner resolution. He contended that its passage would be a calamity, basing this opinion on the reaction of the Arabs and the possibility that British troops would have to be used to quell them.

However, the net result of the Hurley-Marshall-Stimson maneuvers will probably be to kill the resolution regarding Palestine. Senator TAFT is reported to be somewhat irked, because he took great pains to ascertain in advance that the resolution would meet no administration objection.

Before it was introduced, TAFT sent a letter to Secretary Hull asking his views. Since the Secretary of State has been appointed by F. D. R. as chairman of a special committee to help get Jewish refugees out of Axis countries, TAFT felt that Hull was the appropriate person to ask. However, he got no response.

Meanwhile Rabbi Abba Hillel Silver, of Cleveland, called on Hull and asked for his views. Hull read the proposed resolution with painstaking care, then cagily replied: "I cannot tell you that I favor it, because the State Department can take no position in these matters."

So finally, Senator TAFT asked his brother Charles, who works in the State Department, to ascertain Hull's views. Charlie Taft took the matter up in a State Department meeting and got word that the Department had no objection to the resolution, whereupon Senator TAFT went ahead.

But, subsequently, Assistant Secretary of War McCloy let the cat out of the bag to Rabbi Silver that the War Department was supposed to carry the ball for the State Department, because Hull did not want to take a public stand against the resolution.

All of which has made everybody mad. While Jewish leaders are by no means unanimous regarding Palestine, they are unanimous in not liking Government runarounds. And the current State Department runaround has got under the skin of both Jewish and congressional leaders.

In Congress there is a strong feeling that insomuch as the bars against Jewish refugees have been let down in this and many other countries, homeless Jews should not be barred from their original home, especially in view of the money they have poured into it for irrigation and reclamation projects. These projects probably have made it possible for Palestine to support around 4,000,000 people, yet there are only 60,000 Jews in Palestine today.

Furthermore, the Jewish Refugee Committee, of which Hull is chairman, has recommended that, because of difficult transportation Jews in Europe be sent to Mediterranean areas rather than across the Atlantic.

All this has aroused a strong feeling in Congress that the original Woodrow Wilson-Arthur Balfour declaration favoring Palestine as a national home for the Jews must be kept alive at least to the point of leaving Palestine open to Jewish immigration, despite the current British declaration to the contrary.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Did the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON] receive permission of the House to insert Drew Pearson's attack on the administration in the RECORD?

The SPEAKER. They are put in every day by somebody.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but it is done by unanimous consent, and I think the unanimous consent ought to be had first.

As far as I am concerned, I am not willing for Drew Pearson or anybody else to fill this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with attacks on this Government, or which wave the red flag in the face of the British Empire, our great ally in this war, over the Jewish question in Palestine. That is a question for the British Empire and is none of our business. We would resent it if the British should undertake to tell us what to do in Puerto Rico or Alaska.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Is the gentleman objecting or is he making a speech?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi has reserved the right to object. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON] making his own speech, but I have listened to these attacks on Cordell Hull, our great Secretary of State, and I have listened to these attacks on the British Empire concerning this Palestine question. In my opinion, these criticisms are doing more harm than good.

We are at war and Great Britain is our ally. Her soldiers and ours are fighting side by side in the most desperate struggle of all time, and I am not willing to have Drew Pearson, or anybody else, get their material placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, waving a red flag in the face of the British Empire, waving a red flag in the face of 400,000,000 Moslems, Arabs, if you please, who are now friendly toward America and the British Empire. I submit that carrying on such anti-British propaganda in that way is dangerous to the Allied cause and therefore dangerous to the welfare of this country. It is likely to endanger the lives of millions of our young men who are now fighting to save this country.

Gen. George C. Marshall, our Chief of Staff, has objected to the passage of this resolution, and warned that it would disturb our relations with the entire Arab world to the extent that prosecution of the war might be seriously hampered.

We would not only run the risk of creating friction with the British Empire but we would also run the risk, as I said, of stirring up trouble between her and the Arabs that might spread to the entire Moslem world, including the whole of India. In addition to that, we might become involved in the controversy now raging in Palestine between the Communist Jews and the anti-Communist Jews.

A leading news correspondent in the Middle East said on March 6—

It is reliably reported that these two Jewish groups have already had several clashes and that some property belonging to conservative individuals and societies has been destroyed.

This agitation should stop now, before somebody explodes a powder keg that might prove disastrous to the Allied cause in this war, and, as I said, might endanger the lives of millions of our own men.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a part of an article by Drew Pearson appearing in today's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that he withhold it for the time being. I want to see it before it goes in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks and include a speech which he delivered on Sunday—the United Jewish Appeal at War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BROOKS was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks which I shall make today in Committee of the Whole on the first deficiency appropriation bill, I may include certain letters and extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S FOUR POINTS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Tom Dewey has again spoken from Olympus. He now offers a four-point plan for a fake soldiers' vote. He raises a dust storm, further to confuse and confound. He implies that a decent Federal ballot plan might mean that the soldiers will vote for Roosevelt, their Commander in Chief. That, of course, is sacrilege.

Dewey has been described as the cautious young man on the flying trapeze. I think he is now more than slightly dizzy from perpetual motion. With one hand he thrusts aside the crown and

with the other writes his acceptance speech.

His four points:

Point 1. The soldier vote shall be an obstacle race.

Point 2. A vote for Roosevelt means a court martial.

Point 3. Only the States have rights, not soldiers.

Point 4. Dewey shall be the "pin up" candidate.

ELECTION TRENDS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, that the American people are through with the New Deal was evidenced again yesterday in the Denver election in the unmistakable language of votes. They have struck at the New Deal and its sponsors in these special elections again and again, whenever and wherever they have had the opportunity.

In the 10 special elections held since the general elections in 1942, Republican candidates have won all but 2, and failed to carry by only a scant margin 1 of these, a Tammany district in New York City, which had been overwhelmingly Democratic for nearly a quarter of a century.

The issue, the same everywhere, was never more clearly drawn than in the election in the First Colorado District yesterday. Personalities were not involved. The Republican candidate and his supporters from first to last stressed but one thing—that the issue was constitutional government versus bureaucratic dictatorship. They called on the voters to express by their ballots their disapproval of government by directive and decree. The voters responded by electing Dean M. Gillespie, the Republican candidate, by a decisive majority, in a district that had been strongly and consistently Democratic since 1932, having turned in a Democratic majority of nearly 60,000 in the election of 1936.

The winning of the war was not, of course, an issue in the Denver election. The people of Denver, like our people everywhere, want to win the war and win it quickly. They also want to be sure to retain the American system of free enterprise under a free republic. They undoubtedly and rightfully concluded that the election of the Republican candidate would contribute to these ends.

THE NEW DEAL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that the people are through with the New Deal, but I agree with Stanley High, writing in this week's Saturday Evening Post, when he says that the Republicans cannot nominate just anybody and get by with it. It will be a good thing if we get that into the minds of Republican politicians and all people who are on our side. No synthetic New Deal carried in the policies of Wendell Willkie will ever get by this coming election. So while the New Deal is on the way out—I am glad you gentlemen on the majority side of the aisle agree with me, as you indicate by your applause, although that cannot appear in the RECORD—I am glad you are going to join with us and elect a real Republican this time; one who believes in our country, in our Constitution, in our ability to take care of ourselves. We will not be deceived again by Wendell Willkie, so come along with us and we will get a real American President.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INTERTRAIN TELEPHONES

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. McLEAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes; and that, likewise, I may address the House for 15 minutes on Friday following the other special orders that may have been entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

1944 FARM PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and include a statement on farm conditions in my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE MOCKING BIRD MADE THE OFFICIAL STATE BIRD OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein an address I made in 1924.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC WORKS ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. DIES, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report on the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes (H. Res. 464, Rept. No. 1241), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill may continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

Would that be agreeable to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TABER. And perhaps read the first paragraph today?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And if the situation warrants it, read the first paragraph before we adjourn.

Mr. TABER. That is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4346, the first

deficiency appropriation bill, 1944, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will you please notify me when I have consumed 20 minutes?

Mr. Chairman, we submit today the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1944. It is essentially a war bill and it is insofar as the reducible items are concerned an economy measure. The total estimates considered aggregate a little bit in excess of a billion dollars and the bill which we today report to the House recommends an approval of the estimates in the sum of $882,000,000.

The following tables show the amounts of the requests, the amounts recommended, and the reductions in requests, separated as to classes of funds considered:

Requests for new appropriations	$591,338,813.31
Requests for transfer of appropriations	289,259,000.00
Request for contract authorization	130,000,000.00
Total, Budget estimates submitted for consideration	1,010,597,813.31

The amount recommended in the bill under each of the three categories of Budget estimates is as follows:

Recommended for new direct appropriation	$500,103,748.38
Recommended transfers of appropriations	262,314,000.00
Recommended contract authorization	120,000,000.00
Total, recommended by committee in accompanying bill	882,417,748.38

The following are amounts of decrease in the Budget requests divided between the three categories of funds considered:

Reduction in request for direct appropriations	$91,235,064.93
Reduction in request for transfers of funds	26,945,000.00
Reduction in request for contract authorization	10,000,000.00
Total decrease in Budget requests	128,180,064.93

The appropriations carried in the bill include a half billion dollars in direct appropriations, $262,000,000 in transfers, and $120,000,000 in contractual authorizations. We reduced the total Budget request by $128,000,000, in round figures.

Many of these items were matters over which we had no latitude of control. More than half of the bill is made up of appropriations for overtime war pay which had been authorized and granted by acts of the Congress and which we had no choice but to allow. The Congress has in the last 2 years passed five laws relative to war overtime pay. Some of them relate to the District of Columbia, some of them to the Postal Service, and some of them relate to all departments of the Government. Three of these bills authorizing overtime pay provide for termination of overtime pay on the 30th day of June 1945, and two of them provide for termination within 6 months after the close of the war. These acts were largely passed after the estimate for the 1944 appropriation acts had been sent to Congress and provision could not be made, and was not made, in the regular 1944 acts. The result was that the departments were under the necessity of increasing their expenditures and taking the excess out of the funds available for 1944, which, of course, leaves a deficit of that amount. As a result of the payment of these unforeseen expenditures—unforeseen at the time the 1944 estimates were submitted—some agencies will be out of money about April 15, and it becomes necessary, therefore, to make these deficiency appropriations at this time in order to take care of the situation brought about by these unbudgeted disbursements.

There is a gratifying feature of this overtime-pay situation. The overtime authorized by the five acts of Congress aggregated for 1944, $827,000,000, but the departments have been able to absorb a large amount of this overtime expenditure, notably the Army and Navy, which have absorbed all of their overtime pay. As a matter of fact, the departments have absorbed a total of over a half billion dollars, $584,000,000 to be exact, so that instead of having to appropriate the entire $827,000,000 we find it necessary to carry in this bill provision for only $243,000,000 for overtime pay.

Probably the most debated item in the bill, and the item of greatest general interest throughout the country, was the estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget for $150,000,000 for community facilities. The sudden installation of war-production plants in various parts of the country has resulted in huge shifts of population. In many instances areas which 2 years ago were agricultural land under cultivation are now the sites of huge plants and great cities. And in many smaller communities there has been a sudden mushroomed expansion, a huge growth in population due to the necessity of providing workmen for expanded production in enlarged plants. This naturally involved a huge increase in the burden placed upon community facilities. There had to be schools for the children, there had to be child-care centers, there had to be health installations, water systems, sewer systems, roads, streets, police, fire protection, and recreation facilities which could not be provided by the local communities. The purpose of this fund and the purpose of the funds previously expended for this purpose was to take care of the suddenly expanded community needs made necessary by the installation of Federal activities which the local community was wholly unable to provide.

The communities were required to supply, and did supply to the extent of their ability, and as a result of this collaboration the Federal contribution for these projects was only about 70 percent, the communities, insofar as their means would permit, providing the remaining 30 percent. Even then we have not allowed the full amount of the Budget estimate. We cut the recommendation $22,500,000. Out of $150,000,000 asked, we allowed $127,500,000.

There are two classes of these facilities—construction, and maintenance and operation. Of course, the need for construction facilities is slowly decreasing as we take care of the needs of the larger centers of industrial population, but the maintenance and operation costs are naturally increasing. The result is that under the present arrangement we have now practically exhausted all funds for new projects, and we have ready over 300 new construction projects, 600 new service projects which should be immediately financed, and in addition there are 1,360 service projects for which funds will not be available to continue to June 30 next unless we now provide them. The President has declined to approve further projects unless the money is appropriated and is available.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman state, if he has not already done so, the total amount appropriated for the Federal Works Agency for these facilities?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The total amount in this bill is $127,500,000 for community facilities and $7,500,000 for housing facilities.

Mr. RIVERS. How much did they ask for?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They asked for $150,000,000. We allowed $127,500,000, which gives $5,100,000 for administrative expenses, $101,500,000 for projects which are ready to go or will be a continuance of operation of existing projects, and $21,000,000 for new applications which have not come in from field offices.

There have been a vast number of these facilities, and they are distributed over the entire Union. There is not a State in the Union, there is not a Territory or insular possession of the United States, which has not felt the need of, and which has not been supplied with these facilities. The amount which we here provide, $127,000,000, goes to practically every State in the Union, the most widely diffused and distributed appropriation that could be made.

The request for housing facilities was $25,000,000. That estimate was cut much more severely. There is a material doubt as to the need for more housing facilities. It is true that in the airplane industry and in the shipbuilding and naval construction industry production is still rising and the peak of production is still in the future, but in all other war activities, in all other fields of war production, we have about reached the peak. Ample housing has been provided aside from exceptional situations. So that, instead of the $25,000,000 requested, we felt warranted in recommending $7,500,000.

We proceeded on this basis. The amount programed in February, the last month for which figures were obtainable, amounted to $5,000,000. That

seemed to take care of the situation. The prospect is that during the remainder of this fiscal year there will be no greater requirement in any one month than there was in the month of February. This $7,500,000, added to what was available at the end of February, $12,500,000, makes available for this purpose $20,000,000. In view of the fact that there are only 4 months remaining—that is $5,000,000 a month—we thought that would be ample to take care of the situation.

We allowed in full the estimate of $30,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration. It is entirely a hospitalization item. General Hines, who appeared before the committee, testified that from this time on there will be a steady, consistent, and constant increase in hospitalization requirements. It is a sad situation to face, but according to his estimate there will be a continually increasing need for hospitalization of veterans of World Wars No. 1 and No. 2 from now until 1975. By that time, he estimates, we will need 300,000 beds. One hundred thousand of them are already provided or covered by this and other appropriations, 100,000 will be available through Army and Navy facilities now in existence, and we expect to provide another 100,000 in the future, a total of 300,000 beds to be ready and to be reached by 1975.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS. May I inquire if it is contemplated that there will be new hospitals for the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This provision is for the enlargement of a number of present hospitals, a list of which the gentleman will find in the report. In addition, there will be two new hospitals, one in New York, and one in Wisconsin. As the need increases, further hospitals will be provided. In this bill we provide expansion of present facilities as outlined in the report, other facilities to be erected in the future.

The amount recommended for deficiencies in the Post Office Department is $171,895,680, a decrease in the Budget estimates of $251,180. Approximately 60 percent of the deficiency is due to the additional compensation and overtime laws for which provision was not made in the original 1944 appropriations and 30 percent is on account of increased volume of the mail including the free carriage of mail for men of the armed forces.

The sum of $104,432,682 of the $171,895,680 is due to the requirements for payments of overtime and additional compensation to postal personnel under the provisions of Public Laws 25, 49, 205, and 509. The total cost to the Post Office Department under these laws for the fiscal year 1944 is $140,870,692 of which existing appropriations will permit the absorption of $36,438,010, resulting in deficiency needs of $104,432,682. The remainder of the amount carried by the bill, $67,714,178, is occasioned by the increased volume of postal business over and above that contemplated when the original 1944 appropriations were projected. These costs result from additional personal services either in form of added force or overtime pay or substitute hire, increased volume to be transported by railroads, air-transport companies, and by motor vehicle and additional supplies. Some additional needs result from the reletting of star-route contracts pursuant to authorization of law where increased costs have resulted in inequitable situations for contractors.

Postal revenues at the time of the preparation of the 1944 appropriations were estimated at $910,000,000. They are now estimated at $1,072,000,000 or an increase of $162,000,000 over the original figure. These estimates are based upon the rates now in effect and do not take into consideration the new rates required under the Revenue Act of 1943 which become effective March 26.

Present expenditures for this fiscal year are estimated at $1,080,000,000, leaving an estimated deficit on the basis of existing revenue rates of $8,000,000. This is a commendable situation for the Postal Service considering the fact that it is carrying free annually an estimated two and a half billion pieces of mail of members of the armed forces, which, at the regular rates, it is estimated, would produce $70,000,000 in revenue and which, on an advanced estimate basis, is causing an out-of-pocket expense to the Department approximating $30,000,000.

Figures were not available to the committee as to the augmented revenues that will result from the inauguration of the increased postal rates. Department officials advised that substantial increased postal rates generally have an adverse effect upon the volume of business and no estimate figures are ready at this time.

Budget estimates for deficiency purposes for the Navy Department, with the exception of small amounts for the payment of claims for damages, contemplated no additional new appropriations. The request considered by the committee totaled $289,259,000 to be transferred from the appropriation "Ordnance and ordnance stores" to 13 other naval appropriations. These sums involve deficiencies mainly in current funds for maintenance and operation of naval training stations and naval shore establishments and additional incidental expenses arising from increased naval personnel over and above the numbers contemplated by the original 1944 appropriations.

The committee has effected reductions in the amounts to be transferred totaling $26,945,000, making a total transfer of funds of $262,314,000 in lieu of the $289,259,000 requested. The principal decreases have been effected in the amounts for maintenance of naval stations under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts and maintenance of public works under the Bureau of Yards and Docks. The far-flung range of these activities and the speculative character of the future requirements combined with the lag in getting experienced data upon which to gage accurately for the remainder of the year make these estimates conjectural. The committee believes that in some cases the estimates are improbable of realization and in others there are estimated needs, particularly in the case of public-works funds, which careful review will develop not to be bedrock essentials.

The funds for general expenses of the Marine Corps, $51,639,000, arise under the items of clothing, military supplies, and miscellaneous supplies and expenses. The entire amount is due to the increased strength of the corps. The original 1944 estimates were based upon a maximum strength in the fiscal year 1944 of 334,500 men, 18,000 women, and 8,800 officer candidates. The increased strength is based upon 415,360 men, 16,712 women, and 9,000 officer candidates.

Provision is made for the procurement of 1,000 passenger motor vehicles for the Navy. This number is to meet the needs for the fiscal year 1945 and is advanced to this bill from the regular estimates in order to procure the cars at as early a date as possible to save carrying charges. The Navy Department estimates that procurement in this fiscal year in an early bill should make a saving of approximately $500,000 in costs. Cars are all of the lightweight variety, at an estimated cost of less than $1,000 per car.

The Budget recommendation requesting authority to enter into contracts for repair facilities in the amount of $130,000,000 is reduced to $120,000,000. This contract authorization is dependent upon the enactment of enabling legislation for its effectiveness. Such legislation has passed the Senate in S. 1668 and this bill passed the House yesterday without amendment.

Necessity for additional repair facilities is occasioned by the ship-construction programs and by increased marine activities in the Pacific. These facilities are chiefly for the west coast of continental United States. The Navy Department has undertaken, by agreement of other agencies, the responsibility of providing ship-repair facilities for its own vessels and those of the Army and the War Shipping Administration. This centralization of responsibility permits maximum use of all facilities and eliminates competitive action and loss of time and money. The program is geared to the ship-production rate for the future and is designed to have repair facilities ready to meet the volume of ships which will be operating as of January 1, 1945. The program is devoted chiefly to provision for drydocks and supporting facilities, submarine overhaul facilities, additional development of the United States naval drydocks at Hunters Point and Terminal Island, Calif., the replacement of mobile floating repair units by equivalent shore facilities, and additional repair facilities for continental amphibious craft. The $130,000,000 contemplated $77,000,000 for these new facilities, $53,000,000 on account of excess of cost of previously authorized docks and to furnish supporting facilities for such docks to the extent funds for such facilities have been diverted to providing more urgently required repair facility projects, and $26,000,000 as a reserve for contingencies.

This latter amount represented a 20-percent leeway in the entire authorization and from this the committee has deducted $10,000,000 leaving the reserve amount at $16,000,000.

The application of $39,436,884.93 for the restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation was denied. As you are aware, under the statute the Secretary of the Treasury is required to make an appraisal upon the 31st day of March each year. If he finds the capital of the Corporation, which is $100,000,000, has been impaired, he is required to restore it, and Congress is authorized to appropriate the money to restore it to $100,000,000. If he finds the assets exceed the capital stock of $100,000,000, he is required to cover the excess over and above $100,000,000 into the Treasury. In the six appraisals since 1938, he has found in four instances a deterioration of the capital stock, and in two instances an excess of capital stock. In the four instances Congress has provided money to restore the entire capital stock. In this case the committee decided against it, due to the fact that apparently it is not necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I shall take 10 additional minutes. In four instances the amount of the assets and liabilities was so low that restoration of the capital stock was necessary. For example, in 1938 the impairment of the capital stock was approximately 100 percent. We restored it that year with an appropriation of $94,000,000 out of the hundred million dollars, due to the fact that the total assets and liabilities aggregated only $300,000,000. In this instance the amount of depreciation on the 31st day of March 1943 was a little over $39,000,000, but the assets and liabilities were in excess of two and a half billion dollars. In addition to that the corporation is authorized by statute to issue its notes up to the amount of $3,000,000,000, the principal and interest of which are guaranteed by the Government. So it was thought the Corporation was provided with sufficient funds for the time being and that additional capital stock at this time was not indicated.

We provided the full amount asked for grants to States for old-age assistance—the allotment to the States to take care of old-age pensions. A very agreeable feature appeared, in that there has been a decline in the number of those receiving old-age allowances. The total number in the United States has declined in the last year but, on the other hand, there has been an increase in the per capita requirements. Due to the cost of living, which is a result of the war, the per capita per month has increased from an average of $23.29 for fiscal 1943 to an average of $25.68 for 1944.

Under the State Department there is provision for three items. One is an appropriation of $450,000 for the reorganization, which has already been worked out. Then we allowed $1,000,000 for emergencies, a large part of which goes to the Swiss Government, which represents the United States in enemy territory. And lastly we have provided $1,000,000 under a treaty obligation, which is matched by Canada in like amount, to take care of an unusual situation with respect to the salmon run on the Fraser River. Due to obstructions in the river, the salmon cannot get up the river from the ocean to the spawning grounds. As a result, the sockeye salmon, one of the most important of the salmon species, has been tremendously depleted and is in danger of extinction. We are collaborating with Canada—Canada providing a million dollars to match our million dollars—for the removal of these obstructions and thereby restore the salmon industry on the Fraser River system.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. KERR. What percentage of this amount carried in the bill is due to statutory increase of salaries of Government employees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. About one-half of the new appropriations carried in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes. The total amount that is carried in this bill, in a direct initial appropriation out of the Treasury funds, is $500,000,000. The exact amount is $500,103,748.38. In addition to that amount there is made available through reappropriation, as appears on page 28 of the report, $120,000,000 of contract authorizations, and approximately $262,000,000 of reappropriations for the Navy, so that there really is made available by this bill, which could not have been expended otherwise, $382,000,000 in addition to the $500,000,000, making a total of $882,000,000 that is made available, that would not otherwise be, or that could not otherwise be expended.

I am not going to cover the items that have been rather fully covered by the chairman of the committee, because there is no sense in my taking up the time of the Committee in going over those things.

Of the items for the Navy $120,000,000 was made available in contract authorizations which will have to be appropriated later for facilities like floating drydocks and temporary factories and all that sort of thing to be put up in the southwest Pacific very largely. The other items for the Navy, totaling $262,000,000, are mostly items that relate to routine operations like the big item of "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," $158,000,000. That means the upkeep of their facilities and the upkeep of their supplies.

Then there is the item of $38,000,000 for "Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks." That means the maintenance of their buildings. Then there is the Marine Corps item of general expenses, $51,000,000. The other items are comparatively small, including $6,250,000 for miscellaneous expenses and $600,000 for additional research. There are only two items that are going to result in considerable controversy on the floor. The first one that will be reached will be the community facilities fund. There, an appropriation of $127,500,000 is recommended. There is no question we need to spend some money for this purpose. There is no question but what in some places, in poorer territories, there is a requirement upon us to help with school facilities. On the other hand, I think it is being very largely overdone. It has been almost impossible to get any definite, positive, affirmative statement out of the people who run this set-up as to what they propose to do with their money and what they have done with their money. Frankly, the figures came at such a time that I have been unable to go into the details of them enough so that I can analyze them here at this time for the benefit of the Committee. I hope to be able to do so tomorrow when the item is reached for amendment.

In the meantime I shall only call attention to one or two larger things that make it out. There is an item of $3,000,000-plus, for instance, for the construction of a water-works system in San Juan, P. R., when the island itself has an excess tax revenue at the present time of $65,000,000. Why we should do just that sort of thing is a little difficult for the ordinary fellow to understand.

Then there are a lot of other items with reference to recreation centers which they are building for troops on a more or less permanent basis at very large expense, when it would seem as if they could get along with much less money, also further due to the fact that we have so much of that sort of thing that is being done already by the Army and the U. S. O. and by various local organizations all through the country. I shall have a pretty well analyzed set-up on that when we get to the item tomorrow.

With reference to the housing matter I can give you a little bit better analysis. We did not get a very satisfactory statement out of them, but I can say to you that out of a thousand projects that they have built, on upwards of 200 they have no report on occupancy. On 231 out of that 1,000, in addition to the 200 that I have referred to, there is less than a 50-percent occupancy. In the places that they propose to build additional housing, I have here a schedule of the number of occupancies and the number of dwelling units insofar as I have been able to get them. I believe that for your information I should read it. This does not include every item where they propose to build additional housing; or where they propose to build housing, and undoubtedly they, perhaps, might have a legitimate excuse for building a small quantity of housing in some places, but not very much.

Indian Head, Md.: They propose a large number of additional houses. There are presently 240 constructed in one project and 165 occupied. In another project there are 535 constructed,

and 311 occupied. In Newport News, Va., there are several projects. The first one is known as Ann Wyeth Hall, with 368 units, 48 of which are occupied. At Fort Eustis, 75 units, no report. Another project at Fort Eustis, 438 units, no report.

In Portsmouth, Va., what they call the William Crawford project, 400 units, 323 occupied.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Are we to understand that those units are completed with the facilities, water and light and so forth, so that they could be occupied?

Mr. TABER. Well, all I have to go by are their own tables which they presented indicating that they were all completed, that the number of units was completed, and I assume from what they told us that they were all ready for occupancy.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. In the case of the project known as Ann Wyeth Hall, at Newport News, I happen to know something about that: It is very probably due to the fact that they needed additional restaurants and things of that kind around there. The place was located and the buildings are constructed, but I think that the other facilities are needed in order to have them occupied.

Mr. TABER. They did not give us any reason for the absence of occupancy. I have only listed those places where they requested additional funds to build additional residence units.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman refer to the old U. S. H. A. projects?

Mr. TABER. No. I am only referring to what was supposed to be under Mr. Blandford, war construction and other construction that was merged under Mr. Blandford afterwards. I could take the tables that they have furnished me and I could give you the source of the funds under which all of these projects were constructed. That would not appear in the hearings because those things were not available in time to put into the hearings, and the committee regarded them as too bulky. I have those tables here however, and I will make them available to anyone who wishes to look at them.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do I understand that some of the $800,000,000 appropriated for U. S. H. A. in this reorganization that has taken place are being used for the construction of houses other than those originally provided for under U. S. H. A.?

Mr. TABER. I would not say that.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The reason I am asking that question is because I am having difficulty in getting some of these questions answered.

Mr. TABER. I am not surprised at that, because we were able to get very little information, and the information we did get was not so definite and so satisfactory that it was easy to look at the tables which they furnished us and answer the question. So that the whole thing is more or less a pig-in-a-poke. You just do not know where you are going. You do not know how much it ought to cost. You do not know what kind of a job they have done except in those particular instances that you are able to put your finger on.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, the gentleman means to say that the bureau that is now responsible for this housing has the whole thing in a mess?

Mr. TABER. That would be a rather mild characterization.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is somewhat of an authority evidently. What percentage of houses are usually rented in the Nation? What would the gentleman say would be the percentage of rental and what would be the percentage ordinarily of vacancies?

Mr. TABER. It depends on the type of property.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, take family units. That is in this category.

Mr. TABER. I would say where there was a lot of pressure for residences, and those are the places that this organization is supposed to cater to, there should be, from my knowledge of these units that are available under private management, an average occupancy of about 98 percent.

Mr. RABAUT. Ninety-eight percent?

Mr. TABER. Yes; where the pressure exists.

Mr. RABAUT. You could not put it much higher?

Mr. TABER. No; not in cases where there is pressure for property. Under normal circumstances you could not except such occupancy.

Mr. RABAUT. What would it normally be?

Mr. TABER. Under normal circumstances, apartments of that type would run between 90 and 95 percent, except in communities where there was an overbuilt situation, or in times of depression.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, the situation, according to Mr. Blandford, is that they were 92 percent occupied.

Mr. TABER. That may be so.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman's figures are away out of line.

Mr. TABER. That may be so, but I doubt it because of the facts I have given you.

Mr. RABAUT. Are you questioning his word? He made this statement before the committee and it is a part of the record.

Mr. TABER. I am only giving you the facts.

Mr. RABAUT. I am giving you the facts.

Mr. TABER. Two hundred and thirty-one projects out of 1,000 show less than 50-percent occupancy. That means there cannot be anything like 92 percent occupancy of the whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

That is perfectly clear.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman should restudy the record, because the record is different from what he has explained to the House.

Mr. TABER. Perhaps the gentleman does not realize that I have taken these tables that were furnished to the committee, which are not in the record, and I have gone over them carefully with the idea of finding out what is in them and finding out just what kind of a story Mr. Blandford did tell us, and the result of that story is not good.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have a letter, dated March 2, 1944, from the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers' Association, and, among other things, they say:

> Our federation contends that these temporary demountable projects were not needed. The best evidence of this lies in the fact that they are two-thirds empty in our State, and this situation is typical of region 1 temporary housing. The reason for this probably lies in the fact that the newly prosperous defense workers, for whom they were presumably constructed, refused to live in them.

Mr. RABAUT. What State is that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is Massachusetts, and it refers also to region 1.

Mr. RABAUT. Were there any activities in Massachusetts in the war effort that have been curtailed since these have been built?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The charge in the letter is——

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman know the answer to that question? I do not care about the letter.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will furnish the gentleman with detailed information later.

Mr. RABAUT. But if there is some curtailment in the activities of the Federal Government in regard to the war effort, there might be some vacancies, and justifiably so.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not believe there has been any curtailment which compares with the general picture painted in this letter.

Mr. RABAUT. In the general picture there have been such curtailments.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. RABAUT. No. It is the fact.

Mr. TABER. So that we may not be confused at all by general statements, perhaps we should be a little more specific on some things, and should refer, insofar as we may, to the projects in Massachusetts that are referred to in these memoranda.

In the Devoncrest project, 300 units, 264 were occupied.

Another one in the same set-up, 195 units, no report.

Mr. RABAUT. What does that mean?

Mr. TABER. I do not know whether that is a kind of a cover-up or whether they have not paid enough attention to the management of this thing as to have any idea of what the situation is. We have to take one conclusion or the other. We cannot take both.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, we cannot take the cover-up conclusion just because the gentleman makes a statement about covering up.

Mr. TABER. If you were running a business—I know something about the gentleman from Michigan.

I know that he has had large experience in the real-estate business. I know that if the gentleman from Michigan had charge of this, there would not be over 200 out of a thousand "no-report" projects in here. He would know just what the status of every one of them was. I know enough about the gentleman from Michigan to know that.

Mr. RABAUT. I thank the gentleman for the compliment but——

Mr. TABER. And I know that he believes these Government bureaucrats should do just what he would do if he were running the business.

Mr. RABAUT. I do not want to get off the subject and get onto the bureaucrats; I want to stay with the subject of these houses. I think in fairness to the report that the gentleman has there that if he wants to mention some houses that are not reported about, there must be some reason for the absence of the report. Maybe the houses are not finished. No one knows. That does not justify the statement.

Mr. TABER. This column giving the number completed for occupancy—I do not know whether it is correct or not, but I have to assume that it is correct, and when they say they have no report on the occupancy I have to believe it, because I have no way except in one or two instances of which I have personal knowledge of checking up on it.

Mr. RABAUT. As of what date?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. It says here as of December 31, 1943. It was brought up to the committee 2 or 3 days after we closed the hearings.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman, I think, will agree that it is not necessarily an impeachment of the efficiency of the National Housing Authority that some of these houses are not occupied, because the National Housing Authority merely builds these houses on order. It is not responsible for the nonoccupancy.

Mr. TABER. It builds them on order?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Oh, no; they build them wherever they think they can worm in.

Mr. LUDLOW. They build them after consulting the agencies of the Government, the Navy Department, the War Department, or whatever agency is going to need these houses.

Mr. TABER. How does the gentleman know that?

Mr. LUDLOW. I know it to be true.

Mr. TABER. I have had a little experience. I would say that what I said first was correct: They build them wherever they can worm in.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows they are built after consultation with the Army, the Navy——

Mr. TABER. Maybe they are, but I doubt it.

Mr. RABAUT. And the Manpower Commission.

Mr. TABER. I doubt that.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman can doubt all he wants, but those are the facts.

Mr. TABER. I know that in some places they do not do that.

Mr. RABAUT. Where are some of the places they have not done it?

Mr. TABER. Up in my own territory.

Mr. RABAUT. Where?

Mr. TABER. Geneva, N. Y.

Mr. RABAUT. Name a specific place.

Mr. TABER. Geneva, N. Y. There they built 250 units, completed December 1, and only 1 occupied. I had an appraisal made of that project by a competent person and he reported that they would not be occupied because they were not the type of construction that would let people live with any reasonable comfort in that territory, and that they would not in his opinion be occupied, that there was at the present time an agitation going on for the purpose of bringing in a bunch of Italian war prisoners to locate in this project.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes. Now the gentleman knows something about the way they are operated. Right in his own territory they built a great big project that has gone "flooey." I wonder if the gentleman would not tell us about it. Many of them went "flooey." Over a thousand were involved there.

Mr. LUDLOW. If the gentleman will give me an opportunity I will be glad to. In Kingsbury, Ind., was the most outstanding instance of nonoccupancy. The houses were built there on order of the Army Ordnance Bureau. The National Housing Authority merely constructed the houses on order. The fault of nonoccupancy certainly does not rest with the National Housing Authority.

Mr. TABER. The people would not live in them after they were built, would they? Is not that the truth? I think the gentleman must know that.

Mr. LUDLOW. The reason why was——

Mr. TABER. Because they were not of suitable construction.

Mr. LUDLOW. The reason was that they shut the plant down. You cannot blame the National Housing Authority for that. I think the gentleman ought to be fair about this.

Mr. TABER. That may be so, but I have heard other stories about that particular set-up.

Mr. JENKINS and Mr. MAY rose.

Mr. TABER. I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio first and then to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. JENKINS. I think the gentleman has made a mighty good showing on the case he is trying to establish. There is no question but what there has been a terrific waste and poor judgment. It has been a terrible calamity for this country, but let me call the gentleman's attention to this: Down in my section in one location 1,250 houses were built. Now they are moving away 950. I live on the Ohio River. They are moving them on barges down the river. They load these houses, bathroom and all, on barges and take them somewhere down river. I do not know where they are going with them but they are sent down river. I have made some investigation and I find that the best service we can render is to see to it that these houses are not permitted to fall in the hands of sharks who are going to buy them for little or nothing, reestablish them somewhere else, and make a lot of money out of them. I understand on pretty good authority, probably not as good as the gentleman from New York has, that there is an agency now looking out for this very thing. It is financed abundantly and it expects to recover a large part of its finance money by reason of its ability to get into the New Deal somewhere and buy all these properties at a great sacrifice.

Mr. TABER. That is one of the problems that must be taken up as we get along. These temporary housing set-ups, of course, are not going to yield great salvage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from New York knows, of course, that the House Committee on Military Affairs has been conducting an investigation by a resolution of this House into the national war effort, in the course of which as an incidental thing we have studied the question of manpower and housing facilities. We found one instance over in Ravenna, Ohio, where one of the ordnance plants started, where 2,400 houses were built and never used. Kingsbury, Ind., was another place where there was a vast housing plant and practically none of them used.

We are advised by the War Department that they have suspended different projects throughout the country, particularly ordnance plants. Undoubtedly the job of the Congress hereafter will be to prevent these things from being not only a loss, as they are, but from being used for purposes they ought not to be used for. One of the ways to do that—and I do not want to be understood as being critical of the great Committee on Appropriations of the House—is to withdraw or control these revolving funds. I have been hammering away for several years trying to get the Appropriations Committee to adopt some method of calling these revolving funds back into the Treasury or stopping their use. Tremendous funds are loose and being spent by these agencies of the Government

without the Congress knowing anything about what they are spent for. I should like to inquire of the gentleman if his committee has taken any steps along that line; if so they have discovered one of the corporations that are doing business for the Government with unlimited funds and nobody knows what they are doing with them. I hate to mention it but there is one—and everybody knows my position on it, I do not suppose it would be any slander for me to say it again—I am against the Tennessee Valley Authority. They have $15,000,000, or it may be $75,000,000, I do not know. The gentleman knows more about it than I. They are rolling it over and using it as they please. What is the committee doing about it?

Mr. TABER. It is exceedingly difficult to find out about those things. The other side of the picture is that the Appropriations Committee has not the jurisdiction to wind up these corporations. We can reappropriate funds that are already appropriated and freeze onto them that way but where a corporation like the T. V. A. derives its funds very largely out of income from operation and the sale of assets of different types we have no jurisdiction to freeze onto those funds.

I would say that that is a job for the appropriate legislative committees. Likewise, with reference to the R. F. C., which has a tremendous borrowing capacity and over which the Appropriations Committee has no control except the direct salaries of the direct employees of that agency, it would be up to the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. MAY. Perhaps the gentleman is right in connection with authorizations for appropriations, but I still maintain that the Appropriations Committee, when it comes to any particular Government agency, such as the R. F. C., for instance, where it makes appropriations for that agency and it is not using the money, the committee has the power to take that money back and put it into the Treasury, then exercise its judgment as to whether it will reappropriate or not.

Mr. TABER. That is true, but the only authority we have with reference to R. F. C. is to appropriate out of their funds for the current operating salaries. We have no authority as to the money that they get and that they are permitted to lend as a result of their borrowings, either direct from the Treasury or otherwise. That same thing applies to the T. V. A. insofar as their borrowing capacity is concerned, and insofar as their revenues are concerned. I do think that this whole governmental picture should be broken down so that we will not have the Commodity Credit Corporation with a borrowing capacity of $3,000,000,000, the R. F. C. with a borrowing capacity of perhaps $15,000,000,000, and the T. V. A. with a borrowing capacity of whatever it is. I think it is $100,000,000. It may be more or it may be less.

Mr. MAY. I happened to have had something to do with the original T. V. A. Act and all of the amendments thereto. I do not know of any authority in that legislation which authorized them to borrow money. They were authorized by one particular provision to sell bonds and buy a power company, but they do not borrow money, so far as I know, under the law, and if they are doing so they are doing just what I am objecting to.

Mr. TABER. They do have authority to borrow a certain amount of money. I cannot give the exact amount at the moment. It might be fifty, it might be one hundred, it might be one hundred and fifty million dollars. Frankly, I do not think they should have that power. There is that picture.

I will refer now to these housing projects. I made a comment about a few of them. There is one in Niagara Falls which has very slight occupancy, as I remember it only about 20 percent out of a 1,200-house construction, and that is right up there in the airplane factory where the Curtiss-Wright, the Belair, and all those other big fighting-plane plants are located. Then there are other units like the one near Rome, where they have 400 houses, with only 123 occupied. They have one up at Messina with about 200 and no occupancy. I presume the reason at Messina is that they have a permanent family set-up there, 300 with 262 occupied.

In connection with the rest of those units in New York State they do not give the occupancy results. It is all "No report," with the exception of one at Sidney where they claim it is 95 percent occupied. You can go all over the country and you will get practically the same result. There are a very large number of construction projects without the type of occupancy that there should be. Today there are still approximately $125,000,000 of unexpended funds that represent projects mostly under construction. There is, as I understand it, approximately $16,000,000 that have not been obligated or allocated. It may be a little more than that, it may be a little less than that; I do not suppose they can tell us just exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain things that really need some attention and I will refer to one of them that I do think is in need of some temporary house construction. I refer to Solomons Island, down here in Maryland, where they have a naval station that is out by itself and has not anything near it. I think they do need a little low-cost temporary construction down there.

They have plenty of money for all those things that they ought to do and they should not have any more money for the projects that they have asked for than is already provided. In my opinion, we should strike that item out of the bill. I am not going to take any more time, but when the items are reached I hope to be able then to have the opportunity of presenting them to the Committee.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEVENSON. In connection with the thousands of houses in these housing projects that are unoccupied, has the gentleman any figure as to the millions of dollars that are represented in the cost of construction of these unoccupied houses?

Mr. TABER. I have not had time enough to go over these tables so that I could prepare that sort of estimate. I do not know as I would undertake to prepare it for tomorrow because it involves going over a considerable number of figures and I would not want to make a statement that was not up to the mark.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, child delinquency has reached a peak never before realized nor dreamed of in this country. It has reached the all-time high. In its early stages the rapid growth of child delinquency created amazement and now it has become frightening. It has grown to be such a menace and such a threat to the American Nation that J. Edgar Hoover, head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and America's leading crime expert, has seen fit to give a large share of his time in recent months to finding ways and means of stamping out the evil which is threatening to undermine the purity and strength of our social structure at its juvenile source.

It is not difficult to account for a great deal of the increase of juvenile crime. The employment of fathers and mothers in military services and defense plants has robbed the homes of the land of parental guides and mentors, leaving the children "on the loose." Without fathers and mothers to guide them children have been left to the merciless fate of following their own devices and impulses. They are permitted to grow up "like Topsy" and to sow all of the wild oats their inclinations lead them to sow. The result is an epidemic of juvenile misdemeanors and sex irregularities without a parallel. One does not have to be pragmatic or puritanical to realize that this is a lethal tendency which should not be allowed to go on in any community one day longer than is necessary to correct it.

The appropriation for community facilities carried in this bill is an effective means of combating the juvenile delinquency evil. Let us take a look at the figures contained on page 687 of the hearings. Up to January 31, 1944, the President had approved 4,722 community facilities projects. Of those approved 634 were child care projects, 1,650 were school projects, and 815 were recreation projects. In other words, 3,099 of the approved projects, or well up to three-fourths of the total, are projects that have an important relation to the spiritual, physical, moral, and educational welfare of the children and their upbringing along right lines. Not only is the moral development of children being neglected as a result of conditions growing out of war but in many cases the lives of little children are being jeopardized by lack of proper care. Instances

have been cited where tiny children have been locked in trailers or tied to bed posts while their mothers were working in defense plants. Under the Federal works projects nursery care would be provided for these neglected little ones.

Two programs for the direct benefit of the children of America are operated under this community facilities appropriation. One is a nursery-center program for the children from 2 to 5 and the other is a school-age program for children from 6 to 15. On February 9, 1944, the last date for which figures are available, there were in operation under this program 1,431 nursery-school units, with an enrollment of 37,439 children, and 812 centers for school-age children, with an enrollment of 28,333. This makes a total of 2,243 centers, with an enrollment of 65,772. If this appropriation is not allowed, these child-care units will have to be abandoned, and that, in my judgment, would be a national calamity. It would be tantamount to abandoning our children who so much need our protection and care.

Of the 4,722 projects approved by the President, 542 are medical projects, 82 are venereal-control projects, 347 are for water systems, 350 are for sewer systems, and 150 are for fire and police protection, from which it will be seen how closely the program is tied in with the health and well-being of the communities served.

The appropriation of $127,500,000 carried in this bill for community facilities is not as much, in my opinion, as might wisely and judiciously be spent in providing the facilities on which the welfare of the Nation so much depends, but it will cover existing commitments and will provide $18,194,000 of new money to meet contingencies that will arise. The Budget estimate was $150,000,000, and we had definite assurance that if we granted that amount it would close the books and the agency would not return for more money. I voted in committee for the appropriation of the full Budget estimate, which would consume the balance of the authorization of $500,000,000. No one wants to see appropriations cut more than I do, but I do not want to cut them at the expense of our children.

It has been said that there is no precedent for the Federal Government reaching into communities and providing facilities which the communities themselves might be expected to provide. My answer to that is that neither is there any precedent for total war. The factors which make it necessary that these facilities be provided do not grow out of peace; they grow out of war and may properly be charged to the Nation's war bill.

I repeat that the community facilities which are provided for in this bill and which are charged against this appropriation are over and above the peacetime requirements of the various communities that are affected and are made necessary on account of the war. That is what makes them a Federal problem and a Federal responsibility instead of a local problem and a local responsibility. If it were not for the war this estimate would not be before us.

On the point of the ability of the communities to pay for these projects illuminating testimony is found on page 709 of the hearings, from which I quote, as follows:

Mr. LUDLOW. In your opinion, General Fleming, do the local communities, speaking by and large, do their whole part in providing these facilities?

General FLEMING. The act says that we can go in where the communities are unable or are unwilling to meet the need. We find in almost all cases they are unable, not that they are unwilling. I think in very few instances we have found unwillingness on the part of the communities.

Mr. LUDLOW. You try to check very carefully the financial ability of the community to provide them?

General FLEMING. Oh, yes; we do.

Mr. LUDLOW. And the willingness of the community to provide them?

General FLEMING. Yes, sir.

All of us are voting without hesitation and without stint the billions to win the war so as to make civilization safe and secure in the ages to come. While we are doing that I think it is altogether right and proper that we should vote a few millions to cure instead of to kill. We are the guardians of posterity and we have a responsibility to see that the children of America do not suffer spiritual blight and decadence as a result of conditions which it is within our power to remedy.

We will be very derelict in duty if in the face of mounting juvenile crime which already has passed all known bounds we destroy the child-care projects of the community-facilities program by withdrawing the means necessary to enable them to carry them on. We could do no greater disservice to our children, who will be our leaders of tomorrow and who need to be strong and reliant to cope with the momentous problems of posterity.

I have just received a letter from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover which is startling in its revelations as to the extent of juvenile crime. His letter, in which he deals generally with the problem of child delinquency, shows how serious the crime wave is among the children of America and how important it is that all proper means shall be taken to restrain it and stamp it out. I do not see how anyone after reading Mr. Hoover's letter could fail to support with every ounce of his sympathy and resolution the community-facilities program dealing with child care.

I submit for consideration of the House and for publication in the RECORD my letter to Mr. Hoover and his reply:

MARCH 4, 1944.

Hon. J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: I will be most appreciative if you will send me information about the extent and causes of juvenile delinquency. I know this is a subject to which you have given much attention. I would like especially to have this information for reference when the appropriation for community facilities comes up in the House next Wednesday. A large part of these facilities are for child care and I think are highly important as long as fathers and mothers are to be taken into military or essential civilian services, leaving the children "on the loose." I anticipate that an effort will be made to strike out or drastically reduce the appropriation to the Federal Works Agency to continue these facilities.

It is needless for me to say that I value your opinion very highly, and if it is possible for you to reply on Monday or Tuesday I will be grateful.

With every good wish, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

LOUIS LUDLOW.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1944.

Hon. LOUIS LUDLOW,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to acknowledge your communication of March 4, 1944, wherein you request information regarding the extent and causes of juvenile delinquency.

The present upsurge of lawlessness on the part of our young people I consider to be one of our great domestic problems. The figures clearly point to a tremendous rise in the number of youthful offenders. Last year 22.9 percent of all persons arrested were under voting age. The striking factor in the increase of arrests is emphasized by the fact that today our armed forces have taken millions of men and placed them under military discipline, which certainly should reflect a considerable downward trend in the number of crimes committed; however, this has not been the case. On the contrary, arrests of males 17 years of age increased 27.7 percent in 1943 over 1942. More males 18 years of age were arrested than in any other age group.

The increase in the arrests of females under voting age is even more marked. In 1943, arrests of girls under 21 increased 130.4 percent over the calendar year 1941. The year 1941 was selected for purposes of comparison since it was the last pre-war year. In 1943 the arrests of females under 21 increased 47.9 percent over 1942, while arrests for offenses against common decency in 1943 increased 56.9 percent in the number of girls arrested over the preceding year. The arrests of girls under 21 for crimes against property, such as robbery, burglary, theft, and similar offenses, increased 30.1 percent, while arrests of males under 18 years of age increased 39.8 percent for rape; 39 percent for robbery; 27.7 percent for burglary; and 23.4 percent for auto theft, as compared with 1942.

The annual Uniform Crime Reports Bulletin, which has just been issued, sets forth more detailed figures on pages 87, 89, and 91. I am enclosing a copy of this publication for your perusal.

It has been my experience, based upon the investigative reports submitted in thousands of cases by special agents, that the one great factor contributing to delinquency is a general let-down in parental supervision and guidance. Now, more than ever before, I am convinced that the home is directly responsible for the increase in the number of delinquents. This, of course, is accentuated by wartime conditions; families are separated and homes are broken as a result of fathers and older brothers entering the service or mothers working in defense industries. In many instances both parents work on swing shifts which take them away from the children during the very hours of the day when parental guidance is most needed. Then, too, the general spirit of wartime abandon and the "last fling" philosophy has led many young people from a virtuous way of life into one of degradation. In many cases the manpower shortage and diversion of funds has led to a decrease in recreational facilities so necessary in order that young people may spend their leisure time amidst wholesome, constructive influences.

Another factor that cannot be overlooked is the fact that law-enforcing agencies today

are unable to give the protective services which they gave in previous years. The officer on the beat, as a tremendous influence for good, has been superseded by the radio patrol car, or often his place has not been filled at all. Law enforcement has been confronted with a tremendous increase in responsibility and in many communities there has been an actual decrease in the number of police officers available. Likewise, trained and experienced law-enforcement personnel have gone into the armed services and, in many instances, into industry where remuneration far exceeds that which law-enforcement agencies are able to offer.

The whole broad matter of crime prevention is not beyond the realm of solution if community resources can be marshaled and if the trained personnel are available to supplement the home and the school in providing the facilities and advantages which are so necessary.

I trust the foregoing is the information you desire.

With expressions of my highest esteem and best regards,

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

These are the facts about juvenile delinquency from a man who knows. They are amazing. With a juvenile crime wave sweeping the country and lapping every community this is no time to let down the bars. We can, and in my opinion we should, help to combat this great evil by supporting the community-facilities program in this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes; I yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of course, we all recognize the existence of the desiderata, which the gentleman has pointed out and which he says Mr. Hoover has pointed out, but does the gentleman feel that the Congress of the United States or Mr. Hoover has the solution?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think it perhaps is lamentably true that he does not have the complete solution, but he is making efforts in the right direction. He is a grand official, and he has the complete confidence of the country.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What does Mr. Hoover recommend?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have not any detailed plan or specifications from Mr. Hoover, but he has given great consideration to the subject, and he is tremendously and seriously concerned about the matter.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. We are all sympathetic with his position so far as need may be concerned.

Mr. LUDLOW. My argument is in favor of the child-care provisions in this bill as a small step toward a solution of the problem. I feel that the gentleman from Ohio must agree with us in that.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. From a historical standpoint, is there anything to indicate that interference by the Federal Government with problems of this kind, which involve primarily local communities and the States, has ever done even the least bit to improve the morals of the people?

Mr. LUDLOW. I think that I am just as strong for State rights as the gentleman from Ohio. I do not believe, however, that those facilities would ever be created or ever become operative on this great problem of child delinquency, if it were not handled in this way, and with all its irregularity, I still favor doing something, and I believe this would accomplish practical benefit. I do not think we should sit idle while our children sink to degradation and death.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of course, I agree that the conditions described ought to be improved, but the Federal Government has, particularly in the last few years, interfered more and more in matters of this sort, and yet it seems to me that there is no evidence to indicate that this has accomplished any enduring good.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think child delinquency is on the increase because of abnormal conditions due to the war and the separation of families and taking away of parental care from these children. That is why it is on the increase. It is easily explainable, I think, from that standpoint.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The point I want to make is that it is one thing to see the need for removing social evils but it is quite another to supply the proper cure. I am always deathly afraid of political remedies being used as a cure. Historically they have not worked out in the way they were intended.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman from Ohio for whom I have the highest esteem would like to see these services performed by local agencies—and it really is a local responsibility—but when that is absolutely impossible, and the local agencies are utterly unable to meet their responsibility to the children, then I am sure the gentleman from Ohio feels as I do, that still something must be done to curb this evil. I sincerely feel that way about it myself.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not so sure about that. I know that Federal agencies will go into a locality and will solicit people there to adopt this program. In many instances local communities would not have availed themselves of these services if they had not been solicited to do so, and where I think they would have been just as well off without them.

Mr. LUDLOW. I cannot agree with the gentleman that the community would get along just as well, because I think the whole social fabric and the whole social system has been disrupted by the war and if we can we must adopt some agency that will restore normal conditions.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. As one who comes from a highly congested area, due to war activities, I heartily endorse the speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], and I wish to say that I think it is absolutely necessary that we should provide these facilities to take care of these children, if they are going to become good citizens in the fuutre.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal of talk from certain quarters recently about "Dr. Win the War." "Dr. Win the War" has urged that politics be forgotten and that we get on with winning the war. We are all agreed, I believe, that the first objective of all patriotic Americans, the uppermost, constant, driving objective, is to win the war. But I believe, and I think a great majority of the American people, including most of the members of our armed forces, agree that there is one serious hindrance to getting on with the war, united for victory. That hindrance should have been eliminated years ago. It could have been corrected and should have been corrected a good many years ago by the same people who are now so busy getting on with the war that they have apparently had insufficient time to remember it.

The present administration has gravely failed the American people and the American fighting men, failed miserably in a sacred duty, though the need has been great, by not providing an adequate labor-relations policy in this time of peril.

Let me say, first of all, that I am not taking sides for or against anyone, labor, capital, or Government. We are not primarily concerned, for the purposes of this discussion, with the right or wrong of the justice of the demands or the awards in these disputes, but only wish to show the pitiful inadequacy of our present Government in dealing with the most serious problem of our Nation. We wish to show that it is the bureaucratic muddling, unending quarreling among themselves by a variety of quasi governmental agencies, that is in large measure responsible for the tragic labor strikes and stoppages we have had. We wish to show that it is largely a lack of a firm, clear-cut policy and means of carrying out such a policy that has been responsible for these strikes and stoppages of work. We wish also to show, for the sake of this Nation in a grave hour, that they can and should be eliminated if the administration has the courage to face the issue intelligently and firmly.

Let us take as specific examples two of the major labor disputes of the last several months and attempt to trace through the jungle of muddled moves and countermoves which prevented agreement and solution. Let us try to find in that jumble of conflicting rulings and orders either responsibility or policy. Let us take for our examples the two most highly publicized disputes of recent months—the dispute between the railroad brotherhoods, the carriers, and the Government; and the dispute between the United Mine Workers, the operators, and the Government.

The railroad brotherhoods, operating and nonoperating, through their regular long-established machinery under the Railway Labor Act, first began action for a raise in pay in September of 1942, a year and a half ago. Through their established machinery, an emergency board, a decision was submitted to the President for the nonoperating brotherhoods on May 24, 1943, awarding them 8 cents more an hour. On the last day before an agreement embodying that award would have gone automatically into effect the Office of Economic Stabilization

ruled that the increase was inflationary and therefore could not be allowed under the so-called Little Steel formula.

With this agreement thus defeated, the President himself stepped in and with the brotherhoods worked out an agreement for a sliding scale increase of 7 to 10 cents an hour. Once again the Office of Economic Stabilization ruled that the raise was inflationary.

Shortly after that the emergency board studying the case of the operating brotherhoods handed down a decision offering 4 cents an hour as the maximum due under Little Steel, which the brotherhoods refused. William Leiserson, Chairman of the Railway Labor Board, was asked to appoint a new emergency board, but refused to on the grounds that he had no such authority. So the President finally appointed another board to take up the negotiations. The offer of that board of 4 to 10 cents on a sliding scale was refused by the brotherhoods on the grounds that it would upset their established wage scales, and was, in net effect, but a few million dollars less inflationary than their original award of a straight 8 cents across the board.

So far, the brotherhoods had dealt with the carriers, three emergency boards, the Railway Labor Board, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and the President himself. Lost without hope in this bureaucratic jungle for more than a year, the brotherhoods voted for a strike, which, if it were carried through, would have paralyzed the whole industry and the Nation itself. The President, fearful of a general strike, threw in yet another agency of the Government, and on December 27 ordered Secretary of the Interior Ickes to seize the roads, and the Army to run them.

Then, under Government control, negotiations were resumed and completed. The operating brotherhoods, who were supposedly due 4 cents under the Little Steel formula, were awarded 9 cents an hour, 5 of which was supposed to be in lieu of overtime and away-from-home pay. The nonoperating brotherhoods, who were reputedly due nothing under the Little Steel formula, received from 9 to 11 cents an hour increase. Although 8 cents had been ruled inflationary previously, the Office of Economic Stabilization blandly approved, although on the 10th of November previously, the chairman of the National War Labor Board, again another agency, had proclaimed that the Little Steel formula would be steadfastly observed.

The raise, which was originally awarded and then refused because it was inflationary, was finally awarded with increases, and it was ruled not to be inflationary. Can you find policy or responsibility in that? In the meantime, during the long period of uncertainty and delay, a general railroad strike was threatened, furnishing excellent feed for the propaganda mills of the Axis, and keeping the long-suffering people of America in indecision and confusion as to where to place the responsibility.

Can there be any question but that such occurrences constitute a serious depressant upon the morale of our fighting men, who cannot justly see why work stoppages must threaten the production and supply of weapons with which they daily risk their lives for their country?

Now, let us take up the coal dispute of last year. I am sorry if you find difficulty in following all the developments. I have simplified them as much as possible. But it is impossible to be entirely clear about the maze of moves in and out of the bureaus, the negotiation rooms, and the White House. If confusion still exists, it is no fault of your understanding.

It is more than a year since John L. Lewis, speaking for the United Mine Workers, about 530,000 strong, made a demand for a $2 a day raise. He made that demand on February 10, 1943. The employers rejected it on February 11, the one speedy development in the whole dispute. Then the merry-go-round began; considerably more erratic in its gyrations than the measured circle of a real merry-go-round, but in the end not seeming to get any further.

Here are some of the things which happened in the crazy-quilt battle which our national administration must recognize as a result of its labor policy. On March 20, 1943, the United Mine Workers agreed to postpone a strike a month beyond the expiration of contracts, until April 30, and make any settlement retroactive, because negotiations thus far had been unsuccessful. It took 9 days and the intervention of the President merely to get agreement on that. Despite the intervention of the President's personal representative, Dr. John R. Steelman, the negotiations broke down again, and on April 22 the weak hand of the Secretary of Labor made its one and only appearance in the whole drawn-out dispute. On April 22 Madam Perkins certified the dispute to the National War Labor Board and retired for the duration of the argument.

By April 28 the National War Labor Board gave up, too, and referred the dispute to the President. By this time, more than 67,000 miners were on strike, and they rejected the President's ultimatum to be at work by 10 a. m. on May 1. By May 1 most of the total of 530,000 were out, and at the President's direction Secretary Ickes seized the mines for the first time. A day later Ickes and Lewis agreed on a 2-week truce. A day after that Lewis, speaking for the United Mine Workers, reaffirmed the $2-a-day demand.

This time negotiations failed because the United Mine Workers refused to deal with the War Labor Board. On May 18 they broke down again because Ickes said he had no power to deal with Lewis and that any contract must have W. L. B. sanction. On May 25 they broke down again because the W. L. B. refused a $2-a-day raise. On May 31 the negotiations between the miners and the operators broke down once more. And on June 1, 530,000 miners were out, once more refusing to work without a contract. Again the President conferred, and again the miners went back under a 2-week truce.

June 8 the negotiations collapsed again. On June 11, because Ickes attempted to fine the miners $5 apiece for striking, almost 2,000 men were out. On June 15 the negotiations collapsed once more, and by June 19, 58,000 miners were out. On June 20 the W. L. B. talks collapsed, and on June 21 the 530,000 miners again were not at work.

The following day the miners agreed on a truce to October 31, providing the Government kept control of the mines.

And, 1 day later, the President, demonstrating again his acute sense of political timing, in a clever political move, designed to show he had a firm, strong hand in labor disputes, said that he intended to ask Congress to raise the noncombatant draft age to 65, to prevent future strikes by inducting the strikers. Whatever became of that program? Nothing—to my knowledge.

The same day that the President made that threat Secretary Ickes gave America the sober news that 20,000,000 tons of coal had been lost to the Nation since May 1.

On June 24 came more sober news. Forty percent of the Appalachian miners were still on strike, and the United States Steel Co. announced the closing of 10 blast furnaces the following day, due to a shortage of coal.

I cannot give you all the details, it would take almost as long as it did to try to solve the dispute itself, but on June 27, steel company officials announced that the curtailment of production had so far cost 24,000 tons of steel to a nation acutely requiring war weapons.

By July 6, all mines were in production, but men were still on strike. On the ninth the President, in another carefully designed move to absolve himself and the nameless men around him from all blame, said he could not force Lewis to sign a contract approved by the War Labor Board—that he could seize a mine, he said, but not a labor union. A tardy, pitiful excuse on the part of the Executive of a strong nation fighting total war.

But by July 15, 98 percent of the miners were back at work, and July 21, Lewis signed a contract with the Illinois operators calling for retroactive portal-to-portal pay and a raise of about $4.50 for a 5-day workweek.

On August 20, Ickes gave back five mines.

On August 23, Ickes gave back 53 mines.

On August 25, the War Labor Board rejected the Illinois agreement on the ground that the $1.25 daily portal-to-portal portion of the pay increase was a hidden inflationary wage increase.

By September 24, 369 mines had been given back by Ickes.

On September 23 the United Mine Workers and the Illinois operators submitted a new contract to the War Labor Board calling for a total increase on a 5-day week of about $2 a day.

By October 12 Ickes had given back all the mines and men were striking again in accordance with the terms of the truce in protest to the vacating of Government authority.

On October 26 the War Labor Board cut the Illinois wage agreement 37½ cents a day.

On October 28 the War Labor Board countered the $2 a day demanded by the anthracite miners with 32 cents, which they said was proper under the Little Steel formula.

On October 29 the President promised decisive action if the 90,000 miners by then on strike were not back in the mines by the 1st of November.

On the 1st of November 530,000 miners refused to work without a contract.

Once more Ickes had all the mines.

This time Ickes suddenly had the authority after all to sign a contract with the miners, and by November 3 they were back at work on the basis of a contract giving them a raise of about $1.50 per day.

And on November 10 came the surprising announcement through Chairman William H. Davis that the War Labor Board would support the Little Steel formula steadfastly. Nevertheless, they approved on November 20 the new contract with a cut of only 30½ cents a week. The price of coal had to be raised. And on December 17 Lewis signed a contract with two-thirds of the industry calling for $40 in retroactive travel time which had once been ruled inflationary, and other terms approximating the agreement with Ickes.

On January 11, as though the confusion was not already great enough, Secretary Ickes announced that the year 1943 was the highest year in the history of coal production, and that he had given back 465 mines to their owners.

Since that time, the coal mines seem to have left the news pages. I do not know where Ickes put the mines. The last I heard the operators had the 465 back, and that the three-thousand-odd others were still operating by long-distance telephone from the Interior Building. If that is the case, it means that this expensive dispute which began more than a year ago and concerns as vital an industry as any still remains unsettled.

The United Mine Workers and the carriers dealt with each other, the President's personal representative, the Department of Labor, the War Labor Board, the President, the Secretary of the Interior, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and I don't know what others.

If you can find, in that welter of confusion, the earmarks of anything which could rightfully be called a labor policy, your imagination is better than mine. You cannot find the points of disagreement, you cannot fix responsibility, you cannot place blame or commendation, you cannot even fully understand the issues at stake. You cannot tell which bureau or agency was supposed to act, as the chase went from one office to another, nor who had the authority to act. Sometimes, apparently, a bureau has authority—sometimes it does not. Sometimes a raise is inflationary—later the same raise to the same group under a different name or secured through different agency is not inflationary. Is it any wonder that Americans at home and abroad are confused and angry, even if they do not know at whom?

I have gone into something of the history of these two disputes for a very good reason. There is, as most observers are aware, a current attempt on the part of the President to deftly drag an eloquent herring across the trail and to shift the responsibility for this limping, crippled, crabwise approach to America's No. 1 problem onto the long suffering shoulders of Congress. The President would like to square himself as President with the men in arms who have given him such unflinching and courageous support as their Commander in Chief, by pointing an accusing Executive finger at Congress as the unpatriotic duty shirker. He would be blameless.

That is why, in his well-timed Executive message at the beginning of this third calendar year of war, he asked Congress for a national service act, which he has since made no effort to pass. In fact, to make sure that the people would be adequately confused about the subsequent activities of Congress, he tied the national service act to four other controversial measures on the passage of which, he said, the national service act should also depend for passage.

Now, when the American people, including especially the American fighting men, rise up against him in their righteous wrath, he will bend a direct accusing finger to the Halls of Congress and say, with his usual matchless eloquence, "I tried, but those fellows over there would not pass a national service act."

This story of unsurpassed inadequacy is not advanced for partisan reasons. I do it in the interest of focusing attention on America's No. 1 domestic wartime problem, and in order to propose a method and a man to solve it, I bring our President into the discussion to fix the full responsibility upon his administration, as it belongs, and to charge him with the somber responsibility of solving it as his public trust. I suggest to him a proved, practical, solution.

In the State of Minnesota, at one time, there was an extremely bad labor-management-Government situation. It surpassed, in its bitterness, the intensity of the current situation in the Nation. Violent strikes and riots were the accepted methods of bargaining. Labor organizing was synonymous with force. Businessmen, like the Arab, were folding up their battered tents and silently stealing away from the State to more peaceful realms.

Disorder and ill feeling mounted during the thirties. Some of you may remember the bloody milk strikes of 1930, '31, and '32. In a truckers' strike in Minneapolis in 1934, two citizen deputies were killed in a riot. A couple of months later, 2 picketers were killed and 50 wounded when police fired into a crowd of picketers. Howard Guilford, editor of a Minneapolis weekly which had criticized the State administration and the labor racketeers, was assassinated. In 1935 the police and the pickets fought again, this time killing 2 and wounding 30 more. Another editor, Walter Liggett, was assassinated.

In 1937 a mob invaded the halls of the capitol itself and took overnight possession of the legislative chambers.

This was the situation when Harold E. Stassen began his first term as Governor in January of 1939. Feeling of class against class had reached an all-time high. A conservative legislature, aroused by this lawlessness and violence, was ready to wipe out many of the recognized rights of organized labor completely. The radical wing of labor leadership wanted no controls. In between was the sound middle ground, which Harold Stassen pursued, with remarkable insight and unswerving patience, perseverance, and the Governor worked untiringly, with legislative leaders, to compromise the conflicting views and to bring about enactment of a fair and workable labor peace law.

The law itself, as it was finally written, marked a new step forward in labor relations in America. It provided complete and adequate machinery for the peaceful settlement of labor disputes without denying the basic rights of either capital or labor.

The underlying principle of the Minnesota Labor Relations Act is negotiation before the strike occurs. It provides that the employer must give 10 days' notice before he can lock out; that the union give 10 days' notice before it may strike. Negotiation takes place in the quiet atmosphere of the labor conciliator's office while no wages, profits, or production are lost. If no agreement is reached, the strike or lock-out may then be exercised, unless the subject of the dispute is deemed to be in the public interest, in which case the Governor may invoke another 30-day waiting period while a commission of three, appointed by the Governor, attempts once again to settle the dispute.

Additions have been made to the law since then; one, a union democracy act, insuring the rights of democratic procedure within unions to the rank and file members, including an annual financial statement. Another prohibits the secondary boycott.

Harold E. Stassen, while Governor, appointed three labor conciliators to administer the law. They were Lloyd J. Haney, president of the St. Paul Typographical Union; Alfred P. Blair, member of and business agent for the brewery workers of Duluth; and James L. Kelley, first vice president of the International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers.

The law has been tremendously successful. During the first 2 years of its operation strikes were cut by two-thirds over the previous 2-year average and man-days lost by more than 80 percent, while the national strike total was increasing.

During the first 4 years and 2 months of its administration a total of 2,492 out of 2,612 disputes were settled peaceably. These threatened strikes involved almost 200,000 workers.

Today, with 1½ percent of the Nation's wage earners, Minnesota has less than one-half of 1 percent of the Nation's strikes, or less than a third of the national average.

While the Nation in 1942, according to the N. W. L. B., had to suffer through 1,363 strikes in war industries, which cost the Nation's war plants more than 2,000,000 man-days, there was not a single stoppage of any consequence in any

Minnesota war plant due to labor difficulties. In fact, since Pearl Harbor to date there has been no stoppage of any consequence in any of Minnesota's many war plants due to labor troubles. And in the vital iron mines of Minnesota's high range, producing about 70 percent of all the iron ore for our mighty American war machine, there has not been a single moment lost due to labor difficulties since war began. Last year, while the Nation once more had to patiently bear a total of 3,750 strikes that cost our war effort more than 13,000,000 mandays, Minnesota had 10 strikes, according to the best estimate now available.

It seems that the lesson is plain. What we need to put an end to the ineffectiveness of the administration's so-called labor policy is a plan, and a man.

That there is a plan available has been demonstrated in Minnesota. It seems strange that the President, in his many requests to the Nation and to the Congress for unity, has never thought of presenting to Congress a plan for getting unity of Government, labor, and capital.

If the President is sincere in his desire to prevent strikes and achieve unity, he will recognize what must be done and act immediately. The situation has already furnished enough grist for the mills of Axis propaganda; it has already sufficiently impeded the war effort; it has already stirred enough justifiable resentment among the fighting men, the responsible elements of labor, the rank and file of patriotic Americans, the Congress.

In fact, in a statement attributed to General Marshall and never repudiated, it was said that the threatened railroad and steel strikes delayed victory 6 months and might cost the Nation hundreds of thousands of lives.

I call upon the President to present to the Congress and to the people a sound, over-all plan for settling labor disputes patterned after the Minnesota labor peace law, and clearly defining the authority and responsibility. Such a plan should recognize the rights of both labor and capital, but it will also define their responsibilities. It will place the final responsibility for the settlement of all labor disputes in the hands of one single, definite agency, so that the responsibility may be fixed and the pressure of public opinion directed at the proper point to arrive at settlements in labor disputes. It will provide for a waiting period for all disputes, a strike vote, and a written notice of intent to strike, a certain period before a strike takes place. It will further provide for a further waiting period to be invoked by the Executive if the threatened strike is in an industry found to be in the national public interest. This period is needed in order to give time to arrive at the facts and let the American people know what are the issues and what is at stake. Then public opinion can exert its tremendous force. Such a program will cease to emphasize the differences between labor and capital, between labor and government, between capital and government, and will lay emphasis on the common interests of labor, government, and capital, and the united national interest of winning this war by the fastest possible means. It will provide orderly means for enforcement and appeal through the established courts of the Nation.

That is the plan.

The President, secondly, if he sincerely desires to end labor strikes, disputes, and stoppages, will appoint to a position which I shall call director of labor relations some man who has proven his ability to deal fearlessly, fairly, and impartially with labor and management. Such a man must have the confidence of labor as well as of industry. This man should have full authority and full responsibility for the settlement of labor disputes.

I can assure you that if Harold Stassen is elected President that he will follow such a course.

Stassen, as Governor, won the mutual respect and confidence of both labor and capital.

He has clearly demonstrated on a State-wide scale in a State with many large, wide, and variegated industries, from mining to flour milling, automobile assembly to corn canning, that he has the ability and respect to solve the problem of labor relations.

His record as Governor proves that he understands sound governmental administration, the delegation of authority, the fixing of responsibility to make a program of labor relations work. He has proven his ability to work harmoniously with a legislature, and that is a crying need right now.

Stassen believes in the future of American labor. He said, in a speech to the American Federation of Labor convention in 1941:

> My personal family circle has within it brothers holding A. F. of L. cards. My official family circle has within it, in important administrative positions, many members of the A. F. of L. I believe fundamentally in the union organization of workmen.

And again, in an article for the Saturday Evening Post, he said:

> Strong labor organizations are here to stay and it is a good thing they are * * * (Government) should seek to improve their functions in the broadest social sense, and it should act firmly but justly to curb any abuses. * * * Stoppages of work should occur only through the free ballot of the members. Jurisdictional strikes should not be permitted. * * * The officers of unions should be elected at reasonable intervals by the free ballot of the members. Decisions on dues, on initiation fees, and special assessments likewise ought to require the free ballot of the members. Members are entitled to receive, at least once a year, financial statements showing the major operations of their union.

He believes in the future of American capital. He has said:

> The New Deal climate, in its antagonism to the American productive system, cannot be repealed toon soon. * * * It is an instructive contrast to read the record of American industry and labor * * * in the production of the materials of war, and compare it with the record of the Government in such matters as rationing, manpower, price control, and food distribution. Any doubt as to the basic soundness of our free-production system and any lurking belief that the Government, if it took over, might make a better job of it, should be, once and for all, dispelled by the way in which the latter has bungled while the former delivered the goods.

He has clearly demonstrated by his record in Minnesota that Government can bring labor and capital together, instead of constantly emphasizing their differences.

The Republican Party can shorten the war by nominating and electing a President who has proven he can realistically meet these problems and, with the cooperation of the Congress, work out solutions. Harold Stassen is such a man.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

WHY WE SHOULD CHANGE HORSES NOW

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, this is the third of a series of speeches I have prepared and presented to the House in which the fallacies and mistakes of the New Deal administration have been pointed out. The first, given on May 13, 1943, was entitled "The Womb-to-Tomb Security Illusion." In that speech I analyzed the report of the National Resources Planning Board and pointed out the decided socialistic trend of the New Deal. That speech was carefully documented to show the socialistic philosophy of the leading New Dealers. I concluded it by saying that in view of the socialistic philosophy contained in the Delano report and the socialistic philosophy that permeates the New Deal as shown by the statements of its leaders, the main issue in the 1944 campaign should be, "Get rid of the crackpots, Communists, and Communist sympathizers in Government service, and defeat at the polls all elected officials responsible for their appointment."

On September 30, 1943, I gave in the House the second speech of the series. That speech was entitled "The State of the Nation From a Congressional Viewpoint." In that speech I reviewed the last decade which I designated as the "rubber stamp" era, listed the chief accomplishments of the new Congress elected in 1942, and called attention to the two schools of thought existing today in Washington concerning the post-war future. I concluded my second speech by saying, "We need men, not mice, in Congress."

Today I offer the third and final speech of the series. I have chosen as a title "Why We Should Change Horses Now."

Mr. Chairman, in 1932, in the midst of world chaos and threatened world bankruptcy, Mr. Roosevelt came forth as a candidate for the Presidency. He spoke with what sounded like high courage, great conviction, and unbounded optimism. He said:

> Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits.

Again he said:

> If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good. If, in some crises, it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

Those were sound words, courageous words, convincing words. President Roosevelt was elected the first time upon the basis of those statements. A bewildered Nation turned to him as the apostle of hope, of courage, of sanity. But alas! Shortly after he took office, Lord Keynes, financial adviser to the British Government, persuaded President Roosevelt to discard the economy program he initiated when he took office for a "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect" program. From then on we have been sinking deeper and deeper into debt, until today national bankruptcy seems to be just around the corner.

It is the sad record of this Nation that since 1934 under Mr. Roosevelt's administration the national debt has risen every year; the Budget has gotten further out of balance every year—before we went into the war as well as since—and Mr. Roosevelt and his economic magicians and crystal gazers finally, as a measure of self-excuse—and a poor self-excuse it is—invented the plea that debt was meaningless because "we owe it to ourselves." I say to you that we owe it to ourselves not to be fooled again into any gamble, led by a group seeking to dominate world-power politics, by repeating the delusions, the economic absurdities, and the international nonsense which followed the First World War.

Today we are hearing the same fallacies which Garet Garrett so ably analyzed and exposed in his book A Bubble that Broke the World, published in 1932, resurrected as a new economic discovery in order to lure us into undertaking to underwrite once more the living levels, the wage levels, the educational systems, the governmental policies, and, in fact, the governmental plans of all the other nations of the world.

There are 2,000,000,000 people in the world. More than half of them fall within the category of the ill-fed, the ill-clad, the ill-housed. In spite of the billions of dollars that were spent by the New Deal administration upon its political W. P. A., unemployment persisted and the public debt rose to an all-time high even before we entered the war. That debt is still going up, and if we permit the proponents of U. N. R. R. A.—a proposed world-wide W. P. A.—to have their way, our present astronomical debt will continue to rise faster and go higher than even the incomprehensible figures which now describe that debt. It is pertinent at this point to remind ourselves that while the debt may be owed by the Government within the Nation, the goods and services which comprise that debt will be flowing out to other countries and we will be depleting our natural resources, exporting our energy and our labor, never to get them back again.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention at this point to the fact that during the New Deal "rubber stamp" era there grew up in Washington an arrogant, insolent, wasteful, and cunning bureaucracy, which began with clever design to extend its tentacles into every State and county in the Union. Headed by Felix Frankfurter, Tommy Corcoran, Ben Cohen, Leon Henderson, Jerome Frank, Mordecai Ezekiel, Judge Rosenman, and others, this bureaucracy sought to entrench itself as it became swollen and arrogant with power. Finally, as the years went on, and the President lost his chance to pack the Supreme Court by law, but gained the same power by mutations of time and human frailties, the bureaucrats believed the time had come to do a job of thoroughly discrediting the legislative branch of the Government in the minds of the people.

To the end of thus discrediting the people's special instrument of control over their Government, the propaganda campaign carried on by this group assumed the most extensive and vicious proportions of any attack ever made against the legislative branch. Members of Congress who had the courage to stand for the right, and to battle for the preservation of our American constitutional form of government, and our free-enterprise system of economy, were openly threatened with political assassination and with the smearing of their personal characters.

During this period the administration's political W. P. A. and kindred organizations were set up and used for the bold, plain, and insolent purposes of political prostitution. A Senate investigating committee found that under the directorship of Harry Hopkins, the manager in chief of that stenchful Democratic Convention in Chicago that nominated Mr. Roosevelt for a third term, Government relief under W. P. A. had been distorted into the most powerful political instrument of partisan advantage ever devised in the United States of America. In Kentucky, Indiana, and other States, this Senate committee found that intimidation, bribery, and wanton violation of the Corrupt Practices Act not only were countenanced by Harry Hopkins as the Director of W. P. A., but were encouraged by him. When the stench became so offensive to the Nation that even the New Deal managers, accustomed to rottenness as they were, dared not try to continue it longer, Harry Hopkins was promoted to the Cabinet by the way of the secretaryship of Commerce in order to get him out of the line of fire. He finally had to be withdrawn from that position under the plea of illness, and was boosted to a super-Cabinet job ladling out lend-lease billions which must be provided by the overburdened taxpayers of the United States of America.

Meanwhile, these efforts to discredit the Congress as the people's instrument of control over their Government had so aroused the people that in 1938 they elected 6 additional Republican Senators, and 80 additional Republican Members of the House. Realizing the utter danger to which our American constitutional system had been exposed, and frightened by the heavy infiltration into the Government bureaus of Communists whose purposes were to overthrow our American system of government, the American people again in 1942 increased the Republican contingent in the Senate by 9 more, and the contingent in the House by 44—and the "rubber stamp" era or the "regimented thirties," ended.

These efforts by Mr. Roosevelt and his "palace guard" to discredit the Congress as an institution and, in that way, to weaken and finally to destroy the remaining checks and balances provided by the Constitution over the acts of the executive department, reached a new high, or a new low, as one might choose to put it, in a series of insulting messages recently sent by the Chief Executive to the Congress. In his message concerning the deliberations of the Senate and the House on the soldiers' ballot, Mr. Roosevelt did the unprecedented and unethical thing in attempting to interfere directly in the deliberations of the Congress on pending legislation. He branded the measure passed by the Congress as a fraud on both the soldiers and the American people. In that statement he directly attacked the integrity of every Member of the Congress as well as the integrity of the legislative branch of the Government as a whole.

He repeated these insults in an even more aggravated form in his message vetoing the tax bill. Not satisfied with vetoing the revenue measure, which he had a technical right to do, although he violated another precedent to do it, Mr. Roosevelt ignored the advice of his own Senate leader by indulging in not one but several gratuitous jibes and insults at the Congress. So brazen, so insolent, so uncalled for were these insults that they caused even Mr. Roosevelt's faithful flag-bearer to revolt, and, in protest against this action by the Chief Executive, to resign his leadership in the Senate. He was immediately and unanimously reelected to majority leadership in that body in an action which showed that party lines had been eradicated by this Executive assault on the legislative branch of the Government. Indeed, one distinguished Senator summed up the Chief Executive's unparalleled and inexcusable attitude by saying that he was running on a fourth-term anti-Congress platform.

This historic and tragic episode, while we are engaged in the most desperate war in the history of this Nation, and in the history of the world, was the culmination of a long campaign of vilification of the legislative branch indulged in by the President, by his spokesmen, and by New Deal columnists, all with the approval of the Chief Executive.

Mr. Chairman, had it not been for the advent of the war the New Deal administration would have been exposed by now as having failed to solve a single domestic problem, as having failed to keep a single major political promise, and as having permitted, if not aided and abetted, Communist leaders to infiltrate into every department of Government, Communists whose sole purpose is to overthrow our free enterprise system and change our form of government, by persuasion, if possible; by cunning and subterfuge, if possible; by revolution and riot, if necessary. If anybody believes for a moment that patriotism has replaced treachery in the hearts and minds of these Communists during the past 2 years, that individual is grievously mistaken. Communists were picketing the

White House and Communists were sabotaging our production of planes and other machines and matériel of defense up to the very hour Adolf Hitler turned on his partner Joe Stalin and set the Germans at the throats of the Russians. There can be no question in the mind of any clear-thinking person that if Joe Stalin made peace with Germany tomorrow these same American Communists, as slimy and as treacherous as ever, would immediately resume sabotaging our production of war machines and matériel, would foment strikes and walkouts, and, if they dared, would again picket the White House against America's further participation in the war. Now, these are all facts, as I have good reason to know. They are facts sustained completely and absolutely by the latest expressions of Earl Browder, the convict, who was pardoned for his crimes by the President as a political sop to Communists "in the interest of national unity."

Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Roosevelt was a candidate for the Presidency the first time he made declarations which were in accord with the very essence of the Constitution and the finest traditions of our American political, economic, and social way of life. He said in a radio address on March 2, 1930:

> In the matter of a great number of * * * vital problems of government, such as the conduct of public utilities, of banks, of insurance, of business, of agriculture, of education, of social welfare, and of a dozen other important features * * * Washington must not be encouraged to interfere.

Again, in an address before the conference of Governors at New London, Conn., on July 16, 1929, Mr. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York, declared:

> But there is a tendency, and to my mind a dangerous tendency, on the part of our National Government to encroach, on one excuse or another, more and more upon State supremacy. The elastic theory of interstate commerce, for instance, has been stretched almost to the breaking point to cover certain regulatory powers desired by Washington.

Again, in his radio address of March 2, 1930, Mr. Roosevelt declared:

> It was clear to the framers of our Constitution that the greatest possible liberty of self-government must be given to each State, and that any national administration attempting to make all laws for the whole Nation * * * would inevitably result at some future time in a dissolution of the Union itself. * * * Now, to bring about government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy, it is fundamentally essential that practically all authority and control be centralized in our National Government. The individual sovereignty * * * must first be destroyed. * * * We are safe from the danger of any such departure from the principles on which this country was founded just so long as the individual home rule of the States is scrupulously preserved and fought for whenever it seems to be in danger.

Those were strong words, brave words, timely words from the lips of Candidate Roosevelt. Need I tell you, however, that from the first day of its advent up to the beginning of the present World War the New Deal administration has repeatedly violated every one of these declarations.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this review of Mr. Roosevelt's profound declarations before he became President, his cynical breaking of all those declarations, and his more cynical discarding of all the profound truths which he previously had uttered is to show that his administration never meant to do anything more than to give lip service to these profound convictions and traditions of the American people; and that, behind the scenes, a swollen, powerful, insolent, arrogant, cunning bureaucracy left no move unmade and no stone unturned to violate every precept Mr. Roosevelt had laid down in his first candidacy for the Presidency. The Good Book says: "By their fruits ye shall know them." Today we are looking at the fruits of the New Deal administration.

We have heard much lately from those prominent in the administration of what they allege is complacency on the part of the people. My own opinion is that a great part of this so-called complacency is hesitancy and bewilderment on the part of the people because of evasive and misleading statements by officials high in the Government; because of broken promises cynically violated over the past 10 years; because of a veritable maelstrom of contradictions, cross purposes, overlapping functions, jealousies, interdepartmental and interbureau feuds, conflicting orders and policies, the injection of partisan politics into the war operations, and, finally, the utter failure of Mr. Roosevelt to remedy these conditions although they have been called to his attention time and again, over and over again, by many different, responsible persons.

Mr. Chairman, let us now look into another phase of Mr. Roosevelt's past performances and compare them with his present promises. They have to do with our armed forces and the administration's attitude toward veterans. In a broadcast which was conveyed by short wave to all the United States troops everywhere in the world, Mr. Roosevelt promised all sorts of glowing things to the veterans when they return from the war this time. Muster-out pay, pensions, hospitalization for the disabled, rehabilitation, and so on.

In the light of these glowing promises made to the veterans by short wave, it is well to look back to the time when Mr. Roosevelt came into office on a platform guaranteeing that he would reduce the cost of government 25 percent. In those early days the veterans of the First World War and of the Spanish-American War became the victims of Mr. Roosevelt's vitriolic tongue and pen. As a part of his economy program he proposed to close veterans' hospitals by the score, and to throw thousands upon thousands of disabled veterans into the streets, as well as to prevent pensions for veterans. Previously, upon his election, he had offered Senator Bronson Cutting, of New Mexico, a place in his Cabinet, which Senator Cutting declined. The President later broke both his personal and political friendship with Senator Cutting because the latter stood on the floor with other Senators and pleaded with President Roosevelt not to take the harsh measures he contemplated against the veterans. The President went ahead and took those measures. He threw those veterans out of the hospitals. The veterans were told that they were not entitled to any more consideration than any other citizens, and that "your service should be your badge of honor."

Who was the Senate leader for this Presidential legislation to deprive these injured veterans of hospitalization back in those days? It was Senator Jimmy Byrnes, of South Carolina, who is now the President's super-over-all-war administrator. It was these gentlemen who picked out the veterans who had fought for their country and who had bled for their country to bear the brunt of that economy promise while political henchmen such as Rex Tugwell, Harry Hopkins, Tommy Corcoran, and Ben Cohen, came in to draw fat salaries and to hand out multiplied millions.

Now, if you wish to argue that the President may have changed his mind toward the veterans in these past 10 years, I answer that by quoting the words of a wise man, "We can judge a man's character not by his promises for the future, but by his performances in the past."

The record of the procedure in both Houses of the Congress will disclose that it was the Congress in every case who defended the rights, the hospitalization, the rehabilitation, the vocational training, and the pensions for the veterans, even going so far as to override the Presidential veto on several occasions in order to do so.

It is, of course, grotesque, and incredibly insolent, for any individual, the Chief Executive or anybody else, to try to assert that he is going to provide the returning soldiers and sailors with mustering-out pay, hospitalization, rehabilitation, vocational training, or any other benefits. It will be the American people, a grateful American people, acting through their Congress, who will provide these benefits for the returning soldiers and sailors, and who will pay the bills.

Mr. Chairman, we are going to hear much as the campaign of 1944 comes on about it not being wise to trade horses in the middle of the stream or to change commanders in the middle of the war. Now, what are the facts? The facts are these. Any President is, by virtue of his office, Commander in Chief of the armed forces. His function and duty under the Constitution as Commander in Chief is simply to approve the plans and the strategy devised for the defense of the Nation and the prosecution of war by the professional soldiers and sailors of the armed forces. These trained planners and strategists are educated at great expense to the taxpayers at West Point and Annapolis. They are throughout their entire military careers constantly studying strategy, planning how to meet assault from any quarter of the globe, and their plans have to carry on year after year regardless of any political changes, regardless of any shifting of occupants in the White House, regardless of any political considerations. Unless he were a trained general or a trained admiral, the Chief Executive, acting as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, would render his Nation a great disserv-

ice, and probably would involve his country in disaster after disaster if he attempted to override or overrule the plans and strategies devised by these trained defenders in the Army and the Navy, the marines, and the Air Force.

It is, therefore, absurd for anybody to argue that we cannot change Commanders in Chief in the middle of a war. If Mr. Roosevelt, or any other man, were so indispensable as President and Commander in Chief that disaster and defeat would overtake this Nation if he were defeated, the American people could consider themselves in a desperately dangerous situation. The fact of the matter is that if Mr. Roosevelt ceased to function tomorrow the plans for the war would go right on; the strategists would continue to function; the soldiers and sailors and the women as well would continue under the same guidance to battle on the fighting lines, while the home forces would continue under the same guidance in field, in shipyard, in mill and factory to produce the machines and matériel of war. The claim that it would be dangerous for America to change Commanders in Chief in the middle of the war is just as empty, is just as plainly partisan political tommyrot as it is to claim that any one man out of 132,000,000 people is so indispensable in the chair of the Chief Executive that the Nation would falter in its course and fail as a democracy if he were displaced by a vote of the people or if he were removed by an inscrutable providence.

The American people have made it plain that they want their Congress to be an independent instrument of the people's will in government. They have also demonstrated that they do not want one-man government. They have demonstrated they do not intend to surrender the control of their affairs permanently to a political bureaucracy. They have demonstrated that they mean to maintain and to perpetuate our American free constitutional governmental, economic, and social system.

The American people do not believe, and they will not be convinced, that they have lost either the right or the capacity for self-government. They do not believe, and they will not be convinced, that their sons and daughters, their brothers and sisters should fight and die on the battle lines for freedom and Americanism while at home men lusting for world power defeat the very objectives for which our armed forces are offering themselves upon the altar of their country.

We have gone a long way in 10 years toward dictatorship and away from democracy in America. The American people have seen the danger signs. They have turned back. Their faces are set in the direction of free government, free enterprise, and free society for the future in America; and Heaven help the man or the men who incur their righteous wrath by trying to change our American system into some imitation of a foreign dictatorship, either communistic or fascistic.

It is obvious to all of us that only a free, sound, solvent United States of America can help the rest of the world regain sanity, peace, progress, and prosperity. The New Deal bubble has burst. The horse that has kept us in the middle of the stream for nearly 12 years; that has carried us farther and farther downstream toward bankruptcy, regimentation, and despair; that has willfully created one national emergency after another, is not the horse that we want to ride any longer. We have lost confidence in its ability to carry us safely across the stream. Twelve years is a long, long time to be kept in the middle of the stream, riding the same horse. If we ever expect to get across to terra firma, we had better change horses now, before it is too late.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was very much interested in one observation the gentleman made which had to do with the expression we often hear "We owe it to ourselves," referring to the national debt. I do not believe in that philosophy, that we need not be concerned about the debt just because we owe it to ourselves. I think that is just as dangerous as most any other kind of debt. Last evening Chester Bowles, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, delivered an address in which he laid down in general that since the inception of O. P. A. and the price-control program there has been saved to the American people on the goods they have purchased as individuals $22,000,000,000, and that there has been saved on the goods purchased by the Government, which would interest the citizens as taxpayers generally, according to Mr. Bowles, $69,000,000,000.

Mr. MASON. I recall those statistical mirages.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Or a total of $89,000,000,000, which is roughly about $675 per capita on the basis of a 135,000,000 population. He also portrayed the picture as this saving having cost the taxpayer only $1.14 per capita per annum. Those are pretty high returns—$3.42 as against $675. If it makes no difference about the debt simply because we owe it to ourselves, what difference does it make whether we save $89,000,000,000 or $69,000,000,000 or what not? If owing a debt to yourself is all right why boast about saving money for taxpayers?

Mr. MASON. My answer to that, of course, is that on the one hand one of the New Deal spokesmen comes out and says it makes no difference because we owe the debt to ourselves, but on the other hand another New Dealer comes out and says: "We have saved you $89,000,000,000 through a statistical mirage."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, this country is faced with a tremendous new responsibility—that of providing suitable jobs in private industry for its discharged service men and women. As increasing numbers of veterans of the present war are mustered out of the various branches of the service this responsibility is going to grow. Just what is being done about it?

We have provided for separation pay, or mustering-out pay, for our returning soldiers and sailors, but this is only the first step in a program designed to reabsorb them as rapidly as possible into civilian life. The comparatively small sum of money they will receive is not going to last long under present circumstances. Something more than just money is needed.

When Congress passed the Selective Service Act it wrote into the law a provision that permits honorably discharged servicemen to return to jobs held prior to induction. Congress has provided generous benefits for the dependents of service personnel who die in defense of their country and it has instituted programs for the rehabilitation and vocational training of injured veterans. Still that is not enough.

Proper reintegration into civilian life cannot be accomplished with simply a physical examination, a mustering-out pay check and a ticket home. The fact that a man's pre-war job is still waiting for him is not the answer either. Specialized training in any one of the numerous branches of the service may have fitted him for a far better paying job or a more responsible position than he held when he was inducted.

How then, is the individual going to be properly classified when he is ready to return to civilian life and who is going to classify him? When the Selective Service System sent its questionnaire to all registrants in the United States it obtained a wealth of information regarding the special talents and qualifications of every male citizen between the ages of 18 and 65. This was of inestimable value in assisting to place each person in his proper niche in our vast military organization.

Would it not be a good idea to use this same method of determining the individual's specialized training when he returns to civilian employment? Why not use the questionnaire in reverse, plus carefully planned interviews and counsel before the veteran is discharged? We do not want to put a man back on the job in a service station if he is an accomplished radio technician. Nor do we want to help him return to his old position as an elevator operator when he has developed into a first-class aviation machinist.

What particular agency of the Government is going to be able to best judge the veteran's ability when he is ready to be discharged? The United States Employment Service? The War Manpower Commission? The Selective Service System? Of course not. The only branch of the Government that will be properly qualified to classify the individual's proficiency is the division of the armed forces in which he has served.

Fortunately, this problem has not been entirely overlooked, but it needs to be expanded and perfected. I have here a brief summary of the excellent work being done along these lines by the Army

Air Forces redistribution centers, from which I would like to quote:

Working in close cooperation with the above program are the Army Air Forces redistribution centers, with headquarters at Atlantic City, N. J. They are now established in three strategic areas in the continental United States. The purpose of these centers is to examine, reevaluate, and reassign personnel returned from overseas. The redistribution work is directed by the Office of the Assistant Chief of Air Staff, Personnel.

Vocational guidance-personnel officers work with wounded men in the convalescent centers who are to be reassigned in the service or discharged to civilian life because of physical disabilities. The soldier is given personal counsel and aided in finding the type of work for which he is best suited in the light of his desires, training, and disability.

Under the direction of vacational-guidance counselors a broad program of integrational vocational training is carried on in the convalescent centers to enable the wounded to start on their vocational retraining even while they are patients in the hospital. This program is coordinated with and records made available to the Veterans' Administration, War Manpower Commission, Reemployment Division of the Selective Service, and the United States Employment Service.

The purpose of the Army Air Forces program in convalescent and redistribution centers is to return all possible Air Forces personnel to a proper duty assignment; but if this is impossible or impracticable for medical reasons, to aid the discharged soldier in establishing himself in a self-supporting, self-respecting place in civilian life.

The above summary, of course, refers principally to the work that is being done in connection with those who are physically disabled. The time is not far distant, we hope, when the same thing will have to be done for men who are physically sound. With eleven or twelve million men in the service this presents a real challenge to the Army and Navy, to the Government, and to private industry.

Let us take a look at what one private industrial organization is doing in this regard. Not long ago I had the pleasure of discussing with a representative of the Douglas Aircraft Corporation the very excellent system of employee placement that this huge company has worked out. The Douglas Corporation has devised a plan for interviewing, classifying, and placing discharged servicemen which might well serve as a model not only to other industrial organizations but to the various branches of the armed services as well.

The young man to whom I talked, Mr. Clare Harp, of the employee-placement division of the Douglas Aircraft Corporation, has helped to evolve a plan that is working, and working well. He proposes that the various units of the Army and Navy adopt a system which is outlined somewhat as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL SERVICE BUREAU

First. The purpose: To act as a military job-procurement bureau for servicemen, prior to their discharge—medically or otherwise—now and in the postwar period, thus assisting the men in service to find the right niche in civilian life.

This could be brought about through interviews and counsel by men who have served in the armed forces and who understand the problems of the man who has become accustomed to military life.

Forms or questionnaires, similar to those now used by procurement officers, could be properly set up and employed by a forms and procedure department. These forms would, when filled out, contain a complete outline of past experience, including the service record, as well as trades learned while in the service, in order to ascertain the physical, mental, and general adaptability of the applicant for jobs listed with the United States Employment Service or other employment agencies.

The above-outlined plan would be of inestimable value to industry as a whole. It would furnish properly qualified, willing, and efficient personnel and would eliminate the necessity for extensive personnel departments.

Second. The procedure.

Each branch of the service could appoint a qualified personnel man, of the proper rank, in each service-command area, to instruct and direct present enlistment and procurement officers in the interviewing and classifying of servicemen about to be discharged.

Contacts could be made with industry—defense plants, petroleum, transportation, and so forth—to determine what kind of jobs are available, what type of men are wanted, and so forth. It should also be emphasized that industry can benefit by cooperating to the fullest degree.

Comprehensive publicity should accompany any such program so that the general public will become acquainted with what is being done now for medically discharged servicemen and what is planned for the future when general demobilization gets under way.

Third. The results.

The results are obvious. There will be a material increase in morale. Men who are already in the service will know that they will not be forgotten after the war is won. Those who are now enlisting will be comforted by the fact that every possible effort will be made to place them properly when they return. Also, industry is provided with correctly classified personnel now and after the war is over.

It seems to me that a plan such as the one I have outlined, or one of a similar type, should be placed in operation at an early date. H. R. 4057 provides for establishing a veterans' employment service under the direction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Working in close cooperation with the proposed military personnel service bureau the veterans' employment service can render valuable assistance to discharged men and women in placing them properly in civilian life.

Mr. Chairman, I have talked to a great many of the men and some of the women who are serving in various branches of our armed forces about their desires and plans for the future, when peace comes. Almost without exception they express themselves as being primarily interested in a job in private industry and the security that goes with such a job. To assist them in finding their proper position in our vast system of industrial enterprise is the least a grateful country can do.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

ANSWERING THE GENTLEMAN FROM ILLINOIS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois made a very interesting political argument. I shall not attempt to answer everything he said but I should like to discuss a few points he brought to your attention. One of the last statements he made was to the effect that somebody in the Government seemed to think it made no difference how much our national debt was, that we owed it to ourselves. I do not know of any person in the Government who holds to that theory or philosophy. If the gentleman can give me a direct quotation from a person in a responsible position in which that was said I shall be glad indeed to yield to him.

Mr. MASON. That was a direct quote from the President himself in one of his messages to the Nation.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman is mistaken all the way through his speech as much as he is mistaken about that, I doubt that we can give a great deal of thought and consideration to what he has said.

I was here when the President delivered a speech in which it was mentioned that the burden of our debt does not fall so heavily upon us when we owe the debt to ourselves. That was a comparison, I presume, with times heretofore when we were borrowing money and paying a high rate of interest to foreign governments or foreign people. There is quite a difference between what the President of the United States said and what the gentleman from Illinois has construed his language to mean. I will ask the gentleman to get that speech and put it in the RECORD in connection with his remarks. He will see he is obviously mistaken in his interpretation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman tell us when we borrowed any money from foreign countries?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I suspect I could find that information. I think it is a matter of general knowledge that back in the early days of our country we borrowed money from abroad but not in recent years.

Mr. TABER. I hope the gentleman will put that in the RECORD.

NO RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATIVE HAS SAID IT MAKES NO DIFFERENCE HOW LARGE OUR NATIONAL DEBT BECOMES

Mr. PATMAN. I think that is a little bit foreign and wholly unrelated to what I am talking about or what the gentleman from Illinois was talking about either, but I insist that the gentleman has not construed the statement of the President of the United States correctly. There is no person in a responsible position in our Government who has said that it makes no difference how large our debt becomes.

I challenge any person who makes that statement to prove it here on the floor of the House. It has not been made to my knowledge and I have been here a long time.

NO DICTATORSHIP

I know there are a lot of people who seem to be greatly afraid that we are going to have a dictatorship in this country. The gentleman from Illinois implied that we were just on the verge of bankruptcy or dictatorship. Fortunately we have a good Constitution. Under that Constitution next January 3 at noon if there has not been an election this year and 435 Members of the House elected to fill these seats, next January 3 at noon there will be no House of Representatives. If there is no House of Representatives, no revenue bills can originate, because under the Constitution revenue bills must originate in the House. There could be no appropriations of money, therefore our Government would cease to exist. When you consider that fact along with the charges you will realize how impossible it is for a dictatorship to happen in this country. We are not going to have it under our present form of government.

NOT FACING NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY UNLESS WE HAVE INFLATION—IN THAT EVENT WE WILL BE FORCED TO HAVE A DICTATORSHIP

I dislike to hear statements made that we are facing national bankruptcy. We are not facing national bankruptcy, not by any means.

It is impossible for a nation to go into bankruptcy. Nations do not go into bankruptcy; they never have and they never will; it is impossible for a nation to become bankrupt; bankruptcy involves a receivership, a trustee, or some person in custody. So we are not concerned with that as long as we have the taxing power of the Government functioning sufficiently that money can be raised to pay off our existing debts. And may I remind the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, since his speech was colored very much in a political way in which he laid stress on the last 12 years, that when the present administration took charge of this Government and when his administration went out of power March 4, 1933, the total national income in the United States of America was only $38,000,000,000 a year, yet last year alone we collected and will collect in taxes $41,000,000,000. Imagine. More money being collected in taxes in 1 year now than the total national income in 1932. There is a big difference in the two and I think that should be taken into consideration.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. GEARHART rose.

TOO MUCH UNNECESSARY DISUNITY

Mr. PATMAN. I will yield in just a moment.

I do not like such statements to be made on the floor of the House continually which would indicate that there is so much disunity among the people of our country, that we are fighting among ourselves, that we are accusing our allies of things that are calculated to cause those allies to distrust us even though they are made possibly to curry favor with the people back home who do not have all the facts. I think we should be very careful about that and especially in view of the fact that we were warned by Hitler himself, old Adolf Schicklgruber himself in person, when he wrote his book, Mein Kampf. He told the people of Germany that he was going to be helped in all these countries he expected to wage war against, especially the democracies; that the people in the democratic countries would get to hating one another, they would get to fighting one another, they would divide up into all kinds of factions, cliques, and clans and would become so selfish and greedy with one another that he would get substantial aid and assistance from that source which would be of great help to him. I think there is a lot being done today here on the floor of the House every day and in the newspapers of the country to corroborate what Hitler said and to convince the German people that Mr. Hitler was right, that he would have an enormous, tremendous, and powerful weapon right in the heart of America when he waged war against America. Then he said, "When I go in and invade I will know who will rise up and take my part; I will know the people I can trust, those who would help destroy their own government and who have by their statements and acts demonstrated they can be trusted in opposition to their own government."

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Then I say to the gentleman that all the words creating disunion are not spoken on the floor of this House but are spoken to the Congress by the President of the United States when he states our work is a fraud—when he says we are legislating for the greedy and not for the needy. I say those things are creating more discord than anything else.

Mr. PATMAN. How could the President say anything else under the circumstances? How could he say anything else?

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish one at a time.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman seriously making that statement?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish my statement, then I will yield to the gentleman.

When the President asked for a tax bill to be passed by this Congress that would be sufficient to liquidate this enormous debt in a reasonable length of time and not have inflation, he asked for $16,000,000,000. Finally, it was reduced to less than that. What did the Congress do last year? It passed a so-called tax bill, although both parties—Democrats and Republicans—have often said that in the event of another war there will be no profit in war; we do not want any millionaires made out of wartime profits. Both parties have said that. Nearly every Member of this House has said it. So instead of sending to the President a bill that would raise ten or fifteen billion dollars, we sent him a tax-remission bill which created the first crop of war millionaires in America during World War No. 2. It gave back to people—some of them war profiteers—$7,500,000,000.

FIRST AND SECOND CROP OF WAR MILLIONAIRES IN WORLD WAR NO. 2

Imagine the discouragement of a Chief Executive who is trying to liquidate the debt in a reasonable time asking for $16,000,000,000 and getting a tax-remission bill of $7,500,000,000. Congress went in the opposite direction and created the first crop of war millionaires in this war. Then, on top of that, when he asked for more money this last year and we passed another bill, instead of it being for $10,500,000,000 that the Treasury asked for, it was supposed to be $2,500,000,000, but after you take the "deducts" out of it you had less than $850,000,000 left. If you will examine that woodpile, you will find a lot of fellows of African descent in it. That bill made World War No. 2 millionaires, which meant the second crop of war millionaires made in World War No. 2. Imagine the disappointment of a Chief Executive of this Nation when he is trying to keep our Government solvent and pay our debts, and pay them in a reasonable length of time, having a Congress that, instead of levying taxes to pay the debt, always passes tax-remission bills and makes millionaires in this war. I consider it a great disappointment myself, and I can see why the President of the United States would be disappointed. I am not apologizing for any language the President used in connection with that message.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman as an honored Member of this body befouling his own nest by sanctioning and approving the language of the President as used in his message to the Congress?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can construe the language any way he wants to. I am not fouling my own nest when I try to keep this country solvent and try to prevent inflation. I have no apologies to make for that. I do not blame the President in his disappointment at a Congress that would do anything like that. I am personally disappointed myself.

CONGRESS INFLATIONARY

This Congress has been going the road toward ruinous and runaway inflation. I am disappointed in the Congress. Of course, every Member has his own individual responsibility. I have mine and each Member of this House has his own. I am not criticizing any Member. Let him do what he wants to. That is a question for him and for his own people, but in my own individual responsibility I am personally greatly disappointed in this Congress not raising the money to pay our huge war debt in order that it might be paid as much as possible as the war goes on and not pass it on to the shoulders of these fighting men on the 55 fighting fronts of the world when they come back here and reassume their positions in civilian life. We should not do

that. We should pay up this debt as we go along just as much as we can, but to that end this Congress has not cooperated.

INFLATION CAN CAUSE LOSS OF WAR

On the other hand, inflation can cause the loss of this war. Inflation is serious. You cannot have two or three hundred billion dollars in money in a country with 135,000,000 people and not have a serious inflation threat unless there are adequate, proper, and substantial inflation controls. This Congress has not cooperated to that end. This Congress has been going in the direction of ruinous inflation and in the direction of destroying those dams that are holding back that reservoir of purchasing power which is calculated to go over the dam at any time and destroy the purchasing power of the people's money.

I am not condemning the action of any individual Member, but I am keenly disappointed in the Congress not doing two things effectively. One is to pay more of the cost of this war as we go along and the other is to erect proper barriers to prevent ruinous and runaway inflation. We have not done that and I can cite proof of it.

I do not care if everyone is against my proposition, I still say as an individual Member of this Congress, on my own individual responsibility, I express disappointment and disapproval of what we as a Congress have done toward stopping inflation and toward not paying more of the cost of this war as we go along. I am convinced of that. That is my opinion.

Let me discuss price stabilization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman explain to the House whether or not he thinks this three-fourths Ruml plan we passed helped inflation?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, that was highly inflationary, very inflationary.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Returning to the statement made earlier in the gentleman's discourse, that this Government could not go bankrupt, I am disturbed about what happened in Germany during the inflationary period. Can the gentleman explain that, in connection with his statement about a government not going bankrupt?

Mr. PATMAN. The money became worthless, just as it could become worthless over here.

Mr. WHITE. The government issued money, then, that was no good? In what shape was the government when that transpired?

Mr. PATMAN. The government had plenty of money to pay its debts. Of course, the money was worthless, but they paid their debts with worthless money.

Mr. WHITE. What can you procure with worthless money?

Mr. PATMAN. That can happen right here in America. We can lose this war if there is worthless money. Any time it comes to the point that people are asked to work in the factories and on the farms for money that is worthless, they are not going to put forth their best efforts and they are not going to deliver the production. Therefore, it is possible for us to make a great contribution toward the losing of this war by permitting inflation to get hold of this country.

Mr. WHITE. How can the gentleman harmonize that statement with the statement he made that a Government could not go bankrupt?

Mr. PATMAN. I still say that Germany printed the money and paid her debts, but the money was worthless. We could do the same thing here. I hope we never do it.

PRESIDENT HOOVER OR PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT ON TREATMENT TOWARD VETERANS

The gentleman from Illinois mentioned the treatment the veterans have been receiving at the hands of Mr. Roosevelt, our President. I remember back in 1932. I could cite several instances where I have not agreed with the administration on veterans' affairs, in a lot of cases. I have voted against the administration on certain veterans bills, as well as other bills. But at one time there were 20,000 veterans assembled here in Washington, D. C. They came here in support of what they considered to be their rights. I happen to be the author of a bill they were favoring. I protested against their coming. I sent wires and letters and gave out statements to the newspapers that it would not be helpful to our cause, it would be hurtful for people to assemble here in Washington in the form of a mass demonstration. Nevertheless, they were desperate. Many of them were hungry. In their desperation they came to Washington in droves, in automobiles, on freight trains, in passenger trains, and every other way. They came here and they went over to Anacostia flats. They took old pieces of boxes, all kinds of scrap lumber, and pasteboard, everything they could rake and scrape together, and they built themselves little homes. They laid out streets and alleys. They had sanitary facilities built with their own hands, and organized their own police force. They built their homes with their own hands, and they occupied quarters as comfortable as they could make them, 20,000 of them. They were not violating any law, they were not disturbing anybody.

If you will look at the record of crime in the District of Columbia then and compare it with times before and subsequent thereto, you will discover that there was less crime in Washington at that time than at any other time, so certainly they were not law violators.

This administration the gentleman has defended, that was going out of power then, the Herbert Hoover administration, sent the Army against those poor, peaceful, helpless fellows. Many of them had their wives and children with them. Not only did they run them down with officers on horseback, and punish them, but they actually killed some of those veterans. They set fire to their homes when they and their wives and children were sleeping peacefully at night. They were forced out of those little homes; they were forced out onto the highways and the byways, and the next morning, on the grass by the side of those highways here in Washington, you could see those poor wives and veterans sleeping, resting on the grass by the side of the road, driven from their Capital City because they took advantage of an opportunity to appeal to their Government to pay them a debt that had been acknowledged by Congress to be an honest debt. That is treatment No. 1. Let me tell you about treatment No. 2. In 1935, when Mr. Roosevelt was President, the veterans came back here, and they assembled just as they had in 1932. Did President Roosevelt drive them out? Did he have any of them killed? Did he punish them and their wives, and drive them out of the city of Washington? No; he provided quarters and eats for them, gave them an assembly place, and provided a big auditorium and a public-address system, and provided public transportation back and forth from their quarters to this public meeting place. They stayed there, and they passed resolutions. They peacefully assembled, and they left Washington and nobody was hurt. There are two examples of how one President treated the veterans of World War No. 1, and how another President, the present Chief Executive, treated the veterans of World War No. 1.

With reference to Mr. Roosevelt, I say that he has been a great leader, and a great President. The people have a right to pass on the Presidency every 4 years. They have already passed on him three times, and they have a right to pass on every Member of this House every 2 years, which is right, and they have a right to pass on every Member of the Senate every 6 years, which is right. So the people of this country are in control. They are our masters, and if they want somebody to be President, let them have that man. I am talking now from a realistic standpoint. If this World War were over today, who could better deal with Mr. Stalin and Mr. Churchill than President Roosevelt? He has been in all those secret conferences, he knows what they have promised to do and what they had said they would not do. He knows what the agreements are. Name me one man in the world who is in a better position to deal for the United States of America, the people of this country, in the conferences leading up to what we hope will be a lasting peace, than Mr. Roosevelt. If you are going to go out here and convince the German people and others that we are fighting among ourselves, that we hate our leader, that he is no good, that we are going to get rid of him, and we are going to give him a vote of no confidence, then, which country do you

think would crack first, Germany or the United States?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. PATMAN. Why, the people in Germany, of course, can read Hitler's Mein Kampf and read what their leader has said how certain things would happen in these democratic countries, and they will say, "Look at what is happening in America; didn't he tell us that the people would break out and cause dissension and trouble, that there would be so much bitterness and antagonism and envy and hatred and greed that they would destroy one another? Look at America." And perhaps they would be able also to look even in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; but could you think of anybody among the German people making statements like that about their leader? And if someone were in a neutral country today and were to read what is happening in America, and what is happening in Germany, which country do you think that person in the neutral country would believe would crack first? Germany? No; because there is no dissension or trouble there, so far as we know; while in America there is plenty of trouble. Read Hitler's book, and read what is happening, and see if there is any corroboration for it. So I humbly suggest, as one who is deeply interested in this country and in this Congress, that we should not make intemperate and loose statements that are calculated to cause dissension and trouble among our own people, and especially should we not make statements, uncorroborated and unsupported, that are calculated to cause dissension and trouble among our allies.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman from Texas appreciates the fact that no one on the floor thinks that he is serious in what he says——

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I only have 5 minutes, and I might yield for a question.

Mr. BUSBEY. The question is this. On that so-called bonus march to which the gentleman refers, the gentleman from Texas surely knows that was organized by the Communist Party of the United States as a part of their program of revolution to overthrow this Government, does he not?

Mr. PATMAN. Although I opposed that, I think that statement is not true.

Mr. BUSBEY. Is my statement correct?

Mr. PATMAN. They were good, law-abiding men. I do not say that one particular group did not so organize. I do not know, but I have no reason to believe the Communists led that march.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am not talking about any particular group. I am talking about the bonus march.

Mr. PATMAN. They were generally composed of as good men as the gentleman himself.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am saying to the gentleman, if he does not answer the question, that that was organized by the Communist Party of the United States of America, as part of their program of revolution.

Mr. PATMAN. It was not.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman deny it?

Mr. PATMAN. I do, and I state that the rank and file was composed of men just as good as the gentleman himself.

Mr. BUSBEY. The rank and file, yes, but I am talking about the leaders that organized that march.

Mr. PATMAN. They were not, and although I opposed them, and tried to get them not to come here, they were good, law-abiding men. They wanted to collect an honest debt. They were promised a dollar a day for time here during the war and $1.25 a day for time abroad, and they had waited for many years and then there was put a provision in the bill at the time of enactment that if they wanted to borrow money 2 years from date of issuance of their certificates, they could borrow $88.15 on a policy of a thousand dollars on an average from a bank only, but they must pay an interest rate of 2 percent above the Federal Reserve rediscount rate in that district, which meant that when the veteran borrowed about $200 on a thousand dollar policy, the interest would eat up the remainder, and they were trying to get that wrong righted, that is what they were doing. The bank would get $800 and the veteran $200 on the average certificate like it was. I am not trying to say that they were dishonest because they were resorting to that method of trying to get that wrong righted.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman from Texas challenge me to prove on the floor of this House that that march was not organized by the Communists?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to get some statements into the RECORD to corroborate what I said about the Congress not supporting the Chief Executive. When the price-control bill to prevent inflation came up, the Democrats overwhelmingly, 3 to 1, voted for it, and the Republicans voted against it, 93 to 56. The next Price Control Act gave a directive to the President, to stabilize prices and wages and the cost of living, and then the Republicans voted for it overwhelmingly, because it was a directive, and the Congress was saying, "You are hereby directed to do this," and so the Republicans had voted for that, but when it came to providing money to enforce this law, the Republicans voted almost as a unit, 156 to 11, to cut the appropriation $35,000,000, which made the amount available insufficient to enforce the law. That is, they voted for the law, and then voted for an insufficient amount of money to enforce it.

Then when the O. W. I. appropriation came up, the Republicans voted 160 to 5 to eliminate entirely one whole division of the O. W. I. That particular division was charged with the duty, and they were doing a good job in it, of teaching the people about the evils of inflation and how to retard inflation and how to cooperate with their Government in wartime and how to stop and retard inflation. So they voted to eliminate or destroy entirely that important function of the O. W. I. that was doing such marvelous work. Then the other bills came up, the Commodity Credit bill for subsidies, and we will have that in soon in the O. P. A. extension. May it be said of all the power that has been granted the Chief Executive during this war, this Congress has been discreet, as it should be, I do not care who is President; we have written into every major law a provision that the law will terminate on June 30, 1944, or June 30, 1945, or when the war is over, or 6 months after peace is declared. We have written safeguarding amendments in every major law. A cut-off period is written into every major law so it cannot be said we have passed laws giving the Executive unlimited powers from now on. That is strictly not true as to any major law passed by this Congress during this war, any law that I am acquainted with.

On the tax question, when the Ruml plan came up, that was to give back $10,000,000,000. That was to create the first crop of war millionaires of World War No. 2. Our Republican friends voted 182 for it to 22 against it, and on another vote in 1943, on May 4, they voted again on the Carlson-Ruml plan, 188 for it to 12 against it. The Republican vote was almost solid in every case, but there were enough Democrats who joined the Republicans to the point where the Republicans finally won by voting together. On the motion to instruct the conferees to agree to the Senate amendment the Republicans voted 194 to 9 against and there was about the same vote on the agreement to the conference report. It goes to show their attitude on it. I do not blame the members of the Republican Party for supporting their party any more than one would blame other members of other parties in supporting their own party. That is their own responsibility. And to everyone his own conscience is his guide, so far as I am concerned. I am not criticizing. But I do say that this Congress has not cooperated with the Chief Executive, due principally to the fact that our friends on the Republican side, by voting solidly together and then having a few on the Democratic side join them, have succeeded in stopping effective tax laws and have succeeded in making the price control and stabilization law enforcement almost impossible. Remember this, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] brought it out a while ago, we have saved because of the stabilization program; we have not had an increase in prices of steel, not one penny, during this war. We have not had an increase in the price of glass or tin or cement and a number of other critical materials I could name. We have had no increase in the price of those materials whatsoever. And by reason of that, if we compare what we have paid for this war with what we paid during World War No. 1, we will have saved over $65,000,000,000 on the cost of the war alone up to date. In

other words, our war debt would be $65,000,000,000 more were it not for the price control and stabilization program. That means $50,000,000 a day is the amount we are saving on war costs alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I always listen with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas. He has a capacity for utilizing time in the well of the House to make remarks very frequently, and he has evidently convinced himself of the righteousness of his position, although he has apparently been unable to convince either the country or the Congress, or even the Members of the Congress of his own side. The gentleman from Texas says that he was not criticizing the Congress. No; he was not criticizing the Congress. He is just expressing his own contempt for Congress, his own personal contempt and his own personal feeling. Let us analyze that just a little bit. He devoted a lot of his time talking about the tax bill, criticizing this Congress because they had not passed an effective tax bill. In the latter part of his speech he attempted to show that the reason for the failure to pass an effective tax bill was the result of the union of Republicans and Democrats who have succeeded in preventing the passage of a proper tax bill here on the floor of this House. The gentleman is simply following the line that has been adopted by the campaign managers of this administration who are seeking to promote a fourth term, to misrepresent the facts to the American people. The gentleman from Texas knows as well as I know that every tax bill originates in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives. The gentleman knows that the Committee on Ways and Means is predominantly controlled by the membership of people selected from his own party. It is dominated and controlled by Members who are of his party—not Republicans. The gentleman knows as well as I know that the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill to the House under a closed rule and that the rank and file of the membership of the House have to either vote for or against that bill as it is brought here by the Committee on Ways and Means, which is dominated and controlled by the gentleman's own party.

I think the gentleman from Texas is just becoming a little sour and ill-tempered because of his inability, after making 15 or 20 speeches, and having the whole floor of the House, including the well, cluttered up with charts to demonstrate the correctness of his philosophy, I think he is becoming just a little bit sour when the House, by such an overwhelming vote, repudiated the philosophy which he is expounding. He reminds me somewhat of the old fellow back in my town who served upon a jury. His name was Weed. The jury was out for 48 hours and was finally discharged. I happened to be in the courtroom when the jury came out and the judge finally discharged them because they were unable to agree. Mr. Weed was a good citizen. He had his collar open and his necktie untied and his hair was all ruffled up when he came out and said, "Damn the jury system. Oh, what a terrible thing it was. I never want to sit on another jury. They were a lot of blockheads on that jury. They did not have any reasons. They could not be led. They could not understand the evidence or the facts or the instructions of the court." I asked him, "Mr. Weed, how did the jury stand?"

"Why," he said, "they were 11 to 1."

"Well, who was holding out?" I asked.

He said, "I was."

And so the distinguished gentleman from Texas is repeatedly standing in the well of this House making arguments which, when analyzed, will not stand the scrutiny of the intelligent membership of this House. So when these votes are cast, he finds that he is speaking for a very small minority. Let us just analyze one part of his argument. He condemned the Committee on Ways and Means because they brought in a bill which froze social-security taxes at the present rate of 1 percent. The reason he makes that argument is, as he says in substance, by that action the Government has been denied revenue of about $1,400,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield at this time. I will yield in a moment. Let me finish my statement. Maybe the gentleman did not mean that. Maybe he did not use that language, but I heard the President's speech vetoing the tax bill, and I assume the gentleman from Texas is adopting the same tactics that the President did when he said there was a loss of revenue——

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. KEEFE. By reason of the freezing of the social-security tax at the existing figure.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield right at that point?

Mr. KEEFE. I will yield in a moment.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman wants to be fair about it, I know.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to be fair about it. I want to be just like the gentleman. I will yield when I have concluded that portion of this statement and not before. I have had some experience before, where the gentleman used up all my time. The gentleman has had 25 or 30 minutes to speak already.

The gentleman further said—and I do not want to misquote him—that because of the fact that the tax bill froze social-security rates at existing levels, it was an inflationary bill, because it failed to siphon off this additional purchasing power of the laboring people of this country. Well, I think there is some argument for what the gentleman says in that regard, but how inconsistent, it seems to me, is the gentleman from Texas. Just a few days ago he was in the well of this House arguing for the payment of subsidies. He was asking in one breath that the social-security tax be raised so as to reduce the purchasing power in the hands of the people, available for the purchase of consumer goods, and in the next breath he is arguing in the well of this House that we should pay consumer roll-back subsidies by reducing the cost of consumer goods to the consumers so that they would have more money left in their pockets to buy other consumer goods. If anybody can see any consistency in that type of argument I would like to have them make explanation in proper time.

Now let us talk for a minute about another phase of the gentleman's speech. I know why he is making it. We all know that. The gentleman speaks constantly for the administration. He is one of the men who is always up here espousing the affairs of the administration. He is loyal. He has a right to do that. He thinks he is espousing the proper cause. I admire him for it. That is his duty as he sees it. I hope that he gets proper compensation at the proper time, from the administration that he has served so well. There may be a judgeship available in Texas or in some other place, so that the gentleman has nothing to worry about.

There have been many such examples of that in this House before; and I have no objection to it. The gentleman is a good soldier. He presents the position of the administration, sometimes without very much regard for the actual facts, and without very much regard for what he does to the Congress of the United States in the eyes of the people of this country. But, he is carrying on the fight nobly in behalf of the administration that he loves so well. I would direct the gentleman's attention to the fact however, that if all the things he says are true, why is it that only on Tuesday out in Denver, the people of the great city of Denver, many of whom have apparently been heretofore following the philosophy expounded by the gentleman from Texas, went to the polls and said. "We do not want any more of that kind of stuff."

Why is it that the people of this country in all but 2 of the 10 off-year congressional elections have unmistakenly said to the gentleman from Texas and those who are expounding his philosophy, "We do not want any more of that thing; we are through with that sort of philosophy"? Oh, I know what the gentleman is working up to. I put some of it in the RECORD yesterday. Evidently the gentleman did not read it. I wish he had. He is following right along the line of your Democratic National Committee Chairman Hannegan. I think the gentleman has been reading Mr. Hannegan's political speeches, and the thesis of his talk today indicates that he has been inspired to new activity, political activity in the well of this House, if you please, by his new, neophitic Democratic chairman.

Now listen to this if you will. I am going to read it again. I hope it sinks into the gentleman from Texas and some of the others in this Congress who were not here and perhaps have not read it in the RECORD.

I received a letter yesterday from a marine out in the South Pacific, and in that letter, passed by the censors there was enclosed a portion of a mimeographed sheet made up of Associated

Press reports which are sent to Navy stations for the purpose of disseminating news, and sent all over the world. Among other things in this report was one item carrying the date line Minneapolis, Minn. It reads as follows, and I quote it exactly as it came from that clip sheet:

Chairman Robert E. Hannegan, of the Democratic National Committee, said Tuesday night, "The election of a Republican President in November would turn the Government over to unpracticed hands and bring inescapable confusion and indecision in winding up the war and planning the peace."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Have you heard anything like that this afternoon from the gentleman from Texas? It is almost the same language as the speech delivered by the gentleman from Texas here this afternoon.

This sheet further says:

In his second major address since his election to the Democratic chairmanship, Hannegan told the Washington Day dinner up in Minneapolis: "What could hearten Hitler or the Japanese war lords more than tidings that the American people repudiated the administration of Franklin Roosevelt?"

Did you hear anything like that this afternoon from the mouth of the gentleman from Texas? Is that not exactly what the gentleman from Texas was arguing this afternoon in the well of this House, in substantiation of his appeal for a continuation of the indispensable man in the White House? Yes. The people of this country are to be told, as a part of the program of your party, that if they dare to vote for any candidate other than Roosevelt that vote will be a vote for Tojo and Hitler. That is the talk that the gentleman from Texas made here in the well this afternoon. Let us see what effect that sort of talk has upon this marine out in the South Pacific. He put it in this letter to me in more cogent language than I could perhaps use. This is what he said:

This item strikes at the roots of what America is fighting for—a free choice by election of whom we want for whatever elective office we want to elect him without anyone offering the cry of traitor, treason, mutiny, or sabotage. I want the chance to make a choice between Roosevelt and the other candidates, because that's a choice denied the people of Germany, Japan, Italy, France, and the conquered countries. While we're free, I want a free ballot, and I want Hannegan to have a free ballot, but I don't want either of us to tell the other that his candidate is a "Hitler-Tojo" candidate.

It isn't an issue and won't make any votes for them out here, but it is just plain ridiculous that a party, after 12 years of the President, wants to run the show and steer the campaign on anything but those 12 years and the prospects of the next 4. Hitler and Japanese war lords will have more to hearten them if the American people don't have a free election, free of all international intimidation.

Now I say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas: There is the answer from at least one thinking soldier in the South Pacific to the type of argument which he made here today in the well of this House. I regret that such a distinguished gentleman as the gentleman from Texas would permit himself to advance the argument that criticism of this administration or the President is to give encouragement to Hitler and Tojo.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Not at just this moment.

Mr. PATMAN. For a correction?

Mr. KEEFE. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. PATMAN. That statement is not correct.

Mr. KEEFE. The Members present heard the gentleman's statement. I assume that the RECORD will show what it was. I do not know how it will appear in the RECORD tomorrow but I heard his statement and I place that construction upon it. That is what the gentleman tried to convey. He made the statement that there is no talk in the Reichstag condemning or criticizing Hitler.

Did you make that statement? Did you make that statement?

Mr. PATMAN. I will tell the gentleman what I said if he gives me time.

Mr. KEEFE. Just answer that question.

Mr. PATMAN. I said that if some person in a neutral country, an observer, were to read the proceedings of the Congress of the United States and also what was happening in Germany that this interested observer would probably come to the erroneous conclusion that there was more disunity and more danger of America cracking than there was of Germany.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is not answering any question at all. The gentleman made the plain statement that there was not any criticism of Hitler in the Reichstag. I heard him say it and everybody else heard him say it.

Mr. PATMAN. I did not use the word "Reichstag."

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that there is a perfectly obvious reason why there is no criticism of Hitler in the Reichstag. There is a perfectly good reason why there is no criticism of Tojo in the Japanese Parliament. There is a perfectly good reason why there is not any criticism today of Hitler in the official circles in France. They are not free countries. The democracy that we prate ourselves upon having here never existed there and it is dead today.

I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would want the mouths of the Representatives of the people of this country here in this Congress to be silenced as are those of the groveling people who pretend to serve as members of the Reichstag over in Germany?

I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that the people of this country are not going to be fooled by any such specious argument as he made here this afternoon. That is what he said on this floor: Any proper criticism of the acts of this administration is giving aid and comfort to Tojo and to Hitler.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I made no reference to any just criticism of this administration as being unpatriotic. I believe in free and just criticism of any administration.

Mr. KEEFE. What was the gentleman talking about?

Mr. PATMAN. I expressed disapproval of statements that are being made that would create friction between our country and our allies, and unjustified and unwarranted statements in this country that are calculated to cause disunity—unjustified and unwarranted And I will state to the gentleman that I did not make the statement that he said I made a while ago about the Reichstag. I will make the point of order that he misquoted me and ask that my statement be read. I think that in fairness to me that should be done. I did not use the word "Reichstag" at all. If the gentleman does not agree with that, I insist that the speech be produced and read.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; bring the speech up.

Mr. PATMAN. Find where I said "Reichstag."

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know that the gentleman used the word "Reichstag." The speech will speak for itself when it is finally brought up.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman concede the point of order?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, no; I insist upon it; the gentleman asked for it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, there has been no point of order made; there has been no statement made that would interfere in any way with the gentleman's having the floor.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has backed up on the statement, so it does not matter.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has not backed up on the statement and the RECORD must not show that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield me 10 additional minutes?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I know the suave manner of the gentleman from Texas, how he can talk himself in and out of almost any kind of proposition, but let the RECORD show that I insist that the statement which I made will be found to conform to the truth of the statement made by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I insist that if the gentleman now declares I made that statement that the RECORD be brought up and read by the reporter who took it down, because it certainly is unfair to a Member to be misquoted, and in that case I know that I was misquoted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Texas that the RECORD cannot be brought up at this time.

Mr. PATMAN. With the knowledge that the official report for the RECORD will not disclose what the gentleman said, I will not press the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The RECORD will be available in due course.

Mr. BREHM. He used the word "Germany," not "Reichstag."

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; perhaps the fact of the matter is that the RECORD will show that he used the word "Germany" instead of the word "Reichstag"; that may be true, but the inference certainly is the same.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman was very positive.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. So far as I am concerned, I want one or two things to be made perfectly clear. I happen to have some interest in the situation, the same as the gentleman from Texas. He is entitled to his view and as a Member of this House I am entitled to mine. I happen to have four boys from my family in the service. I have some interest in the kind of world that will exist when this war is over; I have some interest in seeing to it that ruinous, run-away inflation does not occur in this country; but let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that a citizen and a patriot does not have to swallow his entire financial philosophy in order to effectively fight inflation. Let me ask the gentleman from Texas this question, and he may answer it: Does the gentleman recall that when the present control law was before the Congress the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] offered an amendment to that bill embodying the principles of the so-called Baruch plan? Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman want me to discuss that?

Mr. KEEFE. I am asking the gentleman, Does he recall that?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] introduced an amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the gentleman vote for or against that amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I did not vote for it.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman voted against that amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I voted against it, and let me tell you why.

Mr. KEEFE. No.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman insisted on asking me a question.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield further. I asked the gentleman a simple question and he has answered it. I do not yield for any further speech from the gentleman. He can get time to make his own explanation at some other time. He will not take it out of my time.

That is exactly as I recall the situation. There was the Baruch plan submitted by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, which was offered as an amendment to the original Price Control Act. That plan proposed to place a ceiling on everything and the gentleman from Texas, who is so loud in his talk against the danger of inflation, voted against it. Of course, he no doubt did so because the President did not approve of the plan. As I recall, he came here with the message and he said: "Now, you fellows over there in the Congress take care of agriculture, you fix the farm prices and arrange for price control and I will take care of labor." Do you remember that? Had you passed the Baruch plan you would have had a control over the rising cost of living which, after all, is what we call inflation. But, oh, no, the gentleman from Texas said, "We will let the President handle this labor situation," although in many cases labor constitutes about 80 percent of the cost of a commodity. See where we are? See where we are today fighting as never before to control this cost of living, which is inflation? If Congress made any mistake, in my humble judgment, it made the mistake of following the philosophy of the gentleman from Texas at that time when the amendment was submitted by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and was voted down. Had we followed the philosophy of Mr. Baruch and the gentleman from Tennessee at that time and wrote into this price-control law an over-all ceiling on everything, we perhaps would not be confronted with the situation of which the gentleman from Texas now complains. Well, the Congress followed his advice then and voted the Gore amendment down. Now we are in a dire situation as a result. Now the gentleman is damning the Congress because it has not controlled inflation to the extent that he would like to have it controlled.

I only call your attention to this situation because it is a pretty good thing when you are weighing the arguments of the gentleman to sort of check back just a little bit and see where the gentleman was when he was casting votes on some of these things. You cannot be fish today and fowl tomorrow, you cannot jump all over the lot on these great economic questions and expect to assume leadership in this House or in the country itself. The people of this country are able to think, they are able to analyze the situation, I may say to the gentleman from Texas, and God be praised, they have indicated that they are able to do it. If I wanted to stick my neck away out, I would say that they have refused and are refusing in tremendous numbers to follow this New Deal philosophy either in finance, in O. P. A., or in any other thing as advocated by the gentleman from Texas, and, perhaps, when the clouds clear after next November we will be able to approach the solution of some of these problems based upon common sense, and common interest, and in the interest of the people of America instead of approaching them through the eyes of the crystal gazer who is looking off into the heavens beyond in an attempt to apply to the whole world the philosophy that has failed so miserably on the domestic front here at home.

I hope that so far as I am concerned at least this subject of politics in the consideration of these bills will be kept out of the well of this House. I have never seen an opportunity missed by the gentleman from Texas to make political speech after political speech in the well of this House whenever opportunity is open in the consideration of any measure. I want to say that if any administration in the history of this country has ever engaged in the process of arraying class against class, one group of our society against the other, farmers against labor, labor against management, it is the present administration and it has resulted from the actions of this administration at the top. The American people are pretty well aware of that situation and know that a vote to stop spending is not a vote for Tojo or Hitler but is, rather, a vote for the preservation of constitutional government here in the United States of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ANSWERING THE GENTLEMAN FROM WISCONSIN, MR. KEEFE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope no one understood me to say that any criticism of this administration is unpatriotic. I have never said that upon any occasion, and I certainly did not say it upon the floor today, because I do not believe that. I believe in justified and warranted criticism. That is the basis of democracy. Our country cannot be the good country and the great country that it is and destroy that great privilege in wartime or in times of peace.

The gentleman from Wisconsin almost caused us to become involved in personalities. Possibly I provoked him and he was more or less justified. I am sorry about that, if I participated in indulging in personalities, because I do not believe in that. If anything like that has occurred, I am sorry, because I feel that each individual Member has his own responsibility. I do not impugn the motives or question the sincerity or honesty of any Member of this body, and I shall certainly not say anything that would be contrary to what I have just said.

Regarding the Baruch report about price control, I think we made lots of mistakes back then. I think if we had had an over-all control and had everything in it, in the light of what has happened since it would have been the best thing. I am not sure that the Gore amendment was the answer to it. But I will say that we should have frozen everything right there and adjusted inequalities and inequities up or down. But if you are going to point back to mistakes, let us not stop there.

Let us go back and say the greatest mistake that we made was in not freezing everything the day we declared war on Germany and Italy and Japan. There is where our greatest mistake was made. Then if we want to go back and observe what happened in the past, and consider hindsight just a little bit further, let us go back and say that the greatest mistake we made was in not helping China several years ago. And let us add to that the great mistake of the isolationists in this country that caused our country to be in such a helpless condition when the attack at Pearl Harbor occurred.

So if the gentleman wants to recount mistakes that were made, I suspect he could find that a lot of mistakes were made, but that does not justify trying to scuttle price control now. We did have a good law passed, an over-all law. The date of it is October 2, 1942. The gentleman's own party has denied the administration sufficient money to prop-

erly enforce that law. To that extent the law was scuttled, because of the inability of the President to properly enforce it, due to the lack of money this Congress failed to give to him.

Mr. TABER and Mr. KEEFE rose.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman from Indiana give me some more time if I yield to these gentlemen?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York, and I hope he will not take much time, because the gentleman has said so much that I want to attempt to answer.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman realizes, does he not, that the trouble with the price-enforcement law was the improper operations of Mr. Henderson when he was the head of it. He wrecked the price-control law by his performances.

Mr. PATMAN. I think Mr. Henderson made lots of mistakes, but if the gentleman is going to say that the people who are enforcing the law are to blame, does the gentleman know that more than 50 percent of the people in key positions in O. P. A. are members of his own party and have been all along?

Mr. TABER. That does not make any difference.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, it does make a difference. If the members of his party are so good at administering laws, why do they not administer them better?

Does the gentleman know that better than 50 percent of the people in W. P. B. are members of his own party?

Mr. TABER. The ones that control are not members of my party, and they are the ones who are doing the damage.

Mr. PATMAN. So it is not a political question at all, it is a question of trying to do something that cannot be done in a satisfactory way. There are certain things that you cannot do in a satisfactory way. O. P. A. and Price Stabilization have taken something away from the people. You cannot satisfy the people and do that to save your life. You cannot administer relief satisfactorily. There is no way to do it.

The O. P. A. is an organization that deals with 8,000,000 different commodities and products, including styles, classes, colors, and designs. Did you know that O. P. A. has more than 1,000,000 telephone calls a day? The law of averages has not been repealed, not even by this Congress. The law of averages would say that a lot of mistakes would be made in a million calls. Did you know that there are more than 1,000 applications for price increases before O. P. A. every day? There are. The law of averages has not been repealed, so that out of a thousand price increases there will be some mistakes made. So let us go into this question openly and frankly, with the knowledge that a lot of mistakes are going to be made and have been made, but in the hope that where they are discovered they will be quickly and speedily corrected.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield briefly, for a question. I do not have much time.

Mr. KEEFE. What party was in control of Congress when the appropriation for O. P. A. was passed last year?

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, the Democratic Party, in theory, but in practice the gentleman's party, voting together, in sort of a conspiracy. I am not criticizing you for it. That is up to you.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is not criticizing?

Mr. PATMAN. But you did, and there were enough on the Democratic side who joined you to permit you to control the situation.

Mr. KEEFE. How much was the appropriation cut?

Mr. PATMAN. The appropriation was cut $35,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Where?

Mr. PATMAN. Here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KEEFE. What was done with it in the Senate?

Mr. PATMAN. It was finally agreed that the appropriation would be cut $35,000,000. To that extent you scuttled O. P. A. enforcement. After you voted for the law, you refused to vote for sufficient money to give the President the ways and means to properly enforce that law.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman like to have the facts about the money?

Mr. PATMAN. There is no dispute about it.

Mr. TABER. Under the direction of the President's budget, the O. P. A. was required to hold out of the money that was appropriated by the Congress $6,690,000. This appears on page 612 of our hearings.

Mr. PATMAN. I am familiar with that. I was here and I know what happened. The gentleman knows, too.

Mr. TABER. Just read the hearings on this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman knows he voted right here in the House to cut this appropriation $35,000,000. Is that correct or not?

Mr. TABER. It is not.

Mr. PATMAN. The RECORD shows it.

Mr. TABER. It does not.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman had better correct the RECORD.

Mr. TABER. The RECORD does not show it, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will take the proceedings of that day, he will discover it, because all the Republican leaders, and he is one, were known to have voted that way.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman knows that is not correct.

Mr. PATMAN. We will look it up. If the gentleman says he did not vote for it, I will take his word for it, but the appropriation was reduced $35,000,000, and I understood the gentleman was leading the fight to do it.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman knows that is not correct.

Mr. PATMAN. Anyway, the appropriation for O. W. I. came up. I hope I am not misquoting the gentleman. The gentleman admits he did vote to reduce the O. P. A. appropriation, does he not?

Mr. TABER. I did not.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman did not vote to reduce it?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. PATMAN. The members of his party did, almost unanimously.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Massachusetts and I did not.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, just you two?

Mr. TABER. I do not know about that, but we did not, I know that.

Mr. PATMAN. Anyway, I will change my statement, then, and say to the gentleman, because the RECORD shows it, that all of you but 11 voted that way. Of course, I will put you two gentlemen among the 11 as representing the exceptions.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. In justice to the gentleman from New York, who is the ranking minority member of the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations, of which I happen to be a member, I may say that we had an agreement in the committee on the amount, and both the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Massachusetts voted to sustain the figure that was brought to the floor.

Mr. PATMAN. Anyway, I will just read the RECORD here, which shows it. The RECORD shows that on the amendment to reduce the appropriation for O. P. A. by $35,000,000—this is June 18, 1943, page 6140; get the RECORD and look it up—156 Republicans voted to reduce it and 11 voted against reducing it. If I were not justified in saying that the Republicans joined together to deny the President sufficient money to enforce the O. P. A. law, then this RECORD is not correct. I was correct in making that assertion. I think it was justified, and the records will disclose it. I did not know about the agreement the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] referred to, which explains why two leaders of the Republican Party voted the other way.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question on this point?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; just for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This has nothing to do with what has been said, except that it is based on what is coming before our committee very shortly in connection with O. P. A. Does the gentleman understand that O. P. A. is now without sufficient funds to administer the act according to its present plans?

Mr. PATMAN. They had to make their program conform with the appropriation for the fiscal year, and I state positively, they have been denied a sufficient opportunity to adequately do it. That is my statement.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of the Budget impounded over $6,000,000 of the funds appropriated for O. P. A., and directed them to utilize those funds in absorbing a portion of the overtime pay which their employees would be entitled to under Public, 49?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not acquainted with what the gentleman alleges to be the fact.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman is not acquainted with the facts, how can he make a proper statement?

Mr. PATMAN. I say that particular statement, that the gentleman's party—I think he was one of them, though, of course, there were 11 who voted against it—voted against cutting the appropriation for O. P. A. $35,000,000 on the floor of this House.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. It reduced the appropriation to the extent that made it impossible to properly enforce that law on price control.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. For a question.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that the action of the House in reducing the appropriation for O. P. A. is not final, and that under due operation of legislative practice, the Senate raised the appropriation, and that in the conference it was finally agreed upon by both the House and the Senate, practically unanimously, and the amount was appropriated for them.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman said that he was going to ask a question.

Mr. KEEFE. And that after that sum was agreed upon, the President signed the bill, and thereafter the Bureau of the Budget impounded $6,000,000 of that money on the theory that they had too much and asked them to absorb over $6,000,000 on their overtime pay.

Mr. PATMAN. Sometimes you have to take something bad, to keep from taking something worse. The point is that the gentleman and his party, first, were for price control and stabilization, and then at the first opportunity that was presented on the floor of this House voted to scuttle the entire program. The amendment was offered and voted on, and 156 of the Republicans voted for it, and only 11 against it, which, to that extent scuttled the enforcement of the O. P. A.

Mr. RABAUT. And the amendment was offered by a Presidential candidate, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. PATMAN. Well, anyway, the Republicans almost unanimously voted for it, and in the same way they voted on other measures. I am not condemning them. That is their right. Let them exercise their right. I am not saying anything about that, except the effect it has on the country, and I think this has a dangerous and a disastrous effect generally. Not only that, but when the O. W. I. appropriation came in, and was doing the best job any organization ever did for the people of this country, in teaching them the evils of inflation and how to retard and prevent it—then the Republicans voted almost as a bloc, and joined with a few Democrats on this side, and they were able to absolutely scuttle and destroy the only division of this agency of our Government that was teaching the people the evils of inflation, and how to retard and prevent it. If that is not an inflationary vote, I do not know how you are going to test an inflationary vote.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman think that the O. W. I. has anything to do with inflation?

Mr. PATMAN. I do.

Mr. TABER. Except to misrepresent things?

Mr. PATMAN. They had a lot to do with it. They were doing a good job. Does the gentleman deny that?

Mr. TABER. I do.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, if the gentleman believes in inflation, he does have that idea.

Mr. TABER. No; I do not believe in inflation.

Mr. PATMAN. I have a very high regard and great respect for the gentleman, and for the minority leader, and all of the Members on that side. Let me just say here as an humble, poor Member, a Democrat from Texas, and suggest that you change your course, and get off that road to ruinous inflation, runaway inflation, and wake up to its dangers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Just wait 1 minute—and throw off that well-earned and deserved and recognized label of being a party of isolationists in time of peace and inflationists in time of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. PATMAN. In all seriousness I agree with what the gentleman said a while ago, that we should not have politics in war, and I regret exceedingly that there has been some display of it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] was within his rights to make certain political remarks, and I had a right to reply to him if I could, and to that extent we engaged in politics in time of war on important matters. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman know that his speech here today has done more to promote disunity and discord than almost anything that has happened in the United States in a long time?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, possibly amongst the Republican Party, I expect that is true, but if the gentleman will take the speech delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], preceding mine, I suspect that he will find some statements there that are calculated to cause disunity among our own people; but any way, in all frankness, we must face this situation which we cannot avoid. I suspect 200 Members of this House have sons in the service. They have them on all of the battlefields of the World War—in Europe, in the South Pacific, and everywhere else—and we are interested in the conduct of the war, and obtaining a lasting peace. We are interested in getting these servicemen back to their positions, to their families and their businesses, when this war is over, and we want the war to end in an early victory, and an early and lasting peace, and let us therefore indulge in as little unwarranted disunity and criticism as possible, and let us try to adopt the policy if we are going to criticize anything, of being constructive, let us say what we would do, if we were in the same position, let us say what we would do, with all of the facts, if we knew them, instead of what is being done.

FIFTY MILLION DOLLARS A DAY SAVED BY O. P. A. AND STABILIZATION PROGRAM

About this O. P. A., I want the attention of gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, in all seriousness and to say that we have developed a program, and we cannot afford to dispense with it. It is one of the greatest programs on earth and at no other time in the history of any government on earth, has the Government engaged and tried to have price and wage stabilization in time of war except in this war. Remember that. It is a feather in the cap of every Member of this House who helped to put on a price control and stabilization program. The first time in all history it has been done, and the program has worked. It has worked successfully. It has caused some annoyance, and we have made some mistakes and we will always have them, but let us see what the result of the program is.

The result is, as I said a while ago, that we have saved $65,000,000,000 in our national debt. You cannot laugh that off. We are saving $50,000,000 every 24 hours on the cost of this war. You cannot laugh that off. Now whenever you have a program like that, that is saving so much money, why cannot we, as Representatives of an average of 300,000 people in the congressional districts which we have the honor to represent, in some way get together and pass some kind of law that will continue this program that has done so much good without all this dissension and trouble, which we could do without and without jeopardizing it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Did I understand the gentleman to say in one breath that the O. P. A. is a great success today and in the next breath say that the Republicans in this Congress had scuttled the whole program by denying appropriations to it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; I say that to the extent you denied them money which they needed you scuttled the whole program, and I reiterate that statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to learn that the gentleman from Texas has at last arrived at the conclusion that this country of ours is threatened with the suffering and anguish which can come from an uncontrolled inflation as a result of the policies pursued during the past decade by the present administration.

Some of us have feared that possibility for a long time. I could produce a copy of a public address which I made as long ago as the summer of 1934, in which I predicted that if policies even then in force under this administration, were continued, they would result inevi-

tably in uncontrolled inflation or its equivalent.

Perhaps I was gun-shy. I had been for years in Germany, in France, in Poland, in Italy, and in other countries in the twenties, when inflation had done its worst. Whether the gentleman from Texas calls it national bankruptcy or uses some other term to describe it, I, for one, do not want to see any part of it in this country of ours.

I did not intend to take any time today, Mr. Chairman, but inasmuch as the matter of war housing has come up for discussion I think perhaps I should insert in the RECORD certain information which I have recently received in this connection from the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations.

I received a letter back in December from Mr. Reginald W. Bird, president of this organization, in reference to housing projects in Massachusetts. He stated in that letter that investigation of these projects had been made by the federation and that the federation was convinced that the results clearly demonstrated "the waste and inefficiency that characterizes these unnecessary and in most cases unwanted projects." He protested against any further appropriation for the construction of additional facilities similar to those in Massachusetts.

Under date of March 2, 1944, I received a further letter from this same organization, which I am going to take time to read into the RECORD. It reads as follows:

Congressman RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing herewith material on Federal public housing in Massachusetts and certain projects in Maine and Connecticut, which are in Region I zone. Our investigation reveals the following defects:

1. Most of these projects, particularly in Massachusetts, were not wanted by the officials in the communities in which they are located. This is true of Pittsfield, Holyoke, Southbridge, and Weymouth, particularly. In other communities the officials took the projects as a matter of course, and are attempting "to make the best out of a bad situation."

2. Our federation contends that these temporary demountable projects were not needed. The best evidence of this lies in the fact that they are two-thirds empty in our State, and this situation is typical of Region I temporary housing. The reason for this probably lies in the fact that the newly prosperous defense workers, for whom they were presumably constructed, refuse to live in them.

3. F. P. H. A. officials in Region I ignored and rejected suggestions for corrections in specifications made by their own engineers during construction, and insisted on following such specifications when it was quite obvious that corrections were necessary because of apparent difficulties. We contend that thousands and thousands of dollars were squandered upon change orders which were issued after the project had been completed, and which F. P. H. A. officials could, by the use of ordinary intelligence, have foreseen and corrected prior to the completion of the project. This is particularly true in the heating installations. For instance, in the Chauncey Homes in Stratford, Conn., it was found after completion of the project that the furnaces and fans were too small to push the heat through the rooms adequately. F. P. H. A. decided to pull out the furnaces and fans, but because of threatened criticism, it was decided to let the furnaces stay, but to install larger fans.

4. We charge that the site selections were most unfortunate. In Pittsfield, Mass., the highest and bleakest hill in the Berkshires was selected as a site for 100 units. The cost of these will run over $6,000 per unit. The reason for the high cost of these cellarless 2- and 3-room dwellings is the fact that ⅓ of such cost was incurred in blasting and excavating made necessary by the topography of the terrain. We charge that all of the site selections of temporary housing projects in Massachusetts were decidedly unfortunate, and unquestionably expensive to the taxpayers of the country.

5. The type of construction is definitely unsuited to our New England climate. Whether single-family or multiple-family units, the construction was generally the same, either gypsum interior and exterior walls, or cinder block exteriors and gypsum interiors. In practically all T. D. U. projects there are no cellars, no telephones, no fire alarm systems. Some are without street lighting systems. Most have no cooking gas, no mail boxes or mail slots in the doors and various other deficiencies which make them unattractive to war workers earning from $50 to $150 dollars a week.

The federation stands behind the allegations made on all the projects in Massachusetts. Information supplied herewith on projects outside of Massachusetts comes from what we consider to be reliable sources, but we have not yet had time to check all of the statements made to us. This, however, we propose to do as soon as possible.

Respectfully yours,
MARTIN R. DURKIN,
Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. I want to say at this point that in the district I represent, and particularly Akron, Ohio, about 6 weeks ago there appeared in the paper a statement that the saturation point had been reached insofar as these temporary dwellings are concerned. When I was home the latter part of the week, another neighborhood in the southeastern part of the city said they have torn up ground to build an additional 400 units. I want to call particular attention in the RECORD that within 20 miles of this place where the saturation point has been reached and they are adding an additional 400 units, there are 1,000 units unoccupied except where widows of veterans have been forced in there, and at that place clubrooms and a theater have been provided at a cost of $125,000 to entertain the people who are not there.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I have received further detail, Mr. Chairman, in this connection from the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers Associations. Under leave to extend my remarks, I propose to insert the material at this point in the RECORD.

The first part of it is verified by the federation. The second part of it is believed to be reliable by the federation, but is not yet verified:

FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING IN MASSACHUSETTS

Federal defense housing in Massachusetts is a monument to bureaucratic inefficiency and incompetency. Millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money have been squandered on projects unneeded in the communities in which they are located, unwanted by local municipal officials, and spurned as unfit to live in by newly prosperous defense workers for whom they were presumably constructed.

Across the face of Massachusetts, from a bleak and desolate hilltop in the Berkshires to a dreary claybank in Chicopee and then down to the swamplands of Weymouth, these empty shanties stand as eloquent evidence of the stupidity of Federal Public Housing Administration officials who would not listen to wise counsel from mere citizens.

What motive could have prompted the F. P. H. A. brain trusters to select the solid rock on top of the coldest hill in Pittsfield as a fitting foundation for cellarless homes for defense workers whose place of employment was 2 miles away?

What consideration impelled the selection, as an ideal housing site, of a long-abandoned claypit in Chicopee where the slippery shifting earth is no firmer underfoot than sand?

Why was a site selected in Weymouth, which had been repeatedly spurned by private builders because the land was under water for part of the year?

Why did the F. P. H. A. contemptuously reject an offer of the free use of a factory building in Southbridge for a defense-housing dormitory and insist upon paying the owner $15,000?

What caused the bull-headed decision of the F. P. H. A. to proceed to the construction of a project in Holyoke over the protest of the Holyoke Housing Authority that such a project definitely was not needed and certainly was unwanted?

These are but a few of the many questions to which the righteously indignant taxpayers of Massachusetts demand answers. The futile dodges and make-shift alibis of regional F. P. H. A. officials are not enough for our distressed and outraged citizens. Congress, through appropriations, made it possible for the Federal wastrels to throw the taxpayers' money around in disgraceful fashion. The people of this State and of this country—for all have to share the expense—demand an accounting. It is time they received it through the agency of their Congress.

The wasteful conditions that exist in F. P. H. A. projects in Massachusetts are typical of F. P. H. A. region No. 1 operations. This region embraces the six New England States. The Portland and Bath, Maine, projects cry out for investigation. One has but to read the annual report for 1943 of the Bridgeport, Conn. Housing Authority to know that F. P. H. A. has learned nothing from its previous housing mistakes.

The best test of whether these projects, particularly in Massachusetts, were needed rests on the extent to which they are occupied. Millions of dollars have been spent, and every promotion device known to the "experts" has been used, yet three-quarters of the defense-housing projects in Massachusetts stand as empty as the ghost towns of an earlier western era.

But the mystery of why these projects were undertaken at all is no greater than the puzzle of how they turned out to be what they are. Engineers, architects, builders, and, indeed, everyone who knows anything about living in modern urban communities all stand bewildered and aghast at the spectacle. They look with obvious disbelief at coal bins out of doors, failure to arrange for gas to be piped in for cooking and water heating, and at combination living-room-kitchen cubicles jammed with a water tank, refrigerator, a coal stove for cooking, and sometimes a "parlor" stove for heating.

Everyone in America except the F. P. H. A. knows at a glance that these life-with-grandfather quarters will attract no one. Specifically they will not attract defense workers who bring home from $50 to $100 and more a week. It might well be that under emergency conditions a defense worker, like any

other American, would be willing to live in less than ideal surroundings; but it goes without saying that no one in this day and age relishes the idea of running outside in zero weather for a bucket of coal, or of planning to cook during the summer over a coal fire, for that matter. No one wants to live where he cannot have a telephone, or where his children and womenfolk must come home after dark through unlighted streets. Neither does anyone want to live in a neighborhood where there are no neighbors. There are even people who recognize, as F. P. H. A. clearly does not, that the automobile has come to stay, and that shelters are necessary for them. Yet, fantastic as it sounds, not a foot of garage space has been provided at any defense-housing project.

This nightmare dream of what living ought to be in industrial America has been made a reality by a large staff of self-designated experts maintained on the pay roll at the regional office in Boston. They cling to their salaries and official dignities in spite of the fact that nearly all projects are completed and turned over to city and town housing authorities. It is but slight exaggeration to say that there are nearly as many experts as there are tenants, each with an imposing and dignified title, each with several assistants, and each assistant with a quota of subordinates.

But it is frequently necessary for the experts to seek advice from still other experts. For instance, when some alterations in the plans are necessary, the F. P. H. A. technical department calls in some engineer to perform the work. In Weymouth everybody but the F. P. H. A. experts knew the project site was honeycombed with springs, which flooded the site periodically. The belated discovery by F. P. H. A. officials threw everybody into a dither. It was then decided that curtain drains were needed to relieve the situation. Technical help from outside the F. P. H. A. was summoned. The bill for this was $500.

Although practically all the projects are completed, the regional office pay roll remains as high as when the experts were first stumbling and mumbling over the plans and specifications. Experts with practically nothing to do, are still drawing down $5,000 and $6,000 a year. The taxpayers demand an immediate slash in personnel in this office. Few, if any, changes have been made since September 1943. The salaries of these employees and their duties require congressional investigation.

Following is a short summary of a recent investigation by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers' Associations, Inc. This investigation, of necessity, was largely confined to the physical and visible aspects of the projects. Needless to say, the federation did not have access to the files of the F. P. H. A.

There are many people who are ready and willing to talk about F. P. H. A. projects in this State. These include municipal officials, local housing authorities, and even honest F. P. H. A. employees who feel they owe a higher duty to their country than to bungling superiors who are responsible for this gross inefficiency and mismanagement.

CHICOPEE

Six bewildered families are the only occupants of a 250-family defense-housing project in Chicopee which cost $558,000. They are bewildered because they do not understand how their beneficent Government could have set their living quarters on the most desolate, muddy, water-logged clay bank available in that section of an otherwise well-drained, pleasant countryside. They find themselves the lonely inhabitants of a community that was a ghost town even before its construction was completed. They understand now why Chicopee city officials so vehemently objected to the project, and why "white elephant" is the least vigorous of the critical descriptions applied to their drab and gumbo-encrusted village.

Most of them are looking for a place to live. They want some of the conveniences, if not any of the luxuries, of life. But here they find no street lights, no phones, no cooking gas, no fire-alarm systems, no cellars—only drab, tawdry empty buildings and an outlook as desolate as the Alaskan tundra in winter. They slog along in and out of the small cubicles that pass for "home," with slimy clay still sticking to their shoes and to the despair of the housewives, all of whom wage an endless losing battle against dirt.

Only blindness, stubbornness, or ignorance mixed with an utter disregard of the first principles of building construction could have prompted the F. P. H. A. officials to select this shifting clay hillside as a site for a project.

There is a story connected with the erection of a schoolhouse hopefully located just above the vacant F. P. H. A. project. It is of too recent origin and too widely known to escape the attention of an intelligent and inquisitive F. P. H. A. site selector, interested in obtaining the best buy for the taxpayers of this country.

Some time after the school was finished the wall on the lower side of the clay hill started to slide. According to witnesses, it moved fully a foot before its progress was stopped. It cost the city of Chicopee thousands of dollars to shore up the foundation and remove the danger of collapse.

Yet, with this example staring them in the face, F. P. H. A. officials selected this unstable hillside as an ideal spot to throw up a new project. Why? Why did the F. P. H. A. insist upon taking over this site over the protest of Chicopee officials when other locations were available? Who was the owner of this site previous to F. P. H. A. occupation? How long did he own the premises? How much did he pay for the premises? How much did the United States Government pay him for the site? Every taxpayer in Massachusetts is interested in the answers to these questions.

Calamity stalks the Federal defense-housing projects in Massachusetts. One day in Pittsfield there were 100 units. The next day there were only 99. Overnight one of the buildings was blasted to smithereens. A gas explosion in the dwelling was given as the cause. And in Chicopee one of the two-story buildings collapsed for some reason as yet undetermined. The builder said it was vandalism, but no complaint was made to the police. Mr. Trevvett, F. P. H. A. development chief, blamed it on loose braces. Another theory was that too much material was stored on the second floor and the weak 2 x 3 studding which supported the upper floor could not stand the strain. But Sumner K. Wiley, the F. P. H. A. director for this region, blamed the collapse on a sudden, severe gale.

SPRINGFIELD

What is a zero housing unit? Zero units, for the information of those initiated in the tortuous processes of the F. P. H. A., is a combination kitchen and bedroom, with perhaps some draperies or a folding door between. They are called zeros presumably for the reason they have nothing else but the one room. They have 16 of these zeros in the Riverview Apartments project in Springfield.

By what devious mental processes could the F. P. H. A. arrive at the conclusion that such skimpy quarters would satisfy $50-to-$150-a-week employees in Springfield's booming war plants?

That another blunder was committed here is evidenced by the fact that hardly any of the zero apartments are now occupied. There was some demand for them at first, but rigid restrictions placed upon entertaining caused some of the gay young tenants to seek quarters elsewhere. Hence the zeros are as empty as the inside of a cipher.

There are 192 units, zero and other kinds, in this project, and two-thirds of them are empty. An effort is now being made to convert the zeros into 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom suites. Nevertheless, John Robinson, chairman of the Springfield Housing Authority, which manages the premises for the F. P. H. A., says that applications for all units have fallen off sharply. The federation has suggested that instead of expanding the zeros into multiple-room units, for which there seems to be no demand, it would be better to demolish these buildings now rather than have them deteriorate into federally owned and operated slums.

The manner of awarding the contract for construction of the Riverview Apartments is such as to warrant investigation by a congressional committee.

The Walsh Construction Co., of Holyoke, was lowest bidder on the project when the specifications were first put out. Immediately the company was requested to hurry a representative to Washington to complete the preliminary arrangements. The company representative conferred with F. P. H. A. officials and was given a verbal go-ahead since F. P. H. A. wanted work started on the project immediately.

The company proceeded to make on-site improvements which cost in the vicinity of $20,000. Suddenly, orders were issued to stop all work until further notice.

Later the company was informed changes in the specifications necessitated calling for new bids. When these were opened the Walsh Co. was not the low bidder. The F. P. H. A. informed the Walsh Co. there was nothing in writing to authorize the on-site improvements and therefore its bill for this work could not be paid.

Question. Why was it necessary to change the specifications suddenly several weeks after the contract had been awarded and work had been started? What F. P. H. A. official was responsible for this sudden shift in plans? What were the reasons for the change? In what particulars did the new specifications differ from the old? These questions might very properly be asked of F. P. H. A. regional director, Sumner K. Wiley.

Springfield city officials did not want this project. There are two other housing plants in the city and they long have felt these were sufficient. Their principal fear is that the Riverview Apartments will develop into a slum area under Federal auspices.

Fancy names have been hitched to most of the defense housing projects in Massachusetts. But even this device has failed to entice war workers to occupy the projects.

The Springfield project is called Riverview Apartments. This is a misnomer. True, the project is located on the banks of the majestic Connecticut, but a 15-foot high concrete wall runs the full length of the river bank at this point, blocking any possible view of the river by any occupant of the project.

"Oophs, there goes another" is a frequently heard expression at the Riverview Apartments. "Another" refers to the flying roofs which fill the air over the project on a windy day. Tar-paper roofing is frequently seen flying in all directions, and much additional expense is incurred in trying to hold the papier-mâché houses together.

HOLYOKE

"The Holyoke defense housing project is a monstrosity. We did not want it here in the first place. It was not needed. We advised against it, but our advice was spurned. We don't want any Federally-owned slums in Holyoke. The Holyoke Housing Authority will have nothing to do with it."

This is the startling declaration of John F. Dowling, chairman of the Holyoke Housing Authority. This does not mean that the Authority is against Federal housing. The Authority now manages for the F. P. H. A. two other projects of permanent nature in the city. But the Authority is unanimous in declaring that it will have no part of the third project, called Liberty Park.

Here again gloom and emptiness pervade this project, which has, indeed, a strange history. Two months ago there were 2 tenants in the 44-family project. Since then there has been a 100-percent increase. Today there are 4 families in the project.

Originally it was planned to build 114 family units. The contract was let to the Walsh Construction Co. of Holyoke. The price was $212,000. The Walsh Co. had expended $20,000 making on-site improvements when word was received from F. P. H. A. moguls to stop work.

It seems that the violent and constant protests of city officials and the Holyoke Housing Authority, that the project was not needed, was beginning to penetrate the outer defenses of the F. P. H. A. consciousness.

Conferences were held. F. P. H. A. stubbornness melted before the incontrovertible evidence that the rental shortage in Holyoke has passed the peak and that rentals in private buildings were available.

F. P. H. A. finally conceded that there was some merit to the protests. But it would not admit a total blunder, however. So the Walsh Co. was instructed to proceed, but on a much restricted basis. The 114-family project was cut to 44 units. But if the F. P. H. A. had to pay for all the on-site improvements that would be an admission that somebody had pulled a boner, so the F. P. H. A. informed Walsh Co. officials that F. P. H. A. would pay only for those improvements where the 44 units were located and the company would have to stand the loss for the remainder. This is further evidence of the F. P. H. A. refusal to admit an error or to learn a lesson from a previous mistake.

Not only are Holyoke officials and citizens indignant at the insistence of F. P. H. A. officials in thrusting a project upon them which they did not want and fear will develop into a slum area, but the defense workers for whom the dwellings were presumably erected, refuse to occupy them.

Here is the story told by William E. Yoerg, former mayor of Holyoke, and now executive director of the Holyoke Housing Authority. The two other projects managed by the authority are filled up. There are long waiting lists for each place. The Holyoke Authority suggested to a number on each waiting list that they take tenements in the Liberty Park project. Their almost universal reply was: "What, live in that dump?"

The Liberty Park project is located on the site of the Holyoke circus grounds. Holyoke officials and citizens say that F. P. H. A. antics bring back undeniable memories of the acrobats, clowns, and mountebanks of a long-past era. But the taxpayers feel they are paying too much for the show this time.

Just one further instance of F. P. H. A. inefficiency and utter disregard of ordinary business principles. During his inspection of the Holyoke project in November, the federation representative found water still in the pipes of the unoccupied dwellings. In a postscript to the Holyoke article in Taxtalk, the monthly publication of the federation, it was suggested as advisable to shut off the water in these units to avert freezing and bursting water pipes. Two years before such an incident had occurred in the Chicomansett project, only a few miles away.

But again advice was ignored by F. P. H. A. officials. For only 2 weeks after Taxtalk was issued, articles were carried in the Springfield and Holyoke newspapers stating that the water pipes in the unoccupied tenements had burst and that water had poured out into the streets creating hazardous conditions.

SOUTHBRIDGE

In Southbridge the F. P. H. A. spurned an offer of an unused factory for a women's dormitory rent free for the duration and insisted upon paying the owner $15,000 for the building.

This is one of the highlights of the two Federal defense housing projects in Southbridge. Neither project was wanted by Southbridge officials and there have been frequent clashes between the town officials and the F. P. H. A.

There are 80 family units in the project called Chestnut Heights. This project was conceived and constructed over the vigorous protest of Southbridge officials. The Southbridge Housing Authority took over the management of this project, but solely "to prevent it from developing into a slum area," according to members of the authority.

Southbridge taxpayers were so resentful of the Chestnut Heights project that they condemned the project on the floor of the town hall at an annual town meeting. It was decided, however, that for the best interests of the town and the taxpayers the town should take over operation of both projects. The selectmen appointed the first housing authority, but now the members are elected at the annual town meeting.

Although completed for several months, the Chestnut Heights project is similar to the others as far as tenancy is concerned. There are not more than 10 tenants in the 80 family units in Chestnut Heights. There are about 35 in the available 98 bedrooms in the dormitory.

Recently the F. P. H. A. autocratically ordered the Southbridge authority to reduce rentals for rooms in the dormitory. The authority refused to do so. The members charged that the F. P. H. A. was attempting to subsidize the defense workers who occupied the dormitory to the detriment of other workers. Furthermore, the authority stated there were plenty of vacant rooms in private houses in Southbridge and that subsidizing the dormitory tenants was competing with those engaged in the rental business in Southbridge. The Southbridge authority seems to have won the first round, as no reductions in dormitory rents have been made.

PITTSFIELD

Whiplashed by the howling gales that sweep in unending tides across the Berkshires, 99 tiny, cigar-box dwellings cling precariously to the rocky top of the highest hill in Pittsfield.

Here is where the F. P. H. A. decided, by some unimaginable process of reasoning, to build 100 single-family units at a cost of $500,000, or $5,000 per dwelling. Today there are only 34 of the dwellings occupied. If any one site selection was to be chosen as the worst example of F. P. H. A. inefficiency, then the palm should go to the anonymous F. P. H. A. official who selected the Pittsfield site.

Perhaps it is only repetitious to say that this site was bitterly opposed by Pittsfield officials. Mayor Fallon was against it from the start. The Pittsfield Housing Authority suggested other sites more suitable. But the same stubbornness and arrogant disregard for the advice of others that seems always to characterize F. P. H. A. site selections, battered down the Pittsfield officials. The result has been constant conflict between the F. P. H. A. and city officials.

Five thousand dollars will build a fairly good small modern house even in wartimes, but $5,000 per unit for the boxes on stilts that pass as homes on top of Victory Hill is positively and unequivocally a waste of the taxpayers' money. Like other projects, the buildings here have no cellars, no phones, no fire alarm system, no mail boxes, and no accepted streets. Coal bins are located outside the back door. No shelter is provided for automobiles of the tenants here where the temperature frequently falls well below zero. The only telephone on the premises is located in the recreation building.

Here is the procedure in case of fire, according to instructions passed out by the F. P. H. A. The tenant who finds his home suddenly ablaze must hurry to the recreation building, either break down the door or smash a window and stumble around in the dark until he finds the telephone. Or he can do none of these things and let his building burn down.

The flimsy quality of these buildings was clearly demonstrated during the November cold spell. One moment everything was peaceful in the lightless streets. The next moment there was a tremendous explosion. Almost immediately one of the 100 units was a mass of flames. It was only a matter of minutes before the building was completely demolished.

F. P. H. A. officials blamed the explosion on leaking gas.

What is the reason these flimsy cigar boxes cost $5,000 each? Again the answer is the blind, stupid selection of this rocky peak as a project site. Thousands of dollars were wasted on blasting through solid rock. Because of the severe winter the frost line is deeper here than in other places and dollars and days were wasted in running public utilities through the solid ledges. This would not have been necessary if the F. P. H. A. officials had heeded the wise counsel of Pittsfield officials.

Pittsfield spent $20,000 running gas, sewerage, and water pipes to the project. City officials are doubtful if the city will ever be reimbursed. Payments in lieu of taxes were held up for several months by F. P. H. A. little Caesars because the city refused to accept the streets located in the project. F. P. H. A. wanted assurance the streets would be plowed out in winter before the Government would make payments. This assurance the city refused to give. Mr. Wiley then said the F. P. H. A. would buy its own plows to do the work. Here is another example of the autocracy of bureaucracy. Here Federal officials would set up a separate governmental unit sufficient unto itself, within the confines of a political subdivision of the sovereign State of Massachusetts.

INFORMATION RECEIVED AND BELIEVED TO BE RELIABLE BY FEDERATION BUT NOT YET VERIFIED

The Bath, Maine, site was selected by an agency other than F. P. H. A., but the deal had not been closed when Mr. Wiley, regional director, took over. He could have dropped this project if he wished, but the final selection was definitely his. There is underground water at Bath with springs constantly supplying water. The site is in a low section surrounded by hills and thousands have been spent in addition to the original contract price for sewers and drainage and it was necessary to install pumps in the houses to eject the water. The overcharges on this project will be tremendous. This site should never have been selected and certainly it should not have been developed, if Mr. Wiley had been on the job. More pumps were requisitioned for this project only last week.

NEW LONDON

Wiley is responsible for the selection of this site. This is on a solid ledge, where thousands were spent and only one-half mile away was an ideal level site. This could have been had for $3,000 more than the selected site, but $35,000 more than the contract price was expended at the selected site on rock excavation.

SOUTH PORTLAND

This was a cost-plus job with contract given to Casper Ranger, of Holyoke. George McLaughlin, former selectman of Belmont, and a capable engineer, was the F. P. H. A. project engineer. He criticized the Ranger type of work and was subsequently discharged because he "talked too much." This project went one and one-half million dollars over the estimated cost, according to our reports. It was said that winter weather and labor conditions ran up the cost, but most of the additional expense was due to inefficient and inadequate supervision of the work by F. P. H. A. McLaughlin complained

on numerous occasions to the Boston office and this correspondence should be very illuminating—yet he did not get the support he should have received.

Casper Ranger held elaborate parties at the Copley Plaza, at which F. P. H. A. officials were particular guests. There were 200 girls in the Ranger office in Portland. Trench diggers, trucks, and other heavy equipment were hauled to the scene of the project, but never used, even though a charge of $50 a day was paid for each item of equipment. Seventy-five dozen shovels and the same number of picks, more doors than were necessary, and much other equipment was purchased through the procurement section, but never used on this site. Fourteen Skilsaws which cost $250 each were stolen from this project. The contractor paid for this expense and F. P. H. A. reimbursed him.

Mr. McLaughlin, the F. P. H. A. engineer, made a written report to the Boston office and nothing was ever done. The Truman committee and the Department of Justice are understood to have started an investigation of the Portland project.

GROTON, CONN.

This was the other cost-plus contract in New England. The contractor was Lindholm, who was also the contractor on the Pittsfield project. The Groton contract ran about a million over the estimated cost. This project was supposed to provide housing for employees of the Electric Boat Co. Mr. Blandford, who was one of the officials in the National Housing Authority was responsible for determining the needs of public-housing projects. Mr. Dobbs is a local director of the N. H. A. with offices at 24 School Street. It is his duty to determine the need in any locality for a project.

The Groton project will never be fully occupied because of the poor site development there. Mr. Wiley is responsible for this site.

Houses in the Fort Hill project at Groton, Conn., were jammed together so badly they constituted a fire menace. The Connecticut fire marshal told the F. P. H. A. the crowding constituted a fire menace. There have been 12 fires in the Groton area, which comprises several projects. One house in the Fort Hill project burned down in 7 minutes.

Ira C. Kimball, 73 Martin Street, Cambridge, worked at the Groton project as an assistant mechanic. He said the Groton Board of Health shut up several houses at the Star Hill project because the septic tanks were laid in clay and the sewage could find no seepage, particularly in the low area, with the result that it overoflwed the tanks and covered the surface. After children became ill the board of health stepped in and ordered the houses in the low areas closed.

Victory Terrace, also at Groton, is a dormitory, or rather was a dormitory until fire nearly destroyed it.

The trouble with the Groton project—and this is typical of practically all temporary jobs—is that the flues are jammed up against the wall material, which is generally combustible. Because of small fans, the hot air is not pushed through the flues as it should, with the result the flues become overheated and fire the surrounding material.

Kimball said the F. P. H. A. installed 200 sewage tanks at the Groton project. One hundred were put in first at Navy Heights and, although found to be unsuitable because of the clay, 100 more were installed at Star Hill. It cost $25 a day to pump out the tanks, and it was necessary to clean out most of them every second or third day.

At Navy Heights, which was constructed for navy officers and their families, as soon as a Navy family would move out a defense worker's family would be installed by the F. P. H. A. This condition became so bad that a protest was made by naval officers to Mrs. Roosevelt. Then the workers' families were thrown out.

Kimball says the 1,100-family Fort Hill project is built on a mud flat near the railroad tracks probably on the wrong side.

Kimball says six houses were built in a very low area and at least three in a swamp. These were condemned by the Groton Board of Health, which put up signs on the houses saying they must not be occupied. But the F. P. H. A. took the signs down—it wouldn't look nice to have newly built houses condemned. F. P. H. A., however, has locked them up and they are not available to tenants.

PORTLAND

Contractor Bowen also had a 500-unit project at South Portland which is not in the housing directory. This cost a million. That it was not necessary is proved by the fact other Portland projects are not occupied.

At Red Bank village, more than $200,000 was spent on extras. Ranger not only had his personal representative on the job at all times but also his personal lawyer. The subcontracts on this were extremely high. This was one of the two cost-plus jobs.

Long Creek is only 20 percent occupied. Mountain Apartments, 382 temporary, cost $1,769,000, has only 10-percent occupancy. Despite these vacancies the F. P. H. A. went ahead with the latest South Portland job, on which Bowen is contractor. There may be a few now in this latest South Portland job but most of it is boarded up.

Although Mountain View, also Portland, was completed nearly a year ago, the heating system was so bad they are still working on it. They spent originally $135,000 on heating. The extras and change orders on heating alone now amount to $28,000 in addition to the $135,000. The entire heating job could have been done and properly for $80,000. One Slotnich, of New York, was the contractor on this.

J. Slotnick, Boston, had the Broadview, Portland job. Although the job has been completed and accepted last fall the F. P. H. A. is holding up $50,000 on Slotnick claiming noncompliance with specifications.

Extras in heating alone are estimated to run into $2,500,000 in region I area. This could have been saved by intelligent planning and construction.

The grade at Groton involved filling which cost additional thousands of dollars and the entire project was handled in a most uneconomical manner. Wiley was responsible for the lack of supervision of the contractor which duty and obligation rested fully and completely on the Boston office. These demountable buildings were designed by an Alabama architect who, apparently, had no conception of the New England climate in winter. The mistakes made in design, particularly regarding heating (Pittsfield is an outstanding case) is an example of lack of foresight.

SOUTHINGTON, CONN.

They have 150 dormitories there. Eight are occupied. There is a cafeteria big enough to feed the whole town. This project should not be completed as there is definitely no demand for the rooms. Unneeded cafeterias were also constructed at other projects.

The Nathan Strauss Duparquette Co. has the inside track on the selling of kitchen cafeteria equipment for these lunchrooms. This company is located in New York. Southington was designed to house workers at the new Pratt Whitney plant, but the project is 3 miles away from this plant and the workers will not go that distance. The manner of awarding contracts on cafeteria equipment might very properly be investigated. This equipment is purchased through the central procurement office in Washington and practically all of this equipment is purchased from the Strauss Co. The majority of the cafeterias are not needed. Most of them run in the red. The Government absorbs the loss of subsidizing the occupants of the dormitories. Several of these cafeterias which were opened in New England are now closed.

WEYMOUTH, MASS.

The Weymouth project, 100 units, with a contract price of $578,000, is built on a rhubarb farm which was bypassed by private builders because of the fact that it was studded with subsurface springs which inundated much of the ground during the spring. The subsurface condition in Weymouth was known to practically every resident in the town.

If the F. P. H. A. had made soil tests they would have discovered unquestionably the presence of springs. However, construction had hardly begun before the subsoil conditions became apparent to the F. P. H. A. engineers. During the first evacuations the steam shovels were taking up as much water as earth. During the course of construction the pumps were operating day and night in an effort to dry out the excavations. No attempt was made during construction, in spite of the obvious water hazard there, to change the specifications and to install proper drainage systems.

Following completion, however, the situation was so bad and the complaints by tenants of flooded cellars were so numerous, that F. P. H. A. had to install curtain drains. The cost for relief of the water situation will run into $50,000 it is estimated. The correspondence between the Boston office and the engineers on the site would show that Mr. Wiley, head of the Boston office, was entirely familiar with the situation and made no attempt to remedy the defects.

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Harold Poole is executive director of the housing authority in Bridgeport. This authority published a report on public housing in Bridgeport which condemns the negligence of the F. P. H. A. officials and squandering of public funds. The situation there is so bad the authority has asked the Byrd committee to make an investigation.

CHARTER OAK TERRACE AT HARTFORD

The subsoil and ground-water conditions at this site were especially troublesome. The site grading plan and street pavement specifications were poorly conceived and many errors and omissions in the drawings were not corrected before the contract was let.

The original drawings submitted by the architects provided for connection of roof conductors to storm sewers which would have carried water away from the houses. The regional office of United States Housing Authority, which comprised the same key personnel as the present regional office of Federal Public Housing Authority, however, insisted that the connections of roof conductors to sewers be eliminated. The result has been that crawl spaces and cellars under houses have been continuously flooded. This project comprises 1,000 dwelling units and has been fully tenanted for a year—and, though about $170,000 has been spent over and above the original contract price to correct these and other errors in planning, it is probable that another $80,000 will have to be spent to fully correct the nuisance and eliminate the hazard to health to which the tenants are being subjected.

Many thousands of extra dollars have been or will have to be spent to overcome drainage defects or to excavate and remove ledge and boulders from poorly selected sites on most of the above projects.

Such errors have not only been costly but they have caused serious delays in time of completion of sorely needed housing and unnecessary health hazards and inconvenience to tenants in those projects that have been occupied prior to correction of the defects.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I also insert two paragraphs from a recent editorial in the Boston Post, a Demo-

cratic newspaper, dated February 26, 1944, which tends to confirm the conclusions drawn from the material which has been furnished me.

The editorial reads in part as follows:

Previously, the war-housing units were reserved for war workers and their families in the areas where it was believed congestion had developed or was threatened. But thousands upon thousands of these units were never occupied at all. The heads of the Government agencies that built these houses say that changes in the war program, development of greater efficiency by the workers, freezing of jobs, etc., resulted in fewer applicants for housing than had been estimated.

In a word, the scores of millions wasted on these projects were spent on guesswork. Even the bad guessing might be excused in the rush of the war emergency, but what does not appear to be excusable was the building of these units in places where the local authorities familiar with the situation said they were not needed; and on top of this, the construction, especially here in New England, was of such a nature that the houses could never be of much use except as summer camps.

At the best they were poorly constructed and, in many instances, little or no provision was made for such public services as light or water. It was maintained by the Federal agencies that these housing projects were to be self-sustaining through proper rentals, but this has proved sadly not so. Now the houses are to be placed in the stand-by category, which probably means they will remain idle indefinitely at Government expense.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this measure contains many items which, in my opinion, are not necessary and nonessential, but which, in my humble opinion, are not helpful to the war effort but which will operate as an obstruction to the war effort in the end. This war is not over. When we receive information respecting our progress in this war we are constrained to say that we are just getting started. We have taken a few outposts only. The major portion of this war is yet to be fought and won before victory is ours.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as we contemplate the very serious situation before us, let us analyze some of the provisions of this measure. However, prior to entering into this particular discussion, let me say that heretofore when our country has become involved in war—and I speak especially of the period during World War No. 1—our country, under the leadership at that time, buckled up the belt and began to economize in every respect except as to those things which were essential for the war and for our ultimate victory. Everything that was absolutely necessary for the war was forthcoming, but those things which were unnecessary for the prosecution of the war were largely eliminated. The leadership of this Nation during the period of World War No. 1 recognized the terrific financial strain upon the people, which was apparent in their efforts to provide the funds with which to prosecute the war. That was a monumental task. But that leadership during that struggle did not continue to make demands for the people to put their hard-earned dollars into the Federal Treasury for unnecessary and nonessential things. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the theory of economy was urged, and it was practiced. Caution and judgment became the watchword respecting our financial condition. That is as it should be. And with the exercise of that care and judgment, when that First World War was over we had a debt of approximately $40,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, in this present conflict the leadership in this Nation has utterly failed to follow, as a precedent, the wise course which was pursued during World War No. 1. Instead of pursuing a course of care and caution, instead of profiting by the experiences of the last World War, and instead of spending the taxpayers' money wisely and carefully for the essential purpose of prosecuting this war, this administration has entered upon a program of spending, waste, and extravagance the like of which has never been recorded in any nation throughout history. I am not speaking about the expense of the war—that which has been necessary in order to successfully prosecute the war—but I am speaking about the waste and extravagance which has been permitted, and in many cases sanctioned, under the guise and pretense of war, and I am speaking of those things which are entirely of a civilian nature which have been continued, although not necessary. We cannot win wars by the waste of money. Waste and extravagance can do one thing—those things can lose wars. The resources of any nation has its limitations; and when that limit has been reached, when the people are unable to respond in purchasing bonds and in paying the taxes which are imposed upon them, then disaster occurs. Those in authority and leadership today should stop, look, and listen. They should take an inventory of our situation, and they should realize that if this present war should continue for 2, 3, or 5 years—as some of the so-called experts have suggested—what a serious situation we will then face. With a debt of more than $200,000,000,000 at the moment, which may be increased to $300,000,000,000 or more before this war is over, and with the terrific taxes the people will have to pay, what will be the opportunity of our people to make progress? And, I wonder, what opportunity will our soldiers and sailors have when they return from war with the terrific tax burden upon them that such a debt will require? These are staggering problems, and those in leadership in this country should think, and act, and stop the unnecessary and nonessential spending of the people's money, and they should stop the waste and extravagance that has been developed in the many and various hearings before congressional committees.

Mr. Chairman, I wish especially to speak of some of the material matters that are exposed by the hearings on this bill. The National Housing Agency, which was created by the present leadership in this Nation, has been the source of more spending and waste, in large amounts, and of gross inefficiency, than any agency of the Government. This measure proposes some 23,261 additional housing units for the remainder of the fiscal year. With all of the scandal that we have had in the past regarding some of these housing projects, and I speak of them advisedly, I am surprised that the committee would consider any such additional housing. In my own State of Indiana, we had 1 project at Kingsford where approximately 1,100 housing units were constructed, at a tremendous cost. There were some 250 of them occupied, and no more. These were of a permanent construction. Then, after this unnecessary construction, the National Housing Agency decided to tear a large number of these housing units down and move them elsewhere. The cost of wrecking these units, and then moving them away, and then trying to reconstruct them at the new location is entailing a tremendous cost to our Government. There was a grave mistake made, in that project, in building the units in the first place. That was miserable bungling on the part of some agency of government, because the people had no part in either the location or the construction of these housing units. They had but to pay the debt. However, the people in that particular locality realized that the Government had made a miserable mistake in constructing such a large number of housing units at that place. The Government officials should have likewise known that those housing units were unnecessary, and that they were unessential. That simply demonstrates that incompetent people are engaged in that work, and that they are contracting for the expenditure of untold millions of dollars of the hard-earned money of the people of the Nation. This same condition exists very largely throughout the country. This must be stopped, and the waste must be discontinued. Those in authority must cause this waste to be stopped. We cannot win this war if waste and extravagance is countenanced. I am speaking for the boys and the girls in the uniform of our country—and I am speaking for the people of this Nation—I urge the immediate discontinuance of all waste and extravagance in every department of our Governmentt, in the interest of our ultimate victory in this war.

Mr. Chairman, under the heading of "Community facility, Federal Works Agency," in the out-plant and store facilities, we find in the testimony that grocery stores, moving-picture theaters, and places—beauty parlors, shoe-shining places, and the like, are countenanced by this Agency. Has it come to the place in the history of our Nation when our Government spends the taxpayers' money for beauty parlors, moving-picture theaters, and shoe-shining stands? This in time of war, when our boys are fighting for liberty and freedom, and we do not know whether the resources of our country will be sufficient to prosecute this war to ultimate victory. These are nonessential things. These are unnecessary things. Money spent in time of war for luxuries and things which can be eliminated from the category of necessities is an obstruction to our war effort. When our soldiers and sailors return from this

war and learn of the foolish and unnecessary things that have been done by this administration while they were fighting, and for all of which they will have to aid in paying, I wonder what they will say.

Mr. Chairman, these are serious days. These are tragic days. This spending of the taxpayers' money for unnecessary and unessential things must be stopped. Yes, we want to win this war—we must win this war—but we cannot win it if this administration continues to spend, waste, and squander the taxpayers' money and the resources of this Nation. This deficiency bill would not be necessary if some economy has been recognized in the past by those in power and control in our Government. Since this measure is here let us cut it down, let us carve out the nonessential things, let us eliminate the needless housing and the beauty parlors and the shoe-shining stands and let us get down to the business of fighting and winning this war, that this Nation may survive and that the people may not be bowed down in debt beyond their ability to pay.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI].

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the day I placed into the hopper H. R. 4352 which amends and revises H. R. 4010, a bill I introduced January 18, 1944. The purpose of this measure is to replace the present cost-plus and other systems of contracting for public construction by a system of negotiated lump-sum contracts. It specifically abolishes the cost-plus contracts by providing that no construction or road-building contract shall hereafter be entered into on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis or a cost-plus-a-percentage-of-cost basis.

Throughout our defense and war-production effort, we have been brought face to face with the tremendous cost and waste that has accompanied contracts let on a cost-plus basis. The scandals that have arisen are not based so much on the fee allowed the contractor as because the costs have been permitted to mount to astronomic proportions as a result of failure to properly plan, control, and limit the expenditures. Only the other day, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], brought to our attention the tremendous waste experienced in the construction of the Pentagon Building. This structure was built on a cost-plus basis and in the end cost the taxpayers of the Nation 150 percent over the amount originally appropriated for its construction.

Mr. Chairman, a number of labor leaders have complained to me, as no doubt they have complained to other Members, that the greatest waste and the biggest hoarders of manpower are to be found among contractors doing work on a cost-plus basis. It is surprising also that the contractors have repeatedly stated that they have found their men least efficient when they are engaged in work known to be done under a cost-plus contract. One of the largest war producers of my State informed me that when a contract for almost identical work was changed from cost-plus to a negotiated contract, the efficiency of the shop increased from 10 to 20 percent.

H. R. 4352 sets up a means of protecting the Government from profiteers. It provides for a simplified system of auditing and adjustment of fees. It sets up a formal process of renegotiation of various construction contracts and acts as an aid to such process. It provides a means of removing many of the causes of unfair-trade practices in public construction which many representative contractors have been endeavoring to wipe out. It provides a triple check of costs of every contract negotiated under it; that is, first, an estimate of the work to be done is established before a general contractor is selected; second, a check and approval of the contract and subcontracts must be made by the ratifying committee before the work is begun and finally, third, the ratifying committee makes a complete audit of the books of the contractor and subcontractors before final payment.

In order to avoid the abuses that creep into contracts as a result of extras, H. R. 4352 specifically provides that all extras shall be negotiated for in advance on a lump-sum basis in the same manner as prescribed for in the original contract.

A central construction-contract ratifying committee is established under H. R. 4352 which would have jurisdiction over all construction and building contracts that are entered into by any and all the various Government awarding authorities. In this way, a more uniform system of contract letting is established and takes the matter out of the hands of whimsical individuals. This ratifying committee is established as a part of the General Accounting Office and is to consist of three members who are qualified engineers or architects. The ratifying committee shall have the power to disapprove any contract that does not comply with the existing law and the provisions of this act and shall have available to it all the records in connection with all contracts that are negotiated by any and all Government agencies. No contract can be consumated without its approval. It shall also have the power to adjust any and all differences arising between the awarding authority and the contractor or between the contractor and a subcontractor. The centralization of the ratification of all contracts should greatly aid in avoiding conflicts and confusion that often occur under the present system of letting Government contracts.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 4352 deals only with construction and building contracts. It is my fervent hope that the committee to which this measure may be assigned for consideration may be able to expand and elaborate it to cover all Government procurement. In order to prevent the abuses that have been creeping into Government contracts, it is the duty and obligation of Congress to adopt a set and definite policy governing all Government contracts and procurement in general. The plan I submit is not a perfect one, and I am not wedded to any particular part of it. However, I believe it points in the right direction and should be developed to that end. I trust that this matter may receive the early attention of the House in order that it may be incorporated into the law of the land as quickly as possible for it is in my opinion a long step toward holding and cutting down the cost of waging the war and any and all work that may be planned in the post-war era.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to remind the membership of a little election—not so small, but very important, that was held in Colorado in the First District only yesterday. I am personally interested in the election and the outcome of it because of the fact, if you know the geography of Colorado, you will realize that the Second District of Colorado, which I have the honor to represent, completely surrounds the city of Denver, and the First District is nothing more nor less than the incorporated city of Denver.

This election had in it all the elements that you will find in the coming campaign. I am sure, had the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who so eloquently addressed us this afternoon, been able to understand the full pulse of the people of that great district, he would realize the fact that the common man has nothing particularly to approve or support the O. P. A., and the gentlemen who have been trying to enforce their regulations.

There were many issues in this campaign that may parallel the campaign coming this fall. There is not any question in my mind but that this particular election might set the pattern. In this election you may see, if you will study the issues as they were discussed by the various candidates and their supporters, just a faint foreshadowing of the things to come. And that is important.

I would like to give you in closing a word or two of statistics on this election.

In 1938 the Republican candidate for Congress was defeated in this district by 4,100 votes. In 1940 the Democratic majority reached an all-time high of 50,000. In 1942 this Democratic majority began to dwindle and it dropped to a majority of 8,000 votes. We now discover in this special election held yesterday that the Republican candidate received a majority of about 3,000 votes. That is not official, it is absolutely unofficial. I wish you would think for just a moment, that in 1940 this district was carried by a Democratic majority of 50,000 and only yesterday the Republican candidate carried it by 3,000. That is a change of 53,000 votes. I think that should shock the gentleman from Texas and make him realize the fact that some of this program these boys have been promoting is not what the people want.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of informing the Committee that during the hearings

we had before us members of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Much talk has gone on here recently in this House relative to subsidies, and I am happy that I was present on the occasion when the Commodity Credit Corporation officials were before the subcommittee, because I have an announcement that I want to make to this House as to the evidence that was presented. Moreover, in making it to the House I hope it will be read by the farmers of this Nation. There has been so much misunderstanding, so many interpretations of facts, so many little individual avenues of approach to this program that lead, as it were, into a blind alley that I am happy now to say that I have from the testimony of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation discovered the truth of the downright subsidy of the farm program. This ought to be news to certain Members of this House who have no respect at all for a subsidy for the consumer.

The consumers' subsidy is one of the greatest pegs that can be placed in the spiral of inflation, and unless this House sees fit to establish such a check we are going to experience inflation to such a marked degree that it will cause the people of this Nation to rise up in justifiable concern. I want to say in the first place that the total of a loss of $182,000,000 by the Commodity Credit Corporation was a subsidy to the farmers. That is including some of the profits that were made. The loss, for instance, to the American taxpayer, coming right out of Uncle Sam's pocketbook on the commodity corn was $44,073,875.59. In the matter of wheat the loss to the American pocketbook, the pocketbook of the taxpayer, to the benefit of the farmer, was something more than $128,000,000. On rye a benefit to the farmer but a loss to the people of the Nation who pay taxes was $576,761.08. On grain sorghum it was $3,107.53. On tobacco it was $1,431,917.53. Subsidies, mind you, every one of these figures to the farmers of the Nation, and still there is a loud cry to high heaven every time you talk about the smallest amount of money for the benefit of the consumer, for the people who live in the great cities of this country, for the people of Detroit from which I come, who hold their heads high in pride, cognizant of their devotion to the war effort, being first in production among the cities of this Nation, yea of the world.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Not until I finish with this question of subsidies to farmers.

Mr. PACE. That was what I wanted to ask about.

Mr. RABAUT. Turpentine and rosin were subsidized to the extent of over $3,500,000. Hops! We hear from every corner of the country that there is a shortage of beer, yet here we find the farmers subsidized for $883,809.66 for hops.

I am going to surprise you by saying that I am for this subsidy for the farmers. But let us tell them the truth about it. Truthfully let them know what this administration has done for them, not distort the facts until there is naught but confusion. As to this program, I have not yet concluded.

Crimson clover: This item, if you please, has been subsidized to the tune of $282.62; and peas and vetch have been subsidized for $1,618.72. Every dollar of it, mind you, goes to the farmers, a subsidy to the farmers; but there is an awful noise in this House every time anything is said about a subsidy for the consumer, yet the subsidy for the consumer is the one peg you can place to stop the spiral of inflation.

Oh, they cry: "I don't want my boy to pay my grocery bill." Why speak about the little family grocery bill when you have the grocery bill for lend-lease and you have the grocery bill for the armed services? Why the approach with the big ego appeal: "I don't want my boy to pay my grocery bill"? The inflation is going to hit your personal grocery bill and every other bill; it is going to hit the lend-lease grocery bill which your boy and my boy and you and everyone else will some day pay.

Likewise it will strike the grocery bill of the armed forces of this country; so if you oppose subsidies, tell the soldier boys the truth: "We are trying to raise the prices on you so you can suffer the longer when you return."

Every one of these figures I have read to you today is from the testimony of the duly constituted authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation and it is in their own printed form brought to the Deficiency Subcommittee on Appropriations that held the hearings to which this form was presented. I can go on. There are agricultural supplies out of Uncle Sam's pocketbook and into the farmers' pockets in the form of subsidies $13,632,464.01.

Mr. Chairman, let us not be deceived, and let us make no attempt to deceive others. We should take the long-range look at this subsidy program and clear our own conscience with reference to the obligation that is upon our shoulders as Members of this body and do our duty as we see it.

The following extract from the hearings before the committee bears evidence to the truth of my statement, proving that the farmer is the recipient of the subsidy:

BENEFICIARIES OF LOSSES

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask Mr. Bartelt a question or two. In the first place, I want to ask you who gets the benefit of these losses?

Mr. BARTELT. I believe that Mr. Hutson is better qualified to answer that question than I am, Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. HUTSON. I will describe the loss to you on wheat as an illustration.

Mr. RABAUT. I mean it more as a general question applying to all of these losses, because I intend to ask you about individual losses. You have an aggregate here of losses altogether in this estimate before us of $183,000,000.

Mr. HUTSON. I think it will be different for different commodities.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, in the first place, here let us take cotton. You have a profit on cotton of eight-million-and-some-odd-thousand dollars, and you have a net profit there totaling $9,069,312.41 on the items of cotton, barley, soybeans, flaxseed, peanuts, butter, and raisins. Those are the items that show profits. Now, the Government gets the benefit of the profits, does it not?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Those total profits amounting to some $9,000,000?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Now let us consider corn. For instance, the first year with corn, forty-four-million-and-some-odd-thousand dollars was lost. Who gets the benefit of that loss?

Mr. HUTSON. I think the loss in the case of corn arises out of a situation in which the producers receive more than the market price for their corn, and I think it might well be said that the corn producers got the benefit of that loss.

Mr. RABAUT. So that the American farmers got the benefit of this loss of $44,000,000?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. What about the almost $129,000,000 for wheat, who got the benefit for that loss?

Mr. HUTSON. That would be split between the wheat producers and the livestock producers.

Mr. RABAUT. So the farmers got the benefit of this loss?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RABAUT. So the producers of wheat and the producers of livestock, both of them farmers, got the benefits of this loss of roughly $129,000,000?

Mr. HUTSON. Well, it was divided between them.

Mr. RABAUT. They went the same place, the farmers got it?

Mr. HUTSON. That is right.

Mr. RABAUT. We have heard an awful lot of talk about subsidies for the consumers, and I just want to bring this out a little bit.

On rye we have a loss of $576,000. Who got the benefit of that loss?

Mr. HUTSON. The growers of the rye.

Mr. RABAUT. The growers of the rye?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RABAUT. The farmers again got the benefit of it. Then there is grain sorghum. You have a loss here of $3,107. Who got the benefit of this loss?

Mr. HUTSON. The producers of grain sorghum. We paid them much more than we could realize from it.

Mr. RABAUT. The farmers got that, too?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. The loss in tobacco was $1,431,917.53. How do you account for that loss, and who got the benefit of that loss?

Mr. HUTSON. The tobacco farmer got the benefit of that loss. We loaned at a rate higher than we could realize out of the loan when we sold the tobacco on the market.

Mr. RABAUT. So the farmers got the benefit of almost a million and a half dollars on tobacco?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. RABAUT. Here is turpentine and rosin, a loss of $3,529,291.13 on turpentine and rosin. Who got the benefit of that loss? The Government lost $3,500,000 here.

Mr. HUTSON. The farmers or naval-stores producers got the benefit of it.

Mr. RABAUT. Are they farmers?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. They are farmers, too?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. They got about $3,500,000 there—very good.

Here is hops. I thought with the great shortage of beer that the demand would be big for hops. There is shown here a loss of $883,809.66 on hops. The farmers got the benefit of that?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes.

(At this point there was a discussion off the record, at the conclusion of which the following occurred:)

Mr. RABAUT. We have quite a Cheddar-cheese program here. Now, I notice in the

Cheddar-cheese program we take a loss of $4,144,067.86.

Mr. LUDLOW. Was that made in New York?

Mr. RABAUT. Some of it is made up there.

Mr. TABER. We do not produce cheese enough in New York to run a corner grocery store.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to know who got the benefit of this loss which the Government sustained of over $4,000,000.

Mr. HUTSON. I can describe the nature of the operation, and I think it could be argued in that case either way. What happened was this——

Mr. RABAUT. Give us both of your arguments, because we are going to dissect them.

Mr. HUTSON. The price of cheese was 23¼ cents a pound at Plymouth, Wis.

Mr. TABER. You mean when you began to operate?

Mr. HUTSON. That is right; back when we began to take this loss. It appeared to the best-informed people in the Department and those that we could contact that it was necessary to pay the producers more than 23¼ cents a pound in order to get the production that we needed. We advanced the price 3¾ cents. We paid the producer of cheese 3¾ cents a pound more than he had gotten prior to the announcement of the program. By doing that we think that we got more cheese produced than we otherwise would have gotten, and to that extent certainly the consumer benefited.

The farmer actually was the first recipient of the benefit, certainly in receiving this additional amount. He got more than he would have gotten if we had not made a change in the program and if we had not absorbed the loss. We could argue that both the farmer and the consumer gained at the expense of the Government.

Mr. RABAUT. You mean the consumer got cheese at a lower figure than he would have gotten it otherwise?

Mr. HUTSON. I think he got more cheese.

Mr. RABAUT. He got more cheese in the consumer market, but he paid more for it?

Mr. HUTSON. No; he did not pay more for it.

Mr. RABAUT. He did not pay any more for it?

Mr. HUTSON. No.

Mr. RABAUT. So the consumer got more cheese into the consumer market.

The CHAIRMAN. But he would have had to have paid more if there had not been more cheese in the market.

Mr. RABAUT. The consumer got more cheese into the market at the same figure?

Mr. HUTSON. That is correct.

Mr. RABAUT. However, the money that was spent here did not go to the consumer?

Mr. HUTSON. It was paid to the producer.

Mr. RABAUT. It was paid to the producer, and the producer was the farmer.

Mr. TABER. Who was the producer?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. RABAUT. Now, we have a loss here on the fluid-milk program of $2,431,595.89. Now, the Government took that loss. Who got the benefit of that loss?

Mr. HUTSON. The situation there was very similar to that described in the case of cheese. It was felt that it was necessary to advance the price of milk in certain cases in order to keep up production.

Mr. RABAUT. In order to keep up production?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes; the prices paid to the producers were advanced and the prices were kept unchanged to the consumers, and we believe that resulted in more milk being on the market.

Mr. RABAUT. More milk was on the market?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I am not criticizing that part of the program, and, in fact, I like that, but I do want to develop that none of this money went to the consumer, but the money went to the producer, who is the farmer?

Mr. HUTSON. That is correct.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. RABAUT. I am opposed to the attitude that is taken against a subsidy for the consumer.

There is a small loss here on peas and vetch, $1,618.72, and there is a loss on crimson clover of $282.62, and there is a loss here on agricultural supplies purchase program of $13,632,000. Tell us about those items; I want to know if those went to the producer?

Mr. HUTSON. The first part—peas and vetch and crimson clover—were losses incurred in connection with guaranteeing producers of these seeds certain minimum prices, and being unable to realize the amount of those seeds when they sold them to other farmers. It was a transaction between two groups of farmers. We tried to get more seed produced by making a price guaranty, and it did not quite balance.

Mr. RABAUT. You had some losses there in order to get seed produced at a minimum price?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes. The growers of cottonseed, soybeans, and peanuts were guaranteed certain prices for their products. We guaranteed the producers prior to the planting season——

Mr. RABAUT. You guaranteed them?

Mr. HUTSON. Well, we guaranteed prices to the farmers to get the crop planted.

When we were ready to harvest the crop the impact of these additional quantities of soybeans and peanuts on the oil-bearing materials would have caused a reduction in cottonseed prices, so in all fairness to the people who sell their cottonseed, the impact from soybeans and peanuts would have caused a competing oil-seed product, and we established minimum prices on cottonseed——

Mr. RABAUT. To the farmer?

Mr. HUTSON. To the farmer.

Mr. RABAUT. So the farmer got the benefit of this $13,000,000; is that right?

Mr. HUTSON. My judgment is that when you marketed the products the existing ceiling prices would not permit the sale of the product at a price as high as the price which you had guaranteed the producers, and so we absorbed some losses, and in the case of soybeans and peanuts we gave the producer more than he otherwise would receive, and we got him to plant more.

In the case of cottonseed we kept the impact from breaking the market.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. RABAUT. I am very much in favor of this program, and all my questions were not asked with the idea of making light of the program, or doing anything injurious to it, but I did want to bring out this fact, that this program constitutes a subsidy to the farmer, which has been somewhat itemized here this morning in this mass of figures we have before us; but no one has an objection to their being subsidized and the market being stabilized.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. RABAUT. There are a few others in which there were profits to the Government that I did not talk about. But I will put them in my remarks.

There was a profit on wool, on figs, and rubber, a profit of $10,000,000 on rubber.

Mr. HUTSON. There was a question whether that should be credited to rubber or cotton. We exchanged cotton for rubber.

Mr. RABAUT. It shows here that there was $10,000,000 in profits on the rubber and $8,000,000 in the cotton figure as profit, so that is $18,000,000 in the rubber deal.

I think that constitutes the entire list.

I want to ask you what is the rate of interest you pay?

Mr. HUTSON. One percent.

Mr. RABAUT. You have had some transactions with the Treasury?

Mr. O'NEAL. What rate does the farmer pay?

Mr. HUTSON. Three percent.

Mr. RABAUT. You have had some other transactions with the Treasury, have you not?

Mr. HUTSON. The last debentures we sold were 1⅛ percent. Prior to that time we had sold debentures in the open market at the rate ranging from three-quarters to 1⅛ percent. We do a small amount of financing with the banks on special transactions as low as one-half of 1 percent and some financing where banks perform administrative services in addition to advancing the funds for which we pay interest at a rate of 1½ percent per annum.

Mr. RABAUT. Your agency has no connection with the meat subsidy or the butter subsidy?

Mr. HUTSON. We do not.

Mr. RABAUT. That is under the R. F. C.?

Mr. HUTSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

THE NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, one of the most important as well as one of the most discussed issues before the country today, is the National Service Act, proposed by the President. Most people, I believe, question the necessity or the advisability of enacting this proposal.

This bill provides for the mobilization of the manpower and womanpower of the Nation by making all men between 18 and 65 years of age and all women between 18 and 50 years of age subject to draft for civilian work necessary to the war effort.

The machinery for drafting civilians is to be local draft boards and their appellate agencies. The President is to determine the needs for agriculture and industries and the relative importance to the war effort of same.

Transportation for persons selected, including dependent and household effects, is to be paid to and from place of employment by the Government. Return to prior private employment with no loss of rights is guaranteed unless it is impossible or unreasonable. States and political subdivisions are requested to restore their former employees.

The penalty for noncompliance with the proposed act are fine and imprisonment.

By the terms of this proposed legislation, the lives and privileges of every individual in the country would be affected.

Now before I could support this type of legislation there are a lot of questions in my mind that the President would have to answer. Among them are the following: Is this action necessary to the winning of the war? If so, is this bill the only remedy which would meet the present need, and have other remedies been suggested or studied? Will the enactment of this bill establish in the United States a system of forced labor? Do the provisions of the bill delegate to the President dictatorial powers to be exercised through a bureaucracy over agriculture, industry, transportation, and labor? Will its enactment impair the constitutional guaranty against taking of property without due compensation or process of law? Will this bill permit the

favoring of certain sections of the country? Might it cause certain sections of the country to be ruined by disrupting its agriculture or its industries? Will fear of the consequences under this bill act as a restraint of free speech by persons covered by the bill? Might it result in coercion similar to that exercised under the Agricultural Adjustment Act? Might it force employers to add to their pay rolls unnecessary employees? Will the bill interfere with the right of an individual to secure higher pay for his or her services? Will it interfere with collective bargaining and the recognized rights of labor? What will the additional taxes be for the administration of this law? How will it affect the status of selectees subject to military law? Will the selectees, under this bill, be entitled to free assembly, and so forth? Could a selectee, under this bill, petition his Congressman for relief, or would he be automatically bound by Executive orders or the Articles of War? What security will he have; will he be given medical service, hospital care, and so forth?

Before the President or proponents of this legislation can have my support they will have to satisfy me as to the above questions.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, there is in the bill now under discussion an item affecting the maintenance of the irrigation project on the Flathead Indian Reservation in Montana. The sum listed in the bill is not enough to take care of the needs of that project and I will at the proper time ask permission to insert in today's RECORD, so that the House may study it, some pertinent material received from the secretary of that project, Mr. D. A. Dellwo, of Charlo, Mont., one of the outstanding experts on irrigation in my State.

Mr. Chairman, the Flathead project is organized into irrigation districts under State laws. Money to defray the costs of operation and maintenance of the irrigation project is raised through a per-acre levy made by our district against the irrigable area. Money for the operation and maintenance of the power system of the project is appropriated out of revenues received from the sale of power. The irrigation and power systems are operated by the Irrigation Service of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The project is billed by the Indian Irrigation Service for the estimated cost of operation and maintenance of the irrigation project well in advance of each irrigation season so that it will have completed its cycle of assessment and collection of its land levy in time to provide funds in advance of each season's operations. The landholders pay the money to the district, the district pays it to the United States, Congress appropriates it for the use of the Indian Irrigation Service, and they expend it in the operation and maintenance of the project. There has not been any Treasury appropriation for operation and maintenance of the project except to take care of costs properly chargeable to Indian lands and that only because the district cannot assess Indian lands.

In the expenditure of funds thus raised, the project management is limited in three respects, namely, they may not expend beyond the amounts collected from the districts; they may not expend beyond their budget; and they may not expend beyond the appropriation made by Congress. Even though there be money on hand, and work is needed to be done, the project management cannot move beyond those limitations. Now to the problem.

The advance estimate for fiscal year 1944 submitted by the project engineer, Mr. G. L. Sperry, in collaboration with the district engineer, Mr. W. S. Hanna, for operation and maintenance of both the irrigation system and the power system, on this project was $246,300. Instead of appropriating that amount, which turned out to be too low an estimate, on acount of increased costs, since encountered, the Congress appropriated $235,000. Increased pay, overtime pay, leaves of absence, and other labor advantages, plus sharply increased costs of materials, which have had to be met during the past season, have increased the costs both already incurred and estimated to complete the fiscal year by about $28,000. This increased cost added to the short appropriation leaves the project with a shortage of around $39,000 to complete the fiscal year and give service to the farms of the project during the first 2 months of the coming irrigation season.

This project operates a large pumping station on Flathead River below Polson for the purpose of supplementing the gravity supply of water when necessary. During the last two seasons it has not had to operate the pumps to any large extent except to finish off the season just closed—1943. During 1942 there was no pumping at that station. Since the pumps are operated only to supplement the water which is taken by gravity from our mountain streams, and since pumped water and gravity water are used on the same land, and since it is impossible to predict the amount of gravity water which will be available during the coming seasons, the costs for pumping, from the very nature of our system, runs from zero up to thirty or forty thousand dollars per season. The maximum figure, of course, has to be used in any workable estimate concerning the operation and maintenance costs of the project, especially when that estimate has to be made about 2 years in advance.

Since there was no pumping in the season of 1942, and since a large part of the costs of that season enter the fiscal year 1943, there was a balance in the project operation and maintenance fund for that fiscal year of $36,565. Apparently the presence of that balance at the end of fiscal year 1943 led to the belief in the Interior Department and in the Bureau of the Budget and in Congress that our estimates were running too high. Of course, that assumption is erroneous and extremely dangerous for the reason that the project positively must be prepared to pump up to the full capacity of its pumps every season whether pumping is going to be needed or not. When the need for pumping is great, in the middle of the growing season it is too late to look for money with which to run the pumps.

Mr. Hanna and Mr. Sperry have asked for a deficiency appropriation for the purpose of completing the present fiscal year. If they do not get it, the project will be desperately crippled in starting the coming season. No preseason maintenance work will be possible. Caved-in canal banks and cattails and other growth in the ditches will have to be contended with during the irrigation season to the costly detriment of the project and to farm operations.

I now quote from a letter to me from Dennis Dellwo, secretary of the Flathead irrigation project, and dated December 4, 1943:

> We want you to look after this for us. We want you to go to the Irrigation Service or the Budget Bureau or the Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Interior, or wherever the proper deficiency bill might happen to be at the time, and get in an item of $38,200 for the balance of the fiscal year 1944. That is about $25,000 for irrigation and the balance for power. You understand this will be an appropriation of moneys raised out here on the project through land levies made by our district and through receipts from our power operations. We are not asking for a penny out of the Treasury in this instance.
>
> I believe the time is short for getting this done. There has been considerable cross-fire of letters and telegrams between the Bureau and the field on this matter which took up a lot of time. It is possible that already the House committee is considering deficiency appropriations. If so, I assume it will be necessary to secure an amendment to the bill being considered.

That is the end of the quotation from Mr. Dellwo, but I shall place at the end of my remarks some further correspondence on this subject, so that the House will have a chance to study this small but very worth-while project and will be able tomorrow, I hope, to make the proper appropriation so that it can continue functioning as it should.

It might be well to bring to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that as far as precipitation in Montana is concerned this year, it is only 20 percent of normal. We are going to have to have help if we are going to irrigate as much as we possibly can. In order to do that, the Congress is going to have to authorize the appropriation of the moneys now waiting to be used and lying in the irrigation district's treasury.

Mr. Chairman, the correspondence I referred to a moment ago is as follows:

FLATHEAD IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
Charlo, Mont., February 10, 1944.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The confusion into which the Flathead irrigation project officials and the Office of Indian Affairs have gotten with respect to funds for the operation of the project for the balance of the present fiscal year and also for the operation and maintenance of the project for fiscal year 1945 seems to be reaching a point where further correspondence would be useless.

The chances for serious loss in case the operation and maintenance of the irrigation and power project should be hampered from lack of funds is so imminent, however, that

we cannot refrain from one more attempt to get to those who are the custodians of our destiny, etc. Our board of commissioners have instructed me to advise you of the facts in ample detail so that you might be able to convince the Indian Office and the Bureau of the Budget that no slide-rule computations made in Washington far from the field will either raise or lower the costs of running the project, and they will not serve to keep the pumps running when authorized funds are exhausted.

First thing, they should quit talking about overtime. This is not a matter of overtime only. It is a matter of increased costs, increased costs of labor, of materials (running to 50 percent); increased costs of work being done on ditches on account of enormous amounts of plant growth in them resulting from unusual moisture conditions last spring, as well as increased compensation and so-called overtime. Then, to augment the difficulty, the estimate made in the field, nearly 2 years previous to the use of the funds, was pared down by everyone up the line, and then when it was finally embodied in an appropriation, it was arbitrarily reduced by $8,850 by someone. I don't have to tell you that an estimate made in 1942 is no good in 1944.

One of the most discouraging things about this letter-writing contest is the continual request of the Office of Indian Affairs for justifications for the anticipated costs for the balance of this year, after several sets of complete justifications have already gone in. Justifications made in detail have gone in so many times that it would be merest repetition to prepare any more. And then, when the requests for justifications are complied with, the Office discovers that at the end of fiscal year 1943 there remained an unexpended balance of funds in the amount of $35,565, and they immediately assume that justifies trimming future estimates.

This balance, of course, as anyone connected with the irrigation service should know, resulted from the fact that in the irrigation season of 1942 and 1943 there were unusual rains and heavy winter snows in the mountains with run-offs during the early summers so great that much water had to be wasted. Little or no pumping is required during such seasons. During the last season the pumping plant on Flathead River lifted only around 3,500 acre-feet of water, whereas during a normal or dry season it might deliver from thirty to sixty thousand acre-feet.

An acre-foot of water during a dry season, when our crops are virtually all produced by irrigation, will produce, with normal prices, around $10 worth of new wealth. Under present prices it might run to $20. If we should be short, say 20,000 acre-feet of water as a result of shortage of funds and stoppage of our pumps therefrom, the loss in money could well run up to three or four hundred thousand dollars. Of course, then we would be able to supply that much less of the vital products of our supposed-to-be irrigated farms to the cause of the war, and we would be able to buy that much less in bonds and we would be paying proportionately less in income taxes, to say nothing about our personal loss. The loss of 20,000 acre-feet of water would be the equivalent of taking 12,000 acres out of production.

Just why should this have to be argued out over and over again? If the project management should be at the point of going hay-wire in the spending of money needlessly, then we would most certainly call them to task. On the other hand, we have taxed ourselves purposely to provide for just such a contingency as this. We have a surplus of money on hand—a good sensible surplus, large enough to carry us through the period of uncertainty and fluctuating costs which anyone should be prepared for during these times. I mean a surplus in our district treasury.

Then the project also has a surplus of funds on hand from payments made by us in excess of costs. I think this is something like $76,000. To sweeten this little nest egg, our district paid the project just the other day the first half of the O. & M. charge for this season amounting to $32,500. We will pay the other half, a like amount, the 1st of July. To be added to this are the payments made by the other two districts. Is it the wish of the Office of Indian Affairs that those moneys should lie idle while our farms burn up for lack of water, with a flood of it going to waste out of Flathead Lake, and our pumps, capable of lifting 400 acre-feet per day, standing by rusting? I don't think it is, but, then, what is the explanation?

Now, what we want is this: In a previous letter I asked that you try to get an item of $39,000 into the deficiency bill for the balance of the fiscal year 1944. Since that time additional funds in the amount of $20,811, earmarked for overtime compensation only, have been released from some source. No part of this amount is available for any costs except overtime. We need an additional $25,000 made available at the earliest possible date so that we may know what to expect and know if an intelligently planned and adequate pumping program can be depended on; and, of course, if when that amount is appropriated, it will be subjected to the usual trimming down, it should be increased to, say $40,000, to make allowance for such trimming. That would be for fiscal year 1944.

Then, in the bill which is now pending before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior, for fiscal year 1945, we want an appropriation large enough to provide for sufficient pumping to carry us over the driest kind of a year. The Budget figure for the Flathead project for the fiscal year 1945 is somewhere around $135,000. While this figure would make some provision for pumping, it is not sufficient to take care of the increased costs and also to provide for a long season of pumping. That figure should be raised to $165,000, with adequate provision for trimming as cited above.

If, then, the next season, 1945, should prove to be another wet one, and if costs should suddenly drop—which they won't—and this full amount should then not be needed, the balance will revert and be there for reappropriation.

Mike, we want you to ride their tails and pour on the buckskin. As I suggested in my other letter, if the situation got too bad, the district would have to take over the operation of the pumps. That, of course, would be bordering upon insurrection, and should not be made necessary by lack of thought on the part of anyone in the Indian Office.

There is no malice in this letter and no attempt to reprove or upbraid anyone, but, of course, our board takes pains to know what is being done about project finances. We have to make the land levies and pay the bill. It naturally follows that we feel some responsibility to not let emergencies find us in repose.

With kindest personal regards and best wishes,

Yours truly,

D. A. DELLWO.

FLATHEAD IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
Charlo, Mont., December 19, 1943.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of the 10th should have been answered sooner, but I was attending the convention of the Montana Reclamation Association at Bozeman for several days.

We are encouraged by your getting quick action on the problem we presented to you. Mr. Sperry, our project engineer, and Mr. Hanna, of Billings, the district engineer, are getting more busy now to provide the Bureau and yourself with additional information. The problem is more than one of overtime pay. It results in larger degree from the higher cost of everything and the lower efficiency of mostly everything.

I think an item of $39,000 should be included in the next deficiency bill. If then Congress appropriates funds for overtime pay, we will not have to spend all of our money, maybe. Our expenditures will be held in line, even if we should become extravagant, by the problem of hiring men. The most that our project management can get done in the way of operation and maintenance will be little enough. They will not need to restrain us by cinching up the purse strings.

You might point out regularly and often that this is an appropriation of money raised out here. It is merely an authority for the project management to spend the money which we raise and turn over to them to spend. An appropriation out of the Treasury of the United States would be a different matter.

I think Mr. Zimmerman will be getting more on this from Mr. Hanna. Thank you again for your assistance.

Yours truly,

D. A. DELLWO,
Secretary, Flathead Irrigation District.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 8, 1944.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANSFIELD: Reference is made to your personal call on January 4, at which time you left with Mr. Dodd certain correspondence concerning the Flathead Indian irrigation project in Montana.

The estimate transmitted to Congress for this project for 1944 was in the amount of $240,000. The estimate was based on a 44-hour workweek with no provision being made for overtime compensation under Public Law 49. The amount of the estimate was reduced by the Congress to $235,000.

The Indian Service, in connection with its estimates for the fiscal year 1945, has indicated the requirement of approximately $28,850 to cover the cost of overtime compensation during the year. Its expenditure record through October would indicate that about $9,000 is all that would be required on this account. It is understood, however, that operation and maintenance on reclamation projects cannot be handled on an equal monthly apportionment or expenditure basis because of the character of some work that has to be performed during the nonirrigating season. Thus, the expenditure experience for the first 4 months of this fiscal year need not necessarily be construed as a definite guide for the total year's expenditure.

It is planned to transmit to the Congress for its consideration in connection with a supplemental or deficiency appropriation bill estimates to cover overtime compensation on a Government-wide basis. In our consideration of the estimates submitted by the several departments and agencies appropriate attention will be given to the requirements of the Flathead project. There is no disposition on the part of this Bureau so to restrict appropriations that maintenance considered essential to the project and paid for by project water users must be deferred.

You also made inquiry with respect to the Bitter Root project. This is a water conservation project to be financed through funds appropriated pursuant to the Wheeler-Case Act. I have been informed that the project has been cleared by the War Food Administration and the War Production Board. The Bureau of Reclamation advises, however, that it has not yet put in final form its report which, under the law, must be prepared

and transmitted to the President, through this office, for approval. If and when the report reaches us you may be assured that it will have prompt attention.

The correspondence left by you is returned as requested.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director.*

FLATHEAD IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
Charlo, Mont., January 26, 1944.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MIKE: I herewith return the letter of the Director of the Budget for your Flathead file. I gave it to Mr. Sperry, our project engineer and he sent a copy to Mr. Hanna, the supervising engineer at Billings. Copy of Mr. Hanna's letter to Sperry is enclosed.

I have seen a wire to the effect that certain funds which apparently had been sequestered from the Flathead appropriation had been released for expenditure, and I am now told that a good part of their deficiency is taken care of. However, as Mr. Hanna says, this appears to be the makings of a good dry year and in all probability much pumping will have to be done. Pumping is expensive, and in case a lot of it will have to be done, a shortage of funds might be disastrous.

Consequently I see no reason why we should stop working for a deficiency appropriation. If the money is not needed it will not be expended. It would be too bad to run into a long siege of pumping and have to stop in the middle of the season for lack of funds, still having plenty of money in the bank. Thanks for your good help.

Yours truly,

D. A. DELLWO.

FLATHEAD IRRIGATION DISTRICT,
Charlo, Mont., January 31, 1944.

DEAR MIKE: I hope I might really get those enclosures into this envelope before it gets sealed and posted. I must be getting old or something. I talked to Sperry yesterday about this matter and he said I am right in insisting upon getting a deficiency appropriation, inasmuch as the outlook for a very dry season, requiring much pumping, is becoming more and more certain. We even discussed the possibility of the irrigation district's being obliged to take over the operation of the pump plant in case the Government should run out of authorized funds. It would be a bad precedent to establish.

Of course our district has funds on hand which are ours to spend, and of course the farmers here would not sit idly by and see their crops burn up, just to save someone's face. It seems so difficult to impress anyone in Washington with the very patent fact that the costs which show in the record for any one month are no criterion as to the needs of any other month. We don't pay ditch riders and we don't pump water in the winter.

Yours truly,

D. A. DELLWO.

BILLINGS, MONT., *January 20, 1944.*

Mr. G. L. SPERRY,
Project Engineer, Flathead Irrigation Project, St. Ignatius, Mont.

DEAR Mr. SPERRY: I have your letter of January 17 enclosing a copy of the letter written Congressman MANSFIELD by the Director of the Budget, concerning Flathead appropriations.

It would seem to me that it would be appropriate for Mr. Dellwo to write Mr. MANSFIELD thanking him for his cooperation in this matter and advising him that, while the allotment of additional funds authorized is not all that had been requested, it will be of great assistance and that, in the event it develops that the water supply from natural flow and storage proves smaller than anticipated, it may become necessary to pump large quantities of water at the Polson pumping plant, in which event an additional sum may be required, and that he will be advised accordingly should the need for further funds become acute.

I believe something along the above line would answer the purpose for the time being.

Very truly yours,

W. S. HANNA,
District Engineer.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a few minutes several features of this bill. I am very appreciative of the attitude of the committee in their consideration of a project in which I have had the deepest interest because of a long service in hospital work and in nursing, as well as their recognition of the serious and immediate problem that faces us in child care.

You will recall, perhaps, that when the appropriations were made for the Bolton Act the request was for $65,000,000 to put the Cadet Nurse Corps into effect. An original grant of $45,000,000 was made to take care of the first 6 months. Then the Budget requested that the amounts should be appropriated quarterly, and this is being done, although it gives a somewhat false impression as the request has to be made in a deficiency bill when the appropriation is for a regular rather than a deficient amount. Because the Budget saw fit to cut the request for the fourth quarter from something over $5,000,000 to $2,700,000, which sum the committee has graciously allowed, it is possible that there will have to be an actual deficiency request made in a later bill. Should this become necessary, I am certain it will be met by the usual fine understanding in both the committee and the membership.

As a woman, I know what it means to the women of the country to have added assurance that Congress is going to do its part in providing skilled nursing care to the the armed forces. The men themselves go into action lifted by the certainty that nurses will be at hand if and when they need them. Our people are strengthened in their natural anxiety by the same assurances. Women everywhere are grateful for the understanding action of this Congress in all matters having to do with an adequate supply of skilled nurses.

Part of this program to insure a flow of girls into nursing necessitated an increase in the number of students in the hospital schools over and above the housing capacity in those schools. Because it was an emergency program, it was considered justifiable for funds to be appropriated through the Lanham Act for the emergency housing of additional students. The slow-down in the appropriation has meant that there have been some rather bad bottlenecks. In some schools they have not been able to take in the March 1 classes because the housing facilities have reached an end. Emergency housing projects had been submitted and approved but money has not been available. Should no relief be given, it will slow down the nurse-training program to what may develop a serious war shortage. But I have confidence that the vision of the Congress is no less clear than it has shown itself to be in all matters having to do with providing nurses for our services.

In the matter of child care: Perhaps we women see that part of war rather differently from most men. We are, of necessity, looking into the future, seeing the results of neglecting the children now. This is part of our responsibility to the future. We know, too, what it means for a mother to be away from her home, because she is doing something patriotic or because she must earn more money. If she feels that her children are not having care and proper oversight, anxiety will have an effect upon her work. Eager as we are to do our bit in this war, we women did not ask to go out of our homes, but industry is pleading with us, begging us to get onto the production lines. The response has been magnificent.

I had luncheon the other day at the Women's National Press Club with some of those very fine women who have answered industry's call.

We must recognize the fact that it is practically impossible for young women to take jobs unless provision is made for their children. In some of the factories it was found that the absenteeism among the women was due to such a large degree to wash day, shopping day, that in some of the nurseries they have set up an amazing volunteer service. The woman brings her children, her shopping list, and her soiled linen in the morning and she leaves them all. In the evening she picks up her child, her clean clothes, and her marketing, grateful to the volunteer service of other women who make her job possible. I want to remind you that in this child-care program women are paying for much of what their children get. They want to pay, but there must be facilities.

I understand there are some 300 projects that have been checked carefully, ready to go in areas where the need is great, waiting for these funds. There are others that are needed, because production lines are asking for another 900,000 to 1,000,000 women, and with the ordinary ratio, that will mean about 140,000 children, who will need some protection. This is a very real emergency need. I feel certain it is safe in your hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix and put in a tribute to my colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked this permission for the purpose of answering one of the most unfair, one of the most vilifying statements that the

filthy pen of any degenerate editor of any second-rate newspaper ever heaped upon the shoulders of one of the sister States of this Nation, and I speak of that nonentity, and I say it advisedly, Eugene Meyer. In his yellow sheet of this morning are things that heap insults upon the State that I have the honor to represent. Among other things his filthy pen, and it is known for his filth, made this observation about the State from which I come. It so happens that the legislature of my State asked the political hitchhikers who are ruining this country, who are trying in the midst of a great war, when our country is fighting for its life, to bring about a commingling of the races, to bring about racial equality, which you know, and which I know, is as impossible as it is to fly to the moon, to let us run our own affairs. A resolution was passed through the legislature asking these people to keep their noses out of the affairs of the South, to let us in South Carolina attend to our own domestic affairs without any help from people who have no background, who do not know where they are going, and care less when they get there. The legislature asked these people to keep their noses out of our State, and let us settle our own domestic affairs, and we asked for that one right under the Constitution. This evil-minded person made this observation about the great State I have the honor to represent:

This is so close to the Hitlerian doctrine of nordic or aryan supremacy as to be indistinguishable from it.

In other words, we of South Carolina are traitors according to the pen of this Eugene Meyer.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I rise to congratulate my colleague on taking this opportunity to make reply to this unwarranted, unjustified, unfair, and libelous attack upon the courage, the loyalty, and the patriotism of the citizenship of the great State of South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman. I also, note, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman of our delegation [Mr. HARE] would have taken this up had he not recently been very ill and unable to talk at this time.

I have no ill will toward any particular section of this Nation. All of you are my friends, and to me there is neither North, South, East, nor West. We are all one Nation. All of you are good people, so far as I am concerned. I am for all of you; I am for your settling your own domestic troubles and quarrels. You all know that we cannot get along if one section is set up against another, and you know that your prosperity is contingent upon my prosperity, and you all know that you cannot vilify the South and expect the South to take it lying down. It seems that it has always been popular for some people to attack the South. Not one of those people has ever taken the time to come to my section and try to see what we do and go back to the North knowing anything about us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. RIVERS. And none of us ever felt that you were unwelcome in our part of the world, and yet these people from far off look down upon us and call us ignorant and say that we are indifferent to the destiny of our colored people and indifferent to the destiny of our American heritage and to the destiny of America. They do not know the problems which we have in the South. I say to you when you from the North, East, and West come down to see us, you know we are trying hard to bring about an understanding of a condition through a friendly approach to the Negro question. We in my State appropriate vast sums of money to take care of our colored people. Then in another part of this same yellow sheet I notice the report here from Mr. Studebaker's organization, the Department of Education, where, among other things, they say, "We have got to put the colored people in our universities." You know good and well we are not going to do that, and all the legislation in the United States is not going to make us do it. You cannot do it. For the Federal Government to take the position that we in the South have got to put the colored people in our high universities is impossible. You are not going to do it, and all the laws in the world are not going to make us do that. When our boys come home they will see to it that they do not do it.

The South, as you know, has had a tremendous percentage of volunteers in this war. So many southerners joined the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps that we had to pass the Draft Act to keep the Army and Navy from being strictly southern boys. You know that. The Marine Corps at one time was made up strictly of southern boys.

We have always clung to the colors when our country was in danger and when we were attacked. Now so many of our young men have marched off to war and left our cities without any single young men, with the exception of the colored boys which the Army has turned down because they say they cannot use them; all of our white boys have gone to the war. While they are away, we in Congress and in our State legislatures are going to resent with every power at our command any attempt to change or to bring about a social equality in the midst of a great war. Do not get out here and villify us. Do not say that we are not patriotic. Do not say that we are clinging to the Hitlerian doctrine. Do not say that we cling to the Meyer doctrine either. He has declared war on the South. He has declared war on the men and women in the service, the mothers, wives, and daughters of those men from the South. He has declared war on me. I accept the challenge and from now on I declare war on Eugene Meyer. And this is not the last you will hear from me. I propose to attack him wherever he is vulnerable. I propose to attack him often. And I do not propose to come out second best either, when a man villifies my section of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert part of a report made by Mr. Aubrey Williams, of the W. P. A., on the loss of life of the injured veterans of the so-called second bonus march, on September 2, 1935. This whole matter was handled in a very careless manner by the W. P. A.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to set the record straight, not in a spirit of partisanship, because it would be too horrible to accuse any administration of any part of deliberately sending war veterans to a place where they very likely might be injured or meet their death as a result of the hurricanes that frequently come to that area in the Florida Keys, namely, Windley Islands and Matecumbe Island. But I do claim that a grave error of judgment was made and that there was grave neglect and carelessness in sending many of the veterans of the so-called bonus march who were in Washington in 1935 to the Florida Keys.

The islands where they were sent from Washington were totally unsuitable anyway for the proper housing and care of the veterans. There were no hospitals there. There was no fresh water practically. There was no sanitation, and at high tide the water lapped over the bunks in the tents where the veterans slept. That was when there was no hurricane. The gentleman from Texas spoke of the fact that this administration gave the second bonus marchers housing and cared for them. What kind of houses did they give them, and where did they send them? If you would like to refer to the record, I refer the Member to the hearings before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. You will find everything that I say verified therein. These veterans were sent to a place that was unhealthy under ordinary conditions when there are vast areas in the country where they might have been sent to do W. P. A. work, which was what they did, or what they were sent out to do, where they could have had good housing and worked under proper conditions and healthy conditions.

Instead they were sent to these two bad places in the Florida Keys where no one went practically except those who went during one season of the year for fishing and for amusement. Warnings were received on a Sunday that a hurricane was on its way to the Windley Islands and Metacumbe Islands. But in spite of that fact nothing was done to remove the veterans to a place of safety. I will not take the time of the House in going into details of all that transpired. Trains were not asked for. Trucks were not asked for. Nothing was done to insure the safety of those veterans or their families. I am giving you the figures

from Mr. Aubrey Williams' report. He was the head of this section of the Works Progress Administration. On September 8, 1935, that was 6 days after the hurricane, he gives the number of men who lost their lives, the identified dead, the missing, and the unidentified dead and identified injured, and the identified uninjured, as a total of 684 veterans who were there on the Florida Keys at the time of the hurricane. Mind you, all of these veterans might have been safe from injury and saved from death.

The number of identified dead is given as 44; missing and unidentified dead 238; identified injured, 106; identified uninjured, 296.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is the gentlewoman from Massachusetts discussing that disaster that occurred in Florida a few years ago?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am. The gentleman from Texas remembers it very well. He was on the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I was not present when the gentlewoman started her address. Is she criticizing anyone for that?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I was criticizing the administration. I was saying I could not accuse any administration of deliberately sending men to their death and sending them to an unhealthy place, but I was severely censuring them for sending men to a place of this sort when they had other great areas in this country to which the men could have been sent, such as in the gentleman's own State of Texas, where they could have sent these bonus marchers and where they could have worked.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is bringing the matter up at a rather late date.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would say to the gentleman from Texas that he brought up the matter of the treatment of the bonus marchers during the Hoover administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A congressional committee exonerated anyone from blame with reference to that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I beg the pardon of the gentleman. Here is the gentleman from Wisconsin, who will verify what I say, who filed the minority report.

Mr. PATMAN. But a majority of the committee exonerated anyone from blame, did they not?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is not my impression. There was no exoneration. There was an inexcusable whitewash by some of the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts please file both the majority and minority reports in connection with her speech so that we will have the facts clearly set before the House?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to have the entire hearings placed in the RECORD. It shows that time and time again the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] and I were prevented from asking perfectly proper and legitimate questions.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, I did not know that. I hope the gentlewoman will put both reports in the RECORD.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I recall this hearing very definitely, and the efforts, particularly of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] in attempting to shut us out from having a very thorough and complete and exhaustive hearing.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask that those words be taken down, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TABER. The regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I ask that the words be taken down, that the gentleman from Texas was instrumental in trying to scuttle the investigation.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I did not say that.

Mr. PATMAN. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I said the gentleman from Texas was very instrumental in objecting to questions that were asked in regard to the examination.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, if that is what the gentleman said.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. That is what I said, and I still stick to it, because you objected to questions that I asked.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, if they were not material, I did.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Oh, yes. Not material. What you might say was material would not necessarily mean that I would think they were material.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TABER. I yield the gentlewoman 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The facts in the record and hearings speak for themselves, whether the committee tried to whitewash the investigation or not. These veterans of bonus march No. 2 were sent to a totally unsuitable place for work, an unhealthy place, without proper sanitation, without fresh water; a place where the water came up over the beds in the tents where the men were forced to live. There were repeated warnings to the men in charge at those camps that a hurricane was coming, and nothing was done to remove those men in time. It was a totally unnecessary loss of lives.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I might add in connection with the statement of the lady from Massachusetts that there was evidence before the committee that Mr. Sheldon had dickered with the railroad company to remove those men, but was not willing to pay the price that the railroad company asked, and kept them on the Keys in spite of the warning. Secondly, that he took from them the ignition keys for the trucks in which they might have gotten out, so that they were unable to move out by means of the trucks. So these unfortunates who had been crowded down there and left out on these Keys had no means of getting away, although for 2 days there had been warnings of an impending hurricane.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I well remember the investigation mentioned by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. It was thought at that time to be politically inspired and a congressional investigation was asked for. I was a member of the committee making the investigation. We heard every one of the material witnesses that the gentlewoman from Massachusetts wanted called, or any member of the minority. We did not object to the introduction of any relevant testimony. Anything that was material was permitted as in all investigations, I presume it has been admitted. After a thorough and complete investigation I think that every person who went into it impartially, that is not having any preconceived notions or prejudices concerning it, was willing to exonerate the administration and the people who were under suspicion of having done something against the veterans of World War No. 1.

I want to state, as a member of that committee, that a report was made to the House of Representatives. It was accepted by the House of Representatives. The administration was exonerated. Every person who was accused or whose motives were impugned was exonerated. That has been a number of years ago. There cannot be any question about it. There is not a reason on earth why it should be brought up now. It is not parallel to the so-called 1932 bonus march, where the facts are absolutely undisputed.

Fact No. 1 is that more than 20,000 men, veterans of World War No. 1, had assembled in Washington in 1932.

Fact No. 2 is that they were within their legal rights in assembling here. Fact No. 3 is that they lawfully assembled in a lawful manner, under the Constitution of the United States, and presented their pleas for the relief they were praying for. Fact No. 4 is that they did not violate the law; that they did not do anything wrong. Fact No. 5 is that they were good, law-abiding, public-spirited citizens, from communities all over this Nation, and from almost every State. The next fact is that they built their own little houses with their own hands, and in some cases accompanied by their wives and children, occupied those little homes. The electric companies even furnished them electricity free of charge. They had a great deal of pride in those little homes. They even built little yards and fences, and they were going to stay there just as long as they could on the support they were getting from their home communities.

Of course, no one asked them to come here, that I know of. I know I insisted that they not come. I thought it would

be harmful to the cause we were sponsoring. But they came, nevertheless.

The next fact is that without any warning whatsoever, the then President of the United States called upon the Army from Fort Meyer to run these former defenders of our country out of the capital city, Washington, D. C. They brought an army against these helpless, defenseless, unarmed veterans. They were armed. They had guns. They had tear gas. They had hand grenades. They had everything necessary to kill these men and to cause the destruction of their little village. Not only did they destroy the homes of these poor, defenseless, ragged veterans, but they also ran them with whip and spur out of the Capital City. The next morning at daylight, when the sun was coming up, if you would go up and down the highways out of Washington you would see those ragged men sleeping on the grass. Some of them injured; some of them would have their little children and wives with them; absolutely driven from the Capital City, sleeping or resting in the open with only the sky as their cover, and only mother earth as their resting places.

I do not think that the case mentioned by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is on all fours at all with such a glaring example as I have just recited about which there is no dispute of the facts as I have recited them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I maintain my contention that the second bonus marchers were treated very badly. The gentleman says it is a political thing. It was not political. Certainly an effort to right a grave injustice to the veterans who fought for us is not a political matter. There were only 80 of the minority party, Republicans, in the House at that time. We, as well as some of the Democrats, tried to secure the passage of a bill that would give these poor widows a higher rate of compensation than was given to the men under the legislation the House passed for them in March of 1936.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I cannot yield any further to the gentleman. All of my contentions are proven by the hearings in March 1935 before the World War Veterans' Committee. I have seen many of the widows of those veterans. They certainly felt that they had been, not intentionally badly treated, but through neglect and lack of foresight, very unfairly and unkindly treated. Their husbands were dead through no fault of their own, and they had not been cared for properly. Care of veterans is not a political thing in any way and should not be made so. I think incidents of the first bonus march were very unfortunate, just as I think incidents that happened as a result of the second bonus march on Washington were extremely tragic and extremely uncalled for.

The following is the minority report which accompanied H. R. 12869 and which proves the lack of proper care for the veterans on the Florida Keys:

EFFECT UNIFORM PROVISIONS IN LAWS ADMINISTERED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, submitted the following minority views:

The undersigned members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, after careful and deliberate consideration of the hearings on H. R. 12869, while they concur with the majority of the committee in other provisions of the bill, feel that the rates set forth in title V, section 500, entitled "Florida hurricane relief for World War veterans and other persons", are too low and should be increased to the rates provided in paragraph IV, part I, Veterans' Regulations No. 1 (a), as amended, promulgated by the President pursuant to Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress.

The United States Government has a most direct responsibility in this matter—a responsibility just as great, or even greater, than it had when its soldiers were sent to battle during the World War. Those soldiers knew they were going into danger; these were given to understand they were to be cared for in a safe, livable place.

The rates provided in H. R. 12869 are the same as those allowed under the compensation laws to men in the Civilian Conservation Corps. The rates recommended above in this report are the same as would be paid to any veteran of the World War who was disabled in active service.

In support of their contentions, the undersigned set forth certain parts of the testimony given during the hearings held on the bill. These excerpts will bear out our contention that the Government's responsibility was great, and will point out the following salient facts:

1. That the Government had a most direct responsibility, as the veterans who died did so through the poor judgment and blunders of someone else.

2. That the veterans should never have been sent to the Florida Keys, on small islands but a few feet above sea level and housed in poorly constructed shacks.

3. That sufficient warning was given to take the men out of the affected area in time to save them.

4. That the men could have been taken out on trucks.

5. That these men were wholly under the control of their supervisors; they were told that if they resigned from the camp they could not come back.

6. That, at the first storm warning, Washington authorities suggested that the men be taken out of the affected area and brought back again, but the suggestion was not acted upon.

7. That the danger was realized, and a train should have been standing by at the camps to take the men out.

Statement of Hon. Howard T. McFarlane representing committee appointed by the American Legion, page 5:

"Mr. PETERSON. That was a report made by him to the national commander of the American Legion. Based on that, subsequently, a committee was appointed and went into the facts.

"To put men such as these veterans were in a location such as the Florida Keys upon a project of this character is probably due some criticism, and in my opinion does not show the exercise of the best judgment. However, viewing the matter from the other angle, it can be fairly and truthfully stated that the building of this overseas highway has been advocated in south Florida for at least 10 years, and that many people do reside the year round on the Florida Keys irrespective of the storms which occur in the fall. Again a contributing cause, and in my opinion the main cause of the disaster, was the nature of the weather bureau reports, due to the system or lack of it, which I have heretofore attempted to outline. A further contributing cause is probably the lack of experience with weather conditions upon the Florida Keys by Messrs. Ghent and Sheldon. In the light of their knowledge and experience, I do not think that they can be called culpably or criminally negligent. However, had their experience been greater, had they had sufficient experience to rely upon their own observation more, or upon the weather bureau reports less, it is possible that a different decision as to the time for evacuation of the men might have been reached.

" 'I do not believe that any investigation which has yet been conducted has uncovered all of the facts or is likely so to do. The probability is that any investigation which is conducted may arrive at somewhat similar conclusions to those herein contained. On the other hand, facts may be uncovered which will throw a different light upon the entire transaction. No investigation conducted unofficially, as the investigation by the F. E. R. A. and the investigation which I have made on behalf of the American Legion, has the power to summon witnesses, to place them under oath, and to searchingly go into the facts. An investigation conducted by the State's attorney of Dade County is handicapped by the fact that he represents an authority of limited jurisdiction. If the whole picture is to be gone into and any investigatior which develops all of the facts is had it must be a body not limited by territorial lines, and have power to bring before it all persons who may have any information, whoever they may be and wherever they may be. The only body which I know having such powers is the Congress of the United States, and if it be desired to go further into this matter and to come to a conclusion based upon all the facts, which will be received as a just verdict by the people of this country, including the veterans, it seems to me that the only way to arrive at that result is through a congressional investigation.' "

Remarks of Hon. Joe H. Eagle, Member of Congress, pages 16 and 17:

"Mr. EAGLE. And whether it be the Government itself, or any subdivision of the Government, the Government men should have known that a sand spit, not high enough above mean low tide to protect against those seasonal hurricanes, was not a fit place for them to select for American citizens to go to that kind of camp, or to remain in. For that reason, I would like to say, very frankly, that I am heartily in favor of compensating the dependents of those who, without any fault of their own, were thus placed in those camps.

"And another observation in that same connection, availing myself of the opportunity of making my views known, which may be hardly fair, but please excuse me, is this: If you are 60 miles out from sea, out from the mainland, on one of those islands, and there is a warning, and in a few hours the information by another Weather Bureau warning that a storm is heading the other way, you would not stay on one of those places 15 minutes for any part of the 30 days in the season, because there is a storm warning out every day.

"It is like the people who dwell at the base of Mount Vesuvius; they know it has erupted, but they think this time it is not going to erupt. It is like an evil that, when you first look at it, it is hideous to behold, but after a while you get so you disregard it, because you get accustomed to it. Those people, once they are warned, and if they should want to get away, how are they going to leave? How are they going to get a boat and get to the mainland?

"They were just stuck there by the honorable invitation of some proper agency of this government. I think it would be monstrous for this Nation not to take care of the dependents of those who lost their lives under those conditions.

"That is too long a statement, Mr. Chairman, but I just wanted to get it off my mind."

Testimony of Julius F. Stone, Jr., administrator of the Florida Emergency Relief Administration, pages 64 and 65:

"Mr. STONE. Mind you, these people were individuals and some of them had peculiarities like some of us have, and anything you have set up as a system is not going to be applied uniformly to 650 men. I can cite a case to show that our men in the camps were not very much different from ourselves, in the sense that when you get what you think you want, you do not want it. Some people in the camps put up a howl about leaving, and wanted us to pay their railroad fare back to Washington. They did not like the clothes or the foreman's blue eyes, or what not, and wanted to get out, and we said, 'Fine, but if you go you are through. You cannot come back. You have quit your job, and other people want these jobs. There are only 600 here, and if you leave you are out, and we are not going to pay your railroad fare back to San Francisco, or Hong Kong, or wherever you want to go. We will pay you your money as long as you work here, and when you get money enough to go, you are perfectly free to leave and pay your fare back to wherever you want to go.'"

Testimony of Harold S. Langlois, veteran, page 537:

"Mrs. ROGERS. Mr. Langlois, there is one thing I did not quite understand. You said it was a case of going to Florida or walk out. Do you mean you could not stay in the transient camp on Canal Street any longer?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. We either had to go to a F. E. R. A. camp from Washington, or they would not keep us any great length of time, on account of people coming in all of the time.

"Mrs. ROGERS. You had to leave Washington?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. It was nothing but a transient camp. You could not exactly make a home out of it.

"Mrs. ROGERS. And they offered you no other alternative; it was either go to Florida or leave?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. That was all that was open for the 'vets' outside of going to a C. C. C. camp, if you could make it, but they are not very easy to make.

"Mrs. ROGERS. You usually have to be a little stronger physically?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. Yes; we did not have much of an examination for the F. E. R. A. camp. At the C. C. C. camps you have got to go through a physical examination to pass, but I was in good condition. I have been in two C. C. C. camps.

"Mrs. ROGERS. I will take a message to your sister when I go back.

"Mr. ENGEL. What you mean is that they would not keep you at the veterans' transient camp if you did not go to Florida, is that it?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. That is the way they mentioned it around there.

"Mr. ENGEL. You do not mean you had to get out of Washington, if you did not go to Florida?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. There were so many veterans coming into the city of Washington and they did not want us to stay here. They wanted to get us out of here."

Testimony of Conrad Van Hyning, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, administrator for Florida, pages 112 and 113:

"Mr. ENGEL. The first serious warning, the testimony shows, was at Key West at 1:30 on Monday. At 4:30 another warning came through, which was very serious—in fact, they were both very serious?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. Yes.

"Mr. ENGEL. And at 8:23 the hurricane struck?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. That is right; yes.

"Mr. ENGEL. In other words, 7 hours, approximately, elapsed from the time the first serious warning came through and the time the hurricane struck; that is true, is it not?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. Yes.

"Mr. ENGEL. Now, there is some testimony here regarding your knowledge of weather reports coming from the newspapers. Now, what was your source of knowledge regarding these reports? Did you get them from the Weather Bureau, from the newspapers, or where did you get them?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. I had none of these reports after Monday morning, except from the newspaper.

"Mr. ENGEL. Except from the newspaper?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. I did not have them direct. I had them by telephone from Mr. Gilfong, the administrator in Key West. I got my information from him, direct by telephone.

"Mr. ENGEL. What time did you get that 1:30 report?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. I did not get that 1:30 report, myself, at all. I talked with Mr. Gilfong, the telephone records show, at 11:23 that morning and——

"Mr. ENGEL. Monday morning?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. Yes; 11:23 Monday morning and 11:53, and 5:52 p. m.

"Mr. ENGEL. Then when did you first receive knowledge of that 1:30 weather report, through the newspapers or otherwise?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. I do not remember ever having seen the 1:30 report. I got it in the course of——

"Mr. ENGEL. What was your first information, or when did you first have knowledge that there was a serious hurricane coming through there, and about to hit Key West?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. When I discussed the situation with Mr. Gilfong around noon, through those two telephone calls at 11:23 and 11:53. At that time the report given to me was that the storm would not be there before Tuesday morning, just in a general discussion. So while I gave Mr. Gilfong instructions at that time to have the train brought in immediately, I do not remember seeing the 1:30 advisory or discussing it with him, because I called him next at 5:52 p. m., and at that time I probably got the latest information.

"Mr. ENGEL. You gave Mr. Gilfong orders over the telephone——

"Mr. VAN HYNING. At 11:53.

"Mr. ENGEL. At 11:53?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. To do what?

"Mr. ENGEL. To order the train; is that right?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. To ask him to call Mr. Sheldon and have the train brought down and not wait.

"Mr. ENGEL. That was on Monday, which would be approximately 8 hours before the hurricane struck; that is true, is it not?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. What time was that conversation?

"Mr. HYNING. The record shows 11:53.

"Mr. ENGEL. Was that the only order you gave regarding the train?

"Mr. VAN HYNING. Yes."

Testimony of P. A. Fellows, administrative assistant, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, pages 547 and 548:

"The CHAIRMAN. What was your position at the time this storm struck?

"Mr. FELLOWS. Administrative assistant under Mr. Baker, who is assistant administrator in Mr. Hopkins' organization.

"The CHAIRMAN. Where were you stationed; here in Washington?

"Mr. FELLOWS. In Washington; yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. You were here in Washington on the morning of the 2d of September 1935, when this hurricane struck the coast of Florida?

"Mr. FELLOWS. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. You can tell the committee what you did.

"Mr. FELLOWS. That was a holiday, and I was at home a little later than normal. I read the paper at breakfast, the Washington Post, and noticed in that paper the storm announcement; that is, the announcement of the possibility of a storm in Florida.

"The CHAIRMAN. That was on Monday morning, was it not?

"Mr. FELLOWS. That was Monday morning, Labor Day.

"The CHAIRMAN. September 2, 1935?

"Mr. FELLOWS. September 2, 1935; yes, sir. So I went down to the office right after breakfast and found Mr. Aubrey Williams in his office and suggested to him that it might be advisable to get in touch with the Florida administration, to see if they had taken care of orders for evacuation or the necessary protection of those men.

"Mrs. ROGERS. At what time was that?

"Mr. FELLOWS. That was 9:30, about, when I was talking with him. At 9:45 in the morning, after getting permission from Mr. Williams, I put in a long distance call for the State administrator.

"The CHAIRMAN. Who is he?

"Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Van Hyning.

"The CHAIRMAN. Did you talk to him?

"Mr. FELLOWS. Not at first. I had difficulty getting through to the office, because of the fact that it was a holiday. I found that the office was closed; that is, the telephone operator so reported to me.

"After that, I called Mr. Williams' office to get Mr. Van Hyning's first name and residence, if possible. I got his first name, but could not get his residence; and in the meantime I had told the telephone operator to get anyone in responsible authority, and I found that Mr. Van Hyning had gone to Tallahassee. So I transferred the call there and told them to get him—I did not know but what he might be at some hotel—to try the hotels and the directory service, because I could not give the office number—I mean, I could not give the residence number. I located him before 11 o'clock, as I recall.

"The CHAIRMAN. Where?

"Mr. FELLOWS. In Tallahassee.

"The CHAIRMAN. What did you tell him?

"Mr. FELLOWS. I told him that I had seen notice of the storm in the morning paper, and asked him if they were making preparations and necessary provisions, and he said he thought they were. I assured him that Mr. Williams had given me authority to call him and ask that he take every precaution that might be necessary for protection; that they could tell better whether there was need for it than I could up here, but I felt that some consideration might be given it, and he assured me that they would take hold immediately and make whatever necessary arrangements that were required. But at the same time he told me that he thought they probably had people in the vicinity there that might do the usual thing; that is, board up, and whatever is necessary.

"And after I got the call through to Mr. Van Hyning and had relayed the message, I reported back to Mr. Williams' office that I had cleared through—not to him personally, but his office—that all requirements were taken care of, and I went up to Mr. Westbrook's office. Mr. Westbrook is another assistant administrator, and I advised him of the situation."

Testimony of P. A. Fellows, administrative assistant, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, page 550:

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. Did you talk then with Mr. Van Hyning about getting the men out of the camps?

"Mr. FELLOWS. I did say this to him, that if they appeared to be in the path, in the

immediate path of the storm, that I thought it would be a good plan to have them out, and I told him that I thought Mr. Williams would prefer to have them out, even if the storm did not strike, rather than stay there; that is, he would rather take the responsibility of seeing them all moved out and moved back again rather than to have them stay at the risk of injury.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. In other words, you did not want to take a chance?

"Mr. FELLOWS. That is right.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. Did you talk with him about the methods of transportation, train or truck or anything of that kind?

"Mr. FELLOWS. No; I do not recall that we had any conversation about the method of transportation at all.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. Were there any particular precautions discussed? You mentioned about boarding up buildings; anything else?

"Mr. FELLOWS. We just discussed the matter of moving the men out, if they appeared to be in the path of the storm.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. Did he offer anything in regard to that?

"Mr. FELLOWS. No, not to me. He said he would communicate with the people down there.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. I think that is all.

"Mr. HOUSTON. In other words, you did everything you thought was necessary at the time to expedite matters and get him into action down there?

"Mr. FELLOWS. In a general administrative way; yes, sir. It was advisory, so far as my relations were concerned."

Testimony of S. C. Cutler, works director for the Florida veterans' camps, page 556:

"Mrs. ROGERS. Did anyone from the East Coast Line Railway talk with you on Sunday about there being extra cars—I think on Sunday—to take the men away?

"Mr. CUTLER. I called the Florida East Coast Railroad.

"Mrs. ROGERS. You called?

"Mr. CUTLER. I called them and tried to get in touch with Mr. Gaddis. He was out of town, however, and I talked to his clerk, and told him that, while I had no authority to order the train, I believed that they would get orders very shortly, as I had previously put in a call to Mr. Ghent in Jacksonville.

"Mrs. ROGERS. At what time was that?

"Mr. CUTLER. I cannot give you the exact time I put in the call. I put in the call for Mr. Ghent, I believe, before I called the railroad, because I know I told Mr. Ghent when I talked to him that I had called the railroad and suggested that they have these trains in readiness for immediate dispatch upon his orders.

"Mrs. ROGERS. Was that in the forenoon or afternoon?

"Mr. CUTLER. I got back from camp 3, as I say, along about 11 or 11:30, and it is my recollection that I put in the call for Mr. Ghent almost immediately after that.

"Mrs. ROGERS. I ask that, because the Florida East Coast Line Railway said in the statement that they thought they had talked with the camp superintendent."

Testimony of Ray W. Sheldon, page 261:

"The CHAIRMAN. Is that all?

"Mrs. ROGERS. I have one more question I would like to ask Mr. Sheldon.

"It seems to me, Mr. Sheldon, in view of the letter that I received from the Florida East Coast Railroad, that Mr. Ghent did not tell you of the letter that they claim to have written him on June 2, that it would take 12 hours to get two trains.

"Mr. SHELDON. Well, now, it may seem strange, but I had no knowledge of it.

"Mrs. ROGERS. I do not mean that it seems strange, but it seems strange that Mr. Ghent did not tell you about that. I think it would be nice if we could question Mr. Ghent about that.

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes; I think any railroad that cannot get a train ready in less than 12 hours ought to have its charter forfeited. I do not care what railroad it is, but if any railroad which is operating and doing business cannot get a train a hundred miles, in case of emergency, in less than 12 hours, it is a mighty poor railroad, and I am speaking from the horrible experiences we have had in the cyclone area in Mississippi and Georgia last week. A railroad which cannot get a train 70 miles in less than 12 hours, indicates to me that it is worse than a tramroad, if that is correct.

Letter from Florida East Coast Railway to F. B. Ghent, director of veterans' work program, page 505:

JUNE 6, 1935.

REMOVAL OF VETERANS FROM THE KEYS DURING HURRICANE SEASON

Mr. F. B. GHENT,
Director, Veterans' Work Program,
Jacksonville, Fla.

DEAR MR. GHENT: Referring to your letter of May 16, 1935, in reference to arranging for train service to remove the veterans from the Keys during the hurricane season.

In every case of disturbance of any intensity we receive, through the weather bureau, sufficient advance notice to enable us to furnish locomotives and equipment to make up two trains, and they would be available after receiving 12 hours' notice of your desire for them.

In the event it is deemed advisable to move the veterans upon receipt of a report of an approaching storm, the railway must be advised definitely to what point the veterans will be moved to get them to safety. In other words, we will have to know definitely between what points the relief trains will be operated in order that we may make necessary arrangements for taking care of the equipment and the train crews after the trains arrive at destination; also, that the railway will not be subject to protest from any community to which the veterans will be transferred with regard to sanitary and other conditions. In order to complete arrangements therefor, those in charge of the veterans' work program should now make advance arrangements and advise the railway to what points it is proposed to move them.

Yours very truly,

——— ———, *Coreceiver.*

Testimony of F. B. Ghent, director of Federal works program in Florida, page 293:

"Mr. PATMAN. There was no effort made to spare expense or trouble or anything else to look after them?

"Mr. GHENT. Dollars and cents were never considered and are never considered when it comes to human life, in my estimation.

"Mr. PATMAN. I mean, in this case, that was not considered?

"Mr. GHENT. No; never the question of dollars and cents."

Testimony of Mr. S. C. Cutler, works director for the Florida veterans' camps, page 580:

"Mr. ENGEL. You testified at the hearings that the buildings of the veterans were of far better construction than the buildings of the natives.

"Mr. CUTLER. The buildings for the veterans were in less exposed places than the native buildings. Most of the natives' buildings are along the water edge, on the ocean side. I am speaking particularly now of camp 3. In camps 1 and 5, those buildings were on the ocean side, too. If I may add something there, it was never intended to house the men in those buildings during a hurricane.

"Mr. ENGEL. Were the buildings fastened down in any way?

"Mr. CUTLER. No, sir; they were not. We had intended to fasten them down, but had never gotten around to doing it.

"Mr. ENGEL. Were they on posts?

"Mr. CUTLER. They were on blocks, set on the ground. They were just platforms, or 2 by 2 platforms.

"Mr. ENGEL. Were they fastened down?

"Mr. CUTLER. The blocks were set on top of the ground, and the walls were spiked to the blocks.

"Mr. ENGEL. They were not fastened down?

"Mr. CUTLER. Only at camp 3, where the dirt had been dumped in around them.

"Mr. ENGEL. You are sure of your statement that they were not fastened down?

"Mr. CUTLER. If you take two camps—one might not say they were fastened down. They were not fastened down in a way that you might consider them fastened down.

Testimony of Aubrey W. Williams, Deputy Administrator, Works Progress Administration, page 442:

"Mr. WILLIAMS. We selected Florida and other Southern States down there for, I would say, two or three reasons. The first reason was the cost of maintaining men in a camp is smaller in a section of the country that is warm, where you do not have the expense of heating, and the necessity of more adequate and complete buildings, and so forth. That was one factor.

"Another factor was we had in Mr. Stone an imaginative and resourceful person who could and was, in our estimation, able to make profitable use in the way of work, to develop profitable work whereby these people could earn their wages.

"The third reason was that we did not receive any general cooperation on the part of a great many States upon our request that these men be organized and put into work projects.

"Mrs. ROGERS. What reason did they give?

"Mr. WILLIAMS. They gave the ordinary reasons, that they have enough troubles of their own, they have plenty of people who are out of work in their State, and that they prefer to see those people get employment rather than outsiders; that they have families who are in need, and that these were unattached men, and so forth, and so on and so forth.

"Mrs. ROGERS. What type of men were they? Did you talk with them before they went down there?

"Mr. WILLIAMS. I met with a good many of their representatives; that is, their delegations came to see me on a number of occasions. I would say that on the whole they were a very good group of men, greatly troubled and harassed by the lack of employment and by the frustrations that they had experienced since the war. They were, many of them, in need of the simplest forms of food and shelter as correctives to their condition. We found, while there was a small percentage, as there always is in any group of people, who had suffered so long and so greatly that it was very difficult to restore them without adequate hospitalization, on the whole they responded very excellently to the camp environment and to the food and to the work.

"Mrs. ROGERS. You felt that it was important to send them to a place where they would be under no stress or strain, under the circumstances?

"Mr. WILLIAMS. I was never conscious that we had any places where the men were under restraint.

"Mrs. ROGERS. No; I said strain or stress. I am speaking of such things as storms. Of course, they do have storms in Florida. For instance, if you go to a travel agency, if you intend to take a trip, during those hurricane months they advise you to take your trip in some other month. So we know that that situation exists.

"The CHAIRMAN. Those men would have preferred that to being driven out of Washington at the point of the bayonet and having their tents burned down, would they not, Mr. Williams?"

Testimony of Joseph F. Fecteau, veteran, page 479:

"The CHAIRMAN. Who was Robinson?

"Mr. FECTEAU. He was our camp superintendent.

"The CHAIRMAN. Who was he employed by?

"Mr. FECTEAU. Well, he went there—he was a veteran and he worked his way up to this job.

"The CHAIRMAN. He was employed by the F. E. R. A.?

"Mr. FECTEAU. Yes; he was employed by the F. E. R. A.

"The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what they paid him?

"Mr. FECTEAU. Well, I should think $125 a month, I believe, is what he was getting.

"The CHAIRMAN. I wanted to know what his position was.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. You were telling us about Tavernier——

"Mr. FECTEAU. Well, Tavernier is not on the mainland, but it is safe or in a kind of little village where there is a good cement building; you felt a little safe, and the train would have been able to make Tavernier, I believe; and we asked Mr. Robinson to take us down to Tavernier, and we would—not myself, but I had my car or truck and could get out, but the boys told him, 'We want the trucks to take us out of here,' and he said, 'You can't get any trucks, because the keys have been turned in to Mr. King.' He said that King had orders to take the keys from the truck drivers, so they would not run away with the trucks, he said they did not want the trucks on the road, but he said 'they will be here and you need not worry about these trucks.' "

Testimony of Harold Langloise, veteran, page 521:

"Mr. LANGLOIS. That was so stated. There was four or five trucks they used to quarry with in the shed, which could have been taken, which could have taken us away from there and got away from that storm. We had plenty of time to get the men out before the storm But evidently, when they used the trucks and they put them away, they take the keys away and give them to the foreman. Where the foreman was, I do not know, because I was separated. But we could have got out of there in time. I was injured in the camp itself, below the camp, my leg and my arm, and I went—I finally dragged myself to shelter—and the only one particularly that I seen the next day was the captain of the camp. We had nothing to eat that day, because it was all washed away anyhow. The buildings were all torn down."

Testimony of Harold S. Langlois, veteran, pages 539 and 540:

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. When did you first see a raise in the elevation of the water?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. When I came out of the shack a quarter to 8 or 8 o'clock at night, and the shack was starting to float off.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. What night?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. That was Monday, September 2.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. The storm was over then, was it not?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. No, sir; it was just starting.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. Eight o'clock, when?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. At 8:15; between half past 8 and a quarter to 8, it was just increasing. When the storm was to its height was around 9 o'clock. That is when I got this [indicating], between 8:30 and 9, and I cannot exactly tell you to the minute.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; but we have had testimony here that you had some pretty heavy wind, and that the timber was blown down in the afternoon of Monday, and the water had already covered the road in spots.

"Mr. LANGLOIS. It might have done that up around company 3, but not around company 1.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. Not where you were?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. No, sir; that was 10 miles up.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. Now, you said there was no foreman or superintendent in charge of your camp on Monday——

"Mr. LANGLOIS. We had a captain there on Monday, the man I referred to a while ago, which I did not know his name. He was there. He was the one that told us that the train would be there most any minute.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. Was he there all through the storm?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. He was, sir.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. All right, did you make any effort or any request of him to get you out of there?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. We didn't make no request, only he said we would have transportation as soon as the train would come, and they would take us to Miami, and to wait, and we practically all stayed in the mess house, and when the mess house started to rock back and forth—and you know it was not put up very safely, 2 by 4 boarded, and it was nothing but a shell. He said, 'Boys, you had better get out of here and get into your shacks,' and that was around 4 o'clock in the afternoon, between 4 and 4:20. We had some soup there.

"Mr. SAUTHOFF. That was on Monday at 4 or 4:30?

"Mr. LANGLOIS. Monday, September 2, and we went into the shacks and most of us stayed there in the shacks until the water got so high I got out of the shack. There were seven of us in one shack, standing in there with the doors closed, and the water come underneath, through the floor, and when I got out of the shack I was up to here [indicating] in water."

The members of the committee signing this minority report urge most strongly a careful reading of the printed copies of the hearings. There is no doubt in our minds that while it would be impossible to place blame for the terrible loss of life, yet the evidence shows a surprising lack of judgment on the part of those responsible for the welfare of the men under their charge. Many blunders were made.

This hurricane has been called an act of God. God may be held responsible for this storm, but He cannot be blamed for leaving these men in the path of the storm, nor can He be blamed for depriving them of their only available method of leaving.

If the employers of these men had been a private company, instead of the Government, no stone would have been left unturned in placing the responsibility. The Government should be treated in the same manner. An employee assumes a risk of common knowledge, but he does not assume a risk arising from the employer's negligence or breach of duty of which he is not aware.

This responsibility is the Government's and should be recognized by the granting of benefits comparable to those permitted service-connected cases of World War veterans.

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS.
HARRY SAUTHOFF.
CHARLES F. RISK.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read down to and including line 3 on page 2.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4346, making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein excerpts from a recent newspaper editorial and certain other material furnished me in this connection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein certain statements and excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other documents, especially the report of the committee that investigated the incidents referred to by the gentleman from Massachusetts that occurred in Florida.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: First, that my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Gen. William E. Chickering, Director of the Army Postal Service; and second, to extend by own remarks made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein some excerpts from the hearings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a statement on the place of silver money in the monetary reconstruction. I have an estimate from the printer in the amount of $157.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

(Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and include therein several communications relative to the subject under discussion.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, this morning the gentleman from Mississippi reserved the right to object to an article from the Washington Post that I asked to have inserted in the RECORD. He had not read the article at that time; he has

since read it and tells me he has no objection. I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the remarks I made this morning.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks certain pages from the hearings on the Florida hurricane in 1935.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WHITE SUPREMACY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, may I preface my remarks by complimenting my distinguished colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] in his very proper statement on the floor earlier this afternoon and to state that I unequivocally agree with what this distinguished gentleman has said.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might discuss a matter of a highly controversial nature, a delicate subject, especially during these trying days of war. The subject to which I am addressing myself, and my desire at this time to discuss the same, has been prompted by recent newspaper stories. I refer to the race question, which is being agitated by high officials and semiofficials, as well as unofficial groups having little or no knowledge of the problem which confronts those of us who dwell in the South where there is a large Negro population.

I approach the discussion of this subject humbly but with full earnestness and seriousness of heart. So much nonsense has been spoken and printed about racial relations that I feel it my duty as the representative of a southern constituency in this honorable body to make some candid observations concerning the true situation. As a rule, these troublemakers may be denominated as "long-haired men and short-haired women." One is inclined to quote the words from Holy Writ wherein it is said, "Forgive them, for they know not what they do."

The loyal, self-respecting colored people, I feel, are desirous of doing their full part in this national emergency. Under the right type of leadership they can be depended upon to do their full share, regardless of danger and risk to life.

By the induction of Negroes into the armed forces, I regret to advise you that a real problem has developed throughout the country. Congress has, as you know, passed legislation providing for the highest rate of pay ever paid by any country to its servicemen and has made more generous allowances for the dependents of servicemen. These allowances, as a matter of course, go to Negro homes, as well as to white homes. One result of our proper liberality toward our gallant fighting men is that it is almost impossible to obtain domestic or other needed help. Our housewives, who had grown so accustomed to the loyal services of colored servants, are, at least for the time being, deprived for the most part of such services. Many of the recipients of allotment benefits are no longer willing to work as they have previously done. What will happen after the war ends, I am not wise enough to know. I sincerely trust that these honest, normally hard-working Negro citizens will then resume their normal lives when peace comes again. If not interfered with by uninformed agitators and starry-eyed, half-baked theorists in other sections of our beloved country, most of them doubtless will proudly slip back into their normal pursuits. In so doing they will have the complete cooperation of every thoughtful white man and woman in the South.

Some days ago you doubtless read reports published in the newspapers of the country of the opening of a local service unit in Washington for service men and women, regardless of color. The stories published at the time noted the presence at the opening of outstanding officials and semiofficials of the United States, and indicated that they joined with others of both races in singing such songs as Let Me Call You Sweetheart.

No Member of this House has greater respect for our leaders than I, but one can be pardoned if he questions the wisdom of such officials participating in these festivities. I unhesitatingly brand that affair as a distinct disservice to the Negro race—one to which our sanction should not be given. Whatever the intent of those responsible for the creation of this particular service unit, is continued operation can result only in the intensification of the race problem, with which we of the South must constantly struggle.

Negroes in the armed services who visit Washington or other centers do not lack service units of their own, as well organized and conducted as any for white service men and women. In all conscience, why not permit them to patronize the units created especially for them. They are always happier among themselves on social occasions, most of them preferring not to mingle with white folks. The race problem is grave enough without deliberately aggravating it by promoting the intermingling of Negroes and whites on such occasions.

Recalling a statement used by that great southern author, Thomas Dixon, in his classic production, The Leopard's Spots, attributed to President Lincoln, I now quote from President Lincoln's speech delivered at Columbus, Ohio, on September 16, 1859, wherein he said:

> I will say, then, that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and the black races; that I am not, nor ever have been, in favor of making voters or jurors of Negroes, nor of qualifying them to hold office, nor to intermarry with white people; and I will say in addition to this, that there is a physical difference between the white and the black races, which, I believe, will forever forbid the two races living together on terms of social and political equality. And inasmuch as they cannot so live, while they do remain together there must be the position of superior and inferior, and I, as much as any other man, am in favor of having the superior position assigned to the white race. I say upon this occasion I do not perceive that because the white man is to have the superior position, the Negro should be denied everything.

It is my firm conviction that had the martyred Lincoln lived the many terrible experiences of the South during the reconstruction era would have been avoided. God seems to have endowed him with a greater degree of wisdom and understanding than is vouchsafed to most of us, which enabled him to get directly to the heart of even the greatest problem and find its proper solution.

Many harsh things were said against Mr. Lincoln in the South when he served the Nation as Chief Executive in time of crisis, and equally harsh things were said against him in the North. But he has grown in stature with the passing of the years. Were Mr. Lincoln alive today, I am confident that his voice would be raised in solemn warning against all who thoughtlessly agitate for social and political equality for the Negro. He would oppose with all the force for which he was noted any movement or agitation that made the lot of the Negro less happy in a great country where he is outnumbered 10 to 1.

The Negro race has produced some great men and women, but they have always been found counseling moderation and restraint on the part of their fellows, not agitating for the intermingling of the races. Indeed, most of them have been proud of the progress which God in His wisdom permitted them to make and fully appreciative of the unceasing efforts of thoughtful and understanding white men and women to keep open the door of opportunity and improve the lot of their race.

You who have few opportunities to examine the conditions in my part of the country cannot easily realize the gravity of the situation created by the type of agitation to which I have called your attention. If you lived with the race problem in the South from day to day you would understand the motives which prompted the House of Representatives of South Carolina's General Assembly in passing recently a resolution severely criticizing agitators in the North, who insist upon stirring up the race problem on every possible occasion, and telling them to mind their own business and let the South alone.

That was a strong resolution, vigorously denouncing those who are seeking by insidious utterances and actions to stir up trouble and bring conflict and strife between the white race and the Negro race of the South; and adding, among other things:

> We indignantly and vehemently denounce the intentions of all organizations seeking the amalgamation of the white and Negro races by a commingling of the races upon any basis of equality as being destructive to the identity and characteristics and integrity of both races, and as being un-American and hostile to the existence and preservation of the American Union of States.
>
> We reaffirm our belief in and our allegiance to established white supremacy as now prevailing in the South, and we solemnly pledge our lives and our sacred honor to maintain it, whatever the cost, in war and in peace.

The resolution went even further, declaring that these agitators, whatever their station—official, semiofficial, or unofficial—are "playing into the hands of the Nazi philosophy of conquest, to first divide, then conquer, and by their treasonable utterances and conduct are giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our common country."

In conclusion the resolution declared that "history and tradition prove that the wisest and safest policy is to allow each race to work out its own destiny in the South by a process of progressive evolution within the confines of its own racial borders."

I think most of you will agree that such a resolution never would have passed the South Carolina House of Representatives except under the compulsion of great provocation. Members of that body know the dangers inherent in the constant agitation of this delicate problem by persons who are not in position to know the true situation. If they did and are blessed with real character and integrity they would not lend their support to any such movement.

And I say to you in all candor that the Negro race as such has never shown ability to govern itself, and Almighty God knows they could not govern us. There are outstanding individual exceptions, but these exceptional characters have acquired wisdom and understanding and will not be found among those agitating for the amalgamation of the races, knowing that such a development would set back the progress of their race indefinitely.

My friends, let me say that I take my stand squarely on the side of white supremacy, not only in the South but throughout the Nation. In so doing I ask you in all earnestness and sincerity to make a real effort to understand the situation which confronts the white race, particularly in my part of the country.

On the basis of test performances, whites are superior to Negroes. The testing of the drafted soldiers during World War No. 1 gave the first extensive body of data on Negro-white differences in this country. In a special analysis of the results of this study by C. Brigham, Princeton University Press, 1923, the conclusion was reached that there was clear evidence for the innate intellectual superiority of whites over Negroes. R. Pintner, Intelligence Testing, 1931, after summarizing the results up to 1930, came to the following conclusion:

> All results show the Negro decidedly inferior to the whites on standardized intelligence tests. * * * These results are sufficiently numerous and consistent to point to a racial difference in intelligence.

P. L. Boynton in his Intelligence, Its Manifestation and Measurement, 1933, concludes:

> That most studies point so definitely to the superiority of the average white over the average Negro that it would seem justifiable to assume this condition to exist.

P. C. Young, for example, administered the national intelligence test to 282 whites and 277 Negro children in Baton Rouge and Lake Charles, La. Principals and teachers assisted in labeling the Negro subjects lighter, darker, and miscellaneous. He found a "noticeable decrease of intelligence as we go from the white child to light Negroes and then to dark Negroes" and concluded that the light Negroes were on the average 19.7 percent more intelligent than the dark Negroes. This may be explained by the hypothesis that white blood makes them more intelligent than the dark Negroes.

Archeologists and evolutionists are quite unanimous on the subject of white supremacy. From prehistoric days the white race has dominated in all fields of activity. The colored race is definitely an inferior race. The prognathism, the lower forehead, the dark skin, the wide nose, all are primitive in character. Dr. Bean, of Virginia, states that the cerebral pattern of the Negro forebrain is inferior to that of the white.

In 1856 Gratiloet stated that in the Negro the cranium closes itself on the brain like a prison. It is no longer "a temple divine," to use the expression of Malpghi, but a sort of helmet for resisting blows. When you truly understand the situation I know that your judgment concerning my stand on the status of the Negro will be free of harshness.

Suppose for a moment that these unthinking people should be the cause of serious racial strife. You know what the result would be. With the Negro outnumbered 10 to 1 he would suffer most. No other outcome would be possible. The cards would be stacked against him—and stacked against him by his self-styled friends—before the strife really got under way. And you know as well as I do that those same pseudo friends would make themselves scarce—flee to bombproof shelters—at the first sign of trouble, leaving the misguided Negroes to their fate. Let no sensible citizen believe any such trouble would be confined to the South. As a sincere well-wisher of all loyal Negroes, I sincerely urge you to do your utmost to stop this dangerous agitation in the best interest of all of us.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio (at the request of Mr. JENKINS), for the remainder of the week, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 872. An act to provide retirement benefits for certain persons who serve as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

S. 1387. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River;

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4166. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 9, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 9, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 9, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 4099, entitled "A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913," which was introduced by the chairman, Hon. JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session on Thursday, March 9, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1267. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers to be disposed of by him of certain Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1268. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers proposed for disposal by the Government agencies as named; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DIES: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 464. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 3961, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1241). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 4352. A bill to replace the present cost-plus and other systems of contracting for public construction by a system of negotiated lump-sum contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4353. A bill to provide for the deportation of aliens who do not diligently attempt to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 4354. A bill to prohibit the entry into the United States of quota immigrants until the expiration of 5 years after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BURCHILL of New York:

H. R. 4355. A bill to provide adjusted-service pay for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4356. A bill to grant free postage to members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 4357. A bill to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4358. A bill to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 4359. A bill to provide an increase in pay for the personnel of the military and naval forces engaged in actual combat; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4360. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEE:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution authorizing a study and investigation of the opportunities for the means of foreign economic collaboration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. Res. 465. Resolution to establish a Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 4361. A bill for the relief of Arch A. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 4362. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Fry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 4363. A bill for the relief of Ollie Brashear Hearldson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4364. A bill for the relief of the postmaster, Portsmouth, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 4365. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Stewart Martin, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 4366. A bill for the relief of Alex Wylie, and the estate of James Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. R. 4367. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Toler; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

5205. By Mr. BREHM: Petition of sundry citizens of the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio, urging the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5206. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California Legislature, joint committee on water problems, protesting against ratification of treaty between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, providing for delivery by the United States to the Republic of Mexico a guaranteed minimum amount of water of the Colorado River; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5207. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Mershed George and 300 other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., opposing House Resolution 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5208. By Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing Congress concerning certain pending legislation relative to the abrogation of the white paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5209. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Supreme President, Serb National Federation, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, to Thee our strong tower and refuge, we come as to the shadow of a great rock in a weary land. Lift us from the dust and mire of the past with all its failures that we may gird ourselves for a new day's work, as upon our strength and ability is laid the burdened needs of the Nation and of the world. Save us from despair when evening finds the morning promise unfulfilled.

As our hopes are quickened by the faith and daring of the Kingdom of God may we be delivered from the web of outgrown precedents and from the stale ways of party cunning. Open our eyes to see the futility of greatly changing the sad pattern of life without any change of lives. When so great a multitude are walking the way of sorrow whose end is marked by a lonely cross, may these searching days reveal the hateful things in our hearts which make our own spirits unfit to be living stones for the fairer temple of humanity. In the vineyard of our inner lives which each man must tend may there be found the fruits of the spirit, love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness, temperance, and faith. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 7, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ELWYN R. SHAW TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the appointed subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on the 17th day of March 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Elwyn R. Shaw, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice Hon. Charles Edgar Woodward, deceased. At the hearing all persons interested in the nomination may make representations. The subcommittee consists of Senators McCARRAN, KILGORE, and WILEY.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WALTER J. LABUY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the appointed subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on the 17th day of March 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Walter J. LaBuy, of Illinois, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Illinois, vice Hon. William H. Holly, retired. At the hearing all persons interested in the nomination may make representations. The subcommittee consists of Senators McCARRAN, KILGORE, and WILEY.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman;

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink,

superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co. against the United States;

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and Juna Dowdell; and

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 176. An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney; and

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 555) for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Capt. Malcolm K. Beyer;

H. R. 272. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, Jesse M. Knowles, and the estate of Lee Stroud;

H. R. 552. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 634. An act to provide for the advancement of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of vice admiral;

H. R. 1046. An act for the relief of David B. Turpel;

H. R. 1635. An act for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search;

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of Mary Lovis Elliott;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Edwin H. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 1755. An act for the relief of Broadus D. Boland;

H. R. 2006. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hagar Simpson, Mrs. Nat Price, Jr., and Griffin Bros. Clinic;

H. R. 2008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel;

H. R. 2288. An act for the relief of Donald J. Munson;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of O. W. James;

H. R. 2337. An act for the relief of John Joseph Defeo;

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Clarence P. Hale, Jr.;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson;

H. R. 2497. An act for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers;

H. R. 2689. An act for the relief of Pete Paluck;

H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of E. Sullivan;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lillian W. Timmerman, mother of Ann Timmerman, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2846. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring;

H. R. 2855. An act for the relief of the estate of John Buby;

H. R. 3102. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of Ruth Coe;

H. R. 3126. An act for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes;

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker;

H. R. 3301. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Polak, a minor;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke;

H. R. 3596. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation against the United States;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of C. C. Evensen;

H. R. 3724. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin;

H. R. 3737. An act for the relief of M. H. Harris; and

H. R. 4278. An act to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 872. An act to provide retirement benefits for certain persons who serve as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

S. 1387. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A confidential letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces on January 31, 1944, under the provisions of law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for each of the Department's reporting units for the quarter ending March 31, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

TABLES OF BANKRUPTCY STATISTICS

A letter from the Director of the Administrative Office, United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, statistical tables containing data in regard to bankruptcy cases pending in the district courts of the United States in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with accompanying tables and charts); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second quarterly report of the Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning October 1, 1943, and ending December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION

A letter from John H. Fahey, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of that Administration for the period July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1942, covering operations of the Federal home loan banks, Federal savings and loan associations, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, and the United States Housing Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Department of Agriculture (6); Office of Scientific Research and Development, and the War Food Administration which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Wellington, Ohio, praying for the establishment of a Christian world order; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GREEN

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Resolution 765

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress concerning certain pending legislation relative to the abrogation of the white paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth

"Whereas there are now pending in the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee in Congress resolutions introduced by Senator WAGNER, of New York, and Senator TAFT, of Ohio, relative to the abrogation of the white paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth, while in the House Foreign Affairs Committee are also similar resolutions introduced by Congressman MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, and Congressman WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania; and

"Whereas this is a tragic hour for millions of European Jews who have been mercilessly persecuted merely because of their faith and the hour has now come when this country of the United States should reaffirm its support of the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth and unequivocally make known its opposition to the white paper: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are earnestly urged to support these resolutions relative to the abrogation of the white paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in order that their passage may be assured; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit

to said Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in Congress duly certified copies of this resolution."

RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS' CONFERENCE ON INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC UNION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted at a public meeting of the Citizens' Conference on International Economic Union, held at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., March 4, 1944.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has been demonstrated by the experience of every nation during the present war and in previous periods of war and peace that the economic needs of all peoples everywhere are common and indivisible and that joint international agreements and action are essential to full employment, to raising standards of living, both at home and abroad, and to the prevention of armed conflict in the future; and

Whereas the broad principles of international economic cooperation to operate throughout the world after present hostilities cease are clearly enunciated in the Atlantic Charter and have been subscribed to by the United States and 33 other nations, while similar principles, outlined in article VII of the mutual-aid agreements, have received the approval of the President and Congress and of representatives of 16 of the other strong industrial nations: Be it, therefore

Resolved by those in attendance at the Washington meeting of the Citizens' Conference on International Economic Union, That the United States shall participate in the establishment, at the earliest time possible, of those international economic agencies essential to preserve peace among the nations—to aid and encourage international investment in productive enterprise, wherever necessary in order to promote industry and development; to secure the removal of trade barriers and promote the unhampered distribution of food, goods, and services produced, in accordance with an international multilateral trade agreement; to establish and maintain stabilized currencies and an orderly pattern of exchange rates; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States shall call a meeting of the United Nations without delay, for the purpose of creating and integrating these agencies of international economic cooperation.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING OF YOUTH—PROTEST

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD without all the signatures attached a letter which I have received from Mrs. L. M. Wheeler and approximately 25 other citizens of Kansas, expressing their opposition to House bill 3947, which provides for a year of compulsory military training for all young men at the age of 17, or on graduation from high school.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *March 4, 1944.*

DEAR SIR: We are opposed to the bill (H. R. 3947) which provides for a year of compulsory military training for all young men at the age of 17 or on graduation from high school.

It is a step in the opposite direction from the principles for which God has blessed and prospered our Nation. It would shadow our freedom and would stimulate bitterness and hate of other nations because war is the natural expression and inevitable outcome of such training in youth of that age and will bring about the same conditions that exist today in Germany and Russia. It is a breeder of crime and immorality and is definitely un-Christian.

As defenders of the faith of our fathers, we remain,

Sincerely,

Mrs. L. M. WHEELER,
Mrs. ALICE SWANSON
(And sundry other citizens of Kansas City, Kans.).

REPORTS OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 7th instant:

On March 8, 1944, the following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS):

H. R. 4133. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 727).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 4183. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 728).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 4070. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 730).

From the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler"; without amendment (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; without amendment.

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1711. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize Army officers designated by the Secretary of War to take final action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage, unserviceability, unsuitability, or destruction of Government property," approved October 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 758); with amendments (Rept. No. 729).

By Mr. AUSTIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1743. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, to continue it in effect; without amendment (Rept. No. 731); and

S. 1749. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect; without amendment (Rept. No. 732).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1590. A bill for the relief of the State of Tennessee; without amendment (Rept. No. 735).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 930. A bill to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the fisheries of Alaska, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 733).

By Mr. McCARRAN (for Mr. McFARLAND), from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1201. A bill to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration; without amendment (Rept. No. 734).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1281. A bill for the relief of Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian; with an amendment (Rept. No. 736);

H. R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 737);

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt; without amendment (Rept. No. 738);

H. R. 2625. A bill for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held; with an amendment (Rept. No. 739);

H. R. 2743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler; with an amendment (Rept. No. 740);

H. R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin; without amendment (Rept. No. 741); and

H. R. 3701. A bill for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; without amendment (Rept. No. 752).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1411. A bill for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart; with an amendment (Rept. No. 743);

H. R. 3139. A bill for the relief of Henry Grossi; without amendment (Rept. No. 744); and

H. R. 3390. A bill for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron; with amendments (Rept. No. 745).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 754. A bill for the relief of Iver M. Gesteland; without amendment (Rept. No. 746);

S. 1305. A bill for the relief of Anne Rebecca Lewis and Mary Lewis; with amendments (Rept. No. 747);

S. 1553. A bill for the relief of J. M. Miller, James W. Williams, and Gilbert Theriot; with amendments (Rept. No. 748);

H. R. 2925. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Goff; with amendments (Rept. No. 749);

H. R. 2993. A bill for the relief of John W. Booth III; without amendment (Rept. No. 750); and

H. R. 3763. A bill to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service; without amendment (Rept. No. 751).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

NOMINATIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS AND CONFIRMED

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session from the Committee on Foreign Relations I ask unanimous consent to report and have considered three nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the nominations, as follows:

George L. Brandt, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

C. Porter Kuykendall, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

John F. Stone, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the nominations as in executive session?

Mr. CONNALLY. I should be pleased to have them considered, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered as in executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered as in executive session, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 7, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; and

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia government and the White House Police force."

HEARINGS BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 267), and, under the rule, it was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, authorized by Senate Resolution No. 53, agreed to January 18, 1943, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate for the same purposes during the Seventy-eighth Congress, $7,500 in addition to the amount of $10,000 heretofore authorized.

C. A. RAGLAND, SR.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Claims, I report back, without amendment, Senate Resolution 256, to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 961) for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr., and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I may state to the Senate that the purpose of the resolution is to have Senate bill 961, together with all documents thereto attached, referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Louisiana, Has the resolution been approved unanimously by the committee?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; it has been approved unanimously.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 256) submitted by Mr. BAILEY on February 21, 1944, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 961) entitled "A bill for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr.", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such section and report to the Senate, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant; and the said court shall so proceed with the same and report to the Senate, irrespective of any statute-of-limitations bar, and irrespective of any administrative requirements or contractual provision relating to notice of protest as to filing claim therefor.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF PART 2 OF REPORT NO. 539, RELATING TO THE CANCELATION OF WAR CONTRACTS, ETC.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Printing I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 261, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That 15,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 539, part 2, current session, submitted by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, pursuant to Senate Resolution 102, relative to the "cancelation of war contracts, disposition and sale of surplus property, and industrial demobilization and reconversion," be printed for the use of said committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona briefly explain the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution provides for the printing of 15,000 additional copies of part 2 of the Report by the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman. There has been a very great demand for the report, so the committee desires additional copies.

Mr. WHITE. The resolution simply provides for the printing of additional copies?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 261), submitted by Mr. GEORGE on March 3, 1944, was considered and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

S. 1762. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 1763. A bill for the relief of the Square D Co. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 1764. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421, 77th Cong.), as amended by the act of October 2, 1942 (Public Law 729, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. VANDENBERG introduced Senate bill 1765, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

MEDALS FOR PARENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WHO LOSE THEIR LIVES

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce a bill to provide for the presentation of medals to parents of persons who have lost their lives while serving in the military and naval forces. I ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1765) to provide for the presentation of medals to parents of persons who lose their lives while serving in the military or naval forces, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the case of any person who shall have died as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by active service in the military or naval forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning on August 27, 1940, and ending 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President, the Secretary of War, if such active service shall have been in the military forces, or the Secretary of the Navy, if such active service shall have been in the naval forces, is authorized and directed to procure and present to the surviving parents or parent of such person a gold star medal of appropriate design.

SEC. 2. The wearing, manufacture, or sale of the gold star medal provided for under this act, or of any colorable imitation thereof, is prohibited, except when authorized under such regulations as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe. Any person who knowingly violates the provisions of this section shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine not exceeding $250 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Capt. Malcolm K. Beyer;

H. R. 272. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vola Stroud Pokluda, Jesse M. Knowles, and the estate of Lee Stroud;

H. R. 552. An act for the relief of Winfred Alexander;

H. R. 1635. An act for the relief of William E. Search, and to the legal guardian of Marion Search, Pauline Search, and Virginia Search;

H. R. 1682. An act for the relief of Edwin H. Taylor, Jr.;

H. R. 1755. An act for the relief of Broadus D. Boland;

H. R. 2006. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hagar Simpson, Mrs. Nat Price, Jr., and Griffin Brothers Clinic;

H. R. 2008. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae Scheidel, Mr. Fred Scheidel, Mr. Charles Totten, and Miss Jean Scheidel;

H. R. 2288. An act for the relief of Donald J. Munson;

H. R. 2303. An act for the relief of O. W. James;

H. R. 2405. An act for the relief of Clarence P. Hale, Jr.;

H. R. 2408. An act for the relief of Clarence E. Thompson and Mrs. Virginia Thompson;

H. R. 2497. An act for the relief of the Daniel Baker Co., of Manchester, Ky.;

H. R. 2648. An act for the relief of Avid Evers;

H. R. 2689. An act for the relief of Pete Paluck;

H. R. 2736. An act for the relief of E. Sullivan;

H. R. 2769. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lillian W. Timmerman, mother of Ann Timmerman, a minor, deceased;

H. R. 2846. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring;

H. R. 2855. An act for the relief of the estate of John Buby;

H. R. 3102. An act for the relief of Mrs. Eva M. Delisle;

H. R. 3114. An act for the relief of Ruth Coe;

H. R. 3126. An act for the relief of Mary Ellen Frakes, widow of Joseph A. Frakes;

H. R. 3301. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Edward Polak, a minor;

H. R. 3496. An act for the relief of Ernest A. Grottke;

H. R. 3596. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corporation against the United States;

H. R. 3668. An act for the relief of C. C. Evensen;

H. R. 3724. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Howard C. Bantin; and

H. R. 3737. An act for the relief of M. H. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 634. An act to provide for the advancement of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of vice admiral;

H. R. 2337. An act for the relief of John Joseph Defeo; and

H. R. 3247. An act for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 1046. An act for the relief of David B. Turpel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 1643. An act for the relief of Mary Lovis Elliott; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 4278. An act to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EMERGENCY RELIEF AND REHABILITATION OF FARM LANDS IN LUCAS COUNTY, OHIO—AMENDMENT

Mr. TAFT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1536) to authorize emergency relief and rehabilitation of farm lands in Lucas County, Ohio, from damage resulting from the extraordinary floods of July and October 1943, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PRODUCTION—LETTERS OF SENATOR MALONEY AND DONALD M. NELSON

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on January 22, 1944, I addressed a letter to Mr. Donald M. Nelson, chairman of the War Production Board. This letter presented several questions which I thought were of great importance in connection with the Government's policy on cutbacks in war orders, the expansion of civilian production, and the procedure which will be followed as war contracts are ended and we undertake to meet the needs of the civilian population. My letter dealt with other questions of great importance—questions of importance to industry and labor and the entire population.

Yesterday I received a reply from Mr. Nelson. He advised me that my communication had been most carefully considered by himself and his associates on the War Production Board—and he has undertaken to give me frank answers to those questions which I submitted to him. I think that Mr. Nelson's letter will be of very great interest to industry, and to Members of Congress, and to a great many other people, and I ask unanimous consent that my letter, and Mr. Nelson's reply, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

It will help manufacturers and others to look ahead, and to give thought to future planning, and afford them a better opportunity to deal with the War Production Board and other governmental agencies as the war comes to an end.

In his letter Mr. Nelson undertakes to answer questions which have been giving great concern to many industrialists of the country. He does not profess to have all of the answers, but he does express a willingness to have the further advice and suggestions of those who are interested in the matter, and I think that his communication will prove to be of considerable help in the days just ahead.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1944.

Mr. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NELSON: I write to you on a matter that is giving manufacturers, and many others, great concern—and I feel sure that it is a problem with which you are quite familiar and about which you, too, are greatly concerned. It is the question of the reconversion program applying to consumer durable goods.

Members of the Senate are very much interested both in the plans that are being made to handle reconversion matters and in the procedures and principles adopted for particular programs. Perhaps my interest goes a little deeper than that of some others because I live in a State which participates to a very great extent in the production of the materials of war.

I will be very grateful if you will be good enough to supply me with some information on this subject, with particular reference to the following questions:

Does the War Production Board participate with the armed services in decisions on cutbacks of war orders?

What policies are in effect governing the extent of cut-backs and their distribution between different firms or regions?

What procedures and policies are in effect or being developed to relate the expansion of civilian production permitted to a firm or industry to the extent of cut-backs on war orders which it has received?

Is it contemplated that all producers of a particular product will be permitted to resume production at the same time and in amounts approximately equal to their relative peacetime production, or will some particular companies or regions be permitted to resume civilian production before others?

In the latter event, will it be practicable to employ schemes which require that those companies which first resume production must manufacture some part of their output for sale by the other companies who are kept on war work entirely or mainly, so that the latter do not suffer a fortuitous competitive disadvantage?

Is there a policy with respect to the treatment of firms which now express a desire to enter production of particular civilian items, even though such firms did not produce such items before the war?

It is not my intention to convey the thought that the manufacture of necessary war materials should under any circumstances be set aside for the production of civilian goods. I think that that is a question to be determined by the armed services and the War Production Board. But I am greatly concerned that no program which is undertaken react to the everlasting disadvantage of long-established concerns engaged in the manufacture of civilian goods. It is my feeling that as orders for consumer durable goods are being placed that all firms in such a field be treated equally and fairly. I know that in the State of Connecticut, for example, firms in that category are engaged on war orders. Connecticut is a critical labor area. Electric irons, for example, have been made in the State of Connecticut. I further understand that you are to permit the early production of electric irons for civilian use. Is it your intention to afford the manufacturers of Connecticut the opportunity to make such irons and other civilian goods, even though you would not permit them to be manufactured in Connecticut under existing conditions? Would you offer them the orders with the understanding, if you felt it necessary, that such items be made outside of the State of Connecticut?

Because this matter is one of so much importance, I will appreciate an early reply.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MALONEY.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1944.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR: I am sorry that this reply to your letter of January 22 has been

so long delayed. Since my acknowledgment on January 28, the far-reaching questions raised in your letter have received the most careful consideration here, both by myself and by my associates. Our answers to those questions follow:

1. Does the War Production Board participate with the armed services in decisions on cut-backs of war orders?

Up to the present the services have consulted the War Production Board on cut-backs only to a limited extent. From now on the answer to your question will be yes. The following procedure is being put into effect: The military services determine their requirements, and when our rate of production is in excess of requirements, they consult with the War Production Board to determine the advisability of cut-backs in the program. The final decision that a cut-back is necessary rests with the military, and they collaborate with the War Production Board in determining where the cut-back is to be made.

2. What policies are in effect governing the extent of cut-backs and their distribution between different firms or regions?

As you know, manpower is the most critical determining factor in war production today. So far as possible, we attempt to guide the cut-backs in the critical labor areas, in order to ease the manpower situation in these areas. For instance, in the Connecticut Valley, we need manpower badly in the ball-bearing plants. As is well known, ball bearings are one of our most critical components. It is not exaggerating to term them our No. 1 production problem. They play an indispensable part in practically every major military program, notably airplanes and trucks, and they are urgently needed for essential civilian programs, such as farm equipment. Consequently, we must try by every means at our disposal, including such cut-backs as may be practicable in other local industries, to solve the problem of more manpower for the ball-bearing industry in the Connecticut Valley.

3. What procedures and policies are in effect or being developed to relate the expansion of civilian production permitted to a firm or industry to the extent of cut-backs on war orders which it has received?

The availability of manpower, materials, and component parts determines the extent to which civilian production can be expanded in concerns whose military production has been cut back. The military services also are concerned over possible adverse effects of an expansion of civilian production at this time on morale both at home and among the fighting men abroad. With these factors in mind, our policy is to expand civilian production as it becomes possible to do so without interference with the over-all war program, and particularly in concerns whose war orders have been cut back. The Office of Civilian Requirements has prepared a number of programs for expanded production of civilian items and has listed their relative order of importance to the economy. It is our purpose to put these programs into effect whenever the military outlook, and the situation with respect to manpower, materials, and parts indicates the advisability of such action.

In considering the desirability of civilian programs, it must be borne in mind that the Chiefs of Staff are looking to us to carry through a supply program which will enable the military services to finish their job in the shortest possible time. This is clearly our first responsibility. At the same time we have worked consistently to produce essential civilian goods for the economy, and I think you will agree that so far the requirements of civilians have been provided for much better than most people expected.

4. Is it contemplated that all producers of a particular product will be permitted to resume production at the same time and in amounts approximately equal to their relative peacetime production, or will some particular companies or regions be permitted to resume civilian production before others?

It would certainly be convenient, as well as fair, to allow all manufacturers in each industry to resume production at the same time, but this is, of course, a physical impossibility, owing to the varying degrees to which companies are engaged in essential war work. It goes without saying that the tremendous impact of war on the economy is bound to produce hardship for some business concerns, as well as for other elements in the society. Obviously, the Government cannot entirely prevent such hardships, and the controlling factor in laying down policy must be the interest of the public as a whole rather than the protection of any one group. If, without interference with the war effort, we can give a manufacturer in a noncritical manpower area materials and parts to resume production of things the civilian economy needs, I think it is to the public interest that we do so without waiting until another concern in a critical area is permitted to resume production. This policy may seem hard on the manufacturer in the critical area, but it would be at least an equal hardship on the manufacturer in the noncritical area if he were prevented from resuming production just because a manufacturer in a critical area could not so do.

Until that happy period when we can resume civilian production on a much broader scale than will be possible so long as direct military production must be maintained in large volume, there will be many shortages of civilian products whose importance to the supporting economy demands their production and scheduling with the same certainty as must be applied to war items. Repair and maintenance parts, supplies for the service industries, and some consumer items whose depletion has left critical shortages in the life of the American household must be assured production. The only way that I can see to do this is to fit them into production schedules wherever it is possible to do so, even though the effects on competitive situations may be painful. This is the same method that we apply to war production for military items, where we do not consult the convenience or the competitive interests of the firms involved. I can see no escape from applying the same method to the most essential civilian production so long as we are forced to meet the military requirements for a quick victory.

5. In the latter event, will it be practicable to employ schemes which require that those companies which first resume production must manufacture some part of their output for sale by the other companies who are kept on war work entirely or mainly, so that the latter do not suffer a fortuitous competitive disadvantage?

There may be certain instances in which this can soundly be done, and if so, I am in favor of doing it. In some industries, however, serious practical obstacles would have to be overcome before such an arrangement could be put into effect. This is a problem requiring individual consideration of and by each industry involved.

6. Is there a policy with respect to the treatment of firms which now express a desire to enter production of particular civilian items even though such firms did not produce such items before the war?

This question touches the roots of national policy. If the Government were to attempt to prevent new competition, there would clearly be grave danger of shackling the country with a regimented economy for a long while to come. Such action would require detailed planning of all production by a Government group—a development which I would strenuously oppose. In my judgment, it is all-important to maintain a competitive economy. I do not believe you can have a democracy and at the same time forbid new competition. It has been my objective from the very start to confine detailed economic planning to wartime production of military and civilian essentials. If, with the return of peace, we were to start out with the policy of planning our peacetime economy in detail, as we would have to do in order to prevent new competition, we would do irreparable injury to the free enterprise system in the United States.

It is my view that controls should be relaxed whenever they cease to be necessary to war production. However, the need for controls is obviously going to continue for some time. Even in the case of material which is in good supply today, if suddenly the controls were relaxed another shortage would be likely to occur, injuring production for war. As for component parts, I would estimate that in the consumers durable goods field there are 20 to 30 industries which require components which are now very critical, such as ball bearings, fractional horsepower motors, heavy castings, and engines. Restrictions on "new" companies which want to enter an industry for the first time will undoubtedly be needed until the now critical components and materials are in easy supply. Certainly, so long as wartime controls are retained, materials and components should not be allocated to these "new" firms until firms already established in the affected industries, and which are in a position to resume production of their former products, have received their just allocations.

There are certainly many fine old-established firms in Connecticut which have done a remarkably good job of producing and selling things that the public has wanted, and they certainly deserve every consideration. However, as I have said, the public interest is paramount. Maximum employment of workers, which lies at the heart of the public interest in peacetime must be an essential test of any Government policy affecting industrial readjustments, and the most farsighted elements in industry accept that plain fact as a basis for their planning and expectations.

As public servants, and as part of the overall management of war production, we of the War Production Board have had not only to supply our fighting forces and to fulfill the President's pledge that this Nation would become the arsenal of democracy, but also to take care of the essential needs of the civilian economy. In carrying out our work within the framework of a democratic free-enterprise system we have necessarily been confronted by hundreds of thousands of separate problems involving conflicting interests. In small problems as in large, we have consistently tried to strike a fair balance among the groups involved, while moving as rapidly as possible toward the goal of conclusive military victory; and as we approach victory we shall have to aim simultaneously at the main public interest in peacetime—maximum employment. There will be no deviation from this policy so long as I have responsibility for the Board's activities.

As to the Board's decisions with reference to the manufacture of civilian items in Connecticut, the questions which you ask can only be answered in terms of specific situations, and after detailed analysis. In dealing with problems of program readjustment, as in setting up the original war programs, we seek the advice of our industry committees, which are representative of all classes of manufacturers, big, medium, and small, and we accept that advice so long as it accords with the public interest and makes for the fulfillment of our obligation to our fighting men. Many of the problems brought out in your letter are now being discussed by

our industry committees, and I shall be glad to discuss these important questions with you or your constituents in person at any time convenient to you.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD M. NELSON.

SOUND FINANCE OR SPENDING IN THE POST-WAR ERA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Sound Finance or Spending in the Post-War Era," delivered by him to the American Retail Federation at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, February 29, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE VERSATILITY AND PRESTIGE OF SILVER—ARTICLE BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Versatility and Prestige of Silver," written by Senator MCCARRAN, and published in the Mining Congress Journal of February 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JACKSON BEFORE THE CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION

[Mr. TRUMAN, for Mr. MEAD, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Robert H. Jackson, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, at the annual meeting of the Canadian Bar Association, Toronto, Canada, February 19, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. BREHON SOMERVELL BEFORE MILITARY AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL, FORT BELVOIR, VA.

[Mr. MCCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Lt. Gen. Brehon Somervell, commanding general, Army Service Forces, before military and civilian personnel at Fort Belvoir, Va., on March 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

STARVING CHILDREN OF EUROPE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Suffer Little Children," published in the Washington News Digest, which appears in the Appendix.]

SAVE SMALL STEEL—STATEMENT BY PHILIP MURRAY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Save Small Steel," written by Philip Murray, president, United Steel Workers of America, and submitted to the War Production Board in March 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE AIMS OF AMERICA—RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the President of the United States from the National Council for Prevention of War, and an article entitled "Constants in Russian Foreign Policy," published in the December 1943 issue of the Nineteenth Century and After, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE READER'S DIGEST—ARTICLES FROM THE NEW REPUBLIC AND THE COMMONWEAL

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles relating to the Reader's Digest, one from the New Republic of March 6, 1944, and the other from the Commonweal of February 25, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

GOVERNOR DEWEY'S POSITION—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Governor Dewey's Position," published in the New York Times of Tuesday, March 7, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOLDIERS' VOTE; FREE ENTERPRISE—ARTICLE BY MANCHESTER BODDY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Manchester Boddy and published in the Los Angeles Daily News of February 5, 1944, discussing, among other subjects, the soldiers' vote and free enterprise, which appears in the Appendix.]

INSURING PROSPERITY—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Insuring Prosperity," published in the Washington Post of March 9, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRUMIDI'S GONE—HIS WORKS LIVE ON—POEM BY H. C. CARLISLE

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Brumidi's Gone—His Works Live On," by Horace C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. 161)

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to have the Senate take up the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I present from the committee of conference of the two Houses the conference report of the so-called soldiers' voting bill and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I think that for the convenience of Senators it would be well to have it printed also as a pamphlet or as a document.

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be so printed in the usual course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be printed in the RECORD, and also in the usual pamphlet form.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas indicate to us when he proposes to take up the matter?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was going to add that, because of the absence of many Senators and the fact that the report is rather voluminous and Senators have not had an opportunity to read it, I shall not, so far as I am concerned, ask that the report be considered before next Monday.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator contemplate that the bill as agreed upon in conference shall be printed?

Mr. CONNALLY. The conference report is in fact just a printing of the bill as it will appear if passed.

Mr. OVERTON. May I also request that the Senator add to his unanimous-consent request that copies of the printed bill be left in the office of each Senator?

Mr. CONNALLY. It will be available in pamphlet form. I do not know about a copy being left in the office of each Senator, but copies can be sent to the Senators.

The report submitted by Mr. CONNALLY is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the Act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 9, 11, and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 3; and strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, as amended by the amendments of the House, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, be amended by inserting after the enacting clause the words 'Title I' and by striking out sections 3 to 15, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to restrict the right of any member of the armed forces of the United States or of any other person to vote in accordance with the law of the State of his residence.

" 'TITLE II

" 'USE OF STATE BALLOTS

" 'SEC. 201. The Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots or the United Service Organizations and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any primary, special, or general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war; and in order to afford ample opportunity for such persons to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible, the following provisions are enacted.

" 'SEC. 202. It is recommended that the several States, when possible, waive the application for a ballot and authorize the proper election officials to send an official ballot to every voter serving in the armed forces of the United States or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots or the United Service Organizations and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States. If an application is necessary then it is recommended that the several States, in order to avoid expense, duplication of effort, and loss of time, shall accept, as applications for absentee ballots under such States' absentee balloting laws and as applications for registration under such States' election laws, the form of post card (when duly executed by a person to whom this Act is applicable) provided pursuant to section 203 of this title and section 3 of this Act prior to its amendment.

"'POST CARDS

"'SEC. 203. In order to afford an opportunity for persons to whom this title is applicable to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize State absentee balloting procedures to the greatest extent possible, the United States War Ballot Commission provided for in title III below shall cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration an adequate number of post cards for use in accordance with the provisions of this title. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such post cards to be delivered to each person to whom this title is applicable for use for any general election at which electors for President and Vice President or Senators and Representatives in Congress are to be voted for, such delivery to be made outside of the United States not later than August 15 prior to the election, and within the United States not later than September 15 prior to the election. The post cards referred to shall also, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be made available to such persons at appropriate times for use in general elections other than those referred to above and for primary and special elections.

"'Upon one side of the post card shall be printed the following:

"'Secretary of state or other appropriate official within the State of _____.

"'I am in the armed forces ( ); in the merchant marine ( ); or in the American Red Cross ( ), the Society of Friends ( ), the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots ( ), or the United Service Organizations ( ), and attached to and serving with the armed forces. I hereby request an absentee ballot to vote in the coming _____ (primary, general, or special) election.

"'(1) I am a citizen of the United States.

"'(2) The date of my birth was _____

"'(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____.

"'(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village of) _____ in the county of _____ at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____.

"'(5) My voting district to the best of my knowledge is _____.

"'(6) My choice of party primary ballot is _____

"'(Fill in only in case of primary ballot)

"'Please send the ballot to me at the following address: _____

_____

_____

"'_____

"'(Print your name and serial number plainly above)

"'_____

"'(Write your usual signature above)

"'Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19__.

"'_____

"'(Commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath, writes here his name and rank or title)

"'Upon the other side of the post card shall be printed the following:

"'Free of postage, including air mail

"'(War ballot)

"'Secretary of state of _____,

"'_____,

"'(City)

"'_____

"'(State)

"'In lieu of and interchangeably with the post cards referred to, the Secretaries of War and Navy may continue to deliver and make available, and the persons to whom this title is applicable may continue to use, post cards provided under section 3 of this Act prior to its amendment until the existing supply thereof is exhausted. In the event of any such delivery or making available to members of the armed forces of post cards provided under section 3 of this Act prior to its amendment, the Secretaries of War and Navy shall authorize changes in the text thereof to provide that the applicant shall print thereon his name and serial number, in addition to normal signature, and shall designate his party affiliation in the case of application for primary ballot.

"'FUNCTION OF POST CARDS

"'SEC. 204. Such post cards may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots under State absentee balloting laws, as applications for registration under State absentee balloting laws, or as sources of information to implement State absentee balloting laws.

"'INFORMATION REGARDING ELECTIONS

"'SEC. 205. The Commission shall, at appropriate times, furnish the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration with any information received from a secretary of state as to the dates of elections in such State, including general special, and primary elections. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, whenever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such information to be made available to persons to whom this title is applicable.

"'COOPERATION WITH STATES

"'SEC. 206. (a) It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, respectively, to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in transmitting to and from persons to whom this title is applicable, making applications therefor to their several States, such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of such applicants, and to cooperate in the execution by such applicants of oaths in connection with such ballots.

"'(b) The Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities shall, so far as practicable and compatible with military operations, take all reasonable measures to facilitate transmission, delivery, and return of post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure, mailed to and by persons to whom this title is applicable pursuant to the laws of the several States, whether transmitted by air or by regular mail. Ballots executed outside the United States shall be returned by air, whenever practicable and compatible with military operations.

"'SEC. 207. (a) It is recommended that the secretary of state of each of the several States, upon receipt of any such post-card application, promptly forward it to the proper county, city, or other election official or officials in order that the request for an absentee ballot may be acted upon as expeditiously as possible.

"'(b) It is recommended that the several States cooperate, to the end that county, city, or other election officials be authorized and instructed, upon receipt of an application made upon such a post card, to mail promptly to the voter making the application, if legally permissible under the laws of the State, a suitable absentee ballot, including therewith a self-addressed envelope for the use of the voter in returning the ballot and any instructions to govern the use of such ballot and envelope.

"'(c) It is recommended, so that the envelope in which the ballot is sent to the voter, and the envelope supplied for the return of the ballot, may be identified by the Post Office Department and other authorities as carrying an election ballot, that there be printed or stamped in a conspicuous place on each such envelope the words "Official Election War Ballot." It is further recommended that, in the case of States in which no provision is made, either on the envelope or separately, for sending with the absentee ballots a printed form to be used by a voter for the purpose of establishing his legal right to vote, appropriate action be taken to have printed and enclosed with absentee ballots mailed in response to applications received on the post cards hereinbefore referred to, a form for the signature and oath or affirmation of the voter; and it is suggested that a form substantially as follows would be appropriate for such purpose:

"'OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 19__

"'I do hereby swear (or affirm) that—

"'(1) I am a citizen of the United States;

"'(2) The date of my birth was _____;

"'(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____;

"'(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village, if any) of _____, in the county of _____, at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____;

"'(5) I am (check appropriate blank)—

"'(a) in the armed forces of the United States_____( );

"'(b) in the merchant marine of the United States_____( );

"'(c) in the American Red Cross ( ), the Society of Friends ( ), the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots ( ), or the United Service Organizations ( ), attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States; and

"'(6) I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered, or promised to pay, contributed, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote.

"'_____

"'Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested.

"'Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19__.

"'_____

"'Commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath, shall write his name here.

"'_____

"'Officer or other person signing above shall print his rank, rating, or title clearly here.

"'(d) It is recommended that, in States where the voters' absentee ballot will not be available for mailing to the voter forty-five days prior to any primary, general or special election, such States cause to be made such changes in the election laws of their States as will lengthen such time; and that all States waive registration of all men and

women in the military service who, by reason of such services, have been deprived of an opportunity to register.

"'(e) It is further recommended that the several States, in order to reduce the weight and bulk for air transport of absentee voting material being sent to persons to whom this Act is applicable, reduce in size and weight of paper, as much as possible, envelopes, ballots, and instructions for voting procedure.

"'TITLE III

"'USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY FEDERAL BALLOTS

"'*United States War Ballot Commission*

"'SEC. 301. (a) There is established a United States War Ballot Commission (referred to in this Act as the Commission), which shall be composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, to serve for the duration of the war and six months thereafter.

"'(b) The Commission may receive assistance from other Federal departments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

"'(c) It shall be the duty of the Commission, in performing its functions under this Act, to consult with State officials. As soon as practicable after any election to which the provisions of this title apply, the Commission shall report to the Congress on the administration of this Act, including the reports received by the Commission from the secretaries of state of the several States.

"'*Application of this title*

"'SEC. 302. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the provisions of this title shall apply with respect to the following:

"'(1) Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States.

"'(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

"'(3) Members of the armed forces, inside the United States.

"'(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to, and the ballot provided for by this title may be used by—

"'(1) an individual referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (B) that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State; or

"'(2) an individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State, even though the Governor thereof does not make the certification referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (1), but only if such individual states in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made application for a State absentee ballot but, as of October 1, has not received it.

No individual who is not included under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall be entitled to use, or be furnished, a ballot under this title. Certifications referred to in this subsection shall be made to the Commission.

"'*Official Federal War Ballots, envelopes, and explanations*

"'SEC. 303. (a) The Commission shall cause to be prepared and printed for use in voting in general elections under this title an adequate number of official Federal war ballots. Each ballot shall be printed in the following form insofar as the offices enumerated are appropriate to the particular election:

"'OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT

"'Instruction: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office.

"'ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

"'(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party, and shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidates by name for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party in your State)

"'Write in the name of your choice for President _____

"'UNITED STATES SENATOR

"'(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

"'Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

"'UNITED STATES SENATOR, UNEXPIRED TERM

"'(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State for an unexpired term)

"'Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

"'REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

"'Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district

"'REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS

"'(Only in the States entitled thereto)

"'Write in the name or names of your choice for Representatives at Large_____

"'(Vote for one or two as the case may be)

A vote for a Presidential candidate by name shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidates by name for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party in the voter's State. No ballot shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate where the candidate intended by the voter is plainly identifiable. Where, because of any defect in marking, a ballot is held invalid as to any particular candidate for office, it shall remain valid as to the other candidates for office.

"'(b) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official inner envelopes for use in sealing the official Federal war ballots. Each envelope shall be gummed ready for sealing. Upon one side of the envelope shall be printed:

"'OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT FOR GENERAL ELECTION

"'Name of voter _____

"'(Print your name plainly here)

"'Home residence:

"'Street and number (if any) or rural route _____

"'(Print street and number or rural route plainly here)

"'City or town (if any) _____

"'(Print city or town plainly here)

"'County _____

"'(Print county plainly here)

"'Upon the other side of such envelope shall be printed the following oath, at the top of which shall be set forth the date of the election:

"'OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN 19__

"'I do hereby swear (or affirm) that:

"'(1) I am a citizen of the United States;

"'(2) The date of my birth was _____;

"'(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____;

"'(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village) of _____ in the county of _____ at (street and number, if any), or rural route) _____;

"'(5) I am (check appropriate item):

"'(a) in the armed forces outside of the United States _____ ( );

"'(b) in the merchant marine outside of the United States_____ ( );

"'(c) serving with the American Red Cross ( ), the Society of Friends ( ), the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots ( ), or the United Service Organizations ( ), outside the United States, and am attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States;

"'(6) (Note: Check this item only if true)

"'I have, prior to September 1, applied for a State ballot for this election, but, as of October 1, have not received it _____ ( ); and that I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered or promised to pay, contributed, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote.

"'_____

"'(Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested)

"'Personally appeared before me the above named voter to me known and known to me to be the person who, after being duly sworn, subscribed the foregoing oath. In witness whereof I have set my hand this _____ day of _____, 19__.

"'_____

"'Commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath.

"'(c) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official outer envelopes for use in returning to the appropriate secretaries of state official Federal war ballots and official inner envelopes. Upon such outer envelopes the following shall be printed:

"'Free of all postage
"'including air mail
"'(Official Federal War Ballot)

"'TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE SHOWN BELOW:

"'Voter's home residence:

"'Street and number (if any) or rural route_____

"'(Print clearly)

"'City or town _____

"'(Print clearly)

"'County _____

"'(Print clearly)

"'State _____

"'(Print clearly)

"'(d) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an adequate number of copies of instructions for voting procedure for use in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"'(e) Ballots, instructions for voting procedure, and envelopes for use outside the United States shall be suitable for air mailing.

"'(f) Where the Commission determines that the transmission abroad of any material required to be prepared and printed by the provisions of this section is inexpedient because of transportation difficulties or for other reasons arising from the conduct of the war, the Commission is authorized to arrange for such material to be printed outside the United States.

"'*Balloting*

"'SEC. 304. (a) Any person voting under the provisions of this title shall secretly mark

the ballot, place it in the official inner envelope, and securely seal the same. He shall then fill in and subscribe the oath printed upon the official inner envelope. After the oath has been duly attested, the voter shall then place the official inner envelope in the official outer envelope, fill in the blanks on such outer envelope, and deliver it to a person designated by proper authority to receive executed ballots for transmission to the appropriate secretary of state.

"'(b) Any commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, in the armed forces of the United States and any member of the merchant marine of the United States designated for this purpose by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration is authorized to administer and attest such oaths as are required by this Act.

"'*Administration*

"'SEC. 305. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall be responsible for the administration of this title with respect to members of the armed forces and civilians attached to and serving with the armed forces and entitled to vote thereunder. The Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall be responsible for the administration of this title with respect to members of the merchant marine of the United States entitled to vote thereunder.

"'(b) In each year in which a general election for Senators and Representatives in Congress is to be held, the Commission shall furnish well in advance of the election an adequate number of ballots, envelopes, and copies of instructions for voting procedure to the Secretaries of War and Navy and to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration.

"'*Lists of candidates*

"SEC. 306. The secretary of state of each State shall furnish the Commission such information as the Commission shall request for compiling a list of candidates and their parties in any general election for President and Vice President or for Senators and Representatives in Congress. The Commission shall transmit to the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, at such times as it deems to be appropriate for balloting under this title, lists of candidates compiled from the information so received, even if incomplete. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, in ample time for balloting under this title, transmit such lists to all units of the armed forces and to members of the merchant marine of the United States, to the extent that such transmission is practicable and compatible with military operations. Incomplete lists of candidates so furnished, or failure to furnish such lists, shall be no bar to balloting under the provisions of this title. No list of candidates furnished under this title shall include information as to a candidate other than his name, address, party affiliation, and office for which nominated.

"'*Distribution and collection of ballots for members of the armed forces and others*

"'SEC. 307. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy, insofar as practicable and compatible with military operations, shall cause ballots, envelopes, instructions for voting procedure and lists of candidates, promptly after receipt thereof from the Commission, to be distributed to members of the armed forces and to civilians attached to and serving with the armed forces and entitled to vote under this title, who desire to vote under this title, and shall cause executed ballots to be collected and transmitted to the secretaries of state of the several States.

"'(b) Wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, the appropriate commanding officer shall be required—

"'(1) to cause lists of candidates to be posted and otherwise made available at conspicuous and convenient places, and to cause copies of instructions for voting procedure and all other necessary information to be furnished to members of his unit and civilians attached to and serving with such unit and entitled to vote under this title;

"'(2) to use his best efforts to assure that every person in or attached to and serving with his unit, who is entitled and desires to vote under this title, has an opportunity to mark his ballot in secret before the latest date which should afford a reasonable opportunity for the return of executed ballots;

"'(3) to destroy, as soon as practicable after the completion of voting within his unit, all official Federal war ballots in his custody remaining unused.

"'(c) It shall be unlawful for any commissioned, noncommissioned, warrant, or petty officer in the armed forces of the United States (1) to attempt to influence any member of the armed forces to vote or not to vote for any particular candidate, or (2) to require any member of the armed forces to march to any polling place or place of voting, but nothing in this Act shall be deemed to prohibit free discussion regarding political issues or candidates for public office.

"'*Distribution and collection of ballots for the merchant marine*

"'SEC. 308. The Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall cause ballots, envelopes, instructions for voting procedure, and lists of candidates for voting in general elections to be made available to members of the merchant marine of the United States upon request. The Administrator shall provide a convenient place for marking such ballots in secret, and shall cause executed ballots to be collected and transmitted to the appropriate secretaries of state or to appropriate representatives of the War and Navy Departments for such transmission. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall arrange, so far is practicable, for the receipt of such ballots and their transmission to the appropriate secretaries of state together with the ballots of members of the armed forces. The Administrator may delegate to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, with the consent of such Secretary, any function of the Administrator under this title.

"'*Transmission of ballots*

"'SEC. 309. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities shall, so far as practicable and compatible with military operations, take all reasonable measures to facilitate transmission, delivery, and return of ballots, envelopes, instructions for voting procedure, and lists of candidates, transmitted to and from persons to whom this title is applicable, whether transmitted by air or by regular mail. Ballots executed outside the United States shall be transmitted by air, whenever practicable and compatible with military operations.

"'(b) The secretary of state of any State, upon receiving any ballot cast under this title, shall at an appropriate time transmit it to the appropriate election officials of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the voter's residence. Such officials shall take oath that they will not disclose to anyone (unless required by law) how any absentee shall have voted. Such officials shall determine that the oath required under sections 303 and 304 has been executed and that it is in order, pursuant to section 311, to open the official inner envelope; whereupon such officials shall compile a voting list of the names appearing on all such inner envelopes received from the secretary of state. No person other than such appropriate election officials shall open any official outer or inner envelope purporting to contain a ballot cast under this title.

"'*Reports*

"'SEC. 310. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall report to the Commission on balloting under this title, including the number of ballots received, distributed, executed, and transmitted to the secretaries of state of the several States, together with any comments thereon or explanation thereof.

"'(b) Each secretary of state shall prepare a report of all ballots received by him and transmitted to the various election officials, and within thirty days after the last day for counting absentee ballots in any election in which ballots are cast under the provisions of this title, each secretary of state shall transmit such report to the Commission.

"'*Validity of ballots*

"'SEC. 311. (a) The Commission shall have no powers or functions with respect to the determination of the validity of ballots cast under the provisions of this title; such determination shall be made by the duly constituted election officials of the appropriate districts, precincts, counties, or other voting units of the several States and this decision shall be final to the same extent as in the case of ballots cast by others in person. Votes cast under the provisions of this title shall be cast, canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in the same manner, as nearly as may be practicable, as the votes cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified.

"'(b) No official Federal war ballot shall be valid if—

"'1. the voter has also voted in person or by absentee ballot in accordance with the procedure provided by State law; or

"'2. the date of the oath of elector is later than the date of the holding of the election; or

"'3. such ballot is received by the appropriate election official of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the State of the voter's residence later than the hour for the closing of the polls on the date of the holding of the election, except that any extension of time for the receipt of absentee ballots permitted by State laws shall apply to ballots cast under this title.

"'(c) All ballot envelopes received by a secretary of state at a date or time too late for proper delivery, and all ballot envelopes not delivered to polling places or to the proper officials shall not be opened but shall be endorsed with the date of reception and shall be retained by the secretary until the time has expired for contesting the election, when they shall be destroyed without examination.

"'*Voting safeguards*

"SEC. 312. Every individual concerned with the administration of this title shall take all necessary steps to prevent fraud, to protect voters against coercion of any sort, and to safeguard the integrity and secrecy of ballots cast hereunder.

"'*Penalties*

"'SEC. 313. The provisions of law prohibiting offenses against the elective franchise shall apply in the case of elections and voting conducted pursuant to the provisions of this title: *Provided, however,* That no act done in good faith by a member of the armed forces of the United States, in the exercise of his judgment as to what was practicable and compatible with military operations, shall constitute a violation of any such provision of law.

"'*Taking of polls prohibited*

"'SEC. 314. (a) No person within or without the armed forces of the United States shall poll any member of such forces, either within or without the United States, either before or after he shall have executed any ballot either under the provisions of this title or under any State law, with reference to his choice of or his vote for any candidate for any of the offices authorized to be voted for by the use of the aforesaid ballot nor state, publish, or release any result of any purported poll taken from or among the members of the armed forces of the United

States or including within it the statement of choice for or of votes cast by any member of the armed forces of the United States for any of the offices authorized to be voted for by the use of the aforesaid ballot.

"'(b) The word "poll" is defined as any request for information, either verbal or written, which by its language or form of expression requires or implies the necessity of an answer, where the request is made with the intent of compiling the result of the answers obtained, either for the personal use of the person making the request, or for the purpose of reporting the same to any other person, persons, political party, unincorporated association or corporation, or for the purpose of publishing the same orally, by radio, or in written or printed form.

"'(c) Any person not a member of the armed forces of the United States who violates the provisions of this section, either within or outside of the United States, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"'*Appropriate State officials*

"'SEC. 315. Wherever, in any State, an official other than the secretary of state is the appropriate State official to carry out any function vested in the secretary of state under this title, the term "secretary of state" shall mean such other official.

"'*Officials and agencies to act for Secretary of State*

"'SEC. 316. Each secretary of state may utilize the services of such State and local officials and agencies for such purposes and to such extent as he may deem appropriate in the exercise of his powers and duties under this title.

"'*Act to be liberally construed*

"'SEC. 317. The provisions of this act shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes.

"'TITLE IV

"'MISCELLANEOUS

"'SEC. 401. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"'SEC. 402. Post cards, ballots, and envelopes referred to in this act shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

"'SEC. 403. As used in this act—

"'(1) the term "United States" used geographically includes only the territorial limits of the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia; and

"'(2) the term "members of the merchant marine of the United States" means persons employed as officers or members of crews of vessels documented under the laws of the United States and persons enrolled for such employment with the United States War Shipping Administration, but does not include those in service or enrolled for service on the Great Lakes or the inland waterways.

"'SEPARABILITY

"'SEC. 404. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"'TITLE V

"'AMENDMENTS TO ACT OF AUGUST 2, 1939, AS AMENDED

"'SEC. 501. The Act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"'"SEC. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer of, or person employed in, the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, Government magazine, Government newspaper, motion-picture film, or other literature or material, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government, or any officer, agency, or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, except as hereinafter provided:

"'"(1) Nothing herein shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must if requested be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party which has a candidate for President in at least six States in the current Presidential election.

"'"(2) Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, or the presentation to members of the armed forces of motion-picture films, radio broadcasts, or rebroadcasts; but—

"'"(a) the list of such magazines and newspapers of general circulation shall be determined in accordance with the preference of the members of the armed forces in some reliable method to be determined by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy;

"'"(b) any such books of general circulation hereafter purchased shall be selected from books not containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for the Federal offices abovementioned; and

"'"(c) such motion-picture films, radio broadcasts or rebroadcasts, and servicemen's magazines or newspapers, sponsored or paid for by the Government, shall be nonpartisan and nonpolitical: *Provided*, That this subparagraph shall not prohibit or curtail impartial coverage or presentation, as news or information, of public events, and persons in public life: *And provided further*, That if in any issue or presentation space or time is allotted to editorials, columns, or other argumentative matter supporting a political party which has a candidate for President in at least six States in the current Presidential election, an equal amount of space or time shall be allotted in the same issue or presentation to similar matter concerning each such other political party.

"'"(3) nothing in this section shall prevent the sending of any letter, communication, magazine, newspaper, or other literature by any individual, corporation (other than a Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation), or political committee to any member of the armed forces, addressed personally to such member of the armed forces, and paid for by him, or by the individual, corporation, or committee sending the same.

"'"SEC. 23. It shall be unlawful for any censor or other member of the executive branch of the United States Government to remove from any letter or communication addressed to an individual member of the armed forces political literature or political arguments or other matter sent to such individual member of the armed forces by any individual, corporation, or political committee, unless such literature or other matter contains information which may be of value to the enemy in their prosecution of the war.

"'"SEC. 24. Any person who violates the provisions of section 22 or section 23 hereof either within or outside of the United States shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the Act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes."

TOM CONNALLY,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
HUGH BUTLER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

EUGENE WORLEY,
J. RANKIN,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will lie on the table, and be printed as a document.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, frankly I think the conference report ought to be considered now; I think it ought to be disposed of just as quickly as we can dispose of it. I see no reason why it should go over until next Monday. On the contrary, I made a similar request last week that I might have the opportunity, as one of the conferees, to study this bill over the week end, and the conferees denied my request.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Quite apart from the question of whether the Senator has been accorded the courtesy and the opportunity of studying the conference report——

Mr. HATCH. I was accorded neither the courtesy nor the opportunity.

Mr. WHITE. It does seem that Senators who are not on the conference committee ought to have the privilege of scrutiny and study and thought before the matter is taken upon the floor. I should very much hope that no effort will be made to take it up before next Monday. It is a matter of importance; it is a matter in which we are all interested, and in which the whole country is interested, and I think there should be time for intelligent study out of which might come intelligent discussion.

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the Senator from Maine that I join with him in that request. I think we ought to have intelligent study and intelligent discussion of the matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did not, in fact, the report go over until Monday?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; it did go over.

Mr. AUSTIN. I was not aware that the conferees had treated the Senator from New Mexico in the way he suggests. I am very surprised to find such a charge made. Certainly it was not in my heart to treat the Senator from New Mexico in such fashion, and my recollection is that the consideration of the report was suspended and went over, and that the next week we resumed consideration of

it. I am very sorry the Senator feels as he does about the matter because I know there was not any intention to deprive anyone in the conference of ample opportunity.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I may say that I am sorry the Senator from Vermont does not remember it, but I made the suggestion after the conferees had agreed on the various amendments and changes that there be a clean print made and that we be given an opportunity to go over it and study it. I recall quite well that Representative LECOMPTE, a Republican from Iowa, said, "That is the best suggestion that has been made in this conference." But I do not wish to talk about the conferees. At any rate, my suggestion was voted down, and the conferees insisted that the report be signed that very day, and it was signed, by those who joined in it.

Mr. President, it will be recalled that there was some discussion as to whether certain Senators should be appointed conferees, whether they represented the majority or the minority side, as though Senators might violate their trust. I wish to say to the Senate conferees, all of them, that they did not violate their trust. I recall that at the time we took the last vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] made a proposal which would have solved this entire matter. With that agreed to, we could all have joined in the report. While the Senator from Texas said he was reluctant to do that, all the Senate conferees voted for the proposal. It was defeated by the House conferees. The Senate conferees have kept faith with the Senate, although I disagree with the conclusion that was reached.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a moment further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say that, so far as the statement of the Senator from New Mexico about the refusal of the conferees to give him additional time and to have a clean print of the bill is concerned, as I recall, the conferees had two clean prints of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator permit me a word?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. They did do that very thing, and they changed it materially after that.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. My complaint was that they did refuse the courtesy which was suggested. As a matter of fact, they actually did what I had requested.

Mr. CONNALLY. Our wounds are somewhat healed, then.

Mr. HATCH. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desired to assure the Senator from New Mexico that, so far as I was concerned, at least, the conferees had no disposition on earth to deny him ample opportunity to examine the bill, and we did have two separate and individual complete prints, just as the bill would appear if agreed upon at the stage of the proceedings at which we were then poised.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his kind remarks about the loyalty of the Senate conferees, under their instructions. The Senator will recall that I indicated originally that if I were appointed on the committee, I would go on it reluctantly, but that if I should become a member of it, I would try to vindicate my duty to the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say, briefly, that according to my own individual views, the bill now presented is the best possible bill that could have emerged from the conference. According to my view, it is this bill as agreed upon, or no bill at all.

I noted a statement in the press a few days ago to the effect that some of the President's friends were going to advise him to veto the bill, and then go before the country and make it a political issue. That sort of advice does not seem to me to be in the public interest.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield if I have the floor. The Senator from Tennessee, in fact, has the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator from Texas is exactly correct, that so far as soldier vote legislation is concerned, it is either the bill now presented or nothing. But there is already an act of Congress, Public Law 712, which will remain on the books, and be the law, regardless of whether this bill shall be enacted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from New Mexico, however, that he is faced with this situation: The State of New Jersey, through its Governor, announced that it will completely ignore Public Law 712, and the Governor of New York——

Mr. HATCH. Did not the Governor of New Jersey also say he would completely ignore the bill which has now emerged from conference?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think he knows what that bill is. I do not know about that, but, at any rate, I am facing the situation to which the Senator from New Mexico refers, that if we pass no bill at all, it will be necessary to fall back to defenses already prepared up in the hills somewhere, Public Law 712; and Public Law 712, as I indicated, will be ignored by probably a very large percentage of the States of the Union, many of whose legislatures are meeting, or will meet as soon as they know what the Congress is going to do. One of the virtues of the bill is that, if enacted, it will serve notice on the States that they must meet their obligation and their responsibility. This is not simply a Federal obligation, it is a State obligation, and the Governors and the legislatures should perform their duties. They can not hide behind a brush pile, or say that it is up to Congress.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I call the attention of the Senator from Texas to the fact that Public Law 712 also calls for action by the States. That act has been the law for almost 2 years, and notwithstanding the sudden burst of interest by the Governor of New York in the soldiers' voting, he has had almost 2 years during which Public Law 712 could have been made effective by State legislation, but the Governor of New York has not evinced any interest until this late hour.

Mr. CONNALLY. Be that as it may, he has certainly evinced some interest recently, and that is what we are dealing with, namely, the present, and not history. This is a realistic proposition. The question is, Do we or do we not want a soldiers' voting bill passed? If we want one passed, my view is that the one now presented is the only one we are going to get.

How many voted under Public Law 712 in the last election? Twenty-eight thousand out of five or six million.

Mr. HATCH. Because the States did not implement that law.

Mr. CONNALLY. That may be.

Mr. HATCH. The States could have done it; they could have made the law effective. An act of Congress is not needed, as a matter of fact, to enable a State to pass adequate legislation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. It comes with very poor grace from any Governor to say that his State has not made provision because Congress has not acted.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with that, but the States have a responsibility, the legislatures and the Governors have a responsibility, and they should discharge that responsibility. The more quickly we enact the proposed legislation, and let them know that whatever Congress is going to do is done, and that from now on they must take up the cudgels and perform their obligation and duty, the better it will be.

In some States there are influences which say, "We will not do anything until Congress acts, or we know what Congress is going to do." When the proposal now made has been enacted, they will know what Congress is going to do, and they must then meet their responsibility and obligation.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas, who will make the principal argument for the conference report——

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am relying on the Senator from Vermont to make the principal argument.

Mr. AUSTIN. If it is not true that today, since this report has been filed, it is absolutely sound for any Member of the Senate to telegraph the Governor of his State, if the Governor is interested in having him do so, that this is now no longer a pig in the bag; that is to say, that the States can this morning know that they will have, in the way of Federal legislation, either the bill upon which the conferees have agreed or Public Law 712, enacted by the Seventy-seventh Congress. That is information definite enough to enable the Governors today, if their legislatures are in session, as some of them are, to have them pass a very simple provision, aimed at either one of these laws. It can be adapted to both of them, so that whichever one persists when we reach the end of the legislation here, the States will have afforded their

citizens who are serving abroad in the armed forces a chance to vote.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has the floor. I should like to have him yield to me for a moment more.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield, but I want to proceed to consideration of the appropriation bill as soon as possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am in entire sympathy with the Senator's wish, but, as the Senator knows, a conference report is privileged. I can sidetrack the other matter if I desire.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I know. That is why I have been so patient.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say, Mr. President, that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is, of course, correct in his statement. Let me also say to the Senate that in the last election, when Public Law 712 was in operation, only 28,000 votes were cast out of six or seven million individuals who came under that law. If the pending measure is not adopted, but is killed, most of the soldiers abroad will conclude that there is no law on the subject and they will forget all about voting. They will not know about Public Law 712. Most of those who could have voted in the last election did not know about Public Law 712. If the pending measure is enacted into law it will stimulate the servicemen's interest, and any soldier who wants to vote will endeavor to vote. Even though Governors and legislators have, on many occasions, struggled violently to surrender them, yet they have some duties and some responsibilities to perform, and on the whole the pending measure offers the best hope of affording the soldiers and the sailors and others involved an opportunity to exercise their privilege of sovereignty.

Mr. President, I do not wish to treat this matter as a political issue. I think it is a matter which is too sacred and too solemn and too important to play politics with. That is why I was denouncing the statement in the press to the effect that there were certain advisers to the President who were going to advise the Executive to veto the bill and then go forth and use it as a political issue in the impending campaign.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Texas in speaking about what someone has advised the Executive, lays most of the emphasis on the politics which apparently is being played with the measure upon the Democratic side of the aisle. I think the Senator will agree with me that politics was first injected into the debate by Republican Senators. The Senator will remember what happened here on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I condemn the use of the measure as a political weapon by the Republicans as well as by the Democrats, or the Socialists, or the Populists, or, as suggested by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Communists, or by anyone else. Of course it ought not to be a political issue. If we have a duty to perform here we ought to perform it as patriotically and as wisely as we know how.

Let me say a word in conclusion. Congress is not going to write any bill dealing with voting by the soldiers which will please everyone. Congress cannot write a bill which is going to meet every situation satisfactorily. Do Senators know of any important bill which has been passed by Congress every sentence of which they have approved? Do they know of a law which, if they had the writing of it, they would not change a little here or a little there? The situation with which we are dealing is a difficult one. We are in a new field. We are working in new ground. We are out on new frontiers, foreign frontiers, touching on foreign fields. My view is that on the whole the pending measure is the best one we could secure. I will ask the Senator from Vermont how long the conferees worked on it.

Mr. AUSTIN. About 21 days.

Mr. CONNALLY. The conferees worked on the measure for 3 weeks; we have been struggling with the problem for that length of time. I wish to say for all the conferees, both the House and Senate conferees, that I think they addressed themselves to the task diligently, and worked industriously to complete it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like the Senator from Tennessee to yield to me to ask the Senator from Texas, or the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], or any other Senator who was on the conference, when it is planned to take up the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Personally, I indicated a moment ago, I may say to the Senator, in his absence, that I did not think I would move to proceed to its consideration before Monday. Quite a number of Senators are absent. Quite a number of those who are here today have had no opportunity to read the report. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] indicated at an earlier stage of the proceeding that although he was on the conference committee for nearly 3 weeks he felt that he ought to have had a little more time to read it over again and know just what it provides.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Inasmuch as the Senator has referred to me, I will say that I think a great deal of time could be used by everyone in trying to find out what the report means. To my mind, it does not mean anything. That, however, is neither here nor there. I did insist last week that time should be given to careful consideration of it. I have no objection whatever to consideration of the report going over until Monday. So far as I am concerned, I am personally willing that it go over until then, and I hope every Senator will, in the meantime, familiarize himself with the measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I was out of the city over the week end, and tried to keep in touch with the matter, and I was told before returning that it was the purpose to take up the report today. When I got back to Washington last evening I was told that it was planned to let it go over until Monday. Then it was suggested that we take it up tomorrow. It is immaterial to me when we take it up, but I think Senators ought to know when it is to be taken up so they may accommodate themselves to that situation and be present if it is at all possible.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the absence of the Senator from Kentucky, I probably took too much latitude in saying what we would do about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Originally the intention was at least to file the report today, and probably to take it up today, but after I had been approached by a number of Senators who expect to be out of the city over the week end, and by others, and in view of the fact that it is a matter of considerable substance, and that Senators had not had an opportunity to read the report and study it, I thought it would be better not to proceed until Monday. I will say now that if it is agreeable to the Senator from Kentucky I shall move on Monday to proceed to consideration of the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all right. I wish to say that all Senators know that the Senate, as well as those who have anything to do with guiding legislation, always try to follow the wishes of conferees as to when a conference report shall be considered. I think that is the proper attitude to be taken, and that is my attitude. So it is entirely agreeable to me that the report be taken up on Monday.

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 176) for the relief of Austin L. Tierney.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. DAVIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

DISTRIBUTION OF POLITICAL PUBLICATIONS BY WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to comment very briefly upon one phase of the soldiers' voting situation, and to present an exhibit for the RECORD. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee will indulge me very briefly.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in connection with the problem of the soldiers' suffrage, I know of nothing more important than that the official sources of information to the armed services should be scrupulously and vigilantly protected against anything which smacks of partisan or prejudicial purpose and influence. I am sure that all those who have interested themselves in the question of soldiers' voting have clearly indicated their desire, regardless

of party, that all official information in respect of any phase of the political campaign shall, as I say, be scrupulously unpartisan and unprejudiced.

Mr. President, I wish to present a monitory exhibit, not so much in criticism of the immediate situation to which I address myself, as in a spirit of fair warning to the War Department against a type of thing which can bring it into ultimate serious criticism and disrepute if the trend to which I shall now refer continues.

I call attention to the fact that the Army War College Library, operating under the War Department, issues once a month a bulletin covering the books and magazines which it is prepared to make available to the armed services. I call attention to the official bulletin issued on February 10, 1944, at page 16, where 10 outstanding magazine articles purportedly selected by a council of librarians are listed and identified on the authority of the War Department, and are offered by the War Department for circulation to the armed forces. The first article which has been culled by the War Department out of the vast reservoir of magazine material available for selection, and offered for general circulation to the Army, is an article entitled "General MacArthur—Fact and Legend," by John McCarten, appearing in the American Mercury a few weeks ago. I do not complain of the article, even though I deeply dissent from its muddy viewpoint. The subject is a legitimate one for public discussion. I discuss only the appearance of the War Department as an official sponsor in behalf of its distribution to the armed forces. The fact that the article happens to refer to General MacArthur is entirely beside the point; because if it referred to anyone else under like circumstances it would present precisely the same challenge which I am presenting. The article is a smear article if I ever read one in my life, and obviously was written for the purpose of undermining this great American. But I come now to my point. Here is the sentence which the War Department uses to describe the article which it offers to the armed services of the country; this is the language of the War Department bulletin. I quote:

> A comprehensive and objective appraisal of the general as Presidential timber, with special reference to the character of his backers, and an analysis of his military reputation before Pearl Harbor and afterward.

Mr. President, I repeat that the fact that the article refers to General MacArthur is entirely beside the point. I also pass without comment the shocking spectacle of the War Department thus lending itself to an attack upon one of its greatest four-star generals. I am simply using it as a symbol to demonstrate a danger in respect to soldier voting.

I ask what business it is of the War Department to present "a comprehensive and objective appraisal" of any man "as Presidential timber." I ask what business it is of the War Department "to analyze the character of the backers" of any candidate for President. I ask what business it is of the War Department to put its imprimatur on any such political literature. And in view of the spirit in which we undertook to write a soldiers' voting bill on a basis which should be completely protected against official prejudice—and certainly that was the intent of everyone who had anything to do with it, from the authors of the bill, down—I ask how this sort of activity by the War Department can be squared with any good-faith interpretation of the intensions of the legislature in respect to soldier voting.

Mr. President, it is casually interesting that the second article chosen for circulation by the War Department to the armed forces, while less obvious, is nonetheless similarly prejudicial in respect to the purposes intended to be accomplished by its circulation, the second article being A President Must Be Elected. The War Department literature seems to have a tremendous interest in this Presidential election. The article, A President Must Be Elected, is by Walter Millis, and appeared in the Virginia Quarterly Review. Mr. President, I present this material in protest against this sort of activity by the War Department.

I submitted the matter to the Secretary of War in a letter on February 23. I said at the conclusion of the letter that I would withhold any public discussion of the matter until I had the benefit of a reply. In other words, I was endeavoring to be wholly fair with the War Department, with the Secretary of War, and with the War Library in the War College, so that its reply could appear coincident with my statement. Two or three weeks have passed since February 23. I have had no answer. Perhaps there is none. Therefore, I think I am entitled to present the matter publicly, as I have done. I ask unanimous consent, for the RECORD, Mr. President, that my letter to Secretary Stimson be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> I have before me the Library Bulletin for February 1944 (No. 248), issued by the Army War College Library. This lists 10 outstanding magazine articles which are available to the Army as a whole from the Army War College Library.
>
> I note that the first outstanding magazine article thus recommended and made available to the Army is John McCarten's article in American Mercury, entitled "General MacArthur—Fact and Legend." It is described in this official publication as a "comprehensive and objective appraisal of the General as Presidential timber, with special reference to the character of his backers and an analysis of his military reputation before Pearl Harbor and afterward." It were better described as a studious smear of a great American character. I confess that I am at a loss to understand why it should be circulated by the War Department. I do not understand why the War Department should be propagandizing any "appraisals of Presidential timber." It occurs to me that this is none of the War Department's business. I do not understand why the War Department should be interested in making available to the whole Army an article about General MacArthur "with special reference to the character of his backers." I eliminate from this discussion the fact that I am one of the sinister "backers" dragged into this Mercury smear. I wish to deal with the subject only in its abstract implications.
>
> Largely inspired by this Mercury smear, I wrote an article for Collier's Weekly, which appeared in the issue of February 12, entitled "Why I Am For MacArthur." I think it would be grossly inappropriate for the War Department, in an official bulletin of the Army War College Library, to make this article of mine available to all "officers within the territorial limits of the United States" (quoting from your bulletin). I should be the first to protest any such War Department circulation of my "comprehensive and objective appraisal of the General as Presidential timber" (again repeating the quotation from your bulletin). I should vigorously protest against its circulation even as an offset to the Mercury smear. But the obvious impropriety in the use of War Department facilities to circulate the Army with my statement about General MacArthur simply confirms the equal impropriety in the circulation of Mr. McCarten's article or any other article appraising any Presidential timber, as such.
>
> I would not thus emphasize this matter if we were not on the threshold of a constitutional election which—in my view—involves the high importance of making ballots as well as bullets available to all of our soldier sons. It seems equally obvious to me that the War Department must be scrupulously careful to avoid the official distribution of partisan or prejudicial material to the Army. This present exhibit happens to involve General MacArthur. I should make the same protest if it involved anybody else. I deal solely with the abstract proposition that the War Department appears to be in the business of giving the Army the benefit of its "comprehensive and objective appraisals of Presidential timber."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I simply wish to repeat and emphasize that I think the War Department had better concentrate on the military war abroad and ignore the political war at home, and that any such circulation of prejudicial, partisan matter is wholly unwarranted, wholly unjustified, and wholly at odds with the theory upon which Congress has been undertaking to make free ballots impartially available to the service men and women of this country. I might add, Mr. President, just by way of parenthesis, without intending to indicate that this final exhibit falls under the same general definition which I have previously given to the other articles—I simply wish to note with interest that the Librarian of the Navy reports in writing that the Navy has purchased 173 copies of the "Century of the Common Man" by Vice President Henry Wallace, for distribution to the naval services.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4133, making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4133), making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the

bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are but two important committee amendments. One relates to the Office of the Secretary in the Treasury Department. Under the item for salaries, the committee amendment increases the amount from $400,000 to $425,000, and strikes out the following language:

Provided, That no part of the money appropriated by this title shall be used to pay the salaries of more than 13 messengers assigned to duty in the Office of the Secretary.

It was thought that that language ought to be stricken out, and it was stricken out.

The other amendment relates to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It provides for an increase of $9,500,000 for the collection of revenue. The Bureau of Internal Revenue is a service department. It is expected to collect more than $42,000,000,000 this year, and, of course, it is necessary to have a larger force. The committee thought it wise to provide for a larger force.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The increase in the item to which the Senator refers is $9,500,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand, if the increase were granted, it would bring the appropriation up to the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct. Let me say to the Senate that the increase is absolutely necessary in order to collect the very much larger sum of revenue which is expected to be collected this year. It is much larger than the amount collected last year. As I recall, the collections last year were approximately $32,000,000,000. This year they will be at least $42,000,000,000, and perhaps more.

With that explanation, I ask that the committee amendments be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Treasury Department—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 6, after the word "experts", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$425,000", and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That no part of the money appropriated by this title shall be used to pay the salaries of more than 13 messengers assigned to duty in the Office of the Secretary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Internal Revenue," on page 17, line 10, after the word "necessary", to strike out "$135,400,000" and insert "$144,900,000", and in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$13,134,000" and insert "$14,057,150."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Post Office Department", on page 34, at the end of line 2, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Accounts, from $300,000 to $336,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Chief Inspector", on page 36, line 16, after the word "inspectors", to strike out "$3,154,711" and insert "$3,273,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General", on page 40, line 2, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$103,315,000" and insert "$107,690,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the item on page 9, commencing in line 17, and continuing through line 22. What does it mean?

Mr. McKELLAR. The item covers what used to be a permanent appropriation for the district judges in Alaska. It is now carried in the appropriation bill regularly every year. The provision now in the bill represents a different method of carrying the item. It is an appropriation for payment to the United States district judges in Alaska for the relief of persons in Alaska who are indigent and incapacitated through nonage, old age, sickness, or accident. This provision was not amended in the Senate committee. The Senate committee did not hold a hearing on this particular provision, but the House committee hearings are available. I will give the Senator a statement from the House hearings. I read from page 220 of the House hearings:

RELIEF OF THE INDIGENT, ALASKA

Mr. LUDLOW. The next item is "Relief of the indigent, Alaska," as follows:

"Relief of the indigent, Alaska: For the payment to the United States district judges in Alaska (not to exceed 10 percent of the receipts from licenses collected outside of incorporated towns in Alaska), to be expended for the relief of persons in Alaska who are indigent and incapacitated through nonage, old age, sickness, or accident, $25,000."

Your appropriation for 1944 is $25,000 and the estimate for the fiscal year 1945 is in the same amount.

Do you know how much the receipts on hand are?

Mr. GREENBERG. We estimate the receipts for this year and next year will aggregate $20,000 for each year, and the amount of the estimate is $25,000, so we gradually are catching up on the receipts. At the close of 1945, if the present estimate is appropriated, we will have a balance of just a little over $5,000, so we will be practically current at the end of that time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I got the impression from what the Senator from North Dakota said that he thought this money was ultimately for the judges. It is paid to the judges for expenditure by them for the relief of indigent persons.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, this money is not for the judges.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. It is for the relief of the classes of persons mentioned in the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Do the judges disburse it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The judges disburse it.

Mr. LANGER. What is meant, in line 22, by the term "nonage"?

Mr. McKELLAR. That means a minor, a person under 21 years of age.

Mr. LANGER. As I understand, the district judges receive no part of this money.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; they are merely agents of the Government in handling the matter.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator very much.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 4133) was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Overton
Andrews	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Austin	George	Revercomb
Bailey	Gerry	Reynolds
Ball	Gillette	Russell
Bankhead	Green	Scrugham
Barkley	Guffey	Smith
Bilbo	Gurney	Stewart
Bone	Hatch	Taft
Brewster	Hayden	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Hill	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Jackson	Truman
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Burton	La Follette	Tydings
Bushfield	Langer	Vandenberg
Butler	Lucas	Wagner
Byrd	McCarran	Walsh, N. J.
Capper	McClellan	Weeks
Caraway	McKellar	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	White
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wiley
Connally	Murray	Willis
Davis	Nye	Wilson
Eastland	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South

Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], are detained on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on official business for the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. The following Senators are necessarily absent:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], who are members of the Senate committee appointed to attend the funeral of the late Senator McNary, have not as yet returned to the city.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, for some 9 months I have worked diligently to help create legislative machinery which would provide opportunity for those in our armed forces to vote in the coming election. During the many weeks of debate concerned with the Green-Lucas soldiers' vote bill, many other Members of the Senate assisted in finding practicable means for facilitating this vote.

When a few weeks ago the Senate by a vote of 46 to 40 passed the bill I introduced as cosponsor with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], I believed the opportunity for our soldiers, sailors, and marines to vote in the coming election had been assured.

This bill was sent on to the House of Representatives, and in a Senate-House conference it was hoped some compromise would be effected which might be found satisfactory and interpreted as legislation worthy of a Congress which understands the hardships and handicaps under which our forces are fighting throughout the world.

The Senate in its debate clarified the problems and agreed upon practicable means for facilitating the vote. The debates at times were bitter and acrimonious, due primarily to partisan politics. It was first injected by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], when in a burst of intemperate audacity he charged the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, men of his own political faith, with running for a fourth term. Because of shipping and transportation difficulties, they had stated that a uniform Federal ballot was the only one that could be successfully used. The Senator from Ohio saw something sinister in this honest presentation of all-important facts.

Following this unusual display of Republican political aptitude, the Senate was next entertained by another extremely reactionary Republican partisan. I refer to the political sage of the great Northwest, the loquacious senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. He delivered a short political philippic that made the headlines in every newspaper in the Nation. He had the temerity to advise the Senate and the country that if Roosevelt would tell the world that he was not a candidate for a fourth term, he would support the Green-Lucas bill prescribing a uniform Federal ballot and the bill would pass the Senate in 30 minutes.

It appeared then, and it appears now, that the majority of the Republican Senators supported the position of the Senator from Oregon. No Republican opposed to the Green-Lucas bill arose on that eventful day, and none has arisen since, to challenge or qualify that shocking political pronouncement.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. In view of the charges the Senator is making, it seems to me that some of the Senators to whom he refers really should be on the floor, if possible. Will the Senator yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I just yielded for a quorum call, and I do not care to yield again for that purpose. Apparently some Senators do not want to hear what I am going to say in connection with this argument. The Senator from Ohio was here just a moment ago, but left the Chamber, and I shall not yield now for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. President, with the utmost good faith I inquire, Was the Senator from Oregon in making that statement concerned about the constitutionality of the Green-Lucas bill? Was he interested in the type or kind of a Federal ballot printed in that bill? Was the Senator concerned in the fundamental question of States' rights, human rights, or Federal rights? When he made that dogmatic statement, was he thinking of the soldier on the beachhead at Anzio, the marine in the Solomons, or the sailor near the island of Attu, and did he care whether or not they received either a Federal or State ballot?

Mr. President, the answer to all these basic fundamental inquiries is emphatically "No." The Senator from Oregon by that historic statement convinced every prudent, knowing mind in America of his utter disregard for the sacred and traditional principles of franchise handed down to us by our fathers in the long ago.

The bitterness and the dislike for the great man in the White House, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, controlled the tempo of the Senator from Oregon on that fateful day. Yes, he was willing to give the fighting men and women of America Federal uniform ballots, but not without a political price, and what a price. He demanded more than his political pound of flesh. He would support the Green-Lucas bill, or any other bill, if it could just be arranged that the Commander in Chief would at this moment desert 11,000,000 fighting men and women by telling the American people that he would not be a candidate for a fourth term.

Mr. President, I doubt that in all American parliamentary history there is recorded a statement so filled with partisan zeal. It was made, and it was made at the expense of the fighting men and women defending home and country.

I agree with the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in what they said about politics involved in this bill. Mr. President, no politics was involved in the beginning of the bill. Neither Franklin D. Roosevelt nor any other individual connected with the White House knew anything whatever about the conception or introduction of the original Green-Lucas bill.

Weeks of hearings and debates, delays, confusion, and amendments cluttered the parliamentary highway of the uniform Federal ballot bill, but in the end those contending for the simple ballot, the uniform ballot, the ballot that would be taken to the armed forces wherever they might be fighting or training, prevailed. The citizen soldiers of America, wrenched from their homes for battle, would be given a real opportunity to participate in the election of those who in the executive and legislative branches of government are responsible for the successful prosecution of the war.

Those of us who had labored long and hard for the soldiers, whose one thought was to give them a chance to vote, had some assurance that uniform Federal ballot legislation would be effective. We believed sincerely that it would ultimately become the law, and yet as always I was willing to agree upon any kind of a decent compromise. I was one of those who as late as last week voiced the opinion that I was agreeable to a fair Senate-House conference compromise if it did not destroy adequate provisions for soldier voting.

Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the result of this committee's conference and the suggestions made to the Senate. In so doing I want to pay my respects to the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. I know the valiant fight the Senator from Vermont has made from the beginning for a uniform Federal ballot. I believe that I know the feelings of the great Senator from Texas upon this question, and I know that both the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Nebraska at various times were agreed upon certain compromises that would have been satisfactory to the Senator from Illinois. So what I say today

in connection with this report is in no way a reflection upon any Senate member of the conference committee. Yet I am constrained to disagree with the majority. I concur in the views of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I am happy to pay a well-earned tribute to these two able Senators, who have never from the beginning wavered in their belief that Federal legislation should be enacted to give the fighting men and women a real opportunity to vote.

However, it does seem strange, indeed, that one House member of the conference committee, a Representative from Mississippi, who is still fighting the Civil War, could practically dominate this conference from the beginning to the end. The strange thing to me is that the Republicans of the North in the House of Representatives acknowledged the Representative from Mississippi as their leader in this great fight. Yet, Mr. President, when I think of the statements made by the Senator from Ohio, and especially the statement made by the Senator from Oregon, it is not difficult to understand why some Republicans of the North joined hands with the Representative from Mississippi.

In other words, it was plain, pure, partisan, Republican politics and nothing else. If this statement needs any further proof, I respectfully refer my colleagues to the unstatesmanlike, unworthy, and unjustifiable assault made this week on the Federal ballot by Republican Governor Dewey, of New York, who uses the controversy over this legislation as a springboard to announce his candidacy for the Presidency.

Mr. President, the conferees have brought forth an unworthy hodgepodge, which would accomplish nothing, and ignores the very obstacles which were discussed and clarified in the Senate many weeks ago. I believe no one who listened and took part in those debates can mistake these recommendations of compromise as anything but death devices to soldier-voting opportunities.

I warned weeks ago of the attitude of our armed forces and the general public over the unsatisfactory progress being made by the Congress on soldier balloting. I explained that the Stars and Stripes had editorially objected to any bill which would leave the voting to the 48 States, with 48 varieties of laws. I emphasized that Ernie Pyle, the noted war correspondent, who is with our soldiers in Italy, advised that our men did not want any red tape in voting. The soldiers desired to vote, Mr. Pyle said, but had neither the time nor the inclination to bother with post-card applications, absentee-balloting procedures, registration forms, and letter writing to election officials. That is exactly what they would have to do under the bill as agreed upon by the conferees or under any State law that may be passed.

From the letters, petitions, and telegrams I have received from the parents and relatives of our fighting men, I can truthfully state they feel as do our fighting troops overseas. The majority of newspapers in the United States, speaking editorially, have also criticized the inadequacy of State election laws and cumbersome State ballots.

Likewise, the Army and Navy definitely said over and over again that there was only a remote possibility, even with full cooperation by the respective States, that State ballots could be transported, voted, and returned before election.

Mr. President, I wish now to show exactly how the State laws work. I have here a statement from Edward P. Morgan, correspondent for the Washington Star and the Chicago Daily News:

LONDON, March 1.—Memo to Congress:

If you want the soldiers to vote, you had better take a tip from Flying Fortress Bombardier Adam A. Mackow, of Newark, N. J., and start mailing out ballots now.

The latest issue of the Army newspaper, Stars and Stripes, reveals that Bombardier Mackow has just received his New Jersey absentee ballot for the gubernatorial election. The story does not mention whether the bombardier is a Republicar or Democrat, but it won't make much difference to the outcome now because the election was held last November (Republican Walter E. Edge won).

The ballot was mailed to the young man on October 11, carefully marked, "For speedy delivery."

The envelope was addressed to Pvt. Adam Mackow. He is a second lieutenant now.

That, Mr. President, is a typical example of what is happening, and will happen, insofar as the soldier overseas obtaining a State ballot is concerned. In my own State, under the special act its legislature passed, one can make an application for a form for a soldier; that form goes to him; he has to go to a commissioned officer and fill it out and swear to it and send it back, and then when he sends back the application on that form, he is sent a ballot. He then has to go again to the commissioned officer, and if he happens to be out on a special detail somewhere, perhaps on some little island, with 40 or 50 men, under a sergeant, he can never vote, under the law the legislature has passed. If he does vote, the ballot comes back to the election officials, and there are four mail services, under any circumstances. Yet the people in Illinois are told that the legislature passed an honest bill designed to enable the soldiers to vote.

Mr. President, with all this evidence and feeling on the part of our soldiers and our people, with the Senate on record for a uniform Federal ballot after a long and hard fight, we have before us the meaningless, unworkable, recommendations of the House-Senate conferees.

One of the ironical things in connection with this conference report is the fact that most of those who originally opposed the Green-Lucas bill did so on high constitutional grounds, because there was a Federal ballot involved, and that Congress had no right to take away from the States their right to provide the type and kind of ballot they desire.

But, Mr. President, the Federal ballot is still there. The only difference is that there are so many conditions and so many barriers placed in the path of the fighting man or woman who wants to vote that in reality there is no opportunity at all. But from the constitutional angle there is no difference. Indeed, it will be interesting to observe how those who have stood here on the floor of the Senate and literally wept with sanctimonious reverence for the Constitution of the United States vote on this conference report. They have told us that the Federal ballot so violated the old document which they deemed the ark of the covenant that they could not vote for it. The Constitution was too sacred to be touched with a Federal ballot of this kind. Now we shall see from their vote whether they really meant it. Listening to some arguments one would believe that the old Constitution would be gone if Federal ballot legislation should be enacted.

Mr. President, I see the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] on the floor of the Senate. I shall be interested to note how the junior Senator from Oklahoma will vote on the report. He has fussed and fumed more about the Constitution of the United States in these debates than any constitutional lawyer in America that I know of today. Sometime ago in the lengthy speech he made against this bill and all those who had anything to do with it—a speech which is now being broadcast throughout the land by the Republican National Committee—he closed with expressions of great reverence for the Constitution. Mr. President, I think I had better read what the Senator from Oklahoma said. He meant what he said that day; he was very serious then; he was almost in tears over the Constitution. This is what he said:

I hope I may never cast a vote for the enactment of a law that I think to be violative of the Constitution. * * * However much I should like to see the men and women in the armed forces have the privilege of voting at elections, I shall not yield at the expense of violating the Constitution and my oath to support it. No man may take a seat in this Senate until he solemnly swears before God that he will support the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. One who violates his oath disowns his God and dishonors himself.

That, Mr. President, was the statement made by the Senator from Oklahoma with respect to the constitutionality of the original Green-Lucas bill, because it contained a provision for a Federal ballot; and not more than 3 weeks after that, when the Taft substitute came before the Senate with the same kind of Federal ballot in it, the Senator from Oklahoma forgot what he said on the previous occasion and voted for the Taft substitute. Now, Mr. President, I am interested to know what the Senator will do with the measure which will come before the Senate in view of the statement he previously made that "one who violates his oath disowns his God and dishonors himself."

What do the conferees propose? Let us give the American people and our armed forces the true picture of these conference provisions. When we pare this legislative monster to the bone, we find the report of the conferees so restriction-ridden as to render it ridiculous.

Although Public Law 712 is inadequate because it does not provide as simple and

expeditious a method of voting for members of the armed forces as could be devised, it is nevertheless a more effective law than S. 1285 in its present form would be.

Under S. 1285, few servicemen would be able to use the Federal ballot. Section 302 of S. 1285 would permit a member of the armed forces of the United States to use the Federal ballot only if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified prior to July 15 that the use of a Federal absentee ballot is authorized by the law of that State. To the best of my knowledge, in only one State would the Governor be in a position to make any such certification if this bill were to become law. I believe that the California Legislature has passed a law to the effect that any ballot supplied by the Federal Government will be treated as valid in that State. In every other State positive action by the State legislature authorizing the use of a ballot cast under the Federal procedure will be necessary before the Governors of those States can certify that Federal absentee ballots are authorized by State law.

Under the Federal procedure provided in S. 1285, no serviceman need register in order to vote. Therefore, the Federal ballot would not be authorized by the law of any State where registration is necessary.

Under the Federal procedure provided in S. 1285, the payment of poll tax or of any other tax as a condition of voting is unnecessary. Therefore, a ballot cast under the Federal procedure would not be authorized in any State where a poll tax must be paid.

The requirement in section 302 of certification by the Governor means that so far as the Federal ballot is concerned, the provisions of S. 1285 which eliminate the necessity for registration or payment of the poll tax become completely nugatory. They are effective only in States which themselves eliminate the necessity for registration and payment of the poll tax. In short, they are completely meaningless.

A careful analysis of this provision will show that it goes even further than this. The Governor must certify that the use of the Federal absentee ballot is authorized by the laws of his State. The laws of the various States specifically provide such matters as the form of the ballot, what must be printed on the ballot, its caption, and the form of the ballot envelope. In addition, the laws of various States contain specific and usually complicated provisions as to the procedure for applying for ballots, for transmittal of ballots, for return of ballots, and so forth. There is no State law which provides a ballot and a procedure for voting identical with that provided for under the Federal procedure in title III of S. 1285. Therefore, there is no State where the use of the ballot provided for by title III of S. 1285 can be said to be authorized by the laws of the State. Hence, it is obvious that no Governor, with the possible exception of the Governor of California, will be able to certify that a Federal absentee ballot is valid under the law of his State unless and until the legislature of his State passes a law expressly ratifying the use of the Federal absentee ballot.

In two States this is, of course, impossible. Neither the Governor of Kentucky nor the Governor of New Mexico can certify that the use of the Federal absentee ballot is authorized by the laws of Kentucky or New Mexico, because the supreme courts of those States have already declared that State absentee balloting laws passed by the legislatures of those States are unconstitutional. In other words, the supreme courts of both Kentucky and New Mexico have stated that no State absentee balloting laws can be authorized by the laws of Kentucky and New Mexico. Certainly, if no State absentee balloting law is authorized by the laws of those States, no Federal absentee balloting law can be said to be authorized by the laws of those States, and hence no soldier, sailor, or marine from Kentucky or New Mexico can use the Federal procedure furnished by S. 1285.

I should like to ask my able friend the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] whether he agrees with my position in respect to the law in connection with the conference report.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator from Illinois has correctly stated the situation; I say it much to my sorrow, but the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

I might point out here that there is language in section 302 which purports to make it possible for servicemen from Kentucky or New Mexico to use a Federal ballot, but the language does not succeed in accomplishing that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I told the conferees on this exact point that they offered the serviceman the ballot with one hand, and then drew it back with the other.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what they did, insofar as the language of this conference report is concerned, as I read it and construe it.

Section 302 (b) provides that an individual who is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified that the State has not provided an absentee balloting procedure and that the use of the Federal absentee ballot is authorized by the laws of the State may use a Federal ballot. However, as I have said, if the laws of New Mexico and Kentucky do not permit the use of the State ballot, it is hardly conceivable that they can be said to permit the use of a Federal ballot.

In the other States the right of a serviceman to use a Federal ballot would depend entirely upon whether the State legislatures, in fact, pass laws expressly permitting the use of the Federal ballot. I doubt very much whether many, if any, States will pass such laws. In fact, several Governors have already indicated not only that they have no intention of calling legislatures in session for this purpose but, also, that they think that Senate bill 1285 in its present form is both a complicated and impractical bill which they see no reason for ratifying. That position was corroborated on Tuesday of this week by the statements made by the Governor of New York. Furthermore, the legislatures of 10 States have already met and adjourned this year. It is extremely doubtful that they will reconvene.

In addition, I would like to point out that under section 302 no member of the armed forces of the United States who is inside the United States may use the Federal ballot.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am wondering how the advocates of States' rights justify this provision.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot follow the arguments of the advocates of States' rights on this matter at all. In fact, it is rather difficult for me to follow most of their arguments on States' rights.

Mr. HATCH. We can offer the Federal ballot to the soldiers overseas, but the Congress of the United States says to the States, let me remind the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], "Even though you authorize this ballot, it is invalid." Is that not correct?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. It is an absolute prohibition to the States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, does the Senator expect me to reply?

Mr. HATCH. No.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Texas if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I dislike being catechized without having opportunity to make full reply. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that, looking at the matter from the narrow, State viewpoint, if he wishes to do so, there is nothing in the bill which would prevent a State from providing for voting by anyone whom it would like to permit to vote.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not want to take a narrow view. I still think the bill is not good, it is not valid, it is not lawful; but I do think the Congress is doing that exact thing; it is saying to the States, "You can adopt this form of ballot for the soldiers overseas, but you cannot adopt it for the soldiers at home." I do not agree that that is lawful at all; but that is exactly what the bill does.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will pardon me, and I crave his indulgence because of his interesting speech, inasmuch as the whole matter has been projected into the debate, I will say that the Federal Government has no authority to say to a State that it cannot permit any kind of ballot that it approves by its laws. We cannot tell a State that it cannot let Jim Jones vote if the laws of the State permit him to vote.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I agree with the Senator from Texas 100 percent, but this bill does do that very thing.

Mr. CONNALLY. No, Mr. President; what the bill does is probably to strain the Constitution and the laws in an effort to help the soldiers who are overseas to vote.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, no, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I have yielded to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall have to retreat to a fortified position already prepared, because I do not wish to indulge in further debate during the speech of the Senator from Illinois, and I do not desire to take up any more of his time in order to engage in a running debate. I shall have to withhold my remarks until the debate next Monday, because I know the Senator from Illinois desires to conclude his address. I shall not ask the Senator's indulgence any further.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Illinois to yield to me for a further moment, in order to permit me to say that, instead of amplifying the soldiers' opportunity to vote and giving them an opportunity to vote, the bill absolutely restricts and curtails that opportunity and places impossible provisions upon the right of the soldiers to vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a provision of this kind is difficult to understand. If our intention is to make it possible for members of the armed forces to vote, why should a serviceman who, for any reason, cannot or does not vote under State law be penalized simply because he happens to be inside the United States?

Furthermore, even assuming that a given State legislature affirmatively provides that Federal absentee ballots will be treated as valid in that State and that, as a result, the Governor is able to certify that the use of Federal ballots is authorized by the laws of his State, a serviceman from that State who is outside the United States may still be unable to vote, because he must swear that he applied for an absentee ballot prior to September 1, but as of October 1 had not received one, before he can vote a Federal absentee ballot.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. How does the Senator reconcile that position with the statement made by Mr. Ernie Pyle, for instance, who comes from my State, that the soldiers want to vote but do not want to have a lot of red tape about it?

Mr. LUCAS. There is no way to reconcile the provisions of the conference report and the statement made by the famous writer, Ernie Pyle. Ernie Pyle knows what he is talking about. He has given to the country the bold, bare facts regarding what the soldiers on the battle fronts and in the training camps of the world are thinking about with respect to the ballot. Mr. President, it is beyond my comprehension why the Congress of the United States will not make provision for a simple, uniform Federal ballot for the poor devils who are in every section of the globe fighting for their own lives and for the lives of all other American citizens and for the Nation itself. I never shall be able to understand it, so long as I live; even in a thousand years I never would be able to understand why great men in the Senate of the United States would deny, for any reason whatever, a simple opportunity for a serviceman to vote the way he pleases. I never shall be able to understand it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I hesitate to make the suggestion I am about to make, because I agree with everything the Senator from Illinois has said. I find that constantly there comes into my mind the thought that these men are fighting and dying for their country, and I think they should have the right to vote for their country.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot understand the philosophy underlying such a provision. Where the extraordinary happens, and a State says, through its legislature and its Governor, that it is willing to receive and to count Federal absentee ballots, the statute would still prevent the soldier from voting unless he has met two arbitrary time limitations. There are many reasons why a serviceman would be unable to apply for a State absentee ballot before September 1. He might not be inducted into the Army or the Navy until after September 1. Even if he applies for a State ballot prior to September 1, and receives one by October 1, there may not be enough time to get the ballot back to the United States in time to be counted. I am not sufficiently sure of the facility with which communication can be had with the Southwest Pacific and Asiatic areas, to be willing to tell soldiers, sailors, and marines in those areas that they must wait until October 1 before they can vote a Federal ballot. This is the story of how the conferees have whittled the Green-Lucas bill passed by the Senate down to the little end of nothing.

Mr. President, I have given to the Senate and the country the contingencies, the conditions, the barriers, and the time-consuming red tape which are found in this conference report. I submit that it is an outrageous injustice to the largest and "fightingest" Army which was ever marshaled under the United States banner.

The fighting man who ought to have the sympathetic ear of Congress is the one who is hit the hardest. I am thinking of the soldier, the sailor, and the marine in combat zones on the far-flung battle fronts of the world. He is denied the right to say whom he wants as his Commander in Chief to continue the prosecution of this war. He is denied the right to say whom he wants as his President to negotiate a permanent peace of understanding. This brave man is denied the right to make his choice of his Senator, a man who may or may not be in favor of real international cooperation in the future. The war and the post-war problems are obviously interwoven in the right of the soldier to cast his vote for the men whom he believes, as a result of his experience throughout the world, to be best qualified to carry on in this crisis and the post-war world to come.

Mr. President, I am familiar with Public Law 712. I am frank to say that I think this statute is wholly inadequate. That is why I was interested in having the Congress enact a more effective absentee voting bill for the members of the armed forces. Public Law 712 was enacted 2 years ago by an overwhelming vote in the Senate and House, and was signed by the President. None of the hullabaloo which we have heard in this national election year was raised at that time. There was some argument and some debate on the constitutional question, but there was none of the delay, confusion, and red tape which exist at present. I wonder why, Mr. President.

However, it is clear to me that Public Law 712, inadequate though it is, is still a better law than Senate bill 1285 would prove to be. For one thing, it provides voting machinery for members of the armed forces, no matter what their State of residence is, and no matter whether they are stationed inside or outside the United States. Secondly, it eliminates the necessity of registration for every member of the armed forces who is otherwise eligible to vote. In the third place, it eliminates the payment of the poll tax for every member of the armed forces who is otherwise eligible to vote.

The problem I have had to face in determining how I would vote on the conference bill has been to decide which of these bills is the lesser evil

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Was any possible restriction suggested to the conferees, which would prevent voting by soldiers, which was not inserted in the bill?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I answer the question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to know if any restriction was suggested which was not inserted in the bill.

Mr. HATCH. That is not quite fair, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is not far from right.

Mr. HATCH. As to the ultimate result, I think the Senator is absolutely correct. However, let me say, as I have previously stated, that the Senate conferees honestly tried to do a good job. Yesterday the present Presiding Officer [Mr. GREEN] made a proposal which would have clarified the whole situation. I wish to say, in frankness, that every one of the Senate conferees voted for that proposal. That is the reason I cannot quite agree with my good friend the Senator from Delaware, although I must agree that, as to ultimate results, he is absolutely correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. I am glad to know that some suggestion which would restrict voting was not adopted. I cannot think of any.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as I have already stated, the problem which I have had to face in determining how I should vote on the conference bill has been to decide whether it or Public Law 712 is the lesser evil. Which will give the sol-

dier, the sailor, and the marine the greater opportunity to vote, and will result in more votes being cast for Federal officers?

Mr. President, the actual voting machinery provided in Public Law 712 is not so simple and expeditious as the actual voting machinery provided in title III of Senate bill 1285. However, every member of the armed forces who is eligible to vote may avail himself of the machinery provided in Public Law 712, and very few members of the armed forces will be able to avail themselves of the machinery provided in title III of Senate bill 1285. For these reasons I have been forced to conclude that if the Congress cannot or will not provide a really effective means of voting for members of the armed forces, it ought at least to vote down the conference bill and, if nothing else, keep Public Law 712 in force.

Mr. President, when I say that I do not mean that I have given up the fight for an adequate soldiers' voting bill. I know that time is of the essence, and that the election is drawing nearer. I shall do everything within my power, feeble as it may be, limited as it may be, to continue the fight to the end, in order that the men and women in our fighting forces may have a real opportunity to cast a simple ballot in the most important Presidential election in the history of this Nation since 1864, when Abraham Lincoln was reelected.

SALE OF MACHINE TOOLS AT DETROIT

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, my sense of justice has been shocked by the lack of action of the Army Air Forces against officers responsible for the sales of $1,721,136.05 Government cost of cutting tools sold in Detroit during the week of August 23, 1943, for $36,924.64.

Behind that sale we find a set of facts which show bungling and incompetency in the disposal of Army surplus material.

I believe that when incompetency and gross negligence are clearly proved justice demands that all concerned shall be fairly tried and that punishment shall be adequate, that it may be a deterrent to others to avoid similar conduct.

Mr. President, I would not rise in this Chamber if I did not feel it my solemn duty to disclose these facts to the Members of this body.

On page 35 of the Truman Committee's Third Annual Report we find a reference to Appendix V—The Detroit Tool Sale. The words on page 188, "No action was taken against any higher authority," constitute what I wish to discuss today. I wish also to discuss the action which was taken against some of the officers in this case.

I have the greatest respect for our armed forces. They are doing a magnificent job in fighting this war. They deserve the loyal support of those at home. When individual officers are guilty of incompetency and gross negligence in carrying on the business end of this war job, we must see that the condition is corrected immediately and that proper discipline is administered.

The taxpayer has a right to know that his tax dollars are not wasted and that care is taken in declaring war material surplus as well as in disposing of surplus materials. This, Mr. President, is not an interference with strategy or with the actual conduct of the war. Criticism should be aimed at the individuals responsible, and not at the entire armed services. To be constructive we must be specific. Therefore, I am going to use the names of the officers responsible for what has taken place in this sale of tools at Detroit and point out to the Senate what part each officer played in the disposal of $1,721,136.05 worth of tools for $36,924.64.

I shall state the facts. I had the privilege of making this investigation for the Truman committee. I have personal knowledge of what the witnesses testified to. I have personally seen the records, and I now state the facts as shown by the evidence in the case, and the records themselves.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. That is about the same information which came before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is true. It was discussed there. It has been discussed in several other committees in connection with the consideration of the sale of surplus property.

Mr. DAVIS. A few days ago I mentioned the sale in Detroit, but I did not go into details in the way the Senator from Michigan has gone into them today. I think we are all indebted to the Senator for pointing them out to us, as he has already done, and for giving us the information.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was the testimony referred to by the Senator from Michigan taken under oath, or was it his personal investigation?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was taken under oath. It is the policy of the committee to swear witnesses and their testimony is taken under oath.

Mr. LANGER. Does the committee go into a plant and put whomever it wants under oath, or does it first subpena them?

Mr. FERGUSON. We subpenaed them in this particular case.

Mr. LANGER. And had them bring the records?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; we had them bring the records. I am speaking from the testimony and from the record.

It will be sufficient to follow the surplus of cutting tools that piled up in the plant of the Studebaker Corporation. That surplus cost the Government $1,671,270.11. This was under a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, and the necessity was brought about by the fact that they were building an engine, to which I shall refer as "A" engine, and when they became adequately tooled they transferred the building of that engine to another plant, and the tools became surplus. They then became the Government's property. But we find nowhere in the record of the Army Air Forces that an inventory had been made of surplus property such as these tools.

I wish to point out at this point that this was back in 1941 when this country was in great need of the important fine steel which is necessary in the manufacture of such tools. It was necessary at that time that all the tool makers of the country make tools; and at the same time that these tools were lying at the Studebaker plant there was no inventory anywhere in the armed forces to indicate that this surplus was on hand.

At the time we took the testimony the evidence showed that it had been estimated there was $10,000,000 worth of tools in the Detroit area alone, and there was no inventory of the tools, and no one knew where the tools were located. There was no control over them.

As early as July 1941 the Army Air Corps in Washington and at Wright Field had full knowledge that a surplus of unneeded tools was piling up at the Studebaker plant. Nothing was done about it. There was a critical shortage of steel and cutting tools. The Studebaker Corporation kept on trying to get the tools into the war effort, but nothing was done until the late fall of 1942. Then the Army Air Forces at Detroit, and also Wright Field, requested a list of the tools. In other words, it took them about 16 months even to request a list of the tools. A list was forwarded immediately by the Studebaker Corporation. Nothing more happened until April 1943. Then the Detroit command ordered the tools shipped to Detroit, and that was done. They were all new and unused tools; 427,838 were ready to use; 19,142 were semifinished. Many of them were standard tools and could have been used by other manufacturers and other agencies.

Witnesses testified that 75 percent were standard tools. The Army today shows figures indicating that 73,504 of a total of 447,030, which is 16½ percent, were special tools, for the evidence clearly shows that the blueprints covered all the special tools in the warehouse, all of which were sold.

Some of these tools, as I have already said, were of special design, but only 322 designs were special, and all the designs were in the blueprints which were given to the War Production Board, about which I shall speak later. We found that from July 1941 nothing was done with those standard tools except that they were allowed to lie in the Studebaker plant or in the Detroit warehouse. But in June 1943, apparently without any coordination with Detroit, some of the blueprints of some of the special tools were sent from Wright Field to the War Production Board at Washington. The blueprints pertained to a very small portion of the Studebaker surplus, and exhibited only 322 special tools, purchased to manufacture the engine which I refer to as engine A. I do so for security reasons. I shall refer to another engine for security reasons as engine B. An examination of the blueprints shows that there were blueprints covering 26 separate tools for A engine, 259 special separate tools for B engine, 33 special tools with no engine number on the blueprint,

1 for C engine, and 1 for D engine. The blueprints show that for A engine there were actually 264 tools at a cost to the Government of $13,464.79.

This is very significant, because up to this moment the Army Air Forces have not contended that there was any authority whatever to sell any other tools than the 264 tools to which I have referred.

The Studebaker Corporation had a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract to manufacture engine A, and proceeded to tool up for that production. After it had started such tooling up the contract was transferred to another company, leaving Studebaker with a surplus of cutting tools which it had never used. The other cutting tools were surplus from a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract to manufacture engine B.

On July 26, 1943, more than 2 years after these tools were manufactured, the War Production Board wrote Wright Field as follows:

SUBJECT: PERISHABLE TOOLS AT STUDEBAKER FOR "A" ENGINE

We have received the prints of the tools which were no longer needed by Studebaker in connection with the production of the A engine. We have also checked with other contractors who might be able to use these tools, and find that they have no need for them. We therefore regard these tools as obsolete. As they are special tools and are obsolete, they should be scrapped.

We understand the tools are no longer at Studebaker, but at the Government furnished equipment warehouse in Detroit, awaiting cataloging, sorting, and placing on shelves. This appears to us to be a complete waste of effort and manpower.

We recommend that no steps toward such cataloging, sorting, or shelving be undertaken, but that the tools be scrapped at once.

FRANZ T. STONE,
Chief, Industrial Specialties Branch,
Tools Division, W. P. B.

In other words, Mr. President, that letter applies to 264 separate tools.

The letter was prepared in duplicate, and reveals the first step to scrap 322 special tools. As a matter of fact, it applies only to 26 special tools, that is, of special make, or 264 actual tools, for the A engine. But there were actually scrapped 427,888 completed tools and 19,142 semifinished tools, $47,598.29 worth of Nash-Kelvinator tools, which were never referred to in the letter, $1,946.25 worth of Hudson Motor Car Co. tools, which were never referred to in the letter, and $321.41 worth of Chrysler tools, which were never referred to in the letter.

Mr. President, if the blueprints had accompanied that letter the 322 special tools could have been identified. That is why the report of the Truman committee says no higher official was disciplined. They did not attach the blueprints to the order. They let it go out, but, as I shall point out later, they could have ascertained, and some of them did ascertain, that they were going to sell and dispose of many more tools.

Let us see what happened here in Washington in reference to this letter from W. P. B. Lt. Col. Maurice M. Osborne was the Air Corps Headquarters liaison officer with the War Production Board Tool Division. Previous to entering the service as a major April 14, 1941, he was identified with an advertising agency and heating activities.

I am advised that he has had a mechanical engineering education. He says that he was spending his forenoons at the Pentagon Building and his afternoons at the War Production Board Tool Division. He was requested to confirm the War Production Board letter. The gist of his explanation is that he sits at a desk with a secretary, and he says, and I quote his exact language—

I was asked to confirm the decision of W. P. B. that these (tools) were scrap. I approved it because I had confidence in the outfit and their knowledge.

He never saw the blueprints of the 322 special tools; he had no personal knowledge as to them. Any officer who assumed the responsibility to confirm a decision should have had complete knowledge as to what he was doing and should have known that his failure to have identified the tools that were to be scrapped would be misinterpreted and would result in loss to the Government.

Colonel Osborne then took the letter, bearing his own approval—he never knew anything about the tools, but he approved it—to his staff chief, Lt. Col. Paul M. Bonner, in the Pentagon Building. Before entering the service forces as a major, July 22, 1941, Lieutenant Colonel Bonner was vice president and manager of Stehle & Co., Inc., silk and rayon weavers. The War Department states his duties as follows:

Chief, coordination of information and instructions concerning requirements and flow of controlled materials between W. P. B., A. R. C. O., A. S. U., and Aircraft Industry. Maintaining liaison with the Controlled Materials Division of W. P. B. Analyzing the national supply and demand and inventories of controlled materials. Supplying all necessary data on requirements and supply of controlled materials for A. R. C. O. representatives and requirements and program adjustment committees. Supervision of those officers assigned as A. A. F. representatives in the three Controlled Materials Divisions of W. P. B. Chief, Redistribution and Salvage Branch. Staff supervision of redistribution and disposal of personal property which has become excess to A. A. F. or has been declared surplus to War Department. Maintaining liaison with redistribution and salvage officers of A. S. F. and and other components of War Department with Redistribution Division, W. P. B., and Procurement Division, Treasury Department.

That was the job Lieutenant Colonel Bonner was supposed to perform. Those were his duties.

Now let us consider what he actually did in connection with this sale. The gist of his explanation is that Colonel Osborne gave him the letter and said:

You better write the order declaring it scrap.

The blueprints were not given to him. The War Production Board kept them. He did not ask for them.

I now quote what he had to say about the matter:

When we ask (the War Production Board) for advice and they give it to us we look upon that as Mosaic law, and we say, "We cannot go any higher than that." Acting on this advice from the War Production Board * * * the Army Air Forces took the required steps under Procurement Regulation No. 7 and declared these tools as salvage.

That is what Lieutenant Colonel Bonner said he did. Therefore Colonel Bonner, without hesitation, without the blueprints, and without any specific evidence of identification in the order he was writing so that the man receiving the order at the other end of the line could identify what he was doing, issued on July 29, 1943, for General Hopkins, an order to the commanding general at Wright Field. I shall read the order which was sent from Washington to Wright Field. At the top of the letter it is stated:

Subject: Perishable tools for A engine.

It will be noted that, for security reasons, I have used the word "A" engine rather than the number of the engine. The order purports to cover only 264 tools, it is now claimed, but at the time the officials came before the committee they stood up and said that the order covered all the tools because they had never seen the blueprints and did not know what the blueprints called for. The order reads:

1. Attached herewith is a copy of letter to Capt. E. T. Lynch, tools subunit, Aircraft Scheduling Unit, from Mr. Franz T. Stone, Chief, Industrial Specialties Branch, Tools Division, dated July 26, 1943, concerning the above subject.

2. Col. M. M. Osborne of this office has agreed that these tools are both special and obsolete and as such have no redistribution value and should be scrapped at once.

3. It is requested that you contact the G. F. E. warehouse in Detroit in regard to these tools and take the necessary action to scrap them at once.

It should be noted that this letter relies upon Colonel Osborne's approval, but there is no description of the tools to be scrapped other than "perishable tools for engine A."

That was all the responsibility and consideration that was deemed necessary by the War Production Board and the Army Air Forces headquarters. Consequently, and pursuant thereto, an order by Brig. Gen. A. E. Jones, Chief, Procurement Division, Wright Field, was issued August 14, 1943, to the district supervisor at Detroit, as follows:

Subject: Perishable tools for A engine.

1. Attached is correspondence from the redistribution and salvage officer headquarters, A. A. F., Washington, D. C., requesting that subject tools located in the G. F. E. warehouse in Detroit be disposed of at once.

There was no inventory of these tools. No one in Washington or at Wright Field or at Detroit had an inventory. How were they going to tell what tools were covered by the order?

I continue the quotation:

2. Capt. E. T. Lynch, of the Tools Division, Aircraft Scheduling Unit, was contacted and stated that Wright Aeronautical Corporation could not use such tools as they were obsolete. He also stated that Air Service Command could not make use of these items. The various branches of A. S. C. were again contacted by this office and all attempts to make useful disposition of these tools were exhausted without results. An inspection of these tools was made by the Detroit repre-

sentative of the A. A. F. Training Command; however, decision was in the negative.

3. It is understood that the tools have occupied critical storage space for almost a year and it is requested that your office negotiate a contract for the immediate—

I emphasize the word "immediate"—

disposition and sale of these tools as salvage.

General Jones is a Regular Army officer. He was a colonel in 1941, and as chief contracting officer at Wright Field he handled the contract with the Studebaker Corporation. He knew, or should have known, how many tools were shipped to Detroit. He has been chief of the Wright Field procurement division since 1939. The functioning of his organization, as the War Department has presented it, is not too clear. Apparently a captain and a second lieutenant were the only ones deemed in any way responsible at Wright Field in the Detroit tool sale, namely:

Capt. James A. Avary, Jr.: Entered on extended active duty as a first lieutenant on March 14, 1942. Promoted to grade of captain on October 9, 1942.

Second Lt. Manuel Simon: Entered on extended active duty as a second lieutenant on October 28, 1942.

Mr. President, that brings us down to the Detroit district officers.

Col. Alfred H. Johnson is a Regular Army officer. He was at Wright Field from 1939 to June 15, 1943, where he served as Chief, Power Plant Unit; Chief, Government Furnished Equipment Branch; engineering executive, production; and assistant chief, production. He was transferred to Detroit June 15, 1943, as district supervisor, in command of the central procurement district.

Lt. Col. Hugh J. McNally, before entering the service as a major March 28, 1941, had been identified, over a period of 16 years, with air-line traffic, sales manager of a telephone directory, and sales director of perfumes. He has been in the service at Detroit since May 18, 1941, starting as property officer. He served as purchasing officer, Chief of Contract Section, property supervisor, and procurement officer. In 1943 he served as procurement officer and procurement executive. On August 24, 1943, he was given authority under Procurement Regulation No. 7, with respect to disposition of surplus, industrial property, and salvage; that is the supposed order under which this sale was made—so McNally was then in charge of the sale—and on October 2, 1943, he was made a member, district redistribution and disposal board.

The legal adviser of the Detroit district is Capt. Richard K. Gandy. He entered the service December 26, 1942, at Wright Field and went to Detroit as district judge advocate, April 19, 1943.

At that time—April 19, 1943—Col. R. E. Cook also went to Detroit as district production officer. Colonel Cook entered the service March 19, 1941, as a major at Wright Field. From February 15, 1942, to his transfer to Detroit, he was Army Air Forces resident representative in Toledo, Ohio. He is a mechanical engineer.

Capt. Leon L. Larason has served as salvage officer at Detroit since he entered the service, January 19, 1942, as first lieutenant. He was previously engaged in newspaper work, with the Civilian Conservation Corps, and in die casting.

Second Lt. Robert G. Ludvik, who actually conducted the amazing sale which I shall relate later, worked 2 years in an automotive-repair shop and 4 years as a drill-press operator. He entered the service February 21, 1942, as an aviation cadet. He was transferred to Detroit November 14, 1942, and was assigned to conservation and salvage, tool store, Government-furnished equipment depot, March 2, 1943.

Three other officers at Detroit—Maj. Charles H. Boesch, Chief of the Contract Section Legal Branch; First Lt. Bernard Salzberg, and Second Lt. Robert E. Crabbe in the Contract Section—were not mentioned in the investigation of the tool sale and their background is not disclosed, although they are mentioned for discipline in a letter I shall read later. They have been given administrative admonition to report apparent irregularities or deficiencies, in contract matters, to their superior officers. For that reason they are mentioned here.

Now, to follow the tool-sale performance, it appears that the order from General Jones at Wright Field was received by the Detroit district on August 17, 1943. There is no evidence that Detroit had been informed that higher authority had taken any action with the War Production Board. The order came out of a clear sky. That it created doubt and confusion is evidenced by the August 19, 1943, reply by the Detroit district:

Subject: Perishable tools for "A" engine.

When they received this order in Detroit they wrote a letter to Wright Field, because they thought that the order should not be enforced, and therefore they wanted higher authority to look into the matter, and to be sure that it should be enforced. For that reason I read the letter. It is as follows:

Subject: Perishable tools for "A" engine.
To: Commanding General, Army Air Forces Matériel Command, Wright Field, Dayton, Ohio.

1. Reference your letter dated August 14, 1943, 80-10; MS;ecb, relative to letter from the Redistribution & Salvage Officer, Headquarters of the Army Air Forces, Washington, D. C.—

They realized that this originated in Washington. They called that to the attention of Wright Field, because in the services it is necessary to go through channels, and Detroit officials were attempting to come back to Washington through channels. So they referred to this letter coming from Washington—

requesting that subject tools, located in the G. F. E. warehouse in Detroit, be disposed of at once.

2. The letter refers specifically to perishable tools for the A engine.

(a) In addition to the tools from the A engine, this warehouse contains tools from the Nash-Kelvinator Propeller Division; Hudson Motor Car Co., Chrysler Corporation, and Ford Motor Co.

Mr. President, I find no other reference, except in this letter, to the fact that there were Ford Co. tools in this warehouse. It will be noticed, however, that the letter does not refer to the fact that there were any tools from the B engine which came from Studebaker, and the great majority of the tools were from the B engine. So because of the lack of inventory, because of the lack of records, because of the lack of judgment and good business principles, we find this kind of letter written from Washington.

I quote further from the letter:

(b) There is some misunderstanding relative to the type tools which are in the warehouse as statement is made that they are "both special and obsolete." Only a small portion of these tools are special design and are being purchased by Air Corps facilities, Ordnance, and Navy in the open market today as standard tools.

(c) The "almost a year" statement also seems to be out of order inasmuch as these tools have been there but a short time; in fact, the first shipment arrived in the warehouse on March 16, 1943, and the last shipment was received August 5, 1943.

(d) The statement that these tools occupy critical storage space seems to be slightly exaggerated as they are now in a small corner upstairs in the warehouse and could be moved, and agreement was made that they would be, upon request of the warehouse commandant.

Here, Mr. President, is a very amazing statement contained in the letter, and this letter was not at first given to the committee. It took some time to obtain it. I wish to read this amazing statement in the letter written by an officer of the United States Army in relation to the sale of surplus property. I think it explains why no inventories have ever been made of these surplus tools, why no judgment has been exercised, and why no business has been put into this system. I continue to read from the letter:

3. The original plan, as outlined to A. S. U., called for publicity for the store. This was stopped by the public relations officer as it was desired to keep the public from knowing too much about overpurchases and cushion ordering.

Mr. President, imagine a public relations official of the United States Government saying that he did not want any publicity, that he did not want any inventory, because the people, the taxpayers, would thereby learn too much about overpurchases and cushion ordering by the United States Government.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is the general policy, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the general policy, and I am glad the Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, asked me that question. But it is amazing to think that we must have publicity agents in our respective agencies who can keep the public from knowing the facts. Yes, it is even more than amazing.

I quote further from the letter:

As a result, definite plans had to be worked out and these are just now commencing to bear fruit. Thirty-five thousand dollars'

worth of tools have been moved from the store at full price.

In other words, they were not allowed to give publicity to the matter because the public would know that they had this surplus, and they were trying to work out some other scheme, some other method of disposing of this surplus so the public would not find it out.

I continue to quote from the letter:

4. Last week a survey was made of the smaller manufacturers to find why they did not buy these needed tools from the Army Air Forces. Every one of the 48 stated that he would gladly purchase these tools at market price if he could buy them as he can buy the same tools from a tool company, that is, telephone his order, if we have it in stock; but each one definitely stated that he did not feel obligated to go to his bank and take a certified check along, when he could merely reach for the 'phone on his desk and obtain the same results through normal channels.

5. This afternoon an order came in from Goodyear Aircraft for the following items, which we will supply:

Twelve dozen No. 44 high-speed straight shank drills; 2,000 dozen No. 30 high-speed straight shank drills; 24 dozen No. 12 high-speed straight shank drills; 24 dozen No. 43 high-speed straight shank drills; 833 dozen No. 41 high-speed straight shank drills; 666 1/8-inch high-speed straight shank drills; 24 dozen 19/64-inch high-speed straight shank drills.

(a) These articles will be used on contract No. 535 ac-181342.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. This conclusively shows that the tools were not special, but were standard.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I am glad the chairman made that statement, because it does make plain that they were standard tools.

I continue to read from the letter:

6. In view of the foregoing it is requested that the order to sell these tools for scrap be rescinded or held in abeyance for 60 days, while a concentrated effort to place them in production is made. It is felt that the two objections raised should be waived, i. e., publicity—

This captain is asking that the two objections raised should be waived. He asks that there be no publicity respecting the fact that the Government had on hand some surplus tools. I continue to read:

It is felt that the two objections raised should be waived—i. e., publicity and certified checks—to give these tools a chance to get back into production.

For the district supervisor.

LEON D. LARASON,
For R. E. COOK,
Lieutenant Colonel, Air Corps,
District Production Officer.

The Detroit district never received a written reply to this letter. Then Captain Larason decides to call on the telephone. So far as the War Department has disclosed, the matter was handled at Wright Field by Second Lt. Manuel Simon. Lieutenant Simon had been in the upholstering business, and, so far as I can learn from the record, did not know anything about tools. But he was the man upon whom was placed responsibility for the disposition of millions of dollars' worth of tools. It is an amazing fact that this responsibility was placed on a second lieutenant.

A few days later Captain Larason telephoned Wright Field about a rescission or extension of the order. He was unable to contact an officer higher than Second Lieutenant Simon, and he was "informed that the matter had been discussed and he had a positive order to scrap the tools."

Naturally, that would include all the tools in the warehouse because they are all described in the order.

Subsequent to requesting the 60-day extension from Wright Field, the action that the tool store had been trying to take was reported to Colonel McNally and by him to Colonel Johnson, under date of August 23, 1943, the date on which the sale was started and completed 3 days later. This is an interesting memorandum. It was discovered rather by accident, as no witness testified before the committee relative to it. I had asked the witness to produce the letter containing the amazing statement about the publicity, and he reached down into his file and pulled out some letters and handed them to me. Among those letters was this amazing document. The Army to this very day has never disclosed, nor has it made a real investigation to ascertain, whether the amazing document I am now going to read was put into the file later so as to cover up. I now here on the Senate floor charge that that was done. I think that unless we are going to have investigations by the Army themselves, after the matter is brought to their attention, there is very little use of having special committees of the House and of the Senate make these investigations. I think the fact that we called the matter to their attention should put them on their mettle, and they should make an investigation.

The letter is amazing. Not a witness ever testified about it. Johnson did not know he had it in his file, and it came right out of his file across the desk. It shows that the tools were not special tools. It shows that the tools could have been sold to others engaged in production, and even could have been used in other Army services. No investigation has ever been made by the War Department relative to how the letter got into the files, as no witness was able to give the information relative to it, not even the man who wrote it. I quote the letter:

1. The following steps are being taken for the liquidation of surplus tool stock at the Dearborn warehouse.

The memorandum is dated on the very day the sale started. They were conducting an auction sale, and the sale lasted for 3 days.

I continue to quote from the memorandum:

(a) All nonstandard tools are being segregated and all tool-making companies and tool-salvage companies in Detroit have been specially invited to bid on these tools prior to Thursday, August 26—

The day they finished the sale.

Mr. DAVIS. August 26 of what year, Mr. President?

Mr. FERGUSON. August 26, 1943—last year.

I read further from the memorandum:

(b) The quartermaster at Chicago has informed this office that Rock Island Arsenal is in need of a large quantity of the standard tools. The Sixth Service Command salvage officer, Col. W. A. McDonald, will be in the city this week with a request for numerous items for the arsenal.

The tools were sold at auction while the letter was supposed to be in existence. I read further:

(c) The Engineer Corps School at Granite City, Ill., have advised this office through the Sixth Service Command that they are in need of the tools on hand at Dearborn. They have been invited to inspect the tools during the next 10 days.

They finished the sale in 3 days. How could those people come from Illinois "during the next 10 days" and find any of the tools left? They simply could not.

I continue to quote:

(d) By the elimination of special tools from the list, only a short list will be needed for the standard tools and this will be sent to the Air Corps facilities with a request that they use these tools.

(e) The firms which refused, in the past, to purchase tools due to red tape (which has since been discovered to be unnecessary) are being notified that they can order the tools as from any tool company. This information is also being included in the revised tool list to all facilities.

(f) Should there still be a surplus of tools remaining on hand, they will be disposed of to the highest bidder before September 30.

2. Tentative approval of this disposition was given by Captain Avary, reclamation officer, Wright Field, in telephone conversation, 5 p. m., Saturday, August 21, 1943.

3. Forty thousand dollars' worth of tools have been moved to date at full price. The estimated value of the remaining tools is around $1,000,000.

LEON L. LARASON,
Captain, Air Corps.

For R. E. COOK,
Lieutenant Colonel, Air Corps, District Production Officer.

This memorandum indicates that there was a market for many of the tools to other services, and that the sale of these tools as junk was not necessary. However, they were sold as junk.

Colonel Johnson, in command at Detroit, testified that it was the customary practice to receive advice from officers of a lower grade in such a manner as Captain Larason was advised by Second Lieutenant Simon, as has been stated. That conversation took place over the telephone. He informed the committee that every officer is considered a staff officer whether a superior or not. He further said:

At that same time I was probably checking up—

You notice that he said, "probably"—

to find out what action had been taken, or my staff officers were, what action was being taken on any communication that we would receive"—

And—

When we have an order, unless we get it rescinded, we follow the order.

Colonel Johnson and Colonel McNally never attempted to have the order canceled or extended, but Larason did, for them.

The Detroit officers concerned with the tool sale understood the scrap order applied to all the tools in the warehouse. That is clear by the letter they wrote and by the telephone conversation. Those in charge could not determine whether a tool was standard or special. The tools had not been sorted. They were scrapped during the week of August 23, 1943, for $36,924.64. That was $1,684,211.41 less than they cost the Government.

I want to describe how this sale of valuable Government property was conducted. I shall point out only one sale. Here were valuable tools belonging to the United States Government, needed by other governmental agencies. The sale took place to the U. S. Tool & Manufacturing Co. Carl D. Wall, Mr. Greig, and Mr. Noren went to the warehouse.

They had received a telephone call that there would be an auction sale of the tools. So they went to the warehouse. There they met a man from the Gratiot Tool Co. who had a large pile of tools. They walked up to him and said to him, "Have you bought those tools?" He said "Yes." They said to him, "Can we buy some of them? I suppose we would have to pay two or three prices more than you paid for them."

He said, "Yes; in fact you would have to pay five or six prices more than I paid for them."

So they thought there might be a bargain, and they started to look around. They found Second Lieutenant Ludvik in charge of the sale. They found several hundred tools. They asked how they could purchase some of the tools. They were told by Second Lieutenant Ludvik to select what they wanted. They did so, and piled the tools along the wall. Then they went to Lieutenant Ludvik, who was in charge of the sale, and brought him to the tools they had piled up, and asked him, "How much are these tools?" He said to them something which amazed them: "How much are they worth to you?"

One of them said, "$500." There was not a quick reply. The second man thought they were not going to get them at that price, so he said, "$750." Still there was no reply. So the third man in the group then said, "I think they are worth $800."

The lieutenant looked at them and said: "You gentlemen cannot agree on what they are worth to you. So let's add the three figures and divide by three, and we will take the average. That ought to be satisfactory."

Just think of that. That was a sale of United States Government property, which had originally been purchased with taxpayers' money.

Then, to the amazement of these men, when they were making out the check the lieutenant said: "No; you do not pay that much for them. We give you a discount of 75 percent"—a discount of 75 percent off the figure they had arrived at by adding the three figures and taking one-third of the total. They testified that their figure was a 40 percent discount, that they would normally have had to pay from $1,200 to $1,400 for the tools. The whole thing really sounds like a fairy story, but it actually took place. Later I shall point out what the discipline was for this kind of a sale.

They sold thousands of tools, but nowhere did they make an inventory or a list of the tools they were selling. They merely said "merchandise"—so many hundred dollars. They did not have any scales in that place. They would let a man gather up a pile of tools and take them away. They would say, "There is a coalyard down the street. Take them down there and weigh them." The buyer did not bring back any weight slip. He would merely return and tell them how much the tools weighed and pay so much a pound for those valuable standard tools. Some of them they did not even send out to be weighed. They said, "How much did your other load weigh? This one is about the same size, so take it at that price."

As I have stated, the sales slips did not itemize the tools or disclose their weight. Subsequently the War Department, after an investigation by the Truman committee, decided that it would get some of the tools back. It now reports that it thinks it has repossessed about 95 percent of the tools sold. I wonder how it can tell what 95 percent of no definite number is.

The committee did not obtain the letter to Wright Field requesting extension of the order to scrap the tools until November 5, 1943. It was then submitted by Major Berger, the attorney representing General Branshaw, commander at Wright Field, and the following pencil notations, in Lieutenant Simon's writing, were then on it:

> 8-21. Spoke to Captain Larason—Detroit is disposing of tools (possibly in 20 days). Say they are standard and being purchased by Ordnance and Navy, 8-30. Captain Larason says already disposed of; will write letter concerning.

Lieutenant Simon said he mentioned Captain Larason's request for an extension in the Wright Field office. Nothing more was done about it.

Where was the higher authority? Where were the experienced executives? Where was the management control?

The fact of the matter is that no one knew where the tools were produced. They did not know that there were tools costing $1,721,136.05 in the tool house at Detroit. They did not know the value of the tools in the warehouse. They spoke of it as $1,000,000, whereas there were tools costing $1,721,136.05 in the tool house at Detroit. They did not know how many more surplus tools the Government had paid for, and they did not know what the existing war need for such tools was.

During the following September the War Production Board Tool Division received a letter from a Chicago tool manufacturer. The sale was made during the week of August 23, and in September the War Production Board received this letter from a Chicago tool manufacturer. It then discovered that the Chicago tool manufacturer had unfilled war orders for $1,250,000 worth of similar tools. The tool manufacturer wrote to the War Production Board when he learned about the sale in Detroit. The War Production Board gave the letter to Colonel Osborne, and he turned it over to Colonel Bonner at the Pentagon Building.

Colonel Bonner received the manufacturer's letter on September 14. He rushed a teletype message to Wright Field to find out what was going on. Wright Field relayed an inquiry to Detroit. Detroit returned an answer to Wright Field. Wright Field rushed a teletype message to the Pentagon Building. It was then September 24. Thus, in the short period of 10 days, Washington headquarters obtained a simple bit of information from the field force in Detroit; that is to say, Detroit directed it to its letter of July 29 ordering the scrap sale. Colonel Bonner testified:

> I didn't know (the tools) had already been cleared, and I didn't know that I had already given a certification to salvage because I didn't realize * * * that these were the same tools * * *. In other words, they (Detroit) are coming right back on my own injunction. I asked for information, and I didn't know that these were the same tools.

Then he advised his commander, General Hopkins, "that everything had been complied with." In other words, Colonel Bonner made an investigation of the tool situation by sending these teletype messages, and then he told his commanding officer "that everything had been complied with." That was the end of the matter until the committee started its investigation on September 28, 1943.

With knowledge of these facts, on October 1, 1943, the War Department Headquarters released a clean bill of health for the Detroit organization concerning the August sale at Detroit. After it had made its purported investigation, it issued a press release, which I shall read. This is the press release:

> The Army Air Forces has complete confidence in Colonel Johnson and his organization.

Of course, his organization included the lieutenant who sold the tools, as I have described.

> He is an experienced and capable officer who acted properly in the sale of obsolete and perishable cutting tools, executing the orders transmitted to him by higher authority.

It will be noted that nothing is said about standard tools.

> There is no intention on the part of the Army Air Forces to make any changes in the command of the central procurement district.

Mr. President, I say that that press release, by a publicity agent, stopped the Army Air Forces cold in their tracks from making any further investigation in this case, because a clean bill of health was given to everyone concerned in this amazing sale.

Later, because of the committee investigation and its own investigation in November 1943, the War Department notified the committee that it intended to take the following action against 10 officers. I quote from a letter written by General Branshaw, paragraph 47:

> (a) That Lt. Col. R. E. Cook, chief of the central procurement district production section, be considered for reclassification by

the matériel command officer reclassification board. Rather than appear before the board he has submitted his resignation, and I shall recommend to higher authority that the resignation be accepted.

That man will leave the service. He will become a war veteran. He will have the same place in society as a man who fought at the front, and who obeyed orders because he was willing to obey them for his country.

(b) That Second Lt. Robert G. Ludvik be considered for reclassification by the matériel command officer reclassification board. He will be required to appear before the board at an early date.

Recently we received word that Robert G. Ludvik, the second lieutenant who sold the tools, as I have described, received an honorable discharge from the United States Army Air Forces. Is this conduct the sort of thing that leads to honorable discharge? I think it would be well for us to ponder that question.

(c) That Capt. L. L. Larason be considered for reclassificaton by the Matériel Command Officer Reclassification Board. He will likewise be required to appear before the board at an early date.

Our latest returns show that he has been transferred, that he has not received anything worse in the way of punishment than a transfer.

(d) That Col. A. H. Johnson, Central Procurement District Supervisor, be given an administrative admonition to develop adequate controls within his organization so that there may be no repetition of similar bungling—

The word "bungling" is used—

in the future.

I took it upon myself to call up and find out what an administrative admonition was. It is not punishment. It is not supposed to be punishment. It is a corrective measure. It can be given either in writing or verbally, and the man in charge of the entire sale, now in Detroit, received an administrative admonition. Is that justice? Will that get service for the United States? Will it be a deterrent to others who may be tempted to fail in the performance of their duty?

I continue reading:

(e) That Lt. Col. H. J. McNally, Chief of the Central Procurement District Contract Section, be given an administrative admonition to take aggressive action looking toward the correction of irregularities and deficiencies as soon as he has knowledge that something apparently has been mishandled.

That is what happened. He was given an administrative admonition. I have already described an administrative admonition.

(f) That Maj. Charles H. Boesch, Chief of the Legal Branch of the Central Procurement District Contract Section, be given an administrative admonition to report to his superior officer immediately upon receiving information that there have been apparent irregularities or deficiencies in connection with contract matters.

We bave been advised that such admonition was given.

(g) That First Lt. Bernard Salzberg and Second Lt. Robert E. Crabbe, of the Central Procurement District Contract Section, be given an administrative admonition for the same reason that Major Boesch is being admonished.

They received that admonition.

(h) That Capt. J. A. Avary, of the Matériel Command Reclamation and Salvage Office, be given an administrative reprimand—

It will be noticed that that is different. He is to be given an administrative reprimand—

for neglecting to keep in close touch with what Lieutenant Simon was doing with reference to the directive from higher authority and the disposition of the specific tools as scrap.

In other words, for not following what was in that letter telling him that these tools were going to be sacrificed, he was to receive a reprimand. I naturally thought he would receive more severe punishment than an admonition, but I am advised by officials of the Army itself that a reprimand and an admonition are the same thing. It can be verbal, or it can be in writing but it is corrective measure and not a punishment.

I continue with the reading.

(i) That Second Lt. Manuel Simon, of the Matériel Command Reclamation and Salvage Office, be given an administrative reprimand for neglecting to forward to the Central Procurement District a list of the 321 tools covered by the directive from higher authority—

As a matter of fact, that covered only 26 separate tools, or 264 actual tools—

for failing to inform his superior officer immediately regarding the telephone conversation with Captain Larason on August 21, 1943; and for failure to confirm the said telephone conversation in writing, thereby answering Captain Larason's letter of August 19, 1943, which is attached hereto as exhibit D.

That was administered. Only recently, as I have said, we have received word that these orders were carried out. There is no evidence that the Army took any action under article 104 of the Articles of War, which provides for reprimands, admonitions, or fines, giving an officer the right to a court martial rather than submit voluntarily to a reprimand, an admonition, or a fine. This action, as I understand, was not punishment, but merely a corrective measure. Does the conduct of the other officers whom I have mentioned require that administrative admonition or administrative reprimand be given to them?

Mr. President, I have stated the facts. What is to be done about the other officers concerned who are at Washington and at Wright Field? What is to be done about the higher-ups who are responsible for this incompetency, this gross negligence, in order that similar acts shall not occur again?

Mr. President, I hope that I shall read the following letter, which I have received and have been requested to read, with the same emphasis with which the writer would read it if he were permitted to be here on the floor. The letter is signed by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War. I wish to be absolutely fair. If I did not feel that what I am doing is in the aid of the war effort, I should not stand on this floor and relate the facts which I have related. This is not in criticism of strategy. It is only in criticism of the manner in which the property of the people is being handled here at home. We shall have millions, yes, billions of dollars' worth of similar property, and if a Senator cannot stand in this Chamber and relate the truth and the facts and ask that justice be done, then we may as well not be here, and there will be no use of our making these investigations. I shall try to read this letter with emphasis, and I shall try and answer it as I read it. It is addressed to me. It is on the stationery of the War Department, and is dated the 8th of March 1944. It was delivered by special messenger. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: I understand that you contemplate making a statement on the floor of the Senate criticizing the failure of the War Department to take disciplinary action against certain officials stationed with the Headquarters, Army Air Forces, in connection with the sale of certain cutting tools at Detroit by the Army Air Forces during the week of August 23, 1943.

In the event that you do make such a statement, I feel justified in urging you to read this letter into the RECORD at the time that you make your statement on the floor.

At the outset, I should like to make it perfectly clear that the War Department does not defend this sale. I have repeatedly stated that it was an unfortunate mistake and I have expressed my appreciation of your diligence in bringing this matter to our attention so promptly. Because of your cooperation it has been possible to recover, I believe—

I wish to emphasize the words "I believe," because I wish to discuss them later—

more than 95 percent of the articles sold, so that the interest of the taxpayers has not been substantially prejudiced.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. Would that have been done without the investigation which was made, may I ask?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator interrupted me at that point. I am satisfied nothing would have been done. A release had been issued to the newspapers making it perfectly clear that everything had been done properly. Bonner replied to his general that the sale was proper. The release went to the Detroit newspapers saying that the transaction was proper, and it received plenty of attention there. Pictures were published of the loads going out from the warehouses, and so there was a lot of publicity without which, I am satisfied, there would have been nothing done.

The Under Secretary of War "believes" that 95 percent of the tools sold have been recovered. How can anyone ascertain how much 95 percent of an unknown quantity is?

I say these sales were made, many of them to junk dealers on a pound basis, without even weighing the loads. They were sold without any weight, without any number, and how, therefore, can it be said that 95 percent have been recovered? It was several months later when the effort was made to recover these tools.

So I think Judge Patterson was correct when he said, "I believe," because he does not have any facts and there is no way he can obtain the facts.

Reading further from Judge Patterson's letter:

If I am correctly informed, you intend to lay the blame for this transaction on certain higher officials of the Army Air Forces.

Oh, how they fear someone will speak the truth about some higher authorities.

Quoting further from the letter:

In simple fairness to these men whom I believe you intend to name, I think the facts of their particular participation should be known, and I feel confident that when those facts are known, no fair-minded person will draw the conclusion that they are in any way to blame for this transaction.

He says he is sure that "no fair-minded person will draw the conclusion that they are in any way to blame for this transaction."

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DAVIS. Can the Senator tell us who is to blame?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. My opinion is that the higher officials who failed to put a proper system into effect, who, indeed, had no system, who had no inventories, and never looked at the blueprints to find out how many tools were being scrapped, and who permitted this order to go through, are to blame. Particularly should blame attach to those who—and it was called to their attention that at Wright Field the order went only to a second lieutenant—had put in charge to do a job such as this a second lieutenant who knew nothing about tools, but had been in the upholstering business or selling perfume or some other article. Of course, that is why this letter was written; but I am willing to submit this case upon the facts to the American people to act as a jury and to decide as to whether or not any fair-minded person will draw the conclusion that higher officers are in any way to blame for this transaction.

Continuing to read from Judge Patterson's letter:

In June of 1943 there was on hand in Detroit a large quantity of cutting tools most of which had been made to special designs of Studebaker Co. and which were no longer needed and which it had not been possible to move.

The Studebaker Co. tried from June 1941, when the contract was canceled, to have these tools transferred to other people, and they waited until April 1943 to do so. So the facts are absolutely contrary to what the judge states in his letter.

Quoting further from the letter:

These tools were the property of the War Department.

Yes; they were the property of the people of the United States.

At that time the Air Forces representative at Wright Field communicated with the War Production Board and forwarded to it a set of blueprints furnished by Studebaker requesting advice as to the disposition to be made of the tools. The tools covered by these blueprints were part of a larger group which were stored at the warehouse of the Army Air Forces at Detroit.

I have explained that they sent to Washington a few blueprints of only 26 special tools of A engine, 231 of another engine, the B engine, and one or two of D and C engine.

Reading further from Judge Patterson's letter:

The Tools Division of the War Production Board examined the blueprints and recommended that no steps toward cataloging, sorting, or salvaging the tools be taken but that the tools represented by prints be scrapped at once.

The fact is, and the Army does not as yet know it, that the blueprints they did approve, and in connection with which they put the number in the letter, called for only 264 actual tools. They do not know that yet because they are unwilling to investigate this case, and they have already given a clean bill of health to everybody concerned, but they now say that the blueprints cover all the tools.

This recommendation was communicated to the office of Brig. Gen. Frederick M. Hopkins, Jr., Chief of the Resources Division, Office of the Assistant Chief of Air Staff, Material, Maintenance, and Distribution, Army Air Forces. In that office the matter was handled by Lt. Col. Maurice M. Osborne, who was acting as liaison officer between General Hopkins' office and the War Production Board, and by Lt. Col. Paul H. Bonner, Chief of the Redistribution and Salvage Branch of the Resources Division.

I have described what those two men did. They took the word of the War Production Board and said it was Mosaic law. If they had taken any care to have the blueprints go with the tools, this mistake would not have happened.

Quoting further from the letter:

These officers forwarded the recommendation of the War Production Board to Wright Field with the direction to put it into effect.

Thus, again saying that they approved it. They did not act merely as messengers; they approved it, and Osborne's approval is in the letter and on the letter; but he never knew what he was approving, and now the Under Secretary of War says that nothing should be done.

This direction was accompanied by the correspondence from the Tools Division, War Production Board, and by its terms was limited to the sale of tools covered by the prints.

It was not limited by the prints only, but merely the amounts of tools in the prints were put in the letter.

Quoting further from the letter:

At no time has it been suggested that the recommendation of the War Production Board was improper as applied to some 73,000 cutting tools which were described in the prints.

Mr. President, this letter is dated the 8th of March 1944. The writer says that the actual tools covered by this letter numbered 73,000. As a matter of fact—and I checked it personally this morning—there were 264, or at any rate less than 300, or the number I have stated here on the floor. They have not even seen the blueprints and they do not want to see the blueprints, because they show evidence as to what really happened. This letter contends that 73,000 cutting tools were involved, but 73,000 as compared to 440,000 is only 16½ percent, if you take Judge Patterson's own figures.

Quoting again from the letter:

The action of the officers in General Hopkins' office in transmitting that recommendation to Wright Field with their approval seem likewise to have been entirely proper.

I have covered that in what I have already said.

The suggestion has been made that in transmitting the recommendation of the War Production Board blueprints should have been attached so as to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding.

The writer of the letter says that such a suggestion has been made. This would indicate that the judge really had a way of solving this whole problem by this suggestion, and that if it had been followed this thing would not have happened. So that answers that part of his letter.

Quoting further from Judge Patterson's letter:

It should be noted, however, that in this instance the blueprint originated with Wright Field to which the direction was transmitted and consequently the officers in Washington had no reason to anticipate that any misunderstanding could arise.

In other words, he says that the Washington men thought that the men at Wright Field would remember what tools were in the blueprints. No; the blueprints should have been sent, for then we would not have had this question before us.

It has also been suggested that Colonel Osborne and Colonel Bonner should have made an independent investigation to determine whether the tools should be scrapped.

I still contend that that is what should have been done, and if it had been, we would not have had this case before us.

It has not been suggested that they could properly have reached any different conclusion from that reached by the representatives of the War Production Board. Furthermore, in such matters Colonel Osborne and Colonel Bonner, who are staff officers, can quite properly rely on the advice and judgment of the experts in the Tools Division of the War Production Board.

In reply to that, Mr. President, I say that if men are to come to Washington and take no responsibility, but merely to have a desk and a secretary and a uniform, and rely upon what some civilian agency is doing, we do not need such men in uniform. It would be much better that we keep the uniform as the garb of a fighting man, a man who is willing to do his duty, and not a man who is anxious only to wear a uniform and become a veteran of the United States Army, to sit at a desk. And, as the Under Secretary of War now says, they have a right, as colonels, to take the word of a layman in the War Production Board, a civilian agency.

I read further from the letter:

The communication to Wright Field was in ordinary course transmitted to the Central Procurement District at Detroit, where it was

referred to the office of Col. R. E. Cook for appropriate action. The order was misunderstood by that office—

"Misunderstood," he says—

as being applicable to all tools on hand, which included a great many items not covered in the blueprints submitted by the War Production Board, and in this broad application the order seemed to that office to be unwise and a letter to that effect was forwarded to Wright Field. At Wright Field the letter was referred to Lieutenant Simon. That officer, not knowing of the existence of any tools other than those referred to in the instructions from Washington, did not cause the directive to be changed.

In other words, this second lieutenant, who had been in the upholstering business, and knew nothing about tools, let this go by, and then they give him "an administrative admonition." They say to him, "Now, young man, we will let you keep your uniform, but please do not do this again."

I quote further from the letter:

It may be conceded—

It even "may be conceded," the Under Secretary says—

It may be conceded that Lieutenant Simon might reasonably have concluded that Detroit had misunderstood the orders which had been forwarded to them.

It is just as plain as anything in the world, but he now says, "It may be conceded." It shows they had in mind selling all the tools, a million dollars worth or more, and now he says that it may be conceded that it may have been misunderstood.

It is not believed, however, that his failure to do this warrants any action more severe than the administrative reprimand already given.

I have explained what a reprimand is. I read again from the letter, because this is the entire defense of the War Department, as I take it, and that is why I am reading it in full. This is an unusual way to present the matter, but I deem it a real privilege that I may take the part now of Judge Patterson, and present this letter, because I want all the facts to be known.

Based on this fundamental misunderstanding of the orders received from Wright Field there followed at Detroit a series of misadventures leading to an unjustifiable disposition of these articles. Investigations made by the War Department have led to the conclusion that some of the officers participating were not free from blame, and the necessary disciplinary action has been taken.

I have disclosed what the War Department has done with these officers.

The adequacy of this action must be judged in the light of all of the circumstances. Inasmuch as a complete investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and by Military Intelligence failed to disclose any evidence whatsoever of fraud or collusion, the War Department believes that the disciplinary action taken has been all that the circumstances could possibly justify.

The F. B. I. did not investigate to see what these men had done. They went up there to see whether or not there was a "pay-off" for this kind of bungling and fumbling, and on their return they decided they could not find anything of the kind. The Army Intelligence investigated with the same result.

Our committee has not found evidence of any "pay-off"; it has not found any evidence of bribery; but I believe it is fair to say to the American people that it has found evidence of stupidity which, if manifested in civilian life, could be considered by a jury as indicating that there had been something more serious. That is why the Department had an investigation by the F. B. I. and the Army Intelligence. It was because this matter had such an appearance that one could not believe it could happen here without indicating that there was something seriously wrong. So the Department did have these agencies investigate, but they did not find anything, and I say now that we did not find any evidence of fraud. We did find that the sale was so good that a man in New York paid a man in Detroit $300 because he tipped him off that this auction was going on.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I may say to the Senator that I have had calls in my office asking me "Please put me in touch with that bureau in the Army which has these bargains to offer."

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the chairman of our committee. I realize that people think they are entitled to bargains from the United States Government.

I read further from the letter:

It has been suggested that blame attaches to these officials for failure to give proper instructions to the central procurement district as to the manner of disposition of property.

Yes; I think there should be criticism of that. This sale was conducted in the manner I have described, and if that is the way the instructions were given, then the sale was carried out under the instructions, and the instructions were certainly wrong.

I quote again:

The record discloses no shred of evidence that any such failure in any way affected this transaction.

What could we say, with evidence of the piling of tools along the wall, taking an average of three prices, which was then 40 percent below the list price and then taking 75 percent from that? If that is the way they are going to sell surplus property, then the people should know it. That is why the Senator from Missouri has had inquiries, "How can we buy property like that? How can we buy property and weigh it on our own scales? How can we buy property and have none of it listed in the bill of sale or in the order?"

I proceed with the reading:

The record discloses no shred of evidence that any such failure in any way affected this transaction.

That is just what did affect the transaction.

The blunders—

And he uses that word himself—

The blunders committed were in the teeth of specific instructions.

There were no instructions as to how to conduct this sale, except "at once," and they conducted it as an auction sale on the advice of their publicity agent that no publicity should be given of this surplus. I ask now what reprimand has that publicity agent received? It is not shown in the record.

I quote further from Under Secretary Patterson's letter:

Any misunderstanding related not to the procedures to be followed, but to the articles to which the order emanating from Wright Field actually applied.

Then Under Secretary Patterson continues:

In view of these facts, it is difficult to understand on what grounds the demand could be made for disciplinary action against the officer in the Headquarters, Army Air Forces, to whom I understand you expect to refer.

Mr. President, if what I have said today causes no disciplinary action to be taken with respect to officers in the Washington office, then nothing that can be said on the Senate floor will cause the Army to discipline any officer.

I continue to quote from the letter:

Certainly the War Department does not see any basis for such action, and proposes to take none.

The Department now says to the people of the United States, "We will not take any action." The Department has had the facts. It knew what I was going to say on the Senate floor. It had the report of the Truman committee. It had all the facts. It now says to the people of the United States, "We will not take any action with respect to these officers."

I continue to read from the letter:

We do not believe they are subject to criticism.

In recent weeks reports of Congressional committees have emphasized the vital importance to war production of the prompt disposal of property no longer needed by contractors for the purpose for which it was acquired.

Yes, Mr. President, that is true. We as Members of the Senate and the Members of the House of Representatives have deemed it of great importance to the people to know what was going to be done with respect to the cancelations of contracts, what was going to be done with the great surpluses which we now have and which we will have in the future. If it were not a vital matter, if I did not feel that what I have had to say today may in a slight degree help in the war effort rather than in any degree hurt it, I would not be standing on the Senate floor making these remarks and giving this information, but I feel that it is my solemn duty to bring the facts in this case before the people. Investigations without publicity, and without demand for publicity upon the part of those who make them, will be of very little good in the future. The people of the country are furnishing the money involved in this matter. They have a right to see to it that those who are to administer the work, who are to buy with the money furnished by the people, and to sell, do the job in a businesslike way. If we

placed the men who were doing this work in civilian clothes we could discharge them if they failed to do the job in a businesslike way. But when we place the uniform of a fighting man on one charged with this work, then it is felt that simply because of that fact he cannot be discharged.

I continue to read from Under Secretary Patterson's letter:

The War Department is in accord with Congress as to the importance of such promptness in disposal.

I agree wholeheartedly with that statement.

The successful disposition of this property depends in large part upon the willingness of the officers—

The willingness, Mr. President—

Upon the willingness of the officers charged with that duty to act courageously.

Imagine, Mr. President, a swivel-chair officer being asked to show willingness to act courageously, at a time when our boys are dying on the seven seas. Our boys show a willingness to act courageously, without being asked to show it. Yet we find it here said that—

The successful disposition of this property depends in large part upon the willingness of the officers charged with that duty to act courageously.

I continue to read from the letter:

Unwarranted criticism of officers engaged in this work is likely to produce a feeling of timidity—

The writer uses the word "timidity." Think of timidity being found in a colonel.

I continue to read:

is likely to produce a feeling of timidity on their part which will result in greatly slowing down this vital process.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator from Michigan was a member of the subcommittee which made the investigation of the Wright engine fiasco, and if I remember correctly, I received a letter almost identical with the one the Senator has just read, warning me that if we exposed that faulty engine construction it would have an effect on the officers in charge of the inspection and the construction of that engine which would make them timid in doing their duty. Now we have the same sort of letter with respect to this tool sale, in which it is said that if we bring the facts out and have them to be made a part of the record of the Senate we will cause timidity in doing their duty on the part of the officers who are charged with this very important job. I rather think that if they have that sort of timidity the sooner it is found out the better, and that we had better get someone on the job who has the "guts" to find out what ought to be done, and to do it as it should be done in the public interest, no matter what may happen on the Senate floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the able Senator from Missouri for the observation he has made. I wholeheartedly approve of it. Such a letter was written at the time the Senator referred to, and such a letter has been written now. I wish to say that in my opinion this letter amounts to an admission by the War Department that officers who blunder cannot be subjected to anything more drastic than an administrative reprimand for fear that other officers will not do their plain duty. I believe that it is time that this wrist-slapping technique should end. I believe that officers who are careless in the performance of important duties involving more than a million dollars of property should be punished with the same expedition and severity that is administered to men in the ranks when they "yoo hoo" in the presence of golf-playing generals.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I gladly yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TRUMAN. It has been our experience that when we have discovered things of this sort either the officer has received an honorable discharge or he has been promoted for doing just what we have talked about here.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator from Missouri. I am glad to have the observation he has made, because it reflects just what we have found. Privates who "yoo hoo" in the presence of a general on the golf course are obliged to walk 14 miles as a penalty for that act; but when officers of the Army do with the taxpayers' money what has been done in this case, they receive as a penalty only a slap on the wrist and an admonition and a reprimand.

This argument of Mr. Patterson's is not new. We heard it more than a year ago—and I was glad to have the chairman's observation with respect to it—when the committee insisted that effective action should be taken to correct the unfortunate situation at Lockland, Ohio, where defective airplane engines were being produced. The War Department made every effort to minimize the seriousness of that situation and to create the impression that full corrective action had been taken. The fact was that the War Department never tore down and reinspected a single engine until after the committee's report, and that the court-martial proceedings against delinquent officers were delayed for many months. Recently good progress has been made, and the courts martial will start in April, over a year after the committee's investigation.

The committee and the Senate receive absolute word now that the Department will do nothing further with respect to what happened in the Detroit tool sale, although it is acting now, after a year, in respect to the other matter.

Instead of trying to overcome laziness and timidity of Army officers through persuasion and wrist slapping, I believe that the War Department should apply to timid and blundering officers some of that military discipline with which the men in the ranks are so familiar. Where they hesitate to do their plain duty for fear that they are incompetent and will blunder, I favor discharging them for incompetence. If they know that an officer's uniform will not protect them, they will get to work and do their jobs or get out. The sooner the Army is rid of such men the better for the Army, and the better for the people of the United States, and the better for a republican form of government.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4183, the War Department civil functions bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Quartermaster Corps—Cemeterial Expenses," on page 3, line 7, after the word "cemeteries" to strike out "$1,224,000" and insert "$1,859,240".

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator briefly explain the increase over the House figure?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The item carries an increase of $635,240 to pay the expenses of the location and improvement of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

Mr. WHITE. Is the cemetery one which has been previously approved?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Rivers and Harbors," on page 6, line 3, after the word "harbors" and the semicolon, to insert "for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized"; in line 19, after the word "law", to strike out "$46,800,000" and insert "$53,044,000"; and in line 25, after the word "by", to insert "another Federal agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 7, line 25, after the words "flood control", to strike out "$100" and insert "$400,100"; and on page 8, line 6, after the words "construction of", to strike out "authorized flood-control projects" and insert "flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 9, after the word "vehicles", to strike

out "$25,000,000" and insert "$26,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Panama Canal," on page 11, line 4, before the word "maintenance", to insert "purchase."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, by authority of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 25, after the word "repealed" and before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided,* That the provision contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942 (55 Stat. 320), concerning the acquisition of mineral rights owned by the Osage Tribe in lands to be acquired for the Hulah Dam and Reservoir project is hereby amended by adding the following: *'Provided,* That if just compensation cannot be agreed upon the Secretary of War may institute proceedings to condemn said mineral rights pursuant to existing laws: *Provided further,* That the construction of the dam may be commenced at any time after the institution of such proceedings.'"

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I assume that the notice required by the rule has been given in this instance; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct. Notice has been given.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to make inquiry in respect to beginning construction of the dam upon commencement of the proceedings, and as to whether provision has already been made so as to assure the persons interested that payment of damages will be made.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. That is the procedure followed by the Federal Government in acquiring property.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. But it is also important to know that the money is available, so that payment can be made.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am advised that the funds are now available.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate, will the Senator explain the general purpose of the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes. Congress has heretofore authorized construction of what is known as the Hulah Dam, a purely flood-control work. It is located just south of the Kansas line in the Osage Indian Reservation. The surface of the site is in private ownership, but the Osage Indians retained the mineral rights. To date the War Department has not been able to secure an agreement from the Indians with respect to the value of the mineral rights. In cases where agreements cannot be reached condemnation must be resorted to in order to secure possession of the property. In such cases it is the policy of the Department to have condemnation proceedings instituted, and to have appraisers on the court pass upon the value. That is the purpose of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I call up another amendment which has been printed and lies on the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 25, after the word "repealed" and before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: *"Provided further,* That food is hereby declared to be a war necessity: *Provided further,* That whenever, during the period of the present war, the War Food Administrator determines that there exists or threatens to exist a shortage of agricultural commodities which are essential to the successful prosecution of the war, the War Food Administrator shall investigate any irrigation project or flood-control or joint irrigation and flood-control project, which is under construction or the construction of which has been authorized, and for which funds have been appropriated, to ascertain if the completion of such project will increase the production of such agricultural commodities. If his investigation, in the light of the available manpower, material, and equipment, discloses that the project is feasible and the amount of increased production of agricultural commodities will warrant its completion, he shall make a finding to that effect and shall recommend, in the case of a project under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Reclamation, or, in the case of a project under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, to the Chief of Engineers, that such project be constructed or completed: *Provided further,* That upon receipt of a recommendation made by the War Food Administrator, as provided herein, the Commissioner of Reclamation, or the Chief of Engineers, as the case may be, shall proceed as provided by law with the completion or construction of such project: *Provided further,* That in the case of any flood control, irrigation, drainage, or joint irrigation and flood-control project referred to the War Production Board by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the War Food Administrator, the War Production Board shall have no authority to pass on the merits of said project but shall confine its jurisdiction over said project to passing upon the questions of the availability of materials and manpower: *And provided further,* That all agencies, departments, and bureaus of the Government are authorized and directed to assist the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers in all matters with respect to the completion or construction of any such project, to the end that the maximum supply of agricultural commodities may be produced at the earliest practicable date."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Let me again inquire whether, in connection with the amendment, the appropriate notice has been given regarding intention to move to suspend the rule?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It has. The notice now appears in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture has repeatedly served notice on the country that we not only face a food shortage but we actually have one. In connection with the hearings on the bill, the secretary of our committee asked the War Food Administrator to appear before the committee and testify with respect to the supply of food and with respect to what is being done to increase the supply. The War Food Administrator, Judge Marvin Jones, was unable to be present because of illness; but he sent his assistant, Mr. Edwin D. White. Mr. White testified, and his testimony appears, beginning at page 63 of the hearings. It reads, in part, as follows:

> There is a great need for food. The need is far beyond our ability to produce. Among the efforts being made by War Food Administration to increase the production of food is the effort to increase the crop area and to increase crop yields through drainage, irrigation, and flood-control works.
>
> The War Food Administration has during the past 12 months been engaged in investigating areas where there seems to be unusually good opportunities for increasing food production through irrigation, through drainage, and through flood-control measures.
>
> Many areas have been investigated and found to be good projects, good war food projects, if proposals for development were carried through.

On page 65 of the hearings we find that Mr. White again stated:

> The demand for food is far in excess of our ability to meet it.

During the hearing I, as chairman of the subcommittee, asked Mr. White the following question:

> What are the prospects of increasing food production during the coming year sufficiently so that this shortage will be eliminated?

Mr. White answered:

> That would be impossible.

So, Mr. President, it seems that whatever we may do in the way of increasing acreage and productivity, we shall not be able to produce all the food that is demanded. So the War Food Administration is recommending construction of such drainage projects—and there is one carried in this bill, on the Sangamon River—irrigation projects, and flood-control projects as the various agencies agree should be constructed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I take it—speaking most generously—that this is an effort to streamline the procedure which must be gone through before these projects can be undertaken and completed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think rather than being an effort to streamline the procedure, it is an effort to short-circuit the War Production Board. Is not the real purpose of the amendment not to streamline the procedure but to get around the rulings of the War Production Board?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is one respect in which the Senator's statement might be correct. The War Production Board was created within the Office for Emergency Management. The War Production Board has created certain committees under the general board. The Facilities and Review Committee was set up and such committee is about the third from the top. The Facilities and Review Committee assumes the power to investigate and pass upon the merits of projects recommended by the War Food Administration. The Appropriations Committee is of the opinion that neither the Facilities and Review Committee nor the War Production Board itself is authorized to exercise such broad power. If this third-degree committee has the power to veto an act of Congress, a recommendation of the War Food Administrator, a recommendation of the Director of Reclamation, or a recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, then, of course, we should know it. This third-degree committee or bureau is now holding up projects which the Congress has authorized and appropriated for and which are being recommended for immediate construction by the War Food Administration, by the Director of Reclamation, and by the Chief of Engineers in order to increase food production for our armed forces and for our people at home. Should this condition of affairs be permitted to remain then we already have bureaucracy running wild. The Congress has not delegated any such power to any agency or department of the Government.

The Constitution places upon the Congress the power and responsibility for declaring war and raising and maintaining armies and navies and certainly the feeding of the Army and Navy is a part of its maintenance. With the notice that we already have a food shortage the Congress should accept the responsibility of doing all it can to increase food production so that our soldiers, our workers, and our people at home may have all the food that can be produced.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. There is one other phase which I think should be emphasized, and that is that not only does the Facilities and Review Committee review recommendations of the Chief of Engineers, in the case of a flood-control project, where farm lands are being flooded, but it passes on the question whether the Chief of Engineers has devised a good scheme to prevent floods. In other words, it goes into engineering measures which the Chief of Engineers has undertaken for flood control and decides that he does not know his business, and that the kind of flood-control works proposed in the bill are not good, and therefore should not be constructed.

A flood-control project is approved by the Chief of Engineers. An irrigation project is approved by the Reclamation Service, which has been in existence for 40 years, and knows how to construct such projects. Those agencies pass upon the merits of the projects. In each case the committees of the House and the committees of the Senate have held hearings, and Congress has appropriated money, which is available for expenditure. In addition to saying that the Chief of Engineers or the head of the Reclamation Service does not know his business, the Facilities and Review Committee says that the Congress did not know its business when it appropriated the money to undertake projects which intrinsically, in the judgment of the Facilities and Review Committee, are not sound. That is going a little too far.

The gist of the amendment is in these words:

> The War Production Board shall have no authority to pass on the merits of said project, but shall confine its jurisdiction over such project to passing upon the questions of the availability of materials and manpower.

That is the only function of the War Production Board. If the materials and manpower are available, and such a finding is made by the War Production Board, we say that the work should proceed. By this amendment the Congress would express the opinion that the War Production Board should not overrule the engineering judgment of the Chief of Engineers, or the judgment of the Reclamation Service, and should not overrule the judgment of Congress when it appropriates money to build such projects.

I think that is a perfectly sound statement. The amendment seeks to confine the War Production Board to its proper jurisdiction. The only question it has to decide is whether the use of material or manpower would interfere with the conduct of the war. If it does, the project should not be built. If the War Production Board were to stop at that point, that would be all right; but it does not do so. It wants to look at the soil surveys and determine whether or not the soil can produce. In a case in Oklahoma it decided that the soil would not produce crops, and that therefore no money should be spent on the project. The Board said, "Why allocate materials to a place where the soil, as we look at it, is not good?" The Department of Agriculture, which knows more about soils than any other agency, approved the project, but the War Production Board decided that the soil was not good.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the statement of the able Senator from Oklahoma with respect to creating greater areas of tillable soil so that more food may be produced. I take it that is the ultimate purpose. Let me ask the Senator if there is any real need at this time for more tillable soil in this country for the production of crops?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There may not be need for more acres, but there is certainly need for more food. I think it is true that we are losing the fertility of the soil on much of our upland. I regret to say that that is largely true in my State of Oklahoma. Much of the upland has been plowed and replowed. To date practically no fertilizer has been used. The soils are being washed away into the Mississippi River, and the uplands are not as productive as they once were. So we are now turning our attention to the improvement of land in the river bottoms, but before that can be done with assurance we must provide some flood-control measures. In the western part of my State, which is semiarid, we are trying to develop some irrigation projects. We have one project which was created as an experimental project. It is located at Altus, in Jackson County, in southwestern Oklahoma. If that can be completed, and if it proves to be a success, and the farmers can increase their food production by putting water on the land, that project will be an experimental or demonstration project and will cause other similar projects to be built in that section. Speaking for myself, I see only three ways to increase food production, namely, first, irrigation, second, flood control to keep flood waters off the low lands, and third, improvement of the soil by terracing, fertilization, and rebuilding the soil.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The immediate effect of reclamation work is to benefit the locality where the reclamation work is done, and improve the fertility of the soil of farmers in the immediate locality. Let me invite the Senator's attention to the fact that it has not been very long since the farmers in very fertile sections of the country were limited in the amount of certain crops they might raise. I point that out because in this very session of Congress, before the Military Affairs Committee, the question was put to the Secretary of Agriculture as to whether that policy was to be continued. His answer was that he would rather not answer the question. He could not answer it at the time. Is it not a fact that even today there is curtailment of certain crops of farmers in fertile sections of the country?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I believe only one crop will be curtailed during 1944, and that is tobacco. There is no curtailment of any other crop that I know of, unless it be rice. I am not sure about rice. Rice is not grown in my section of the country. If the tobacco planters vote for control, there will be control of tobacco production this year. However, all other controls are lifted, and there are none in existence now, and so far as I know, none are contemplated. That leaves the farmers of

America free to grow any crop they wish during the current year. What will happen next year, of course, I am unable to say.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In discussing this question, the Senator from Oklahoma accepted a statement made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the effect that the War Production Board should be limited to jurisdiction over materials and manpower. Is it not the understanding of the Senator in charge of the bill that this amendment would entirely deprive the War Production Board of any authority, leave it without any vestige of authority? Is not that the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; I should have to answer that question in the negative, Mr. President. The Board would still have control over manpower necessary for the war effort because Mr. McNutt is on the War Production Board. The Board would still have control over materials and equipment necessary for the war effort. But there are localities where there is surplus labor, surplus materials, and surplus equipment. Of course, it is only in areas where there is ample manpower, material, and equipment that any of these projects are to be undertaken.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me refer to the language in the amendment dealing with the War Food Administrator? It reads as follows:

> If his investigation, in the light of the available manpower, material, and equipment, discloses that the project is feasible and the amount of increased production of agricultural commodities will warrant its completion, he shall make a finding to that effect and shall recommend, in the case of a project under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to the Commissioner of Reclamation, or, in the case of a project under the jurisdiction of the Chief of Engineers, War Department, to the Chief of Engineers, that such project be constructed or completed: *Provided further*, That upon receipt of a recommendation made by the War Food Administrator, as provided herein, the Commissioner of Reclamation, or the Chief of Engineers, as the case may be, shall proceed as provided by law with the completion or construction of such project.

Does not that language rather definitely put the authority on the War Food Administrator rather than on anyone else?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, no department would insist or even request the construction of a project unless there was available manpower, material, and equipment. In my State, for example, the Sheffield steel plant at Sand Springs makes only reinforcing steel. The record shows that the plant has on hand 3,500 tons of steel which it cannot sell. It has sufficient scrap and pig iron to make an additional 5,000 tons of reinforcing steel. That is all it makes. It has few if any orders. The record shows that unless some orders come to the plant, it will have to suspend operations and close down. We have in my State, for example, two large cement plants; one at Dewey and one at Ada. Officials of both have testified in the record, through telegrams, that the plants are running at only 30 or 40 percent of capacity. They have plenty of cement, but cannot sell it. They have ample manpower for making more cement. So, in my area there is plenty of lumber, plenty of cement, plenty of steel, and plenty of manpower.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not wish to pursue the subject; but, nevertheless, does it not come down to this that he is circuiting the War Production Board; and if this amendment should be agreed to, is it not true that the War Production Board would have absolutely nothing to say about these projects?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I do not take that viewpoint at all. The War Production Board still has control of manpower, steel, cement, lumber, and all the materials necessary for the war effort. If it makes an allocation of material or equipment for any project that comes first, then if there is a surplus, over and above what it needs, or if a surplus can be produced, over and above what it wants, then that surplus will be available for the Chief of Engineers or for the Reclamation Commissioner in the building of reclamation or flood-control projects in order to increase the production of food.

Mr. BRIDGES. Merely in order to make the record clear, will the Senator point out to me where in his amendment the War Production Board has authority to stop any project?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I read the language once. I will read it again.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the Senator did not read all of the language bearing on that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. I will read beginning where the Senator stopped. The language reads as follows:

> *Provided further*, That in the case of any flood control, irrigation, drainage, or joint irrigation, and flood-control project referred to the War Production Board—

It is assumed that all these projects will be referred to the War Production Board—

> by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, or the War Food Administrator, the War Production Board shall have no authority to pass on the merits of said project—

That is, whether it is a good or a bad project—

> but shall confine its jurisdiction over said project to passing upon the questions of the availability of materials and manpower.

That sets forth the jurisdiction. The War Production Board would have jurisdiction to pass on the two questions I have enumerated, namely, whether manpower is available and whether material is available. If it finds that the necessary manpower and material are not available the project cannot be built. If it finds they are available the project can be built. However, it would have no right, in the light of this amendment, to say that the Chief of Engineers did not know what he was talking about when he said that the dams could be built on the Arkansas River and would prevent floods along that stream in an area where a large part of the land has now been put out of production.

The last part of the amendment is a directive to all departments, agencies, and bureaus of the Government, and reads as follows:

> *And provided further*, That all agencies, departments, and bureaus of the Government are authorized and directed to assist the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers in all matters with respect to the completion or construction of any such project, to the end that the maximum supply of agricultural commodities may be produced at the earliest practicable date.

That language directs cooperation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose the War Production Board finds that the materials and manpower are available for the construction of an irrigation project or a flood-control development, but at the same time the War Production Board believes that that material and manpower are more essential for some other purpose. Would it then have the authority to determine for which purpose the available material and manpower are to be assigned?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is no doubt that the answer is in the affirmative. It would.

Mr. AIKEN. It would have power to do that, would it?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It certainly would.

Mr. AIKEN. That is all I wanted to know.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is contemplated to use only surplus materials on hand or surplus materials which may be produced in the construction of such projects.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator's statement has made it plain. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In line with the questions submitted by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] I merely wish to make the comment that the President's Food Conference, which has been functioning largely behind closed doors for the past year, is now advocating and stating that legislation is in process of completion to increase the plowed land of this country by 40,000,000 acres.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, has the Senator yielded the floor?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I wonder if the Senator will permit us to pass this bill while we have it before us? If one or two motions can be agreed to, I think we can complete consideration of the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to talk on a certain matter, and I prefer not to wait until action on the bill has been completed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

MAINTENANCE OF THE DIGNITY AND AUTHORITY OF CONGRESS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am a rock-ribbed Republican representing a rock-ribbed Republican State—and deeply proud of it. Yet today, for a brief hour, I wish I were sitting on the other side of the aisle, with the Democratic majority, so that no one might ascribe party motives to what I propose to say. I wish I knew how to erase the shadows of partisan interest that may be cast across my words by the suspicions of skeptics. Believe me, Mr. President, that I want most earnestly to speak from the heart, to detour politics, and hew close to the line of fundamental principles.

I ask for no special credit for this attitude. We are at a juncture in American history so decisive for the whole future of our Nation that it challenges the patriot in every American under the habiliments of partisanship. This is a time of sacrifice and travail when no honest man could look at himself in the mirror of a morning without wincing if he permitted partisan considerations to blur his sense of national interest.

Only a short time ago, the members of the Senate and the citizens of our great Republic were thrilled to the marrow by a demonstration of principle beyond partisanship. I refer to the occasion when the majority leader of the Senate moved us all to the quick because it was crystal clear that he spoke not as a New Dealer, nor an Old Dealer, not as a Democrat, not even as a Senator. He spoke in a capacity that surpasses all of these—he spoke as an American.

He felt it necessary to defend the honor and the integrity of the Congress of the United States against shocking accusations by the President of the United States. It was for him a particularly harsh task because he had for so many years served ably and faithfully, whether in fair or foul political weather, as the President's spokesman in the Senate. Americans everywhere were quick to feel the drama of our colleague's action. It is devoutly to be hoped that they will not be slow to understand its deeper meaning. They will grasp, I trust, that in defending the dignity and integrity of Congress, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was not protecting us as individuals. His primary purpose, I feel sure, was to protect the legislative branch of our Federal Government, for he knows it to be the heart of American democracy.

If it were true, as the President has charged in his veto of the tax bill and on too many previous occasions, that the Congress is not a genuinely representative body but an instrument of greed and special privilege, it would mean that our democracy is corrupt at its heart, and each of us in his private conscience, knows that to be profoundly untrue. To doubt the integrity of Congress is to doubt the health and vigor of our whole system of government.

Mr. President, Congress is a human, all too human, institution. It makes mistakes. Sometimes it stumbles and fumbles under the sheer weight of its responsibilities. Often it pays in a lack of efficiency for its highly representative character—a price that democracy must be willing to pay in order to remain democratic.

I do not for a moment contend that Congress is or should be immune to criticism; but I insist that there is all the difference in the world between principled criticism and unprincipled attack. In recent years, unhappily, Congress has had to contend not merely with honest and legitimate strictures on its judgments, but with calculated assaults on its essential honesty. Whether those responsible intended it or not, they have in effect spread corroding doubts as to the usefulness of this institution—a most serious matter in a period when democratic government is under fire throughout the world.

It is one thing to examine and take exception to the conduct of the legislative branch of our constitutional government. It is quite another thing to emasculate its functions, to undermine its influence and to chip away its constitutional powers, duties and prerogatives, one after another. What is involved in the prolonged and increasingly serious friction between the executive and the legislative households of our Government is nothing less than the survival of the American system of democracy of the kind we have known and revered since it was fashioned by the founding fathers.

Let no one light-mindedly forget that wherever people's government gives way to arbitrary and dictatorial government by groups, the process begins by whittling down the prestige and the functions of the elected legislature. The core of the problem is not, as superficial observers assume, whether Congress or the Executive is "right" or "wrong" in a given conflict of authority. Reduced to its simplest terms, the question raised by political events in the past three administrations is this:

Shall Congress continue to make the laws of the land or shall that central task be transferred, in large measure if not entirely, to the Executive? Shall Congress, as the most direct and most sensitive instrument of the popular will, be permitted to play its constitutional role, or shall it be reduced and degraded into a blotter for the thoughts and wishes and purposes of the executive branch?

Let us be forewarned, Mr. President: If Congress, whether by connivance with the Executive or by default, loses the full force of its law-making functions, American democracy is finished. I am weighing my words, Mr. President. I dare pose the matter so sharply because I consider the issue too vital for double-talk and evasion. What we have witnessed in these critical years is not simply an attempt of the Executive to influence and shape legislation. It has been, in effect, a consistent attempt by the Executive to legislate.

Through the mechanisms of Executive orders, arbitrary edicts by appointive officials, directives flowing in tumultuous abundance from the various executive agencies, decisions have been made which have the force and the function of law. Repeatedly the Executive has sought to accomplish by administrative fiat results that have not been authorized—or that have been specifically rejected—by Congress.

There are some in our midst, I know, who remain indifferent to this process of siphoning off the legitimate constitutional powers and prerogatives of Congress because they happen to approve the social or political objectives of the Executive. I can only marvel at such tragic short-sightedness. These men, most of them patriotic and highminded, evidently have not paused to consider that a basic principle of government is involved. They forget that powers seized and exercised today by their political friends might, tomorrow or the day after, be exercised by their political enemies.

When someone engages in robbery, we do not excuse it on the ground that he will make better use of the proceeds of his crime than the original owner of the property. It is equally fantastic to excuse diversion of congressional functions to administrative channels on the ground that the Executive "knows better" than the people's Congress. Once such diversion is tolerated, the whole democratic American structure is endangered.

Congress itself, of course, must share the blame for the fact that more and yet more blank-check powers have been concentrated in Executive hands. This body has been hasty and occasionally frivolous in the complacency with which it relegated functions and tied its own hands. The process of Executive concentration of authority beyond anything known in the past was far and dangerously advanced at the time we declared war on the Axis. Since then the exigencies of war, unavoidably, have accelerated that process.

The very circumstance, however, that Congress has itself, through the action of a majority of its Members, been guilty in this matter makes it that much more imperative for Congress to undo the mischief. We must devote ourselves without delay to the all-important job of retrieving the congressional authority that has been siphoned off. Calmly but resolutely we must reexamine every blank check and set a reasonable and safe limit upon the amount to which it can be drawn.

We have unfortunately delegated many powers without clearly defined administrative standards. Other powers have been so expanded in the course of use that their present exercise is miles beyond the original intent of the Congress. The teeming commissions and bureaus and administrative offices which batten and fatten on these snowballing powers must therefore be carefully checked by Congress with a view to their elimination or rigid regulation. Executive powers and the officers exercising

them must simply be brought into line. They cannot be permitted to run wild.

We are all aware of the unprecedented extent to which the President has concentrated the spending power of this Government in Executive hands. What makes his recent veto of the tax bill, and especially the strange language in which it was couched, so significant and so alarming, is that it raises the danger of Presidential concentration of the taxing power as well.

But each of us knows, and the country knows, that the control of the Nation's purse strings must remain firmly in the grip of Congress. To do less than to retain that control is to court disaster. The to-do about the tax veto was therefore both justified and wholesome. We cannot permit the present President, or any President, whether we get a new deal or a new deck, to intrude upon the taxing and spending functions of Congress.

Let me give one sidelight on this subject while I am at it. The President, it will be recalled, blamed upon Congress the fact that tax-return forms are so long and confusing. I want to say that this sort of complaint comes with ill grace from that source. It happens that executive agencies are the worst and most incorrigible offenders in the department of red tape, complicated forms, contradictory directives, official confusion, and sheer bureaucratic stupidity. Any businessman who has had occasion to deal with Government will tell how his days have been embittered and his nights made sleepless by red tape and form filling. Yet it is the executive branch, from the depths of a jungle land of paper forms which has become its natural habitat, that seeks to unload on Congress the blame for tax complexities.

The greatest danger that confronts the American democratic system at this time is that powers handed to certain administrative bodies for definite purposes, and for what we thought were specific periods of time, may be exercised too long, or even in perpetuity. Because it is the greatest danger it is also the greatest challenge to our sense of vigilance.

Official agencies have a tendency to entrench themselves and perpetuate themselves. That is human nature, and, more to the point, that is in the nature of power itself. Authority loaned for a given time becomes a habit. It takes on the psychology of permanence. Rare, indeed, is the administrative body that can be left free to fix its own life span. The emergency which may have brought it into being somehow is never liquidated. If we are to restore to Congress the full measure of its constitutional functions, then it is of particular importance to set a term upon each and every major power we have delegated to the Executive in recent years.

In all the discussion about demobilization and reconversion after the Axis has been securely beaten, there has been strangely little or no reference to demobilizing wartime powers of executive government, and reconverting our democratic processes to peacetime purpose. Yet, in the nature of the case, it would be ludicrous if we left it to those who wield wartime authority to decide when they should give it up.

Already, here and there, one hears the cute suggestion that the war will not be "really over" when the Axis surrenders and hostilities cease. The war emergency, some hint, will not be ended until peace treaties are finally signed and sealed.

However, in all directives, and in most Executive orders containing it, the phrase "for the duration" is open to any interpretation. A common-sense view might very well be that "for the duration" means until the end of hostilities, but it is already rumored in palace-guard circles that "for the duration" means until actual peace treaties are signed with those powers on whom we have declared war. But these peace treaties might not be signed for years. This time peace terms may be worked out on a pragmatic, piece-meal, experimental basis over a long period of time. Unless we clearly define what we mean by "the duration," we may suddenly wake up and discover that the executive board and wartime powers of the Chief Executive will go on for years.

Are the President, the W. P. B., the W. L. B., and the rest of the alphabet bureaus, to continue sending forth thousands of directives with the force of law long after hostilities are over? Is our economy to remain in its wartime strait jacket or some new one that may be designed by these bureaus, until the official guardians themselves decide when, if ever, to release us? That certainly was not the intent of Congress in voting wartime authorities to the administration.

It seems to me, and to many others, Mr. President, of the utmost importance that Congress should apply itself without further delay to the urgent problem of setting a juridical terminus upon all wartime powers. We dare not, if we value our constitutional government, leave any margins of doubt or any unclarity on this matter.

I propose, therefore, before long to join in introducing legislation with the purpose of defining the time element in all war powers, and setting a clear and unequivocal limitation on the exercise of those powers. I believe Congress should act on this matter before it becomes another football to be kicked around by the partisans of expanded and well-nigh unlimited executive authority. I believe that our definition should be sufficiently lucid and simple to avoid the risks and delays of interpretation by the courts.

Administrative agencies, unfortunately, have a tremendous capacity for growth. They sink deep roots into political and economic life and are not easily uprooted. Also, these agencies become convenient receptacles into which the Executive can dump more powers and authorities as the need arises.

Within these last weeks, for example, we have seen how some of the excellent and worthy suggestions made by Mr. Bernard Baruch, in connection with restoring the Nation to normal life when the emergency is ended, have been parcelled out—on a kind of subcontract basis—to existing agencies. Nothing I say should be construed as criticism of the Baruch proposals per se. There is real merit in both the objectives he has sought and the methods for attaining them that he has indicated.

The alarming aspect of the business, however, is that it has been undertaken, and is in the process of being carried out, without the consent or cooperation of Congress. On the contrary, the project was initiated in direct competition of Congress, which has started the machinery for similar purposes. Again, it is not a question as to whether the executive or the legislative branch can produce a better plan. The question is whether the authority vested in the people through Congress shall be taken over arbitrarily by the Executive.

I submit, Mr. President, that we cannot afford to take this whole subject of the dignity and functions of Congress lightly. Under the whiplash of the President and his palace guard, Congress has at moments been inclined to cringe and apologize. In the unfortunate and inexcusable competition with the Executive, all the disadvantages are on the side of Congress. This branch of the Government is large, and in some respects unwieldy. It does not possess those great organizations of press agents, those high-powered legions of public relations men, who continually and by every device of advertising and propaganda sell and often oversell to the American public every administrative action and policy. The Executive can make up its mind on any issue in the privacy of the President's chambers, in consultation with a few hand-picked brain trusters. Congress, by contrast, must consult out loud, it must search its conscience through the difficult democratic processes of public debate.

Congress is a numerous and variegated body, but in its size and in its variety is its democratic strength. I for one would not trade an iota of its representative character for seeming unity and seeming efficiency. Our Congress includes men and women from every section and every corner of this great land, men and women who, taken together, reflect every extreme of opinion and prejudice, every social and economic segment of our immense and multisided population. However unwieldy the process of its formulation of laws and policies may seem, it comes nearer to reflecting the amorphous and sometimes contradictory will of the over-all electorate than any other governmental body devised by the mind of man.

At a time when national unity is of such paramount value, it is truly heartbreaking that an unprecedented competition in the domain of legislation should have been set up by the executive branch of the Government. It is deeply to be deplored that attacks not only on the actions but on the intentions of Congress should have become almost second nature for the President and a portion of his political entourage. I am thoroughly convinced that the balance can be restored, unity achieved, not by appeasement of the President, but by ordered and self-respecting restoration of

the full rights and total functions of Congress.

To the Members of the Senate, Mr. President, and to the country at large, I want to say: Do not sell Congress short. Congress, despite its shortcomings, is the truest mirror of the American people.

The pernicious sport of Congress-baiting has been encouraged in these years by Americans who should know better and perhaps do know better. They have not scrupled to resort to ridicule, vilification, moral abuse. Some months ago I read an article on Congress by the eminent historian, Prof. Charles A. Beard. After citing some ripe samples of the abuse against Congress, Professor Beard wrote:

> If such statements are true, then representative government is dead in the United States. And more ominous still, the people of the United States, who elect these Senators and Representatives, are incapable of self-government. In that case, what have we to look forward to except one-man tyranny of some variety?

Of course, he denied that those accusations had any truth in them, and concluded with words that sum up what I have tried to convey today:

> The faults of our Congress—
>
> Professor Beard wrote—
>
> are in the last analysis our faults. We cannot kill off Congress without committing suicide as a democratic nation. We cannot hamstring Congress without hamstringing our own American civilization. American talents should be concentrated on the problem of maintaining and improving constitutional government in America—the most precious institution of liberty, the most certain bulwark against servitude that we as a people possess.

The way back to congressional government will be long and hard, but we cannot regain our self-respect and fulfill our democratic destiny unless we retrace our steps. There is more bogus "indispensability" per square foot in Washington than there is per square mile in the rest of workaday America. Every bureaucrat by this time has vested interest in his job and his power, and will resist the effort to prove that he is really a squatter living by grace of Executive order and the carelessness of this Congress.

I wish to conclude as I began, with the expression of the earnest hope that the issues I have raised will be treated as I intended them, in a truly nonpartisan spirit. There can be no party lines on a problem as crucial as the restoration of congressional government. I propose, Mr. President, to dedicate my best energies in the 5 years I have still to serve in the Senate to the restoration of the dignity of Congress and its protection against Executive encroachment. I propose to persevere in this effort whether the present Chief Executive is reelected or not; whether the White House is occupied by a Democrat or by a member of my own party.

I regard the reestablishment of the full functions of Congress as the most important single domestic problem facing the American people, and I know that many of my colleagues in the Senate share this view. I call upon you all to join with me in a crusade to safeguard congressional government without reference to party or to differences on other issues. Only thus can we leave our own Republic as we found it, a government of three coordinated branches working in unity and harmony under the genius of our Constitution.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], on page 8, line 25.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 4183) was passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BROOKS conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, from the Committee on Commerce:

William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice W. L. Clayton, resigned.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the Clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 13, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 9 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

Leland B. Morris, of Pennsylvania, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

Orme Wilson, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 assigned to the Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Haiti.

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now serving as counselor of Embassy at Madrid, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, now serving as counselor of Embassy at Habana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., of California, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iran, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iceland.

Gen. Thomas Holcomb, of Delaware, United States Marine Corps, retired, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

Kenneth S. Patton, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Calcutta, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John J. Morris, Jr., of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the District of

Delaware, vice Charles Stewart Lynch, term expired.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Lipe Henslee, of Dickson, Tenn., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Tennessee, in place of Joe F. Hale.

James P. Finnegan, of St. Louis, Mo., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri, in place of Robert E. Hannegan, resigned.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Col. Walter G. Farrell to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 25th day of November 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of August 1943:

Frank C. Caldwell, a citizen of South Carolina.

John T. McFadden, Jr., a citizen of California.

William C. Hawkins, a citizen of South Carolina.

Platoon Sgt. Ralph M. Sudnick, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 11th day of August 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943:

John C. Landrum, a citizen of Georgia.

John L. Bricker, a citizen of Minnesota.

Staff Sgt. Billy E. Horner, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 3d day of November 1943.

David W. Ketler, a citizen of Pennsylvania, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of December 1943.

Charles Toma, Jr., a citizen of Ohio, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 9 (legislative day of February 7), 1944.

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

George L. Brandt
C. Porter Kuykendall

TO BE CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

John F. Stone

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Infantry

First Lt. William Myers Kasper

To Air Corps

First Lt. John Jacob Stark
Second Lt. Boyd Blaine Chambers, Jr.
Second Lt. Edward Lawrence Corcoran
Second Lt. Carroll Bernard McElroy
Second Lt. James Harper Walker
Second Lt. Ben Marshall West

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant generals

Courtney Hicks Hodges
Richard Kerens Sutherland
Raymond Albert Wheeler
John Clifford Hodges Lee

To be major generals

Charles Love Mullins, Jr.
Paul Ramsey Hawley
Edmund Bristol Gregory
Junius Wallace Jones
Edmond Harrison Leavey
Hugh Johnston Knerr
Charles Carl Chauncey
Leslie Richard Groves
Laurence Sherman Kuter
William Moses Goodman
Howard Arnold Craig
David Goodwin Barr
Howard Kendall Loughry
James Millikin Bevans
Curtis Emerson LeMay
Robert Battey McClure
Bennett Edward Meyers
George Clark Dunham
Roderick Random Allen
Cecil Ray Moore
George Jacob Richards
Robert Wells Harper
Daniel Noce
Hugh John Casey

To be brigadier generals

Whitfield Putnam Shepard
Everett Ernest Brown
Joseph Jones Twitty
Russell Alger Wilson
George Clement McDonald
Royal Bertrand Lord
Jesse Auton
Morris Williams Gilland
Charles Orval Thrasher
Murray Clarke Woodbury
Ewart Gladstone Plank
Joseph Franklin Battley
Charles Yawkey Banfill
Donald Reuben Goodrich
Edward Wharton Anderson
Ray Henry Clark
Theodore Morrison Osborne
Albert Daniel Smith
Isaac William Ott
Frank Otto Bowman
Arthur Thomas
Fremont Byron Hodson
William Horace Hobson
Francis Hopkinson Griswold
Charles Pearre Cabell
Edward Michael Powers
Thomas Edison Roderick
Condon Carlton McCornack
Harry Briggs Vaughan
Norris Brown Harbold
Joseph Pescia Sullivan
Duncan Grant Richart
Lewis Andrew Pick
August Walter Kissner
Emmett O'Donnell, Jr.
Terence John Tully
Aubry Lee Moore
Arthur John McChrystal
John Franklin Egan
Robert Duane Knapp
Bartlett Beaman
Clarence Lemar Burpee

POSTMASTERS

MARYLAND

James J. Hadaway, Chestertown.

NORTH DAKOTA

Alfred O. Fosness, Forest River.
Noble O. Julson, Plaza.

PENNSYLVANIA

Hazle Houseberg, East Bangor.
Amelia Teuchert, Milmont Park.
A. Blanche McClain, Picture Rocks.
George Ed. Reed, Vanderbilt.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sophie F. Poston, Johnsonville.

VERMONT

Sergio Pasetto, Barre.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name be glory and honor. Awaken in us a full realization of our inheritance and make known Thy providence in guiding the destiny of our Republic. As we walk humbly among men, we pray Thee to keep us true and undaunted in our labors to maintain those institutions upon which it must forever rest for its perpetuity.

Blessed Lord, at times we are silent and bewildered; take Thou our chilled hearts and our determined wills and mold them in responsive devotion and obedience. Whatever may betide us, whatever fails us, grant that it shall not dim the insignia of our responsibility. When sorrow comes, teach us how to use it and impress us that the human heart is built for trouble that always comes with the years; when disappointment clouds the day, forbid that it should weigh us down. Nothing of great worth can be accomplished with half a mind, with a faint heart nor with a lame endeavor. Almighty God, bless us with that glorious release—liberty of faith, liberty of conscience, and freedom for all—and Thou shalt have the praise. We pray in the name of Him who is the consummation of our love and hope. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MARCH 8, 1944.

The Honorable The SPEAKER,
The House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. JAMES H. TORRENS as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Twenty-first Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Joseph A. Gavagan, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TORRENS appeared at the Bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram from a citizen of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Bill Cunningham which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald on February 20, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made before the Committee on Roads by the State Highway Commissioner of South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter written by the Secretary of the Interior to Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, dated July 6, in relation to Senate Report No. 310.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

FARM IMPLEMENTS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed at a statement put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator REYNOLDS concerning the proposal of Governor Lehman as Administrator of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation program, to send farm implements and repairs to foreign nations under the present conditions in this country today. My people in Montana are complaining bitterly and have been for over a year on account of the fact that they cannot get needed farm machinery to harvest their crops. It is impossible to get help as farm help has disappeared in the main. Consequently, they must have machinery with which to harvest their crops or else they will have to quit. It is proposed by Governor Lehman to send hay rakes, hay mowers, both horse and power; sugar-beet diggers, threshing machines, tractors, and nearly every other farm implement together with repairs, when we are denied in this country those very things which are necessary for the production and harvesting of our crops. The report of the Truman committee recently filed shows an acute condition with reference to farm machinery and equipment. In the face of this, we are sending these needed implements out of the country.

I know of one county in Montana that produces in the neighborhood of 50,000 tons of native hay aside from alfalfa, that was allotted 1 year ago two hay rakes and one mowing machine. How in the name of God, facing this condition, can we as sensible people follow such a policy and such actions as Governor Lehman is doing? The question arises in my mind just what kind of damned fools are we getting to be.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Did the gentleman vote for U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I made a motion to cut it down one-half, and the Members on the gentleman's side did not vote for it.

Mr. REED of New York. But the gentleman voted for it?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I voted for it in the end, but I tried to cut it in two, on the theory that no such insane things would be done like I am addressing the House about today—by the Administrator of the program.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by Dr. James H. Cotter, a distinguished citizen of my home town, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter written to me by Purl Willis on Indian affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial which has appeared in most of the newspapers of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish the attention of the gentleman from Montana, who just finished sobbing and squawking because the farmers in his district and State are not able to get farm machinery because U. N. R. R. A. was planning to send so much farm machinery abroad. The gentleman voted for the establishment of the U. N. R. R. A. and the authorization of $1,350,000,000 of the——

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. The gentleman voted for the money. What did he expect?

Mr. O'CONNOR. How did the gentleman vote on the amendment I offered to cut that amount in two?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I voted against the whole thing, lock, stock, and barrel, because I knew from former actions and from my knowledge of those in charge what they were going to do—that the money would be used to aid foreigners before our own farmers were supplied.

Mr. O'CONNOR. How did the gentleman vote on my amendment?

Mr. HOFFMAN. On the gentleman's amendment? I would not cut out just half of it; I would take it all away. Why is not the gentleman consistent?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why did not the gentleman vote to cut it in two? If that amendment had carried, it would have stopped such foolishness as we are talking about; but, frankly, no one dreamed that we would send needed farm machinery to foreign countries.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Cut it in two? I voted to wipe it all out.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial that appeared in this morning's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the use of aircraft in connection with the merchant marine and to include therein certain quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Federal grants.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OUR AMPHIBIOUS FORCES

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GRANT of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IN THE MATTER OF POLICYHOLDERS, WAR-DAMAGE INSURANCE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Robert B. McGaw.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a

speech I delivered before the Real Estate Board of Kansas City, Mo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an excerpt from an address delivered by my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ELMER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from the secretary of State of Mississippi, and also a copy of the absentee voters' law recently passed by the legislature of that State and signed by the Governor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FARM PRODUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. CARRIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks and include a letter addressed to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CARRIER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

A RECORD IN MADISON COUNTY, N. C.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some talk this morning about the farmer. I happened to see a few minutes ago an article about a farmer in my district, Mr. J. B. Wallin, who lives in the mountains of western North Carolina on Marshall R. F. D., Madison County. I have not the time to go into it fully, but let me show you what he and his wife did with 60 acres of land last year. The record shows that they marketed 39,017 pounds of milk, 5,379 pounds of broilers and other chickens, and 6,003 dozen eggs. They also produced 3,566 pounds of burley tobacco, and in addition followed a good live-at-home program, with plenty of fruits and vegetables which they also produced.

Mr. Wallin, said—quoted in the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C.—lately:

It is a revelation of what a will-to-win and hard work and resourcefulness can do in increasing food and feed production on the average farm.

He also said:

Any sacrifice I may make in producing milk, eggs, and poultry here on my farm, is small compared with the sacrifices our boys are making all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, my friend Mr. Wallin is a great American.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Allen, Ill.	Harless, Ariz.	Pfeifer
Andersen, H. Carl	Harness, Ind.	Plumley
Angell	Hays	Pracht, C. Frederick
Baldwin, Md.	Heffernan	Pratt, Joseph M.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hendricks	Ramspeck
Bell	Hobbs	Randolph
Bennett, Mich.	Holifield	Rees, Kans.
Buckley	Horan	Rodgers, Pa.
Buffett	Howell	Sabath
Burgin	Jarman	Satterfield
Byrne	Jennings	Scott
Camp	Johnson, Calvin D.	Shafer
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, J. Leroy	Short
Chapman	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Simpson, Pa.
Chenoweth	Jones	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Jonkman	Smith, W. Va.
Costello	Kelley	Stefan
Courtney	Klein	Stewart
Cox	Knutson	Stockman
Davis	Landis	Taylor
Dawson	LeCompte	Treadway
Dingell	LeFevre	Vinson, Ga.
Domengeaux	McGehee	Voorhis, Calif.
Douglas	McKenzie	Vorys, Ohio
Elliott	Madden	Vursell
Ellsworth	Maloney	Wadsworth
Feighan	Manasco	Welchel, Ohio
Ford	Merrow	Wene
Fuller	Morrison, La.	West
Fulmer	Morrison, N. C.	Whelchel, Ga.
Furlong	Mott	Wilson
Gale	Mundt	Winter
Gallagher	Murray, Wis.	
Gamble	Norman	
Gifford	O'Leary	
Gilchrist	O'Toole	
Hall, Leonard W.		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 322 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FURTHER APPROPRIATIONS FOR INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 466) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the study, inquiry, and investigation authorized by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and House Resolution 52 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, not to exceed $50,000, in addition to the unexpended balances of sums made available during the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses for conducting the study, inquiry, and investigation authorized by said House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of privilege.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I read from an article which appeared in the Beaumont Enterprise, the principal paper in my congressional district, on March 6. This article also appeared in many of the leading newspapers in the United States, having been sent out by the United Press:

DIES COMMITTEE ABOLITION ASKED BY LAWYERS' GUILD—PAVING OF WAY FOR FASCISM IN UNITED STATES DECLARED TO BE OBJECTIVE OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES UNIT

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Demanding that Congress abolish the Dies committee, the National Lawyers' Guild charged tonight that Chairman MARTIN DIES, Democrat, of Texas, and his House cohorts, JOHN E. RANKIN, Democrat, of Mississippi, and HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, are seeking to pave the way for fascism in the United States.

In a letter to all House Members the Guild's executive secretary, Martin Popper, charged that that trio is attempting to sabotage the war aims of the United Nations during an election year in the hope that confusion and chaos will result in the election of a Government and Congress subservient to their un-American objectives. Contending that the Dies group has functioned not as an agent of Congress but as the American proponents of the Hitler vicious anti-Comintern, Popper said: "When DIES' activities are joined to the anti-Semitic, anti-Negro tirades of his close collaborator, Congressman RANKIN, and to Congressman HOWARD SMITH'S efforts to destroy the functioning of decisive war agencies——

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has gone far enough to establish a question of privilege.

Mr. DIES. I also want to read very briefly from a letter sent to every Member of Congress by the political action committee of the C. I. O., as follows:

The Dies committee is invested with the authority to investigate subversive and un-American activities. DIES has done little in the sphere to which Congress confined him. Instead, he has earned and received the blessing and praise of such characters as Fritz Kuhn, imprisoned Nazi bund leader; William Dudley Pelley, the imprisoned Silver Shirt leader, and a score of other good friends of fascism.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I regret the necessity of trespassing upon your time for the purpose of answering these malicious charges as well as many other malicious charges that are being circulated throughout the country not only against me but against the majority of the Members of this House. I have hesitated for a long time to make this speech,

but it has become obvious day by day that there is a well-organized, concerted, and highly financed campaign to smear the majority of the Members of the Congress of the United States.

When Sabotage was published and received its first Nation-wide plug from Mr. Winchell, and then when Under Cover was published and became immediately the best seller by reason of the extensive publicity which it received by radio commentators and certain newspapers, I had occasion to carefully investigate both of these books and their authors. I thought perhaps, having published these books, those who were responsible for their publication would be content to rest their case; however, recently they have been sending throughout the country book reviewers who are appearing in my State, who pretend to review the book as a pretext to launch a vicious attack against me, questioning my patriotism and my sincerity.

Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a very prominent citizen which will illustrate the point I want to make. I see no necessity to read his name; however, I may say he is a public official in the county of Freestone, where my grandfather and my grandmother are buried and where my father grew from boyhood to manhood. This letter will illustrate the kind of campaign which is now being conducted against me in the State of Texas and in many of the cities of this country for the purpose of convincing uniformed people that the committee I have the honor to head as chairman is engaged in spreading fascism in the United States or that it is anti-Semitic or that it is anti-Negro. This letter is from a Legionnaire, and, as I said, a county official:

DEAR BUDDY: Recently a Miss Evelyn Oppenheimer, of Dallas, Tex., gave a review of the book Under Cover at a local theater, sponsored by the Methodist ladies. In this review she made a lot of statements I do not believe, but one was that your committee had aided the Fascist groups in the United States. Could you give me any information on Miss Oppenheimer or John Carlson, who wrote the book Under Cover. I have not read the book in question. She also charged that a Texas Representative and a Texas Senator are aiding the America First people, which include a lot of eastern Congressmen, Henry Ford, Lindbergh, and others.

Mr. Speaker, recently in the city of Detroit, Harry Bridges, a prominent figure in the Political Action Committee of the C. I. O., made a vicious attack upon Members of Congress. I wish to read his exact words, which he has not repudiated. Harry Bridges said:

There are more Hitler agents to the square inch in Congress than there are to the square mile in Detroit.

That, Mr. Speaker, is only an isolated instance of the kind of propaganda that is being deliberately spread by the political action committee, the Lawyers Guild, the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and many other Communist-controlled organizations. In their publications, pamphlets, and through their speakers they charge that the majority of the Members on both sides of this aisle are the agents of Hitler. They accuse us of being appeasers and of secretly wanting a Nazi-Japanese victory. Because of these statements made by the spokesmen for one of the large labor organizations in the United States, an organization that is now busily engaged in raising $2,000,000 by levying a tribute upon the workers who are compelled to belong to that organization in order to retain their jobs, I feel that it is high time that as the agent of the committee I answer in detail some of these charges and that I should explain to the House that behind this concerted attack today is a sinister force. It is the result of a carefully thought-out scheme for the deliberate purpose of undermining the confidence of the American people in the parliamentary system of government.

Mr. Speaker, in every totalitarian country it has been invariably true that the enemies of democracy have resorted first to the tactics of undermining the confidence and respect of the people in parliamentary government. The Bolshevists, the Nazis, the Fascists, all of these groups who believe in totalitarianism in one form or the other, denounce parliamentary government as futile and as inefficient, and in every country where they have triumphed, they have first attacked successfully the parliamentary system. I wish that it were possible for the Members of this House to read, as I have read, some of the scurrilous attacks that have been made by hundreds of so-called labor leaders in the C. I. O. and by heads of some of these so-called progressive organizations upon the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that we on the Democratic side and those on the Republican side do not always agree with our own colleagues, but I believe that it will be generally conceded that we all have respect for the integrity, the patriotism, and the sincerity of those with whom we disagree. Some of the colleagues on my side of the aisle violently disagree with me, yet they are my personal friends. We have never permitted disagreements on a matter of policy or a matter of politics to cause us to engage in bitter attack one upon another.

First, let me deal with the Lawyers Guild so that I may dispose of it and let the House know the character of men who have made this attack upon me and these other gentlemen of the House. From time to time we have exposed the Lawyers Guild as a Communist-dominated organization. When we first exposed the Lawyers Guild as controlled by the Communist Party, we were bitterly assailed and yet immediately thereafter Robert Jackson, who was then Attorney General, now upon the Supreme Court, withdrew his membership from the organization because, as he said, it was clearly controlled by Communists and he would have nothing to do with it. Mr. Adolf Berle, an outstanding liberal, likewise withdrew his membership from the organization for the same reason. Judge Pecora also denounced the organization as Communist-controlled and stated that he could no longer affiliate himself with it.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most conclusive proof of the nature of this organization which has so many representatives in key positions in this Government as I shall show in the course of my speech is for us to consider for a moment the national president of the organization and the national executive officer. Rob-W. Kenney is national president of the guild. Martin Popper is national executive secretary. Surely these two men may properly be considered the ones who hold the key positions in the Guild. Now, look at the facts. Martin Popper was a member of the seditious and potentially treasonable American Peace Mobilization group. He was present as a delegate at the Chicago convention which launched the American Peace Mobilization movement. From the convention he sent a telegram to the President of the United States in which he denounced the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill as "unconstitutional and as representing a violent upheaval in the social, political, and economic life of our country." That telegram was obviously the voice of the Communist Party couched in the language which the party was speaking at the time. I do not need to say more at this time on the Communist affiliations of Martin Popper, although his Communist record is a much more extensive one.

Robert W. Kenney, national president of the Lawyers Guild, was a member of the national committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy. The seditious and potentially treasonable character of the American League was fully exposed by our committee many years ago. The league's platform included the following plank:

To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transport of munitions in time of peace or war, and in time of war the transport of all other materials essential to the conduct of war through mass demonstrations, picketing, and strikes.

That leaves no question on the seditious affiliations of the president of the Lawyers Guild.

In Washington, D. C., there are some 700 members of the National Lawyers Guild. Overwhelmingly, these Guild members here in the Nation's Capital are employees of the Federal Government. As is the case nationally, so here the Lawyers Guild is under the domination of Communists.

Later in my speech, if the House will have the patience to permit me to develop this subject fully, I shall show that the American Peace Mobilization was completely dominated by members and leaders of the Communist Party. I will show that it encouraged strikes and stoppages of work in factories and plants in the United States, that it went on record advocating that all workers in the United States should refuse to work in any industry that was engaged in supplying munitions or implements of war to England and the other besieged democracies at that time.

The ladies and gentlemen of this House will recall that the American Peace Mobilization picketed the White House, that they accused the President of the United States of being a warmonger. You will recall, however, that when Hitler invaded Russia there was immediately a change of policy on the part of the leaders of the American

Peace Mobilization. I shall show you in the course of my speech, if I have the time, that many of the leaders of the political action committee of the C. I. O. were the moving spirits behind the American Peace Mobilization; that, as a matter of fact, you can take the roster of the leading prominent actors in this political action smear campaign, and it reads almost the same as the leaders of the American Peace Mobilization.

Mr. Speaker, here is the National Lawyers Guild, with 800 of its members holding Government positions in the city of Washington, and here is the political action committee with 500 keymen identified with Communist organizations, the majority of whom were denouncing me and other Members of Congress because we voted for lend-lease, for conscription, for measures of preparedness to equip this country with the matériel, and implements of war necessary to defend our very lives. At that time we were called warmongers. Today the same forces, Joe Curran and Mike Quill, and all of them that I shall deal with in the course of my speech, are denouncing not only me and the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Virginia but, as I shall show, the majority of the Members of this Congress as being agents of Hitler, as being Fascists who are seeking to destroy democratic government.

Of course, the fact that fascism has been defined by Mussolini to be everything for the state, nothing outside the state, and nothing against the state; in other words, a highly centralized government, the fact that the majority of us have consistently opposed the trend toward bureaucratic despotism, and the fact that the moving spirits in the guild and in the C. I. O. political action committee have been the great advocates of a corporate state in the United States, and have, without exception, used their influence for every measure designed to strip the States of their sovereign rights and the individual of his fundamental rights, and to clothe the Federal Government with totalitarian powers, the fact that that is an obvious truth does not deter these gentlemen in the slightest respect from making their present attack upon those who have consistently supported the foreign policy of this Government and have consistently resisted the totalitarian trend toward bureaucratic government.

Mr. Speaker, I think that what I have said about the Lawyers Guild will dispose of it temporarily to the satisfaction of this House, and I think that this House will resent, as I resent, the fact that men working in this Government, holding positions as lawyers in this Government, would be permitted to affiliate themselves with a treasonable organization like the Peace Mobilization without any indictment. Yet, at the time I was calling upon the Department of Justice to proceed against these groups I wrote letter after letter urging this Government to proceed against all of the Fascist groups named by me at the time in letters to the Attorney General—the German-American Bund, the Kyffhauserbund, and the various Fascist groups, and to proceed likewise against all organizations that are agents of foreign political bodies.

Mr. Speaker, not only has the Lawyers Guild launched this attack, but, likewise, in a very insidious way, a man who calls himself John Roy Carlson has sought to smear me in his book. I shall read briefly for the benefit of the House the record of this man. His true name is Avedis Arthur Derounian, alias John Roy Carlson, alias George Pagnanelli, alias Thomas L. Decker, alias John Correa, alias Rudolph Kibers, also allegedly known as Carlove Derounian—author of Under Cover, 1943; born in Alexandropolis, Greece, on April 9, 1909, of Armenian parentage; arrived in the United States of America April 2, 1921; brothers, John and Steven; first lived on Willis Avenue, Mineola, Long Island.

Mr. Speaker, during the time of its existence our committee was investigating the Christian Front—and in this connection permit me to read the report of our investigator, dated August 24, 1939. This particular investigator was a former F. B. I. agent who worked with our committee for some 6 or 7 months. May I read for the benefit of the House an excerpt from his report:

> Joseph McWilliams ended his remarks by stating that Christians are being misled by the publicity-seeking Dies committee, which is Jew controlled and interested only in exposing Christian activities and ignoring the real enemies of society, namely, Jew communism.

I hold here a number of pamphlets distributed at that time by these various organizations that I will show were then being aided and encouraged by George Pagnanelli. Typical of the statements contained in these pamphlets is the following:

> Dies Jew-controlled committee is an anti-Gentile inquisition.

And so it goes on.

Numerous pamphlets and pieces of literature were printed and distributed by these organizations, and at the time they were distributing them, George Pagnanelli was publishing the Christian Defender and the Christian Crusader, which were distributed by the Christian Front, by the German-American Bund, and by all of the Fascist and Nazi groups we were exposing at that time. In other words, he was furnishing much of the literature and the material that the agents of Hitler in the United States were disseminating for the purpose of promoting racial hatred. The Christian Defender and the Christian Crusader which boldly carry the name of George Pagnanelli as editor and publisher on their masthead are replete with anti-Semitic propaganda. Here is a man whose excuse for playing Hitler's game over a period of years was to make "a million dollars on a book."

I hold here some of his letters which I wish to read for the benefit of the House, letters that he wrote before Pearl Harbor, and after Pearl Harbor, and at various periods. This letter that he wrote was at the very time our committee was engaged in ferreting out and exposing these Nazi groups. The letter was written to Parker Sage now under indictment for sedition after having been exposed by us.

> DEAR MR. SAGE: I received a penciled note the other week asking for dues. I have misplaced it and do not know if it was you who wrote it. At any rate, I am enclosing 50 cents in unused stamps, as requested. I do not know how much I owe, and do not know if the 50 cents will settle matters up to date, or for next month. Will you kindly let me know. I do enjoy reading the Newsletter, and do not want to be in arrears.
>
> I have recently ordered 100 copies of the enclosed leaflet on The International Jew. It is just the thing I have needed for distribution. I send them anonymously to certain people who I know will be interested. I don't know if the booklets have yet reached Detroit. If you can lay your hands on some literature—regardless of what it is, as long as it's nationalist and patriotic, please do not hesitate to send it to me. I'll remit postage immediately. We're mighty short of it here in New York. Things have been so tightened up against us. I can use anything you send—I just give it out at meetings, send it through the mails, and whenever I see a name and address in the papers which I think is good I send the stuff along. Judges, public officials, police, soldiers—they all get material; and none know where it's coming from.
>
> Cordially yours,
>
> GEO. PAGNANELLI.

This was 2 weeks before Pearl Harbor when under his own signature Pagnanelli, alias Carlson, was sending out Nazi propaganda and treasonable literature to the soldiers of the United States. Then, after Pearl Harbor we have another letter which he wrote in which he said:

> Things are in a confused and in a despondent state back East. We can work out of it I am sure. I would like your opinion of whether organized nationalism is out of the picture again, or whether you believe it can come back resurgent, triumphant, and victorious. I will be grateful for your reassuring words.
>
> With the season's greetings, I am
>
> Yours very truly,
>
> GEORGE PAGNANELLI.

Mr. Speaker, bear in mind that the Department of Justice will be in a short time engaged in the prosecution of 33 alleged seditionists. I submit that when any man disseminates this character of treasonable literature as he did all over the United States, while meeting with and supporting Nazi organizations during the critical period when our committee was denounced and jeered because we exposed them, the Department of Justice should seriously consider its responsibility to include him in any prosecution that may be pending.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. And does it not sometimes occur to the gentleman that it is necessary sometimes to have a thief catch a thief, and would it not be reasonable to assume that this man Carlson joined these organizations for the purpose of ferreting out their treasonable character and for the purpose of exposing them, so that he could get this information. I do not know that that is so, but does not the gentleman think it might be?

Mr. DIES. And is it not a fact, I ask the gentleman, that our committee has been denounced by so-called liberal

organizations because it was charged that we used ex-Communists to expose Communists? Was not this the principal charge preferred against our committee by all those who have been so critical of it? I am not going into the question of whether or not this man was engaged in his activities for the purpose of obtaining the truth, because there is no way of definitely determining that, insofar as I am concerned. He says that he was at that time engaged in these activities for the purpose of ferreting out and discovering the true agents of Hitlerism, but I am making the point to the gentleman that a man who, over his own signature, confesses treason and then publishes a book that becomes the best seller, and when reviewers are sent out to small communities in the country, to use statements in that book for the purpose of smearing Members of Congress, that it is a most serious situation, and does not the gentleman agree with me on that?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Let me finish this for a moment.

Mr. RANKIN. I merely want to call attention to one thing. It was not necessary for this low, slimy alien to circulate treasonable literature among our soldiers that the Japs were not going to attack Pearl Harbor, in order to mislead the American people.

Mr. DIES. Let me read one of his letters for the benefit of the House if I have time. If I may be given time I shall develop all these facts and no one can dispute them. Here is a pertinent excerpt from a letter dated April 30, 1942, written by Carlson to his literary agent, Jack Morris:

As to the libel angle, I declare that there is no fear, no fear whatever of that. I have a feeling that that is going to vex the publishers. I can get you the finest lawyers in the country free, to go over the stuff. Just before coming over I established contact with American Jewish Committee. Some of my data is being turned over to them. The contact is very valuable, and I know they are pleased with the work, though I have only given them a few things. I had supper with their Detroit man the other night. Every facility will be extended the publishers.

After you recover from this blast you can write me again at Slomovitz's if you care to. I'm in splendid health, and in especially fine mood to cuss the hell out of anybody that crosses the book. G—— d—— it! I wish I had those publishers in front of me now. I'd punch off their noses one by one, and good riddance. That book could have been making a fortune now.

Now, let us go further into this matter. In his book, Under Cover, which I have, I want to read to the House the character of attacks that were made upon me. Here, for instance, is a portrait showing me seated besides a Catholic priest with the statement:

Friends: The Reverend Edward Lodge Curran, with his arm around MARTIN DIES and George U. Harvey, once an ardent Coughlinite and former borough president of Queens, N. Y. The trio spoke in 1938 on patriotism at a meeting tendered by Brooklyn veterans.

Then there is another portrait showing the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] standing beside some lady with the American flag, and on the same page is shown a picture of the German-American Bund marching, and on the opposite page is the picture of me and the priest. That is what is known in Communist lingo as smear-by-association. It is done to create the idea that there is something fundamentally wrong with a man whose picture appears on the same page with somebody else who may or may not be guilty of wrong.

The truth is that the meeting at which I spoke was sponsored by the veterans of the World War, and present on the platform was a Jewish rabbi who took occasion to praise the work of our committee. The audience was composed of people of every nationality, and pictures were taken at the time of me beside the Jewish rabbi, but, of course, it would not do to publish a picture showing a Jewish rabbi with MARTIN DIES, because no inference of fascism could be drawn from that.

So the picture of the Catholic priest is published in the book for the purpose of creating the impression that MARTIN DIES was pro-Fascist, simply because he appeared with this Catholic priest. But let me go a little further in disposing of this dastardly plot. I want to read now from Under Cover:

After seeing Pelley and Henry, I took the bus to Muncie, to meet Court Asher, publisher of the X-Ray. It was afternoon, but that did not matter to Asher, for he was in his pajamas and with bare feet. On his arm was a tattooed nude woman with awesome bust and hips—

That had to go in there to give appetite to the book—

He welcomed me into his home.

Now, here is a man who walked into the home of Court Asher, and Court Asher is reported to have said:

"Howdy, George, right glad to see you stop by. MARTIN DIES was asking about you."

Taken aback with the distinction of being paged by none other than the chairman of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, I asked Asher for the details.

"I was in Washington having lunch with DIES and others on his committee, when DIES turned around and asks me if I know George Pagnanelli."

"What did you say?" I asked.

"I told him I knew nothing about you."

"DIES is all right. I would vote for him for President."

"Did you meet anybody else in Washington?" I asked.

"Hell, yes—SPRINGER, RAYMOND S. SPRINGER, from Indiana, was with me all the time. He introduced me to a lot of the other boys. I met RANKIN and HOFFMAN; both are fine gentlemen."

Mr. Speaker, in the first place I had never met Court Asher in my life until he appeared before our committee in obedience to a subpena served upon him requiring his appearance and records before our committee. We were the first agency of this Government that ever examined and exposed Court Asher. I never ate lunch or any other meal with him and neither did any member of the committee ever eat with him. So that we have a case of a foreign-born Armenian—and, of course, that is no reflection upon him, nor do I say it for the purpose of implying that because he was born abroad that that is any reflection on him—but it is a strange situation when a man immigrates to the United States to seek refuge under our institutions and then he engages in treasonable activities, writing letters in which he acknowledges that he has been sending to our soldiers and to our public officials treasonable literature designed to destroy this country. Then he publishes a book, and the book is disseminated throughout the country and becomes a best seller. In the book he prints hearsay in an attempt to smear me and other Members of the Congress.

Now let me develop it a little further. Let me read to you the examination of Court Asher because on the basis of this book many Jewish people have been convinced that MARTIN DIES and the Committee on Un-American Activities are pro-Fascist—make no mistake about that. I receive letters from many of these misinformed people every day in which they make scurrilous attacks upon me. Let me read excerpts from this investigation of Court Asher containing some of my questions and statements that appear in the record because I think you should know exactly what took place at the time:

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps, in your desire to build up the paper, it did not occur to you it is a pretty dangerous thing to spread any kind of hatred. You would not want to do innocent people an injustice, would you?

The CHAIRMAN. We all do know of certain people, but you do not point out in these various articles about the Jew and so forth and so on, to whom you refer specifically; you would not want that to affect many innocent people who are good Americans?

The CHAIRMAN. When you have articles of a generalized nature and they take a general tone and do not discriminate between the ones that are bad and ones that are good, do you not think it is likely to cause injustice to some people?

The CHAIRMAN. Even in past times the very foundation of our country is the right of every citizen to worship God according to his own conscience. He is entitled to protection, regardless of his race or his color; do you not think so?

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose you pick out a certain number of individuals who have been criminals and who are not good citizens and then, we will say, they are Catholics. Then you take all the Catholics in this country and say, "All Catholics are trying to commit criminal acts." Would you not say that would be an injustice to Catholics in general?

The CHAIRMAN. To put it another way, suppose you pick out a certain number of Catholics who have been criminals and not good citizens, and then you take all Catholics in general and say that Catholics are trying to dominate, would that be an injustice?

I want to give you the type of questions which I, as chairman of this committee, directed toward this man who had disseminated so many malicious lies upon the Jewish people:

The CHAIRMAN. Or supposing they were Baptists?

And he says, "Yes, sir."

There are people in the Baptist Church who are no good; you agree to that, do you?

And he says, "Yes, sir."

We have sent Baptists to the penitentiary, just as we have sent people of all other denominations?

And he answered, "Yes, sir."

The CHAIRMAN. If you generalize and condemn all Baptists because of the misdeeds and misconduct of some of the people, are you not attacking the very foundation of our country?

And Mr. Asher said, "Yes, sir."

Mr. Speaker, in other words, he was compelled to acknowledge that what he had done in his violent and malicious attacks upon the Jews in general was undermining the foundation of our country.

It is unnecessary to read all the excerpts. I read the above excerpts from the hearing to show you my questions and statements to Court Asher, with whom my name has been linked throughout the United States, based upon lying statements contained in this book, and yet in the very examination, I was seeking to protect millions of decent, law-abiding Jews in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if I had the time I would read other excerpts from this book, but let me proceed to give you another example of the type of propaganda which it contains.

The book contains the following:

In a folder entitled "The Fifth Column Conspiracy," Kamp urged "patriots" to withhold information "regarding Communist activities" from J. Edgar Hoover's F. B. I. and submit it, instead, either to MARTIN DIES or to him. "If you are fearful of becoming involved, your information will be treated in confidence if sent to the Investigations Department of the League," Kamp suggested coyly. "It is natural that this apparent collusion between an associate of Lawrence Dennis and the Honorable MARTIN DIES should lead to suspicion, particularly when it followed on the heels of a Kuhn-approved luncheon tendered Mr. DIES by the Franco-ite, Mr. Hart."

Of all the malicious lies deliberately spread on the pages of this book, this is the worst I have ever read. What are the facts? The facts are that neither I nor my committee have ever had any association directly or indirectly with Joseph Kamp. When Mr. Winchell said, over the radio, that Joseph Kamp had access to our files, I immedately wired him and wired the Blue Network. I denied the statement and denied other statements that had been carried over Mr. Winchell's broadcast. I said to the Blue Network and to Mr. Winchell, "I will be glad to meet with you and to submit conclusive proof."

"I will be willing to let the Blue Network and Mr. Winchell sit as a jury to pass upon the question whether or not these charges are true or untrue. If you agree that the evidence is conclusive that they are untrue, then I ask you to give me his time on the radio so that I may deny them to the same audience to whom the statements were made."

The Blue Network took the matter under advisement, and then after several weeks they wrote me a letter in which they denied my request.

Bear in mind that here are statements attacking my patriotism, charging I was using the files of this committee for the purpose of aiding Joseph Kamp; further charging that I was deliberately seeking to withhold information with reference to the 33 people who are charged with sedition and now facing trial. Remember that these charges, by inuendo against me involved my integrity and my patriotism as a citizen of the United States, and as the representative of one of the large congressional districts in the State of Texas. The Blue Network, having been tendered conclusive proof, I having made them the proposition to permit them to serve as a jury to determine whether or not it was true or false, wrote back and said:

DEAR MR. DIES: I have your letter suggesting that the Blue Network cancel Winchell's program and allot his period on the air to you.

I felt that was only just and correct, that if a man charged me with some offense over an important Nation-wide hook-up, in justice I should be permitted to address the same audience briefly and reply to it and deny the charges.

They say:

And allot his period on the air to you to answer the references he has made on his program.

A careful review has been made of pertinent portions of the scripts and I believe you will conclude from a careful consideration of the excerpts I forward to you that Mr. Winchell's references to you and the committee are sometimes complimentary.

I hold here all of his excerpts, and I have read them over carefully to find anything that could be complimentary of me or of the committee, and I failed to find them.

He says further:

And never exceed the limits of reasonable criticism accorded any citizen in commenting on the activities of prominent public officials.

Think of that. Over the radio is carried a charge, in effect, that I am permitting the files of this agency of government to be used by certain individuals who are alleged to be pro-Fascist; in effect I am accused of being a traitor to the United States of America, and the Blue Network says that that is within the right of commentators to broadcast, and does not exceed legal bounds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the quotations which Mr. Winchell used were from Sabotage, another book which was published by Michael Sayers and Albert E. Kahn, both of whom have long Communist records, for the purpose of defaming certain Members of Congress. Let me make to you a somewhat startling statement. Much of the material in this book was taken verbatim from the committee's reports on Japanese and Nazi activities. In other words, the authors copied verbatim, without showing quotations or without showing the source of the material, and in the same book in which they relied principally upon our information they printed certain false attacks that are designed to establish the impression in the country that I am pro-Fascist.

After we had examined this book we notified Harper & Bros., book publishers, that the authors had plagerized the material of the committee, and that while the material of the committee was public property and they, of course, like all citizens, were free to use it, nevertheless, it was customary to give credit to those responsible for the material. Harper & Bros. then made a careful examination and found that what we had charged was true. They took it up with the authors of this book and said, "We will not print any more editions or supplements until you give credit to the Committee on Un-American Activities for the material that you have stolen." The authors refused, and Harper & Bros. refused to publish any more books, and another publisher was found.

Nowhere in the annals of our history has there ever been a more dastardly attempt to defame and smear public servants than this current attempt on the part of Under Cover, Sabotage, and certain radio commentators and the political action committee. * * *

Now, let me develop for a moment this extensive plot to destroy the parliamentary system. I wish to deal at some length with the political action committee. What I shall say is substantiated by conclusive proof, and I defy anyone to take issue with the statements I shall make.

Not long ago word leaked out that our committee was considering the advisability of preparing and publishing a report on the political action committee. Immediately all of the Communist dominated organizations began to attack me and the committee for the purpose of convincing the people of the country that the committee was pro-Fascist. In other words, they knew they were vulnerable. They knew, as the American Federation of Labor charged not long ago, that the Communists dominated the political action committee. They knew, as John L. Lewis charged not long ago, that Communists dominate the C. I. O. They knew, as some of the leaders of the American Labor Party have charged in the press in New York, that the political action committee was dominated and controlled by certain well-known Communists. They did not want that fact made public, because they had planned an elaborate and well-financed campaign, supplied with tremendous sums of money, for the purpose of defeating Members of this House whose only crime in their eyes was that they had refused to be subservient to the domination of Communist leadership.

Thereafter, through their allied agencies, integrated as they are with all other Communist groups, they began this campaign to becloud the issue and, in advance, to discredit the report of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, the origin of the idea of the C. I. O. political action committee is of real importance. That origin was definitely within the Communist Party and some of its leaders. In June 1943 the Worker's Library Publishers, official Communist Party publishing agency, brought out a pamphlet by Frank Rhylick entitled "Congress and You," and the July 1943 issue of The Communist, official monthly organ of the Communist Party, Earl Browder and Eugene Dennis contributed articles entitled "Hold the Home Front" and "Victory and the 1944

Elections," respectively. Those writings by Rhylick, Browder, and Dennis cut the pattern for the C. I. O. political action committee. They appeared some weeks before the formation of the Hillman organization. An examination of the views of Rhylick, Browder, and Dennis shows how they anticipate in every detail the organization and activity of the C. I. O. political action committee.

In his article entitled "Hold the Home Front," Browder wrote as follows:

> We must unite the C. I. O. behind the leadership of Phil Murray and his clear-cut program for the labor movement, and we must work with every honest leading element who goes along with Murray, and the fullest collaboration, giving them our confidence, and so forth, without any regard to possible past or present ideological differences. We must build unity of all anti-Axis elements for the war now.

And on and on. I have a number of articles that I will not take the time of the House to read, all clearly showing that it was the Communist leadership in the United States which conceived the strategy of building the political action committee, then seizing control of it and levying tribute upon every worker in their organization to build a fund for the purpose of destroying parliamentary government in the United States and to bring about the election of men who will serve as their stooges in the Congress of the United States. Other Communist Party publications such as the New Masses and the Daily Worker bore down heavily upon the need for an organization like the C. I. O. political action Committee in the weeks which immediately preceded the formation of Hillman's committee.

Whether or not Philip Murray and Sidney Hillman knowingly adopted a program of action for the 1944 elections which had been set forth by prominent Communist Party leaders and individuals, the record shows beyond the possibility of dispute that well-known Communists immediately assumed important roles in the regional, State, and local activities of the C. I. O. political action committee. Murray and Hillman may allege that it was a mere coincidence that their organization so completely conformed to the one whose pattern had been drawn by the Communists. They cannot deny the presence of well-known Communists in the ranks of the C. I. O. political action committee as it has been functioning from coast to coast during the past 7 or 8 months.

One of the most striking facts concerning the C. I. O. political action committee is the large proportion of its leaders who were affiliated not so long ago with the seditious and Communist-controlled American Peace Mobilization, these people who are now busily engaged calling the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] and the gentleman from Idaho and numerous other Members of this House Fascists and agents of Hitler. Prior to the invasion of Russia by Adolf Hitler, these same men were denouncing all of us for supplying England with badly needed materials to preserve herself in the hour of need. They castigated the Congress for voting funds to build up our armed forces and to conscript needed soldiers. These men are now masquerading as patriots and organizing 14 regional offices and committees in every town and city in the country, going from house to house, from door to door, spending the hard-earned money of the workers of this country who dare not refuse to pay this tribute levied by a group of un-American racketeers without parallel in the history of any free country.

The American League for Peace and Democracy had the distinction of having been the first Communist Party's front to attract to itself a large following. Our committee heard voluminous testimony concerning the American League and its activities, and by a unanimous vote found that the organization was a Communist front. The American League for Peace and Democracy was the predecessor of the American Peace Mobilization. Many of the leaders in the C. I. O. political action committee were the moving spirits, leaders, and agitators in the American League for Peace and Democracy, unanimously found by our committee to be a Communist-controlled organization.

What was the program of the American League for Peace and Democracy? Let me refresh your memories so that as I bring down to current date the history of these moving spirits in this conspiracy to destroy parliamentary government you may understand the evolution of the whole organization. The program of the American League for Peace and Democracy was as follows, and I quote from their own program:

> To work toward the stopping of the manufacture and transport of munitions in time of peace or war, and in time of war the transport of all other materials essential to the conduct of war through mass demonstrations, picketing, and strikes.

Many of the most prominent C. I. O. leaders were affiliated with the American League for Peace and Democracy, as we shall point out in citing their records individually. We are concerned chiefly with their support of the American Peace Mobilization.

The signing of the Soviet-Nazi pact on August 23, 1939, marked a sharp turn in the line of the Communist Party and all of its subservient front organizations. Stalin's embrace of Hitler was the beginning of the end of the American League for Peace and Democracy. This organization has been found unanimously by the members of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities to be a front organization of the Communist Party. Its propaganda has been especially adapted, however, to the period of Communist effort known as the People's Front.

It was practically impossible for the party to readapt the organization to the purposes of the new period of Stalin's pact with Hitler. Various prominent members of the American League for Peace and Democracy found it impossible to justify Stalin's alliance with the Nazis. When, therefore, the league's executive committee refused by a vote of 14 to 1 to condemn Stalin's and Hitler's wiping of Poland from the map of Europe, some of the erstwhile duped liberals dropped away from the league.

Now, Mr. Speaker, not only were these leaders of the C. I. O. political action committee active leaders in the American League for Peace and Democracy and later in the American Peace Mobilization, but we find them identified with numerous other Communist organizations in the United States. In the report which I hope our committee will submit to the House we will detail the records of every promiment leader in the political action committee. We will show that more than 500 of them are now active in the various parts of the country stirring up hatred against Members of Congress and other public officials who refused to be subservient to them. We will show that these leaders have been active from the very beginning in spreading communism in the United States.

Early in the present year the National Committee of the Communist Party announced that it had decided to dissolve the party as such and to transform it into an organization with some such name as the American Communist Political Association. Earl Browder immediately delivered a speech in which he elaborated this decision. This Communist maneuver was a first-class news story. The immediate significance of the party's dissolution is that during the 1944 elections Communists will throw their entire weight into the C. I. O. political action committee. Their political leader will be in effect Sidney Hillman instead of Earl Browder. They will attempt, indeed they are already attempting, to do by stealth and subterfuge through the C. I. O. political action committee what they have failed to do when functioning as a political party under their own name. Communists have long been entrenched in the leadership of most of the unions which are affiliated with the C. I. O. They now aspire to more complete political control over that organ of organized labor, the C. I. O., which numbers several millions of voters.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have the time to go into this question in detail, but as I have previously indicated, the report which I trust our committee will soon issue contains conclusive proof showing how the Communists have seized control of this Political Action Committee, how they are now using it and the vast funds which they are raising not only for the purpose of electing people friendly to them, but more insidiously to create the widespread impression that in the Congress of the United States a majority of its Memberr are Fascists and sympathetic with Hitler. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that minority groups who enjoy the protection of the American Constitution would be very careful not to engage in the same type of intolerance and hatred that characterized their own suffering in Europe, that they would be careful to set an example of tolerance, that they would not associate with any movement or any group designed to engage in the same strategy, the same tactics that led to the defeat of democracy in Europe and the rise of totalitarianism.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] may be permitted to continue for an additional half hour.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, of course, will put the request, but it is a very unusual thing when a Member is recognized for an hour on a question of personal privilege to extend the time.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4346, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how far we have proceeded in reading the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Just the first paragraph has been read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Grants to States for old-age assistance: For an additional amount for grants to States for old-age assistance, subject to the conditions specified under this heading in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1944, $11,350,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for a few moments I want to call attention to the few facts that I think should be directed to the attention of the Congress and the people of this country in connection with the consideration of this first deficiency appropriation bill.

The first deficiency bill now under consideration provides, among other items, funds with which to pay war overtime pay and other compensation increases provided for in some five acts of Congress in addition to pay for alien employees. The total added pay-roll costs resulting from the enactment of Public Laws 509, 22, 25, 49, and 205, plus amounts necessary to pay alien employees totals $827,464,053.

This deficiency item is occasioned because provision was not made in the regular supply bill last year covering additional compensation and overtime pay for Federal employees. It will be noted that the deficiency contains a new appropriation for these items amounting to $240,108,931. The committee report indicates that the various departments of Government are absorbing $584,210,717 of the required additional cost for overtime pay and additional compensation out of appropriations heretofore made. The War and Navy Departments alone are absorbing all of the estimated cost of additional pay to employees in those Departments totaling $414,324,115. The other agencies of Government are absorbing additional costs amounting to $173,031,007. As a result the committee recommends the appropriation of $240,108,931.

Mr. Chairman, this stipulation has inspired the interest of many Members of Congress.

We find the various departments of Government including the Army and Navy paying to Federal employees a total of $827,464,053. They only need $240,108,931 to enable them to discharge their full responsibility under the laws heretofore referred to.

Is it not clear therefore that appropriations have been made in excess of the needs of these departments under their regular appropriation bills enacted last year, which excesses are now being used to pay a large portion of the additional burden created by these overtime and additional compensation laws?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The question I want to raise is this. Is it not clear, therefore, that these departments when they came before the various subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations of this Congress last year, overstated their requirements when justifying their budget estimates?

To me these facts demonstrate the absolute necessity for closer scrutiny by the Appropriations Committee of every request by a department for funds. This set of facts further demonstrates the absolute necessity for having skilled investigators and auditors in the employ of the Congress and the Appropriations Committee to comb the requests for appropriations so that these excesses might be discovered and be eliminated at the time the appropriation bill is considered by the committee and by the Congress.

May I say as a member of two of the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations that it is rather astonishing to me that these departments of Government are able to absorb personnel-pay increases in the departments amounting to $584,210,717. They are absorbing these pay increases out of their current funds. Yet when these people come before the Congress and the Appropriations Subcommittee, I never knew them to fail to claim that the Congress is niggardly in its appropriations and that we are not giving them enough money. In the face of those contentions repeatedly made on the floor of this House and repeatedly made before the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, we now find them able to absorb and pay out of current funds the huge total of $584,000,000 necessary to complete their responsibility for overtime pay and additional compensation under laws we have passed.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. I wonder if that condition could not be very largely corrected by the adoption of the resolution I have introduced, and which has been pending for well over a year, to have an office of fiscal investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives to see what is done with the money we appropriate.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that I, as one Member of this Congress and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, am in complete accord with the proposal he has pending before this Congress and the efforts he has made for several years now to bring about an agency of this Congress and the Appropriations Committee so that we can scrutinize more thoroughly these requests for appropriations. The demonstration of the necessity for it, it seems to me, is very clear in the facts which I have given you here today with reference to the pending bill.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that the heads of the different departments said they were unable to state last year the amount of money necessary to meet the overtime and increased wage payments and were, therefore, asking sufficient money in other items to meet that situation?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know what they may have stated to the committees of which the gentleman is a member as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but I have no knowledge of any such statement as that being made by the head of any department to the subcommittees of which I am a member. They were not able to compute overtime compensation because some of thes laws were not passed yet and did not become effective so they could include the money in the budget estimates that came before us in these appropriation items last year.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But most of the laws were passed before last year, and they made that statement before our subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I again compliment the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] for his fight over a period of several years to bring about some kind of an agency answerable only to the Congress that can make investigations in reference to the proper expenditure of money to determine where there is waste and extravagance, where departments are over-

manned, and so forth. I am in favor of the objective, but not the manner the gentleman from Texas desires, nor in the manner desired by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I want to see a set-up that is a permanent set-up, whereby we shall be able to get competent men that understand this Government to do the job.

As I have repeatedly stated, the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 gives to the Committee on Appropriations the authority the gentleman from Wisconsin desires to set up such an agency in an agency of the Congress, in the office of the Comptroller General. I went before the Appropriations Committee and urged that the Bureau of the Budget be given money to set up an investigating agency so that the Bureau of the Budget could assail the Budget recommendations that came to it from the various departments and agencies. That money was granted. I think it was $250,000. They have a permanent set-up in the Bureau of the Budget, but the Bureau of the Budget is an agency of the President and not an agency of the Congress. If we can provide for such a set-up for the Bureau of the Budget, why do we delay doing the same for ourselves? We can save millions for the taxpayers if we will give the Comptroller General money to set up a division in his office to gather and furnish us with information.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri that I do not think there is very much difference in our approach to this problem. In the thinking that I have been able to do on this subject, I am in complete accord with his idea, that any agency that is set up should be a permanent agency. I do not care whether the agency is connected with the Appropriations Committee, or whether it is set up in the General Accounting Office, but I agree with the gentleman, and I think he agrees with me, on the necessity of having an agency somewhere that is responsive to the Congress of the United States to deal with this problem.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully agree with the gentleman if the set-up is responsible only to the Congress of the United States. In creating the Comptroller General's position and the General Accounting Office we made it an agency of the Congress. I went before an informal meeting of the members of a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] was there. I had the Comptroller General there and two of his assistants were also there. We discussed this question, and I thought I had sold them a bill of goods. Later, while I was necessarily absent from the House, a resolution was passed, setting up in the Appropriations Committee an organization to make investigations for the Appropriations Committee. Following the passage of that resolution the Committee on Accounts brought in a resolution and set aside $100,000 for that purpose. You have that now. The last time I looked at that appropriation I think you still had a balance left of around $75,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Several years ago I advocated to the full Committee on Appropriations an appropriation of $1,000,000 to establish a permanent committee, to go out into the different departments and make an investigation so that we could get some facts other than what we are receiving today from the departments, and at that time, the Budget, when they would make a recommendation, it was only information which they had received from the permanent departments, but there was no action taken on my proposal. I think that by appropriating $1,000,000 we could save $100,000,000 a year in that way, done in the proper form.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully agree with the gentleman from New York. I realize the necessity, but let me tell you this. Despite the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has $100,000 for this purpose, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has another resolution pending. He wants to set up in each subcommittee some examiners and auditors, which would be duplication of effort.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] made a speech the other day on a resolution he offered, providing for committee appointments to be made by the majority and the minority leaders of both Houses, approved by the Speaker of the House. That is not a permanent agency. What you must have is a Civil Service agency where you can get the right kind of men and let them know that they are going to have a permanent job, so that they will be willing to leave their present assignments and take up the new work. You cannot pick up efficient personnel to do this work unless you assure them the job is permanent. It needs men who know something about the Government, and you don't learn the inside workings of the Government overnight.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri did not get time to finish one of his sentences, when he yielded to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]. It is true that $100,000 was set up under a very restricted program for the use of the Committee on Appropriations, so restricted that I doubt very much whether that program has had any real efficacy. The gentleman was going to tell the House how much has been spent of that $100,000 appropriation. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. COCHRAN. I said that the last time I looked at it there was a balance, I think, of $75,000.

Mr. KEEFE. That is, $25,000 of the appropriation has been expended.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. I wanted that to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me say to my distinguished colleague that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made a statement on the floor of the House recently, telling the work that has been accomplished under that resolution, and I read that statement in the RECORD. The point I make is that I am in favor of this objective of running down the expenditures, and seeing that the money is spent for the purpose appropriated, and, above all, to find the waste and extravagance, where they are overmanned, and bring the information to the Committee on Appropriations and to other agencies of the House. But I do think, as I stated before, that I feel we should take advantage of the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, where you find the authority, and appropriate the money, and let it be known that it will be permanent, turning the money over to the Comptroller General. Then send instructions to the Comptroller General and he will certainly carry out the mandate of the Congress. He said he would do the job if the Congress gave him sufficient money.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman feel that the recent exposé by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] as to the expenditures for the construction of the so-called Pentagon Building, some fifty-odd million dollars in excess of the actual appropriation made by the Appropriations Committee of this Congress, should justify a real investigation by this Congress to find out where and from what funds the excess appropriations or expenditures were used. Is not that a complete justification in itself?

Mr. COCHRAN. I say to the gentleman that you have two committees that have jurisdiction. One is the Committee on Military Affairs, which has authority to subpena witnesses and papers, and likewise you have authority under that resolution that set up the funds for the Committee on Appropriations. Why have another one? I am just advised that investigation is being made by the Military Affairs Committee now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of my beloved colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. He made reference to our former colleague, the present Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, of North Carolina. They have served in this body with great distinction and with marked ability, and for each I have an abiding and an affectionate regard.

The gentleman from Missouri has stated his approval of the objective of the legislation that I have requested, and I feel sure that that statement reflects also the judgment of the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren. A year or more

ago the three of us consulted with reference to the accomplishment of this objective, and means and methods to that end. Personally, in view of the fact that we have been unable to get any action along that particular line, I am inclined to think that the wise present course would be the adoption of the resolution which I have introduced.

This must be taken into consideration, that the resolution I introduced establishes an office of fiscal investigations as an agency of the House of Representatives. It is my understanding that any selection of personnel the Comptroller General would be authorized to make under the law would have to be from among those who had qualified under the civil-service rules and regulations. Therefore, they would likely have to be taken from various governmental departments, which would in a way obviate the independence and the lack of any possible and natural personal bias that an investigator might have in following these appropriations.

From the standpoint of the permanency of such an organization, we have a permanent office of drafting counsel for the House of Representatives. It seems to me that the one which I have suggested is somewhat analogous to that organization, though different in purpose. I think if we could adopt this resolution and have even a temporary force as our own agency of the House of Representatives to look into the manner in which these funds are expended, that it would so prove its worth that we would have no difficulty then in making it permanent legislation, because from the many instances which have been cited on this floor, it is very evident that such an office of fiscal investigations could save the taxpayers of this country many millions of dollars; and, if we could try it out without delay as a temporary organization of the House of Representatives, I think the efficiency it would manifest would lead to its establishment as a permanent organization, otherwise, of course, than through the process of a resolution.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POULSON. I wish to say to the gentleman from Texas that the idea which he has advanced is very commendable, because I have seen it in practical application in the State of California. During the past 2 years they have appointed a legislative committee, the budget committee, which is carried over from one session to another, and they hire their experts. In the past session they were able to not only put in a budget immediately but they were able to save millions of dollars simply because they had some of the facts which they were not able to get otherwise. And, of course, with the United States Government, which is so much greater in magnitude and in the volume of expenditures, the idea is definitely workable, and it should be a very practical step.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman. We ought not to have to rely upon ex parte testimony before the Committee on Appropriations.

I wish also to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, for the interest they have taken in the objective of this resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain every Member of the House is in complete accord with the objective indicated by each of the gentlemen who has spoken here this morning. I do not think there is a Member of the House who would disagree in any degree with the purpose which they seek to achieve. The only possible difference of opinion would be as to the method of achieving the objective. And it is the wide divergence of opinion on that score that occasions this irrelevant debate.

Mr. Chairman, the most popular pastime in the country today is criticism of Congress—criticism of its personnel, criticism of its organization, criticism of its integrity, and last but not least, criticism of its procedure. There is no surer way to get an audience, no more certain method of breaking into print than to lay down the premise that Congress is lacking in this or that; Congress ought to have this or that; that Congress ought to be reformed, renovated, reconditioned, and streamlined. Everyone is offering some new nostrum, rule, device, or machinery to be superimposed on the present rules of the House or to supplant machinery we already have.

There is an especially insistent demand for more elaborate and more expensive machinery for research and investigation. And in all this demand for innovations no one pauses to consider using the ample means already at our disposal.

Mr. Chairman, the House has already at its command—ready for the using—every legislative and parliamentary facility for any research or any investigation it cares to initiate. It has at its beck and call established and tested agencies of inquiry and examination to get all of the information wanted and to secure all of the results that have been suggested here this morning. Once invoked it is automatic. All that is necessary is to set it in motion.

Speaker Cannon once said there were Members who went about beating their breasts and crying out that the rules fettered them when they would not know the rules if they met them in the public highway. Likewise Members have launched great campaigns to establish elaborate and costly instrumentalities of investigation when they have never asked for any fact or made the slightest effort to use the agencies of investigation already at their command.

I shall not take the time of the House to go into the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It is one of the oldest committees of the House, first established in 1816. It was created and has been maintained for more than a hundred years for the very purpose discussed here this morning. In the House of Commons, the oldest deliberative body in the world, the Committee on Expenditures is one of the most important committees of the Parliament and one of the most desirable. Those who serve on it are chosen from among the ablest men in the House of Commons. Our Committee on Expenditures was created with identical powers. It has the same prerogatives and jurisdiction. If any Member desires to inquire into the disposition of any dollar appropriated by Congress, here is a committee in every way qualified to handle it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield with pleasure to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman I have been a member of the Expenditures Committee for more than 15 years.

I was chairman of that committee for many years and, against my own wishes, I left the chairmanship to take the assignment which I now have. I will say further to the gentleman that with the ranking member of that committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] I went before the Committee on Rules, not once, but several times, seeking to get some assistance and authority from the Committee on Rules that would enable us to make proper investigations in reference to expenditures. But on no occasion would the Committee on Rules act favorably. As a result the Congress now has set up in round numbers about 25 select or special committees. Only today I brought in a resolution granting $50,000 additional to 1 of those committees to make investigations of expenditures and so forth. That is the second $50,000 they have received. Every one of those committees that have been set up under the rules by a resolution brought in by the Committee on Rules has been given at least 1 appropriation. I do not recall the exact amount, but we have appropriated a tremendous amount of money for the committees of the House to make investigations in reference to expenditures—Military, Naval Affairs, Merchant Marine, Public Buildings and Grounds, and other committees. They have the authority now. Why do they not do the job, if it is not being done? The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has no authority practically to speak of. It can investigate but does not have proper help.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it was an unfortunate day when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] left that committee because his work on the committee was outstanding and of inestimable value to the Congress and the Nation. As he well says, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has the jurisdiction to make these investigations and the Committee

on Rules has authority to grant any facility for exercising that jurisdiction. We do not need a lot of new committees and a lot of new machinery and a plethora of additional expense. All we need is to use what we have. In addition to the regular committees, we have more than a score of special committees. We do not need more. We need less.

So far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, we have the most effective and most practical means of investigation that could be supplied. It is efficient and it is permanent. It has served every need. No information has been requested which it did not supply expeditiously and accurately.

No member of the Committee on Appropriations can suggest any subject within the jurisdiction of the committee on which he wishes information which will not be supplied promptly and authoritatively. There has not been a single criticism of it from any member of the committee who has used it, from either side of the aisle. It is foolproof. It is partisanproof. And it meets the most exacting requirements.

Of course it is subject to the criticism that it is too inexpensive. It is not costing enough money. There is a tendency abroad in the land to minimize anything—especially any governmental agency—which does not spend a lot of money.

There is extant a too generally accepted philosophy that unless you are spending large sums of money you are not getting results. If, for example, a little spadework is to be done the spade should be gold-plated; and there should be a large staff of assistants to advise the spademan and secretaries to the assistants, and secretaries to the secretaries. Too often we are prone to look askance upon results secured too economically. For example, the Committee on Appropriations is criticized because it does not have enough personnel; because it does not use enough machinery. But we are getting results. We have the most expert corps of investigators that can be assembled in the city of Washington. You cannot suggest any method of selecting operators that can supply more competent or better qualified men than we are getting, and you cannot suggest any plan for getting expert services for less money than we are paying, because we select from every appropriate department of the Government just the men we need, qualified specifically for the job to be done, and at their current civil-service salary.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I would like to say, as a result largely of the fine constructive statesmanship of the gentleman from Missouri who is addressing the Committee, an instrumentality of government has been created which is going to demonstrate its worth more and more as we go along, and that is the investigatorial staff of the Appropriations Committee. It is doing splendid work. It is going into the different departments and finding where the faults are, and it is making instructive reports to our committee. I am in a position to testify that our own subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman—the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Departments—was able, by the instructive suggestions of those investigators, to include in our bill a provision which will result in saving the people of this country millions of dollars.

Mr. MAY. That is fine.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All of those who heard or read the debate on the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill had a practical demonstration of the efficacy of this system of investigation. Under the control of the distinguished and efficient gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], they secured all the information they requested, all the information which could possibly be desired by any who have participated in the debate here today. They brought it to the floor. They incorporated the results of that investigation in their bill and they presented, in my opinion, the most satisfactory bill ever reported to the House from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. TABER. I want to compliment the chairman upon his having followed this method of handling investigations by the Appropriations Committee. I appreciate that we have not been able to cover all the ground that we should cover. There is no use being mealy-mouthed about it, but we have covered some ground and we are starting in the right direction. I do feel that every single department and agency of the Government should be gone over with a fine-tooth comb by our investigators, and that that kind of investigation should be had every year before the committee begins the hearings, so that we can get the best results out of it.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. Does not the gentleman from New York feel that we have gone far enough to know that this investigatorial staff is going to be of great worth to the Congress and to the country?

Mr. TABER. If we use it at the right time and extensively enough I do think it can do the job.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield further to me?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I think the staff that the gentleman has set up is to be complimented, but I happen to know, as chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee, that we have lifted the ceiling on everything as far as amounts are concerned in authorizations, because of our confidence in the Appropriations Committee. Now, we get reports from the committee relating to the War Department, that some eighteen or twenty or thirty billion dollars are rolling around downtown somewhere that are not being used. It is not necessary to use it. That kind of thing is what I am worrying about.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for his confidence in the Committee on Appropriations. We appreciate it. I suggest if he wants any information on what happens after the money is appropriated that he consult this great committee on expenditures, which has the jurisdiction and is in a position to give him that information.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will there be any attempt here to limit debate in a few minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. So far as I am concerned, the gentleman is entitled to all the time he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In early pioneer days in my section of Missouri there was a very resourceful young man who spent a great deal of his time sawing cordwood. He conceived the idea of inventing a machine which would hold one end of the saw while he held the other, so that he and the machine together could saw the wood more expeditiously and with less labor.

It was quite an ingenious contrivance, with wheels and bands and levers. He demonstrated his invention with great pride, but he discovered after a while that he was not only sawing the wood but he was also running the machine.

The machine was merely adding to the arduous labor of his task. A great deal of the improved machinery suggested for Congress is of that character. And if we should adopt it we would find that we are not only doing the work but we have the added burden of running the machinery also—and paying the million dollars per annum which has been suggested here this morning—in addition.

It is an old adage that poor workmen always complain of their tools. We have the tools. We have the committees—too many inactive committees. We have the jurisdiction. We have ample means at our command to achieve everything that has been suggested here today. All that is necessary is to make use of what we have.

In view of the proposals made here today and the general interest in the subject, I shall take the liberty of sending each Member of the House a short pamphlet on this subject and I shall deeply appreciate it if the Members will find time to read it, or part of it, and let the committee have the benefit of any

suggestions which may occur to them in this connection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion here today. Being one of the newer Members and not familiar with all the ramifications of the committee work, if these committees have all the jurisdiction, power, and authority the distinguished gentleman from Missouri tells us they have why do they not go into action and stop up this useless spending? Bureaucracy has seemingly gone hog-wild with spending over the past several years and it is about time to provide some legislation to afford relief to the American taxpayer.

In these days when people are thinking of billions instead of millions, how many of us really appreciate how much a billion dollars is? To the average person it is just an awful lot of money.

Well, a million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars and a billion dollars is a thousand million dollars.

Statisticians have figured out, however, that if a person were born at the time of our Saviour and had been given a billion dollars to spend at the rate of a thousand dollars a day, and could live until his money was gone, he would still have about 800 years to go. By now he would just about have finished spending his first $700,000,000.

Reflecting soberly on this astounding fact, let me remind you that during 1943, Federal expenditures totaled $88,000,000,000 or approximately $241,000,000 every 24 hours.

Do you envy the members of the Appropriation Committee of the Congress who are now holding hearings on the $100,000,000,000 Federal Budget for the next fiscal year? And they are trying to do a job for the American people.

One hesitates to talk about effective economies in these days of colossal spending, and no one minds spending money to win this war. If it took every penny we have to win the war and bring it to a rapid conclusion to save the lives of our American boys, we would willingly give everything we possess.

But wasteful expenditure like the reckless spending of $135,000,000 on the Canol project up in the Canadian wilderness, the reckless spending for the Pentagon Building; and now, Secretary Ickes wants $165,000,000 for an Arabian pipe line which is universally condemned.

If these committees are empowered and authorized as the distinguished gentleman from Missouri says they are he will see that proper authorized committee stop up this proposed $165,000,000 pipe line over in Arabia. I think these committees ought to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress what is happening and report these matters to the Congress so that the American people will know what is going on which will permit us to have an opportunity to present our opposition and to stop up this unnecessary spending. If we have $165,000,000 to spend, let us spend it on exploration projects in our own back yard and not in Arabia.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. No; I decline to yield.

I am not interested in Arabia, I am only interested in this Republic of ours. This type of spending that has been going on must stop or we will soon have the American taxpayer and this Nation of ours bankrupt. I do not know what legislation is needed or how it can be brought up, but some type of legislation should be enacted by the membership of this House to stop this reckless spending by a group of impractical, immature, inexperienced theorists who are interested in exploiting their day dreams and ideas. They have gone hogwild in spending the American taxpayers' money. The people of this Nation are now demanding that this spending stop. Let us give them some relief.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to discuss an item in this bill. I prefer to speak at this time, rather than when the section is read, so that by no stretch of the imagination can it be construed that I am opposed to the appropriation. I refer to the item of $30,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration. I want to say at the outset that I admire General Hines. I consider him one of the finest and soundest Administrators in the employ of our Government.

We have scores of fine, well-constructed well-administered hospitals from one end of this country to the other. They stand as a memorial to his energy, ability, and integrity. But I do think, Mr. Chairman, that at this time the Veterans' Administration is going a little too slow on its hospital planning. General Hines testified before the Committee on Appropriations that it was his thought that the Veterans' Administration should wait until the war ends and then find out what hospitals have been built by the Army and the Navy that can be turned over to the Veterans' Administration. I fear if we do that some day we shall find that sufficient hospital beds are not available. That would be tragic.

If I may be excused a personal reference may I say that, following the conclusion of the last war, I saw the hospitalization program of this Government from the inside looking out rather than from the outside looking in. I had the misfortune to spend seventy-odd months in Veterans' Administration or Government hospital beds. I know something about the evils of the old contract system. Many Members of this House will recall that the Government had to go into communities and take any kind of space that could be found for hospital beds to hospitalize men returned from France in 1919. We know that with the laws now on our books we are going to have a greater percentage of men hospitalized as a result of this war than were hospitalized following World War No. 1. For one reason, under present law, any man who serves as much as 1 day in the armed forces, and is honorably discharged, is entitled to free hospitalization as long as he lives, for either service or nonservice disabilities. This benefit was not made available to veterans of World War No. 1 until 5½ or 6 years after the close of the war. So, if in this war the same percentage is returned sick or wounded that was returned in the last war and no more, we will need a great many more beds than we did last time.

There are hospitals throughout the country that have all of the utilities, the heating plants, the operating rooms and nurses' homes adequate for a large number of beds. That is true of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Newington, Conn. There are only 230 beds now at Newington, but it has utilities adequate to make it a 500-bed hospital.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say that it was due in large part to the efforts of the gentleman from Connecticut that that hospital was constructed. It was greatly needed. The gentleman did a very fine thing for Connecticut, and we ought to have added beds there now to meet the veteran load.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I want to complete that project at this time. General Hines has testified on previous occasions, as a matter of fact on numerous occasions, that a 500-bed general medical hospital is the best size both for efficiency and economy. There is no question, there cannot be any question in anybody's mind but what 500 beds in the State of Connecticut for general medical patients is the lowest possible number we can consider. Some responsible authorities feel that the Government should provide a minimum of 1,200 beds in the State of Connecticut. I am willing to wait a little while for that, but I can see no reason why they should not add the additional 170 beds at this time. There is no doubt but what they will be used at once.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I would like to get the gentleman's idea on this angle that I have recently run across. I think the gentleman will agree with me, will he not, that for the immediate short-term future we can expect a rather rapid increase in the number of casualties and the load on the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes; no doubt about it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. In reference to medically discharged patients. Does not the gentleman agree with me that perhaps we are attempting a very short-sighted policy when we abandon these training camps and immediately engage in a mad race to tear down those hospitals and discard facilities that in many cases cost millions of dollars?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think it is nothing short of criminal.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. For instance, at Fort Brady, up in northern Michigan, there is a hospital up there that cost $893,000. They are tearing that thing down and throwing it all away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, not only in Michigan but throughout other States these hospitals are being torn down. Very soon they will be badly needed. We do not want to go back to the old contract system that was in vogue in 1919 and 1920, with the scandals that resulted.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The fact is they are only getting 8 cents on the dollar on the original cost of those things.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. If they got 100 cents on the dollar, it would be a mistake to tear them down at this time. The end of the war is not in sight yet.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand in Florida there is a hotel where soldiers are hospitalized to give them rest and rehabilitation treatment, and they are planning to pull the veterans out of that hospital, which would be a great pity, to my mind, and turn it back to use as a hotel. It is needed for veterans.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Many things are going on that should be convincing to this Government that we need additional hospital beds in various parts of the country. The other day the newspapers carried a story that a number of the residents of the soldiers' home at Togus, Maine, had been transferred out to Ohio. Some of them had lived in this home for many, many years. It was home to them. They were happy there. They are being uprooted and sent a thousand miles away from their homes out to Ohio. It is poor planning, and should not be permitted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Today there is a great overcrowding in some of the nerve hospitals, which is extremely bad for nervous cases.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Conditions will be worse before they are better.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to use the additional 3 minutes allowed me to discuss a different question. I am wondering who gave the authority to the R. F. C. to announce a plan for making loans to discharged servicemen in order to reestablish them in business. Do not misunderstand me; I am not opposed to the program; but I wonder why a program of that kind is not brought to the Congress, referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, and give that committee the opportunity to study the program, and either approve or disapprove of such a far-reaching program. It is evidently going to be administered under some Executive order. The plan may be sound, and I certainly have all the confidence in the world that Mr. Jesse Jones will do a good job, but it seems strange to me that we have so far given up the control of the purse strings, and I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will hear me. I repeat that we have gone so far in giving up the control of the purse strings that an executive agency of our Government can set up a program that will cost millions of dollars without any action by Congress. No matter how many investigators the Committee on Appropriations may have, they will have no control over the purse strings of this Government as long as the R. F. C. is allowed to borrow and lend billions of dollars without coming to Congress for authority to embark on a new undertaking.

In my humble opinion, Mr. Jesse Jones is the ablest man in this administration. His sound business judgment has saved many a man from ruin. He has saved the taxpayers millions of dollars. I believe that Mr. Jones would want Congress to keep a tight grasp on the purse strings of this Government. Every agency of this Government should cover into the Treasury every dollar of income received by it from any source and they should all come to Congress for money with which to carry on their work. There are millions of dollars floating around downtown over which we have lost all control. Let us have no more blank checks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I notice in the pending bill an item for $127,500,000 for community facilities, and on pages 6 and 7 of the report I find that 1,650 projects refer to schools, totaling an estimated cost of $147,000,000, of which $77,000,000 shall be Federal funds and $69,000,000 or nearly $70,000,000 are funds to be advanced by the local school districts and communities or sponsors. Out of the 1,650 projects, 862 refer to school districts for war public services and 788 to war public works.

Mr. Chairman, I am well aware that the impact of the war brought to many communities problems which they could not solve because of the erection or creation of war plants for the production of war materials, necessitating a great influx of people with children to such an extent that the local school authorities could not cope with the problem, therefore it became necessary for the Federal Government to step in and provide funds and facilities to take care of the educational problems. Congress promptly passed some laws to cope with it, for example, the Lanham Act. There has come to my attention just recently a pamphlet issued by the Office of Education over the signature of John W. Studebaker, Commissioner of Education, dated February 29 this year. I want to quote from this pamphlet which was used at a conference held here in Washington by the Office of Education on March 3 and 4, only 6 days ago. On the first page of the pamphlet in paragraph 3 I find these two significant lines:

> The Federal Works Agency now administers the Lanham Act to build and operate school facilities with no significant relationship with State departments of education.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. In refutation of that statement I would like first to quote to my friend from Michigan the provision of the law which was approved June 28, 1941, to this effect:

> (b) No department or agency of the United States shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds have been or may be expended pursuant to this title, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement under this title relating to, or any lease, grant, loan, or contribution made under this title to or on behalf of, any such school, prescribe or affect its administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods of instruction, or materials for instruction.

I may say that in the administration of the law that provision I just referred to has been carried out. All the Federal Works Agency has done with reference to the education of children of these inmigrant workers has been to build an addition to a school where necessary and afford the money for additional teachers that have been necessary, the teachers being selected by the local authorities. So there is absolutely no foundation for that statement.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas and to the House that no one has been more meticulous or careful in protecting the school systems of the States of this Nation than has the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds that prepared the law to which he has just referred. But the language that we find in this pamphlet when compared with the language which the gentleman has just quoted from the law is in conflict and does not agree at all.

What does this language mean? Does it mean that we are to have a dual system of schools in this country? Does it mean that in certain school districts we are to have a Federal system of education and a State system of education? Does it mean that the Federal Government will set up its own course of study, its own standards for teachers, its payment for teachers and decide how the public schools shall be run? Or does it mean that the law which the gentleman has just read is not to be enforced and carried out to the letter and intent of the Congress? The plain interpretation of

the statement I read from the Commissioner's pamphlet is that the State departments of education are to be bypassed and ignored in order to obtain a foothold for Federal control of public education and public schools. When the war is over who will own, operate, and maintain these Federal schools? Washington or the States?

Mr. LANHAM. May I say that insofar as the administration of this act by the Federal Works Agency is concerned, there has been no effort whatever of the Federal Government to interfere with educational systems in the States. I am not so sure with reference to the Office of Education in view of certain very startling recommendations that we have recently seen announced in the press as having been made by that Office.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say further that the superintendent of public instruction of my State of Michigan, Dr. Eugene B. Eliot, one of the foremost educators in the country, has recently written an article over his signature that has been printed and given wide circulation under the title "The States Must Fight." The substance of the article is that the States must fight to retain control of public education. It is very evident from the statement by the Office of Education which I have just read to the House, that there is reason for the States to fight in order to maintain their own educational system or have it dominated and controlled by bureaucracy here in Washington.

There has also come to my attention a pamphlet issued by the Office of Education entitled "Planning Schools for Tomorrow." The date of this pamphlet is 1942. It was issued by the Office of Education of the United States. On page 21 of this pamphlet I am disturbed to find quoted the theories and the philosophies of a man who believes that it makes no difference how much we owe as a nation because we just owe it to ourselves. Under a paragraph entitled "Can We Afford to Pay for Education?" Alvin H. Hansen is quoted, and I find in a footnote that this quotation apparently was taken from an article entitled "After the War—Full Employment," from the National Resources Planning Board, January 1942, pages 5 and 6. I ask the House to listen to the theory and the philosophy expounded in this article:

> The notion that we cannot finance our own production is quite without foundation. Every cent expended, private and public, becomes income for members of our own society. Costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield.

Then, quoting again, from page 21, under this paragraph I find this language:

> There are some individuals who are apprehensive about the debt we are now assuming for the waging of the war. In commenting upon debt Hansen writes as follows: "An individual will always improve his asset position if he is able to pay off a part of his debt. But a nation may make itself poor by repayment of public debt."

That is the theory and the philosophy expounded. I am amazed and surprised to find such theories quoted, printed, and distributed broadcast throughout the United States, with the taxpayers' money, by the Office of Education here in the city of Washington.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. With all due respect to the gentleman from California, and no one doubts his word for one moment, I do not know of a single dollar of Federal money that has ever gone into a State that was not followed or preceded by a Federal politician advocating the adoption of some of these New Deal theories of political practice.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct and the whole trend has been toward socialism. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] wanted to ask me a question. I yield to him now.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman has answered my question in his statement. I wanted to ask him who issued these pamphlets.

Mr. DONDERO. I explained that to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I want to renew my question to whoever is in charge of the bill here. Will there be an attempt later to cut off debate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman will have all the time he wants, as far as I personally am concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As far as being in charge of the bill, I suppose, you are concerned.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I always listen to the gentleman with pleasure and edification.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As I understand the gentleman's statement, Mr. Studebaker would favor the Federal control of education in this country, according to that pamphlet?

Mr. DONDERO. The pamphlet speaks for itself.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am under the impression that is just what he would like to see, but the States of this country want to control education and not turn it over to the Federal Government.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman entirely.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman speaks of education. Is it not a fact and have you not found that there is a blind spot in our educational system, that the subject of money is not taught to the rising generation?

Mr. DONDERO. In answer to the gentleman from Idaho I want to say that in my judgment the blind spot is a failure on the part of the public school system of this country to teach properly the American system of government, American history, and American ideals of government.

Mr. WHITE. And the monetary system under which we operate.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. In view of the question just asked by the gentleman from Idaho, may I point out that there is a great deal of difference of opinion on the theory of money. A few moments ago someone was standing in the well of the House berating the fact that we are spending so many billions of dollars a year. It might be well to remember that in a monetary economy like our own, all of the money has to be spent by somebody or the system will not stay together. It has to be spent for consumption goods or for capital goods. It must be spent currently, or invested. It cannot be hoarded in a monetary system like ours. The fact that we can spend $90,000,000,000 a year or $120,000,000,000 or $150,000,000,000 a year is merely evidence of our productive capacity. Let us hope that we can spend $200,000,000,000 a year. We can spend it if we produce it. If we produce it, we must spend it. We must either consume it in current consumption or spend it for capital goods.

Mr. DONDERO. Let the people spend their own money instead of the Federal Government.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. May I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, can you spend it two or three times if you do not produce it?

Mr. McMURRAY. In answer to the gentleman's question, I will say that if you hold prices stable and there is no inflation involved in the transaction, you can spend only what you produce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a short time ago the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and some other Members of the House were discussing, if I understood it correctly, the proposition of more money for some agency to check Government expenditures. May I ask the gentleman from Missouri if that is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. There was quite a discussion on the subject; yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know nothing about the need for another agency or for more money for that purpose, but it does happen that I was present a few days ago when one of the committees was examining some of the officials of the Shipping Board or the board which trains and recruits seamen for the merchant

marine. We heard one of the officials testify that he had been drawing pay here in Washington at the rate of $5,900 per year working for the Government, that he had some sort of a promotion and went up to New York in connection with the work of the Shipping Board, so-called, and that his salary has increased to $7,500 a year.

Also, that for at least 3 months he received two checks, one at the rate of $5,900 a year, and one at the rate of $7,500 a year. He says that he received those checks, and that before getting them he had to sign a voucher each time stating that he had not received any other compensation from the Government. Nevertheless he drew pay on two pay rolls, and it took the Government a year to get him to pay back the amount he was not entitled to receive. He is still on the Federal pay roll. His boss, Mr. Dimock, I believe, said that he did not think, as long as the man returned the money, that there was any reason why he should be discharged. He did not believe the fact that the man believed in social equality among the seamen recruited and shipped on the vessels where, regardless of race, they had to eat and sleep together; he did not think that that was any reason for discharge, although he did admit that perhaps that would create a situation that would not contribute to the efficiency of the shipping industry in wartime. To an outsider, who does not know very well how the Government machinery operates, it would seem that we ought to check matters of that kind when a thing of that kind happens, when a fellow can get away with it, with one agency paying him and another issuing a second check, it does not seem as though we had tightened things up quite enough. I assume that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is doing something along the line of keeping a check on this matter, so that a fellow cannot be on two pay rolls at the same time and get away with it for 3 months, and for a year keep the money without paying his overdraft back to the Government. I am sure that the gentleman who has been sometimes characterized as the watch dog of expenditures, except of course when New Deal expenditures are involved, will take this up.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ROWE. I want to make an observation. There was a statement made before the District Committee yesterday, that a man employed here in a building on the Hill, who certified six names of men who were supposed to be working for him, and this continued for nearly 4 years, and until more than $60,000 had been paid to him before he was apprehended as a crook. Another statement, that a person serving as a C. C. C. official certified a whole company of names, when there were no such persons, drew, endorsed the checks, obtained more than $30,000 before he was apprehended.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, that was just a simple matter of graft, and this other may be only one instance in millions. Perhaps I should not have called it to the attention of the gentleman, or of the House, but I still think these mistakes, though small in number, should be checked up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, within the next few minutes we will reach the item for Veterans' Administration. I am one of those, like the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER], who spoke a few minutes ago, who prefers to speak on that item before it is reached, so that there will be no misunderstanding. I am in favor of the appropriation of $30,000,000 now, as I was in favor of the appropriation of $10,300,000 a few months ago, for the construction of additional veterans' facilities, but I do take this time to voice a protest against the continued refusal of the Veterans' Administration to build in Rhode Island a veterans' hospital.

I, as well as others, have beseeched, begged, and implored the Veterans' Administration to build a veterans' hospital in Rhode Island.

We have until now been denied such a hospital, and Rhode Island veterans who have been given hospitalization have had to go to hospitals in other States to get it.

Always when I talked to General Hines in the matter he either told me that the Federal Board of Hospitalization had just recently completed a survey and found that figures did not warrant a hospital for Rhode Island or he told me that the Board was about to make a survey. Again this morning I talked to him on the subject and was again told the subject is under study.

The only local hospitalization provided in Rhode Island by the Veterans' Administration has been under a contract for 80 beds in the naval hospital at Newport.

When the load in veterans' hospitals in New England became too great from time to time, instead of constructing a hospital in Rhode Island for Rhode Island veterans and moving these men from hospitals outside the State into their home State, thus making room for residents of the States where the hospitals are located, the Veterans' Administration has constructed new hospitals in those States and continued to hospitalize Rhode Island veterans at long distances from their homes.

The difficulty I have just described existed at a time when the Veterans' Administration was dealing only with World War No. 1 cases, but now that cases arising out of the present war are beginning to come in the condition is bound to demand a change.

There are now in the armed forces of the United States approximately 80,000 Rhode Islanders, and this figure is expected to rise to 100,000 by the end of this year. Even if we should be so conservative as to believe that only 1 percent of them will require hospitalization, and I cannot believe the figure will be that low, because I realize that our casualty lists will mount terribly as we increase our activities, that would mean a minimum of 800 cases to be taken care of, and you know as well as I do that this minimum is very much too low to expect.

On pages 122 and 123 of the hearings General Hines gives the following estimate of the beds needed for the care of veterans: In 1945, 105,200; 1950, 142,600; 1955, 171,900; 1960, 204,900; 1965, 249,400; 1970, 287,900; 1975, which is expected to be the peak, 298,400.

The State of Rhode Island is furnishing about 1 percent of the men for the armed forces, and it is only fair to estimate that it will also suffer 1 percent of the casualties. On the basis of only one-half of 1 percent of the total number of Rhode Island men in the service needing hospitalization the figures show that the hospital load will run from 526 in 1945 to 1,492 by 1975.

There are many other reasons why Rhode Island should have a veterans' hospital, but I shall use only this one and leave it to your good judgment as to whether or not we are justified in asking that a veterans' hospital be constructed in Rhode Island now.

The State government of Rhode Island is ready, and has advised the Veterans' Administration that it will either provide a site for such a hospital suitable to the Administration or it will pay up to $50,000 for any site which the Administration desires to purchase. Under either offer, the Federal Government is assured that a suitable site will be provided at no cost to the Government.

In these days when we voice so much solicitude for the veteran, I feel it is high time that the Administration stop discriminating against Rhode Island and get busy to provide its veterans with a suitable hospital.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

War public works (community facilities): For an additional amount to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by titles II and III of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531–1534 and 1541), $127,500,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, of which amount not to exceed $5,100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head "Defense public works (community facilities)" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371): *Provided*, That not more than $7,500,000 of the funds for war public works shall be used for construction of outplant facilities: *Provided further*, That the funds herein and heretofore appropriated to the Federal Works Agency for community facilities may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works without regard to the limitation contained in the act of July 15, 1943 (Public Law 150).

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on the ground it is legislation in an appropriation bill. I call the chairman's attention to the language at the top of page 8, "without regard to the limitation contained in the act of July 15, 1943."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the gentleman

from New York [Mr. TABER] makes the point of order against the proviso only and not against the whole paragraph?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the whole paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from New York is within his rights. I was in hopes that he would let the rest of the paragraph go through.

Mr. TABER. There are so many things in that paragraph which require the attention of the committee that I feel that whatever might finally be in the bill would be better accomplished if the whole paragraph were thrown out and an attempt made to put it back in, or such part of it as might be desirable to put back in. For instance, there is something that the gentleman referred to this afternoon, the continued availability of the fund. There are large amounts that are in this set-up for so many things that really I do not think ought to be considered.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman does not contend that there is no authority of law for some of the provisions of this paragraph, does he?

Mr. TABER. Oh, no. But there is a limitation in the law of $40,000,000 for certain things which it is sought to get rid of by this language, and to that, I think, we should direct our attention.

Mr. LANHAM. Should not the gentleman confine his point of order to that rather than to the parts of the paragraph for which there is authorization in the law?

Mr. TABER. I feel just as the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said a little while ago, that we should confine our efforts just as far as we can to annual appropriations. I feel this is one of the cases that cries out loud for that kind of treatment. I should like very much to see it in there and I do not see any way of getting as far as that without throwing it out and letting it be offered in some way or other, whichever procedure is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to make this inquiry. I do not know whether the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations contemplates offering that part of the paragraph which is clearly authorized by the law, and I would like to interrogate him in that regard in case the point of order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order and I will offer an amendment providing for that portion of the paragraph which is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair rules that the last paragraph is legislation and sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 7, after line 6, insert:

"FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

"War public works (community facilities): For an additional amount to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by title II and III of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531–1534 and 1541), $127,500,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, of which amount not to exceed $5,100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head "Defense public works (community facilities)" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371): *Provided*, That not more than $7,500,000 of the funds for war public works shall be used for construction of outplant facilities."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the point of order of the gentleman from New York is based on the proviso beginning at line 22, on page 7. The rest of the paragraph is in order, but under the rules of the House, if a part of a paragraph is out of order, the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order if the point of order is made. In view of the fact that the gentleman makes a point of order, not only against the proviso but against the entire paragraph, I am reoffering in this amendment all of the paragraph which is in order, that is, all of it except the last proviso. It is vital that this proviso be included in the bill. If this should be stricken from the bill, it would stop the projects which are now under agreement for maintenance and which are of vital interest to the war program and it would stop the operation of these facilities already in operation. For that reason the remainder of the paragraph should be included now in the present amendment. There are over 1,300 service projects which are in operation. They are operated under agreements by which the sponsors put up money and the Federal Government puts up some to run to a certain date. The elimination of this proviso means the discontinuance of these projects when the present agreements expire.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER to the amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Strike out "$127,500,000" and insert "$68,690,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that there is a certain unpopularity connected with doing one's duty. I recognize that there are people who are in favor of the Federal Government doing all sorts of things and going a long way. I am going to tell you a few of the things that this money has been used for and a few of the things that it is proposed to use this money for. At a time when the revenues in Puerto Rico are $65,000,000 in excess of their demands for expenditure in a single year, they have spent upwards of $7,500,000 of these funds for building a power system in Puerto Rico, and it is proposed that they spend $3,000,000 out of the funds that are here involved for a water system in Puerto Rico. I wonder how many of you had that in mind when you were thinking about this situation. They are making all sorts of allotments for schools, for recreation centers, for so-called child care and recreational activities. Large parts of them are being done in the most wasteful way. Large parts of them are being done in the most inefficient way. I am going to give you a tip so that you can go and find out for yourself something of the kind of job that is being done, without too much effort on your part. If you will call at 314 D Street SE., you will find the largest child-welfare set-up in the District of Columbia. I would suggest that you go there and see if you think that is being handled in such a way to promote child welfare. That is the largest child-welfare organization in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Why does not the gentleman tell us something about it?

Mr. TABER. I have had it inspected. The people who came back from it told me it was dirty and was not the kind of a place that children ought to be kept in. I know who is in charge of this set-up. I do not know whether the rest of the House knows it or not. Mrs. Florence Kerr is in charge of this set-up. She has a record. She was Assistant Administrator of the W. P. A. under Mr. Harry Hopkins. All of you know about the efficiency with which the operations of the W. P. A. were conducted. Up in my State this thing is little used. Members here have received telegrams from their educational authorities, hoping that there will be no more of this. Members from my State and Members from other States adjoining have received similar telegrams hoping there will be no more of this proposition with Federal control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Are not these facilities all under certain grants? Who is running this particular center? What agency is in charge?

Mr. TABER. It is impossible for anyone to tell.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, you are making great complaint about it.

Mr. TABER. It is a job that is being done under this appropriation bill. That is the only thing I can tell you.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. In my opinion, it is very unfair——

Mr. TABER. How can anybody do anything else with the things we have been supplied with? It has been almost impossible for us to know anything. I have spent hours and hours going through that blue volume that you have on that table in front of you. It is almost impossible to get your finger on anything and get down to earth on it. All you can do is to get the information that is available to you, and that I have been doing and I have been telling about it as I have gone along.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I am going to take my own time now. If the gentleman does not understand it, when I get through he can get up in his own time and he can tell.

Mr. RABAUT. Nobody will defend the gentleman any more than I will. I will defend the gentleman any time I think he is right.

Mr. TABER. But let me tell my story first.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman knows that from his own experience.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. RABAUT. I will ask the gentleman this question: Under what agency is this center operated? The agencies that we are talking about only make grants. Now, who is operating it?

Mr. TABER. Oh, these agencies—some agencies are local and some agencies are national. The Federal Works Agency has as the head of it—Mrs. Florence Kerr is the head of this so-called child welfare.

Mr. RABAUT. Is she operating the place at 314 D Street?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I do not know.

Mr. RABAUT. I thought that is what the gentleman said.

Mr. TABER. I said it was being operated with funds under this proposition. That is all I said. Now, if the gentleman expects that I am going to be able to find out who it is—evidently the gentleman does not want to have the facts brought out. I have told as much as I could.

Mr. RABAUT. The lady to whom the gentleman referred, if he will yield furfher, works for the Federal Works Agency.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes; she does, but she is in charge of this set-up, and that is one of the reasons that makes people suspicious because we know what she did before and what her record is.

Mr. RABAUT. In what capacity?

Mr. TABER. I have told it once. The gentleman evidently was not paying attention or was not present. If I am going to have to tell the same thing over five or six times before the gentleman can get it through his head, it either indicates the gentleman is not paying attention or else he did not want to listen. I have told it once and I will not tell it again now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is just filibustering. He is not doing anything else.

Mr. TABER. I appreciate that the majority in this House does not want to have the facts at all. That is why we are going to have a statement made before we get through that my operation here is based on partisanship. Let me tell you it is based on a desire to do my duty to the United States of America, and I will tell you that first.

Now I am going to tell you what I propose to do and what this amendment would do. It would cut down, so that the unexpended balance of the $40,000,000 limitation that was put in this bill when it was being considered, the authorization bill by Mr. LANHAM'S committee—it will cut down the amount that can be used for so-called services like recreation centers, like these child-care set-ups, like grants to schools, which are quite small in the aggregate comparatively, to the $40,000,000 which is the limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes, because I think this should be brought out.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. It will also cut down to $40,000,000 the amount of new money that will be available for projects that are not covered by allotments. That is the amount that covers those that are in process of review in the central offices and the regional offices; that amount that covers $11,000,000 that have been approved by the Federal Works Agency, but which the President has not yet approved. It will allow in addition to the $11,000,000 that they have spent on these so-called welfare outfits, $28,000,000. To my mind these welfare outfits are of doubtful validity because of the way they are being handled. My State, for instance, spent more money, 10 times over, than the Federal Government spent in our State for that purpose. They do a fairly good job, but we do not have very much of this kind of operation with Federal aid.

That would allow $28,000,000 yet to be spent in addition to the $11,000,000 that has already been spent. That would carry them through all of the projects that are in process of review in the central office in the same way.

This thing has got to stop sometime. That was what General Fleming came before us with, that this thing must stop sometime. Why not set it up in such way that it will stop at the end of 1945 and not try to spread it out forever? There are a great lot of things in here that are not necessary and that we should not give in to. I cited one set-up. All of our educational authorities feel that the State educational authorities should have the handling of whatever money is granted to the schools. They also feel that these child-welfare propositions should be handled in a better way than they are being handled.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman does not contend that the money that goes to the schools for additions to the schools where necessary to take care of the children of these in-migrant workers and to pay the salaries of additional teachers who may have to be hired—the gentleman does not contend that that is not controlled by the local school authorities, does he?

Mr. TABER. It has been so far, that is true; on the other hand they seem to be all worked up about it and they do not seem to like it. They do not seem to like the way the money is being granted by the Federal Government direct to the schools and circumventing the State departments of education.

Mr. LANHAM. The local school systems like it.

Mr. TABER. I do not think so; that is where the telegrams come from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Virginia will be recognized for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter, and I ask the indulgence of the Committee that they may have the full facts and know just what the implications are if they adopt this amendment offered by my distinguished friend from New York. I repeat what I have said many times, the House and the Nation owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, for his fine work on the Appropriations Committee, but every once in a while he gets wrong and when he gets wrong he does a good job of it. Now, he is dead wrong on this. This is a vitally important link in the war program, the furnishing of community facilities. It is as vitally necessary that this sort of thing be done as it is to make the airplane, to make the tank, and to make the ammunition. And you cannot have this production if you do not come to the aid of these communities that feel the impact of this war program.

I have here a list that comprises every State in the Union; I think, some 2,317 projects. In some States there are 60 or 70 projects authorized. There is hardly a State in the Union that has not some need for these community facilities. You will find in the report the type of thing that is embodied: Schools, child care, medical—general, venereal-disease control, water systems, sewer systems, recreation, power, fire and police, streets

and highways, garbage disposal, sanitary facilities.

What does it mean? It means that some of these large war industries have gone into small communities and that suddenly, almost overnight, the population of those communities has been doubled, trebled, or quadrupled. People have been brought in there to face inadequate sanitary facilities. There are no school facilities for their children, there is no housing, there are no venereal-disease control centers, there is no medical care, and those commodities are absolutely unable to meet that load and to carry it, and they would not have been able to function had it not been for the relief the Federal Government has given.

We have been scrupulously careful in this program. In the last deficiency bill there was a Budget item for $50,000,000 for community facilities. What happens? We did not allow a penny because they had $14,000,000 left. Even my beloved friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], whom we all love and admire and usually follow, offered a motion to cut the item to $25,000,000, but the House defeated it and there was not any money put in there. We told them to come back and bring us a detailed statement outlining specifically where these funds were to be used. They did so and on the desk or table there is a large volume that must have taken months of work, day and night, to assemble; it contains the statistical data they have sent to the committee.

What has happened? The point of order took out of this bill the proviso, on page 7, line 22, which would have permitted the Federal Works Agency to have continued for the balance of this fiscal year some 1,360 projects heretofore approved, not available for continuance after the present date of termination. That point of order will not permit the continuance of those projects.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The point of order simply wipes out the provision that would do away with the $40,000,000 limitation on those things. Only $11,000,000 has so far been spent. This would not affect the continuation of those projects.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am told by the Agency that unless that limitation is removed these projects close. There is no doubt about that. I want to read a little statement. If you want to find out something about what ought to be done for these children, these nursery projects, these child-care projects, our committee had the distinction of having the lady Members of Congress appear before us, every one of them: The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], the gentlewoman from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. LUCE], and the gentlewoman from New York [Miss STANLEY]. I wish all of you would read this statement. If I had the time, I would read it in its entirety, but I do not have the time, so I will read just a part of it, and I hope you will read the balance. It is not what I say about this but what these ladies say:

> As of course you know, under the wartime child-care program, funds are allotted for assistance in the operation of facilities for the care of children whose mothers are employed in jobs essential to the war effort. Local communities participate in the cost of the service to the extent that funds are available and the parents pay a fee which must cover, at least, the cost of food.

Let me say parenthetically that these projects are not run by Mrs. Curry in the Federal Works Agency. Allotments are made to the actual community that runs the project. Every one of these projects are run by the local communities. If there is something wrong with the one in the District of Columbia, it is because the District of Columbia is not looking after it properly. The allotments are made to the communities; it is up to the communities to run them. Then they say:

> We want to call to your attention the urgency of this program because of the vast number of women now in industry and the need for more than 1,000,000 additional women workers by July 1.
>
> The health and safety of our children, as well as the achievement of our war-production goals, depend on speedy provision of the necessary funds.

Now as to the $40,000,000 this is what these ladies say:

> A further step is necessary to the fulfillment of this program. The limitation of $40,000,000 imposed by act of Congress of July 15, 1943, on the amount of funds permitted to be used for maintenance and operation of these war services should be lifted. Allocation of funds to the child-care projects already approved and pending would bring the total allocation up to the limit imposed. Therefore, the failure to remove this limitation would mean a total collapse of the child-care program.

We tried to remove that limitation, but the point of order takes that out of the bill. We are hoping, of course, that the body at the other end of the Capitol will take care of it, but I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that we have cut this community facility program from the $150,000,000 Budget estimate down to $127,500,000. I want to say to you very frankly and candidly that it is my belief as well as that of other Members who have studied this that to further cut will seriously cripple and endanger this war program. I am sure that the Members of Congress who have these projects in their districts will find out if they have not already found out that there will be a lot of protest and disappointment where these projects have been curtailed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If we do not make this appropriation there will be a great deal more juvenile delinquency than exists today?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think it is vitally necessary to be carried on.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. I am a little perplexed in that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said only eleven million of the forty million had been expended; now the gentleman says if the limitation is not removed projects will stop.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It may not be expended, but it is stated and the agencies tell us that if the limitation is not changed they will stop. That is the information that is given. That is the statement filed before the Members of Congress, and the gentleman from Texas can also verify it. Without the lifting of that limitation some of these existing projects will either have to be closed or curtailed.

Mr. ROWE. The gentleman, having made a study, will tell us the difference in the commitments between eleven and forty million dollars?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is the difference between eleven and forty million dollars. The whole forty million has been committed and will not run until the end of the fiscal year. There is no question about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a project in my district, Camp Barkeley, which has asked the city of Abilene, Tex., for water facilities. Abilene itself does not need the water facilities. These water facilities are for Camp Barkeley, where two divisions have been trained and are now fighting overseas and a third one is just about finished. If this is knocked out Camp Barkeley will have to close in the summer months part of its activities. The city there, as I say, does not need the water facilities, but it is contributing $74,000 in order that these facilities may go to Camp Barkeley. I am sure our friend from New York [Mr. TABER] does not want to cut that out.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That condition is duplicated all over the country where there are large industries and a large concentration of troops.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I come from possibly the most congested area in the United States. I believe that the Hampton Roads section is known as military congested area No. 1. We need the entire $150,000,000, I do not say for that area but for the country at large.

If the pending amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to reduce the amount in the bill prevails, the situation will become chaotic; it will be impossible for us to carry on adequately our work of production of ships. People are not coming and staying in any community which does not give them reasonable facilities. The schools that are to be provided cannot be built and cannot be supplied with teachers unless this appropriation goes through. We need hospitals, sewerage systems, additions to jails, bridge repairs, schools,

sewer improvements, recreational facilities, comfort stations, and various services at miscellaneous projects.

The schools are operated and constructed strictly in accord with State law and regulations and are under the supervision of State officials and State authorities. In every instance the Public Works Agency, so far as I know—and I think I am correct—has secured the certification and approval of the State officials to the project before it has been approved. I wish you would read the speech of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] yesterday in which he brought out the contribution that is made to crime by reason of failure to provide proper facilities for the children.

In my own particular area, with the Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., with the Langley Field operations there, and the training bases that train the men before they are sent overseas, you can see the result that will immediately follow. We have a Seabee training camp there; we have there a port of embarkation and debarkation through which the soldiers are passing to go overseas to fight and returning. To deny the community the facilities that are necessary would be a colossal calamity. I call your attention to the fact that the population of that particular area on my side of the water increased from 87,388 in 1940 to a present population of 189,329.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The fact of the matter is I assume that in this area that the gentleman comes from, as well as other similar areas throughout the United States, the development of homes and so on has not added anything to the tax roll of those communities because of the acquisition of property and land by the Government which really takes land off the tax roll?

Mr. BLAND. That is the situation. We are begging that something may be done to relieve us from the burden that we are carrying with respect to that loss in taxables.

Mr. KEEFE. Due to the loss of taxes and due to this influx of people, those communities are unable utterly to provide the necessary community facilities?

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman is absolutely right, yet the community is bearing its share in these facilities as best it can.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to leave given me to extend my remarks, I submit the following statement that I made to the committee:

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

STATEMENT OF HON. SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

If I understand the break-down correctly as to the needs for the $150,000,000, there are now certain projects in process of negotiation, practically concluded but still in process of negotiation as to the conditions for the award, that would be omitted if the bill confines the appropriation to existing projects where contracts have been let and money allocated. There are now many projects awaiting final approval or allocation of funds which are very necessary and could not be made unless the total amount of $150,000,000 recommended by the President and approved by the Budget is appropriated. For my own district, this would include projects for hospitals, nurses, homes, sewerage, health center, addition to jail, bridge repairs, schools, sewer improvements necessary to health, recreation and comfort stations, and service at various projects including schools, all of which will be stopped and war work seriously impeded if the full appropriation is not granted. The workers needed for defense work are not coming to the community to do this work and will not stay there unless provision is made for these projects, and many workers now there are going to leave. Defense works essential to the successful prosecution of the war will inevitably be slowed down.

The need for protecting fire equipment in this locality is great. The climatic conditions are such that property unprotected rapidly deteriorates. There are many similar situations throughout the United States and particularly in my district, which is so very greatly congested with defense projects. I may mention the shipyard with its construction, the various Army camps and war activities, which have resulted in such an increase in the population in this area that the existing communities, are unable to take care of these demands. I am speaking for the area which includes, in addition to the shipyard, the port of embarkation at Newport News, aviation activities at Langley Field, activities at Fort Monroe, the Navy mine depot at Yorktown, Army activities at Fort Eustis, all of which are taxed to the limit and bring in a population for which schools must be provided and hospital facilities, sewers, comfort stations, recreation facilities, fire protection, nurseries, and various other conveniences necessary to preserve morale, to secure personnel, and to retain the workers necessary to the defense work. This area comprehends Fort Monroe, Old Point, Hampton, Newport News, York County, Warwick County, Elizabeth City County, and it is impossible to determine accurately some time in advance just what activities will be needed. An illustration exists in the case of the water line from the present water system at Newport News to the Chickahominy River. To show the necessity for flexibility in the appropriations, I may mention that when this project was approved originally, it contemplated a pipe line of certain dimensions, which had subsequently to be materially increased to take care of the Seabee operations near Williamsburg. This was not known when the project was originally granted and the existence of a flexible fund enabled W. P. A. to meet the situation which otherwise it could not have done.

If the increase is not granted, schools are not going to be built which have been already approved, but which lack money for their construction. This would include two schools in Warwick County and in York County, a school in Elizabeth City County, and there will be no money with which the necessary services for these schools can be provided.

Some of the facilities needed such as a health center, addition to jail, bridge repairs, schools, comfort stations, and sewers already have been approved by W. P. A. and some have gone so far as to receive Presidential approval, but unless the money is provided in this bill, they cannot continue. The question of necessity was gone into very fully by the Federal Works Agency. These people have done an excellent job. They have scrutinized carefully all the applications and have only approved projects where the evidence procured in the field and submitted by the applicants has shown the projects to be necessary. Not only is this true as to the approval of projects, but the authorization was most carefully considered by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the authorization was only made after the necessity for that amount was demonstrated. I know that the Appropriations Committee does not desire to place itself in a position of retarding the necessary defense work, and I am sure that that result will inevitably follow the failure to provide now the full appropriation of $150,000,000 with such flexibility in the appropriation as that the program can go forward, new situations can be met and new conditions can be relieved. This appropriation above all others is one that cannot be placed in a strait jacket.

As an illustration of the need of funds to meet future applications and because already pending, I may mention the situation very near my own home where a volunteer organization known as the Wythe Fire Department in Elizabeth City County has served the United States adequately and promptly throughout this emergency. That organization with the head of the Board of Supervisors of Elizabeth City County has been able to maintain efficient and modern equipment, but has been unable, though they have an application pending, to secure the necessary funds for a fire house. That fire department is located near a settlement built with Government money where there are 22,500 persons needing protection.

There is the greatest need for this project, and it ought to be provided, but I fear it will not be secured unless the appropriation is made in this bill. It should be fully studied, and it will be, but however meritorious this or any other project may be it cannot be constructed unless the appropriation to be made now for community facilities has sufficient flexibility and is sufficiently large to cover meritorious cases at present undetermined. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had this in contemplation when it made the authorization.

We have made a remarkable record in defense work, and it has been due considerably to the provision of necessary community facilities.

This defense area in my district embraces 260 square miles. It includes the cities of Newport News and Hampton and the town of Phoebus. It includes the counties of Elizabeth City, York, and Warwick. The population in 1940 was 87,388, and as of June 1943, the population was estimated at 189,329, the estimate of population being based upon 145,726 No. 2 ration books plus an estimated floating population. As of January 1, 1944, there were 161,934 No. 4 ration books. The estimated population of 189,329 appears conservative.

I am convinced that there is imperative need of getting the program throughout the Nation, which is now in a position of stalemate, resumed as quickly as possible and not only resumed, but pressed to completion. Members of the House of Representatives who represent districts in which the full impact of the war upon community life has not been felt are less aware of the need.

I have tried to show, and I know that communities in the vicinity of shipyards and munitions plants of all kinds are crowded with working men and their families who have been attracted from other parts of the country. Many of these communities have experienced a vast increase in population within the last few months. Old patterns of a once settled community life in such places are breaking up. A vast number of new problems have arisen in relation to public health, sanitation, education, recreation, and transportation that are completely insolvable without Federal assistance.

Let me cite a few instances from the Hampton Roads area, in Virginia, which today is the scene of intense military, naval, and shipbuilding activity. The area had a 1940 population of 386,394. The population now,

as estimated by the Bureau of the Census, is in excess of half a million. This is only the population domiciled within the area. It does not include the thousands of visitors who come in every day to transact business, nor the naval and military personnel who, in large numbers, are being constantly moved into the area to remain for some days or weeks before assignment elsewhere, and whose presence enormously complicates problems of public health and the protection of life and property.

When we examine individual communities within the area, the contrast between the situation 4 years ago and the situation today is even more extreme. The city of Hampton has increased in population from 5,800 to 7,000, Newport News from 37,000 to 60,000, Elizabeth City County from 32,000 to 40,000, Warwick County, outside of Newport News, from 9,000 to 28,000—a threefold increase. Figures for other communities in the area are equally startling.

The impact is felt in many directions. For example, a new housing development in Warwick County, known as Copeland Park, and tenanted by shipyard workers, is without adequate school facilities. Application has been filed with the Federal Works Agency for assistance in building a school for about 400 pupils, to cost around $120,000. There can be no question whatever about the need; it has been attested not only by the regional office of the Federal Works Agency but by the State educational authorities, the local officials, and by the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. Yet the school cannot be built because there are no funds for the purpose. The importance of this to the war effort cannot be exaggerated. Ships are imperatively needed, but the workers will not stay to build them, as past experience abundantly proves, unless there are educational opportunities for their children.

Not only cannot the vitally needed additional schools be built, but there are no funds with which to operate many of the schools already in existence. Warwick County received in Federal funds last year $44,000 to meet the deficit in its school operations. This year it has asked for $205,213. The difference between the two sums affords some measure of the increasing strain on the local facilities caused by the rapidly increasing population. This is money needed, not to pay for luxuries or for educational fads and frills, but just to take care of the minimum essentials—to help pay the teachers and the janitors. Elizabeth City County has asked $430,244 with which to help carry on regular school work, and unless that sum is provided the schools will have to close.

And so I could go through a long list of needed school buildings, support for existing schools, health centers, hospitals, garbage disposal, sewage treatment plants, new sewer extensions, care for the children of working mothers, comfort stations, the repair of a bridge over which people have to pass to get to their work, an addition to the jail.

Applications for some of these have been filed in the regional office of the Federal Works Agency. In due time those applications will be forwarded to General Fleming. I think he will have to approve them and send them to the President. If the President should approve, and I think he must, since the need is war-connected by every conceivable test, they will be returned to General Fleming. And there they will come to rest. This is nothing more than preliminary paper work. Without funds additional child-care centers cannot be provided, no schools will be built, no sewage treated. The need for speed is perhaps most evident in the case of schools, for unless money is made available within the next few weeks, construction cannot be completed within the coming construction season and the buildings made ready for occupancy next September.

From Newport News alone additional applications for facilities are expected. The regional director has sent his engineers and investigators to the city to survey the need and to make sure that it is war connected, since there is no point in going to the trouble and expense of preparing an application, with all the complicated statements as to local resources that are called for, unless it can be established in advance that the work intended comes within the limitations of the Lanham Act. The war-connected need has been established up to the hilt, but there is still no assurance that the facilities can be provided.

I cite these instances, not because I think that the particular section of the country in which I live is entitled to greater consideration than hundreds of others similarly situated, but simply because I have personal knowledge of them. Hampton Roads is a vital bastion of our war effort, but it is no more than illustrative of the problem as a whole which now afflicts hundreds of overcrowded war production and military areas throughout the country from coast to coast.

I hope the full sum of $150,000,000 will be appropriated. In the past we have been appropriating to the Federal Works Agency under the Lanham Act in piecemeal fashion, a little somewhat grudgingly advanced at one time, a little more later. In view of the tremendous need, that policy is not logical.

I understand that General Fleming will tell you that if the entire balance of the authorization were made available to him he would be able to finish up the program, so far as the need can now be foreseen. Knowing something of the dimensions of the need, I think that may be a somewhat overly optimistic prediction. But I strongly urge, however, that we give him the help he needs to try to carry out the promise.

What is at stake is the health and safety of millions of people throughout the country. Also at stake is our all-out effort to win this war as quickly as possible and with as little loss of life as necessary. Unless we can throw about these people at least minimum protection of their health and welfare they will not stay on the job to build the ships and planes needed or, if they are compelled to stay, their productive efficiency will deteriorate to a point where lives will be imperiled for the lack of tools of war which our fighting men must have to win.

The problem is truly national in scope. These overburdened communities throughout the country have a right to look to us for aid in their time of peril and we must not fail them. Nor must we fail the war effort.

Let us do now what we would eventually be compelled to do in any event, and let us do it as ungrudgingly as we would act to relieve distress brought about by a flood, an earthquake, or any other kind of public calamity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, to cut approximately $60,000,000 from this appropriation. I was somewhat amazed to hear the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] a few minutes ago make the contention that if we attempt to cut any money from this appropriation we will be frustrating or retarding the war effort. In reality, we would be conserving both manpower and finances. I agree with the gentleman that the Federal Works Agency, through the community facilities program, has done some outstanding work, but so did W. P. A., N. Y. A., C. C. C., and these other agencies which have been outmoded.

Let us examine the record and see what the community facilities program has provided during the past 33 months. You will probably recall that this program was started in July 1941. During these 33 months there have been approximately $360,000,000 expended, or about $10,000,000 a month. The appropriation which is proposed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] would take care of a program on the same basis without any streamlining or retrenchment during the next 12 months.

A few minutes ago I got the impression from the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia that this appropriation was only for the balance of this fiscal year, but the report made by the committee points out that this appropriation would carry through an active program until June 30, 1945, or about 15 months. I should like to recall what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations said yesterday during the course of his remarks—and I quote the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]:

> They asked for $150,000,000. We allowed $127,500,000, which gives $5,100,000 for administrative expenses, $101,500,000 for projects which are ready to go or will be a continuance of operation of existing projects, and $21,000,000 for new applications which have not come in from field offices.

We have heard a great deal on the floor of this Chamber during the past few years about blank checks, and now through this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri it is proposed to issue another blank check so that this Federal Works Agency can, during the next 15 months, approve some of these applications which have not yet been processed and are still in the field offices.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that the war is going to end with this fiscal year, and should we make provision in our production merely for the accommodation of the workers for this fiscal year, or with reference to the duration of the war?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I can assure the gentleman that, regardless of how long the war lasts, this Congress or the succeeding Congresses will be in session; and just as this is a deficiency appropriation bill, if a legitimate and logical need exists for these facilities and services, I am sure that the Committee on Appropriations will not hesitate to bring here and present to this House legislation for the necessary funds. There is no need at this time for issuing another blank check, anticipating that for the next 15 months this program must be carried on to the same extent that it has been during the past 33 months. That is an indefensible position to take.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am sure the gentleman knows that there are

projects being completed now in new industries where the housing projects have not even been started yet. The Federal Government has said to those towns, "You permit this housing project to go into your town and we will make a grant for a school."

Mr. DWORSHAK. I do not know of any housing projects like that.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Come up to my district and I will show you some.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I will take you to Niagara Falls and different places and show you hundreds and hundreds of vacant housing units that ought not to have been built.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. That is not true in Connecticut. There is a question of good faith involved.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman will recognize that we are already canceling billions of dollars of war contracts, and there is no legitimate need at the present time for continued shifting of population.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Is the gentleman familiar with the projects that are contained in this bill for the State of Idaho, and can he say that they are not necessary?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I will say that the projects that were completed during 1943 probably were.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; the ones that are in this program that you are fixing to cut out by this amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I believe in that kind of economy that will involve reductions in my State on the same basis that I am asking for economy in other States.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman thinks that half the projects in Idaho might be cut out and not hurt any?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I believe that some of them can be eliminated.

I call your attention to the fact that, when you stress child care, there was only about $38,000,000 of a total of a half billion dollars expended for child care, so when they say that this program is for the children of the mothers that are working in war plants, I contend that only a very small proportion of the funds have been devoted to this worth-while purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that this legislation is strictly war-emergency legislation. It is designed to take care of the in-migrant workers at these great war-production plants without whom the plants themselves could not operate. If you do not wish to continue and accentuate absenteeism and the lack or loss of morale, then do not deny these workers the ordinary living conditions which are unfortunate, at best, in these various areas. This is a war-emergency matter purely.

Let me call attention to the fact that more Members of the House of Representatives have come to see me, beseeching me that something be done to give them the benefit of these facilities at these plants in their districts, than with reference to any other matter that has ever come before me personally for attention. A great many of these Members from all over the United States have appeared before the Committee on Appropriations urging the necessity for these facilities in order that our war production may be carried on. With the appropriation mentioned in this bill we still lack $22,500,000 of meeting the authorization, and the Congress evidently believed that that authorization was necessary or it would not have enacted it into law. As to this idea of providing only for the fiscal year, you cannot put up these various facilities in a few days; often not in a few months.

We must provide for this war. No man knows just what its duration will be. You cannot expect these women, for instance, with reference to that particular feature of community service, who are working in these plants and who are being called upon more and more to contribute their labor to the war effort in the production of the necessary equipment, to go into these plants and be denied every reasonable living convenience to carry on.

It is of the very highest importance that this appropriation be made. Let us hope that the amount provided in the bill will be sufficient to meet this emergency. Undoubtedly it should not be reduced. I think if those of you who have come to see me urging the necessity for this legislation, with reference to conditions in your own districts, will support it, the figure which is stated in this bill will remain there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is indeed an odd situation in which the House finds itself this afternoon. To take a real appraisal of this picture we must go back to the days when we took the women into the armed services of this country and took many a mother's helper away from the home. We must realize that we have called for women to go into the industries of our Nation, and we must realize that child care is a mother's first love. For Members who recognize their positions as Representatives of the people to stand in the well of the House and argue against the proposition for the support of child care throughout the United States in these days of war is beyond my comprehension.

My special concern in child care is aggravated by the attitude of the gentleman from New York, but in the same breath I desire to call your attention to the fact that his own district has been well provided for. He has a sewage project in his district, to which the Federal Government contributed $13,650, at Geneva, N. Y. The entire cost of the project was $40,965. It is wrapped up and in the bag, and in the gentleman's district.

Then, also at Geneva, N. Y., there is a hospital, built with Federal funds, costing $82,621, all wrapped up and in the bag in the gentleman's district.

I want to say further that his amendment will ultimately affect his own district in New York for a child-care center, the total of which is $25,766.

The gentleman's position, as evidenced by his amendment, is opposed to mine. It strikes at community facilities so necessary to child life such as schools, care centers, and hospitals. For my part, it is a pleasure to stand on the floor of this House and champion those concerning whom the Saviour of the world said, "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I realize that the gentleman is trying to put the heat on. I only ask that we cut this down to give them enough to work on and then stop.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman should remember that the women Members of the Congress, women who have intimate knowledge of this situation, came before his committee and advocated support of this measure.

What is the situation concerning the $40,000,000? Thirty million dollars of the sum is allocated at the present time, and the remaining $10,000,000 will not take care of the balance of the projects on hand. And there is no money for new projects, and no funds with which to renew the contracts of the existing projects when they expire. If that is what the gentleman wants — chaos — his amendment is perfect.

In substantiation of these facts I quote from the report No. 1239 accompanying the bill, H. R. 4346:

> The act of July 15, 1943 (Public Law 150 of the 78th Cong.), the last authorization for community facilities, placed a limitation of $40,000,000 on the total amount of community-facility funds that could be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943. This limitation will shortly be exhausted and further aid to maintenance and operation of schools, child-care centers, hospitals, and other facilities will not be possible unless it is removed or modified to meet the needs of the program to June 30, 1945. Pursuant to the Budget request and the recommendation of the Federal Works Agency, and after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the committee recommends the removal of the limitation so that the service program may continue without interruption.
>
> A great many Members of the House have appeared before the committee in the interest of additional facilities to meet the need in communities that are hard pressed because of the heavy impact of war conditions. The committee was also privileged to have a report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, through its capable chairman, Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM, who fathered the legislation authorizing the program and who has kept in close contact with its administration. The following is the concluding paragraph of his statement before the committee:

"The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has had monthly reports from the Federal Works Agency on this program. I am glad to report to the Appropriations Committee that our committee feels that the program has been capably and economically handled. The present estimate looks to its completion. It has required less money than was anticipated. The maintenance and operation funds necessary for the services involved are certainly urgent. I am also impressed with the need for supplementary facilities in hard-pressed communities in direct aid of war production. These are needed because of the extraordinary employment of women, the consequent strain that that employment makes on their homes, and the congestion of war workers in isolated centers, which makes it difficult, if not impossible, for access to normal community facilities at hours which war jobs permit. The Government has a tremendous investment in shipyards, airplane factories, and other war industries. To make that investment completely serviceable and fruitful every effort must be made to prevent labor turn-over and to provide means by which the workers can get at the necessities of life."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am very much surprised and disappointed at this debate today. A few days ago Mrs. ROGERS, Mrs. BOLTON, Mrs. SMITH, Mrs. LUCE, Miss STANLEY, and I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations to discuss the child-care program. We were led to believe that the committee was in entire sympathy with the program, and so I am amazed at the way in which the debate has developed today. I cannot believe that there is a man on the floor of this House, and I know there is not a woman who does not consider that this is an absolutely necessary program. We have been begging women to take jobs in industry. A great many of those women have children. You know and I know that a woman's first consideration is to care for her children, and no woman will leave her home and her children if she does not believe that proper care will be given to those children, nor should she—not even to serve her country, because the care of her children should come before anything else. How can she answer the call of her Government and take a job in industry unless her Government assists in providing the necessary care for her children? She cannot. It is simply impossible. And the best means to provide this care is by the continuation and expansion of the nursery program with Lanham funds. The fact we must bear in mind is that this appropriation is for a wartime emergency—strictly so. It is wartime legislation. We have got to have this money to provide proper care for the children of working mothers. There should be no disagreement about that, and I do not see how there can be.

There seems to be much confusion regarding this appropriation. The Federal Works Agency does not operate child-care facilities. Neither does it administer, supervise, or prescribe standards.

Every nursery school and child-care unit receiving assistance from Lanham Act funds is under the full and complete control of the local community. In nearly all cases the local public-school systems are the applicants for funds and are in charge of operation. In a few cases where the schools have been unable or unwilling to assume this responsibility, funds have been granted to welfare departments, parochial schools, or other agencies qualified or authorized to operate this type of facility. This same Lanham Act specifically prohibits any Federal agency or department from supervising, administering or interfering with school operation in any way. This has been strictly and carefully followed by the F. W. A. The same community agencies operate the program as would do so under any other type of Federal financing. The F. W. A. program has the further advantage of being an established, going concern and is better adapted to a wartime program since it can promptly meet needs in any congested war area without waiting for the development of over-all State plans.

Mr. Chairman, as one who had a great deal of experience in nursery work, having organized day nurseries during the last war, I say to you that it is the only proper way to take care of the children of working mothers. We cannot do it in any other way. If we want these women to work, and the War Manpower Commission and every other agency of the Government insist they are absolutely necessary, then we must provide for their children, or we cannot have the benefit of their services, and I am sure that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is not really serious when he tries to cut down this worth while project, and I beg of the Members of the House not to go along with him in doing so.

The dividends this appropriation will pay in better health and happiness for the children of working mothers are difficult to estimate. Not only will the children be safeguarded but the mothers of these children will do much more efficient work if they are assured of the safety and welfare of their children. These facilities are understood and recognized as a wartime expedient. The authorization of the Lanham Act is limited to the duration of the war. Of all the money appropriated for wartime services none is more important.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, in spite of the fact that I discussed some of this program yesterday, I want to say a few more words today, and put more emphasis on the child-care program rather than upon the nursing end of it as I did yesterday. No one is more aware of the fine work being done by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] than I am, nor more aware of the need for great economy in every aspect of our war program, as well as the home program, but there is such a thing as being penny-wise and pound-foolish. There is such a thing as doing for today and forgetting all about tomorrow. It is the responsibility of woman to look toward tomorrow and to see to it that every conceivable thing is done to make it possible for us to have children tomorrow, to have the children of today grow into adults of tomorrow who will be strong, fine, true Americans. On the Continent of Europe there has been a complete destruction of homes. Children are no longer children.

The Axis Powers have destroyed youth. They have taken from women in tremendous measure the capacity to produce children for the future. Here in America we are faced with a situation that involves our asking our women to go onto the production lines in addition to doing their first and foremost role of homemaking. Have we no responsibility to help them in this? Are we remembering that children need care and protection? We are troubled over delinquency. Can we expect it to decrease if we create additional causes for such tragedy? Is it not necessary for us to be more forward-looking and to have more vision? Heaven knows I am against Federal encroachment on States' rights or local rights. I do not like it. I do not approve it. But it is the Federal Government that is asking women to go into production. Are we going to be penny-wise and pound-foolish? Are we going to fail to keep first things first?

Admitted that there are probably many things done in this program that should not be done, it seems to me that unless we have something better to put in its place to protect our children we must see that that which is being done continues; that we must see to it that there is some way provided to protect the children of working mothers. Do not confuse this with the old-fashioned charitable institution that gave everything. These mothers are paying for much of it.

I am in accord with the gentleman from New York that we should do an enormous amount of watching and trying to see to it that the thing is done better, but the way to do that at this moment, with the war in is present stage, and with our need for production the way it is, is not by such curtailment of these projects.

I know what it is going to do to the nursing situation if we do not get more housing for our students. We are not going to have nurses for the men at the front. Nor are we going to have children growing up strong and well, the children of the great masses of our people unless we protect those whose mothers go on to the production lines.

We have a responsibility to see that the administration of all these projects improves, that it stops encroaching where it does not belong—but our greatest responsibility is to the children whose mothers are responding to the call sent out by industry that our armies may be invincible.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege during the past year as a member of the Congested Area Subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee to visit eight congested war areas. My committee visited industries, housing projects, schools, and nurseries and child-care centers. We talked with men

and with women workers. We made a survey of labor turn-over of absenteeism, and of delinquency, and found that the lack of community facilities was largely responsible for the problems which existed. Women are coming into industry in increasing numbers. They are trying to do their part in the shipyards and the aircraft plants. But in addition to this women are obliged to maintain their homes and to keep their children and their husbands fed and clothed. We found many women standing in line waiting for medical care, for themselves and for their children. We found them waiting hours after work to get their groceries and other necessities. We found children roaming the streets and some even locked in automobiles, not only because their war-working parents were absent from home but also because of the lack of child-care facilities and schools. This is an emergency. We have waited altogether too long to meet it. We should anticipate these things and be ready for them. We cannot expect these women to come into industry and take the place of men unless we help them. The war is not over. The end does not appear to be near. These war-congested areas are carrying the burden for the rest of the country. This is only a part and a very small part that many of us can do, and I hope that nothing may be done to curtail this program that can be so helpful toward winning the war. I hope with the rest of you that after the war we can go back to normal living. But let me point out that appropriation for community facilities is an investment, not a short-term expenditure. These community facilities increase the productivity of war workers and decrease absenteeism and labor turn-over—the resulting greater production shortens the war and each day the war is shortened means the saving of untold lives and expense. Then we will be out of the emergency and we can economize, but not when it comes to the care of our children. As my subcommittee observed in its Columbia River report, the unwise saving of dollars is sowing a whirlwind of juvenile delinquency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, of all the money that we have appropriated here since Pearl Harbor, with the exception, obviously, of that part which went for direct combat activities, none, in my opinion, has been more important nor more successfully expended than that which we have provided for the installation of these community facilities. I come from a district where expanded and additional community facilities were perhaps needed more than in any other part of the United States. As my colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Judge BLAND, has stated to you the Hampton Roads, Va., area officially has been designated as the No. 1 war-congested area of the United States. The facilities which the Federal Works Agency, in cooperation with the localities, has provided have attested to the vital worth of this Agency and the appropriations that this Congress has made for it.

We had a sudden tremendous influx of war personnel and war workers, with their families. Our population was more than doubled. It is quite obvious that this great influx and the expansion of Federal war activities, plus increased housing activities, greatly overtaxed our community facilities. For a while, our situation appeared to be absolutely hopeless, but with the aid of the Federal Government, through the Federal Works Agency, in cooperation with our community governments, the situation was taken in hand, and has been handled exceedingly well up to this time.

The counties and the cities in that area were eager to do their full part, and they have shouldered a fair and generous part of the financial burden. But there is a definite and inescapable obligation resting upon the Federal Government to make its proper contribution to the solution of this problem. To the extent that the Federal Works Agency has been able to do so, the problem has been solved. The installations in that area have contributed vitally to the efficient functioning of the war program and that part of the war machine. Let me give you one example of the problem that we ran up against. The utilization of water by the Navy and other Federal activities in the Norfolk area of Hampton Roads district increased tenfold or twelvefold. It was necessary to go many miles to a river for an additional supply of water. Even that could not provide the increase in the water needed, and pipe lines, with pumping stations, had to be laid another great distance to a second river.

We also had to lay pipe lines all the way to Fort Story, at Cape Henry, and to Camp Pendleton, farther down the coast from Norfolk. The Navy said at that time if this water was not provided quickly, the Navy would have to move out.

We ran into comparable problems in connection with sewage, schools, hospitals, fire protection, and other vital health matters.

There have been erected in my part of the Hampton Roads area more than 20,000 additional housing units. In one Government project, there are over 5,000 new houses, making necessary additional community facilities. The same need which exists in our part of the country obtains in many other areas. I, therefore, earnestly trust that this appropriation shall be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRIS] has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON] is recognized.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to oppose the very capable minority leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], because I feel he is not only very well qualified, but he has very competent information. However, in suggesting a reduction of the item by 50 percent, I do not consider that in the light of being an approach from an economy standpoint. I think that is merely a matter of doing away with the program. In the Los Angeles area one of the great problems is the labor problem. In connection with that problem we find that the Government, through their employing agencies, have gone out and solicited the districts and have pled with the people of that district, asking that the women do their part and that, in turn, the Government will try to cooperate with them to the extent that they will take care of the children and provide the necessary facilities under such circumstances.

You must bear in mind that women working in retail establishments, for instance, are taking the place of men who have either gone into the service or who are working in other war industries. The average weekly earnings of those women is $20.89. I know from personal observation and contact that domestic help is asking 75 cents an hour. When we take into consideration the fact they are required to pay that much for domestic help, there is not much incentive to work. We hear so much about the earnings of the workers in the aircraft industry. The average earnings of the women in the aircraft industry is $35 a week. There is no incentive for them to work unless we have facilities for assisting them in their home problems. As a result, we find a great many of them quitting their jobs. We have a very serious situation there, which is directly connected with the war, and it is of an emergency nature.

For that reason I cannot go along with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in what I think is a definite curtailment of the program. For that reason I will support the original amount of the appropriation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Great stress has been placed upon the child-welfare program. Of the approximately $500,000,000 which has been spent on this entire program, only about 7 percent has been utilized for the child-care program. That will not be jeopardized in any way even with this prevailing cut.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As far as specific appropriations are concerned, any money appropriated to build homes for these workers to live in, where there are children, certainly the children are the beneficiaries of that. So that it is far greater than simply a direct appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. For the benefit of the majority leader, I would like to say that none of the housing construction is involved in this amendment, and that only $22,000,000 gross is asked for this child-care proposition, out of the proposal on my part of $68,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was referring to the $500,000,000 heretofore referred to.

Mr. TABER. That is not a part of the appropriation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, perhaps I, too, might lay claim to being somewhat interested in the care of the children of working mothers. The real question, however, is not whether or not they need care; that is recognized by all. The question is whether or not this is the best way to provide it.

There seems to be considerable confusion here this afternoon on this point. It is presented as if a vote against this appropriation as it stands is a vote against child care; that our only choice is child care under the Lanham Act or no care at all. If that were the case, I should favor this full appropriation; but, fortunately, it is not. There is another alternative, and one about which no one has yet spoken. I favor that alternative rather than this plan not because I am not interested in the care of children but just because I am intensely interested in the best possible care of children, and I do not believe this is the best way to handle it.

This bill is entitled "First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944." Its official purpose is supposed "to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944." If it were drawn so as to do just that, to supply the money necessary to carry on to the end of the fiscal year the program to which we have been committed, and if the total amount of $127,500,000 were broken down into specific appropriations so that we could know just how much of it is to go for child care, how much for schools, how much for water systems, and each of the other 8 or 10 projects, I certainly would go along. But all we have is a table in the report of estimated total costs, and no assurance the money will not be spent in totally different proportions than suggested in the table. When are we going to stop issuing these blank checks?

My concern for the proper care of our children requires that I try to make sure how much is to go for that purpose and how its allocation is to be determined. I feel there is a far better way of providing proper care than through this omnibus sort of appropriation. It was provided for in a bill passed by the Senate last June, and referred to the House Committee on Education, where it has lain ever since, the so-called Thomas bill, S. 1130. It sets forth a program which I think is far superior to this, because it makes its primary and sole object not politics or patronage but the best possible care of the children; and it therefore provides for dispensing the money and directing the work not through a polyglot emergency patchwork set-up but through those whose life work it is to take care of and train children; namely, the regularly established and experienced departments of education in the respective States.

For some reason, not officially explained, some of us have never been able during almost 9 months to get even a hearing on that bill before the House Committee on Education.

I should like to have been able to vote for specific appropriations to carry the child-care program, as well as other most worth-while and urgently needed projects, through to the end of the fiscal year, to June 30, and in the meantime work out a better program whereby we can be sure at least this part of the total community services can be taken care of not from the standpoint of providing jobs or multiplying offices and salaries but from the sole standpoint of taking the best possible care of these children while their mothers are at work.

May I say that I have not heard a single word or received a single letter from my district criticizing the program there. It has been most admirably handled by the local authorities and they are all for it; but that does not allow me to close my eyes to the fact that there are increasing complaints from many areas and many mothers are quitting their war jobs because the effects on their children have been so bad they are unwilling to leave them longer under the program as administered in those places. I am including with my remarks a lettter received just today giving light on administrative difficulties encountered in a project in New York.

Mr. Chairman, it seems too bad that this bill does not permit us to vote on clean-cut issues, approving definite amounts for those projects which are demonstrated to be sound, and demanding improvement of those which are less sound. Instead we are being asked to give a blank check in the words of the bill, "to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency," however long that is going to be. It makes a decision very difficult. I believe we should appropriate now only enough to carry through this year and then bring in a more specific program so we can legislate with a greater degree of intelligence and discrimination.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y., *March 7, 1944.*

The Honorable WALTER H. JUDD,
Member, House Committee on Education, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing you in behalf of bill S. 1130 which is now before the House Education Committee.

We have been operating in Saratoga Springs a child-care program, with funds appropriated under the Lanham Act, since April 1943. We have experienced considerable difficulty in meeting the requirements of the various agencies involved in the financial administration of these projects, and we are convinced that the administration outlined in S. 1130, which provides Federal funds as grants-in-aid to the States and puts the supervision of administration in the hands of the State education department, would eliminate these unnecessary difficulties.

Although our relations with the regional office No. 1 of the Federal Works Agency have been most cordial, that Agency handles projects from 9 States. This burden, plus an insufficient staff, has resulted in almost intolerable complications and delays in financing our local projects.

For example, although we made our request for the final quarter of our 1943 allotment in October, and our application for the renewal of our Federal grant in the same month, we did not receive the full amount of our 1943 allotment until the middle of January 1944, and we received no part of our 1944 allotment until February 23. As a result, it was necessary for us to borrow on our personal notes the funds needed to pay the salaries of our teachers and other staff members. During the major portion of that time no other bills were paid, and the credit of the project and relationships with the community were decidedly strained.

The experience has convinced us that a State education department, handling only the extended school projects in one State could operate more efficiently than a Federal agency handling a multitude of States. Certainly, from the local point of view, it would be infinitely easier to deal with a single agency. We hope, therefore, that you will report favorably bill S. 1130 and support its passage. If your committee is not prepared to act favorably at once, we earnestly request an immediate public hearing on the measure. Such an important bill should not be allowed to die in committee.

Sincerely yours,

KATHRYN H. STARBUCK,
Chairman of Civilian War Services.
ALICE P. REEVES,
Chairman, Child Care Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, it is very seldom I inject myself into debate on an appropriation bill, as the Members know by experience. On every amendment, however, I have my own personal views, but as leader I feel that in most matters, particularly in appropriation bills where an amendment is offered, the members of the committee on both sides are best able to make a greater contribution in assisting Members to make up their minds.

I take second place to no man in this House in my respect and admiration of my good friend the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. He clearly understands from many past expressions and actions on my part, the regard I have for him and my respect for his ability as a legislator, but in this instance I am constrained to disagree sharply with the argument he has advanced in support of his amendment.

This is emergency activity directly connected with the war. This activity concerns itself with the home life, with the community life, with the program of child care, schools, and other public facilities, all of them arising as a result of the war. I am unable to look forward, much as I wish I could, and say that the war is going to close in 3 or 6 months from now. I wish, I hope, and I pray, as we all do, that it might terminate tomorrow. While I hope it will terminate in the near future, in response to the exercise of my rational mind I cannot say that it will; therefore, we have got to look ahead and plan from a long-range angle. The matter under discussion is definitely connected with the war and directly concerns the family life. Each and every one of us is concerned with as strong a family life as we can have, even under war conditions, and it seems to me this appropriation as recommended by the committee should be adopted by the committee, and the amendment offered

by the gentleman from New York defeated.

It also seems to me that those Members who have projects in their districts are not the ones most interested. As a matter of fact, I sympathize with the Members who have these projects in their districts. The projects are there because of war industry and the increased activities as a result of the war. There is going to be a tremendous displacement and readjustment in those districts after the war is over. Those communities have got to have these extra facilities. The war brought about this condition. The local taxpayers in the main are unable to meet it. After the war is over there are going to be ghost villages in more than one community throughout this Nation. So the Member who has no project is just as much interested in this, I sometimes feel more interested, as the Member who has a project, because after the war is over his community is not going to be affected by the disturbance that will take place with the termination of the war. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment again.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER, of New York, to the amendment of Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Strike out "$127,500,000" and insert "$68,690,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 59, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4346, the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1944, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF O. P. A. ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced an amendment to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and the Stabilization Act of 1942 which extends the operation of both of those acts from June 30, 1944, until June 30, 1945. It makes no change in existing law, it merely extends the operation of these acts as they are now upon the statute books.

The President in his message stated that this had to be done in order to avoid price chaos and to insure the stability and integrity of the American dollar. Before long we shall conduct hearings upon this very momentous question. I feel confident that the Congress will pass this amendment which is so necessary for the preservation of the prosperity of the American people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TALBOT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a short editorial, and I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee this afternoon and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two different instances and to include therein newspaper articles and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein some extracts from a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts from Supreme Court decisions and also a brief editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include in one an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor and in the other a communication by Judge Harry M. Fisher, of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Ill., on the American Jewish Conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN]?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman;

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States;

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine corps;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; and

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 10, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Friday, March 10, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in open session on Friday, March 10, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on S. 1225, entitled "An act granting a pension to Constance Eager," which was introduced by Senator TYDINGS, and S. 662, entitled "An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes," which was introduced by Senator BILBO.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1269. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1945, totaling $40,000 (H. Doc. No. 478); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1270. A letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1271. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 466. Resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 52; without amendment (Rept. No. 1244). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Special Committee on Small Business. Fifth interim report pursuant to House Resolution 18, a resolution creating a Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives and defining its powers and duties; without amendment (Rept. No. 1245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3528. A bill to provide effective date of awards of death pension or compensation in cases of persons missing or missing in action, to authorize payment of such benefits from the date of death of such person as reported or found by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4368. A bill to amend section 3360 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FISH:

H. R. 4369. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish seeing-eye dogs for blind veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 4370. A bill to further amend the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide for the relief of certain widows, children, and other dependents of servicemen who die as a result of injury or disease incurred in or aggravated by military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 4371. A bill to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WHELCHEL:

H. R. 4372. A bill requiring concurrence of seven Justices of the Supreme Court to reverse prior decisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4373. A bill to provide that where the rating of disability of a veteran of the World War as to an arm or leg is equal to the rating for amputation at any level, the loss of use of such extremity shall be considered as established, for statutory award purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 4374. A bill to modify section 4 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934, with reference to certain funds collected in connection with the operation of Indian Service irrigation projects; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 4375. A bill to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for services rendered from May 1 to September 30, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 4376. A bill to extend the period of operation of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 and of the act of October 2, 1942, entitled "An act to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. VINSON of Georgia introduced a bill (H. R. 4377) authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5210. By Mr. JUDD: Petition of the Minnesota State Branch of the International Union of Operating Engineers, opposing passage of House bill 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5211. By Mr. CASE: Petition of the Reverend R. B. Bonney, pastor of the Methodist Church of White Lake-Kimball-Underwood, S. Dak., and 65 citizens of these communities, urging passage of House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5212. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of about 800 citizens of Oneida County, N. Y., Thirty-third Congressional District, protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5213. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the emergency mass meeting of the communities of northern Hudson County, N. J., memorializing the Congress to exert their best efforts toward the immediate passage of House Resolutions 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5214. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of 160 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5215. By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois: Petition of the delegates and electors of the American-Jewish conference held in Chicago, Ill., March 1, 1944, endorsing House Resolutions 418 and 419, respectively; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5216. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Mrs. J. W. Powell and other citizens of Fairview, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5217. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Rev. Nellie Lanpher and 25 other signers of Freedom, Maine, urging action on House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5218. Also, petition of Rev. Mabelle H Whitney and about 40 other citizens of Winterport, Maine, urging action on House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 10, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of heaven and earth, hear our supplication and move us to pray for the things we most need. Quicken in us those springs by which we may discern Thee more perfectly. Grant that we may not be satisfied with the things of the past; give us a more generous and broader understanding. Fill us with a desire to possess the grace of humility and spiritual knowledge, out of which grow the fruits of divine love and which make secure against the winds of fate and chance.

O King eternal, fulfill Thy mission; rule in human hearts and reign in all lands, pouring out Thy beneficent and reforming zeal in wisdom and power, winning victory for that righteousness and truth which are stronger than all the schemes of men. We rejoice that in these evil days we do not mourn as those without hope and do not fear as those who have no faith. Let our greatest grief be lost in the certainty of trust and joy, putting our lives and destiny in the enabling care of a good God. O lift all minds to Thee and deepen within us that gratitude that Thou wilt guide our desires; in using nobly and happily our earthly years is found that larger life beyond. In the name of our blessed Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4133. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4183. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. BROOKS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 176) entitled "An act for the relief of Austin L. Tierney," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. DAVIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Department and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Office of Scientific Research and Development.
3. War Food Administration.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 7, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on March 6, 1944, elect WESLEY E. DISNEY, of Oklahoma, as a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Thomas H. Cullen, of New York, and to serve with the following other House members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of such joint committee: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; ALLEN T. TREADWAY, of Massachusetts; HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota.

Respectfully yours,
R. L. DOUGHTON,
Chairman.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Messrs. LUDLOW, O'NEAL, MAHON, CURLEY, TABER, KEEFE, and DWORSHAK.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH OVER THE AIR

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, in the event the broadcasting companies refuse to comply with my request to work out an arrangement whereby citizens who have been maligned and falsely attacked on the air will be accorded an opportunity to answer the charges over the same facilities to the same audience, it is my intention to introduce legislation that will insure this opportunity. I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the Congress are anxious to support legislation to guarantee freedom of speech over the air to citizens and public officials who have been slandered. Refusal by the broadcasting companies to work out some suitable arrangement will convict them of complicity in the conspiracy to destroy free speech and parliamentary government. The Congress and the American people will no longer tolerate the totalitarian practice of permitting the use of broadcasting facilities to assassinate the character and reputations of innocent people. If the broadcasting companies are wise they will take the initiative in working out a fair arrangement that will accord to the maligned people the opportunity to be heard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the Speaker and those in charge of the rules of the House on their efforts in restricting publication of extraneous matter in the RECORD. I have thought this to be a very fine rule. Only twice since that rule has been in effect have I asked unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD any material in excess of that allowed in that rule. Yesterday I asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and I find today that the article which I wished to insert in the RECORD is one page over the limit. I have tried to curtail it, but I cannot very well bring it within the limit. I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost will be $135. Under the circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed regardless of the rule. In making this request I am moved by information that leads me to believe that some of this material is very pertinent to the Indian Affairs matter now pending before Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

TAXES IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, what is the truth about the per capita tax load in the United States as compared with that in the United Kingdom? One faction contends that it is much greater in this country; another declares that it is considerably smaller. Both are right; both can prove their contention. It is a situation that bears out the old adage, "Figures never lie, but liars sometimes figure." Here are the statistics:

Per capita tax (1944) in the United States	$371
Per capita tax (1943) in the United Kingdom	$256
Per capita income (1944) in the United States	$1,151
Per capita income (1943) in the United Kingdom	$609
Per capita rate of taxation (1944) in the United States	32%
Per capita rate of taxation (1943) in the United Kingdom	42%

Of course, the per capita tax is higher in this country, but because our incomes are also higher, the tax figures alone do not tell the story. Only 32 cents out of every dollar of income in this country goes for taxes, whereas in the United Kingdom taxes take 42 cents out of every dollar. In other words, the tax load is actually 31 percent greater in the United Kingdom.

This is a striking example of how deception can be perpetrated. Also it shows that this desire to deceive is nonpartisan. Republicans and Democrats alike declare that taxes in this country are higher, knowing all the time that the burden of taxation is actually much lighter. They present figures to prove their point, but they do not tell all of the truth. I hope that the Members of Congress will recognize that we still have a long way to go in this country before we catch up to the citizens of the United

Kingdom when it comes to making sacrifices through the medium of taxation.

There seems to be an insatiate desire on the part of many people to discredit our allies in any possible way. Russia is condemned daily in the Congress of the United States, and yet Russia is driving through the enemy at a rapid pace, bringing our common enemy nearer each day to a final collapse. This must be encouraging to Russia when they know that anyone in the United States who speaks a kind word for Russia is immediately set down in the Dies Gestapo book as a subversive citizen. The latest attack on England is the declaration that we are being mulcted by taxes while the English enjoy a peacetime tax load. I hope the above figures will expose the truth.

We have curious ways of putting up a united front with our allies to meet the onslaughts of a common enemy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. Yesterday I asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the address of Eddie Rickenbacker. The Public Printer replies that it exceeds the limit and will cost $150. This is the first time that I have ever asked to have anything of that kind inserted. I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the added space necessary to print the article, that I be permitted to extend it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON THE AIR

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], and what he has said this morning about radio stations being required to give equal opportunity to those who are slandered by men speaking over the radio, permit me to add that a bill introduced by me now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, would make radio commentators responsible for libel or slander published over the air in the district where the broadcast is heard. That is no more than fair. They send out the word, and their liability should follow and go along with it, so that any one slandered in any part of the country where that sort of thing is heard may have his action in the local court.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the radio has developed into a most dangerous instrument so far as the welfare of this country is concerned. I am not interested in the personal attacks on me so much as I am in the attacks on the Congress of the United States and the Government of this Nation.

A short while ago Walter Winchell was strutting around in the uniform of a lieutenant commander of the Navy and at the same time maligning Members of the Congress of the United States, consorting with that alien Carlson, whom the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] denounced as a traitor on yesterday, and spreading subversive propaganda throughout the Nation. When Members of the Congress demanded that he either strip that uniform off or get into the war, instead of going to war, where other young men have gone, he stripped off the uniform and went before the radio and denounced the Congress as the "House of Reprehensibles."

It is time that Congress took steps to put a stop to such subversive attacks on the legislative branch of this Government over the radio.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial from the Chicago Sun.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is the editorial from the Chicago Sun? Does it refer to the Members of Congress in a disparaging way?

Mr. SABATH. No. It does not smear anybody. The Sun leaves smearing to other newspapers. It just speaks about the soldiers' voting bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does not say that Congress has committed a fraud?

Mr. SABATH. The Chicago Sun does not malign Congress, but it does, when justified, criticize the action of Congress or that of a few individual Members whose names I have no need to mention. It naturally defends itself when unfairly attacked by Members on the floor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right, that is fine, but if they charge Congress as an institution and that it is a fraud, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. If it is one of those slimy editorials——

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SABATH. It is nothing about the gentleman from Mississippi. It is about the soldiers' voting bill and the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it an attack on Congress? I ask the gentleman to withhold it and let me look it over.

Mr. SABATH. Then I shall object from now on to like requests being made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. RANKIN. That is perfectly all right. I have enough matters of personal privilege to speak on from now until the end of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. It is not a question of reservation. The question is, Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Read the editorial and you will find there is nothing really objectionable or personal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under his statement, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Eddie Rickenbacker.

The SPEAKER. I think that has already been placed in the RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I placed it in the RECORD today.

Mr. FISH. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars by including two articles from newspapers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOMBING OF GERMAN CITIES

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks, and include a radio address by Mr. Raymond Gram Swing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FOLGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE BILL

Mr. WORLEY submitted a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 1285) to amend the act of September 1942 which provided a method of voting in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Mott
Andersen, H. Carl	Gore	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Gross	Norman
Baldwin, Md.	Hall, Leonard W.	Norrell
Baldwin, N. Y.	Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Harris, Ark.	O'Hara
Bloom	Hartley	O'Leary
Brumbaugh	Hays	O'Toole
Buckley	Heffernan	Pfeifer
Burchill, N. Y.	Hendricks	Plumley
Burgin	Hobbs	Pracht, C. Frederick
Byrne	Hoch	Pratt, Joseph M.
Camp	Holifield	Ramspeck
Cannon, Fla.	Howell	Randolph
Capozzoli	Jarman	Reece, Tenn.
Celler	Jennings	Rees, Kans.
Chapman	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rodgers, Pa.
Chenoweth	Johnson, J. Leroy	Satterfield
Coffee	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scanlon
Costello	Jones	Scott
Cravens	Jonkman	Sheridan
Dawson	Kee	Short
Delaney	Kelley	Smith, W. Va.
Dickstein	Kirwan	Stockman
Domengeaux	Kleberg	Sullivan
Doughton	Klein	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	Knutson	Torrens
Ellsworth	Lane	Treadway
Feighan	LeFevre	Voorhis, Calif.
Fogarty	Luce	Vorys, Ohio
Ford	Lynch	Vursell
Fuller	McGehee	Weichel, Ohio
Fulmer	Madden	Weiss
Furlong	Maloney	Wene
Gale	Manasco	West
Gallagher	Merritt	Whelchel, Ga.
Gamble	Merrow	Whitten
Gathings	Morrison, La.	Wilson
Gerlach	Morrison, N. C.	Winter
Gibson		
Gifford		
Gilchrist		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to propound this parliamentary inquiry: Whether, under the rules of comity between the two Houses, when a Senator—or I will say a Member of another body; I believe I am required to say that and not refer to a Senator—makes a statement on the floor of the other body about a Member of the House for the purpose of prejudicing Members of this body on the legislation—I want to know if the Member of this body who is referred to has the right to take the floor and read what that Member of the other body said in that body and comment on it. I do not want to violate the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. That question has been passed upon several times.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but if we are going to have comity between the two Houses, I want it respected at both ends of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER. As long as the present occupant of the Chair is here he will try to see that the House lives up to that rule. The Chair will therefore hold that comment on what happened in the other body is a violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. When a Member of another body inserts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not statements of his own but scurrilous and slanderous attacks on the membership of this House, the entire membership of the House of Representatives, is there no recourse against proceedings of that kind? Must we sit here and permit that to go on? Or is there some way of enforcing the rule of comity between the two Houses in an orderly way?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can only hold as the Chair held a moment ago, that the rules of the House clearly outline how this comity between the House and the Senate is to be preserved. The Chair trusts that the Members of the House will at all times conduct themselves so that the House may not be accused of violating it.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, Mr. Speaker, but when this violator at the other end of the Capitol—what I am protesting against is a Member of another body inserting a statement of a little old fellow named Frank Kingdom, a little Communist up here in New Jersey, a slimy, malicious, lying attack on the membership of the House of Representatives. I want to know how the House can protect itself or protest in an orderly way to the membership of the other body against such slander?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is compelled to hold that the question of whether or not the rules have been violated is a matter for the other body to determine.

Mr. RANKIN. Then it is about time we revised the rules if the Senate is not going to respect them.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF WAR DEPARTMENT—1945

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and ask for a conference with the Senate thereon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. SNYDER, STARNES of Alabama, KERR, MAHON, POWERS, ENGEL of Michigan, and CASE.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after disposition of the legislative program in order for the day and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

ISALINE GARNEY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 467) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Isaline Garney, mother of Mary Garney, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate she was receiving at the time of her death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Mary Garney.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a recently received agreement between Australia and New Zealand, signed on the twenty-first of January, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—1944

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4346, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public Roads Administration: For the payment of claims for damage to roads and highways under section 10 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (23 U. S. C. 3), as amended by the act of July 13, 1943 (Public Law No. 146), as fully set forth in House Document No. 466, Seventy-eighth Congress, $3,589.30.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have to perform this morning perhaps the most disagreeable job that I have ever had in my 21 years

of service in the House of Representatives. Ordinarily it has been my practice when people have made statements villifying me in an effort to belittle me and all that sort of thing to ignore them. However, this has come now three times from the same man and three times under similar circumstances. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee in the House during all my service and it has been my endeavor to attend the hearings just as regularly as such a thing could possibly be done and to pay the closest attention to them and to base my judgment upon what was to be done with reference to those appropriations on a thorough study and upon what I thought was the right thing to do. No man has ever seen me come out here on the floor and ask for anything for my own district.

When the item in the war-agencies bill for the Board of Economic Warfare was up for consideration I moved to cut the thing down and failed by one vote. During the progress of the debate upon that motion the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] made a statement belittling my intelligence, indicating that an attitude of trying to cut that item was not patriotic and that it was a great war question. Misled by that situation, which was exposed within 60 days as not correct and it has since been exposed many times as not being correct, the House by a very small majority defeated the motion to cut the appropriation which was way beyond what it should have been.

When the item for the Office of War Information was up for consideration along about the middle of November I moved to cut the item and the same sort of thing took place. I guess by this time everyone is convinced that the Office of War Information is not a great war agency.

Yesterday we had the Federal Works Agency community facilities proposition up for consideration and the same thing occurred. I expect in a few moments to offer another motion to try to save some money for the Treasury in connection with another item. Frankly, in view of the fact that there is no justification for the item whatever, I expect that the same sort of tactics will be used again. I want the House to know it and hope the House will realize that when one has no case it is customary to resort to that sort of tactics. I hope that in the future the House will be guided by the facts and the arguments as to the facts rather than by personal attacks.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." My friend from New York is mad. I venture to say that 95 percent of the Members of the House who were here yesterday during our little discussion of the item in question, as I myself certainly did, thought that the gentleman from New York was going to get after another member of our committee who really went after him yesterday. I did not. I did not say anything about the gentleman yesterday except something complimentary, and I read from the RECORD. Here is what I said:

> Mr. Chairman, this is a very important matter, and I ask the indulgence of the committee that they may have the full facts and know just what the implications are if they adopt this amendment offered by my distinguished friend from New York. I repeat what I have said many times, the House and the Nation owe a debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, for his fine work on the Appropriations Committee; but every once in a while he gets wrong, and when he gets wrong he does a good job of it. Now he is dead wrong on this.

I said he was dead wrong on that, and the Committee of the Whole, by defeating his motion, said he was wrong on that. If it is an indictment of a man's intelligence and patriotism to say he is wrong when he takes a position on a bill here in the House, and the vote goes against him, Lord help all of us. But I have never by word or act said anything whatsoever that reflected in the slightest way on the gentleman from New York, and he knows that perfectly well when he is not mad. I have never reflected on the intelligence and patriotism of any Member of this House. I do not have to conduct myself that way. But I do reserve the right to have my opinion and to say so when I think another Member is wrong. And when the gentleman from New York states that he is right and somebody else is wrong, there is not a Member in this House that can say it harder than the gentleman from New York can say it, or with more vehemence and more feeling; and that is all right. If you cannot take it, gentlemen, this is no place to be fooling around.

My friend from New York has gotten out on the limb once or twice. He wanted to cut some things when the rest of us did not think they ought to be cut. I have been wrong many times and I have been bowled over by this House, and nobody has been walked over any more times than I have, and pretty roughshod sometimes. It stings a little bit. But you have to get up and come again.

I think the gentleman was wrong in trying to cut the appropriation for community facilities, and, as evidence of that, take the hearings and find how many Members of his own side of the House, including all of the women Members of Congress, came before the committee and testified for the items. I think my friend is going to be wrong when he offers a motion to cut out all of this money for housing, which comes in a few minutes.

If it is unfair tactics for me to take the floor and say that he is wrong about it, then I am sorry I have to be unfair, because I have my duty to do just as the gentleman has. I have my conscience just as the gentleman has his. I can point to my record in the House and I do not believe any man can turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and find where I have ever hit any man below the belt, and I do not intend to start it now.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to inject myself into the discussion or debate that has just preceded. We have under consideration a deficiency bill. There are one or two things about this bill that I think the Congress should know. I want to speak specifically of the items of war public works and services conducted under Lanham Act funds by the Federal Works Agency.

I want to say that in my humble opinion, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, the Congress is being given the run-around with respect to appropriations. Let me demonstrate and attempt to prove what I mean by that statement.

I happen to be a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that considers the appropriations for the Labor Department and the Federal Security Agency. Included in the Federal Security Agency is the Public Health Service. Each year the Public Health Service submits a budget to our committee asking for appropriations, and General Parran and his group come before the subcommittee to justify those appropriations.

Among the items that they justify each year is an item for venereal-disease control. Originally the authorization for that appropriation was limited to $2,000,000, then it increased to $5,000,000, then to $7,000,000, and now the lid is off, so that the Congress can appropriate any amount for venereal-disease-control funds to be allocated to the States by the Federal Public Health Service.

The Public Health Service came before our committee last year and asked funds for venereal-disease control. The Budget estimate amounted to $12,367,000. The committee gave them $12,367,000.

When they came before our committee, they had full knowledge of every situation in this country as to the congregation of people in Army and Navy camps and in the war centers. They said, "We need $12,367,000 to carry on this fight." The committee and the Congress gave them every dollar they asked for.

Now what happens. Now, General Parran—and I think the world of him; he is a great administrator—goes to the Public Works Agency and gets from the Lanham Act funds an additional allocation for Federal expenditures of $11,722,433. In other words, instead of submitting their whole program to the Committee on Appropriations and asking us for the funds that they need for their entire program, they slip over to the Public Works Agency and get $11,722,433 more to spend.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. On what theory could Lanham Act funds be used for this other purpose?

Mr. KEEFE. The Lanham Act fund, in my humble judgment, due to the construction that has been placed upon its use by the Federal Works Agency, is a blank check that will enable them to spend those funds for almost anything conceivable, including venereal-disease control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes. This is an important question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. When General Parran was before our committee on another subject, he was questioned with reference to the allocation that was made to the Public Health Service from the Lanham funds, and he explained that those funds were used in constructing facilities particularly at the Army areas for the treatment of venereal diseases.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that exactly, but that is part of their general program. That is their program. They should have come before the Committee on Appropriations and justified that program. Instead of justifying it before the Committee on Appropriations, where is it justified? It is justified before the Administrator of the Public Works Agency. Thus the Congress is bypassed to the extent of $11,000,000.

I am not criticizing the expenditure of that money. The Committee on Appropriations would no doubt have given most of it to them had they come in and made their case.

The contention has been made that they went to the Lanham Act funds because the allocation of the funds under the formula of the general law under which the Public Health Service operates is not flexible enough to permit them to allocate the funds to the very localities where they are most needed.

Let me read you the law on the subject and see whether that is true. The public law under which the Public Health Service operates specifically provides the method and the formula under which the Public Health Service shall allot these funds to the various States for the control of venereal disease.

First, the population in the State; second, the extent of the venereal-disease problem; and third, the financial needs of the State determine the amount of the allocation. Thus, in the organic law, there is set up a formula flexible enough to justify the Public Health Service in allocating its funds any place in the country, where the demand was present, for the control of venereal diseases. Under these circumstances they could properly set up clinics and operate them in conjunction with State agencies just as they spend their regular funds. The point I make is this: If we are going to appropriate blank-check funds to the Public Works Agency, to which other agencies of the Government may go and secure allocations to supplement the appropriations regularly made by this Congress, then you have another blank-check appropriation that can be used by those agencies of the Government in bypassing the Appropriations Committee, and the Congress. I think it is bad appropriating practice to proceed in that manner. I might call attention to the situation with respect to the appropriation of $45,000,000 to implement the Bolton Act. How much more have they spent out of Lanham Act funds? Can any man on the floor of this House tell? I do not know. I have not the breakdown. I do know that this report shows $65,595,000 medical general funds of the Lanham Act funds. I do know that the Lanham Act funds have been used to the extent of large sums to implement and supplement the funds which we appropriated to carry out the purposes of the Bolton Act. I am not saying that those funds have not served a good purpose. I am saying that if we are going to legislate intelligently on appropriation matters, these agencies should come to the Committee on Appropriations with their whole program, and justify it, so that we will know just what their program is to be, instead of bypassing us, and getting their funds out of Lanham Act funds, as has been done in these two cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. Regarding the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], there is no such thing as bypassing that has been brought to the attention of the House. The Lanham Act placed these funds under the Federal Works Administrator, and I am reading from the act, title II, defense public works:

> The funds are devoted primarily to schools, water works, sewers, sewage, garbage and refuse disposal facilities, public sanitary facilities work for the treatment and purification of water, hospitals, and other places for the care of the sick—

Then it continues:

> recreation facilities, streets and access roads.

That is the story in a few words; that is the law as we passed it. That was approved June 28, 1941.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. There is no question that what the gentleman says is true. That is found in the list of approved projects found on page 6 of the committee report, but the gentleman has entirely missed the force of my argument as to venereal disease control. Can the gentleman see any reason why the Public Health Service should not come to the proper committee and lay its plans before that committee and get an appropriation covering the whole program?

Mr. RABAUT. The answer is in the law which puts it under the Federal Works Administration, which agency does not come before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Do you find anything in the law that specifically relates to the venereal-disease control?

Mr. RABAUT. Well, right here, I will interpret this language for you, "on hospitals and other places for the care of the sick."

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman understand that that supplements or supersedes the general law which provides for venereal-disease control which is on the statute books?

Mr. RABAUT. Evidently that is the interpretation that is given to it. When we speak about war areas I certainly think that is a proper interpretation.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman from Wisconsin referred to the formula in existing law for appropriations or allocations or allotments of funds for venereal control to the States. That is the grants-in-aid program and is entirely separate from the provisions of the Lanham Act which provide facilities for treatment and hospitalization and clinics and other necessary facilities in these areas of congested population where there is a threat. The two are entirely separate. I think the Public Health Service would be thoroughly willing to bring its requests for additional venereal disease control money to the Committee on Appropriations, but it is in two separate categories entirely.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee who speaks with such great authority on this question that he read the hearings and the presentation made before the subcommittee on appropriations last year in justification of the request for the Public Health Service appropriation on this subject.

Mr. PRIEST. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield further, that the gentleman from Tennessee for the last week and a half has been sitting on a subcommittee recodifying the public health laws and has had this whole question before the committee very recently and does not have to refer to previous hearings.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee that he, perhaps, will not find very much in his recodification, if he is referring to the Bulwinkle bill, that does not have anything to do with this.

Mr. RABAUT. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin opposed to this provision of the law?

Mr. KEEFE. No; I am not opposed to it at all. But I am only calling it to the attention of Congress because I conceive it to be a bad method of providing funds and makes it impossible for Members of Congress to know what money is being expended, unless you can check through the break-down of expenditures of the Public Works Agency. That is the thing I am trying to make clear.

Mr. RABAUT. I feel that the gentleman preferred that this matter, instead of being under the Federal Works Administrator, should have been in one of the items that comes in the bill before his subcommittee on appropriations; is that correct?

Mr. KEEFE. I take this position, that the whole subject of venereal disease control, which under organic law is vested in the hands of the Public Health Service, to be administered by them, should be so administered.

Mr. RABAUT. What about the Army and Navy? They deal with this menace. Around the camps they have control of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

For an additional amount for the maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act, fiscal year 1944, $14,000, to remain available until June 30, 1945.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 8, strike out all of line 9, down to and including the figure "1945" in line 13.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike out the request for $14,000 by the National Capital Housing Authority. The request for this money was made before the Appropriations Committee February 15, 1944, by Mr. John Ilder, executive officer. Mr. Ilder justified this request on the ground that it was needed to pay the cost of repairs on buildings.

I have not the time to go into this question in detail. I want to say for the benefit of the House that hearings are now proceeding before the Burton subcommittee of the Senate District Committee investigating the operations of the National Capital Housing Authority, which clearly show that some of the figures contained in the Authority's annual report to Congress do not check. From the fact that they are asking for money to repair and maintain the properties shows that the operating profit as stated in the report is not a true figure because in their operating costs they do not have set up enough money to maintain and repair the properties in regard to the normal depreciation and maintenance needs. This agency has made the claim that its economic rents pay all operating expenses, taxes, interest, and amortization. Yet the operating statement contains no figures for interest, amortization, or real-estate taxes, aside from the fact that enough reserves are not set up for maintenance, repairs, and depreciation.

This is a fact even though the agency has repeatedly maintained that it is a self-liquidating organization under title I and is clearing the Washington slums with no cost to the taxpayers. Had they set up proper reserves for maintenance, repairs, and depreciation as well as taxes, interest, and amortization, their reports would show an annual loss rather than an "operating profit." This is what could be called "double-empty bookkeeping," instead of the usual bookkeeping practices carried on by private enterprise. Then on top of this finagling, the poor, dried-up taxpayer has to pay for all these losses and the mismanagement that goes with this scheme.

Aside from the question of the $14,000 requested here by the National Capital Housing Authority, I am formally calling to the attention of the lower House the fact that this agency is now seeking another appropriation of $100,000,000 to engage in further Federal Housing activities in the District of Columbia. In addition it is asking for a $20,000,000 revolving fund. This House in no uncertain terms turned down the request for an appropriation of $1,400,000,000 for the United States Housing Authority. Of course, no one who knew anything about the forces which had been operating from the time this program was started here in the District of Columbia in 1934 had any idea that would be its end. By no means. Now we see this hydraheaded monster beginning to rise again here in the District of Columbia. It was here in Washington that this whole program had its birth and just as it was originally used as a pattern for a Nation-wide program of Federal housing, so it is intended again to form the basis for a further extension of this communistic scheme.

I want to serve notice on the National Capital Housing Authority and all who are aiding it in seeking further appropriations for the promotion of this program that I intend to do everything within my power to, as quickly as possible, bring about the abortion of this movement. I want to see the Federal Government removed entirely from the building industry. I want to see this whole industry entirely in the hands of private individuals.

I hope my amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, under the law the revenues of the Capital Housing Authority are covered into the United States Treasury and funds for maintenance and repair must then be appropriated by Congress. The revenues from this Authority amounted to approximately $51,000, or a little bit in excess of $51,000, a year and they go back into the Federal Treasury. All rental property, and this property is no exception to the rule, deteriorates under the ravages of time and weather and occupancy. It needs repairs every year. This appropriation is to provide essential repairs. It is for painting and rehabilitation, which if allowed to go uncared for means the deterioration of the property. If we are to maintain this property and keep it in rentable condition we must maintain and repair it just as any other landlord maintains and repairs property of that character. There is no other way to get it done. The Authority cannot use the rent and income from the houses. We must go to the Treasury under the law to provide for upkeep. That is all this comparatively small item involves. After putting $51,000 back into the Treasury, we now ask for this necessary $14,000 to paint and repair the property to prevent its damage and deterioration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio) there were—ayes 19, noes 26.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). One Member has arisen; not a sufficient number.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War housing: For an additional amount to carry out the purposes of title I of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. ch. 9), and subject to the applicable provisions of the joint resolution approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1115), $7,500,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 8, line 14, strike out all down to and including line 21.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am asking to have $7,500,000 of a raid on the Treasury stricken from this bill. I expect you will be told that this is exceedingly necessary for the war effort.

Let me give you a little of the picture, and that is all I shall be able to do or all I expect to do in the time that I have upon this amendment.

There are a little over a thousand projects involved in this war housing, so-called. Of those 1,000 projects, 356, the Housing Agency, headed by Mr. Blandford, has no report as to occupancy.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman says "has no report". Does the gentleman mean the agency does not know whether they are occupied or not?

Mr. TABER. Does not know how much occupancy there is as to those projects, or that is at least what they told us. If anybody might question it, I have brought the papers here, and I have the papers that they produced so that anyone can check that up if they choose. I had that counted this morning.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I notice by the morning paper that the First Lady is going down to Colombia or somewhere. Why do they not send her around to learn how many of these houses are occupied?

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know.

Mr. MASON. She is going down there to get colored maids.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Illinois says she is going down there to get colored maids.

Mr. TABER. Well, there are 93 other projects that have 27,008 units. I have them all listed here. I have taken them from the returns that they turned in, and of those 27,000 units there are 6,987

occupants, according to their own story. That is 24 percent.

Now, here is practically 50 percent of their set-up with no report, or with 24 percent occupancy. They have gone all over the country, and I have reports from all over the country indicating that they are not building the type of buildings that are desired or are needed in the localities in which they are constructed. Wherever there is any other kind of housing they can get into they will take one room instead of the things that these people are putting up. They are costing a very considerable amount of money. I know of one project of 250 units costing about a million dollars, of a temporary character that is to be torn down when we are through.

Now I will call your attention to some of these cases. Avon Terrace, Stratford, Conn., 600 units, 106 occupied. Chauncey Homes, at the same place, 744 units, 80 occupied. Niagara Falls, N. Y., Pine Crest, 1,200, only 40 occupied. That is about 4 percent.

Massena, N. Y., 200 units, none occupied.

Now, I will give you one that makes me a little doubtful as to some of the procedure that these people have indulged in, in the statistics they have furnished to the committee. Ogden, Utah, known as the Anchorage, reported 200 units, 97 occupied. One man who was out there in the last 2 weeks told me that he was shown this set-up and it looked as though it was all vacant. He asked a native who was with him if it was all empty and the native said, "Yes." I do not know anything more than that about it.

Bauxite, Ark., Woodland, 312 units; 47 occupied. Another place, Pine Haven, 150 units; 45 occupied.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Does the gentleman have statistics for Windom, Ohio, included there?

Mr. TABER. I think it may be in the larger report. I will look. It was not in the list of those that was gotten up for me this morning of those that were less than 50 percent occupied. What does the gentleman know about it?

Mr. ROWE. It was reported to me that there are a thousand units there with no occupancy, and they are attempting to encourage the wives of veterans who are in the service to take occupancy therein, to justify its existence.

Mr. TABER. I note that there was one at Ravenna, Ohio, with no occupancy.

Mr. ROWE. That is the one.

Mr. TABER. I have been told that, but that did not show up as under 50 percent occupied.

Mr. ROWE. It might be interesting to note that they have completed a recreation room and theater there at a cost of $125,000.

Mr. TABER. After they evidently knew there was to be no use for the housing.

Mr. ROWE. As I said, it is designed to entertain people that are not there.

Mr. TABER. I suppose that is what this $25,000,000 would be used for.

So that we may not be fooled about any story of great necessity, they have already got $125,000,000 that is unexpended that is involved in contracts which they claim are let. Then they have $16,000,000, according to the information that I got, that is not allocated or anything else. So that they have $16,000,000 to play with, and if they need to have a trailer camp or something like that some place else for immediate service to some unit that is hard pressed, they could perhaps take care of it without any trouble.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. Is the gentleman familiar with the 80 houses that are going to float down the Ohio River?

Mr. TABER. I heard a little about that yesterday.

Mr. GRIFFITHS. The gentleman might be interested in this. This is from Point Pleasant:

THIRTY 4-ROOM HOUSES TO GO "DOWN THE RIVER"

CINCINNATI.—Thirty 4-room houses soon will go sailing down the Ohio River on a 600-mile river trip from Point Pleasant, W. Va., to Camp Breckinridge, Ky., it has been learned here.

The houses, complete with stoves, refrigerators, and bathrooms, will make the trip down the Ohio on barges.

E. G. Kirschner, of Cincinnati, has the contract for transporting the houses. The trip to Uniontown, Ky., near the Army camp, will require about 6 days, he said. Another 50 houses will be brought down the Ohio late in March.

The houses were built by the Government for war workers at a plant near Point Pleasant, but were never occupied.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice on page 9 that the Budget estimate of $25,000,000 was reduced to $7,500,000.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Was that reduction included in the vacancies the gentleman has already given to the House?

Mr. TABER. The vacancies are only on completed projects that I have given to the House. I have studiously avoided using the list that was furnished me that covered uncompleted projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Regarding those houses that are taking this river trip, that is an example of what they are trying to do to save them. We have demountable houses in the program. Instead of criticism of this activity I think there should be commendation.

Mr. TABER. If that is what they were that would be something that we should give attention to, but I wonder if the gentleman would know about that, whether they were constructed as demountable houses or not?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I can give the gentleman some information about that. Twelve hundred and fifty houses were constructed at that place. Nine hundred and fifty have never been occupied.

Mr. TABER. What was that place?

Mr. JENKINS. Point Pleasant, W. Va. They are not demountable houses as we generally consider the term; they are small cottages, about four-room cottages, I think.

Mr. TABER. That is not even given in the list, or at least I cannot find it. Does the gentleman from Michigan know where it is?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; it will be found at page 656 of the hearings.

Mr. TABER. I was looking in this book.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I think the main concern of the folks along the Ohio River down in my section of the country is whether or not they are being taken for a ride down the river along with the houses. That is the main issue down there.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. The statement of the gentleman from Michigan as to what is being done to save them would be interesting if we knew what they were saving them from or what they were saving them for.

Mr. TABER. Here is the story I got out of this book. Occupancy: There are 600 of these buildings supposed to have been built and available for occupancy at Point Pleasant. The number occupied they indicate is not known by them because it is under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I might call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at Sidney, Nebr., 220 very fine apartments were built, but they never had more than 20 families in there. Then they moved those 20 families out to another building project where they have some 200 houses not over 25 percent of which were occupied. The apartments at Sidney had very fine plumbing and equipment in them, but no one to occupy them.

Mr. TABER. I have checked up on the number they wanted to build. This appears at page 643. I found that where they asked for a large number there was always involved in that number vacant housing in a very nearby project. For that reason I do not believe they need another dollar of funds for this housing project. I think it is a menace to the war effort to be putting our people to work at a time when we have a shortage of manpower, putting skilled artisans to work on houses that are not going to be occupied, that are not needed. The construction is largely of a type that does not result in occupancy. I hope, and I hope very urgently in the interests of the war effort, that this House will refuse to provide any more funds for this proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman not know that some 800,000 refugees were brought into this country since the war began with another batch yet to come; that of the 800,000, some 6,000 are doctors? Perhaps we are to furnish the 800,000 with homes while our boys are sent abroad. The refugee doctors are to take the place of our own physicians. Why cannot these physicians remain abroad and aid in caring for our soldiers?

Mr. TABER. That is a part of the post-war program that should be referred to the committee studying post-war problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we always seem to have quite a field day when this matter of housing is broached in this Chamber. I recall that we passed in less than a month more than $100,000,000,000 of appropriations without a dissenting voice in order to construct our various war plants; but when relatively small amounts are asked for wartime housing where it is not available for the workers who operate those plants and without whom the plants would be idle, we always hear a great furor.

The Budget recommended $25,000,000 for this purpose at the present time. The committee reported in the bill $7,500,000, which is less than one-third of the Budget recommendation. I am wondering how many of the Members who have risen and spoken about these vacancies at different projects have manifested a proper spirit of investigation by getting in touch with the administrative authorities and finding out the circumstances as to why those vacancies exist. I wish the Members who have been urging these objections would advise me if they have taken the matters up in these particular instances with the administrative authorities to learn the real facts.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. At Sidney, Nebr., we protested that they should not build these units. They said there would be 10,000 people out there and they were still insisting that 10,000 people would be out there, yet they never had more than 500.

Mr. LANHAM. All right; did the gentleman get in touch with the administrative authorities here in Washington and have conferences with them?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, I did; with Mr. Blandford himself.

Mr. LANHAM. Then the gentleman is practically in a class to himself.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I do not want to lose all my time.

Mr. TABER. I have been trying to find out something about this from Mr. Blandford, but not until long after the hearings closed did some of this stuff come up. It has been absolutely impossible.

Mr. LANHAM. Let me say with reference to the matter of vacancies that in the first place, with reference to family units, they are more than 90 percent occupied.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would yield there, these tables that have been furnished do not indicate that.

Mr. LANHAM. Ah, but the gentleman has not taken up with the administrative authorities the details of these various places.

Mr. TABER. I asked him for details of the work and spent hours with him in my office.

Mr. LANHAM. The statement has been made over and over——

Mr. TABER. I wonder why it is? The gentleman may get something that I do not get. Are they operating on a kind of cover-up basis? That is the way it has looked to me all along.

Mr. LANHAM. Now, if I may have a little of my time, let me say that we have monthly meetings with the administrative authorities of the National Housing Agency before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the testimony is that more than 90 percent of the family units are occupied.

Bear in mind in the first place that the War Department and the Navy Department that have charge of running this war tell the Housing Authority where these buildings are to be built to meet their needs of production. Naturally, if the War Department and the Navy Department change their minds then the picture is changed necessarily. Many of these vacancies have arisen by reason of the fact that the plants at which these houses were established have completed their work and consequently they are moving them to get them to some place where they can be used without the necessity of constructing new buildings.

Naturally, in these buildings for single workers more vacancies occur because the turn-over is great. A great many of them are taken into the armed services and there is a constant change. And may I call your attention to the fact, too, that these are but temporary buildings, that they are to be removed after the war. The testimony before our committee is that we will recoup for the Treasury at least three or four hundred million dollars of the appropriations that we have made. Furthermore, there must be at plants that are operating a certain percentage of vacancies in order to take care of the recruiting of workers.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, it is a very healthy sign that in some of these places vacancies do arise, otherwise these plants now in operation might not be able to carry on at full production.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the total amount that has been appropriated? The gentleman stated that two or three hundred million dollars would be saved.

Mr. LANHAM. There will be, according to the testimony, at least three or four hundred million dollars saved from the housing. The appropriations that have been made, as I recall, amount to a little over a billion dollars.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. In reference to these buildings that have been torn down, has the gentleman any idea as to how much salvage value has been recouped?

Mr. LANHAM. I cannot give the gentleman that information, but I am sure he can get it by application to the administrative authorities.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I think it is a very important matter.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said on the floor of this House with reference to the types of houses. They complain sometimes that they do not build good enough houses and they complain at other times that they build too good houses for the workers. These houses are temporary structures, they are not intended as permanent homes for these people, and where these plants are located and housing is not available some provision must be made, though the living quarters may not be as desirable as they would be under ordinary circumstances, in order that the workers may have some of the conveniences of living which will enable them to stay there and carry on the work. Then we hear complaints about the sites that have been selected as not being very good sites. We do not want to put in the temporary houses that are to be torn down right up in the center of these various cities and their choice residential locations. If we did we would hear still more complaint with reference to that.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter in which I have no more personal interest than any one of you. It was started certainly as a matter of war emergency in order that housing might be provided where these plants are located to the extent that housing was not already available and that private capital could not take the risk of building the structures. After the investigation which has been made it has been determined by the Committee on Appropriations that this amount is necessary. It has been cut down by more than two-thirds of the Budget estimate.

Upon the information that has been given to the committee and with reference to which this sum has been placed in the bill, if this amendment prevails be sure not to complain if production goes down in the plants in your district by reason of lack of available housing for the workers. If you will look into these specific items of vacancy and take them up with the administrative authorities, you will find that there are justifying circumstances for each and every one of them. Bear in mind they were constructed originally by this agency not of its own will and volition but upon the

recommendation of the military and naval authorities of this country in the prosecution of the war. For the vacancies which have existed, in addition to those that are naturally incident to the turn-over by single workers being called into the war service, and that have existed by reason either of the ceasing of these plants to operate or through diminishing operation of those plants, you cannot hold the National Housing Agency responsible, because those are circumstances over which they have no control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, except for the conclusions that may not be justifiable on the part of the gentleman preceding me, I would not rise to give voice to my thoughts on this issue. I want to assure the gentleman that I have personally investigated these projects as they affect the district that I represent in this Congress. I want to further assure him that as a result of investigations in previous instances I have caused to be stopped what would have been an injustice in the building of war housing units out there.

I would further call to his attention that a short time ago as a result of the laying off of some 5,100 workers at Goodyear Aircraft Co. in Akron, Ohio, a statement was issued by the authorities that temporary houses for war workers had reached the saturation point in that community. I want to further advise the gentleman that I am now in contact with Mr. Blandford of the F. P. H. A. to prevent their coming into that community and misplacing an additional 500 units. I want to call to the gentleman's attention specifically, as he remarked, that "we do not want to bring these temporary units into the uptown sections of the city," that these new units I am objecting to are to be built in the built-up sections of the city. They are temporary houses and they will seriously deteriorate the value of properties near where they are to be situated.

I have called the head of this agency, Mr. Blandford, and I find he was out of the city and could not give me the information I wanted. I have been referred to a subordinate, then subsequent thereto I received a phone call from a third person who advised they would look into the matter and see what they could find out about it. The fact remains, the ground has been broken at this locality and the neighbors are protesting frantically for something to be done to stop these buildings coming into the neighborhood where the people have paid for their homes and suffer the assessment of taxes on them.

The gentleman from Texas made other statements I would like to lend thought to, namely, that the Army and Navy desire these buildings at the place they specify, which is the reason that the Housing Authority builds them there. In that statement I can agree. I can agree, except that the War Production Board, in its attempt to conserve the essential building materials, has completely absolved itself of the responsibility of conserving that material, and they have turned it over to the agency that builds these buildings. I want to add this: Because of the exclusive right for the issuance of these essential materials, they have excluded from the field of building of these temporary and permanent houses substantially all of private enterprise and I believe the information that is now being disclosed in the District of Columbia clearly indicates that the cost per unit under the agency to which we are appropriating money here today is materially more than if it were in the hands of individual enterprise.

I cannot agree that the Army or Navy picked the sites these new buildings are being built upon, nor do I believe they insist upon their being built.

I agree that the Army and Navy has the right to say that they need a certain number of units at certain places, and I also agree they may make an error in designating certain places and time the number of units are required, but I say further that the Army and Navy does not exclusively fix the responsibility for this in the Federal Housing Agency. It is an authority they retain to themselves. That is fixed because of powers granted through us to the War Production Board and the executive department. It is their exclusive right to that material and its use.

I believe that one of the outstanding businesses of this country, one to which we may look with great expectancy in the reconversion for employment of men in the post-war season is the building industry, yet in the district I represent there are innumerable private building enterprises that are crying for materials to go to work. They could just as well build these houses as could the public agency under regulation to conserve essential materials and I am sure at a much less cost under a contract rate.

We are providing much work, but the manner in which we are doing it by delivering exclusive right to the F. P. H. A. in allotting materials to build not only this type of building but all other kinds of buildings as well. We are stultifying a very substantial business and we are blighting private enterprise within the country. We have destroyed any number of small businesses by exclusive rights vested in such public agencies as this, equipped with power to regulate by force of directive law.

I approach this question sincerely. It is not that I have a pronounced antipathy toward this agency, but I think it is our responsibility to move back toward the fundamentals which this country is built upon, private enterprise, just as soon as we can, and this appears to be an opportunity now to start it. We must invest a little more faith in our people and not continually subject their every move and privilege to regulation by strong agencies here in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, there is little time to answer many of the inquiries that have been made concerning the housing program, but I have here some information concerning the program attacked yesterday by the gentleman from New York; located in his own district, at Geneva, N. Y. The colloquy concerning it is found in the RECORD on pages 2359 and 2360. There were built there, the gentleman said, 250 units completed on December 1, and only 1 occupied.

Now, the facts that have been given to me are entirely different. Has the gentleman any new information on that?

Mr. TABER. I have no new information other than I had before, but I have some very considerable information of one type or another.

Mr. RABAUT. About Geneva, N. Y.?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. The following is the information of the history and the activities of war housing programed for Geneva, N. Y.:

WAR HOUSING PROGRAMED FOR GENEVA, N. Y.

With the establishment in 1941 of the Senaca ordnance depot at Romulus, N. Y., approximately 11 miles southeast of the city of Geneva, and the establishment early in 1942 of the Sampson Naval Training Station, about 10 miles south of Geneva, it became apparent that housing would be needed to accommodate the essential civilian war workers who could not be recruited within the area.

Because of an influx of thousands of construction workers employed in building the ordnance depot, many of whom were forced to live in makeshift accommodations under insanitary and unhealthy conditions, the former Division of Defense Housing Coordination authorized the Farm Security Administration to construct a trailer camp on the Senaca County fair grounds in the fall of 1941 to provide 90 publicly owned trailers and sites for additional privately owned trailers for key construction workers. About the time that peak construction employment at the depot was reached, the Navy undertook construction of the Sampson Naval Training Station, which is one of the largest stations of this kind in the country. As construction declined at the depot, the workers were hired by the Navy and additional workers brought into the area. Although barracks were built by the contractors, these proved inadequate and the trailer project was increased to 200 units on July 16, 1942.

On September 23, 1942, the National Housing Agency, successor of the Division of Defense Coordination, approved the first housing program intended for civilian operating personnel of the 2 military establishments. This program authorized the construction of 300 publicly financed family dwelling units and 250 single dormitory units for employees of the naval station and 100 dormitory units for employees of the ordnance depot, the latter having been requested by Col. L. R. Groves, of the Corps of Engineers, in a letter dated June 1, 1942, to the Administrator. The program was based upon information furnished by Capt. H. A. Badt, commanding officer of Sampson, that 2,500 civilians would be required by the training station, and upon information furnished by Capt. E. M. Bell, representative of the commanding officer of

the Senaca ordnance depot, that 800 additional civilians would be needed by that establishment. Of the total of 3,300 workers required, the United States Employment Service estimated that 1,800 could be recruited locally and that 1,500 would be inmigrants. Of this latter group, it was estimated that 500 would enter the area as single workers and that the remaiing 1,000 would come as members of 750 families. At that time the local homes registration office had only 3 family dwelling units listed as vacant in the locality. Because of the temporary character of the military establishments, private builders were not interested in constructing permanent homes to meet the wartime demand. Therefore, after making an allowance for the housing to become available as the construction work tapered off, the accommodations mentioned previously were authorized to meet the minimum immediate need. These projects have been constructed on the military reservations so that the occupants will be available for duty at all hours and in cases of emergency.

On September 21, 1942, Lt. Col. William A. Davis, of the Corps of Engineers, referred to the National Housing Agency a recommendation by the division engineer that 400 additional dormitory units be constructed for civilian employees of the Seneca ordnance depot. The National Housing Agency did not concur in this recommendation, and on December 29, 1942, Colonel Davis advised that the 100 dormitories previously authorized would be adequate to meet the need for accommodations of that type among the single employees of the ordnance depot.

Throughout the fall of 1942, the Geneva area was under constant observation by representatives of the National Housing Agency. During this period operations at the ordnance depot and the naval training station continued to expand; several industries in the city of Geneva shifted to war production, necessitating an increase in their staffs; the families of many of the military and naval personnel stationed at Seneca and Sampson moved into the area and the service trades increased employment to accommodate the additional population. Local citizens repeatedly pointed out to National Housing Agency representatives that the shortage of housing was critical and in September the B. E. S. reported that "Geneva has reached its capacity for the accommodation of lodgers and roomers." Numerous private trailer parks and tent camps sprang up, summer cottages were occupied long after cold weather set in and many workers commuted up to 100 miles a day. The commanding officers of the Military Establishments estimated that 2,500 families of service personnel would seek housing accommodations in addition to the in-migrant civilian war workers.

Under these conditions the National Housing Agency prepared an additional program in January 1943. This program, based upon estimates obtained from the commanding officers and the United States Employment Service and confirmed by the regional office of the War Manpower Commission, anticipated a necessary increase in employment at the war activities of 4,100 persons of whom 2,100 could be obtained locally and 2,000 would be recruited outside the area. Of the 2,000 inmigrants, it was estimated that 600 would be single workers, and that the remaining 1,400 workers would enter the area as members of 1,025 families. The dormitories then under construction and the rooms available and to become available by the exodus of construction workers were believed adequate to accommodate the single in-migrants. To meet the needs of the workers entering the area as members of families, there were 300 dwellings under construction at Sampson and 500 additional were authorized by the National Housing Agency. Of this additional housing, 250 units were assigned to the Federal Public Housing Authority for construction in the city of Geneva, and 250 were to be provided by converting and remodeling existing structures. Thus, 800 units were to be provided for an estimated in-migration of 1,025 families. The program was purposely kept at a minimum because it was realized that the War Manpower Commission might experience difficulties in recruiting the additional workers needed and because of the possibility that the Army and Navy might use military personnel to fill some of the jobs intended for civilians.

Since the housing previously authorized had been constructed on the military reservations some distance from Geneva, the housing approved in the winter of 1943 was recommended for development in the city of Geneva in order to accommodate workers employed by the United States Radiator Co., the Geneva Foundry Corporation, the Andes Range & Furnace Corporation, the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station, and other establishments engaged in war work as well as the military activities. It was believed that enough housing had been located at the military reservations to enable them to meet their emergency needs, and it was felt that many workers would prefer to live within the city rather than on relatively isolated posts. The site selected for the 250-unit public-housing project provided advantages in regard to utilities, schools, shopping centers, and hospitals unobtainable outside of the city limits. The mayor of the city, the board of public works, the board of education, the chamber of commerce, the commandant of the naval training station, and the commanding officer of the Senaca ordnance depot were consulted prior to selection of the site and all gave their approval to the location chosen. This project was started on June 19, 1943, and was reported as 99 percent completed on January 31, 1944. Occupancy of the project has been delayed because of difficulties encountered in the repair of a sewer line owned by the city to which the project is being connected.

Occupancy of all of the war housing programed for Geneva was reported as follows as of January 31, 1944:

(a) Project NY-30121: 300-family duration units at Sampson, 100 percent occupied.

(b) Project NY-30122: 250 dormitory units at Sampson, 193 occupied and 57 vacant. All of the units in this project intended for female workers are completely occupied. Because of selective service withdrawals the units intended for single males are largely vacant, and the Navy Department is considering converting these units for female occupancy.

(c) Project NY-30072: 97 dormitory units at Seneca ordnance depot. This project is under management by the War Department and occupancy data are not immediately available.

(d) Project NY-30086: 250 family units in Geneva—not yet opened for occupancy.

(e) Two hundred family units by publicly financed conversions, 59 occupied, 55 vacant, 79 under construction, and 7 not started.

(f) Fifty family units by privately financed conversions, 6 occupied, 1 vacant, 3 under construction, 40 not started.

Within the past few months, following consultation with the War Housing Advisory Committee of Geneva, composed of a group of prominent local citizens, the National Housing Agency's regional representative has relaxed the eligibility requirements for war housing to permit occupancy by in-migrant military personnel, resident war workers, and resident military personnel inadequately housed, in addition to the in-migrant civilian war workers for whom the housing was originally intended. This step was taken since employment at the Seneca Ordnance Depot has been curtailed and since the other war activities in Geneva, as in many other areas, have not been able to obtain all of the workers needed to bring their staffs up to the scheduled peak. Consequently, the housing provided in anticipation of the expected demand is now being made available to other deserving groups to the extent that such action will not interfere with essential war production.

It may be mentioned that the War Department and the War Food Administration recently have requested that the public-housing project in Geneva be turned over to the War Department to house prisoners of war to be brought into the area to meet a serious shortage of farm labor. It is understood that 200 units of the project could be fenced off and guarded very easily, leaving 50 units available for war workers with large families or low incomes, who cannot find adequate accommodations in other housing. The National Housing Agency is at present investigating the desirability of an arrangement of this type.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes, certainly to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I am interested in the project, particularly in Ypsilanti Township, described as in the Detroit area, where 1,900 units were built and only 70 occupied. I supported the building program for war housing.

Mr. RABAUT. Is that the Willow Run project?

Mr. DONDERO. It is in Ypsilanti Township, West Ledge.

Mr. RABAUT. Is that the Willow Run project?

Mr. DONDERO. I assume that is the project.

Mr. RABAUT. Well, if that is the Willow Run project, the Senator from Michigan used all the power he had to get the thing built, and then recognized afterwards that it probably was a little too far out for occupancy. That is particularly true about the dormitory units. This is all the information I have concerning that particular project.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it would be helpful to the committee and the House if some explanation was made of this vast number of projects. Ninety-three projects of 27,000 units are only about 25 percent occupied.

Mr. RABAUT. I recognize the interest of the Members of the House in this tremendous undertaking in the supplying of housing for workers and personnel engaged in various activities in the war effort. I will say that I anticipated just such an interest and such an inquiry. And, as a member of the committee, I asked the National Housing Agency to supply me with the proper data as to their activities to the last date obtainable. As a result of that inquiry I place in the RECORD their latest summary:

A REPORT ON WAR HOUSING OCCUPANCY

War housing continues to be geared directly to war production and the needs of specific war plants for manpower. It has been built only to meet official in-migration estimates agreed upon by the War Manpower Commission, Army and Navy procurement agencies, the War Production Board, and industry management. But because the war-production effort has blanketed the Nation and has required an unprecedented movement of

labor, war housing has had to be provided in nearly 1,000 communities.

Today approximately 1,500,000 new or converted war-housing units have been completed by the joint effort of private and public enterprise. This housing, plus the 2,000,000 accommodations obtained from existing housing, has met the needs of essential incoming workers in the majority of war-industry areas. It has made possible the attainment of peak war-production goals in those areas.

In the great majority of localities the new housing is being fully utilized by eligible war workers. At least 94 percent of all family quarters completed for 3 months or more are currently occupied.

Vacancies now exist in some areas, just as some war plants are not now needed to full capacity. A majority of current vacancies in publicly financed family dwellings are in temporary projects not fully completed or completed for less than 3 months. Many are being held open for future manpower recruitment by specific war industries.

In a war program—as contrasted with peacetime—surplus housing, like surplus bullets, is frequently an asset. Much war housing must be built in advance of the need, because the availability of completed quarters is absolutely essential to attract the workers needed to reach production goals.

CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE RECOGNIZES NEED

In recognition of this fact, the Izac subcommittee of the House Naval Affairs Committee stated in its report on January 5, 1944:

"Because it is impossible to determine accurately the number of housing units that will be required at any definite time, housing officials must be given the opportunity to proceed with a program that will maintain at all times a slight excess of housing facilities."

There are various other causes of vacancies in war-housing projects, which involve only a small percentage of a national program representing a private and public investment of about $6,000,000,000:

1. Substantial downward revisions in some war-production schedules, caused by revised demands from the battle fronts.

2. Elimination of some production items, causing complete shut-downs and the shifting of workers to other war plants.

3. Improved production methods, improved utilization of local manpower, and increased labor efficiency.

4. Delays in or failures of labor-recruitment drives.

Hampton Roads, Va., affords a good example of the importance of available housing to continued recruitment of war labor. Serious difficulties in manpower recruitment developed early in 1943. This coincided with the completion of a large volume of war housing, with the result that there were as many as 7,000 vacancies at one time. The availability of this housing was promptly utilized as a recruitment tool, since prospective workers from outside the area could be guaranteed adequate housing. As a result, 6,000 war workers were recruited for the Navy and shipyards in Norfolk area, and now there are only about a thousand vacant dwelling units—which probably soon will be filled.

Authorities agree that this essential recruitment for the navy yard and other war establishments would have been most difficult, if not impossible, without these vacant war-housing units.

SINGLE WORKERS FAIL TO SHOW UP

Current vacancies in temporary dormitory projects in the Bridgeport, Conn., area illustrate the impact of downward revision or delays in expected labor recruitment. Construction of these projects, involving 1,908 accommodations for single workers, was authorized by the N. H. A. early in 1943 on the basis of official estimates that at least 5,000 single-women workers would have to be brought into the area for urgently needed expansion in naval-aircraft production and that other war industries would also require dormitory accommodations. The actual in-migration of single workers, however, has been much less than the need officially forecast, and about 2,500 of the single workers who have come into the area have been housed is private rooms. As a result, 796 of the accommodations have been placed in stand-by status, with their ultimate disposition dependent upon developments in the Bridgeport manpower situation and the need for aircraft production.

A good example of vacancy problems resulting from sharp downward revisions in production schedules is provided by the Kingsford Heights project in Kingsbury, Ind. A total of 2,974 demountable houses were built to house part of the labor migration required for the ordnance plant there. Peak employment was officially estimated at over 26,000. However, after rescheduling of munitions production, employment was cut to less than 9,500 workers, most of whom commuted from other towns. As a result, most of the Kingsford Heights project was made unnecessary.

Some 2,200 of the demountable houses have been or are being moved to other areas where there are urgent needs for additional war housing.

HOUSING BASED ON MANPOWER ESTIMATES MONTHS AHEAD

Downward revision in production at ordnance plants has caused vacancy problems in a number of other localities. These plants and the housing which serves them provided for a margin of safety considered essential by military authorities in the early days of the war. The fact that they do not now have to be used at capacity is a reflection of the favorable course of the war, for which the Nation can well be grateful.

Considering that at least 6 months are required to build most types of housing and that programs have had to be based on production and employment forecasts months ahead, housing estimates have been close to the actual demand in the great majority of areas. Vacancies would have been far greater had not the N. H. A. steadily resisted insistent pressures—both local and national—for larger programs than it has ever approved in any areas; and if it had not sought and obtained community cooperation in the use of existing housing through local war housing centers and share-your-home campaigns.

At the same time, the N. H. A. has consistently recognized the inevitability of shifts in production and manpower requirements because of unpredictable war developments. For that reason it has programed permanent war housing—predominantly privately financed—only where there is reasonable likelihood of a continuing post-war demand. Because of this policy, there is virtually no vacancy problem in the large volume of units financed by the $4,000,000,000 private investment in war housing.

Where it was clear that the need would be limited to the war period or subject to possible sharp fluctuations in demand even during the war, the N. H. A. has installed temporary housing financed by public funds. This temporary housing is carrying the brunt of fluctuating manpower needs and current vacancies—as it was intended to. From the outset it has been viewed by Congress and by the N. H. A. as an expendable war commodity. In no sense is it comparable to commercial housing, since it has been provided only where construction of commercial housing was impossible because of prohibitive war risks.

TEMPORARY HOUSING ($2,700 PER UNIT) TO BE REMOVED AFTER WAR

While providing comfortable, sanitary quarters for the duration, temporary housing has deliberately been built below acceptable standards for permanent housing in order to make maximum economies in use of materials, manpower, and money. The average temporary family dwelling uses 80 percent less critical material than a pre-war permanent dwelling and costs about $2,700, including sites and utilities. In accordance with legislation enacted by Congress on the recommendation of the N. H. A., all temporary housing will be removed after war needs have passed.

Even though carrying the full weight of shifts in war production schedules, 85 percent of the family units in temporary projects completed for 3 months or more are occupied, and in many areas temporary projects are being utilized to capacity. Temporary dormitories—subject to the additional factor that an increasing proportion of labor recruitment now consists of older men with families, who require family accommodations—now are about 70 percent occupied.

In many areas war housing must be held vacant to meet future needs. But in any area where it is clear that it will not be needed for incoming war workers because of a permanent change in manpower requirements, N. H. A. regional offices have full authority to open projects to resident war workers, to military personnel and their families, to the families of men entering the armed services, or to returning veterans—or to lift all restrictions, depending on local needs and the local housing situation. In this way, war housing can relieve congestion in crowded war areas.

HOUSING NEEDS STILL CRITICAL IN SOME AREAS

If both permanent private war housing and temporary public war housing are available in an area, the N. H. A.'s policy is to fill the private housing before filling the temporary housing. If there appears a future need for any vacant temporary housing, it is placed in a stand-by category as long as necessary. If there obviously is no longer any residential use for it during the war period, it will be disposed of for other war uses or will be dismantled and the materials salvaged—in accordance with procedures already established by the N. H. A.

These problems are now current in only a handful of the hundreds of areas where war housing has been built. In most areas, while completions of housing have generally caught up with the need, a continued tight supply requires that projects still be reserved exclusively for occupancy by eligible in-migrant workers.

There are other important areas where production and manpower requirements are still expanding. To meet these needs, about 300,000 additional war-housing units—involving both private and public financing—are under construction or scheduled. While war production in the aggregate is at peak levels, there will be continuing adjustments within that aggregate—both upward and downward. Some of these upward adjustments will inevitably create additional war-housing needs.

This is the case particularly on the west coast, where most of the current war-housing construction is now concentrated. However, it is also true in other areas. For instance, the War Manpower Commission has just launched a drive to recruit 300,000 workers in the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, and North Carolina for war employment elsewhere in that same region. Furthermore, workers brought into war-industry areas as replacements for selective-service withdrawals will frequently

create new housing needs, since many families of men entering the armed services will continue to occupy their present homes rather than releasing them to the market.

The major war housing job obviously is turning from construction to the task of efficiently utilizing the housing supply. In that sense the job won't be done until the war is won.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

During the general debate I took occasion to refer to the criticism that has been leveled at the war housing work of the National Housing Agency by the Massachusetts Federation of Taxpayers' Associations. I quote again a part of that criticism:

Federal defense housing in Massachusetts is a monument to bureaucratic inefficiency and incompetency. Millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money have been squandered on projects unneeded in the communities in which they are located, unwanted by local municipal officials, and spurned as unfit to live in by newly prosperous defense workers for whom they were presumably constructed.

I quote further:

The wasteful conditions that exist in F. P. H. A. projects in Massachusetts are typical of F. P. H. A. region No. 1 operations. This region embraces the six New England States. The Portland and Bath, Maine, projects cry out for investigation. One has but to read the annual report for 1943 of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Housing Authority to know that F. P. H. A. has learned nothing from its previous housing mistakes.

The best test of whether these projects, particularly in Massachusetts, were needed rests on the extent to which they are occupied. Millions of dollars have been spent, and every promotion device known to the experts has been used, yet three-quarters of the defense housing projects in Massachusetts stand as empty as the ghost towns of an earlier western era.

The Federation's criticism includes what may be called a bill of particulars. I have not time to read it. Under the leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD at this point.

ADMINISTRATIVE DEFECTS

The New England Regional Office of the Federal Public Housing Authority is subject to the following defects:

1. Absence of effective coordination between division heads in the region office.

2. Failure to handle correspondence, change orders, and requisitions for payment promptly. Because of this some contractors have had large sums of money due on contracts held back by the Government for as long as 9 months.

3. Failure to accurately review and correct specifications and drawings prior to award of contracts. The Boston office frequently asked the project engineers for suggestions for improvements, which were frequently offered, but the Boston office never adopted them. Mr. Wiley and his immediate subordinates never profited by previous mistakes. Much of this trouble, perhaps, originates in Washington, but this is the reason why so many extras go into the costs.

4. Failure to obtain accurate data by borings and test pits to determine ground water and subsoil conditions on sites for projects under consideration before final selection of sites is made. This failure has resulted in the expenditure of many thousands of dollars to overcome natural obstacles that could have been avoided by selecting better available sites.

5. Failure to carefully review and correct site grading drawings and drainage systems prior to award of contracts to prevent surface water from reaching basements and crawl spaces. This has caused the expenditure of large sums of money to correct errors which could have been avoided by careful review of drawings.

6. Failure to promptly negotiate and close contracts with local utility companies for water, gas, and electricity. This has caused much delay and extra expense. The lawyers in the legal division are responsible for this defect. It is their duty to negotiate the contracts. Wiley should make them do the work promptly.

7. Failure to aggressively expedite priority requests through the regional office, the central office, and the War Production Board. Many delays have resulted.

8. Failure to expedite requisitions for plumbing, heating, and electric fixtures from the Massachusetts purchase section of the F. P. H. A. central office.

9. Failure to require contractors to comply with the elevations and dimensions shown on contract drawings and correct contract noncompliances and defective workmanship prior to final acceptance by the Government.

It is probable that the omissions and errors enumerated above will have cost the Federal Government several millions of dollars of avoidable expenditure in New England alone by the time the war housing program has been completed.

Investigation will reveal that large sums have been wasted by reason of one or more of the foregoing deficiencies in connection with the development of the attached list of projects.

Project No.	Location	Remarks
Me-17023	Bath, Maine	Poor site selection—excessively wet subsoil. Large extra expense to correct.
Me-17024	do	Do.
Me-17031	South Portland, Maine.	Cost-plus contract—uneconomical prosecution of the work by the contractor. Large overrun in total cost—poor supervision.
Vt-43014	Springfield, Vt	Poor site engineering. Large extra expense to correct errors and divert water.
Conn-3-4	Charter Oak Terrace, Hartford.	Poor site selection and engineering. Total extra cost for overcoming avoidable errors will be about $250,000.
Conn-6125	Rocky Hill, Conn	Poor site selection.
Conn-6029	Wethersfield, Conn	Excessive ledge rock in subsoil.
Conn-6092	Bristol, Conn	Poor site selection. Excessive ground water and out-cropping boulders.
Conn-6141-T	Groton, Conn	Do.
Conn-6017	New London, Conn	Poor site selection. Excessive ledge rock and out-cropping boulders.
Conn-6028	Glastonbury, Conn	Poor site selection. Excessive springs and ground water.
Mass-19061	Pittsfield, Mass	Poor site selection. Excessive rock in subsoil and poor location for transportation.
Mass-19052	North Weymouth, Mass.	Poor site selection. Excessive springs, ground water—poor site engineering.
Mass-19053	Hingham, Mass	Failure to avoid ledge rock in locating houses. Also poor drainage engineering.
Mass-19025	Springfield, Mass	Poor site selection. Bad subsoil conditions.
RI-37013	Newport, R. I	Poor site selection. Wet subsoil. Poor site engineering and noncompliance by contractor with contract requirements.
RI-37022	Wickford, R. I	Defective engineering in choice of sewage-disposal facilities. Spent much extra money to correct.
Conn-6082	Bantam, Conn	Do.
RI-3-1	Woonsocket, R. I	Poor site selection and wet subsoil conditions. Poor drainage engineering.
Conn-6031	New Britain, Conn	Poor site selection. Excessive amount of ledge rock in subsoil.
Conn-6032	do	Poor site and drainage engineering.

In the limited time available I can add little to the picture which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has painted.

I hold in my hand a compilation prepared from figures furnished by the National Housing Agency, in which are listed projects in important locations in this country, where there is less than 50 percent occupancy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the compilation at this point in the RECORD:

Location and name of project	Completed for occupancy	Occupied units
Bridgeport, Conn.:		
Burr Courts	360	93
Berkshire Courts	196	58
Stratford, Conn.:		
Chauncey Homes	744	80
Avon Terrace	600	106
Hartford, Conn.:		
Brewer Street Homes	209	87
Norman Homes	241	40
West Hartford, Conn., South Quaker Terrace	159	23
Meriden, Conn.:		
Gale Terrace	150	0
Do	152	47
Southington, Conn.:		
Broad Acres	100	12
Do	160	24
Wallingford, Conn., Hillcrest	68	30
New Britain, Conn., Rockland	150	90
Willimantic, Conn., John Cates Terrace	184	32
Windsor Locks, Conn., Bradley Dormitories	114	43
Houlton, Maine, Lane Dormitories	100	21
Location and name of project	Completed for occupancy	Occupied units
Pittsfield, Mass., Victory Hill	100	32
Southbridge, Mass., Harrington Hall	98	41
Holyoke, Mass., Liberty Park	44	6
Newport, R. I., Perry Mill	208	57
Seabrook Farms, N. J., Upper Deerfield Township	748	66
Niagara Falls, N. Y., Pineacres	1,200	46
Massena, N. Y., Massena Homes	200	0
Rome, N. Y., Wright Park	400	123
Coatesville, Pa., Garver Court	100	13
Erie, Pa., Iroquois Court	186	51
Geneva, Pa., Daniel Tozy Court	160	41
Philadelphia, Pa.:		
Chelton Terrace, Camden, N. J	200	43
Tacony Homes	250	88
Tinicum Manor, Tinicum Township	286	81
Fulmer Heights II, Upper Moreland Township	200	55
Pottstown, Pa., Hilldale Homes	300	46
Newport News, Va., Ann Wythe Halls, Elizabeth City County	368	48
Radford-Pulaski, Va., Newbern-McGill Village	150	69
Savannah, Ga., Augustine Park	425	192
Thomasville, Ga., Three Toms Inn	150	54
Aberdeen, Miss.:		
Stone Homes	200	38
Davis Apartments	160	12
Pascagoula, Miss., Eastlawn	596	178
Elizabeth City, N. C.:		
Enfield Homes	100	15
Do	550	257
Charleston, S. C.:		
Liberty Homes	500	212
Ashley Homes	1,000	397
Detroit, Mich., West Lodge, Ypsilanti Township	1,960	70
Saginaw, Mich., Caledonia Courts	250	95
Piqua, Ohio, Victory Heights	180	81
Sidney, Ohio, Buckeye Terrace	100	28

Location and name of project	Completed for occupancy	Occupied units
Troy, Ohio, Highland Park Homes	350	120
Warren, Ohio, Ridge Homes	190	45
Rosiclare, Ill., Spardale	150	73
Savanna, Ill., Blackhawk Village	250	5
Burns City, Ind., Crane Homes	350	61
Rapid City, S. Dak., Air Base Terrace	72	21
Sturgis, S. Dak., Comanche Courts	35	12
Eudora, Kans., Sunflower Village	852	367
Sidney, Nebr.:		
Sioux Villa	175	1
Ordville	436	55
Ogden, Utah, Anchorage	200	97
Bauxite, Ark.:		
Pine Haven-Woodlands	312	47
Pine Haven	150	45
Hot Springs, Ark.:		
Shorewood Hills	258	67
Do	50	0
Alexandria, La., Crest Haven	300	73
Hurley-Santa Rita, N. Mex., John M. Sully Villa	200	81
Orange, Tex., Washington Homes	600	101
Big Spring, Tex., Ellis Homes	172	35
Kingsville, Tex., Retama Park	200	61
Anaconda, Mont., Victory Homes	200	77
Astoria, Oreg.:		
Riverwood Park	240	90
City Hall Dormitories	67	1
Warrenton, Wash., Evergreen Ridge	46	5
Anacortes, Wash., Bayview Homes addition	80	31
Ephrata, Wash.:		
Silver Sage Dormitories	100	10
Elstan, Moses Lake	274	14
Do	130	28
Seattle, Wash. (Kirkland):		
Stewart Heights	592	163
Do	200	23
Do	500	187
Renton, Wash., Renton Highlands	700	338
Seattle, Wash., Union Street Reception	207	64
Tacoma, Wash., American Lake Gardens	150	19
Flagstaff, Ariz., Clark Homes	200	85
Florence, Ariz	70	5
Miami, Ariz.:		
Miners Dormitories	280	100
Miami Homes	280	105
Greenlee County, Ariz	230	71
Inyo County, Calif., Pine Creek Village	130	57
San Francisco, Calif.:		
Candlestick Cove War Dwellings	944	467
Double Rock War Dwellings	552	174
Watsonville, Calif., Pajaro Dormitories	50	24
Tonapah, Nev	214	103
Las Vegas, Nev., Carver Park	324	54
Total	27,008	6,987

The agency fails to give any report in respect to 356 projects.

The compilation includes projects in Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Utah, Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Texas, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, California, and Nevada. The average occupancy for the projects listed is 24 percent.

The committee has experienced the greatest difficulty, Mr. Chairman, not only in this but in a previous instance, in obtaining adequate information from the National Housing Agency. In this instance the testimony indicated that it was impossible for the Agency to predict with any accuracy the projects or location of projects that might be necessary; that the pending appropriation was desired to meet emergency situations that might arise subsequently.

I do not think the request has been justified. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that the necessity for further expenditure for war housing at this time has not been demonstrated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY].

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to war housing. I will vote for it. However, I feel, in justice to the war effort and to the community I represent, I should say these few words on this occasion. Time after time I have made trips downtown to the various authorities, calling to their attention that in my district and in the surrounding area there are 8,362 empty homes; in my district alone there are 20,000 employables, thousands of skilled workers; there are railroads in abundance, a thorough labor-training program, and there are industrial sites, paved roads, electric power, gas, water, sewers, fire protection, and so forth, and yet we cannot get the War Production Board and the other authorities to give us much-needed industries. I could show to the Members of the House beautiful homes, home after home, all unoccupied. It seems to me that as long as that situation exists, there is something rotten in Denmark. Those in charge of plant facilities location owe it to the war effort to examine further the Scranton situation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, 10 minutes were reserved for the committee. I ask to be notified at the end of 5 minutes as the last 5 minutes will be consumed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], chairman of the subcommittee which considered this estimate in the independent officies appropriations bill, 1944.

Mr. Chairman, the war in which our country is engaged is not only the greatest war in history, but a war which departs drastically from all hitherto accepted standards of warfare. It is essentially a war of production, and we are winning the war only because we have produced more and better war materials than our adversaries. When it is finally won, it will be due to the fact that our factories have turned out more guns, tanks, ships, and munitions of war than all the rest of the world combined. In order to do that it has been necessary for us completely to convert and reorganize the entire industrial system of America. We have discontinued the production of all civilian goods, have remodeled and expanded existing factories, established new factories, and united in all-out production on a scale never attempted before.

In order to service these factories it has been necessary to draw manpower from all over the Nation. The result has been huge and unprecedented shifts in population overnight. In many instances where 2 years ago there were waving fields of grain, there are today factories, plants, and populous cities which have sprung up in mushroom growth far removed from peacetime communities and community facilities. It is axiomatic that workmen for these factories require housing accommodations. And the housing must be available before the plant opens. Just how much housing would be needed was in most cases highly problematical. Requirements varied from day to day with changing conditions at the front. For example, in my congressional district we began the feverish manufacture of light tanks. When the tanks went into action in Africa they failed to measure up to requirements, and, as suddenly as production had started, production stopped and was never resumed. Astronomical quantities of barbed wire were ordered in the early days of the war which later experience proved unnecessary and again factories closed down without notice.

All these unexpected changes involved major changes in housing requirements. Sometimes there was too much; sometimes too little. Often it was not ready on time and in other instances it was never needed at all. War is not an exact science insofar as production is concerned and at best it involves wastage and error and loss and miscalculation on a huge scale. But always we have proceeded—and properly—on the theory that if mistakes are to be made, they shall be mistakes in having too much and having it too soon rather than not enough and too late. The destiny of nations is at stake in this titanic conflict and we cannot risk a single house or a single workman or the product of a single day's labor in order to attain meticulous accuracy between present supply and ultimate need.

Our allies have been confronted by the same problems and have solved them in much the same way. The same proposition is before the English Parliament today, and I wish to read an excerpt from the debate in the English Parliament as reported in Hansard, the official record of the proceedings and debates of the House of Commons. I read from page 553 of the proceedings of the 25th of January 1944, in the British House of Commons:

SCOTLAND HOUSING, GLASGOW

Mr. McGoven asked the Secretary of State for Scotland if, in view of the existing serious shortage of houses in Glasgow area, he will inform the house of his plans for the immediate construction of temporary accommodation to meet the requirements of the overcrowded one- and two-apartment houses where from 4 to 10 and 8 to 16 persons, respectively, are at present living.

To this question Mr. Johnston, the Secretary of State for Scotland, replied:

Mr. JOHNSTON. Immediate construction of sufficient temporary accommodation to meet the requirements of the housing situation in Glasgow is not at present possible owing to labor shortage. But nearly 1,000 houses were completed in Glasgow last year and 763 are now under construction, while 600 emergency houses are being built in areas adjacent to Glasgow. The erection of further houses, both of the emergency type and of permanent construction, will be undertaken at the earliest date upon which labor resources can be made available.

It is evident from this statement that in England, where they have been at war for more than 4 years, they are still in acute need of all kinds of housing. The United States is in the critical stage of

the war. We have just reached the peak of production, and it must be continued through 1944. Large groups of workmen must still be taken care of. Population continues to shift here as it continues to shift in England, and as it is shifting in Russia, and we must be in a position to take care of it. There is no alternative. That is what we are providing for in this amendment. There is no desire to build a single house that is not needed. We give private industry every opportunity and encouragement to build these houses before the Government builds them.

But they must be built. Somebody must build them. And when private enterprise cannot build them the Government must.

Appropriations for the housing of workmen engaged in the production of war material are as much a part of the war program as appropriations for the war material itself. There can be no distinction. I trust the House will adopt the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, lest I overlook it in the brief time allotted me I would like to call attention to the fact that the vacant houses shown in the pictures presented to the committee by the gentleman from Pennsylvania were old houses up in the Scranton area in no way connected with any war industry and not available to serve any war industry. I understand that my colleague's complaint is that they ought to put some more industries there so as to make use of those houses. I can understand, of course, how an interest in his district and in his community would suggest such a thought. We have authorized for this housing program $1,500,000,000 in the authorization bill. There has been appropriated up to the present time $1,350,000,000, leaving $150,000,000 balance of the authorization. In the bill which we acted on in December of last year there was a Budget estimate for $200,000,000 for public housing, the remaining amount authorized under the Lanham bill. The committee and the Congress cut that to $50,000,000, showing a very great desire on the part of not only the Committee on Appropriations, but the Congress, to hold down this public-housing program to the very minimum. In the present instance, the Budget estimate is for $25,000,000 and the committee cut that to $7,500,000 for the same reason. Let us see what will happen if we adopt this amendment. This Housing Authority has $12,000,000 unprogramed and unallocated. Their allocations for February were at the rate of about $5,000,000 a month for their requirements to meet the demands of the defense industries. The $7,500,000, if we give what is in the bill, would carry them through the rest of this fiscal year up to June 30, on the same basis that they were running their program in February. If we adopt this amendment and give them no funds whatsoever for any additional housing, then they will run 2 months and a half at the rate they ran in February, and they are entirely out of funds for public housing.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not just now; I would prefer to continue for just a few moments.

Mr. TABER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. What is the situation? Do we want to do a thing like that? Is it an answer to point to isolated instances where these houses are vacant? In the report of the hearings, at page 633, there is a statement which Mr. Blandford inserted, "that we have programed, I think it is generally agreed, conservatively and taking the family dwelling units, which are the most significant and useful part of our program, public and private, and considering those that have been available 3 months to allow for recruitment, we still have about 94 percent occupancy."

There is a 94-percent occupancy. It is true that there are instances where these houses have been built and by the time the houses are built the war industry has left there. That has happened. It will happen again. It is happening today in the British Empire, because this is a changing program. The War Department or the Navy Department will set up a project and will notify the housing people they wish to import some laborers into that territory, and they cannot get them there unless there are houses. By the time the houses are built something happens in the war program which puts the emphasis somewhere else, and they move away and the houses are standing there vacant. That is not anybody's fault. That is because the war shifts from place to place and shifts the scene of activity. But, I say to you, we are adopting a very dangerous policy if we say we are going to shut down entirely and under no condition, after a month or two, are we going to make any provision whatsoever for any kind of housing program. That is exactly what we would be doing. Nineteen hundred and forty-four is the peak year of our production, or it is supposed to be. It is the critical year of the war. You and I cannot tell and there is no way of looking into the future and saying in June, July, or August what is going to happen. The Army could go into some communities right now where we are in a critical condition in some areas for housing. There are vacant houses in some places and no housing in another. The distinguished gentleman from Connecticut told us on the floor of the House that in Connecticut there is a critical need for additional housing for people who need to be taken care of in the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 55, noes 54.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TABER to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 73, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Widener gift tax, National Gallery of Art: For the payment, by the National Gallery of Art to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, of taxes which have been levied by that Commonwealth as a result of the gift effected September 9, 1942, to the National Gallery of Art of a collection of works of art, which gift was made by the late Joseph E. Widener, of Philadelphia, Pa., as authorized by the will of his father, the late Peter A. B. Widener, and accepted by the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery of Art in reliance upon the authorization contained in Public Law 707, approved September 3, 1942, $307,630.50, to remain available until expended.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order against the appropriation contained in the item entitled "Smithsonian Institution" on the ground that such appropriation is not authorized by law.

It is no less than amazing to discover that the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, through its tax laws, would impose a tax of $307,000 upon a gift to the National Gallery of Art, which might be of benefit culturally not only to the people of Pennsylvania, but to the people of the entire country as well as the world.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard in opposition to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There can be no question about the authorization of this appropriation. It was specifically authorized by Public Law No. 707, Seventy-seventh Congress, passed by the votes of every Member of the House present on the floor at that time.

The authorization pledges the faith of the United States to the payment of the obligation provided for in the pending bill. The act authorizing the appropriation is found at page 720 of the appropriation estimates for the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session.

Mr. COLE of New York. Would the gentleman read the wording of the law which expressly authorizes the payment of this tax? I grant that the law authorizes acceptance of the gift, but I am anxious to have the wording of the law which authorizes the payment of the tax.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The act is as follows:

[Public Law 707—77th Cong., ch. 556, 2d sess.]

Senate Joint Resolution 160

Joint resolution providing for the acceptance of title to the Widener art collection of Philadelphia, and for other purposes

Resolved, etc., That the faith of the United States is pledged that, upon acceptance for the Smithsonian Institution by the Trustees of the National Gallery of Art, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51; U. S. C., title 20, secs. 71–75), of a collection of works of art as a

gift effected by Joseph E. Widener, of Philadelphia, Pa., pursuant to the terms of the will of the late P. A. B. Widener, of Philadelphia, Pa., the United States will provide the National Gallery of Art with such funds as may be necessary for the payment of any taxes which may be levied as a result of the gift.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amount as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Approved, September 3, 1942.

I read the paragraph of authorization which the gentleman requests:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, such amount as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The item in the pending bill is not only in compliance with that authorization, but specifically refers in terms to the authorization contained in Public Law No. 707, approved September 3, 1942. By way of emphasis, it is to be noted that the act provides that:

The United States will provide the National Gallery of Art with such funds as may be necessary for the payment of any tax which may be levied as a result of the gift.

There could be no more specific authorization.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BONNER). The Chair is ready to rule.

Public Law No. 707 of the Seventy-seventh Congress specifically authorizes this appropriation.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to address myself to the next paragraph in the bill, which is with reference to the Veterans' Administration. For many years I have been greatly interested in veterans' hospital facilities.

It was immediately after the last war that I became interested in the condition and status of veterans' hospitals throughout the United States. In the early twenties I visited a great many of those hospitals and saw the conditions of them, and made some reports of an official nature at that time.

During the years following 1920 the Veterans' Administration used temporary buildings of frame construction, which were of the cantonment type and brought down for use from the last war. The thing that concerns me with reference to the veterans' program is that a similar set-up is now being planned by the Veterans' Administration at the present time. For instance, I understand that the Army has some 250,000 beds. Those beds are located in buildings largely of wooden construction and largely of the cantonment type. It is the purpose of the Veterans' Administration, as I understand the testimony of General Hines, to take over from the Army out of its surplus hospital facilities about 100,000 beds. That, supplemented with its own construction program of over 100,000 beds to be built, and another 100,000 beds in fireproof, permanent buildings, which the Veterans' Administration presently has and uses, will complete the entire program of 300,000 hospital beds for the veterans of this and other wars.

That program, of course, is a large one, but the thing that concerns me with reference to the program is the use to be made of these cantonment-type buildings in the hospital program of the future. I will admit, Mr. Chairman, that for the present it may seem to be advisable to use 100,000 beds, many of which are located in cantonment-type frame buildings, because of the use of critical materials in any construction program during this war; but if the veterans' program is to be carried on over an indefinite period of time in frame buildings left over from this war, I think the program is wrong and ought to be immediately changed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. In just a minute. Already out of this war the Army and the Navy have discharged, and the Veterans' Administration hospitalized, over 40,000 veterans. In the month of November over 4,000 veterans of this war were in Veterans' Bureau hospitals. I am satisfied that by the month of March of this year the number has gone up at least 2,000 additional. The hospital needs of the Veterans' Administration are already beginning to be felt and if we are going to give these men who come out of this war with broken bodies and minds that which they are entitled to, we should at once begin a permanent hospital program that will take care of every one of these men in permanent hospitals.

I visited Veterans' Bureau hospitals in about the year 1923, after the last war. I saw men with tuberculosis housed in cantonment buildings, frame construction, such as we had in the last war. I saw the buildings poorly heated. I saw those men who were able to get out of their beds huddled around stoves in these buildings to get away from the portions of the building that were not properly heated, and to keep warm. They were firetraps and were not fit for hospitals.

Following this war, Mr. Chairman, we do not want to see this type of program repeated. I am sure this committee and this Congress want these men kept, not in temporary cantonment buildings as after the last war, but in modern permanent, fireproof buildings which will be a credit to our Nation and a compliment to these men who have given their best in defense of this Nation. I have talked to General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, about this program and I am sure he wants to provide the best possible obtainable in hospital buildings and facilities; and by all working in unison we can keep ahead of the hospital needs in buildings of which we will be proud.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that I agree with him thoroughly in his statement regarding the building of permanent hospitals for our disabled service men and women. I was asked by the President in 1922 to cover the country inspecting hospitals where veterans were hospitalized with a view to securing permanent construction. Many of the buildings of that time were nothing but fire traps.

Last year I introduced a bill for the earmarking of $500,000,000 for the erection of veterans' hospitals in order to insure that we would receive that amount for hospital construction. It is possible the amount should be larger. I have felt that the Veterans' Administration was absolutely asleep because, until recently, it had no real plan for permanent construction to meet the need of disabled veterans of World War No. 2. It should have had those buildings up by now with an adequate nursing staff, doctors' staff, physiotherapists, and everything else that goes with a permanent hospital. You cannot take care of sick people without physicians, surgeons, and an adequate number of nurses. There is now a shortage of over 735 nurses in the Veterans' Administration hospitals alone, with a large shortage of doctors. I am very sure that the House will pass legislative authorization for the building of permanent buildings for this program in the near future and, also, a bill to create a permanent Medical and Nurse Corps.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand the gentlewoman's statement, it is in line with what I have said, that while it may be all right to house these men temporarily in buildings such as are used presently by our troops or even by our field hospitals, we do not want men to be housed permanently in anything but the finest fireproof buildings.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is what I wanted to say. Today there is overcrowding in the hospitals for the nervously sick which could easily make a very bad and even dangerous condition. I am reliably told that in California there is a great shortage of beds for men coming in very badly injured. We must do everything possible to secure temporary buildings until the construction of fireproof buildings goes through. I think that by legislation we should declare that the Veterans' Administration is a war agency second only to the Army and the Navy in the conduct of the war. It can be done by Presidential edict, but it ought to be established that way for all time by legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is not the War Department and perhaps the Navy Department, too, in the possession of permanent buildings which may be made available for hospital use after the war when they are no longer needed?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That might be done as a temporary and emergency measure and it is imperative that we secure quarters at once to house disabled service men and women.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentlewoman that the hospitals are inadequately manned. I wonder if they could not consider drafting into the Army men in the IV–F classification, possibly physically unfit for combat duty but certainly able to take care of the wounded in these veterans' hospitals as corpsmen. That would relieve the distressing situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that already men from the Regular Army not physically fit for combat duty have been assigned as hospital corpsmen.

Mr. COOLEY. But they are going into the Army hospitals, and the Navy hospitals use regular corpsmen of the Navy, but the veterans' hospitals are still manned by special staffs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Veterans' Administration has secured from the War Department numbers of soldiers to act as corpsmen in its hospitals. If they could take men in the IV–F classification it would relieve the others for more active service.

Mr. COOLEY. Take the case of the Mount Alto Hospital right here in Washington; I do not think they have any Army men, whether they are IV–F's or otherwise doing any corps work at this hospital.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. To speak of my own district alone, at Bedford, where there is a hospital for the nervously sick they have army men as corpsmen. They are being used more and more. There is a new hospital in West Roxbury, Mass., where they are using soldiers as corpsmen. But, of course, if IV–F men could be used it would relieve these men for more active duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in heartiest agreement with the gentleman from Louisiana and with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts who can always be relied upon to support humanitarian and philanthropic legislation, particularly true when it relates to the veterans and their interests.

And in this connection may I take advantage of the opportunity to add just a word as to the efficiency with which we are handling this problem. We have today not only the best-fed, best-equipped, best-clothed, best-housed, best-armed army in the world, but we have the best hospitalized army in the world. Never before in any war has any nation provided so adequately and so effectively for the medical care and hospitalization of its veterans.

In response to the suggestions made here, may I say there is no intention to provide temporary accommodations generally. There are a few of the better cantonments which may be used after some alteration, mainly for domiciliary cases. The permanent construction is estimated to cost nearly $3,000 a bed. We provide the most modern, best-equipped hospitalization that can be provided for the benefit of veterans who are in need of either medical or surgical care.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know whether or not existing law permits the Veterans' Administration to utilize Army personnel as corpsmen in any of their facilities? The gentlewoman from Massachusetts indicated that Army personnel was being used in some of the veterans' hospitals in her district. I had understood that the law did not permit that and that that was not being done.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was done, I understand, by Presidential edict, just as the Army has loaned to the Veterans' Administration 100 doctors in order to take care of these men until the Veterans' Administration can build up their own staff of doctors.

The Navy Department has lent to the Veterans' Administration 50 doctors, but the Veterans' Administration needs more doctors.

Mr. COOLEY. That is an extension of the lend-lease program in this country?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; in this country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not recall any legislative authority for the permanent use of Army personnel for that purpose.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman not think it would be well to make such provision when we realize that thousands upon thousands of men are being deferred from the services by reason of some slight physical defect? Those men could go into these veterans' hospitals and care for and comfort the wounded men who are returning every day from the front.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If there is any need for their services there should be some provision for their utilization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in this colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, and the gentleman from Missouri. I am wholeheartedly in agreement with the thought that the veterans must have permanent hospital facilities; at the same time I think you will agree that for the immediate and relatively short-term future it is conceivable that we may have an abnormally heavy peak load. For the time being it may be perfectly true that some of these men can be temporarily hospitalized in some of the facilities which are now being abandoned by the Army, facilities which are not of the same flimsy cantonment construction type of the last war.

At Fort Brady, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., we have a 350-bed hospital up there that cost a million dollars with equipment—$843,632, to be exact. It has a modern steam-heating plant in it that cost $115,000. The entire building is of very warm construction, having double windows throughout, perfectly modern construction, and absolutely as fireproofed as wood can be made. It has a sprinkler system costing about $12,000 and an automatic fire-alarm system costing around $12,000. The hospital is built in wings, isolated wings, with fire-protection doors in between to minimize the fire hazard.

The entire augmented troop structures up there at Fort Brady have been declared surplus property and are now being torn down, and we are only realizing a scrap value of 8 cents on the dollar of the original construction cost. However, I have succeeded in getting a temporary stay of execution on that hospital for 60 days in the hope that perhaps the Veterans' Administration or somebody else will take it over. I think it is nothing short of criminal to embark right now on a mad-haste program of tearing down these facilities which can be used in the immediate future when we may have a peak load.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I fully agree with what the gentleman says about the fact that there is not an immediate emergency; however, some of the veterans' associations have testified, for instance the D. A. V., that the peak load of disability cases will not come for 25 years, but at that time if the experiences of the First World War are borne out there will be 1,250,000 disability cases.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman on the idea of permanent construction. The point I am trying to make is that I think our wartime or short-term post-war peak load in this country may not come for another 6 months or a year when these casualties come back from the frontal assault on Germany and as the inevitably increasing casualties come back from the Pacific. My point is that I think it is entirely possible that within a year we may have immediate use for all the facilities now available in this country, such as at Fort Brady, and at the present time I repeat it is nothing short of criminal to embark on a mad-haste program now of tearing down and throwing those facilities away.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman also that I trust the hotels which are being used up at Atlantic City now for the training and rehabilitation of the men in the service will be kept for that purpose. The Air Corps has been doing a very fine job in rehabilitation and retraining for about a year and the Army has been doing it for some months now. There is also a hotel in Florida that I understand they are considering turning back for hotel use that now houses disabled veterans and others who are there for training purposes. I hope they will keep that hotel because the least we can do is to turn these men back to civilian life as well as possible.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am very glad to have that observation from my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts, who I know has always been extremely interested in the problems of the veterans and has always kept herself very well educated right up to the moment on those problems. I am especially grateful for the fact that she has brought up the question of the rehabilitation of airmen. I was about to speak on that problem. I, too, have been working on this subject for the past several months. I agree with her that the Air Forces have been doing a splendid job at Atlantic City in rehabilitating not only the wounded airmen who have been brought there but also those psychiatric cases which I understand are classified in the vernacular as "flak happy." My intense interest in this problem is in no small measure motivated by the fact that at Alpena, Mich., which is within 30 miles of my home, the Government has spent something over $5,000,000 in constructing an Army air base, which has never been activated, nor have any number of planes ever been stationed on this base since it has been completed. It would make an ideal spot for the rehabilitation, or shall we say the reactivation or retraining, of our airmen. As I understand it, some of these airmen need hospitalization for recovery from relatively minor wounds, but more particularly because of the shock to the nervous system. I understand that in some instances it is practically necessary to start the pilots, and even some of the crewmen, right back almost to the beginning of their career; or, in other words, they have to start regaining their confidence in the handling of smaller and slower planes and gradually progress, step by step, up to the faster and heavier combat types. I am told that complete rest and relaxation is of paramount importance in effecting this rehabilitation. Where then can a more pleasant atmosphere or more pleasant surroundings be found than in Alpena, which is located in the very heart of northeastern Michigan's resort and recreation area?

The Alpena Air Base is admirably suited for this purpose. It was constructed to house approximately 2,500 men. Its facilities are complete in every particular. Its principal hangar measures 200 by 400 feet inside, clear area. It is of wooden frame construction, of course, and as originally constructed was complete with all possible mechanical repair features, including a very large machine shop and woodworking shop, originally built to utilize the efforts of some 400 civilian mechanics. The main hangar was orginally equipped with complete facilities for the overhauling and maintenance of aircraft instruments, also for the care, repacking, and repairing of parachutes. Two Link trainers were set up and ready for students and in fact the entire base was originally set up for the purpose of training students in the art of flying in northern climates. The flying field runways are laid out in the form of a triangle; each concrete runway being over a mile long and 150 feet wide, with, of course, a very wide and lengthy concrete apron in front of the hangar.

The hutment barracks, recreational halls, mess barracks, and in fact all of the living quarters were built in the shade of northern Michigan evergreen trees. Our northern air is extremely pure and as free from pollen count as any place in the world. There is no more healthier climate to be found anywhere during the four seasons of the year. Some 8,000 acres of land comprise the Alpena Army Air Base; land which is in the main largely overgrown with second growth conifers; land which provides game cover and food; and on the air base can be found the ruffed grouse, the varying hare, or snowshoe rabbit, in the small game. In season, ducks abound on the stream running along the edge of the property and in the fall this property is overrun with deer and bear. Within a quarter of a mile of the field is a nine-hole golf course, the facilities of which have always been made available free of charge to the personnel of the air base. It is a most ideal set-up for these boys who come back "flak happy" and jittery and who want to get as far away from the war for the time being as they can. Many of these boys want to go back to nature, and they can find it at Alpena. Seven miles away from the air base is the city of Alpena, with a population of approximately 15,000, a thoroughly modern and progressive city in every sense of the word. The principal industries of Alpena are two large limestone quarries and a large cement mill.

As I have previously said, this Alpena Air Base, originally built with the idea of training pilots in northern flying, has never been activated since it was completed. It represents an investment of approximately $5,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. At the present time it is being maintained in a stand-by status. The commanding officer, Lt. Col. H. L. Kumpfer, has a caretaker crew of approximately 35 officers and men under him. He is doing an excellent job of maintaining this post ready for instant use. Its 275-bed hospital is fully equipped and ready for use at any moment. When I last inspected the Alpena Air Base, on February 20, I was instantly impressed with its readiness to serve at almost a moment's notice. In fact, Colonel Kumpfer told me that if he received telegraphic orders to prepare for a contingent of 500 men—injured or hale and hearty—he could be ready to receive them and shelter them comfortably within a space of 2 hours.

I sincerely hope that the Army Air Forces may find it not necessary but rather advisable to utilize the facilities of the Alpena Air Base in the very near future.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman explain to the House what the construction is of the Fort Brady Hospital in his district?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The Fort Brady Hospital is of wooden-frame construction built on concrete floors, with double flooring, a wood floor on top of the concrete. The main hallway is of concrete-block construction running from one end of the building to the other. The hospital wings run off the side of the main hallway and at the end of the main hallway is this large steam-heating plant with three boilers, stoker-fired, the boilers themselves costing $68,965. The steam-heating system cost an additional $46,000. As I say, it has an automatic sprinkler system and an automatic fire-alarm system. It is modern in every way.

Its complete cost data tabulate as follows:

Sewerage system	$13,894
Boiler distribution system	25,019
Electrical distribution system	11,795
Steam distribution system	46,000
Automatic sprinkler system	11,175
Automatic fire-alarm system	12,064
Structures	723,685
Total	843,632

NOTE.—Included in the "structures" is the cost of the steam plant with equipment, which was $68,965.

Of course, I will say this to the gentleman. It is said that this hospital is of temporary 5-year construction. That may be true as to its official classification according to the Army. But, I know of wooden frame constructed buildings up in our country, constructed nowhere near as sound nor of any better materials than this Fort Brady hospital, that, with reasonable maintenance, have stood up and been used for 40 or 50 years and are still going strong. And I repeat, in closing, that is nothing short of a criminal waste of the taxpayer's money to madly rush into a demolition program and tear this facility down and throw it to the wolves of the salvage fraternity for 8 or 10 cents on the dollar and then come before the Congress and ask for additional millions and millions of dollars to construct additional facilities elsewhere. Do you wonder why some folks in the Soo are asking me day after day, "Why should we continue to buy War bonds in the face of such a wasteful, extravagant program?" And the people of the Soo and all northern Michigan have patriotically met every call put on them for an ever-increasing quota of War bonds. In fact, the record will disclose that our quotas in northern Michigan have been repeatedly increased out of all proportion to the national average of increases. What of the future?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the RECORD should show in this connection that the Veterans' Administration is considering the utilization of some of the facilities that the Army has. The Veterans' Administration at this time is in the process, I understand, of taking over the hotel at Daytona Beach with a view to using it as a hospital facility for the Veterans' Administration. I refer to the hotel at Daytona Beach that the Army has been using there.

This hospital construction program was discussed before the Independent Office Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in December in connection with the regular appropriations for the Veterans' Administration. At that time General Hines stated to us that under a directive of the Bureau of the Budget this $30,000,000 construction program was not included in the regular independent offices bill but would be submitted later in a deficiency bill in order to permit the Veterans' Administration to make a canvass of Army facilities and installations to see whether or not some of them might be used. I was just a little surprised in reading the hearings on this bill that there was not more evidence of what the Veterans' Administration has been doing in this regard.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman's observation is absolutely correct that General Hines is making a survey of these things. What I am getting at is this: Until I intervened the other day they would have sacrificed that Fort Brady hospital and they would have torn it down before General Hines got a shot at it.

Mr. CASE. The War Department would have?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes; the War Department would have.

Mr. CASE. That is regrettable in the interest of economy as well as in the interest of servicing these veterans who need immediate care. Facilities that are available now that can be used even for temporary use should be used.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Not only that, but we hear a lot of demagogy down here about renegotiation of war contracts. It is about time that we hear something about renegotiation of scrap contracts.

Mr. CASE. I think possibly the gentleman has something there, although I would not class as demagogy any real saving of public funds, nor any prevention of waste.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. They are getting 8 cents on the dollar up there.

Mr. CASE. General Hines explained in connection with this hospital program that the biggest need for hospital beds was in connection with the psychiatric patients and he stated that the proper care for that type of patient is a hospital of permanent-type construction. That is a more suitable proposition than some of these temporary barracks that have been used, or some of the T. O. installations of the Army. In addition to Daytona Beach, I understand that the Veterans' Administration today is considering the possible use of at least two old line Army posts, posts that were built many years ago which have the permanent type of buildings, stone and brick buildings; so that along with this construction program proposed in the pending bill the Veterans' Administration is proposing to use the hotel at Daytona Beach and is considering the adaptation of some Army posts that are built with the permanent type of construction such as brick and stone.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have heard that the Army has considered turning back The Breakers at Palm Beach, Fla., to the hotel people and turning out the men receiving training there. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. CASE. I am not familiar with the particular incident to which the gentlewoman refers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Also that the peak load of the mentally sick cases of World War No. 1 veterans will not be reached until 1949; so we must have these built for them, in addition to those of World War No. 2.

Mr. CASE. I was talking this morning to the Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and he told me that the need for beds for the neuropsychiatric cases was a very urgent one at this time.

As the gentlewoman knows, a great many of these cases under proper environment respond to treatment, and are restored to health so that they can return to their homes. It is a most urgent need and every possibility should be explored, because the use of existing facilities means treatment for these veterans that much quicker than if we have to build entirely new construction.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that a good many of the veterans are being sent to hospitals at the present time where they should not be sent. They should have their own hospitals.

Mr. CASE. Well, it undoubtedly is true that good treatment prescribes that neuropsychiatric patients should not be mingled with other types, domiciliary cases and regular hospital cases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. A good many of them really have cases of shell shock, and in such cases proper hospitalization is essential.

Mr. CASE. Yes; I understand that it is a nervous condition rather than a mental condition. Proper environment and care produce good results.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a public statement made last night before the American Palestine Committee, which met at the Statler Hotel. There were some seven or eight hundred people there. The meeting was of sufficient importance that the Vice President of the United States and various other public officers addressed the meeting.

The authorized public statement of Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, referred to, seemed to me to give ample authority to the Members of Congress to discuss and pass the Palestine resolutions which have temporarily been held up in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Roosevelt admits that the American Government has never given its approval or assent to the British white paper of 1939, which, on March 31, will close the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration. The convention which this Government signed with Great Britain in 1925 demands that we give our assent to any modification of the mandate given to Britain over Palestine. We have not given that assent, as the statement of the President sets forth. Therefore, I say it is our duty to protest this inhuman exclusion of the Jews, particularly at this critical period for them in Europe.

The authorized statement of President Roosevelt, made public by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, of New York, and Dr. Abba J. Silver, of Cleveland, is as follows:

The President has authorized us to say that the American Government has never given its approval to the white paper of 1939.

The President is happy that the doors of Palestine are today open to Jewish refugees, and that when future decisions are reached full justice will be done to those who seek a Jewish national home, for which our Government and the American people have always had the deepest sympathy, and today more than ever in view of the tragic flight of hundreds of thousands of homeless Jewish refugees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Free Public Library, binding, District of Columbia, 1941, $114.04.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, reference was made just now in debate to Hansard, the official verbatim reports of the parliamentary debates in the English House of Commons, which is published daily when Parliament is sitting.

Through the kindness and generosity of an official group associated with the House of Commons, I have been favored with a subscription to Hansard and received copies by mail, which I have made available to Members of the House by placing them in the Speaker's lobby. The Clerk of the House has very kindly provided a folder for it, and I suggest that the Members who may be interested consult it from time to time. There is such a striking similarity in many of the legislative problems under consideration in the English House of Commons and the American House of Representatives—as illustrated in the debate just referred to—that I think you will find it both interesting and helpful.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Salaries and administrative expenses: For an additional amount of salaries and administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation, fiscal year 1944, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, $100,000, payable from the funds of said Corporation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 17, after line 3, insert:

"WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

"Notwithstanding the percentage limitation in section 3 (c) of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944, a total amount not exceeding $972,000 shall be available for administrative expenses pursuant to such section under the combined sum of the direct appropriation in section 1 of such act and the appropriation in Public Law 45 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to supply an oversight made at the time of the passage of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act of 1944. That act, as will be recalled, appropriated $30,000,000 for recruitment of a farm labor supply for calendar 1944. For convenience of accounting and handling of the program with the States this amount was consolidated with the $26,100,000 provided for a similar program for the calendar year 1943.

In fixing the amount of administrative expenses the conferees on the bill placed a limitation of 1½ percent, believing that it would apply to the total of the new money plus the unexpended balance of the previous year's money. However, the Comptroller General has ruled—and under the law I think he had no other choice—that the 1½ percent runs back to the very beginning of the 1943 program.

This situation leaves the War Food Administration in a position where it will be unable to function adequately with the administrative funds available. They requested $730,000 for the calendar year 1944. The percentage limitation, the way it will operate, would only give them $467,805. The amendment which has just been offered will provide $598,305, which is approximately $130,000 less than was sought in the beginning. The Administrator, through Colonel Bruton, who is doing an excellent job in providing this farm labor, believes that they can bring about the necessary reductions and curtailments to operate on the $600,000.

Percentagewise the amount fixed by this amendment will give them 1.55 percent of the total funds available in the calendar year 1944 to be used for administration, approximately what the committee intended. If the change is not made the percentage is reduced to 1.22 percent, which is considerably lower than the committee intended. This amendment is to correct the situation and to permit the program to operate as programed by Congress.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, the chairman has stated the case correctly. This is simply a case where the limitation was intended by the conferees to apply only to the unexpended balance and the new money asked, whereas the way it was drawn the Comptroller construed it to apply to last year's operations, when they were given a limitation at 2 percent. This is designed to correct that situation. It does not give any more money for administrative expenses than was originally intended.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman from New York indicates, this amendment merely carries out the original purpose and intent of the conferees who drew up the conference report on the bill. It provides no appropriations, involves no new money, and applies solely to allocation for administrative expenses from funds already appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Payment of interest on Indian trust funds: For an additional amount for payment of interest on moneys held in trust for the several Indian tribes, as authorized by various acts of Congress, fiscal year 1943, $65,720.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether or not he expects to finish this bill reasonably soon. We have been promised that this afternoon the resolution introduced by my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would come up, which would provide for an investigation into the Indian conditions of the country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think we have practically concluded the consideration of the bill and will do so in a very short time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance, irrigation systems, Flathead Reservation, Mont. (receipt limitation), 1944, $26,890.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 49, line 6, after the figures "1944", strike out "$26,890" and insert "$40,000."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday, March 8, I took some of the time of the House when this bill was being discussed under general debate to give some figures and include some correspondence pertaining to this particular item, the Flathead Indian irrigation project. As I tried to bring to the attention of the committee, we are facing a very dry season this year in Montana. At the present time the precipitation is only 20 percent of normal. This amount asked for is not much of an appropriation, but it amounts to a great deal to the people on the Flathead Indian irrigation project. We are not asking the Congress to appropriate any money out of the Federal Treasury, but in this amendment we are asking the Congress to allow these people to use money which is theirs, which is in the Treasury, but which they have to ask Congress to use. Permit me to read for the benefit of the committee a statement by D. A. Dellwo, who is the secretary of this project. He says:

I have seen a wire to the effect that certain funds which apparently had been sequestered from the Flathead appropriation had been released for expenditure, and I am now told that a good part of their deficiency is taken care of. However, as Mr. Hanna says, this appears to be the makings of a good dry year and in all probability much pumping will have to be done. Pumping is expensive, and in case a lot of it will have to be done, a shortage of funds might be disastrous.

Consequently I see no reason why we should stop working for a deficiency appropriation. If the money is not needed it will not be expended. It would be too bad to run into a long siege of pumping and have to stop in the middle of the season for lack of funds, still having plenty of money in the bank.

Yours truly,

D. A. DELLWO.

I repeat, this is money which they have paid into the Federal Treasury themselves, but it is money which they cannot use unless they get the consent of the Congress to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this appropriation is for a specific purpose, and cannot be used for anything else.

It is provided solely and wholly for overtime-work pay. It could not be used for pumping or for additional personnel, or for any other purposes except for overtime pay. Increasing the figure in any amount would have no effect whatever upon the situation. It could not possibly provide for the purpose for which the gentleman suggests additional funds. I trust the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 4346, the first deficiency appropriation bill, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the amendment on page 7, with reference to the Public Works Agency.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 7, after line 6, insert:

"FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

"War public works (community facilities): For an additional amount to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by title II and III of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531–1534 and 1541), $127,500,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, of which amount not to exceed $5,100,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head 'Defense public works (community facilities)' in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371): *Provided*, That not more than $7,500,000 of the funds for war public works shall be used for construction of outplant facilities."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 10, noes 15.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 269, nays 15, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—269

Abernethy	Clark	Forand
Allen, La.	Clason	Fulbright
Anderson, Calif.	Cochran	Gavin
Andresen, August H.	Coffee	Gearhart
Arends	Cole, Mo.	Gillie
Arnold	Cole, N. Y.	Goodwin
Auchincloss	Colmer	Gordon
Barden	Compton	Gore
Barrett	Cooley	Gorski
Bates, Ky.	Cooper	Gossett
Bates, Mass.	Courtney	Granger
Beall	Cox	Grant, Ala.
Beckworth	Crosser	Grant, Ind.
Bell	Cunningham	Gregory
Bender	D'Alesandro	Griffiths
Bennett, Mo.	Davis	Gwynne
Bishop	Dawson	Hagen
Blackney	Day	Hale
Bland	Dewey	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bloom	Dies	Halleck
Bolton	Dilweg	Hancock
Bonner	Dingell	Hare
Bradley, Mich.	Disney	Harless, Ariz.
Bradley, Pa.	Dondero	Harris, Va.
Brehm	Drewry	Hart
Brooks	Durham	Hartley
Brown, Ga.	Eberharter	Hébert
Brown, Ohio	Elliott	Herter
Bryson	Ellis	Hess
Bulwinkle	Ellison, Md.	Hill
Burch, Va.	Elmer	Hinshaw
Busbey	Elston, Ohio	Hoeven
Cannon, Mo.	Engel, Mich.	Hoffman
Carlson, Kans.	Engle, Calif.	Holmes, Mass.
Carrier	Fenton	Holmes, Wash.
Carter	Fish	Hope
Case	Fisher	Hull
Chiperfield	Fitzpatrick	Jackson
Church	Flannagan	Jeffrey
Clason	Folger	Jenkins
Clevenger	Fulton	Johnson, Anton J.
Cochran	Gamble	Johnson, Calvin D.
Coffee	Gathings	Johnson, Ind.
Cole, Mo.	Gerlach	Johnson, Luther A.
Cole, N. Y.	Gibson	Johnson, Okla.
Colmer	Gifford	Johnson, Ward
Compton	Gilchrist	Judd
Cooley	Gillette	Kearney
Cooper	Graham	Keefe
Courtney	Green	Kefauver
Cox	Gross	Kerr
Crosser	Hall, Leonard W.	Kilday
Cunningham	Harness, Ind.	King
D'Alesandro	Harris, Ark.	Kleberg
Davis	Hays	Kunkel
Dawson	Heffernan	LaFollette
Day	Hendricks	Landis
Dewey	Hobbs	Lanham
Dies	Hoch	Larcade
Dilweg	Holifield	Lea
Dingell	Howell	LeCompte
Disney	Izac	Lemke
Dondero	Jarman	Lesinski
Drewry	Jennings	Lewis
Durham	Johnson, J. Leroy	Ludlow
Eberharter	Johnson, Lyndon B.	McConnell
Elliott	Jones	McCord
Ellis	Jonkman	McCormack
Ellison, Md.	Kean	McCowen
Elmer	Kee	McGregor
Elston, Ohio	Kelley	McKenzie
Engel, Mich.	Kennedy	McMillan
Engle, Calif.	Keogh	McWilliams
Fenton	Kinzer	Maas
Fish	Kirwan	Madden
Fisher	Klein	Magnuson
Fitzpatrick	Knutson	Mahon
Flannagan	Lane	Mansfield, Mont.
Folger	LeFevre	Mansfield, Tex.
Fulton	Luce	Marcantonio
Gamble	Lynch	Martin, Iowa
Gathings	McGehee	Martin, Mass.
Gerlach	McLean	Mason
Gibson	McMurray	Michener
Gifford	Maloney	Miller, Mo.
Gilchrist	Manasco	Miller, Nebr.
Gillette	May	Mills
Graham	Merritt	Monkiewicz
Green	Merrow	Monroney
Gross	Miller, Conn.	Mott
Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Pa.	Mundt
Harness, Ind.	Morrison, La.	Murdock
Harris, Ark.	Morrison, N. C.	Murphy
Hays	Mruk	Murray, Tenn.
Heffernan	Murray, Wis.	Newsome
Hendricks	Myers	Norton
Hobbs	Norman	O'Brien, Mich.
Hoch	Norrell	O'Brien, N. Y.
Holifield	O'Hara	O'Connor
Howell	O'Leary	O'Konski
Izac	O'Toole	O'Neal
Jarman	Pfeifer	Outland
Jennings	Powers	Pace
Johnson, J. Leroy	Pracht, C. Frederick	Patman
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Pratt, Joseph M.	Patton
Jones	Ramspeck	Peterson, Fla.
Jonkman	Randolph	Peterson, Ga.
Kean	Rees, Kans.	Philbin
Kee	Rodgers, Pa.	Phillips
Kelley	Rogers, Calif.	Pittenger
Kennedy	Sasscer	Ploeser
Keogh	Satterfield	Plumley
Kinzer	Scanlon	Poage
Kirwan	Scott	Poulson
Klein	Short	Price
Knutson	Smith, W. Va.	Priest
Lane	Stefan	Rabaut
LeFevre	Stewart	Ramey
Luce	Stockman	Rankin
Lynch	Sullivan	Reece, Tenn.
McGehee	Sundstrom	Reed, Ill.
McLean	Thomas, N. J.	Reed, N. Y.
McMurray	Torrens	Richards
Maloney	Towe	Rivers
Manasco	Treadway	Rizley
May	Vinson, Ga.	Robertson
Merritt	Voorhis, Calif.	Robinson, Utah
Merrow	Vorys, Ohio	Robsion, Ky.
Miller, Conn.	Vursell	Rockwell
Miller, Pa.	Wasielewski	Rogers, Mass.
Morrison, La.	Weichel, Ohio	Rohrbough
Morrison, N. C.	Weiss	Rolph
Mruk	Wene	Rowan
Murray, Wis.	Whitten	Rowe
Myers	Wilson	Russell
Norman	Winter	Sabath
Norrell	Wright	Sadowski
O'Hara		Sauthoff
O'Leary		Schiffler
O'Toole		Schwabe
Pfeifer		Scrivner
Powers		Shafer
Pracht, C. Frederick		Sheppard
Pratt, Joseph M.		Sheridan
Ramspeck		Sikes
Randolph		Simpson, Pa.
Rees, Kans.		Slaughter
Rodgers, Pa.		Smith, Maine
Rogers, Calif.		Smith, Va.
Sasscer		Smith, Wis.
Satterfield		Snyder
Scanlon		Somers, N. Y.
Scott		Sparkman
Short		Spence
Smith, W. Va.		Springer
Stefan		Stanley
Stewart		Starnes, Ala.
Stockman		Stearns, N. H.
Sullivan		Stevenson
Sundstrom		Sumners, Tex.
Thomas, N. J.		Talbot
Torrens		Talle
Towe		Tarver
Treadway		Taylor
Vinson, Ga.		Thomas, Tex.
Voorhis, Calif.		Thomason
Vorys, Ohio		Tibbott
Vursell		Tolan
Wasielewski		Troutman
Weichel, Ohio		Vincent, Ky.
Weiss		Wadsworth
Wene		Walter
Whitten		Ward
Wilson		Weaver
Winter		Welch
Wright		West
		Whelchel, Ga.
		White
		Whittington
		Wickersham
		Wigglesworth
		Willey
		Winstead
		Wolcott
		Wolfenden, Pa.
		Wolverton, N. J.
		Woodruff, Mich.
		Woodrum, Va.
		Worley
		Zimmerman

NAYS—15

Buffett	Dworshak	Lambertson
Carson, Ohio	Heidinger	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Horan	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Jensen	Sumner, Ill.
Curtis	Kilburn	Taber

NOT VOTING—144

Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	Kinzer
Andersen, H. Carl	Ford	Kirwan
Anderson, N. Mex.	Fuller	Klein
Andrews	Fulmer	Knutson
Angell	Furlong	Lane
Baldwin, Md.	Gale	LeFevre
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gallagher	Luce
Barry	Gamble	Lynch
Bennett, Mich.	Gathings	McGehee
Boren	Gerlach	McLean
Boykin	Gibson	McMurray
Brumbaugh	Gifford	Maloney
Buckley	Gilchrist	Manasco
Burchill, N. Y.	Gillette	May
Burdick	Graham	Merritt
Burgin	Green	Merrow
Butler	Gross	Miller, Conn.
Byrne	Hall, Leonard W.	Miller, Pa.
Camp	Harness, Ind.	Morrison, La.
Canfield	Harris, Ark.	Morrison, N. C.
Cannon, Fla.	Hays	Mruk
Capozzoli	Heffernan	Murray, Wis.
Celler	Hendricks	Myers
Chapman	Hobbs	Norman
Chenoweth	Hoch	Norrell
Costello	Holifield	O'Brien, Ill.
Cravens	Howell	O'Hara
Curley	Izac	O'Leary
Delaney	Jarman	O'Toole
Dickstein	Jennings	Pfeifer
Dirksen	Johnson, J. Leroy	Powers
Domengeaux	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Pracht, C. Frederick
Doughton	Jones	Pratt, Joseph M.
Douglas	Jonkman	Ramspeck
Eaton	Kean	Randolph
Ellsworth	Kee	Rees, Kans.
Fay	Kelley	Rodgers, Pa.
Feighan	Kennedy	Rogers, Calif.
Fellows	Keogh	Sasscer
Fernandez	Kinzer	Satterfield
Scanlon	Thomas, N. J.	Weichel, Ohio
Scott	Torrens	Weiss
Short	Towe	Wene
Smith, W. Va.	Treadway	Whitten
Stefan	Vinson, Ga.	Wilson
Stewart	Voorhis, Calif.	Winter
Stockman	Vorys, Ohio	Wright
Sullivan	Vursell	
Sundstrom	Wasielewski	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Short.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Graham.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Wene with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Cravens with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Jones.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Sundstrom.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Norman.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Jonkman.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Celler with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Stefan.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Doughton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Kinzer.
Mr. Burchill of New York with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. May with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. C. Frederick Pracht.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Angell.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Joseph M. Pratt.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Miller of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Ellis.
Mr. Harris of Arkansas with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Green with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Hays with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Gross.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Myers with Mr. Gallagher.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Mruk.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Miller of Connecticut.
Mr. Steward with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. BUFFETT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 8, lines 14 to 21, strike out the whole paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, could we have that paragraph read so we will understand what is sought to be stricken out?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That may be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the paragraph may be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War housing: For an additional amount to carry out the purposes of title I of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 9), and subject to the applicable provisions of the joint resolution approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1115), $7,500,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 128, nays 156, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 41]

YEAS—128

Andresen, August H.	Case	Elston, Ohio
Arends	Chiperfield	Engel, Mich.
Arnold	Church	Fellows
Auchincloss	Clason	Fenton
Barrett	Clevenger	Fish
Bates, Mass.	Cole, Mo.	Fisher
Beall	Cole, N. Y.	Gavin
Bennett, Mo.	Compton	Gearhart
Bishop	Crawford	Gillie
Blackney	Cunningham	Goodwin
Bradley, Mich.	Curtis	Gossett
Brehm	Day	Grant, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Dewey	Griffiths
Buffett	Dondero	Gwynne
Busbey	Durham	Hagen
Carlson, Kans.	Dworshak	Hale
Carrier	Ellis	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Elmer		
Halleck	McCowen	Schiffler
Hancock	McLean	Schwabe
Heidinger	McWilliams	Scrivner
Herter	Martin, Iowa	Shafer
Hess	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Hill	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Hoeven	Michener	Smith, Ohio
Hoffman	Miller, Mo.	Smith, Wis.
Hope	Miller, Nebr.	Springer
Horan	Monkiewicz	Stanley
Jenkins	Mundt	Stevenson
Jensen	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sumner, Ill.
Johnson, Anton J.	O'Konski	Taber
	Phillips	Talbot
Johnson, Ind.	Pittenger	Talle
Judd	Ploeser	Taylor
Kearney	Plumley	Tibbott
Keefe	Poage	Troutman
Kilburn	Reece, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Kunkel	Reed, Ill.	Wickersham
Lambertson	Reed, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Landis	Rizley	Willey
LeCompte	Robsion, Ky.	Wolcott
Lemke	Rohrbough	Woodruff, Mich.
Lewis	Rowe	Worley
McConnell	Sauthoff	

NAYS—156

Abernethy	Granger	O'Connor
Allen, La.	Grant, Ala	O'Neal
Anderson, Calif.	Green	Outland
Barden	Gregory	Pace
Bates, Ky.	Hare	Patman
Beckworth	Harless, Ariz.	Patton
Bender	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Fla.
Bland	Hart	Peterson, Ga.
Bloom	Hébert	Philbin
Bolton	Hinshaw	Poulson
Bonner	Holmes, Mass.	Price
Boren	Holmes, Wash.	Priest
Boykin	Hull	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Ramey
Brooks	Jackson	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Jeffrey	Richards
Bryson	Johnson, Calvin D.	Rivers
Bulwinkle		Robertson
Burch, Va.	Johnson, Luther A.	Robinson, Utah
Burdick		Rogers, Mass.
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Rolph
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Ward	Rowan
Carter	Kefauver	Russell
Clark	Kilday	Sadowski
Cochran	King	Sheppard
Coffee	Kleberg	Sheridan
Colmer	LaFollette	Sikes
Cooley	Lanham	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Lea	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Lesinski	Snyder
Cox	Ludlow	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	McCord	Sparkman
Curley	McCormack	Spence
D'Alesandro	McGregor	Starnes, Ala.
Davis	McKenzie	Stearns, N. H.
Dawson	McMillan	Stewart
Dies	McMurray	Sumners, Tex.
Dillweg	Maas	Tarver
Dingell	Magnuson	Thomas, Tex.
Disney	Mahon	Thomason
Drewry	Mansfield, Mont.	Vincent, Ky.
Eberharter		Walter
Elliott	Mansfield, Tex.	Ward
Ellison, Md.	Marcantonio	Weaver
Engle, Calif.	Mills	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Monroney	West
Flannagan	Mott	Whelchel, Ga.
Folger	Murdock	White
Forand	Murphy	Whittington
Fulbright	Murray, Tenn.	Winstead
Gordon	Newsome	Wolverton, N. J.
Gore	Norton	Woodrum, Va.
Gorski	O'Brien, Mich.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—144

Allen, Ill.	Capozzoli	Furlong
Andersen, H. Carl	Celler	Gale
	Chapman	Gallagher
Anderson, N. Mex.	Chenoweth	Gamble
	Costello	Gathings
Andrews	Cravens	Gerlach
Angell	Delaney	Gibson
Baldwin, Md.	Dickstein	Gifford
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dirksen	Gilchrist
Barry	Domengeaux	Gillette
Bell	Doughton	Graham
Bennett, Mich.	Douglas	Gross
Brumbaugh	Eaton	Hall, Leonard W.
Buckley	Ellsworth	
Burchill, N. Y.	Fay	Harness, Ind.
Burgin	Feighan	Harris, Ark.
Butler	Fernandez	Hartley
Byrne	Fogarty	Hays
Camp	Ford	Heffernan
Canfield	Fuller	Hendricks
Cannon, Fla.	Fulmer	Hobbs
Hoch	May	Satterfield
Holifield	Merritt	Scanlon
Howell	Merrow	Scott
Jarman	Miller, Conn.	Short
Jennings	Miller, Pa.	Slaughter
Johnson, J. Leroy	Morrison, La.	Smith, W. Va.
	Morrison, N. C.	Stefan
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Mruk	Stockman
	Murray, Wis.	Sullivan
Jones	Myers	Sundstrom
Jonkman	Norman	Thomas, N. J.
Kean	Norrell	Tolan
Kee	O'Brien, Ill.	Torrens
Kelley	O'Hara	Towe
Kennedy	O'Leary	Treadway
Keogh	O'Toole	Vinson, Ga.
Kerr	Pfeifer	Voorhis, Calif.
Kinzer	Powers	Vorys, Ohio
Kirwan	Pracht, C. Frederick	Vursell
Klein		Wasielewski
Knutson	Pratt, Joseph M.	Weichel, Ohio
Lane		Weiss
Larcade	Ramspeck	Wene
LeFevre	Randolph	Whitten
Luce	Rees, Kans.	Wilson
Lynch	Rockwell	Winter
McGehee	Rodgers, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Madden	Rogers, Calif.	Wright
Maloney	Sabath	
Manasco	Sasscer	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Anderson of Minnesota.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Madden with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
Mr. Kelley with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Kirwin with Mr. Rockwell.
Mr. Wright with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who took part in the debate may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter received from the Director of the War Food Administration in connection with the amendment just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 13

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader if he can tell us the program for next week so far as he knows at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday the Mundt resolution will be coming up. I understand there is no

bill to come up out of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

On Tuesday, if the Senate disposes of the conference report on the soldiers' voting bill, that conference report will come up. If the Senate does not dispose of the conference report on Tuesday then, of course, it will come up Wednesday. I am giving notice now, that immediately after being disposed of in the Senate the conference report will come up in the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You said the Indian bill would be up on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; that is, the resolution. Of course, the soldiers' voting bill will not come up before Tuesday, but in any event I am giving notice now so that the Members will realize it will be brought up the day following its disposition in the Senate, or as soon thereafter as possible.

On Thursday the legislative appropriation bill will come up. Of course, any other conference reports that are agreed upon will be brought up as soon as possible after they are reported. There are two bills in conference, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill and the civil functions bill. There are some other matters which, if they are reported out of committee and if the calendar will permit, may be put on for next week, but outside of one bill that I cannot make any statement about now, I have no knowledge of any. Of course, I will give my friend from Massachusetts advance notice, but what I have said is probably in the main the program for next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, is there a possibility that the so-called Wadsworth resolution will be up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. If it is reported out—but as I understand, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, says that there has been no hearing on it as yet.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] intend to have hearings on it next week?

Mr. SABATH. If the majority leader will permit me to state, yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] called on me and explained his resolution and the new resolution, that is, the amended resolution. I informed him that I will endeavor to call a meeting of the Committee on Rules as speedily as I can. I assured the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] that we will have a meeting shortly and take up the resolution that he spoke to me about.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assume the gentleman from Illinois will inquire of the War and Navy Departments as to their position on the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. I have sent out a request to the Army and the Navy for their viewpoint on that resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know what action will take place on that, so I do not want to make any commitments at this time as to that particular resolution. But what I have announced already is, in the main, the program for next week.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill which has been reported out of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and on which a rule has been granted.

Mr. McCORMACK. That will be assigned for the 20th and 21st of March. That is the intention now.

Mr. SABATH. I am merely calling attention to it because I feared it might have escaped the gentleman's mind.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] be allowed to address the House for 45 minutes after any orders hitherto entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes following the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] on the same day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be allowed to extend his own remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if there will be an opportunity on Monday, or some other day along the forepart of next week, for the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] to finish that statement about the C. I. O. political action committee and whether there will be opportunity for some more of us who want to speak along the same line to say a few words next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will just be the Mundt resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman think somebody could be recognized to raise a point of personal privilege?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I have in mind the conversation I had with the gentleman. The gentleman very kindly withheld his objection to adjourning over from today until Monday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. I thought perhaps tomorrow we would not have anything to do.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had that in mind, and I think if the gentleman wishes to raise a point of personal privilege that Monday would be an appropriate day. I do not think it will interfere with the consideration of the Mundt resolution.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did not want to interfere with the soldier vote conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. The soldier vote bill will not be considered before Tuesday, in any event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE FARMERS AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, immediately after we were attacked at Pearl Harbor our farmers were made aware of the indispensable role they would be required to play in total war. Like all the rest of the Nation they were taken by surprise. But the problem that confronted them was far more complex and far more difficult than that which confronted any other group.

For, although our machine-tool industry found itself facing the problem of converting from a peacetime to a wartime economy, it had, at least, the tools, the plant capacity, and the momentum of large production. On the contrary, the great majority of our farmers were still struggling under the oppression of an economy of scarcity.

Farming in many parts of our country is and long has been adapted to large-scale machine operation, but such is not the case in many other sections, where the fields and the crops require the use of smaller machinery, or where only part of the farming operation may be performed by machinery, while the remainder still must be done by hand. Such conditions exist to a very great extent in my own State. For while machinery can be used in part in preparing the land there, a large amount of hand labor still is required in the planting, cultivation, and the harvesting of many of our crops. And under the economy of scarcity that prevailed before the war, many of our farmers were unable to purchase machinery, while others were discouraged from installing machinery even for operations in which it could be used.

That, Mr. Speaker, was the handicap that confronted the farmers of my State at a time when the exigencies and the necessities of a wartime economy came upon them overnight. Our Government urged them to produce to the limit of their capacity. They were urged to return fallow fields to production; they

were urged to bring in new fields; they were urged to extend their planting and intensify their cultivation. They were prodded, praised, and promised. They were extolled and glorified. They were called together in mass meetings and public assemblies in which propagandists led them to believe that they were in control of their own programs and that they were engaged in a great and progressive endeavor. "Food fights for freedom" was the slogan coined largely for their benefit.

But, Mr. Speaker, many of our farmers soon came to find that as ever before the praise bestowed upon them was in part flattery and lip service, and that the promises in many instances were empty. When our farmers began the mighty effort that has kept our soldiers, our allies, and ourselves fed and clothed during global war, they found first of all that their sons were to be drafted into the armed forces. There was no occupational deferment for those boys. They qualified for service, too, for they had the stuff of which soldiers are made. Our farmers did not often ask that their sons be deferred upon the very legitimate basis of essential industry. It was total war to them. They accepted that fact with grim faith and determination.

The next blow to strike our farmers came when our machine-tool industry and contractors on Government projects enticed away their remaining labor by the high wages of cost-plus contracts, the lure of short hours, industrial deferment, and juke-box environment. Yet, sir, they carried on; they girded their loins; they worked longer hours. They did not strike. But, Mr. Speaker, the end was not yet. When in their despair they turned to the only relief in sight—the introduction or the increase of farm machinery—they were told that machinery sufficient to meet present and pressing needs was not available to them or that if any were available it had been frozen for the duration. We find that the manufacturers are allocating 80 percent of their production, while the war agencies control and allocate 20 percent. We also find that in spite of the serious domestic needs 7 percent of our total production has gone into export. Farm machinery produced in this country is piled up unused in many parts of the world. Such a condition cannot be justified in time of war.

Mr. Speaker, I, of course, do not criticize our war effort. No civilian, in my opinion, has a sufficient knowledge of the over-all strategy of this global war upon which to predicate any valid criticism of its progress. As a nation not habituated to war, and without any preliminary notice of war, we have shown to all the world a most amazing spectacle of preparation for the conflict. While I would not criticize the war effort on the fighting front, I do feel that I am qualified to analyze, to discuss, and to criticize the conduct of our economy on our home front. And I think I am justified in doing so. My qualifications in this respect, sir, are based upon that which I know and upon the ever-increasing volume of protest that daily pours into my office from my constituents and my friends in my district. And therein, too, lies my justification.

I do not pretend to be an arm-chair strategist. I do not claim the role of global economic adviser. Sufficient for me is the constant, daily mass of information that comes to me from the people who elect me to represent them. Day by day their needs grow more critical as they find themselves caught between an almost superhuman effort to produce the crops necessary to the winning of this total war and the bureaucratic ignorance or tyranny that oppresses them. Day by day many of them see the savings of a lifetime threatened as they find themselves crushed between the arbitrary ceilings fixed by bureaucrats and the constantly rising floors elevated by the operation of natural economic laws.

Mr. Speaker, I accept the arbitrament of war. I know, I think, what force means. I would not raise my voice nor lift my finger if I thought that the doing of either would in the most remote possible way defer victory for even so much as a second. But, sir, the things for which I contend would not, in my opinion, defer victory for a second. On the contrary, it is my firm conviction that if observed and heeded they would help to hasten the end of war. Certainly they would help to save our own people, our own economy, and our own Nation. They would, I believe, sustain the morale of the embattled farmers of our land, and they would aid in bringing peace to our home front.

We have taken upon ourselves the task not only of global war, which, as I have stated, I accept; but we have assumed as well the role of global uplifters, global entrepreneurs, global purveyors, global philanthropists, and global musketeers for the post-war era. And, lest we fail in any of those roles when their scenes shall be set, we have decided to anticipate them and play the roles now without either stage or scenery.

It may be proper military strategy to keep our allies supplied with food and munitions so long as war lasts. I accept that. It may be necessary, sir, to provide food, clothing, and even shelter for the dislocated casualties of our allies. I accept that. But, sir, many of my people do not understand a post-war global philanthropy that causes the present exportation to nonbelligerent nations of the machinery and equipment we need so badly at home right now.

What, sir, will it profit our people if we destroy our farmers now and the war be won later? What will it profit even our global philanthropists if we destroy our little merchants, our little business men and women, and our little banks now and later win the adulation of the passing throng? My people, sir, are not uncharitable. Nor am I. But, sir, while our sons and daughters fight for the freedom of the world, they who now control our economic destiny are equipping those with whom we shall be forced to compete in the post-war era with the facilities we ourselves need now upon our own farms and in our own factories.

Somewhere, Mr. Speaker, there is something wrong in our domestic economy. Long ago we passed the peak of our steel production for the needs of war. Yet no new steel products have come to lighten the burdens of our farmers, who beg for trucks and tractors and parts. One day, sir, we are told that we are producing synthetic-rubber products far in excess of our erstwhile production of natural-rubber products. The next day we are told that no synthetic-rubber products are available even for our farmers, and that it is not certain when there will be. And although we have rationed severely the amount of gas we allocate to our farmers for essential needs we send petroleum products to Spain from our Caribbean areas.

Bureaucrats fix the ceiling prices at which our farmers and our little merchants must sell their products; but they also fix the prices at which our farmers and our little merchants must buy. I doubt, sir, if in all the vast horde of draft-evading bureaucrats—and every department of the Government is stuffed with them—there is one who possesses the business acumen or the economic intelligence of a single little merchant in my district. And if I be challenged on that, I know that I cannot be challenged on the assertion that while our farmers and merchants support a horde of bureaucrats, the whole horde in its entirety never supported a single farmer.

In the fight against inflation a deliberate attempt has been made to organize and arouse public opinion against the farmer. The hypocritical charge is made that his efforts to secure a fair price for his products constitute a threat against our national economy. That charge is made in face of the fact that although farmers comprise more than one-third of the working population of the Nation their total income is less than one-tenth that of the total national income. That false charge is made against them in face of the fact that although the price of the commodities they produce has risen to some extent, the price of the manufactured products they and all the rest of the Nation must buy has risen many times as much.

For many years the Government has been promising the farmers parity. Yet, although the Government has taken complete control of certain of the farmers' crops, it refuses to allow them a price that even closely approaches parity. In estimating the cost of producing farm commodities the Government refuses to take into consideration the cost of the farmer's labor or the labor of his wife and his children, while in the case of industry full allowance is made for the wages paid to all industrial workers. In this whole matter of inflation the bureaucrats of this Government have conspired to make scapegoats of the farmers. Besides being regimented to the point of slavery, they are being regulated out of existence.

Mr. Speaker, if our people are to survive the exhaustion of war; if our farmers and merchants and private industry are to be preserved from bureaucratic annihilation, this Congress must act to reclaim and to recapture some of the powers it has so mistakenly delegated away. In the next ensuing months our

people will look increasingly upon Congress as that branch of our Government most directly responsible for their economic welfare and also directly responsive to their suffrage.

I know the problems that confront my people. I know their economic needs, and I must protest against every innovation in this Government that would deprive them of their right to pursue their economic destiny as free men and free women in a land pledged to secure freedom for all the world. If "food fights for freedom," then we must fight for the men and women who by their toil and sweat produce that food, as well as for all others who work and fight to preserve our sacred inheritance of free enterprise in every field of human endeavor.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, after the disposition of all other business on the Speaker's table on next Thursday, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and the business of the House and such special orders as may antedate mine, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today in Committee of the Whole and include certain statements to which I referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include therein certain statements relative to the matter discussed at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances, and in one to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a newspaper article on the soldiers' vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein extracts from the report of the special committee of the House known as the Dies committee, printed in that report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects, in one to include an address delivered by Rev. Karl J. Alter, D. D., on the subject The Family and the State; and in the other to include an editorial from the Chicago Daily Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a sermon delivered by Rev. Karl Frederick Johnson, of the First Evangelical Lutheran Church of Thief River Falls, Minn., at a memorial service conducted for Leonard Sanders, a young soldier killed in action in a foreign land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 15 minutes.

ONLY THE PEOPLE CAN PRESERVE THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I shall discuss a change which has taken place in the course of the great war in which we are engaged. We should not only recognize that this change has taken place, but we should know, and must know, that the war objectives of some other nations have also changed. That has not changed the necessity for our engaging in or continuing this conflict. It has not changed the necessity for our undying determination to win this conflict decisively and conclusively. But it will have a very great bearing on the shocks of disillusionment which inevitably will come to us at the end of the war.

The world-wide conflict, in which we are so desperately engaged, which is bringing sorrow and misery to so many American families, is one of those great events which separate eras in human history. Here in America we can hardly realize the full significance of the war. Mr. Roosevelt proposed as a name for it "the war of survival," and propaganda agencies coined such slogans as "the war for freedom," "the war for democracy," "the war to end wars." The older generation of us, of course, recognized these slogans from World War No. 1, and remembered the sad fate of such lofty ideals when victory had been achieved in 1918. The peacemakers of Versailles, instead of applying them in the world of realities, created a peace structure based on power politics, on hatred, national greed, ignorance, and stupidity. The causes for the present conflict were set up by the shortsightedness and the incompetence of the peacemakers of 1918.

The American people, you and I, want a victory for the ideals of freedom, of democracy, and of peace on earth. We want a settlement of the present conflict which all reasonable men of good will in all countries will accept as a basis for an enduring peace and a better future for the whole of mankind. Many national aspirations, some of them wicked of design, will, of course, not be realized. Disappointments will be inevitable for those peoples who lose the war; yet it is essential to the future peace of the world that the terms of the settlement be such that even the losers will accept them in good faith and not with mental reservations, nursing burning wounds of grave injustice. We cannot expect an enduring peace if we perpetuate bitter hatred caused by atrocities which call for revenge whenever, in the future, an opportunity for revenge may arise. On the other hand, we cannot leave free for future aggression a bestial, ruthless, cunning Japan of the war lords. We often say that we will not repeat the mistakes of 1918. When you have the occasion, as I have, to study the innumerable official and unofficial plans for the post-war world you will often doubt, as I often doubt, whether we have learned anything and where many of those schemers, if they had their way, would not repeat the errors of 1918, only on a much greater and more disastrous scale. I am afraid that too many Americans, and particularly too many of the visionary post-war schemers, have forgotten those ageless Christian principles of love, even toward our enemies, which are the only safe guiding lights leading us to peace on earth. Instead, the gospel of hate is being broadcast by a most efficient propaganda machine. Those who preach hate contribute nothing to the successful prosecution of the war. In addition, their activities, if persisted in and if successful, will prevent future peace. An individual filled with blind hate is like a blind beast.

The soldier who fights because he loves the country and the ideals for which it stands, is an efficient hero. The post-war planner who is guided by hatred and revenge is a menace to society. The post-war planner who builds on the ageless rock of peace on earth to men of good will is the only one who can build a house that will stand. War manufactures hatreds and destruction. Only peace makes progress possible. Mr. Churchill, on June 22, 1941, in a radio broadcast, coined the phrase "the climacterics of the war." He meant those moments of great events which bring great changes. Americans would say "momentous developments." That very speech, although at the time it was not realized by many, itself was a great climacteric of the war in which we are now engaged. Up till that day the war had been almost a crusade, a fight for great ideals and principles. In fact all the actual fighting was a courageous though hopeless defense against a tremendous war machine which brutally crushed one nation after another. It was an heroic war in the sense I talked about a moment ago. It was a noble fight of men and women who fought because they loved their freedom, their country, and their homes. Nevertheless, we must fully realize that there were men in the foreign offices in other na-

tions who pulled strings in the interest of political designs. We have even recently had important men in England tell us frankly that England declared war on Germany because Hitler threatened to become too strong and powerful. However, even if one would admit that this war was first declared as a move in a great game of power politics; it was quite obvious that all the nations who opposed the German Army had to do so to defend their freedom, their national institutions, and the happiness and sanctity of their homes.

Only people with a great love and a burning faith could have stood up unflinchingly in those dark days after Dunkerque when common sense and logic would have permitted only one conclusion—namely, that the fight was hopelessly lost. On June 22, 1941, Hitler attacked Soviet Russia and in the evening the world was awaiting Mr. Churchill's speech with great anxiety. Would he accept the Bolsheviks as allies although they had just been expelled from the League of Nations because of their aggressive war against Finland; although they had by aggression just absorbed three free republics; although they had invaded Poland and, by aggression in collaboration with Hitler, become partners in the tragic partition of that unhappy country; although Stalin had, by aggression, just taken possession of a big slice of Rumanian land. The alternative, of course, would have been to let the German-Russian war proceed as a conflict in which the Allied Nations had no direct part. We all know Mr. Churchill's choice on that day. In fact it marked the great climacteric of World War No. 2. The choice was between a war for ideals and a war for power. We folks in America, not ordinarily very much concerned about what happens in Europe—and we have great difficulty in understanding why the European nations cannot keep their peace—we were not aware at the time that a new phase of the war had been inaugurated. So when Congress officially said that we had entered the conflict, we started off under the old banners taken from the arsenals of the last war. We went to war for freedom, for democracy, and for the noble purpose of once and for all putting a finish to the grim business of war. We were slow to appreciate that, taken as a whole, there was no more freedom per hundred inhabitants in the lands of the allies than in the lands of our enemies. We did not fully understand that of the four major powers in our camp, that two—namely, the Soviet Union and China—by no possible interpretation could be accepted as possessing even the most rudimentary vestiges of a democracy, and we still to this day are loath to admit that our two major allies, Great Britain and the Soviet Union, by now openly and unashamed, profess unmitigated power aims.

I am confident that the idealism of the American people has never been needed so much as at the present moment. If Russia wants to subjugate or extend her political and military influence over all the nations of eastern Europe, then a war for that purpose is not our war. If Great Britain, as the Prime Minister of South Africa, Field Marshal Smuts, recently suggested in a speech in London, finds the only possible answer to the threatening increase in the power of the Soviet Union in absorbing into the British Commonwealth the countries of western Europe, then this is not our war. Alone among the major Allied Powers, we have no designs on the lands of other nations. We have no wish to tell them how they shall run their own affairs any more than we would permit them to tell us whom we should elect as the next President of the United States. We should, indeed, do a poor job of liberation if the best we could do would be to substitute slavery and servitude to one power for slavery and servitude to another.

The foreign policy of the United States, our policy of war and peace, is the responsibility of the American people. In the long run no Government can lead this Nation where it does not want to go. It seems to me that it is high time that we the people speak up and insist that we fight this war for America and for the ideals for which this Nation has always stood—freedom for everybody who wants and deserves freedom; equality of rights for all, big and little; government of the people, for the people, and by the people in this country; and peaceful, decent relations with every foreign nation. It is time the American people make it clear that they have gone to war for the principles of the Atlantic Charter even if these principles be now hushed down, even repudiated, by the men who but recently signed them. It is not the business of our Government to have our young men and women killed and to send our scarce goods and food as gifts to other nations, to help them achieve political purposes and military aims with which we have no right to identify ourselves.

At this stage of the war we are the only great nation that still upholds the banners of freedom, of democracy, and of peace. If our leaders succumb to the contagious craving for power within the Nation and at the expense of other nations, then we are lost, and not only are we lost ourselves, but the civilized world is lost. Centuries might pass before, in a future generation, students of history would unearth the forgotten ideals of freedom, the rights of the individual to govern his own destiny, the relations between individuals and between nations, based on the Christian message of brotherly love.

The American people confront an unprecedented responsibility and face an unparalleled challenge. Again it is the American people who must hold high aloft the torch of liberty to light up the ideals of Christian principles and peaceful progress in the world. Regardless of how the objectives of the leaders of other nations may change, regardless of how the course of the war itself may change, the people of America can and must keep alive the noblest ideals and the highest principles upon which we entered this conflict; otherwise, civilization is doomed and chaos will result. It is up to the American people—the still free American people, the liberty-loving American people—to give their unstinted devotion and their unstinted efforts to prevent another era of ignorance, superstition, and cruelty such as characterized the Dark Ages. You, my friends, must win this war for civilization by keeping vibrant and vital the ideals upon which peace between men of good will can reign on this earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JARMAN (at the request of Mr. GRANT of Alabama), from today until March 21, on account of official business.

To Mr. NEWSOME, for March 13 to 18, inclusive, on account of official business.

To Mr. WASIELEWSKI, for 1 week, beginning Monday, March 13, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 13, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 and hearings will be held on H. R. 3959 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Saturday, March 11, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, March 15, 1944, on H. R. 2522 and H. R. 4350.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on S. 1225, entitled "An act granting a pension to Constance Eager," which was introduced by Senator TYDINGS, and S. 662, entitled "An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes," which was introduced by Senator BILBO.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1272. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of schedules, or parts of, covering records proposed for disposal by the Government agencies indicated; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1273. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, for Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1274. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Budget for 1945 involving an increase of $20,682,370 (H. Doc. No. 479); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1275. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $3,879,000, and drafts of proposed provisions, in the form of amendments to the Budget for the said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 480); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1276. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Petroleum Administration for War for the fiscal year 1945 containing an estimate of appropriation amounting to $6,550,000 (H. Doc. No. 481); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1277. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Solid Fuels Administration for War of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1945 containing estimate of appropriation amounting to $5,025,000 (H. Doc. No. 482); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1278. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Censorship for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $29,814,425 (H. Doc. No. 483); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1279. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the War Shipping Administration for the fiscal year 1945 containing estimates of appropriations amounting to $550,350,000 (H. Doc. No. 484); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1280. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the National War Labor Board of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945 containing estimates of appropriations amounting to $15,596,000 (H. Doc. No. 485); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1281. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Committee on Fair Employment Practice of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945 containing appropriations amounting to $585,000 (H. Doc. No. 486); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1282. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Division of Central Administrative Services of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $9,133,000 (H. Doc. No. 487); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1283. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Committee for Congested Production Areas, of the Executive Office of the President for the fiscal year 1945 containing estimates of appropriations amounting to $669,000 (H. Doc. No. 488); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1284. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $18,811,000 (H. Doc. No. 489); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 467. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and $250 funeral expenses to Isaline Garney, mother of Mary Garney, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1248). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4378. A bill to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations for Government employees, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 4379. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $25 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. J. Res. 250. A joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Third Division; to the Committee on the Library.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the disposition of its taxes as the legislature sees fit; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH introduced a bill (H. R. 4380) for the relief of Mabelle E. Olive, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5219. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of George McGee and others, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5220. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council, urging the passage of the Green-Lucas bill, giving all members of our armed forces an opportunity to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5221. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of G. M. Hauralian and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5222. Also, petition of W. A. Fitzpatrick and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5223. Also, petition of Blanche H. Williams and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5224. Also, petition of S. E. Dooley and 14 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5225. Also, petition of Frederick E. Taylor and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5226. By Mr. FOGARTY: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, concerning the abrogation of the white paper and the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5227. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the Reverend B. E. Dobbins and citizens of the town and community of Tingley, Iowa, in the interest of the Bryson bill, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war, by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5228. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of 180 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5529. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition of 60 citizens of Pennsylvania, protesting against passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5230. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Stan Segal and 24 other persons, all of Chicago, Ill., favoring enactment of House bill 4063, authorizing the appointment of optometrists as commissioned officers in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5231. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Local Union 185, United Clerical, Technical, and Supervisory Employees of the Mining Industry Division of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, located at Grant Town, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 3962; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5232. By Mr. WEISS: Petition of 5,200 citizens of Pennsylvania, protesting against the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5233. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francisco Elias Quinones, of Rincon, P. R., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the removal of Rexford G. Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5234. Also, petition of W. W. Fuller, Jr., of Miami, Fla., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to amending the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, Thou dost gladden our eyes and thrill our beings with the glory of Thy handiwork; Thou hast written Thy law in our hearts; Thou hast wedded our finite days and ways to Thy eternity. In Thy fellowship alone we find peace for our spirits and power for our tasks. In a desperate day of disappointment, disillusionment, and despair, when so many hopes are crippled and crucified and so many loved ones are scattered far and wide, with all the world's disruption and confusion, we bow in grati-

tude for the mercies beyond our deserving which hallow our lot—the sacrament of friendship, the opportunities for service, the joys of a free life.

Give us the insight, the faith, and the courage in these days of destiny to escape the futile repetitions of old errors and the restoration of ancient evils. Let not ignorant or mean partisanship or selfish greed block the way to a new order in the world, with hope of lasting peace, enlarging brotherhood, and universal justice, a world in which the lives now being offered on the altar of righteousness shall not have been given in vain. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 9, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM OREGON

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I present the certificate of appointment of the Governor of Oregon designating the Honorable GUY CORDON a Senator from Oregon. The Senator-designate is present in the Senate Chamber, and is ready to take the oath of office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Salem, March 4, 1944.

To the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Oregon, I, Earl Snell, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint GUY CORDON a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the death of Charles L. McNary is filled by election, as provided by law.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, Earl Snell, and our seal hereto affixed at Salem, Oreg., this 4th day of March A. D. 1944.

EARL SNELL, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

ROBT. S. FARRELL, Jr.,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be placed on file.

If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. CORDON, escorted by Mr. HOLMAN, advanced to the desk, and, the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him by the Vice President, he took his seat in the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 9, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 872. An act to provide retirement benefits for certain persons who serve as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs;

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

S. 1387. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 10, 1944:

S. 872. An act to provide retirement benefits for certain persons who serve as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

On March 11, 1944:

S. 1554. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; and

S. 1658. An act to extend for 1 year the date of termination of Public Law 22, dated April 1, 1943, entitled "To provide for a temporary increase in compensation for certain employees of the District of Columbia government and the White House Police force."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4133) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. MAHON, Mr. CURLEY, Mr. TABER, Mr. KEEFE, and Mr. DWORSHAK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4183) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, and Mr. CASE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman;

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co. against the United States;

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; and

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

DISTRIBUTION OF POLITICAL PUBLICATIONS BY WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the last session of the Senate I brought to the attention of the Senate certain one-way correspondence I have had with the War Department regarding certain political publications under the auspices of the War Department. Immediately thereafter I received a thoroughly satisfactory letter from the Secretary of War on the subject in which he advises me that he has ordered total abandonment of the particular system against which I was protesting. I wish to thank the Secretary for his forthright reply and I ask that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: I have your letter of February 23, calling my attention to the Army War College Library Bulletin for February 1944, which contains in a list of Ten Outstanding Magazine Articles an article entitled "General MacArthur—Fact and Legend," by John McCarten, published in the American Mercury.

For some time past it has been the custom of the Army War College Library to reprint in its Bulletin, as a routine library function, this monthly selection of current magazine articles by a council of librarians. The present head of this council is Dr. Luther H. Evans, Chief Assistant Librarian, Library of Congress. The list is taken from a poster sent out each month by Harper & Brothers to public libraries throughout the United States, and I enclose a copy of the January 1944 poster. From this you will note that comments reprinted under the title of each article in the Library Bulletin for February 1944 are reproduced exactly from the text which appears on the poster.

There has been no intent to imply War Department approval of these selections. The sponsorship by a council of librarians is indicated as part of the heading. Monthly circulation of this publication represents fewer than 500 copies.

In order that there may be no opportunity for misunderstanding of the War Department's position, however, I have directed that the list be eliminated from future issues of the Library Bulletin. I need hardly assure you of my complete agreement with your statement that "the War Department must be scrupulously careful to avoid the official

distribution of partisan or prejudicial material to the Army," either at this time or at any other.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

MESSAGE FROM THE CONGRESS OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES AT BARI, ITALY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the text of a message received in the State Department and directed to the Congress of the United States from the Congress of the Political Parties held at Bari, Italy, January 28–30, 1944, which letter and message was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the text of the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first free assembly of southern Italy, the islands and the patriots of all Italy belonging to all the anti-Fascist parties salutes the great American democracy, in its supreme expression, its Congress.

We want to fight side by side with the Allied armies for the liberation of Italy and we also want the reconstruction for our country of strong democratic institutions that may insure for us the four liberties which are the glory of America. Fascism is not dead. It is still entrenched in strong positions.

We confide in the help of the United States of America for the final destruction of this danger that is not only of Italy, not only of Europe, but of the whole world.

FOURTEENTH REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a report on operations under the Lend-Lease Act, from the passage of the act, March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1943, filed with the Secretary of the Senate on March 11, 1944, by the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, which will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADDITIONAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 164)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an additional estimate of appropriation in the amount of $7,250,000, for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1945, in the form of an amendment to the Budget (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DEVELOPMENT OF LANDING AREAS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE (S. DOC. NO. 165)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed provision extending the availability of the existing appropriation for the development of landing areas for national defense, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, Department of Commerce, to June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 166)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of $1,650,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 162)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the amount of $4,500 for the Post Office Department, fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 163)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriations in the amount of $2,869,000, for the Department of State, fiscal year 1945, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, revision No. 1 of the estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, for the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Post Office and Navy; War Production Board, Tennessee Valley Authority (2), and Reconstruction Finance Corporation (2) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; ordered to lie on the table:

"Whereas the United States, and particularly the Northwest, has sustained a great loss in the untimely death of a tried and true friend, CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, for many years the floor leader of his party in the United States Senate; and

"Whereas CHARLES L. MCNARY has been a United States Senator from Oregon since 1917 and was honored by nomination for Vice President of the United States; and

"Whereas by his remarkable ability, personality, and leadership he has not only endeared himself to all who served with him, but has performed the greatest services throughout his public career to the people of the Northwest, as well as the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas, due to his character and leadership he has become universally beloved and his place will be hard to fill: Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That we extend our sincere sympathy and condolence to Senator MCNARY'S family on account of their great loss; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the Journal of the Senate; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Mrs. McNary; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senate."

A cablegram from the secretary of the Senate of Puerto Rico embodying a resolution adopted by that senate; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

SAN JUAN, P. R., *March 3, 1944.*

Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE,
President, Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate of Puerto Rico adopted today the following resolution: "Whereas there is pending in the Congress in Washington legislation to deprive Puerto Rico of the taxes collected on the sale of Puerto Rican rum in the United States;

"Whereas for more than 40 years the people of Puerto Rico have enjoyed the right to use and dispose of these taxes in accordance with the laws of its legislature; and

"Whereas the increase in these taxes is practically the only favorable factor caused in Puerto Rico by the war in the midst of the many sufferings which the war has caused our people and which our people are bearing in a spirit of sacrifice and comprehension in defense of the great democratic principles: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico, To express to the Congress of the United States its respectful and firm opposition to having the people of Puerto Rico deprived of the right which they have enjoyed for more than 40 years to dispose of those taxes through the legislature and for such purposes as the legislature in representation of the people believes of the greatest utility and benefit to Puerto Ricans."

Y. SOLA MORALES,
Secretary of the Senate
of Puerto Rico.

(The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a cablegram from the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico, embodying a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition signed by the pastors of several churches of Snow Hill, Berlin, Pocomoke City, Newark, Girdletree, and Stockton, Md., on behalf of the members of their congregations, praying for the enactment of House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RETURN OF DODECANESE ISLANDS TO GREECE—PETITION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I desire to present a rather unusual and important petition sent to me by the President and Secretary of the board of directors of the Greek Orthodox community, of Tarpon Springs, Fla.

The letter transmitting the petition was signed by Hon. V. G. Arfaras, president, and Hon. Peter Saclarides, secretary. The petition contains the photographic signatures of the officials composing the board of directors of Calymnian Society, also the signatures of the board of directors of Halki Society St. Nicholas, and the signatures of the officials and board of directors of the Taxiarchis Symean Society, Tarpon Springs, Fla.

They are loyal American citizens and have always contributed their share wholeheartedly to the effort of the United States and the United Nations to reestablish self-government in enemy-ridden Europe and their native Greece.

They are descendants of the inhabitants of those beautiful historic Greek islands of the Aegean known as the Dodecanese, which have been Greek in language, sentiment, tradition, and religion since the dawn of history, notwithstanding the fact that the vicissitudes of war have deprived them of political independence during several periods, including the present. Most of the petitioners still have relatives and even members of their immediate families in those islands, and have retained the emotions, feelings, and traditions of their forebears.

The Senate of the United States unanimously adopted a resolution on May 17, 1920, in favor of the freedom of the Dodecanese Islands, reading as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the 12 islands of the Aegean where a strong Greek population predominates should be awarded to Greece and became incorporated in the Kingdom of Greece.

Unhappily this resolution was never effectuated, and the islands have for two decades been dominated by Italy under Mussolini, and thus the economy of the islands was disturbed; and the ultimate result is that the population has been reduced from 150,000 to 60,000.

On March 25, 1944, the independence and freedom of modern Greece will be celebrated, and petitioners pray that the Senate proclaim and reiterate the resolution adopted in 1920 on behalf of the Dodecanese Islands, and that they be set free at the end of this war to join their mother country—Greece.

Mr. President, I ask that this petition be received and that the letter of transmittal, together with the resolution adopted and signed by the city commissioners of the city of Tarpon Springs, Fla., be printed in the body of the RECORD, and that the petition and resolution with all signatures be then referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK ORTHODOX COMMUNITY,
"SAINT NICHOLAS,"
Tarpon Springs, Fla., February 7, 1944.

The Honorable Senator CHARLES W. ANDREWS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDREWS: We, the undersigned inhabitants of Tarpon Springs, Fla., respectfully submit to you the following:

We are all American citizens and residents of this city and State for many years past. We have been loyal Americans and have contributed our share of wholehearted effort and work to the successful fulfillment of our democratic institutions and of the political and social objectives in this great democracy.

We feel proud of our American citizenship and also feel proud of our traditions which we brought into our country and which are the imperishable traditions of the Greek love for freedom, for democracy and for human decency.

We derive, all of us, from the Greek islands of the Aegean, known as the Dodecanese, which have been Greek from the dawn of history and have remained Greek in language, sentiment, tradition, and religion for 30 centuries, notwithstanding the fact that the vicissitudes of history had deprived them of political independence during several periods. Some of us still have relatives or members of family in those islands, but all of us retain the emotions and feelings associated with memories and traditions of the life of our fathers and forefathers in these charming and lovely islands of the Greek Dodecanese.

Our American heritage of attachment to political freedom, democracy, and popular administration necessarily imbues us with the deep feeling and desire to see the Dodecanese set free and united with the Greek people, and it is natural for us, as for all freedom-loving people, to wish the United States to do all in its power to see that the Dodecanese are set free at the end of this great war which is being fought for democracy and freedom, and in which the children, husbands, or fathers of many of us are now fighting.

The Senate of the United States already in 1920 had adopted as unanimous Resolution No. 324 on May 17 in favor of freedom of the Dodecanese. The resolution quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 59, part VII, page 7160, reads:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the 12 islands of the Aegean where a strong Greek population predominates should be awarded to Greece and become incorporated in the Kingdom of Greece."

Unhappily, the object of this resolution was not effectuated and the islands were allowed to remain under the Italian tyrannical rule after the end of the last World War. What this alien tyranny meant is well known. Greek schools were closed, the Greek language was suppressed. The exercise of the Greek religion was by all manner of means made difficult. Men were deported, others maltreated or killed. The economy of the islands was destroyed. The result was that the population of the islands was reduced from 150,000 to 60,000 people.

For these reasons and on the occasion of March 25, 1944, when the independence and freedom of modern Greece is celebrated, we request of you, our Senators and national leaders, to proclaim on behalf of this country that the United States reiterates the resolution adopted in 1920 on behalf of the Dodecanese Islands and that they definitely expect the Dodecanese Islands to be set free at the end of this war to join their motherland Greece, our gallant ally.

In the belief that you share our feelings in this matter and that you will take such action as in your judgment may be appropriate in the circumstance, we subscribe

Respectfully,

V. G. ARFARAS,
President,
PETER SÅCLARIDES,
Secretary,
Board of Directors, Greek Orthodox Community.

Resolution 625

Whereas the 12 fair islands of the Dodecanese that lie off of the Hellenic mainland have been subjected to the ruthless and brutal and inhuman practices of the dictators and totalitarian governments, and in spite of such hardships and impositions the people of these islands have continued to keep alive the spirit of democracy throughout the ages and in so doing have given to the world many of the sciences that have spread the benefits of civilization in all directions, and it is a recognized fact that the science of medicine looks to the Dodecanese and recognizes her as its motherland; and

Whereas this chain of islands has always been populated by industrious, freedom-loving Greeks who, in spite of their punishment and hardships, have never submitted to and will never bow to the ruthless demands of the dictators; and

Whereas there is a very close and common feeling between the residents and citizens of Tarpon Springs and the inhabitants of these islands because of the fact there have emigrated therefrom a large number of its outstanding and upright citizens who founded and have maintained the sponge industry in the city of Tarpon Springs, thereby contributing in a large measure to the economic growth and development of this city; and

Whereas it appears that the day is not far distant when these oppressed people will be liberated and the islands returned to their motherland, and once again these people will be able to breathe the air of freedom, and the ruthless acts of the dictators will be blotted out and a peace-loving people will once again be able to turn their talents and energy to the betterment of civilization; and

Whereas it is the earnest wish of this board that these people will be liberated in the near future and in order to keep the word "Dodecanese" and what these islands stand for and the contribution they have made to civilization before our statesmen, diplomats, and other high-ranking officials of international affairs, this board is of the opinion that as a matter of principle it would be wise, just, and beneficial that a public street, avenue, or boulevard be named "Dodecanese"; and

Whereas after making a thorough and complete survey of the city of Tarpon Springs, the board is of the opinion that it would be most fitting that the name of Anclote Boulevard be changed and henceforth known as Dodecanese Boulevard: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Tarpon Springs, Fla.: Section 1. That because of the principles, matters, and things set forth in the preamble of this resolution, from and after the passage of same, that public thoroughfare known as Anclote Boulevard shall henceforth be known and designated as Dodecanese Boulevard, and that copies of this resolution be furnished such diplomatic officials and other international figures advising them of the interest of this Board in the early restoration of the Dodecanese Islands to their motherland, and the liberation of the fine and upstanding race of people that has made countless contributions to the progress of civilization.

Passed and adopted on this 2d day of January A. D. 1944.

J. M. YOUNG,
Mayor-Commissioner.
ELMER L. HOADLEY,
ROBERT GREER,
HENRY H. EMERSON,
MIKE SAMARKOS,
Commissioners.

Attest:

W. D. FLETCHER,
City Clerk and Collector.

NATIONAL WAR SERVICE LEGISLATION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD at this point, a letter embodying a resolution which I have received from the resolutions committee of the Connecticut Grand Lodge of the International Order of Good Templars. The letter contains a resolution adopted by the members of that organization, expressing disapproval of the passage of a labor draft law.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNECTICUT GRAND LODGE,
INTERNATIONAL ORDER OF
GOOD TEMPLARS,
NEW BRITAIN, CONN., *February 27, 1944.*

We the members of the Connecticut Grand Lodge of the International Order of Good Templars, assembled to discuss the proposed

labor draft law, have voted to submit the following resolution to Members of Congress, particularly those representing the State of Connecticut:

"*Resolved* That passage of a labor draft law is a dangerous encroachment on our basic liberties as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States; that the passage of this act would be a hindrance rather than an aid to production. Free Americans can and will out produce forced or compulsory labor. Our members consist of both labor and industry and it is the unanimous opinion of all that the passage of this law would be inimical to the welfare of our country."

HARRY JOHANSON,
RUDOLPH F. BANNOW,
ALICE M. LEVINE,
Resolutions Committee.

SANITARY EMBARGO—BEEF PRICES—TARIFF

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD three resolutions adopted at the Forty-seventh Annual Convention of the American National Livestock Association held at Denver, Colo., on January 13, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolutions presented by the Senator from Kansas will be received, printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

SANITARY EMBARGO

Whereas the war condition which exists in our country and the world today has brought the realization of the need for an increased meat supply and other necessary foods for the United States; and

Whereas in order that we may maintain the production of these increased meat supplies, it is of vital importance that we protect and safeguard the health of our herds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our opposition to any modification of the existing sanitary embargo applying to countries where foot-and-mouth disease and/or rinderpest exists.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

BEEF PRICES

Whereas numerous radio news commentators and Government officials by radio, news release, and in testimony before committees of Congress have claimed that cattlemen were asking only for higher prices for beef: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we declare that such statements are not in accord with the facts; that our opposition has been to the fixing of ceilings on live animals as impractical and unworkable; and that since the order of December 16, 1942, affecting wholesale beef ceilings we have not in our resolution of January 1943, the resolutions adopted at the Kansas City conference on September 2, 1943, or by the testimony of our members before congressional committees asked for higher beef prices.

To the Committee on Finance:

TARIFF

Whereas in much of the post-war planning it is proposed that tariff barriers be lowered or eliminated entirely in order to promote international trade; and

Whereas such proposals ignore completely the difference in living and operating costs between this and most of the other nations of the world—and ignore also the fact that all the nations of the world will be seeking access to this, the richest market in the world, and many of them will have greatly increased capacity in industrial plants: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we reaffirm our belief in a policy of reasonable tariff protection which will equalize the difference in the cost of production between this and foreign countries. In no other way can our farms and ranches, our labor groups, and our industries hope to continue to operate successfully and maintain the living standards which have been developed under this system.

PROTEST BY KANSAS GASOLINE DISTRIBUTORS AGAINST O. P. A. REGULATIONS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter from H. L. Parker, president, Independent Gasoline Distributors Association, Wichita, Kans., protesting against O. P. A. regulations which require endorsement of gasoline stamps. It seems to me that the gasoline distributors have a legitimate objection to the extra work required, in view of the manpower shortage, and hope their suggestion that coupons be numbered serially, in lieu of requiring endorsement by purchaser, may be given consideration by the O. P. A.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT GASOLINE
DISTRIBUTORS ASSOCIATION,
Wichita, Kans., March 4, 1944.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the annual meeting of our State-wide organization, the Independent Gasoline Distributors Association, held at Wichita, Kans., February 21, 1944, a motion was passed by unanimous vote to oppose the present O. P. A. regulations requiring endorsement of gasoline stamps, for the following reasons:

1. It accomplishes no real purpose.

2. Service-station employees are not qualified and do not make accurate inspection of license numbers, rationing books, and other information theoretically required in releasing purchasers.

3. Purchasers should be required to make proper endorsement before receiving stamps, if endorsement serves any purpose.

4. Service-station operators and employees, by and large, are attempting to ration gasoline honestly.

5. Present requirements lower the proper cooperation of service-station operators because manpower shortage makes it physically impossible for them to secure endorsements as outlined by O. P. A. at this time.

6. If all gasoline stamps will be serially numbered in the future, their endorsement would serve no purpose.

We will appreciate proper consideration of this matter and immediate relief for the already burdened gasoline-marketing industry.

May we have an early reply?

Yours truly,

H. L. PARKER,
President.

HIGHER TAXES IN CONNECTION WITH INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter from members of a social studies class of the junior high school at Augusta, Kans., signed by Clifford Boucher, president of the class, and 24 other members, urging Congress to levy higher taxes as an aid in preventing inflation. I think it is a fine thing that these youngsters are taking an active and intelligent interest in current affairs.

In this particular instance, however, I think it is only fair to suggest that the revenue measures now in effect will draw off from forty-two to forty-six billion dollars in Federal taxes this year, approximately one-third of the entire national income, and that State and local taxes will amount to another $10,000,000,000, making total tax collections between fifty-two and fifty-six billion dollars, which is more than one-third of the entire national income.

Furthermore, if present estimates are correct, Federal tax collections should equal about one-half of the war expenditures for the present calendar year. Incidentally, I am not certain that the parents of the children, after the parents make out their income tax returns for March 15, would support the children's request that tax levies be increased at this time. I ask that the letter, and the signatures, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Augusta, Kans., March 2, 1944.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: We, the members of the sixth-hour social-studies class, urge your support of measures for higher taxes. We believe in a pay-as-you-go plan, because many people are making more money now than they will after the war in won. Higher taxes now will also help to prevent inflation.

We are more than willing to do all we can to help win this war. We want to express our loyalty to, and our faith in, our country and its democratic institutions.

Respectfully yours,

Dorothy Jean Hime; Jane Gillespey; Earlene Nance; Margaret Varner; Ruth Myers; Geneva Strait; Betty Edwards; Richard Hamilton; Buster Crouley; Joan Bramlett; Clifford Boucher, president of eighth-grade class; Earlene Punke, secretary; Jo Anne Tague; Clay Plymate, Jr.; Dorothy Rippee; Jacqueline Sue Peal; Clyde Eugene Ewart; J. E. Chappell; Dorvin Dean Davis; Bonnie Jewell; Barbara Jean Hada; Helen Larcom; Neomi Collins; Sam Scheyods; Kathleen Lewis.

FRANCES SCARBOROUGH

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 258, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 258) submitted by Mr. TYDINGS February 25, 1944, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Frances Scarborough, widow of Harold Scarborough,

late keeper of stationery of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR McNARY

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I also report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 265 submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. It provides for the payment of the funeral expenses of the late Senator McNary. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 265) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY, late a Senator from the State of Oregon, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE — LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I also report back favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 267, which seeks to increase the limit of expenditures of hearings before the Committee on Appropriations by the sum of $7,500. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 267) originally reported by Mr. MCKELLAR from the Committee on Appropriations on March 9, 1942, was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations, authorized by Senate Resolution No. 53, agreed to January 18, 1943, to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject referred to said committee, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate for the same purposes during the Seventy-eighth Congress, $7,500 in addition to the amount of $10,000 heretofore authorized.

INVESTIGATION OF PETROLEUM RESOURCES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now report from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, without additional amendment, Senate Resolution 253 submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] for himself and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] on February 9, 1944, providing for an investigation of petroleum resources and the production and consumption of petroleum within and outside the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce on February 17, with amendments, and from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate without additional amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Commerce was, on page 1, line 2, after the words "composed of", to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in line 3, before the word "members", to strike out "three" and insert "two"; in line 4, before the word "members", to strike out "and three" and insert "two"; in line 5, after the word "Commerce", to insert "and two members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I notice some changes have been made in the resolution. I wonder if we might have an explanation?

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the clerk read the resolution in full as amended. I think that will explain it to the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator mean to have it read as amended?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. I think that a reading of it as amended will give a full explanation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is a very good idea.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution is not very long, I will say to the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution as proposed to be amended.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution as proposed to be amended, as follows:

Whereas adequate petroleum reserves are essential to our national security and economic welfare; and

Whereas the Petroleum Administrator for War has recently stated that the United States was not now in a position "to oil another war": Therefore be it

Resolved, That a special committee of nine Senators, to be composed of two members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, two members of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, two members of the Committee on Commerce, and two members of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to be appointed by the President of the Senate upon the recommendations of the respective chairmen of such committees, and one member to be selected and appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to petroleum resources, and the production and consumption of petroleum and petroleum products, both within and outside the United States, in their relation to our national welfare and security. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with its recommendations for the formulation of a national petroleum policy.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the last committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the word "committees", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "and one member to be selected and appointed by the President of the Senate."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, is the amendment to strike out the language "one member" and insert in lieu thereof "there members" to make the total membership of the committee 11?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Such an amendment has not as yet been proposed.

Mr. BAILEY. The clerk read it as if the committee were to consist of one member.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will again state the last committee amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. The last committee amendment starting on page 1, line 8, after the word "committees", proposes to insert a comma and the words "and one member to be selected and appointed by the President of the Senate."

Mr. BAILEY. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to a strike out the words "one member" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "three members." I offer that amendment at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator from North Carolina has another amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. The other amendment is on page 2, line 6, after the word "committee", to insert "shall select its own chairman and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 6, after the word "committee", it is proposed to insert "shall select its own chairman and."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Now Mr. President, the final amendment is to strike out in line 1, page 1, the word "nine", and insert in lieu thereof the word "eleven."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "nine" and insert in lieu thereof "eleven."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if that completes the amendments, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from North Carolina—and I have conferred with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]—that it seems to me the second whereas in the preamble should be eliminated. The first whereas sets out sufficient ground for the resolution. The second whereas merely quotes a statement in the newspapers alleged to have been made, I suppose, by the Petroleum Administrator for War.

Mr. BAILEY. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that that whereas is not necessary, and I move that it be stricken out.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to strike out the second whereas in the preamble.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 253), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR THE ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS, DIRECTIVES, REGULATIONS, ETC.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 252.

This is a very important resolution, and I ask that the clerk read the first paragraph of the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey any or all Executive orders of the President, and directives, rules, and regulations issued by or under authority of any department or independent agency of the Executive branch of the Federal Government, with particular regard to the source of constitutional or legislative authority upon which such Executive orders, directives, rules, and regulations are based, their validity and the effect and manner of their enforcement, and to report to the Senate before the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress the results of such study and survey, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems justified.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the resolution go over for a few days because I wish to look into it and discuss it with the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who reported the resolution from the Judiciary Committee, before it is acted upon, if that is agreeable.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, this resolution was pending before the Committee on the Judiciary for many months. The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has been quite zealous in his attempt to have the matter considered. Before my beloved predecessor passed away, he was instructed by unanimous vote of the Committee on the Judiciary to prepare the resolution for reporting, but for some reason it was not then reported. As soon as I became chairman of the committee I reported the resolution, and I have been rather insistent that the Senator from Illinois bring it to the floor of the Senate. It entails a considerable and serious study of the subject of the resolution. I shall be glad to have it go over so that the leader and others may give it consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—MAGNESIUM (PT. 17 OF REPT. NO. 10)

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, the secretary of the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] has requested that I obtain permission for the Senator from Washington to file today an additional report on magnesium for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program. The report has been prepared, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be filed on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] for the special committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1766. A bill for the relief of C. C. Thornton; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. THOMAS of Idaho, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPPER, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCLELLAND, Mr. HILL, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BILBO, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. WILEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. WILLIS, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. WALLGREN, Mr. BONE, Mr. NYE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SMITH, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HOLMAN, Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. HAWKES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MEAD, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. WEEKS, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. CORDON) introduced Senate bill 1767, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 1768. A bill to provide for the payment of national service life insurance benefits in the case of Lester D. Blumberg (XC-3,034,-306); to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 1769, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1770. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes;

S. 1771. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 1772. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; and

S. 1773 (by request of the Navy Department). A bill to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservation, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 1774. A bill authorizing the Shoshonee-Goship Bands of Shoshone Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

FEDERAL AID FOR READJUSTMENT OF VETERANS IN CIVIL LIFE

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill providing for Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning veterans from World War No. 2. I ask unanimous consent to introduce the bill on my own behalf and on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Nevada [Mr.

McCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. In order to make the roll of the Senate quite complete, I should like to ask unanimous consent to add my name.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very happy to add the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. President, I should like to ask the indulgence of the Senate for a moment or two in order to explain this rather unusual procedure. Several weeks ago on behalf of several other Senators as well as myself, I introduced Senate bill 1617, known as the Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944, and more familiarly known as the "G. I. Bill of Rights." This bill was referred to the Committee on Finance and was there referred by the chairman of that committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of which he had done me the honor to appoint me chairman.

That committee has held lengthy and complete hearings. We have labored long and hard to bring out the best and most comprehensive bill which it is possible for us to enact at this time. In addition to the voluminous hearings, members of the committee had held many conferences with Senators interested in the subject, with representatives of veterans' organizations, with various departments of the Government, and with other interested persons.

As a result of these hearings and conferences the bill has been extensively amended. The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] who had already prepared, and who on his own behalf and that of the Senator from Georgia and myself introduced, a measure on the subject of reemployment and unemployment insurance for veterans, has given generously of his time and advice; and the title in the bill as it is now introduced is largely his handiwork. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] had introduced a bill upon the subject of education for veterans which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor and is now on the calendar. Nevertheless, he has given us the benefit of his great experience and wisdom, has worked untiringly in consultation with us and with the agencies of the Government to bring about a general agreement, and has generously consented to be one of the sponsors of this bill, which is in substantial conformity with the provisions of his own.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] had introduced a bill on the subject which they later introduced as an amendment to Senate bill 1617. They have been most helpful in conference and in attending the hearings of the committee, and many features of their bill are embodied in the measure as it has been introduced today. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has given us the benefit of his vast experience as the author of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act which is the basis of the agricultural section of the present bill. Certain technical amendments suggested by the Army and Navy, the Federal Housing Administration and the Agricultural Department as well as the Veterans' Administration are also included.

Instead of reporting the bill with many far-reaching amendments, it was decided to reintroduce what might be called a "clean copy" with the amendments showing as part of the text. We have discussed the matter with many Senators who have shown great interest in the matter and who expressed willingness and desire to join in sponsoring and introducing this important matter. It is in this way that the bill has just been presented with the names of an unprecedented number of Senators attached.

Let me add one word, Mr. President; I regard this bill as one of the most important measures that has ever come before the Congress. The men and women of the armed services and those who will be in the armed services before the end of this war, not only now hold the fate of this country in their hands but they will hold it for a generation to come. On the extent to which they can be speedily reintegrated in our population as decent law-abiding citizens the welfare of this Nation depends. If we should fail in that endeavor, as most of the participants in the last war failed, the consequences to our future well-being might well be most tragic. If we succeed and the trained and disciplined efficiency and valor of these men and women is turned into the right channels we will have a better country to live in than the world has yet seen. This bill—which I wish to emphasize is in all respects in line with the President's program as outlined in various messages—is designed for that purpose. I do not contend that it is the last word on the subject. I do assert that it will be a fundamental bill of rights for service men and women in facilitating their return to civilian life and I assert that it represents as little as we can properly do at this time.

I should like to add that the bill in its present form has the undivided and enthusiastic support of the two great servicemen's organization, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, which, to my mind, are better qualified than any other organizations now existing to represent the views of the men and women now in the service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, introduced by Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CARRYING OF UNITED STATES OBLIGATIONS OWNED BY BANKS, ETC.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the carrying of obligations of the United States owned by banks, and so forth, and I request that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1769) to authorize the carrying of obligations of the United States, owned by banks, trust companies, and insurance companies, at their par value, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the market value of any interest-bearing bond, note, or other evidence of indebtedness, which is a direct obligation of the United States or which is fully guaranteed by the United States as to principal and interest, and which is owned by a banking institution, a trust company, or an insurance company, is less than the par value thereof, such bond,

note, or other evidence of indebtedness shall be deemed, for the purposes of any requirement of Federal law or regulation, to have a value equal to the par value thereof plus any accrued interest thereon.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4346) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HEARINGS BEFORE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF INTERNATIONAL WIRE AND RADIO COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 268), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That for the purposes of Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to October 19, 1943, authorizing an investigation of international communications by wire and radio, the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places, either in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee for such purposes, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

MERIDEN, CONN., THE NATION'S IDEAL WAR COMMUNITY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, because I think the event is of great importance, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed in the RECORD a newspaper article pointing to the fact that Meriden, Conn., the city in which I live, and the city in which my distinguished colleague was born, has just been chosen as the "Nation's ideal war community."

The newspaper article, taken from the Meriden Record, describes why Chairman Paul V. McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission, and others, selected this city as the ideal war community of the United States.

I ask further consent, Mr. President, that immediately following this article there be printed an editorial from the Meriden Record referring to the same matter.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Meriden (Conn.) Record]

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 9.—Meriden, Conn., has been chosen the Nation's ideal war community, it was announced here today by Chairman Paul V. McNutt, of the War Manpower Commission.

"This community is a perfect example of how the main streets of America have completely mobilized every resource for war," the chairman declared. "The people of Meriden are making their contribution and that means management, labor, city officials, housewives, students, and returning veterans of World War No. 2. Meriden is solving its own manpower problems in the best democratic tradition of this Nation."

Tribute to the city's war record will be paid by Government, civic, and labor officials at ceremonies in Meriden on Monday, March 20, Mr. McNutt announced. The city's war plants will be inspected in the afternoon. In the evening, industrial and labor leaders of the city will sponsor a dinner for newsmen and Government officials at the opening of a new employees' cafeteria at one of the war plants. This will be followed by ceremonies and coast-to-coast broadcast from the Palace Theater to tell the story of Meriden's mobilization for war.

COOPERATION EXEMPLIFIED

The cooperation of Meriden's industries with the War Manpower program was exemplified during the recruiting campaign for the town's ball-bearing plant last fall. Mr. McNutt explained. At the time other employers voluntarily ceased hiring new empployes for a 1-week period so that all available labor resources could be directed to the vital war industry with the most urgent manpower needs.

With a high record of men and women in the armed services, Meriden employers set an example early in the war by voluntarily hiring large numbers of women.

Thousands of Meriden women who had never worked before took full and part-time jobs in the city's war plants and now 54 percent of the city's 20,000 war workers are women.

"Meriden is a town that has closely followed the war-manpower program," the chairman said. "Through adherence to the manpower-employment stabilization plan every member of the community has cooperated and done his part under his own local leaders who comprise the War Manpower Commission management-labor committee for the area. It demonstrates how a patriotic, cooperative community can solve its own manpower problems through the utilization of all its facilities.

NO ABSENTEEISM PROBLEM

"The war plants of Meriden have adopted modern personnel policies and job turnover has been reduced until, in December the quit rate amounted to only 2.2 percent. Absenteeism is at a minimum.

"One child day-care center has been established in Meriden and another will shortly open. Workers from other places are welcomed to Meriden under a plan developed by the Y. M. C. A. New citizens of the town are met at the station, escorted to their new employer's plant and then taken to their new homes. Next the workers are taken on a tour of the city and shown places of interest and the location of their churches. Newcomers' social clubs have also been organized to provide recreation and prevent homesickness.

MET HOUSING NEEDS

"The city has worked out its housing problems through conversion of many old homes and estates into suitable living quarters, and by cooperation of citizens in making spare rooms available, through a Y. M. C. A. registry service.

"Through the War Manpower Commission's local United States Employment Service office, discharged veterans are being placed in war industries and in jobs where they can once again take their place in the life of the community.

[From Meriden (Conn.) Record]

MERIDEN'S STAR ON UNITED STATES MAP

"The love of praise, howe'er concealed by art, reigns more or less, and glows in every heart." There is no use concealing the fact that Meriden is preening herself over the national recognition which has come to her through her selection as the Nation's ideal war community. Chairman McNutt's message to our city which tells us our community is a "perfect example of how the Main Streets of America have completely mobilized every resource for war" is sweet praise. When March 20 dawns for the official celebration of our citation, we will all be humming Oh, What a Beautiful Mornin', no matter what the weather may be.

Reviewing the various qualifications which caused Meriden to be designated for her signal honor, we are justified in a realization that it is fully deserved. Many factors had their influence, because there are other industrial communities who have made an excellent record and who gave us a close race in the contest which none of us had entered consciously.

Cooperation of Meriden's industries in the war manpower program was exceptional when our ball-bearing plant producing a vital war necessity had need for increased staffs. The women of Meriden answered the call for more hands on the production line to the extent that 54 percent of the war workers in town are women. The campaign for raising annual funds for our community chest combined with war agencies went over the top on schedule, giving us a unique position among other industrial cities in Connecticut.

The recent War bond drive had a phenomenal response from Meriden citizens. E bonds were sold far beyond our quota, with $1,785,000 invested when the quota was $1,638,000. E bonds indicate the individual's recognition of patriotism in loaning to the Government for war purposes. They also indicate a knowledge of what constitutes sound investment. The sale of other class bonds in the drive was almost double the quota which had been set for Meriden. Reviewing those figures gives us a sense of security for the future when this temporary war prosperity is a part of history.

Survey of our juvenile-delinquency records shows Meriden to have an exceptionally low ratio of such problems. Health conditions and housing were also considered in making the final selection of the "ideal American war community." This means that the various social agencies have fully met the unusual conditions imposed by war, and that city agencies have been awake to changing needs. That Meriden finally tipped the balance of the scales to drop this glory into her lap is due to the cooperative efforts of representatives of industry, elected and appointed officials, untiring volunteer workers, and the citizenry as a whole.

We will get wide recognition for this citation. Already the papers throughout Connecticut are blazoning our name. An old proverb, which is unpardonably from a Japanese source but nonetheless applicable, says that if one man praises you a thousand will repeat the praise. For a time we can bask in our earned renown. But it is well to remember other proverbs about old praise dying unless you feed it and "to whom much has been given, from them much, much shall be required."

Meriden has gotten herself a shining star on the map of the United States. Our present success should be a spur to greater accomplishments. We are on the threshold of a new era in history when complex problems must be met with good judgment and competent industry. We cannot afford to let the luster of our star be dimmed by any subsequent diminution of the ideal we have reached. The honor done to us does not mean we have perfection. There are still many faults to correct. But we are on the right path and have found Meriden a good place to call our home.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, supplementing the remarks of my distin-

guished colleague the senior Senator from Connecticut, I think it appropriate to tell the Senate that Meriden, Conn., is not only the native city of my colleague, but is my native city.

Mr. MALONEY. I referred to that.

Mr. DANAHER. I did not catch that statement in the Senator's remarks, no doubt due to the noise in the Senate.

It is a source of very real pride to me to join my colleague in the notice which he gives to the city which is now his residence, and of which he was at one time mayor.

I might add that for a period of 25 years or more Connecticut was represented in the Senate by a distinguished citizen, Orville H. Platt, who also was a resident of the city of Meriden. Indeed, in 1888, my father entered Senator Platt's law offices to commence the study of law, and remained his associate until the death of Senator Platt. The Silver City is the city of Senators.

I think it might be advisable to supplement the information submitted by my colleague by an article which appeared in the Hartford Courant on March 10, 1944, and I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point. It concerns the statement by the War Manpower Commission.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

W. M. C. CITES MERIDEN AS IDEAL CITY—MCNUTT COMING TO HELP CELEBRATE DESIGNATION AS NATION'S MODEL WAR COMMUNITY

MERIDEN, March 9.—The War Manpower Commission has chosen Meriden as the ideal war community in the Nation, Chairman Paul V. McNutt, of the W. M. C., announced in Washington Thursday, adding that he and other Government officials will pay the city a visit on March 20 and inspect its war plants.

Following the announcement, Mayor Francis R. Danaher called a public meeting Thursday night at which a general committee was formed to plan for a celebration on March 20 to do justice to the honor that has come to this city.

Approximately 200 persons attended the meeting and unanimously voted to promote the celebration as means, not only of noting the honor but also of raising possibly $10,000 for the Red Cross War Fund.

The New Departure Division of General Motors is completing work on a new cafeteria for employees and it will be ready in time for the celebration. Milton L. Gearing, manager of the plant, offered use of the cafeteria for a large-scale dinner with the firm underwriting the expense. It was voted to charge $2 for attendance at the dinner, the money to go to the Red Cross.

BIG PROGRAM PLANNED

At 11 p. m. on the night of the celebration, a program will be held at the Palace Theater when the world premiere of Main Street Today, produced by M. G. M. at the request of the Federal Government, will be presented, along with other features.

During this program Chairman McNutt will speak and his speech will be broadcast on a Nation-wide hook-up. Admission to the theater party will be $10 for 700 of the theater's seats and $2 for the other 1,000 seats. These proceeds will also go to the Red Cross.

Arrangements are being made to have Capt. Glenn Miller and the Four Hundred and Eighteenth Army Band and Radio Unit, stationed at Yale University, appear at the celebration. There will also be nationally known movie stars and other celebrities on the program.

The Meriden Ministers Association, with Rev. Isaac Smith as chairman, will conduct a Civic Sunday, March 19, with a massed service planned at 11 a. m. Meriden High School will hold a special assembly on the afternoon of March 20, with hopes that one of the speakers for the main program will appear there.

EXAMPLE OF COOPERATION

McNutt declared:

"This community is a perfect example of how the Main Streets of America have completely mobilized every resource for war. The people of Meriden are making their contribution—and that means management, labor, city officials, housewives, students, and returning veterans of World War No. 2.

Meriden is solving its own manpower problems in the best democratic tradition of this Nation."

McNutt said the cooperation of the city's industries with the war-manpower program was exemplified last fall during a recruiting campaign for a ball-bearing plant there. Other employers for 1 week voluntarily ceased hiring new workers so that all available labor could be channeled into the vital war industry.

McNutt also pointed to the large number of women hired in the city's war plants, saying 54 percent of the 20,000 war workers in the city were women.

"Meriden is a town that has closely followed the war-manpower programs," McNutt said, adding that every member of the community has done his part and this "demonstrates how a patriotic, cooperative community can solve its own manpower problems through the utilization of all its facilities."

Absenteeism is at minimum in Meriden, the manpower chairman said. The war plants have adopted modern personnel policies and job turn-over has been reduced until in December the quit rate amounted to only 2.2 percent.

He also mentioned child-care centers, the warm welcome which the city gives to new citizens, and the vigorous attack on housing problems.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that there be read from the desk the release of the War Manpower Commission on the honor which has been accorded to Meriden, because of my pride in the city and her people, and particularly because of the fact that my younger brother, Francis R. Danaher, is now serving his fourth term as mayor of the city of Meriden.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that we on this side did not hear the name of the city referred to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma, I am sure could not have been without cognizance of the presence of the two Senators from Connecticut, but he may not have known that we are both natives of the Silver City, Meriden, Conn. Indeed, we once lived on the same street, and my colleague became mayor of our city. I repeat, the name of the city is Meriden.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Meriden, Conn., has been chosen by the War Manpower Commission as an ideal war community, Chairman Paul V. McNutt, of W. M. C., announced today.

"This community is a perfect example of how the Main Streets of America have completely mobilized every resource for war," the Chairman said. "The people of Meriden are making their contribution—and that means management, labor, city officials, housewives, students, and returning veterans of World War No. 2. Meriden is solving its own manpower problems in the best democratic tradition of this Nation."

Tribute to the city's war record will be paid by Government, civic, and labor officials at ceremonies in Meriden on Monday, March 20, Mr. McNutt announced. The city's war plants will be inspected on Monday afternoon. In the evening, industrial and labor leaders of the city will sponsor a dinner for newsmen and Government officials at the opening of a new employees' cafeteria at one of the war plants. This will be followed by ceremonies and a coast-to-coast broadcast from a theater to tell the story of Meriden's mobilization for war.

The cooperation of Meriden's industries with the war manpower program was exemplified during the recruiting campaign for the town's ball-bearing plant last fall, Mr. McNutt explained. At that time other employers voluntarily ceased hiring new employees for 1 week so that all available labor resources could be directed to the vital war industry with the most urgent manpower needs.

With a high record of men and women in the armed services, Meriden employers set an example early in the war by voluntarily hiring large numbers of women. Thousands of Meriden women who had never worked before took full- and part-time jobs in the city's war plants, and now 54 percent of the city's 20,000 war workers are women.

"Meriden is a town that has closely followed the war manpower programs," the Chairman said. "Through adherence to the manpower employment stabilization plan, every member of the community has cooperated and done his part under his own local leaders who comprise the W. M. C. management-labor committee for the area. It demonstrates how a patriotic, cooperative community can solve its own manpower problems through the utilization of all its facilities.

"The war plants of Meriden have adopted modern personnel policies and job turn-over has been reduced until in December the quit rate amounted to only 2.2 percent. Absenteeism is at a minimum."

One child day-care center has been established in Meriden and another will shortly open. Workers from other places are welcomed to Meriden under a plan developed by the Y. M. C. A. New citizens of the town are met at the station, escorted to their new employer's plant, and then taken to their new homes. Next, the workers are taken on a tour of the city and shown places of interest and the location of their churches. Newcomers' social clubs have also been organized to provide recreation and prevent homesickness.

The city has worked out its housing problems through conversion of many old homes and estates into suitable living quarters, and by cooperation of citizens in making spare rooms available through a Y. M. C. A. room-registry service.

Through the War Manpower Commission's local United States Employment Service office, discharged veterans are being placed in the war industries and in jobs where they can once again take their place in the life of the community, the W. M. C. survey of the city showed.

ADDRESS BY BISHOP BRUCE R. BAXTER AT FUNERAL SERVICES FOR THE LATE SENATOR McNARY

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Bishop Bruce R. Baxter, of the Methodist Church, at the funeral services for the late Senator McNary, in the State Capitol of Oregon, at Salem, Oreg., on March 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY TO QUEENS COUNTY MEDICAL SOCIETY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Queens County Medical Society, Jamaica, N. Y., February 29, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

A UNIFORM FEDERAL BALLOT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a banquet tendered him by the Havana, Ill., Chamber of Commerce, on February 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

USURPATION OF POWER BY THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "How Long Shall We Submit to the Usurpation of Power by the President?" delivered by Senator TAFT before the Republican Editorial Association, Indianapolis, Ind., on March 11, 1944, which appears in the RECORD.]

THE PALESTINE RESOLUTION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JACKSON

[Mr. JACKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Palestine Resolution," delivered by him at a community mass meeting sponsored by the Indianapolis Emergency Council for Palestine, at Indianapolis, Ind., March 5, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RACE PROBLEM—ADDRESS BY JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the race question, by John Temple Graves II, delivered at America's Town Meeting of the Air, in New York, February 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROBLEMS OF YUGOSLAVIA—ADDRESS BY LOUIS ADAMIC

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the problems of Yugoslavia, delivered by Mr. Louis Adamic at the Book and Authors' Club luncheon given by the New York Herald Tribune, New York, March 7, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SOUTH AND THE RATE SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY ALVIN W. VOGTLE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The South Is a Beneficiary, Not a Victim, of Its Freight Rate System," delivered by Alvin W. Vogtle, of Birmingham, Ala., manager, traffic and sales, of the De Bardeleben Coal Corporation, before the Rotary Club of Nashville, Tenn., on November 2, 1943, together with an analysis by C. E. Childe, a member of the Board of Investigation and Research, Transportation, which appear in the Appendix.]

HEALTH INSURANCE—ARTICLES BY ALBERT DEUTSCH

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of articles on the subject of health insurance, written by Albert Deutsch and published in the newspaper PM, which appear in the Appendix.]

KANGAROOS IN THE FREIGHT RATES—ARTICLE BY A. J. RIBE

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Kangaroos in the Freight Rates," by A. J. Ribe, published in Nation's Business for February, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS DOES GOOD JOB—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Congress Does Good Job," by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Star of March 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 1285, the so-called soldiers' vote bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

(For the text of the conference report, see p. 2404 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 9, 1944.)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a few days ago the committee of conference on Senate bill 1285, commonly known as the soldiers' voting bill, submitted a report, and did not press for immediate consideration, because it was desired that Members of the Senate should have opportunity carefully to examine the report and the action of the conference committee.

It is rarely easy for a conference committee representing the divergent views of the two Houses to submit a report which meets the views of either extreme. In this case that is quite true. The report probably will not satisfy the extreme proponents of a universal Federal ballot; nor will it please advocates of the other extreme, who desire no Federal ballot whatever.

The conference committee was engaged intermittently for a period of approximately 3 weeks. We had many meetings and went over the measure time and time again. On the motion of members we reconsidered certain sections which we thought we had finished. The utmost tolerance and freedom prevailed in giving consideration to every view advanced by various members of the conference committee. If Senators will examine the report, they will find that much of the actual language contained in the bill as finally drafted has to do with suggestions and recommendations to the various States.

Mr. President, so far as I am acquainted with the history of the United States, suffrage has always been regarded as a State function. Until this measure was considered, I do not know that I ever heard of what is called a Federal ballot. During the War between the States the armies in the field took part in the elections for the President and Members of Congress in 1864, but as I read history, those elections were conducted by election commissioners representing the various States, who went into the field where the armies were encamped, there opened the polls, and received the ballots.

The reason for so much of the measure being taken up with undertaking to stimulate and encourage the States to make provision by the modification or alteration of their laws is the fact that such a large element desired to secure not alone the right of soldiers to vote for Senators and Representatives but also the right to vote for Governor and other State officials in whom they might be interested. After all, that is a part of the right of suffrage.

Under the Constitution it is possible for the Congress to enact legislation relating to the times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives; but in the view of the conference committee, the authority of Congress does not extend beyond those three provisions. However, those provisions are limited by the further provision that Congress may not make or alter regulations as to the places of choosing Senators.

Every inducement is offered to States which have not already made such provision to provide a liberal absentee voting law, to extend the time, and allow a greater period between the application for ballots and the casting of ballots. Every facility that the Government can supply for aiding the States in the transmission and collection of the ballots is provided for in the report of the conference committee. It is provided that the post cards which were sent to the troops under the old law which was enacted in 1942 may be regarded, if used, as applications under the new law for either the State or Federal ballot, as the case may be.

I should like to have Senators refer to section 302 on page 6 of the report. Before we reach that, however, allow me to say that it is provided that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission shall constitute the Commission. It is provided that the Commission shall do all the detailed work which I shall not recite here because it would be merely a recitation of certain mechanical operations. It is provided that the Commission shall do all those things to aid in transmitting State ballots, whenever possible, to the soldiers wherever they may be.

It is also provided that by going before an officer, or a noncommissioned officer of certain rank, the soldier may prepare his ballot and mail it back, or hand it to the proper Army or naval authorities who will see that it is forwarded to the secretary of state of the State of which the soldier is a citizen. It is provided that the secretary of state, under the State law, shall forward the ballot to the proper election precinct, to which I shall advert a little later when describing the power to determine the validity of the ballots when so cast.

Probably the source of more controversy than any other is section 302 on page 6 of the report. I am sure that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is a member of the conference committee, and who worked very diligently

on this matter, will agree that this is probably the center of the measure so far as it relates to the Federal ballot. I shall read it at the risk of being tedious. Please bear in mind that this is section 302 (a). It reads as follows:

Section 302 (a). Subject to the provisions of subsection (b)—

Subsection (b) is set forth a little further down on the same page—

the provisions of this title shall apply with respect to following:

This title deals with "Use of supplementary Federal ballots." To whom shall it apply? It shall apply to the following:

(1) Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have in my hand a composite draft of Senate bill 1285 printed on February 9, 1944. I refer to page 4 thereof in order to call attention, before the Senator leaves this point, to the improvement made by the conference report over the text represented there, which is the text agreed upon by the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator read it.

Mr. AUSTIN. What I have reference to is found beginning in line 21.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of what page?

Mr. AUSTIN. Page 12. It reads as follows:

1. Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States, who state in their oath that they have not received State absentee ballots which include the officers who may be voted for under the provisions of this title.

In other words, when we finally got through working on that subsection we chopped off the limitation and left it as it appears in the report, namely, "Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States."

If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him as he goes along, I should like to invite attention to each one of the improvements, showing the difference between the text of the composite draft and the text of the conference report in order to show that in every case the conference expanded the category of voters.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Vermont, and I shall be glad to have him interrupt me whenever he desires to do so.

"Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States," is one category. I assume that most Senators are interested primarily in the persons coming within this category. They are, of course, interested in all of them, but those persons have greater difficulties than others, and consequently our anxiety to alleviate their situation is probably somewhat stimulated.

I read the second category.

2. Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I point out that the conference struck out the limitation appearing on page 13, beginning with line 9 of the composite text, in the following words:

Who state in their oath that they have not received State absentee ballots which include the officers who may be voted for under the provisions of this title.

In other words, the language of the conference report relative to category No. 2 is broader than the text of the Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Vermont. That explains the situation with regard to those who are outside the United States.

The third category is as follows:

3. Members of the armed forces, inside the United States.

That means that, within certain provisions thereafter contained, those inside the United States shall have the voting privilege.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I invite attention to what was struck out of the Green-Lucas text by the conference in making its report. I refer to the following language which appears on page 13, beginning in line 13 of the Green-Lucas text:

Members of the armed forces who are inside the United States who are residents of any State of which the secretary of state has not certified to the Commission prior to August 1, 1944, that the State has made provision for such members to vote by absentee ballot and that the State will accept postcard applications as provided for in title II of this act; and the Commission shall promptly advise the Secretaries of War and Navy of the names of the States which have so certified. Any such member of the armed forces who is inside the United States and who has not received his State ballot may vote under the provisions of this title, provided such member shall execute the oath hereinafter set forth.

All of that was stricken out, and there was substituted the language describing the third group, namely, "Members of the armed forces, inside the United States."

Mr. CONNALLY. And subject to such conditions as are thereafter set forth in subsection (b).

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Vermont. It is very plain that certain limitations were stricken out at the point to which he refers, but were they not reinserted at some other place in the bill?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; the insertions in subsection (b) were quite different and much more liberal. The limitations in the conference report would enable every State in the Union, which is not prevented by a constitutional barrier, to get ballots to its citizens, as I shall try to explain.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Colorado.

I now refer to subsection (b). It carries certain modifications which must be observed. It reads as follows:

(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to, and the ballot provided for by this title may be used by—

(1) An individual referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a)—

Those are the armed forces, members of the merchant marine outside the United States, members of the welfare organizations outside the United States, and members of the armed forces inside of the United States. Any one of those individuals is entitled to vote by State absentee ballot—

(a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (B) that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State;

In other words, if the Governor of a State certifies by the 15th of July—and we put up the date as far ahead as we consistently could in order to give the servicemen as long a time as possible to enable them to vote in the general election—if the Governor should certify by the 15th of July that his State had made no provision, enacted no law, provided no procedure which would enable the citizens thereof, those in the three categories, to vote by absentee ballot, and the Governor should also certify that the Federal ballot as to its form and so on is authorized by the laws of such State, then the person can vote the Federal ballot in that State.

No constitutional question can be raised, as I see it, as to that, because if the Governor certifies that the ballot is authorized under the law of the State, then, in effect, it becomes a State ballot to that extent only; and the Federal Government, having the right to provide the "times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives," has certainly the right to provide that, if a State accepts it, such a ballot may be used—

or (2) an individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2)—

One or two refers to soldiers and sailors outside the United States and to members of welfare organizations outside the United States. Therefore subsection (2) of subsection (b) refers to those outside the United States—

or (2) an individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, that the use of ballots provided for by this title, is authorized by the laws of such State, even though the Governor thereof does not make the certification referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (1), but only if such individual states in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made application for a State absentee ballot but, as of October 1, has not received it.

In other words, if he has made an effort to get his State absentee ballot but has failed up to the 1st of October, then he may proceed to vote the absentee Federal ballot on the certificate of the Governor as provided.

Mr. President, I do not want to take up much of the time of the Senate; most Senators are familiar with the general subject matter because of the debate heretofore on the passage of bills in relation to the matter, but I wish to say that, according to my view, this is the best possible bill that could emerge from the conference committee.

Some Senators will not like portions of the bill. In my service here, however, I do not recall any bill that ever passed this body to which I agreed in every sentence and in every paragraph and in every period and semicolon and comma. It is suggested to me by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] that I did not agree unless I prepared it and introduced it, and it was not amended. That is a contingency so remote, I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma, that it is hardly worthy of the consumption of any time.

Of course we are not going to secure a bill which will be satisfactory to everyone, because our minds are not identical, our purposes are not always the same, and, if they were, the language which we should choose in expressing them would not always agree. So, I do not in presenting the conference report entertain the hope that every one is going to embrace the bill as now framed, but I do say that those who want legislation, I believe, should support this measure, because if the conference report is rejected and the bill is not enacted I do not believe there will be any other legislation at this session of the Congress, and the elections will be coming on soon. The primaries are not very distant in some States, and whatever we do we should do speedily.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator has just remarked that the primaries are coming along soon, but as I read sections 302 and 303 they will not apply to primaries. Am I not correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think section 303 would if the soldier could get a State ballot. It would not apply to a Federal ballot primary.

Mr. DANAHER. I am talking about section 302 and section 303. They have no application to primaries, have they?

Mr. CONNALLY. Section 302 would not apply to primaries.

Mr. DANAHER. Section 303 specifically states that it is to be used "in voting in general elections under this title."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct; but let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that prior provisions as to State ballots would apply to the primaries if a soldier could get his application across and obtain a primary ballot, though of course that might be impracticable in most cases.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. To those of us who have not been in on the conference the Senator is touching upon a most important point. As I look at page 2, section 201, I find that it applies to "any primary, special, or general election." I find, however, when I go to section 203 the following:

> The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such post cards to be delivered to each person to whom this title is applicable for use for any general election at which electors for President and Vice President or Senators and Representatives in Congress are to be voted for.

So there is a distinction, is there not, between the language in section 201 and that in section 203?

Mr. CONNALLY. I invite the Senator's attention to the last two or three lines.

Mr. DANAHER. I have read them.

Mr. CONNALLY. They read:

> be made available to such persons at appropriate times for use in general elections other than those referred to above and for primary and special elections.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me repeat the question. Section 201 deals with a State ballot, does it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Section 202 applies to a State ballot?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. So that section 203 merely states that the post cards are to be made available as applications for State ballots "for use for any general election at which electors for President and Vice President or Senators and Representatives in Congress are to be voted for." Is not that so?

Mr. CONNALLY. It includes primary and special elections, as the Senator will see if he will read on down to the bottom.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator explain this: Is there a reason why the words "general election" appear about six lines from the bottom of section 203.

Mr. CONNALLY. I read the provision:

> The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such post cards to be delivered to each person to whom this title is applicable for use for any general election at which electors for President and Vice President or Senators and Representatives in Congress are to be voted for.

And so on. The idea is that officials mentioned should make every endeavor to have the post cards delivered to the individual voter in every case.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think it would be well——

Mr. CONNALLY. I am yielding now to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. OVERTON. What I wished to say would be in answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Connecticut. I think it would be well if the Senator would read the concluding sentence of section 203. It still applies to primaries.

Mr. CONNALLY. I called the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to that clause.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I had read that final sentence and I noticed, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana, that the final sentence commences:

> The post cards referred to shall also, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be made available—

And so on. Clearly, there is something that is distinguishable between those two sentences, one of which would give the post cards application for use in voting for Federal officers only, and then in the final sentence giving application to post cards for use in primary elections, as well as general elections, under certain circumstances. Surely there must have been some real differentiation in the minds of the draftsmen who put those words in there. If that were not so, why not eliminate the word "general", in the eighth line from the bottom, and insert "general, primary, and special"?

Mr. OVERTON. That could have been done. That was a mere matter of draftsmanship. There is absolutely no difference between the provisions in the two sentences. They might have all been incorporated in one sentence. Instead of that, the draftsmen elected to have a second sentence referring to primary elections as well as general elections, but the provisions are identical.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, of course it would be very difficult for the Army and Navy, with the great variety of primaries and dates, to be able to select each soldier and know what particular ballot he desired; but the bill merely provides that they shall make the ballots available, and let the soldiers, in most cases, make application for the particular ballots they desire.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, there are two States in the Union which, I understand, have constitutional provisions inhibiting absentee ballots, namely, Kentucky and New Mexico, and there is some such statutory provision in South Carolina.

The whole conference report revolves around the primary idea that if the soldiers are to be permitted to vote effectively, the States must modify and amend their laws so that the soldiers may be able to cast their ballots under the law and under the constitution within the State.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. The Army can do all that is possible to insure cooperation with the States, and what we propose in this bill is not only to make it easier for the soldier to vote, but we encourage and wish to stimulate the States to enact proper laws so that the soldiers can vote.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to endorse most heartily what the Senator has just said. To me that is a method of opening the widest door of opportunity to the soldier to vote. I am happy to tell the Senator that, recognizing that responsibility, the legislature in my own State of Maryland, which met and adjourned just last week, has put on the statute books, insofar as I have been able to interpret the law, a measure which will permit every serviceman coming from Maryland ample time to get the State ballot and to vote it from top to bottom, for all the officers whose names will be on it. If other States will do likewise, the discussion and debate we have had over this matter will have been largely to no avail, because all the servicemen will have a right to vote. If the States will do what they should do, the controversy will have been a tempest in a teapot.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Maryland, and I congratulate his State for rising to its responsibility, as well as claiming its privilege and its right. How much better it is for a citizen soldier of Maryland to vote the entire ticket than to prevent him from voting for any officers except Representatives and Senators.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that many of the other States, all that can do so, will call their legislatures and amend their absentee voting laws, if it is necessary, so that additional time may be afforded and all necessary provisions may be made whereby the men in the armed services can vote, and can do so with as wide a latitude of choice as possible.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. State rights carry with them State responsibilities and State obligations. It is not possible to pass to the Federal Government the sole obligation and the sole responsibility with regard to suffrage and voting, which has always been, under our system, a State function. If the States want to claim their privileges and their rights, they must also assume their obligations and their responsibilities. The people of the States should see to it that those within the States who are invested with authority and power perform their duty in this situation.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to ask the Senator from Texas if he will consider a possible interpretation of the difference in language to which we earlier adverted. Further reading of it on page 2, section 203, would indicate that there is this difference in the sentence which commences "The Secretaries of War and Navy." We find that they shall "cause such post cards to be delivered to each person to whom this title is applicable for use for any general election" at which Federal officers shall be voted for.

As I interpret that language upon further reading, it imposes the positive duty upon the Secretaries of War and Navy to cause the post cards to be delivered to each person when Federal officers are to be voted upon, but the final sentence merely states that they shall cause the post cards to be "made available" to various persons for use in general and primary elections. So that in one case, where the Federal officers are to be voted upon, post cards must be made available; in the other case, where State as well as Federal officers are to be voted upon, a supply of post cards shall be at hand. Is not that so?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Connecticut is probably correct in the technical interpretation of the language, but in the case of the Federal ballot the respective Secretaries are directed "wherever practicable and compatible with military operations." We must all realize that there are many things which may prevent the smooth working of this operation.

Mr. DANAHER. I understand, and that runs all through the measure. We know that to be so.

Mr. CONNALLY. If a reason is found for changing the language, it is a fact that the Federal ballot is more nearly standardized. Everyone knows the date of the election at which the Federal ballot is to be cast; it is the date of the Presidential election. But in the case of the primaries in 48 States, many of them have different dates, and it was felt that it was impracticable to require that the Army hunt up each man and deliver a ballot to him, but it was thought that, so far as practicable, the ballot should be made available. The soldier may call for it, he may request it, and upon request may secure it. That is the reason for the divergence if there is one.

Mr. DANAHER. I think undoubtedly that is so. I think the sentence commencing "The Secretaries of War and Navy" is intended explicitly to impose a positive duty on those Secretaries only with reference to general elections.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. And that, therefore, so far as primaries are concerned, in those States where the primaries in fact determine the result, and the general election in November merely confirms what has already been done, the last sentence would apply to the primaries.

Mr. CONNALLY. In answer to the Senator's suggestion that the first part of the provision was the only place where requirement was made, while the requirement there is a little more comprehensive, there is a requirement in the last sentence, that the ballot must be made available, if any soldier makes inquiry about it.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I notice that in section 201 the language is intended to apply not only to members of the armed forces, Society of Friends, and the like, but there is no limitation in any respect that they be outside the United States. Yet all individuals to whom section 302 (a) on page 6 applies must be outside the United States, except those described in clause (3).

Mr. CONNALLY. The reason for that is that section 201 applies to the State ballots, and there is no reason for making any distinction between those inside the State and those outside.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, other Senators desire to discuss the conference report. Let me say in conclusion that the report, if adopted, will do much to stimulate and to place upon the States the obligation and the duty of amending their laws so that the soldiers and sailors and others covered by this measure may have an opportunity to vote.

The measure goes as far as it is believed Congress can go under the Constitution in dealing with this subject. From a practical standpoint it goes as far, I believe, as the Congress can go, in view of the divergence of views of some Senators and Members of the House; but, on the whole, I commend it to the Senate as a wholesome measure, one which exerts to the fullest, subject to conditions or circumstances, the power of Congress to permit the members of our armed services, both at home and abroad, to exercise their privilege of suffrage, one of the highest privileges of citizenship.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will promptly accept the conference report.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the right to vote is basic to American democracy. It is the essential guaranty of representative government—of a form of government under which the wishes of the majority of the people can be made effective. It is that which distinguishes our form of government from the totalitarian form against which we are fighting. For the maintenance of representative government millions of American citizens have entered the armed forces and are fighting throughout the world.

The Congress of the United States under its constitutional authority declared the state of war which has brought these men and women into the armed forces. It is the duty of Congress under its constitutional authority to provide that they will not be disfranchised by reason of their military service. The Federal Government by the draft, or by accepting their voluntary enlistment, prevented their exercising this fundamental right of voting. It was the duty of the Federal Government so far as possible to restore the exercise of this right. Recognition of this duty prompted the Seventy-seventh Congress to pass Public Law 712, the existing servicemen's voting law, in September of 1942. At that time almost all the States had enacted absentee-balloting legislation. Nevertheless, the Congress determined that a Federal law was necessary because State legislation did not guarantee the maximum opportunity to vote for members of our armed forces.

Public Law No. 712 provided that during time of war, first, no member of the armed forces need register in order to vote; second, no member of the armed forces need pay any poll tax as a condition of voting; and, third, every member of the armed forces otherwise qualified to vote under the laws of the State of his residence, should be given the opportunity to vote in elections for Federal officials.

This law was based on certain principles. It recognized the qualifications for voting in the respective States and left

them unchanged. It changed only the two conditions of voting which generally could not be met because of military service. Its application was limited to Federal officials because under our Constitution the election of State officials is a matter for States alone. I believe these principles are sound and should be the basis of any legislation.

Parenthetically may I comment on the recent soldiers' vote message of Governor Dewey, of New York, in which he contemptuously refers to the proposed Federal ballot as "a blank piece of paper called a soldier's ballot limited to the election of Federal officials and without provision for the election of State and local officials." These implications are unfounded because, first, under the Federal Constitution the Federal ballot must be limited to Federal offices; and, second, under the existing soldiers' vote law provision is not limited to the election of Federal officials; and, third, under the Green-Lucas bill the Federal ballot is supplementary to the State ballot and only to be used in cases where the latter fails.

This is a conspicuous illustration of widespread misunderstanding on the part of some commentators, columnists, editorial writers, public speakers, and even high State officials of what the Green-Lucas bill really provides. In consequence many people believe that it provides a Federal ballot instead of a State ballot whereas it actually provides a Federal ballot supplementary to a State ballot.

A congressional election was held in 1942, and that experience showed that there were a number of defects in Public Law 712. One major defect was in the machinery which it established for voting. Under that machinery, the serviceman had to fill out and mail a post-card application for a ballot to the secretary of state of the State of his residence. The secretary of state was required to return a ballot to the serviceman. The latter then filled it out and retuned it to the secretary of state for forwarding to the appropriate election officials of the voter's residence.

Experience showed that these three steps necessary for voting were too cumbersome and time consuming. The rapid and unpredictable movement of troops. the delay and other inescapable hinderances in time of war, in adidtion to the time element involved, made it difficult, and in some cases impossible, for members of the armed forces to use the procedure.

For this reason, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and I introduced the bill now under discussion, S. 1285. This sought to overcome the communication difficulties involved in voting by servicemen during time of war by providing a simpler and more expeditious method of balloting. The so-called Green-Lucas bill reduced the three steps involved in voting under Public Law 712 to one step. The necessity of the serviceman's applying for an absentee ballot and of transmitting that ballot to the voter were eliminated. Instead, a blank ballot distributed well in advance of the election would be executed by the voter in sufficient time to be returned to the appropriate election officials for counting.

The Green-Lucas bill was first introduced on June 29, 1943. After a summer of study by its authors, by the War and Navy Departments, by the secretaries of state of the several States and by many others, an amended form of the bill was introduced on last October 12. Hearings were held, the bill was further studied by members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and by all interested parties and on November 15 it was, by a vote of 12 to 2, reported back to the Senate. Thereafter on the floor of the Senate weeks of debate ensued. During the debate the Senator from Illinois and I accepted amendment after amendment in order to meet objections that were raised to details, in the hope that we could arrive at a generally acceptable bill.

This Green-Lucas bill finally passed the Senate and was sent to conference. Although it contained some provisions I thought were unnecessary and one or two I would have preferred not to see in the bill, and although it did not contain some provisions which I considered desirable, nevertheless, I think it was an improvement on the existing law. It was a bill to give a greater opportunity for more servicemen to vote than is now possible.

The conference was prolonged, and the bill which has now been reported out bears only a superficial resemblance to the bill sent to conference by the Senate. It contains much of the language of the bill that passed the Senate, but its provisions to make it possible for more of those in the armed services to vote, and to make the voting procedure simplier, have been so changed by whittling down here and there and adding hampering conditions that I was finally forced to the conclusion that it was inadvisable to enact it into law, because under it not more, but fewer, in the armed services could vote.

The argument is made that this bill is "the best possible under the circumstances," and that "it is this bill or nothing," and so we should enact it. I do not know just what the phrase "under the circumstances" means. I suppose it means that the majority of the House managers would not agree to anything better. All the Senate managers and one-half the House managers voting, voted in favor of a compromise proposal I made, which, while it would not have been as good as the original bill, would have been an improvement on the existing law. In other words, one man stood in the way of a far better law to provide the ten or eleven million men and women in our armed services with the opportunity to vote. Perhaps under this circumstance the bill reported is the best possible.

What is meant by the phrase "this bill or nothing"? It must mean "enact this bill or leave the present law 712 unamended." Well, if the change proposed is not an improvement on the present law, why should we be urged to adopt it? If more men and women in camp, on the high seas, and at the front do not have restored to them the opportunity to vote which the Congress has taken from them, then why pass any bill?

We started out in an endeavor to help more soldiers vote. Now we find ourselves fighting to prevent the vote being taken away from those who have it under the present law.

Let me make perfectly clear to the Senate what Senate bill 1285, the so-called Green-Lucas bill, in its present form does:

First. Under section 302 (b) of the bill no member of the armed forces may use a Federal ballot unless the Governor of the State of his residence has certified prior to July 15 that the use of a Federal ballot is authorized by the law of such State.

Second. Even if the Governor of the State makes such a certification, no member of the armed forces may use a Federal ballot unless he makes oath that he applied for a State ballot prior to September 1 and as of October 1 had not received it.

Third. Even if the above conditions are complied with, no member of the armed forces within the United States may use a Federal ballot.

Title III of the proposed bill relates to the use of the Federal absentee ballot supplementary to the State absentee ballot. Essentially the three provisions I have mentioned mean that no member of the armed forces may use the Federal absentee balloting procedure provided for in title III unless the Governor certifies that the use of a ballot provided for under the Federal procedure is authorized by the laws of his home State. I believe that the laws of only three States—California, Minnesota, and North Carolina—contain a general provision permitting the use of a Federal absentee ballot. In every one of the other States there would have to be positive action by the State legislatures to enable members of the armed forces to use these ballots. This is because there are many sources of conflict between the provisions of title III and the provisions of the absentee voting laws of the various States. In every case where there is a conflict a servicemen cannot vote under the provisions of title III unless the State affirmatively acts to eliminate the conflict.

Let us consider some sources of such conflict: Title III retains the provision of Public Law 712 which makes it unnecessary for members of the armed forces to register in order to vote during time of war. The laws of many States require registration by servicemen, and some require it in person. Therefore, no Federal ballot cast by an unregistered serviceman under title III would be a ballot authorized by the laws of a State which requires registration. In some cases the State registration requirements are to be found in the constitutions of the States. In such a case it would be impossible for the State legislature to authorize the use of a ballot provided for under Senate bill 1285, because such an authorization would be inconsistent with the constitution of the State unless the constitution itself were amended.

Title III also retains the provision of Public Law 712 which makes it unnecessary for members of the armed forces

to pay a tax as a condition of voting during time of war. The laws of some States require a payment of taxes as a condition of voting. Therefore no Federal ballot cast under title III by a serviceman who does not pay such a tax would be authorized by the laws of the State which requires payment of the tax as a condition of voting. Ordinarily these State requirements are to be found in the constitutions of the States. Thus, here also, it would be impossible for the State legislature to authorize the use of this ballot, because such an authorization would be inconsistent with the constitution of the State.

The laws of almost all the States prescribe the form and contents of State absentee ballots in great detail. Frequently, the ballot is actually set out in the statute. These State ballots differ substantially from the ballot provided for in title III. Thus, no ballot cast under it would in fact be authorized by the laws of a State, unless the legislature of that State were to amend its laws so as to ratify expressly the use of such ballots.

It is needless to mention specifically any further examples of conflict between title III and the absentee balloting laws of the various States. Anyone familiar with those laws knows that they are complicated and that they contain very specific provisions as to procedure and form. I cannot emphasize too strongly the point that every specific provision as to procedure and form which does not appear in title III of Senate bill 1285, makes a ballot cast thereunder a ballot unauthorized under the laws of the State, and hence a ballot which it is impossible for a member of the armed forces to use, or at least have counted.

Therefore, it is clear that if the Congress passes S. 1285 in its present form very few members of the armed forces will be able to use the Federal ballot therein provided. Those who have been consistently opposed to any kind of a Federal absentee balloting bill know that the Federal absentee provisions of S. 1285 are meaningless, and that is why they are at last willing to vote for S. 1285 in its present form.

But in its earlier form the Federal balloting provisions of S. 1285 were not meaningless, because they were not subject to ratification by the States. Under the original Green-Lucas bill, in the event of a conflict between State law and Federal law, the Federal law was supreme—a supremacy which is derived directly from the Constitution of the United States. It seems to me unnecessary to present here in the Senate again a reply to the claim some have made that this is unconstitutional. Others as well as I have refuted this claim repeatedly, giving both an explanation of the reasons and the citation of supporting authorities. Anyone interested may find some of these in the debates reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last January 27 and March 7. Although such legislation might be justified even in peacetime, it is unnecessary now to go beyond the war powers of Congress because the law is expressly limited to time of war. Under its war powers the Congress has complete control over the rights as well as the duties of the servicemen, and has exercised it in this war. For example, the statute of limitations is superseded for them. Their civil rights are protected by suspending litigation in both Federal and State courts. Many other illustrations might be given. Yet similar laws were upheld by the courts in the first World War; and in this war no contention has been made that these laws are unconstitutional in wartime, or violate the doctrine of States' rights. They are no more and no less constitutional than a law to protect the servicemen in their right to vote. Yet in the compromise bill now under consideration it is provided that in the case of any conflict between Federal and State law, the State law is supreme by the terms of the conference bill itself.

Thus the Federal Congress is asked to abdicate its undoubted right as set forth in Public Law 712, and hand over to the States exclusive jurisdiction in this matter. Instead of Congress doing all it now can do to aid the servicemen, the proposal is that it abandon even that which it already has done. The Federal Congress in effect says to the States, "In this matter whatever law we pass will be subject to your approval or veto." It must be remembered that it was because of the failure of the States to act effectively that the Federal Congress legislated 2 years ago, and that it was to perfect that legislation that the Green-Lucas bill was introduced.

The statement is made that the States are at last aroused and will pass new legislation. That may be true. I believe that is one good result of the agitation arising from the prolonged discussion of this bill. It must be borne in mind, however, that this State legislation will be enacted whether or not this proposed amendment to Public Law 712 passes. Whether the States keep their present absentee ballot laws, or enact new and better laws, it will still be desirable to provide this supplementary Federal ballot for many cases in which for one reason or another, the State ballot cannot be used.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BONE. Is it the view of the Senator from Rhode Island that the adoption of the conference report would not only fail to simplify the matter of voting, but would complicate it?

Mr. GREEN. That is my opinion.

Mr. BONE. I am frank to say that I am unable to understand why, in view of the unending barrage of criticism over the complications of the income-tax schedules, Congress itself should now, by its own conscience, act in the passage of legislation, seek to complicate the process of voting.

Many men are getting "unshirted hell" for formulating income-tax return forms which are so complicated that they defy the understanding of many; but Congress cannot walk away from the personal responsibility for complicating the voting issue. The young men who are carrying rifles in our Army are interposing their bodies between the bayonets of the enemy and the Constitution itself. If they fail in their efforts to defend this country, there will be no constitution over which Congress can worry itself. That bulks larger in my mind, I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island, than any other consideration. If a boy is willing to die to preserve the Constitution, certainly such sacrifice calls upon us to make it possible for him to exercise the highest privilege in a republic, which is the right to vote. So far as I am concerned, I want to sweep away all obstacles to giving the boys who are dying or will die in this war an opportunity, perhaps for the last time, to exercise the privilege which has been bought with the blood of millions of men who have died to establish free governments.

Mr. GREEN. As to the suggestion that this bill is very complicated, I may say that outsiders who have not been familiar with the development of its provisions have commented to me that it is almost as difficult to understand as the income-tax law.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In line with what the able Senator from Washington has just said, I should like to make an observation in the time of the Senator from Rhode Island.

With respect to the income-tax blanks which are so complicated, when the President sent his veto message to Congress, the Congress specifically pointed out to the country that the income-tax blanks, complicated as they are, were compiled by the Treasury Department. At that time Congress did not take any responsibility for the type or form of the income-tax blanks which are now being filled out by millions of taxpayers. But so far as the compromise soldiers' vote bill is concerned—this hodge podge of red tape and meaningless nothing—the Congress must assume responsibility for all the barriers which are placed in front of the soldier as a result of this compromise. We cannot shift the responsibility at this hour, so far as red tape, contingencies, confusion, and all the other barriers which have been placed in the bill are concerned, making it practically impossible for the soldier to vote.

Mr. GREEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let us consider for a moment in how many States the legislatures will enact positive legislation expressly authorizing members of the armed forces to use the Federal absentee ballot. It is, of course, impossible to answer this question categorically, but after studying the conference proposal and reading the comments of some of our Governors, it seems to me that such would not be the case in many States.

In some States it is clearly impossible for the State legislatures to authorize the use of the Federal absentee ballot. Absentee-balloting statutes enacted by the

legislatures of the States of New Mexico and Kentucky have been declared to violate their State constitutions by the supreme courts of both of those States. There is language in section 302 of S. 1285 which purports to give servicemen from States like Kentucky and New Mexico, stationed both inside and outside the United States, the right to use the Federal ballot. This language is completely meaningless, because servicemen from those States cannot use a Federal ballot unless their Governors certify that such ballots are authorized by State laws. Since no absentee ballots are authorized by the laws of those States, it is obvious that Federal absentee ballots are not authorized by the laws of those States. Hence it would be impossible for the Governors of those States to make any such certification.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In connection with what the Senator is now discussing, I wish to point out that under Public Law 712, which is the positive assertion of Federal power under the Federal Constitution to give the soldiers a vote, it is entirely possible that under that law soldiers from New Mexico and Kentucky could vote.

Mr. GREEN. Exactly.

Mr. HATCH. However, by the language which has been inserted in the bill, that right has now been taken away from them because the Governor is prohibited from certifying that under Federal authority the soldiers might vote. He is restricted to the narrow confines of the State law, which gives no right whatever.

Mr. GREEN. In other words, the pending proposed law would take away from the soldiers and sailors and others in the armed forces from Kentucky and New Mexico, for example, the right given them by the existing law.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is absolutely correct. There is no question about it at all in my mind.

Mr. GREEN. It is impossible for these Governors to make such certification for another reason. According to the wording of this compromise bill, any Governor would have to certify to two entirely contradictory statements (1) that his State has made no provision enabling the servicemen to vote by absentee ballot and; (2) that the laws of his State authorize the servicemen to use the Federal ballot provided in S. 1285. I will leave it to others to explain how any Governor can make such a certificate, and if he cannot, how any serviceman can vote in that State.

There are constitutional provisions in other States, also, which prevent the acceptance of such ballots. As I have said before, the constitutions of some States require voters to register or to pay taxes before they can vote. Governor Dewey said in his message that the kind of ballot provided for in title III of S. 1285 violates the Constitution of the State of New York. A study of the constitutions of the 48 States will show that these are not isolated instances.

As to the States which do not have constitutional provisions which would prevent their legislatures from authorizing the use of Federal absentee ballots by members of the armed forces, I am doubtful that very many will actually pass statutes which would make it possible for our soldiers, sailors, and marines to use these ballots. I can draw no other conclusion from statements made by the Governors of several States than that they have no intention of requesting their legislatures to authorize the use of Federal ballots.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator remember how many such there are?

Mr. GREEN. I have a list of them. I can find it a little later.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not wish to put the Senator to that trouble. I thought that perhaps he carried in his memory the number of them. My recollection is that there are some 27 of those States. That is my recollection, but I will check it myself.

Mr. GREEN. Furthermore, 11 States will not be holding special sessions of their legislatures this year, and the legislatures of 10 other States have already met and adjourned.

Thus, my conclusion is that very few States are going to authorize the use of ballots provided under title III of S. 1285.

But even in those few cases where States expressly permit the use of Federal ballots there are other serious difficulties. Section 302 provides that no member of the armed forces may use a Federal ballot unless he swears that he applied for a State ballot prior to September 1 but had not received one as of October 1. This seems to me to be a most unfortunate provision, because it makes it impossible for a soldier from a State which is willing to accept Federal ballots cast under S. 1285 to vote a Federal ballot unless he has met a very rigid and arbitrary time limitation. I cannot understand why the Congress should make it as difficult as possible instead of as easy as possible for servicemen to vote. There may be wartime conditions preventing a member of the armed forces from applying for a State absentee ballot before September 1. What if he were inducted into military service after September 1? Is it not possible that a sailor on the high seas would have to transmit his ballot in September to make sure that it will be returned in time to be counted? But under this provision he would have to wait until October 1 to execute a Federal ballot, even though by waiting until then he thereby disfranchises himself.

I should like to point out also that a Federal ballot under S. 1285 may be used only by members of the armed forces and merchant marine who are outside the United States. Once more I must confess that I cannot understand what prompts a provision such as this. It seems to me that where for any reason a member of the armed forces stationed anywhere in this country has not voted under State law, he should be given an opportunity to vote under Federal law. There is no justice in this discrimination, especially as a serviceman cannot know in advance whether he will be at home or abroad.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The reason I rose, Mr. President, is because the Senator had just made a statement which I think is somewhat confusing, although I admit that everything about this bill is confusing. The Senator had just stated that he sees no good reason why the soldiers within the United States should not be permitted to vote under Federal law.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Is the Senator referring to Public Law 712, or to title III of the conference report?

Mr. GREEN. I am merely enunciating a general principle as applying to any law.

Mr. HATCH. Very well. I thought the Senator was making reference to some particular language.

Mr. GREEN. No; I believe the members of the armed services should all be treated alike, because there are a great many circumstances which would prevent a man in the armed services in this country from using his right to vote a State ballot, just as there are difficulties in his voting a State ballot abroad. Many men change their position, their location, from one place to another so frequently that the ballot will never catch up with them. I think they should vote a State ballot and be given a State ballot, but in a great many cases the State ballot would not reach them in time to be used, and in such cases I think they should not be deprived of the right to vote. They should have a right to vote under the Federal ballot.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Rhode Island and other Senators continually talk about the soldiers being deprived of the right to vote. We are not depriving the soldier of the right to vote. We are not only according to him all the rights he now has, but are giving him additional rights. I rather resent the statement continually being made that we are depriving the soldiers of anything. We are not depriving them of anything at all. If they can vote without any action being taken by the Congress, let them go ahead and vote, but they cannot all vote under the present circumstances.

I should like to ask the Senator one other question.

Mr. GREEN. I should like to answer the first question. Perhaps the Senator thought it was unanswerable. In my opinion the answer is very clear.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I know that in the case of the Senator from Rhode Island nothing is unanswerable.

Mr. GREEN. The Congress has taken away from the men who have been drafted, or who have accepted service voluntarily, the opportunity to vote. Of course, they have the right to vote but

by drafting them we have taken away from them the opportunity to vote. We have taken them from their homes and sent them overseas, or to different sections of this country. We have deprived them of the privilege of registering, paying a tax, or complying with the conditions of voting, or even from getting a ballot so that they can vote. In other words, because of the action of Congress these men have been deprived of the opportunity to vote. I do not believe that that statement can be questioned. Since Congress has deprived them of the opportunity to vote it should, so far as possible, restore to them that opportunity.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas thinks that that is what we are doing by this bill. The Senator said awhile ago that he thought every soldier or citizen of the United States should have the right to vote a Federal ballot.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; if he cannot get a State ballot.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is provided in this bill.

Mr. GREEN. I beg the Senator's pardon. It is expressly stated and the Senator read it himself. It is limited to men outside of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator read it himself, it is so.

Mr. GREEN. I said the Senator from Texas read it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand. If the Senator from Texas read it, it is so. But would the Senator favor that sort of a system in peacetime?

Mr. GREEN. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Would he favor a Federal ballot for everyone?

Mr. GREEN. No; but this is wartime, and the proposed law itself is limited to wartime.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was about to make that suggestion, and then I was going to emphasize again the fact the Senator from Vermont just stated, which the Senator from Texas evidently ignores, that under Public Law 712—and I am not arguing its constitutionality—every individual in the armed forces of the United States, wherever he may be, is entitled to vote that ballot. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. But the pending conference report absolutely deprives every soldier who is within the United States of a chance to cast that ballot, with the intended exception of the three States mentioned, and, to my mind, it also deprives them of it if the servicemen happen to be within the United States.

Mr. GREEN. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, and then I shall not bother him further?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from New Mexico points out that there are three States in the Union whose citizens cannot vote an absentee ballot. Is that correct?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; under this proposed law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under any law?

Mr. HATCH. No; I just explained that a moment ago when the Senator was not on the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sorry; I always regret not hearing the Senator from New Mexico. But in reference to preventing the soldiers from New Mexico from voting, if they are prevented from voting, it is because New Mexico prevents them from voting and because New Mexico has no law under which they can vote. The fact that New Mexico will not perform its duty is no reason why the Federal Government should come along and perform the duty for that State.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me further?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I must make reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Texas. It is unfortunate, I am sure, that New Mexico does not have an adequate absentee-voting law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Neither does my State, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say to the Senator that, assuming it to be constitutional, the Congress of the United States provided nearly 2 years ago an absentee ballot for every member of the armed forces from the State of New Mexico. Even though New Mexico had been deficient in her duty, Congress tried to correct that deficiency. But this bill reaches out and takes away what a former Congress tried to give, and with that the State of New Mexico has had nothing to do.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me to say a word in response to the suggestion of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know whether the Senator from New Mexico thought of this, but suppose that the Congress should pass the pending measure and that it were to be followed by an act of the Legislature of New Mexico providing in very simple language for procedure by the officers of the State of New Mexico which would permit the use of the Federal ballot described in this bill. What I desire to know is whether the Senator from New Mexico would consider the possibility that the act of Congress was constitutional, and that if the Congress had seen fit not to consider the wishes or public policy of New Mexico in the matter, still it would have been constitutional to have imposed such a ballot on the citizens of New Mexico.

If that is the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico, as it is that of the Senator from Vermont—we do not disagree even today about that fundamental question—in the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico would not the act of the Legislature of New Mexico in ratifying the use of this procedure be strictly within this distribution of authority that he and I recognize, namely, that New Mexico would then be operating under the supreme law of the land, that is a statute of Congress, passed in pursuance of the Federal Constitution? Does the Senator understand my question or have I made it too involved?

Mr. HATCH. I understand the Senator's question, and if I may answer, Mr. President——

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that he is now calling back into play the powers of the Federal Congress to enact legislation for the soldiers under the Federal Constitution. If that be correct, under that theory, if the language of this bill were so worded, I would say that there would be a possibility that the soldiers from New Mexico could vote; but in the bill we now find more restrictive provisions, so that, frankly, I do not think anybody can tell whether this bill calls for the exercise of Federal authority or for the exercise of State authority. That is one of the reasons I cannot support it, for, in addition to the procedures which the Senator from Vermont has mentioned, the Governor of New Mexico must still certify that this bill is authorized by State law.

Mr. AUSTIN. No, not that; that was not in my question.

Mr. HATCH. I know it was not in the Senator's question, but is still in the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; the bill only provides with reference to the use of procedure; it does not provide an acceptance by the States of the Federal statute. The only condition to voting by a citizen of New Mexico would be that the certificate cover the use of the ballot provided for by this title. That is all. All the Governor would have to certify would be that "the use of the ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State." He would not have to certify that the legislature had taken the whole act and ratified it. He would merely attempt to do the thing I asked the Senator from New Mexico about; namely, hold it fast to the war power of the Congress to enact legislation to govern the armed forces and to provide for the support of the Army and the maintenance of the Navy and to enact all laws that are necessary to carry on these powers, including the making of war; and he would be merely certifying that his legislature had recognized the validity of an act of Congress passed under the war powers of the Constitution when he certified to a brief resolution to the effect that the Federal statute providing a Federal war ballot and procedures affecting voting by absent war voters, "are authorized in this State." I think a few lines such as those would cover the whole situation for New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island once more yield to me?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that all during the conference and since then I have studiously tried to avoid considering this proposed law expressly in the light of what might happen in my own State, because I have never thought that Congress ought to legislate merely for one State. But necessarily, and naturally I think, I have been interested and have given thought to what would happen in New Mexico, and I say to the Senator from Vermont the very argument he makes in explanation makes the matter more confusing to me than it was before.

I do not mean to say that is so by reason of anything the Senator has said, except that I do know that there was the absolute intent in the conference to abandon the theory of Federal power under the Federal Constitution and confine this bill to a State ballot proposition. I thought the conferees had practically done that thing, although I am not certain about that, and I do not believe we can determine whether we have a State ballot law or a Federal ballot law under this conference report, and, as I have stated, that is one of the reasons for my position.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think we have both of them.

Mr. HATCH. I doubt it very much.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from Vermont permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is troubling me in connection with section 302 is the power of the Governor of a State to interpret the law and certify his interpretation of the law to the Federal commission which the bill would create. I have found no provision, either in the constitutions of the various States or in the statutes of the States, which would permit or allow the Governor to interpret the law and certify his interpretation of the law.

If that is sound, then this section is absolutely useless, and no one can vote under it, because, taking the Governor of the State of New Mexico, for instance, he could not certify an interpretation of New Mexico law. Does the Senator understand that this requires him to interpret the law, and certify what the law provides?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, that is straining pretty hard to arrive at an interpretation that was not intended. What is referred to is a mere ministerial function. It might just as well have been the secretary of state. It is quite customary for the secretary of state to certify that here are on the statute books such and such laws. In this case that function is given to the Governor. What he really certifies is a fact rather than an interpretation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have not as yet finished my answer.

Mr. CONNALLY. I beg pardon.

Mr. AUSTIN. So far as concerns soldiers from Vermont in the Orient, which is the most remote spot in point of getting the ballots there and back, if the law of Vermont is so restricted in its time table that that could not be done, and it is not a feasible procedure, and that is all there is to it, then the Vermont soldier will get his chance to vote by the Federal ballot.

Mr. FERGUSON. Provided the Governor of the Senator's State does something.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And that something is that he shall certify, prior to the 15th of July of this year, that "the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State." Suppose there are two sets af factors, one that the Governor will not certify, even though the law of his State permits him to certify. He can then, by his failure to certify, keep the man from Vermont from voting a Federal ballot.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; that would qualify the man from Vermont to have the Federal ballot. That is one reason why this provision is inserted. It is not within the power of the Governor of any State to deprive the citizens of his State of the ballot.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask another question, if the Senator will yield. Let us consider subsection (2). I am not reading from the bill, and therefore cannot give the line. I am reading from the report, but I refer to subsection (2). It says:

> An individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)—

Which means the soldiers outside the United States as well as the other persons provided for outside the United States—that is, members of the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, and so on—can vote provided two things happen: First, the Governor certifies that they may use this war ballot as a legal ballot in the State; second, that they will themselves certify or swear that they have, prior to the 1st day of September, made application for a ballot and by the 1st of October have not received it. Two things must be done before the soldier outside the United States can vote. First, the Governor must certify and, second, the man himself must certify that he has sent for a ballot and that he has not received it by the 1st of October.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator will permit me to answer, what is this terrible thing called certifying? From what is said one would suppose it was something the doing of which would be obnoxious to a Governor. If that is an impediment to affording the soldiers opportunity to vote let us throw up our hands. I cannot conceive of the Governor of a single State in the Union who would be unwilling to certify to the laws of his State. That takes care of question No. 1.

In the second place, what State is there which has the opportunity to pass a statute which would not pass a simple statute of four lines to this effect:

> *Resolved*, That provision contained in any Federal statute for a Federal war ballot and procedures affecting voting by absentee war voters, are authorized in this State.

What State would not pass it, if it had a chance to do so? If it did, then it would be directly in line with what is proposed. A State which has never passed such a statute of course has never qualified its citizens to use a Federal ballot. That is where the distinction came in the conference. There was one body, the Senate, which favored a ballot which did not require State ratification, a Federal ballot which rested upon the war powers of the Constitution, and for which I voted, and in which I thoroughly believe at this minute. There was another House which said, "That is unconstitutional. The war powers do not extend to the matter of elections and qualifications of voters and voting procedures, and therefore it is unconstitutional, and we will have none of it. We will have nothing to do with the controlling of State elections, and Federal elections, too."

Very well; that is how we stood in the conference, plumb against each other. It is not possible to compromise on a principle. One is either for it or against it. That is the way we were; we could not compromise on that. One side or the other had to give in before we could take a single step forward in composing the differences with respect to the details of transportation, and all the devices for aiding and spurring up the States to do what they should do to expand their timetables. All other questions were held up until one side or the other would yield on that proposition. The Senate conferees yielded, not on principle, for I adhere to my original belief in this matter; but we yielded in practice. Here is a matter on which we can agree without surrendering our theory. We can provide that what we have written into the Federal statute shall not be operative in the State of Vermont unless the Governor of the State of Vermont can certify, because it is true, that the legislature of that State has said that provisions of the Federal statute providing a Federal war ballot and procedures affecting voting by absent war voters are authorized in his State. That removes the whole question of constitutionality.

This conference report differs from Public Law No. 712 in that very respect, that no question of constitutionality could be raised about this bill, whereas it is possible to raise such a question as to Public Law 712. I am not saying anything about the constitutionality of Public Law 712. I do not have to say it. We are now confronted with another proposition, that is, can we go along and have two ballots instead of one, a State ballot and a Federal ballot, give the soldier two opportunities instead of one, practically assure the voters of any State in the Union, except those which are inhibited by constitutional provision, a chance to have their voice registered at the polls? That is the point we have reached. I think we have accomplished that. I am not so very proud of this work, but it represents tremendous study. We were 21 days altogether in conference, we held 13 joint meetings, and there were two special meetings of the Senate conferees, and the problem was as I have stated it.

Senators know what it is to agree by composing opposing views toward the text of any measure. A text which is not very lucid will be obtained, and I admit that that is the case in this instance. We are dealing with the result of this attempt to compose the differences between the House and the Senate, and it will never be entirely satisfactory to either side.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have found by experience that if I yield for a question, it will mean yielding for a long discussion and practically yielding the floor. That seriously interrupts the current of my argument, and I prefer—it will not take me much longer—to complete my argument before I yield again.

The only standard by which Senate bill 1285 can be judged is whether it provides a greater opportunity to vote for more members of the armed forces than does Public Law 712, the existing law. Two questions must be asked. First, would more soldiers vote under this bill than under existing law? Second, would it be easier for soldiers to vote under this bill than under existing law? When I analyze the conference bill in terms of these two questions I am forced to conclude that Public Law 712, inadequate though it is, is a better law than Senate bill 1285.

Public Law 712 provides a method of voting for members of the armed forces from all of the 48 States whether they are stationed inside or outside the United States. Senate bill 1285 does not.

Public Law 712 eliminates registration and poll-tax requirements. Senate bill 1285 does not.

Public Law 712 contains none of the restrictive limitations as to time of application for ballot, transmittal of ballot, and return of ballot which are to be found in many of the State absentee balloting laws which will govern under S. 1285.

Public Law 712 does not, it is true, provide an adequate method of voting for members of the armed forces. But if the Congress is unable to agree upon a more effective method of voting than that provided in Public Law 712 it ought at least refrain from passing S. 1285 and thereby deprive our soldiers, sailors, and marines of whatever opportunity to vote does exist now under Federal law.

The Green-Lucas bill was introduced with the purpose of amending the present law so as to improve the facilities for voting and to increase the number of those who could vote by absentee ballot. It would be better to pass no amended law at all than one which would not eliminate the present handicaps to voting, and which would not increase, but would decrease the number of those who under it would be eligible to vote. Therefore, it is my opinion that the Congress will do the members of the armed forces a greater service by taking no action at all than by passing S. 1285.

In conclusion, there are two further thoughts I would leave with the Senate. In the first place, the story of this legislation does not redound to the credit of the Congress. I refer not only to the interminable delays in consideration of the amendment, and not only to the futility of the result achieved by decreasing instead of increasing the number of those in the armed forces who will be able to vote, and in making more instead of less complicated the procedure of voting. I refer more especially to the fact that Congress, at times critical of the exercise of its authority by others, and at times claiming more authority for itself, yet in this instance seems incapable of using the authority it has, and abandons to the States a matter over which it has both the right and the duty to legislate itself. The people want action, and in vain look to the Congress for it.

In the second place, if our American soldiers and sailors are deprived of their right to vote, what answer will they give when the men fighting by their side from Australia, New Zealand, and Canada, ask our men, "Why will not your Government give you the opportunity to vote? We have it." Furthermore, what answer will they give to their German and Japanese prisoners of war who say to them, "We thought you were fighting for democracy and that is the right to vote. Yet your Government takes that right away from you when are fighting for it. Is there after all any fundamental difference between your Government and ours?" I ask you, Senators, what answers you would have our servicemen make to these pointed questions?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give us any estimate of how many more soldiers could vote under Public Law 712 than under the provisions of the conference report?

Mr. GREEN. No; I cannot. I can only estimate them by classes of individuals, and I tried to summarize, as the Senator will remember, if he was listening, the reasons why I concluded that far more individuals would be able to vote under existing law than would be able to vote under the proposed amendment to that law.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator think it would be as many as two or three million individuals?

Mr. GREEN. I think so.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator thinks that two or three million more individuals could vote under the present law than under the conference-report measure?

Mr. GREEN. I would rather not deal in figures, but a very large number who can vote will have the opportunity to vote under the present law, but would never have such opportunity under the proposed law.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, if the conference report is adopted, then, in the Senator's opinion, two or three million individuals will not be able to vote who otherwise would be able to vote?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. AUSTIN obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield for that purpose?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Radcliffe
Andrews	Green	Revercomb
Austin	Guffey	Reynolds
Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smith
Brewster	Holman	Stewart
Bridges	Jackson	Taft
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Bushfield	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Vandenberg
Connally	McFarland	Wagner
Cordon	McKellar	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	Maloney	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Millikin	Weeks
Downey	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	Willis
George	Overton	
Gerry	Pepper	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is absent attending the funeral of the late State Senator Weaver, of Virginia.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I desire to reply briefly to the query of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] regarding whether more or fewer soldiers would be able to vote under the conference report than under existing law. I shall not undertake to be categorical about it, and to say "yes" or "no"; but I shall furnish the Senator with proof, and he can make the answer "yes" or "no," himself.

Under Public Law 712 the great category of members of the merchant marine or the War Shipping Administration is not included. It is a category which I was informed Saturday night now contains 132,000 men. At the hearings the number was stated as being 125,000 men, but that unit has been constantly augmented. Of the whole number, not all are absent at the same time. Some of the members of that group are on shore. The best estimate given to me of the number who will be offshore or outside the United States at any given time on

a conservative basis is 87,000. Very well; compare the number of men who will be affected by the operation of Public Law 712 with that number. According to the proof, the operation of Public Law 712 produced only 28,000 votes. That number is approximately only one-third of the number which constitute this additional category which will be given the privilege of voting if the bill which is the subject of the conference report shall become law. In addition to the members of the merchant marine, there are the members of the American Red Cross, the members of the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the members of the United Service Organizations. Those are the services which my distinguished colleague caused to be added under the provisions of the bill on which the conference report has been filed. I cannot give the exact figures, but I can give approximate figures. They are not large, but they are sufficient to affect the result of the vote: Members of the American Red Cross overseas or now outside the United States, 5,000; members of the Society of Friends and United Service Organizations, estimated at 5,000. Those are cold figures, and are stated on a conservative basis.

In connection with the question of additional votes which will probably be cast by virtue of the bill which is the subject of the pending conference report, instead of under presently existing law, I desire to call attention to the following: The conference report, beginning at page 2, and extending through pages 2, 3, and 4, down to section 207 (a), covers additional machinery for getting the State ballots to the soldiers. That is all brand new, and it is important. It tends to facilitate voting by State ballots. It was not in Public Law 712, and is not in it now. There is no such machinery at all in that law. Not only that, but we have had the experience of the last election, when the members of the armed services who are the transporters of mail offshore in time of war found it utterly impossible to comply with the requisitions of a great State such as the State of New York, whose information book contained 900 pages.

In the conference report we have a provision relating to facilities and machinery for State ballots alone which is really bound to augment the number of persons who will be able to vote, but for whom no provision for help is contained in Public Law 712.

I could go on with other matters, but I wonder if what I have stated answers the Senator's question.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; the Senator has answered my question. However, I wish he would continue; I should like to hear the remainder of the answer.

Mr. AUSTIN. I shall further answer the question of the Senator from North Dakota in this way: Under the conference report the provisions of section 302 (a) and (b) are such as to extend the privilege of voting to all three categories; that is, the armed forces outside the United States, the services which are connected with the armed forces outside the United States, and the armed forces inside the United States.

I refer to a report by the Bureau of the Census regarding the soldier vote of 1942, which report is found on page 86 of the hearings held on October 29 and November 5, 1943. If experience is the lamp to guide our feet, it is probably the best resort to which we can turn in order to judge the probable effect of the passage of the conference report bill as compared with the existing law of 1942. From the report to which I have referred it appears that in 27 States the maximum time available for the absentee voting transactions in 1942, as shown in table III, was 30 days or less.

I digress long enough to point out that the evidence shows that the minimum time required for the transportation of mail which would take the ballots, postal cards, and returns across the Pacific to the most remote stations and theaters of operation in the Orient, is greater than 30 days.

As I recall, it is 42 days. I will call attention to the exact time later, but I assure the Senate that it is greater than 30 days. Therefore certainly in the case of 27 States, if those States have not held sessions of their legislatures, or do not do so in the future, to extend the time beyond 30 days, voters from the 27 States would be without ballots unless a Federal ballot was provided. If we rely on the States, they cannot get their ballots started until 30 days before the election, and there is not sufficient time to enable the ballots to be returned to the polls in the States. That is the situation in 27 States.

If it is a hardship for a State to hold a session of its legislature for the purpose of extending the time, then what? Under the terms of the conference report, every one of those States would be qualified, provided there were authority in the State which would allow the Governor of the State to say, "This State has made provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot", or the contrary. If we enact the proposed law, and the 27 States fail to take action to enable the Federal ballot to be recognized at the polls, what happens? On October 1, which is more than 30 days before the election, the soldier receives a ballot with certainty. He receives the short form of ballot, under one or the other of those provisions.

In other words, by the existing law, Public Law 712, the soldier has only one opportunity of voting, and that is by a ballot which is either the short form or the long form. If the State exercises its option to add to it the State ticket, it is a long form of ballot, but there are not two separate ballots.

Under the terms of the conference report the soldier would have two opportunities to vote. If by October 1st he had made his request for a State ballot and had not received the State ballot, he would get out of storage the short form of ballot and cast it. Let us assume that on October 2nd his State ballot comes along. He wants to vote for his own State officers, so he votes the State ballot. There is nothing in this proposal to prevent it. So he sends two ballots across the ocean, and in all probability they will both reach their destination. But when they arrive, only one of them can be counted, and that is his State ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. First, let me compliment the Senator from Vermont on his extraordinarily lucid and cogent discussion of the conference report. I thank him for it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. It seems to me that the Senator from Vermont in the last few minutes of discussion, is according to section 302 (b), subclause 2, a little greater weight than that to which its language would seem to entitle it. I am wondering whether the Senator, through inadvertence, has made a statement perhaps too sweeping, or if in fact he believes that it goes as far as his answer to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] would seem to indicate. It is important that this point be most definitely established. It is utterly essential to our final conclusion with reference to this bill.

Let me say further to the Senator from Vermont that while we went into the question only briefly today in the earlier discussion, I fear we have not done justice to the language which the conferees bring us. Let me point out to the Senator the fact that in subsection (b) of section 302, subclause 1 is said to apply to all the individuals mentioned in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of subsection (a).

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. But subclause 2 of subsection (b) does not apply at all to paragraph 3 of section 302 (a), and consequently does not apply to any members of the armed forces who are inside the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct; and I will tell the Senator why. Subclause 2 deals only with the cases in which there has been failure to get the ballot. Is not that true?

Mr. DANAHER. That is my understanding; and it applies to the 27 States which, for one reason or another, mechanically cannot comply in the sense that they cannot get the ballots into the hands of the soldiers.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. Subclause 1 relates to the States which have not adopted State statutes or balloting procedures which can be executed within the time table. In other words, subclause 1 is the case of no law. Subclause 2 is the case of no ballot. That is the difference between the two. In the one case there must be an application, and in the other there does not have to be an application. It is not necessary to send a post card to get the Federal ballot. The Federal ballots are all sent over now. The post cards are used only to ask for State ballots. Under subclause 2, the soldier says, "I have used a post card and asked for a State ballot. I did it on September 1. It is now October 1, and it ought to be here, but I have not received it; therefore, give me one of the Federal ballots." So he mails a Federal ballot. That may be the only ballot he will ever cast; but if he should

receive a State ballot after that, he would have a right to vote it; and if it were received at the polling place it would be counted, and would be superior to the Federal ballot. The conference report makes the State ballot superior to the Federal ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. However, if the absentee is within the United States, then subclause 2 of subsection (b) will not apply.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. And the assumption is that he is near enough to his home, and the mail service is subject to so many less hazards at home than overseas, that the probability is that he will get his State ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. But in that respect he is no worse off than he is under State law, he is no worse off than he is under Public Law 712, and insofar as his brother overseas is concerned, subsection (2) is an expansion of all existing remedies for the absentee voter.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator has made a beautiful explanation. He has clarified the situation enormously. His statement has unfolded the procedure so that it is clear and understandable. I wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut. His statement has been of very great help and, in my opinion, it will have a tendency—I did not make any promise that I would not say this, did I?—it will very largely increase the number of men who will get a chance to vote over the number who would have such opportunity under Public Law No. 712, which provides no such procedure, no such facility.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect will this new law, if enacted, and which repeals specifically all the present law excepting sections 1 and 2, which relate only to registration and the poll tax——

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. By implication.

Mr. BARKLEY. Waiving the question of whether it repeals them by implication, it does repeal all the remainder of the text and substitutes for it the new matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The new law would apply only to service men and women overseas and not in the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. I mean, in effect it would do so.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; not in effect either. I have the language before me. Here is what it states:

> Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the provisions of this title—

That is, the title relating to the Federal voting—

> shall apply with respect to the following:
>
> 1. Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States.
>
> 2. Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.
>
> 3. Members of the armed forces, inside the United States.

That is a narrow category. It does not include the services that are attached, the supposition being that the members of the armed services here on this continent will very easily be able to use title II instead of title III.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is all summed up in the provision of the bill which requires the Governor to certify that by some act the legislature has validated this act of Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. At some time in its history. It does not have to be by a future act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, that raises the question of whether the legislature can validate an act of Congress which is not in existence.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will show the Senator how it can do so, that is, how it can do so in my opinion.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not really what I was coming to. Under the laws of my State and under the laws of New Mexico, or under constitutional provisions there is some doubt whether the legislature can pass an absentee voting law at all, and whether it can validate an absentee balloting law passed by Congress. A considerable number of soldiers voted under Public Law 712, there were not a great many, but even soldiers from my State cast votes. It seems to me that under the new provision here presented, unless the Governor certifies that the legislature has enacted a law validating this proposed law, and inasmuch as the proposed law repeals all the present law except sections 1 and 2, and to which I have referred, the soldiers, sailors, marines, and all others in the armed forces from my State would not be permitted to vote at all under this law, because the Governor could not make any such certification.

Mr. AUSTIN. If there is any State which has no absentee voting law at all, or which has a constitutional provision prohibiting it anyway, I cannot see how that State has any vote to lose.

Mr. BARKLEY. The present law was enacted under the theory that Congress had the right to provide a means by which the men in the armed services could vote, and, as I recall, the Senator from Vermont took that position.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did; and I stand on it now.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was thought that Congress, having taken the men away from the place where they could vote, had a right to make provision to enable them to vote for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. It was under that theory that we passed the law, and it was under that theory that they voted, although there was no absentee voting law in the State itself. But this bill would repeal all of that and base it all on the contingency of the Governor being able to certify that the legislature had passed a law giving the members of the armed services the right to vote, or had validated this particular statute. While under the present law some votes were cast in 1942 by servicemen from my State, I do not see how any of them could be permitted to vote under the proposed statute, because it is not based on the right of Congress to say whether the men shall have a right to vote, but it is based on the right of Congress to say that if the Governor does certain things which the legislature must have provided for in advance of his certificfiation, then the men may vote.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not an important job for any officer to certify that a State has passed such a statute.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is so important that he must know that there is such a statute.

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly. What is all this hullabaloo about casting some doubt on the problem of a soldier getting his ballot? That seems to me the most absurd thing I ever heard of. Can the Senator conceive of a Governor refusing to certify that there exists a law on the statute books of his State that will enable a citizen of his State to cast his ballot?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. AUSTIN. I cannot conceive of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. He does not certify simply that the legislature of the State has passed a law, which it could do independently of the Congress, giving the men the right to vote by absentee ballot, but he must still certify, as I read the proposed new act, that the legislature has enacted a law that specifically validates this act of Congress.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator has correctly interpreted the situation. That is just the point of difference between the Senate and the House positions.

Mr. BARKLEY. In States which have not done this, and cannot do it unless the Governor calls an extra session of the legislature, no Governor would be able to certify in such a way as to give the service men and women a right to vote.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, that is quite true. It is absolutely the difference between the position taken by the Senate and the position taken by the House. There was an irreconcilable difference. It was necessary for one side to yield, or there would not have been any bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate all that, and I am willing to concede that the Senate conferees did the very best they could, and got the best they could obtain in view of the situation and the position taken by the House conferees. But I am required now to exercise my own judgment about what they did get, which is admittedly the best they could get.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. The Senator will find difficulty in discovering anything in Public Law 712, the existing law, that is not in the conference report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. What is more, if the Senator will take the subject of facilities under consideration, or aids to the soldiers, he will find in the conference report that that is one of the most important factors upon which we agreed, namely, aid in getting the ballot over and back, doing away with the post-card application for the Federal ballot, which exists under Public Law 712 and is defective, and enabling the soldier to have the benefit of free transportation by air

when it is not in conflict with military operations, and so on. All those things which are to be found in the conference report do not exist in the present law, and they will mark the difference, in my judgment, in successful operation as between the two laws. To say nothing about categories of voters, the facilities set up under the conference report are so superior to the lack of facilities in Public Law 712 that it will make the difference of a great number of votes that otherwise would not be cast at all.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot agree with the Senator's last conclusion. That, however, is not what I was going to ask him about. I desire to ask the Senator if it is not true that under paragraph (b) of section 302, if the Governor of a State determines that the State has a State absentee-voting law sufficient to enable a soldier to obtain a reasonable chance to vote, it is not necessary for him to make any certification whatsoever?

Mr. AUSTIN. If I have understood the question.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall repeat it. If the Governor of the State concludes that the absentee-voting law of his own State is sufficient to afford a reasonable opportunity for a man overseas or in another State to get a ballot, the Governor does not have to make any certification at all?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, no; nothing like that. The trick in that question is the conclusion. The Governor does not have any right to make any such conclusion. He certifies to the law; it is a fact to which he certifies, and nothing but a fact, and his conclusion does not mean a thing.

Mr. LUCAS. Then, what does paragraph 1 of subsection (b) of section 302 mean?

Mr. AUSTIN. Paragraph 1 of that section means that in the State of Illinois, for instance—I shall give an illustration instead of a covering answer.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Illinois is a very good State to make an example of.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the State of Illinois has a timetable too narrow to transmit the application and have the vote returned and the vote cast, then that State is in the category described in paragraph (1) of subsection (b).

Mr. LUCAS. Who is going to determine that?

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator will; every citizen will; the facts will make it plain. We know that the timetable for mail from the Pacific is some 42 days in which all these transactions may be completed.

Mr. LUCAS. Was the Senator in the Chamber a few days ago when I put in the RECORD a letter from a boy from New Jersey who got his ballot 2 months after the gubernatorial election in New Jersey a few weeks ago?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly, that illustrates the case of a man who does not get his ballot. That comes under another section. The two sections in question take care of every case except that of a citizen of a State whose constitution bars voting by absentee ballot.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may make further inquiry of the able Senator, in the final analysis does it not mean whether paragraph (1) or paragraph (2) be followed, that the Governor of the State before he can certify either with respect to what is contained in (1) or (2) must call a special session of the legislature to validate what the conference report is attempting to do with respect to this proposed legislation?

Mr. AUSTIN. Absolutely no.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Governor of a State, without a special session of the legislature validating this Federal action certify that his State has complied?

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is involving in his question much more than this proposal contains. All that the Governor would have to certify to is as follows:

> (B) That the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State.

That is all he would have to certify to; he would not have to certify that his legislature had come together and had reenacted Senate bill 1285. All he would have to deal with is what this deals with, namely, that the use of the ballots provided for in this title is authorized by the laws of such State. It happens that some of the States have already done that.

Mr. LUCAS. Only one, and that is California.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is that all?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Several States have already held sessions of their legislature. I am not familiar with their laws, but I have the impression that several of them already have recognized the use of the short form of ballot. In any event, if these States are as earnest as we are—and I assume that they are—they will hold sessions of their legislatures, and, if they do nothing else, they will pass a brief statute of four lines reading, for example:

> That any Federal statute providing a Federal war ballot and procedure affecting voting for absent war voters is authorized in this State.

They can do that without hanging around very long. They can come into town, pass such a brief resolution, and go out, if they want to.

Mr. BARKLEY. But they have to come into town, and pass it, and go out.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is not that too bad?

Mr. BARKLEY. It is if a special session of the legislature is not called.

Mr. AUSTIN. As I contemplate the war and what others are doing, the little act of coming to town to pass a resolution of this kind is exceedingly small.

Mr. BARKLEY. The members of the legislature cannot come to town unless the Governor calls them.

Mr. AUSTIN. What Governor will refuse to do so if his people are behind him?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not mention any names. I do not know.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to see what would be left of a Governor if he should refuse so to act.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would be willing to venture that there are some Governors who would not call the legislature into session. One or two have already announced that they would not call their legislatures for such a purpose.

Mr. AUSTIN. How far will they get with their ballot, unless we fail to act? They will get about as far as they did in 1942, when the record shows some of these very States groaned and complained seriously because our Army and our Navy did not give up everything else in order to transport great books of instructions and heavy weights of ballots and papers. They complained bitterly.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there are two elements about section 302, subsection (b), which it seems to me the Senator might very properly point out in answer to the question put by the Senator from Kentucky. The first is, as I read it anyway, that, whether proceeding under subparagraph (1) or subparagraph (2), the Governor can make some certification in either case.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Then, we come to a second phase, and that is that under the bill which left the Senate, whether the State of New Mexico or the State of Kentucky did or did not through their Governor make certification to a war-ballot commission, we were going to put a Federal war ballot into those States, under the language of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. But under the language of the conference report we put no ballot into either of those States unless there be a certification by the Governor. Is not that a correct statement?

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is talking about voters inside the United States?

Mr. DANAHER. I am talking about those inside the United States and at any other place so far as those two States are concerned. I will repeat the question for fear I may not have made its purport clear; perhaps I was a bit verbose.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me start out as I understand it, and, if I do not follow it properly, then the Senator can repeat it. This matter is a little complex and somewhat difficult to deal with.

Mr. DANAHER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Now let us take a State which has not passed laws that will make it possible for the ballot to reach Florida, we will say, where the troops of the State of Vermont are being trained, and to be returned. In that event the citizen of Vermont would come under section (1); he would get a short form; he would get the Federal ballot because he could not get his State ballot. That is because of the failure of the State of Vermont to pass a statute that changed its timetable from 12 days to a sufficient number of days to send the applications out and have them returned under the State law. That is the reason why that is so. If the Vermonter is abroad, if he is overseas, or outside the United States, and if he wants to vote his State ballot, he applies for it.

He is accustomed to that. Indeed, the post cards have been sent out already; 12,000,000 of them have been sent out already, and the soldier can use a post card. If we enact this amendment to the present law those post cards will be adaptable to primaries, so that they can be used in Vermont and other States where the primary decides the result. They cannot be used unless this measure is passed for that purpose, because under Public Law 712 the only thing for which those post cards can be used is the general election.

Under Public Law 712, the existing law, the voter gets no ballot unless he asks for it by a post card that is prescribed in the law. Under the new proposal, the pending proposal, he gets two ballots. He gets a Federal ballot anyway, without a post card, and he gets his State ballot by using a post card. He can get a State ballot for a primary, and under the bill we afford the facilities, which do not exist under Public Law 712, for informing the voter that there is to be a primary in his State to nominate a candidate for the United States Senate on a certain day, and that he can have a ballot.

So, under these two subsections of section 302 I say that, except in those States where the Constitution of the State bars the man voting unless he presents himself in person at the polls, there is not a citizen soldier who cannot have his opportunity, and there is not a citizen soldier outside the United States who cannot have two opportunities. Does that answer the question?

Mr. DANAHER. I think the Senator has offered a splendid explanation of section 302, subsection (b). I think he does not meet the point the Senator from Kentucky raised, as I understood it, and I was trying to ascertain whether or not my apparent understanding of the point of the Senator from Kentucky coincided with the view of the Senator from Kentucky or with the view of the Senator from Vermont. I am trying to say, by way of restatement, that the whole question of the principle is turned about in this conference report as compared with the version of the bill which left the Senate, in that we said in the bill that left the Senate, we will permit the use of an absentee ballot for Federal officers in the State of New Mexico whether the State of New Mexico has a constitutional provision or not, whether or not the Governor certifies. And we said likewise with reference to Kentucky. But in each of those States there can be no certification by the Governor that an absentee ballot such as here proposed is acceptable, because the constitutions of those States forbid it. Consequently, when we cause the validity of the ballot here referred to to depend upon a certification by the Governor that the ballot here proposed is acceptable under the laws of the State of Kentucky or the State of New Mexico, we are just exactly reversing ourselves in that we now say that we no longer insist that Congress may put a Federal ballot into those States where they like it or not. We are going to let them be the deciding factor as to whether they do or do not accept the ballot we here propose. Do I state the situation in accordance with the Senator's view?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is certainly what occurred in the conference in the yielding of the Senate's position on this point and the adopting of the position of the House on the point. What had to happen was that either one or the other had to yield on that particular issue, or we could not carry on any further. There would have been an impasse and we would have had to decide what the Senator is now apparently considering, whether we would take Public Law 712 in lieu of trying to work out something which would give the men and women in the service the facilities of the Green-Lucas bill.

Mr. President, what I am about to say is not a reflection on my very warm friends, with whom I worked so long for the Green-Lucas bill, but it is surprising to me that it appears to them that the facilities provided in their bill are not worth enough to make them stand up and see them put through here, even though it calls for yielding on the point of the constitutionalism of the Federal statute.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think the Senator from New Mexico first asked me to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to comment on what the Senator from Connecticut said. He left the impression that it was apparently left to the States to decide for themselves whether they would have the Federal ballot or not. That is exactly what I think the report does not do, for the reason I shall state.

As I have explained before, the theory on which the Federal ballot was extended to the State of New Mexico and the State of Kentucky was that it was an exercise of Federal power under the Federal Constitution, and that the Congress had the right to give that ballot to voters in the other States. That is the theory of the ballot.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. That theory is reversed when it is said the Governor must certify that the use of the ballot is authorized by the laws of the State. To my mind, it is taken out of the category of a Federal ballot, and its validity is made to rest upon whether it is authorized by the State, and the Governor so certifies.

When the ballot in this form is extended to New Mexico and Kentucky, there is no question of the Federal power being valid because it is not exercised. It must be valid according to the laws of the State. The Legislature of New Mexico may meet and the Governor may certify that it is authorized by the State, but that still will not change the constitutional provisions of the State. In other words, if it is not recognized by the State, there is no power upon which it can rest.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In my opinion, the statement of the Senator from New Mexico is not greatly in disparity with my understanding of the situation, but I go further and point out, particularly as to his concluding sentence, that he would not have us now, under the conference report, do more nor less than would have been done with any ballot under the bill as it left the Senate, for the question of the validity of the exercise of that ballot in New Mexico would have been decided by the State of New Mexico anyway. Is not that so?

Mr. HATCH. Under the original bill the validity of the ballot would have been determined by the local officials, and that decision would have been final. As I recall, that was the language of the bill as it left the Senate. But under that bill the officials could have had the privilege of determining the ballot to be valid under the exercise of constitutional power, under the Federal Constitution. That is denied them now.

Mr. AUSTIN. That issue is out, is it not?

Mr. HATCH. I say that is wiped out, but now the Governor of my State is being asked to certify that a ballot is authorized by the State, limiting him to a State law under which he could not possibly make the certification. That is why I say you would extend it with one hand and jerk it back with the other.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator from Vermont permit me a word further?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. I think that while we have used a great many words to say so, we are all in complete understanding of the legal effect both of the bill as it left the Senate and the effect of the bill the conferees have brought back, and I wish to thank the Senator from Vermont for his assistance.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the real help the Senator from Connecticut has given to this cause. I observed when I first came to this distinguished body, some 13 years ago, that my colleagues here were all individualists, all of them highly trained specialists in something, many of them very versatile, but certainly all of them with such mature character that I said to myself, "I cannot see how 96 men holding the opinions that these men do and having the character and strength that they have ever get together on anything." I sat in amazement at the operation of the United States Senate, and I learned something, I hope, and that is that the process of legislation actually necessitates some yielding, and that the reason why the men who arrived here only after struggling against great obstacles and overcoming difficulties and thus hardening their sinews can get together is that they recognize the necessity to yield something.

I am prompted to repeat the old story of Ben Franklin, who was visiting his neighbor, Cotton Mather. Ben and Cotton were not great friends—in fact, they were bitter enemies—but they were engaged in the same kind of business, and they visited back and forth. After Cotton died, Ben wrote his son, and said, "I have omitted something. I omitted to

thank your father for a great gift to me." Franklin said, "You know, your father and I were not very good friends, but he has passed on now, and I want to thank you on his behalf. I was going through a passageway in his printing house and received a bad crack on the head. I bumped my head on a beam. Your father turned to me and said, 'Ben, stoop a little going through life. It will save you many a bump.'"

Mr. President, I think no man could have gone into a conference with more firm conviction than I that the war powers, the express grant of responsibility to the Congress of the United States, not merely authorized the Federal ballot but also all the machinery that would facilitate its casting, having in view the morale of our troops by their participation in the very thing for which they are fighting. No man could have been more devoted to that principle than I. Yet when I confronted the absolutely fixed stand by the House members of the conference committee, whose distinguished members are here to listen to me, I saw that the question of legislation depended upon our yielding, and we were the only ones who could yield on that proposition so there could be further progress with this legislation. I did not yield in principle; in fact, I cannot change my judgment about it now.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the Senator one question. I want to understand subparagraphs (1) and (2) of paragraph (b) of section 302. Am I correct in my understanding that before the ballot of a soldier overseas would be counted in the State of Illinois the Governor would be compelled to certify in line with what subparagraphs (1) and (2) provide?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. I think the question is too broad.

Mr. LUCAS. What I am trying to ascertain is how a Federal ballot which is cast overseas is going to be counted in the State of Illinois.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have the idea that no Federal ballot can be counted in the State of Illinois if the State of Illinois has not done this much, that is, by law authorized the use of a Federal ballot in that State.

Mr. LUCAS. That is number one. If I may further interrogate the Senator; in other words someone in authority in the State of Illinois, which is the State legislature, must provide by law the authority to use that ballot?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is exactly correct. That is the point of yielding in the conference. If we have not crossed that bar, we will never cross it. That is right where the division stood, and I think we have closed that incident by our report.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. I appreciate that. Now if the Governor of the State of Illinois—and I do not know what he will do in connection with this matter should the pending legislation become the law—but if the Governor of the State of Illinois or the Governor of Vermont should refuse to call the legislature into special session to agree upon what this conference report is recommending, then there will be——

Mr. AUSTIN. Now that is the trouble. The Senator will excuse me for interrupting him?

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. AUSTIN. That takes it too far.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to go too far.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Governor does not have to do that. All in the world the legislature has to do in order to put this provision into effect is to pass a law of four words.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. I do not care what the language is, but the point I am making is——

Mr. AUSTIN. The Governor does not have to approve this whole thing.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I appreciate that. I am not quarreling with the Senator from Vermont upon that point. What I am trying to find out definitely is—and perhaps the Senator has answered it—whether before a man serving in the armed forces overseas is permitted to vote either in Illinois or Vermont, the State legislature must pass a law of 4 lines or 40 lines adopting in substance what we are doing here today.

Mr. AUSTIN. I answer that question, "No." The legislature does not have the obligation to adopt what we are doing here. It does not have to say even that this title applies in the State of Vermont. All the legislature has to say is that it accepts this ballot in the State of Vermont, or in the State of Illinois, as the case may be.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well; but that requires an act by the legislature composed of the four words, "We accept this ballot."

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. That is No. 1. Will a soldier, sailor or marine serving inside the United States ever have an opportunity to vote a Federal ballot under either one of these provisions?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator again tell me how that can be done? I do not want to take up too much of his time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Let me call attention to the matter briefly. I think perhaps I can make it clear.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator would, because it is very important. It is something that I had not realized previously. If a soldier serving within the continental limits of the United States can vote a Federal ballot, then I want to know how it can be done.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. I read from page 6 of the report.

APPLICATION OF THIS TITLE

SEC. 302 (a). Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the provisions of this title—

That means the whole of title III—

shall apply with respect to the following.

* * * * *

(3) Members of the armed forces, inside the United States.

Very well. Now we have the scope of title III, have we not?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. But I want to know how it applies.

Mr. AUSTIN. This refers to those inside the United States. The language is:

(3) Members of the armed forces, inside the United States.

Let us now read subsection (b):

The provisions of this title shall apply to—

I want Senators to note that this is in the affirmative, whereas most of the other drafts of this provision were in the negative form, and quite confusing—

The provisions of this title shall apply to, and the ballot provided for by this title may be used by—

(1) An individual referred to in paragraphs (1), (2), or (3)—

That includes the soldier inside the United States—

if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (B) that the use of ballots provided for by this title—

Is acceptable or has been authorized by the State. There is the answer. I cannot conceive of plainer language. If it needs any interpretation at all it is upon the point that that does not mean a State which has no absent voters' law. It would include such a State, but it also includes the other States which have absentee voters' laws where their timetables or other matters are not adapted to enabling the citizens thereof to vote.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the language in the latter part of subsection (b) mean when it says:

No individual who is not included under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall be entitled to use, or be furnished, a ballot under this title.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose that the soldier inside the United States—that is what the Senator is inquiring about?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose he has ample time within which to mail his post card and request his State ballot, receive his State ballot, and return his State ballot. He does not need the provision which is made here. Therefore, we say he shall not have it; we say he shall not even finger that short ballot. That is the place where we gave priority to the State ballot. If the member of the armed forces is inside the United States and can obtain his State ballot within the limits of his timetable, that is the only ballot he will receive.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Illinois has not concluded, I shall wait.

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; that is perfectly all right. I suppose it is because of my limitation of comprehension and my poor power to understand that I am becoming more muddled all

the time as I try to find out something about the conference report.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I apologize for muddling the Senator. I did not try to do much more than read the statute.

Mr. LUCAS. No; it is not the Senator who has muddled me. It is the conference report itself.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I wish to explain to the Senate the first paragraph to which the Senator has referred. That is paragraph (A) of subdivision (1), on page 6:

> That such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot.

That language has always given me trouble in my endeavor to know what it means, and to know whether a Governor of a State will have discretion to exercise. Are we vesting in him the right to review the laws of his State, and to say, "According to my judgment, and my opinion, the laws of my State do not enable it"?

I am asking the Senator to explain what that language means, because I think it is important language.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I observe that this point is the very one on which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and I did not agree. As to the interpretation of this language, I asked that very question before the conference was concluded. I asked, "Can you understand this the way I do, namely, that this is the equivalent of saying that if a State does not have laws that are adequate to enable its citizens to vote, then they can vote the Federal ballot?" That is what this language means to me. It is simply a question of fact. It is not anything that is mysterious.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish stating my thought. If I had known that we would have presented to us the questions which have arisen on the floor, giving weight to the certificate of the Governor as if it were an independent act, an act different from merely certifying the law, I certainly would have endeavored to change that language, and would have endeavored to take it out of the report at that point, and would have said in a separate paragraph, "The facts above referred to shall be evidenced by the certificate of the secretary of state." Then we would not have this great question, as if there were some wonderful decisions to be made by the Governor, something under the control of the Governor. The Governor does not control this at all. He is nothing but a certifying officer.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am not being captious in my questions about the certificate of the Governor.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand.

Mr. HATCH. I simply wish to determine what the language means. The Senator has answered, I think, that in his opinion if any Governor certifies—and I repeat that I am not being captious about that—that the laws of his State are not sufficient to enable the State absentee ballot to be cast, then the Federal ballot may be used by the soldiers from that State who are serving inside the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, indeed; I believe that is the purpose.

Mr. HATCH. Does not that provision vest considerable power in the Governors of the several States, when it gives them the right to have that power and to exercise that judgment?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; we do it constantly. We make provision with respect to certification by the secretaries of state of the various States regarding Federal statutes. That is all that provision means.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the conditions stated by the Senator from New Mexico it would not be necessary to call a special session of the State legislature if the Governor or the secretary of state were to make the certification; is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. If the Governor would turn to his old State statute, passed after Public Law 712 was enacted—the State statute which relates to Public Law 712—and would say, "Section so and so of the public laws of my State provides for balloting procedures such as this"—and he could do that, of course—he would not have to call a special session of the legislature for that purpose, if it has already been done. I expect that in years to come, if this law persists as a part of the war legislation of this country, other Governors may have to make a certificate founded upon State statutes passed at this time. I hope we shall not have such emergencies in the future, but they might arise.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me give the Senator an illustration. As he well knows, there are approximately 12 or 15 States which provide less than 15 days' time for absentee voting under the absentee voting statutes of their respective States. Assuming that the 15 States did act with respect to changing their absentee voting laws——

Mr. AUSTIN. It is an absolute certainty that they would come under section 1.

Mr. LUCAS. Would they come under section 1 regardless of whether the Governor made the certification? In other words, if the ballot commission had before it a list of the 15 States providing not more than 15 days' time, and if it reached a definite conclusion that the men serving within the United States could not receive the State ballots in time, would it be necessary for it to rely upon the certificate of the secretary of state or the certificate of the Governor?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; as we have written the provision. That is just what I referred to a moment ago. If I had realized that these questions were to be raised as if this were a separate function of judgment or decision by the Governor of a State, I would have endeavored to have taken out that provision, and to have made it perfectly clear that it was nothing but a piece of evidence to consider as to whether the law of a given State was adequate in its procedures to enable its citizens in the far Pacific to vote the State ballot.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, as I see the legislation which is bound up in this conference report, the Federal Government definitely keeps control over the States which cannot or which will not ultimately give their citizens who are serving in the armed forces a real opportunity to vote, even when they are serving inside the continental limits of the United States. I cannot reach any other conclusion, in view of the colloquy I have had with my good friend the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]; because if those States do not call their legislatures into session, and if the legislatures do not change their absentee-voting laws to the end that the men serving within the continental limits of the United States have a real opportunity to vote, then under this measure the Federal Government will still retain the power to count the Federal ballots if servicemen receive Federal ballots when they are within the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the section which provides that the Governor shall certify provides that he may send the law to the commission, instead of sending his interpretation of the law—namely, that, in his opinion, the soldiers from his State serving within the United States cannot vote—then am I to understand that the certificate referred to can be interpreted by the commission, so that the commission can determine whether the State law is such as to permit them to vote?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the commission has no authority to make any decision of that kind at all, and the conference report does not contemplate any such thing as certifying to the commission with respect to the issue whether the State has made provision for procedures which will enable the citizens thereof to vote by their State ballots. All the conference report does is to enable those citizens to vote whose States have not established procedures which enable them to use their State ballots. That is all there is to it. Is it not an easy thing for a Governor—the distinguished Senator from Michigan has been a Governor—to certify that there are no provisions in the statutes of his State which would enable votes to be cast by the citizens of his State who are in a place which requires 42 days to transmit the mail?

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me correct the Senator. I have never been a Governor.

Mr. AUSTIN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. FERGUSON. This provision applies only within the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; it applies anywhere.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am speaking of the first section. It applies to those within the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. The first section applies within the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reading the last lines on page 6:

No individual who is not included under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall be entitled to use, or be furnished, a ballot under this title.

Under that section is it not true that someone must determine whether or not the individual may use or be furnished a ballot?

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is not reading that accurately. It is not "this section." It is "this subsection." That makes all the difference in the world in the meaning.

Mr. FERGUSON. The word "subsection" applies to subsection (b).

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. There are two subparagraphs under subsection (b). This sentence must be read just as it is printed.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thought I was reading the word "subsection." Someone must determine, first, whether or not a soldier may use, and second, whether he may be furnished, a ballot. Then, reading the next line—

Certifications referred to in this subsection shall be made to the commission.

Why does that section provide that the certification shall go to the commission, if the commission has no right to determine, first, whether or not the ballot shall be used by the soldier within the United States, and second, whether or not it shall be furnished to the soldier in the United States?

Mr. AUSTIN. I will answer that question. It is to enable any citizen, including any of us who may be interested in the question of the validity of an election, to have a place to which to go which is the legal repository of the certificates. It is the place that is provided by the Federal Congress as the repository of the certificates, so that we may know whether the Governor did make such a certificate or not, and may judge of the quality of the certificate, or any other question we may wish to raise about it.

This measure deals with the right of the ballot. It is up to those who administer the law, of course, to try to follow the law. The commission is the head of the organization, and the commission happens to be the same secretaries of departments and administrators who will have the duty of transporting the mails, which is the essential part of this machinery. Therefore, the machinery is freed from all the confusions which might arise from an additional bureaucracy. It is kept together in a cohesive plan which is admirable if it is looked at from the right point of view.

I feel pretty good about this bill. I think we did pretty well in view of the great conflict of opinion about it. We all know that it is difficult for a person to yield ground when he has a firm conviction. The House yielded upon many points.

This whole discussion relates to section 302 (a). That section went through the mill several times before it reached its present form. In order to arrive at its present form, there had to be yielding on both sides. The first example of that was in connection with a proposal by the House dated February 26. If Senators could read that, they would see how much work had to be done on this section to get it into final form. At one time we wiped out the Danaher amendment, and then we brought it back, in effect.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it not true that the Senate conferees voted unanimously for the amendment advanced by Representatives LECOMPTE and BONNER?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes. That is one of the incidents of experience.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. This bill has to do with voting. The only effect of the bill is with respect to certain groups; that is, the armed forces, which means the Army and Navy and their component parts—the merchant marine, the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. So far as voting is concerned, no one else is affected by this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Not quite. There are included in the term "armed forces" the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, the Women's Naval Reserve, and the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps. They are all affected by it, and will have the benefit of these facilities if this bill becomes a law. My recollection is that they are included in Public Law 712.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am glad the Senator made that point clear.

There is one other point which I think is clear on the face of the report. Take my State as an example. There must be 50,000 men and women from Oklahoma who are not now in our State, but are in other States, in defense industries of one class or another. I am advised that in the State of Oregon, in the neighborhood of Portland, there are at least 150,000 men and women who are there as transients, working in the great defense industries. What provision, if any, in this bill affects their voting? My understanding is that there is none. Am I correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. No, Mr. President. If the Senator will be patient for a moment, I shall try to answer that question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should like to have that point cleared up.

Mr. AUSTIN. The evidence tends to show——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am not referring to members of the armed forces. I am referring to citizens of my State who are working in defense plants.

Mr. AUSTIN. I did not catch that.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should like to have that point cleared up in the RECORD.

Mr. AUSTIN. There is no attempt whatever to reach those voters by this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is exactly the point.

Mr. AUSTIN. The supposition is that Oklahoma will take care of that question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That point has not yet been taken care of in my State, and I wanted the RECORD to show that this bill has nothing whatever to do with that class of voters.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. In my State, and in other States, if provisions are made for the men and women from any given State to vote, that matter, as well as the right of members of the armed forces to vote, must be taken care of by the State.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have listened with profit to the very able presentation of this matter by the Senator from Vermont. I can see how he has tried to apply the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the various States to the difficult problem at hand. However, as I listen to the debate, it seems to me that the only fair way by which the soldier can be given an absolutely square deal is to set aside the Constitution of the United States and the constitutions of the various States, for this obvious reason: Take a small State such as Delaware as an illustration. Delaware has 3 electoral votes in the electoral college. Of course, the electoral-college vote is the vote which elects the President. Delaware has a population of 266,505. Illinois has a population of 7,897,241, the population of Illinois being 26 times that of Delaware. Yet Delaware has 3 votes in the electoral college and Illinois has 28, as I recall. So while the population of Illinois is 26 times that of Delaware, Illinois has only 9 times as many votes in the electoral college as has Delaware. Therefore, a soldier from Delaware would have 2½ votes for President of the United States as against 1 vote for a soldier from Illinois.

To make one more illustration in order to draw my conclusion, while Delaware has a population of 266,000, New York has a population of 13,000,000, New York having 43 times the number of persons of Delaware. Delaware has 3 votes in the electoral college, and, as I remember, New York has 45 votes in the electoral college. So New York, which is 43 times as populous as Delaware, has only 15 times as many votes as Delaware in the electoral college. Therefore, a soldier coming from Delaware would cast 4 or 5 votes for President to every vote cast from New York State by a soldier coming from New York. Why is that—and I think the point gives cogency to the Senator's argument? The reason is that when this Republic was formed, the 13 original States would not come into it unless each was guaranteed 2 United States Senators, and only 2, the idea being that the large States should not coerce the little States. So the one thing in the Constitution which cannot be changed except by the approval of every

State in the Union is the provision that 2 Senators shall come from each State.

At the same time it was insisted that there be put into the Constitution a provision that each State should have control of the qualification of the voters within the State. The States would not come into the Union until section 2 of Article I was inserted in the Constitution, for the very same reason that they would not do so until there had been inserted in the Constitution that provision that each State should have two United States Senators.

Many men have said, "We drafted the soldiers; did we not? Why should we not give them the right to vote?" With the abstract and crystal-clear justice of that remark no man on God's earth can argue. That is true. That is abstract justice. But, on the other hand, we might carry the argument further, and might say, "Why should a soldier coming from New York State have only one-fifth of the vote, in voting for President of the United States, that a man coming from Delaware has? Why should a soldier coming from Delaware have 5 votes for President, whereas a man coming from New York State has only 1 vote for President?" If we are going to consider this matter on the principle of abstract justice, the very first thing we should do is give every soldier an equal vote for President, regardless of the Constitution of the United States. But, Mr. President, I thought we were fighting to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I simply throw that thought into the hopper, to show Senators that even if we pass the Green-Lucas bill, one soldier from Delaware will outvote five soldiers from New York State, or three soldiers from Illinois.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what the Senator has stated may be an interesting theory; but, really, I cannot very well apply it to the conference report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Does the Senator desire to ask a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to ask one further question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. My question relates to the following language in paragraph (1) of subsection (b):

> Whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies—

And so forth. Assuming that the Governor calls a special session of the legislature, and that the legislature will not go along with him on what he thinks should be done in order to make this possible, assuming that he is not able to make into the law the four words which the Senator suggested a while ago, I ask, Would the Governor then have the power to certify to the end that the soldiers from the State of Illinois, for instance, could vote a Federal ballot within the United States?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, if the legislature failed to pass the law, that would be the end of it; is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. That would be the end of the right of the soldier from Illinois to the use of a Federal ballot.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. Let us consider by way of example a State which still has, let us say, a 12- or 15-day absentee-voting law, and in which no change at all has been made. Let us assume that the Governor calls a special session of the legislature for the purpose of making the change, but that he fails to have the change made. He would then certify to the commission, I presume, that the laws of his State are not adequate for the purpose of giving the soldier an opportunity to vote. Would the soldier from his State have an opportunity to vote a Federal ballot?

Mr. AUSTIN. He would provide, of course, that the brief acceptance of the ballot form which I have suggested were made.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, that goes with all of this. Why not settle once and for all that there will not be a Federal ballot for the citizen of any State which does not accept the short form of ballot.

Mr. LUCAS. I misunderstood the Senator a moment ago. A moment ago I went away practically satisfied that there would be two types of ballots.

Mr. AUSTIN. There will be. I am talking about the short form of ballot. I assumed that was the basis of the Senator's question.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. I am talking about the ballot that will go overseas to the members of the armed forces.

Mr. AUSTIN. Both ballots will go overseas. If this conference report is accepted, I feel confident that the mechanism set up under it, which does not exist under Public Law 712, will take a vast number of State ballots overseas in time to be brought back and be counted.

Mr. LUCAS. I am not arguing that point with the Senator. That depends primarily and solely upon what the Governors do with respect to removing the barriers, conditions, and restrictions which now surround absentee voting in every State.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. If they do not care enough to give the soldiers two chances, and if they do not attempt to remove the barriers affecting the provision for recognition of the Federal ballot, then the result may be ascribed to them.

Mr. LUCAS. I misunderstood the Senator a moment ago when he said that in each of the States to which I referred, if the Governor merely certified that in his opinion, without any——

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, no. I have repeatedly denied that the Governor is given any jurisdiction to exercise opinion, judgment, or discretion, or to do anything else but a ministerial act which will certify a fact. That is all there is to my claim.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry I misunderstood the Senator a moment ago. If the Senator will look at his remarks, as they will appear in the RECORD tomorrow, I think he will find that his answers to my question were that certain soldiers within the United States, under certain conditions, could get a Federal ballot, without the necessity for a special session of the legislature.

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, yes; I repeat that. That may be true, if the States have existing on their books, as we have in Vermont, a statute which recognizes the Federal ballot.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point, whether the State passes a law before the Federal law is enacted; or afterward.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course. If the conference report becomes law, the law will require action by the State legislature, either in the past, the present, or the future.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. Assuming that today there is no law on the books which the Governor may certify, does the Senator know of any time factor which would prevent the enactment of such a law in time to be of use insofar as the approaching election is concerned?

Mr. AUSTIN. I know of one time factor, and that is October 1. There is now ample time for any State in the Union to pass a simple statute which would make the Federal ballot usable by its citizens. October 1 is the deadline. If the soldier swears in his oath to the ballot which he obtains, the oath being on the envelope, that he applied for his State ballot before September 1, that he has not received it by October 1, and that he wants a Federal ballot, he gets it on October 1. He is entitled to it at that time only if his State has passed a resolution merely saying that provisions under any Federal statute by which a Federal war ballot and procedures affecting voting by absent war voters are authorized in this text, are acceptable; and the State will have until the day when the soldier asks for a new ballot, namely, until October 1; the State will have all that time in which to do that simple thing.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I think he has masterfully and against some opposition elucidated the particular sections and subsections of the conference report.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JACKSON. I am not the only Senator confronted with the question which is better, Public Law 712 or the conference report. The Senator has pointed out many things, and once in his remarks he said that Public Law 712 lacked many facilities which the conference report provides, and also he put it the other way and said that the conference report provides many facilities lacking in Public Law 712, which, I think, is the same thing. I have listened with great interest to the Senator. Does he intend in his planned remarks to go further and point out what if anything else is provided in the conference report from the standpoint of facilities which Public Law 712 does not provide? If the Senator does, I shall sit and listen, for I should like to have him point them out.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes, I will, and, first I refer to section 203. This one factor would make me choose the conference report as against existing law. Existing law, Public, 712, provides for the distribution of post cards, and it states, "Upon one side of such post card the following shall be printed"—it is mandatory, as will be seen—but that post card makes no provision for a primary ballot.

Of course, in a State such as my own, where the primary constitutes the election and we have practically a closed primary, our law says one cannot have any other ballot except the one that belongs in the primary and therefore he must ask for the party ballot that he wishes to vote. Under the existing law the most important election in the State of Vermont would not have a single absentee soldier's vote, but under the conference report every soldier, either inside the United States or outside the United States, could have a State ballot for the primary. Why? Because of the provision which I read from the bottom paragraph of page 3 of the conference report.

In lieu of—

Mind you, this is all new, and it is not a recommendation to a State but a Federal law, if passed.

In lieu of and interchangeably with the post cards referred to—

That means the post card which has a line in it reading:

My choice of party primary ballot is_____.

And in the blank the voter writes Republican, if he votes in his primary for a Republican candidate, and he has a choice between Republican candidates in the primary.

Mr. JACKSON. May I ask the Senator when the primary is held in Vermont—on what date?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not recall at the moment, but we will have to change it; we are bound to change it, in order to get in under the pending legislation. We are going to change it and let no one forget that. We think enough of this proposed law to hold a session of the legislature to do this thing.

Mr. JACKSON. I will say to the Senator so does the State of Indiana, but our primary election occurs on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in May. Is that the date in the State of Vermont? If it is, I am wondering whether the Senator thinks the machinery would be available in time?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know, but we will certainly make necessary provision in ample time, and will make such a change that everything will be all right. I again read the provision:

In lieu of and interchangeably with the post cards referred to, the Secretaries of War and Navy may continue to deliver and make available, and the persons to whom this title is applicable may continue to use, post cards provided under section 3 of this act prior to its amendment until the existing supply thereof is exhausted.

That means that the 12,000,000 post cards which have been circulated throughout the different theaters of combat, the 6,000,000 others which are in storage if they are necessary to be used, and the approximately 8,000,000 more which the Navy is circulating, all of them defective because they conform to the provisions of Public Law 712, may continue to be used, but here is what is said about them:

In the event of any such delivery or making available to members of the armed forces of post cards provided under section 3 of this act prior to its amendment, the Secretaries of War and Navy shall authorize changes in the text thereof to provide that the applicant shall print thereon his name and the serial number, in addition to normal signature, and shall designate his party affiliation in the case of application for primary ballot.

That one provision alone which is brand new, facilitating the voting by Vermonters in their type of election which really counts, would make me favor the pending proposal as against existing law, because that cannot be done under the existing law; the absent soldier voter could not get into a primary under existing law, that is, into a closed primary. There was a rather peculiar provision inserted in the existing law which might have been intended to reach such a thing, but it does not reach it. I refer to section 13 of the existing law and I read from page 5 of the pamphlet:

SEC. 13. All provisions of this act shall be administered, mutatis mutandis, in behalf of any individual to whom this act applies when, under the law of the State of his residence, any such individual is entitled to vote in primary elections in choosing candidates for electors of President and Vice President of the United States, United States Senators, and Representatives in Congress.

If, mutatis mutandis, the provisions of the act were altered and the dates changed so that it was administered so as to apply to the primary, still the serviceman could not get a ballot because he could not ask for one. He would have to follow the prescribed form of post card, which does not signify what party ballot is applicable. That is only one page; do not think that there are not others.

Mr. JACKSON. I trust the Senator will touch upon the others.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are pages upon pages of facilities provided in the pending measure, after very careful study of the capacity of the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps to do the job, which are not provided in Public Law 712.

Mr. JACKSON. That is what I am interested in more than in the primaries.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not care to interrogate the Senator on this particular point, but before he concludes—I do not press it now—I hope he will point out to the Senate how the general use of State ballots, which is encouraged and facilitated and made easier, can be brought about and the real importance of the so-called Federal ballot be greatly minimized. Much of the discussion we have had here today would probably almost vanish if the States would cooperate, as we think they will, under the provisions of this bill, to get the State ballots to the soldiers everywhere in the United States and outside the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for the sake of the record let me comment in response to the distinguished Senator from Texas that, so far as the State of Indiana is concerned, the leaders of both houses of our legislature are at work upon and have practically completed a bill to provide for a ballot for soldiers, and the Governor at the proper time will issue the formal call, so we are very much interested in it. To repeat, I am interested in the other provisions which the conference report makes but which Public Law 712 does not make. I do not say that argumentatively; I am only here for enlightenment and to say, insofar as concerns the primary situation in Indiana, that we have not been thinking in terms of our primary election in relation to the soldiers' ballot.

Mr. AUSTIN. There are other States besides Vermont that make their decisions in the primaries.

Now, to answer the question of the distinguished Senator from Texas, Public Law 712 provides no separate facilities for balloting according to State laws for the offices named in the State statutes. What it does is to set up an official war ballot and booklets, which is a "must" feature of Public Law 712, which then provides an option in these words:

And may—

That is, the secretary of state may—

And may, in case the State legislature of his State shall have authorized it, also provide for voting for candidates for State, county, and other local offices, and with respect to any proposed amendment to the State constitution or any other proposition or question which is to be submitted to a vote in the State.

It will be seen that the "and may" clause follows a comma, and if the State operated under this option and by State law authorized this kind of a ballot, the Federal ballot and State ballot would all be on one sheet of paper. In other words, the existing law provides for one ballot. It is either exclusively a Federal ballot or it is a combined State and Federal ballot. Then it provides that such ballot shall be uniform in size and style of type, describing it, and shall contain the title of each office, and so forth and so on.

By contrast to that, title II of the conference report deals wholly and exclusively with the subject of the State ballot, and it makes most prominent the State ballot by the section in the beginning of the report:

Nothing in this act shall be deemed to restrict the right of any member of the armed forces of the United States or of any other person to vote in accordance with the law of the State of his residence.

Then comes title II, which sets up the changes in the State statutes which are recommended in order to straighten out the time table of events. Then come pages of facilities afforded to the State by the conference report bill, which they have not under the existing law, which they cannot compel under the State law. Pages 2, 3, and 4, down to section 207 (a), all relate exclusively to help to the

States to transmit their State ballots to the service men and women.

I might call attention to a few of the provisions. I have already called attention to the use of the post-card application, but I read now the last sentence on page 2:

The post cards referred to shall also, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be made available to such persons at appropriate times for use in general elections other than those referred to above and for primary and special elections.

There is not now a provision of that kind applicable to a single State of the Union for getting post-card applications for the State ballots to the right person at the right time by a commission. In fact, there is not any commission under existing law.

Mr. JACKSON. That is, the States would not be able to do that under Public Law 712?

Mr. AUSTIN. They would not be able to do it if we failed to adopt this report. There would be no ballot commission and no obligation to facilitate the obtaining of the post cards.

Then here is a function given to a post card which does not exist under the present law.

Mr. JACKSON. So far as my questions are concerned, the Senator need not go through the conference report by pages.

Mr. AUSTIN. It would save a good deal of time not to do so. Very much of title III, which relates to the Federal ballot, adds quite a good deal of insurance toward getting the material to the servicemen; that is, it carries within it information about elections that will reach the soldiers. These short-form ballots will go over in bulk by ship, instead of through the air, instead of occupying space on airplanes which should be carrying V-mail, in the proportion of something like 1,000 V-mail letters to 1 of the ballots. Instead of taking that space, the ballots can be shipped in bulk all over the globe, and can be delivered where they are needed months ahead of time. The only important point is that they arrive by October 1. That would be the deadline, if the report should become effective.

Mr. JACKSON. If the conference report should fail, does the Senator think the same object might be accomplished by some kind of an Executive order to carry the ballots back and forth?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I do not.

Mr. JACKSON. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. First, I should like to say that I would oppose the suggestion I am about to make if anything came of it, but for the benefit of those who desire to get the largest number of votes from the soldiers, and who are not overly touchy about how far they are willing to intrude upon the States, the simple device of postponing the national election, which constitutionally we have the right to do, by 1 day, would, as a practical matter, compel every State in the Union—except those which we might exempt, such, for example, as Kentucky and New Mexico, and those States which already have adequate absentee balloting laws—to call a special session of its legislature and during such special session adequate absentee ballot legislation could be adopted. I should oppose that, but it is a very mild intervention in the affairs of the States compared with what has been attempted here.

Mr. AUSTIN. I see the point. Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer to a letter of great importance to me from Macon Reed, a boy very much loved by many people, who was in our Gallery here as the representative of the Transradio Press, and who is now overseas. I wrote him and asked him some questions about the matter we are considering. As Senators know, he is a very shrewd observer.

This is what he replied to me:

As to the soldier vote, the idea is only slowly penetrating that we are being—indeed, by now I think have been—euchered out of it.

That was February 8, a month ago.

We didn't catch on at all the first time, but I think it is now coming clear and will be very clear, indeed, by election time. But I seriously doubt if there will be any great feeling of grievance among us or any specific resentment against those responsible. We have a tendency to take it easy on the political front and trust our people and leaders at home.

I asked my friend Gene Glenn, a level-headed lad from Centralia, Kans., how he felt about voting. With apologies (mine, not his) for his French, he said:

"Sure, I'd like to vote if they'd fix it so's a fellow could just go and vote. But if it is a lot of trouble and red tape, the hell with it. I figure the folks at home can take care of the election in good shape, all right."

Personally, I think it would be one of the most magnificent gestures of all history for an army of 10,000,000 men to cast its ballots in a democratic election right square in the middle of a war. But what a living tribute to the workableness of our way of government and our sure faith in it. And what an object lesson to the peoples among whom we sojourn.

* * * * *

It will be a miserable shame, I think, if we can't follow through with a genuine mass performance of the rite of voting.

He spells the word "r-i-t-e" with malice aforethought, I think. I continue to read:

Not that we want to get all riled up with political controversy, or are anxious to get in our 2 cents' worth. We overseas watch with interest, but with a certain detachment. I think, by and large, it is the wholesome attitude you would expect of a wholesome army—but I do think we could use more political news and views.

I have omitted a part of the letter.

I have taken specimen letters from the different theaters of operations so as to try and present a small graphic impression of how the soldier looks at this matter.

I have before me a letter from a Vermont boy, Donald M. Manley. He is a private first class in a Signal Corps outfit across the Atlantic. He wrote to me:

I would like to add that I was also very much impressed with what Congress has, and is, doing with regard to soldiers voting. It strikes me that most of the politicians back home are trying to make it as difficult as possible for us to vote. Are they afraid of the outcome if we did voice our opinions by ballots instead of by writing them a letter? Letters can be thrown into a wastepaper basket and forgotten, but not a ballot. That must be the answer.

This is the first year that I will have the opportunity to vote, and I am going to go out of my way to exercise my right as a citizen of the United States, mainly to give myself the satisfaction that a few people in Washington couldn't stop this Vermonter from voting, no matter how tough they made it.

That, Mr. President, is interesting to me as bearing upon one feature of the conference report, and that is the provision for the use of post cards. We find on top of page 4:

Such post cards may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots under State absentee-balloting laws, as applications for registration under State absentee-balloting laws, or as the sources of information to implement State absentee-balloting laws.

That, Mr. President, is a very precious right. It enables boys who have never registered to become registered, and this man says:

I am going to go out of my way to exercise my right as a citizen of the United States—

He says he has never before cast a vote, but he is going out of his way to cast his vote. He will not have to go far. We will be making it easy for him, provided we adopt the conference report.

Here is an interesting letter from across the Pacific. In the letter came something which proves how well those boys are informed concerning what is going on here in Congress. It is a cartoon which shows the jungle filled with wild beasts, serpents, and so forth, and two of our boys wading through the water, their guns on their shoulders, and they come to a sign in the jungle which says:

If you have moved since you last voted do not forget to register.

It came in this letter, written by Lt. Col. Daniel Wilson. I omit the personal part:

I speak strictly in my status as a citizen of Vermont. Reference attached cartoon, which hits the spot out here, will you kindly show it to Senator AIKEN and Representative PLUMLEY? The question will always be remembered as this: Was States' rights employed to hamper and/or destroy ballots for Federal offices? Or are we wards needing guardians, as in the time of the first prohibition law?

Sincerely,

DANIEL WILSON.

Then here is another letter from still another corner of this war-torn world. This letter is from a chaplain:

As I understand it, you are a member of the joint conference committee to consider the problem of a Federal ballot for servicemen. As a serviceman I should like to express to you my personal opinion on this subject.

By the time of the Federal elections next fall I fully expect to be overseas. The passage of a Federal ballot bill would ease my mind from the anxiety of waiting for an ordinary absentee ballot to catch up with me. It would also relieve me from the anxiety of

not knowing whether it will be returned to my home State in time to be counted.

Beyond this personal reason, I am concerned for the honor of my country in this question. As a chaplain I am in a position to know the opinions and sentiments of a great number of enlisted men. And I honestly feel that the excitement created over this issue has aroused in the minds of thousands of soldiers and sailors a distinct expectation of receiving a Federal ballot. Army and Navy publications have given concrete evidence of this fact. Secretaries Stimson and Knox have spoken in favor of it. And I can testify that my cross-section view of the men in the ranks reveals the same desire for a uniform Federal ballot. They will feel dishonored and betrayed if their own Congress fails to give them what they regard as preeminently their privilege and their right.

You do not need to be told that the life of a soldier or a sailor is mainly a life of sacrifice, including perhaps the supreme sacrifice. For this reason he clings tenaciously to the few individual rights left to him—the right to worship, to receive mail from home, to be judged according to a strict and fair code of justice, and finally, to vote. All opinions to the contrary, I am sure that few servicemen would fail to vote in the coming Presidential elections if given a chance. They will scorn most bitterly a Congress which does not do everything in its power to facilitate this right They will fight most valiantly for a Congress that honors not only their ability as warriors but also their dignity as citizens.

Mr. President, the point of all this is that we will respond to that noble sentiment if we show by our affirmative act here that we are willing to give the soldiers a separate Federal ballot as an assurance of their right and privilege to vote. They cannot obtain it under existing law. Let me modify that statement and say that they can obtain it if a State permitted the ballot to go out without having any State candidates on it.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator for reading into the RECORD the letters he has received dealing with the subject before the Senate. I join in the sentiments expressed therein. The letters sound to me like the speeches I heard made on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago, shortly after I came to the Senate, speeches made by those working for the passage of the Green-Lucas bill, such as the Senator from Vermont. In view of the fact that the Senator has read several letters, I wish to say that I have just received the first letter from my eldest son since he left the port of embarkation, and he is now in the Pacific somewhere. His name is James Woodrow Jackson, and those of my friends who are of the political faith of the distinguished senior Senator from my State and the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois who sits here now, have said that he was named James for James Madison, and Woodrow for Woodrow Wilson, and they could guess about the remainder of his name. I want for him only the same ease of voting that I want for every other soldier. What I wish to know from the Senator from Vermont, or from any other source, is whether the adoption of the conference report will accomplish that objective rather than to hamper its accomplishment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I spent 2 or 3 hours trying to determine that. In my judgment, when the Senator reads the provisions relating to machinery and Federal aid for getting the ballots to the members of the armed forces overseas, and when he realized the difficulties which interrupt the movement of the State ballots, he will feel certain that in the separate Federal ballot which is provided for by the conference report rests the sole assurance that his boy and other boys in similar situations will get a chance to vote. That is the sole assurance there is. I would not weary the Senate by reading the testimony relative to the difficulties, but I can tell the Senator that there are tremendous difficulties in respect to getting the State ballots to the men overseas.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was called out of the Chamber a moment ago when the Senator from Vermont was discussing, as I recall, the question whether a soldier in the United States proper could vote the Federal ballot, if by any chance he had applied for a State ballot and had failed to receive it. I was advised upon returning to the Chamber that the Senator from Vermont had stated that such a soldier in the United States could receive the Federal ballot because of the failure of the State to supply him with a State ballot.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask the Senator to permit me to finish stating my thought on this matter. As I read the language at the bottom of page 6 of the report, on which page title III commences, the last paragraph reads as follows:

> No individual who is not included under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall be entitled to use, or be furnished, a ballot under this title.

Then I looked at the language farther up on the page in order to determine who would be the individuals not included under paragraphs (1) or (2). I find that they are members of the armed forces——

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, no, Mr. President; let me interrupt the Senator at once. He went too many rungs up the ladder. This is the same trouble I have had with other Senators. The Senator did not read that word correctly. The word is "subsection", not "section."

Mr. TYDINGS. The language is "of this subsection"; is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. It means subsection (b); does it?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am merely requesting information. In other words, according to the way the bill is now drawn, it means that a soldier within or without the United States who has applied for a State ballot, but who has failed to receive it, can vote a Federal ballot, insofar as the Federal law is concerned. Am I correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; the Senator is exactly correct. Let October 1 come along, and the soldier who has applied for a State ballot by September 1, but has not received it by October 1, can request a Federal ballot—and it will be there for him—without any doubt at all. He then can vote the Federal ballot. However, the use of the Federal ballot would not bar him from subsequently using a State ballot if it reached him. I want the Senator to note that there is nothing about the conference report which would bar such a soldier from voting a State ballot on the morrow. If a State ballot showed up after October 1 and if the soldier wanted to take a chance on having it get through in time, he could vote the State ballot; and if it reaches the polling place in time it will take precedence.

Mr. TYDINGS. It will?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; it will.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to ask the Senator another question at this point. I do not want to read along in the report and later have to ask the Senator another question. I ask the Senator where in paragraphs (1) or (2) it is specified that a soldier in the United States can vote.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator will notice that category (3) in section 302 (a) says "Members of the armed forces, inside the United States."

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. They are persons to whom this title applies.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Category (3) is a subsection of section 302 (a).

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Therefore, when we see it again, down in subsection (2)—

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, Mr. President, that language reads:

> (2) an individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a)—

Mr. AUSTIN. That is it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I continue to read:

> if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State, even though the Governor thereof does not make the certification referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (1), but only if such individual states in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made application for a State absentee ballot but, as of October 1, has not received it.

That is the language the Senator relies upon to bring the soldier serving in America in proper possession of a Federal ballot; is that correct?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. He does not have to take any oath that he has not received a State ballot, at all. All he has to do is to take it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; but even then, as I interpret the conference report, the soldier would not be permitted to receive that ballot if he were stationed in the United States, unless the State law authorized voting by Federal ballot.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; let me stop the Senator there?

Mr. TYDINGS. He would get it, all right; but the point is that it would not be counted or would not be legal unless the State had validated that type of balloting for voting.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct. The point I make right here is that the use of the Federal ballot must be authorized by the State, in order to have the ballot counted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont and I are in complete agreement about that.

Let me say further that it all boils down to this—and I make this statement in order that I may understand the philosophy of the conference report—that the State law as to the qualification of the absentee servicemen determines whether, regardless of what ballot the serviceman gets or votes, the ballot is valid and will be counted when it gets back to the ballot box.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; and no one except the State official shall judge that.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is specifically provided.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to be excused from stating further points about this matter at this time. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a memorandum relative to the present soldier-vote law and the provisions agreed upon in the conference report.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE PRESENT SOLDIER VOTE LAW AND PROVISIONS AGREED UPON IN CONFERENCE REPORT

THE PRESENT LAW

1. Does not take a State ballot to the voter through any Federal Commission. Section 7.

2. Does not require the War and Navy Departments to expedite a State ballot.

3. Does not permit merchant marine to have either State or Federal ballot.

4. Does not authorize postal card for State ballot.

5. Does not provide for a separate official State war ballot.

6. Does not facilitate soldier voting at any election except for electors of President and Vice President of the United States, United States Senators and Representatives in Congress (secs. 1 and 3).

7. It does extend the primaries (sec. 13) in choosing candidates for Federal offices, but to no others, but this is futile because the post card is defective.

8. It does give an option to a secretary of state to provide for voting for candidates for State offices if State legislatures have authorized it.

9. This is not a separate ballot and lacks the advantage of a separate ballot for Federal offices which is light, short, and capable of being shipped in bulk.

10. There is no backstop in the existing law against failure. The soldier gets but one chance at voting.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT PROVIDES

1. Each soldier has two chances to vote, namely: By State ballot if it arrives in time; the Federal ballot if the State ballot does not arrive by October 1.

2. Only one application is required, and 12,000,000 post cards have already been distributed (sec. 203, pp. 3 and 5).

3. It extends the privilige of voting to a new category, namely, to those coming of age (sec. 204, p. 6).

(NOTE.—The existing law is limited to the election of Federal officers in this regard (sec. 1 and sec. 3, par. 712).)

4. It extends the privilege of voting to another new category, namely, voters in special elections and in primaries (sec. 201, par. 2, line 13; supra, (6) and (7)).

5. It provides Federal machinery for both Federal war ballots and State war ballots (sec. 303 (a) (Federal), secs. 203, 206 (State)).

6. It avoids the challenge of unconstitutionality by limiting operation of the act to voters of States that by law have authorized the use of Federal ballots (sec. 502).

(NOTE.—No such limitation is contained in par. 712.)

7. It extends the facilities of air mail to both Federal and State ballots (which was not granted by par. 712) (secs. 309 (a), 206 (a)).

8. It extends the frank to cover post cards, ballots, and envelopes including air mail.

9. It recommends to the several States reduction in weight and bulk (sec. 207 (e), par. 10).

Since the foregoing was drafted, a new category of voters has been added, namely:

10. Members of the armed forces inside the United States who reside in States that have no absent-voter laws enabling categories 1, 2, and 3 to vote, and will be entitled to the Federal ballot. This category is not required to make an oath that it has applied for a State ballot and has not received it. Such oath is not necessary because such an application would be fruitless.

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island, inasmuch as I understand he wishes to have a letter placed in the RECORD.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I have received from Mayor LaGuardia, the brilliant mayor of the city of New York, a very interesting and illuminating letter about the soldier absentee-voting bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read, as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., March 11, 1944.

Hon. THEODORE F. GREEN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Knowing of your sincere interest to devise simplified machinery to permit men and women in the armed forces to vote, and also of the opposition with which you are confronted, it occurred to me that it would be interesting to you and your confreres on the committee to get an actual illustration of how the whole purpose may be defeated by resorting to so-called State ballot.

I would say that our State is practically 100 percent in favor of doing everything possible to give men and women in the armed forces an opportunity to vote in the coming election. There are some who believe in a State ballot. They are absolutely sincere but I believe they have not thought out the problem fully. Our Governor has made a very careful and complete study of this matter and I am sure that, in keeping with his usual care and thoroughness, he has put to work on this problem the very best minds and authority on election law and procedure. The result is a recommendation made by the Governor to the State legislature asking for legislation to effectuate the voting of men and women in the armed forces through the medium of a State ballot. Here we have as simple a form as is possible to carry out a State ballot system of voting, the result of careful thought and study by the best minds and submitted in absolute sincerity. Yet it is a mess.

A study of this plan will show that any State ballot system is hopelessly impractical and impossible. It would require tons and tons of paper, thousands of men to carry out and supervise the voting, an enormous amount of time and result in such confusion that would delay the final count not for weeks but for months. Here are the requirements and, I repeat, this is a plan conceived in absolute good faith and in all sincerity by master minds:

1. Every member of the armed services desiring to vote would simply send to the secretary of state of New York his name, home address, and service address. Semiaddressed post cards may be distributed to the members of the armed services for this purpose or the soldier may send the simple information required in a letter, on a post card or a scrap of paper.

2. The war ballot commission would forward the post cards to the local election boards.

3. The election boards would then mail directly to the soldier voter a ballot and self-addressed return envelope, all of a size and weight complying with the wishes of the Army and Navy.

4. The soldier or sailor upon receiving his ballot would mark it for any or every office and mail it to the war ballot commission, which would forward all the ballots to the proper local election boards to be counted.

Let us examine this procedure. Take the State of New York.

There are 9,329 election districts in our State. There are about 1,225,000 men and women residents of the State of New York in the armed services. So we start off with 1,225,000 post cards to these men and women all over the world and await 1,225,000 replies. This adds up now to 2,450,000 pieces of mail. Then these must be assorted and distributed to 9,329 election districts, now making your total number of handlings 3,675,000. Then the 9,329 election districts must send out 1,225,000 ballots. We are now up to a total of 4,900,000 pieces of mail. The soldier mails it to the war ballot commission thus increasing the total number of handlings to 6,125,000 and they, in turn, will assort it and mail it to the 9,329 election districts. By now the total pieces of mail are up to 7,350,000. It is then finally counted and the vote added to the election returns. Just how the time can be synchronized with election day and the returns from each election district within the period before officials are to take office, considering the distances and the remote and numerous places the men and women are stationed has not and cannot possibly be worked out.

As I stated, the total number in our State is approximately 1,225,000 men and women. This represents slightly under 10 percent of the total number of men and women in the armed forces, and our voting population is slightly under 10 percent of the Nation's. Multiply and add the remaining 90 percent and you will get an inkling of what State ballots will mean or rather what it will not mean in voting results if a State ballot system is ultimately adopted.

Inasmuch as Presidential electors are elected by State, there necessarily must be 48 different ballots and must be counted by each State. Therefore the only means of really giving the soldiers and sailors an opportunity to vote and to have their vote counted, which, after all, is important, is to have one

form of ballot for each State with only Presidential and State-wide elected officials on such ballot. Beyond that, it is humanly and practically impossible to go if the votes are to be counted. Ballots should be shipped out at one time, and distributed as they arrive in each location at one time and then shipped from each location to a central point in the United States, to be distributed to each of the 48 States. In this way, we will have but 48 distributions instead of 150,000. There must be at least 150,000 units counting, tabulating and certifying to votes cast in an election. Now multiply the pieces of mail going to and fro, in accordance with the State plan, and the absurdity of such a plan will be realized. The soldiers may be given a vote in this way but that vote will never be counted. Let us not humbug the soldier.

I thought you might be interested.

Sincerely yours,

F. H. LAGUARDIA, *Mayor.*

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, regardless of what men may say in or outside of this Chamber, the bald fact remains true and cannot successfully be disputed, that regardless of the section from which they come, there is a grave fear on the part of some that colored citizens or poor white citizens may, by reason of this bill and its provisions, obtain the right to vote which otherwise would be denied to them.

Equally it is true, and equally indisputable, that there are those who are thinking more of how, and for whom, the soldier will vote, than they are of whether he obtains the right to vote.

It was made very clear on the floor of the Senate in the course of debate in recent weeks that if Mr. Roosevelt would announce that he was not a candidate the provision for a Federal ballot could be passed within 30 minutes.

In short, two fears stand out. They are:

First, that if the simple ballot is provided some of the soldiers may cast a vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Second, that if the payment of the poll tax and registration are waived, the colored troops and poor whites may thereby obtain the right to cast a vote, which they cannot do under the so-called States' rights provision.

It is my firm conviction that if these two forces of fear prevail, few, if any, soldiers inside, and none outside, the United States will be able to vote for a Government which countless thousands of them are fighting and dying at this very moment to preserve.

Between those who are afraid to let our colored citizens and poor white citizens vote at all, and those who are afraid to let the soldiers vote for fear they will vote for Roosevelt, the Congress, if this bill becomes a law, will be perpetrating the greatest organized election steal since 1876, when the Republican Party were the beneficiaries of the Presidential election which was stolen from Samuel J. Tilden.

Can anyone believe that the verdict of the coming elections will be accepted as binding by those who have been deprived of the ballot or that those who have been deprived of the ballot will not feel entitled strongly to resent and to combat the policies which may be adopted as a result of this outrageous fraud and deliberate betrayal of democracy in the house of its friends?

Before acting on this bill, I should like to remind Senators of a certain hot summer day some 12 years ago, in 1932, when the previous occupant of the White House, President Hoover, issued orders to the Chief of Staff of the United States Army to send soldiers with fire and sword against the veterans of World War No. 1 who had peaceably assembled here in the city of Washington for the redress of their grievances.

I think it is well to recall that incident, because when this war is over there will be other veterans and they, too, may come to Washington and demand an accounting from a Congress which refused to allow them to exercise the right to vote and denied them a voice in the selection of Federal officers who will adopt policies which will govern the veterans of this war on their return to civil life.

This measure is not a service voting bill. It is a bill to disenfranchise 12,000,000 American citizens in the armed forces of the United States.

I warn the Senate and the country that Congress is playing with TNT when it attempts to put behind barbed wire, in a concentration camp, as it were, the men who are fighting and dying for America in Italy, in China, in the southwest Pacific, and in the skies over Germany—the men and women on whom we depend for the successful invasion of Europe.

Senators, do not hide behind outworn and false arguments. Stand up and be counted either for or against permitting all these young patriots to cast a simple ballot for the candidates of their choice, no matter what party label they wear.

INCREASES IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE POSTAL EMPLOYEES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1; and agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
WILLIAM M. LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHEL,
D. J. WARD,
FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report, with the understanding that the unfinished business will not be displaced.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Lipe Henslee, of Dickson, Tenn., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Tennessee, in place of Joe F. Hale; and

James P. Finnegan, of St. Louis, Mo., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri, in place of Robert E. Hannegan, resigned.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana. (Mr. Tansil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 12, 1944);

Theron Lamar Caudle, of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina. (Mr. Caudle is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 9, 1944);

Timothy T. Cronin, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin, vice Berthold J. Husting, term expired;

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware, vice J. Leslie Ford, term expired; and

Charles H. Cox, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia. (Mr. Cox is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 12, 1944.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Several officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942;

Capt. Forrest B. Royal, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 27th day of October 1942;

Maj. Gen. Holland M. Smith to be a lieutenant general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 28th day of February 1944;

Col. Walter G. Farrell to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 25th day of November 1943; and

Sundry citizens and several meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. M. Burden to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the hope that we may finish the conference report tomorrow, as in legislative session I now move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 14, 1944, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Rudolf E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to act as chargé d'affaires of the United States of America near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James Harold Doolittle (major, Air Reserve), Army of the United States.

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO SIGNAL CORPS

First Lt. Burnis Mayo Kelly, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1938.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Vernon Price Mock, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1938.

First Lt. Thomas Henry Muller, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1943.

Second Lt. Benjamin Willis Mills, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. William Bailey Crum, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1943.

First Lt. Newton Elder James, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 12, 1942.

First Lt. Robert Belden Kuhn, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 14, 1941.

First Lt. Robert Morris, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1938.

First Lt. Arthur Tilman Williams 3d, Cavalry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1942.

Second Lt. Jerald Morris Davies, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. James Edwin Foley, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Thomas Terrell Jackson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

Second Lt. Martin Cadenhead McWilliams, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. Irving Richard Perkin, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Boone Seegers, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from January 19, 1943.

Second Lt. James McIndoe Winterbottom, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named chief warrant officers to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

Del L. Young	Theodore R. Cooley
Lee J. Delworth	Elmo D. Runyan
Jesse L. Holloway	Clyde B. Lee
Elof W. Hermanson	David R. Sword
Homer K. Davidson	Hubert W. Fisher
Percy D. Genereus	James Dyer

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

Grant E. Horsley	John D. Fuller, Jr.
Thomas E. Russell	Westley L. Larson
Richard K. Margetts	Marion C. Kelly
Wilfred E. Fleshman	William F. Gadberry
Saleem D. Frey	Kenneth F. Shiffer
Walter W. Jones, Jr.	William W. Gribble
John E. King	Forrest A. Lees
Clyde C. Sapp	Milford C. Kendall
Elmer L. Prescott	Orville L. Beck

The following-named chief warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

John W. Perdue
John H. Newcomb

The following-named warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

Bernard M. Kassell	Laurence F. Seaman
Joseph B. Simpson	Joseph C. Lawrence

The following-named warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

Floyd X. Passmore
Raymond E. Dillon

The following-named chief pay clerks to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

William C. Humphrey
Edgar M. Brown
Goff E. Manuel

The following-named pay clerks to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

Arthur W. Shawkey
Adam P. Mastio
Creo Baldwin

Chief Pay Clerk Edward J. Hagen to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 14th day of January 1944.

The following-named pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

James E. Corcoran	Henry C. Krueger
Francesco H. Barbero	Michael J. Knapp
Walter Barsz	John L. Warden
Joseph R. Shirley	John A. Keefer
Frank S. Bird	

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 14th day of January 1944:

Donald F. Kent
Lester F. Debil
John T. Barham

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Harold R. Keller, Jr., June 3, 1941.
Francis H. McClanan, June 21, 1941.
Forest H. McClanan, June 21, 1941.
Robert J. Beaudine, October 10, 1941.
William B. Troendle, October 16, 1941.

Assistant Surgeon Delphos O. Coffman to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 8th day of September 1939, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

George T. McCoy, Jr., March 17, 1941.
Clark O. Martin, March 19, 1941.
Francis I. Lundquist, June 16, 1941.
Bryant W. Russell, September 24, 1941.
Edgar R. Bryant, September 24, 1941.
Robert O. Dodd, Jr., February 13, 1943.
Calvin A. Vobroucek, March 15, 1944.

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Capt. Allan E. Smith, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of November 1942.

Capt. Robert W. Hayler, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of January 1943.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

DELAWARE

Howard R. Elliott, Laurel, Del., in place of R. F. Quillin, deceased.

Albert I. Stafford, Middletown, Del., in place of E. E. Shallcross, resigned.

FLORIDA

Edward L. Toof, Fern Park, Fla., in place of M. J. Barnett, resigned.

IDAHO

Madge D. Becker, Hayden Lake, Idaho. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

ILLINOIS

Ralph Lavere Douglass, Adair, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

William G. Richardson, Astoria, Ill., in place of S. J. Schuman, resigned.

KANSAS

Bessie M. Stafford, Easton, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Rosa E. Collier, Randall, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Philip Louthan, Simpson, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

La Vera Wheeler, Towanda, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MAINE

Henry L. Holden, Jackman, Maine, in place of H. L. Holden. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

MASSACHUSETTS

Joshua T. Wilkinson, Charlton City, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MICHIGAN

Charles C. Malosh, Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Harry J. Skinner, McMillan, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Sister M. Margaret Rose Dushane, Nazareth, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Homer B. Fouts, Omena, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

James C. Bedell, Wakefield, Mich., in place of Arthur Cavender. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Mae Dust, Wellston, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Howard S. McCormick, Whitmore Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MINNESOTA

Ida S. Knauff, Glyndon, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Myrtle T. Ellingboe, Sunburg, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Theresa M. Reichensperger, Waite Park, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

George J. Klosterman, Woodstock, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Albert H. Sugg, Zumbro Falls, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MONTANA

Bernard R. Carey, Crow Agency, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Orville C. Hanson, Gildford, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John C. Abrahamson, Roberts, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Gertrude M. Neese, Savage, Mont. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEBRASKA

Mildred I. Onstot, Riverton, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Wilbur Brawner, Wilcox, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NEW JERSEY

Gerald J. Buchanan, Parlin, N. J., in place of J. F. Creamer. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1939.

NEW YORK

Henrietta Fairbanks, Bainbridge, N. Y., in place of Henrietta Fairbanks. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1940.

Maria A. Goodwin, Blue Point, N. Y., in place of Josephine Adams, removed.

NORTH CAROLINA

William Lewis Joyner, Rocky Mount, N. C., in place of W. G. Cherry, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Horace T. Storm, New Leipzig, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Harke, transferred.

OHIO

Muza R. Grove, Curtice, Ohio. Office became Presidential October 1, 1942.

Alice Salzman, Excello, Ohio, in place of John Roth, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Stanley V. Reppy, Plymouth, Pa., in place of T. V. Brennan, deceased.

Ernest F. Haeussler, Shillington, Pa., in place of R. D. Fister, removed.

Myrtus P. Spangenberg, Waymart, Pa., in place of M. L. McMahon, appointee declined.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Anna C. Liggett, New Underwood, S. Dak., in place of Kathleen McClaskey, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Marvin M. McKnight, Bemis, Tenn., in place of Marvin McKnight. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1938.

TEXAS

Mollie S. McHaney, Sylvester, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

VIRGINIA

Ruth O. Griffin, Newsoms, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Alice L. Paxton, Oceana, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Robert M. Bradshaw, Rice, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Amelia K. Stalding, Grayland, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Robert L. Van Arsdall, Lakeview, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Bertha M. Simmons, Milton, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WEST VIRGINIA

Londa E. Green, Beaver, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Edna E. Arnold, Bownemont, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Kittie C. Kirk, Kermit, W. Va., in place of J. L. Dunn, removed.

John J. Mathison, Wheeling, W. Va., in place of W. L. Brice, removed.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

William A. M. Burden to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

POSTMASTERS

HAWAII

Alfred Fernandes, Waimea.

IOWA

Ambrose J. Leinhauser, Agency.
Ruth Longenecker, Aurora.
Earl T. Van Metre, Clemons.
Lena Berg, Lockridge.
Velma Olson, McCallsburg.
Donald F. Sturtz, Montour.
William H. Lamoureux, Salix.
Anton Balik, Spillville.
Hannah Nelson, Stratford.

LOUISIANA

Linus A. Sims, Hammond.
Irma Hawsey Chandler, Pineville.

OKLAHOMA

Elijah E. Meggs, Fort Towson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou God of all grace and Father of all goodness, wilt Thou sanctify our affections that our ways may be directed into the great undiscovered realm of the soul. Help us to begin this day, scorning every brand of littleness and lift our heads as men who have a great expectation, pledging to keep our minds on pure and unselfish thoughts and our ambitions on worthy objects.

Thou who art the power not of ourselves, let us fold away all fears and strive for that which dignifies society and life and for that which makes a man among men, and all that links him to the attainment of the best type of citizenship. O grant to this great people a deeper sense of divine dependence and self-assertion, a more ardent desire to love Thy law with obedience. May all selfish power be curbed and intemperate speech restrained that the light of knowledge may rise upon a thorough understanding. We pray that every power and faculty we possess be consecrated to the work of promoting the kingdom of justice and peace among men. In a world which has lost its way, may our presence in this memorable Chamber be an omen of good, a sign of might, and a token that we are pledged to humanity and our Government. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 10, 1944, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address made by myself in New York on Friday before the Citizens for Victory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. LEMKE and Mr. BOYKIN asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business for the day and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a Mount Vernon, Ohio, news article entitled "Unjustly Accused."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial on the death of a former Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I made yesterday at Manhattan Center in New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by David Lawrence on the subject Do We Deserve Peace?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENNETT of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article from the St. Mary's Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Buffalo-Pittsburgh Diocese of the Polish National Church.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in the February 21 edition of Broadcasting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address by the Honorable Dwight Griswold, Governor of Nebraska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and wish to follow it by a unanimous-consent request. I wish to raise the question now and then follow it by the request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. RANKIN. No. I think the Members of the House ought to be here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I am not going to raise my question of personal privilege now.

Mr. RANKIN. I am going to insist on my point of order. I think the Members of the House ought to be here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I withdraw my request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 42]

Allen, Ill.	Gibson	Morrison, La.
Andersen, H. Carl	Gifford	Mruk
Baldwin, Md.	Gilchrist	Murray, Wis.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gillette	Myers
Barry	Gorski	Newsome
Beall	Gossett	Norman
Bell	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Leary
Bender	Harless, Ariz.	O'Toole
Buckley	Harness, Ind.	Pfeifer
Burch, Va.	Harris, Va.	Philbin
Burdick	Hart	Phillips
Butler	Hays	Plumley
Camp	Heffernan	Ramey
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Ramspeck
Capozzoli	Herter	Randolph
Celler	Hobbs	Reece, Tenn.
Chapman	Hoch	Rivers
Chenoweth	Holifield	Robertson
Cooley	Jarman	Rodgers, Pa.
Costello	Jennings	Rogers, Calif.
Cox	Johnson, J. Leroy	Satterfield
Dawson	Jonkman	Scanlon
Delaney	Kee	Short
Dickstein	Kelley	Smith, Va.
Dies	Kennedy	Smith, W. Va
Dirksen	Keogh	Somers, N. Y.
Domengeaux	Klein	Stearns, N. H.
Douglas	Knutson	Stockman
Drewry	Lambertson	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	Lane	Tibbott
Ellison, Md.	LeFevre	Torrens
Elmer	Luce	Vorys, Ohio
Fay	McGehee	Ward
Feighan	McMurray	Wasielewski
Flannagan	Maas	Weichel, Ohio
Fogarty	Madden	Weiss
Fuller	Magnuson	Wene
Fulmer	Manasco	West
Furlong	Marcantonio	White
Gale	Miller, Mo.	Wilson
Gamble	Monroney	Winter
Gerlach		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and three Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Detroit News of February 3, 1944, there was printed the following:

C. P. Quinn, president of the C. I. O. council, disclosed that a resolution condemning Hoffman for "seditious statements and activities" was passed by the council Tuesday night.

The resolution declares: "This Fascist-minded Congressman has thus climaxed a long record of pro-Fascist activities and by such seditious implications has laid himself open to immediate Federal action under the Espionage Act which places such utterances as this in wartime as treason and aid to the enemy."

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the gentleman has stated a matter of privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may take this matter up and discuss it upon the conclusion of the discussion and action on the so-called Indian bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter from Randolph Paul, of the Treasury Department, on tax simplification.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and insert in the Appendix of the RECORD copies of remarks made by me in New York City on Saturday, March 11, memorializing the invasion of Austria by Germany.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATORIAL SERVICE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, supplementing my remarks of December 1, 1943, and March 9, 1944, on the efficient and economical system of investigation employed with such success by the Committee on Appropriations, I submit for the RECORD a letter from Chairman Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board, as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
March 11, 1944.

DEAR MR. CANNON: Messrs. Francis X. A. Eble and Bernard Connor, who are special employees of the staff designated by your committee to conduct special studies, have presented their credentials and are currently engaged in examining the administrative structure and the operations of the War Production Board. These gentlemen have impressed my staff with their practical knowledge of Federal administration and their sympathetic understanding of the many problems confronting an agency of this size and complexity. I want you to be assured that every courtesy is being extended to them.

I have been concerned for some time over the manner of conveying to your committee a full understanding of our problems and operations in the time allowed for budget hearings each year. Reviews of the type now being conducted by Messrs. Eble and Connor will establish closer working relationships between your committee and the Board. A precedent has now been established which should prove mutually helpful. I welcome the opportunity to furnish any information your committee may require in its deliberations.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this letter is typical of many expressions received by the committee and is indicative of the helpful cooperation received by the committee from the departments. The service is of

mutual benefit to the executive and legislative branches of the Government and not only results in a more complete understanding of the problems to be dealt with but materially lessens the burden of work of both the departments and the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by former Congressman Oscar J. Larson from the Eighth Minnesota District, which appeared in the Virginia (Minn.) Daily Enterprise of Monday, February 14, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Virginia Daily Enterprise, of Virginia, Minn., under date of March 7, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SHOTGUNS AND AMMUNITION FOR FARMERS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEVENSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a recent radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE HALL FURLOUGH BILL

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the report which has come to me from my district of soldiers and sailors of the American armed forces bumming their way home through snowstorms, through sleet and through rain, without any opportunity of having a way to get home after they have been given a 10-day furlough, and after exhausting practically all of their furlough en route, leaving only a day for them to see their loved ones at home, is a sad commentary upon the treatment which Uncle Sam is giving the boys in the armed forces.

I sincerely hope that the Hall furlough bill which has been proposed a number of times before the House will be given immediate consideration, especially when one considers that the coming invasion of Europe is not far off. There will be millions of men leaving the country and as many as possible should be given a chance to go home before they go. My bill will provide each one of these men and women with a travel certificate so everybody who is entitled to a furlough will be able to take advantage of it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders today I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS OF INDIANS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 166, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas a concurrent resolution of the South Dakota State Legislature memorializes the Congress of the United States to instigate an investigation and study to determine the necessity and advisability of revising the Federal laws and regulations relating to Indian affairs pointing out that—

(a) Most of the said existing laws and regulations were formulated at a time when all the Indians were considered as wards and dependents of the Federal Government and incapable of assuming the duties, obligations, and station of citizenship; and

(2) Most of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation have now been accorded the legal status of citizenship and have advanced in education and progress along the lines of racial development to a point where they should be treated as full citizens, and most of the restrictions and regulations limiting their rights and freedom of action should be removed; and

(3) Many of the Indian inhabitants of the Nation are now graduates of high schools and colleges, and all of them are capable of receiving full high school and college education; and

(4) Many of our Indian citizens have entered loyally into the present war and assumed the risks and duties of active warfare on the same basis as other citizens of the Nation, and their efforts should be recognized and rewarded accordingly; and

Whereas members of the Indian affairs committee of the South Dakota State Legislature made a personal inspection of living conditions on a typical Indian reservation in South Dakota and there found many of our American Indians living in deplorable conditions, lacking adequate protection against winter weather and suffering from inadequate nourishment, and inadequate sanitary and health provisions; and

Whereas it is believed that many American Indians living on reservations in other States of the Union are similarly lacking in the minimum essentials of living conditions which provide for healthful development and for their eventual assimilation into the general population of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation to determine whether the changed status of the Indian and the conditions under which he now lives require a revision of the laws and regulations affecting the American Indian and to prepare recommendations to Congress for the enactment of any needed legislation to improve the status and advance the opportunity of the American Indian.

The committee shall report to the House as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation and changes of policy and program as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strikes out the whereases.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this is the so-called Mundt resolution, giving the Committee on Indian Affairs authority to make investigation for the purpose of effecting economy and saving through a gradual liquidation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and putting the Indians on their own, as the gentlemen who appeared before the Rules Committee stated. At present the operation of the Indian Office costs $33,000,000 a year; and we have an Indian population of about 350,000. It is estimated that savings in administration of Indian affairs would amount to ten or fifteen million dollars a year after this proposed investigation.

I had been informed and I informed the gentlemen when they appeared before the Rules Committee that the other legislative body has been making an investigation for a "short" period of about 18 years; that it has about 40 volumes of evidence and reports and has made some recommendations; but aside from publishing a report in June 1943, nothing has been done, no legislation has been enacted to remedy some of the evils or reduce costs. The Indian Committee feels that something should be done in behalf of the Indians, and at the same time in behalf of our Government to save unnecessary expenditures.

Personally, of course, I do not have very many of these Indians in my district to whom this would apply. I have some very friendly Indians to whom this legislation would not apply. They would not cost the Government anything. Nevertheless, I am interested that something should be done to effect a release of the real Indian from Government wardship, because many of these Indians today possess as thorough intelligence and knowledge of their own affairs as have white men, and they do not need to be any longer under the wardship of Uncle Sam. The proponent of the resolution, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and members of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I am sure, will explain the need more fully than I can.

I am informed that the gentleman from Missouri, my beloved friend [Mr. COCHRAN], desires 10 minutes in opposition to the resolution. I have stated to him that I will be only too pleased to yield him that time, but I will have to get some of the time from the other side. I do not suppose I will have any trouble in getting a little time for him. If I am unsuccessful, I will have to reduce the time I have promised to the other three gentlemen.

I well remember that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has frequently opposed appropriations for investigating committees.

Although I dislike to take any more time, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], as chairman of the Committee on Accounts, has seen fit to recommend large sums of money year after year to investigating committees, which appropriations I have felt and still feel should not have been approved. I concede that some of the investigating committees have not, after long investigations, effected any remedial legislation. I am not going to call attention to the sum of money allotted for the Dies committee or any other investigating committee, which Dies committee, unfortunately, has gone far afield from the original intent of the Congress.

For instance, the Dies committee was created to investigate un-American activities of Communists, Fascists, and Nazi organizations and individuals, but in the last 3 or 4 years it has devoted practically all its time to investigating personnel of various departments and independent agencies and has actually failed, especially since Pearl Harbor, to properly investigate the Nazi, Fascist saboteurs, and has persisted in finding fault with organized labor and the so-called Communists. This when everybody must know that ever since Pearl Harbor, regardless of what some of the misguided so-called Communists might have said here and there before Pearl Harbor, they have continuously favored and assisted their country in every way in an effort to effect early victory.

Of course, there are other committees that have received much larger allotments of money than this proposed investigation would cost, but when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] stated that no committee has ever succeeded after an investigation in effecting remedial legislation, I know that today he does not mean to include all committees. He must agree with me when I say that the Select Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations saved thousands upon thousands of people's investments and brought about a reduction of the inexcusably high fees of lawyers, trustees, receivers, and depositories under section 77B of the Bankruptcy Act, and it took out of the clutches of these so-called protective committees, which name is a misnomer, hundreds of properties in behalf of the rightful owners, the bondholders.

That select committee also brought to light the abuses and the nefarious activities of a few manipulators who destroyed about 42 small life-insurance companies and saved thousands upon thousands of policyholders. Yes; that select committee succeeded in effecting two amendments of the Bankruptcy Act and precluded for the future the wholesale imposition of investment bankers and speculators upon the public.

Had the other legislative body acted upon my original bill as it passed the House, we would have eliminated the professional receiver and trustee and would have taken the rightful owners out of the clutches, I repeat, of the trustees who are still in possession of the remaining properties they have not as yet bartered away.

Moreover, at that time the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] did not realize to what extent 6,000,000 to 8,000,000 American investors had been not only imposed upon but actually robbed of their life savings. That select committee also investigated many suspected judges, a few of whom were obliged to resign, and some later were removed from the bench.

So I say that some investigating committees can be of real service to the people of the country, and I am pleased to say that I had the high honor to be chairman of that Select Committee to Investigate Real Estate Bondholders' Reorganizations, the only select committee of which I have been a member during my long service here.

I was fully aware that the powerful investment bankers and these men who came into control of the $20,000,000,000 of bonds and property belonging to the bondholders—the receivers, trustees, trust companies, banks, title and insurance companies—left no stone unturned to undermine the progress of that select committee. Notwithstanding the tremendous influence of these powerful men and organizations, I defy anybody to say that a great deal of good was not accomplished by our investigation.

If it were not imperative that we devote all our energies to winning the war, I would urge that another select committee be created to further investigate the activities of many of these trustees who came into possession of hundreds of these valuable properties and operated them not in the interest of the bondholders but for their own profit and purpose.

In view of all this, I feel that, inasmuch as this resolution authorizes the Indian Committee itself to make the investigation and that it will not cost any more than $15,000, according to the chairman's statement, and it may save from ten to fifteen million dollars annually, the resolution should receive favorable consideration.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and shall yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

I am obliged to reserve 10 minutes for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] wishes to proceed now, I will yield to him and will thereafter yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that for once at least we find ourselves in agreement in support of a measure before this House, House Resolution 166, which as the chairman of the Committee on Rules has so ably stated, simply authorizes the House Committee on Indian Affairs to proceed with an investigation, and giving that committee the power to subpena witnesses and compel the production of records and papers, in connection with the expenditure of public funds for the benefit of the Indians under the control and supervision of the United States Government.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that in considering this measure we must remember that during the past 25 years there has been something like $600,000,000 of public funds spent in behalf of the Indians, and for their care and advancement. At the present time we have in the United States approximately 360,000 Indians with approximately another 40,000 Indians in Alaska. Of these, between 75,000 and 150,000 are said to live white men's lives.

There is some question, a grave question, as to whether or not the continued expenditure of these huge sums is necessary for the best interests of the Indians and of the country. It is true that the other body of this Congress has had an investigation in recent years, but seemingly has done nothing about it. I am convinced from my study of this matter that the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House can, in a few short weeks, make a careful and comprehensive study and investigation of this matter; and perhaps report back to this body legislation that will result in great economies and great savings to the people of the United States, as well as greater justice and better treatment for the Indians. So I support this measure which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. SABATH. Just one minute before the gentleman yields——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will defer to the gentleman from Illinois if he wants to yield to somebody on his side first.

Mr. SABATH. No; go right ahead.

Mr. COCHRAN. They all, Mr. Speaker, want to reserve their time. Everyone apparently wants to follow me. I am willing to talk now. I am willing to state my case now.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman from Missouri want to proceed at this time?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am willing to proceed now. You all want to take advantage of this situation. The gentleman has already yielded to the gentleman from South Dakota. You all know I am against the resolution. I am willing to give my side before the proponents state their case if that is the advantage you want.

Mr. SABATH. If there is any question about it, let the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] proceed now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is in position to recognize any Member to whom time may be yielded.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am always ready to cooperate with the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will proceed. Let them answer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How much time is the gentleman yielded?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is so kindly disposed I will let him have 10 minutes out of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the preamble of this resolution has been stricken out but if anyone will read it he or she will see that the suggestion for this resolution originated in the Legislature of South Dakota. The Legislature of South Dakota expressed the hope that the Congress would do something in regard to the laws and the administration of the laws by the Indian Bureau. The preamble further calls attention to the fact that the legislators of South Dakota did not like the manner in which the Indians were being treated at one reservation in South Dakota.

It would have been very easy to have referred this matter to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and let him correct the situation if it needed correcting, but instead we have presented to us a resolution providing for an investigation by the Committee on Indian Affairs of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I know that for the last 18 years the Senate of the United States has been investigating this subject. Over 40 volumes of testimony has been taken and is available from the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. Aside from that, Mr. Speaker, this committee of the Senate has made reports from time to time. Last June it made a report, and in my opinion that report is the cause of this resolution. You talk about comity between the two bodies. What will result if this resolution passes will be an effort to endeavor to get a House committee to repudiate the views of four outstanding Senators, Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma, the chairman of the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate for the past 12 years; Senator CHAVEZ, Senator WHEELER, of Montana, coauthor of the Wheeler-Howard act; and Senator SHIPSTEAD, of Minnesota, each and every one of them having any number of Indians in their States, men who have disclosed throughout their services in the Senate that they are absolutely in favor of helping the American Indian.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; I am going to use all my time. I have but 10 minutes. The balance of time, 50 minutes, goes to those in favor of the resolution.

Mr. CASE. Will not the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I refuse to yield, Mr. Speaker. If I can get some time I will yield to the gentleman or any other Member. Surely the opposition should be permitted to use the 10 minutes allotted.

Mr. Speaker, in June the Senate committee made 33 recommendations. Those recommendations, if carried out, would revolutionize the handling of the Indians in this country by our Government. Besides making recommendations they state in their report the amounts that can be saved. So far as I know those recommendations have not been placed in bills, they are not before the Congress; but those recommendations aroused the ire of certain officials of this Government who are in charge of the administration of our Indian laws. That statement cannot be denied. Further I understand the Commissioner of Indian Affairs favors this resolution. Yes, it was the Senate report that excited those who were criticized by that report. I long ago learned the Indian Bureau did not want anyone to tell them how to handle the Indians. Their resentment is what is back of this resolution. They want to repudiate by the hearings that might be held what the Senate committee has said. That report was based, as I say, on investigations over a period of 18 years. If this resolution passes today there will be immediately filed another resolution which will be sent to the Committee on Accounts to give the committee money in order to make the investigation. Why, you could not scratch the surface in an Indian investigation between now and next January. It would be absolutely impossible, with the reservations scattered all over the country.

Let me call your attention to another matter. We have now practically 25 authorities set up by your Rules Committee for investigations by select committees and legislative committees of this House. Well over a million dollars are being spent by those committees. When you talk about waste, extravagance, and the expenditure of public money that should not be made, and when you vote on this resolution, think of these speeches that you have made, especially my friends on the Republican side. It will cost money to make this investigation and once it is started try to stop it. That is the history of investigating committees of this House—start them, and Members want them to go on forever. I am very sorry to say that in the main very little legislation follows the work of an investigating committee. That is the record. Some have brought good results, I admit.

There is not one sound reason why this resolution should be adopted today. We have matters of grave importance before this body which require the presence here of the members of the Indian Affairs Committee and we should not send them on a joy ride from reservation to reservation taking testimony. If they will go over the Senate report, pick out what they feel is good and bring in a bill here, if it will better conditions and save money, I will vote for it. Let us eliminate these unnecessary expenditures. No one individual has the right to make the statement that if this House passes the pending resolution today it means a saving of $15,000,000. How are you going to better their condition if you do not give them more money? I say to you it would be a mistake to put another investigating committee to work in this House when there is absolutely no reason whatsoever for it. I appeal to those interested to go through the 40 volumes of testimony that have been taken by the friends of the Indians in the Senate. The Indians themselves have been heard, their lawyers have been heard, the organizations in this country that have been organized for assisting the purpose of the Indians have been heard. All the information you need is there and if the Indian Affairs Committee wants it all they have to do is to study that record.

Mr. Speaker, may I say again that this forum should not be used to repudiate the action of the Senate committee. The House Committee on Indian Affairs is in control. They do not have to bring in legislation here unless they approve it and if they do not approve the report of the Senate committee they do not have to report a bill from that committee even though it passed the Senate; so why start a fight between the Indian Affairs Committee of the House and the Indian Affairs Committee of the Senate to satisfy those who are administering our Indian laws?

It costs money to send committees around the country. It costs money to pay their hotel bills, and if you pass this resolution you are going to have to provide the money. I sincerely hope, regardless of what will be stated by Members who favor this resolution, that the House will vote it down. The opposition has but 10 minutes, friends of the resolution will take the remaining 50 minutes. No one can answer any argument they make.

In conclusion, let me read to you a statement, and I will say I am surprised to see it come from this gentleman. It proves to you that what I say in reference to those administering the laws is true. This is at the bottom of a letter written to Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma by Secretary Ickes. He says to Senator THOMAS:

> The report is a disservice to the committee, to yourself, and to the purposes, objectives, and achievements of our Government in its dealings with the affairs of our oldest minority.

You complain about people uptown telling the Congress of the United States what it should do and what it should not do in reference to changing and administering laws, but you make no complaint about that strong language.

Find out whether or not the laws are properly administered, whether regulations have been adopted that are harmful, and, if you make that charge,

then you have a committee already set up with plenty of money that is charged with making just such an investigation; to determine whether the laws are being administered as Congress intended and to determine whether they have gone beyond the laws in adopting rules and regulations. That is the committee presided over by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I know if you make charges that they are not properly administering the laws, and that the regulations go beyond the laws, and you make your request, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] will make an investigation and he will respond immediately.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York as the time was allotted for that purpose.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If we pass this resolution and bring a bill in here to improve the condition of the Indians, in place of reducing the cost it will increase it. I am speaking as a member of the subcommittee having to do with the Indian Bureau. I am in sympathy with the Indians and I believe we should do everything possible for them, but to rise here and say it is going to reduce the cost is not a fact, it cannot do anything of the kind. If you are going to improve the condition of the Indians it will probably double the cost or add 50 percent or more to it.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from New York is absolutely right. I regret, Mr. Speaker, the time is not more evenly divided. Now you will only hear from those favoring this investigation. Much more could be said why this resolution should not pass, but time is not available. Those who will speak have been here for years. If conditions are bad, as they will say, then let them explain why they have not brought in legislation that would have provided better treatment for the Indians.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 166 has been before the Congress from the standpoint of being before committees for a long time. I do not want the House to feel that my resolution was inspired by Senate Report No. 310, which was issued last June, however, because my bill was introduced here in March a year ago. There were hearings before the Indian Affairs Committee a year ago and that committee by unanimous vote approved the resolution on the 23d day of March 1943, several months before Senate Report 310 was ever brought out. The Rules Committee, as you have heard it said, gave its approval to this bill on the 3d day of March, this year. So much by way of straightening out the record and by way of reiterating the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all, in response to my good friend from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] because I know he is a friend of the Indians—I have been before his committee—that it is possible to improve the status of the Indians and at the same time decrease the cost of the Indian Service. That is so for this reason: At the present time there is no legislative method by which you can determine when an Indian comes out from under his special status and as a result the Indian Office itself is overburdened with having to account for many people leading a white man's life, but who are still classified as Indians and retaining wardship attributes, and there is no legal manner in which they can be removed from that status. So it is possible, on the one hand, to decrease the cost annually, and on the other hand, to do more for the Indians who actually require help from the Indian Office.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations never had any evidence that it would decrease, but on the contrary, it would increase the cost.

Mr. MUNDT. That is true under prevailing conditions only.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the testimony before our committee. I am in sympathy with the Indians.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure you are. It will continue to be an increasing cost until we can find some legal method which we hope will develop from an investigation such as the one I am proposing for taking from the rolls all Indians who should not be there, actually defining the problem confronting us, and then developing a constructive program destined to give fairness and freedom to the American Indian. We propose to suggest methods by which the Government can increasingly help the Indians to better be able to help themselves.

In short, Mr. Speaker, it is a threefold purpose that this resolution hopes to accomplish. In the first place, it hopes to improve the status of the American Indian, as I have already indicated. That is our first objective. That is our fundamental purpose. It is our primary goal.

The second is to decrease annual appropriations, and to do that by requiring the Indian Office and the various services to devote their functions and services to the Indians in need of it, and not to the vast population of Indians determined by the Census to have some little portion of Indian blood but needing no help. We have to define the problem and that is one thing this investigating committee hopes to do.

In the third place, we hope to set up a pattern which will work toward the eventual elimination entirely of the Indian Office, not abruptly, not in the next 5 or 10 years, but after the Indian problem has been solved, by a series of constructive measures. It would be unnecessary to maintain the Indian Office at all had we done this 50 years ago. The chances are that today your subcommittee, Mr. FITZPATRICK, would not be bothering at all with Indian appropriations had Congress adopted a sound and beneficial program 50 years ago. It is my hope the Mundt resolution will help produce such a program.

Our Committee on Indian Affairs hopes to apply this simple test to every existing Indian policy and every proposed Indian policy coming before us. It is this: Does it hasten the day when the Indian can become an independent citizen and take his rightful place in our American economic and political activity? That is one rule we seek to apply to this problem. I believe it is a sensible standard to keep before us.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. The gentleman from Missouri has stressed the Senate report and has rather implied that action in passing this resolution would be a repudiation of the Senate report of last year. I do not want to be in the attitude of voting for a resolution that would be a repudiation of the report by the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MUNDT. No; of course not.

Mr. DISNEY. The people in my State are interested in this matter and I should like some light on it.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be happy to comment upon that. In the first place, our investigation cannot be a repudiation of any report, because we hope to consult the facts and bring in testimony, and after that conclude our resolutions. We have no idea where these resolutions will lead at this time. We are neither dedicated to the repudiation of the report nor to its endorsement. We expect to engage in neither a whitewash nor a witch hunt. We simply expect to pursue the facts wherever they may lead and to let the chips fall where they will.

As to Senate Report 310, the Senators who have signed it themselves are somewhat skeptical about some of the 33 recommendations which it includes.

I have a letter here which Senator THOMAS, of the gentleman's State, wrote to a man in the Indian Agency at Anadarko, Okla., in which he says, in commenting on this report:

> The report mentioned was agreed to by a subcommittee of the Indian Affairs Committee and the attorney for the committee was ordered to prepare the text for the report. The report was intended to outline a long-term plan for the liquidation of the Bureau and just how the dates calling for the boarding schools to be eliminated at the end of this fiscal year is somewhat of a mystery. It may have been that some members of the committee knew of this provision but it was not called to my attention and of course had I known that these dates were inserted I would not under any condition have signed the report.

In a later paragraph he says:

> You can readily see how easy it would be for some secretary to put me in a most embarrassing position if statements were made in any communications which did not conform to my viewpoint and policies. This is actually what happened in the report that was published.

The report that was published is in direct conflict with evidence submitted to us by Secretary of the Interior Ickes and also by Indian Commissioner Collier. On most of the 33 points at issue, Mr. Ickes and Mr. Collier say one thing and Senate Report No. 310 says something else. It is impossible for the House Indian Affairs Committee, without having the authority to study the problem and investigate it, to pass intelligently on this kind of a controversy. We would either have to say to the Senate Indian Affairs Committee, "You are wrong, you have misrepresented the facts," or we would have to say to Mr. Collier and Mr. Ickes, "You are wrong, you have misrepresented the facts"; and we cannot be put in that kind of a position.

We are assuming that they are both right in certain aspects. We are assuming that they are both talking about different things in part, but there is no legislation growing out of the whole Senate report, and our committee proposes to bring in some kind of recommendation for legislative action.

I would like to say this to my Democratic friends, because I think there is a reasonable question that you might ask, and that is, Is there any reason why we should vote for a resolution brought in here by a Republican which might propose to investigate an administrative agency? Let me answer that question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will answer that question. I do not care whether it is a resolution, an appropriation, or a tariff bill if it is a good one; I do not care which side of the aisle it comes from.

Mr. MUNDT. Fine.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As a Representative of my district and State, I am also a Representative of the 48 States of the Union, and I will vote for anything that is beneficial to them.

Mr. MUNDT. Thank you. The resolution as brought in here came into being in part as the result of the South Dakota Legislature memorializing Congress to do something about the Indian problem, our State being a typical State having a large Indian population. Subsequently I offered this resolution. If it is approved, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, will be in charge of the investigation and will be chairman of the investigating committee. And, as is right, the investigating committee will have more members of the majority party on it than of the minority party.

I might add this further thing, that this is a friendly, fact-pursuing investigation. It does not go out to repudiate anything or to persecute anybody. It has the unanimous support of the Committee on Indian Affairs. It has the support of Mr. Collier, the Indian Commissioner, who, like the committee members, is eager to have the facts brought out so that we can know what kind of legislation is desired. This is not an effort to expose a situation or to persecute an individual, it is simply an attempt to evolve a constructive Indian policy which will lead to better conditions for the Indian.

There are 10 general problems which we hope to study. May I just mention those 10 briefly. We may not, of course, have time to go into all 10 of these and the list does not bar the inclusion of other matters, but it will indicate some of the matters our investigation will consider, if it is approved.

No. 1 is, as a matter of definite policy, to determine what is an Indian. When does an Indian pass from his special status and take his part in the white man's society? Mr. Collier tells us it requires an act of Congress to define this. We cannot intelligently recommend to you such an act of Congress until we have had an opportunity to investigate and study the facts.

No. 2 is to bring to a conclusion the interminable Indian claims coming before this body. There are now over $700,000,000 worth of Indian claims pending, in which the Indians make claims against the Congress and against the Government. We hope to arrive at some formula and some basis for putting a stop date on those claims. Those which are meritorious should be paid, and those which are not meritorious should be outlawed. Under existing conditions, all claims are delayed and deferred, and some attorneys apparently look upon Indian tribes as perpetual clients.

Third. There are now 23,000 American Indians in the armed services of this country—a larger percentage of Indians having entered the service incidentally than of any nationality represented in our Army, Navy, and Air Forces. An additional 25,000 to 30,000 are away from home working in our defense industries. Something must be worked out to provide for the readjustment of these Indians to productive, independent, self-supporting peacetime living after the war.

Fourth. The Wheeler-Howard Act has now been in operation about 10 years. Some Indian tribes have voted themselves completely under the provisions of this act, some have voted to remain entirely out, and still others have voted to accept certain provisions of the act and to reject others. No opportunity has been provided for subsequent votes and for tribes to change the status they decided upon with their original votes. Such opportunity should be provided and investigation may well reveal that certain important changes are desirable in this legislation.

Fifth. In 1924 Indians were made citizens of the United States by an act of Congress. Nevertheless, many of them are still treated as wards and almost all Indians live under certain aspects of wardship status. This incongruous situation should be corrected and an examination should be made of all special Indian penal statutes to determine whether they can be repealed or made inoperative in many cases.

Sixth. The whole problem of Indian heirships needs to be opened up and its operations revamped. Today some Indians have equities in 30 or 40 widely scattered pieces of property and these equities run as small as $3 to $5. Something must be done to consolidate these holdings and to make income and principal of some value to the individual Indian.

Seventh. On some Indian reservations no adequate protection is provided for the wildlife resources of this country. In some cases neither Federal nor State protective laws apply. A correction should be found for this situation.

Eighth. The relationship of Indian lands to State and local taxes should be investigated and redefined. In some cases it is now impossible for tribes to secure all the land needed to support their people because of the ruinous impact of more tax-free land upon the local taxing bodies. Thus, both the Indians and the white citizens in Indian country are the victims.

Ninth. The possibility of establishing an advisory continuing Indian council should be explored, such council to work with Congress, with the Indian Office, and with the Indians themselves in developing and supporting the administration of a program of advancement for the Indians. Thus, the shock of changing Indian administrations would be softened and a continuing program could be developed which would not be abruptly altered every time there is a change of political administrations.

Tenth. We should examine the feasibility of transferring more of the Indian services such as school, health, agricultural supervision, vocational training, etc., to the administration of the individual States with grants in aid from the Federal Government. In some localities and with some tribes this might result in better treatment, more rapid advancement, and reduced costs to the Federal Government. In all events more opportunities for advanced vocational training should be provided for the Indians. We must increase the Indian's earning power before we can decrease his dependency upon the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing list is suggestive of the great need for the investigation proposed in the Mundt resolution. Other even more important problems may be developed as we get into the investigation, if it is authorized. It may also develop that some of these 10 will present difficulties too mighty to overcome but we can do nothing unless we make the effort. The American Indian is a great citizen. He is the original American. He deserves better treatment than has been accorded him by his white conquerors during the past 200 years. Let us decide today to take the step I am proposing as an effort to bring equity to the first victims of aggression on the North American Continent—the aboriginal Indians from whom we took by force and trickery the best terrain in all the world. I earnestly believe that the passage of the Mundt resolution today will be a step in that direction, and will help not only to improve the living conditions of the American Indian but also provide suggestions for reducing the present high costs of maintaining the Indian Bureau.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this particular resolution is very badly needed. It goes much further than trying to evaluate the points that were brought out in Senate Report 310. As a matter of fact, it gets to the basis of our entire Indian policy. As was stated a few minutes ago, the eventual end of that policy should be taking the Indians out of the status of wards and making them complete citizens in every sense of the word.

I have studied rather carefully Senate Report 310. Regardless of anything else that may be said, it hardly seems to me that it is the basis for a revaluation of our policy regarding the treatment of Indians.

There are two things we are specially anxious to do. One is to see that at the present time the American Indians are given decent and fair and just treatment. When complaints have arisen and when points have been raised that such treatment is not taking place, it seems to me there is need for a thorough check up on the whole problem of Indian Affairs.

In the second place, any policy must look forward to an eventual termination of the wardship of the Indians of this country. Up until about 1929, the Indian Bureau was just about the most badly mismanaged bureau in the United States Government. Antiquated personnel and antiquated equipment were being dumped into it. Starting about 1929, a revolutionary change took place in that Bureau. During the past 14 years it has gradually become one of the more efficiently operated bureaus of American Government.

I think it is noteworthy to point out in that connection that it has so operated under both Republican and Democratic administrations. It is not partisan in any sense of the word.

Let me cite just one illustration of the achievements of this particular Bureau. In 1929 the Indian death rate was 27 per thousand annually. At the present time it is 13 per thousand annually. The cutting in half of the death rate during that time seems to me to be a noteworthy achievement.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am curious as to whether or not I heard the gentleman correctly. Did the gentleman say that the purpose of this resolution is to stop the Indians from being wards any longer and make them all full citizens?

Mr. OUTLAND. I said that the eventual hope of our Indian policy, it seems to me, should be that; not for the immediate purpose of the investigation, no.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The improvement in the death rate is due to the fact that the Indians were not treated as private citizens but were very carefully taken care of as wards of the Government.

Mr. OUTLAND. Yes; but I am sure that my friend would agree with me that after the Indian Bureau has been able to help the thousands of Indians to help themselves, the eventual aim should be that they should become free.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, probably no resolution for an investigation will come before this Congress that has a deeper meaning for a larger proportion of any Member's constituency than this has for mine. One person in eight in my district is enrolled in an Indian reservation, and entitled to Indian rights. There are five Sioux reservations in the district.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] raised the question as to whether or not this resolution should be adopted, upon the grounds of expense that it may entail. I cannot imagine that this select committee, created by this resolution, would expend over five or ten thousand dollars in its total expenditures, and if it spent twice that much, it should yield results that would save many, many times that amount.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] also raised the question as to whether this was the proper time for an investigation such as the one proposed. Let me say in reply to that, that the Indians, who have led all minority groups in the country in the rate of voluntary enlistment in the armed forces, are entitled to this study as a matter of justice. They are entitled to have the Four Freedoms established here at home.

The gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] intimated that everything that had happened before 1929 had been bad, so far as the Indian is concerned. Let me say that the time of greatest prosperity, so far as the Sioux Indians were concerned, was before 1929, and not since then. I wish the time permitted me to say something more about that. I disliked the gentleman's remark in particular because of the uncalled for reflection upon all Commissioners before 1929. It happens that a distinguished gentleman from South Dakota, a former Member of this House for 14 years, Hon. Charles H. Burke, was Commissioner of Indian Affairs, during a portion of the twenties. His constructive administration of that Bureau does not deserve the implications of the gentleman's remarks. An Oklahoma Member on this floor today has said to me that Charlie Burke was the best friend the Indians ever had as Commissioner.

Now, this resolution is proper because procedure in Indian affairs needs to be adjusted to the progress the Indians have made and the place they are capable of taking in American life. Let me illustrate. Every Sioux Indian who is serving as a private in either the Army or the Navy is getting at least $50 a month salary as a soldier or a sailor. He spends it as he pleases. He buys War bonds. He saves part of it. But when he comes to his reservation, if he has lease money deposited to his credit at the agency, he will have to come, hat in hand, and wait at the convenience of some clerk in the Indian agency, to submit a work program to know whether or not he can draw and spend his own money—probably far less in a year than the amount he has been receiving and spending in his own right in a single month.

Is it any wonder that the Indians wonder whose freedom they are fighting for? But they do fight and they go willingly and proudly, because they love their country.

I would like to see Congress pass a bill of emancipation for the American Indian. It should provide for the continuing of the benefits that have been promised the Indians by treaties and by the laws of the Congress, and also should provide a bill of rights that would permit the Indians to act in full the citizenship which was promised him by the Citizenship Act of 1924, passed during the Coolidge administration.

This resolution should be passed in order that the House Committee on Indian Affairs may proceed with full powers in a study of what should be done to enable the Indian to take his proper place in American life. The limited time for debate on the resolution does not permit a full discussion today of the various items that should be considered, so I shall ask permission to extend my remarks in that regard at a later date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the resolution will be adopted. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] says that no Member of this House has a deeper interest in the implications of this bill than he and his district. I say to the gentleman that I am running him a close second in that respect, because in the State of Arizona there are 50,000 Indians. That number does not happen to be 1 in 8, but 1 in about 10. Also, the economic life of Arizona Indians is intimately linked with the well-being of my State.

I think if there is any one thing misunderstood, it is this matter of our relation as a nation to the American Indian throughout our history. For decades and decades we handled the Indian tribes and treated with them as though they were foreign states, states within a state, and we made treaties with them, treaties which were usually broken. It is a sad chapter, much of this complete story about our dealings with the American Indian, and yet it has some good phases. As a nation we have wanted to be humane.

I call attention to one thing, that out of the 400,000 Indians in this country today, about a third of them we are told are men and women who could take their

places among American citizens, on an equal standing with all others. A large number, perhaps another third, are reservation Indians who are not now able to take their place among the white citizens and get along satisfactorily. They must continue for awhile, at least, as wards of the Government. Then, of course, there is a middle group on the border line. It is our duty as a Congress to study this whole question and see how we are able to induce those who are competent to assume the full duties of citizenship to be merged into our citizenship, leaving the status of others unchanged. That is the purpose of this resolution.

As I have so often said before to the Indian Affairs Committee of the House, "There are Indians and Indians." But that I referred to the vast differences in attainment among the various tribes throughout our country. I have known personally many Indians, especially in Oklahoma, who are college graduates and as wards of the Government had to ask permission to do the most trivial business acts. I have known, as many of you have known, high class members of the Cherokee Nation who held membership in this honorable body and in the other branch of Congress. And I know of many Indians as outstanding State officials and other Indian officials who were not predominately of white blood. Yet many reservation Indians have not had sufficient schooling to be entrusted to take care of themselves.

One reason for that may be that we count a man an Indian if he has only a small amount of Indian blood, no matter how much education he may have nor how capable he may be in doing his own business. I feel very positively that the friends of the Indians in Congress ought to subject this whole American Indian problem to close study with the view of releasing all from the governmental guardianship to a sphere of greater freedom as soon as it is to the benefit of the individual and the well being of society to do so.

With some reservation Indians this greater degree of freedom must not come too soon. I do not know the situation in South Dakota, but considering all our Indians, I doubt whether most of them are now ready to pass out of a condition of wardship. Certainly those far Western States like my own could not look with anything but apprehension upon the Government's withdrawing its guardianship as some have so thoughtlessly suggested. That is why I urge the adoption of this resolution for a study.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, my first direct contact with the Indians was through a nursing group which was asked to make a survey of public-health nursing in the United States. Among other places visited were the Indian reservations. The conditions were not good, but the survey was the beginning of better things. Apparently what was needed was a challenge to the service.

My service on the Indian Affairs Committee brought me into closer touch with Indian problems and I have deeply regretted that membership on the Foreign Affairs Committee prevents my continuing my earlier work.

Any study of the American Indians shows that from the beginning it has been the Indians' unfortunate lot to be subjected to governmental experiment after experiment.

The first, which sprang largely from fear of the Indian, was the plan of extermination.

The second was the idea of concentration. In other words, segregate the Indian and let him live his old tribal life.

The third experiment was the introduction of the Allotment Act, which has been abolished.

The fourth is embodied in the Wheeler-Howard Act. It has been presented as a method of decreasing control by the Federal Government and granting greater self-government to the Indians themselves. But it would seem as if acceptance of the act changed the status of the Indians from that of involuntary wardship to voluntary wardship, making his last lot more grievous than his first. This needs illumination. Such a survey as this resolution contemplates would furnish it.

I think it high time that we knew just how well this last method has worked. Are we integrating our Indians into our general population or are we not? We should know exactly what we are doing. It would seem to me an admirable time for us to very quietly examine into the situation of our Indians. They can be most useful citizens when they have opportunity so to be. They are a very loyal group in spite of their difficulties. We know that the percentage of Indians in the Army is extraordinarily high and that they are fighters. All of these qualities could be of increasing value to the United States. Let us remember that the Indian, after all, did own this country. We took it from him and we have an obligation to ourselves to see that he has a real chance to participate in complete citizenship. Let us make certain that the methods now being used are doing everything possible to integrate the Indian into our corporate life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I favor the passage of House Resolution 166, introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. Like the gentleman from South Dakota, I have quite a few Indian constituents in my district and I feel that I know their many problems. I have the honor to represent Indians that are members of the Winnebago, Omaha, and Santee Sioux Tribes, They are good citizens and they have contributed substantially to the welfare of their State and Nation. Many of them have rendered military service in previous wars and many others, among them sons of the older veterans, are today with our armed forces throughout the world. Many of them have achieved distinguished heroism in this war.

It is my custom to visit my Indian constituents yearly or oftener if possible. I join them at their council meetings and I visit them individually so that I may be informed about them. I find them tremendously interested in public matters. They participate in government. They vote and in spite of their many hardships under white man's rule, they are patiently waiting for legislation that will right the wrongs that have been done them. I subscribe to their natural feeling of entitlement to equality of treatment among citizens. If, by the passage of this resolution, the House of Representatives can advance the welfare of American Indians, let us vote for it unanimously.

There are many matters affecting the Omaha, Winnebago, and Santee Sioux Indians that I would like to discuss in the House. There are jurisdictional questions, many varieties of Indian claims, tax adjustments, and many other questions. But I feel that if this resolution is passed and this investigating committee functions effectively, we can acquaint that committee with the principal Indian grievances.

Something has been said here about the cost of this proposed committee. It has been represented to me that this committee can develop much needed information about many Indian problems that we cannot or will not otherwise get. I doubt if the cost will be high. I believe that a good job on the committee's part may even save money in addition to improving the welfare of Indians.

The United States Government is, at this moment, spending a large sum of money on the publication of a handbook on South American Indians, designed to help South American Indians. We have not done anything like that for our native Indians in many years. I opposed this South American expenditure on several occasions because I felt our native Indians are entitled to first consideration.

Let us vote for this resolution and urge the committee, should the resolution pass, to be thorough in its inquiry into all phases of Indian grievances so that the Congress may apply itself to the permanent betterment of our native American Indian citizens.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman, the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND], for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject now under discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, to one who knows the history of the Indians, no legislative proposal can awaken keener interest than one which has for its purpose the improvement of the status of the Indians and the rendering to them of a larger measure of long-delayed justice.

Among the citizens of Alaska are approximately 33,000 people who are given the generic name of Indians but who really embrace, by race, some 12,000 In-

dians, 20,000 Eskimos, and 1,000 Aleuts. Their legal condition is the same and, therefore, it may be proper to refer to them as Indians because in law they have been treated as the Indians of the several States.

While I am not in accord with some of the statements contained in the preamble of the resolution, it is to be noted that the preamble has been stricken and is no longer part of the measure now under consideration so that a vote in the affirmative will be a vote for the resolution without the preamble.

There is nothing extraordinary about the resolution. Its purpose is to bring about larger knowledge on the part of Members of Congress as to present conditions among the Indians. The proposal is to authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs of this House, or a subcommittee thereof, to conduct an investigation to determine whether the changed status of the Indians and the conditions under which they now live require a revision of the laws and regulations affecting the Indians, and to prepare recommendations to Congress for the enactment of any needed legislation to improve the status and advance the opportunity of the Indians. In my judgment, such action is highly desirable. It is true that the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I have the honor to be a member, can gather and has gathered a vast amount of information about the Indian races or tribes of the States and Alaska. But there is really no substitute for an inquiry on the grounds. Witnesses who come before the committee from the several States and from Alaska, no matter how honest or intelligent, are not able to give to the members the really penetrating insight and detailed knowledge of conditions which are so necessary to enable the members of the committee to draft any desirable legislation and then to explain and defend it on the floor of the House when the legislation is brought up for consideration here.

Moreover, it is obvious that conditions are not the same in every State or every community, or every tribe or association of Indians. In fact, conditions widely vary, and legislation that may be suitable for the Indians of South Dakota, for example, may not be at all suitable for those of Arizona or California or Oregon or Alaska, and this wide variance in circumstance and condition among the Indians of the United States, including Alaska, makes it the more necessary that there should be in every instance possible a comprehensive and detailed inquiry on the ground where all the knowledge available can be brought forcibly to the attention of those making the inquiry.

It has been suggested that since a similar committee has made similar investigations in another body there is no need for the enactment of this resolution. That argument, although substantial, leaves out of sight the fact that the House is a coordinate legislative body and that it is the duty of the House to form its own conclusions upon the evidence that shall be presented to it in favor of or opposed to any legislation. In a matter of such importance, it seems indispensable that the House should make its own inquiry, through its own agency, and thus be in best position to arrive at its own conclusions.

The proposal to have the investigation made by the House Committee on Indian Affairs or a subcommittee is a salutary one. That committee, under the leadership of its able, distinguished, and eminently just and fair-minded chairman, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], is surely, upon all grounds, singularly well-fitted to undertake the work.

The money appropriated for the purpose should be ample to permit a thorough inquiry into all phases of law and economics which affect the Indians. A hasty investigation embracing little more than "a lick and a promise" will be all but valueless. What the Indians need, what the Nation needs, and what Congress, itself, needs is a comprehensive body of reliable knowledge and information—a body of fact—relative to the Indians and their circumstances and environment and what may best be done to give them any assistance that they need and to which they are entitled by law or justice.

I earnestly hope that no one will vote for this resolution upon the theory that it is going to effect an enormous saving of appropriations for the Indians. On this feature of the matter I join in the opinion so forcibly expressed by the able gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] during this debate on the resolution, namely, that if full justice is done to the Indians the appropriations for them will be greatly augmented instead of being reduced. In Alaska alone, although large advances have been made in recent years both in the volume of appropriations and in the efficient administration of the Office of Indian Affairs, much greater amounts should be now provided in order to reduce and eventually control the appalling ravages of tuberculosis among the native peoples of Alaska where the incidence of that terrible disease is more than 12 times that of the people of the United States as a whole.

It has been properly observed that the record of the Indians in the present war is one in which we can all take pride. So far as Alaska is concerned, I am sure there is not among the natives a single case of even mental disloyalty to our cause and to our Nation. The Alaska Indians and other native races serve in the armed forces willingly, cheerfully, and efficiently. While they would be the last to suggest that they should have any extra compensation for their loyalty, it is only becoming that there should be rendered to these descendants of a people who once owned the whole country, all of the land and the forests and the lakes and the rivers and the mountains, the things that are theirs in right and justice at the hands of our Government.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may have the privilege of inserting in the RECORD an editorial from the Lynn Telegram News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my talk this morning I would like to add a letter dated March 9, 1944, from the War Production Board from Arthur G. Eaton, Director, to myself, and a statement of the War Production Board regarding the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 166 has for its purpose an investigation into the problems of the Indians, wherever situate, by the House Committee on Indian Affairs, or a subcommittee thereof.

The Indians cannot be treated as one kind of people owing to the various tribes, their different languages and the disparity of conditions under which they are living. As an illustration, 90 percent of the Navajos of Arizona cannot speak English, whereas 90 percent of the Flathead Indians in Montana can speak English. Time will not permit an elaboration upon the various diversities of conditions, languages, and so forth. Suffice it to say at this point that no one standard can be set up for the welfare of all of these groups of people.

A report has been submitted, known as Senate Report 310, and the same has been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House, and we doubt the efficacy of the recommendations therein contained. The adoption of it by the Congress would abolish and liquidate the Indian Department and put the Indians on their own, so to speak. Such a procedure would be a violation of the treaties with the Indians sincerely entered into. And, moreover, the States having the largest Indian populations would find the financial responsibilities impossible. We must not overlook the fact that the Indians have been driven westward from the productive Eastern States to designated reservations and then when it was found on those reservations that the lands were of particular value from agricultural and mineral standpoint they were, in many instances, deprived of such lands.

So, as a result of our policy, we find many of the Indians living in poverty and squalor. On the other hand, we have many Indians carried on the rolls who should no longer be charges of the Government. We have many on the rolls classified as Indians with but very little Indian blood and who are just as capable of caring for their own affairs and themselves as the whites. It is interesting to note that technically there are 11,500 employees in the Indian Service. About 2,500 are Indians. Three hundred of these employees are in the Chicago and Washington offices. If the number of Indians who are absolutely capable of self-government were taken from the rolls necessarily the staff of employees could be and should be materially reduced and perhaps the number should be reduced anyway.

EFFECTING A TREMENDOUS SAVINGS

On this one phase of the Indian problems I might say that our committee of the House has in mind, instead of the abrupt liquidation called for in Senate Report 310, the gradual, timetable liquidation of the various tribes according to and depending upon the ability of those tribes to be assimilated into the general economy of the country and when I say "assimilated" I do not necessarily mean that any one tribe is to lose its identity as a political, social, or even economic entity if it does not desire to do so. In other words, segregation is not necessarily nonassimilation. The terms are not necessarily incompatible. Such a program would merely entail the exclusion of those tribes and all of their affairs, when and if able, from any greater degree of Federal aid and assistance and control than their white neighbors were receiving. There are some tribes, such as the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, who, I believe, would prefer neither to be assimilated nor helped. The Pueblo tribes are thousands of years old and prefer their own culture and Christianity and I do not believe that 100 years from now will see their economic or social conditions changed very much.

There have been claims presented by Indians and Indian tribes against the Government, alleging that Indian treaties have been violated by the Government, going into the hundreds of millions of dollars. These claims are always coming up, and they cloud the minds of the Indians. The Congress neither allows them nor repudiates them. As a rule these poor people never get a chance to go into court to have their claims adjudicated, and if something is not done in this regard, the Indians will still be at the doors of Congress asserting their claims a century from now. A policy must be worked out in conformity with the Democratic and Republican platforms of 1940, if we are going to do justice by the Indians.

A law was passed in 1834 which bars the sale of liquor in any form to any person who is an Indian. This law follows that man wherever his course takes him in this country. Whoever sells or gives liquor to any person with any Indian blood in him today violates the law wherever such sale or gift occurs. You cannot solve this problem by one act of Congress, as in many places local options should be the rule and local ordinances regulate the sale and gift of liquor. In my own State I believe the Indians would like to see the law wiped out entirely. Such a law, under the conditions in my State, amounts to an absolute discrimination against these great people. Investigation into the field must be made to determine the proper course in this regard.

What is termed the "land mess" that occurs in all allotted areas? For instance, an allotment was given to Indians—men, women, and children. They, in time, have passed away and left heirs. Their equity passed on into the third and fourth generations, and maybe the fifth. Sometimes these equities come to five or ten dollars in value. No procedure has yet been suggested as to the answer in this matter. No title can be given to a purchaser so long as this chaotic condition is permitted to exist, and no leases can properly be made. The result is that it has been generally referred to as the "Indian land mess," and the Government is compelled to expend over a million dollars a year in management of just such estates which the Commissioner of Indian Affairs says is pure waste. This phase of the problem will require legislation and field work. For instance, on the Rosebud Reservation in South Dakota, they are trying to work out a consolidation scheme. Field work should be done there to see what the method is and what the results have been. On the Fort Peck Reservation in my State of Montana, one-half of the personnel in the Indian department in that section is used in trying to work out this heirship problem, and up to date their efforts have been futile.

The Indian appropriation bill seems to me to be anything but sensible. It carries something like, as I am informed, 1,000 appropriations. A study should be made to simplify the appropriations for the Indians, making it flexible so the amounts could be used where needed most. Today appropriations are made for specific things.

We should investigate the reservations to find out if self-government is working under what is known as the Wheeler-Howard Act. Ten years have gone by since this reorganization act was passed. The people on these various reservations know whether or not this is working properly and what, if any, changes should be made.

We have in this country and Alaska approximately 400,000 Indians. It is costing the Government in the neighborhood of $32,000,000 per annum to administer the affairs of the Indian department. Prior to this administration it was costing in the neighborhood of $40,000,000 to administer this department; so the cost of administration has really been going down during the past 12 years, but it can be materially reduced if we make the proper approach to all of these problems as a result of deliberate action based upon information gotten direct from the reservations and the Indians.

This investigation has for its purpose two primary objectives: First, to rehabilitate and restore the American Indian to his proper status and second, to do away with the useless expenditure of money, the expenditure of which is doing no one any good and perhaps harm. On the first phase of it, the American Indian is discriminated against. As Senator Thomas P. Gore, former Senator from the State of Oklahoma, once said:

> The root of the whole trouble is that the Indian has no existing right in the court. As a tribe, as a member of a tribe, he has no right in the court trying to protect his tribal assets or himself as a member of his tribe. You have heard of a man without a country. The Indian is a man without a court. I am not exaggerating that. The Indian has no forum in this land where he can vindicate his constitutional rights.

It is well to point out that 18,000 of the descendants of the great Indian chiefs are today fighting on every one of our battle fronts. In some Indian jurisdictions 30 percent of the able-bodied men between 18 and 38 are on the firing lines. In others it will run from 60 to 70 percent. Since the war their production of farm products has been increased nearly 100 percent. The home front is fighting and is working to win this war. In my own State, over night, the Crow Tribe offered all of its resources and all of its manpower to the Great White Father. Even the Indian cowgirls tried to enlist in the service. They did the same in New Mexico, California, and every other State where Indians live. I could take up your time by the hour in going over the records of the heroism of many of our soldiers, red in color. It is reported that in the State of Arizona a boy who wanted to enlist traveled over 100 miles over wintery and wind-swept roads to get to a place where he could enlist, braving storms and taking a chance with death. He was overtaken by a snowstorm and with resultant death it is said he froze into an American legend.

Hitler, the Germans, and the Japs, know the mettle of these boys. The Indian as a soldier in the white man's wars was discovered in 1918. In that year, before the surrender of Germany, Gen. Karl Von Prutch said:

> The most dangerous of the American soldiers is the Indian. He is brave above all else. He knows far more about camouflage, inherited from his ancestors, than any modern soldier that has the benefit of science and great laboratories. He is a dead shot. He needs no orders when he advances. He is an army within himself. He is the one American soldier Germany must fear.

Let us take Joe Longknife, an Assiniboine Indian from my State. He was at Bataan. He was decorated with the silver star, with the following citation:

> Private Longknife was the leading scout in his platoon. On approaching the enemy position under heavy small arms fire he noticed the enemy to his immediate front and also to his flank. He immediately opened fire and with excellent marksmanship killed 10 Japs with 16 shots. He then crawled back to his platoon under heavy fire and informed his squad leader of the threatening enemy position on his front and flank. His action saved his platoon from possible ambush.

In north Africa they still talk about Ken Scissons, of Rapid City, S. Dak. Ten Nazis in 4 minutes of Commando action outside of Bizerte is his record. The official citation reads:

> In December 1942, during a raid near Tunisia, upon the ambush of his unit by the enemy, Private Scissons, seeing two of his comrades attempting to crawl to safety, did, without regard to his own life, engage the enemy with his rifle and draw their entire fire upon his position. Only after his comrades reached safety did Private Scissons attempt to withdraw. His coolness and courage under fire and his desire to sacrifice himself, if necessary, for the safety of his comrades are a profound inspiration to the members of the armed forces and reflect the highest tradition of our Army.

Do you not think we had better take stock and see what we are doing for these people and see whether they should not be given a chance to be free Amer-

ican citizens as you and I are? A bloody war was fought in this country for the freedom of another race.

As to Senate Report 310, let me quote from a letter I received from an Indian who is superintendent of the Crow Indian Reservation in Montana. He is the only Indian holding down such a position in the United States today:

If the recommendations of the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate were executed tomorrow morning, within 1 year from this date you will have Indians who will be unwanted public charges and applicants of the poorhouse in each county and State in which we find them. This is a harsh statement to make, but I know that it will be the situation that will obtain 1 year hence. On account of his total inexperience in business matters he will lose his lands by mortgage foreclosure and otherwise, also in trades for automobiles. You, then, will have a real problem. The States wherein they are found will have real problems, akin to those social problems now being experienced by the European countries.

In view of the conditions obtaining throughout the Indian country at this moment, certainly most of the recommendations of the Senate committee should be held in abeyance for some future time when the conditions of the Indians would warrant their adoption by Congress. Let me take this reservation as an example of what would happen if the 32 recommendations of the Senate Indian Affairs Committee were adopted: Suppose I were ordered by the Commissioner to issue patents in fee to all of the Indians, and I proceed as instructed and fee patents were issued right and left to the Indians. I know only too well that within a very short time these beautiful river-bottom lands, capable of producing from 12 to 25 tons of sugar beets per acre, 4 tons of alfalfa per acre, oats, barley, etc., in abundance, would be in the hands of non-Indians, either through failure to pay taxes, real estate loans made to them that they cannot lift when the repayment time arrives, or outright loans in which foreclosures will be the order of the day right and left. The Crow Indians, who own, perhaps, one of the best Indian reservations in the United States, will be paupers in 12 months from the date of the issuance of patents in fee to each and every one. Socially they are ostracized from white communities; politically the same thing is true; economically they are the forgotten people. Every kind of a discrimination is practiced against these people on account of race. This serious situation seems to have been overlocked entirely by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate when they made their recommendations, some of which are very good, others very disastrous.

The Supreme Court of the United States has this to say:

These Indian tribes are the wards of the Nation. They are communities dependent on the United States; dependent largely for their daily food; dependent for their political rights. They owe no allegiance to the States, and receive from them no protection. Because of the local ill feeling, the people of the States where they are found are often their deadliest enemies. From their very weakness and helplessness, so largely due to the course of dealing of the Federal Government with them and the treaties in which it has been promised, there arises the duty of protection, and with it the power (May 10, 1886, 30 L. Ed. 228).

It is proper at this time, in connection with Senate Report 310, to review some recommendations made by the Senate committee in 1933, with reference to some of the recommendations made in 310.

The Senate committee, in 1933, made a report which presumably was to be controlling policy. In order that the dilemma of administrative officials may be more fairly brought out, I should like to place some of the recommendations of these two reports alongside each other.

Senate Report 310, 1943, recommends:

(10) Eliminate the rehabilitation of Indians as Indians; (15) transfer Indian education to the States, annual savings in excess of $5,000,000; (21) eliminate Indian agriculture extension; (23) cease the purchase of land; (24) eliminate all Indian boarding schools.

In contrast with this blanket recommendation to dispense with all services for Indians, the Senate committee in 1933, had the following to say:

The committee recommends that the United States provide the relief by meeting its obligation to its own wards to the extent of providing in substantially full amount the money required for education, health, law enforcement, and indigent relief.

The committee recommends specifically—

that the United States by appropriate legislation shall declare that it is its policy to meet the full expense for the progressive development of the Indian citizens.

The Senate committee's report in 1943 recommends:

(22) Eliminate Federal trust over all individual lands, including those in inheritance status. This will free the Indian owners to become respectable citizens—

And, of course, throw the lands onto the tax rolls. The committee in 1933 had the following to say:

Two suggestions are frequently encountered, that the tax-exempt character of the Indian land be altered and the land made taxable as rapidly as treaties with the Indians will permit. * * * It is disapproved because it is impracticable and would inevitably result in the loss to the Indian of his property.

At the time House Resolution 166 was introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota, Congressman MUNDT, which, in turn, was referred to the Rules Committee, I was personally exploring the field of Indian problems with the objective in mind of introducing a similar resolution. When this resolution came up before our committee, after considerable discussion and hearings, it was reported on unanimously and I am supporting it. I believe that if a thorough and sincere investigation is made, with no political ax to grind; with letting chips fall where they will, that a great good may come out of it and perhaps many injustices that have occurred in the past may be rectified or at least give the Indians a square deal in the future, and an annual saving of millions of dollars be effected.

It has been said that inasmuch as there is an investigatory body in the Senate investigating Indian problems that there is no need for a like body in the House. This is a separate body of the Congress. We are entitled to place our own interpretations on the facts as we find them. That interpretation may differ from that of the Senate and the facts as they found them. I might say that Senate Report 310 was filed some time ago, and I think it is significant that no bill has been introduced in the Senate to bring about the cure or the solution of the Indian problems as set forth in the many recommendations of said report.

Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House going on 8 years. I have listened to testimony concerning conditions on Indian reservations from about 20 or 25 States in these United States. Almost without a single exception the story is one of poverty and neglect and living conditions that are almost unbelievable. To my good friend from Missouri, I at one time made a statement on the floor of the House that I thought he was prejudiced against Indian bills. I would change that statement since I have learned to know the distinguished gentleman from Missouri better. I will say this, now, that I do not believe the gentleman understands the problems of the American Indian in this country.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am always glad to yield, if it is not for too long.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman states he has heard testimony from Indians in about 25 States of the Union. Can the gentleman tell me whether he has ever brought a resolution in or a bill on this floor to benefit or improve the conditions of the Indian as the result of that testimony: And if he has heard it, then let the gentleman tell me why, he did not——

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield no further. Yes. Resolution after resolution has been brought up on the floor of this House to help the Indians and the gentleman has stood at the bridge and prevented their passage. That is what the gentleman has done. But I choose to believe the gentleman does not understand the Indians' problem. Of course, the gentleman always argues that. He is adroit and clever.

Mr. COCHRAN. Not one would benefit the Indians.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Now, Mr. Speaker, the people who are fighting these bills for the Indians do not know their problems. I have seen the Indians living in squalor on reservations. I have known the Government of the United States to take from the Indians nearly everything they had of value. I have seen some of the best lands taken from the different tribes and sold to the white man. What was the massacre at Wounded Knee Creek about, where 200 women and children were massacred by the soldiers? It was because gold was discovered in the Black Hills country. Read the history of it, and you men with red blood in your veins will at least try to see that the Indians get a square deal from here on. Read the history of Custer's last stand in Montana, in my district, and you will find there a connection with the gold that was discovered in the Black Hills. Those Indians were on their own

ground. It was easy for the Government to give Indians a lot of land, but when something of value was discovered, a way was found to take it away from them. As a result, many of them are living in poverty upon land that human beings ought not to be forced to exist upon.

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. DISNEY. I am going to vote for this resolution in the hope that something will really come of it, but I personally will be very deeply disappointed if this is just going to be another investigation committee and if it dawdles around and does not do a real job of this. I hope the gentleman will have something to say about the whole proposition after this resolution is voted, if it is, keeping in mind that Members of the House do expect something to come out of it. There is plenty to be done, in my judgment. In my district, in practically every county we have Indian county officers. The Indians have been coming in and joining the white population and becoming fine citizens. The purpose of the resolution, I presume, will be to get out of the old rut of keeping the Indians as Indians right on down the years; bring them in with the white population and assimilating them, until they become regular American citizens. I think the committee ought to bring in a comprehensive program, else there is no use having the investigation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say that is just exactly what we propose to do. In my previous statement I have said in a different way just what the gentleman recommends, which I regard as very helpful.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman knows I have been trying to get some time and have not succeeded. We have some 40,000 Indians in my State and we are somewhat interested. Do you propose that most of the restrictions and regulations limiting the rights and freedom of action shall be removed? It happens that some of those restrictions have protected the Indians and their property. If you take away the property restrictions, the Indians will lose all their property in a very short time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is right—we must proceed step by step—to bring about assimilation of the Indians with the whites and the American way of life.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is this resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The committee will have charge of the work and I will assure the gentleman the Indians' rights will be protected.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. But this is stating the policy, that the restrictions and regulations limiting their rights and freedom of action shall be removed. We do not subscribe to that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, no; as I said, it must be a slow process, otherwise we would do more harm than good.

We do not propose to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The resolution says that you do.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The resolution provides for an investigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, it is true that I have no Indians left in my district except the great white father at Hyde Park, whom I predict will not be the big chief much longer. At one time the Hudson River Valley and the Delaware Valley, both of which are in my district, were the headquarters of the famous Delaware Indians of the Leni-Lenape Tribe, which all of you have read about in The Last of the Mohicans by Fenimore Cooper.

My only connection as far as the Indians are concerned is that I am a member of the Red Men in the city of Beacon. But I have taken this time because my boss, the only boss that I recognize—I have been in this House many years and I have followed many leaders, but in all that time I have had only one boss—and that boss has ordered me to appear here today and speak in behalf of this resolution. She is a daughter of a former Democratic Congressman from New York State but let no Republican get excited as she is even more against the New Deal than I am. I was further informed that if I did not do so, I would be in the dog house when I got home for dinner tonight. So I have risen in these few brief moments to speak in behalf of the resolution, which I think is nothing more nor less than a square deal and a fair deal for the American Indians. And why not? Why should we not have an investigating committee? Why should not the House investigate the vital problems affecting 400,000 Indians, and come back in 60 days with some concrete and constructive recommendations? I have faith in the ability and the competency and intelligence of the Members of this House. I do not care whether the Senate has spent 12 years investigating the conditions of the Indians or that it has failed to do anything about it.

I am voting for this resolution because I think it is the sound and wise thing to do and that it will get results and improve the conditions of the Indians. Furthermore let me call your attention to the fact that thousands of Indians today are in our armed forces not only in Italy but all over the world with our combat troops, fighting with distinction, bravery, and honor as American citizens. I believe the American people will agree that Congress should put into effect the "four freedoms" in our own country before spending $1,350,000,000 to afford relief for people in foreign nations. Why can we not afford some relief to those American Indians who are in need and distress and in poverty-stricken circumstances? I do not know whether this resolution will cost the United States one penny or some Indian wampum, and I do not care if it does, if it actually improves the condition of the Indians. There may be certain tribes that are poverty-stricken, that need relief; there may be others that do not. I rise therefore, Mr. Speaker, because I believe in it and also because my boss has ordered me to do so.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amended preamble.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COCHRAN) there were—ayes 71, noes 21.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently on the count just made there is not a quorum present. The roll call is automatic.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays, 100, not voting 128, as follows:

[Roll No. 43]

YEAS—200

Allen, La.	Dawson	Hope
Anderson, Calif.	Day	Horan
Anderson, N. Mex.	Dewey	Howell
	Dilweg	Hull
Andresen, August H.	Disney	Izac
	Dondero	Jackson
Andrews	Dworshak	Jeffrey
Angell	Ellis	Jensen
Arends	Ellison, Md.	Johnson, Anton J.
Arnold	Ellsworth	
Auchincloss	Elmer	Johnson, Calvin D.
Barrett	Engel, Mich.	
Bates, Ky.	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Ind.
Bates, Mass.	Fellows	Johnson, J. Leroy
Bell	Fenton	
Bennett, Mich.	Fernandez	Johnson, Okla.
Bennett, Mo.	Fish	Judd
Bishop	Fitzpatrick	Kean
Blackney	Gallagher	Kearney
Bloom	Gathings	Keefe
Bolton	Gavin	Kefauver
Boren	Gearhart	Kerr
Boykin	Gillette	Kilburn
Bradley, Mich.	Gillie	King
Brown, Ga.	Goodwin	LaFollette
Brown, Ohio	Gordon	Landis
Brumbaugh	Granger	Larcade
Buffett	Grant, Ala.	Lea
Busbey	Grant, Ind.	LeCompte
Canfield	Green	Lemke
Carlson, Kans.	Hagen	Lesinski
Carrier	Hale	Lewis
Carson, Ohio	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McConnell
Case		McCowen
Chiperfield	Halleck	McGregor
Church	Harness, Ind.	McKenzie
Clason	Hartley	McLean
Coffee	Hébert	McWilliams
Cole, Mo.	Heidinger	Mansfield, Mont.
Cole, N. Y.	Hinshaw	
Compton	Hoeven	Martin, Iowa
Crawford	Hoffman	Martin, Mass.
Cunningham	Holmes, Mass.	Michener
Curley	Holmes, Wash.	Miller, Conn.

Miller, Nebr.	Robinson, Utah	Stewart
Miller, Pa.	Robsion, Ky.	Sullivan
Monkiewicz	Rockwell	Sundstrom
Mott	Rogers, Mass.	Taber
Mundt	Rohrbough	Talbot
Murdock	Rolph	Talle
Norton	Rowan	Taylor
O'Brien, Mich.	Sabath	Tibbott
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sadowsky	Tolan
O'Connor	Sauthoff	Towe
O'Hara	Schiffler	Troutman
O'Konski	Schwabe	Vinson, Ga.
Outland	Scott	Voorhis, Calif.
Patton	Scrivner	Vursell
Peterson, Fla.	Shafer	Walter
Peterson, Ga.	Sheridan	Weaver
Pittenger	Simpson, Ill.	Welch
Pracht, C. Frederick	Simpson, Pa.	Wickersham
	Slaughter	Wigglesworth
Pratt, Joseph M.	Smith, Maine	Willey
	Smith, Wis.	Wilson
Reed, Ill.	Sparkman	Wolcott
Reed, N. Y.	Springer	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rees, Kans.	Stanley	Wolverton, N. J.
Richards	Stefan	Woodrum, Va.
Rizley	Stevenson	

NAYS—100

Abernethy	Fulbright	Merritt
Barden	Gore	Mills
Beckworth	Gossett	Morrison, N. C.
Bland	Graham	Murphy
Bonner	Gregory	Murray, Tenn.
Brehm	Griffiths	Norrell
Brooks	Gross	O'Brien, Ill.
Bryson	Gwynne	O'Neal
Bulwinkle	Hancock	Patman
Burchill, N. Y.	Hare	Poage
Burgin	Harris, Ark.	Price
Byrne	Hess	Priest
Camp	Hill	Rankin
Cannon, Mo.	Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.
Carter	Johnson,	Rowe
Chapman	Luther A.	Russell
Clark	Johnson,	Sasscer
Clevenger	Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Cochran	Johnson, Ward	Sikes
Colmer	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Cooper	Kilday	Snyder
Cox	Kinzer	Spence
Cravens	Kirwan	Sumner, Ill.
Crosser	Kleberg	Thomas, Tex.
D'Alesandro	Kunkel	Thomason
Doughton	Lanham	Vincent, Ky.
Eberharter	Ludlow	West
Elliott	Lynch	Whelchel, Ga.
Elston Ohio	McCord	Whitten
Fisher	McMillan	Whittington
Flannagan	Mahon	Winstead
Folger	Mansfield, Tex.	Worley
Forand	Mason	Wright
Ford	May	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—128

Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Marcantonio
Andersen, H. Carl	Gerlach	Merrow
	Gibson	Miller, Mo.
Baldwin, Md.	Gifford	Monroney
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gilchrist	Morrison, La.
Barry	Gorski	Mruk
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.
Bender		Myers
Bradley, Pa.	Harless, Ariz.	Newsome
Buckley	Harris, Va.	Norman
Burch, Va.	Hart	O'Leary
Burdick	Hays	O'Toole
Butler	Heffernan	Pace
Cannon, Fla.	Hendricks	Pfeifer
Capozzoli	Herter	Philbin
Celler	Hobbs	Phillips
Chenoweth	Hoch	Ploeser
Cooley	Holifield	Plumley
Costello	Jarman	Poulson
Courtney	Jennings	Powers
Curtis	Jonkman	Rabaut
Davis	Kee	Ramey
Delaney	Kelley	Ramspeck
Dickstein	Kennedy	Randolph
Dies	Keogh	Rivers
Dingell	Klein	Robertson
Dirksen	Knutson	Rodgers, Pa.
Domengeaux	Lambertson	Rogers, Calif.
Douglas	Lane	Satterfield
Drewry	LeFevre	Scanlon
Durham	Luce	Short
Eaton	McCormack	Smith, Va.
Fay	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Feighan	McMurray	Somers, N. Y.
Fogarty	Maas	Starnes, Ala.
Fuller	Madden	Stearns, N. H.
Fulmer	Magnuson	Stockman
Furlong	Maloney	Sumners, Tex.
Gale	Manasco	Tarver
Thomas, N. J.	Ward	White
Torrens	Wasielewski	Winter
Treadway	Weichel, Ohio	Woodruff, Mich.
Vorys, Ohio	Weiss	
Wadsworth	Wene	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Short.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. McMurray with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Miller of Missouri.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Norman.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Fay with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Weichel of Ohio.
Mr. Burch of Virginia with Mr. Jonkman.
Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Ward with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Furlong with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. Harless of Arizona with Mr. Mruk.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Newsome with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Butler.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment striking out the preamble to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the title, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNOR: Strike out the words "create a select committee" and insert in lieu thereof "authorize the Committee on Indian Affairs."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order heretofore granted, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, because there was no other legislative business for the day, permission was obtained to speak at this time.

In the Detroit News of February 3, 1944, there was printed the following:

C. Pat Quinn, president of the C. I. O. council, disclosed that a resolution condemning HOFFMAN for "seditious statements and activities" was passed by the council Tuesday night.

* * * * *

The resolution declares: "This Fascist-minded Congressman has thus climaxed a long record of pro-Fascist activities and by such seditious incitations has laid himself open to immediate Federal action under the Espionage Act, which places such utterances as this in wartime as treason and aid to the enemy."

The statements reflect upon the integrity and the patriotism in his official capacity of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and raise the question of personal privilege.

Time should not be taken to reply to this charge were I the only one interested in this question. As time goes on, practically every Member of this body, on the majority as well as on the minority side, will have like charges made against him. We know from past experience that at least two-thirds of the Members of this House and two-thirds of the Members of the other body have been openly and repeatedly charged with being antilabor, with favoring legislation which interfered with the war effort, with being, you might say, pro-Nazi. Therefore, the House and the Members of the House might now as well as later meet these charges and do what it can to expose the falsehoods.

ACTIVITIES OF C. I. O. POLITICAL-ACTION COMMITTEE

The C. I. O.—the political-action committee of the C. I. O.—should be the last to make charges of that nature, and it is my purpose today to place in the RECORD facts and circumstances undisputed, which show that the C. I. O. itself has been, and is now, engaged in a campaign which has in the past and which today does hinder the production of munitions of war.

The activities of some of the C. I. O. leaders tend to create discontent. They promote disorder. They instigate riots and create a condition fertile for civil war. Here is an old circular which was used by me in the last campaign when in my district the C. I. O. in published advertisements wanted to know whether I was fighting Hitler or the C. I. O. In the papers of the district I replied with the statement that I was fighting both of them. The reasons why I was fighting Hitler were evident to all. And these pictures, some of which I published, showed why I was fighting the C. I. O. I have copies of this, and I think I will have enough for any Member who wants one. If any Member here is assailed during this campaign for nomination or

election by the C. I. O., you can present to the people of your district a photograph of what the C. I. O. does and the kind of activities it carries on. Now, do not misunderstand, no broad, general charge that the C. I. O. is composed of disloyal men or women is made. The only claim is that a few of those at the top who control the actions of the C. I. O. are the ones who are doing these things.

C. I. O. MEMBERSHIP PATRIOTIC

There are hundreds of thousands of patriotic workers in the C. I. O.; but from 1937, when, in violence and bloodshed, in disregard of law and the constitutional rights of citizens, the sit-down strikes were brought by it to Michigan down to the present moment, many of its leaders have been dominated, whether they know it or not, by Communists working toward the overthrow of our Government by force. Some of the methods of the C. I. O. are those of the Communists. They seek to create discontent, promote disorder, instigate riots, and create a condition fertile for civil war.

The pictures which I hold in my hand are a reproduction of but six of many pictures taken at the time of the April 1941 strike at the Ford plant. Keep that date in mind.

According to testimony given in the United States District Court at Detroit, two of the five U. A. W.-C. I. O. men who were beating unresisting Melvin Bartling, a timekeeper, were Communists, and copies of their membership cards in that organization are in my possession.

Not one of the five shown in the picture was an employee of the Ford Motor Co. All were members of Briggs Local, U. A. W.-C. I. O., 212. All were trespassers on Ford and public property.

JOHN L. LEWIS OBJECTED TO COMMUNISTS

Long prior to that strike, John L. Lewis, who had caused an investigation to be made, in Senate Document No. 14 of the Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, made the following statements:

> Imported revolution is knocking at the door of the United Mine Workers of America and of the American people. The seizure of this union is being attempted as the first real step in the realization of a thoroughly organized program of the agencies and forces behind the Communist International at Moscow for the conquest of the American continent.
>
> The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs, is being attempted on a more gigantic scale, with more resolute purpose, and with more crafty design than at any time in the history of this Nation.

Lewis also said:

> It is purely a revolutionary organization and makes no pretense at legality. * * * This party has at its head the supreme executive revolutionary committee in America, responsible only to * * * officials of the Communist International.
>
> The movement is aimed not only at the labor unions but at the entire industrial, social, and political structure of the country, and with the single aim of eventually establishing a Soviet dictatorship in the United States.

Within the last month, the same John L. Lewis, in an exclusive interview to the Washington Times-Herald, speaking of the Communists, said:

> Their technique is simple. The American Communists limit their membership to only the cleverest schemers they can find. Then they worm their way into key places in local chapters of unions. In this way they control whole organizations which our public, therefore, thinks have "gone Communist." But the more the newspapers and our public shout about such a union as a Communist hotbed, the more misunderstood and abused the rank and file of the ordinary members feel—and the thing goes around and around in a vicious circle.
>
> Oh, they're clever; believe me, I know. When I was organizing the C. I. O. we picked up a lot of Communists as we grew—including Harry Bridges. But if I had not resigned the chairmanship and left the C. I. O. in 1940, I can tell you the Communists would have been weeded out.
>
> Instead, as anyone might expect who has seen them throw their weight around inside labor organizations, the Communists dominate the C. I. O. today. Philip Murray today is the prisoner of the Communists in his own union. They control him and the C. I. O. through their seats on his executive committee. Sidney Hillman is just as badly off. Both of them have got to play ball with the Communists now—or die.
>
> This is the way communism takes hold. This is the way it endangers the labor movement, and our country. For the same thing happens in governments. Communism has an antinatural and basically antieconomic quality. History shows that communism is only compatible with primitive and undernourished economic surroundings. In its control and destruction it does not distinguish error from truth, good from evil, justice from injustice. It does not care for history or the experience of humanity, for freedom, or for the dignity of man. And the last thing on earth the American Communists are interested in is the American way of life.

As Lewis said:

> Agencies of the Government like the N. L. R. B. have for years been aiding the C. I. O. to force the employees into their organization.

Now get this—if you read the RECORD, you know that statement is true. Where is the pay-off? The pay-off this year came when the C. I. O. in their national convention endorsed the New Deal candidate for a fourth term, as rotten a political deal as ever was made.

Communist membership in the United Mine Workers, headed by Lewis, is barred by the constitution of that organization.

REASON FOR C. I. O.'S CHARGES

It is understandable why the C. I. O. charges me with sedition or with treason, for, with all due modesty, may I state that publicity given to it and some of its actions has resulted in ending some of its strikes.

Time after time, from 1937 on, have I, from the floor of the House and publicly, called attention to the fact that the C. I. O., that the Communists which it harbored, were following a policy which would destroy our Government.

But what right, logically, has the C. I. O. to charge anyone with either sedition or a hindering of the war effort?

The record of the C. I. O. has been one—and down to this moment it is one—of lawlessness and violence; of utter and complete disregard of the constitutional rights, of the moral rights, of other citizens.

The whole case against it, its greed, its seifishness, is proven beyond argument by the fact that it attempts to force everyone who would work in a defense industry to contribute to its funds.

RECORD AND METHODS OF THE C. I. O.

When it could not win its point by argument, it has not hesitated to use force. By coercion, by intimidation, and by violence, as well as by persuasion, it has collected millions of dollars, and today it is using that fund so collected to besmirch, to defeat, every Member of House or Senate who ventures to oppose its will. It seeks to become a dictator of American political action.

There are many who believe that the President's unstatesmanlike veto message on the tax bill was due to the influence of Philip Murray, who objected to the inclusion in that measure of a provision which required unions, as well as other organizations, to file with the Treasury a statement showing the amount of their income.

Agencies of the Government, like the N. L. R. B., have for years been aiding the C. I. O. to force employees into that organization. In return, the C. I. O. is out in support of the fourth term.

Notwithstanding the no-strike pledge given by the C. I. O. shortly after the beginning of this war, the most casual reading of the daily press shows that strikes in C. I. O.-controlled factories and industry have been of almost daily occurrence. Everyone who reads the papers knows this charge to be true and for many of the strikes there has been not the slightest excuse.

Now, it is true that, within the past 10 days, undoubtedly alarmed by the wave of public indignation which is about to overwhelm it, the C. I. O. through some of its officers has consented—note that word "consented"—to the discharge of certain employees in the Ford plant who were disrupting production, who brought about a strike.

But let me give you just one incident, which is typical of all too many. Two men employed in the Edgewater branch of the Ford Motor Co. as testers were able to do a certain job in 15 minutes. Union officials told them they must take 45 minutes. When they failed to loaf for 30 minutes, they were expelled from the union and, under the union's contract with the company, their discharge was demanded. The company refused to discharge them and a row followed.

But why enlarge? Similar incidents are familiar to most of the Members of this House. They certainly are familiar to many of our people living in industrial centers.

C. I. O. CURTAILS PRODUCTION

The whole situation is portrayed by three letters which passed between the director of the Ford Motor Co. and the president of the union. Those letters read as follows:

JANUARY 19, 1944.

MR. R. J. THOMAS,
President, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, C. I. O., 411 W. Milwaukee Ave., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: In May 1943, two men, Neil Smith and John Elvin, were employed

by the Edgewater Branch of the Ford Motor Co. as road-testers. The operation upon which these men were placed had been taking 45 minutes to perform. They were able to and did do the job in 15 minutes.

Our information as to subsequent events is as follows: The ability of these men to do their operation speedily and efficiently in one-third the time it had formerly taken to perform the job immediately aroused resentment among their coworkers and officials of Local 906 of your union at the Edgewater plant. We are informed that some of the officials and a number of other members of Local 906 approached these two men and told them that they must take 45 minutes to perform the operation, and that when the men continued to perform it in 15 minutes, the members of the local attempted to intimidate them with threats of bodily harm and expulsion from the union.

After failing in every way to intimidate the men, the local finally made good its threat to expel them. On Monday, January 17, 1944, company officials at the Edgewater, N. J., branch, received a communication from Local 906 stating that these two men had been expelled from the union and could not, therefore, be retained in the employ of the company. No reason was given to the company or the men by the local for the expulsion.

It appears that the union, on these facts, is using the union-shop provision of the contract as a whip to force employees to slow down production.

As you know, during the negotiations which led up to the first contract between the union and the company, the company voluntarily gave the union the provisions of the union shop and check-off. Obviously, it was not intended or even contemplated that the very thing that the company gave you voluntarily for the purpose, as it believed at that time, of enhancing good relations between the company and the union would be used by the union as a weapon to coerce employees to slow down production.

While the case of these two individuals would seem relatively unimportant, it is, nevertheless, very important from the standpoint of establishing a precedent, and we certainly cannot permit the union to apply the union-shop features of our contract in a way that was never intended. The company must, therefore, refuse to recognize the notice of expulsion above-mentioned.

Recently, when I spoke to you of the misuse of the union-shop provisions by local officials to cripple the company's position during the last foremen's walk-out at the Willow Run Bomber Plant, you stated that the facts had not been brought to your attention and that, had they been, you would have taken appropriate action.

I am, therefore, bringing this to your attention in the hope that you will make a thorough investigation and, if the facts are as we understand them, take appropriate action to remedy the situation and prevent future recurrences. On the other hand, if it turns out that we have been misinformed, we shall appreciate your so advising us.

Very truly yours,

H. H. BENNETT,
Director.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AIRCRAFT, AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA (U. A. W.-C. I. O.),
January 24, 1944.

Mr. HARRY H. BENNETT,
Director, Ford Motor Co.,
Dearborn, Mich.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter dated January 20 relative to the action taken by the membership of local union No. 906, Edgewater, N. J., against Neil Smith and John Elvin, I want you to know that I have checked into this matter and find that Local Union No. 906 acted in accordance with the constitution of our union as it deals with trial procedure of union members.

Furthermore, information given in your letter as to the events that led to the expulsion of Messrs. Smith and Elvin differs from the facts of the case as established by the local union trial committee, whose verdict was unanimously approved by the membership of the local union in attendance at a regularly called local union meeting.

Because of the seriousness of your complaint I gave my personal attention in getting to the bottom of the entire situation. I have conferred with the ranking officers of the local union, and I am convinced that the action taken was in the best interest of the war effort and the relationship between the company and the union. The findings of my investigation clearly indicate that the abovementioned employees are only interested in self-advancement at the expense of the war effort. By that I mean that Mr. Smith and Mr. Elvin, according to the information at hand, deliberately falsified their reports in order that the record would show increased output. The method they are charged with using in doing this was to fill out their test reports on Army trucks without any check whatsoever. The union has substantiating evidence to this effect.

I might further advise you that during the month of September, prior to the filing of any charges against the aforementioned employees, Mr. S. Schillon, then in charge of labor relations, called representatives of the local union and Messrs. Smith and Elvin to his office allegedly for the purpose of clearing up the entire situation. The union representatives at that time expressed full agreement to any proposition that would increase the output on this particular job, providing, however, that such increased output would meet all specifications required by the Government.

Now let's see what happened in this case. Immediately following return to their jobs, all the men working as testers were informed by company supervision that unless they attained the same standard of output as Elvin and Smith, they would be subject to discharge. The union leadership became very resentful inasmuch as they felt that they were being framed by Elvin and Smith's actions into getting out work of inferior quality.

Consequently, the union, in order to protect its integrity and its membership, had no other course to pursue than rigid disciplinary action against the above-named individuals.

I might further point out that during the period of the meeting held in Mr. Schillon's office, there was no charge against any of the leadership of the local union regarding intimidation or any other attempt to curtail production.

In conclusion, it might be well to advise you that the union and the company are confronted with an immediate serious problem regarding the disposition of the controversy that now prevails. The union feels that the agreement between the Ford Motor Co. and the union is clear and specific. I refer you to section 2 of the 1942 Ford-Union contract under the caption "Union shop."

If the company for any reason feels disposed to disagree with the union's interpretation, we must insist that in the interest of (and this I must repeat) the war effort, a quick decision be forthcoming and that the umpire, Dr. Harry Shulman, be permitted by agreement of the parties to make an immediate decision regarding the union's prerogative.

Very truly yours,

R. J. THOMAS,
President, International Union, U. A. W.-C. I. O.

JANUARY 26, 1944.

Mr. R. J. THOMAS,
President, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, C. I. O., Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. THOMAS: I have your letter of the 24th with reference to the action of Local 906 at Edgewater, N. J., regarding the expulsion of Neil Smith and John Elvin.

Your investigation was evidently confined to conferring with the officers of the local involved. At any rate, you could not have talked to any disinterested persons with knowledge of the facts, such as the Army and Navy inspectors at Edgewater, because if you had you would have readily found out that these two men have had fewer rejects than a number of other testers who take more than twice the time to do the same work. Obviously, I would not expect the union officials responsible for this action to say that they suspended these two men, because they refused to slow down. A better-sounding reason would have to be concocted for public consumption. Yet the only reason these officials could think of to attempt to justify their unjustifiable action was to say that the men were not doing their work properly and were inefficient. They forgot, however, as you evidently also have, that under the Ford-U. A. W. contract the right to maintain efficiency and the right to discharge for inefficiency are the sole functions of the company, to which the union agreed in sections 11, 12, and 13 of the contract.

You state that at a meeting before Mr. Schillon, of the labor relations office of the company in September, these men made no charge against any of the leaders of the local union regarding intimidation. While that statement is true, it is only half of the truth. The important half, which you neglected to mention, is that the meeting in Mr. Schillon's office was held upon the complaint of these two men that they were being constantly harassed, annoyed, spat upon, and threatened by their cotesters, and that upon several occasions attempts had been made to "frame" their work, and trucks which they had sent to the shop for adjustments were tampered with in the shop in order to discredit these two men.

Mr. Schillon called the union officials and committeemen, who agreed to see to it that these annoyances would stop, and who also agreed to attempt to step up production.

In your letter you state that you are convinced that the action taken by the local was "in the best interests of the war effort and the relationship between the company and the union." No statement could be in more direct opposition to the truth. The process of reasoning by which you think that resisting attempts to increase production and crucifying any man who tries to increase production is helpful to the war effort is beyond comprehension, as is also your apparent belief that the union, by usurping functions of management, would enhance relations between the company and the union.

As a matter of fact, the local in question has not only resisted attempts to increase production but has actually decreased it below peacetime levels. While giving lip service to the war effort, the facts show that at this plant, which is assembling 158-inch trucks for the Army and Navy—a truck almost identical with the 158-inch truck assembled at this same plant for civilian use prior to the war—it requires 16 hours per truck for assembly exclusive of minor assemblies, whereas in 1941 the almost identical truck was completely (including subassemblies) assembled in 8 hours.

The management has constantly asked the union leaders to assist them in correcting this situation, and approximately 6 months ago Mr. Edmonds, manager of the Edgewater plant, took up this matter with Mr. Leonard,

who promised to do something about it. Not only have none of those promises so far materialized, but an attempt has been made to crucify two employees who were honestly and sincerely interested in the war effort.

In conclusion I wish to remind you that the union by its action in this case has knowingly and deliberately violated sections 11, 12, and 13 of our contract by applying the union shop feature in a way never intended nor contemplated. We shall be glad to submit the entire issue to the umpire on the question as to whether or not the union is violating those sections. While we are most anxious to have an early decision on this matter, we shall, of course, insist on a reasonable length of time in which to prepare the evidence for submission to the umpire.

Very truly yours,

HARRY H. BENNETT,
Director.

For days I could stand here on the floor and read into this RECORD case after case where the C. I. O. has either fostered, promoted, or failed to protest, strikes which time and time again have held up war production, have interfered with the ability of our men abroad, not only to destroy the enemy, but to protect their own lives.

I will give you just two—one showing you how the C. I. O. more than 4 years ago—in one instance for 24 calendar days; in the other, for 41 calendar days—held up the production and delivery of castings for airplane engines in process of construction at the Naval Air Factory, Navy Yard, Philadelphia, and the production and delivery of bearings.

The official disgraceful story is told in a reply dated October 20, 1939, from Charles Edison, then Acting Secretary of the Navy, to House Resolution 314, Seventy-sixth Congress, second session, introduced by me. Read it; then hang your head in shame over the pusillanimity of an administration which will submit to such conduct on the part of any organization.

And do not think that the C. I. O. has not continued its obstructive war-hampering actions.

More recently and as late as January 9 of this year, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard, referring to C. I. O. strikes on the west coast, disclosed that those strikes were delaying convoys and troops which otherwise would have sooner reached those who are fighting for us in the southwest Pacific. Among other things, Bard wrote:

> East Bay Local 1304 refused to permit its members to work on those week ends under conditions applicable to all other local labor. This refusal had the specific effect of disrupting work schedules on new vessels under construction and involving delays in several ship projects of extreme urgency. A further consequence was failure to effect repairs on Navy and Army vessels so preventing these vessels from meeting schedules controlling convoys required for shipment of men and supplies with the result that convoys were delayed and schedules of troop movements to ports of embarkation were seriously disorganized.

With a record of obstructing the war effort behind it, the C. I. O. leadership, led around by the nose by the Communists, should hang its head in shame and repent in sackcloth and ashes. When the people know these would-be political labor leaders for what they are; when they are once familiar with what they have been doing and what they propose to do, the union men themselves will throw them out of office.

All of the smoke screen of false charges raised by the C. I. O. smear artists will never for one moment deceive the returning soldiers, who will remember that, while they were fighting in their fox holes thousands of miles from home, that organization was interfering with the production and the transportation of the arms, the ammunition, the planes and the guns, which were, which are, so sorely needed.

Putting it another way, while the men who have been drafted from the stores, the farms, the mills, and the mines, and the countrysides are fighting and dying, these unions, and R. J. Thomas is one of the officials who directs the policies, are hindering the production of the things the fighting men need.

If there is anyone who is guilty of conduct which tends to create dissatisfaction among the men of the armed forces who is it? Is it the man who criticizes some New Deal policy, or is it the man who holds up to the knowledge of those in the Army, the production and transportation of the things which they must have if they are to defeat our enemies and if they are to preserve their own lives?

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. GATHINGS. I would like to say right at that point that in 1943 there were more man-days lost than in 1942 by three times, because of work stoppages.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is correct; according to the figures of the Department of Labor.

The facts cannot be successfully contradicted. Here is the C. I. O. which presumes to accuse Members of Congress of seditious utterances, of treasonable activities, according to its own records and the records of the plant—its own records as to membership and the company records as to employment and production, taking twice as long in wartime to assemble a truck similar to the one which was assembled in peacetime in half the length of time.

What standing, I ask you, has the C. I. O. or the Committee for Political Action of the C. I. O., to charge anyone with slowing down the war effort, with doing, saying, or even thinking of anything which would aid our enemies?

The C. I. O. should first clean its own house before it ventures to criticize anyone else.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield briefly.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman will agree that the "new orderites" are so hot in the prosecution of their campaign to communize America as to make it impossible for them to realize that there boils beneath their own feet public sentiment that is likely to explode at any time? And if the gentleman agrees that these "new orderites" showing the first sign of weakness, the multitude like a pack of angry wolves are going to rush upon them and tear them into tatters.

FALSE CHARGES BY JERGENS' HIRED MAN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Anyone who listened last night to Walter Winchell could not help but realize that, yellow as he is, he realizes the change in public sentiment, and the Jergens Co., which hires him, ought soon to sense it, for if you ever heard a fellow start to alibi, start for the cellar, that fellow did last night; there is no question about it, he did.

However, he did, probably from force of habit, include a false charge or two in his broadcast. And, incidentally, do not rely upon the transcript of his broadcast. It has recently been found necessary for the Federal Communications Commission to add to its regulations on broadcasters a statement which you will find in the Broadcast News that hereafter these broadcasters must make an electrical transcription when they broadcast. The Commission, of course, should go one step further to get the inflections and insinuations. That transcription should be made at the time of the broadcast, not before the broadcast is put on the air. For example, I say: "Oh, yes; you're loyal? You are?" That is Walter's method of insinuating an evil thought where none is intended.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wonder if the gentleman would permit me to quote in this connection a line from Joanna Boillier's De Montford, which runs:

> Think'st thou there are no serpents in the world
> But those who slide along the grassy sod,
> And sting the luckless foot that presses there?
> There are who in the path of social life
> Do bask their spotted skins in Fortune's sun,
> And sting the soul.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is one statement Winchell, in substance, made last night—I give the thought, not the words: The F. B. I. is investigating a Detroit motor magnate who is promoting strikes.

Mr. SHAFER. Fostering strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, "promoting" or "fostering" whichever it was. This morning into my office came an F. B. I. man. Oh, do not worry, he was not investigating me, but Walter will tell you, by inference at least, when he reads that he came into my office that he was investigating me, so I am telling you that I told the F. B. I. man to investigate Winchell and Pearson.

I asked the F. B. I. representative what, if anything, there was to the statement that the F. B. I. was investigating a Detroit motor magnate on the question of instigating or promoting strikes. He called the F. B. I. office and replied that the F. B. I. was not doing anything of the kind; that it might be possible that such an investigation was being made by the Department of Justice.

Then Walter gave us more news—I think he claimed it was exclusive—most of his stuff even though a week old is claimed to be exclusive—that MacArthur had an interesting and mysterious conference with the former head of the American Firsters.

What is the insinuation? Is it that MacArthur is disloyal? You have all read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or in

the newspapers how when somebody operating under the War Department recommended a questionable article about MacArthur, it was challenged by a Member of the other body with putting out political propaganda. The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, on the delivery of the speech, sent up a letter repudiating that kind of action.

What I would like to know is how long the Navy will permit similar smear tactics to go unchallenged. After the Army says it is improper and contrary to their policy and regulations to make an attack upon a general in the Army, how long is the Navy going to permit Mr. Winchell to continue his insinuations that MacArthur, who is leading our troops, our armed forces in the Pacific, is doing something that is disloyal? How long is the Navy going to let it continue?

The Navy has stripped Winchell of his uniform, of any duties he might have had; they have stripped him of his pay, but he is still, to the disgrace of the Navy and every decent man in it, carried on the rolls as a Reserve officer. He is carried there according to my understanding by virtue of White House influence. How long are they going to carry that man?

The Army code carries a section which punishes a man in the armed forces who is guilty of unmilitary conduct, of conduct unbecoming a gentleman. When I wrote the Secretary of the Navy pointing out conduct which would bring Winchell under that regulation, the Navy Department said that that did not apply to the Navy.

Being interpreted, that means that you cannot stay in the Army and be guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman, but you can be in the Navy and be guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman and remain there as an officer. I have prepared an amendment to the title governing the Navy which will add those sections which are in the title which governs the Army so that the two services may be on an equality in that particular respect.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I was just wondering if there would be anything disgraceful or unpatriotic or un-American for a general of our Army to consult with a man like General Wood who is at the head of the America First Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly not. We all realize that when the men in the South Pacific hear that sort of insinuation one of two things comes to their minds: They are either disgusted or discouraged to think that here at home, while they are carrying on the battle, we permit that sort of charge to be made against a commanding officer. Do you suppose some of them think when they hear Walter Winchell make that kind of charge that there is something wrong with General MacArthur?

In my opinion they do not. That would be a proper inference, but Walter is so widely known for what he is that they do not pay much attention to him.

CRITICISM SEDITIOUS—?

Since the drive to override our constitutional form of government, remake America, and convince our people that Franklin D. Roosevelt is an indispensable man began, those who ventured to question the propriety of unconstitutional action without a constitutional amendment, the soundness of New Deal policies, or the purpose of the New Dealers, Communists, or fourth-termers, have been the targets of the smear brigade.

ROOSEVELT SAYS THERE IS NO INDISPENSABLE MAN

They ignore that Roosevelt himself pointed out there never was, never would be an indispensable man when, on March 2, 1930, criticizing the Republican administration, he said:

The doctrine of regulation and legislation by "master minds" in whose judgment and will, all the people may gladly and quietly acquiesce, has been too glaringly apparent at Washington during these last 10 years.

Were it possible to find "master minds" so unselfish, so willing to decide unhesitatingly against their own personal interests or private prejudices; men almost Godlike in their ability to hold the scales of justice with an even hand—such a government might be to the interests of the country.

But there are none such on our political horizon, and we cannot expect a complete reversal of all the teachings of history.

More than 2 years later, on November 3, 1932, Roosevelt, candidate for the Presidency, said:

In speaking for the common purposes of all of those forward-looking men and women I have, I believe, avoided the delusion that this is a campaign of persons or of personalities.

To indulge in such a fantastic idea of my own individual importance would be to betray the common hope and the common cause that has brought us all together this year.

A great man (Wilson) left us a watchword that we can well repeat: "There is no indispensable man."

THE WOLF-PACK SMEARERS

The wolf-pack smearers, numbering among its more mangy members the foul-mouthed Walter Winchell, creator and disseminator of malicious falsehoods, assisted in his campaign of vilification by his sponsors, the Jergens Co., which, through Walter, sells some sort of lotion, starts off in full cry, determined to pull down and destroy everyone who even ventures a word of criticism of the New Deal, its candidates, or the Communists.

The members of the gang which has done and is doing so much to create disunity have long been at work. Prior to the 1942 campaign the New Republic, the Daily Worker, official spokesman for the Communists whose party slogan has been the overthrow of our Government by force, the New Masses, Marshall Field's PM, the Chicago Sun, the Luce publications, and other publications apparently more interested in other countries than in the welfare of America, some radio commentators and newspaper columnists, by falsehoods and half truths, attempted to destroy the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives.

NEW DEAL INTENDED DESTRUCTION OF CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

In the early days of the New Deal, Guy Rexford Tugwell, who was then in the favor of the President and of the First Lady, made this illuminating statement. I quote:

Business will logically be required to disappear.

The future is becoming visible in Russia. * * * Perhaps our statesmen will give way or be more or less gently removed from duty.

Perhaps our vested interests will submit to control without violent resistance. * * *

We have no reason to believe that the disestablishment of our plutocracy would be pleasant. These historical changes never are. We have, however, the duty of avoiding violence as the process goes on.

WALLACE, selected by Eleanor Roosevelt and the President as the President's running mate, among other things wrote that the New Deal was engaged in "making America over." Referring to such action he said, and I quote:

We may hope that such action can be taken as bloodlessly as the Constitution was enacted.

The President himself set the pace early in his administration by referring to respectable and respected businessmen, merchants, industrialists, in fact to all those who, through work, economy, and thrift, were able to provide old-age security for themselves as princes of privilege, economic royalists. He smeared and jeered at decent, honest, patriotic Americans for apparently no reason at all, other than that they were not dependent upon State or Federal Government.

More recently his Vice President WALLACE designated those who do business in New York's Wall Street, as Fascists.

For long, one Thomas Corcoran, familiarly known to the President as "Tommy the Cork," had the Presidential ear and many times presumed to speak for the President. On one occasion, he enlightened us as follows:

We know that a revolution is actually here. All we can hope to do is canalize it. Our whole conception of private property is going to be changed and all we can hope to do is help it to come about gently, without any general blow-up.

To a man representing a great insurance business, which the Government more recently has been attempting to take over, "Tommy the Cork" made this enlightening statement:

When we get through with you fellows, this business will be run by the Government.

The sit-down strikes, conceived by the Communists, were born in Michigan in 1937. They gathered strength and attained their objective because the administration refused to curb their lawlessness and their violence. The armed forces of the State, without rebuke from the President's man Friday—in fact, acting under his orders—gave them support. Some of those who carried on those strikes have since hindered and obstructed the war effort.

DEMOCRATS' OPINION OF NEW DEAL

The fallacies of the New Deal became so evident, the attempt to destroy the

confidence of the people in their Representatives in Congress became so vicious that respected leaders of the Democratic Party felt compelled to break their silence. Said Senator CARTER GLASS as early as June of 1937:

The last election was carried by people who were getting favors from the Government, people who were subsidized by the Government, people who were on relief rolls, and people who were sanctioning the invasion of private property and its occupation, as is being done now.

Again he said:

The New Deal, taken all in all, is not only a mistake, it is a disgrace to the Nation, and the time is not far distant when we shall be ashamed of having wandered so far from the dictates of common sense and common honesty.

Finally, even the Presiding Officer of the House, Democratic Speaker RAYBURN, evidently outraged by tactics of the smear artists, in March of 1942 said, and I quote:

Not from one section of the country but from every section of the country are coming letters and telegrams; many of them are very insulting. They come not from Democrats nor Republicans, but from every class and section.

They read: "Congress is playing politics." "Politics control the Army and the Navy." "Our war production has bogged down, and neither Government nor manufacturers nor labor is doing its job." * * *

Instead of these meetings breeding division and discord and discontent and disunity, it would be much better for the safety of the country and our war effort if they were turned into unity parades and the effort and the wrath that is expended there be applied to doing some of the work of trying to win this war.

Congress is being criticized, but Congress has given the President every law and every dollar he has asked for defense purposes.

Notwithstanding the fact that those who spoke for America, who pledged allegiance to our interest, were reelected and the smear gang's candidates were defeated, they still give utterance to dastardly falsehoods, continue to create dissension by charging with disloyalty all who will not bend the knee, bow the head, and give support to their unsound theories, their foreign-born ideology, their schemes for the surrender of our independence, for the scuttling of the Constitution.

PEARSON QUESTIONS ARMY'S HUMANITY

Only a week ago Sunday night, a radio commentator and columnist made a statement in substance that the wife of a soldier was turned away from an Army hospital while the dog of an officer was given treatment.

He said that the dog lived, while the wife of the soldier died, and he called on Surgeon General Kirk for an explanation. The purport and the purpose of that statement as made by Drew Pearson was to create in the minds of his listeners the disturbing inference that those in charge of the Army hospitals were more interested in treating dumb animals than in the treatment of the servicemen's dependents. It was a damnable lie, as Pearson knew when he uttered it. Its only result in the minds of the servicemen—of those who believed it—was to cause discontent and discouragement.

Pearson and Winchell, both following the New Deal and the Communist Party line, in almost every broadcast say something by way of criticism of those who believe in this country, its institutions, and its future.

JERGENS SPONSORS DISUNITY CREATOR

Winchell, in particular, demands the prosecution for sedition of all those who disagree with his foul insinuations, made while he is paid by the Jergens Co., which asks you to buy its products, and while he is a Reserve officer in the Navy. He is a disgrace to any reputable manufacturer, an abomination to the Navy and to every decent member of it. He has been stripped of his uniform, of any pretended duty, and of his pay. Yet, because of Presidential favor, he retains his status in the Navy—a sawdust sailor so cowardly that he lacks the courage to walk abroad without bodyguard as do other Americans—millions of whom he described, because of the way they voted at the last election, as "damned fools."

How does the Jergens Co., selling lotion and other cosmetics, like to have its customers described as "damned fools"? Do those who buy Jergens' lotion and products realize what Jergens' hired man is calling them? Is it possible Winchell was thinking when he called citizens "damned fools," of the purchasers of Jergens' products, not of those who voted for successful candidates for the Senate and the House?

So, my dear hearers, if you have been purchasing Jergens' products, it might be well to write in and ask the company or the druggist from whom you purchase, whether Winchell was referring to you or someone else when you purchased something with the Jergens label on it.

COERCION, INTIMIDATION ADDED TO SMEAR

Neither the fourth-termers, the remakers of America, nor the Communists are satisfied with a smear campaign. To it they add coercion. It is common knowledge; in fact, it is a matter of record from the report of a committee of the other body, that money appropriated for the relief of the needy has been used for campaign purposes. It is a matter of common knowledge that A. A. A. and the funds at its disposal have been used to garner in the votes.

Several years ago those who borrowed from a Government agency were required to promise in writing that they would in no way criticize the New Deal agency which loaned them money until the principal borrowed and the interest thereon had been paid in full.

Just last week, I received a letter from a farmer enclosing a letter from the A. A. A. in one of the counties in my district which shows that organization hooking up the rationing of gas with support for the A. A. A. farm program. The letter from the farmer and from the A. A. A. reads as follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Enclosed is a form letter from our A. A. A. I have never received any payments or followed their program. My farm is 40 acres, one-half improved, of light soil, not grain land. My wife, 67, and I, 65, kept out of the red all through the depression and we do all we can to win the war.

Last year the A. A. A. agent called. We tried following their plans, increased our potato acreage, which drowned out; replanted some and summer-fallowed balance; buyers seem to be holding off on reports of such a large crop.

The W. F. A. froze our grapes of about 100 bushels after I had them about sold. They told me they would send a man and truck to get my grapes at $75 a ton, and he never showed up, so we took a loss after holding grapes for 18 days. About 6 weeks later I got a card to get my grapes released if they had not been released, which I had not.

We increased our chickens. You know about the feed and egg situation at home. A home-made tractor is more economical than horses for us, as we have to buy all our chick feed and would like to do our own planning and make both ends meet.

Now am I compelled to go to the A. A. A. for my gasoline? Last year the rationing board gave me my stamps. June 19, 1943, they returned my farm plan for changes, so I pigeon-holed it; seems like the same thing over this year.

Can I farm my own way if I do not ask for their payment and get what gas I need for my tractor?

FEBRUARY 18, 1944.

DEAR FARMER: As a front-line soldier of production you are being requested this year to produce even more food than your record production last year. Necessarily you must have the facilities to do your job efficiently.

One of the foremost of these is gasoline and fuel oil to operate your tractors and engines. The supply will not be sufficient to meet all civilian demands, but there will be enough for you to use in carrying on your farming activities.

Your local A. A. A. committee is cooperating with your local war price and rationing board in working out a program to assure you enough gasoline and fuel oil for the year.

This is what you will be asked to do. Your community A. A. A. committeeman will soon contact you to discuss with you plans for meeting the goals on your farm. He will ask you to sign the 1944 farm plan.

The form you fill out when the committeeman calls will be your application for gasoline and fuel oil for the year, based on your farming operations for 1944. It must be approved by the county A. A. A. committee before any action is taken by the local rationing board. It will be to your advantage to have the above-mentioned information ready when the committeeman calls.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN A. CHASE,
Chairman, Van Buren County A. C. A.

Note the last sentence.

Now the information sought above is pertinent to gas rationing, but why the implication that unless the farmer signs up with the agricultural program he will not get gas? Has it come to pass that here in America farm crops cannot be grown, cattle cannot be raised, milk produced, or fruit picked and marketed, unless the A. A. A. first gives its blessing?

Apples grew in the Garden of Eden before A. A. A. was in existence; undoubtedly long after it has followed other political theories, old Mother Earth will still produce food.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION CHARGED WITH POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Rural electrification is in theory a good thing, and it has brightened the lives of many a farmer, but like so many New Deal agencies, it, too, has been used for political purposes. That is not my criticism; it is the criticism of a loyal, con-

scientious Democrat, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN]. Within the week he cited scandals in the R. E. A. which he charged warranted impeachment proceedings and submitted to a House Appropriations Subcommittee, evidence of a R. E. A. "conspiracy to capture rural America and perpetuate it in economic serfdom."

He further charged that R. E. A. was wasting millions of dollars and "saddling farmers with a mountain of debt." Among others, he cited a specific instance, saying, and I quote:

> The farmers of Long Valley have paid an outrageously high price for a utility system that fell apart almost as soon as it was unloaded on them. The farmers accepted in good faith the written certificate that the project was self-liquidating.

No one denies but that R. E. A. has rendered an invaluable service to the farmers, but like suckers on a fruit tree which harbors scale, which year after year is visited by a horde of parasites, these New Deal agencies need trimming and pruning. They need spraying and pestilent-eradicating chemicals; many of them need disinfectants. All too many of them are lousy with grafters, with foreign-born parasites on the public pay roll.

PRESIDENT RELEASES BROWDER, WHO NOW SUPPORTS FOURTH TERM

The President, when he released Earl Browder from prison, issued the following statement on May 16, 1942:

> Browder paid his fines of $2,000 and has now been imprisoned for a year and approximately 2 months. The sentence imposed upon him was longer than the usual sentence imposed for offenses involving the fraudulent obtaining and use of passports.
>
> The President believes that the premium of obedience to law has been sufficiently vindicated by the punishment already suffered by Browder and that the commutation of his sentence, which brings about his release at this time, just shortly before he will become eligible for parole, will have a tendency to promote national unity and allay any feeling which may exist in some minds that the unusually long sentence in Browder's case was by way of penalty imposed upon him because of his political view.

The President did not add to the people's confidence in his administration by the release of Browder. Especially is this true since Browder has come out wholeheartedly in support of his benefactor as a candidate for the fourth term in the White House. The release of a known Communist from prison and that Communist's political support and his party's support of the President looks too much like a political deal. The people have not forgotten, they cannot forget that Browder is the head of the Communist Party; that the party doctrine is the overthrow of our Government by force; that the Communists have done so much to, as John L. Lewis has said, undermine labor organizations, destroy the confidence which the people have in honest patriotic labor organizations.

INTIMIDATION

Apparently there is no limit to what New Deal agencies will do to stifle criticism of the New Deal. We are all aware that the New Dealers are determined to perpetuate themselves in power, to govern by rule, order, regulation, and directive. Anyone who has watched official Washington for the past 10 years can see the clear pattern of a dictatorship, of a government by man, rather than a government by law.

PRESIDENT PACKS COURT

The President, impatient with the decisions of the Supreme Court which made it possible for us to continue under a constitutional form of government, sought to pack the Court. He and some of his supporters made an effort to belittle the Court, which up to that time had the confidence of all our people. The decisions of the Supreme Court up until the coming of the Roosevelt regime had always been accepted and followed without question both by the people and the lower courts. Those decisions in the main had been consistent, but the President changed all that. Two of his ardent supporters sought to discredit the Court by referring to its members as "Nine Old Men."

Defeated in his desire to pack the Court by legislation, by resignation and death the President was enabled to appoint seven of the nine members of the Court. He, it may be said without intending any disrespect to any of his appointees, selected the new members because of their political philosophy, rather than because of their legalistic standing.

BUT ADDS TO CONFUSION

Notwithstanding his obvious packing of the Court with those to whom he attributed New Deal philosophies, the Court itself, has fallen into disagreement until today it is in a worse state of confusion than ever before and some of its members have charged in their considered opinions that the Court has ceased to be a guide for the administrators of justice in the lower Federal courts.

In a recent opinion, Justices Roberts and Frankfurter stated that a "tendency to disregard precedents" in recent decisions of the United States Supreme Court has left litigants and lower courts "without confidence that what was said yesterday will hold good tomorrow."

It was further said that reversal of previous decisions tended to make the law "a game of chance."

In their opinion, they further said that—

> The tendency to disregard precedents * * * has become so strong in this court of late as * * * to shake confidence in the consistency of decision and leave the courts below on an uncharted sea of doubt and difficulty.
>
> Defendants will not know whether to litigate or settle, for they will have no assurance that a declared rule will be followed. But the more deplorable consequence will inevitably be that the administration of justice will fall into disrepute. Respect for tribunals must fall when the bar and the public come to understand that nothing that has been said in prior adjudication has force in a current controversy.

According to the statement of at least one Justice, the highest court in the land is no longer a compass on which the judges of appeals and district courts can rely, and itself does not know what its next holding will be.

THE F. B. I. EFFICIENT

The Department of Justice has long been regarded as free from political influence. J. Edgar Hoover throughout the years, by efficient work and a legitimate flare for publicity, built up for the F. B. I. a reputation for efficiency, thoroughness, and fairness.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am very glad to hear the gentleman make that observation, because in my opinion Mr. Hoover's record speaks for itself. I do not think there is a more outstanding citizen in this country, and when Winchell tries to claim himself to be a friend of J. Edgar Hoover, it must be just as much of an offense to Hoover as it is to anybody else.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Every time Congress was asked for an appropriation for that Bureau, because they believed it was doing a good job a half dozen or more Congressmen, without any necessity therefor, would, from the floor of the House, praise and commend Hoover and the F. B. I.

But the searing, destructive influence of the New Deal, if current events be accepted at their face value, if the facts outlined in an editorial from the Hartford Day Spring, Van Buren County, Mich., be true—and I have no reason to doubt their truth—seems to be affecting even the activities of the F. B. I.

That editorial is attached hereto, marked "Exhibit A," and the reply of the F. B. I., made after investigation, is marked "Exhibit B."

Nor is there any reason why the F. B. I. should degenerate into a gestapo; do the dirty work of the New Dealers.

BUT NEW DEAL WOULD WRECK IT

For 4 long years, the New Dealers tried to get J. Edgar Hoover, tried to make the F. B. I. a subservient agent of the New Deal. But Congress, steadfast in its faith in Hoover and in the F. B. I., thwarted that move and today the F. B. I. has the opportunity of remaining a free, independent, investigatory agency solely because Congress came to its rescue.

There is not the slightest reason why that organization should permit itself to be hooked up with Walter Winchell or any of the other professional smear artists.

Beyond question, thousands of complaints come to the F. B. I. about subversive activities. We all receive now and again complaints from constituents who think that some individual in their community is originating or is circulating stories which affect the war effort adversely. Those complaints we pass on to the F. B. I. for investigation—always heretofore secure in the thought that a fair and impartial investigation and report would be made.

We are all familiar with the smear campaign which was carried on against Herbert Hoover, with the smear tactics of Charlie Michelson. Gradually, but quite naturally, and characteristic of the policy followed by the Communists, the smear campaign has increased in volume as the New Dealers and the Communists have gone unrebuked.

For several years, a man who is a disgrace to his race, who makes his money by spreading filth, false, and malicious

gossip, the natural tendency of which is to impair the morale of our fighting men, has claimed to be an intimate of J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the F. B. I.

Time and again, in his talks over the radio and through his column, he has insinuated that he had access to F. B. I. information which otherwise was secret. He has spoken time and again under circumstances which would lead his hearers to believe that he had the confidence of the head of the F. B. I., that Hoover met him on terms of social equality and, as a matter of choice, sought his society, enjoyed his company, and, by inference, his dirty gossip.

True, on occasion, when Winchell has made false statements purporting to have come from the F. B. I., Mr. Hoover has publicly denied Winchell's statements.

Nevertheless, so far as I am able to learn, Hoover has never categorically denied Winchell's claims to access to confidential information obtained by F. B. I. agents.

HOOVER SHOULD DIVORCE WINCHELL

In this statement I may be in error and, if I am, it will do no harm for Mr. Hoover to again deny that he or the F. B. I. furnishes or permits Winchell access to confidential information.

In the smear publications, Sabotage, Under Cover, and various newspaper articles, Members of both Senate and House have, by inference, been accused of disloyal conduct. The method is to associate their names with the names of known or suspected disloyal individuals.

Mr. Hoover is familiar with this method. Yet he permits Winchell, who is known throughout the country as the originator and distributor of false information, to publicly, week after week, to millions of American listeners, carry the impression that he—Winchell—and J. Edgar Hoover are buddies.

Hoover has always been able to get all of the publicity he needed, and it would be no arduous task for him to tell the American people the truth about his association or lack of it, his relationship, if any, with Walter Winchell.

No one believes for one moment that J. Edgar Hoover has any sympathy for the views or the methods of Winchell. Nevertheless, Winchell, using the methods of Avedis Arthur Derounian, alias John Roy Carlson, alias George Pagnanelli, alias Thomas L. Decker, alias John Correa, alias Rudolph Kibers, author of Under Cover—the power of association of names—to obtain some reflected degree of respectability and accuracy for himself, his broadcasts, and his column, links himself to the respectable head of the F. B. I. This, in reverse, is the method of the smearers.

Unless J. Edgar Hoover and the F. B. I. disassociate themselves from Walter Winchell, the public sooner or later will begin to think, from Winchell's statements, that they are acting in a common cause.

If the F. B. I. wishes to investigate claimed subversive activities, seditious utterances, it might do well to classify and check Winchell's statements to ascertain whether or not they create disunity, arouse antisemitic feeling, tend to discourage our fighting men here at home and on the battlefield.

WINCHELL TRIES FOR VENEER OF RESPECTABILITY

Winchell and the other smearers like to use the old saying that birds of a feather flock together; that a man is known by the company he keeps. They used, and are using, that method to create in the minds of the people the belief that Senators and Congressmen are disloyal because they may have met some of those who have been indicted for sedition; because some who have been indicted, some who have been convicted, have circulated speeches made by the people's representatives.

There would be just as much sense, just as much logic, in claiming that the writer of a sacred hymn was a criminal because a jailbird passed it on to his fellow prisoners.

Throughout this country hundreds of thousands of persons are seeking seriously for the reason why Winchell, Drew Pearson—whom the President described as a chronic liar—and others are permitted unlimited freedom in creating disunity, while honest, respectable citizens out in the country are, upon complaint, immediately investigated by agents of the F. B. I.

The incident which I am about to cite is not typical, I am sure, of the F. B. I. and its methods, but it is indicative of the way in which the New Deal is extending its blighting influence throughout every Government agency.

It is time for J. Edgar Hoover and the F. B. I. to get an absolute divorce from Walter Winchell and the smear artists; to let the public know that they will no longer be responsible for the charges of disloyalty heaped against the people's representatives.

Free speech is one thing, but the use of a Government department to give it weight and political influence is quite another thing.

Winchell is using the Department of Justice for political purposes. It is time that the Department of Justice put an end to such use.

Already we have, so it is reported, some 10,000,000 in the armed service of the United States. We have millions of men and some thousands of women more than 3,000 miles away, fighting and dying on foreign soil and in hitherto unknown islands and seas, to, according to the President, carry in our time the "four freedoms" to the utmost ends of the world. One of those freedoms for which our flesh and blood are fighting and dying is freedom of speech.

SCHOOLBOY CLAIMS RIGHT OF FREE SPEECH

We have every reason to believe that hundreds of thousands—yes, perhaps a million—young Americans, who love life as you and I, who had or have everything in the world—friends, loved ones, home, children—to look forward to, will never return to the homeland which sent them forth.

They are told they are fighting so that others throughout the world may be free from want, free to worship, to enjoy a free press, and the right to speak freely. Yet, here at home, a 17-year-old schoolboy, who will fight for the right of free speech, has his right to speak freely challenged; is charged with sedition and with traitorous conduct by a Government agent, because he ventured to exercise the right of free speech, to call attention to the President's failure to keep a promise.

The young man, who is a resident of the village of Hartford, with a population at the last census of 1,694, a month after he became 17 years of age, September last, enlisted as an air cadet, and, upon graduation in June, will go into training, hoping to become a member of a crew piloting a fighter or a bomber over Germany or the South Sea Islands held by the Japs.

Almost 6 months ago he offered all that he has—his life—all that he might look forward to—marriage, a home, children, and a happy old age with his family here in America—so that other people in distant parts of the world might have some of the blessings which we and our ancestors have enjoyed.

According to the editorial by Joseph N. McCall, publisher of the Hartford Day Spring, a copy of which is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A," the young man, in a class discussion of current affairs, referred to a campaign speech of the President, made in Boston on October 30, 1940. He then charged that the President did not tell the truth when he made that promise.

Some people will say, with some show of reason, that the President did not tell a falsehood; that he only made a promise and that subsequent events made it impossible to keep that promise. That argument is sound if, at the time the President promised that our boys would not be sent into any foreign wars, such was his intention and, if he had not, prior to that time, been following a course which he knew, or, by the exercise of ordinary diligence should have known, would make it impossible for him to keep his promise.

As to whether he and his administration had followed or were at the time following a policy which would inevitably lead to war will be discussed in a few moments.

YOUR BOYS ARE NOT GOING TO BE SENT INTO ANY FOREIGN WARS

There has been a studied effort to convince the American people that the President never made an unqualified promise that American boys were not going to be sent into any foreign wars. Both the President's wife and the smear artist, Walter Winchell—who by Presidential favor is retained as a Naval Reserve officer but without uniform, without pay, and without duty—have asserted that the President never made the unqualified promise and that his statement "your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars," had attached to it the qualifying limitation, "except in case of attack."

That there may be no further misunderstanding on this subject, let us put the facts on the record.

On October 23, 1940, at Philadelphia, the President said:

> We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war.

We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

It is for peace that I have labored, and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life.

The foregoing I quote from page 495 of volume 9 of the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Neither the First Lady nor Winchell, the scandal-monger and salesman for Jergens cosmetics, can change that record.

After making the statement at Philadelphia, quoting the Democratic platform, which pledged that—

We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack.

And after 7 days' reflection and deliberation, President Roosevelt went one step further, cut off the limitation and unequivocally promised the fathers and the mothers of America that their sons were "not going to be sent into any foreign wars."

In that speech, made at Boston on October 30, 1940—and I am quoting now from the same volume 9 of the Public Papers and Addresses of Franklin D. Roosevelt, page 517—the President said:

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance.

I have said this before, but I shall say it again and again and again:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

The purpose of our defense is defense.

The President deliberately, and after he had time for reflection and after he knew the limitation made upon the promise contained in the Democratic platform, without qualification, to obtain political support, gave his solemn promise to the citizens of this country that their boys would not be sent into any foreign wars.

The President made promise after promise and into the RECORD tonight will go, under leave to revise and extend, some of those promises made by the President which he has not made any pretense of keeping and into the RECORD will go not only promises which have been violated but into the RECORD will go the instances of where he has not told the truth.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Did the gentleman vote for declaration of war?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I did.

Mr. GORE. Then why is the gentleman complaining?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I voted for a declaration of war because there was nothing else to do after the Japs attacked at Pearl Harbor; however, I voted against every move which I thought would get us into that war and never did I, with a promise on my lips to keep us out of war, do one act which was bound to get us into war.

While the President was telling us he was not going to get us into war, while he was telling us that our boys would not be sent to foreign soil to fight, he was having passenger liners fitted up to be used as transports. That is what he was doing, and, as he himself said, a man should be judged by what he does and not by what he says. The President said one thing and he was doing another.

I have not forgotten that just a few weeks ago the publisher of the New York Times said that we went to war when we voted lend-lease, for which the gentleman voted. Then is when we went to war, according to the publisher of the New York Times. There was nothing we could do when Japan attacked us but go to war.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. Of course, the gentleman is entitled to his opinion that the votes which he cast and the speeches which he made were supposed to keep us out of war. He is entitled to so interpret them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The President so said.

Mr. GORE. I am speaking of the speeches which the gentleman from Michigan made and the votes which the gentleman from Michigan cast. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to view those votes and those speeches as steps to keep us out of war, if that is his belief; however, there are many people in the country who think that those were steps over a period of years most calculated to get us into war.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right as to the right of one to his belief. I am finding no fault with anyone's opinion. I will put into the RECORD the statement where the President said that we could stay out of war if we had the courage to say "No." That is what the President himself said. I will give you the exact words in a moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman does not have to yield unless he wants to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, I could not resist.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have never been able to resist the gentleman when he has asked me to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, what lovers we are, almost like the gentleman from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN, and the Member from Michigan.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let the gentleman keep his associations to himself and I will keep mine.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why so touchy? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is a distinguished Member of this body, a member of the gentleman's party, a Member respected by all on both sides of the aisle. The gentleman just told me he liked me. If he wants to withdraw it, go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. I enjoy my association with the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Let us cut out the blarney. Go ahead.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman object to American soldiers being sent abroad to fight in this war?

Mr. HOFFMAN. To our American soldiers being over there? Certainly I do not object to reinforcements. I only wish the President, instead of sending everything across the Atlantic, had sent something down to the Philippine Islands to help out down there.

You remember what Churchill said. We had lost in the Pacific because we sent our aid—munitions and men—to the battle of the Atlantic. How many thousands of our boys down there in the Pacific were tortured and starved until they died because we helped the British and let our own men down there die for lack of food and medicine?

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman vote for the Guam appropriation?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true that the officials of the Army and the Navy advised against the fortifying of Guam?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure; that question of fortifying Guam is an old political catch question. The question of fortifying Guam was never before the House.

Mr. BREHM. The Navy said they could not hold it. Do not lay that on our doorstep.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will answer the gentleman from Massachusetts by saying I do not recall how I voted, but I will say this, that you would not have kept it anyway, when the British, with over 100 years and with millions of dollars expended, could not fortify and hold Singapore. What are you talking about, holding the Island of Guam?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is entitled to that opinion, but the question is, did he vote for or against the Guam appropriation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I told you I do not recall, but if I voted the way I intended to vote, I voted against it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And it was not a fortification appropriation; it was for dredging the harbor. The more we sprawl and spread ourselves out, the weaker we become. We could not hold the Philippines, if we would not give them reinforcements. Why are you talking about putting men on another island? Do you want more of them taken? Do you want more of them tortured?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman knows that at the Washington Conference in 1922, under a Republican administration, they agreed that the Philippines would not be fortified. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman arguing now that everything the Republicans did was right?

Mr. McCORMACK. Are you?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, and I am not swallowing the proposition that much of what the New Dealers have done is right. There might be away down under somewhere something in this program of remaking America, in this alliance with

labor leaders and with Communists in control of labor organizations in exchange for their votes—there may be possibly something of good but it is very hard to find.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. GORE. In complaining that the President——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not complaining. I am just calling your attention to the record of the administration.

Mr. GORE. In criticizing the President——

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not criticizing him. I am just calling your attention to the record of the administration.

Mr. GORE. Well, in citing the record——

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. GORE. That aid did not get to the Philippines, does the gentleman remember whether or not he voted for or against the many measures here to increase the United States Navy which, if they had been passed, might have made it possible to get some aid there?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, you have quite a few "ifs" and "mights" in there.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman remember how he voted?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. A great deal has been said about who cuts defense appropriations. The Republican members of the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in 1942, and before the election, asked to have placed in the record a yearly statement since 1924 showing (1) the amount of money asked for by the War Department for national defense; (2) the amount sent to Congress by the President through his Budget Director; and (3) the amount appropriated by Congress. That record was never published and was ordered locked up in a safe in the Appropriations Committee by the chairman. The reason it was not published was that it was the President who, through his Budget Director, had cut the Army appropriation, and not the Congress. Congress gave them more than the Budget asked for. These are the facts. If anybody doubts them, let him go back into the safe of the Appropriations Committee and get that record out. It is there under lock and key.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized. It is his own time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may have an additional 20 minutes so that the gentlemen can answer each other on some of these questions, because I have not yet touched on the point that I wanted to make when I rose to the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is reluctant to recognize the gentleman for that request, because there are three other Members of the House who have special orders.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, Mr. Speaker, and that, may I say, has been the ruling of the present occupant of the chair on various occasions; and I think the ruling is correct. But unfortunately for consistency the Speaker of the House when occupying the chair and on my making that point ruled the opposite. I do not like intimidation, but I have a couple or more questions of personal privilege here.

Mr. McCORMACK. Where is the intimidation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The intimidation? If I do not get my additional time of 20 minutes or 10, I shall have to insist on raising the question of personal privilege again.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is intimidating the House?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to say that I, as the holder of one of these special orders, will be only too glad to accord with the gentleman's request that he have an additional 20 minutes, if he cares to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair calls the attention of the House to the fact that there are three other special orders. It is a matter within the control of the House.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan to proceed for an additional 20 minutes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Instead of 1 hour.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair hears none. It is so ordered.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Just in order to keep the record straight as to this remark about the Navy appropriation and how the gentleman voted on it, the gentleman will recall that when a two-ocean Navy was suggested and recommended to the President, he said anybody who was for a two-ocean Navy was stupid, just stupid, that is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I recall that, and I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] both recall that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just before Pearl Harbor there was an appropriation bill in here to appropriate money to build 5,500 airplanes. A motion was made on the Republican side in the Committee of the Whole to reduce it to 1,000, and it was defeated. Later a motion was made to reduce it to 4,400-plus airplanes. That was defeated, and then a motion to recommit was made, and that was defeated. The entire consistent record of practically all the Members on the Republican side before Pearl Harbor was against everything that would go toward the defense of our country. If a majority of the Congress had followed the votes of the majority of the Republican Party, when Pearl Harbor happened this country would have been defenseless and we would have had to make any kind of a peace we could get.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, do not forget that what we did put over there the administration lost, or at least we did not keep.

Let me say something else to the gentleman. The statements I will put in the RECORD tonight quoting the President will show that he was the most inconsistent of the lot, that no Member of Congress could have been as inconsistent as was he in his statements when his statements are compared with his acts.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, testified before our subcommittee in January 1939 that he had up to that time been following a policy of quality first and then quantity; that we were 3 to 5 years behind Germany in research and development in airplane construction. A month or two later, perhaps 6 weeks later, he came in and stated the reverse policy, that then he wanted quantity without regard to quality.

The facts of the case were these—we Republicans agreed with General Arnold that in the construction of airplanes quality should come first and then quantity. That we should not build obsolete planes. That our boys were entitled to the best possible planes. That it was suicide to send a boy up in an obsolete plane. The President proposed that we build 5,500 planes, 3,300 of these were to be operated, approximately 1,000 in reserve, and 1,250 more were to be built and stored. We Republicans on the committee and on the floor did not oppose the construction of the 3,300 planes despite the fact that they would be obsolete. We did not oppose a normal reserve. We did oppose the construction of 1,250 of these obsolete planes which were to be put in storage. In October 1940, a meeting was held in the War Department office on Constitution Avenue. There were present at that meeting the Secretary of War, some 15 or 20 Army officials including the Deputy Chief of Staff and a number of Members of Congress. I asked for information at that meeting as to the actual number of planes built. I was told to write a letter. I wrote that letter. The President had stated that we were to retain 50 percent of all planes for our own use and send 50 percent to Europe over a 2-year period. I asked the War Department whether we were to have the first 50 percent of the planes produced or the last 50 percent produced over a 2-year period; second, whether we were retaining 50 percent of combat planes, 50 percent trainers, or all trainers and no combat planes. I also asked specific information as to the number of planes of each type actually built. This letter was published at the time in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I was given the information subsequently, but was not permitted to publish it at the time. The facts, however, were that we were keeping practically all training planes and no combat planes. The record, I believe, will verify this statement. The planes that we sent to Europe were obsolete. They had no armored pilot seats, no self-sealing gasoline tanks, they lacked fire power, climbing power, and speed. These were the planes that we were told were left lying on the docks in England unused

because they were obsolete. I said then and I say now that we made a mistake in not continuing General Arnold's policy of quality first and then quantity. It is suicide for a flyer to go up in an obsolete plane as against planes that have modern appliances and modern protection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. And on that very point my recollection is very clear, that the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] insisted before this House on a matter then before the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee, for the Army, that the policy of the Nation should be that, as stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], we should take that money and use it to build experimental plants and develop a decent plane, and it was that policy announced on the Republican side which finally gave rise to the development of these airplanes you have now, and had we followed the policy announced by the distinguished majority leader of spending that money in building a lot of planes which would have been obsolete before they were built, before they left the ground, we never would have had a decent aviation policy in this country, and everybody knows it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. And the gentleman read the statement in the newspapers of Captain Foss, that, thank God, now he could go over there and be on a plane that was not old, like the Grumman Wildcats, which the Japs went by like a bat out of hell.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Those planes had no self-sealing gasoline tanks, they lacked fire power, climbing power, and speed, and they had no protection for the pilot seat. I made the statement at that meeting in October 1940 that the entire French Air Force, with every American plane in it, was wiped out by the German Air Force during the first 10 days in the battle for Belgium. No one contradicted me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Permit me now to return to this question of the investigation of the F. B. I. of the schoolboy at Hartford, Van Buren County, Mich., because he made, among others, the statement that the President was untruthful.

The young man at Hartford is patriotic. As stated, a month after he became 17, he enlisted as an air cadet and is only awaiting his graduation from high school the coming June to enter the armed service of his country.

When President Roosevelt assumed office, this young man was no more than 6 years of age. Beyond question, he is familiar with the story of Washington and the cherry tree; with the statement attributed to Washington, "Father, I cannot tell a lie." Perhaps he belongs to the "horse and buggy" days, when people believed that a promise made was to be kept. Perhaps he had accepted the statement of President Roosevelt that a campaign promise was "a covenant with the people to be faithfully kept by the party when entrusted with power."

Perhaps the boy had heard of the President's statement in a radio address on May 7, 1933:

I am going to be honest at all times with the people of the country.

In any event, the young man is little more than a boy, although he will play a man's part in the war. And no one should criticize him because he did not at the moment realize the difference between a promise and a false statement. Many people believe that a promise made, but not intended to be fulfilled, is an untruth.

PRESIDENT SAID HE OPPOSED WAR

That the President intended the people of America to believe that he was opposed to war and that he would not send their sons to fight in any foreign wars is made evident by his prior utterances on the subject of war and of the Nation's policy toward war. To list just a few of them, note the following statements by the President:

On December 28, 1933:

The definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention.

On January 3, 1934:

I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in political arrangements in Europe.

On January 4, 1935:

The maintenance of international peace is a matter in which we are deeply and unselfishly concerned. There is no ground for apprehension that our relations with any nation will be otherwise than peaceful.

On June 12, 1935:

As a nation we have been fortunate in our geographic isolation, which in itself has partially protected our boundless resources. It is in full appreciation of our advantageous position and of our own devotion to the cause of peace that our Nation's defense system has always reflected the single purpose that that name implies.

On October 2, 1935:

The American people can have but one concern and speak but one sentiment: Despite what happens in continents overseas, the United States of America shall and must remain, as long ago the Father of our Country prayed that it might remain, unentangled and free.

As President of the United States I say to you most earnestly once more that the people of America and the Government of those people intend and expect to remain at peace with all the world.

On October 16, 1935:

I have pledged myself to do my part in keeping America free of those entanglements that move us along the road to war.

On November 11, 1935:

The primary purpose of this Nation is to avoid being drawn into war. * * *

The new generation, unlike us, have no direct knowledge of the meaning of war. They are not immune to the glamor of war. * * * Fortunately, there is evidence on every hand that the youth of America, as a whole, is not trapped by that delusion. They know that elation and prosperity which may come from a new war must lead—for those who survive it—to economic and social collapse more sweeping than any we have experienced in the past.

America must and will protect herself. Under no circumstances will this policy of self-protection go to lengths beyond self-protection.

On January 3, 1936:

The United States and the rest of the Americas can play but one role: through a well-ordered neutrality to do naught to encourage the contest, through adequate defense to save ourselves from embroilment and attack, and through example and all legitimate encouragement and assistance, to persuade other nations to return to the ways of peace and good will.

Within democratic nations the chief concern of the people is to prevent the continuance or rise of autocratic institutions that beget slavery at home and aggression abroad.

On August 14, 1936:

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign wars; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations.

I wish I could keep war from all nations; but that is beyond my power. I can at least make certain that no act of the United States helps to produce or to promote war.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer—must answer—"We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion.

On October 13, 1936:

We have sought for security from war with other nations. * * * We propose, of course, no interference with the affairs of other nations.

On October 14, 1936:

All major wars have brought about major disturbances in our social and economic machinery. The late war has been no exception. We rejoice here that these problems are being met and solved without impairing our faith and confidence in the people's ability to do it themselves by the peaceful processes of democratic representative government.

On October 14, 1937:

The Nation knows I hate war, and I know that the Nation hates war. I submit to you a record of peace.

Today there is war and rumors of war. We want none of it. But while we guard our shores against threats of war, we will continue to remove the causes of unrest and antagonism at home which might make our people easier victims to those for whom foreign war is profitable. Those who stand to profit by war are not on our side in this campaign.

In September 1939:

I give you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today.

I say this because with the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict.

I believe that American vessels should, so far as possible, be restricted from entering danger zones. * * *

The second objective is to prevent American citizens from traveling on belligerent vessels or in danger areas. * * *

Under present enactments such arms cannot be carried to belligerent countries on American vessels, and this provision should not be disturbed.

To those who say that this program (embargo repeal) would involve a step toward war on our part, I reply that it offers far greater safeguards than we now possess or have ever possessed to protect American lives and property from danger. It is a positive program for giving safety. This means less likelihood of incidents and controversies

which tend to draw us into conflict, as they did in the last World War. There lies the road to peace.

On October 23, 1940:

We are arming ourselves not for any foreign war. We are arming ourselves not for any purpose of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas except in case of attack."

It is for peace that I have labored; and it is for peace that I shall labor all the days of my life.

On October 28, 1940:

By the Neutrality Act of 1935, and by other steps, we made it possible to prohibit American citizens from traveling on vessels belonging to countries at war. Was that right? We made it clear that American investors who put their money into enterprises in foreign nations could not call on American warships or soldiers to bail out their investments. Was that right?

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent, and that they must stay out of war zones. Was that right?

Later, the President asked for the repeal of the Neutrality Act on the theory that its repeal would assist in maintaining peace, keep us out of the war.

PRESIDENT SAID WE COULD KEEP OUT OF WAR IF WE HAD COURAGE TO SAY "NO"

If it be said that force of circumstances, the attack by Japan, forced us into the war and that therefore the President's promise that our boys would not be sent to fight in any foreign wars could not be kept, let it be said that, while that may be true and that war was unavoidable, yet the President placed no such limitation upon his promise and as long ago as August 14, 1936, he told us:

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "No" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

That statement shows that he either did not know what he was talking about or that he did not have the courage to say no, for we did not keep out of the war.

It is not my purpose to make any argument as to whether we could or could not have stayed out of this war. My sole purpose is to show that the schoolboy who said that the President was untruthful had, under our form of government, the right to make that statement in view of political events and statements.

Perhaps the young man who charged that the President did not tell the truth when he made the promise that American youth would not be sent to fight in any foreign wars did not rely solely upon the President's words, plain on their face; made deliberately by a candidate for the highest office in the land; nor upon the sincerity of the views expressed in the words just quoted as to the President's attitude toward war and our Nation's participation therein.

Perhaps, in justification of his charge, the young man sincerely believed that the promise was not made in good faith. Perhaps he measured the President's promise with the yardstick of the President in mind, when, on the 19th of September 1932, as a candidate for office, he said:

But remember well that attitude and method—the way we do things, not just the way we say things, is nearly always the measure of our sincerity.

WAR PREDICTED IF ROOSEVELT ELECTED

Perhaps the young man had in mind previous events which led some of us to the conclusion that the policy of the administration was day by day and step by step drawing us nearer to war, to predictions that war would come if the President's policies were followed.

Permit me to cite from news releases sent out by me and published in the papers of my district a few of these events.

Note this prediction of August 17, 1940:

The President asked authority to call out the National Guard for military training. I know of no one opposed to that procedure. Unfortunately, the President also asked—and he jammed through Congress—authority to send the National Guard on active service anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. An amendment to limit that service to the continental United States was voted down.

If military training was the purpose of calling out the National Guard—and certainly they need the training if we are to prepare for adequate defense—there was no reason for giving the President authority to send the Guard into South America, where we have never been asked; where we are sure to get into trouble.

You and I know that, if the Guard is sent to South America and there they become involved in military strife, the Regular Army and the Navy must be sent to aid them. Our national defense will not be strengthened by scattering our forces all over the Western Hemisphere when we are so ill-prepared here at home.

The President's demand for authority over the National Guard is further evidence of his determination to involve us in the World War. In my judgment, he should not be given the power to make war until the people, through Congress, have declared war. For months now, he has assumed to act as a dictator and it is because of his sayings and his actions that our danger from abroad has been greatly increased.

Weeks before this the President had transferred 50 American destroyers to a foreign nation, even though section 33 of title 18 of the United States Criminal Code expressly provided that—

It shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war * * * with any intent * * * that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation.

Over my signature in some of the papers of the District on September 5, 1940, more than a year before the Japs struck at Pearl Harbor, appeared this statement:

If Roosevelt is reelected, under the guise of defending ourselves, we will be sending our Navy to foreign waters, our soldiers to foreign lands, and we shall be in a war of aggression.

Again, on September 26, 1940:

The drive for war centers here in Washington, where the President called for a voluntary propaganda organization—as though the New Dealers were not doing plenty of that now.

In Washington theaters some Government employees wildly cheer pictures of Roosevelt signing the conscription bill, which takes the boys from their homes; boo and hiss pictures of Willkie, who promises they will never fight on foreign soil. (These cheerers are safe in Federal jobs.)

* * * * *

Yes, the drive to involve us in the war is on in dead earnest. Under the guise of helping Great Britain, the President has sent her, in violation of our solemn promise to the world, warships, planes, artillery, trucks, ammunition. All well and good as long as we remain out of the war, you say? But be not fooled. He intends to send American soldiers, when once we are completely involved.

On October 16, 1940:

Roosevelt has promised that he will not send American soldiers to foreign soil, but experience has demonstrated that his promises, after election, are easily forgotten.

On January 9, 1941:

The local press contains many items carrying the assumption that we are in the war. Public polls begin to indicate a growing sentiment for war. Why? Because a deliberate and widespread effort is being made to create the impression that war is inevitable; that we are already in the war; and that no loyal persons will question the wisdom of continuing on a course which will result in sending an army to Europe.

* * * * *

This talk of "destroying the Axis Powers," if made in good faith, can only mean sending an army to Europe.

On March 11, 1941:

Do you know—

That the Bethlehem Co. is converting American liners into transport ships? (Is the purpose to fit them to carry troops?)

That the administration is asking that the National Guard, called to train for 1 year, be kept for an additional 6 to 12 months?

That the administration has defeated all amendments to the lend-lease bill, which would limit the power of the President to send American ships or men to fight in World War No. 2?

On March 27, 1941:

Two weeks ago I told you about American liners which were being converted into transport ships for troops.

* * * * *

American warships are being painted to resemble Britain's warship, the *King George*, and on the high seas, in the combat areas, it will be difficult for German U-boats to distinguish them from British warships. Can you think of an easier way of getting an American warship torpedoed?

It may be that the Hartford school boy, when he said that the President was untruthful in making the promise that our boys would not be sent to fight in any foreign wars, was of the opinion that the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, was not the beginning of the war. Others, with a far wider experience, years of judging the trend of national and international events, have had that thought.

PUBLISHER OF NEW YORK TIMES SAID LEND-LEASE A WARLIKE ACT

Arthur Hayes Sulzberger, president and publisher of the New York Times, and a member of the central committee of the American Red Cross, speaking at a meeting of the American Red Cross in New York on January 31, 1944, for the purpose of giving aid to our prisoners, among other things said:

I happen to be among those who believe that we did not go to war because we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. I hold rather that we were attacked at Pearl Harbor because we had gone to war when we made the lend-lease declaration. * * * That declaration was an affirmative act on our part, and a warlike act.

There were many of us in America; there were some of us in Congress, who believed that sending ships with munitions of war to belligerent nations—that the carrying out of the lend-lease program—meant war, even though we were told by the President and outstanding members of his party that the repeal of neutrality legislation, that the transfer of the 50 destroyers, that the adoption of lend-lease, were all efforts to keep us out of war.

It is a tribute to the intelligence, the judgment, of the American schoolboy that this country boy in the little town of Hartford apparently was as accurate in his conclusion as to the result of the New Deal policy as was the president and publisher of the New York Times.

It may have been difficult for the young man, knowing, as did many other Americans, that the administration was following a course which must end in war, to believe that the President's promise not to send our boys to fight in foreign wars was made in good faith.

Again, the young man may have had in mind other promises of the President which had been violated. There is an old Latin maxim, "Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus"—false in one, false in all—which the boy may have known.

PRESIDENT'S PROMISES NOT KEPT

The President has made many, many promises to which he made no pretense of adhering. All can recall many of these promises. They are familiar in almost every household of the land. Let me cite just a few.

The President and his party had promised in substance that it would not go off the gold standard. On September 12, 1932, Patrick J. Hurley, then Secretary of War, charged that, "If the Democrats are elected in November and take office on the 4th of March, they will follow the program of the House of Representatives and not the Chicago platform." He further charged that the Democratic administration would go off the gold standard.

Answering the charge that, if the Democratic Party succeeded at the November election, the United States would be driven off the gold standard, on November 2, 1932, Senator CARTER GLASS said that, if Hurley made the charge—

He is totally unfit for official responsibility and the President should have booted him out of office before breakfast time the following day. * * * This alleged declaration if made by this strutting trumpeter of the President was not far short of treason.

Two nights later, on November 4, Candidate Roosevelt himself, after referring to the words of Senator GLASS quoted above and upholding his position, said:

It is worthy of note that no adequate answer has been made to the magnificent philippic of Senator GLASS the other night, in which he showed how unsound this position was. And I might add, Senator GLASS made a devastating challenge that no responsible Government would have sold to the country securities payable in gold if it knew that the promise—yes, the covenant—embodied in these securities was as dubious as the President of the United States claims it was.

Yet, Roosevelt having won the election, within less than a month after taking office repudiated the Nation's solemn contractual obligation to redeem its promises in terms of gold and the United States went off the gold standard. The Democratic platform promise and the promise of the President was not kept.

In his first campaign, the President had a great deal to say about the Nation's then $4,000,000,000 debt and about excessive Federal spending. Among other things, he said:

It is my pledge and promise that this dangerous kind of financing shall be stopped and that rigid governmental economy shall be forced by a stern and unremitting administration policy of living within our income.

* * * * *

We must eliminate actual perfunctions of Government—functions, in fact, that are not definitely essential to the continuance of government. We must merge, we must consolidate subdivisions of government and, like private citizens, give up luxuries we can no longer afford.

* * * * *

I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues of this campaign.

* * * * *

We are not getting an adequate return for the money we are spending in Washington, or, to put it another way around, we are spending altogether too much money for Government services which are neither practical nor necessary. In addition to this, we are attempting too many functions and we need a simplification of what the Federal Government is giving to the people.

I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetimes in all our history—one which has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs or reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats have been retained at the expense of the taxpayer.

* * * * *

On my part I ask you to assign to me the task of reducing the annual operating expenses of the National Government.

* * * * *

Revenues must cover expenditures by one means or another. Any government, like any family, can for a year, spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse.

* * * * *

Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficits. Let us have equal courage to reverse the policy of Republican leaders and insist on a sound currency.

* * * * *

Now the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If in some crisis it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms.

But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay, and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy. For over 2 years our Federal Government has experienced unprecedented deficits in spite of increased taxes.

* * * * *

This simply means that one-third—33⅓ percent—of the entire income of our people must go for the luxury of being governed.

That is an impossible economic condition. Quite apart from every man's own tax assessment, that burden is a brake on any return to normal business activity.

* * * * *

Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors, because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. If excessive, they are reflected in idle factories, tax-sold farms, and hence in hordes of hungry tramping the streets and seeking jobs in vain.

Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages, in increased cost of what they buy or, as now, in broad cessation of employment.

* * * * *

I regard reduction in Federal spending as one of the most important issues of this campaign. In my opinion, it is the most direct and effective contribution that Government can make to business.

In March 1933, the President said:

Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on rocks of loose fiscal policy. We must avoid this danger. * * * We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of the Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy.

And the Democratic platform of 1936 contained this statement:

If these problems cannot be effectively solved by legislation within the Constitution, we shall seek such clarifying amendment as will assure to the legislatures of the several States and the Congress of the United States, each within its proper jurisdiction, the power to enact those laws which the State and Federal legislatures, within their respective spheres, shall find necessary. * * * Thus we propose to maintain the letter and spirit of the Constitution.

A definite promise that the Constitution would not be ignored.

No citation of facts or of figures is needed to show that long before any appropriations other than normal ones for national defense were made, the President and his administration had entered upon and carried on a campaign of wild, reckless, wasteful, extravagant expenditures, and he continued to borrow to meet those expenditures, even though, before he became a candidate, he had pointed out the folly of such a course when he said, on September 9, 1931:

Right now we have to consider how to meet such an emergency (depression times). Shall we meet it according to the example of our Federal Government, which feels itself obligated to put out $800,000,000 of long time bonds to cure the defects of a budget whose revenues have not come up to expectations? I think we should be very foolish and recreant to our trust if we should follow any such precedent. We don't know what the future holds for us. This depression is today's problem. Men of all parties are agreed that this need exists and must be met. I think most of us are agreed, too, that we cannot and must not borrow against the future to meet it. We must share now out of what we have but not out of what we expect to have some day in the future.

His ego inflated by the acclaim accorded him, the President not only stated—

I should like to have it said of my first administration that, in it, the forces of selfishness and of lust for power met their match. I should like to have it said of my second

administration that, in it, these forces met their master—

But, in 1936, added these boastful statements—

RECOVERY COMPLETE, BUT ONE-THIRD NEEDING RELIEF

Recovery is with us. Federal revenues are increasing, emergency expenditures are decreasing. A balanced budget is on the way.

* * * * *

The Government has sought and found practical answers to the problems of industry, agriculture, and mining.

* * * Factories singing the song of industry, markets humming with bustling movement, ships and trains running full.

But by January 20 of 1937, the President sang a different song, set to a different tune. Listen to his words:

I see millions of families trying to live on incomes so meager that the pall of family disaster hangs over them day by day.

I see millions whose daily lives in city and on farm continue under conditions labeled indecent by a so-called polite society half a century ago.

I see millions denied education, recreation, and the opportunity to better their lot and the lot of their children.

I see millions lacking the means to buy the products of farm and factory and by their poverty denying work and productiveness to many other millions.

I see one-third of a nation ill-housed, ill-clad, ill-nourished.

And on March 4, 1937, he said:

Here is one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed—now.

And, on March 9, 1937, he added for good measure:

I want to talk with you very simply about the need for present action in this crisis—the need to meet the unanswered challenge of one-third of a nation ill-nourished, ill-clad, ill-housed.

"Factories singing the song of industry, markets humming with bustling movement, ships and trains running full"—all the President's creation, according to his view—had reduced to ill-nourished and ill-clad and ill-housed a third of our population. Was it because he planned it that way?

WASHINGTON BUREAUCRACY IN FULL CONTROL

Let us forget the President's unkept promises. To record them would be but a waste of time, for the majority of our people now know that the President just does not keep his promises, although some still claim that the failure was due to circumstances beyond his control. That theory might be accepted, had he not told us that—

After 34 months of work, we contemplate a fairly rounded whole. We have returned the control of the Federal Government to the city of Washington.

* * * * *

In 34 months we have built up new instruments of public power. In the hands of a people's government this power is wholesome and proper. But in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy such power would provide shackles for the liberties of the people.

And had he not also said:

Yes; we are on the way back—not by mere chance; not by a turn of the cycle. We are coming back more soundly than ever before because we planned it that way, and don't let anybody tell you differently.

UNTRUTHFULNESS

Was the schoolboy at Hartford, Van Buren County, Mich., the boy who has offered his life in the service of his country, untruthful when he said that the President was untruthful?

PRESIDENT PROMISED TO SUPPORT THE CONSTITUTION

Of our Constitution the President, on June 10, 1936, said:

The Constitution provided the best instrument ever devised for the continuation of these fundamental principles (of Federal Government). Under its broad purposes we can and intend to march forward, believing, as the overwhelming majority of Americans believe, that it is intended to meet and fit the amazing physical, economic, and social requirements that confront us in this generation.

On July 4, 1937, in his proclamation on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Constitution—September 17, 1937—he made this statement:

We shall recognize that the Constitution is an enduring instrument, fit for the governing of a far-flung population of more than 130,000,000, engaged in diverse and varied pursuits, even as it was fit for the governing of a small agrarian nation of less than 4,000,000.

On three occasions, the President has taken this oath:

I, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me God.

As the President so well said, let his acts, rather than his words, speak.

Did he keep his promise to uphold the Constitution?

He attempted to gain control of the Supreme Court by the unconstitutional method of increasing its membership.

Laws which were held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court were forced through Congress with his approval.

Rules, orders, regulations, and directives which deprived the citizens of their rights, of due process of law, have been enforced by agencies created by him, operating under his control.

THEN ASKED CONGRESS TO FORGET IT

He has not hesitated to boldly demand that Congress pass legislation of doubtful constitutionality. On July 5, 1935, referring to the Guffey coal bill, about the constitutionality of which there was a grave question, he wrote:

I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation.

PRESIDENT SAID HE DID NOT COMMENT ON PENDING LEGISLATION BUT FORGOT HIMSELF 17 TIMES

In refusing to state his position on the Overton-Russell amendment to a bill pending in Congress, the President said he had made it a rule not to state his position while measures were still before Congress. This was in September of 1940.

That is a statement as to a fact. It was not true. The President did emphatically state his position on the court-packing bill, on the Guffey coal bill as just cited. On the wage-hour bill, he had said:

I still hope that the House, as a whole, can vote on a wage-and-hour bill—either by reconsideration of this action by the Rules Committee itself, or by the petition route. As I have suggested before, I hope that the democratic processes of legislation will continue. That is my personal view.

The following is at least a partial list of instances when he did state his position on pending legislation—all in 1940.

The President authorized Representative Dunn (Democrat of Pennsylvania) to make public a letter approving the Vandenberg reapportionment bill then pending in the House Census Committee.

January 19 the President objected to the elimination by the House of funds for the National Resources Board and the Office of Government Reports.

February 2, the President expressed opposition to the action of the House Appropriations Committee in cutting farm-relief estimates.

March 2: The President criticized Congress for delaying improvements to the Panama Canal.

March 5: The President permitted himself to be quoted directly in opposition to the Tobey resolution, which would have eliminated from the census schedule inquiries on individual income. He said:

The whole thing is obviously a political move and nothing else. Everybody accredited to Congress knows the motive for the opposition is political.

At this same conference, he also urged passage of the Hatch Act extensions bill, then pending before the Senate.

March 8: The President endorsed the Wheeler-Lea transportation bill then in conference and opposed the views of Secretary Woodring and Secretary Wallace on suggested revisions.

March 15: The President again denounced the Tobey census resolution.

March 26: The President authorized Senator Harrison to say that he opposed any amendments to the trade-treaty extension bill.

April 2: The President opposed Senate committee action in adding new authorizations to the rivers and harbors bill.

April 2: The President authorized Representative COLE to make public a letter from him suggesting modification of a bill pending in a House committee which would establish partial Federal control of oil production.

April 5: The President urged that funds to bring back the Byrd expedition be added to a bill then pending before a Senate committee.

April 5: The President opposed the Logan-Walter bill, which had passed the Senate and was before the House committee.

May 6: The President again endorsed the Hatch Act extensions when the bill was still before the House committee.

June 4: The President endorsed a congressional move to increase defense taxes and put the program on a pay-as-you-go basis. The bill was then before the Ways and Means Committee.

June 14: The President approved the Cummings resolution, extending the sug-

ar control bill for 1 year, and expressed the hope that it would be passed in the form approved by the House Committee on Agriculture.

July 27: The President discussed the problems involved in a bill, approved that day by the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to permit the use of American ships in the evacuation of the British children.

Was there not some excuse for the young man thinking that perhaps the President did not always state the truth?

As a matter of fact, it is the duty of the President, in his messages to Congress, to advise Congress not only on the state of the Union, but as to any needed legislation. So why did he say that he had made it a rule not to state his position while measures were still before Congress?

PRESIDENT SAID HE DID NOT TAKE PART IN PRIMARY ELECTIONS—BUT HE DID

On August 7, 1937, Presidential Secretary McIntyre, at Hyde Park released the following statement:

The President repeated for the thousandth time that he has not taken part, is not taking part, and will not take part in any local primary election except his own home town and home county.

Now we all know that the President did take a very active part in the purge campaign by which he sought to prevent the election of some Democratic candidates.

On June 24, 1938, in a fireside chat, he said:

As President of the United States, I am not * * * taking part in Democratic primaries. As the head of the Democratic Party however * * * I feel that I have every right to speak.

An open admission that politically he was a Mr. Hyde and a Dr. Jekyll, and he did bring about, with the aid of the Communists, the defeat of a Democratic candidate, John O'Connor, who was at the time chairman of the powerful Committee on Rules of the House.

Speaking on the same platform where sat a Democratic candidate for Senator, he in substance told the audience that the Democrat should be defeated.

And, in a 1942 campaign, here was the administration's test for candidates:

The President says he will support any liberal candidate selected by the leaders of New York State, provided he had supported his—

The President's—

war policy 100 percent before Pearl Harbor.

Was he truthful when he said that he would not take part in a primary election outside his own State; when he said that he would not, as President, take any part in an election?

Was he just an individual—not the President of the United States—on his purge trip throughout the South and the Southwest? Did he not travel on a Government train, paid for by Government dollars; eat food paid for with the taxpayers' money?

DID NOT KEEP PROMISE TO LABOR

On November 14, 1941, while the coal strikes were in progress, the President said:

The Government of the United States will not order, nor will Congress pass legislation ordering, a so-called closed shop.

The Government will never compel this (remaining) 5 percent to join the union by a Government decree. That would be too much like the Hitler methods toward labor.

But, on Sunday night, December 7, 1941, a special three-man arbitration board appointed for the purpose by the President, by a 2 to 1 vote, gave John L. Lewis the closed shop in the captive coal mines—another promise violated.

SAID HE WOULD NOT BE A CANDIDATE—BUT HE WAS

On March 4, 1937, President Roosevelt said:

My great ambition on January 20, 1941, is to turn over this desk and chair in the White House to my successor.

That must have drawn a laugh from the New Deal politicians.

Then came the Democratic Convention of 1940, where Senator BARKLEY stated he was authorized to say that the President had no desire or purpose to continue in office.

HIS FRIENDS' OPINION

Two of the President's warm personal friends, both of whom have passed beyond, both known as careful, accurate reporters, commented on that statement.

Listen to these words of Raymond Clapper, reprinted in the United States News of August 7, 1940:

What shakes me is that statement which President Roosevelt authorized Senator BARKLEY to make to the Democratic National Convention.

This—that he, Mr. Roosevelt—"has never had, and has not today, any desire or purpose to continue in the office of President, to be a candidate for that office, or to be nominated by the convention for that office."

I simply do not believe that. Mr. Roosevelt can cite no action that he has taken to support it.

* * * * *

The urge to power and glory is an overwhelming thing when it takes hold of a public man. Only such an urge could have betrayed Mr. Roosevelt into the monumental and historic deception which he now places on the record. This is a page that I would rather have never read.

Note that Clapper, the President's friend, said: "I simply do not believe that"; then characterized the statement as a deception.

Should the schoolboy of Hartford be criticized because he ventured the statement that the President was not truthful?

In the same publication, on the same date, Hugh S. Johnson, also a personal friend of the President and a one-time intimate, referring to BARKLEY'S statement, said:

There is only one word to characterize that, but it ought never to be applied to a statement by a President—nor deserve to be applied.

Everyone who knows the President—and I used to—knows precisely the reverse of that. So, on all the facts, does the whole country. It wasn't at all necessary to secure the nomination. Its only purpose was for the campaign—to deceive the people on a flagrant violation of the third-term tradition and this Hitlerized nomination. Thus this convention of the party to which my fervid loyalty always ran and my father's and my grandfather's, for over a hundred years, this convention starts that party off to the keynote of the most cynically barefaced lie in American political history.

Read again the last sentence quoted above, and then give reason, if any there be, why a representative of the F. B. I. should accuse a schoolboy of Hartford, Mich., who is known in his community for his loyalty and his patriotism, for his courage and his outspokenness, of seditious conduct, of acts bordering on treason, because he expressed his opinion that the President was not truthful.

According to the press, on November 4, 1940, and prior to the election, the President made a definite promise that he would not be a candidate for a fourth term. Speaking to his neighbors and to a radio audience, he said:

You will have a new President in 1944.

At Beacon, N. Y., after saying he had just come "to say how do you do to a lot of old neighbors," the President said:

It is the last time very obviously that I will do this as a candidate for office—but you can be quite sure that, in all the years to come, my heart will be in Dutchess County, where it always has been.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT TO CONGRESS

On January 25, 1944, in the very first paragraph of his message to Congress vetoing the so-called soldiers' vote bill, the President said:

Our men—

Meaning those in the armed service—

cannot understand why the fact that they are fighting should disqualify them from voting.

A moment's reflection will show that the bill did not "disqualify" anyone from voting; it did not take from anyone the right to vote.

The servicemen's opportunity to vote was lessened by the fact that he was away from home or that his State did not provide for absentee voting. And the bill sought to overcome the obstacles to voting.

In the same message, the President charged that he considered the legislation "a fraud on the soldiers and sailors and marines now training and fighting for us and our sacred rights. It is a fraud upon the American people."

That statement, as everyone who has read and understands the bill knows, was not true.

PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT CHARACTERIZED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

The Hartford schoolboy is not alone in the conclusion that the words of the President cannot always be accepted at their face value.

Both Houses of Congress passed a tax bill. It went to the President and he vetoed it, sending to House and Senate a message so inaccurate, so filled with misstatements and false charges, that 80-year-old Representative DOUGHTON, a Democrat who has been in Congress since 1911, arose in righteous indignation and challenged the truthfulness of the President's veto message.

Advocating the adoption of the legislation, notwithstanding the veto, the

gentleman from North Carolina, among other things said:

I resent deeply the circumstances, the methods, the reasons, and the language of this veto message. It does not, as a state paper should, concern itself with the central question; it extends far beyond the necessities of the occasion to make gratuitous slaps at the Congress and contains political platitudes which are not only erroneous and unfounded in fact but are subject only to the construction that they are intended to discredit the Congress and to impair the confidence of the American people in their chosen representatives.

* * * * *

The issue is simple and clear. It is: Shall the people of this Nation retain, as they zealously sought to do in the Constitution, a complete and direct control over the taxes they are to pay, or shall we permit a group of irresponsible individuals to thwart the will of our people?

Two other Democrats of unquestioned standing, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], both Democratic members of the House Ways and Means Committee, likewise pointed out, not only the inaccuracy, but the unfairness, of the President's veto message.

The House overrode the veto by a vote of 3 to 1.

The President's veto message was so vitriolic, so unfair and, to put it charitably, so inaccurate, that the President's spokesman, the Democratic leader of the other body, who has served continuously in the Congress for 31 years, advocated overriding the veto. Among other things, the gentleman from Kentucky said:

In order still further to belittle the amount of revenue provided in this new tax bill the President has resorted to one of the most unjustifiable methods of calculation it is possible to conjure up, which obviously was handed to him by a mind more clever than honest.

Referring to another statement in the message, the gentleman said:

It simply is not an accurate statement of the facts, and everybody knows it.

Again:

Mr. President, no man could have made that extraordinary statement who has sat in tax committees in the Capitol of the United States. If it was made by anybody who ever sat in a tax committee, it was a deliberate and unjustified misstatement in order to place upon Congress the blame for universal dissatisfaction with tax complexities, and in order to produce the illusion that the executive departments have in vain protested against this complexity.

Once more:

In his effort to justify this veto message, the President has gone forth with a searchlight and magnifying glass to find inconsequential faults.

Let me quote again:

In his effort to belittle and discredit Congress throughout his veto message the President says:

"It is not a tax bill but a tax-relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy."

That statement, Mr. President, is a calculated and deliberate assault upon the legislative integrity of every Member of Congress. Other Members of Congress may do as they please; but, as for me, I do not propose to take this unjustifiable assault lying down.

* * * * *

Mr. President, let me say, in conclusion, that if the Congress of the United States has any self-respect yet left, it will override the veto of the President and enact this tax bill into law, his objections to the contrary notwithstanding.

The following day, the gentleman resigned as the President's leader of the Senate and was immediately unanimously reelected as leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate—and there is a distinction between the two positions, for, while heretofore the gentleman spoke for the President, in obedience to the President's wishes, hereafter he will, in the other body, represent the majority party therein, if he follows his announced course.

THE WRECKERS MUST BE STOPPED

The wreckers of national unity, the would-be destroyers of public confidence in constitutional government, the vilifiers of the Congress, must be exposed for what they are.

When so exposed, the American people will no longer tolerate them nor their sponsors, like the Jergens Co., which all too long has maintained on its pay roll one who, by one newspaper article, was described as follows:

Another one in the forefront was Walter Winchell, pitchman for the Andrew Jergens Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio, manufacturers of hand lotion, and the high priest of New Deal vilification. Winchell goes on the air almost every week prejudging the defendants in the Washington sedition cases, asserting that some one or another of them is guilty as charged. Ordinarily, this would be contempt of court in any land.

And by another:

It is a compliment to the intelligence and the morals of newspaper readers in New York that the Post has the smallest daily circulation in the city, 182,000. The Post is owned and edited by Mrs. Dorothy Schiff Backer, the pinko daughter of the late Mortimer Schiff, international banker. By the same logic that has led the smear brigade to describe as a violent anti-Semite anyone who finds fault with Mr. Winchell's taste or Judge Rosenman's politics, Mrs. Backer could be described as a violent anti-Catholic in view of her paper's unconscionable attack on Senator WALSH.

* * * * *

Walter Winchell, commander of the latrine detail in the New Deal's smear detachment, whose radio salary is paid by the Andrew Jergens Co., of Cincinnati, heralded publication of this scandal on the radio by declaring that it would involve one of four noninterventionist Senators whose names begin with the twenty-third letter of the alphabet.

The New Deal's sponsorship, the administration's support, of these smear artists, can no longer be concealed. Nor can the American people be deceived by the false charges of a gang so patently engaged in preparing the soil for the success of the Communists' efforts to overthrow our Government.

The pattern which the C. I. O. Committee for Political Action, backed by its millions of dollars; its co-workers in the Communist Party; the Winchells and the pinko press, are deliberately weaving is plainly discernible.

The purpose is to create discontent, disunity, a lack of confidence in constitutional government; a disregard for equal justice under law; a government here in Washington by departments, bureaus and agencies.

While we are engaged in a war; while the attention of our people is distracted from Washington by their efforts to aid in the defeat of our enemies, all too many agencies of the Government, harboring Communists as policy-makers, by their restrictive, oppressive, and arbitrary actions, are stirring up the resentment of our people against the Congress by falsely charging that the Congress is responsible for what is happening.

The Congress is responsible in but one way. That is because it has failed to curb the activities of those who are carrying on this revolutionary campaign.

These would-be destroyers of our freedom and our liberty, of our prosperity and our happiness, can be found in all too many agencies here in Washington. They have functioned in the O. P. A., in the F. E. P. C., in the F. C. C., in the N. L. R. B., in the Labor Department, in the Department of Justice, in the Shipping Administration; in fact, in almost every administrative agency.

Morale-destroying pamphlets and books, as well as radio broadcasts, have been fed to the members of the armed forces, apparently without restraint.

WAR COLLEGE LIBRARY ENDORSES SMEAR OF M'ARTHUR

Just a few days ago, the Army War College Library, operating under the War Department, found itself embarrassed by an official bulletin on February 10, 1944, wherein was listed for general circulation in the Army an article entitled, "General MacArthur—Fact and Legend." The War Department bulletin contained this language:

A comprehensive and objective appraisal of the general as Presidential timber, with special reference to the character of his backers, and an analysis of his military reputation before Pearl Harbor and afterward.

The article was a smear article. It made an attack upon one of the Army's greatest four-star generals.

From February 23 to March 9, a letter to Secretary of War Stimson from a Member of the other body, calling attention to the article, went unanswered.

When the matter, however, was aired on the floor of the Senate, a reply was immediately forthcoming from the Secretary of War, who properly condemned the practice. Among other things, Secretary of War Stimson stated:

I need hardly assure you of my complete agreement with your statement that the War Department must be scrupulously careful to avoid the official distribution of partisan or prejudicial material to the Army, either at this time or at any other.

When an agency operating under the direction of the War Department itself can smear a commanding general, all must realize that the time to call a halt has arrived.

The prompt action of the Secretary of War is proof that publicity is an effective weapon and that, knowing as they do

that the people—the sound, conservative people—of our Nation have no sympathy whatever for their attempts to re-make America, the New Dealers will haul in their horns when attention is called to their actions.

NAVY SHOULD FOLLOW ARMY PRECEDENT

Is it not time that the Navy follow the example of the Army and kick out of the Navy service and deprive of his status as a Reserve officer the notorious purveyor of false information which can be used by our enemies to the detriment of our war effort?

In view of the fact that so many of the New Deal agencies are engaged in a smear campaign; recalling, as we do, that the F. B. I. has always borne a reputation for fairness and for thoroughness, for even-handed justice, permit me to now suggest that it repudiate or explain the acts of its agent who suggested to the Hartford schoolboy that his questioning of the veracity of the New Deal candidate for a fourth term was either sedition or an approach to treason.

There is no room here in America for a gestapo. There is no room here for a denial of free speech or a free press. Nothing will so disrupt the people's support of the war as acts of attempted intimidation and coercion on the part of those in authority here in Washington.

The O. P. A., throughout this land of ours, is resented because of its oppressive and unfair methods and rulings. Other agencies of the Government, because they have attempted to serve the New Deal rather than the people, are resented and in them the people have no confidence, nor will they to them give support.

F. B. I. SHOULD DISOWN WINCHELL

Recent elections have shown that the people no longer will submit to oppressive, arbitrary Government activities exercised without legal sanction.

If the F. B. I. desires to retain the confidence of the people, it must divorce itself not only from the mouthpiece of the Jergens Co., Walter Winchell, but from New Deal political control. If it does not, it will soon find itself, so far as the public is concerned, in the same category as other Government agencies.

The editorial reprinted at the end of this talk expresses the feeling of the people of the great Middle West whenever an attempt is made to coerce them.

If the F. B. I. and J. Edgar Hoover will follow the traditions which it has built up and heretofore maintained, it will always retain the respect of the people. But if it permits parasites like Winchell to attach themselves to it; if it yields to political domination, it will soon become just another New Deal agency.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman referred to the broadcast last evening by Mr. Winchell. I listened to that broadcast. It was quite different from any that I have ever heard before. I want to ask the gentleman, in view of the fact that he has been pretty well posted on the previous broadcast experience of Mr. Winchell, is he not of the opinion that, for at least the first time I have ever heard, Mr. Winchell started on the defensive and started to build a cellar for himself, a cyclone cellar, so to speak; that he is beginning to see the wrath of America rise in his direction and he is beginning to anticipate and try to guard against what he sees is inevitably coming in his direction? Could not the gentleman from Michigan see that interpretation of the speech that he made last night?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I listened to Walter last night, and I got the impression that, like every rat that deserts a sinking ship, he senses that the people are not with him; that they have caught on to his false, malicious propaganda; and that his foulness, his dirtiness, and his nastiness have so disgusted them that he no longer is the "great I am." But his sense of egotism is so developed and his mind is so warped and twisted, that having once started on that course it will be very difficult if not impossible for him ever to be decent, as are other Americans.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman has referred to egotism. I wonder if he would accept the classic definition that the word "egotism" is the anesthetic which Nature provides in order to deaden the pain of being a damned fool.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has his opinion.

A JOB FOR THE F. B. I.

If the F. B. I. has surplus funds and extra time at its disposal, why can it not, instead of investigating, seeking to intimidate, to deny to a young man who is on his way to serve his country on the war front, the right of free speech, devote a little of its energy to rounding up and exposing the Walter Winchells, who do so much to stir up disunity, to spread dissension, create class and racial hatred, spread false, malicious charges, the purpose of which is to destroy the people's confidence in their Government?

Why not bring to light and expose the activities of the Communists who openly advocate the overthrow of the Government by force; who hold policy-making positions in the Federal Government, and who, by infiltration into labor unions, interfere with war production and transportation?

Let the F. B. I. clean the New Deal house here in Washington and elsewhere. The people of the country are sound, patriotic, and courageous, and neither need, nor will they submit to, intimidation, the denial of their constitutional rights.

In view of the foregoing, is it permissible to suggest that the F. B. I. and other agencies of the administration, including the Department of Justice, cease to persecute, to attempt to intimidate and coerce citizens who have lived long in their respective communities; whose acts are open and aboveboard; who are known as honest, law-abiding, loyal, patriotic citizens; and that they devote their time and the spending of the taxpayers' money to their respective duties, as defined under the Constitution, exercise their powers within the Constitution, to the end that the defeat of our enemies may be brought about as quickly as possible, with the least possible suffering and loss of life?

Is it permissible to say, without being charged with sedition or traitorous conduct, that the reestablishment of the "four freedoms" here in America, the reestablishment of constitutional government, of equal justice under law, be given first consideration?

May we, without being accused of sedition or treason, call in question, criticize the acts of administrative, of executive officers?

If this administration, which has recently defied Congress, refused to give the information as to when or where or how the taxpayers' money was spent, administrative activities carried on—and the Jergens Company, engaged in selling cosmetics through its mouthpiece, Walter Winchell—who, figuratively speaking, hides under the White House porch—and the President's political allies, the Communists, can stifle all criticism; refuse to answer all questions, we have a dictatorship.

Fortunately, election day will soon roll around and, if the people of the countryside are permitted to vote and their and other votes are honestly taken and honestly counted, there is every indication that the day of arbitrary government by the new dealers will end; that the effort of the Communists and some of their friends to overthrow our Government by subterfuge will not be successful.

EXHIBIT A

Did you see the article on "gumshoe experts" in a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post? Hartford had its own incident of "snooping" last week, by a man representing himself as an F. B. I. agent, that has set us wondering just how far these investigators may go in suppressing free expression of speech by implied threats that leave the investigated with the impression that he had better keep his mouth shut or run the chance of getting himself into trouble.

We have had no official news release from our Government advising us that the Constitution's Bill of Rights has been abrogated by Supreme Court decision, congressional action, or Presidential decree. We have had little reason to doubt that "freedom" as described in the first 10 articles of the Constitution is the right and privilege of every citizen of the United States. But our thoughts perforce return to consideration of this fundamental grant to democratic peoples in the light of an F. B. I. agent's visit to Hartford last Thursday.

A 17-year-old Hartford high-school boy this week walks in the shadow of doubt and suspicion because he freely expressed his opinion in a class discussion of current affairs—specifically because he labeled President Roosevelt a "liar." He has been questioned by an F. B. I. agent and has been left with the odious impression that for his own safety in the future he had better confine his opinions to less "seditious" statements. The Federal representative in order to impress the meaning of his word on the young man's mind, consulted the dictionary and read some such definition as appears in the one at hand: "conduct tending to treason."

How disgustingly absurd is such an implication! We are wondering if the F. B. I. is now investigating Senator Barkley for his speech before the Senate last week in which he also called the President a liar but in more refined words. Speaking of the President's statement issued with the veto of the tax bill, Mr. Barkley said, "It is a deliberate misstatement." The phraseology is not the same; the meaning is.

The Hartford youth's accusation was made in reference to Mr. Roosevelt's statement (before his last election) in which he asserted that no American soldiers would fight on foreign soil. What our young man said reached the ears of only his classmates, a few parents, and eventually the F. B. I.; what Mr. BARKLEY said reached the ears of the world.

It is true the Senator has proven his patriotism, and never more convincingly than in his "declaration of independence" last week. This young American, like so many others, has also proven his. He enlisted as an air cadet last September, within a month after he became 17 years of age, and expects to go into training when he is graduated in June.

He is anxious to serve his country just as 10 of his cousins are, and as his ancestors have in the past. Two uncles were in the last war, and one is serving the Nation today, a geologist of world fame, who was second in command on the first Admiral Byrd expedition to the South Pole. His parents, both born in the United States, are good citizens of this community; his great grandfather was a pioneer resident of Van Buren County. He is an active worker in the church, an intelligent student, a leader in school affairs. That he is faithful to his country, is obvious. He is the type of a straightforward, honest young man who will help our Nation develop great statesmen of clear vision during the next generation.

These facts could have been verified by the ambitious Federal agent without resort to threats and insinuating implications.

During the interrogation, the investigator asked where the youth had received his information on the Roosevelt not-to-foreign-soil promise. When informed he had read it in the newspaper, the F. B. I. agent asserted that one shouldn't believe everything he reads. When told he also heard Roosevelt make the speech by radio, the Federal man's reply was to the effect that: If I were you, I wouldn't discuss things I know nothing about; you're liable to get into trouble. Another statement credited to the agent was: That's practically treason; they put men in jail for less than that. There were questions about War bonds, Jews, home and school discussions on national affairs. All questions seemed to lead up to that concerning the President, said the young man, that being the last of a long list.

The significance of this investigation is much deeper than the embarrassment of one Hartford family. Basically, it is a challenge to democratic ideals of freedom. We are at war and are willing to accept regimentation to whatever degree necessary. It is not necessary to stifle free expression of opinion. Our Nation was founded by fearless, outspoken men. Nurtured by freedom of speech and press, our Nation thrived. Today men are fighting and dying to guarantee to future generations the right to enjoy these freedoms.

We cannot but be deeply impressed with the crude cruelty of investigations such as that in Hartford. On a Nation-wide scale, Government-sanctioned interference with free speech in the manner of this investigation would soon lead to repression of constructive criticism and a break-down of public confidence in our Government. We cannot permit our faith in democratic ideals to be compromised through such ill-advised, haphazard methods by protective Government agencies. We cannot sacrifice democracy and save it too.

EXHIBIT B

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1944.

Mr. JOSEPH N. MCCALL,
Publisher, Hartford Day Spring,
Hartford, Mich.

DEAR MR. MCCALL: The Federal Bureau of Investigation, under my administration since 1924, has existed solely for the purpose of discharging the responsibilities assigned to us by the President, the Congress, and the Attorney General—and we have endeavored to carry out these responsibilities in the American way.

Thus, I was concerned with the allegations in your column, Did You See, which appeared in the March 1, 1944, issue of the Hartford Day Spring. I can assure you that any statement that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is engaged in any program "to stifle free expression of opinion" is wholly unsupported by the facts and could arise only from a misunderstanding. If at any time any representative of this Bureau should exceed the bounds of his authority and attempt to stifle freedom of speech, prompt and decisive administrative action will result.

As you know, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is an investigative organization—it is our duty to receive complaints in matters bearing on the internal security of the Nation, investigate these complaints and present those facts to the prosecuting officials of the Department of Justice. We do not express opinions but do report what is told us by the citizens whom we contact. To avoid the injustices, the hysteria, and mob spirit that existed in World War No. 1, we asked citizens to furnish us with any information they might have pointing to a violation of Federal statutes or which affected the security of the Nation. Then we asked citizens to take no action after reporting the facts to us and not to circulate rumors. As a result of the fine cooperation which we have had from citizens and by careful investigations of everything that came to our attention there have been no acts of sabotage by enemy agents and espionage has been brought under control. To be sure, many complaints come to our attention which are found to be without basis, such as the report in Hartford from one of your citizens which prompted your inquiry. That report stated. "There has come to my attention an unwholesome condition in Hartford, which appears to have arisen from a Nazi-inspired source." We had no choice but to make a preliminary inquiry which I am happy to say revealed the complaint to be without foundation.

Special agents of the F. B. I. are under the strictest of instructions that in every inquiry they should consider the individual's standing in the community and should exercise every precaution to protect the individual's reputation from undue suspicion which might arise from the inquiry. At the same time, the agents are instructed to be thorough and to vigorously seek the facts which would establish the innocence or guilt of the individual about whom the complaint is made. In every instance, the agents are under instructions to be ethical, fair, and impartial. Facts, and only facts, are to be sought. And I am sure that the record of the Federal Bureau of Investigation speaks for itself. Beyond that, any other course of action would be a practical impossibility because of the background and training of our agents. They come from all stations of life and every section of the country. There are few colleges and universities in the land whose graduates are not found in the service of the F. B. I. Each is carefully investigated before appointment and if any question arises as to their character, reputation, or integrity, every doubt is ruled against their appointment. So with this background I am sure you can see that anything so odious as impugning the freedom of speech would be alien to the characters of the men of the F. B. I.

I am the first to concede that the F. B. I. is a human organization and we do make mistakes, but we welcome having them called to our attention so that we can guard against making that same mistake in the future. Likewise there can be misunderstandings—we try to avoid them, yet at times they do occur, and we welcome having such matters called to our attention, for we stand on our record and have nothing to conceal.

If at any time in the future any question as to the program or policies of the F. B. I. should arise in your mind, I hope you will not hesitate to communicate with me because I consider the F. B. I. the servant of the people and strictly accountable to the people.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER, *Director.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

AMERICA AT THE CROSSROADS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am genuinely reluctant to take the floor today. I had hoped events would not make it necessary, but in view of what I fear is about to happen in Europe at any moment, and what has already happened in some instances, I cannot shirk what I sincerely believe to be my duty to the people of the United States, especially that great legion of foreign-born, loyal, patriotic Americans who have enjoyed and appreciate the blessings of our form of government, and have contributed so much to its success.

I have at no time had anything but praise for the wonderful deeds of the Soviet Army and what they have accomplished in this war since Hitler tried to overrun their homeland. But I will fight tooth and nail against those who exploit the heroism of the Russian people in order to undermine democracy and destroy it.

For 150 years America has stood as a beacon light of hope for the oppressed and downtrodden of the world, as the symbol of liberty and democracy. In my own district there is a veritable melting pot of nationalities coming from all corners of the globe, who have been attracted to these shores by the magic spell of American freedom and opportunity. In all earnestness and with full consciousness of the seriousness of what I am saying, I tell you that we face the danger of dashing the hopes of these loyal and hard-working American citizens to the ground.

These citizens of foreign birth are giving their sweat and toil to make bigger ships, faster planes, and more powerful guns to insure an early victory for our armed forces. They are buying bonds, and more bonds, to back up our war effort. More than that, they have given their beloved sons and daughters to Uncle Sam, their own flesh and blood, for the cause they hold dear. They have done all these things, willingly and without stint, in the belief that thereby they might safeguard here and abroad those

blessings of democracy which they so gratefully enjoy in this great republic of ours.

I cannot fully and adequately describe to you the alarm and despair which is gripping the many citizens of foreign descent. Hardly had they begun to rejoice at the prospect of the liberation of their loved ones in their native lands from Nazi enslavement, than they were faced with the ghastly alternative that these countries were apparently to fall victim to another sort of totalitarian enslavement.

First, Estonia, then Lavia, then Lithuania, then Poland, and now Yugoslavia, and little Finland, are all on the spot, to say nothing about Italy.

These are some of the countries to which we held out the Atlantic Charter as a pledge of self-government. These are the countries where many good American citizens first saw the light of day. There they have mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, and children. To them they have sent of their earnings, expressing the message that America spells hope, that America spells liberty from tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to you from the third article of the Atlantic Charter, issued by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt, in August 1941 in which they gave their solemn assurance to "respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live"; and "to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Mr. Speaker, my constituents, and citizens throughout the country are asking why President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill are not making good on the solemn pledges contained in the Atlantic Charter.

Picture, if you please, what is going on in the minds of these our fellow citizens. When the Communists tried to sow dissension and disunity among the foreign-born in America, they stood steadfast and loyal to the land of their adoption. Now it seems their loved ones are to be sold down the river to the totalitarian tyranny they had learned to know and detest.

Is America to be the broker in this nefarious bargain? That is what they are asking. I would be untrue to my oath as a Congressman did I not bring this to the attention of Congress.

I am no military expert, although I did my share at St. Mihiel and in the Argonne. Neither am I an impractical dreamer seeking to bring a quart of milk to every Hottentot. But I do believe in holding firm to our resolve that this war shall bring to the peoples of the world, and especially the peoples of war-torn Europe, that modicum of simple blessings which is inherent in democracy. I understand full well that in many cases we are forced by military necessity and expediency to make compromises and perhaps sacrifice some of the aims we have set for ourselves. I am ready to face such practical considerations on their merit in a sane and practical way. It is neither my purpose nor desire to take issue on this point.

I am deeply concerned, however, by the thought that there are some individuals high in the Government service, or high in its confidence, who are moved by no thought of the welfare and aspirations of the United States and her citizens, who are openly and avowedly interested rather in promoting the designs of a foreign power. The fact that this power found it expedient to join with us as ally in a common struggle against Nazi Germany after she was attacked, does not alter the responsibility of high-ranking American officials toward our own Government.

Entrenched in the Office of War Information, in the Office of Strategic Services, in the Office of Economic Warfare, in the Federal Communications Commission, and in other strategic posts, are those who are working night and day, not in the interests of our Goverment, but rather to pave the way for totalitarian domination of the United States and the European Continent.

As an example, let us look into the activities of one Louis Adamic, a Yugoslav by birth, who is loathed by his own people both here and abroad. Mr. Adamic has openly boasted of his powerful connections and influence in the Office of War Information, the Office of Strategic Services, and even the State Department.

Recently, he published in a Communist foreign-language newspaper an offer of employment in the Yogoslav section of U. N. R. R. A., directing applicants to apply to him. We all know the U. N. R. R. A. is destined to play an important part in deciding the future of post-war Europe, but no one can find out who authorized Mr. Adamic to advertise for employees.

Mr. Adamic has published in great quantities books, pamphlets, and propaganda material calculated to sway American public opinion. His articles have appeared in our most influential magazines. He has openly boasted of his success in molding American public opinion to his illicit purposes.

Joining with him in this deluge of propaganda has been the Communist Party, its press, its fraternal organizations, and the front organizations included in the All-American Slav Congress, organized in response to an appeal from Moscow. The policy we are following in hapless Yugoslavia today is the policy advocated, if not actually laid down, by Louis Adamic.

Who is Louis Adamic? Let us see what he stands for. I will give his views, in his own words. I quote from the Worker, official Communist Sunday paper, of December 6, 1942, on the occasion of Mr. Adamic's acceptance of the position of chairman of the Slovene National Congress, an affiliate of the All-American Slav Congress:

> I feel honored to have been selected for this function. * * * There seems to be no doubt that the Osvobodilina Fronts Partisan troops have engaged the Axis in important battles. * * *
>
> Nor is there any doubt that the commanders of some of the Partisan troops are Communist or men who are sympathetic to communism or to Russia or both, while the majority of the rank and file is not Communist, but strongly pro-Russian. It is more than probable also that in Slovenia and in the rest of Yugoslavia there are Soviet commissars or Soviet Army officers who are the advisers, if not the supreme commanders, of the Partisan troops. * * * There is no doubt that Russia as a government or state is deeply interested in Yugoslavia as a whole and perhaps particularly in Slovenia, both in an immediate military sense and from the long-range view which may take in the post-war period. * * * I believe that the Congress should be deeply impressed by the fact that Soviet Russia is the only great power so far which has officially and unequivocally expressed itself in favor of a united Slovenia.

The following views of Louis Adamic are quoted from his book, The Native's Return:

> I see now that the salvation of the Yugoslav people and other small backward nations in that part of the world lies, clearly and inescapably, in the direction of Russia. They will have to overthrow their present racketeer rule, form a Balkan or East European federation of collectivist national republics, and in some mutually satisfactory way attach themselves to the U. S. S. R.
>
> Now I see why the Russian revolution was necessary, from the standpoint not only of backward, peasant Russia but of the world at large.

Again quoting from The Native's Return:

> I believe that a majority of people forming the Yugoslav Liberation Front and the Bulgarian underground are eager or ready for sovietization. * * * If sovietization, with all it implies, does occur, it may be the simplest process. The Yugoslav federation would become a republic within the Soviet Union and would most likely be headed by Tito or Dimitroff.

Dimitroff was previously head of the Communist International.

While Mr. Adamic is glowing in his praise of the Soviet Union, whose interests I charge he is openly promoting above all others, although he is not registered as a foreign agent, which, in my opinion, he should be, his attitude toward the land of his adoption is cynical, to say the least. I now quote from his book entitled "Dynamite":

> The story I present here is, as I see it, a criticism of your American capitalist-democratic civilization, the most severe criticism, it seems to me, that anyone could write. * * * America is at the crossroads. * * * Right or left? * * * But eventually it will be left, for in the very nature * * * it is a left or revolutionary country.

Mr. Adamic has a record of association with the following Communist front organizations, which shows indisputably where his real sympathy and loyalty lie:

American Artists and Writers Committee.

American Friends of Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau.

Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo.

Film Audiences for Democracy.

Films for Democracy.

National Committee for the Defense of Political Prisoners.

National Committee for Peoples Rights.

National Emergency Conference.

Fight magazine—official organ of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

American Writers Congress.

Conference on Pan American Democracy.

A number of these organizations have been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

Louis Adamic also spoke in honor of George Dimitroff, former head of the Communist International, at a meeting held in Carnegie Hall, in New York, on December 22, 1943, together with Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, did it ever occur to you that for months and months all reports coming out of Yugoslavia after Germany overran that country, contained glowing accounts of Gen. Draja Mihailovich? Reports of how his guerrillas were the only forces in that section of the Balkans that were giving resistance to Hitler's hordes? How, because of their opposition, Hitler was not and has not to this day been able to conquer all of Yugoslavia.

Recently, as a result of the activities of Adamic and his henchmen, the exploits of General Mihailovich have not only been deleted from the American press, but he is now being undermined and slandered as a Nazi agent. Using all the arts of fiction and propaganda, Adamic and his group of trained seals are flooding the country with fabulous tales about a mysterious character, an avowed Communist, named Tito, and his Partisans.

Mr. Speaker, you or no one else ever heard of Tito and his Partisans until after Germany attacked Russia, and it is generally acknowledged that if it had not been for General Mihailovich, Hitler would have overrun Yugoslovia a long time ago.

On November 28, 1943, a United Press dispatch from London quoted the Yugoslav Partisans as announcing that the rail line from Sarajevo to Visegrad had been practically destroyed. Notwithstanding the fact that this dispatch gave credit to the Partisans for this work, another dispatch, dated December 6, 1943, by press wireless quoted a dispatch from the Woods and Mountain Radio Station of General Mihailovich to the effect that the blowing up of these bridges was done by General Miroslav Trifunovich, a commander in the Yugoslav Army under General Mihailovich, and that the complete destruction of the bridges was executed in the presence of Brigadier Armstrong, the chief of the British Military Mission, and Lt. Col. Siez, the chief of the American Military Mission. To my knowledge, there has never been a denial by anyone in authority of the truthfulness of this latter statement. I cite this as an example of the unreliability and the nondependability of many of the statements appearing in the American press, regarding the situation in Yugoslavia.

An example of the loose methods now being employed in selling Tito and his Partisans to the American people is to be found in the New York Times of December 22, 1943, in which is depicted a so-called Partisan hero, accompanying a story about Yugoslavia by Mr. Sulzberger. Unfortunately, those responsible forgot to note that they had used the same picture on October 12, 1941, to depict a heroic Chetnik. The photograph is identical, even to the Chetnik insignia on the soldier's turban in both instances.

Because I had noticed particularly the United Press releases in the newspapers began the policy of carrying a great deal of information about Tito and very little about General Mihailovich, I made an appointment to talk with Mr. Earl Johnson, vice president and the active head of the United Press in New York City. I spent 2 hours with him in his office on the 27th of November. Mr. Johnson explained to me that their London correspondent who had been furnishing the reports at first, received his information in London from the Yugoslav Government in exile, headed by King Peter, but since they moved to Cairo, the Partisan representatives had established headquarters in London, and they were the only group available in London for releases.

Mr. Johnson also informed me that in an attempt to get reports direct from General Mihailovich, he had sent one of his best reporters to Cairo, where King Peter had given him permission to go to General Mihailovich's headquarters, but the reporter was unable to obtain transportation. This section of the Mediterranean is under the control of Great Britain.

Another recognized foreign correspondent has been trying for many months to reach the Balkans, in order to give a true picture of what is happening there, only to have innumerable official and unofficial obstacles thrown in his way.

As far as I know, there is no one in the United States who can positively identify Tito, or knows what he looks like. The picture frequently used in connection with any article about him is a facsimile said to be from a German poster offering a 100,000 reichsmarks reward for his capture, and it is a likeness of a certain Josip Broz, whom they believe to be Tito. Because the likeness of Josip Broz resembles in some respects certain features of Abraham Lincoln, many articles have been written comparing the two men. Naturally the Communists play up this angle, because for many years they have been capitalizing on the popularity of Lincoln.

Just to refresh your memories on a few incidents, the Communists formed the Lincoln Brigade during the Spanish Revolution, they have a camp for children near Chicago, called the Lincoln Camp, and only recently they have changed the name of their school in Chicago from the Workers School to the Abraham Lincoln School.

During the week of February 7–11 of this year, a publication which is distributed to school children in Detroit carried a half-page story on Tito, and accompanying the article was a picture of Abraham Lincoln. It is an insufferable slander on the character of our Abraham Lincoln to draw any comparison between him and Tito.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak on this situation in the near future as it pertains to Poland, but the treatment Poland has been receiving parallels the Yugoslav situation so closely, I feel compelled to make some reference to it at this time.

Have you forgotten how gallant, heroic Poland stood up and fought Hitler's powerful mechanized army, when she really had nothing with which to fight? Have you forgotten those solemn vows that were made that Poland would be avenged, restored, and made to live again?

Where are all those who professed their friendship, and wanted to do so much to help Poland? Now is the time to speak up and make your voices heard, for tomorrow may be too late.

The March 1944 issue of The Sign, a national Catholic magazine published by the Passionist Missions, Inc., in an article entitled "Atlantic Charter on Trial," had this, among other things, to say regarding Poland:

> The happenings of 1939 are still fresh in most people's memories. It is too early to say with absolute certainty whether there was a Russo-German agreement stipulating that the U. S. S. R. and the Third Reich would attack Poland simultaneously, and that the new border between both totalitarian countries should run along the Vistula. All we know definitely is that the Soviet Union delayed her attack till September 17, and that military actions took place. The Soviet Union had waged an undeclared war against Poland, and this was publicly admitted by Molotov in his report to the Fifth Extraordinary Session of the Supreme Soviet on October 31, 1939. The Soviet Union then proceeded to deport not only the Poles from that area but also the leaders of the Ukrainian and White Russian non-Communists parties. Nationalists and Socialists met an identical fate. A mock election took place early in 1940 which "proved" that 97 percent of the population desired Soviet rule.
>
> One million six hundred thousand people were deported into the interior of the U. S. S. R. Of these, 230,000 were prisoners of war, 144,000 were able to leave for western countries via Persia, a few hundred thousand were located, but over 900,000 people are unaccounted for. They may or may not be alive.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The proposal to give to the Soviet Union East Poland and to give to Poland East Germany is so immoral and contrary to all principles of the Atlantic Charter that it need not be discussed in a Catholic periodical. It probably would prevent peace between Germany and Poland for all future times, a situation pleasing to Russia with its recrudescing Pan-Slavist tendencies, but against the interests of a Christian Europe.
>
> East Poland in Soviet hands means the very end of the idealism of the Atlantic Charter and the end of Allied prestige. It would be the total negation of the democratic principle of self-determination. It would thoroughly undermine the confidence of the continental European nations in the Anglo-Saxon powers and their professed ideals.

Is it any wonder people all over the world are asking where is the Atlantic Charter?

Mr. Speaker, I defy any one of these individuals who did everything possible to undermine our form of government and sabotage our defense program until Hitler marched into Russia on June 21, 1941, to match my 25 years of work in Americanism, at all times putting forth my best efforts in behalf of our country and everything our Constitution guar-

antees. Since when do these June 21, 1941, superpatriots speak for true Americanism?

Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that Louis Adamic is considered by many people in the United States, including myself, as far more dangerous to our American way of life than Earl Browder? A man like Browder, who is out in the open, I do not consider nearly as dangerous as a man like Adamic, who hides behind organizations of high-sounding names.

At the beginning of this speech I expressed my reluctance to make it, and that I had hoped events would not make it necessary. But in view of what I feel is about to happen in Europe at any moment, I considered it my patriotic duty to do so.

The event that I am now fearful will happen in Europe is that General Mihailovich and all his guerrila forces that have and could add so much to the winning of this war, especially against Hitler, will be thrown to the wolves by denying them the matériel and supplies they so badly need to contribute their part on the side of the United Nations. It would not surprise me one bit to read in the papers any day that King Peter was recalled to London to serve notice on him that henceforth General Mihailovich and the government in exile can no longer look to the United Nations for help, but, instead, that only Tito and the Partisans will be assisted. If this comes to pass, in my humble opinion, it will be a sad mistake and will delay the final victory in Europe.

When we established these United States we assumed a gigantic responsibility to the millions who placed their faith in America and what she stands for. Let us make sure that faith is not shattered and that we remain true to our trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

UNNECESSARY POWER PROJECTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I always regard it as a privilege to have an opportunity to address this House and all of the Members therein. As I say, it is always a privilege to talk to them, to give the majority party an opportunity to save a little money which otherwise would be wasted—money of the taxpayers. I am only talking here today about an opportunity to save some $52,000,000, and I am really concerned as to where all of the 216 Members of the majority party went—is there a $100-a-plate dinner scheduled somewhere?—and where is that 1 lone Democrat coming from who is going to move, by custom, the adjournment of the House? I have in the past had the privilege of addressing remarks on this subject of unnecessary power projects to somewhat larger audiences. At times on the majority side we have had as many as 5 present, at others 3, but unless at least 1 gentleman of the majority comes in who will have to move the adjournment of the House we may have to waive the custom of this august body and exercise a hitherto unused privilege and request some Member of the minority to adjourn the House so that we may all go home for the day.

NONESSENTIAL GOVERNMENT PROJECTS: CONGRESS SHOULD REVIEW THE POWER PROGRAM—A THIRD REPORT

Mr. Speaker, this is my third report to the Congress on the subject of nonessential Government power projects.

On September 17, 1942, I addressed the House on the wastage of critical materials embodied in the continued construction of entirely unessential public power projects. I itemized by name the projects to which I referred. Previous criticisms of extravagant power-need estimates had already brought down on my head from the New Deal's radical wing their usual epithet of "reactionary." In the tarnished lexicon of the left, anyone who demands to be shown is a reactionary.

I again addressed this House on December 2, 1942, at which time I reported on steps I had taken to publicize the unnecessary character of these projects and to bring about their abandonment. I reported that work on the projects had, after some maneuvering around, been suspended, thus releasing an immense quantity of critical materials for use in the building of warships, planes, and other war materials.

In my first speech on this subject, of September 17, 1942, I said:

> The continuance of these nonessential projects involves the expenditure of a great deal of the taxpayers' money, which expenditure could well be deferred until the institution of the public-works program after the war, since money, too, is ammunition and ought not to be spent for any but the most essential purposes in wartime. To spend it for nonessential public-works projects is, in effect, to throw it away, in view of the crisis in the battle of production which now impends.

I am addressing the House today because I have information that the same crowd of New Deal spendthrifts whose efforts have been balked from time to time are at it again, and they plan to seize certain unexpended funds and to waste them upon nonessential public-works projects, not for the war effort but to promote their own particular postwar ideology. I am in a position to say, upon excellent authority, that the construction these boondogglers have in mind will provide power for which there will be no need whatsoever, at the very least, until 1952.

In this first speech I also warned:

> The whole history of these projects warrants the public in concluding * * * that those who are charged with the completion of the projects can be expected to use every sort of pressure to raise the priority rating later and to wangle critical materials from every nook and corner in order to keep these New Deal projects going, and thus to assure the continuance of their nonessential, nonwar jobs. * * * Thus, by its insistence upon the building of certain dams and completion of certain generator units at high priority ratings—while construction of other generator units continues at a presumably slower pace—our bureaucrats, to whom the war must seem very distant indeed, are actually depriving the war effort of materials of a most critical nature. Thus the completion of these dams means that some ships will not be built, some planes will not fly, some tanks will not roll.

WARSHIPS POWERED BY EQUIPMENT SAVED ON POWER PROGRAM

The last words proved prophetic: When I said that the completion of these unnecessary dams would mean that some ships would not be built, I necessarily had in mind the converse of that statement as well, namely, that if these nonessential projects could be halted more critically needed ships than ever could be constructed, and more planes and more tanks. As it turned out, successful halting of these nonessential projects had precisely the predicted effect. The Electrical World of February 19, 1944, in an article, quoted in full at the end of these remarks, said, in part:

> The reddest face must be that of the New Republic magazine, which in April 1942, carried an article titled "The Power Lobby Comes Back," reading in part:
>
> "Constantine Bary of (W. P. B.'s) Power Unit, is playing into the hands of reactionary Congressmen who gobble up the short-sighted power-need estimates he hands them, refusing to consider as war projects any which cannot be completed within the next 2 years. Bary and his pals are gambling thousands of lives on this bet that our war needs will be a thing of the past 2 years from now."
>
> No doubt the Marshall's invasion fleet includes craft which are powered by the turbines, boilers, and generators which W. P. B. decided not to install at Ottumwa and points west—the power capacity saved in the big program slash of mid-1942 which was based, among other things, on Bary's short-sighted power-need estimates.

On December 2, 1942, I reported to the House that the Power Branch of the War Production Board having exhibited no interest in the statements made by me on an earlier occasion, I then communicated with the Acting Chief of the Power Branch on October 6, 1942, and October 20, 1942, demanding information as to whether these unnecessary power projects were continuing and if so, why? On the day following my last letter, namely, October 21, 1942, Chairman Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board, announced in an official press release the revocation of priority assignments "on a large part of nonmilitary construction" and on October 24, 1942, the Acting Chief of the Power Branch confirmed to me that the cancelation of nonessential Government projects referred to more euphemistically as "nonmilitary construction," included the projects itemized by me in the September speech as the T. V. A. and Department of the Interior projects and further advised me that he had been personally informed by the Corps of Engineers that they had also halted work on their projects. All of these statements were confirmed to me by the Acting Chief of the Power Branch in a letter dated October 27, 1942.

On October 28, being convinced that it would be advisable to make absolutely certain of the intention to abandon these

projects, I wrote the acting chief of the power branch:

Does this mean that all projects enumerated in the press release of August 22 (copy of which list I enclose) have been definitely abandoned for the duration of the war?

The acting chief of the Power Branch replied by letter dated October 29, 1942:

As to the projects listed in the press release of August 22 under the heading "Government projects proceeding on low priorities or unrated," as indicated in my letter of October 27, priorities have either been revoked or, as I understand it, are in the process of being revoked by action of the facilities committee.

I doubt whether anyone could say with absolute assurance whether or not it might be necessary before the close of the war to reinstate some of these projects. That question should depend upon future developments in the situation with respect to power supply and requirements.

You will note the escape clause contained in the last sentence. I have been wondering whether the future developments referred to with respect to power supply and requirements warranted the construction of additional power projects.

PRESENT CONSTRUCTION ADEQUATE

The facts show that present construction has proved entirely adequate to meet the power needs of the country and that the termination of these nonessential projects was both wise and timely. It develops, as will be seen at more length in the article from the Electrical World, which is included hereafter, that the power estimates of the War Production Board proved to be accurate within thirteen one-hundredths of 1 percent. The power program, during this period of expansion, was in direct competition with the program for warships, synthetic rubber, high octane gasoline plants, and other critical programs. As the result of the able Mr. Constantine Bary's remarkably accurate estimate of the Nation's power needs, it is now clear that the power program in this competition with other essential war materials received and used just about what it needed. This means that because of the decision to suspend the unnecessary projects, it did not take steel, copper, plant space, or skilled manpower which it did not need, and thus did not use them to the disadvantage of competing programs.

This is not to say that the ideological New Deal public-power advocates deserve any credit; it is abundantly clear that constant pressure was exercised to obtain the completion of the additional and unnecessary power projects on which construction was stopped. Had new dealers succeeded with their extended power program, based upon erroneous estimates of the Federal Power Commission, then the power program would have taken away for nonessential uses vital war materials needed elsewhere.

I concluded my remarks on December 2, 1942, by saying:

One final word of warning: We can look for efforts from now on to get some of the suspended projects put back on the active list of projects to be completed, notwithstanding war demands. This will be done under the guise of war necessity, but they will be the same Government projects which have been heretofore terminated as wasting critical materials and skills. * * * Without eternal vigilance we will certainly lose some of the ground gained.

I was right about the need for eternal vigilance.

On January 17, 1944, I wrote to the Bureau of the Budget to inquire as to status of appropriations unexpended but held in active condition presumably to meet emergency war requirements of electric power.

On February 1, 1944, I received a letter from the Director of the Budget enclosing copies of correspondence, which I set forth at this point in chronological order:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 12, 1943.
The Honorable HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: As you know, the War Production Board has recently found it necessary to stop work on certain electric generating projects of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the War Department. All of these projects had been authorized by the Congress and appropriations had been made for them.

Major new electric projects are among the chief competitors with our most urgent and important war programs, such as rubber, aviation gasoline, heavy bombers, warships, merchant ships, ammunition, and lend-lease. Because of the exceedingly tight situation as to critical materials, manufacturing facilities, and manpower for such programs, it has been necessary for us to operate and plan on the basis of close margins in the electric field.

In consequence, if changing conditions at any time during the next 6 months should dictate expansion of our existing power program, it would be necessary to reinstate some of the halted Federal projects on very short notice. In that event, any delay in resuming work might prevent completion of the project in time to meet power requirements in the area affected. We have planned our power program with a high degree of flexibility so that we shall be able to meet all contingencies, provided only that the operating Government agencies which we count upon to provide expansion will themselves be in a position to act with promptness.

In order that we may be prepared for quick action, as circumstances may require, I should like to enlist the cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget in measures to make funds available to the Government power agencies so that the moment the War Production Board decides that any particular project must be reinstated, the money for that purpose will be immediately available. Until just before the decision to reinstate any project it is impossible to specify the projects or the total capacity which it might be necessary to have. However, on the basis of present outlook, there is a possibility that at some time prior to the end of this fiscal year, we should want to reinstate as much as several hundred thousand kilowatts of capacity for the Department of the Interior, several hundred thousand for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and a substantial—although lesser amount—for the War Department, all to be selected from among the projects recently halted.

I shall greatly appreciate your advice as to what steps are necessary to be prepared, from a budgetary standpoint, for such a program. We shall, of course, be glad to go over this matter with you in detail; and, if desirable, I shall be glad to present to the appropriate committees of the Congress the urgent necessity for the measures I am recommending.

I am sending a copy of this letter to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1943.
HON. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. NELSON: We have your letter of January 12, 1943, advising of the possibility of renewing construction on some of the Federal projects recently halted by orders of the War Production Board. We have reviewed the funds available to the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the War Department for the authorized electric-generating projects and find that sufficient sums are available to make the obligations necessary for renewing and continuing construction until such supplementary appropriations as may be required are obtained.

As you know, work on projects stopped by the war production order is being brought to a close and men and construction material will soon be moved to other sites or disposed of completely. In the interest of economy, the saving of material and skilled labor, and the speedy completion of those projects necessary to meet war-connected needs, it seems to me that an early decision should be made with respect to those projects that are to be reinstated. You may be assured of my full cooperation in connection with the financing of such projects, whether by the release of presently reserved funds or by recommending supplemental appropriations.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE COY,
Assistant Director.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1943.
MR. WAYNE COY,
Assistant Director,
Bureau of the Budget.

MY DEAR MR. COY: Mr. Nelson has requested me to reply to your letter of January 21 with reference to the funds required for renewing construction on Federal power projects recently halted by the War Production Board, should circumstances warrant such construction at a later date. We are pleased that you have found sufficient sums for this purpose until such supplementary appropriations as may be required are obtained.

It is recognized that some time and money have been lost through the halting of these projects, but in view of the greater need for materials and equipment in connection with other urgent programs, this sacrifice was a necessary one. We do not expect the situation will change sufficiently during the next several months to warrant any new decision, but we are following conditions as they develop. Before the middle of the year we will have better information as to whether some of these projects should be reinstated. We shall keep you advised concerning developments.

Very truly yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Power Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1944.
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SCOTT: I have received your letter of January 17, 1944, in which you request advice as to the status of appropria-

tions which Mr. Donald Nelson requested be held in active condition to meet emergency war requirements of electric power. Your letter also requests copies of correspondence between Mr. Nelson and this office.

In the period of preparedness, prior to the declarations of war, funds were appropriated to the War Department, the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority to permit those agencies to construct various flood-control, reclamation, and navigation projects, at which appreciable amounts of hydroelectric power would be developed. However, as a result of the critical situation which arose in connection with materials, facilities, equipment, and manpower, many of these projects which did not lend themselves to early completion were suspended. Under date of January 12, 1943, Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, recommended that the appropriations for those projects be held for immediate use in the event the Board found it essential to the war program to proceed with the construction of any of the facilities involved.

Mr. Nelson's request has been adhered to by the Bureau of the Budget insofar as it has not been in conflict with the administration's fiscal program. The appropriations were generally made available solely for specific projects and available until expended. By and large, these funds were placed in reserve for obligation as needs developed. Certain of the appropriations, however, have been available for general programs rather than limited to specific projects, and, as it has not been consistent with budgetary policy to build up unnecessary balances of unobligated funds, these appropriations have, with the consent of Congress, been used to finance other projects which have been considered immediately urgent and essential to the prosecution of the war but which do not involve hydroelectric power development. This has been particularly true with respect to funds appropriated to the War Department.

The Budget for 1945 indicates that the Tennessee Valley Authority will have approximately $19,262,298 unobligated on June 30, 1944, the greater portion of which is for power facilities, and the Bonneville Power Administration will have about $24,969,339 for the construction of power transmission facilities. Most of the funds available to the Bureau of Reclamation for power facilities have been released to meet schedules approved by the War Production Board. The unobligated balance to be available to the War Department for power projects at the end of the fiscal year is estimated at $7,525,883.

In accordance with your request, there are enclosed copies of the correspondence on this subject between this office and the War Production Board.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director.*

KEEP YOUR EYE ON THE $52,000,000

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted that the unobligated balances referred to in the Budget letter total $51,757,520.

These unobligated balances amounting to nearly $52,000,000 present an almost irresistible temptation to the public power planners who are hopeful that these balances can continue to be retained until such time as labor, material, and equipment are available for the construction of more and more unnecessary and presently unusable power projects.

Why unnecessary? Why presently unusable? Because the Government's own power forecasts assure that it will take 2 to 3 years after the end of the war to reach post-war electric loads higher than those which actually obtained in 1943. In some regions where the load growth during the war has been very high, and this has especial application to the regions such as T. V. A. and Bonneville where most of the load growth during the war has been caused by war industries, it may take considerably more than 3 years after victory to produce loads higher than actually obtained in 1943. These conclusions are based on present construction without contemplating any additional construction whatever.

Why should these fifty-two millions of unobligated balances be held to tempt the spending brigades who are putting in a lot of time in Washington hotel rooms trying to find some way to use this money without regard to any war need but rather to a view to carrying out a long-range program of Government domination through control of public power?

As far back as January 12, 1943, it will be noted that Mr. Nelson referred to the possibility of the need for reinstatement of several hundred thousand of kilowatt capacity for the Department of the Interior, several hundred thousand for the Tennessee Valley Authority, and a substantial although lesser amount for the War Department, all to be selected from among the projects recently halted. As a matter of fact, as of February 11, 1944, 13 months later, no additional kilowatt capacity has had to be reinstated for the War Department or for the Department of the Interior and only 130,000 kilowatts of capacity for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Why should these $52,000,000 continue to be kept in escrow? These funds were appropriated by Congress at a time when the duly appointed agencies of the Government were concerned about the adequacy of power supply and so advised Congress. The shortage of power supply reported by the Federal Power Commission—see reports of 1936, 1937, 1938, 1939, 1940, 1941, and 1942—was based on the power requirements of national defense and later war production. Congress, supporting the requests of duly constituted executive agencies, appropriated funds in amounts consistent with the seriousness of the situation. As reported by Mr. Nelson in all reports on power supply in late 1942 and in 1943, there is ample power supply to meet all needs through 1945. The funds were appropriated for war needs. There are no unsatisfied needs for war. There is therefore no reason for the funds to be held further.

Should not the unexpended appropriations be returned? They should be returned. Any use of these funds now in the type of facility for which they were appropriated will not be in accordance with the intent of Congress in making the funds available. Under the laws of this country executive agencies point out, a Government agency having appropriations must, as promptly as possible, proceed with the work. And the only reason the work is not in progress now is because priorities for releases must be had from the War Production Board. Any release of material, labor, or equipment would be the signal for the agencies holding these appropriations to proceed, citing existing authorizations as their authority. This temptation to proceed at the earliest possible opportunity should be removed. The result of such construction will be in the interest of long-range Government power planning rather than the creation of power needed for war purposes. The original intent of Congress in making the appropriation, could thus be subverted.

TIME TO REVIEW THE POWER PROGRAM

Is not this the time to review the projects on their merits? Depending on war developments and timing of major offensives, the period will come when the only restrictions—those of the War Production Board—will be removed and all unexpended balances will be available for use as soon as labor, material, and equipment can be mobilized. For Congress to delay its review can well mean substantial loss of the taxpayer's money where facilities are started under the war emergency appropriations, only to be canceled belatedly by congressional action.

Much of the power capacity installed by the various agencies has been unable to provide under low-water conditions energy required to meet the needs of three-shift, 7-day week working programs. They were installed as war facilities, but with adverse water conditions were unable to meet the requirements of war without costly help from others. They have peaking capacity, but under adverse water conditions lack the energy—water—to make that power keep flowing as long as the war plants need it.

The United States Government has spent billions of dollars in this type of facilities during the war. The Government-owned power facilities have been expanded to almost 150 percent of their pre-Pearl Harbor installation. Congress has not investigated the propriety of these expenditures.

It has not compared the cost per kilowatt of net firm capacity against any other installed presently available means of generating power. Congress has not compared original estimates with actual additional amounts spent on individual irrigation, flood control, or waterway projects to combine power generation with the fundamental purpose of the installations.

TO WHAT EXTENT IS THE POWER PROGRAM DESTROYING SOURCES OF TAXATION?

Congress has not checked the effect on tax collections brought about by the nationalization of power facilities, formerly owned by tax-paying corporations and individuals and covering large portions of many of the States.

NEED FOR REVIEW NOW

Certainly the projects stopped by the War Production Board and for which funds are now being held, should be reviewed to ascertain their merit and that review should take place before the only key log in the dam, the authority held by the War Production Board, is released.

The determination of the merit of these projects, and of future projects, will require a review and evaluation of the expenditures that have been made, particularly because of the amounts of

money that have been spent in the war rush with no review by Congress.

Reverting to my earlier warning that this whole program will continue to call for checking and rechecking on Government bureaus, I have sent a letter under date of March 13, 1944, to Mr. J. A. Krug, Director, Office of War Utilities, War Production Board, in which I have requested certain up-to-date information, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1944.

Mr. J. A. KRUG;
Director, Office of War Utilities,
War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KRUG: The Government projects on the list attached to this letter were referred to in a press release on August 22, 1942, as "proceeding on low priorities or unrated."

On October 21, 1942, an official press release, duly carried by the Associated Press, stated that Chairman Donald M. Nelson, of the War Production Board, had given instructions to revoke priority assignments to a large part of nonmilitary construction for the Federal Government. On October 24, 1942, the Acting Chief of the Power Branch advised me that the cancelation on nonessential Government projects related to the T. V. A. and Department of the Interior projects referred to on the attached list and that he had been personally advised by the Corps of Engineers that they had halted work on their projects. This he confirmed in a letter to me dated October 27, 1942.

I should like specific information on the following points:

1. Has work ever been resumed on any of the projects on the attached list?
2. If so, when was the work resumed and to what extent has the work progressed?
3. From what source were such funds obtained and in what amounts?
4. What priorities were allowed on such construction and by whom?
5. If construction was resumed, what reason was given for the resumption and who approved it?

I would appreciate a detailed reply to this request at your earliest possible convenience.

With assurance of my best personal regards, I remain,

Yours sincerely,

HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.

AGENCY, PLANT, AND LOCATION

Tennessee Valley: Wilson Nos. 15, 16, Alabama; Watts Bar No. 4 (steam), Tennessee; Pickwick No. 5, Tennessee; Fort Loudon Nos. 3, 4, Tennessee; Guntersville No. 4, Alabama; Chicamauga No. 4, Tennessee; Wautaga Nos. 1, 2, Tennessee; Wheeler Nos. 5, 6, Alabama; South Holston Nos. 1, 2, Tennessee; Wilson (steam), Alabama; Fontana No. 3, North Carolina; Kentucky Nos. 3, 4, 5, Kentucky.

United States Engineers: Bluestone, W. Va.; Markham Ferry, Okla.; Wolf Creek, Ky.; Center Hill, Tenn.; Allatoona, Ga.; Norfolk No. 2, Arkansas; Fort Peck No. 2, Montana; Fort Gibson, Okla.; Denison No. 2, Texas-Oklahoma.

United States Bureau of Reclamation: Colorado-Big Thompson, Colorado; Anderson Ranch, Idaho; Keswick No. 3, California; Davis Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Arizona-Nevada.

Federal Works Agency: Pensacola, Okla.; High Point, N. C.

Bonneville Administration: Grand Coulee Nos. 7, 8, 9, Washington.

Numbers designate generator units in hydroelectric developments.

I will advise the House of any information received in reply to this request. I suspect that some of these projects were revived since it was felt that pressure on the Hill had lightened up somewhat and it will be interesting to see whether this is true. Perhaps I am unduly suspicious, but past experience would lead me to believe that my suspicions may be justified.

I also submit at this point the article in the Electrical World to which reference has been made.

WASHINGTON COMMENT

(By R. N. LARKIN)

ON THE NOSE

Stories of industrial miracles achieved under pressure of the war are legion. An equally astounding performance, concerning the electric power industry, came to light February 7, through a Federal Power Commission release listing the peak load on principal utility systems in 1943.

This is a story of long-range planning and estimating, of calculated chance-taking whose tangible results can be measured in fighting ships now in action—or almost ready to fight—which otherwise would be months away from the water, in rubber and high-octane gasoline plants producing for war instead of being merely under construction.

F. P. C. dispute

In October 1941 there was furious dispute as to the war requirements of electric power. The Office of Production Management, whose Power Division was then small, was arrayed against F. P. C. and other Federal agencies which foresaw only disaster unless power equipment was rushed to completion in tremendous amounts. F. P. C. had predicted a 1943 peak load of 42,715,000 kilowatts. O. P. M. set it at 37,400,000 kilowatts. The abuse which rained down on O. P. M.'s figure was heavy.

F. P. C.'s recent release set the 1943 peak load at 37,063,961 kilowatts. For the purposes of power supply calculation, however, the actual 1943 peak load was 37,252,000 kilowatts, which is the sum of all noncoincident peaks at the end of the year. Area peaks were attained from August through December. Since area power supply must be calculated on the number of kilowatts which will be required in a given area in a given year, the sum of all area peaks at the end of the year is the more valid figure for O. W. U. W. P. B.'s 1943 peak, calculated 27 months in advance, was high by four-tenths of 1 percent. F. P. C.'s prediction 30 months in advance was 14.6 percent high on O. W. U.'s actual peak.

Seventeen months after its original estimate of 1943 peak, in February 1943, a W. P. B. review came up with a 1943 peak of 37,250,000 kilowatts, so close to the actual 1943 sum peak that the difference can hardly be figured.

Again in July 1943, 6 months before totals were in, W. P. B. recalculated its estimated 1943 peak, setting it this time at 37,310,000 kilowatts. This estimate proved to be 13/100 of 1 percent high.

The significance of these predictions in immediately apparent when it is realized that the power program was in direct competition with such programs as fighting and cargo ships for boilers, turbines, valves, and generators, with synthetic rubber and high-octane gasoline plants for pumps, valves, and boilers. It competed with everything for steel, copper, plant space, and skilled manpower at a time when these things were tightest.

Acknowledgments

This long-term sharpshooting of such phenomenal accuracy was almost entirely the work of the Power Forecast Section of W. P. B.'s Power Division, later O. W. U., headed by Constantine Bary, on loan from the Philadelphia Electric Co.[1] He credits five factors for its accuracy.

Part of it was luck. The original estimates, for instance, included 100,000 kilowatts of aluminum capacity, 100,000 kilowatts of steel capacity, and 100,000 kilowatts of special ordnance work which failed to materialize in 1943. The resulting overestimate was offset by cancelation of the coastal military dim-outs which added 300,000 kilowatts to the 1943 peak. There were other similar instances of sheer luck.

Part of the credit goes to executives of several operating utility companies who had the "pre-war vision" to finance the slow and painstaking research work on class-of-load characteristics over a wide range of energy use which was necessary for the calculations to have any basis of merit. It was as a result of this pre-war research that authentic relationships were established which were of real value in appraising the behavior of war loads.

Dr. Maurice Levin, formerly of O. P. M. and W. P. B., gets part of the credit. It was in several conversations with Dr. Levin that Bary got his ideas on the interrelationship between war loads and civilian load displacement which played a significant part in the forecasting of 1943 power requirements.

Part of the credit goes to F. P. C. which made available to W. P. B. comprehensive historic statistical data on utility system loads and energy output. This data was invaluable for trend analysis.

Part of the credit is due Bary for having developed methods of making load forecasts.

J. A. Krug, then chief of W. P. B.'s Power Division, and his staff brought to their jobs broad operating and engineering experience and the knowledge of the industry's problems which comes only with that experience. Their predictions and programs were assailed by some public and even a few private systems when W. P. B. compared its estimates with those of major groups of electric systems.

The power lobby

The reddest face must be that of the New Republic magazine, which, in April 1942, carried an article titled "The Power Lobby Comes Back," reading in part:

"Constantine Bary, of (W. P. B.'s) Power Unit, is playing into the hands of reactionary Congressmen who gobble up the short-sighted power-need estimates he hands them, refusing to consider as war projects any which cannot be completed within the next 2 years. Bary and his pals are gambling thousands of lives on this bet that our war needs will be a thing of the past 2 years from now."

No doubt the Marshalls invasion fleet includes craft which are powered by the turbines, boilers, and generators which W. P. B. decided not to install at Ottumwa and points west—the power capacity saved in the big program slash of mid-1942 which was based, among other things, on Bary's "short-sighted power-need estimates."

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Congress of the United States, through appropriate committees, should review the entire power program, that the Congress should regain control over these unobligated balances, and should impose such further controls as would seem desirable on future spending for the construction of additional power projects. No longer can the argument of military necessity be used to justify the wildest kind of

[1] Mr. Bary is the author of the analytical study of the behavior of electricity system loads following the war which appeared in the January 8 issue of Electrical World under the title "Post-War Loads on Electric Utility Systems."

estimates and excessive construction of various petty projects requested by administration favorites and diverted to favored sections of the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain letters and correspondence referred to, together with certain lists of Government power projects and an article from the Electrical World.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain figures pertaining to shipments on the Missouri River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous special order, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SOLDIER VOTE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the law that was passed in the 1943 session of the general court regarding the bill passed to allow the soldiers, the men and women absentee voters, the privilege of voting, and also two letters of thanks from men who were overseas, because they were allowed to vote in the municipal election at Brookline, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the 1943 session of the general court, Massachusetts passed, so far as I know, the first law and blazed the trail which allows the absentee men and women overseas of our fighting forces to vote in all of the Federal, State, and municipal elections. It is a very fine thing that they did in blazing the trail. You will note that Massachusetts, as a result of popular demand and foresight, accomplished the very thing that supporters of the Federal ballot proposal have argued States would not do.

The Massachusetts act provides for the registration of men who reach the voting age while serving abroad or at distant camps. Their relatives can record them as voters. It also permits servicemen's relatives to have ballots mailed to servicemen who do not personally apply for them. When the special session of the general court advances the date of the primaries—a certainty—Massachusetts will have made it possible for all servicemen everywhere to vote.

The experience of the town of Brookline is informative and inspiring. In a recent Brookline municipal election, in which there were few contests and no unusual interest, 242 servicemen voted. A ballot sent to a soldier in London was back in 5 days; a ballot sent to a commissioned officer in India was back in 26 days; a ballot sent to a man in north Africa was back in 11 days; a ballot sent to a sailor on the Pacific Fleet flagship was back in 17 days; a ballot sent to a marine in the Solomons was back in 23 days; a ballot sent to a soldier in Alaska was back in 14 days.

In brief, Brookline reached the most distant points of the globe, and did it all in less than a month. If this had been a national election, with the Federal Government speeding the movement of the ballots, the time for the transmission of each could have been shortened by several days.

There can be no doubt about the honesty of the system which Massachusetts has demonstrated to be practical and appealing to the servicemen.

There is a very strong probability that the Green-Lucas bill is unconstitutional. It seems to me that the Green-Lucas bill is unconstitutional because the Constitution of the United States clearly and specifically gives exclusive control of ballots to the States and in no circumstances and for no purpose permits Federal control. Besides, the servicemen want and deserve a complete ballot and the right to vote for all persons listed as candidates.

If servicemen will vote in India for a school-committee aspirant in Brookline, surely they will vote for Congressmen and Senators.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a letter sent by a serviceman to Mr. Arthur J. Shinners, town clerk, Brookline, Mass. This serviceman is somewhere in Sicily:

I guess that you must be wondering what the reason is for you to be receiving a letter from somewhere in Sicily, and so here 'tis.

If you will notice, I have left out the line which is to be filled in with some sort of address, to which the official absent voting ballot is to be mailed, for my address is a little larger than the room on the application.

I must say that it really was a pleasure in receiving the ballot, for it is really wonderful the way the old town remembers all of us in the distant lands of the world. I can now brag even more about my town, for I really have the proof of the pudding in the application for the absent voter's ballot. Please let me thank you and wish you all well.

It will be seen that this letter expresses an appreciation of an opportunity to vote in just a municipal election.

The other letter addressed to Mr. Shinners thanks him very much for sending an application for an absentee ballot and states that the writer will be very glad to have one sent to him.

The letter is as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1944.

DEAR MR. SHINNERS: Thank you very much for sending me an application for an absentee ballot. I shall be very glad to have one sent to me here.

I am now at Pearl Harbor, and the scenery here is very nice.

I hope you are well and that everything is O. K. in the town.

I will be very glad when this war is over and I can return to my old home town.

* * * * * *

Sincerely yours.

If there is anyone has any doubt about the success of mailing a complete ballot to the service men and women in order that they mark their ballots for every candidate running for office, I think this information proves that that person is wrong, and that the men and women will be overjoyed to have an opportunity to take part in the next election, which is only their just due. The Federal ballot would cheat the service men and women of two-thirds of their right to vote.

The Massachusetts absentee-voting law is as follows:

Chapter 390

An act relative to absent voting by residents of Massachusetts serving in the armed forces of the United States during the present war and to the qualification of such residents as voters at certain elections

Be it enacted, etc., as follows:

SECTION 1. Except as herein provided, words and terms used in this act shall be construed in accordance with the definitions set forth in chapter 50 of the General Laws. For the purpose of this act, the word "kindred" shall mean spouse, father, mother, sister, or brother of the whole or halfblood, son, daughter, adopting parent or adopted child, stepparent or stepchild, uncle, aunt, niece, or nephew.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any contrary provision of general or special law, any legal resident of the Commonwealth while serving in the armed forces of the United States during the existing war between the United States and any foreign country and whose name is included in the current annual register of voters of any city or town therein, or who may be determined to be qualified as a voter thereof in accordance with section 8 of this act, may be furnished with an official absent voting ballot prepared in accordance with clause (a) of section 87 of chapter 54 of the General Laws, for, and may vote by means of such ballot at, any regular biennial State election or at any regular annual or biennial city or town election at which absent voting is permitted, provided an application therefor is filed with the clerk of the city or town of which he is such legal resident and the same is certified by the registrars of voters thereof, in the manner hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. Application for an official absent voting ballot to be furnished to such resident for any such election may be made to the clerk of the city or town in which such resident is registered as a voter, or in which he has been determined to be qualified to vote as provided in said section 8, by any registered voter of the Commonwealth who is a kindred of such resident. The applicant shall state therein his name and that of the city or town in which he is registered as a voter, together with the street and number of his address, if any, the name of the resident in whose behalf the application is made, the place of his legal residence on January 1 of the current year, or on such subsequent date when he first became a legal resident of such city or town, and the address to which such ballot is to be mailed. The applicant shall also make a statement of his relationship to such resident, shall make oath to the truth of all statements in such application, and shall sign the same.

SEC. 4. The State secretary, or the clerk of each city and town subject to this act, as the case may be, shall seasonably prepare, prior to each regular biennial State election or regular annual or biennial city or town election, in such quantities as he shall deem necessary, all of the papers prescribed by said section 87 of said chapter 54, as amended, with such changes therein as may be required to give effect thereto. On the envelopes prepared for returning the official absent voting ballots furnished to any person determined to be qualified to vote under said section 8,

except as to his ability to sign his name and to read, there shall be provided a space for him to sign his name and there shall be printed five lines of the constitution of the Commonwealth in English. There shall be included in the jurat to be executed by the officer in whose presence such person makes his affidavit a statement setting forth that the affiant has signed his name in the officer's presence, and has read the said five lines in such a manner as to show that he was neither prompted nor reciting from memory, or was prevented by a physical disability from doing either.

SEC. 5. When an application is made for an official absent voting ballot as provided in section three and the same is filed with the city or town clerk, it shall be transmitted by said clerk forthwith to the registrars of voters of such city or town and, if they are satisfied that the statements therein are true and that the person in whose behalf the application is made is a duly registered voter of such city or town or has been determined to be qualified to vote therein at such election as provided in said section 8, they shall so certify thereon and return such application to the city or town clerk. If the person in whose behalf such an application is made is a duly registered voter, the clerk shall cause to be placed upon the voting list to be used at the election, to vote at which such application is made, the letters "SAV," in capitals, opposite the name of such voter. The said clerk shall then mail, postage prepaid, to such resident at the address designated in such application, such ballot together with all blank forms and envelopes required.

SEC. 6. Any such resident who has received an official absent voting ballot furnished in accordance with this act may vote by mailing the same to the clerk of the city or town where he resides. He shall mark such ballot in the presence of a commissioned officer in the armed forces, in a municipality or place other than the city or town in which it is determined that such voter is qualified to vote. Before marking his ballot he shall exhibit it to said officer, who shall satisfy himself that it is unmarked, but he shall not allow such officer to see how he marks it. Such officer shall hold no communication with such voter, nor he with such officer, as to how he votes. After marking his ballot he shall enclose it in the proper envelope provided for the purpose and shall execute in the presence of such officer the affidavit thereon. He shall then seal the envelope with the ballot therein and shall mail the same, postage prepaid, to the city or town clerk, on or before the day of the election in a municipality or place other than the city or town in which he has been determined to be qualified as a voter. The postmark, if legible, shall be evidence of the time and place of mailing.

SEC. 7. Except as otherwise provided in this act, the provisions of sections 86 to 103A of chapter 54 of the general laws relating to absent voting, and of sections 27 and 34 of chapter 56 of the general laws prescribing penalties for violations of laws relating to absent voting, shall, where pertinent, apply to absent voting under this act.

The provisions of section 95 of said chapter 54 relating to the duties of election officers at polling places with respect to absent voting ballots shall apply to ballots cast under this act. In addition to the duties prescribed by said section 95, the warden or his deputy shall, in comparing the statements appearing in the affidavits upon the envelopes in which such ballots are enclosed with the applications therefor, determine whether the statements appearing in such affidavits conform to those appearing in such applications, and whether the persons signing such affidavits have been determined to be qualified to vote at such election. All envelopes, opened and unopened, enclosing ballots returned by persons determined to be qualified to vote at such election in accordance with said section 8 shall, instead of being retained and returned with the ballots cast, be enclosed and sealed in an envelope provided for the purpose of returning the same to the city or town clerk, and said clerk shall retain such envelope as long as he retains the ballots cast, after which he shall transmit the same to the registrars of voters who shall preserve such envelope for 5 years from the date of such election.

SEC. 8. Any legal resident of the Commonwealth who is serving in the armed forces of the United States during the existing war between the United States and any foreign country and who has the qualifications for voting prescribed by the constitution of the Commonwealth, but whose name is not included in the current annual register of the city or town of his legal residence, may be qualified for voting at any regular biennial State election or at any regular annual or biennial city or town election at which absent voting is permitted upon the personal application of a registered voter of the Commonwealth of the kindred of such resident made to the registrars of voters of the city or town in which the right of such resident to vote may be claimed. Such application may be made not less than 20 days before the day of such election at any time during regular business hours or at sessions held for the purpose of registering voters for such election, and shall be upon a form prescribed by the State secretary. The person making such application shall state thereon his name, and that of the city or town in which he is registered as a voter, with the street and number of his address, if any; the name of the person in whose behalf the application is made, his place of legal residence when he entered the service, on January 1 of the preceding year, on January 1 of the current year or on such later date when he first became a legal resident of such city or town, and at the time of making such application, and the place and date of his birth, and shall make a declaration that such resident has legally resided in the Commonwealth 1 year, and in the city or town in which his right to vote is claimed 6 months, next preceding the election at which such right is claimed. The applicant shall also make thereon a statement of his relationship to the resident in whose behalf such application is made, shall make oath to the truth of the statements therein and sign his name thereto.

If the resident in whose behalf such an application is made claims to be a naturalized citizen, or to derive United States citizenship through the naturalization or citizenship of some other person, the applicant shall produce for inspection papers of naturalization, certificate of citizenship made under Federal authority, or any other papers upon which he relies to prove the citizenship of the resident, and, if the registrars are satisfied that the resident is a citizen, they shall make upon such papers a memorandum of the date of such inspection.

The registrars shall make and certify on the application made under this section a statement of their determination as to whether or not the resident in whose behalf the application is made appears to be entitled to be registered, except the ability to sign his name and to read in the manner prescribed by article XX of the amendments to the Constitution. In case it is determined that such resident is not entitled to be registered, the registrars shall give written notice thereof to the applicant and give him an opportunity to be heard.

If the registrars certify that the resident has the qualifications entitling him to registration, except that his ability to sign his name and to read as prescribed by article XX of the amendments to the Constitution has not been determined, he shall, nevertheless, be entitled to receive an official absent voting ballot and application therefor may be made in the manner provided in section 3 of this act. Before permitting him to mark his ballot, the officer referred to in section 6 of this act shall require him to sign his name if he is physically able to do so, and to read in his presence and in such a manner as to show that he was neither prompted nor reciting from memory the five lines of the Constitution printed on the return envelop as provided in section 4 of this act. If he is unable to do either, and is not prevented by physical disability from so doing, the officer shall so certify on said envelope, and shall not permit him to vote but shall return the envelope with the ballot enclosed and unmarked, and the ballot shall not be counted.

Applications for qualification of residents as voters under this section shall be preserved by the registrars for 5 years and the registrars shall cause a suitable index to be made containing the name of each person determined to be so qualified, his place of legal residence, with street and number of his address, if any, at the time of making such application, the name of the military or naval unit in which he is then serving, and his rank, his place and date of birth, and, if he is a naturalized citizen or has derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of some other person, the facts appearing in such application relating thereto. Such index shall be preserved as a public record, but shall not be deemed to be a part of the general register of voters.

Persons registered under this section shall be subject to the provisions of sections 48 and 49 of chapter 51 of the general laws and, except as herein otherwise provided, to all of the provisions of said chapter 51 prescribing qualifications for voting. The provisions of sections 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 of chapter 56 of the general laws prescribing penalties for offenses concerning the listing or registration of voters shall, so far as pertinent, apply to persons applying for registration under this section.

SEC. 9. The registrars of voters may cause an investigation of any application under this act to be made by a police officer who shall forthwith after such investigation report to them his findings with respect thereto, and for this purpose the board or officer in charge of the police force of each city or town shall give the registrars such assistance as they may require.

SEC. 10. The registrars of voters shall include in the voting lists prepared in accordance with section 55 of chapter 51 of the general laws for use at each regular biennial State election and at each regular annual or biennial city or town election at which absent voting is permitted the names and residences on January 1 preceding, or subsequently, as the case may be, of all residents of their respective cities and towns who have been registered at any such election as provided in section 8 of this act and shall cause to be placed opposite the name of each such resident the letters "SAV" in capitals. They shall forthwith, following the twentieth day preceding any such election, give written notice to the State secretary, or the city or town clerk, as the case may be, of the number of residents who have been registered under this act in such city or town, and in each ward and precinct therein, and shall likewise furnish the said secretary with mailing lists of such residents before each such State election.

SEC. 11. The provisions of section 46 of chapter 51 of the general laws shall apply to all applications for registration under this act on behalf of persons who have all the qualifications of a voter, except that of age, and who will, on or before the day of the next regular biennial State election or next regular annual or biennial city or town election at which absent voting is permitted, as the case may be, attain the age of 21 years.

SEC. 12. The State secretary shall forthwith, after the effective date of this act, prepare in such quantities as he may deem necessary, the following papers:

(a) Blank forms for registration application worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, a duly registered
(Name of applicant)
voter of the city or town of _____,
(Name of city or town where applicant is registered as a voter)
residing at _____ in such
(Street and number)
city or town, do hereby make application for an official absent voting ballot for the _____ to be held in _____,
(Name of election) (Name of city or town)
on _____, 19__, for _____,
(Name of person in service)
serving in the _____ with the
(Name of unit)
rank of _____, and a duly qualified voter for such election at _____ in
(Street and number)
the city or town of _____,
(Name of city or town)
and, as I believe, entitled to vote at said election in ward ____, precinct ____, in the city or town of _____, said ballot to be mailed to _____.

I hereby further declare that I am the _____ of the person in whose behalf
(Relationship)
this application is made.

Signature of applicant _____,
(Date) _____, 19____

Personally appeared before me the above-named _____ and made oath that the foregoing statements are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

_____
(Registrar of voters)

_____
(Not to be filled in my applicant)

We, the undersigned, a majority of the registrars of voters of _____, hereby
(Name of city or town)
certify that _____, in whose behalf
(Name of person in service)
the foregoing application has been made, has been determined to be a duly qualified voter at the _____ election to be held in ward _____, precinct _____, of the city or town of _____, and is entitled to vote therein at such election.

(Four blank lines for signatures of registrars.)

(b) Blank forms of affidavit to be printed on envelope for enclosing official absent-voting ballot furnished to person whose name is included in current annual register of voters and serving in the armed forces of the United States, worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, serving in the _____ with the rank of _____,
(Name of military or naval unit)
do hereby make oath that I am a registered voter in the city or town of _____, Mass., at _____ in precinct _____,
(Street and number)
ward _____; that the place where I now am is not the municipality in which I am registered as a voter; that I have carefully read the instructions forwarded to me with the ballot herein enclosed; and that I have marked and sealed the within ballot as stated hereon by the person taking my oath.

(Signature of voter) _____

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19__; and I hereby certify that when I was alone with the affiant he showed me the ballot herein enclosed unmarked, and then in my presence marked the same without my seeing how he marked it, after which he sealed said ballot in this envelope. I had no communication with the affiant as to how he was to vote.

(Seal, if any) _____
(Name of Officer)
_____
(Unit)
_____
(Military or naval rank)

(c) Blank forms of affidavit to be printed on envelope for enclosing absent-voting ballot furnished to resident determined to be qualified to vote as provided in section 8, worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, serving in the _____ with the rank of _____, do hereby make oath that at the time I entered the military or naval service or on the 1st day of January I was a legal resident of _____ at _____; that
(City or town and State) (Street and number)
on the first day of January of this year I was a legal resident of _____ at
(City or town and State)
_____, and that I am now a legal
(Street and number)
resident of _____ at
(City or town and State)
_____; that I was born on
(Street and number)
_____ in _____;
(Date of birth) (City or town and State or country)
that I am a citizen of the United States, and that I have been a legal resident of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts 1 year and of the city or town of _____ 6 months next preceding the election at which I claim this right to vote.

(The voter shall then sign his name and read the following aloud to the officer taking his oath.)

(Print five lines of the State constitution here)

I do hereby further make oath that the place where I now am is not the municipality in which I claim this right to vote; that I have carefully read the instructions forwarded to me with the ballot enclosed, and that I have marked and sealed the within ballot as stated by the person taking my oath.

(Signature of voter) _____

Subscribed and sworn to before me by the above affiant this _____ day of _____, 19__; and I hereby certify that such affiant has signed his name in my presence, or was prevented by physical incapacity from so doing, read aloud the five lines of the State constitution appearing hereon in such a manner as to show he was neither prompted nor reciting from memory, and that when I was alone with him, he showed me the ballot herein enclosed, unmarked, and then in my presence marked the same without my seeing how he marked it, after which he sealed the said ballot in this envelope. I had no communication with the affiant as to how he was to vote.

(Seal, if any) _____
(Name of officer)
_____
(Unit)
_____
(Military or naval rank)

(d) Blank forms of application for qualification of person in service as a voter as provided in this act, worded substantially as follows:

I, _____, a duly registered
(Name of applicant)
voter of the city or town of _____,
(Name of city or town where applicant is registered as a voter)
residing at _____ hereby
(Street and number)
make oath that _____ is now
(Name of person in service)
serving in the _____ of the United
(Name of unit)
States _____; that on January 1 of last year he was a legal resident of _____ at _____
(City or town and State) (Street and number)
and, on January 1 of this year, of _____
(City or town and
_____ at _____; that he is
State) (Street and number)
now a legal resident of _____
(City or town and State)
at _____; that he was born
(Street and number)
in _____ on _____
(City or town and State or country) (Date of birth)
and that he has legally resided in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for 1 year and in the city or town of _____ for 6 months next preceding the election at which his right to vote is now being claimed.

I hereby further declare that I am _____of the person herein named in
(Degree of relationship)
whose behalf this application for qualification as a voter at said election is claimed.

(Signature of applicant) _____(date)____, 19__.

Personally appeared before me the above named_____and made oath that the foregoing statements are true to the best of his knowledge and belief.

_____
(Registrar of voters)

(If the person in whose behalf the application is made is a naturalized citizen or has derived United States citizenship through the naturalization of another, the registrars shall record in the space below, from the papers presented by the applicant, the facts required to show the citizenship of the person in service.)

(Not to be filled in by applicant)

We, the undersigned, a majority of the registrars of voters of the_____of
(City or town)
_____, acting under authority of
(Name of city or town)
section_____of chapter____of the acts of 1943, do hereby determine that_____is
(Name of person in service)
(is not) qualified to vote at the_____
(Name of election)
to be held in ward_____, precinct_____of the city or town of_____on_____
_____, 19__.

(Four blank lines for signatures or registrars)

(e) Blank forms of report of police investigation, worded substantially as follows:

This is to certify that, after investigation, I find that, on January first of this year,
_____
(Name of person in whose behalf application for qualification as voter is made)
was a resident of_____, and that he is
(City or town and State)
now a legal resident of_____at
(City or town and State)
_____. This information was fur-
(Street and number)
nished to me by_____residing at
(Name of informant)
_____.
(Place of residence of informant)

(Signed) _____
(Police officer)

(f) Suitable forms of certificates of listing, notices of omitted, additional or corrected listings to assessors and collectors of taxes and notices to registrars of voters of other cities or towns.

SEC. 13. The registrars of voters in the preparation of their annual register shall remove therefrom the name of each person registered under the provisions of this act who does not re-register in person as a voter within 6 months of the time of his or her discharge from the armed forces of the

United States or of the termination of the existing states of war between the United States and certain foreign countries.

SEC. 14. If any part of this act, or section thereof, shall be declared unconstitutional, the validity of the remaining parts thereof shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 15. This act shall remain in force only during such period as the existing war between the United States and certain foreign countries shall continue and until a declaration of the termination thereof by the President of the United States.

Approved June 2, 1943.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JONKMAN (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. HARLESS of Arizona, for several weeks, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 14, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Tuesday, March 14, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, March 15, 1944, on H. R. 2522 and H. R. 4350.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on S. 1225, entitled "An act granting a pension to Constance Eager," which was introduced by Senator TYDINGS, and S. 662, entitled "An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes," which was introduced by Senator BILBO.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the land grants subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 16, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 4184 entitled "To amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2328 and H. J. Res. 49 (to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable). Hearings will be held.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1285. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Selective Service System for the fiscal year 1945 containing estimates of appropriation amounting to $63,573,000 (H. Doc. No. 492); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1286. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of amendment No. 1 covering the personnel requirements of the National Archives for the quarter ending March 31, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1287. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a short interim report of the operations of the Farm Credit Administration during the calendar year 1943; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1288. A letter from the Commissioner, Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration for the period July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1942 (H. Doc. No. 493); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

1289. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Chehalis River and tributaries, Washington, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and by an act of Congress approved on June 13, 1934 (H. Doc. No. 494); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1290. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 5, 1944, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Cumberland River and Yellow Creek, with a view to improvement of Yellow Creek, in the vicinity of Middlesborough, Ky., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on March 25, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 495); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1291. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $19,174,000 and contract authorization for the fiscal year 1945 amounting to $2,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 496); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1292. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Second Quarterly Report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the Education and Training of Defense Workers, covering the period beginning October 1, 1943, and ending December 31, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1293. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the text of a message received in the Department of State and directed to the Congress of the United States from the Congress of the Political Parties held at Bari, Italy, January 28–30, 1944; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2116. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to exemption of property from judicial process, the assignment of salary or wages, and the advance payment of salary or wages for the purpose of preventing attachment or garnishment; with amendment (Rept. No. 1254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4377. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4381. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4382. A bill to facilitate the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts of the Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4383. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of States, political subdivisions thereof, and instrumentalities of States or political subdivisions, and to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4384. A bill to simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transferring assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterans to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 4385. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4386. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. R. 4387. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4388. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 4389. A bill to define the term "agriculture"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 4390: A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political

activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended and extended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 4391. A bill to amend section 409 (e) of the Social Security Act approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 4392. A bill to create an office of demobilization, establish general policies for the operation of that office, provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, prescribe the jurisdiction of courts in connection therewith, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 4393. A bill authorizing the Shoshonee-Goship Bands of Shoshone Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4394. A bill authorizing the Western Bands of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 468. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4134, a bill to reestablish the grade of admiral of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass House bill 4003; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 1617; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4395. A bill for the relief of Glassell-Taylor Co., Robinson & Young; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 4396. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alberta Harvey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 4397. A bill for the relief of W. S. Burleson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4398. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4399. A bill authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Royal E. Ingersoll, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4400. A bill for the relief of the Transit Investment Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 4401. A bill for the relief of Verge McClure; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5235. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of 1,560 citizens of the Thirty-third Congressional District of the State of New York, protesting against any legislation which will prohibit or restrict the sale or manufacture of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5236. By Mr. FELLOWS: Petition of Mabel Hamlin and 35 others, and Stuart K. Stairs, of Caribou, Maine, and 21 others, favoring enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5237. By Mr. GWYNNE: Petition of Mrs. B. L. Haug and many other residents of Marshalltown, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5238. Also, petition of Alletta L. Dillon and many other residents of Cedar Falls, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5239. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 21 residents of Butler, Pa., requesting the enactment of House bill 2082 which would stop the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and during demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5240. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Carl H. Hammack, of Bryan, and Mrs. Mabel Robertson, of Austin, Tex., favoring House bill 4269; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5241. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of members of Harry Higgins Post, No. 83, the American Legion, Ashland, Ohio, to immediately enact the Legion omnibus bill now pending on World War veterans' legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5242. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of Genevieve Parlor, No. 132, Native Daughters of the Golden West, regarding evacuated Japanese; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5243. Also, petition of the San Francisco Auxiliary, No. 1, B'nai B'rith, urging abrogation of Chamberlain White Paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5244. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of the Ladies Aid Society, of Bremen, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, for greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants, and better protection of men in training camps from effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5245. Also, petition of Alma Bishop and 50 other signers of Skowhegan, Maine, urging action to stop the manufacture, sale, and transportation of beverages for the duration by enacting into law the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5246. Also, petition of Hattie White and 27 other citizens of Wayne, Maine, urging favorable action on House bill 2082 for greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants and better protection of our men in training camps from effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., associate minister, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious Lord, who didst come to save all men, redeeming them out of tawdriness into beauty, and out of heaviness into joy: Look, we beseech Thee, with the eyes of Thy mercy, upon a war-torn world forgetful of Thy redemptive love. Though it has failed Thee in Thy purpose, help it to confront failure with courage, and to find in imperfection, not disillusionment but opportunity, not a fact in which to acquiesce but a problem to be solved under Thy guidance, knowing that because of Thy grace no failure need be final.

Thou knowest, O Lord, the enemies that surround us, the temptations that beset us, the darkness that engulfs us. Increase our valor in all conflicts of this mortal life. Renew our courage after every failure, that we may rise from the dust with a double portion of Thy grace to rededicate our lives to the ideals of justice and mercy, peace and love, with which Thou hast ennobled us, until as sons of God we come at last to Thine eternal Kingdom. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 13, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 13, 1944, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 78) to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LATE SENATOR McNARY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that when the Senate convenes on Thursday I shall hope to be recognized to speak briefly about the services of the late Senator from Oregon, Charles L. McNary.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, upon the recommendation of the respective chairmen of the committees as will be indicated, appoints as members of the Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources, authorized by Senate Resolution 253, agreed to March 13, 1944, the following:

From the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE]; from the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]; from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]; and on his own initiative the Chair also appoints the

Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] members of the special committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923

A letter from the President of the Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for the purpose of making the present salary advancement law operate more effectively as a work incentive (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an amendment covering the personnel requirements of The National Archives for the quarter ending March 31, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States S. 1617, a bill sponsored by the American Legion providing legislation for the benefit and protection of veterans of World War No. 2; and

"Whereas S. 1617 provides that the Veterans' Administration shall be an agency of the United States, vital and essential to the successful prosecution of the present war, and as such will be accorded priorities for personnel, equipment, supplies, construction, and matériel, and will grant the Administrator authority to place in Army and Navy installations Veterans' Administration personnel for adjudication of claims of men and women about to be discharged from the service, and also provides that a man or woman shall not be released from active duty until his or her certificate of discharge and final pay, or a substantial portion thereof, are ready for delivery; prohibits the system of requiring statements from men and women about to be discharged regarding the origin, incurrence, and aggravation of their disabilities; provides that accredited service officers of veterans' organizations be permitted to visit and assist hospitalized men at any time; reenacts section 23 of World War Veterans' Act that provides for review by the Administrator of the case of any person discharged from active service by court martial to the end that if the Administrator determines that at the time of the commission of the offense resulting in the court martial the person was insane, such person may have his rights restored; provides for mustering-out or demobilization pay; provides for educational allowance, including such vocational, professional, or technical refresher courses as may be approved by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; provides for a loan system operated by the Veterans' Administration through the several States to aid veterans in the purchase of a farm or home; providing for a veterans' employment service to be vested in the Administration; provides for unemployment allowances for veterans during a reasonable period of unemployment, authority over such payments and operation of the plan to be vested in the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas S. 1617 is necessary and essential for the protection of the rights of veterans of World War No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, in second extraordinary session assembled, endorses the principles and purposes of S. 1617 and recommends them to the earnest consideration of our representatives in the National Congress; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States, and to the chairman of the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee of the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition your Excellency and honorable bodies as follows:

"Whereas documented reports of our State Department and continuous despatches from Europe, while telling a horrible story of the atrocities to which the conquered peoples of Europe are being subjected, definitely reveal that the Jewish people of these occupied countries have been specifically earmarked for utter annihilation; and

"Whereas until now the world has, with great horror, learned that more than 3,000,000 of innocent Jewish men and women and children have been subjected to death by tortures unparalleled in human history in lands where their fathers and forefathers have lived for centuries; and

"Whereas there now remains, in these occupied countries, many millions of those who escaped these mass annihilations by the generosity of their non-Jewish friends; who are engaged in heroic underground activities to defeat our common enemy, and who are waiting for the hour of liberation; and

"Whereas the President of the United States of America, on behalf of civilized humanity, initiated the War Refugee Board, a governmental agency, to do all it can to save those who can still be saved; to find for them havens of refuge; and

"Whereas we must recognize that while it is our duty to secure the rights of each individual to return to his or her former residence, hundreds of thousands of these Jewish victims will be unable to return to their former countries which inevitably will recall to them the horrible death of their loved ones, thus clearly demonstrating the urgent need to end the homelessness of the Jewish people; and

"Whereas we have observed with admiration the reconstruction of the Jewish homeland in Palestine, resulting from the Balfour Declaration and the League of Nations' mandate entrusted to Great Britain with the sanction of our country, and have watched with pride the great role played in the upbuilding of Palestine by the Jewish people, a community which contributed greatly to the war efforts of the United Nations and simultaneously absorbing hundreds of thousands of refugees from European countries; and

"Whereas Palestine possesses, through modern irrigation and industrial development, the absorptive capacity, and Palestinian Jewry is willing to assume the responsibility of resettling their brethren, victims of the Nazi persecution, in large numbers; and

"Whereas a resolution has been presented in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America on this subject, and reads as follows:

" 'Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved, "that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected"; and

" 'Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need for a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution: Therefore be it

" '*Resolved*, That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth': Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Washington State Legislature now in special session at Olympia, Wash., hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to reaffirm the unanimous stand of the Congress in June 1922, and adopt the above-mentioned bipartisan resolution, which will bring succor to the victims of Nazi persecution by keeping the doors of Palestine wide open and enable the Jewish people to reconstitute there a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Washington; to the Committee on Immigration.

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"To the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas United States Representative RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, has introduced a bill in Congress, being H. R. 4003, which would grant full citizenship to Filipinos resident in the United States prior to May 1, 1934, upon certain conditions therein named; and

"Whereas under the present law the Filipinos are considered aliens for certain purposes but owe allegiance to the United States and by their services in the armed forces of the United States and by their services in industry and their purchase of War bonds and full cooperation in the war effort have demonstrated their patriotism, loyalty, and allegiance to the United States; and

"Whereas H. R. 4003 is intended to clarify this anomalous situation and to settle legal, racial, and marital status of resident Filipinos;

"Now, therefore, your memorialists pray that the Congress of the United States speedily pass and that the President sign H. R. 4003; be it

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States

House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Washington."

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from R. T. Harris, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Morgan County, Ala., and sundry other citizens representing counties in Alabama served by the Tennessee Valley Authority, remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called McKellar amendments relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 13, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 393. An act for the relief of William Kovatis;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 617. An act for the relief of Homer C. Chapman;

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co. against the United States;

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; and

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship-repair facilities, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1775. A bill to provide for restoring real property acquired by the United States for military purposes to the former owners thereof; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 1776. A bill for the relief of L. T. Gregory; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. TAFT introduced Senate bill 1777, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1778. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of enabling former members of the armed forces who are not covered under the old-age and survivors-insurance provisions of such act to secure coverage thereunder; to the Committee on Finance.

SMALL BUSINESS FINANCE INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and in connection therewith I request that a statement prepared by me relating to the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement presented by the Senator from Ohio will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1777) to establish a Small Business Finance Insurance Administration in the Department of Commerce, to aid in financing small business enterprises by insuring loans to and purchases of stock in such enterprises, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. TAFT in connection with the bill is as follows:

Nothing is more important for the maintenance of employment and the increase of the national income and prosperity in the post-war period than the revival and encouragement of small business enterprise. There must be a constant birth of small businesses and a constant growth of small business to big business. Unfortunately, tax requirements and other circumstances make it very difficult for new small businesses to get started. There is no longer any incentive to a wealthy man to take the risk involved. The small saver should not risk all that he has saved in one venture. I believe that the capital-gains tax should be repealed to give the man with capital the incentive to take a chance in a number of different companies. The act I am introducing is intended to make it possible to attract the money of small savers into enterprises which have an element of risk.

A number of bills have been introduced providing for Government loans to small business. I have two objections to this approach. First, I don't believe the Government ought to be in the business of making direct loans, and I think it ought to get out of that business just as soon after the war as possible. Second, the need of small business is not so much for loans, which are usually available when deserved, but for more equity capital, men who will buy stock in the concern.

The bill I am introducing proposes a Government insurance fund, similar to that of the Federal Housing Administration. It is proposed that this fund insure investment companies, registered under the Investment Company Act of 1940 and subject to S. E. C. control, against 50 percent of any loss they suffer by investing in the common stock of small business enterprises, and against 65 percent of any loss they suffer by investing in the preferred stock of such enterprises. Such stock must have been issued at least one-half to provide new capital, and, of course, each investment must be approved by the Insurance Administrator before it is insured. In the case of manufacturing companies, the preferred stock cannot be more than one-half of the total capital after the money is invested, and in the case of retail concerns it cannot be more than one-third of the total capital. The total investment in common stock cannot exceed 60 percent of the total common stock in a manufacturing concern, or 45 percent of the common stock of a retail company.

The bill also provides for insuring banks against 90 percent of the loss on capital loans to manufacturing companies, which capital loans cannot exceed 50 percent of the equity capital already invested.

Adequate premiums will be charged for the service of insurance, and it is hoped that the fund may be self-supporting.

The project would necessarily be experimental, but I hope that it may at least lead the way in providing a method by which the small savers will assist in the development of new enterprise. In the future there may be no savings except those made by men and women with limited income. We have seen recently a number of investments by insurance companies in large-scale housing projects. This is one method by which small savings in the form of life-insurance premiums assist in providing capital for a limited type of business enterprise. I hope the Federal insurance fund may do the same for the capital requirements of progressive and promising ventures in the field of manufacturing and merchandising.

TWENTY-SEVENTH MONTHLY MESSAGE TO THE PEOPLE OF JAPAN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD his twenty-seventh monthly radio message to the people of Japan, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE BEFORE CHARLESTON BRANCH, UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator KILGORE before the Charleston branch of the United Nations Association at the Thomas Jefferson Junior High School Auditorium on March 8, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR IRRESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY CHARLES A. BEARD

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Irresponsible Government" written by Charles A. Beard and published in the Progressive of March 6, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOUTHERN MILK VERSUS OLEO—ARTICLE FROM HOARD'S DAIRYMAN

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Southern Milk versus Oleo," together with an accompanying table, published in Hoard's Dairyman of September 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPETITION BETWEEN OLEOMARGARINE AND BUTTER—EDITORIAL FROM HOARD'S DAIRYMAN

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Who Cries?" published in Hoard's Dairyman of September 25, 1941, which appears in the Appendix.]

SAVE THE SOIL—STATEMENT BY JERRY EDDINGS

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Save the Soil," prepared by Jerry Eddings, a member of the Mound Valley 4-H Club, of Hominy, Okla., which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WORLD-WIDE BROADCASTING FOUNDATION—ARTICLE BY ERIC UNDERWOOD

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The World-Wide Broadcasting Foundation—A Record of Achievement," written by Eric Underwood and published in the magazine World-Wide Listener, winter issue of 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BONUS FOR VETERANS—UNEMPLOYMENT AND TAXES AFTER THE WAR

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one entitled "The Bonus Bill" and the other entitled "And Taxes After the War," published in the Washington Times-Herald, and an article published in the same newspaper entitled "Twenty-five Million Idle Seen at Post-War Peak," which appear in the Appendix.]

ARMY CAMP LIFE—ARTICLE BY PRIVATE IGOR CASSINI

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with Army camp life, written by Pvt. Igor Cassini and published in the March 7, 1944, issue of the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL PROPAGANDA

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Propaganda Plot Laid to United States Bureau," published in the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWTH OF THE AIR MAIL SERVICE—ARTICLE FROM THE POSTMASTERS' ADVOCATE

[Mr. GREEN (for Mr. MEAD) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Amazing Growth of the Air Mail Service," published in the February 1944 issue of the Postmasters' Advocate, which appears in the Appendix.]

LETTER FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL TO WASHINGTON COLLECTORS' CLUB

[Mr. GREEN (for Mr. MEAD) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Postmaster General Walker to Mr. William M. Stuart, vice president of the Collectors' Club, Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR EXPORT LUMBER PROBLEMS—STATEMENT BY CHARLES E. DANT

[Mr. HOLMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Charles E. Dant Answers Some Questions and Expresses His Opinion on Various Phases of Post-War Export Lumber Problems," which appears in the Appendix.]

STUDIES OF FOREIGN TRADE AND FOREIGN-TRADE POLICY

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Joint Inquiry," published in the Washington Post of March 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONOPOLIES AND CARTELS—EXTRACT FROM PROCEEDINGS OF THE BRITISH PARLIAMENT

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from Hansard, the official report of proceedings of the British Parliament, of January 25, 1944, dealing with the subject of monopolies and cartels, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHRISTIAN SERVICE—STATEMENT BY HARRY G. HOGAN

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a leaflet entitled "Christian Service," by Harry G. Hogan, general warden, Fort Wayne (Ind.) Civilian Defense, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Revercomb
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Stewart
Brewster	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Kilgore	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	McKellar	Weeks
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	
George	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in this morning's Baltimore Sun there appears an editorial entitled "Congress Debates the Newest Service Vote Bill." The editorial is not long. It is very illuminating, and in my opinion presents most cogently the meat of the whole controversy. I ask that the editorial be read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

CONGRESS DEBATES THE NEWEST SERVICE VOTE BILL

After protracted debates in the conference committee, the Federal service vote bill has at last been reported out and is now being considered in the Senate.

The President's friends are said to feel that the test of the new bill is whether it would increase or decrease the number of servicemen's votes. That is to say, if they decide that the Federal voting law of 1942, already on the books, would enable more servicemen to vote than would the new Federal law, they will try to beat the new law.

But if that indeed is to be the criterion, then the new Federal bill is pretty likely to win. Pass over the point that only the new bill provides a supplementary Federal ballot (subject to State approval) for men who do not receive State ballots. Remember that the law of 1942 now on the books attempts to supersede State control of the eligibility of voters and, so, of the validity of votes cast. But, whatever the Federal law, many States will continue to resist any Federal vote program that tries to dodge around them.

This they will do under the clear provisions of the Federal Constitution. This such a State as Maryland, governed by a Democratic administration, has already done in the opinion of Attorney General Walsh which held over a year ago that the Federal law of 1942 was invalid and could not be enforced in Maryland insofar as it flouted Maryland's control over the registration of voters.

Now, it is conceivable that some States under supine officers, or under officers genuinely of the belief that the present Federal law is valid, might permit that law to supersede their States' control of the ballot. But that is much less likely now after the prolonged and detailed debate of the last few months.

For the long debate has aroused State sensibilities. It has encouraged wavering State officials to assert their old prerogatives. It has impelled many States, including Maryland, to pass legislation specifically to protect their constitutional rights. Let us remember, finally, that 26 States now have Republican Governors. Among these 26, surely, Mr. Roosevelt could expect little cooperation in any constitutionally dubious plan of voting.

The choice, then, would seem to be between a bill acceding to the rights of an aroused union of States and a statute already on the books flouting these rights. It should not be difficult to guess which law would result in the larger number of votes being cast. Certainly, there is little doubt under which law the larger number of votes would be judged valid by dutiful State election officers, who have the say on that issue.

And that, after all, is the real point of the whole debate. The feverish centralizers have stressed votes cast, without much attention to whether the votes so cast would be counted as valid or not. The States' rights people in the debate have wanted the maximum number of votes cast and they have wanted all the votes cast to be valid. Servicemen themselves will have little difficulty in detecting in which camp their true friends are to be found.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to read into the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of this morning entitled "The Soldier Loses":

THE SOLDIER LOSES

According to Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, the measure which he presented to his colleagues yesterday as the conference compro-

mise on the soldier-vote proposals "represents the best possible bill that can be secured." But a better plan, and one thoroughly consistent with constitutional requirements, would have been to assure every soldier overseas the right at least to vote for Federal office, with the States to determine according to their own records and standards the validity of such ballots.

Under the provisions of the present bill, the service men and women overseas will receive Federal ballots only if their State governments have certified by July 15 that such ballots will be acceptable for counting. If the States do not take this action, the soldiers will have to depend on what provisions each State has made or will make. The Army and Navy Departments have warned that because of the time factor they cannot promise to get State ballots to the service men and women, even where provisions for them have been made. Those farthest from home, those facing the greatest dangers, will be the least likely to get a vote. Those in or near the United States will have a better opportunity, in case their States have a workable system of absentee voting.

The debate has shown that this is no longer an issue of States' rights. After starting off on the wrong foot, and stretching Federal authority too far, the proponents of the Green-Lucas measure were willing to leave it to the States to decide whether or not Federal service ballots for national offices should be counted. They were willing to do what could be done to get separate ballots fo. State and local offices to the service men and women, if such ballots were made available. What they asked was a simple and uniform mechanism—the only kind that will do the job—for obtaining the voting preferences of absent service people and presenting such preferences to the home election boards.

This is still what they ask. Anything less is an injustice to the very men and women whom we most profess to honor. In Italy, in the South Seas our fighters are doing their duty under circumstances whose horrors we can hardly even imagine. In Britain hundreds of thousands of American soldiers are waiting the word to attempt the most hazardous military adventure in all history. Many thousands of young Americans won't vote this fall, or ever. By what reasoning can any Senator or Congressman justify refusal or delay in the cases of those who still survive?

Mr. President, I shudder at the thought that the Congress should expect the officers in charge of our armed forces to understand the complex and complicated bill which has come from conference. I despair that the rank and file of our fighting men will ever be able to comprehend it. I am afraid that when they start studying it they will become disgusted and will feel that the Congress has let them down. I say this without in any way impugning the motives or questioning the sincerity of the members of the conference committee who brought forth this compromise proposal. I simply do not think it is workable or practicable unless we can find a way to call off the war for a month or two so that our soldiers can go to voting school.

REPORT OF W M. GARRARD ON THE NEW YORK COTTON EXCHANGE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a report to the directors of the Staple Cotton Cooperative Association, which is one of the greatest farmer cooperatives in the United States, by its general manager, Hon. W. M. Garrard, of Greenwood, Miss. In his report Mr. Garrard states that the New York Cotton Exchange has ceased to perform its functions; he attacks futures contracts and the rules and regulations of the New York Cotton Exchange relative to such contracts, and charges a dereliction of the New York Cotton Exchange that is detrimental to the cotton farmer and to the cotton trade. He advocates that the New York Cotton Exchange be suspended unless corrective measures are taken. I read Mr. Garrard's statement, which is self-explanatory:

Has the New York Cotton Exchange ceased to function legitimately? In other words, does the New York Cotton Exchange offer a price insurance contract that can be used by the cotton trade as a hedge for shippers in the conduct of cotton merchandising, and does the contract furnish price insurance to the mill against cotton bought by the mill to be used subsequently in manufacturing?

This question is being asked in various forms by practically everyone connected with the cotton trade. In our many years of experience in cotton merchandising, there have been but few times when there has been as much criticism of the New York Cotton Exchange contract as there is today, and in our opinion this criticism is based on sound reasoning.

According to the present New York Cotton Exchange quotations, cotton for delivery on the March contract is valued at approximately $9 a bale more than the value of the same cotton if held and delivered on contract next December, and yet it will cost approximately 10 points per month to carry the cotton from March to December, 9 months, or 90 points, or $4.50 per bale. This does not take into account the normal loss in weight that will occur in carrying cotton this length of time.

It cannot be argued with any degree of soundness that anticipation of peace, or fear of world prices becoming operative, is the reason for the disparity between the present price of cotton and the price indicated by the New York futures contract as the value of cotton next December. It is a known fact that a tremendous need for cotton goods has been built up for civilian use, and even though all Government contracts were canceled, it would take at least 1 or 2 years, with mills working full time, to supply the requirements of civilian needs. Consequently, it cannot be argued that cancelation of Government contracts is a sound reason for apprehension on the part of the trade that mills will not use cotton for the next year or 2 on a full-time operating basis. Neither can it be argued with any degree of soundness that world prices will become operative, and thereby depress the price of cotton, for the fact is that next year's Government loan guarantees a price for cotton to the domestic producer even higher than the guaranteed price this year. It is reasonable to anticipate a loan price next year of approximately 20 cents per pound, which is considerably above the base loan value this year.

The cotton owned outright by the Government is of inferior quality and, to a large degree, is not competitive with the desirable cotton held by interests other than the Government. Much of the Government cotton, if offered for delivery on contract, would not meet the requirements of the contract.

In the light of the foregoing facts, we ask the question: Why, according to New York Cotton Exchange quoted values, is cotton worth less each succeeding month from March on through to December? Why does the New York Cotton Exchange value March cotton at 45 points, or $2.25 per bale, more than the same cotton will be worth in May, 2 months hence? Why does the New York Cotton Exchange value May cotton at 60 points more than the value of the same cotton 2 months later, in July?

Under such valuation, there is no way for the cotton merchant or mill to buy cotton and secure a legitimate hedge in the New York contract market. It has been argued from time to time, when investigations were held, that the New York contract was a price insurance contract, that it was not a spot cotton contract, that it was never intended to be. To this we agree. That is not true of the Liverpool market, which in operation offers a spot cotton contract, and this very fact, when the Liverpool market is in operation, has gone a long way toward stabilizing and, we might say, legitimatizing the New York contract.

If the New York contract is not a spot contract, but is supposed to be a price insurance contract, and if it does not offer price insurance to the trade, then we ask, why should not the New York Cotton Exchange be suspended until such time as its rules and regulations are amended to assure the cotton trade that it will have a legitimate price insurance contract? We all recognize the need of the Cotton Exchange services, when offered to the trade on a legitimate and protective basis. We hardly see how the cotton trade could operate on a broad basis without a price insurance contract being offered either by a cotton exchange or by some other organization or agency that would give to the operator legitimate protection in the merchandising and manufacturing of cotton.

However, we see little need for the New York Cotton Exchange as it is operating today, when it does not offer the trade any protection, and when instead of offering price insurance it only offers price destruction. There is an old saying, and a very true one, that the royal road to ruin is to hedge cotton in discounts. With the present inverted contracts, and the inversion being extreme, there is no hedge for the merchant or the mill. Naturally, without a hedge, the volume of business and the normal flow of cotton from producer to mill is restricted. Instead of having a free and a broad market for the producer, he is faced with a congestion that forces him to sell his cotton for less than it is worth, according to the New York March, or spot month, quotation; for no shipper can afford to buy on the near month and sell on the distant month. It is the exception when you find a mill that will buy on the near month, when the distant months are at heavy discounts. It has been our observation that during periods of an inverted market, the quotation for spots in the southern markets follows the quotation for the near month in New York, and not that the near month on the contract market is based on spot quotations In an extreme situation, such as exists today, with heavy discounts in the distant months, the southern spot quotations are to all practical purposes nominal quotations. This is confirmed by the falling off in sales in all southern spot markets for the past 2 weeks, since the extreme premium that has existed for the March option over the May and subsequent months.

I want to quote here from a letter I received under date of March 6, 1944, from an outstanding executive of one of the largest mill groups in America:

"It is my understanding that a big house must show that they have a short interest in spots in both March and May, in order to have the right to carry this long interest which they have in futures. I am inclined to believe that this short interest is premeditated and is done on purpose, because they sold some of the stock which they had on hand anywhere from 50 to 100 points less than competition was offering the same cotton, so as to create as much short interest as possible. I also understand that they

hooked as many mills as possible, by selling them cotton for forward shipment at a cheap basis, and I also understand again that they are at the present time offering cotton much cheaper than any other shippers. Of course, you understand that whenever they sold a mill, say, 1,000 bales, based on March or May, they immediately doubled up on their contracts by telling the mill to buy an equal amount of either March or May, and then they bought for themselves the near month and sold the distant month.

"Now, all of this has brought about a condition where the future market in New York has ceased to function, and all of the shippers and mills are just doing nothing. No one wants to buy any cotton with July selling sixty-odd points less than May, when delivery day on May is nearly 2 months in the future. It may not be so bad with the mills, excepting, of course, those that have cotton purchased on call, but it is very bad on the cotton trade as a whole because they have an enormous expense and are unable to do any business. All of this seems to have been brought on by a firm that, it looks like, deliberately planned and executed a squeeze; and I was just wondering if the cotton trade is going to sit idly by and allow such things as this to happen."

I have checked with other important mill executives, and they are equally positive in their statements that the New York Cotton Exchange has ceased to function as an organization that offers to the trade a legitimate and sound price-insurance contract.

Now, unless the New York Cotton Exchange, of its own volition, adopts corrective measures so that the Exchange will function for the benefit of the trade as a whole, and not for the benefit of a few, then, in our opinion, the time has come when the S. E. C. should suspend trading on the exchange. We should dislike very much to see this become necessary, for, as stated before, the New York Cotton Exchange can and should be of inestimable benefit to the cotton trade as a whole. If it is operated for the benefit of the trade as a whole, then it performs a vital function in the movement of cotton from the farm to the mill, but unless it does perform a legitimate and sound function, there is, as we see it, no justification or excuse for its existence.

Mr. President, I personally know Hon. W. M. Garrard. He is one of the most eminent and competent men in the American cotton trade. As I have stated, he is general manager of one of the great farmer cooperatives, probably the most successful farmer cooperative in the United States. Mr. Garrard does not go off half-cocked.

Upon receiving a copy of this report I telephoned the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission, who informed me that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the commodity exchanges, and no jurisdiction over the New York Cotton Exchange. This jurisdiction is lodged in one of the bureaus of the Department of Agriculture. I have placed this report in the hands of a high official of that bureau. He has assured me that the bureau will immediately investigate the situation to see if certain big interests are violating the law. However, he also tells me that the facilities of his bureau for investigation are very limited.

Mr. President, these are grave charges and are based upon sound reason. They set forth that in the belief of the cotton trade, through the New York Cotton Exchange, the cotton market is today being rigged by certain important interests. Because of it the cotton grower must sell his cotton for less than it is worth. The cotton merchant and the cotton mill cannot protect their purchases of cotton. The cotton trade is stagnant, and the cotton farmer is the loser. According to eminent men engaged in the cotton trade, the New York Cotton Exchange has ceased to perform a useful function, all because certain big interests are rigging the market and prostituting the legitimate functions of the New York Cotton Exchange for private gain. Those interests are depriving the cotton farmer of the real value of his product.

Mr. President, I call this matter to the attention of the Senate and of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senate itself should investigate these charges. This is an extremely serious matter. It is our high duty to protect the cotton grower and the legitimate cotton trade. The facts must be ascertained by the Congress. If this is being done within the law, then legislation is needed to correct the situation and to prevent its recurrence. After an investigation we shall have the facts on which to legislate so as to make the recurrence of this condition impossible.

I thoroughly agree with the letter which Mr. Garrard wrote to me under date of March 11, 1944, in which he stated:

> In my opinion the New York Cotton Exchange performs a necessary function when and if regulatory measures are adopted which will prohibit the rigging of the market by certain important interests.

I request the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to undertake this investigation immediately. If necessary, I shall offer a resolution providing for an investigation.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I shall speak for a short time today on the subject before the Senate, which is the conference report on the so-called soldiers' vote bill. I have slight hope that anything I may say will affect the vote in this Chamber, but I shall speak with the idea that there will be a record of the position which I have taken with regard to the bill which, to my mind, has at this time more implications than merely the vote of the soldiers, although that is of tremendous importance.

I am one of those who do not believe in a restricted franchise. The first great advocate in this country of the restricted franchise was Thaddeus Stevens. I am one of those who believe that in order for democracy to survive there must be a vote by those who have the sovereignty of the Nation. Certainly, if our theory of government is correct, there must be a vote by the real sovereigns and a determination by them.

Because of world conditions over which our soldiers, sailors, and marines have no control, they are not now able to vote. They have been placed where they cannot exercise their voting rights. We sometimes have used the expression, "the right to vote." I think I have used it myself, and yet the right to vote is not what we are struggling for here. The servicemen have a right to vote. The question is whether they shall have the opportunity to vote.

Yesterday it came to my attention that there was being held in Washington a meeting of Republican women of the United States, and I noted that they made the statement that the Democrats were trying to play politics with the soldiers' vote bill. I do not know that that is true. It is the first time I have ever heard it said that we cannot advocate citizens having an opportunity to vote without being accused of being partisan in our voting, or in our operations.

I have before me the editorial section of the New York Times of last Sunday. I find in it the following statement:

> Behind the trouble in arriving at a simple voting system for servicemen most observers saw a struggle for partisan advantage. President Roosevelt and other administration leaders, confident that the soldiers would vote for their Commander in Chief, have fought for the widest possible soldier participation in the election.

I do not particularly appreciate the implication that I would not favor soldiers voting if I thought it was a disadvantage to my party. I am one of those who believe that it is an advantage to the Government of the United States for its citizens to express themselves. The implication contained in this editorial is that the President and Democratic Senators have only one thing in mind, namely, benefit to their party. I do not think that that is a fair implication. I resent it, and I appeal to the common sense of the American people on that question. We are not giving the soldiers any right which they do not have. We are giving them merely an opportunity to vote if the Federal ballot bill shall pass.

At the outset let me say that there is absolutely no rivalry or competition between the so-called Federal ballot and the State ballot laws, because the bill, as it passed the Senate, provided that if a person should vote both the Federal ballot and the State ballot, only the State ballot should be counted. Therefore, a person could very easily and consistently favor both a Federal ballot and a State ballot.

Mr. President, I wish to read the remainder of the editorial to which I have referred, which will be found in the editorial section of the New York Times,

because it has reference to another phase of the subject. It reads as follows:

The Republicans, some of whom have frankly expressed their fear that the servicemen would vote Democratic, have taken up a constitutional position in favor of the State ballots. They have been supported in many instances by southern Democrats fearful that a wide soldier vote might endanger traditional voting restrictions in their areas.

The first question which comes to my mind is, How would that help this particular situation? If, as we are told by the advocates of the so-called State plan, everyone would have a chance to vote for the President, for Senators, and for Representatives, then what difference would it make if there were a Federal ballot if, by that means, a few more persons would have the opportunity to vote? We are told by this editorial that the Republicans favor the so-called State system because the Federal ballot would permit persons to vote who would vote for President Roosevelt. If there is anything in that assumption at all it means that they are not in favor of any State ballot which would permit voting for President, Senators, or Representatives from a particular district. There is no consistency in the contention that they favor a State ballot, which would also permit voting for Presidential and congressional nominees, and at the same time oppose a bill which would permit voting for Presidential and congressional nominees. So I am compelled to conclude that there are those on the Republican side who favor a limitation of the franchise. Those who have accused our southern friends of limiting the franchise by the poll tax and otherwise will have to remember that they were the ones who taught the South to limit the franchise when they refused to let any of the respectable people of the South vote.

Some Republicans who have frankly expressed their fear that the servicemen would vote Democratic have taken up a constitutional position in favor of the State ballot. In other words, they resort to the constitutional argument because they fear that if those in the armed services vote they may vote for the present President of the United States. This is a serious problem when we think that from one-fifth to one-fourth, and perhaps a full fourth, of the voters of the United States who are likely to exercise their right of franchise are among the armed forces.

Do we or do we not assume any obligation to give them an opportunity to vote when we take the boys from the places where they could vote? I want to remind our friends who have taken the position as to the State ballot that it was not the State that took the boys away from home; it was not the State which was responsible for this war; it was not the State that assumed the responsibility for the defense of the Nation and sending our boys into foreign countries where they have never been before in large number. New situations have arisen.

The final paragraph of this editorial comment is:

They have been supported in many instances by southern Democrats fearful that a wide soldier vote might endanger traditional voting restrictions in their areas.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] stated bluntly just what was bothering his school of thought. He said that if the President would withdraw his name and let it be known that he would not be a candidate for President the opposition to this bill would cease in 30 minutes. That shows how much consistency there is in the idea that it is a constitutional question.

This argument should not be used against all Republicans. I was looking at the vote on the final passage of the bill in the Senate, and I find that 10 outstanding Republicans and 1 outstanding and the only Progressive in the Senate supported the bill. So there are two schools of thought among Republicans as well as two schools of thought among Democrats, because there were 11 Republicans and Progressives and 36 Democrats who supported that bill; and, on the other hand, there were 16 Democrats, 15 of them were from the South and 1 from the North, who voted against the bill and there were 22 Republicans who voted against it.

This writer comments on the position of those Democrats in the South:

They have been supported in many instances by southern Democrats, fearful that a wide soldier vote might endanger traditional voting restrictions in their areas.

I think that it is wrong, no matter which party advocates it, to favor a restricted vote. We do not know just who will be restricted next. As I suggested at the beginning of my remarks, the first great restriction on voting by arbitrary power was at the conclusion of the Civil War, when the population of the South—at least, the white population of the South—was prevented from exercising their right as citizens of the United States. At that time the results did not exactly justify the means.

I think that both Republicans and Democrats who favored this bill did so without any idea as to whether it would benefit their party or the opposition party. When I recall such stalwarts as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] agreeing exactly on a bill, I cannot think that they were working as partisans; they were working as American citizens.

Now, let us look at the bill which has come back to the Senate in the conference report. There are in section 302 three possible classes of persons who might benefit or who might be able to vote: First, members of the armed forces outside the United States; second, persons serving with the American Red Cross and other auxiliary organizations who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States; and, third, members of the armed forces inside the United States.

Now, let us look at that. That is divided first into two parts.

(1) An individual referred to in paragraph (1)—

That is those serving outside the United States—

(2), or (3)—

That is members of the Red Cross and other auxiliary organizations and those serving inside the United States—

of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (B) that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State.

If there is such a State I have never heard of it—a State that has not provided for any State ballot and yet has provided for a Federal ballot, and this particular Federal ballot.

(B) That the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State.

In other words, it provides simply that there must be a certificate of the Governor of a State at a time mentioned before July 15 that such State has made no provision and yet that the Federal ballot, provided, this particular Federal ballot, is authorized by the law of that State. I do not think there is a Governor in the United States who could honestly make such a certificate, and I do not believe there will be one when July 15 arrives. That is one of the reasons why we find an editorial such as this in the Philadelphia Record, dated February 27 to March 14, a consolidation of editorials; but it is pretty interesting:

America's fighting men have been double-crossed and sold down the Potomac.

The Record urges President Roosevelt to veto the alleged "Federal ballot" compromise.

The bill as finally agreed upon by Senate and House conferees is not a compromise at all; it is a fraud. It leads servicemen to believe their right to vote has been safeguarded; actually, it is so cleverly contrived that millions of soldiers never will be permitted to exercise that right.

Better to deny our soldiers and sailors a Federal ballot openly than to cheat them with a phony.

About the only provision not included in this compromise is one requiring the serviceman to stand on his head while he marks the ballot with his left foot. Lucky he'll be if he ever sees a Federal ballot, for the compromise is so hedged about with ifs, buts, and complications to make that unlikely.

There are three swindles in this bill.

Swindle No. 1: Use of the Federal ballot would be restricted to men who had applied for a State ballot, and who could take an oath that they had not received any by October 1.

Swindle No. 2: Even a man who survived the hurdles of swindle No. 1 would be denied the vote unless the Governor of his home State certified, by August 1—

The copy which I have, and I suppose it is the right one, though I have several here, says July 15. The editorial in the Record says August 1.

that the Federal ballot would be acceptable under State law.

Swindle No. 3: No member of the armed forces stationed in the United States can vote a Federal ballot under any circumstances.

I think that is true, because I think under the first paragraph no Governor can honestly and truthfully make such a certificate.

IT'S A DOUBLE-SLICKIE

What makes this compromise a double-slickie is that it gives secretly hostile Governors a chance to make fine speeches, with no assurance their words will mean a thing.

For this bill makes State constitutionality the new obstacle to soldiers' voting.

Governor Dewey already has said the plan would require a constitutional amendment to permit New York servicemen to use a Federal ballot.

We were told yesterday, as I recall, that about one-tenth of the armed forces of the Nation would be refused the franchise, coming, as they do, from the State of New York, because in that State there is not a constitutional provision.

The same cry can and undoubtedly will be raised in many other States.

Still another hurdle resulting from this compromise will occur where Governors might certify the Federal ballot, and even when such ballots are actually cast.

It takes little imagination to forecast taxpayers' suits, filed by obscure G. O. P. obstructionists, aimed to invalidate soldier votes on the ground that such and such a Governor exceeded his power when he certified the Federal ballot.

In other words, if any person ever voted a Federal ballot in any of the 48 States it would raise a question, of course, as to whether the State law permitted a Federal ballot at all.

From all this you can figure how many soldier votes are likely ever to be counted.

First, this compromise bill screens out the votes of all men stationed in this country.

Those are screened out at the start, because of paragraph No. 1, which I have read.

Second, it throws out all votes cast overseas unless the Governor of the voter's State has certified that they will be counted.

Third, it opens wide the way to invalidation of the rest by inviting suits to throw the ballots out on State constitutional grounds.

That's why we urge a Presidential veto.

If Congress wants to let the soldiers vote it can do so under the plan proposed by President Roosevelt. A Federal ballot with no ifs and buts.

When those men are fighting for our lives it is no time to hand them this cheap counterfeit of democratic process turned out by one of the weakest Congresses in our history.

I do not know about that, Mr. President. It is suggested that it is only because we constitute a weak Congress that we produce any such bill as this. I think it is because we approach the subject, as this editorial writer in the New York Times has said, from three or four different standpoints. "If we want the soldier to vote" is one position. According to this writer, the Democratic Party wants them to vote for purely selfish reasons.

Let us look at subdivision (2) of subsection (b) on page 6 of the conference report, and find who this ballot is for. It certainly does not find anybody in the first paragraph.

(2) An individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15—

Mind you, a date is inserted so that the Governor has to make his certificate at a particular time, or prior to a particular time, or he cannot make it at all, or, if he does, it has no effect.

Whose Governor has certified prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State, even though the Governor thereof does not make the certification referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (1).

Why he should have made the certification referred to in clause (A) if he is making this one is not plain. It could not possibly be made by the same Governor, as I see it.

But only if such individual States in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made application for a State absentee ballot but as of October 1 has not received it.

I sat here yesterday and listened to the debate. I did not ask a question and did not make an interruption, but I listened to Senators who are lawyers and have made their fortunes and their reputations and their livings by practicing law, and I heard them disagree as to sentence after sentence. Some of the best lawyers seem to be the most confused; and I think that is the situation. I think if a person had no knowledge of law, he would simply say, "I don't know anything about it. What does it mean?" And he then goes to his lawyer, but the lawyers, the advocates of the bill, the writers of the bill, did not know what subdivision (2) meant. That became so apparent from the questions asked and the attempts which were made to answer, that one wondered if the question had not been studied by experts and phraseology drafted for the purpose of preventing soldiers from voting. Mr. President, I believe that is what it amounts to, and I suggest to those who are responsible for the measure now before the Senate that, instead of calling it a bill for the purpose of facilitating voting, it be given a new name and called "A bill to prevent men in the armed forces from voting."

The Senator who presented the report on the floor said he resented any implication that any individual will be disfranchised under the provisions of the measure. Well, he will find that there will be more than implications with respect to disfranchisement. Anyone who can understand what the measure means should be a law professor or in an insane asylum—I do not know which.

Mr. JACKSON. Perhaps both.

Mr. TUNNELL. Perhaps both is suggested.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] yesterday said he could not understand how anyone could imagine that a Governor would not issue the required certificate. I think the Senator was telling the truth. The Senator from Vermont is so sincere, so honorable, that when he makes such a statement I think he does not understand the implications of the measure. I do not think he understands the purpose of all the chicanery which is hidden in the language of the conference report.

Let us see what must be done under paragraph (2). First the Governor must certify before July 15. Why it would not do for the Governor to certify before the 16th I do not know, except that by making it the 15th it would result in shutting out a few more individuals, disfranchise a few more soldiers. That would result in keeping a few more individuals from having the right to vote, as the Democrats say, for President Roosevelt, and as the Republicans say, it will prevent such a possibility. So from both standpoints apparently the object seems to be to keep President Roosevelt from receiving votes. Those who have that idea may be wrong. I do not know. The soldier boys may use their opportunities to vote against certain individuals. That is often done. The American people often vote against those they know best. At any rate, the Governor, if he is willing, as was suggested in the Philadelphia Record editorial, will make certificate that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State. Is there a Governor in the United States who could today rightfully say that this ballot is authorized in his State? I do not know. There certainly are not many Governors who could say so. But suppose a Governor should make such a statement. I wonder by what right, as the Senator from Michigan said yesterday, the Governor of a State becomes the chief judicial officer to determine what can or cannot be done, or what laws can or cannot be used? I wonder by what right the Governor of a State, who frequently is not even a lawyer, may certify?

Let us see what it is proposed that the Governor shall certify? He shall certify "that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State." The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who both favor the Federal ballot law, and who are both eminent lawyers, disagree as to what that language means.

It is just possible that some Governor might make such a certificate. Apparently, it has been felt that it will never do to leave that up to the Governor. Some Governor might forget and might make the certificate, and President Roosevelt might receive another vote or another hundred votes. Therefore something else must be inserted in the bill. Let us see what it says:

But only if such individual states in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made aplication for a State absentee ballot, but as of October 1, has not received it.

In other words, there must be a condition that was not expected at all in order to be able to get hold of a Federal ballot. After the Governor has made the certificate it must develop that the individual tried away back before September 1 to obtain a State ballot and had not been able to do so. That is what, as I understand, is called in golf a hazard. That is hazard No. 10 or No. 15.

But that, Mr. President was not enough. Someone might have been able to vote under that provision. So such a thing must certainly be prevented, because the bill is a State ballot bill, and no one must be allowed to vote under the Federal ballot bill. The so-called Green-Lucas bill must not only be killed, but an individual must not be permitted

to vote under any Federal bill unless he makes certain statements under oath.

The individual might send for a ballot, but not receive it. The individual might not make a statement with respect to it in his oath. He may forget to make the statement. The individual cannot get one of the Federal ballots unless he swears that he made application for a State ballot prior to September 1 and that the ballot had not reached him by October 1.

Mr. President, who will go around and tell the boys from the United States in north Africa, in Italy, in the various camps in the United States, that, according to the laws of their States, application must be filed before September 1 or they can never receive the Federal ballot. But one of the nicest tricks of the whole thing is that no individual can obtain his Federal ballot before October 1.

All sorts of hazards have been placed before the service men and women so they cannot get a chance to vote. This is the last one. If the individual does not file the application before September 1, or if he files it before September 1 and a statement to that effect is not made in his oath, he cannot receive a Federal ballot. If he makes the statement in his oath and he receives the State ballot on October 1, then the ballot must reach his election officers by the November election. Of course, it is not intended that he should ever receive the ballot. The editorial which I read from the New York Times gives us the reasons for it.

Mr. President, I think the time will come when the boys who are now overseas are going to examine the list of Members of Congress to ascertain how they voted. I think they are entitled to do so. Senators from States whose people believe in restricted voting can continue such voting if they pass this measure, which apparently they will be able to do.

Mr. President, I have heard many say, "The boys do not want to vote. They are not interested in the vote." I do not know about that, but I know that America is interested in their voting, whether the boys are interested or not. America needs their vote. They are entitled to the vote, and they are entitled to have all this chicanery swept out of the bill.

The Senator from Mississippi was perfectly frank when he introduced the bill. His position cannot be criticized. He has his own problem. He said the bill is one to maintain white supremacy. I desire to remind him and all those who think with him and who live with him that he is in bad company, when the Senators from the southern part of the Nation, who are interested in white supremacy, tie themselves up with and vote with the party of Thad Stevens, who was not interested in white supremacy, and who practiced what he preached.

That is the situation facing us. Let us see how a restricted franchise has worked. Under the provisions of the conference report, soldiers cannot vote at all under paragraph (1). The probability of their ever voting under paragraph (2) is very limited.

Let us examine the State vote in 1868. We find that Alabama voted for Grant, that Arkansas voted for Grant, that Florida voted for Grant, that Georgia voted for Seymour, that North Carolina voted for Grant, that South Carolina voted for Grant. Tennessee voted for Grant. Texas was not counted at all. Virginia was not counted; Mississippi was not counted. That is what came from a restricted franchise.

Let us see how that was followed up. Today we hear a great deal about constitutional government and States' rights. After the assassination of President Lincoln the country found itself with a strong Congress, a Congress led by Thaddeus Stevens, if a man who was as incapacitated as he was can be called a leader. We find that Congress decided it would get rid of the Tennessee Democrat who was in the White House. There could not have been in the Senate of the United States such a majority as there was if there had not been a restricted franchise. That is what gave Thaddeus Stevens his power. That is why we find that situation. The good citizens of the States I have named—Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Mississippi—were prevented from voting.

Let us see how the restricted franchise worked later. In 1872 conditions were continuing much the same. Alabama voted for Grant, Arkansas voted for Grant. Florida voted six votes for Brown and three votes for Greeley, but the House of Representatives by resolution simply would not count the votes for Greeley. Georgia voted for Grant, North Carolina voted for Grant, South Carolina voted for Hendricks. Tennessee voted for Hendricks. Texas voted eight votes for Hendricks. Virginia and Mississippi were counted for Grant. That was a restricted franchise. The country had a restricted franchise, and a strong Congress.

Today we are told that the President of the United States is assuming too much power, that we are getting away from constitutional government. What do we accomplish when we take the boys away from their homes, refuse to let them vote, and set all these traps to prevent their being able to vote at the coming election? Of course, I have my preference about who shall be elected, but I am now referring to the right to have an opportunity to vote. I am in favor of a proper soldiers' vote bill; I would be in favor of any bill which would give the members of the armed forces an opportunity to exercise their right of franchise.

Within a few weeks or a few days we shall have the great poll-tax question brought up in the Senate, so we are told. Then, again, we shall hear much about constitutional government and States' rights. Let us be consistent; let us either get on the side of those who are in favor of States' rights or on the side of those who are opposed to States' rights. The States I have just named did not even have a respectable organization to put their votes in the Grant column. They were simply counted in the Grant column by the scalawag votes, the carpetbagger votes, the votes which were put in the ballot box by reason of soldier supervision. We had that situation in my own State of Delaware.

Let us consider the election in 1876. That was another great year. First there had been the attempt to get rid of the President because the Congress disagreed with him politically. Then there was the reconstruction period when the respectable people of the South were treated like so many dogs, when their property was promised to those who formerly had been their servants. In 1876 those States again had a right to vote. Alabama voted for Tilden, Arkansas voted for Tilden. They had gotten away from Grant; the citizens were voting. Georgia voted for Tilden, Mississippi voted for Tilden, North Carolina voted for Tilden, Tennessee voted for Tilden, Texas voted for Tilden; Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina also voted for Tilden. Those who so lamented the prospect of having a Democratic President who would be strong, those who favored counting in the man they wanted, said, "We will restrict the franchise of those States; we will count out a certain number." So they counted Florida for Hayes, Louisiana for Hayes, and South Carolina for Hayes.

Mr. President, that is the party with which southern Senators are being lined up—the party which stole the votes of three States in order to cheat the United States out of its lawfully elected President in 1876.

Today they have turned around, and they tell us they want constitutional government and States' rights, and they line up with those who, according to the editorial I read, do not even want our soldiers to vote.

Let us see what happened after the Tilden-Hayes steal, in connection with which three members of the Supreme Court, three Members of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives were used as willing servants. I remember that as a boy I heard much about the Force bill. Our southern friends were wild about the Force bill. By whom was it introduced? By the same man who was able to defeat President Wilson in his attempt to assure world peace. It may be possible, by disfranchising some of our voters, to retire every northern Democrat from the Senate. I can conceive how that might be done. I do not know how far our opponents are going, but if they continue they will have more than the Force bill. They will suffer more than we as individuals.

The objection was made that it was unthinkable that soldiers should be placed at the polls in order to carry elections for a particular party; and yet that was done by the party which now protests that we are about to lose our liberty. Yesterday the newspapers carried a statement by the Senator from Ohio to the effect that fourth term would mean the loss of more liberty. Liberty for whom? Not the type of freebooters who were in charge of the Government during reconstruction days.

Not even those who were of no value to the country in 1932. They say they want more freedom, and less liberty removed. If one watches the Senator from Ohio in his attitude toward a Federal vote bill he knows what the objective of those who oppose it must be. If a Senator is from the North, the objective is one thing; and if he is from the South, there is a different objective. However, both objectives mean a restriction of voting among those who are entitled to vote.

In 1940 I took a trip to the Middle West. As I went from Detroit to Philadelphia I saw the trees, fences, and houses plastered with pictures of the man whom our friends across the aisle do not wish to look at now. I saw pictures of Wendell Willkie everywhere. We are told that there was raised for that campaign between $30,000,000 and $50,000,000 to corrupt the electorate of this Nation and place pictures of Wendell Willkie on the fence boards of the Nation. He got a lot of advertising out of it, and he is still using that advertising. It did not work in 1940. No doubt it had some effect. I know it did in my State. It had its effect in placing Wendell Willkie in a position where today he is a power. I have never heard that he favored keeping the boys in the armed services from voting. He may have committed a great many sins, and I am not his attorney, but I have not yet heard that charge made against him.

It did not work in 1940. Now it is proposed to pass a bill which will perhaps accomplish the same result. I realize that Senators from the South are not doing it for that purpose. With one exception, the position of every Senator has been explained. If the boys are not to have an opportunity to vote, do not fool them. Let this bill be killed, and let them know that the Senate does not favor giving the boys an opportunity to vote; that we are afraid as to whom they will vote for; we are alarmed that the result may be to produce votes for someone whom we do not want elected. As proof, consider the statement of the Senator from Oregon that if the President of the United States were to announce that he would not be a candidate the opposition to the bill would end in 30 minutes. Constitutional government, States' rights, and white supremacy would all go out the window if we could only be assured that the President of the United States would not be a candidate.

Much can be said on a subject of this sort. It has been pretty well exhausted. The tendency today toward the restriction of the ballot is a thing to be regretted, far beyond the election or its effect upon any particular candidates. If this Government is to be conducted, and its officers are to be elected, by a portion of the voters, that is to be regretted.

I have read the figures from three campaigns—1868, 1872, and 1876—in order that Senators may realize what the result of a restricted franchise may be. It may be that you and I will fall into some prohibited class by the time of the next election. The idea of constitutional government as conceived by our opponents is such a peculiar one that I do not know who may be in the prohibited class in 4 more years.

I do not know whether we are going backward to the days of 1872-76, or whether we are going forward. I do not know what the purpose of those who have charge of this movement may be. However, the same interests which controlled the Government in that period are struggling to control the Government today. The same interests are struggling to say who shall or shall not be elected; and they are willing today, as they were then, to restrict the franchise. They are willing to take away from your boy and my boy their right of citizenship. They are willing to do that in order that the Government may be theirs. It is not the Republican Party. It is the interests behind this movement. Those interests, if they should once obtain control, would use the Democratic Party as willingly and as freely as they use the Republican Party. I warn Senators that the same interests which interfered with their States and with my State, with their ancestors and my ancestors in the exercise of their God-given rights, are ready to interfere with their children and my children in the exercise of their rights under the Constitution.

The bill before us is wrongly named. The purpose of it is concealed. The result of it can be foretold. The result of the passage of the bill will be that instead of a 100-percent vote we may have only a 75-percent vote. Instead of all the intelligent active defenders of our country in foreign lands being able to cast their vote, some will have to rely on the whim of a Governor in a particular State who may probably not be in sympathy with their right to vote.

I think that the situation confronting us is one of the most serious which has arisen in the last quarter of a century. It has arisen because of new circumstances, which could not have been foreseen, but which the writers of the Constitution thought they had covered in most general language when they gave Congress the power to reach out and do the things that would be necessary to do in order to carry into effect the purposes of the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I am taking this occasion to make one final observation with reference to the so-called soldiers' vote bill.

I stated early in the consideration of this bill that it was purely a partisan political measure. It still is being discussed from the standpoint of partisan politics. Members on both sides of the aisle, in the Senate and in the House, have charged that it is political. Both sides are right.

There is nothing whatever that Congress can do under the Constitution to aid the soldiers in voting, except to facilitate the transportation of the ballots to and from the places where the soldiers may be. We still have the matter with us now, in some form or other, to be discussed and voted upon. It is mostly for discussion. The matter of soldiers voting, or any other citizens voting, is purely a matter for the States, and it cannot be anything else. I have consistently voted against it. I shall still vote against it. If I have an opportunity to vote on this bill when it comes to a vote, I shall vote against it for reasons that I have heretofore stated, namely, that the Congress has no authority to change the qualifications of voters simply because we are at war. To sustain that decision I have painstakingly quoted from the decisions of the courts and from the opinions of able men in both branches of Congress.

One of the authors of this bill, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has talked for hours and hours and hours about his concern for the soldiers' vote. He is very solicitous now to know how I may vote upon this bill. He, as well as the Senator from Rhode Island, the coauthor of the bill, has declared himself opposed to it. To ease his concern now, I am saying for the record that if and when I have a chance to vote upon this bill I will vote as they both declare they will vote—but probably for different reasons.

The pending bill apparently amends the procedure for the soldiers to vote under Public Law 712, but it does not repeal the provisions of that law, which in itself is clearly unconstitutional. It has always been my hope that I would have a chance to vote upon a measure that would repeal Public Law 712, in the enactment of which I had no responsibility. It is common knowledge that it passed through the Congress and was approved by the President with only a superficial consideration.

The Senator from Illinois recently observed what he thought to be a great inconsistency in my vote on the Taft amendment. I recognize that the Taft amendment was unconstitutional. I now assert that it was. The Taft amendment minimized the invasion of the rights of the States. I voted for it upon the theory that if it should become the law it would be the lesser of two evils. If the Taft amendment had been adopted, I would have voted against the bill, and therefore the Taft amendment.

If the pending bill shall be defeated—and I hope it will be—we shall still have Public Law 712. Any votes cast under it that do not comply with State laws will still be subject to challenge in the courts, and successful challenge, in my opinion, as to their constitutionality. But it is already the law, and it seems that this Congress will not repeal it.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] seems to have grown very much infuriated over some observations I made heretofore, and has stated that the speech I made against this measure was being circulated by the Republican National Committee. If it is being circulated by the Republican National Committee I am not aware of it. It is perfectly apparent to me that the Senator from Illinois intends to make a political issue out of this vote bill, which he has a perfect right to do. I understand he will need some issues in his coming campaign in the State of Illinois. His disparaging statements made concerning me as a Senator, because I am alleged to be a businessman, may not be too enthusiastically approved even in Illinois.

It happens to be my privilege to have an acquaintance, and to have had a good deal of experience, with businessmen in Illinois. I assume that the people in Illinois are a good deal like the people in Oklahoma, or any other State, and I believe that they are pretty well aware of what has been done to them by their Representatives in the Congress. I could never quite understand just why the Senator became so furious at my recitation of some of the political events in which he participated. All I stated was some facts of which the Nation, including his State of Illinois, is well aware. If the facts hurt, he can only blame himself for them.

I do not want any row with the Senator from Illinois. I should like to get along with him while we are both here together. If I have any occasion to participate in any discussions with reference to his reelection in Illinois it will be purely on the ground of our disagreement upon our philosophies of government. If I do have an opportunity to discuss his philosophy of government, I shall do it without any personal animosity toward him, I am sure. His invidious insinuations as to my record in Oklahoma probably will not be of much concern to the people of Illinois.

It has been said that "politics makes strange bedfellows," and apparently when the Senator from Illinois and I vote upon this measure we will further demonstrate that fact.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who desires to address the Senate, is apparently not in the Chamber at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JACKSON in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Revercomb
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Stewart
Brewster	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Kilgore	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	McKellar	Weeks
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	
George	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

C. GUY EVANS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1589) for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash., which was, on page 2, line 2, after the word "Provided", to insert "That C. Guy Evans and Garland Hot Mineral Springs, a corporation, execute documents satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury, releasing the United States from any further liability for the destruction of the recreation hall; *Provided further.*"

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the conferees of both Houses of the Congress have come forward with recommendations which, if enacted into law, will enable every member of the armed forces, who is otherwise eligible, to cast a legal ballot in the forthcoming November elections.

Imbued with a determination to make se vice participation possible, Senators and Representatives on the conference committee have worked diligently and untiringly to achieve that purpose, and they are to be congratulated for the rapidity under adverse circumstances and the thoroughness with which they discharged their responsibilities to the National Legislature and to the Nation. Theirs was a difficult task. They faced it squarely and courageously, with due regard for the best interests of all concerned.

Frankly, Mr. President, this issue of service voting, though quite simple, has been surrounded by such a maze of confusion, charges, and countercharges it is no wonder that the people are unable to understand its import.

From the very moment the so-called Federal bobtailed ballot proposal was presented in the Senate and House there has been a barrage of misrepresentation released by its proponents which leaves many of us astounded. Some of this false propaganda to force through the administration measure quickly and with but scant deliberation emanated from the residence at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and from its principal occupant, who had the audacity to brand a legal State-ballot counterproposal as a "fraud."

The mimeographing machines of the able Senators from Illinois and Rhode Island, who coauthored the Federal ballot bill, have been put to such extensive use that it may become necessary for them to apply to the War Production Board for an A–1 or better priority to replace them. Almost daily we witness the scene staged on the Senate floor, in which the two Senators are the principal actors, aided by others, which depicts them literally crying on the Senate's shoulder over the demis of their poor illegitimate child. Their sorrow is mingled with anger a they charge a long series of disastrous plots.

However that may be, suppose we forget the wailing and gnashing of teeth for the moment; suppose we dispel the smokescreen and consider this measure before us with the simple logic that need be applied.

This bill permits every man and woman in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, serving overseas, otherwise eligible to vote, to participate fully in the forthcoming election—that is, every member of those services would be given the right to vote the same ballot that we citizens here at home vote—for President, Vice President, Members of Congress, governors, 34 of whom will be elected several months hence, other State, county, and local officers.

The method prescribed is simple. They have merely to fill out a post card provided by the War Department requesting a ballot, and it will be forwarded them in ample time to be marked and returned to the United States. If for some unexplained reason the State ballot does not reach them before a specified date, then they may avail themselves of another form of balloting which will be provided by the Federal Government.

It is that simple, Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, so for heaven's sake why all the fireworks?

Can it be that the proponents of the Federal plan have an ulterior purpose in trying to force through the Congress an unconstitutional method which could and would utlimately be challenged in the courts, perhaps compelling the House of Representatives to designate the next President of the United States? Can it be that they are so out of touch with the sentiment of the members of the armed forces that they feel our military and naval personnel can be voted like a herd of cattle for the fourth term?

If the latter is the case, then my administration friends are doomed to disillusionment. Those boys and girls gladly and proudly wear the Nation's uniform, but they most assuredly are not going to wear the New Deal's collar.

When they vote they want to vote for the men of their choice, without coercion or interference from anyone; they want to vote the full ballot, not the bobtailed variety; they want to know who the candidates are, that they may vote intelligently, and they want their ballot to be constitutional so that it might be legally counted.

The recommendations brought in by the conference committee provide all of these requirements, and there is no reason in the world why the Senate should not promptly accept these recommendations in the interest of those serving our Nation abroad. Personally, I believe we should give speedy approval.

And when this measure is received at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, I trust that the President will also approve without further delay.

I warn you, Mr. President, that if the Chief Executive does otherwise—if he fails to affix his signature to the bill thus making it law, then he and he alone must assume full responsibility for the disfranchisement of hundreds of thousands, and possibly millions, of our soldiers, sailors, marines and coast guardsmen, and he and he alone must face that day of reckoning when the people of these United States will demand to know why he did not want the members of the armed forces to participate in the 1944 elections.

He cannot shirk this responsibility; the boys in the fox holes of Italy, in the swamps and jungles of the islands of the South Pacific, the boys bombing Berlin, on the ships plowing the seven seas, in planes in the air, will demand an accounting—and get one.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the conference report should be agreed to without delay.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, when this question was originally before the Senate, I voted in favor of the Green-Lucas bill, because I felt, and I still feel, that every duly qualified citizen of the United States should be permitted to cast his vote in the forthcoming elections.

The men and women in the armed forces of this Nation have every reason to expect that their right of suffrage will be recognized and made operative, regardless of the physical and legal difficulties which may be encountered. I firmly believe there is no Member of either House of Congress who would deny the right of suffrage or any other right of citizenship to those who now carry on the fight in defense of humanity and justice.

But, Mr. President, in the consideration of any legislation of this type, we who attempt to speak for the Nation are confronted with many considerations which cannot be ignored. The Federal system of government, the dual sovereignties of State and Nation, the constitutional limitations, and our own personal oaths to uphold that constitution have all entered into this question in varying degrees of intensity, with the result that a clear and unmistakable objective, unanimously endorsed by the Members of Congress, is met with certain practical realities of constitutional government which can neither be ignored, nor swept aside with utter disregard.

It is inevitable that in such a setting as this, differences of opinion will develop among sincere and honest men. These differences of opinion, Mr. President, are far too sincere, far too basic and fundamental to be described as "outrageous frauds" or "deliberate betrayals of democracy." These differences are in fact the manifestations of democracy at work, and out of these differences must be welded the final policy of this great legislative body. Those who persist in hurling the cynic's ban are contributing nothing toward the formulation of any policy.

As I have previously indicated, Mr. President, I voted for the Green-Lucas bill when it was approved by the Senate. The House of Representatives, as is their right, approved a vastly different bill.

This turn of events necessitated the appointment of a joint conference committee to which this body and the House appointed 5 Members each from their membership to agree upon a basic bill. The 10 men who functioned on that committee are men whose competence, whose sincerity, and ability are above reproach. They have labored diligently with this problem, Mr. President, and they are to be commended rather than maligned for the results which they have achieved in the face of grave difficulties.

I was particularly impressed with the remarks made yesterday by the able and distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who, in describing the work of the conference committee, pointed out that adjustments and concessions were necessary on all sides in order to prevent an impasse in this vital matter.

In his remarks yesterday the Senator from Vermont said, in part:

> I sat in amazement at the operation of the United States Senate, and I learned something, I hope, and that is that the process of legislation actually necessitates some yielding, and that the reason why the men who arrived here only after struggling against great obstacles and overcoming difficulties and thus hardening their sinews, can get together is that they recognize the necessity to yield something.

That is the essence of the legislative process, Mr. President, and no worthy or enduring piece of legislation has ever been enacted by this body in defiance of that process.

It is true that the pending conference report does not and will not satisfy everyone who has developed an opinion on this particular subject; for the varying shades of opinion on this matter are far too multiple and far too complex to be properly incorporated into any basic report.

But this report represents the best efforts of 10 respected and competent Members of the Congress—all of whom are sincerely interested in extending the right of suffrage to every American citizen in the armed forces.

The bill reported by the conferees, far from representing a disenfranchisement of any group, represents a sincere, and I feel a successful, effort to make effective the franchise and the vote of every American citizen from whatever station or walk of life he may come.

The clear, lucid, and able explanation of the conference report given by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] yesterday has convinced me that this measure can be made effective, and that the fundamental purpose of providing for the full and effective participation of the members of our armed forces in the selection of their governing officers can be fully and effectively carried out under the procedure recommended in the conference report.

Mr. President, 8 out of 10 conferees have agreed to this report, among them a number of the outstanding men in the Senate of the United States. As one who voted for the Green-Lucas bill, as one who hoped that the conference report might embody that bill, I now stand ready, Mr. President, to commend my colleagues for the report which they have submitted and to vote in favor of accepting that report.

I feel that in voting to accept the report I am keeping faith with the Constitution and the people of the United States, with the integrity of this body, and with the members of the armed forces, among whom I am proud to number my own son.

It will remain for history to determine whether or not this action is sound, but I entertain no doubt that time will prove that the report is not the instrument of evil and iniquity which some zealous souls have held it up to be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to consume more than a very few moments of the Senate's time in discussing the conference report. I do not wish to delay a vote upon it, because I am sure we are all anxious to vote today. But, inasmuch as I have decided to vote against the conference report, I wish briefly to give my reasons. I do not do so, Mr. President, with the expectation that my reasons will affect the result of the vote. I assume the conference report will be agreed to, but I am unable to vote for it, and I wish the RECORD to show, and my constituents to know, and especially the service men and women in whose behalf the legislation is presumed to be under consideration, to know my reasons for voting against this particular conference report.

First, I wish to say that neither my vote nor anything I shall say is to be regarded in any respect as either impunging the motives of the conferees or indicating that they did not do the best they could in obtaining any sort of a report at all to bring back to the Senate. We all know with what difficulty we obtained a workable bill through the Senate in behalf of the service men and women. It seems to me that in the midst of this great war, when all the power of the Government of the United States for the purpose of waging war has been exercised or may be exercised in the raising of an army and a navy and in their equipment, and in sending them all over the world to fight for the things that we hold dear, it is most unfortunate that it has taken several months for the Congress of the United States to reach a termination of its consideration—not of the right of these people to vote, but of the opportunity to exercise their right to which I think they are entitled.

Mr. President, I am not speaking now of the Senate, I am speaking of the Congress as a whole, and we all understand the situation that confronted the conferees because of the position of the conferees representing the other House of the Congress. Speaking of the Congress as a whole, of which we must speak in determining the effectiveness and the validity or the value of this legislation, it seems to me and has seemed to me all along that more adhesive tape has been used in binding restrictions around any legislation possible of enactment, in order to prevent our service men and women from voting, than was ever brought to bear before, in my opinion,

in regard to any legislation that Congress has enacted.

I felt from the beginning that it would have been a simple matter, and that it ought to have been a simple matter to provide a way by which 11,000,000 eligible voters who have been taken from their homes and their communities and their States in order to fight the battles of democracy, should, while fighting for that democracy, be permitted to vote for it.

I do not know how the soldiers or the sailors or the marines or those in the Coast Guard, or the women, or individuals in any of the other branches of our service will vote. I have no right to inquire how they will vote. To me it has made no difference how they vote. If every one of them from my State, given the opportunity to exercise the right to vote, should announce in advance that he would vote against me if I should be a candidate again, I would nevertheless feel it my duty to give each one an opportunity to do that very thing. If all the soldiers and sailors and all the combined armed forces of the United States Army and Navy and all the other United States forces scattered all over the world should at this hour announce that they would vote against the party now in power, if the opportunity to vote were given to them, I would nevertheless feel it my duty to vote to give them that opportunity. I am sorry I cannot now vote for a bill which does that. I do not think I can in this report. I do not think that opportunity is before us. Therefore, I have been constrained, with much regret, to come to the conclusion that insofar as I am concerned, in the discharge of my individual responsibility here, I should vote against this conference report.

Mr. President, I am not going into any legalistic argument about it. I am not going into any constitutional argument about it. Able lawyers and legislators honestly differ about the power of the Congress to enact legislation in war or at any other time in regard to the regulation of elections. I am one of those who believe that, under the Constitution, Congress does have some power in regard to the regulation of elections for Federal officers, namely, President, Vice President, and the Members of Congress. I do not know that that power is any greater in war than it is in peace; but certainly the need and the occasion for it are greater in time of war than in time of peace, because by our own act and by the strong arm of our own Government we have taken these eligible voters away from their homes and away from the opportunity which is theirs to cast their vote not only in Federal elections but in State and local elections. Having done that, I have thought from the beginning and I so expressed myself at the very outset, that Congress not only had the power to deal with it, but it owed a duty to the country, as well as to those involved in the suffrage, to make it as easy as possible, within the law and within its constitutional power, for these voters to exercise that right, instead of making it as hard as possible. Those who have opposed any legislation at all along such lines have sought to make it as hard as possible. I do not criticize that effort on their part. They are no doubt as sincere as I am. But I think it is unfortunate for our country, for those of us who are left at home, and for those who now are doing the fighting and who must continue to do it until this war is over. It is unfortunate because of the reaction and the effect which the refusal of Congress to make it easy for the members of the armed services to vote may have upon their own true understanding of what they are fighting for and what we have sent them around the world to fight for.

I do not oppose the conference report merely because under it the soldiers and sailors and others from my State who are in the armed services will not be permitted to vote. If I felt that the bill granted any substantial increase in opportunity for all the armed services to vote, I might be inclined to vote for it, although not a soldier or sailor from my own State might be able to vote, because I have not looked upon the matter purely as a local one. I do not now look upon it as a local matter. But believing, as I do, that the conference report does not enlarge to any substantial degree the opportunity for voting, beyond the opportunity afforded by the present law, the fact that under the present law soldiers from Kentucky did vote in 1942 and, in my judgment, can vote in 1944, and as long as the present war shall last, constitutes at least an additional reason why I am unable to support the report of the conference committee.

There has been brought into the discussion the question whether the present law is repealed, either by specific reference to its sections or by implication, by the conference report. This bill is a substitute for all the present law with the exception of sections 1 and 2. If it becomes enacted, it nullifies all the rest of Public Law 712. It does not directly repeal sections 1 and 2, which relate only to registration and the payment of the poll tax; but, because of the restrictions placed in the conference report and in the House bill upon the right of exercising the suffrage by the members of our armed services, I think by implication and by necessary interpretation and effect the present conference report repeals sections 1 and 2 of the present law, which waived or sought to waive registration in States where it was required insofar as Federal elections are concerned, and sought to waive the payment of the poll tax.

So, Mr. President, if it be true that by its very terms sections 3 to 15, inclusive, are repealed by this bill, and sections 1 and 2 are repealed by necessary interpretation and implication, then it follows, of course, that no serviceman or servicewoman anywhere will be allowed to vote by reason of any waiver of the payment of the poll tax or registration; and in my judgment under this proposed statute, if it is enacted as the conference report contains it, no one will be allowed to vote, no one will have his or her vote counted, unless he or she is registered according to the laws of the State in which he or she is a legal voter, and unless he or she has paid the poll tax, in the case of States in which payment of the poll tax is a prerequisite to voting.

Mr. President, for the moment let us lay those considerations aside. I wish very briefly to discuss the provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 302 which, it seems to me, are so utterly contradictory and so utterly at cross purposes that, as was suggested earlier in the day, it will be impossible for the high-ranking Army and Navy officers to explain to the millions of men and women in the armed services down the line what these provisions mean. It will be even more difficult for the privates in the ranks to understand them; and finally, in disgust because of their inability to find out what Congress meant, what Congress was willing for them to do, probably they will give up any effort to vote at all.

While it is true that under the present law in 1942 only approximately 28,000 votes were cast by members of the armed services, I think that many more than that number would be cast under the present law in the coming election.

In the first place, that was what we call a byelection. It is always true that more people vote in Presidential elections than in congressional or State races. By the law of averages, we may expect many more men and women in uniform to vote in 1944 than voted in 1942.

In addition, there has been much agitation on the subject. The right of the soldier to vote has been brought particularly to his attention. It has been emphasized and debated. It has been written about not only in newspapers in the United States but in service newspapers all over the world. Members of the armed forces are more interested in the exercise of the right of suffrage; and I dare say that many a soldier or sailor who under ordinary circumstances might not be willing to take the trouble required in order to vote, now that he finds that someone is trying to deny him the right to vote, will make a more determined effort than ever to vote, and will be greatly disappointed if his willingness, desire, or opportunity to vote is thwarted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will excuse me. I do not wish to consume any more time than is absolutely necessary. One question leads to another. I am merely stating my reasons for voting against the conference report.

As I was saying, aside from all other considerations, I believe that under the present law, without amendment or further enactment, probably hundreds of thousands more members of the armed forces would vote in 1944 than voted in 1942. I do not know what the fate of the measure now before us will be. At the outset I stated that I assumed that the conference report would be adopted in the Senate. It will probably be adopted in the House. What will happen to it after that, I have no way of predicting. I have no information on the subject, and I make no prediction as to whether the President will sign it, veto

it, or allow it to become a law without his signature. I do not know what his views are, and I do not know whether he knows, until the bill is sent to him for his examination. According to a standard which I understand he set a few days ago at a press conference, namely, that his attitude might be determined on the basis of whether the pending bill would allow greater or lesser opportunity to vote than does the present law, I am unable to predict what his verdict will be.

Yesterday, in a question or two directed to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], I briefly discussed section 302, under title III. The heading under title III is "Use of Supplementary Federal Ballots." Section 301, under the heading "United States War Ballot Commission," establishes the United States War Ballot Commission, and prescribes its duties. Section 302, subsection (a) provides as follows:

SEC. 302. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the provisions of this title shall apply with respect to the following:

(1) Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States.

(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

While it does not say so, it means outside the United States.

(3) Members of the armed forces inside the United States.

In subsection (b), to which subsection (a) is subject, because it says "subject to the provisions of subsection (b)," we have this provision:

(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to, and the ballot provided for by this title may be used by—

"The ballot provided for by this title" is the ballot printed on the following page—page 7 of the conference report. That is the ballot meticulously set out in terms by this title. That is the ballot to which reference is made in section 302, subsections (a) and (b).

(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to, and the ballot provided for by this title may be used by—

(1) an individual referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (b) that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State; or.

I challenge anyone to find an ordinary man who is not steeped in the intricacies of the law who can understand, after reading that, whether he will be entitled to vote or even to receive a ballot. But that is not the main objection to this particular section.

We now come to subparagraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 302:

(2) an individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State, even though the Governor thereof does not make the certification referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (1), but only if such individual states in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made application for a State absentee ballot but, as of October 1, has not received it.

I think it is presumptuous to assume, as a matter of law and constitutional power, that any State legislature can meet in session, validate the terms set out in a subsequent congressional action, and approve the ballot set out in the law. If that be true, even though a State legislature may have passed what it regards as an adequate local absentee ballot law under the State law, the legislature of that very State will have to be called back into extraordinary session in order to pass a resolution, even as simple as that submitted the other day by the Senator from Vermont, saying that the soldier or sailor who is eligible to vote under the laws of that State may likewise use the particular ballot set out in this law in casting a vote upon a Federal ballot.

This language does not say that the Governor must certify that some legislation has been enacted by the legislature. It does not say that the legislature has adequately taken care of its own absentee ballot voting situation. This particular paragraph says that the Governor must certify that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of the State.

The ballot is set forth on the following page. That means, in my judgment, that the legislature must convene and say, by resolution, or by an enactment of some kind, that this particular ballot, which is spread over page 7 of the conference report, is a legal ballot under the laws of the State. In my judgment that means that the State legislatures will all have to be called into extraordinary session in order to validate this ballot. I know that many of them will not do so. Already the Governors of some States have publicly announced that they will not call their legislatures into extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting any soldier ballot legislation. I would not venture a prediction as to how many of them will do so. I feel that many of them will not.

For that reason the Governor of the State will be unable to certify that this particular ballot has been approved by the legislature of the State, not by a blanket approval, but after having it before the legislature to vote upon in the terms in which Congress has enacted it.

If that be true, my theory is that in most of the States no kind of Federal ballot will ever reach the soldiers or sailors, or any others in the armed services. If it should reach them and be executed and returned, if the Governor had not been able to make the certification set out in the bill, it would be left to some local precinct officer in the community where the votes are cast to decide whether such action on the part of the Governor, if attempted, was legal, or whether the Governor had taken any action at all. In my judgment, such confusion would result as to make it possible for fewer men and women in the armed services to vote under the proposed statute than under the law as it now exists.

I regret this, Mr. President, because I think the Congress would do well, and would have done well from the beginning, if, instead of attempting to make it more difficult day by day for the members of our armed services to vote, it had been liberal in its interpretation of its power and made it easier for them to exercise the right for which they are fighting, and for which, perhaps, hundreds of thousands of them will give up their lives. They are fighting that we here at home may not only vote but may hold office by the election and choice of the people in whose behalf the men and women to whom I have referred are fighting and sacrificing.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that I believe that the conferees on the part of the Senate did the best they could do. I realize the stone wall they were up against in meeting the conferees from the other House. As we all know, on several occasions the conferees on the part of the Senate practically gave up any hope of being able to arrive at a conference report at all by any agreement which might be brought back. Notwithstanding the sincerity of the Senate conferees, and notwithstanding their effort to go further than they were finally able to go, I feel that, as a whole, the bill falls far short of what should have been done, and that it falls far short of giving to the American soldiers, sailors, marines, and all the other members of our armed services the kind of electoral recognition to which they are entitled, and for that reason I am unable to support the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names.

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Revercomb
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Bankhead	Gurney	Robertson
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Stewart
Brewster	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Kilgore	Truman
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Tydings
Capper	Lucas	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Walsh, Mass.
Connally	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Cordon	McKellar	Weeks
Danaher	Maloney	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Murray	Willis
Ellender	Nye	Wilson
Ferguson	O'Mahoney	
George	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

The question is on the adoption of the conference report. On that question the yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. TOBEY's name was called). I am asked to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is unavoidably absent and that if present and voting he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WAGNER (after having voted in the negative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] is absent on official business. I am authorized to announce that, if present, she would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I do not know how he would vote, but I transfer my pair with him to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "yea" if permitted to vote, and I allow my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote yea.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]; the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]; and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from California, the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and that the Senator from Virginia, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business. He is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]. If present the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent. He is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. If present the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is necessarily absent. He is paired on this question with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. If present the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea." He has been paired by transfer.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 31, as follows:

YEAS—47

Andrews	Danaher	Revercomb
Austin	Davis	Reynolds
Bailey	Eastland	Robertson
Bankhead	Ellender	Shipstead
Bilbo	George	Taft
Brewster	Gerry	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Gillette	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Gurney	Tydings
Buck	Hawkes	Walsh, Mass.
Burton	Hill	Weeks
Bushfield	Holman	Wheeler
Byrd	McCarran	Wherry
Capper	McClellan	White
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Willis
Connally	Overton	Wilson
Cordon	Radcliffe	

NAYS—31

Barkley	Kilgore	Russell
Bone	La Follette	Stewart
Clark, Mo.	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Lucas	Truman
Ferguson	McFarland	Tunnell
Green	Maloney	Vandenberg
Guffey	Millikin	Wagner
Hatch	Moore	Walsh, N. J.
Hayden	Murray	
Jackson	Nye	
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	
	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Ball	Maybank	Smith
Butler	Mead	Tobey
Caraway	Murdock	Wallgren
Chandler	O'Daniel	Wiley
Chavez	Reed	
Glass		

So the conference report was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4070, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the adoption of the motion of the Senator from Tennesese, but after consulting with him and with the distinguished minority leader, it is understood that the bill is not to be taken up this afternoon, but will go over until Thursday. With that understanding, I have no objection to it being made the unfinished business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the bill should be taken up as soon as possible, but I have no objection to the suggestion made, as the two leaders think that course should be pursued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that consideration of the bill be postponed, at the request of the two leaders, until next Thursday, at the time the Senate convenes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 700.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FIRST CALL ON FARM MACHINERY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, before we proceed with the call of the calendar, I should like to have an opportunity of inserting some articles in the RECORD, and making brief observations relative thereto.

I have before me an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, the issue of March 6, 1944, entitled "First Call on Farm Machinery." The editorial has relation to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, upon which the Senate voted several days ago.

Mr. President, I opposed the joint resolution relating to the U. N. R. R. A. because I do not believe that we are in a position to vote $1,350,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for the relief and rehabilitation of European countries, at a time when our national debt is soaring.

I opposed the joint resolution for the further reason that I feel that the farmers of this country should have first call on farm machinery. I respectfully invite the attention of the Members of this body to this very able editorial, which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST CALL ON FARM MACHINERY

Representative CALVIN JOHNSON of Illinois has performed a useful service in calling attention to proposals for giving away large

quantities of farm machinery to European farmers when the war ends. He believes that the export of 30,000 tractors, 80,000 plows, 50,000 mowers, etc., from this country was suggested by British advisers to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and that some of the estimates were actually increased by the New Dealers.

Mr. JOHNSON remembers that American farmers have had the greatest difficulty in replacing worn out machinery for several years and he is rightly concerned that our own needs be kept in mind. Even those new dealers who are more interested in European welfare than in the well-being of their own country can hardly fail to recognize that American implements are likely to be more productive in the hands of men accustomed to their use than if turned over to peasants who don't know how to run them. Mr. JOHNSON is puzzled, also, by the allocation of implements to the Baltic countries and to Poland, in view of the Russian claims to these areas. Are our contributions to relief and rehabilitation to be used to coerce the little nations, against their wills, into accepting Soviet domination?

Americans, recognizing that there are millions in Europe who have been living on short rations, are willing this time, as so often in the past, to extend relief. The new dealers, dominated as they are by British thinking, have thus far prevented relief organizations from sending protective foods and medicines to the children in occupied countries, a fact which justifies some skepticism about the charitable origin of their present plans. At any rate, it is noteworthy that the principal deficiencies in Europe's wartime diet are in fats, oils, dairy products, and animal proteins. The export of farm machinery is not likely to contribute greatly or promptly to the relief of these shortages.

European soil and climate, for the most part, are not well suited for the production of vegetable oils. Moreover, it is the destruction of herds rather than the lack of machinery which is limiting the output of dairy goods and meat. So far as cereals, potatoes, and such field crops are concerned, European production is believed not to be much below normal. Where the populations lack bread and potatoes, the fault can generally be attributed to lack of transport or to confiscation for military or political purposes.

Nevertheless, Europe will need some farm machinery and should have it, subject to the prior claims of our own farmers. How much should be exported will depend in considerable measure on the season at which the war ends. If the fighting stops in the summer or early fall, a pretty good start can be made in European factories on the production of farm machinery for use in the following crop year. At any rate, until it is known how speedily Europe can convert its factories from swords to plowshares, there can be no reliable estimate of the quantities of farm machinery which, in charity, we should send abroad.

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION FOR VETERANS OF WORLD WAR NO. 2

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a few days ago the able and distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] introduced in the Senate a bill pertaining to adjusted compensation for veterans of World War No. 2. I estimated that the bill, when every feature of it shall have been finally liquidated, will cost the taxpayers of this country some twenty-five or thirty billion dollars.

Mr. President, I am cosponsor of the bill with the distinguished Senator from Colorado, because I believe that of all the people of our country we should first take care of those American citizens, men and women, boys and girls, who are now in uniform.

I have before me an editorial from a recent issue of the Washington Times-Herald, entitled "The Bonus Bill," in which the editor disagrees with the distinguished Senator from Colorado and myself about the proposal. He is in opposition to it. I clipped this editorial because of its last sentence, which is as follows:

> We believe Congress can serve them best—
>
> Speaking of the soldiers and sailors—
>
> at this time, by concentrating on measures to have productive jobs ready for them in abundance when they come home.

Mr. President, I clipped another editorial from the same issue of the Washington Times-Herald. It is headed "And taxes after the war."

I read one sentence from that editorial:

> Whether millions of our fighting men return to jobs and opportunities—or to unemployment—will depend upon how wisely and speedily a peacetime tax program is put into effect.

That relates to unemployment after the war.

In connection with the two editorials from which I have just read, I bring to the attention of Members of the Senate a news item appearing in the columns of the Washington Times-Herald of several days ago under the headline "Twenty-five million idle seen at post-war peak."

The article is as follows:

> America's post-war unemployment peak will find 25,000,000 out of work, Ewan Clague, Director of the Bureau of Employment, Social Security Board, told officials representing Government, industry, and labor last night at a meeting of the International Association of Public Employment Services in the Interior Department Auditorium. Millard Rice, national service director of the Disabled American Veterans organization, warned that the Veterans' Administration will have all it can do to handle disabled servicemen and proposed that able-bodied servicemen be cared for through other agencies.

Mr. President, with reference to the matter of unemployment mentioned in the article, I desire to say that if we are really and genuinely serious in our desire to provide jobs for our uniformed men and women after the war, we must guard well against the usurpation of those jobs by hundreds of thousands of aliens who are now being permitted to come into this country at a time when we are at war.

I call attention to the fact that when we became engaged in the present war there were approximately 6,000,000 aliens in this country. Since our involvement in the war I imagine that at least several hundred thousand of those aliens, many of whom had been here for years, have become American citizens, and have taken the oath of allegiance to this country. Nevertheless, regardless of that number, I dare say there are nigh unto four or five million aliens in the country at the present time.

Mr. President, what I desire particularly to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate is that actually since the present World War began on September 3, 1939, more than 600,000 aliens have entered this country. Many of them are very rich. They left their native lands and came here to bask in the sunshine and safety and prosperity and pleasure afforded by America, instead of staying in their homes and fighting for the countries of their birth. On the contrary, our boys and our girls have left this country and gone to the countries of these aliens to fight for them. I protest again against the admission into the United States of any alien from any country in the world while the war is in progress. I protest for the reason that I think that every single American job should be held for the benefit of American men and American women who are wearing the uniform and are now on foreign shores fighting for the "four freedoms" all over the world.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I am rather curious about one aspect of the problem which the Senator has mentioned many times. I understand that the aliens he refers to came in on visitors' visas.

Mr. REYNOLDS. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. What is going to happen to them when the war ends and the emergency conditions no longer exist in Europe? How will this country handle that particular problem? Will the people involved be sent out of the country, or what will happen to them?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I will say in answer to the Senator that in my humble opinion, based on past experiences with respect to hundreds of thousands who are here now, they will never leave, and we will never force them to leave. I recall vividly, and I am sure the Senator from Washington recalls likewise, that for a number of years we had before us the question of expelling criminal aliens. At the time a bill carrying that provision was before the Senate I went to the Immigration Division, which is now in the Department of Justice, and collected the names and the nationalities of more than 2,300 alien criminals who had committed murder, rape, forgery, and almost everything else in the category of crime, and for 2 years I endeavored to get the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins, to expel those 2,300 alien criminals; but we were never able to have any of them expelled because they were placed in the category of what it was pleased to term "hardship" cases.

I take the responsibility personally of saying on the Senate floor that very few of the 600,000 refugees and aliens from all parts of the world who have come to this country during the time when we have been at war, fighting for their liberties, fighting for their countries, will ever return to devastated Europe. They will want to remain here where the money is, where the opportunities are, where we enjoy the "four freedoms." That is why I protest again and again against permitting these people to come into the United States on temporary visas, or student visas, or permanent passes, or anything else. If we are to keep America American I believe we must

deport several hundred thousand individuals who have tried to indoctrinate our country with un-American ideas and to instill them into our people. I say that it is our duty as Members of this body to save America for Americans, and by that I mean save American jobs for American heroes, for American women and American men who are in uniform.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BONE. What does the Senator from North Carolina think would happen in this country if we had 25,000,000 unemployed, as was suggested in an article he read earlier?

Mr. REYNOLDS. That would be more unemployed than we had between 1930 and 1934. At the peak of unemployment during that period approximately 18,000,000 persons were out of work. Many more millions were employed only part-time.

CIVILIANS ENGAGED IN CONSTRUCTION OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar we shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 337, Senate bill 683, to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal.

COMPENSATION FOR TAKING OF PRIVATE FISHERY RIGHTS IN PEARL HARBOR, T. H.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I desire to have the call of the calendar commenced, pursuant to the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 700, in accordance with the previous order.

The bill (S. 1682) to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, island of Oahu, T. H., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named claimants the sums respectively indicated herein as full and complete compensation for their respective rights in the fisheries of Pearl Harbor, island of Oahu, T. H.: Trustees under the will and of the estate of James Campbell, deceased, and Oahu Railway & Land Co., $62,375.20; the Dowsett Co. (Ltd.), $1; H. N. Kaikainahaole, $1; Adelaide K. Akina, $1; trustees of the Bernice P. Bishop estate, $6,952.80; executor of the estate of Lincoln Lloyd McCandless, $2,827.22: *Provided*, That payment shall not be made to any of said claimants until such claimant has consented to the dismissal with prejudice of all pending litigation wherein right to compensation for the taking of such fishery rights and of any interest therein or part thereof has been or is claimed or asserted against the United States, in a manner satisfactory to the Attorney General, has conveyed to the United States any and all right, title, or interest in said fisheries, and has released all claims to damages or compensation against the United States with respect to alleged rights in said fisheries; and has consented to the entry of a final order or judgment of condemnation in the condemnation proceedings instituted by the United States and pending in the United States District Court for Hawaii for the condemnation of claimants' rights in said fisheries.

CHARLIE HOLCOMB

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1588) for the relief of Charlie Holcomb, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "to," to strike out "Charlie Holcomb, of Voth, Tex., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for (1) compensation for personal injuries sustained by his minor son, Eugene Holcomb, as the result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by an Army vehicle in Voth, Tex., on July 28, 1942, and (2) reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries," and insert "the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, of Voth, Tex., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by Eugene Holcomb, a minor, as the result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by an Army vehicle in Voth, Tex., on July 28, 1942, and for all medical, hospital, and incidental expenses heretofore and hereafter incurred as a result of such injury," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, of Voth, Tex., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by Eugene Holcomb, a minor, as the result of an accident which occurred when he was struck by an Army vehicle in Voth, Tex., on July 28, 1942, and for all medical, hospital, and incidental expenses heretofore and hereafter incurred as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, a minor."

DEPENDENTS OF DR. ARTHUR B. WYSE, AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 3371) for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS COURCIL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 248) for the relief of Louis Courcil, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

H. G. TOOLEY

The bill (H. R. 2880) for the relief of H. G. Tooley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT C. HARRIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1355) for the relief of Robert C. Harris, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$12,653.25" and insert "$4,435"; in line 9, after the word "of", to insert "loss of wages, medical, and hospital expenses, and"; and on page 2, line 3, after the word "truck", to change the period to a colon and insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert C. Harris, Fort Hancock, N. J., the sum of $4,435. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert C. Harris against the United States on account of loss of wages, medical and hospital expenses, and personal injuries sustained by him on March 17, 1943, when the automobile which he was driving on Rumson Road in Monmouth County, N. J., was struck by a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATHILDE B. MEISTER

The bill (H. R. 2183) for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

IRVING L. JONES

The bill (H. R. 929) for the relief of Irving L. Jones was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NADINE GORMAN

The bill (H. R. 2385) for the relief of Nadine Gorman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JOHN H. CATHCART

The bill (H. R. 1062) for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DELORES LEWIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Delores Lewis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$369."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HEIRS OF SIMON M. MYHRE

The bill (H. R. 1273) for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADELARD DEMERS

The bill (H. R. 2875) for the relief of Adelard Demers was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLARD KERR, JR.

The bill (H. R. 3195) for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF LORRAINE NOVAK, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 3173) for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWIN FOLEY

The bill (H. R. 2772) for the relief of Edwin Foley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REV. C. M. McKAY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 544) for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$581.10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FROM LIABILITY FOR OVERPAYMENTS

The bill (S. 1665) to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the employees responsible for the excess or erroneous payments represented by the sums herein stated be, and they are hereby, relieved of financial liability therefor and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, in such amounts not exceeding the sums stated herein, which have been or hereafter may be disallowed, as may be necessary to relieve such disbursing officer of financial liability therefor: *Provided*, That this act shall not be construed to bar recovery of the amounts herein specified from the persons to whom and through whom such amounts have been paid:

First. A. J. Dalton, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Baltimore (now Fort Howard), Md., in the sum of $4.50, which amount was expended March 31, 1941, under symbol 11559.

Second. D. D. Campbell, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Perry Point, Md., in the sum of $7, which amount was expended in February 1941, under symbol 11559.

Third. C. F. Sargent, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Batavia, N. Y., in the sum of $420, which amount was expended from December 1, 1938, through February 28, 1939, under symbol 11564.

Fourth. John A. Hadley, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Bath, N. Y., in the sum of $12.66, which amount was expended from August 1 through September 26, 1939, under symbol 11564.

Fifth. Malcolm L. Stoddard, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, in the sum of $467.50, which amount was expended from January 1 through June 30, 1939, under symbol 11565.

Sixth. D. F. Ivory, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Togus, Maine, in the sum of $42.50, which amount was expended June 30, 1939, under symbol 11565.

Seventh. F. X. McFadden, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration office, Philadelphia, Pa., in the sum of $4.20, which amount was expended July 31, 1941, under symbol 11566.

Eighth. H. H. Higginbotham, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Pittsburgh, Pa., in the sum of $5.26, which amount was expended in May 1941, under symbol 11568.

Ninth. Guy F. Palmer, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Dearborn, Mich., in the sum of $4, which amount was expended in July 1941, under symbol 11571.

Tenth. I. G. Sims, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Knoxville, Iowa, in the sum of $60, which amount was expended July 23, 1941, under symbol 11571.

Eleventh. A. B. Conley, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, Wichita, Kans., in the sum of $125, which amount was expended in May 1940, under symbol 11573.

Twelfth. S. E. Malmsten, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $18.55, which amount was expended July 12, 1938, under symbol 11647.

Thirteenth. A. P. Carson, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $83.03, which amount was expended June 15, 1936, under symbol 99280.

Fourteenth. J. C. Dale, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., in the sum of $182.25, which amount was expended June 30, 1936, under symbol 99280.

Fifteenth. M. Carey, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration facility, New York (Bronx), N. Y., in the sum of $100, which amount was expended June 15, 1936, under symbol 99282.

Sixteenth. A. Rosentahl, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Cleveland (now Brecksville), Ohio, in the sum of $4.71, which amount was expended July 10, 1936, under symbol 99284.

Seventeenth: C. A. Blackburn, certifying officer at Veterans' Administration, Little Rock, Ark., in the sum of $43, which amount was expended on June 15, 1936, under symbol 99288.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT BRAINERD, MINN.

The bill (S. 1660) granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the county of Crow Wing in Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the county of Crow Wing in Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Mill Street in the city of Brainerd, Minn., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

CONDEMNATION OF MATERIALS UNFIT FOR USE IN BUTTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1006) to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the committee was, on page 2, line 4, after the word "butter" and the period, to strike out:

Such ingredients shall be marked "inspected and passed" if found to be clean, wholesome, healthful, and otherwise fit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter. All ingredients found to be unclean, unwholesome, unhealthful, or otherwise unfit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter shall be marked "inspected and condemned" and shall be destroyed or denatured for food purposes in the presence of an inspector.

And insert:

All ingredients which are found to be putrid or decomposed or which contain organic or inorganic substances which are foreign to such ingredients when properly made, manufactured, produced, collected, stored, transported, or handled, and which organic or inorganic substances cannot be removed by processing, shall be deemed unfit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter, shall be marked "U. S. inspected and condemned," and shall be denatured or destroyed under the supervision of the inspector. All other ingredients shall be marked "U. S. inspected and passed," and shall be deemed fit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 3, line 5, after the words "shall be", to strike out "destroyed or denatured for food purposes in the presence of an" and insert "denatured or destroyed under the supervision of the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 24, after the word "regulations" and the period, to insert: "The Secretary of Agriculture may, from time to time, by regulations define the foreign substances and the extent thereof that render the ingredients unfit for use in manufacturing process or renovated butter."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 19, after the words " 'process butter' " to strike out "or 'renovated butter.' "

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 6, to insert:

(k) The administration and enforcement of the provisions of this act, other than its provisions relating to revenue, but including the seizure and denaturing or destruction of ingredients intended to be used in the manufacture of process or renovated butter and the denaturing or destruction of process or renovated butter, are committed exclusively to the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That any powers and duties of the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 301, and the following), as regards such ingredients before they come into the possession of the manufacturers of process or renovated butter, or as regards such powers and duties in connection with process or renovated butter after it leaves such manufacturers and comes into the hands of wholesale or retail dealers, or others, shall not be affected by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2325 of the Internal Revenue Code, approved February 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 254), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2325. Inspection of process or renovated butter: For the purpose of protecting interstate and foreign commerce from process or renovated butter which is unclean, unwholesome, unhealthful, or otherwise unfit for human food:

"(a) The Secretary of Agriculture shall, through inspectors appointed by him, cause inspections to be made of all milk, butter, butter oil, and other ingredients intended for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter. All ingredients which are found to be putrid or decomposed or which contain organic or inorganic substances which are foreign to such ingredients when properly made, manufactured, produced, collected, stored, transported, or handled, and which organic or inorganic substances cannot be removed by processing, shall be deemed unfit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter, shall be marked 'U. S. inspected and condemned,' and shall be denatured or destroyed under the supervision of the inspector. All other ingredients shall be marked 'U. S. Inspected and Passed,' and shall be deemed fit for use in the manufacture of process or renovated butter.

"(b) The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause inspections to be made of all process or renovated butter. If such butter is found to be clean, wholesome, healthful, and otherwise fit for human food, it shall be marked 'U. S. inspected and passed.' Process or renovated butter that is found to be unclean, unwholesome, unhealthful, or otherwise unfit for human food shall be denatured or destroyed under the supervision of the inspector.

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause inspections to be made of all factories wherein process or renovated butter is manufactured to determine the sanitary conditions thereof, and if it is found that the conditions existing at any such factory do not meet the standards prescribed by the Secretary in his regulations, he shall cause inspection to be withdrawn therefrom.

"(d) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to withdraw inspection from any factory wherein process or renovated butter is made, if the manufacturer shall fail to comply with any of the provisions of this section or with any of the rules and regulations prescribed hereunder.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such rules and regulations as he deems necessary for the efficient administration of the provisions of this section, and all inspections hereunder shall be made in such manner as may be prescribed in such regulations. The Secretary of Agriculture may, from time to time, by regulations define the foreign substances and the extent thereof that render the ingredients unfit for use in manufacturing process or renovated butter.

"(f) The Secretary of Agriculture shall cause to be ascertained, and he shall report, from time to time, the quantity and quality of all process or renovated butter manufactured and the character and condition of the materials from which it is made.

"(g) No person, firm, or corporation shall forge, counterfeit, simulate, falsely represent, detach, or knowingly alter, deface, or destroy, or use without proper authority, any of the marks, stamps, labels, or tabs provided for in this section or in any regulations prescribed hereunder by the Secretary of Agriculture for use on process or renovated butter or on wrappers, packages, containers, or cases in which the product is contained, or any certificate in relation thereto.

"(h) All process or renovated butter and the packages or containers thereof shall be marked with the words 'Process Butter' and by such other marks, labels, or brands, and in such manner, as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

"(i) No statement that is false or misleading in any particular shall be placed on or affixed to any wrapper, label, carton, or container of process or renovated butter.

"(j) No person, firm, or corporation shall transport, or offer for transportation, or sell or offer for sale, in interstate or foreign commerce, or in commerce affecting commerce among the States, any process or renovated butter that has not been inspected and passed and marked, labeled, and branded in accordance with this section and the regulations issued hereunder.

"(k) The administration and enforcement of the provisions of this act, other than its provisions relating to revenue, but including the seizure and denaturing or destruction of ingredients intended to be used in the manufacture of process or renovated butter and the denaturing or destruction of process or renovated butter, are committed exclusively to the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided*, That any powers and duties of the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C., 1940 edition, 301, and the following), as regards such ingredients before they come into the possession of the manufacturers of process or renovated butter, or as regards such powers and duties in connection with process or renovated butter after it leaves such manufacturers and comes into the hands of wholesale or retail dealers, or others, shall not be affected by this act."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 2326 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 255) is amended by striking out "shall be punished by a fine of not less than $50 nor more than $500 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 month nor more than 6 months, or by both said punishments," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following, "Shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for a period of not more than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

SEC. 3. Section 2327 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 255) is amended by striking out subsections (b) and (c) of said section.

SEC. 4. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR OIL PIPE LINE OVER OGDEN ORDNANCE DEPOT MILITARY RESERVATION

The bill (H. R. 1488) to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL F. R. WILSON

The bill (H. R. 3547) for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT BECKWITH, JULIUS BUETTNER, AND EMMA M. BUETTNER

The bill (H. R. 1469) for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEO GULLO

The bill (H. R. 2999) for the relief of Leo Gullo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF RICHARD ZIELINSKI, A MINOR

The bill (H. R. 1847) for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KENNETH E. SHEPARD

The bill (H. R. 2189) for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. BESSIE PIKE AND MRS. ESTELLE ROSENFELD

The bill (H. R. 1518) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MILDRED B. HAMPTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an

amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$487.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. GLADYS M. GREENLEAF AND THE ESTATE OF RALPH ALTON GREENLEAF, DECEASED

The bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF WATER SUPPLY OF SITKA, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 2956) for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS FROM NATIONAL FORESTS FOR PURCHASE OF FOREST LANDS

The bill (S. 1618) to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests for the purchase of lands in the State of Utah within the boundaries of said national forests, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 513), is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the Uinta and Wasatch National Forests in the State of Utah, which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States as to minimize soil erosion and flood damage, and to pay for said lands from the receipts derived from the sale of natural resources, other than mineral, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forests, which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose until said lands have been acquired; all lands so acquired thereafter to be subject to and administered under the laws applicable to lands acquired under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 519, 520, 521), as amended: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 500 and 501 of title 16 of the United States Code shall not be applicable to receipts so appropriated and expended. Nothing contained in this act, however, shall diminish payments to or expenditures within the State of Wyoming under the provisions of said sections; and any appropriated amounts which are, or which heretofore have been, unexpended and unobligated at the close of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be transferred to the national-forest receipts of that fiscal year, and amounts so transferred and such portions of the receipts of any fiscal year as are not, or heretofore have not been, appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts."

SEC. 2. The act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from the Cache National Forest for the purchase of lands in the State of Utah within the boundaries of said national forest, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 513), is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States to minimize soil erosion and flood damage; and to pay for said lands from that proportion of the receipts derived from the sale of natural resources, other than mineral, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forest which is equal to that proportion of the gross area of said national forest situated in the State of Utah which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure for that purpose until said lands have been acquired; all lands so acquired thereafter to be subject to and administered under the laws applicable to lands acquired under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C., 519, 520, 521), as amended: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 500 and 501 of title 16 of the United States Code shall not be applicable to receipts so appropriated and expended. Nothing contained in this act, however, shall diminish payments to or expenditures within the State of Idaho under the provisions of said sections; and any appropriated amounts which are, or which heretofore have been, unexpended and unobligated at the close of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be transferred to the national-forest receipts of that fiscal year, and amounts so transferred and such portions of the receipts of any fiscal year as are not, or heretofore have not been, appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts."

SEC. 3. The act of June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests for the purchase of lands in the county of Riverside, State of California, within the boundaries of said national forests, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture, with the approval of the National Forest Reservation Commission established by section 4 of the act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 513), is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the San Bernardino and Cleveland National Forests, in the county of Riverside, State of California, which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States as to minimize soil erosion and flood damage, and to pay for said lands from those proportions of the receipts derived from the sale of nautral resources, other than mineral, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forests which are equal to the proportions of the net areas of said national forests situated in the county of Riverside, State of California, which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for expenditure for that purpose until said lands have been acquired; all lands so acquired thereafter to be subject to and administered under the laws applicable to lands acquired under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 519, 520, 521), as amended: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 500 and 501 of title 16 of the United States Code shall not be applicable to receipts so appropriated and expended, but any appropriated amounts which are, or which heretofore have been, unexpended and unobligated at the close of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be transferred to the national-forest receipts of that fiscal year, and amounts so transferred and such portions of the receipts of any fiscal year as are not, or heretofore have not been, appropriated, for the ensuing fiscal year shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts: *Provided further*, That the amounts to which the county of Riverside would otherwise be entitled under section 500 of title 16 of the United States Code shall be reduced by the amounts by which payments to the State for distribution to counties under that section are reduced pursuant to the above proviso."

SEC. 4. The act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from the Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests for the purchase of lands in the State of Nevada within the boundaries of said national forests, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase any lands within the boundaries of the Nevada and Toiyabe National Forests in the State of Nevada which, in his judgment, should become the property of the United States in order that they may be so managed with other lands of the United States as to minimize soil erosion and flood damage or promote efficiency and economy of administration, and to pay for said lands from the receipts derived from the sale of natural resources, other than mineral, and the occupancy of publicly owned lands within said national forests, which receipts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for that purpose to the extent of amounts not exceeding $10,000 per annum until said lands have been acquired; all lands so acquired thereafter to be subject to and administered under the laws applicable to lands acquired under the provisions of said act of March 1, 1911 (16 U. S. C. 519, 520, 521), as amended: *Provided*, That the provisions of sections 500 and 501 of title 16 of the United States Code shall not be applicable to receipts so appropriated and expended. Any appropriated amounts which are, or which heretofore have been, unexpended and unobligated at the close of the fiscal year for which appropriated shall be transferred to the national-forest receipts of that fiscal year, and amounts so transferred and such portions of the receipts of any fiscal year as are not, or heretofore have not been, appropriated for the ensuing fiscal year shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts."

SALE AND CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LAND BY WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATOR

The bill (H. R. 3618) to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 454) dividing the State of Florida into two judicial districts, defining the territory embraced in each, and fixing the time of holding term of court therein, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF NAVAL PLANTATIONS OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1634) to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment; on page 2, at the end of line 2, to change the period to a colon, and to insert *"Provided further,* That except for the plantation at the Naval Operating Base, Trinidad, British West Indies, no plantation or farming operations shall be undertaken by the Secretary of the Navy without the prior approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and thereafter similar approval for the continuance of any plantation and farming operation, including the operation of the plantation at Trinidad, shall be obtained annually on or before June 30 of each year: *Provided further,* That statements relating to each operation showing the receipt and expenditure of money, data on production, and recommendations for the continuance or abandonment of each project, shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of December 31 of each year: *And provided further,* That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, commanding officers, pursuant to the authority contained in this act, may undertake local gardening projects for the purpose of furnishing fresh vegetables to messes, whenever the production of vegetables is considered practicable and fresh vegetables are not otherwise available and funds are administratively allocated to the costs of a garden project", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to manage, operate, maintain, and improve plantations and farms outside the continental limits of the United States, directly by the United States or under such lease, contract, or other arrangement as he may find suitable and in the interest of the United States, for the purpose of furnishing food and food products to the armed forces of the United States and the personnel thereof, and to civilians serving with the armed forces: *Provided,* That no land shall be acquired for the purpose: *Provided further,* That except for the plantation at the Naval Operating Base, Trinidad, British West Indies, no plantation or farming operations shall be undertaken by the Secretary of the Navy without the prior approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and thereafter similar approval for the continuance of any plantation and farming operation, including the operation of the plantation at Trinidad, shall be obtained annually on or before June 30 of each year: *Provided further,* That statements relating to each operation showing the receipt and expenditure of money, data on production, and recommendations for the continuance or abandonment of each project, shall be made by the Secretary of the Navy as of December 31 of each year: *And provided further,* That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, commanding officers, pursuant to the authority contained in this act, may undertake local gardening projects for the purpose of furnishing fresh vegetables to messes, whenever the production of vegetables is considered practicable and fresh vegetables are not otherwise available and funds are administratively allocated to the costs of a garden project.

SEC. 2. Appropriations for the subsistence of naval personnel shall be available for any and all expenditures necessary in the management, operation, maintenance, and improvement of any such plantation or farm: *Provided,* That equipment, material, and supplies required therein may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and other laws applicable to purchases by governmental agencies.

SEC. 3. Food and food products and other property incidental to the operation of any plantation or farm may be sold under such regulations as may be issued by the Secretary of the Navy without regard to the provisions of other law relating to the sale of Government property, and all funds and moneys received or accruing from such sales shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts: *Provided,* That surplus production over the amount furnished or sold to the armed forces of the United States and the personnel thereof, and to civilians serving with the armed forces, may only be sold outside the continental limits of the United States.

SEC. 4. All persons employed directly by the United States, and their heirs, shall be governed as to compensation for disability or death from personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty, by the act approved September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742, 5 U. S. C. 751 ff.), as amended: *Provided,* That only American citizens, employees of the United States, shall be entitled to benefits under the civil-service laws and other laws of the United States relating to the employment, work, compensation, rights, benefits, or obligations of civilian employees of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I would appreciate it if the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs would indicate to me just what are these naval plantations.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I shall be very happy to inform the Senator. The naval base at Trinidad consists of approximately 10,696 acres. At this base there were large acreages devoted to the cultivation of citrus fruits, namely, grapefruit, oranges, lemons, limes, and other citrus fruits. The Navy was in the position of continuing the cultivation or of abandoning it and letting the fruits be wasted. The Navy has continued to cultivate the fruit trees and to keep them in condition to produce citrus fruits, and has supplied the entire naval unit there, as well as the Army units located at Trinidad and the vessels which come in and out of Trinidad, with citrus fruits. Our committee went into the matter very thoroughly, because we realized that this was somewhat of a departure from the usual naval activities. The committee decided that it would be a very great waste not to take advantage of the very successful, productive citrus fruit area which was already there.

Another question arose in connection with this matter, namely, that in the southern Pacific on certain islands the naval personnel is unable to obtain any fresh vegetables.

The officers and men themselves undertook, at their own expense, to plant vegetables so that they would have fresh vegetables at their tables. The Navy Department has asked for legislation to sanction the continued cultivation of citrus fruits in Trinidad, and also to permit the planting of fresh vegetables and the hiring of native labor, which is a very cheap operation, so that in those sections where it is impossible for the men otherwise to obtain them they may have fresh vegetables. Several letters were presented to us complaining about the inability of the men to obtain fresh vegetables. We felt that this was a departure which ought to be very carefully safeguarded. The amendment which has been read requires the Navy Department every year to obtain the consent of the House Naval Affairs Committee and the Senate Naval Affairs Committee to continue these operations. The amendment restricts and limits the possibility of extension and expansion in this field of operations. We did not want the Navy to go into the farming business, but we felt that with this restriction and limitation it would not be a dangerous precedent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Who owns the land in Trinidad?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. We have a lease for 99 years.

Mr. REVERCOMB. What will be the cost annually?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The original plantation at Trinidad, which was acquired under the lease-base agreement and extension thereof, has been cut up in the course of the development of the naval base at Trinidad so that at present, among other installations situated on the original plantation site, are the hospital, the radio station, rifle range, ammunition storage, and so forth. The remaining parts of the plantation under cultivation have not been appraised in value. However, it is estimated that the remainder of the plantation being operated as such represents an estimated land value of $100,000 and an estimated value of trees and planting of $150,000. The value of the crops, on the basis of present operations, is estimated at a yearly gross of $50,000.

The islands in the southern Pacific, of course, we have taken through occupation. The gardens in this area are only a temporary arrangement to raise vegetables from season to season.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is merely a year-to-year garden?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is a vegetable garden which the men themselves have undertaken to operate for their own benefit.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Has any estimate been made of the cost of maintaining the citrus fruit groves in Trinidad?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. It is comparatively small. I have not the figures before me, but in any event the expenditure would be less than it would cost the Navy to buy the fruits and vegetables in the open market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point, so as to make clear what the limitations are.

There being no objection, the report (No. 723) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1634) to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department. As introduced, it authorized the Secretary of the Navy to manage, operate, maintain, and improve plantations and farms outside the continental limits of the United States, for the purpose of furnishing food to the armed forces.

It provided that no land shall be acquired for the purpose.

The committee amended the bill by providing that, except for the plantation at the naval operating base, Trinidad, British West Indies, no plantation or farming operations should be undertaken by the Secretary of the Navy without the prior approval of the Naval Affairs Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and that approval for the continuance of any plantation and farming operation, including the operation of the plantation at Trinidad, shall be obtained annually on or before June 30 of each year. The committee provided also that commanding officers may undertake local gardening projects for the purpose of furnishing fresh vegetables to messes, whenever the production of vegetables is considered practicable and fresh vegetables are not otherwise available.

The bill, as amended by the committee, authorizes the Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to manage, operate, maintain, and improve the plantation at the naval operating base at Trinidad, British West Indies. This operating base includes a substantial plantation, from which large supplies of tropical fruits and other products have been furnished to the armed forces in Trinidad and to civilians serving with them and to vessels of the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard, calling at Trinidad.

The naval operating base at Trinidad consists of about 10,696 acres, of which 7,196 acres were originally leased for 99 years under the London Agreement of March 27, 1941, or April 22, 1941, and approximately 3,500 acres have since been leased under said agreement on December 24, 1942, for the remaining period of the basic 99-year lease.

About 2,900 acres of this area was a producing plantation and farm at the time the United States acquired it. This operation has since been continued on a salvage basis under the general construction contract for the construction of military and naval facilities at the base. This method does not contemplate replanting or necessary cultivation to keep the trees healthy and bearing. It subjects the plantation to the hazard of becoming run-down and unproductive within 2 to 5 years.

The plantation contains an extensive acreage of citrus fruit. Its products include grapefruit, oranges, and limes in considerable quantities. The plantation also produces tonka beans, coffee, coconuts, nutmegs, mangoes, and other products. Other crops, such as fresh vegetables, could be grown. Livestock for local use and food supply could be raised.

In order to preserve the plantation and to assure the continuance of production, the plantation must be operated and cared for with that object in view, and provision for adequate maintenance and improvement must be made. For this purpose legislation is required.

The sale of surplus products to others is authorized by the bill, provided that such products may only be sold outside the continental United States. Such sales would be made only with the approval of the authorities governing the island of Trinidad, in conformity to the basic London Agreement pursuant to which the base was acquired.

In view of the location of this plantation beyond the continental United States, the bill provides that all persons employed directly by the United States, and their heirs, shall be governed as to compensation for disability or death from personal injury sustained while in the performance of duty by the act approved September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742, 5. U. S. C. 751ff), as amended, provided that only American citizens, employees of the United States, shall be entitled to benefits under the civil-service laws and other laws of the United States relating to the employment, work, compensation, rights, and benefits of civilian employees of the United States.

In order to facilitate and simplify the operation of this plantation, it is provided that equipment, material, and supplies may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and other laws relating to purchases by governmental agencies, and that sales of produce may be made without regard to the provisions of other law relating to the sale of Government property. Appropriations for the subsistence of naval personnel are made available for expenditures in managing, operating, maintaining, and improving this plantation. The proceeds of all sales are directed to be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

From the experience gained in the operation of the plantation on the naval operating base at Trinidad, it appears that the plantation is self-supporting financially, when the value of all its produce is taken into account. The Navy Department informed the committee that no cost to the Government would, therefore, be involved in the enactment of the bill.

The bill has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

SURVEY OF FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is there any member of the Committee on Commerce present who can give us information concerning this joint resolution? All I wish to find out is whether the joint resolution does anything more than authorize a study or survey. Would it in any respect change the existing law?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator who reported the joint resolution [Mr. BILBO] is not present.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the joint resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

Mr. BILBO subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 736, Senate Joint Resolution 112. At the time when the joint resolution was called, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] objected to its consideration. However, with the assurances I have given him, he has no further objection to it, and I should like to have it passed. The proposed survey by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is very important.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I asked that the joint resolution go over because I did not know at the time, and no one was present to advise me, whether the joint resolution affected the legislative status at all, or whether it was merely to authorize a study and a survey to be made. I understand the latter to be the fact, and under those circumstances I have no objection.

Mr. BILBO. I can assure the Senator that the joint resolution pertains merely to a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, in order that they may be protected and developed for the use of the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to conduct a survey of the character, extent, and condition of all of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources and other aquatic resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, including high-seas resources in which the United States may have interests or rights; and the economic organization and status of the industry based thereon; such survey is to include but is not to be limited to the following:

(a) The current methods, practices, facilities, and equipment used in producing commercial fishery products.

(b) The methods, practices, facilities, and equipment used in processing, distributing, transporting, marketing, and storing fishery products, including an assessment of measures required for the protection of these perishable commodities.

(c) The methods, practices, facilities, and equipment which may be practicable for expanding the utilization of the existing or potential marine and fresh-water fishery resources, inclusive of recreational fishing.

(d) The laws and regulations that govern the commercial and recreational fisheries.

SEC. 2. The Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior is directed to submit a report to the Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than January 1, 1945, concerning the results of the survey mentioned in the preceding section, and also shall submit recommendations with respect to the following:

(a) New or revised regulations or precautionary measures deemed to be necessary or advisable for the protection, conservation, and management on a sustained-yield basis of the fishery and other renewable marine and fresh-water resources.

(b) New or revised regulations or precautionary measures deemed to be necessary or desirable to insure adequate protection of the fishery and other biological resources from contamination by pollution or other hazards, and to prevent spoilage or deterioration of fishery products; such recommendations to apply to catching, landing, processing, transporting, marketing, or storing fishery products or commodities derived from the fisheries.

(c) The opportunities for, and the advisability of further arrangements for, coordinating fishery administration and management through State fishery compacts with the consent of the Congress (as authorized by article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States of America), and opportunities for, and the advisability of additional coordinated management and administration of, international fisheries.

(d) The means of effecting the maximum utilization, consistent with their continued preservaton at an optimum level of productivity, of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources utilized or potentially capable of utilization for commercial and recreational fishing, giving special consideraton to methods of managing and increasing the fishery production of interior waters, including artificial impoundments and farm ponds.

(e) New and improved methods of capturing, landing, processing, storing, distributing, and marketing fishery products or commodities, including increasing consumption as food and the industrial utilization of fishery products through public education, or other activities; such recommendations to contemplate the full and cooperative use of the personnel and facilities of appropriate State, Territorial, county, local, or other organizations, as well as those of private and industrial or other organizations and enterprises.

(f) A program of economic stabilization of the fisheries and of Federal, State, or other assistance needed during the post-war period and thereafter to effect orderly development and expansion of the commercial fisheries and allied enterprises, and to secure and provide for the fisheries benefits comparable to those afforded the food-production activities and industries dependent upon the lands.

(g) A comprehensive statistical and market-reporting system to provide complete, accurate, and current data on production and fishing intensity in the commercial and recreational fisheries, to facilitate the most efficient utilization of the aquatic resources and the greatest possible benefits and returns therefrom, as well as for the purpose of providing fundamental information on rates of withdrawal in order that the effects of utilization upon the basic resources may always be known.

(h) Special and regular appropriations necessary to establish a national policy and to carry out a program for the optimum utilization of the marine and fresh-water commercial and recreational fishery resources such as may be necessary to accomplish the specific purposes and objectives hereinbefore mentioned, including funds for the publication and dissemination of technical and practical information.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such funds as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, but not to exceed $20,000.

The preamble was agreed to.

MRS. PRISCILLA B. McCARTHY

The bill (H. R. 2440) for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1711) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize Army officers designated by the Secretary of War to take final action on reports of survey and vouchers pertaining to the loss, damage, spoilage of Government property," was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILSON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

IVER M. GESTELAND

The bill (S. 754) for the relief of Iver M. Gesteland was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Iver M. Gesteland, of Sawyer, Wis., a member of the crew of the steamer *W. D. Calverly, Jr.*, the sum of $617.70 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as the result of illness contracted in March 1942, the serious nature of such illness having prevented his removal to a United States marine hospital where he would have been entitled, as a seaman, to medical treatment and hospitalization without cost to him: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MAVIS NORRINE COTHRON AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,000"; and in line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$6,000" and insert "$3,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ANNE REBECCA LEWIS AND MARY LEWIS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1305) for the relief of Anne Rebecca Lewis and Mary Lewis, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$11,065.24" and insert "$2,857.50"; and on page 2, line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$10,410.37" and insert "$806.50," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Anne Rebecca Lewis, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $2,857.50, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by her, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her, as the result of an accident which occurred when her privately owned automobile which she was driving collided with a Navy patrol car at the intersection of Southwest First Street and Eighth Avenue, in Miami, Fla., on March 11, 1943; and (2) to Mary Lewis, of Baltimore, Md., who was riding as a passenger in such privately owned automobile at the time of such accident, the sum of $806.50, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by her as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. M. MILLER AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1553) for the relief of J. M. Miller, James W. Williams, and Gilbert Theriot which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$500"; and on page 2, line 13, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$500" and insert "$250", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to J. M. Miller, of Kenner, La., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him, as the result of an accident which occurred when his privately owned automobile which he was driving collided with a Navy jeep (No. 227873) at the naval air station, Houma, La., on July 30, 1943; (2) to James W. Williams, of Houma, La., who was riding as a passenger in such privately owned automobile at the time of such accident, the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him as a result of such accident; and (3) to Gilbert Theriot, of Houma, La., who was also a passenger in such privately owned automobile at the time of such accident, the sum of $250, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him, and for reimbursement of medical and other expenses incurred by him as a result of such accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered

to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REBECCA A. KNIGHT AND MARTHA A. CHRISTIAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1281) for the relief of Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$75,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian, both of Durham County, N. C., the sum of $7,500, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the deaths of their mother and stepfather, Lena U. Hare and William E. Hare, who died from injuries sustained by them when they were struck by a United States Marine Corps truck at a point on the Goldsboro Highway near Kinston, N. C., on July 19, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY GROSSI

The bill (H. R. 3139) for the relief of Henry Grossi, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDDIE T. STEWART

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1411), for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,292.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOHN W. BOOTH III

The bill (H. R. 2993) for the relief of John W. Booth III, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARIE GEILER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2743) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,577.75" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF CARL OPLINGER AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 2459) for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FORMER POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The bill (H. R. 3763) to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] or any other Senator who is familiar with postal matters, know whether or not House bill 3763 is general legislation, or whether it is designed merely to take care of the accounts referred to in the letter of the Postmaster General dated November 25, 1943, and found in the committee report?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let the bill be passed over for the present, until I can examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

Mr. McKELLAR subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 751, House bill 3763, about which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] questioned me. I think I can explain it to him in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? Without objection, the clerk will state the bill by its title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. An act (H. R. 3763) to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into military service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I find from a report of Postmaster General Walker that this bill applies to only eight employees. I will read a portion of his letter in regard to them.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 25, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RAYBURN: In the administration of the Postal Service a situation has arisen due to the induction of postal employees into the military service, which I wish to bring to the attention of Congress with a recommendation for remedial legislation.

Some eight postal employees, upon varying dates, were inducted into the military service and immediately furloughed, whereupon they were inadvertently permitted to continue their duties as postal employees, although such course was in contravention of the dual compensation laws inasmuch as such inductees were receiving compensation as personnel of the armed forces. A typical case is that of William F. Quirk, who was a regular carrier at Ware, Mass., regarding whom the postmaster addressed this Department under date of September 8, 1942, a copy of the postmaster's letter being hereto attached. It will be seen that Mr. Quirk was inducted into the military service on April 15, 1942, but was sent home with the information that he might be called for service in 30 days. The postmaster was not aware that Mr. Quirk was to receive any remuneration until he was actually called for service. As a result Mr. Quirk received not only his military pay but $141 for service as a letter carrier from April 16, 1942, to May 15, 1942. In a ruling to the Secretary of Agriculture under date of June 5, 1941 (20 Comp. Gen. 860), it was held to be unlawful for an individual to receive both military pay and civilian pay while in an active military service status.

In those cases where the individuals involved have received their compensation as postal employees, the respective postmaster's accounts have been charged with the amounts and in cases in which the compensation has not been paid, it has been necessary for the postmasters to withhold payment because of the ruling of the Comptroller General.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee stop the reading at that point?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. That is what led to my inquiry. Insofar as this bill purports to deal with clearing the accounts of postmasters who have been charged with compensation hitherto paid to postal clerks through error, there can be no question, and the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so.

Mr. DANAHER. If, on the other hand, the bill is to be taken as a precedent for permitting postmasters in the future to continue to make payments to men who are furloughed pending actual induction into service, obviously a very different situation would arise. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree entirely.

Mr. DANAHER. This bill does not deal with any such future permission so to make payments, does it?

Mr. McKELLAR. My interpretation of it is that it does not. I wish to say that this bill has not come from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, but for some reason has come from the Civil Service Committee. I do not know how it got to that committee, but it did. It is a fair and proper bill for these eight men, because evidently a mistake had been made for which they were not responsible, and they were able to perform the work while on furlough. I take it there is no objection to the arrangement of the accounts so as to relieve them; but surely if any others come forward with a similar claim they will be turned down.

Mr. DANAHER. I think the bill provides for a fair adjustment and should be passed. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the entire letter from Postmaster General Walker, which I read in part.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., November 25, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RAYBURN: In the administration of the Postal Service a situation has

arisen due to the induction of postal employees into the military service, which I wish to bring to the attention of Congress with a recommendation for remedial legislation.

Some eight postal employees, upon varying dates, were inducted into the military service and immediately furloughed, whereupon they were inadvertently permitted to continue their duties as postal employees, although such course was in contravention of the dual compensation laws inasmuch as such inductees were receiving compensation as personnel of the armed forces. A typical case is that of William F. Quirk, who was a regular carrier at Ware, Mass., regarding whom the postmaster addressed this Department under date of September 8, 1942, a copy of the postmaster's letter being hereto attached. It will be seen that Mr. Quirk was inducted into the military service on April 15, 1942, but was sent home with the information that he might be called for service in 30 days. The postmaster was not aware that Mr. Quirk was to receive any remuneration until he was actually called for service. As a result Mr. Quirk received not only his military pay but $141 for service as a letter carrier from April 16, 1942, to May 15, 1942. In a ruling to the Secretary of Agriculture under date of June 5, 1941 (20 Comp. Gen. 860), it was held to be unlawful for an individual to receive both military pay and civilian pay while in an active military service status.

In those cases where the individuals involved have received their compensation as postal employees, the respective postmaster's accounts have been charged with the amounts and in cases in which the compensation has not been paid, it has been necessary for the postmasters to withhold payment because of the ruling of the Comptroller General.

There is enclosed herewith a list of employees together with the respective amounts involved, the aggregate of which is $2,613.38.

In view of the fact that the postal employees in question actually performed service for the amounts of salary involved and that the compensation accruing to them as members of the armed forces were comparatively small, it is believed that the legal barrier to the payment of the employees of the compensation to them should be removed. Accordingly there is submitted herewith, with the recommendation that legislation of this character be enacted, a tentative draft of measure which it is believed would accomplish the desired purpose.

Very truly yours,

FRANK C. WALKER,
Postmaster General.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3763) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LT. COL. JASON McVAY AUSTIN

The bill (H. R. 3387) for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLINTON A. CLAUSON

The bill (H. R. 3701) for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD E. HELD AND MARY JANE HELD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2625) for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLARENCE WAVERLY MORGAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2212) for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CHARLES J. GOFF

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Charles J. Goff, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the name "Idaho", to insert "as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff, as administrator of the estate of Judson E. Goff, deceased."

CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION OF ALASKAN FISHERIES

The bill (S. 930) to assure conservation of and to permit the fullest utilization of the fisheries of Alaska and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill is approximately 30 pages in length. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has already been made. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. BILBO subsequently said: Mr. President, with reference to Calendar No. 757, Senate bill 930, am I to understand that objection was made to consideration and passage of the bill? It is known as the Wallgren bill, and has to do with the conservation and utilization of the fisheries in Alaskan waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection was earlier made to consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, the bill consists of some 28 or 30 pages. It deals exhaustively with the subject of the fisheries of Alaska. I think it is somewhat too important to be taken up at this time on the call of the calendar. I wish to have an opportunity to examine the bill, because its subject matter happens to be one in which I have been much interested in years past. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I appreciate the observation of the Senator from Maine. The Commerce Committee spent considerable time in working out the details of the bill. It is a very important piece of legislation, and I sincerely trust that it will be acted upon at the earliest possible moment.

PROSECUTIONS AFTER LAPSE OF A TEMPORARY STATUTE

The bill (H. R. 1201) to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REQUISITION OF PROPERTY

The bill (S. 1748) to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, to continue it in effect, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of the first section of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), as amended by the acts of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 176, title VI, Public Law 507, 77th Cong.), and June 30, 1943 (Public Law 104, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of the Act of October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the date "December 31, 1944" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1945."

AUTHORIZATION FOR REQUISITION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES AND MATERIALS

The bill (S. 1749) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), as amended by the act of July 2, 1942 (Public Law 643, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The authority granted in this act shall remain in force until June 30, 1945, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

CHANGE OF NAME "LABORER" IN THE POSTAL SERVICE TO THAT OF "MAIL HANDLER"

The bill (H. R. 2419) to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSTHUMOUS COMMISSION TO THE LATE COL. WILLIAM MITCHELL

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 10) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is authorized to issue posthumously to the late William Mitchell, late a colonel, United States Army, a commission as a major general, United States Army, as of the date of his death in 1936.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized and requested to amend the records of the War Department so as to carry the said William Mitchell as a major general, United States Army, at the time of his death in 1936.

RELIEF OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

The bill (S. 1590) for the relief of the State of Tennessee was announced as next in order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee desire that I explain the bill, which is No. 764 on the calendar?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this bill is for the purpose of giving the State of Tennessee a credit of $2,920.18 for supplying the Army with certain articles, such as shirts and other clothing, which the National Guard of Tennessee required when it was mustered into service and took part in the maneuvers in August 1940. I say it is a credit because the State of Tennessee owes the War Department approximately $6,700 for lost, destroyed, and damaged goods; so it is merely a bookkeeping credit. However, the goods were turned over to the United States Army, and were used by it. The War Department has examined into the matter. The Judge Advocate General has stated that this is the proper way in which to handle the account. Everything is in proper order.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1590) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to give to the account of the National Guard of the State of Tennessee credit in the amount of $2,920.18 for the money value of property listed on approved reports of survey for which the State of Tennessee has been held pecuniarily responsible, said credits to be given in full satisfaction of any and all claims of the State of Tennessee against the United States on account of clothing purchased by the State and issued to the National Guard of Tennessee to meet a shortage existing prior to the Army maneuvers of August 1940. This credit shall be established by the submission of evidence acceptable to the War Department of the purchase, issue, and transfer of title to the United States of the clothing.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 252) to inquire into the legal authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be passed over.

The call of the calendar is completed.

PROTECTION OF THE COINAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. On the last call of the calendar, Mr. President, Calendar No. 639, House bill 3408 was objected to. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is in charge of the bill, discussed the matter with me on the floor at that time. It seemed, Mr. President, that an amendment was indicated in order that, in our effort to protect against the manufacture of tokens, slugs, discs, and other devices which might be used for counterfeiting purposes, we should also take steps to protect the ration tokens, which are put out by the Office of Price Administration in the administration of the rationing program. The matter was brought back before the Committee on the Judiciary, and it was voted that I submit on the next call of the calendar as a committee amendment the amendment which was then and there considered.

With that explanation, Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Kentucky to yield further in order that I may ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to Calendar 639, House bill 3408.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield for that purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for that purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3408) to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I now send to the desk an amendment, which will appear on page 1, line 11, after the words "United States", to insert "or any token, disk, or other device issued or authorized in connection with rationing by any agency of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 11, after the words "United States", it is proposed to insert a comma and the words "or any token, disk, or other device issued or authorized in connection with rationing by any agency of the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments reported by the committee were, on page 1, line 7, after the word "sale", to insert "or expose or keep with intent to furnish or sell"; in line 8, after the word "manufactured", to insert "furnished" and a comma; and on page 2, line 15, after the word "him", to insert "exposed or kept with intent to furnish or sell", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 7 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1115; U. S. C., title 18, ch. 7) is hereby amended by inserting after section 168 the following new section:

"SEC. 168A. (a) Whoever shall manufacture, sell, offer, or advertise for sale, or expose or keep with intent to furnish or sell, or shall cause or procure to be manufactured, furnished, sold, offered, or advertised for sale, any token, slug, disk, or other device similar in size and shape to any of the lawful coins of the United States, or any token, disk, or other device issued or authorized in connection with rationing by any agency of the United States, with knowledge or reason to believe that such tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices may be used unlawfully or fraudulently to procure anything of value, or use or enjoyment of any property or service from any automatic merchandise vending machine, postage-stamp machine, turnstile, fare box, coin-box telephone, parking meter, or other receptacle, depository, or contrivance, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States, shall be fined not more than $3,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(b) 'Knowledge or reason to believe,' within the meaning of paragraph (a) of this section, may be shown by proof that any law-enforcement officer has, prior to the commission of the offense with which the defendant is charged, informed the defendant that tokens, slugs, disks, or other devices of the kind manufactured, sold, offered, or advertised for sale by him or exposed or kept with intent to furnish or sell, are being used unlawfully or fraudulently to operate certain specified automatic merchandise vending machines, postage-stamp machines, turnstiles, fare boxes, coin-box telephones, parking meters, or other receptacles, depositories, or contrivances, designed to receive or to be operated by lawful coins of the United States."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INVESTIGATION OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS

Mr. MURRAY and Mr. BUSHFIELD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I have a very brief matter to present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the Senator from South Dakota desires to deliver an address. Therefore, I shall yield first to the Senator from Montana, not that I attach more impcrtance to what he may have to present, but probably it will not last quite so long.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to recur to Calendar No. 550, Senate Resolution 195.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would granting the request interfere in any way with the unfinished business, which is the appropriation bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is for unanimous consent and it would not interfere with the unfinished business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, may I ask what the resolution proposes?

Mr. MURRAY. The resolution was reported to the Senate from the Military Affairs Committee on November 26. The purpose of the resolution is to have the President direct the various Government agencies to make a study of the amounts and types of surplus war materials on hand now or likely to be on hand after the war. By the end of the war we will have on hand an estimated $75,000,000,000 worth of materials, machinery, factories, and other property that have been bought for war purposes. There is legislation now pending in the Congress with reference to the disposition of these surplus properties and materials, and it is most essential that there should be an inventory made of them in order to aid in the program for their disposition.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize the importance of that objective ultimately, but I am wondering whether at this stage of the war the Government agencies or departments can with any degree of accuracy report on the amount of surplus property they have or will have at the end of the war. For some of it which may now appear to be surplus they may find use between now and the end of the war.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true; but the resolution contemplates that adequate current records and inventory controls will be developed, so that when the time does come for the disposition of the property the information will be readily available. Surplus property is being disposed of today. A short time ago there was disposed of in Michigan a large amount of surplus material, valued at over $1,700,000, for $31,000, and it was disposed of by the agencies that had control.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the resolution contemplate that the reports under the resolution shall be made from time to time, or when one report has been made does that end it?

Mr. MURRAY. No; it contemplates a study and investigation of—

(2) The adequacy of current records and inventory controls to keep the Congress and the Executive informed as to the foregoing particulars with respect to such materials and property; and (3) those modifications in the method of keeping such records and maintaining such controls which may be necessary to make the above information readily available to the appropriate Government authorities.

It is absolutely necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not disposed to object to the consideration of the resolution, but I will say frankly that I do not see how the War Department or the Navy Department or the Maritime Commission or any other agency can at this stage of the war determine what property is going to be surplus.

Mr. MURRAY. They can determine in many instances what is going to be surplus. At the present time, of course, they cannot determine the entire amount of surplus that will be on hand at the end of the war. They can, however, make broad general estimates.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the resolution would necessarily make it obligatory upon the Government agencies to be cautious in reporting as surplus what might actually be surplus when the time comes, because if they reported a surplus once they could not recall their report.

Mr. MURRAY. The resolution does not require them to report property as surplus. It merely requires them to report to Congress on the results of their study and investigation, together with recommendations on improved inventory controls.

Mr. BARKLEY. If it is not needed it is surplus.

Mr. MURRAY. By the resolution the President is requested "to direct the appropriate executive agency or agencies to make a study and investigation with respect to (1) the types, quantities, cost, location, and custody of those war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, owned or controlled or hereafter acquired or controlled by or in behalf of the Government of the United States, which are or shall become no longer needed for war purposes."

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object, but I think the Senator's resolution sets a rather difficult task for the Government agencies to perform.

Mr. MURRAY. I have been in contact with the various agencies of the Government involved in this problem, and, as chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, I have been carrying on investigations, and I can say that it is most important that the resolution be adopted in order that preparations may be made for the disposal at the proper time of surplus property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 195) was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the President is hereby requested to direct the appropriate executive agency or agencies to make a study and investigation with respect to (1) the types, quantities, cost, location, and custody of those war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, owned or controlled or hereafter acquired or controlled by or in behalf of the Government of the United States, which are or shall become no longer needed for war purposes; (2) the adequacy of current records and inventory controls to keep the Congress and the Executive informed as to the foregoing particulars with respect to such materials and property; and (3) those modifications in the methods of keeping such records and maintaining such controls which may be necessary to make the above information readily available to the appropriate Government authorities. The President is requested to report to the Senate within 3 months after adoption of this resolution and at intervals of not more than 3 months thereafter until such study is completed, concerning the results thereof together with his recommendations.

PRESERVATION OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT—THE FOOD CONFERENCE

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, in the spring of 1934 Dr. William A. Wirt, superintendent of Gary, Ind., city schools, startled the country with a statement that the Roosevelt administration was planning to destroy our Government and to substitute in its place a Fascist state, with complete power over the lives and activities and property of the American people.

A special committee to investigate this charge was selected by the House of Representatives and Professor Wirt was summoned to appear and tell his story. It was at a time when the New Deal was riding high, wide, and handsome. They were in complete possession of the Government. Nothing could be denied them. They occupied all the offices, their doings filled the newspapers from coast to coast. Their demands and Washington-prepared legislation dominated the State capitals of the country. The power of the new President was almost unlimited.

As always, in the exercise of power, the top-heavy New Deal majority was careless of the rights of individuals and of minorities.

The Indiana school teacher, when called as a witness before the committee, was denied the right of counsel. He appeared alone with his wife to tell his story, but was not even allowed to tell it without interruption, ridicule, and abuse.

He testified that he had heard the scheme for remaking our Government discussed at a dinner party given for New Deal officials by one of them. He had been a guest at the dinner, but his testimony of the conversation that had been had at this dinner party was denied by each one of the guests attending, as well as by the hostess.

Mr. Wirt was made to appear ridiculous and unworthy of belief, and before they were through he was completely discredited. The impression was created, by those desiring it, that he was not a very clever liar, and that he had imagined the whole story. But the story was not a figment of his imagination. It was not a dream. If we may judge by what has happened since, there is little doubt that Dr. Wirt told exactly what he had heard, and that the parlor economists who flocked to Washington with the New Deal planned to remake this country just as he said they did. Fortunately, the Supreme Court, before it was revolutionized by new appointments, threw out as unconstitutional many of the plans of this group.

Today, after 11 years, the President says that the New Deal is dead; that he wants it respectfully buried with flowers, but that he does not want it mentioned again. His new slogan is "Win the War."

Most Americans have had the impression that this was not a New Deal war, but was an American war, fought by all of us, for the survival of the American way of life. The New Deal does not have any patent right upon this war. Your son and my son are in this conflict, not

because they are Republicans, or Democrats, or New Dealers, but because they are Americans, and they hope to come back to the America they knew when they left home.

There are those within the President's own group who do not agree with him that the New Deal is dead. The Vice President is one of those, and I am inclined to agree with the Vice President, because the New Deal has followed a certain pattern from the very beginning. In spite of the President's wishes, in spite of the very evident fact that the New Deal is sick and will be buried next November, those of the inner circle of this unique organization of parlor economists are still at work charting and planning our future for us.

The people are tired of and disgusted with the kind of government we have been getting during the last 10 years. Totalitarianism—for that is what it is—represents a philosophy of government as alien to our shores as that administered by the Japanese Emperor. Our constitutional form of government is a government of the people, by the people, and responsible to the people.

A totalitarian government is the complete opposite. It assures the people that what it is doing is for their good, that the regulations and restrictions are imposed for the welfare of all the people. But the regulations are never relaxed when once imposed. From the cradle to the grave the people are under its paternalistic care. The individual as such disappears. He becomes dependent upon government. His initiative is gone. His will to work, to progress, to acquire, his purpose in life, disappear. He drifts along with the tide, rudderless and helpless, waiting for orders. Such is the course of every totalitarian state in history. Such is the pattern of government through which we are now traveling.

For proof turn to the record of the last 10 years, showing the demand for and assumption of emergency power year after year. None of those powers has ever been surrendered, and every attempt on the part of Congress to repeal them is fought bitterly.

I have a letter from a soldier in which he discusses the new pattern for America. In this letter he says:

> What do they mean fussing around about what kind of an America we servicemen want when we get home? Do they value America as something that can be changed with the seasons, the same as women's hats and clothes?
>
> We can't escape the notion here that some people back home are trying to fashion new patterns for America—running around with tape measures, shears, chalk, and things, and quarreling among themselves as to what style of a tailor-made country will please us after the war.
>
> You tell these self-appointed designers to let Uncle Sam alone. When we get back, we want to see his swallowtail coat still there and his boot straps, tall hat, and everything else that's familiar. His way of dressing has been all right for a long time. It's what we're fighting to keep all right for a long time to come. Leave him be. Just have him there to say "Hello" when we return—dressed the way we know him.
>
> When that period is over all that we want is to be free to work at what we can do best. Doesn't it make sense?

Mr. President, maybe it is just as well if we do not undertake to revolutionize this country while 11,000,000 soldiers are tied up in a war. Maybe it is just as well if the planners let nature take its course until the boys come home. I, for one, believe so. I see no necessity for rushing into plans for the future before the future has disclosed itself and before the boys most concerned can take part in the planning. We have another job today far more important than planning what we will do next year or next decade, and that job is to defeat the enemy, for all the plans of the star gazers will be useless if we fail.

Last April the President called a food conference. It was secret, behind closed doors. It was held in Hot Springs, Va., because there it was easier to guard the members of the conference from contact with the public. Why it was necessary to hold a secret conference with armed guards surrounding the hotel in which the conferees lived has never been explained to the American people, but such was the case. The representatives of 44 nations were gathered at that conference. There was plenty of liquor, but little news. The newspapers were refused admission. Prepared statements were handed out each day by those in charge. That was our only news report. For the first time in our history newspapermen were denied admission to a conference upon public business. Members of Congress were neither wanted nor invited to attend.

Some 15 Members of the United States Senate met to consider the situation. A representative of the State Department met with us. Our case was stated. He said he favored an open conference, but his superiors did not. The request that the Senate be represented was ignored.

Now, almost a year after that conference, comes the first official statement indicating what was done there and what is intended to be done in the future. I have the statement before me. It is by the Department of Agriculture, and describes the plans adopted for your welfare and mine for all future time. This statement, entitled "The Farmer and the War," starts out with this declaration:

> This conference, meeting in the midst of the greatest war ever waged, and in full confidence of victory, has considered the world problems of food and agriculture and declares its belief that the goal of freedom from want of food, suitable and adequate for the health and strength of all peoples, can be achieved.

The objectives of the conference are then set forth:

> First, that the governments represented declare to their own people and to one another their intention to obtain more and better food for all who need it.
>
> Second, that these governments recognize that a great increase will be needed in the total production if this goal is to be attained.
>
> Third, that the governments recognize that it is useless to produce food unless men and nations have the means to acquire it for consumption.

Thereupon the conference proceeded to appoint an Interim Commission to prepare the way for a permanent organization. No doubt, Mr. President, the thought has occurred to you, as it did to me when I first read these statements, that the objectives were worthy ones, to which all men could subscribe, but when we begin to delve into the underlying reasons, purposes, and objectives of this plan, we see the proverbial nigger-in-the-woodpile, and in this particular case the American people are to be placed under complete Government control. It is a continuation of the planned economy about which the President declared, "We have planned it this way and do not let anyone tell you differently."

The conference declared:

> Those in need must have the required purchasing power to buy, otherwise they can be provided only at public expense.

Public expense means the American taxpayer, through the channel of the Federal Treasury.

> For the first year or two—

Declared the conference—

> after the fighting stops, we shall probably have to continue to maintain our farm production and our diets on the wartime basis of producing and consuming these products that enable us to get the largest total amount of the most needed food nutrients per unit of resources used.
>
> Such changes will enable us to meet relief requirements and at the same time fill most of the requirements for good nutrition here at home, though not exactly the products which consumers would like to buy.
>
> In the years immediately following the war this disparity between demand and supply is likely to be even greater than it is now, for a larger part of our supply will be needed for relief and rehabilitation in liberated countries.
>
> During that period, farmers in the United States will face even larger export demands than during the war, and both farmers and consumers will find it urgent to make our foods go as far as possible.

Then comes the inevitable suggestion that America do the providing. The conference report says:

> For these reasons the Food Conference recommended that the countries not occupied by the enemy make every effort to supply the devastated areas with the needed food and means of producing food—machinery, fertilizers, seeds, and other production supplies—even though it may mean that such nations may have to postpone the achievement within their own borders of adequate nutrition for all their people.

Inasmuch as we are the only uninvaded country in the world, it means that we are to supply the needs of the world.

> It was also agreed—

Stated the report of the conference—

> that the proposed international agricultural organization should devote a large part of its efforts to increasing agricultural production and efficiency in each country by helping each country get started on crop-improvement work, livestock breeding and feeding, soil and water conservation, land development and reclamation, and all the other things that can be done to increase farm output. Each country will also be helped to develop an agricultural extension service to aid its farmers in using the new and improved methods.

All of which is building competition for our own markets.

> In effect, this proposes a joint cooperative effort on a world-wide scale.

And then it goes on to say:

> This long-time program of the world-wide scientific research, development, and educa-

tion in modern agriculture will not, of course, solve the immediate problem of enough food as soon as the fighting stops. The first supplies of food for emergency relief feeding will have to come from the United States and from the other nations that have been fortunate enough not to have their own fields and farmsteads and cities overrun by invaders or bombed out from the air.

The conference informs us that the after-the-war period will require 40,000,000 more acres of crop land to be financed by our Government.

Except for the normal increase of population, we will have no more people to feed than we have today. There has been no deficiency in the food supply of the American people during the past several years. There is no deficiency now. One cannot help but wonder why the planners insist that 40,000,000 acres more of crop be planted following the war than we have today at a time when we are at our highest peak of farm production. Does it indicate a hidden purpose to burden the United States with the care of the entire world? That this is so is more than suggested by the language used. Here are the words contained in the report upon this very point:

We submit first, in the most general terms, that the over-all objective of government should be adequate food and fiber for all at prices fair to both consumers and producers. But so stated this is one of those general objectives or purposes that can usually be expressed in such broad terms as to arouse no disagreement and be meaningless. Hence, in proposing such sweeping objectives we must indicate, as necessary, the general means by which they may be accomplished. In doing so we are acutely conscious that as we go thus further we run the risk of reducing the number of those who will agree with us.

This statement means that the conference purposely concealed in general terms the objectives which they are seeking. Who are to be deceived? Surely not the people of Russia. They do as Joe Stalin tells them to do. Not the people of conquered Germany. They will do as the Allied Nations tell them to do. Not the people of Great Britain, because Winston Churchill has stated many times that he proposed to protect the British Empire from encroachments upon any side. Then, who are the people the conferees wish to deceive? Obviously, it is we, the American people. The members of the conference apparently understood that if the truth were told and publicized their proposals would not be approved by us.

The report of the conference proceeds as follows:

We subscribe to the Atlantic Charter. Under this charter, it is our responsibility, through both private and public processing and distributive channels, to help provide the means for securing freedom from want for all men. To attain freedom from want is a task that has both world-wide and national aspects. Difficulties of finance, culture, and tradition raise their heads on both the international and the home fronts.

We believe that as a Nation we should embark upon a program of producing the kinds and quantities of food consistent with an expanding international trade, should provide a nutritionally adequate diet for our own people, and should do as much as possible toward helping all the people of the world reach a similar goal.

These goals, to have specific meaning, must be interpreted in terms of quantities; a pattern of production must be decided upon and concrete measures must be devised that will enable the great masses of the population to obtain and use the food produced.

That means governmental control. We are to be directed when, how, and where to plant, how much to eat, and the kind of food to consume. Liberty is soon at an end.

The conference statement continues:

For some time after the close of the war, we shall probably send abroad, for relief and rehabilitation work even more than we are now sending.

If, at the end of the war, our own people were allowed to buy all the food they will want, at present food prices and under conditions of a high level of employment, they would take all we shall then be producing. Nothing will be left with which to play our assumed role in the world rehabilitation or to meet the nutritional needs of our own low-income groups. We believe, then, that the keystone of our own policy for some time after the war should be the selective expansion of food production.

Further along in the report this statement is made:

Our rural school systems are notoriously inferior to those of our cities. Millions of our farmers are still unable to enjoy the modern benefits of electricity. Too many are still isolated by mud every time it rains. In many rural areas hospitalization and medical services are either nonexistent or of very inferior quality. Recreational facilities furnished at public expense in urban centers are conspicuously absent in rural areas.

Now is it not a sad state of affairs, that every farmhouse does not have a bathtub and inside plumbing? I shudder when I contemplate the degradation of it. Even the Government-sponsored Chic Sale projects must now be discarded.

The rural schools are not so large and expensive as the massive stone structures of our cities. Of course not. No one expects them to be. But the planners demand that we in the farming districts of the country start a spending spree that will equal that of our city brothers.

The report also says:

Millions of our farmers are still unable to enjoy the modern benefits of electricity.

Mr. President, was the United States of America settled with electricity? Did your father and mine pioneer into the West carrying an electric iron with which to press their pants? Did your mother or mine grieve because no electric washing machine was there for her?

And what a sad state of affairs it is that many farm homes are isolated by mud every time it rains. I wonder if the planners know that the men and women who live upon farms in this country welcome the rain?

The report also says:

And in many rural areas proper hospitalization and medical services are not provided.

How unfortunate it is that every township throughout this broad and great land of ours is not provided with a modern hospital and a staff of doctors and nurses.

Who is going to pay for these things, and how? Are we to be told by some bureau in Washington when to build a hospital, hire doctors and nurses, when to build schools, roads, and install electric lines and inside plumbing; or are we going to stick to the pattern we have always followed, and buy them when and if we are able to pay for them?

The statement goes on to say:

Farmers have a real stake in a high level of consumption, which should be achieved through full employment if possible and with governmental aid if necessary. If consumers are to be able to absorb the larger quantities of foods and other farm products called for under the policies here proposed, commodities must be available to them at a reasonable cost.

In other words, farm production is to be financed out of the Federal Treasury, and the consumption of food is to be financed from the same empty barrel. The Government pays both coming and going.

The report further states:

Measures should be adopted to establish fair-wage payments and other conditions of employment, including such means as efficient routing and placement of farm workers.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is the administration's way of "holding the line." [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

I read further from the statement:

The Social Security Act should be amended to give all agricultural people, including the self-employed, the benefits of old-age and survivors insurance and all other social-security benefits.

Mr. President, here is a significant statement from the report:

We believe that private property is a public trust and wherever public and private interests in land use conflict the public interest should prevail.

Mr. President, I will repeat that quotation from the report, so that all Members of the Senate will recall the statement by this food conference of the President's:

We believe that private property is a public trust and wherever public and private interests in land use conflict the public interest should prevail.

If that is not socialism, pure and unadulterated, I do not understand the meaning of the word.

I read further from the report:

If all the goals already suggested could be achieved, tenure conditions would undoubtedly improve, but we should see to it that where indirect methods fail, direct methods are used.

Again we see the gloved fist, namely, the statement by those in authority, "If you do not like the food we prepare for you, we are going to force it down you, in spite of your objection."

Here is another gem in the statement which may interest the Senate:

The price of farm land should be kept in line with the capacity of given tracts to yield the product for a decent level of living.

Farm tenancy should be improved through better leasing agreements—

In other words, Mr. President, take it out of the hands of the landlords and

owners, and let the Government make the leases—

to make the rules of the game more equitable.

Experience has demonstrated that for some land, private ownership serves no public purpose—

Think of that, Mr. President—

these lands should be returned to public ownership.

Mr. President, Russia has collective farming. The Government owns the land. The serfs are told how, when, and where to plant, and what they may consume. Have the American people arrived at a stage of development in our new totalitarian existence where we will accept such folderol as is outlined in this report from the Department of Agriculture—a department, by the way, which has 76,000 people on its pay roll. I wonder if this would not be an opportune time to relieve the Department of a few thousand of the employees used to get out such reports as this.

Then comes the climax of all this balderdash. The statement says:

Anyone who wants a "substandard" material level of living, and who does not want to work, should be permitted to live the life of his choice, but no such person should be allowed to force children into this type of existence.

Not content to regulate the lives of those in being, the planners do not even intend to let the poor of this country have children in their own way and in their own time.

In closing, the Department puts forth this gem of wisdom:

We believe that with due consideration for military necessities, we should evolve programs that will tend to reduce domestic production of agricultural commodities that cannot meet world competition and yield an American level of living to producers without tariffs or other forms of Federal subsidy.

It is now suggested through press releases that this new plan, this scheme of world organization, of international farming, can be started for a billion dollars a year, and that we in America are expected to furnish the billion.

These secret deals which dare not be shown the light of day, which dare not be explained to the American people, are not, as yet, in effect, thank goodness; but the legislation necessary to implement them is being prepared to be presented to Congress within a few weeks.

Are we going to turn American farming over to any such starry-eyed scheme as outlined here? It is but a continuation of the planning that has been going on in this administration for 11 years. The plans may be changed from time to time, but the objectives never are. The control of the American people is the objective, and that objective has remained steadfast throughout the entire life of the New Deal. We are even informed by the press that Congress favors this scheme, even though Congress has never seen it and many Members of Congress never have heard of it.

That, Mr. President, is what the President's food conference proposes to do to America. Is it not time that we, ourselves, began to do some remaking for our own protection?

The boys of 1917 and 1918 went to war to make the world safe for democracy. They came home, and all they got was a League of Nations that did not work. The boys of 1943 went to war to save our way of life. If this scheme goes through, all they will get when they return home will be a glorified W. P. A.

As Thomas Jefferson said, "Were we directed from Washington when to sow, and when to reap, we should soon want bread."

SESSION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF DELAWARE TO ACT ON SOLDIER VOTE LEGISLATION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, it is with considerable pride that I point to the proclamation issued last Friday by Hon. Walter W. Bacon, Governor of the State of Delaware, calling for the convening of the general assembly in special session on Friday, March 24, at 11 a. m.

The purpose of the call is to provide for voting by members of the armed forces, regardless of where they may be stationed, and to exempt them from payment of State income taxes up to the first $3,000 received from services rendered in the armed forces of our country. In addition, the proclamation calls for the enactment of legislation accepting the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943 and for confirmation of officers appointed by the Governor since the last session of the State senate.

While we in Washington have watched weeks, yes, months, fly by without enactment of soldier-vote legislation, the State of Delaware has decided to go ahead on its own initiative to see that its sons and daughters will have a voice in the elections next November, whether they are at home, at camp, out on the high seas, or on foreign soil.

Governor Bacon indicated last December that he was awaiting congressional action on the soldier-vote legislation before taking any steps. He indicated further, however, that he would do everything within his power to protect the ballot rights of those in the armed forces. He waited patiently for almost 3 months, and at last decided to go ahead and call the legislature into session, before it would be too late.

In a statement last December, the Governor declared that—

Those who are engaged today in the battle for the survival of our Republic should not be deprived of the right guaranteed them under our Constitution to have a voice in the selection of their elective officers.

We owe it to those men and women who are sacrificing their all, that we may continue to have the right to vote—to guarantee their right to vote while they are engaged in this great conflict.

I, for one, am not interested in the possible political consequences of a "soldier vote." I am interested in the guarantee of their constitutional rights for a free election of Government officials by majority rule. It is necessary under our form of government for all citizens to vote, regardless of whether they are civilians or in the military service.

Delaware's present Governor has always indicated a great interest in veterans' welfare. He was responsible for the creation of a Delaware Veterans' Commission and it has brought about the setting up of a central clearinghouse to ease the returning servicemen into civilian life. Only recently he said—

The welfare and happiness of our returning veterans are of paramount importance to all of us, and any contribution that we can make toward achieving these objectives will be worth all the time and effort we can spend. Nothing can repay the veterans for the sacrifices they have made, but we can at least have foresight enough to assist them get readjusted into civilian life.

The veterans' clearinghouse is now located at Eighth and Shipley Streets in Wilmington, and is known as the Delaware Red Cross Veterans' Clearing Bureau.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the proclamation issued by Governor Bacon calling the general assembly into special session on Friday, March 24.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the provisions of section 16 of article III of the Constitution of the State of Delaware authorize and empower the Governor of the State to convene the general assembly on extraordinary occasions by proclamation.

Now, therefore, I, Walter W. Bacon, Governor of the State of Delaware, by virtue of the power and authority vested in me as aforesaid, do hereby proclaim the following:

That the One Hundredth and Ninth General Assembly of the State of Delaware shall convene at Dover, the capital of the State, on Friday, the 24th day of March A. D. 1944, at 11 a. m., eastern wartime, to consider and act upon certain matters hereinafter set forth which are of great concern to the people of our State.

(1) The enactment of necessary amendments to the election, registration, and absentee ballot laws to provide reasonable opportunity for voting by all qualified absentee voters of our State, and particularly those serving in the armed forces of our country, the merchant marine, the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

(2) The passage of such amendments to the income tax and war emergency gross-income tax laws as will exempt from taxation up to the first $3,000 of moneys, including mustering-out pay, received for services rendered in the armed forces of our country, the merchant marine, the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, and those who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States and to be retroactively effective beginning with the calendar year 1942 and to continue in force and effect for the duration of the war.

(3) The enactment of legislation accepting the provisions of the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act amendments of 1943" so that benefits being derived therefrom will not be discontinued.

(4) The confirmation of officers appointed by the Governor since the adjournment of the last session of the Senate.

In testimony whereof, I, Walter W. Bacon, Governor of the State of Delaware, have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of said State to be hereunto affixed, at Dover,

this 10th day of March A. D. 1944, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-eighth.

WALTER W. BACON.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. STOREY,
Secretary of State.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law:

Maj. Gen James Harold Doolittle (major, Air Reserve), Army of the United States, to be lieutenant general; and

Brig. Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Theron Lamar Caudle to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Timothy T. Cronin to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul B. Messick to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles H. Cox to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James P. Finnegan to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lipe Henslee to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Army nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Enrique Campos del Toro, of Puerto Rico, to be Attorney General of Puerto Rico, vice George A. Malcolm.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harry H. Holt, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Hon. Sterling Hutcheson.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Raymond E. Thomason, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama. (Mr. Thomason is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 2, 1944.)

Roulhac Gewin, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama. (Mr. Gewin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 29, 1944.)

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Bolger is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 9, 1944.)

Robert W. Rabb, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (Mr. Rabb is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 25, 1943.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Leroy P. Raynor to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of February 1944.

John H. Brittain to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey from the 1st day of February 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

Theron Lamar Caudle to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina.

Timothy T. Cronin to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Paul B. Messick to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware.

Charles H. Cox to be United States marshal for the northern district of Georgia.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

James P. Finnegan to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Missouri.

Lipe Henslee to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Tennessee.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Philip Doddridge

TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Second Lt. John Edward Fritz

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Frederick Grinnell White

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Louis E. Denfeld
Forrest B. Royal

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be lieutenant general

Holland M. Smith

To be brigadier general

Walter G. Farrell

REGULAR SERVICE

To be second lieutenants

Frank C. Caldwell
John T. McFadden, Jr.
William C. Hawkins
Ralph M. Sudnick
John C. Landrum
John L. Bricker
Billy E. Horner
David W. Ketler
Charles Toma, Jr.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Paulina-Mae Pittori, Betteravia.
Don M. Benedict, Tarzana.

COLORADO

V. Lester Finch, Springfield.

GEORGIA

Fred S. White, Hartwell.

ILLINOIS

Joseph B. Lager, Albers.
Esther Cherry, Arrowsmith.
Mildred E. Harder, Atwood.
Louis P. Baron, Beaverville.
Seth D. Abbott, Big Rock.
Oscar C. Stehr, Bonfield.
Florence I. Reising, Cabery.
Minnie A. Ralston, Caledonia.
Edmond Lovel, Cambria.
Naomi C. Reiter, Cherry.
Verda Malone, Chesterfield.
Victor L. Strawn, Dana.
Saidee A. Bowling, Dowell.
Anna Holshouser, Frankfort Heights.
Jessie M. Hickman, Good Hope.
Ella M. Watson, Harvel.
Anna Kirk, Ina.
George L. Campbell, Kingston.
Walter C. Howe, Latham.
Mary G. Lawless, Loraine.
John E. Cornelius, Lyndon.
Jeanette O. Perry, Martinton.
E. Floyd Crockett, Neoga.
Joseph Leonardo, Palos Heights.
Eloise N. Morgan, Payson.
Mary C. Guest, Reddick.
Katherine Hake, Tovey.
J. Amelia Crichton, Towanda.
Ambrosia E. Walker, Vergennes.
Francis H. Greene, Wapella.
Lea J. Orr, Wilmette.

INDIANA

Harry M. Collins, Dugger.
Robert E. Wilhelm, Hammond.

LOUISIANA

Ethel Barry, Grand Coteau.
Charles Williams, Many.
Frank C. Bertrand, Paradis.
Lillian Boyett, Serepta.
Mary Irma Jenkins, Tickfaw.

MONTANA

Ruth E. Hewett, Flaxville.
Keith G. Carpenter, Sidney.

NEBRASKA

Luise A. Zaiser, Avoca.
Charles E. Furman, Danbury.
John P. Moran, David City.
Walter Nowka, Glenvil.
Eva L. Denney, Lyman.

NORTH DAKOTA

Bernice K. Gustafson, Alexander.
Ralph S. McConn, Fairmount.

OKLAHOMA

Daniel H. Blair, Clayton.
Otto L. Badgley, Keyes.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Rosa R. Rountree, Buffalo.
John E. James, Summerton.

TENNESSEE

Minnie M. Dyer, Byington.

VERMONT

Wright E. Rives, Barton.
Catherine G. Hoag, Grand Isle.
Edgar J. Chapman, North Springfield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who dwellest far beyond the light of suns and yet art forever with us, keep in our thought that all we do in soul and body, our God standeth by as witness. We pray that ours may be the memory of a useful life, eloquent in truth and in wisdom. Help us to understand that all that lives is in conflict and that there is no living virtue nor glory except in overcoming. In every situation we pray that the spirit may be stronger and more courageous than the flesh.

Heavenly Father, should we pause here? Art Thou not the God of those children beyond the flood? Hast Thou not said: "I will go with thee all the way"? We most earnestly pray that war, with its most inhuman cruelties, may cease and the wine press no longer be trodden with heavy and bleeding feet. May that day soon dawn in which the groans which have filled the earth with a vast moving requiem, shall come to an end and the joyful trumpet tidings shall resound throughout the world, and the prophecies of our blessed Lord shall be fulfilled. Then will begin the ministrations of humanity with its blanched face, and tragic memories shall be dissolved into an alluring hope that shall never die. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) entitled "An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Navy.
2. Post Office Department.
3. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
4. Tennessee Valley Authority.
5. War Production Board.

AWARD OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL IN THE NAME OF CONGRESS TO ADMIRAL CHESTER W. NIMITZ

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 4377, authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Georgia please explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the law a Distinguished Service Medal may be awarded by the President to any person, who, while serving in any capacity with the Navy of the United States, since April 6, 1917, has distinguished himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility. It may be awarded for combat or noncombat action.

The Committee on Naval Affairs felt that in view of the fact that Admiral Nimitz has rendered such outstanding service, it is fitting and proper that the Distinguished Service Medal be awarded to him in the name of Congress. Therefore, we unanimously reported this bill to the House.

As the House and the country know, Admiral Nimitz is the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet. He is one of the most outstanding officers in the armed forces of the United States.

While it is appreciated that the President is empowered, without further action by Congress, to present a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Nimitz, the enactment of the bill would announce the special approval of the Congress of his services and it is therefore deemed appropriate.

His ability, judgment, and masterful conduct of naval warfare in the Pacific have placed the naval forces of the United States in that area in a position of dominance and have forced the Japanese back from vital sectors of its defense ring.

Admiral Nimitz's designation as Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet on December 17, 1941, was a fitting climax to a naval career which has been one of distinction ever since he was appointed a naval cadet in 1901. Admiral Nimitz, in the 40 years between the date of his appointment as a cadet and his designation as Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet, served on battleships, cruisers, and for a considerable period served aboard submarines and in command of submarine units. He served 3 years as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Navigation—now the Bureau of Naval Personnel—and on April 28, 1939, he was appointed Chief of that Bureau and was serving as such when he was called to take command of the Pacific Fleet.

Upon assuming command of the Pacific Fleet, Admiral Nimitz, exercising sound judgment and bringing to bear his great naval skill as a strategist, directed the units of the Pacific Fleet with the result that successful actions were fought against the enemy in the Coral Sea in May 1942, off Midway Island in June 1942, in the vicinity of the Solomon Islands in the summer and fall of 1942, and, as the losses of ships and materials sustained at Pearl Harbor were made good and more ships were placed at his disposal, he assumed the offensive and conducted the brilliant operations of the past few months which have resulted in the taking and occupation of the Gilbert Islands and the Marshall Islands and attacks on the perimeter of the inner defense circle.

Admiral Nimitz now holds a Distinguished Service Medal, awarded to him in 1942; the American Defense Service

Medal; Fleet Clasp; the Victory Medal; Submarine Clasp; a Silver Lifesaving Medal, awarded to him on March 20, 1912, for rescuing a man from drowning; and he was given a special letter of commendation by the Navy Department for the performance of his duties as chief of staff to the commander, United States Atlantic submarine fleet in World War No. 1.

Under the successful direction and leadership of Admiral Nimitz, the American Navy has come a long way since Pearl Harbor, and under his continued leadership we can look forward to still more glorious victories and the ultimate annihilation of the Japanese Navy.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed in any way to object to the request of the gentleman from Georgia, but I was wondering whether you are not establishing a precedent that you now have to give the same medal to a number of generals in the Army?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to establish the precedent. The President has the authority, under the law, to give the Distinguished Service Medal to anyone he desires. But with these naval officers who have earned this honor, I think it means so much more when it is given in the name of the Congress. Therefore, I am not worried about the precedent that may be established.

Mr. FISH. I am not worried about the precedent at all either. I am glad the Congress does act sometimes on these things. But I was wondering whether it was not true, if we give this to Admiral Nimitz, if we should not likewise give it to General Eisenhower and General MacArthur.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. If I were a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I would have a similar bill here. But that is a matter entirely within the discretion of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Georgia would not object if I were to introduce a bill for General MacArthur in the same way?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. If there is any distinguished officer who, the gentleman feels, has earned the Distinguished Service Medal, and if Congress thinks so, the medal should be given to him in the name of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, for exceptionally meritorious and distinguished service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility as Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet from December 31, 1941, to the present time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE MISSOURI RIVER IMPROVEMENT—FORT PECK DOING ITS PART TO WIN THE WAR—"CHAIN OF ROCKS" DANGER ZONE FOR NAVAL TOWS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some time after the end of World War No. 1, I had the privilege of attending a hearing before a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission concerning certain barges that had been built for use on the Missouri River but which had been diverted to other service during the war. Senator Reed of Missouri was demanding the return of the barges to the Missouri, and made one of the most interesting and informative speeches it was ever my pleasure to have heard. He was criticizing the dilatory course that prevailed, and said that his patience had been worn threadbare, notwithstanding he had a reputation for patience that was Nation-wide.

Senator Reed also discussed the silt situation, and called attention to the fact that engineering estimates had shown that the Missouri was discharging into the Mississippi a cubic mile of silt and sand every year, and that every possible effort should be put forth to relieve the situation without further delay. Speaker Champ Clark was also present at this hearing.

Since World War No. 1 systematic methods have been applied for the improvement of the Missouri. A 6-foot navigation project from the mouth to Sioux City, a distance of about 800 miles, is being successfully carried out. Bank revetments and dikes to stabilize the channel have relieved the silt situation to a large extent, and the confined flow of water has kept the main navigation channel scoured out to the extent that required depths are being attained and maintenance costs materially reduced. The engineers report that on at least four-fifths of the stretch from Sioux City to the mouth the channel now has a depth of 9 feet, though the project depth is only 6 feet.

The pending river and harbor bill has provision for increasing the project depth from 6 to 9 feet to be uniform with the major river channels with which the Missouri connects. This plan does not call for any additional water from the Missouri Basin, but will be carried out as stated by General Robins, as follows:

House Document 214, Seventy-sixth Congress, outlines the proposed work in detail. It states specifically that the 9-foot channel is now available for at least four-fifths of the mileage and that the improvement of the obstructive stretches will be by means of minor extensions of existing contraction systems, by bank revetment, cut-offs, closing of channels, removing of snags, and dredging.

The proposed 9-foot channel will be obtained in a manner similar to that used for the Mississippi River. The contraction works serving generally to confine the wide shallow portions of the river to narrow and deeper sections. It will not be attained by any additional demand upon the water resources of the Missouri River Basin over that presently authorized.

In this connection I will call attention to the fact that more water is now being released from the Fort Peck Reservoir than is necessary for the present 6-foot channel on the Missouri. It is for another purpose entirely and as a war measure. A few miles below the mouth of the Missouri is an extremely dangerous condition on the Mississippi known as the Chain of Rocks. All shipping passing this point must use great care and caution.

Approximately 1,000 ships and boats of various types for the Navy use have been towed down through this dangerous stretch of the river since our participation in the war. The normal flow of the river was inadequate to meet this situation at the Chain of Rocks and it was relieved by the release of additional waters from the Fort Peck Reservoir. In the month of January ice conditions interfered for a short time with the release of water at Fort Peck, and at the request of the Navy, the War Department obtained the release temporarily of additional water through the Sanitary District of Chicago.

Hon. Chester Thompson, in charge of the Federal Barge Line operations, informed me a few weeks ago that he is now carrying out a contract of towing 360 naval vessels from Lake Michigan to the Gulf. These boats, he said, consist of submarines, destroyer escorts, frigates, PC patrol cruisers, SC mine sweepers, and YW Navy water tenders. Some of these ships are over 300 feet in length, and have a draft of 17 feet. In order to tow them down on a 9-foot channel to New Orleans, it is necessary to lash them to steel pontons to give them greater buoyancy, raising them to a draft of about 6 or 7 feet. It would then be hazardous for such tows to pass the Chain of Rocks without this additional water from Fort Peck.

The Navy takes the further precaution of having the tows of the main naval vessels convoyed by the Coast Guard. Owing to limited equipment available only three tows of these ships are now sent down each week from Chicago. The Navy is in urgent need of them, and some are taken down in sections before completion.

The construction of the Fort Peck Dam was commenced under the National Recovery Act by the P. W. A., in 1934, when an allotment of $25,000,000 was made for the commencement of the work. The project was then embraced as a Senate amendment in the river and harbor bill of 1935, and completed as a navigation project under the Army engineers. The total cost was $118,443,000, of which $5,411,000 was for the installation of the power plant.

The project as originally adopted by the P. W. A., and as embraced in the act of Congress in 1935, was upon the recommendation of Gen. Lytle Brown, then Chief of Engineers, which was in part as follows:

I further recommend that the project for navigation on the main stem as heretofore authorized, namely from the mouth to Sioux

City, Iowa, be vigorously pressed to completion, and that, in addition, the reservoir at the site of Fort Peck be built to the maximum practicable capacity; and be operated primarily for navigation, with such arrangement for future installation of power as will permit the maximum production of hydroelectric power consistent with the primary demands of navigation; and for these purposes an authorized expenditure of $145,000,000 be authorized, together with the maintenance that may be found necessary.

In 1938 a river and harbor measure was passed providing for the installation of power facilities at Fort Peck. This was a Senate bill which created a Government bureau at considerable cost, for the transmission and sale of the electric energy. Under the direction of the Rivers and Harbors Committee I reported the bill in the House which was Report No. 1504 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. This report struck out all the Senate bill after the enacting clause and substituted a new bill, which is now the law.

This new bill from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had the recommendation of Hon. John Page, then Commissioner of Reclamation, who said that the limited amount of power to be produced at Fort Peck would not justify an expensive set-up as proposed in the Senate bill, and as provided in a similar law for disposition of the power at Bonneville. We therefore decided to place the matter in the hands of the Reclamation Bureau, which would involve but little, if any, additional expense and avoid the establishment of an additional Government bureau. Section 1 of the act, among other things, contains the following provision:

The Secretary of War shall provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve at Fort Peck project such machinery, equipment, and facilities for the generation of electric energy as the Bureau may deem necessary to develop such electric energy as rapidly as markets may be found therefor.

Under this provision of the act of 1938 one power unit only has been installed by the Secretary of War, and no request has been made by the Bureau of Reclamation for additional units. The Fort Peck Reservoir is 189 miles long, with storage capacity of 19,412,000 acre-feet of water, and is said to be three-fourths full at the present time. The testimony before the committee when this measure was under consideration in 1938 showed that about 200,000 acres of land could be made accessible for irrigation from the Fort Peck project.

The interests of navigation and reclamation are mutual. The water that turns the turbines will flow down the stream. The greater the number of turbines in operation the greater will be the flow for navigation.

The pending river and harbor bill has provision for elimination of the dangers at the Chain of Rocks by cutting a canal around it on the Illinois side and installation of locks. After enactment, completion of the work would probably require several years. The war will not wait for this to be done.

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not been derelict in its efforts to eliminate the danger at the Chain of Rocks. After authorizing the survey and receiving the favorable report of the Chief of Engineers, the project has been embraced in every river and harbor bill presented to Congress since that time. It was in the bill that fell under the veto ax in 1940. It was in the bill which was not permitted to come to a vote in the last Congress. It is in the pending bill which is expected to come before the House next Monday. We hope for its enactment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in this connection and to include therein a few brief extracts from existing law and Government reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADMIRAL NIMITZ

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has just introduced and the House has just passed a bill to award the Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Nimitz. As a Member of this body I would feel somewhat derelict today if I did not also mention a few things about the man with whom and under whom I had the privilege of serving in this war.

I am glad the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] brought up the question of whether or not we were establishing a precedent. In the military services as the gentleman knows, it is somewhat difficult sometimes to give a medal of high merit to a commanding officer. The people sometimes feel they are slighting those in minor positions.

Admiral Nimitz has almost been one of us in Congress, since he served for so many years in the Bureau of Navigation. We on the Committee on Naval Affairs almost claim him as our own. For once, we want the Congress to speak out and say, "Here is a leader who should be rewarded. He served long and tirelessly for many years." I think when history is written he will be shown to be one of the greatest naval strategists of all times. We do well to pay him this honor here today in the name of Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address I delivered some time ago before the Social Security Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FROM THE WILL OF SAM HOUSTON

Mr. DIES. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a very appropriate and timely bequest from the will of Sam Houston, the hero of Texas, dated April 2, 1863:

To my eldest son Sam Houston, Jr., I bequeath my sword, won in the battle of San Jacinto, never to be drawn only in defense of the Constitution, the laws and liberties of his country. If any attempt should be made to assail one of these, I wish it used in its vindication.

ADMIRAL NIMITZ

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, would like to express great approval of the fact that the Congress is giving this Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Nimitz.

I happened to see him just before he left for the South Pacific. I saw his grim determination to be successful in winning the war. Most of us have an idea, although we have not been there, of what he has had to do in that extremely difficult area. It is a very fine thing, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has pointed out, that the Congress should give this medal—that it does not come by favor from any particular group in the Navy Department, but comes with the approval of the Members, representing the people all over the United States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on the question of awards of medals by the Congress to generals and admirals in the military services. I think General Eisenhower already has the Distinguished Service Medal. As far as I can see, the question of to whom medals are to be awarded should rest with the military and not with the Congress. I have the highest regard, as has everyone, for Admiral Nimitz, but if we start in the medal business here with one man it will never stop, and it might well be left entirely to the military, to the Army and the Navy, as to whom these decorations are to be awarded.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include therein a list of the dairy feed payments made to the farmers of the 10 counties of the Third District of Wisconsin, and also a summary of the oil meal distribution in the Third District of Wisconsin, through the A. A. A.; also a letter from the chairman of the Wisconsin Agricultural Conservation Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL TAX STRUCTURE

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House of Representatives have every reason to be proud of the splendid work which has been accomplished by the great Ways and Means Committee during 1944. It has devoted many weeks to the difficult task of preparing a new revenue law at a time when the American people are already paying into public treasuries more than 40 cents out of every dollar of their incomes. Some of these payments are made in the form of direct taxes. A large part of our tax burden is paid through a system of indirect taxes. Both have helped to create a very complicated tax structure, particularly with reference to the United States Government. The need for simplification of the Federal tax structure, and thereby of the Federal income-tax returns filed by corporations and individuals, has become progressively greater year by year under the Roosevelt administration.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee have pointed out that the Treasury Department should have developed a program for simplification of our tax laws and tax returns long ago. Since the administration leaders failed to take an active concern in this serious situation, the members of the House Committee on Ways and Means have taken it upon themselves to initiate corrective legislation. They have not relied solely upon their own personal knowledge of the tax subject, of which they have a wide and sound knowledge, but they have called in the Treasury experts as well as the experts employed by the committee. The members of the committee raised this issue early in January at the start of this session. On January 25, 1944, I spoke on this subject here in the House, urging that full support be given to the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman FRANK CARLSON, who had offered a program for simplification of taxes and returns at that time. Other members of the committee have since offered other suggestions and programs.

It is gratifying to note that after the passage of the revenue bill over the President's veto on February 25 of this year, the Committee on Ways and Means immediately took up the difficult problem of simplification of our Federal tax structure. They have held hearings, they have worked assiduously; they have secured results. We are delighted to know that before the month of April has passed bills will be introduced in the Senate and House which will provide for the simplification of our Federal-tax laws. The simplification of the tax laws will result in the simplification of the tax returns. This activity on the part of the Ways and Means Committee will bring untold relief to many thousands of American citizens. In accomplishing this much-needed tax reform, the credit will belong solely to Congress and largely to the members of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Thirty million Americans who now file returns will be relieved altogether of filing returns. We are told that normal taxes, surtaxes, and Victory taxes will be combined into one tax. Relief from guesswork about one's income for months ahead will be given in large measure.

Every American is vitally interested in this legislation. I hope that the committee bill will be given immediate consideration by the House as soon as it is reported.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INDIANAPOLIS POWER & LIGHT CO.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include in the text of my remarks the text of a citation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday last, I obtained unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article entitled "Representation for Smaller Business." I have been informed by the Government Printing Office that the insertion of this article will cost about $120. Notwithstanding that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. If there is general debate that may be done, but if a bill is being read for amendment, the policy is not to permit it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the request until tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial in regard to public schools.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial appearing in the Indianapolis Star recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on calendar Wednesday may be dispensed with tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial from the Chicago Times and one from the Watertown Daily Times, and a telegram, all on the soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the Chicago Times of yesterday on why it is absolutely necessary to reelect President Roosevelt in the interest of the country and the world.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ROOSEVELT BUTTONS SENT TO SOLDIERS

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McWILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to quote an extract from a soldier's letter sent from the north African theater of war:

> We are being flooded with Roosevelt pin-on buttons. We are invited to take them by the handfuls. This leads to some queer uses for the buttons. Arab babies usually don't wear them, but French babies do, and French mothers find it useful, in a general scarcity of safety pins, to employ the F. D. R. buttons to pin diapers. Some of the men go down to the water front and have fun, for, with practice, the buttons make admirable skimmers.
>
> We also are using them as chips in games of chance. Some Arabs find them valuable to pin together what sketchy undergarments they wear.
>
> Seriously, the men I have talked to resent this kind of politicking, and we'd all be obliged if you could tell us who is to blame. When I come home I'll bring you a handful.
>
> That's what we call teamwork—600,000 diapers from lend-lease and Roosevelt campaign buttons from O. W. I. to hold 'em up.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. William Borthwick, tax commissioner, Territory of Hawaii,

and a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. John C. Cuneo, of Modesto, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, March 8, the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior made a very important announcement concerning the fine progress they were making with the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington. I ask unanimous consent to insert that press release in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for Thursday of this week may be transferred to Wednesday, March 22.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the American Federation of Labor Federationist entitled "Still Lots of Truman Reports."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News entitled "Unity at Washington."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today at the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SMEARING OUR HEROES IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SMEAR ATTACKS ON GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the wolf pack of communistic smearers and radical New Deal and fellow traveler stooges are out gunning for Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our greatest fighting general, who with little to fight with wins victory after victory over the Japs while our invasion troops have been bogged down in Italy for 6 months.

Why the calculated and deliberate assaults by the smear artists of the War Department Library Service and the PM newspaper, or the uptown edition of the Daily Worker, except that both the New Deal hatchet men and the Communist fellow travelers are afraid that he will be drafted by the Republican National Convention in June to lead the fight against the Great White Father? Are the New Dealers afraid that General MacArthur will steal the war ball from the Commander in Chief?

What is wrong with Gen. Robert Wood, with a fine record in World War No. 1 and former head of the America First Committee, visiting Australia on official business, having a conference with General MacArthur? Evidently the PM forgot that Brig. Gen. Hanford MacNider, a gallant soldier wounded in the last war and in this, is serving directly under General MacArthur and that General MacNider is a Past National Commander of the American Legion and was a member of the National Executive Committee of the America First Committee, as was Mrs. Nicholas Longworth, sister of another brave officer, Brig. Gen. Theodore Roosevelt.

General MacArthur is the best-known and the best-loved officer in our armed forces, and if these unfair smear attacks continue they will insure his nomination and election as the next President of the United States. These false smear attacks can only undermine the morale of our armed forces, and cause dissension and disunity and come dangerously near the border line of sedition and treason against the United States.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York is recognized for 30 minutes.

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein certain excerpts and a bill now pending before the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I intend today to discuss the important problems raised by the British white paper on Palestine and the resolutions introduced in the House and the Senate calling for the abrogation of this White Paper.

It seems that the powers that be have set down their foot on the attempt made by Congress to pass a resolution urging the British Government to annul its so-called white paper, which bars Palestine to all future Jewish immigration.

Through the actions of elements evidently hostile to the Jewish people, it has been decided that Palestine should be the one country in the world to which Jews should not be allowed to go. What a strange travesty on justice.

Twenty-five years ago the British Government solemnly proclaimed Palestine as the national Jewish homeland. At that time Palestine belonged to Turkey, so Britain was very generous in deciding to make Palestine the Jewish homeland.

Now, 25 years later, when Britain obtained a mandate from the League of Nations to administer Palestine, Britain sees fit to pervert this mandate into full control, to such an extent that by its own unilateral action Britain tries to prevent Jews from entering their own homeland forever.

Such is the story of 25 years, during which the Jews poured their blood and treasure into the building of their own homeland. Deserts have been converted into blooming agricultural areas and industries were started where none ever thought industries could arise. For 25 years Jews were coming into Palestine from many countries and a population of some half a million found their homes there.

When Hitler began his campaign for extermination of the Jews of Europe, many were able to escape by going into Palestine, and Palestine still remains for many the one oasis of hope and settlement.

But the fact that the powers that be have closed the gates of Palestine should not make us close our eyes to the very need of the Jews of the world, particularly all those in the Hitler-occupied areas of Europe, tc find some place to which they might go in this emergency. And so I introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives on September 14, 1943, which stated the following things:

House Joint Resolution 154

Joint resolution to provide for the temporary admission into the United States of political or religious refugees from the Axis Nations

Whereas it is common knowledge that countless thousands of innocent persons, of all racial and religious denominations, in many of the countries of continental Europe have been murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted by the Axis Nations; and

Whereas it is accepted by well-informed people that unless something is done within the next few months, which months will embrace winter, countless more thousands will be murdered or otherwise ruthlessly persecuted; and

Whereas under the present existing immigration laws, unlike the limitation on the number of persons who may come to the United States permanently as immigrants, there is no such limitation on the number of those who may come temporarily; and

Whereas under present practices of administrative officials but very few persons are permitted to come to the United States temporarily or otherwise; and

Whereas ocean transportation of persons coming to the United States can be made available on returning transports: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that immediate temporary relief should be granted to those unfortunate people and it is therefore urged that an administrative policy be

adopted to admit to the United States for a period not exceeding 6 months after hostilities have ceased between the Allied and Axis Nations such persons now residing in continental Europe who desire to come to the United States and who can establish to the satisfaction of any American consul before whom they may appear that they are bona fide political or religious refugees: *Provided, however,* That it is further the sense of the Congress that no persons should be admitted, in accordance with the spirit of this joint resolution, if they are afflicted with any loathsome, dangerous, or contagious diseases, have criminal records of crimes involving moral turpitude, or whose presence in the United States would endanger the public safety of the United States or otherwise be inimical to the best interests of the United States. It is is further urged as being within the spirit of this joint resolution that as time is strictly of the essence in the success of the purpose of the joint resolution, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General are urged to issue their joint regulations to carry into effect the purpose of this joint resolution just as soon as it is possible following the passage of the joint resolution.

What I propose to do under this resolution is to save as many human lives as can be saved within the framework of our immigration laws.

While much can be said concerning our future immigration policy, there is no question that restrictions of immigration and limitations of immigration have been clearly written into our legislation and there is no question but that our future immigration policy will continue to be based on selective immigration.

It is therefore impossible to do anything by way of increasing the number of permanent immigrants who might be admitted from Europe from the Hitler ridden countries. I still hope that Palestine will not be closed as a haven for Jews persecuted all over the world. But apparently something must be done without any further delay to keep the doors of Palestine open, since the arbitrary policy of Great Britain has already cost millions of human lives.

In his progress through Europe, Hitler has already murdered and enslaved masses of people in every country to which his legions have gone. He enslaved the countries of western Europe and whenever his armies are forced to retreat from Russian territory, he slaughters and enslaves thousands along his path.

The only way we can save at least some of his victims is by granting temporary havens of refuge to as many as can find the opportunity to escape, until such time as they shall be able to return to their homelands or until such time as other countries might be found ready to receive them.

The object of my resolution is, therefore, no amendment to our immigration laws and no desire to interfere with a settled policy of our immigration laws, but it is purely a temporary measure and a measure designed to help and to save.

Only a few days ago a Member of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE], suggested that there might be a way of finding a home for the persecuted Jewish people on the Pacific coast in the great Republic of Peru, one of our good neighbors to the south. There might be other places of similar nature and other countries which require cultivation and pioneers, for which many of those who are persecuted today are particularly well fitted. The Commonwealth of Australia, for instance, has repeatedly stated that it would welcome white settlers.

But, the important thing now is not to provide for a future settlement of these people, but to enable them to save their lives until such time as definite plans could be made for their settlement.

Hitler will not wait for us to rescue them from his clutches. He is carrying on his program with ferocious and unrelenting might, and if we do not do something now at once, and in a hurry, there will be nobody to save when the time will come for us to resettle the ravaged countries which Hitler has despoiled.

I am addressing my remarks not only with reference to the people who have borne the brunt of Hitler's extermination policy, but we might say the same thing about the people of other nations who have fallen a prey to Hitler, and even about the people of Italy, who for a while Hitler called his allies.

We know how in the last few weeks resentment in Italy arose to fevered heat and how in the sections of Italy which are under Hitler's control the people revolted and engaged in strikes or sabotage, to prevent Hitler's machine from grinding them to dust. Hitler treats his former friends, if you can call them so, with the same ruthlessness with which he treats his alleged enemies.

When Italy surrendered to the Allies, it gave Hitler the opportunity to seek to enslave every Italian who came within the orbit of his power, and even the people of Germany cannot honestly say that their lot has improved with Hitler, but the common people of Germany are just as much Hitler's slaves as are the people of the European nations whom he had conquered.

But, this is not the time to shed tears over the fate of the German people. After all, "they made their bed and they must lie in it." The German people were warned by every nation in the world as to their fate if they saw fit to elect Hitler as their ruler, and they must suffer for their brutality and ruthlessness when the time comes for retribution.

Our duty as Americans and as Members of Congress is to help those who cannot help themselves and to rescue the victims of brutality wherever they may be found.

The Jewish people have suffered more than any other and while the other peoples enslaved by Hitler will eventually see the dawn of a new day and will sooner or later be relieved of the nightmare of Nazi domination, no such hope can be dangled before the eyes of the Jewish people.

The many Jews in Europe who were uprooted from their homes and whose means of livelihood have been taken away from them cannot expect that with the defeat of Hitler they could calmly go back to their own homes and start life anew.

Even the most progressive European peoples, even the Czechs and the Dutch, who have forever been lovers of liberty and particularly fair in their treatment of the Jews in their respective countries, will be unable to restore their Jews to the position they held before the Hitler invasion.

Hitler has so thoroughly mixed up the affairs of every country in Europe that there is no way by which any person can possibly find his home again in the place where it was before Hitler destroyed it. There will be many thousands who will have to look for homes elsewhere and many thousands will have to find new homes for themselves.

It was therefore my hope that with the aid of our Congress we shall be able to impress upon the British government how we as Americans resent the so-called White Paper of 1939.

A few days ago President Roosevelt specifically stated that the American people never approved or consented to the British white paper of 1939. America must be consulted, under the terms of the Palestine mandate, on every major change of policy which Britain as a mandatory power may wish to adopt with reference to Palestine.

So, if Britain saw fit to establish limitations on Jewish entry into Palestine, she did so without consulting us, and we are not in any way bound by the British White Paper.

It was therefore rather painful to many of us to have listened to testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee given by some members of the War Department suggesting that military expediency would not permit the passage at this time of the resolution designed to call upon Britain to abrogate this so-called White Paper.

I do not believe that it was really the intention of these important public officials to stand in the way of our passage of this resolution. I am positive that the Palestine resolution is closely linked to the question of rescue of the Jewish people. The creation by the President of a War Refugee Board aims at the same object.

We must not forget that the entire problem is only one and can only be treated as one. It will do no good to separate the various activities and lose sight of the principal question, which is the question of rescue of human lives. If we permit the British Government to continue with its White Paper and ban Jewish immigration into Palestine, the entire work of the War Refugee Board will be futile from the start.

How can the War Refugee Board help to rescue anybody if the most obvious place of rescue, Palestine, should be closed to a considerable portion of Hitler's victims?

But, aside from any question of humanitarianism and aside from the fact that America has always prided herself as being the asylum for the oppressed, how can we as their allies possibly forget the great debt of gratitude which Britain owes to the Jews of Palestine for their fine record in the present war.

Pierre van Paassen called the Palestinian Jews the "forgotten ally" and the forgotten ally they really are.

We must not forget the fact that Hitler's armies stood at the entrance of the Suez Canal. It looked as though the British Empire would be doomed to utter extinction and that Hitler's armies and the armies of the Mikado would join hands at the Indian Ocean as soon as the Suez Canal was taken over by the German Army.

The German marshal, Rommel, was already "licking his chops." It seemed a matter of hours that Britain would be doomed and it was this small Jewish population of Palestine which far above its means and far in excess of its physical ability was able to stem the tide of the German advance and win this battle for Great Britain, when otherwise Britain would have undoubtedly perished.

Another important phrase which was coined by Van Paassen was that "this was the best kept secret of the war." The British Government never gave the Jews of Palestine any recognition or credit for their exploits and never wanted to admit that it was the valor of the Palestine Jews which saved the day for the Allies in the Near East.

As against this record we have the record of all the other peoples in and about Palestine, that did absolutely nothing to aid the cause of the United Nations. Neither the Syrian, nor the Egyptian, nor the Iraqis furnished as much as a donkey or a camel to aid the Allies in the war, and strange as it may seem the British Empire is seemingly trying to appease the Syrians, Egyptians, and Iraqians, who did nothing to help the British, but on the other hand is attempting an anti-Jewish policy with reference to Palestine, thus repaying by utter ingratitude the help which they received from the Jews of Palestine.

It seems that to some extent the reluctance of our statesmen to help the cause of Jewish settlement in Palestine is due to the fact that we expect to obtain oil concessions from Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia, which countries are seemingly opposed to Jewish immigration because they are afraid that if Jewish immigration continues, Palestine will become in fact, the Jewish homeland and therefore exclusively Jewish.

We can assure Egypt, Syria, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia that any fears they entertain with reference to the Jews' excluding other people from Palestine are absolutely groundless. The Jews do not intend to make Palestine an exclusive Jewish country, but on the contrary tney wish to establish in Palestine a democratic commonwealth open to all who wish to make Palestine their home.

As a matter of fact, at this time there are many non-Jewish refugees in Palestine who are full of praise for the treatment they are receiving from the Jews in that country. We have a large contingent of Polish refugees who have established their headquarters in Palestine and who have found the Jews of Palestine very cooperative and very helpful. Even some former Germans, so-called Aryan refugees, who found new hope in Palestine are more than eager to see an increase in Jewish immigration into that country, since they feel that they will not be discriminated against and will be able to live happy lives in Palestine.

If we consider the fact that in the brief space of 25 years Palestine has changed from a desert into a blooming country, we can well see what debt of gratitude is due to the Jews for the work which they have done in Palestine. The Arabs who lived in Palestine before 1917 are more than happy to continue to live in Palestine and they have shown in their demeanor and their generous spirit of friendship for the Jews, how much they appreciate the changes which were made in Palestine in the last 25 years.

I am hesitant to believe the statements which are so common around the Capitol today and which seek to imply that the opposition to the Jewish commonwealth of Palestine is based upon the fact that we expect to obtain oil concessions from the Arab countries and therefore must play with the Arabs against the Jews. I hesitate to believe that any such considerations should have any weight with responsible public opinion in the United States and I feel that any idea of imperialistic oil concessions is clearly out of date at this time.

No, I do not believe that we will be swayed by such improper considerations to base our national policy on such utilitarian foundation. America will not forget that in the 150 years of its national history it has always been an asylum for the oppressed and has always taken the part of the oppressed.

Palestine is not going to prevent a union of all the Arab states if they see fit to form a confederation. If Egypt, Syria, and Iraq should desire to unite, the existence of a Jewish homeland in Palestine will not in any way prevent such a confederation. We have situations in Europe where nations have become confederated even if some adjacent territories were under another flag.

Take for instance, Switzerland, which exists as an independent country, in spite of the fact that these people speak French, German, and Italian, and there is an independent France, Germany, and Italy.

It will not hurt the future Arab Commonwealth to find a little Switzerland in the Near East, just as there is a Switzerland in Europe.

Palestine, by its geographical position and by virtue of its natural resources and the spirit of its inhabitants, is clearly destined to become another Switzerland.

The protests made against the Palestine resolution by Arab states are contrary to good diplomatic procedure and contrary to the normal procedure which prevails in the Congress of the United States.

What nonsense it is to have officers of a foreign government attempting to tell the Members of Congress what to say and what not to say? Since when do we obtain ideas and statements of policy from foreign governments? Under the Constitution of the United States no Member of Congress can be questioned for any statement he makes on the floor of the House by anybody in the United States. Shall we submit to questioning by foreign governments?

I am afraid that while "the voice is the voice of Jacob, the hand is the hand of Esau." I am very suspicious of the source of these utterances and am afraid that behind them is the fine hand of the British Foreign Office. I am afraid that it was the British Foreign Office which prompted our Syrian, Iraqian, and Egyptian friends to express their views in such form as to prevent Congress from doing its duty.

But I am also convinced of the fact that no Member of this House will be influenced by the statements coming from such foreign sources and will do his duty fearlessly and as his own conscience prompts him.

The question before us is much broader than the mere problem of Palestine and even the question of rescue of the Jewish population of Europe. The question before us is shall we bow to the dictation of Egypt, Syria, and Iraq?

We have received numerous appeals from various groups and organizations. Church organizations have called upon Congress to do something to help the Jewish people, pointing out that if we permit the Jews to be annihilated it will encourage the Nazi barbarians to extend their program of brutal murder to others. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that many Christians have been murdered in cold blood by the same Hitler followers. All are clamoring that something be done to help, yet nothing has been accomplished. As far as the persecuted Jews of Europe are concerned, their only avenue of escape at the moment, as well as their last hope, is Palestine. Unfortunately, the Palestine White Paper of the British Government is about to close this last avenue of escape and to shatter this last ray of hope.

As a result of mounting indignation in this country, and as an official protest against the vicious provisions of the White Paper, a resolution was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. COMPTON], and in the Senate by Senator WAGNER and Senator TAFT, to persuade the British Government to abrogate the White Paper, which would close the doors of Palestine—at the end of this month—to further Jewish immigration. All of the Members of the House were hoping and waiting for an opportunity to support such resolution. But out of a clear sky we hear today around the Capitol and other places that the Wagner and Wright resolution and other similar resolutions have been tabled in the committees. Why? The answer seems to be that some influential people, some politicians in the Arab countries, were able to convince some Americans with influence that the creation of a Jewish homeland would create unrest in the Arab countries.

We hear further, Mr. Speaker, that the War Department has interposed some objections to these resolutions. This latter objection is very amazing to me. I have a high regard for the War Department. If it were really and truly a fact that by tabling the resolution we would help the war effort, I would be for it. If

it were going to help us win the war, in spite of the fact that millions of Jews and others could not be saved from being murdered, I would be willing to heed the War Department's advice. But, Mr. Speaker, from the evidence before us and from the observations of well-qualified people—even within the War Department—who have been in the Near East recently, the Department's objections are based on much less important—that is, important to our country—grounds. It has no more to do with the war than the man in the moon.

Palestine is just a little piece of land when compared with the millions of miles of Arab land. Palestine is just a little spot when compared to the vast area under the control of the Arabs. In all the 25 years the Jews have settled in Palestine they seem to have gotten along very nicely with the Palestinian Arabs, except for a few political, self-appointed leaders of the Arabs who have created a lot of disunity to further their own interests. They have enjoyed the benefits of the Jewish homeland but at the same time they have been spreading insidious propaganda abroad that Jewish immigration to Palestine is detrimental to Arab interests.

I hope and trust that the proper committees—both in the House and the Senate—will look into the matter and expose this insidious propaganda. It is a pretty sad state of affairs when in this whole great world, with lots of space, we cannot find enough room, whether it be in Palestine, the United States, or in any other part of the world—to offer as a place of refuge to the tormented people whom we may be able to snatch from the claws of the Nazi beast.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. In 1939 when the British Government issued its Malcolm MacDonald White Paper to which the gentleman has adverted, we were not at war and despite the fact that 60 United States Senators and a great many Members of this Chamber protested to our own administration that it in turn protest the issuance of this MacDonald white paper, our administration was silent. As I stated, we were not at war at that time. Now, 5 years later, we are at war and the same attitude is assumed toward the British Foreign Office with reference to this White Paper. Was our administration and our State Department correct in 1939 or are they correct now? In other words, were they correct in their attitude when we were not at war or are they correct now when we are at war?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think they have been wrong in both instances. I thank the gentleman for calling that to my attention. Of course, he is correct.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I would like to get the gentleman's idea and also the idea of the other gentleman from New York on whether they are just going to make speeches here and let it go at that, or whether they are going to strive to get action from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, even if it is necessary to amend the original proposal? I have an idea that if this thing were put in proper form, that is, in a form in which we could come out and repudiate the white paper and hold the Balfour resolution upon which the Congress has voted unanimously, we could get action. What I am interested in, of course, is action to permit these hounded and persecuted Jews to find a haven, a refuge, a homeland in Palestine. I think that raises the real question.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I can assure the gentleman that as far as I am concerned, I do not intend to stop with a speech. I will knock at every door, I will try to reach every home of Americans with decent judgment, Americans who are good people, to get behind this resolution and to do everything in their power to assist us in saving as many human beings as possible.

Mr. FISH. May I say right here and now that I am in favor of the resolution, but I want to get action and I am going to take a resolution in amended form striking out all reference to the establishment of a commonwealth so that we can repudiate the "white paper" in order to demand immigration into Palestine and the right of the Jews to go there, to own property, to live there and bring up their families there?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. I think the gentleman from New York, our distinguished colleague, speaks directly and wisely. If we can get that resolution past the House Foreign Affairs Committee without the use of the word "commonwealth," I certainly would be for that proposal. It is essential to open Palestine to refugees so that the hapless, hopeless, tempest-tossed Jews can find some haven of refuge, be it only temporary. If we can get that resolution through, and thereby needle and spur England into action to withdraw this MacDonald "White Paper" and to allow further Jewish immigration into Palestine, even for temporary purposes, we will have accomplished something. I want to congratulate the distinguished gentleman from New York, first, because he was the author of the original Fish resolution of 1922 and because of his remarks in that regard just presented to us.

Mr. FISH. May I say to the gentleman that I am willing to cooperate in that way with him and the others to amend the resolution and even to write the amendment in order to get action.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY. As the gentleman knows, I am interested in this subject and made a talk in December before the House. I am wondering as a practical situation and from a parliamentary standpoint, whether we could file a petition to discharge the committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In my judgment there can be no objections to the filing of such a discharge petition and I intend to take this action if the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not report the Wright-Compton resolution within the next week.

Mr. KENNEDY. May I say to the gentleman that if a petition is filed I will be delighted to assist the gentleman in bringing it before the House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman. I have had the same statement made to me by many, many Members of the House and I am sure it is the will of the American people to have us live up to the obligations we took upon ourselves when our Government officially endorsed the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. May I inquire if the gentleman can inform me what the reason is for the proposed modification of the term "commonwealth"?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know. Someone is raising some technicality, for fear that a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine will arouse objections by some Arab interests.

Mr. ROWE. Why, is what I would like to know.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is a lot of British and Arab propaganda being carried on to that effect.

Mr. ROWE. Are we not acceding to the same injustices that brought about the White Paper?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no question about that. I think we ought to insist upon what we believe is the right thing to do; in other words, when the Balfour Declaration was adopted, the other nations endorsed it. Britain was just given the mandate over Palestine—to administer such mandate subject to approval of the Mandate Commission of the League of Nations and the other powers who endorsed the Balfour Declaration.

Mr. ROWE. I concur in the views of the gentleman. I do not believe it is possible to modify a wrong.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for taking that position. That is the position I have taken. I am tired of foreign governments telling us just what to do and how we should do it. I am tired of listening to a lot of irresponsible Arabs, who were nobodies until the settlement of Palestine. When the place was cleansed, progress was made, and money earned by these Arabs, all due to the work and sweat of the Jewish pioneers who battled malaria and trachoma and who turned the desert into gardens and fields. The absentee landowners among the Arabs, afraid that the poor fellahin, the poor exploited, unsettled Arabs, would learn to enjoy these new luxuries and learn too much to remain under the complete domination of these large, absentee landowners, started a campaign against the Jews.

Mr. ROWE. I am informed that the Arabs that were directly connected with the Palestinian group are the best off of all the Arabs, and I am further informed that they themselves are not complaining particularly about this.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROWE. It is the Arabs that are not part of the development in Palestine.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. ROWE. Inasmuch as it is them, I am not too willing to place the blame upon the Arabs. I am inclined to think it is more attributable to some international politicians, particularly those interested in empire rights.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman has something there. I agree with the gentleman that it is not the Arab in the area of Palestine who is complaining, because he is receiving the benefit of the prosperity which has come to Palestine under the new agricultural and industrial development of the country brought about by the Jewish settlers.

It is the Arab who is hundreds and thousands of miles away from Palestine who is seeking to put an obstacle in the way of the destinies of millions of people who have been dreaming of and working hard for the establishment of a homeland—a homeland guaranteed not only by England but by the United States and the other nations of the world.

The big question is whether this Congress shall, in its wisdom, bring out this resolution and discuss it openly. Let us know what is behind the opposition. Let us find out whether it can stand the searching light of public inquiry. Let us find out whether the oil deal with King ibn-Saud is really responsible for our appeasement policy—whether the accusation in an editorial in New York's PM, March 13, 1944, excerpts of which I would like to read to you, is justified:

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

And like all forms of economic imperialism, this one has already started a train of political consequences. The Jews in Palestine have proved the first victims. One of ibn-Saud's conditions in granting oil concessions to America may well have been that the American Senate withdraw its projected Wagner resolution about Palestine. And it is not impossible that General Marshall acted on the reasoning that oil is a matter of great military moment, and that its sources for fueling future wars ought not to be endangered by native Arab unrest. At any rate, he appeared before the Senate committee, and the resolution was tabled. Also, somewhere in the Arabian desert, a quantity of rifles and ammunition was handed over by Maj. Ralph Royce to ibn-Saud, as a lend-lease token. Ibn-Saud said he was satisfied by the American response, and I am sure that the British are not grieving.

Thus all goes well for oil imperialism. To be sure, the smell of oil may thus have set back for a decade the great dream that Theodor Herzl had for a Jewish homeland. To be sure, also, it may doom millions of Jewish post-war refugees to continued poverty and persecution in Europe. But in the perspective of the oil imperialism these are trifling matters.

Mr. ROWE. I am inclined to think that the Arab on whom we are placing the blame for starting this uprising is merely a smokescreen, in that the final act so far as the white paper is concerned can be attributed to the English Government and those in the Parliament that want to accede to the politicians to bring about this infiltration of Jewish people.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Exactly. That is what I stated at the beginning of my remarks.

Mr. ROWE. That was done over the remonstrance of the fair-minded people of Great Britain, and we ought to place the blame where it belongs, with the international politician, who has ulterior motives and selfish interests.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then why should we, the Congress, representing the will of the people, stifle resolutions affecting an official agreement entered into in good faith by our Government?

Mr. ROWE. If the question is directed to me, may I say that I am a new Member of this House and I am anxious to express myself on this matter, but as yet the opportunity has not been afforded me.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am sorry. I hope the gentleman is given such opportunity very soon.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not a fact that the power politics to which the gentleman recently referred will prove the greatest stumbling block to future world peace?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am inclined to agree with my distinguished colleague.

Mr. Speaker, this cannot go on. We would be the laughing stock of the world if we were to accede to threats and intimidations. We are told by some foreign hoodlums that they are objecting to something which is humane and which is right. We have made some official commitments regarding the Jewish homeland in Palestine and we are honor bound to live up to them. In acquiescing in this pact that we made with other nations in 1917 and 1918, we agreed to the very program that is now being violated by Great Britain. I want to mention at this point that the permanent Mandate Commission of the League of Nations refused to ratify the Palestine White Paper when it was submitted to them by Britain. This conclusively proves my point that Great Britain has no authority to enforce it.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, I serve notice now that unless the Wright-Compton resolution is reported out I will file a discharge petition. I have every confidence that every Member of this House will do the right thing and give us an opportunity to discuss this question. Then, whether you are for it or against it, we can discuss it in an American way without dictation from foreign sources, foreign governments, or foreign interests. How long will the civilized world permit the hangmen of the Nazis to go on murdering and slaughtering innocent people of all religious faiths? If we have a conscience we must take steps to save as many people as it is humanly possible to save from the gruesome deaths planned for them by the madman of Berchtesgaden.

At first we had the Bermuda Conference. We in Congress believed that the Bermuda Conference would bring about some relief for the persecuted people. Our hopes were in vain. Now, after much discussion in this country and all over the world, the President of the United States has created a War Refugee Board. One of the important tasks of the Board was to assist Jewish refugees escaping from the Lowlands and the Balkans to get to Palestine.

Now comes Great Britain and says, "After the end of this month Jewish immigration into Palestine is forbidden.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What reason did Great Britain give for refusing to let the Jews go to Palestine?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no reason under the sun.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What reason did Great Britain assign?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Great Britain—the great imperialistic power—is not used to give reasons for any of her actions. Britain claims she is afraid of Arab trouble. The evidence shows that the role the Arabs have played in this war is so negligible—unless you consider their help to the Axis—that their behavior could not possibly harm us any more than it has already done, no matter what we do or fail to do to appease them.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. If the gentleman will consult the minutes of the Permanent Mandate Commission of the League of Nations, he will find repeatedly expressed there that there has never been any trouble between the Jews and the Arabs in Palestine, except that which was caused by the British Colonial Office. He will find there evidence that Britain does not wish Palestine to be industrialized, because they are afraid that modern industrialization will raise the standard of living of the Arabs. They want to keep the Arab fellahin on a low standard of living. The Jew wishes to industrialize Palestine, but the British do not want that. They have just used their old method of divide and conquer to gain their own ends.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why does Britain frown on the industrialization of that territory?

Mr. CELLER. For the same reason that she frowns on the industrialization of India. England is not self-sufficient. She has to depend upon her manufactured exports to exist. There are practically only 40,000,000 inhabitants in Great Britain, and, therefore, if Palestine or India or any of the colonies of England become industrialized, there would be a lot of competition for English industrialists and the ruling families of England, who are primarily interested in large industries, do not want competition of that kind.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then, of course, it resolves itself down to the old British policy of divide and conquer, just as she did in Ireland.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That may be one of the causes, but there are many others.

It boils down to a political situation of certain groups within the Arab country who are playing ball with some British industrialists.

Mr. CELLER. The economic absorptive capacity would not permit, say, 4,000,000 more Jews to go into Palestine, or even 2,000,000 more, because of its smallness. Palestine is only half the size of the State of Vermont, and contains only about 10,000 square miles, and unless we do industrialize it, you would not give them the economic absorptive capacity to permit the entrance of a large number of Jews.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true, but that would not come overnight. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, a noted American soil conservationist, at present Assistant Chief of the United States Soil Conservation Service, in his splendid book Palestine, Land of Promise, points out that the unique combination of the natural features and resources of the Jordan Valley makes possible a huge reclamation project, capable of supporting at least 4,000,000 refugees in addition to the 2,000,000 Jews and Arabs already living there. There are more than 500,000 families in Palestine today who ask that they be permitted to take one or two or three refugees, no matter where they come from, to take care of them temporarily, until after the war.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman means 600,000 inhabitants, not families?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Do I understand that the gentleman means that the Jews are not going in there on a competitive basis but that whatever developments there are would be only enough to take care of their own needs?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman inform the House what is the attitude of the President of the United States on this resolution?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not know that I can answer that question. I have no right to say how the President feels on this resolution. The fact remains that the President has created a commission to save the suffering people of Europe, and that he has authorized a statement to the effect that he was happy that the doors of Palestine were open to refugees and that the United States had never given its consent to the Palestine White Paper. The gentleman may draw his own conclusion.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me in order that I may answer the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is my understanding on the highest authority that only within the last 10 days the President of the United States made a statement that this country had never recognized the so-called white paper.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Which is true.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And that of course would be an indication of his decision with respect to this problem.

Mr. FISH. I think that is important, and I ask the gentleman to yield because I think that is the whole issue. It is the white paper. I believe we ought to have an expression from the Congress against the white paper and that is what I want to see done.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. FISH. And we do not want people from the other departments of the Government coming here and favoring the white paper. What we want is an expression by the Congress against the white paper.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is why I said this resolution ought to be reported from the Foreign Affairs Committee to give us an opportunity to discuss it on this floor.

Mr. EBERHARTER. And I would like to say for the benefit of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] that I favor strongly the reporting out of that resolution, and its passage, and would say that I appeared before the committee on the first day it opened these hearings.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I know that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I argued that the white paper had no standing in international law, and that this country had never approved it in any form.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman. I know that is the fact, and what I am trying to point out is that this resolution, call it what you like, ought to be discussed here on this floor and not behind the doors of a committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. As I understand it, the whole point of this thing is the white paper?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Does the gentleman know whether any agencies of the Government sent any individual down to the Foreign Affairs Committee to oppose this resolution?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The Government did not—as far as I know. It has been rumored, however, that somebody in the War Department wrote a letter to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and some Army man—I don't want to discuss the name—appeared before the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and put it on the war exigency basis.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Was there any opposition from the State Department?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Not that I know of.

Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, this is not a partisan issue; this is not a political issue. This is an issue which raises the question of our national honor and of our conscience as decent human beings. Are we, as a nation, going to live up to a covenant entered into in good faith; are we, as decent human beings, as Americans, going to live up to the faith and hope put in us by our suffering brethren trapped in the Nazi inferno?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order for today be put over until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain statistics.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may be excused today on account of illness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] for 45 minutes.

PROPAGANDA—DISSEMINATION OF POLITICAL INFORMATION TO THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago I addressed this body in support of House Resolution 431, which would provide for the appointment of a bipartisan committee of six members, with direction and authority to study and investigate the dissemination of news, motion-picture, and radio broadcast material, pertaining to public officials other than officers of the armed forces, candidates for public office, national legislation, or public issues, to the armed forces of the United States, either at home or abroad, by or through any governmental agency. In support of this resolution I cited instances of unfair and improper handling of news and like material sent overseas. I also gave what I believed to be reasonable and proper arguments in support of favorable action on the resolution.

Last week an administration spokesman made a rather weak, and I believe futile, effort to defend the Office of War

Information and its activities in the dissemination of news and propaganda. I use the word "weak" in this connection because the administration spokesman made many statements that cannot be substantiated by the record. I say futile because I am convinced that there are few, if any, Members of this body who have been misled by the gentleman's effort to clothe this bureaucratic agency of the Government in the white robes of benign righteousness and sanctimonious purity.

In his attempt to defend the Office of War Information the administration apologist quoted Mr. Palmer Hoyt as saying, "O. W. I. is no propaganda agency." Evidently, the gentleman did not know Mr. Palmer Hoyt served only as Chief of the Domestic Branch of the Office of War Information, and had nothing to do with the preparation or dissemination of foreign news and propaganda. Mr. Hoyt, it is true, is a Republican. He was brought into O. W. I. after this Congress had become so disturbed over O. W. I. activities in the domestic field that it refused to appropriate the huge sums requested for the Domestic Branch of that agency, thus forcing its reorganization. Mr. Hoyt was placed in charge of the domestic end of O. W. I. to do a needed job of house cleaning. He did it well; but there is not a newspaperman in America who does not know that when Palmer Hoyt made the statement, "O. W. I. is no propaganda agency," he was discussing only the Domestic Branch of O. W. I., and was in no way referring to its activities in the foreign field. Of course, it is needless to remind you that Palmer Hoyt, a Republican and a splendid public servant, is out of the Office of War Information, and that his place has been filled by a gentleman whose political thinking fits in better with the New Deal pattern. You can judge for yourselves as to whether the coming elections had anything to do with the change that has been made.

The administration spokesman, in attempting to defend the Office of War Information, makes some directly conflicting statements. In one paragraph of his speech he attempted to tell us—and I quote:

> My investigation shows that, in accordance with a standing agreement with the press associations, O. W. I. files full texts of all statements, speeches, or messages of the President when they are available in advance. In keeping with this agreement, the O. W. I. filed the text of the President's message on the soldier-vote bill for all the news services to pick up. The text also was sent to Algiers in accordance with a request from the Psychological Warfare Branch of the Army for all soldier-vote material, but also included in the file was a description of the vote in the House of Representatives, showing that Members had stood up to be counted.

However, in the following paragraphs of his prepared speech the gentleman attempted to deny the very words he had just previously spoken by saying—and I quote him:

> A check of the scripts of the four major short-wave broadcasts in English, French, Italian, and German shows that the Office of War Information did not broadcast anything in regard to the President's soldier-vote message, the roll call, or the statements of Senators GUFFEY and BYRD.

And then he continues by stating—and I quote him:

> In psychological warfare it would be absurd for the O. W. I. to consider that congressional action on the soldier-vote legislation was good propaganda material for transmission abroad.

Now, fit those two statements together if you can.

But let us hurry on: The gentleman, speaking in defense of the Office of War Information, flatly denied that the O. W. I. controls news or entertainment going to the armed forces, and insisted that the information sent out relative to soldier-vote legislation was a fair and unbiased report of what transpired here in this Chamber. I hold in my hand a statement from our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Representative SCOTT, in which he tells of contacting the Office of War Information on the day the President's message was read to the House; and of being referred by Mr. Barnes, assistant to Mr. Elmer Davis, to the War Department, where inquiry was made of Colonel Munson, the officer in charge of disseminating news by short-wave broadcasts to the armed forces, if the President's message would be covered on the forthcoming broadcast. Upon being informed that relevant excerpts therefrom would be sent overseas the inquiry was made as to whether the action of the minority leader, in asking unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of and vote on the soldiers' vote bill, would be given as a matter of news. Colonel Munson agreed, that in the interest of presenting the news objectively, action of the minority party should also be reported. Assurances were given the gentleman from Pennsylvania that both sides of the story would be told, but I have here a copy of that short-wave broadcast, which, while playing up Mr. Roosevelt's charges of fraud, in no way mentions the minority leader or his reply to the President's message.

Of course, it is entirely possible that later on some of the agencies of the Government disseminating so-called news may have sent overseas some information as to the roll call on the soldiers' vote bill here in the House, but if so it was done only after the poisonous seeds of the President's fraud charges were first well planted. Thus far I have been unable to find any evidence whatsoever that any information was ever given as to the actions or statements of the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], in connection with the soldier-vote legislation.

And before I leave the subject of the publicity given the President's message on the soldiers' vote bill, and the failure of our governmental agencies to properly tell both sides of the story, let me say to you that, in my opinion, this Presidential message was a purely political document prepared and distributed not only for political use on the home front but especially for its political effect on the armed forces.

I do not contend there is anything wrong in any governmental agency furnishing to the armed forces the content of any Presidential message delivered to the Congress—or in giving the content of any other Presidential statements on domestic or political affairs—even though such messages contain affronts to, and cast aspersions upon, the Congress of the United States, as in the case of Mr. Roosevelt's tax-veto message. However, I do contend that it is unfair and un-American, after publishing a Presidential message on a controversial issue, to refuse or fail to give just as full publicity to the statements of those who oppose the President's position—or, in other words, not to give the other side of the story.

Oh, I know one of our colleagues who has spent some time in the Aleutians told us the other day that the only news received there was from the condensed reports of the press associations reprinted and posted as bulletins for the benefit of Navy personnel. I do not question the gentleman spoke the truth; but on last Tuesday another colleague—the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]—quoted from one of these Navy press bulletins, posted out in the far Pacific, giving an excerpt from a press association report of certain statements made by the new chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in which that gentleman spoke at length as to the alleged necessity of reelecting Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term. Information as to this bit of political propaganda, which was contained in the Navy news release, was furnished to the gentleman from Wisconsin by one of his State's fighting sons who expressed his bitter indignation over the fact that the other side of the story was not given.

This is typical of the very practice I am protesting against—the practice of selecting from the regular press association news services, for dissemination to our troops, those particular statements or news items that are favorable only to one candidate, to one school of thought, or to one side of a public issue. This editing of the news so as to favor one particular viewpoint or person is sometimes called, in newspaper parlance, "putting English on the ball." And then quite often I have noticed the news releases from O. W. I. and other governmental agencies, going overseas to our armed forces, carry what we call in newspaperdom, "reverse English," which means to play up or to so report news as to create a poor impression of the particular candidate, public official, or side of an issue opposed by the publisher. A clever editor can always stay within the confines of the exact truth and still so color the news as to favor one candidate or one point of view. Likewise in the reverse order, he can create in the minds of his readers disrespect or opposition to an individual or to one side of an issue.

For instance, I have read a number of so-called "profiles," or little sketches of various public men, including Members of Congress, which have been prepared and distributed by the Office of War Information during the past year. I am not surprised to find that the most ardent of the administration supporters were pictured as valiant warriors for the right, clothed in the armor of purity and good,

with nothing to be found in any of the sketches of such favored individuals with which anyone could disagree or find fault. However, in the profiles written of those who have opposed the actions and philosophies of the President and his administration, there always appear subtle sentences that are either injurious or at least not helpful to the individual concerned. That, my friends, is what you call smart and clever propaganda.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. In that connection I had a letter a few days ago from a boy in Africa. At the close of his letter the boy said, "If we do get to vote, I do not know how we can get the true picture."

It seems to me that is the important problem here, and it is entirely a nonpartisan matter. It is something that this Congress on both sides of the aisle should be equally interested in. I would like in that connection to point out a comment made by a member of the Senate, Mr. LUCAS, who is certainly not by any stretch of the imagination a Republican, and, as a matter of fact, who would not care much about being associated with the Republican Party. He says:

> I am for a commission or anything that will give the troops honest and fair information about all candidates, regardless of who they are. I do not want anyone to have any advantage.

The proposal being made by the gentleman from Ohio does exactly the same thing that this soldier boy is asking about, and it does exactly the thing that Senator LUCAS is asking about. It seems to me if we are going to do the job right by these boys and give them an opportunity to vote, we should go at least a step further than will be necessary to give them an intelligent vote and have this kind of a commission to see that this kind of a job is done.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska, and I agree fully with his conclusions.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I want to compliment the gentleman for the study he has made of this important topic. He has surely brought to the attention of the House in his speech today and his speech made a short time ago something about which we should know. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he has had an opportunity to go into this proposition: I understand that in practically every department in the Government an investigation is being made in some way by somebody who was once employed in the O. W. I. with the idea in mind that every bit of news that goes out from the various departments of the Government has to be sanctioned by somebody who had his training in O. W. I. I do not know whether it is true or not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that O. W. I. does, through the domestic branch, pass on news released from the different governmental agencies, as far as it affects the war effort, at least.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I have been very interested in the distinguished gentleman's statement, because I know he is an experienced newspaperman. I think the gentleman will agree with me that it is very possible for newspaper writers who seek to put "English on the ball," so to speak, and give added color to the description of a simple little event, to do so by the choice of language. For example, a bank is robbed. That is the story. One writer in describing the incidents outside the bank said "that John Jones was walking down the street after the robbery." Another writer said, "John Jones was seen slinking down the street after the robbery"—an entirely different construction placed upon the situation by just the choice of the word "walk" and the word "slink." The type of news releases that might be put out can be colored in describing an absolute fact, on which there should be no difference of opinion, simply by the choice of a word here and there.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman has given a very good illustration of the way news items can be twisted and distorted, and I expect to point out some examples a little later.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. In connection with what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said, a few years ago in my district there appeared an article worded like this: "A certain gentleman running for public office was contacted and asked the question, 'Is it true that you were drunk and discovered in a certain location with another man's wife the other night?' The gentleman said: 'Absolutely not.' So the next day the propaganda comes out, 'Mr. Jones denies that he was drunk and caught with another man's wife.' "

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is another apt illustration and a very clever one.

And, of course, our fighting men have been, and are being, propagandized cleverly and adroitly in other ways. Sometimes it is possible to color and change men's way of thinking by the reading material furnished them; such as by the distribution to the armed forces of 50,000 copies of Louis Adamic's book, The Native's Return, which was called to the attention of the Congress and the public not long ago by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] in which Adamic urges that America should and must turn to the left. Personally, I agree with the gentleman from Michigan in condemning the distribution of such a book, written by a man of foreign birth whose activities and membership in a number of Communistic front organizations have been made a matter of record by a committee of this House.

I hold in my hand another book that has been distributed widely among the armed forces of our Government at the expense of the American taxpayers. It is purported to be a Pocket History of the United States. It is written by Allen Nevins and Henry Steele Commager. Mr. Nevins, I am informed, is a controlling influence in that well-known liberal publication, the New Republic. This book interprets history from the radical angle. It views the happenings of days gone by through pink, if not red, colored glasses. Under no stress of the imagination can it be considered an impartial and unbiased recording of historical facts. Instead it constantly belittles and decries those individuals and policies with which its authors disagree, and praises and deifies the persons, the actions and the philosophies with which they agree.

Let me read you just a few excerpts of that which these gentlemen have written relative to recent history—history with which many of you are personally well acquainted. I quote from pages 470 and 471:

> A group of Republican Progressives, led by Senators Norris, La Follette, Costigan, and Cutting, had challenged Hoover's policies, but they were not strong enough to wrest control of the party from the "old guard." Of necessity the country looked to the Democrats for salvation. In 1930 the Democrats swept the Congressional elections, and in 1932 they prepared to take over the presidency. The Republican Old Guard, which had learned nothing from the depression, defiantly renominated President Hoover, who appealed once again to "rugged individualism" for a solution to the national crisis. The Democrats presented the brilliant and magnetic Franklin D. Roosevelt, who as governor of the Empire State had revealed himself as a resourceful, courageous, and humane leader, and who promised the Nation a "new deal." In the November elections Roosevelt rode triumphantly into the White House on the crest of a popular majority of 7,000,000 votes.
>
> One of the most heartening things about American democracy is that it has always managed to find great leaders in time of crisis. Sometimes, as in the case of Washington, the choice has been reasoned and deliberate; at other times, as in the cases of Lincoln and Theodore Roosevelt and Wilson, it has been largely fortuitous. It cannot be said that Franklin Roosevelt was an unknown quantity when first elected to the Presidency; it can be asserted that few of those who so hopefully voted for him realized that in Roosevelt they had a leader who as spokesman for democracy and nationalism was the peer of Lincoln, as a leader toward a better world order the peer of Wilson.

And again we find on pages 478 and 479:

> Finally, the Roosevelt administration inaugurated important far-reaching reforms in administration. The executive department of the Government, which had grown in a helter-skelter fashion and which was inefficient and extravagant, was reorganized and reformed. * * * And in 1937 the President, deeply concerned by an unprecedented series of Supreme Court decisions nullifying most of the New Deal measures, proposed a plan to reform the Court. The method was to bring about the retirement of aged Justices and infuse new blood into the Court; the purpose to persuade the Court to return to the great tradition of Marshall and Story and Holmes—the tradition that interpreted the Constitution as a flexible instrument of government rather than as a barrier to government. Roosevelt's specific proposal was defeated, but his purpose was achieved. The Court, frightened perhaps by criticism and sobered by a realization of its own inadequacy and incompetence, took a more enlightened view of the legislation enacted by the other equal and independent branches of the Government, and reversed most of its earlier paralyzing decisions. Not the least of Roosevelt's achievements was this of educating the Nation to the real character of the American constitutional system and persuading the Court to accommodate itself to American democracy.

Now that I have read these excerpts from the official Government-approved Pocket History of the United States, perhaps those of you who played some part in the historic events described therein are, for the first time, fully aware of what actually happened. At least you know what our soldiers and sailors are being told happened in those particular instances.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I recall a rather celebrated remark that was made on one occasion:

I care not who fights a nation's war so long as I may write its history.

I would suggest to the gentleman that perhaps some of the people responsible for history should pay a little more attention to fighting and winning the war.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think we should pay more attention to who writes our news releases, as well as to our histories.

Yet, the gentleman from North Carolina tells us to sleep quietly; no propaganda goes to our men in uniform.

But let us look again as to how some of the news of what happens right here in this body is interpreted and sent overseas by the Office of War Information. Let me quote from the official news release of O. W. I. on February 27, 1944, in which is described the dramatic and historic events connected with the overriding of the President's veto on the recent tax bill. I quote:

And at home, in the midst of war, the American home front has been giving a first-class example of a democracy in action. Congress passed two bills which were sent to the President for his signature. One was a bill stopping Government food subsidies. The other was a new tax bill. President Roosevelt disapproved both—or in American parliamentary language—he vetoed them. Congress upheld the veto on the food-subsidy bill—or, on second thought—it agreed with the President.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is fair to point out that in both Houses of Congress more than a majority still held the same opinion they held before the bill was vetoed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is true, and I shall later point that out. Again quoting:

But on the tax bill, Congress disagreed. The Presidential veto was overridden by a decisive vote in both Houses. In spite of President Roosevelt's disapproval, the tax bill has become a law.

Now some of you may be rather surprised to learn that this House agreed with the President on food subsidies; but that is certainly the impression that has been given by the O. W. I., even though the truth is that a majority of this House continued to register its opposition to the payment of food subsidies despite the President's veto, by a vote of 226 to 151.

But let me continue by reading the next paragraph, which is as follows, and I quote:

This is democracy in action. Laws are made in the United States by joint action of the Executive—the President—and the legislative—the Congress. But the President and the Congress do not always agree. When they disagree, there is orderly machinery in the American Constitution for setting the disagreement. During the past 10 days, this machinery has worked as it was meant to work.

Now, again, some of you may be surprised to learn from that paragraph of the O. W. I. release that the Chief Executive of the Nation, the President, helps make the laws, and that the Congress does not have original jurisdiction in framing the laws. Perhaps you have noted that according to O. W. I. the Executive seems to be the senior partner in the lawmaking business, inasmuch as he is named first.

And then let me read the balance of the news release, and I quote:

Over the tax bill there was a sharp argument between the President and the majority leader of the Senate, Senator BARKLEY, of Kentucky. And this argument was published in the Nation's press. It was not concealed or denied. Every American knew about it. President Roosevelt, in his message vetoing the tax bill, said it was, in his opinion, a bad bill. He gave his reasons, in forceful language. Senator BARKLEY, who is leader of the President's own party in the Senate, thought the language was too forceful. Senator BARKLEY felt that the integrity of Congress had been called in question. He said so, publicly, on the floor of the Senate. His remarks, too, were published in every American paper, on the front page, as President Roosevelt's veto message had been. By an overwhelming vote of both Houses, Congress agreed with Senator BARKLEY.

In some countries, the President, as leader of his party, would have found himself out of office because of lack of party support. In other countries, Senator BARKLEY would have been rebuked or punished for disagreeing with his party leader. In certain countries, the press would not have dared publish the details of the disagreement. But in the United States we don't do things like that. The whole controversy was brought out into the open. And since the people elect their President, and their Congressmen too, the people will decide, at the next election in November which side in the debate they will support.

After this public airing of a difference of opinion, both President Roosevelt and Senator BARKLEY publicly stated that the argument itself had not destroyed the mutual confidence, respect, and affection that each had for the other. President Roosevelt urged the Senator to continue as majority leader. Senator BARKLEY, in a letter to the President, said: "I want you to know that you have my utmost confidence and affection, and the personal and official relations which have been to me a source of infinite pride, I hope may be continued."

There was a disagreement in the American democracy this week. There was an orderly settlement of the disagreement by legislative process. A renewed expression of confidence between the two main persons in the argument resulted. The whole matter was known to every American; it was published in full in the press and discussed fully on the air. And while the discussion went on, the United States continued to bear a major share in the United Nations offensive all around the world.

Now, if that is not pouring oil on the troubled waters and taking care of the President's interests, then I am unable to judge the English language.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In other words, they reduced the matter between Senator BARKLEY and the President to one of a personal nature.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; and on top of it, of course, in interpreting to the soldiers and sailors, they gave the impression that the President makes the laws, right along with the Congress, which, of course, is not according to the Constitution.

Of course, I am happy that O. W. I. saw fit to point out that in the United States a Member of this Congress can still publicly disagree with the President without being rebuked or punished. I hope that such a situation may continue to exist.

In my original address to the House on this subject I made the statement that O. W. I. not only actually controls the flow of news to our soldiers, but also controls the kind and form of much of their entertainment—and that our armed forces are exposed to the propaganda disseminated to the peoples of foreign lands, and discussed over the radio or published in the press in the lands in which they are located. The spokesman for the administration, in his attempt to answer these charges, denied that O. W. I. furnished much of the news or information and like material to the armed forces overseas, and even seemingly denied that our fighting forces in foreign lands listened to the short-wave radio.

Let us see what the facts are: Mr. Elmer Davis, Chief of the Office of War Information, told the House Appropriations Committee—page 710 of the hearings—that O. W. I. was providing news to 3,000 newspapers in 39 countries, and was furnishing practically all the foreign news reaching north Africa. Mr. Sherwood, in charge of the Foreign Branch of O. W. I., told the Senate Appropriations Committee—page 244:

Wherever the Special Service Division of the United States Army has set up a paper like the Stars and Stripes, or Yank, and wishes to get news service from our outposts, we furnish it.

General McClure, in replying to a query by our late colleague Mr. Ditter as to what our men are reading, replied—page 1259:

They not only read it, but also receive information that comes in from the United States—from any source—information that comes in daily from O. W. I., news bulletins, etc., which are furnished the Stars and Stripes, as well as the foreign press, and they use it.

Mr. Hamblet, an O. W. I. official who had just returned from Sicily, north Africa, and the Middle East, and was presented to the committee by Director Davis, testified—page 1272:

We have the responsibility of providing the Army staffs in the field with all the news that reaches them.

Remember, please, that he was speaking about the O. W. I.

In justifying their Budget request for the Radio Outpost Division the O. W. I.

told the Appropriations Committee—page 770—that 80,000 news releases were broadcast every day by short-wave radio to foreign cities and that they had 3,200 radio programs a week. The O. W. I. official further testified—and I quote:

The Division has these responsibilities for programs to American troops overseas:

1. To produce and broadcast via short-wave from transmitters in this country news programs directed at the armed forces, but which also have tremendous propaganda value to a large "eavesdropping audience."

2. To cooperate with the Special Service Division of the Army by providing broadcasting time on Office of War Information transmitters for network programs and for troop entertainment shows prepared by the Army.

3. To arrange for distribution and broadcasts at the outposts of transcriptions produced by the Army.

O. W. I. officials further testified before the Appropriations Committee—page 773—that all short-wave broadcast facilities in this country are under their control; and that no private concern or commentator can broadcast short-wave at all from this country—page 779.

Representative WIGGLESWORTH—page 780—asked Mr. Sherwood, Assistant Director of the O. W. I., this question:

If a soldier in Africa is to hear short wave, is it O. W. I. and nobody else?

To which Mr. Sherwood replied:

Yes, if it is from the United States.

Mr. Barnes of the O. W. I. testified before the House committee—page 776—that the material being broadcast over short-wave by O. W. I. "runs roughly 70-percent news and 30 percent what we call features." In reply to a query by Mr. TABER as to what a feature was, Mr. Barnes explained:

A radio program comparable to an editorial in a newspaper.

Mr. Lattimore, who is in charge of O. W. I.'s Pacific Bureau, in defending an O. W. I. appropriation, said—page 810:

The amount is largely for programs for rebroadcasts in Australia. One is a program for our largest family—our troops overseas.

Mr. Sherwood again told the Senate committee—page 244:

Our only service that reaches troops is straight, factual news by short-wave radio, which, of course, reaches more than troops abroad.

Then later in October he told the House committee—page 1267:

We are inaugurating a 24-hour-a-day flash news service from New York to Algiers, Tunis, and Naples.

I wonder if the administration's apologist still contends that our troops do not listen to the short-wave radio, or that O. W. I. has nothing to do with furnishing the troops with their radio and news programs. By the very words of the top officials of the Office of War Information, the charges I have made have been proven true. O. W. I. does furnish a great portion of the news, both by short-wave radio and by straight dispatch, that reaches our armed forces. O. W. I. officials admit it. Everyone else seems to know it, except the gentleman who attempted to challenge my original statements.

Furthermore, O. W. I. does control the motion-picture entertainment that reaches our troops overseas; at least, officials of that governmental agency so testified before the Appropriations Committee—page 793—in which they stated:

Hollywood representatives of the Motion Picture Bureau (officials of O. W. I.) view all films designed for export, either in the script form or during production. The purpose is to help the industry produce pictures which will aid the war effort when commercial American films are shown in foreign countries. Not only are inappropriate sections corrected through this cooperative process but it frequently is possible to introduce new and helpful subject matter.

Perhaps this explains the famous propaganda film, Mission to Moscow.

On page 799 Mr. Sherwood testified that O. W. I. also produces pictures of its own and distributes them overseas, stating frankly:

The people who are working on the overseas job think directly and frankly in terms of propaganda. Everything they do is intended to produce a certain state of mind on the part of those who see the motion pictures or hear the radio programs.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. What I am about to say is in the nature of a tribute to the farsightedness and thoroughness of one of the deceased Members of this House, the Honorable J. William Ditter, of Pennsylvania.

Last year in discussing the Office of War Information, Mr. Ditter urged that there be less propaganda and suggested the elimination of Government magazines, radio programs, and printed material.

We have established media in these fields which the people trust—

Mr. Ditter said.

To create confidence, and to get a better job done, let O. W. I. ask the organized groups—The American Newspaper Publishers Association, representing the daily press; the National Association of Broadcasters, the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors, the National Editorial Association, representing the weekly press, and the National Publishers Association, representing magazines—to draft outstanding committees of top executives to cooperate with Government and direct the information program.

Last week, I read in the press that Mr. George W. Healy, Jr., the present executive of the domestic branch of O. W. I., stated that his organization would ask for decreased funds for future operations, and the newspaper story added:

Mr. Healy explains that his agency can operate far more economically than in the past because it now uses established media—newspapers, radio, magazines, and the motion picture industry—for its campaigns. For example, in the early days, O. W. I. made its own war campaign motion pictures. This function alone cost about $1,750,000 a year. Now, it gets the big studios to do the job free and only $50,000 a year is needed to maintain an industry liaison office.

Thus we have an illustration of an able legislator of vision, pointing the way for both better organization and economy within an administrative agency.

I want to congratulate the gentleman on making such a fine speech, and may I add that I hope some day to have an opportunity to go into this question of the movies a little further, because I think I have some information that may interest the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his tribute to our late lamented colleague, Mr. Ditter, who while with us contributed so much to the welfare of the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In October of 1943 O. W. I. officials told the House Appropriations Committee how they had taken over the movie theater in Palermo, Italy, and showed their own films. Similar action was taken in other occupied areas where unquestionably our troops see such films. O. W. I. books and publications are also placed in libraries in occupied territories, to which unquestionably our troops have access.

So to deny that O. W. I. propaganda has reached our armed forces overseas certainly seems foolish.

In my previous discussion on this subject I made the charge that the O. W. I. was made up of a hodge-podge of ideological hues, and that there are some reds, pinks, and pastels down there. This statement was seemingly challenged by the administration spokesman, who in his attempt to defend the O. W. I. and its staff, contended all employees, including aliens, employed by O. W. I. are, and I quote him, "cleared by the regular Government investigating agencies, including the F. B. I., the Civil Service Commission, and O. W. I.'s Security Board."

For the benefit of the record let me point out that when O. W. I. officials appeared before the Appropriations Committee of this House testimony was given showing 486 aliens, not counting numerous employees in outpost offices, were on O. W. I. rolls. Many of these 486 aliens were undoubtedly included in the 1,720 employees of O. W. I. who had not yet been completely investigated by the Civil Service Commission at the time Mr. Hamblet testified before the House Appropriations Committee late last year on the supplemental national defense appropriation for 1944, page 1349 of the hearings. Nine hundred and twenty-nine employees had received spot checks, but 791 had neither had a spot check nor a complete investigation, according to the admissions made by the official O. W. I. witness.

Let us again look at the record for a moment. Before the Senate committee, Mr. Sherwood, Assistant Chief of

O. W. I., was asked this direct question by Senator NYE:

Against how many persons on your staff has the charge of communistic association or belief been made?

To which Mr. Sherwood answered:

I do not know, Senator, but it seems to me that charges have been made against an enormous percentage.

Later in the same hearing Senator O'MAHONEY made this statement:

It seems to me that the percentage of people of this type—

Meaning communistic or radical—

in your division is pretty high. I cannot see how you get into your job such a high percentage of questionable individuals. I can see that in any organization like yours there will be a reasonably high percentage of them, but I cannot see why you have so many.

I believe that such statements are complete substantiation of the charges I have made on this particular phase of O. W. I. activities.

Another matter I would like to discuss for a moment are some of the instructions sent out by our War Department to guide those who furnish information to our armed forces. David Lawrence in his column calls it an "appeasement guide," which tells the officers how to control or influence the minds of the troops. Stars and Stripes on January 29 carried an editorial telling about the new guide book issued by the War Department for officers and other personnel in charge of information and orientation courses for soldiers, in which it counsels against the undemocratic notion of the Army coming home some day to run the country.

That the soldiers themselves do not like this attempt to control the information they received, and their way of thinking, is attested to by a letter one of my colleagues but recently had called to his attention by the wife of a man serving in the Mediterranean area, in which he wrote under date of February 6 as follows:

The enclosed clipping from the Stars and Stripes dated January 29, 1944, has made everyone boiling mad and if this is the sample of the kind of stuff the administration is handing out to stifle free expression just before election, somebody better look out. It means that certain groups are getting desperate because of their fear of the trend of things. I want you to look this document up and send me this guidebook. This is certainly going too far and I am stating openly that this be given full publicity if it is a matter closed to the American press.

I am sure that no censor—if one reads this—in his right mind will X out a word of what I say. If he does, let me know at once what has been deleted (by sentences, I have a copy) so that we may know whether stifling is starting on this side, by instruction.

The enclosed notice says: "A new War Department Guide Book issued for officers and other personnel in charge of orientation and information courses for soldiers wants the men counseled against the undemocratic notion (! ! !) of the Army coming home some day to run the country. * * *" So what's wrong with that? It's a dirty, skunky trick and I am protesting and defying anyone to tell me that I dare not criticize the perfect job that civilians at home are doing. No, the Army as such will not run the country but we returning soldiers, as citizens, will certainly take a hand, and God help any fool that stands in the way. Write me quick on this matter.

I could read you many other letters that have been received by families and even by Members of Congress, from the men serving overseas, in which they protest the manner in which much of the news sent them is distorted or colored. Those men, who fight under our flag on a half hundred different battle fronts throughout the world, want factual information as to what is going on here at home. They are entitled to it. They do not want to be propagandized. There is no reason why they should be. We are not playing fair with them when we permit such practices to continue.

Undoubtedly the different governmental agencies affected will deny the charges made against them, but the records speak for themselves. These agencies are not unbiased and impartial in their work. They are playing favorites in the dissemination of the news, and this Congress has a duty and a responsibility, both to our fighting forces abroad and to our people at home, to study and investigate the situation.

I want it clearly understood that I in nowise impugn the motives or the professional standards of the regular officers of our Army and Navy when I make the flat charge that fourth term, political and ideological propaganda is being distributed among our troops and sailors at a time when it is impossible for them to get both sides of every controversial question. I am firmly of the opinion that these men of our regular forces, and the overwhelming majority of those who have entered the service since war threatened and became an actuality, wear their uniforms as officers and gentlemen. I make the charge, on the other hand, that our armed forces are having pressures put upon them to disseminate propaganda which I have described. And we all know, gentlemen, of the pressures which are in the hands of this New Deal administration, once it had made up its mind that it would use such pressures, to exercise the arts of propaganda. I would trust the judgment, the discretion and the honor of General Marshall and Admiral King to the ends of the earth in this matter. But, this Congress in turn owes a duty to them to be sure that their operations are not interfered with by some who put politics and economic passions even ahead of a speedy winning of the war.

Truth does not seek the darkness. Truth does not shrink from the light. If these agencies of our Government have nothing to hide, then why should there be any objection to a bipartisan committee from this House being named to study and investigate just how the dissemination of news to our armed forces is being conducted? Why has the chairman of the powerful Rules Committee, of which I, too, am a member, failed and refused to extend to me the usual courtesy of a hearing on Resolution 431? Why has the word seemingly gone out from high sources to kill my resolution and to prevent, at all costs, the investigation I have suggested and requested? If the practices which I condemn, and of which so many fighting men complain in their letters home, have not been followed and do not exist then why should anyone object to an investigation? It seems to me that if these agencies of Government, charged with the responsibility of disseminating news and informational material to our armed forces, have carried on their work well and properly they would want the Congress and the country to know just what they have done; they would welcome a thorough study and investigation by a committee of this House; there would be no need for apologies or explanations to be made in their behalf. But when they take the opposite attitude, and the word goes out to block the naming of an investigating committee at any cost, then the suspicion grows that there must be much to hide.

I believe I have already presented sufficient evidence to establish the need for the passage of House Resolution 431 and for the study and investigation provided thereunder. I hope prompt legislative action on the resolution may ensue.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. I appreciate the statesmanlike address just given by the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman has documented his remarks in such a way that their accuracy cannot be fairly questioned. They are a devastating answer to those who seek to picture as lily white the "red" complexion of the O. W. I.

We all know that the O. W. I. distributes political propaganda, favoring the administration, to the troops. I would go further and point out that even the Army has not always been as careful as it should be in this regard. The gentleman has made reference in passing to the fact that the War Department has published a pamphlet, No. 20–3, entitled "A Guide to the Use of Information Materials." This pamphlet is for use of editors of Army newspapers. It is also a guide for informational officers and those concerned with orientation courses in the Army.

This booklet to which I refer tells the officers how to color the minds of the troops on the very things that will make votes for or against the Roosevelt administration in November of this year. The pamphlet, consisting of 25 pages, is full of subtle suggestions such as the one I read from page 7:

No good purpose is served by plying the soldier with information emphasizing the prevalence of high wages or extraordinary profits or other data tending to show that he is carrying an excessive share of the burden of the war, or that civilian forces on the whole are not cooperating, or that certain economic or social groups are slipping into special favor.

Certainly no good purpose would be served the New Deal administration by such disclosures.

It is also interesting to observe that responsible authorities are permitting Marshall Field, publisher of the Chicago Sun and PM, to send letters which are published in Army newspapers. A

United Press dispatch of March 8, coming from Naples, records that the Fifth Division News, a servicemen's newspaper, published a letter from Field boosting New Deal proposals for public works to employ servicemen after the war.

I have read in the March 9 edition of PM that an Army newspaper in Hawaii has conducted a poll of soldier opinion concerning Westbrook Pegler, foe of labor racketeers. I thought that polls of servicemen had been outlawed by somebody. But, this poll attempts to show that Pegler promotes disunity and by inference, therefore, is disloyal and an obstacle to victory by our forces in the war. It does seem that the Army could concern itself with more important activities and certainly with activities not so subject to suspicion by many citizens. It seems to be the idea of the New Deal that it must spoon-feed the minds of our people. It could be that the Army has, to some extent, unconsciously fallen in with these Pied Pipers who would lead the Nation to ruin because, I am told, O. W. I. furnishes much of the personnel as well as propaganda to the Army for its publication activities.

House Resolution 431, introduced by the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], should be approved. An investigation needs to be made of this whole question. Certainly if the O. W. I. and other agencies are guilty of no abuse of their responsibilities in this connection they need not fear such investigation. If they have been in error the complete state of facts should be exposed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix an address on Post-War Air Transportation, and include testimony of Admiral Land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Also, Mr. Speaker, to extend in the RECORD my remarks on the construction of ships of February 1939 to January 31, 1944, and include a letter from Admiral Vickery.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Flathead Monitor, of Kalispell, Mont.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday next, March 21, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore agreed to, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] for 45 minutes.

INVASION OF WESTERN EUROPE

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, are we Americans, as a nation, losing our instinct for self-preservation?

We have known since the time of the first conscription bill that military decisions were being imposed upon our General Staff from above by officials who are not military experts. We know that after General Marshall stiffened at Quebec, only irate public opinion prevented his being replaced by a general who would be a more complete rubber stamp. We know that while some high Army and Navy officials gave lip service to the decision to finish Hitler before Japan, others managed to let their apprehension become known. We know that against the advice of ranking American military officers who thought it foolish, we went up into Italy because Mr. Churchill wanted it, though Stalin opposed it. We know that the decision to invade western Europe was made because Mr. Stalin demanded it, though Mr. Churchill opposed it. It seems that we follow the leadership of our allies, regardless of what American experts may contend is for the best interest of America. But when our allies differ, we adopt the course which requires America to sacrifice the most.

If we are to invade western Europe, the date of the invasion should be determined not by some gratuitous, anachronistic commitment made in the past, but by our highly trained American military experts. The validity of that determination depends upon correct findings and estimates with respect to numerous abstruse, complicated, highly technical factors. Only a highly skilled military expert is qualified to make these assessments and decisions. They involve such things as tides, weather forecasts, air support, diversion of enemy forces, ability to sustain attack—this last factor being affected by the altered situation in Italy. It is important that Germany shall have been bombed thoroughly, though that is not more important than that the enemy fortifications along the coast which would resist the intended attack shall have been reduced. It seems, nevertheless, that we are to be hurtled pell-mell into an insufficiently prepared invasion according to a schedule made in agreement with Stalin. We act as if going through with this invasion on the date set, pursuant to Stalin's demand, involved no more serious consequences than a shotgun marriage.

Americans are to furnish around 80 percent of the invading force and also replacements. It is admitted that the invasion may cost us a half million men. It might cost a million men or more.

Mr. Churchill opposed this invasion. It is hard to see why it should be important to America to invade Europe if it is not important to Britain. Privately, some of our keenest military experts call the invasion "costly and stupid." It looks as if failure to protest against it is like the unnatural mother. She rides in the car with her husband who is a reckless driver. She watches him heading straight for a collision which may kill her children. She does not cry out because she fears to be called a "backseat" driver.

If the invasion was promised as part of the bargain to revive the senile League of Nations' scheme, it was a poor bargain. It should not have taken much persuasion to induce Britain and Russia to join a reincarnation of the now decomposed League since they are exmembers. A single member of the League—France or England—could have prevented the building up of Hitler. The belief that with America in it so that our partners could more easily tap American resources and manpower, it would insure us against wars in the future, is naive. Look at the way American men and resources are being used by the partnership in Europe now. American aid is being used to buy us trouble now and in the future. It is being used for the purpose of aggression.

Today the British Empire is saved. Russia, or nearly all of it, is saved. But we also saved, it seems, the spots on the leopard. Friend Stalin's gangdoms in various nations which, in a tight moment, he promised to disband, have not really been disbanded. They now work for revolutions harder than ever before in the nations of Europe and also all over Latin America. Oumansky leads the hoodlums in the various South American countries. Here in the United States men who mouth Stalin's party line, work in key positions in strategic Government agencies, including the Office of War Information, the Federal Communications Commission, the Office of Strategic Services, and the armed forces. In the Army they have subtly succeeded in compelling the emasculation of counter-intelligence.

By a fake reorganization of the Russian Government, our irrepressible partner has asserted claim to the Baltic Republics, Polish territory, and Finnish territory. The move to "compensate" Poland by giving her extensive German territory is a move to put German enemy vipers in the vitals of Poland and make her too weak to defend herself. The demands to have Brother Stalin's supporters given important positions in the Governments of Finland, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia are moves to seduce and weaken those nations. Stalin's German committee, which Secretary Hull was assured would be dissolved, has not been dissolved. Headed by the German, General von Seidler, it broadcasts daily to Germany. It offers a peace which will leave the German Army intact, minus Hitler and some prominent Nazis. What would Hitler ever have

amounted to without the German Army? We know that he was a convenient front for the army. We know that if the German Army is left intact Germany has a good chance to rise again. But Stalin's committee implores Germans, when the time comes to overthrow Hitler, to preserve the German Army.

At this peculiar moment in history, when our ally, Stalin, starts finishing the job he helped Hitler start, our Government adopts what it announces is a neutrality policy against such aggressions. This is a sweet time for our Government to turn isolationist! There is no such thing as isolation when you are stretched out in war all over creation. Neutrality, before we became involved in war, was the way to keep out of war, but neutrality when we are in war is a sure way to stay in war.

Neutrality against aggressions now only serves to encourage aggressions because Stalin, if he had not the use and threat of use of American aid, could not make these power and territory grabs. One whose partner uses his resources to commit crimes is also held guilty of those crimes. You cannot wash it off your hands. Europeans, after the last war, called us "Uncle Shylock." This time smaller allies feel we are betraying them. Do you know what they have already started calling us this time? "Pontius Pilate!" Several cocks crew when recently the British Prime Minister, addressing Parliament, disavowed the well-known British treaty obligation to Poland, the British-American agreement with Yugoslavia, and the claim of humanity that the "brave new world" shall not be built upon a foundation of dynamite.

For a thousand years, repeated attempts to enslave the 110,000,000 people in eastern Europe have always caused explosions. Poland, for example, is no small country. A nation of 35,000,000, it is almost as populous as France, which has 40,000,000. Polish history, the past 150 years, lists repeated forced partitions and repeated wars for independence. Brutal treatment by both Hitler and Stalin, begun during the Hitler-Stalin conquest and partition, has made Poles detest both dictators. Poles will never stop fighting until they are free again.

Another explosion sure to come is in Yugoslavia. There are 8,000,000 Serbian men, women, and children in Yugoslavia. Encouraged by our allies, they threw off their pro-Nazi ministry and fought Hitler while Tito, the Earl Browder of Yugoslavia, was still an outlaw trying to cripple their war effort against Hitler because at that time Stalin, his leader, was the partner of Hitler. After Stalin joined the Allies, Tito joined the Yugoslav Army. But, Serbs say, he and his Communists shot so many anti-communistic villagers that the army had to expel him. Now, Serbs complain, the Allies "cooperate" with Stalin to force the Serbs to accept Tito, Stalin's henchman, as their general and ruler. They say that their own General Mihailovich, though refused lend-lease, and having only the equipment he can capture from the Germans, fights with surprising success—a fact carefully concealed from the American public. A recent dispatch received from Mihailovich says that Hitler's planes are flooding Serbs with leaflets containing Churchill's speech regarding Yugoslavia, and saying that his speech is clear proof that the Allies have deserted Mihailovich for Tito. It is clear that these Serbs will never submit peacefully to rule either by Hitler or Stalin.

Another fuse sure to explode in the future is Turkey. Turkey is the iron fence which limits aggression on the Black Sea in the same way that Poland limits aggression on the Baltic. According to the theory used by German militarists, Poland and Turkey are two keys to world domination. At first, the Allies were glad to have Turkey neutral. But Britain, on Stalin's insistence, refused Turkey lend-lease for defense. Then, urged by Stalin, the Allies demanded that Turkey participate in the war—but still without giving Turkey defense equipment. Turks see in this frightening sequence of moves, plus Stalin's demand for a navy, a sinister program to squeeze them out of the Dardanelles and weaken them into submission to Stalin. Turks have never submitted to conquest. Turkey is another potential explosion.

The British have always acted so as to prevent the danger to Britain of letting Europe be dominated by any one power. They know, of course, that the Russian dictator's excuse for seizing power and territory in strategic areas—self-protection—is the same excuse Hitler used for aggressive moves in the same strategic areas. They know that Russia, if Germany were eliminated, would be in no danger from anybody. They know that Stalin could have no need for all the territorial power he is building up, plus the German Army, unless he hopes to conquer more than Europe. The London Times publicly advocates that Germany shall not be dismembered. More significant is the fact that the British make no determined effort to dislodge the German forces from the Aegean and eastern Mediterranean. Why? Obviously, the Germans will block the egress of Russia through the Dardanelles and the Balkans. The Germans, thus, are cheap insurance for the British Empire's life line.

What then will America get out of the coming invasion of western Europe but the corpses of our best young men? The demolishment of Germany? No, because both Britain and Stalin want that Germany shall not be completely demolished and that Germany shall be permitted to retain an army. The liberation of western European nations? Must we repeat all the mistakes in history? Must there be another tragic Children's Crusade? The countries we might liberate in this way would be Luxemburg, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Norway, and France. The terrific bombing of those countries sure to accompany the invasion will leave them a shambles. Their industries, their harbor arrangements, their little model farms, the means by which they live will be destroyed, and, some refugees from those countries say, that is what is wanted. Why else, they say, did Stalin object to the invasion through the "soft underbelly" of Europe, through the Balkans where one could destroy central European war industry and Rumanian oil fields, the source of German power?

Will this invasion help gain for Europe a durable peace? No. We know in advance that the new Europe already taking shape which we have agreed to "cooperate" with our allies in policing, will be anything but peaceful unless Stalin liquidates the brains of Europe. The report that at the Teheran Conference of potentates he revealed that such is his intention is less excruciating than logical.

If we really want to remedy our mistakes and secure a durable settlement of Europe's troubles, the time to get it is now—not later. Later may be too late. Now means before lend-lease stops and before the invasion starts.

It is blithely assumed by mental midgets that when we invade Europe we shall not have to fight the full strength of the German Army because it will still be heavily engaged fighting Stalin. That is a criminally reckless chance to take. Why, when the invasion starts, should not Germany accept the peace being offered by Stalin? Germany would be foolish not to accept it, since it leaves the German Army intact—minus the Nazi prima donnas who have now become a horrific political liability outside of Germany and, perhaps to a larger degree than we realize, also inside Germany. Such a peace, rumor says, has already been arranged. Germany, to be sure, would not relish leaving Stalin free to range through Yugoslavia, the Dardanelles, and elsewhere. But what could be more important to future German aggrandizement than the weakening of the American Army, fighting far from home in western Europe?

America is the force which, Germans think, prevented their winning World War No. 1. America is the force that kept England stubbornly fighting in World War No. 2 long after Germans expected England would be forced to accept negotiated peace. America is the force without whose aid Stalin could not have driven Germany out of Russia. Without American aid Stalin might not long remain the new master of Europe. America, moreover, unless prevented by our allies or Germany, is apt to destroy Germany now.

It is suicidal for America to rush headlong, willy-nilly into this invasion until German coastal defenses are reduced to the extent considered sufficient by American military experts; until American military experts are agreed that we are thoroughly prepared and ready to invade; and until our military experts are sincerely agreed that the invasion is for the best interest of America. Even then, we shall be risking all that we have and all that we hope to have.

Today, Germany sees America poised upon the Channel. Germany cannot be sure how strong we are. The longer we wait, the more thoroughly Germany is bombed, the more punishment she takes. Today we are in a bargaining position. We can do what President Wilson did when he offered the 14 points that brought World War No. 1 to a speedy, successful conclusion.

We know what the terms of a durable peace settlement are. This time it does not require 14 paragraphs to express them. You can express them in a single word—justice. They have already been expressed in this single sentence: "Sovereign rights, territories, and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

This neat description of what would be a just peace for Europe is lifted from that miracle of manifestoes which rose like the shining sword Excalibur from watery depths—the Atlantic Charter. Nobody has forgotten the Atlantic Charter except the exalted personages who sponsored it. Indeed, the sentence quoted is only half a sentence from the Charter, but disillusioned Europeans would now be delighted to get this solid tidbit from the luscious bounty which has turned out to be a mirage. They will not get that tidbit unless both Hitler and Stalin cough up whatever power and territory they have aggressively usurped since the time these two Macbeths started the war in partnership. But, truly, it looks as if we will never get a durable peace—unless we postpone the invasion long enough to persuade Hitler by bombing, and Stalin by postponement of invasion and diplomacy, including restrictions against aggressive use of lend-lease, to give us that kind of peace. Nobody has the right to refuse to accept this ultimatum. Because every ally has already accepted the Atlantic Charter while the necks were still in danger and before the fists got into the American Treasury.

The invasion of Europe may mean that our war against Japan will go by default. American military experts have always insisted that unless we punish the Japs swiftly and thoroughly, the Japanese ax will hang over the United States for a hundred years. Japs are strengthening themselves in subtle ways. With race propaganda they seek, not without some success, to stir up a billion orientals against us. They had a heyday on the radio propagandizing the Arabs when the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—the State Department having taken a neutral position—held hearings on the Palestine resolution, which is anathema to Arabs. The friendship of Moslems in Africa, who are thus being stirred up, is important if we are to bring home safely the American soldiers now engaged in the Italian campaign. The Japanese, it is reported, are spending money to stir up race agitation in the United States among our colored American citizens.

It is folly to delay crushing the Japs. We have no treaty obliging either Britain or Stalin to give aid in our war against the Japanese. Indeed, Stalin already demands part of our ships which we need and he does not. There are, to be sure, unexploited riches in the Pacific Indies area which our partners might like to acquire. But our military experts say American possession of those areas is vital to the defense of the United States. We have no territorial ambitions but, do not forget, we have already bought and paid for any area of the world vital to the defense of the United States.

The well-advertised Mountbatten campaign has amounted to nothing. American military officials complained softly at the time that it was not intended to be anything but a flashy means of diverting needed officers, men, equipment, and attention from the effort led by General MacArthur. The Burmese campaign is not likely to be important. Burma can easily be picked up at the peace table. To patriotic Americans, Japan is the villainous power that foully plunged America into war, but that is no reason to expect that those who wanted us into the war would especially hate the Japanese.

The leaders of our shamefully neglected forces in the Pacific say they might conquer the Japanese with power already in the Pacific—if it were coordinated under a single unified command. The single command should be headed by General MacArthur because, according to those qualified to make the estimate, he is our ablest American general—perhaps the ablest general in American history. American soldiers out there have fought with superhuman endurance. They deserve the best leadership America can give them.

With a unified command, our forces under General MacArthur may conquer the Japanese within 2 years. Otherwise, it is warned, our war against the Japs may drag on for several years. A single command would be able to lighten the forces in one Pacific area in order to concentrate really effective blows in another. As it is, our Pacific forces are inefficiently divided into four theaters—five counting Lord Mountbatten's—with the overlapping functions and divided authorities typical of Washington civilian agencies. At the moment, General MacArthur sorely needs amphibious equipment. Instead, one hears, he is to be treated to a public smear campaign.

Amphibious equipment is the kind of equipment now being dissipated in the abortive Italian campaign. It is the kind of equipment now being assembled in great quantities in preparation for the western European invasion—for our rendezvous with destruction.

Today, therefore, I introduced two bills. One bill provides for postponement of the invasion until the suggested ultimatum shall be carried out and until our qualified American military experts shall agree that the invasion is for the best interest of the United States.

The other bill directs that the forces now employed in our war against Japan shall be coordinated under a single unified command, of which General MacArthur shall be commander in chief. It provides that no forces now employed against the Japanese shall be withdrawn without his consent and that all forces and equipment requested by him, including amphibious equipment, shall be turned over to him.

All these moves can be made by the Executive without legislation. But probably they will not be made unless the American people vociferously insist. The time has come for patriotic Americans at home to speak up with something of the courage with which American fighters abroad risk their lives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered recently in Boston, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. PHILLIPS, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. KELLEY (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for 5 days, on account of the death of his mother.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 15, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Wednesday, March 15, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, March 15, 1944, on H. R. 2522 and H. R. 4350.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the small business subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2:30 p. m., Wednesday, March 15, 1944.

Business to be considered: Resume hearing on H. R. 2201, a bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Small Business. Meeting in Accounts Committee room on Ground Floor of House side of Capitol.

There will be a meeting of the land grants subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 16, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 4184 entitled "To amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on S. 1225, entitled "An act granting a pension to Constance Eager," which was introduced by Senator TYDINGS, and S. 662, entitled "An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes," which was introduced by Senator BILBO.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting on the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads

on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2328 and H. J. Res. 49 (to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable). Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on H. J. Res. 148, joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health, on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1294. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration, transmitting a report on operations under the Lend-Lease Act, from the passage of the act March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 497), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4381. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. H. R. 4099. A bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913; with amendment (Rept. No. 1256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KLEBERG:

H. R. 4402. A bill to provide for the control of prices for food commodities during the present war and for 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 4403. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to defer registrants engaged in commercial fishing operations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 4404. A bill to transfer Government activities in connection with domestic rabbits to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4405. A bill to amend the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), as amended, so as to more specifically provide for pay, allotments, and administration pertaining to war casualties and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4406. A bill to provide for the payment of overtime compensation to Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

H. R. 4407. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain employees of the Government of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4408. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 4409. A bill to make retroactive as of June 1942 the increase in the purchase prices paid by the Procurement Divisions of the Treasury Department on and after January 14, 1943, for class A used nonportable typewriters to be used by the armed forces, and to provide for payment of such increase in prices to all persons, firms, and corporations who sold such typewriters to the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department prior to January 14, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4410. A bill to extend for an additional 90 days the period which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 4411. A bill to exempt from the individual income tax earned income earned in certain taxable years following an individual's discharge from the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. J. Res. 251. A joint resolution authorizing a preliminary examination or survey of Anchorage Harbor, Alaska; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

My Miss SUMNER of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 252. Joint resolution to postpone the invasion of western Europe and secure a durable settlement of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. J. Res. 253. Joint resolution to provide relief for the American forces now employed in the war against Japan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 469. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4381, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIES:

H. R. 4412. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Frank Calhumen et al.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 4413. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Eleanor Peasley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5247. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5248. Also, petition of the Allegheny County Federation of the Blind, asking for the enactment of House bills 2017 and 275, and Senate bills 65 and 910; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5249. By Mr. CASE: Petition sponsored by Charles Agee, of Midland, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5250. Also, petition sponsored by Robert Wenger, of Groton, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5251. Also, petition sponsored by Dr. L. M. Davis, of Winner, S. Dak., and signed by 40 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5252. Also, petition sponsored by H. A. Lawien, of Timber Lake, S. Dak., and signed by 15 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5253. Also, petition sponsored by Lee Elder, of Timber Lake, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5254. Also, petition sponsored by Carl L. Fuller, of Isabel, S. Dak., and signed by 41 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5255. Also, petition sponsored by George Davis, of Dupree, S. Dak., and signed by 42 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5256. Also, petition sponsored by R. R. Hande, of Webster, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5257. Also, petition sponsored by Leonard Likness, of Langford, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5258. Also, petition of Post 1273, Veterans of Foreign Wars and Ladies Auxiliary, Rapid City, S. Dak., signed by 45 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any such bill as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5259. Also, petition sponsored by Esther Cox, of Andover, S. Dak., and signed by 19 citizens, protesting against the enactment of any bill such as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5260. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of about 350 residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5261. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of L. P. Zimmerman and 1,057 citizens of the southern section of Schuylkill County, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5262. By Mr. JUDD: Petition submitted by Henry Martin for 21 citizens of Minneapolis, opposing passage of House bill 2082, which would impose complete prohibition for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5263. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5264. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of John Knutson, of Crocker, and Ingeman Berge, of Wallace, S. Dak., and others, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5265. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the Women's Guild of Congregation Emanu-El, San Francisco, urging abrogation of the Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5266. Also, petition of the San Francisco Congress of Industrial Organizations Council, urging that all sessions of Congress be broadcast; to the Committee on Rules.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou King of glory, who hast opened heaven to all believers, help us to think of Thee as being merciful, long suffering, slow to anger, and in the abundance of forgiveness for all transgressors. We pray for the emancipating faith in Thy mercy in which we may ever live in the scope of Thy holy being. Wilt Thou humble us and reconcile us to the presence of our Heavenly Father upon earth that we may bring to Thee our best sentiments, our glowing enthusiasm, walking in self-restraint before our fellow men.

Our Father, if Thou wert not manifested in the mission of our Saviour, from the tempest we would cower; before the storm, the wind, the earthquake, and the fire we could not stand. We rejoice that by Thy supernal power the tribulations of the world, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature can separate us from the divine love. So clothe us today that we may make known Thy counsel for the welfare of men. Be the shadow of a great rock unto those who are grievously burdened; unto those who are discouraged by the hardness of the way and feel the pull of some temptation. Arm us all with that confidence that outlasts the senses and takes hold of the great treasure of eternal truth. In the name of Him who is alive forever more. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner;

H. R. 1488. An act to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shephard;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2419. An act to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2880. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 2956. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lieut. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson;

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; and

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 248. An act for the relief of Louis Courcil;

H. R. 544. An act for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay;

H. R. 1313. An act for the relief of Delores Lewis;

H. R. 1411. An act for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart;

H. R. 1412. An act for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton;

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan;

H. R. 2625. An act for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held;

H. R. 2743. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marie Geiler;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Charles J. Goff;

H. R. 3390. An act for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron; and

H. R. 3408. An act to amend chapter 7 of the Criminal Code.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 754. An act for the relief of Iver M. Gesteland;

S. 1006. An act to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in procees or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian;

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Anne Rebecca Lewis and Mary Lewis;

S. 1335. An act for the relief of Robert C. Harris;

S. 1553. An act for the relief of J. M. Miller, James W. Williams, and Gilbert Theriot;

S. 1588. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, a minor;

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the State of Tennessee;

S. 1618. An act to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes;

S. 1634. An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States;

S. 1660. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota Department of Highways and the county of Crow Wing in Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street, in Brainerd, Minn.;

S. 1665. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer;

S. 1682. An act to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, island of Oahu, T. H.

S 1748. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, to continue it in effect;

S. 1749. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect;

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1285) entitled "An act to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes."

EXTENSION OF 90 DAYS FOR WHICH CERTAIN GRAINS AND OTHER LIVESTOCK AND POULTRY FEED MAY BE IMPORTED FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES FREE OF DUTY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of the bill (H. R. 4410) to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to permit the importation from foreign countries free of duty, during a period of 90 days, of certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed, and suspending for 2 months the increase in the tax rates under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act", approved December 22, 1943 (Public Law 211, 78th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"That (a) notwithstanding the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, the following, when imported into the United States from foreign countries, and when entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, at any time after December 22, 1943, and before June 20, 1944, shall be exempt from duty:

"(1) Wheat, oats, barley, rye, flax, cottonseed, corn, or hay, or products in chief value of one or more of the foregoing or derivatives thereof, any of the foregoing if to be used as, or as a constituent part of, feed for livestock and poultry.

"(2) Flaxseed, if the entry or withdrawal is after the date this paragraph takes effect.

"(b) This joint resolution shall not be construed to authorize the importation of wheat for milling purposes.

"(c) As used in this joint resolution the term 'United States' means the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territories, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASES IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BURCH of Virginia submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

VOTING IN TIME OF WAR BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, MEMBERS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE AND OTHERS

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full conference report.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 44]

Andersen, H. Carl	Gifford	O'Leary
Anderson, Calif.	Gilchrist	Phillips
Anderson, N. Mex.	Harless, Ariz.	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Hendricks	Poulson
Baldwin, Md.	Jarman	Rivers
Baldwin, N. Y.	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Boren	Jonkman	Rowan
Chenoweth	Kelley	Short
Cox	Klein	Smith, W. Va.
Dawson	Lambertson	Sparkman
Domengeaux	LeFevre	Stearns, N. H.
Feighan	Luce	Stockman
Fogarty	McGehee	Vorys, Ohio
Ford	McMurray	Wadsworth
Fulmer	Manasco	Ward
Gamble	Monroney	Wasielewski
Gibson	Morrison, N. C.	Winter
	Newsome	
	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 371 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

VOTING IN TIME OF WAR BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES, MEMBERS OF THE MERCHANT MARINE, AND OTHERS

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the Act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendments numbered 9, 11, and 12.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter inserted by the amendment of the Senate to the amendment of the House numbered 3; and strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, as amended by the amendments of the House, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, be amended by inserting after the enacting clause the words 'Title I' and by striking out sections 3 to 15, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

" 'SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to restrict the right of any member of the armed forces of the United States or of any other person to vote in accordance with the law of the State of his residence.

" 'TITLE II

" 'USE OF STATE BALLOTS

" 'SEC. 201. The Congress hereby expresses itself as favoring, and recommends to the several States the immediate enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots or the United Service Organizations and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States, who is eligible to vote in any election district or precinct, to vote by absentee ballot in any primary, special, or general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war; and in order to afford ample opportunity for such persons to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States to the greatest extent possible, the following provisions are enacted.

" 'SEC. 202. It is recommended that the several States, when possible, waive the application for a ballot and authorize the proper election officials to send an official ballot to every voter serving in the armed forces of the United States or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots or the United Service Organizations and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States. If an application is necessary then it is recommended that the several States, in order to avoid expense, duplication of effort, and loss of time, shall accept, as applications for absentee ballots under such States' absentee balloting laws and as applications for registration under such States' election laws, the form of post card (when duly executed by a person to whom this Act is applicable) provided pursuant to section 203 of this title and section 3 of this Act prior to its amendment.

" 'POST CARDS

" 'SEC. 203. In order to afford an opportunity for persons to whom this title is applicable to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize State absentee balloting procedures to the greatest extent possible, the United States War Ballot Commission provided for in title III below shall cause to be printed and delivered to the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration an adequate number of post cards for use in accordance with the provisions of this title. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such post cards to be delivered to each person to whom this title is applicable for use for any general election at which electors for President and Vice President or Senators and Representatives in Congress are to be voted for, such delivery to be made outside of the United States not later than August 15 prior to the election, and within the United States not later than September 15 prior to the election. The post cards referred to shall also, whenever practicable and compatible with military operations, be made available to such persons at appropriate times for use in general elections other than those referred to above and for primary and special elections.

" 'Upon one side of the post card shall be printed the following:

" 'Secretary of state or other appropriate official within the State of _____.

" 'I am in the armed forces ( ); in the merchant marine ( ); or in the American Red Cross ( ), the Society of Friends ( ), the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots ( ), or the United Service Organizations (1), and attached to and serving with the armed forces. I hereby request an absentee ballot to vote in the coming _____ (primary, general, or special) election.

" '(1) I am a citizen of the United States.

" '(2) The date of my birth was _____.

" '(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____.

" '(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village of) _____ in the county of _____ at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____.

" '(5) My voting district to the best of my knowledge is _____.

"'(6) My choice of party primary ballot is _____

"'(Fill in only in case of primary ballot)

"'Please send the ballot to me at the following address: _____

_____

_____

"'_____

"'(Print your name and serial number plainly above)

"'_____

"'(Write your usual signature above)

"'Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19__.

"'_____

"'(Commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath, writes here his name and rank or title)

"'Upon the other side of the post card shall be printed the following:

"'Free of postage, including air mail

"'(War ballot)

"'Secretary of state of _____,

"'_____,

"'(City)

"'_____.

"'(State)

"'In lieu of and interchangeably with the post cards referred to, the Secretaries of War and Navy may continue to deliver and make available, and the persons to whom this title is applicable may continue to use, post cards provided under section 3 of this Act prior to its amendment until the existing supply thereof is exhausted. In the event of any such delivery or making available to members of the armed forces of post cards provided under section 3 of this Act prior to its amendment, the Secretaries of War and Navy shall authorize changes in the text thereof to provide that the applicant shall print thereon his name and serial number, in addition to normal signature, and shall designate his party affiliation in the case of application for primary ballot.

"'FUNCTION OF POST CARDS

"'SEC. 204. Such post cards may be used, if State law permits, as applications for ballots under State absentee balloting laws, as applications for registration under State absentee balloting laws, or as sources of information to implement State absentee balloting laws.

"'INFORMATION REGARDING ELECTIONS

"'SEC. 205. The Commission shall, at appropriate times, furnish the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration with any information received from a secretary of state as to the dates of elections in such State, including general, special, and primary elections. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, whenever practicable and compatible with military operations, cause such information to be made available to persons to whom this title is applicable.

"'COOPERATION WITH STATES

"'SEC. 206. (a) It shall, wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, be the duty of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, respectively, to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in transmitting to and from persons to whom this title is applicable, making applications therefor to their several States, such absentee ballots, and envelopes to be used in connection therewith, as may be provided under the laws of the several States for the use of such applicants, and to cooperate in the execution by such applicants of oaths in connection with such ballots.

"'(b) The Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities shall, so far as practicable and compatible with military operations, take all reasonable measures to facilitate transmission, delivery, and return of post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure, mailed to and by persons to whom this title is applicable pursuant to the laws of the several States, whether transmitted by air or by regular mail. Ballots executed outside the United States shall be returned by air, whenever practicable and compatible with military operations.

"'SEC. 207. (a) It is recommended that the secretary of state of each of the several States, upon receipt of any such post-card application, promptly forward it to the proper county, city, or other election official or officials in order that the request for an absentee ballot may be acted upon as expeditiously as possible.

"'(b) It is recommended that the several States cooperate, to the end that county, city, or other election officials be authorized and instructed, upon receipt of an application made upon such a post card, to mail promptly to the voter making the application, if legally permissible under the laws of the State, a suitable absentee ballot, including therewith a self-addressed envelope for the use of the voter in returning the ballot and any instructions to govern the use of such ballot and envelope.

"'(c) It is recommended, so that the envelope in which the ballot is sent to the voter, and the envelope supplied for the return of the ballot, may be identified by the Post Office Department and other authorities as carrying an election ballot, that there be printed or stamped in a conspicuous place on each such envelope the words "Official Election War Ballot." It is further recommended that, in the case of States in which no provision is made, either on the envelope or separately, for sending with the absentee ballots a printed form to be used by a voter for the purpose of establishing his legal right to vote, appropriate action be taken to have printed and enclosed with absentee ballots mailed in response to applications received on the post cards hereinbefore referred to, a form for the signature and oath or affirmation of the voter; and it is suggested that a form substantially as follows would be appropriate for such purpose:

"'OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN 19__

"'I do hereby swear (or affirm) that—

"'(1) I am a citizen of the United States;

"'(2) The date of my birth was _____;

"'(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____;

"'(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village, if any) of _____, in the county of _____, at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____;

"'(5) I am (check appropriate blank)—

"'(a) in the armed forces of the United States_____( );

"'(b) in the merchant marine of the United States_____( );

"'(c) in the American Red Cross ( ), the Society of Friends ( ), the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots ( ), or the United Service Organizations ( ), attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States; and

"'(6) I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered, or promised to pay, contributed, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote.

"'_____

"'Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested.

"'Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19__.

"'_____

"'Commissioned officer noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath, shall write his name here.

"'_____

"'Officer or other person signing above shall print his rank, rating, or title clearly here.

"'(d) It is recommended that, in States where the voters' absentee ballot will not be available for mailing to the voter forty-five days prior to any primary, general or special election, such States cause to be made such changes in the election laws of their States as will lengthen such time; and that all States waive registration of all men and women in the military service who, by reason of such services, have been deprived of an opportunity to register.

"'(e) It is further recommended that the several States, in order to reduce the weight and bulk for air transport of absentee voting material being sent to persons to whom this Act is applicable, reduce in size and weight of paper, as much as possible, envelopes, ballots, and instructions for voting procedure.

"'TITLE III

"'USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY FEDERAL BALLOTS

"'*United States War Ballot Commission*

"'SEC. 301. (a) There is established a United States War Ballot Commission (referred to in this Act as the Commission), which shall be composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, to serve for the duration of the war and six months thereafter.

"'(b) The Commission may receive assistance from other Federal departments and agencies in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

"'(c) It shall be the duty of the Commission, in performing its functions under this Act, to consult with State officials. As soon as practicable after any election to which the provisions of this title apply, the Commission shall report to the Congress on the administration of this Act, including the reports received by the Commission from the secretaries of state of the several States.

"'*Application of this title*

"'SEC. 302. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsection (b), the provisions of this title shall apply with respect to the following:

"'(1) Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States.

"'(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

"'(3) Members of the armed forces, inside the United States.

"'(b) The provisions of this title shall apply to, and the ballot provided for by this title may be used by—

"'(1) an individual referred to in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a),

if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (B) that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State; or

"'(2) an individual referred to in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a), if he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State, even though the Governor thereof does not make the certification referred to in clause (A) of paragraph (1), but only if such individual states in his oath that, prior to September 1, he made application for a State absentee ballot but, as of October 1, has not received it.

No individual who is not included under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection shall be entitled to use, or be furnished, a ballot under this title. Certifications referred to in this subsection shall be made to the Commission.

"'*Official Federal war ballots, envelopes, and explanations*

"'SEC. 303. (a) The Commission shall cause to be prepared and printed for use in voting in general elections under this title an adequate number of official Federal war ballots. Each ballot shall be printed in the following form insofar as the offices enumerated are appropriate to the particular election:

"'OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT

"'Instruction: To vote, write in the name of the candidate of your choice for each office.

"'ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

"'(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party, and shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidates by name for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party in your State)

"'Write in the name of your choice for President _____

"'UNITED STATES SENATOR

"'(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

"'Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

"'UNITED STATES SENATOR, UNEXPIRED TERM

"'(Only if a Senator is to be elected in your State for an unexpired term)

"'Write in the name of your choice for Senator _____

"'REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

"'Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district

"'REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS

"'(Only in the States entitled thereto)

"'Write in the name or names of your choice for Representatives at Large_____.

"'(Vote for one or two as the case may be)

A vote for a Presidential candidate by name shall be deemed to be a vote for the candidates by name for Presidential and Vice Presidential electors of his party in the voter's State. No ballot shall be invalid by reason of mistake or omission in writing in the name of the candidate where the candidate intended by the voter is plainly identifiable. Where, because of any defect in marking, a ballot is held invalid as to any particular candidate for office, it shall remain valid as to the other candidates for office.

"'(b) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official inner envelopes for use in sealing the official Federal war ballots. Each envelope shall be gummed ready for sealing. Upon one side of the envelope shall be printed:

"'OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT FOR GENERAL ELECTION

"'Name of voter _____

"'(Print your name plainly here)

"'Home residence:

"'Street and number (if any) or rural route _____

"'(Print street and number or rural route plainly here)

"'City or town (if any) _____

"'(Print city or town plainly here)

"'County _____

"'(Print county plainly here)

"'Upon the other side of such envelope shall be printed the following oath, at the top of which shall be set forth the date of the election:

"'OATH OF ELECTOR FOR VOTING IN THE GENERAL ELECTIONS TO BE HELD IN 19__

"'I do hereby swear (or affirm) that:

"'(1) I am a citizen of the United States;

"'(2) The date of my birth was _____;

"'(3) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the State of _____;

"'(4) For _____ years preceding this election my home residence has been in the (city, town, or village) of _____ in the county of _____ at (street and number, if any, or rural route) _____;

"'(5) I am (check appropriate item);

"'(a) in the armed forces outside of the United States _____ ( );

"'(b) in the merchant marine outside of the United States _____ ( );

"'(c) serving with the American Red Cross ( ), the Society of Friends ( ), the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots ( ), or the United Service Organizations ( ), outside the United States, and am attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States;

"'(6) (Note: Check this item only if true.)

"'I have, prior to September 1, applied for a State ballot for this election, but, as of October 1, have not received it _____ ( ); and that I have not voted and do not intend to vote in this election at any address other than the above; and that I have not received or offered, do not expect to receive, have not paid, offered or promised to pay, contributed, offered, or promised to contribute to another, to be paid or used, any money or other valuable thing as a compensation or reward for the giving of a vote at this election, and have not made any promise to influence the giving or withholding of any such vote.

"'_____

"'(Voter must write his usual signature here and oath must be administered and attested.)

"'Personally appeared before me the above-named voter to me known and known to me to be the person who, after being duly sworn, subscribed the foregoing oath. In witness whereof I have set my hand this _____ day of _____, 19__.

"'_____

"'Commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, or other person authorized to administer and attest this oath.

"'(c) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an appropriate number of official outer envelopes for use in returning to the appropriate secretaries of state official Federal war ballots and official inner envelopes. Upon such outer envelopes the following shall be printed:

"'Free of all postage

"'including air mail

"'(Official Federal War Ballot)

"'TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE OF THE STATE SHOWN BELOW:

"'Voter's home residence:

"'Street and number (if any) or rural route_____

"'(Print clearly)

"'City or town_____

"'(Print clearly)

"'County_____

"'(Print clearly)

"'State _____

"'(Print clearly)

"'(d) The Commission shall also cause to be prepared and printed an adequate number of copies of instructions for voting procedure for use in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"'(e) Ballots, instructions for voting procedure, and envelopes for use outside the United States shall be suitable for air mailing.

"'(f) Where the Commission determines that the transmission abroad of any material required to be prepared and printed by the provisions of this section is inexpedient because of transportation difficulties or for other reasons arising from the conduct of the war, the Commission is authorized to arrange for such material to be printed outside the United States.

"'*Balloting*

"'SEC. 304. (a) Any person voting under the provisions of this title shall secretly mark the ballot, place it in the official inner envelope, and securely seal the same. He shall then fill in and subscribe the oath printed upon the official inner envelope. After the oath has been duly attested, the voter shall then place the official inner envelope in the official outer envelope, fill in the blanks on such outer envelope, and deliver it to a person designated by proper authority to receive executed ballots for transmission to the appropriate secretary of state.

"'(b) Any commissioned officer, noncommissioned officer not below the rank of sergeant, or petty officer, in the armed forces of the United States and any member of the merchant marine of the United States designated for this purpose by the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration is authorized to administer and attest such oaths as are required by this Act.

"'*Administration*

"'SEC. 305. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy shall be responsible for the administration of this title with respect to members of the armed forces and civilians attached to and serving with the armed forces and entitled to vote thereunder. The Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall be responsible for the administration of this title with respect to members of the merchant marine of the United States entitled to vote thereunder.

"'(b) In each year in which a general election for Senators and Representatives in Congress is to be held, the Commission shall furnish well in advance of the election an adequate number of ballots, envelopes, and copies of instructions for voting procedure to the Secretaries of War and Navy and to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration.

"'*Lists of candidates*

"'SEC. 306. The secretary of state of each State shall furnish the Commission such information as the Commission shall request for compiling a list of candidates and their parties in any general election for President and Vice President or for Senators and Representatives in Congress. The Commission shall transmit to the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, at such times as it deems to be appropriate for balloting under this title, lists of candidates compiled from the information so received, even if incomplete. The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall, in ample time for bal-

loting under this title, transmit such lists to all units of the armed forces and to members of the merchant marine of the United States, to the extent that such transmission is practicable and compatible with military operations. Incomplete lists of candidates so furnished, or failure to furnish such lists, shall be no bar to balloting under the provisions of this title. No list of candidates furnished under this title shall include information as to a candidate other than his name, address, party affiliation, and office for which nominated.

"'*Distribution and collection of ballots for members of the armed forces and others*

"'SEC. 307. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy, insofar as practicable and compatible with military operations, shall cause ballots, envelopes, instructions for voting procedure and lists of candidates, promptly after receipt thereof from the Commission, to be distributed to members of the armed forces and to civilians attached to and serving with the armed forces and entitled to vote under this title, who desire to vote under this title, and shall cause executed ballots to be collected and transmitted to the secretaries of state of the several States.

"'(b) Wherever practicable and compatible with military operations, the appropriate commanding officer shall be required—

"'(1) to cause lists of candidates to be posted and otherwise made available at conspicuous and convenient places, and to cause copies of instructions for voting procedure and all other necessary information to be furnished to members of his unit and civilians attached to and serving with such unit and entitled to vote under this title;

"'(2) to use his best efforts to assure that every person in or attached to and serving with his unit, who is entitled and desires to vote under this title, has an opportunity to mark his ballot in secret before the latest date which should afford a reasonable opportunity for the return of executed ballots;

"'(3) to destroy, as soon as practicable after the completion of voting within his unit, all official Federal war ballots in his custody remaining unused.

"'(c) It shall be unlawful for any commissioned, noncommissioned, warrant, or petty officer in the armed forces of the United States (1) to attempt to influence any member of the armed forces to vote or not to vote for any particular candidate, or (2) to require any member of the armed forces to march to any polling place or place of voting, but nothing in this Act shall be deemed to prohibit free discussion regarding political issues or candidates for public office.

"'*Distribution and collection of ballots for the merchant marine*

"'SEC. 308. The Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall cause ballots, envelopes, instructions for voting procedure, and lists of candidates for voting in general elections to be made available to members of the merchant marine of the United States upon request. The Administrator shall provide a convenient place for marking such ballots in secret, and shall cause executed ballots to be collected and transmitted to the appropriate secretaries of state or to appropriate representatives of the War and Navy Departments for such transmission. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall arrange, so far as practicable, for the receipt of such ballots and their transmission to the appropriate secretaries of state together with the ballots of members of the armed forces. The Administrator may delegate to the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, with the consent of such Secretary, any function of the Administrator under this title.

"'*Transmission of ballots*

"'SEC. 309. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities shall, so far as practicable and compatible with military operations, take all reasonable measures to facilitate transmission, delivery, and return of ballots, envelopes, instructions for voting procedure, and lists of candidates, transmitted to and from persons to whom this title is applicable, whether transmitted by air or by regular mail. Ballots executed outside the United States shall be transmitted by air, whenever practicable and compatible with military operations.

"'(b) The secretary of state of any State, upon receiving any ballot cast under this title, shall at an appropriate time transmit it to the appropriate election officials of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the voter's residence. Such officials shall take oath that they will not disclose to anyone (unless required by law) how any absentee shall have voted. Such officials shall determine that the oath required under sections 303 and 304 has been executed and that it is in order, pursuant to section 311, to open the official inner enevelope; whereupon such officials shall compile a voting list of the names appearing on all such inner envelopes received from the secretary of state. No person other than such appropriate election officials shall open any official outer or inner envelope purporting to contain a ballot cast under this title.

"'*Reports*

"'SEC. 310. (a) The Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration shall report to the Commission on balloting under this title, including the number of ballots received, distributed, executed, and transmitted to the secretaries of state of the several States, together with any comments thereon or explanation thereof.

"'(b) Each secretary of state shall prepare a report of all ballots received by him and transmitted to the various election officials, and within thirty days after the last day for counting absentee ballots in any election in which ballots are cast under the provisions of this title, each secretary of state shall transmit such report to the Commission.

"'*Validity of ballots*

"'SEC. 311. (a) The Commission shall have no powers or functions with respect to the determination of the validity of ballots cast under the provisions of this title; such determination shall be made by the duly constituted election officials of the appropriate districts, precincts, counties, or other voting units of the several States and this decision shall be final to the same extent as in the case of ballots cast by others in person. Votes cast under the provisions of this title shall be cast, canvassed, counted, and certified in each State by its proper canvassing boards in the same manner, as nearly as may be practicable, as the votes cast within its borders are canvassed, counted, and certified.

"'(b) No official Federal war ballot shall be valid if—

"'1. the voter has also voted in person or by absentee ballot in accordance with the procedure provided by State law; or

"'2. the date of the oath of elector is later than the date of the holding of the election; or

"'3. such ballot is received by the appropriate election official of the district, precinct, county, or other voting unit of the State of the voter's residence later than the hour for the closing of the polls on the date of the holding of the election, except that any extension of time for the receipt of absentee ballots permitted by State laws shall apply to ballots cast under this title.

"'(c) All ballot envelopes received by a secretary of state at a date or time too late for proper delivery, and all ballot envelopes not delivered to polling places or to the proper officials shall not be opened but shall be endorsed with the date of reception and shall be retained by the secretary until the time has expired for contesting the election, when they shall be destroyed without examination.

"'*Voting safeguards*

"'SEC. 312. Every individual concerned with the administration of this title shall take all necessary steps to prevent fraud, to protect voters against coercion of any sort, and to safeguard the integrity and secrecy of ballots cast hereunder.

"'*Penalties*

"'SEC. 313. The provisions of law prohibiting offenses against the elective franchise shall apply in the case of elections and voting conducted pursuant to the provisions of this title: *Provided, however,* That no act done in good faith by a member of the armed forces of the United States, in the exercise of his judgment as to what was practicable and compatible with military operations, shall constitute a violation of any such provision of law.

"'*Taking of polls prohibited*

"'SEC. 314 (a) No person within or without the armed forces of the United States shall poll any member of such forces, either within or without the United States, either before or after he shall have executed any ballot either under the provisions of this title or under any State law, with reference to his choice of or his vote for any candidate for any of the offices authorized to be voted for by the use of the aforesaid ballot nor state, publish, or release any result of any purported poll taken from or among the members of the armed forces of the United States or including within it the statement of choice for or of votes cast by any member of the armed forces of the United States for any of the offices authorized to be voted for by the use of the aforesaid ballot.

"'(b) The word "poll" is defined as any request for information, either verbal or written, which by its language or form of expression requires or implies the necessity of an answer, where the request is made with the intent of compiling the result of the answers obtained, either for the personal use of the person making the request, or for the purpose of reporting the same to any other person, persons, political party, unincorporated association or corporation, or for the purpose of publishing the same orally, by radio, or in written or printed form.

"'(c) Any person not a member of the armed forces of the United States who violates the provisions of this section, either within or outside of the United States, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"'*Appropriate State officials*

"'SEC. 315. Wherever, in any State, an official other than the secretary of state is the appropriate State official to carry out any function vested in the secretary of state under this title, the term "secretary of state" shall mean such other official.

"'*Officials and agencies to act for secretary of state*

"'SEC. 316. Each secretary of state may utilize the services of such State and local officials and agencies for such purposes and to such extent as he may deem appropriate in the exercise of his powers and duties under this title.

"'*Act to be liberally construed*

"'SEC. 317. The provisions of this act shall be construed liberally in order to effectuate its purposes.

"'TITLE IV

"'MISCELLANEOUS

"'SEC. 401. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"'SEC. 402. Post cards, ballots, and envelopes referred to in this Act shall be transmitted free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails.

"'SEC. 403. As used in this Act—

"'(1) the term "United States" used geographically includes only the territorial limits

of the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia; and

"'(2) the term "members of the merchant marine of the United States" means persons employed as officers or members of crews of vessels documented under the laws of the United States and persons enrolled for such employment with the United States War Shipping Administration, but does not include those in service or enrolled for service on the Great Lakes or the inland waterways.

"'SEPARABILITY

"'SEC. 404. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"'TITLE V

"'AMENDMENTS TO ACT OF AUGUST 2, 1939, AS AMENDED

"'SEC. 501. The Act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", as amended, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following new sections:

"'"SEC. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer of, or person employed in, the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, Government magazine, Government newspaper, motion-picture film, or other literature or material, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government, or any officer, agency, or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, except as hereinafter provided:

"'"(1) Nothing herein shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must if requested be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party which has a candidate for President in at least six States in the current Presidential election.

"'"(2) Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, or the presentation to members of the armed forces of motion-picture films, radio broadcasts, or rebroadcasts; but—

"'"(a) the list of such magazines and newspapers of general circulation shall be determined in accordance with the preference of the members of the armed forces in some reliable method to be determined by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy;

"'"(b) any such books of general circulation hereafter purchased shall be selected from books not containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for the Federal offices abovementioned; and

"'"(c) such motion-picture films, radio broadcasts or rebroadcasts, and servicemen's magazines or newspapers, sponsored or paid for by the Government, shall be nonpartisan and nonpolitical: *Provided*, That this subparagraph shall not prohibit or curtail impartial coverage or presentation, as news or information, of public events, and persons in public life: *And provided further*, That if in any issue or presentation space or time is allotted to editorials, columns, or other argumentative matter supporting a political party which has a candidate for President in at least six States in the current Presidential election, an equal amount of space or time shall be allotted in the same issue or presentation to similar matter concerning each such other political party.

"'"(3) nothing in this section shall prevent the sending of any letter, communication, magazine, newspaper, or other literature by any individual, corporation (other than a Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation), or political committee to any member of the armed forces, addressed personally to such member of the armed forces, and paid for by him, or by the individual, corporation, or committee sending the same.

"'"SEC. 23. It shall be unlawful for any censor or other member of the executive branch of the United States Government to remove from any letter or communication addressed to an individual member of the armed forces political literature or political arguments or other matter sent to such individual member of the armed forces by any individual, corporation, or political committee, unless such literature or other matter contains information which may be of value to the enemy in their prosecution of the war.

"'"SEC. 24. Any person who violates the provisions of section 22 or section 23 hereof either within or outside of the United States shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both."'"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the Act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes."

EUGENE WORLEY,
J. RANKIN,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

TOM CONNALLY,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
HUGH BUTLER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House Nos. 9, 11, and 12, and the amendment of the House No. 3, and the Senate amendment thereto, to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

PROVISIONS RELATING TO VOTING BY STATE ABSENTEE BALLOT

Section 1 of the bill, as amended by the House, contained a provision by which Congress expressed itself as favoring, and recommended to the several States the immediate enactment of, appropriate legislation to enable each person absent from the place of his residence and serving in "the armed forces of the United States or in the merchant marine of the United States, or serving in the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organizations outside the United States and attached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States," to vote by absentee ballot in any primary, special, or general election held in his election district or precinct in time of war. This provision is retained in the bill agreed to in conference (see sec. 201), except that the words "outside the United States" have been omitted, thus making the provision broader in its application to the civilian organizations named above. This same change has been made in the provision which appears in section 202 of the bill agreed to in conference.

Section 1 of the bill, as amended by the House, contained provisions making a number of recommendations to the States with respect to the taking of action for the purpose of affording ample opportunity for the persons above referred to to vote for Federal, State, and local officials and to utilize the absentee balloting procedures of the various States, to the greatest possible extent.

These provisions recommended, among other things, (1) the sending of ballots to the persons referred to even though application is not made therefor, (2) the acceptance, in cases where application is necessary, of applications made by the use of post cards to be made available by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration (the post cards referred to being those printed pursuant to section 3 of the act of September 16, 1942 (Public Law 712, 77th Cong.), and the bill authorized additional amounts of such post cards to be printed), and the prompt sending of ballots in response to such applications, together with an appropriate form of oath where necessary for establishing the voter's right to vote, (3) the making of changes in election laws in cases where ballots will not be available for mailing 45 days prior to the general election, so as to lengthen such period of time, (4) the waiver of registration for persons in the military service who, by reason of such service, have been deprived of an opportunity to register, and (5) reduction in the size and weight, so far as possible, of paper used for the printing of envelopes, ballots, and instructions.

Section 6 of the bill, as amended by the House, repealed section 3 of Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, which provided for the printing and distribution to members of the armed forces of post cards to be used in making application for the "official war ballots" provided for under said act.

In the bill agreed to in conference these provisions making recommendations are retained, with minor modifications, and there have also been incorporated certain provisions taken from title II of the matter contained in the Senate amendment to House amendment No. 3. These provisions provide for the preparation and distribution to the persons hereinbefore referred to, of a post card for use in making application for State absentee ballots. This post card differs somewhat in form from the post card printed under the act of September 16, 1942. The conference bill contemplates continued use of available supplies of the post cards printed under the act of September 16, 1942, in addition to the new card the printing and distribution of which is provided for.

There has been eliminated from the suggested form of oath, contained in the bill as it passed the House, the provision which would have called upon the voter to state that he had not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that he had been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage. The provision in the suggested form of oath relating to censorship of the ballot has also been eliminated.

Section 2 of the bill, as amended by the House, recommended the giving of instructions to election officials to prepare a war-duty registration list consisting of voters in the armed forces, the checking of applications for absentee ballots against such list, and the mailing not earlier than 60 days before the election of absentee ballots to eligible voters on the list from whom an application had not been received, the mail-

ing of ballots to overseas addresses not less than 50 days prior to the date of election, and of ballots to addresses within the continental United States not later than 25 days prior to the date of the general election. These provisions have been omitted from the bill agreed to in conference.

Section 3 of the bill, as amended by the House, made it the duty of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, respectively (wherever practicable and compatible with military operations), to cooperate with appropriate State officers and agencies in transmitting to and from the above-described persons such absentee ballots and envelopes as might be provided under the laws of the several States, and to cooperate in the execution of oaths in connection with such ballots. This requirement is retained in the conference agreement, in section 206 (a).

This section also provided that the post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure referred to in the foregoing provisions should be transmitted free of postage including air-mail postage in the United States mails. This provision is included in the bill agreed to in conference, in section 402, but has been limited to post cards, ballots, and envelopes.

This section also required the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration to take all necessary steps to give to the transmission and delivery of such post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure priority over all unofficial communications and priority over official communications except where, in the judgment of the appropriate military and naval authorities, such priority would interfere with the effective prosecution of the war. In the bill agreed to in conference (see sec. 206 (b)) this provision has been modified so as to require the Secretaries of War and Navy and other appropriate authorities to "take all reasonable measures to facilitate transmission, delivery, and return of post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting procedure," mailed pursuant to the laws of the several States, whether transmitted by air or by regular mail. The provision as modified gives the same treatement to State balloting material as is accorded by section 309 (a) of the bill agreed to in conference to Federal balloting material, in respect to which no priority is required.

This section also (1) defined the term "United States" as including only the several States and the District of Columbia, (2) defined the term "members of the merchant marine of the United States", and (3) defined the term "State" to include the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, the effect of this being to make the provisions hereinbefore referred to applicable to such Territories as well as to the several States. In the bill agreed to in conference the definition of the term "State" has been eliminated thus limiting the application of the provisions referred to above to the several States.

PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE USE OF A SUPPLEMENTARY FEDERAL BALLOT

The bill as passed by the House made no provision for the use of a Federal ballot.

The Senate amendment to House amendment No 3 proposed to strike out sections 3 to 15, inclusive, of Public Law No. 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, and to insert in lieu thereof provisions relating to the use of a Federal ballot in general elections for Federal officers, and provisions relating to other matters which are referred to elsewhere in this statement.

The bill agreed to in conference provides for a supplementary Federal ballot for use in general elections for Federal officers, but substantial changes have been made from the Senate provisions. The changes made by the bill as agreed to in conference, are explained below:

Persons eligible to use the Federal ballot.—The Senate provisions proposed to authorize the use of the Federal ballot by—

(1) members of the armed forces, whether outside or inside the United States;

(2) members of the merchant marine of the United States, outside the United States;

(3) persons outside the United States, serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, or the United Service Organizations, and attached to and serving with the armed forces.

Use of the Federal ballot by such an individual was subject to the qualification, however, that he was required to state in the oath accompanying the ballot that he had not received a State absentee ballot enabling him to vote for Federal officers.

The bill agreed to in conference (see sec. 302) contains the following provisions with respect to eligibility to use the Federal ballot:

(1) Members of the armed forces and members of the merchant marine, outside the United States, and persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, outside the United States who are attached to and serving with the armed forces, may use the Federal ballot—

(a) if the Governor of their State has certified prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable voting by State absentee ballot, and (B) that the use of Federal ballots is authorized by the laws of such State; or

(b) if the Governor of their State has certified prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held that the use of the Federal ballot is authorized by the laws of such State and if (such Governor not having certified that such State has no procedure which will enable voting by State absentee ballot) the individual voter states in his oath that prior to September 1 he made application for a State absentee ballot but as of October 1 had not received it.

(2) Members of the armed forces inside the United States may use the Federal ballot if the Governor of their State has certified prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held (a) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable voting by State absentee ballot, and (b) that the use of the Federal ballot is "authorized by the laws of such State".

The bill as agreed to further provides that no person not included in paragraph (1) or (2) above shall be entitled to use, or be furnished, a Federal ballot.

For purposes of the above explanation, the term "United States" includes only the several States and the District of Columbia.

United States War Ballot Commission.—The Senate provisions provided for the establishment of a United States War Ballot Commission, which was given various duties in connection with the administration of the Federal ballot provisions of the bill. The Commission was to be composed of four Commissioners, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Two of the Commissioners were to be appointed from a list of nominees submitted by the national committee of the political party casting the largest popular vote for Presidential electors in the most recent Presidential election, and two Commissioners were to be appointed from a list of nominees submitted by the national committee of the political party casting the second largest popular vote. Each member of the Commission was to receive compensation of $25 a day when engaged in performing his duties.

In the bill agreed to in conference these provisions have been modified so that the Commission is to be composed of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration. These officers will receive no additional compensation by reason of their service as members of the Commission.

Other provisions relating to the Federal ballot.—In the bill agreed to in conference, as has been true in the case of other bills relating to proposed use of a Federal ballot, a large part of the text is devoted to provisions which, assuming the use of a Federal ballot, are not believed to be controversial. We refer to the provisions relating to the preparation and distribution of ballots, envelopes, list of candidates, and instructions, the execution of ballots and oaths, the return and delivery of ballots to local election officials, and so on. These provisions are not explained in detail below.

In addition to the matters explained above, the following features of the bill as agreed to in conference, relating to the Federal ballot, are called to the attention of the House.

In using the Federal ballot (see sec. 303) the voter must vote for the candidate of his choice by name, and may not vote by party.

In the Senate amendment, an individual using the Federal ballot would have been required to sign an oath stating that he had had not been convicted of bribery or any infamous crime, or, if so convicted, that he had been pardoned or restored to all the rights of a citizen, without restriction as to the rights of suffrage. This requirement has been eliminated in the bill agreed to in conference. The provision on the form of oath relating to censorship of the ballot has also been eliminated.

Under the Senate amendment, executed ballots would have been sent back to the United States War Ballot Commission, and the Commission would have sent them on to the appropriate secretary of state. In the bill agreed to in conference, provision has been made for sending executed ballots directly to the secretary of state of the appropriate State. This will expedite the return of ballots to their appropriate destination.

The Senate amendment prohibited any commissioned, noncommissioned, warrant, or petty officer of the armed forces from exerting influence or compulsion on members of the armed forces in the matter of voting. This provision is retained in the bill agreed to in conference (see sec. 307 (c)) but the following provision has been added: ", but nothing in this Act shall be deemed to prohibit free discussion regarding political issues or candidates for public office."

The bill agreed to in conference, as did the Senate amendment, provides (see sec. 309 (b)) that no person other than the appropriate election officials shall open any official outer or inner envelope purporting to contain an official Federal war ballot.

The bill agreed to in conference (see sec. 311 (a)), as did the Senate amendment, provides that the Commission shall have no powers or functions with respect to the determination of the validity of Federal war ballots, but that such determination shall be made by the duly constituted election officials of the appropriate districts, precincts, counties, or other voting units of the several States, and that this decision shall be final to the same extent as in the case of ballots cast by others in person.

The bill agreed to in conference, as did the Senate amendment, provides (see sec. 311 (b) 1) that no Federal ballot shall be valid if the voter has also voted a State ballot.

In the bill agreed to in conference there has been included a provision (see sec. 311 (b) 3), not contained in the Senate amendment, providing that any extension of time for the receipt of State absentee ballots shall apply also in the case of the Federal ballot.

The Senate amendment contained a section prohibiting the taking of polls among members of the armed forces. This section has been included in the substitute agreed

to in conference (see sec. 314), but there has been eliminated from the section the paragraph directing the Secretaries of War and Navy to fix penalties and provide for trial of members of the services violating the prohibition, and the penalty of a maximum fine applicable to persons not in the armed forces has been reduced from $10,000 to $1,000. It is believed that the matter of punishment of members of the armed forces is already adequately taken care of without the necessity of retaining the paragraph omitted.

In the Senate amendment, provision was made for payments to the States to compensate State and local agencies for administrative expenses incurred in connection with the Federal ballot provisions. This provision is not included in the bill agreed to in conference.

The bill agreed to in conference provides that post cards, ballots, and envelopes (and this includes State as well as Federal balloting material) shall be free of postage, including air-mail postage, in the United States mails. The similar provision in the Senate amendment covered all communications relating to Federal and State balloting procedures.

PROVISIONS AMENDING THE ACT OF AUGUST 2, 1939, AS AMENDED

Section 4 of the bill, as amended by the House, amended the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", as amended, by adding thereto three new sections to be designated as sections 22, 23, and 24.

The Senate, in its amendment to House amendment numbered 3, also included proposed sections 22, 23, and 24, to be added to the act of August 2, 1939. These provisions differed somewhat from the provisions contained in the bill as passed by the House, and have been used as the basis for the text agreed to in conference.

The proposed section 22 in the bill as passed by the House read as follows:

"SEC. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer of, or person employed in, the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, Government magazine, Government newspaper, motion-picture film, or other literature or material, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government, or any officer, agency, or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, except as hereinafter provided:

"(1) Nothing herein shall prohibit the rebroadcast over Government-controlled radio stations of any political address, but equal time must if requested be given for such purposes to representatives of each political party which polled at least 10 per centum of the votes cast in the most recent Presidential election.

"(2) Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, or the presentation to members of the armed forces of motion-picture films, radio broadcasts, or rebroadcasts; but no such distribution or presentation shall be undertaken by any Federal agency: *Provided, however*, That nothing herein shall prevent or interfere with the customary activities of the War Shipping Administration or the United States Maritime Commission or the War, Navy, and Post Office Departments: *Provided further*, That it shall be unlawful for any commissioned officer or enlisted man in any branch of the armed forces of the United States to command, order, direct, or undertake to influence any member of the armed forces to cast his or her vote for any candidate or candidates, or party, in any election, or primary. Any person violating this provision shall be subject to the provisions of State and Federal law prohibiting offenses against the elective franchise."

In the bill agreed to in conference (see title V, sec. 501) the provisions of the proposed section 22 are changed as follows:

(1) In paragraph (1), the requirement as to the giving of equal time for broadcasts over Government-controlled radio stations has been made to apply to each political party which "has a candidate for President in at least six States in the current Presidential election" instead of to each political party "which polled at least 10 per centum of the votes cast in the most recent Presidential election".

(2) In lieu of paragraph (2), the bill agreed to in conference contains the following paragraphs:

"(2) Nothing herein shall prevent the distribution to members of the armed forces of books, magazines, and newspapers which have a general circulation in the United States, or of servicemen's magazines or newspapers, or the presentation to members of the armed forces of motion-picture films, radio broadcasts, or rebroadcasts; but—

"(a) the list of such magazines and newspapers of general circulation shall be determined in accordance with the preference of the members of the armed forces in some reliable method to be determined by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy;

"(b) any such books of general circulation hereafter purchased shall be selected from a list of books, not containing political argument or political propaganda of any kind designed or calculated to affect the result of any election for the Federal offices abovementioned; and

"(c) such motion-picture films, radio broadcasts or rebroadcasts, and servicemen's magazines or newspapers, sponsored or paid for by the Government, shall be nonpartisan and nonpolitical: *Provided*, That this subparagraph shall not prohibit or curtail impartial coverage or presentation, as news or information, of public events, and persons in public life: *And provided further*, That if in any issue or presentation space or time is allotted to editorials, columns, or other argumentative matter supporting a political party which has a candidate for President in at least six States in the current Presidential election, an equal amount of space or time shall be allotted in the same issue or presentation to similar matter concerning each such other political party.

"(3) Nothing in this section shall prevent the sending of any letter, communication, magazine, newspaper, or other literature by any individual, corporation (other than a Government-owned or Government-controlled corporation), or political committee to any member of the armed forces, addressed personally to such member of the armed forces, and paid for by him, or by the individual, corporation, or committee sending the same."

The substance of the prohibition contained in the last proviso of paragraph (2) of section 22 in the bill as it passed the House, quoted above, is included in section 307 (c) of the bill agreed to in conference, hereinbefore referred to.

The proposed section 23 contained in the bill as amended by the House read as follows:

"SEC. 23. It shall be unlawful for any censor or other member of the executive branch of the United States Government to censor or interfere with any ballot or official inner envelope, or to censor or interfere with any letter or communication addressed to an individual member of the armed forces for the purpose of removing therefrom political literature or political arguments or other matter sent to such individual member of the armed forces by any individual, corporation, or political committee, unless such literature or other matter contains information which may be of value to the enemy in their prosecution of the war."

In the bill agreed to in conference this section has been amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. It shall be unlawful for any censor or other member of the executive branch of the United States Government to remove from any letter or communication addressed to an individual member of the armed forces political literature or political arguments or other matter sent to such individual member of the armed forces by any individual, corporation, or political committee, unless such literature or other matter contains information which may be of value to the enemy in their prosecution of the war."

The proposed section 24 contained in the bill as amended by the House, which provided for penalties in the case of violation of section 22 or 23, has not been changed in the bill agreed to in conference.

EUGENE WORLEY,
J. E. RANKIN,
HERBERT C. BONNER,
K. M. LECOMPTE,
HARRIS ELLSWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest apparent in this bill, the conferees on the part of the House thought it would be fair and proper to ask for an additional 1 hour's time in which the Members might be heard and might ask questions concerning the operation of the bill. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the conference report be extended 1 hour, at the conclusion of which the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pensylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if it is the intention of the gentleman from Texas to see that those who are opposed to the conference report will be given an opportunity to be heard?

Mr. WORLEY. That was the original intention, so that those who are opposed to this bill will have an opportunity to be heard. It is further the intention of the chairman to divide the time equally between the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress, and myself.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in view of the fact that the additional time, as the gentleman states, will be equally divided between himself and the gentleman on the other side, and in view of the fact that the Republicans are for the conference report and for this bill, I feel we who are opposed to the conference report should have equal opportunity to be heard against the conference report and that the time should be so allocated and divided, as it has always been my aim to do, on an equal basis.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, is it possible for somebody, not a member of the committee, to ask that the time be extended to 3 hours?

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] is pending.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a unanimous consent request that the time be extended to 3 hours.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman from California that his request will have to come after the other request is disposed of.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] that the situation with reference to the time is exactly what it was when the bill was before the House, except that the situation is reversed. It was held then that the ranking minority Member have half the time and the chairman of the committee, who is opposed to the bill, have the other half, and that he distribute it or allocate it as he desires.

Mr. WORLEY. And that it be distributed fairly.

Mr. RANKIN. The time to be distributed as he desires. And he allocated it fairly, I will say to the gentleman from Texas. For that reason the time ought to be allotted in the same way. We tried to get another arrangement at that time, but it was decided that the chairman should control half the time and the ranking minority Member control the other half.

Mr. SABATH Mr. Speaker, that is satisfactory to me. I have no objection to that arrangement.

I am interested that the chairman on this side and the ranking Member on the other side would agree to divide the time equally between those in favor and those opposed to the conference report, which is only fair, and which, as a rule, I advocate and agree to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will look after his side we will look after our side in a very satisfactory manner.

Mr. SABATH. But you understand the difference. Unfortunately you are for the conference report at this time and we are not.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of the allotted time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

I now yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think we will all agree that the war has taken the soldier away from the ballot box back in his own State. I think we will agree further that it is the solemn duty of Congress and the States to do everything within their legal and constitutional power they can do to take the ballot box to the soldier, wherever he may be. No true American can disagree with that premise. It would be a relatively simple problem to work out a solution if the only consideration were to get the ballot to the soldier. Unfortunately, however, in this democracy we have differences of opinion. Those differences mean the difference in a vote for or against a measure, and we have allowed some extraneous considerations to interfere with our primary objective of giving the soldiers a vote.

Confronted with these extraneous circumstances and conditions the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate met and tried to work out what at first seemed to be hopelessly irreconcilable differences between the two Houses. I think you will recall that S. 1285 as it passed the House contained no form of a Federal ballot whatever. The same bill, as later amended by the Senate, did contain a Federal ballot. The House conferees took the position that if we accepted the use of the Federal ballot, then the Senate should recede from its original position and permit the House to restrict the use of the Federal ballot. The Senate agreed with that proposition, and the Senate receded on almost every point.

Now the conference report that we now present will not satisfy the extreme view on either side. In my personal opinion I think we could have done a much better job than the conference report reflects. However, those who take the opposite view think that perhaps we could have done worse. So, in the true spirit of democratic government and in the spirit of compromise, all five members of the House conferees signed the report, not because any or all of us were completely satisfied, but because we were firmly convinced that it was the best we could get.

I am personally satisfied with half a loaf if I cannot get a whole loaf. I think the soldiers will be better satisfied and will have a greater opportunity to vote for or against Federal and State officials under the terms of the conference committee report than they will under the present law, Public Law No. 712. I do not make that statement hastily nor without a great deal of thought. It is my considered judgment that more members of the armed forces will have a better opportunity to vote under this bill than under the present law. But let me qualify that to this extent: The Governors of every State in the Union and perhaps the legislatures thereof, must assume the responsibility that is properly theirs and which is contained in the conference report. As I see it the Congress had an opportunity to exercise legal, valid, and constitutional powers to provide the soldier with a greater opportunity to vote. A majority of Congress, however, has taken the position that the entire matter should be left to the States. It was therefore incumbent upon the House conferees to work out the best bill we could under those conditions.

This bill, in two or three instances, is rather complicated. The entire soldier-vote question is complicated because, among other reasons, of our dual system of government and the traditional view which we have held that the States have always had the primary responsibility to conduct elections and to determine the validity of all ballots cast.

Now, if all Members have copies of the bill I would like to briefly discuss most of the provisions of the conference report.

In the first place, sections 1 and 2, of Public Law No. 712 are not specifically repealed, but I will discuss that point later. Section 3, on page 1, provides that nothing in this act shall be deemed to restrict the right of a soldier to vote his State ticket. Title II provides for the use of the State ballot, which is comparable to the bill that passed the House as S. 1285, originally. We call upon the States to enact appropriate legislation, and to move the dates of the filing time up.

Other suggestions and recommendations are made that the States make it easier for their soldiers to vote. These recommendations carry no exertion of congressional power, but are simply recommendations. We provide for a post card which the soldier may use free of charge and free of postage, including air mail, to apply for a State ballot.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I understand there are two or three States, perhaps only one or two, of which Kentucky is one, that do not have any absentee voting ballot authorized.

Mr. WORLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I intend to discuss that in connection with section 302, just a little later.

Now, this is a rather important point: Page 4 requires the distribution of post cards as applications for ballots not later than August 15 to those overseas, which is approximately 80 days prior to the November election. It provides that soldiers within continental United States shall receive these cards not later than September 15, which is approximately 50 days before the general election.

So far as the general election cards are concerned, the Army and Navy are called upon to distribute those cards, but insofar as special, or other general elections are concerned the cards are simply made available to the soldiers at appropriate times. The card also provides a choice of party primary ballot to prevent duplication in sending State primary ballots.

On page 6 we recommend that if State law permits the cards may be used as applications for registration or as sources of information. Section 205, also on page 6, provides that the war ballot commission shall secure and compile information from the various secretaries of state as to the dates of holding all elections, and various other political matters which shall be disseminated to the armed forces. The Secretaries of War and Navy are directed, so far as practicable and compatible with military operations, to take all reasonable measures to facilitate transmission, delivery, and return of the post cards, ballots, envelopes, and instructions for voting.

We provide that ballots executed outside the United States shall be returned by air, whenever practicable and compatible with military operations.

Section 207 (a) carries a recommendation to the secretary of state of each of the several States that they promptly forward post-card applications to the

proper county, city, or other election officials. We recommend likewise that the several States cooperate to mail promptly to the voter his ballot. We recommend in section (c) that the envelope and the ballot sent to the voter carry the phrase "official election war ballot" so the postal authorities can give free mail service or free air-mail service, as the case may be, to the State ballot.

The oath of the elector is a general oath worked out in conjunction with the various secretaries of state to make it easier for them to handle.

Page 9 suggests to the States that they change their laws so that the ballot can be sent out at least 45 days prior to any primary, general, or special election.

Section 206 (e) on page 10 recommends further that the several States reduce the weight and the bulk of the State ballots for air transportation. Some States have ballots the size of a saddle blanket, while others have ballots not much larger than one of the pages of this bill.

The size varies with the several States. We have asked the States to reduce these ballots as much as they can so they will not burden the mails and will facilitate the air-mail transportation of these ballots.

Now we come to title III, which is the crux of the whole bill; it is the most important part. It represents the compromise between the House and the Senate. If the Members of the House want to be fully informed as to exactly what this title does, I would suggest that they turn to page 11, section 302, and follow this reading carefully, because it states who shall and who shall not vote the Federal ballot. It is also to be found on page 6 of the conference report.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, from what page in the bill is he reading? I am unable to find it.

Mr. WORLEY. I am using the Senate bill. I understand it appears at page 6 of the conference report.

Mr. MICHENER. What is the date of the Senate bill the gentleman has in his hand?

Mr. WORLEY. March 7, 1944.

Mr. MICHENER. The one the rest of us have is February 9.

Mr. WORLEY. I will use the conference report, then.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The proponents of this bill in the Senate and elsewhere changed their minds so often that we have a great many prints, so I suggest the gentleman use the conference report.

Mr. MICHENER. All we want is to know how to follow the gentleman.

Mr. WORLEY. I understood the conference committee print was available rather than the other bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not believe the print is available. We all have this February 9 version. The only way we can possibly follow the gentleman is to follow the conference report, and that does not give us the bill.

Mr. WORLEY. Yes; the conference report gives the full bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. I mean in detail, not as the bill is written.

Mr. WORLEY. Yes; in italics, in detail, all the way through.

Mr. WRIGHT. If we can find it in the conference report that is all right.

Mr. WORLEY. I will use the conference report rather than any of the bills.

First, on page 6 of the conference report under title III, section 301, establishes a war ballot commission composed of the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, with no power whatsoever other than purely administrative. If you think this title is complicated as it is presented in the conference report, you should have seen the original draft.

Please note carefully the provisions of section 302, which is use of the Federal ballot, shall apply with respect to the following:

(1) Members of the armed forces and the merchant marine of the United States, outside of the United States.

(2) Persons serving with the American Red Cross, the Society of Friends, the Women's Auxiliary Service Pilots, and the United Service Organizations, outside the United States who are atttached to and serving with the armed forces of the United States.

(3) Members of the armed forces, inside the United States.

Subject to the following restrictions:

If he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is to be held, (A) that such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable the citizens thereof to whom subsection (a) applies to vote by State absentee ballot, and (B) that the use of ballots provided for by this title is authorized by the laws of such State; or—

Stating it more simply, section 302 divides all voters into two classes: One, those inside the United States may use the Federal ballot if, first, the Governor of the voter's State has certified to the war ballot commission, prior to July 15, that: "Such State has made no provision for procedure which will enable" soldiers and others in those categories to vote a State ballot.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

And, second, the use of the Federal ballot "is authorized by the laws of such States." That provision was inserted to aid New Mexico and Kentucky, whose constitutions forbid absentee voting. Senators HATCH and BARKLEY do not agree that thereby aided those States because we went further and provided that before a soldier from those States could vote the Federal ballot the Governor of those States had to certify, first, that no provision was made for absentee voting; and second, that that type of ballot was authorized by the laws of such State. It is up to the Governor to say whether the use of the Federal ballot "is authorized by the laws" of that State. Whether that can be done is a matter for the Governor of Kentucky and for the Governor of New Mexico to certify.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, the only thing the Governor of Kentucky can certify would be that no provision had been made for the absentee ballot for soldiers, and that is all he can do. Now, would they still be entitled to vote?

Mr. WORLEY. I hardly see how they would get to use the Federal ballot unless the Governor made both certifications required in section 302. Perhaps, however, the Governor could reason that, in view of the fact this ballot is enacted under the Federal Constitution, and since no State law can be superior to or conflict with the laws of the United States enacted under the Federal Constitution, he might recognize the validity of this title and say it is therefore authorized by the laws of that State. This approach to the problem might also be of assistance to other Governors.

Mr. MAY. In other words, if he certifies that no provision has been made, that precludes him from certifying that they can legally cast a Federal ballot.

Mr. WORLEY. The terminology is "authorized by."

Mr. MAY. It is up to the Governor of the State whether they vote?

Mr. WORLEY. The primary responsibility rests upon the Governor and the legislatures of the States under the provisions of section 302.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is aware of the provision of the constitution of the State of Louisiana in reference to the use of a certain type of ballot. Will the gentleman comment as to how this bill could be worked out in reference to the State of Louisiana.

Mr. WORLEY. The gentleman has reference to the constitutional provision that the ballot shall be printed?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. WORLEY. I am not familiar with all the details of the Louisiana Constitution, but it seems to me that the attorney general could probably hold that when the soldier writes or prints his name on the Federal ballot that such action would satisfy the legal requirements.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman feels then that in the case of the State of Louisiana with its constitutional provision that the attorney general could rule in such a way that these men can vote?

Mr. WORLEY. Without going into greater detail, let us say again that the responsibility is upon the Governors of the several States to certify that this type of ballot is authorized by the laws of their respective States.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. It seems to me that there is an inconsistency in this act. Section 1 of Public Law 712 does not re-

peal. It provides by Federal law for the waving of provisions of State law for the registration of voters. Now, we go down to subsection (d) of section 207 of this bill.

Mr. WORLEY. Section 207?

Mr. WRIGHT. I guess it is section 207. It is on page 5 of the conference report. The Congress recommends to the States that they change their election laws so that there shall not be any registration necessary for soldiers. In the one provision of the section from Public Law 712, which is still effective, the Congress itself provides that registration shall not be a prerequisite to voting. Then in this section (d) of the law we are passing now, the Congress recommends to the States that they change their law so that registration is not necessary. I suppose the gentleman is aware of that?

Mr. WORLEY. I am fully aware of that fact. There is a difference of opinion as to whether Public Law 712, sections 1 and 2, which relate to waiver of registration and waiver of poll-tax payments, are repealed. I take the position they are not expressly repealed, but that they are in a state of suspended animation and the only way they can be activated is by the Governor to certify that the use of this type of ballot is authorized by the State. Such certification recognizes sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712 and causes them to live again. Without such certification they are dead.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in his opinion sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712 are in substance repealed?

Mr. WORLEY. I say they are not expressly repealed, but they are effectively nullified. We have tied them down to such an extent that they are dead unless the Governors make the necessary certification.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Does the gentleman realize that they are very expressly not repealed?

Mr. WORLEY. I say they are not expressly repealed because we do not touch them. In fact we make no mention of them at all, but that still does not alter my statement.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The act that we have before us is simply an amendment to Public Law 712 and we leave sections 1 and 2 in Public Law 712.

Mr. WORLEY. We do. We leave sections 1 and 2 in there, but they are encased in a strait jacket.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There cannot be any argument on the suspension of the right to vote as the bill affects registration.

Mr. WORLEY. We leave it on the books, because we do not mention it, but we restrict it to such an extent that sections 1 and 2 are not operative unless the Governor of the State certifies that the use of the Federal ballot is authorized by the laws of the State.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In other words, the Federal Government suspends the poll tax and registration insofar as the Governor can do it?

Mr. WORLEY. But the State must assent. Without State action sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 712 are ineffective. We do not exercise the power granted under Public Law No. 712, but, on the contrary, make its provisions subservient to the laws of each of the 48 States.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Now, reverting to the observation made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT], I call attention to the fact that the Congress enacted sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 712, which is the law of the land today.

Mr. WORLEY. That is true.

Mr. MICHENER. And all this bill S. 1825 does, insofar as those two sections are concerned, is to recommend to the States that the State take some action. Now, if substantive law is on the books, does the gentleman contend that by merely recommending in another law Congress can in any way change the law which is now on the books?

Mr. WORLEY. I believe I have answered that question, but perhaps I can answer it better if the gentleman will advise me his construction of section 302, in which we compel the Governor of the State to certify that the use of this type of ballot is authorized by the law of the State. I take the position that we kill sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 712 unless and until the Governor certifies that it is authorized by the law of his State.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Can the gentleman answer this question directly: Could the Governor of a State whose State laws require the payment of a poll tax, honestly certify that a serviceman can vote if he has not paid a poll tax? Can he truthfully make such certification?

Mr. WORLEY. I believe he can under the present Federal act, Public Law 712. But he cannot make sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712 live under the conference report unless he certifies in accordance with section 302 of the report. Until he makes such certification sections 1 and 2 of 712 are stone dead.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Would he not have to certify it was legal in his State?

Mr. WORLEY. He would have to certify that its use was "authorized by the laws" of his State—which is practically the same thing.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Then he cannot make that certification if the law requires it?

Mr. WORLEY. Unless which law requires it?

Mr. WRIGHT. If a State in which registration is required sent out that ballot then would section 1 be effective? In other words, section 1 is effective apparently sometimes and it is ineffective at other times. It seems to me that you have more confusion here as to whether a nonregistered soldier can vote than you had under the Worley Act which was defeated here as to whether the ballot should be counted.

Mr. WORLEY. Perhaps the following will answer those questions: Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712 do not operate at all unless the Governor of the State certifies that the use of the Federal ballot, and, therefore, sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712, is authorized by the law of the State.

Mr. WRIGHT. How about the State laws?

Mr. WORLEY. I see no other conclusion to be drawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute in order to discuss the second class of voters.

The second class of voters are those outside of the United States who may use the Federal ballot but they are also subject to the following restrictions: If, first, the Governor certifies prior to July 15 that the use of Federal ballots "is authorized by the laws" of such State, but, second, only if the voter states in his oath that he has made application for a State ballot prior to September 1, but as of October 1 has not received it. No additional certification is necessary by the Governor but the soldier must state in his oath that he has made application for a State ballot prior to September 1 but that as of October 1 it has not reached him. Then he is permitted to vote the Federal ballot.

If time permits I hope to have the opportunity at the conclusion of this discussion to answer any additional questions.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents a compromise but I think a compromise that will extend to all the soldiers an opportunity to vote. Certainly innumerably more soldiers will be enabled to vote under this bill than would be possible under the old act know as Public Law 712, the Ramsay Act, under which 28,000 out of 5,000,000 soldiers were able to vote in the 1942 election.

The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of this committee, who has worked diligently throughout, has made such a complete statement that I only want to supplement his remarks very briefly.

In regard to sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712, I want to read just briefly.

The conference report provides that Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, be amended by striking out after the enacting clause the words "title I" and by striking out sections 3 to 15, inclusive, and inserting in lieu thereof the following.

That leaves sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712. Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712 are very definitely the sections that provide for the suspension of registration and the suspension of the poll tax. If the Federal Government has not suspended the poll tax and the registration features, it is because the Federal Government is not able to do so. That is my frank and honest opinion.

Today we are doing our very best to suspend the poll tax and the registration features as they apply to men in the armed services.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROGERS of California. The conferees must have considered adding the words "or Federal" so that the Governor could have certified that this would satisfy the requirements of either State or Federal laws, which would have put Public Law 712 back into effect. Why did they not leave those two words in?

Mr. LECOMPTE. The conferees agreed, I think I can say unanimously, and I do not think I am violating any confidence when I say the conferees believe that by leaving in sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712 we have done everything possible to leave in the statute the suspension of the poll tax and the registration.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I will answer the gentleman from California. We were trying to bring this law within the scope of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I was going to come to that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What would happen to a soldier who has not registered yet and who casts a State ballot, not a Federal ballot, under the terms of this bill?

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Federal Government can do very little about his registration. We are making an effort now to give him a chance to vote a State ballot, or in the event he is not able to get a State ballot, to vote a Federal ballot, and we are even providing for the suspension of registration and the suspension of the poll tax.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the judgment of the gentleman this does not help that soldier to have a ballot?

Mr. LECOMPTE. On the contrary I think definitely we have helped him in a good many ways.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. It does in the instance that the Governor certifies that the ballot is available and legal in his respective State.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I understand the gentleman is definitely of the opinion that there is nothing in this conference report that repeals sections 1 and 2 of Public, No. 712 either directly or indirectly.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is my opinion. I have a great deal of respect for the fine legal mind and the ability of the gentleman from Virginia, but it is my opinion that we very definitely left the suspension of the poll tax and registration requirements in the existing law.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to agree with the gentleman, because our State law is based upon that assumption.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not true that the Governor must certify that the particular provision is authorized by the law of the State, not by the Federal law but the law of the State?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Let me state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we have made an effort to write a soldier-voting bill that will come within the Constitution. Article II of the Constitution provides definitel; that the States control the selection of electors. It is not done by the Federal Government. In order to make it constitutional we have to leave some authority with the State government.

Mr. MURPHY. Regardless of that, is it not a fact that the Governor, whether they have a poll tax or registration requirement, is precluded by these very words, "authorized by the laws of the State," from saying they have a right to vote under 712?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the Governor of the State may suspend the poll tax without an act of the Federal Government, but we have done our best to suspend it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. On Monday I put into the RECORD a very fine law passed by the State of Massachusetts which allows the men and women there to vote in all elections. I think it was the first one, and other States may want to copy it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think nearly all of the States are going to provide a State ballot.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SNYDER. It is only 39 days from now to the primaries in the State of Pennsylvania. Will the soldiers be privileged to vote in that State primary?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes. We are not interfering with that in any way; in fact, we are extending facilities for the soldier to vote in the primaries and special elections in all the States. Of course, the Federal ballot which is provided for in this bill applies only to the general election, not to the primaries.

Mr. SNYDER. Is there nothing in this bill about the primaries?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes; there is definite provision about the primaries, but that is in title II, in which we make recommendations for special and primary elections. Title III, which relates to the Federal ballot, is only for the general election.

Mr. SNYDER. The statement is made here that the ballot shall be received 45 days before the primary.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is for the general-election ballot.

Mr. SNYDER. Not the primary?

Mr. LECOMPTE. No.

I think we can feel that we have done the best we can for the suspension of the poll tax and the registration. As I said in the beginning, this is a compromise, and I repeat that this compromise represents the best efforts of the conferees to extend to the soldiers, the men in the armed forces all over the world, not one but two or three opportunities to vote: First, the State ballot if it is possible to get it to them, and, second, if they cannot possibly get a State ballot, then the short Federal ballot in lieu of no opportunity at all to vote. We are doing our best in every way to give the soldiers a ballot throughout.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the majority leader from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. If my understanding is correct, the short ballot cannot be used unless it is authorized by State law.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is right. I am going to come to that in just a moment.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the State legislature has to meet and authorize the use of the short ballot and provide that if used it will be counted within that State.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The Governor has to certify that the Federal ballot comes under or within the laws of the State. It may be the laws are already sufficient. That is the answer to the question, I believe.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman know of any State that has a law that is sufficient, outside of possibly California?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I would say California, and in the balance of States it may be a matter of interpretation of existing law. I am not going to attempt to interpret the laws of the several States. I could not quite do that.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. COMPTON. I merely wish to say that the State of Connecticut has legalized the use of the short ballot.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Thank you for the contribution.

In the course of the deliberation of the conferees it was found necessary to strike out of the bill S. 1285 the provision for the Federal ballot for the Territories and Insular Possessions, inasmuch as the War Department and the Navy Department have to administer the act, and representatives advised that it would add to their difficulties to have separate forms for the men from the Territories, since these men could not vote for President and Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Am I correctly informed in understanding that the conferees rejected the House amendment covering the Territories only because it complicated the use of the Federal ballot?

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is correct.

Mr. FARRINGTON. And that as far as the Territories' own voting laws are concerned for President and Vice President they remain?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes; the Army and the Navy felt they could not handle two different forms.

Mr. FARRINGTON. And may I ask this additional question, that the action of the conferees should not be construed as meaning that they did not believe that the legislatures of the Territories should not make provision to enable their men in the service to qualify for voting?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Oh, definitely not. We want them to vote, but we did not feel that we could furnish two different forms.

Mr. FARRINGTON. And in the event they do, that the same facilities of the Army and the Navy that are extended to the States will be extended to the Territories for that purpose?

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is our interpretation. There was no intention to slight the citizens of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Alaska, and elsewhere in any way.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. What is there about the Federal ballot that makes it so easy to obtain and that makes it so difficult for the States to obtain the State ballot?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Oh, we have fixed it so that it is easy to get the State ballot. We retain practically all provisions of S. 1285, as it passed the House, and that was strictly the State ballot proposition and we extend to the States free mail and free air-mail service for the transmission of ballots.

I want to proceed in the few minutes remaining to discuss the compromise proposition in title III. The conferees apparently would have remained deadlocked except for the very valuable services of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] who joined with me in sponsoring a compromise. Without this effort I doubt whether we could have resolved the log jam into which the conferees had gotten and for the additional fact that the other conferees accepted and joined in our proposal which I think is a very fair compromise, and one that I will defend. Most legislation is a compromise. In fact the Constitution itself is a compromise and it is accepted everywhere as the greatest document ever conceived and enacted by a legislative body. Title III is the crux of the entire act, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] stated. This report provides that first and foremost men in the armed services must be given a chance to vote under the State election laws of their respective States. In the event they cannot do that then we have a provision for them to vote a Federal ballot. The men in the armed forces overseas from States which have absentee voting laws may vote the Federal ballot if the Governor of the State certifies on or before July 15 that the Federal ballot is legal, or is authorized by the laws of the State, and if the soldier himself certifies that he has made application for the State ballot on or before September 1 and as of October 1 has not received the State ballot. He will then be given a Federal ballot, and be permitted to vote a Federal ballot and in the event the State ballot comes a few days later, he could vote the State ballot without any penalty whatsoever and if both go back to the precinct where his vote is to be counted, the State ballot will be given the preference, and will be counted. Probably there are men in the armed services from States which have no absentee voting laws, no State ballot. These men, whether in continental United States or somewhere in the far removed theaters of war, are permitted to vote a Federal ballot if the Governor certifies by July 15 that this act is authorized by the laws of his State.

Mr. Speaker, I think that represents a very sincere effort to extend the ballot to the armed services all around the world, and at the same time keeps the act within the Constitution of the United States. The men in the armed services certainly ought to have the right to vote, and we want to go to every length to give them a chance to vote. It would be a cruel and heartless trick to give a man a ballot, and then have him find out afterward that the ballot was not legal and could not be counted; and certainly we would not be defending the Constitution if we laid the foundation for a contest that would result in turmoil and confusion—one that might last for several months, and perhaps even leave the Presidency in doubt when Inauguration Day comes. The members of this conference committee unanimously recommend this report as the best thing that could be had out of two conflicting bills.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Why was not the same treatment accorded men in continental limits of the United States as well as outside?

Mr. LECOMPTE. We did that. We provided that the men within the continental limits of the United States may vote if they have no State absentee-voting law and the Governor certifies to the validity of the Federal ballot.

Mr. ROGERS of California. That was not the same consideration.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It was exactly the same.

Mr. RANKIN. There will be no difficulty about getting State ballots to the men in continental United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am now, as always, in favor of giving as many of our men and women in the armed forces as possible the right to vote. In 1942 I collaborated in the formulation and passage of the Ramsay Act; and here and now I want to emphasize that such act is constitutional, regardless of what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has said or may say; and that under the Ramsay Act more servicemen will have an opportunity to cast their votes than under the emasculated Green-Lucas-Worley bill.

Even the conferees themselves cannot assure the House that all States will be able to qualify under this new proposal. Personally, I, for one, would dislike very much to depend and rely on the action of unfriendly Governors who would be, by this conference report, given the right to say whether the servicemen may vote or not. That right inherently belongs to the servicemen, and I feel that this conference report deprives many of these men of the privilege that the 1942 act gave them.

I am sorry that I have not enough time to explain thoroughly to the House statements which I put into the RECORD the day before yesterday, explaining clearly the constitutionality of the 1942 act and the impossibility of enforcing this pending conglomerate concoction. I hope you have read my statements in the RECORD of March 14, which plainly show that the rulings of the Supreme Court are that the Congress has the right to prescribe and even control elections for President, Vice President, and Members of the Congress.

I do not blame the conferees of the House. The House voted for that bill because our Republican friends wanted that kind of measure and I do not want to say it—I hate to say it; I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings—but I cannot help but believe that the Republicans, fearing that most of these servicemen, by right, would cast their votes for President Roosevelt, who must be a candidate because the country demands it, voted for the bill originally, and will vote for the conference report because they feel that in accordance with this conference report many of those servicemen and servicewomen will be deprived of the right to vote. They do not want any law that would give those in the armed forces the constitutional right to cast their vote in the forthcoming election.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman shows great discretion in not yielding.

Mr. SABATH. Up to now the proponents have used about 40 minutes, and this is the first 5 minutes that the opponents have secured. I hope the remainder of the time will be equally divided and that there will be no discrimination against those who have the courage to fight for the servicemen and servicewomen to have the rights which this conference report would deprive them of. I feel that many of you on the Republican side are willing that

these service boys shall vote, and many of you deserve their votes. Therefore, why should you play or be forced to play politics with this matter?

Mr. JENSEN rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the statement that this is the——

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot yield. I do not yield for any statement by any Member who feels that what I have said especially applies to him. I made a general statement; and I know there are many Republicans who are deserving of the votes of these servicemen, and I repeat it. However, there are many who are not. I said that; I stand by and will continue to say it.

It seems to me that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] assumes that I have placed him in the category of those who are not entitled to the soldiers' vote. I did not, however, specifically do that; but if the shoe fits him, let him wear it.

I know that many of you Republicans dislike to hear anybody say you are playing politics. You do not like to hear that; but day in and day out you make the most ridiculous allegations that we Democrats and those in the administration do this and that for political purposes.

I have pleaded earnestly with you Republicans for more than 2 years that we should not play politics but should devote our energies and efforts to winning of the war as soon as possible, but to no avail.

It seems to me that you think more of the coming election than you think of winning the war and giving the servicemen, these brave, deserving, courageous fighting men, the right to cast their votes.

Regardless of what you say or what you promise to do, that will not avail anything, because, I repeat, the intelligent, honest, sincere men and women of this country, the fathers and mothers, the brothers and sisters, the kinsmen and friends of those whom you would deprive of their right to vote, will energetically resent your action and give a wholehearted approval of the great services rendered to the masses of our country and to humanity in general by President Roosevelt, recognized by the people not only of the United States but of the world as the greatest and most influential statesman of his generation, who will soon, let us hope, as our Commander in Chief accomplish the defeat of the despicable Nazis and the detestable Japs, and at the peace table wield greater influence than any other man in the creation of a lasting peace.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] desire more time?

Mr. SABATH. I know that some of you gentlemen are very liberal, but I will take the time a little later on.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly very touching to hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] express solicitude for the men in the armed service. Today, as usual, he echoes the master's voice. Unless memory plays me false, he is one of those gentlemen who, after the last war, did not think so much about paying the soldiers their bonus. But, of course, this is a different proposition.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from Michigan is wrong. I voted for it, and I voted out everything to help the boys.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I stand corrected. The gentleman did vote for the bonus, although for a moment it did not seem possible that he ever opposed the President's wishes.

I do recall, however, that, when the President vetoed the bill and the question came up in the House on May 22, 1935, as to whether that veto should be sustained, the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. SABATH] forgot the veterans, listened to his master's voice to the extent of dodging the issue, of supporting the veterans in opposition to the President, and is recorded—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 79, part 7, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, page 7997—as 1 of the 12 who did not vote.

The gentleman for some reason best known to himself took a run-out powder. He may not have loved the veterans less, but he certainly was not caught voting against the gentleman in the White House.

I know now by his record here in the House on this legislation that he does not want those in the armed services to have a complete ballot. He supports and votes for legislation which if adopted will deprive those in the service of the opportunity to vote for their State candidates, for their county candidates. He supports legislation to give them a blank ballot with which, perhaps, the O. W. I. or some other New Deal agency or organization can put across or write in or print a name. The idea of giving the soldiers the same kind of ballot that the civilians here at home will have does not appeal to him. What he wants to do is to give them this bobtailed ballot which will deprive them, and he knows it well, of the opportunity to vote for their local and State candidates.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman, in fairness, yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the use of the gentleman contending that he wants the servicemen to vote and then deny them the opportunity to vote, using the same kind of a ballot he and I are given? Are not those in the service entitled to as complete a ballot as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

What the proponents of this bobtailed ballot want to do is not to permit soldiers to vote, and I am making no charge against any Member of the House, but they want another commission to supervise and control the voting with a ballot with a blank space which opens the door to all kinds of fraud in distribution, in voting and in transmitting the ballot. How easy, how easy it will be to get those applications, from those in service, send them in, and then get the ballot, and maybe they will get them to the men in the service and maybe they will not. Some New Deal agency may think of a short cut, as is the habit of New Deal agencies, and just mark and return the ballot for the serviceman, so saving him the trouble.

Oh, yes; we will have a commission, an impartial commission. Whenever a question arises the President appoints a commission—which does his bidding. Perhaps they are going to have Republicans—Republicans like Knox and Stimson and Willkie, and Frank S. Knight, of the Detroit Free Press, and Marshall Field, of PM, on it—that is the kind of unbiased commission they would give us to handle the voting.

The President owes his reelection in part to the vote in some of the boss-ridden larger cities. The vote which elected him the last time came principally from the centers of population.

Now we on this side are thoroughly convinced if those in the service ever get an opportunity, a fair opportunity, to vote they will vote the Republican ticket, because some of them who have left their homes, their wives, and children—some of the soldiers and sailors and marines are beginning to inquire as to the objectives of this war, which, in the beginning, they were told was to carry the "four freedoms" to all corners of the world now; which was to be fought to preserve the integrity, the sovereignty, of small nations like Poland. They have been asking that question right along, and they have never yet been told by anyone in a responsible position in this administration when the war was going to end. I do not mean the date.

Time and again the Republicans have asked the majority party and have asked the administration, through the press, What are you fighting for? To whip Hitler? Yes. To whip the Japs? Yes. All right; after Hitler has been disposed of, are the British and the Russians going down and help us whip the Japs? And after the Japs are disposed of and Stalin wants to take Poland and other countries and proceeds to do it, are we to fight him? What our boys would like to have is a definite statement from the party in power and from the administration as to what are the objectives of this war.

All I am asking is this: How far into Europe, Asia, Africa, on the South Seas—all over the world—must our armed forces carry the battle flag of victory; what countries and seas must our armed forces overrun, conquer, before the war ends?

As the days go by and American youth continues to die thousands of miles from home, those in the armed services and those they have left behind are entitled to know the goal toward which we are striving, the goal which they must reach before the war can end. Offering their lives as they are, they have the right to be told by this administration the magnitude of the task and what is to follow its accomplishment.

Our servicemen are more interested in knowing when they will have finished

their job, when they can return to their loved ones, than they are in voting.

Let us not pretend. If the soldiers are to vote, they are entitled to the same kind of a ballot that we here at home will use. That is the kind of a ballot that we who support the so-called States' rights bill, the conference report, demand our servicemen shall have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, no matter in what language those who are favoring the adoption of this conference report dress their words, the facts are that this conference report actually repeals a present provision of law which makes it unnecessary for men in the armed forces to either register or to pay poll tax. Even before this report was printed, from the accounts in the daily press—and I say this without any disparagement—when the gentleman from Mississippi expressed himself as being pleased with the conference report, those of us who are anxious to have the greatest possible number of soldiers vote, felt we were justified in being apprehensive that no great number of soldiers could vote if this were adopted into law.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. No, my friend; I cannot yield. I only have 4 minutes. If I have time later, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman ought not to get in the well of the House and make a statement like that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi has consumed more time on this legislation than any other man in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I will pay my respects to the gentleman from Mississippi. Let me say to him he can intimidate and coerce other Members of this House, but he cannot intimidate and coerce me. Just as soon as the gentleman from Mississippi understands that, maybe he will conduct himself differently when he is dealing with me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] seeks to perpetuate in his own State a system of poll tax, under which thousands of boys now serving in the armed forces cannot vote even when they are in this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. He seeks to extend that to those who are already in the armed forces. I do not yield right now.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to correct the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BELL). The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. He ought not misrepresent my State in that way.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order, and that this not be taken out of my time.

I recollect when we had a work-relief bill in this House. A gentleman from one of the poll-tax States said to me, "We do not have to care about these people who are out of work, because we have a retroactive poll tax of $2 a year. If they want to vote they have to pay accumulated taxes of $20 or $30." I want to say to my friends on the Republican side in all sincerity, because I have many good friends on the Republican side, I want them to recollect that when these soldiers come back they are going to be resentful of those who have made it difficult for them to cast their ballots. I think you have made a mistake in following the lead of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on this bill. Perhaps in those States where they have a poll tax, when the soldiers come back they will not be able to express their resentment of Members of Congress who voted for this legislation, because they will not be able to pay the accumulated taxes. But, where they do not have the retroactive poll tax, where the soldier does not have to pay $10 or $20 or $30 to vote when he comes back, I say those of us who do not give him the opportunity he is entitled to under the Constitution, for which he is shedding his blood, will have to take care, because he is going to have something to say about it.

Now, my friends, there is no language you can use to change the purpose of this report. It is a bill to make it difficult for soldiers to vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] was most ridiculous. The State of Mississippi has already set aside its registration and poll-tax provisions for servicemen during this war. For the gentleman from Pennsylvania to make such a statement is unfair. We do not need to take any lesson on political morality from any Philadelphia politician.

I am reminded that a few years ago when the marines were sent to Nicaragua it was said they went down there to see that they held an honest election. Senator Norris said, "Why in the hell do you not send them to Philadelphia or Pittsburgh?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, for 5 minutes I would like to return to a discussion of some of the questions in the conference report and review briefly some of the merits of it, and some of the reasons why I believe this conference report is an acceptable and a reasonable plan for providing a ballot for overseas and domestic women and men in the service. It was fully agreed in the conference at all times, first, that every member, not only of the conference but of the Congress itself, every member, I repeat, was anxious to have all of the men and women in service cast a ballot in the election.

The second point on which all conferees agreed and on which I believe all Members of the House agree, was that all service people should have an opportunity, if possible, to vote a complete ballot. Therefore, the consideration of the Federal ballot plan obviously would be limited to such individuals as could not obtain the regular, full-length State ballot. I believe that is what has been accomplished as the conference report is written. It was necessary to change Public Law No. 712. Public Law No. 712 never was adequate to provide voting for the servicemen. It left the entire responsibility of the printing and transmission of the ballots up to the States, and placed the entire burden of transporting the ballots in the hands of the States, when as a matter of fact, the States have no control whatever over the Postal Service or over the air-transport command or over military and naval transportation facilities. So it was necessary for the Congress to provide proper transportation.

In considering the shortcomings of Public Law No. 712, the entire act was looked over in the conference, and it was determined that the first two sections might as well be retained in this law, and it is my belief and I think the belief of the conferees, that sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 712 have not been repealed. I was somewhat surprised to hear the chairman say there was some doubt about that. I conclude the doubt has only to do with the Federal ballot, and that sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 712 are not in any sense repealed so far as the State absentee balloting is concerned. This conference report contains the complete bill now under consideration. There are several printed copies of S. 1285 under several dates, and for any Member to endeavor to find out what is in the conference report by referring to S. 1285 as printed, is utterly hopeless. I recommend to Members that in considering this legislation they refer only to the conference report, and thereby save confusion. Other printed versions, even the conference print, I think may be confusing. The entire matter is contained in this Conference Report No. 1247, which is now available.

I am in favor of the adoption of this conference report. I think it goes far beyond Public Law No. 712 in permitting more soldiers and sailors to vote. The statement to the effect that it will not allow as many service people to vote as Public No. 712 is absolutely absurd and entirely incorrect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful if any matter with which we in Congress have had to deal has ever been attended by so much confusion; it is doubtful if there is any matter about

which there is so much misunderstanding. The purpose of the misrepresentation and the confusion I shall leave for you to judge.

The simple, plain, unvarnished facts are these:

The administration forces proposed a so-called Federal or bobtail ballot by which the armed forces would be permitted to express their choice only for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. I say "express their choice" advisedly because there is a serious question whether this would constitute casting a vote because of the further serious question as to whether these so-called ballots would be counted. Certainly there would be all sorts of contests, challenges, and litigation that would probably throw the next election into the courts and the Congress.

But momentarily let us say that this is beside the point.

The opponents of this form of ballot proposed a complete State ballot about which there would be no question of its validity and which would permit the armed forces to vote for all of their officers—county and State as well as national. Thirty-four Governors of our States are to be elected this year. Have we gone so far in concentrating authority in Washington that it is of no importance who these Governors are? Is it the contention that the armed forces are not concerned in them? Is it the contention that they are not concerned in their other State and local officials?

Why seek to disenfranchise the young men and women who are serving us all over the globe in the matter of their State and local officials? The rest of us will be permitted to vote for them. Why not the armed forces?

The answer which the proponents of the Federal bobtail ballot have sought to give is that it is impossible, that the States would not provide the necessary facilities.

But 46 Governors have already said they would. It may be that at the outset there were some reasonable doubts as to what the States would do. There are certainly none now. I repeat that 46 Governors have now reported that action has either already been taken or will be taken to insure the armed forces of their State an opportunity to vote—not only for President, Vice President, and Members of Congress but for their State officials as well. This is the sort of ballot the rest of us will have. We at home certainly deserve no advantages in a matter of this kind over those who have been called away on the greatest mission of their lives.

There is one thing of which you can rest assured out of all this confusion, all this propaganda:

The armed forces—those young men and women who are offering their very lives for the preservation of our institutions—they are going to have the opportunity to vote to the same extent as we at home. We take away many of their rights when we draft them and send them to 50 fighting fronts all over the world. But this is one that we will not take from them.

And the reason this right will not be taken from them is because a majority of the Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, were not swept off their feet by hysteria, because they would not permit themselves to be high-pressured by forces whose purpose I shall leave for you to judge. As the result of our steadfastness, these young men and women will not only have a complete ballot available but they will also have available the names of the candidates. This they would not have on the Federal bobtail ballot. They would have voted blindly, except for what information they would be able to obtain, for either the Democratic candidate for President, for Senator, and for Representatives, or the Republican ones.

This was an entirely unconstitutional proposition that was put up to us, and it is seldom that Members of Congress have been subjected to such a campaign of abuse and hate. This is something, however, that collectively we have become accustomed to. Your legislative body is still in existence in Washington and it is still serving you.

Frankly, I cannot imagine anything more unsound and un-American than the implication of the bobtail ballot—that the Governors of your State are of no importance; not of enough importance for those who are fighting for us to be concerned about. We are all aware, of course, that this has been the trend in our country for the past 11 years. We know of the efforts to make our State officials but puppets of the vast political autocracy in Washington; and we know of the degree of success which was met. We know that the Washington Government has become so contemptuous of State officials that it does not consider it important that they be voted upon.

But, fellow citizens, we can thank our stars that this trend has been arrested. Just as you have seen a rejuvenation of your Congress, you have seen a rejuvenation of your State governments. Able, high-minded men have come to take the places of those who shunned their responsibilities and to the extent that they have, more orderliness has come into our affairs.

State Governors, in the estimation of Congress, are all-important. I want to say to you that in their ability, in their sense of honor, and their sense of duty largely lies our salvation. It is for these gentlemen to take back the responsibilities that are theirs. In that way largely lies the solution of our problems. Continued unloading of them on the bureaucracy of Washington will bring us immeasurable grief; it will bring us disaster.

Never in our history, fellow Americans, has the caliber of our Governors, our other State officials, been of such vital concern to us; and that being the case we intend to see that those in the uniform have an opportunity to say who they shall be.

All sorts of rumors have been afloat in Washington as to the underlying purposes of the so-called bobtail ballot. There have been rumors that it was designed to help this candidate or that candidate. Maybe so. Those of us who have supported the full ballot have had just one purpose in mind. And that purpose is that regardless of what the armed forces might, individually or collectively, do with their ballot, they are entitled to it—entitled to a full ballot. The idea of a restricted franchise is something new to us in a Republic. But we have seen many things new in recent years and we have come to expect most anything.

What has taken place here is a justification of our legislative processes. Out of the maze of propaganda, the false charges, the deliberate effort to confuse, a clarity has come. I doubt that I have ever heard so important a subject so mistreated in the press and on the radio; but the majority of the Members of Congress were not stampeded. And now light is beginning to prevail.

We were falsely charged with trying to deny these young men and women the opportunity to vote. There are 531 of us. We have the human frailties and the strengths of the American people. We have the responsibilities of the country as a whole. Our individual judgments are often wrong, but seldom is our collective judgment. When that errs then the people as a whole have erred, because we are the composite of them.

Some day this war will be over and those young men and women out there carrying the torch of liberty will return to their homes—those of them who have not paid the supreme sacrifice. They will return to take up their lives. And they want to take them up under the democratic processes which they went away to defend. They have a right to say who their officials are—their State and county officials, not just who is their President, their Senator, or their Representative.

Furthermore, they will know just exactly whom they are voting for under the full State ballot. The candidate's name will be right there on the ballot for them to see. It will be a secret ballot just as that which we at home will have.

I insist the men and women in the service must be given the opportunity to vote. Every man and woman ought to be given an opportunity to vote for a complete State and national ticket. Legislation must be within the borders of the Constitution and the States, we have been assured, will put their voting machinery in order so that every service man and woman will be enabled to vote, and have his vote legal when it is returned. This conference report will do exactly that which is required, and I sincerely hope it will have the support of the entire membership of this House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, although not a perfect law—in fact, no law is perfect—I favor adoption of the conference report.

During the past several weeks, while the soldiers' vote law has been before Congress I have received letters from

friends in service in nearly all theaters of operations.

Not one of them has appeared nearly as agitated as some political leaders and Members of Congress over this matter.

Only one of them expressed any real concern, and that was the desire to vote the same ballot the folks at home vote—a full ballot, top to bottom. This he can now do.

These men and women have confidence in the judgment of their folks at home—confidence that the homefolks will vote for the best interests of the various States and the Nation.

The members of our armed forces have one paramount desire—the winning of the war, winning at the earliest possible moment.

Their next goal is to return to their community, get a job, establish a home, get a car and radio, and go to church and the movies. In other words, get home and again live a normal American life.

This conference report is a practical demonstration, even in crisis, of how well our representative form of government works, as it has worked from the inception and adoption of the Constitution by the compromise of radical differences in conference.

Congress having spoken, the next step is up to the various States. They will act, I am sure, as Kansas has already acted, so that these men and women may, if they desire, cast their ballots.

With cooperation by all the States these men and women can, by use of a post card, get and cast, not merely a bobtailed ballot but a full ballot for Governor, judges, sheriff, Members of Congress, and for Presidential electors—a full legal, constitutional ballot, a ballot which will dispel, to a great extent, the specter or possibility of contested election of Members of Congress and the President.

Despite the difficulties which may be encountered, the Army and Navy will, as always, overcome all difficulties and properly distribute the post cards and ballots in ample time.

Having the privilege, may those in uniform cast their ballots wisely; may they elect public officials who will, as they are fighting to do, maintain the United States as a free country of free Americans under our Constitution.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report represents the considered judgment of a number of the Members of the House and Members of the Senate, all of whom are thoroughly familiar with all the propositions of law and fact involved.

This report with the vote of the House this afternoon will bring to a head this question of the soldiers vote which has been of such great interest to the American people. I do not now recall any legislation that has been of such vital interest to so many people that has been so unfortunately misrepresented in so many different ways. I feel sure, however, that the American people now understand the matter much better. When the American people understand a proposition and have a fair chance to express themselves they always express themselves clearly and emphatically.

The agitation with reference to this legislation will subside entirely just as soon as this conference report has been approved and the President has acted. Should the President approve the conference report then the matter will be closed. If he vetoes the conference report, I am confident that there will be no effort on the part of the House or the Senate to pass legislation over his veto because that will not be necessary. Those who constitute the majority that will vote in favor of this conference report would prefer that we continue under the present law than that we back up and give legislative approval to this nondescript bobtailed ballot which cannot be justified under the Constitution or under the mental reactions that we term "common sense."

Should the President veto this conference report the situation, as I have already stated, will be that we will then operate under the present law, which was passed 2 years ago and which has been found to be quite acceptable in most cases. That legislation, however, is not as effective as the legislation which practically all the States have enacted, or will enact, to permit those in the armed forces to vote the same ballots that they would vote if they were at home.

From the beginning I have felt that there is grave danger that this bobtailed ballot cannot be constitutional under any circumstances, because the Constitution leaves with the States the power and authority to set up election machinery, and it expressly provides that the President and Vice President are elected by the votes of electors selected in the States and not by popular vote. By that I mean the direct vote of the people. In other words, under the terms of the Constitution I maintain that a ballot which permits a voter to vote directly for a President would not be within the Constitution. This bobtailed ballot, which does not even contain the name of anyone, would be more unconstitutional than if it did contain the names of all the candidates for the Presidency and other national offices.

I shall not discuss this conference report at length, but I make this statement for I do not want my vote this afternoon to be construed as the vote of one who is thoroughly and completely satisfied that these bobtailed ballots are constitutional.

I should like to say a few words to the House with reference to the many thousands of splendid men and women from Ohio who are in the armed forces of the Nation, and who are defending us in practically all of the 55 or 60 military and naval fronts. At the present time the State of Ohio has what might be considered a satisfactory absent-voters-ballot law in peacetimes. But it can be easily amended to make it more satisfactory for wartimes. There is one provision of it that has worked a hardship quite frequently, and that is the provision which lays down such rigid requirements for registration. These restrictions must be removed as to the members of our armed forces. At every election in Ohio many thousands of legal voters from Ohio take advantage of the present absent-voters law. Governor Bricker has publicly announced that as soon as the Congress of the United States has disposed of this legislation which has been pending before it for some little time he will call the Legislature of Ohio into special session and will encourage such legislation as will be necessary to provide adequate and sufficient facilities for every man and woman from Ohio in the armed services to vote the same ballot as that person's parents will be permitted to vote in his or her home town. This action will be taken in sufficient time to enable every Ohioan anywhere in the armed services to cast a ballot for State and local candidates and also for electors to vote for the President and the Vice President and every other candidate from the top to the bottom of the ballot.

Regardless of whether the President should sign this conference report or whether the legislation considered in this conference report becomes a law, Ohio expects to see to it that all of her sons and daughters in the armed services, wherever located, will have ample time and ample opportunity to vote a regular full and complete American ballot. It will be our purpose in Ohio to see to it that the Ohioan in our armed forces shall not be compelled to vote a bobtailed ballot the constitutionality of which is questioned and the incompleteness of which must be recognized by all.

I want those from Ohio who are in the armed services, wherever they may be, and their parents, also, to know that not one single Congressman from Ohio, either Republican or Democrat, has been in any way in favor of any legislation that would prevent any soldier or sailor from being permitted to vote.

There has been much discussion to the effect that it will be impossible to transport the ballots to the soldiers in time for them to vote the ballots and have them returned to the proper authorities by November. Of all the groundless arguments in favor of the bobtailed ballot, this one seems to me to be the worst. In Ohio I am sure that our legislature will pass legislation that will relieve the soldiers from the necessity of any formal registration. No doubt this legislation will provide that soldiers, sailors, and all others in the armed services will be considered as being registered automatically. Provision then will be made to furnish them with a full and complete ballot under circumstances that will enable them to vote these ballots free from any military domination or any spying or any duress of any kind.

That this all can be done easily, let me read a short editorial that I have clipped from the Christian Science Monitor. This great paper has very decided leanings toward the New Deal in some of its programs but it is fair enough to publish the following editorial, which language I adopt as my own:

SOLDIERS DO VOTE

One thing that may have been overlooked in the fuss over soldier-vote legislation in

Washington is the simple fact that many States, and political subdivisions thereof, have for a long time sent out ballots to absentees and continue to do so, though not all absentees bother about voting.

For instance, recently the town clerk of Brookline, Mass., sent out 1,420 ballot applications to absentees, most of them service men and women. In return he received requests for 450 ballots and mailed them February 9 for the March 7 town election. There was plenty of time, as some ballots came back from India, Africa, and Sicily.

Two States forbid absentees to vote, and little can be done about this until the States change their own laws.

There are many other reasons that I could give for my vote in favor of this conference report. My principal reason is that under the State plan, as above set forth, all of the Ohio men and women in the armed services will be provided with the same kind of a ballot that their parents will use. They will, of course, be satisfied with that situation. Any ballot that would not be complete would be a curtailment of their rights. Consequently with confidence that every Ohioan wherever he or she may be will be permitted to vote a complete Ohio ballot free and unrestricted, I shall vote for this conference report.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in order to equalize the time, I yield the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] 8 minutes of the time on this side that he may in turn yield as he sees fit.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from an address of President Roosevelt before the American Legion convention in Chicago, Ill., on October 2, 1933.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, as most of the Members know, I have been vitally interested in this legislation, being a member of the Elections Committee of the House. I heartily approve of the compromise that has been so painstakingly worked out through the 2 or 3 weeks that the conferees of the House have been meeting with the conferees of the other body. They have done a splendid job and they have let the Federal ballot go just about so far and no further. I think they are to be complimented, because the main purpose back of H. R. 1285, and the main object of Members on this side of the House and on the other side of the House, has been to keep this legislation within the framework of the Federal Constitution and within the framework of the various State constitutions and their election laws so that when the election will have been held and a decision will have been made we will avoid all chaos after November, which might have taken place if those favoring the Federal ballot had been successful in having it extensively used on the various battle fronts of the world and in the various camps of the United States of America, a result that none of the people of this country want to see in these terrible times of stress. They have provided for the Federal ballot in certain instances, and it is my honest opinion that 95 percent of the principles of those of us who have supported the State ballot are still in the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this has been a great victory for constitutional government in this country. I am satisfied that the people who believe in constitutional and representative government, as exemplified by the Seventy-eighth Congress, have heaved a sigh of relief in their realization that there are enough men in the Congress of the United States and that there is such an abundance of them in the lower House, that constitutional and representative democratic processes of government have come to life here for the future benefit and welfare of this country.

I was a little amazed at the gentleman from Illinois, who is so worried about this short ballot. One of the reasons that we did not want the short ballot was because of such populous centers as Chicago, because of the corrupt political machines in the States, and particularly in cities like Chicago. I have lived in Chicago and have had some experience in politics there. I have been in the gentleman's ward many times. I know that the jails of Chicago during the past 10 or 15 years have been bulging with political prisoners—yes; political prisoners who have weighed the ballots and short-penciled the ballots and corrupted the election instead of allowing the will of the people to work in the selection of their public officials in Chicago.

I can well understand that with this short ballot, and with all safeguards taken away, if they would run true to form as they did, and if there was the same degree of corruption as they had when I was there, it would be possible, in my judgment, with the short pencils and the short ballots to vote nearly everyone who had left the city of Chicago and entered the armed services, whether they might yet be alive, whether they might be in prison camps, or whether they might ever make application for a ballot.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is true that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], voted for the soldiers' bonus, but when it came to the vital question of sustaining the President's veto, his love for the soldiers and veterans evaporated and he was absent. He just did not vote. He heard his master's voice and he sat silent in his seat.

Mr. VURSELL. We who supported the State ballot have stood against the pressure groups, have withstood the pressure of the radicals, the pressure of PM, the C. I. O., and many Members, to their credit, on the Democratic side of the House have stood against the added and powerful weight of the Administration in order that representative government might function here in the Congress of the United States on Capitol Hill where for the past 11 years, it has been absent and mistreated so often.

The people will approve this measure. Do not worry about what the soldiers will say when they get home. The fathers and mothers of the soldiers are beginning to learn that the men who have stood for representative and constitutional government are back of a full and complete ballot and that they have not only been the friends of the soldiers but the best friends of the Government in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report. The House, some weeks ago, by a vote of 6 to 1, passed a so-called State-ballot bill to enable the men and women in our armed services and the auxiliaries with them to vote. This measure went to the Senate and the Senate attached its bill to the House bill and these two bills then were referred, under the rules of the House and Senate, to a conference committee made up of five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate—six Democrats and four Republicans. After 2 or 3 weeks of hard work on these measures, they brought in a compromise bill which is included in the conference report. All five of the conferees of the House, three Democrats and two Republicans, agreed to the conference report. Three Senators of the Senate conference committee, the two Republicans and one Democrat, agreed to this compromise bill and, therefore, by a vote of 8 to 2, the conference committee brings the compromise bill in this report to the House and Senate. On yesterday the Senate adopted the conference report by a vote of 47 to 31. Twenty-three Democrats voted for the conference report. If the House accepts this conference report, and I firmly believe it will be a vote of at least 2½ to 1, this compromise soldier-vote bill will go to the President for his approval or disapproval. The Congress, Republicans and about one-half the Democrats favor this legislation. If the President vetoes this bill, then we go back to Public Law 712, passed in the Seventy-seventh Congress and approved by the President, September 16, 1942.

Now, the President has said that he favors the measure that will permit the greatest number of our service men and women to vote.

I was pleased to hear the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], who had charge of the President's so-called Federal blank bobtailed ballot bill, make the statement here today on the floor that in his opinion more service men and women could vote under the bill as set out in the conference report before us than would be able to vote under Public Law 712. I was also pleased to hear our colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] another Democrat on the committee, make the same statement, and this position was strongly emphasized by

the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] another Democrat on the committee. These statements were reported by our colleagues the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HARRIS ELLSWORTH], and this is the opinion of many others who have spoken today, Democrats and Republicans.

I am of the opinion that this compromise bill, included in the conference report, is the very best bill that has yet been offered, giving an opportunity to vote to our service men and women and the auxiliaries with them.

Now, if Mr. Roosevelt vetoes this measure, as some of his New Deal friends are urging him to do, we will then be thrown back on Public Law 712, and a less number of our service men and women and their auxiliaries will have an opportunity to vote. Being very anxious for the men and women in our armed services and their auxiliaries to have the fullest opportunity to vote and to have their vote cast as they desire and counted and certified as cast, I am speaking and shall vote for the adoption of the conference report.

There is no group in this broad land of ours who has a higher or better right to vote at this time than the defenders of our country and they should vote free from coercion, intimidation, and fraud.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Of course, the gentleman is a very able Kentucky lawyer, and I would like to have his views with respect to whether or not the Governor of Kentucky, under the provisions of this law, can possibly certify, in the face of our constitutional provision, that provision has been made for the soldiers to vote who come from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The Governor of Kentucky is, as the gentleman knows, an able lawyer in his own right. He was a distinguished and outstanding member for many years of Kentucky's highest court, and I shall not here today prejudge the action taken by Kentucky's Governor.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, the gentleman knows that he will not certify it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. No; I do not know that. I am sure the Governor will give it his earnest consideration.

I think we are going here upon the assumption that we here in Congress and the President are more interested in our service men and women voting than the Governor of Kentucky and the Governors of the other 47 States and the people of the 48 States. Do you not know they are quite as anxious as you and I are for our servicemen to vote?

Mr. MAY. I agree that my colleague, of course, wants every one of them to vote, and so do I; but does not the gentleman think we would be precluded by our Constitution from letting them vote?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Neither I nor my party are responsible for the Constitution of Kentucky. My distinguished friend's party was in control and they submitted and adopted the Constitution of Kentucky and gave it to the people of Kentucky. Perhaps our Republican Governor can find a way to afford the men and women of Kentucky in the service an opportunity to vote. I certainly want them to vote.

SECTIONS 1 AND 2 IN PUBLIC LAW 712

In order to mislead some persons, it is claimed that sections 1 and 2 in Public Law 712, approved September 16, 1942, are repealed by this compromise bill. Sections 1 and 2 waive the necessity of our service men and women registering or paying any poll tax. This compromise bill is an amendment to Public Law 712 and sections 1 and 2 are still intact in the law, and therefore no man or woman or their auxiliaries will be required to register or pay any poll tax in order to vote. I think this clearly appears, and the opinion was expressed on the floor of the House by those of the committee and others that sections 1 and 2, Public Law 712, will still be the law and no registration or the payment of a poll tax will be required of our service men and women to vote.

IS PRESIDENT PROMOTING HIS OWN SELFISH INTEREST?

President Roosevelt has shown himself to be the most selfish, ambitious man who has ever occupied the White House. He was not satisfied with two terms as were Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, Grant, and Coolidge. He wanted the third term and now he wants the fourth term. He, with his New Deal friends, regards himself as the indispensable man out of 135,000,000 people. Is it not reasonable to suppose that he favors this so-called Federal bobtailed blank ballot because he thinks it would promote his election for a fourth term? He insists that our servicemen vote only for President, United States Senator and Congressman. The bill he favors provides that a vote for President also carries with it a vote for his man for Vice President.

I can see no good reason why our service men and women should not have a constitutional, legal, regular ballot with the names of the political parties and the names of all the candidates on the ballot. President Roosevelt says, "No; I don't want that kind of ballot. If you don't provide for this bobtailed blank ballot, I don't want the service men and women to have any ballot at all."

The House and Senate by an overwhelming majority refused to accept the President's views. They insist upon a regular, constitutional, State ballot, giving the names of all the candidates and all the political parties, that gives the service men and women an opportunity to vote for President, Vice President, State, district, county, and city officials, and for constitutional amendments that may be on the ballot. They want our service men and women to have the same kind of ballot that they have been accustomed to and would have handed to them to vote if they were at home and voting, and the same kind of ballot that their fathers, mothers, husbands, brothers, sisters, and cousins will vote next November, that gives the service men and women an opportunity to vote for their relatives, neighbors, and friends for State, district, county, and city officers as well as for President, Vice President, United States Senator, and United States Representative.

For the life of me, I cannot see how anyone can argue for this so-called Federal bobtailed blank ballot that limits our service men and women to vote for President, Senator, and Congressman without giving them the names of the political parties or the names of the candidates on the ballot. An overwhelming majority of the House and Senate by their speeches and votes declare that more of our service men and women can and will vote under the regular State ballot than will be able to vote under this Federal blank, bobtailed ballot. The compromise bill before us provides for the regular State ballot, the same kind of ballot the several States provide for their citizens.

TWO DOMINANT ISSUES

The two dominant issues in this controversy from the beginning to now are, first, Shall Congress authorize those in our armed services to be furnished by a Federal Ballot Commission, appointed by the President, a blank bobtailed ballot in the United States and outside the United States and distribute these blank bobtailed ballots in great numbers without being delivered especially to those entitled to vote and desiring to vote; or, second, have furnished to those in our armed services outside the United States on their application a regular, legal State ballot.

Cards will be furnished to these service men and women through air-mail facilities with the aid of the War and Navy Departments and the Shipping Board. On receipt of a ballot our service men and women will vote in secret and place it in a sealed envelope and return it to the secretary of state of their State, and they will in turn transmit them to the election officers of the various counties so that these ballots will be received and counted by the election officers in the counties or in the precincts as provided by law.

A. The serious objection raised to the so-called bobtailed blank ballot is that it will not contain the names of any political party or candidate. This will place our service men and women at a great disadvantage.

B. In the opinion of many Members of the House and Senate such a ballot violates the Federal Constitution and is in conflict with the election laws of the several States in the Union, perhaps with the exception of one.

C. The Federal bobtailed blank ballot gives our service men and women an opportunity to vote only for President, Vice President, Senator, and Congressman. In thirty-odd States this year Governors and other State officers are being elected, and in practically all of the States, district, county, and city officers will also be elected. This Federal bobtailed blank ballot would deny millions of our defenders an opportunity to vote for any of these.

D. The so-called blank Federal ballot and the handling of it as proposed by the administration opens wide the door for fraud, coercion, and intimidation.

KENTUCKY, NEW MEXICO, SOUTH CAROLINA

It is urged that the constitution of Kentucky, New Mexico, and perhaps South Carolina forbid absentee voting. This compromise bill takes care of absentee service men and women in these States so far as Congress can do so under the Constitution of the United States and constitution of Kentucky. This compromise bill provides that if the Governor of each of these States fails to certify on or before July 15, 1944, that absentee voting is permissible then in that event these Federal ballots may be used, but it is also provided that in that event the ballots will be counted provided they can legally and constitutionally be counted under the constitution and laws of those States. It will be up to the Governors of those States to say whether or not these ballots can be legally counted, and this was a provision in the President's so-called bobtailed blank-ballot bill. This compromise bill also provides that if the States fail to provide ballots for the service men and women within proper time limits then in that event the so-called Federal blank bobtailed ballot may be used. We all know, however, that the Governors and other officials and the people of the several States are quite as anxious for their service men and women to vote as are the President and Members of Congress. They appreciate the wonderful services these men and women are rendering just as much as we do and they are just as anxious to afford them every opportunity to vote as we are.

This New Deal administration has regimented labor, the farmers, business, commerce, and almost everything else, and now they are very anxious to take over the elections. This is striking a real blow at the liberties of the people, especially when they propose to limit persons to voting for President, Senator, and Representative. The President and his New Deal friends wanted these Federal bobtailed blank ballots issued to all of our service men and women in the United States as well as in foreign service. This bill limits these war ballots to be sent to those in the foreign service. Those living in the United States will use the usual and regular facilities for absentee voting, except in Kentucky, New Mexico, and South Carolina. The Federal ballot may be used in these States under the conditions we have heretofore stated.

Believing that the measure before us will afford the greatest opportunity for our service men and women to cast legal ballots without intimidation, coercion, or fraud, and their ballots will be fully protected and counted and certified as cast under this compromise measure, I feel it is my duty to vote for it. I trust that the President will not veto it, because our service men and women will not have near as many opportunities to vote under Public Law 712 as under this measure. There is no Federal ballot provision in that bill, and we cannot invoke the aid of the Army, Navy, merchant marine, the Post Office Department, and the Air Service to get these ballots to and from our service men and women.

Mr. WORLEY. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

NOT A COMPROMISE, BUT A SURRENDER

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I enthusiastically supported the original Worley bill, which I believed to have been carefully prepared and introduced in good faith in an effort to give every qualified man and woman in the armed forces an opportunity to vote. I shall not support this conference report today, recommending this monstrosity now before us for the reason that I feel very definitely that it has been designed and written for the avowed purpose of preventing our men and women in the armed forces from the opportunity of voting. Now, I want to make a prediction, and I measure my words when I say that I predict if this monstrosity actually becomes law, not 5 percent of the men and women in the armed forces outside the continental United States will vote, either in the primaries or the general election this fall. But bear in mind, gentlemen, they will all vote when they do return home.

I have listened with some interest and a great deal of amusement at the statements made by several previous speakers, who have congratulated themselves profusely and the conferees of the House and Senate on the so-called compromise now before the House. In fact some of the speakers, to my amazement, have referred to the bill, as finally agreed upon, as a 50–50 compromise between the so-called Rankin bill and the original Worley measure. These speeches of felicitations and congratulations on the 50–50 compromise reminds me of the old story with which all of you are no doubt familiar. It is about the fellow who was doing a land-office business in making what he called 50–50 hamburgers. When someone asked him for information as to the contents of his famous hamburgers, he proudly boasted that by "50–50" he meant 50 percent horse meat and 50 percent rabbit meat. When pressed a little further, however, he admitted that by 50–50, he really meant that he used one rabbit for each horse.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, there is not a rabbit's sized proportion left of the original Worley bill in this so-called compromise soldier-vote measure as now agreed upon. It is not a compromise but a surrender. It is indefensible. Several of the States have no absentee-ballot laws at all. In others, the laws are so complicated and cumbersome that it would be impossible for a person outside the United States to vote under such State laws. But let me point out that if all the States should pass absentee-ballot laws during the next few months, that they could not possibly be in conformity, and as the heads of the Army and the Navy have pointed out repeatedly, it would be impossible for officials of the Army to comply with its complex provisions. Other Members say it is the best compromise possible to secure. But, of course that is no valid reason or excuse for voting for this bill.

A lot of pious talk has been made on the floor of this House about preserving that great document known as the Constitution of the United States. Several Members have talked solemnly about this measure being within the framework of the Constitution. It is amazing how many great constitutional lawyers have come forth to defend this so-called States' rights bill. While they tell us over and over how anxious they are for those citizens in the armed forces to vote, they also would impress us on how extremely difficult it is for men who are giving their all for freedom's cause to vote under the terms of the Constitution of the United States.

In this connection, I have a letter from an Oklahoma farm boy, now in the southwest Pacific, who pays his compliments in no uncertain terms to those in Congress who have suddenly become so interested in preserving the letter of the Constitution at the expense of the rights and privileges of those men who are fighting to preserve our liberties. Here is a quotation from one of the many letters I have on the subject:

> What is all this talk about it being a violation of the Constitution for those of us in uniform to vote? If the Constitution says it is O. K. to fight and die, if need be, for our country, there is surely nothing in it to prevent us from voting in any election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the original Worley bill was presented to the House on December 18, the gentleman from Texas yielded to me, at which time I made the following observation, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentleman from Texas, who has the distinction of serving several months as a naval officer in the present war, not only for his introduction of this measure which, if enacted into law, will make certain that all qualified men and women in the armed forces of the United States will have an opportunity to vote, but also for this informative address he has delivered here today. May I add that I would go still further. I am strongly of the opinion that every man and woman in the uniform of the United States should be, irrespective of age, given the opportunity to vote. Surely anyone who is willing to lay down his life if need be for freedom's cause should be given the right to vote. I hold that anyone who is old enough to fight for his country is sufficiently matured to cast a vote for any candidate from President to constable.

That was my position on this controversial issue then, and that is exactly where I stand today. I do not care to accept any responsibility for the enactment of this monstrosity, more complicated than a 1944 model income-tax report, which this House is about to pass because some Members evidently feel that it will make sure that certain minority groups will not be permitted to vote in some States, and others say it is perhaps the best compromise they have been able to secure. I do not wish to accept responsibility, even in part, for such an indefensible measure and therefore shall vote "no" when my name is called.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, supported the original Worley bill on soldier voting because I felt that it would

be more effective in providing what was needed in this legislative matter and would do it in a constitutional way. It seemed to me when the proposition was before the House on February 3 that, on the one hand, we must make a choice between what was ideal but impossible—that is, a complete State ballot for both primary and general elections to every member of the armed forces away from home; and, on the other hand, a practical and possible arrangement—that is, a simple, short Federal ballot for the general election which the military authorities could collect and convey and local authorities could approve and count. Any proposal between these extremes that could be enacted, I felt, was bound to be far from satisfactory to many Members, but I thought the final Worley bill was the most nearly satisfactory.

On February 3, on the Anderson amendment to pass the Worley bill, I voted "yes." That was roll call No. 19. By that roll call the Worley bill was definitely rejected by the House. On roll call No. 20, immediately afterward, on final passage of the Rankin States' right bill, I voted "yes," not because I was satisfied with the Rankin bill but because I wished some further legislation enabling the members of the armed forces to vote, and I hoped that something better could and would be worked out in conference. I did not want, by voting "no" on final passage, to seem to oppose any change in legislation which purported to improve facilities for soldier voting. Meanwhile, the conferees have worked long and hard. However, in this conference report I do not see the improvement over the Rankin bill as the House passed it last month as much as I had hoped for. In fact, as I now see it, it is about a toss-up between this conference measure and the law we have had on the books for 2 years.

If this conference report is not enacted into law—although I feel sure it will be, even though I am constrained to vote against it—if it does not become law, the existing law of 1942 will govern the matter. I believe that most of the States have, or will move to get, better results this year than in 1942. My own State of Arizona has long had provisions for the absentee ballot. As a recent special session of the State legislature, Arizona has made every effort for her young citizens in uniform to vote in both primary and general elections. That is the way it should be.

Of course, I like the feature of this conference report which provided for the military authorities to help in the matter of transportation and distribution of ballots. Even if this conference measure should fail of enactment, I feel sure the Federal Government will provide facilities for handling the State ballots under the law of 1942. The need of such Federal assistance is much greater this year of far-flung military operations than it was in 1942. The Federal Government is responsible for removing these voters from their polling places; therefore, the Federal Government should be responsible for taking the ballot box to them. If the elections are to be conducted under the 1942 law, free air-mail service should be provided for the ballots. All this, it seems to me, could have been arranged for in a much simpler and effective manner than provided for in this conference report.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill in its present form and in practical effect says to the soldier, "You fight the war and after you win the war you can come home and then we will let you take part in governmental activities."

It will be just as difficult as ever for the soldier or sailor to vote. You deny them the practical right to do what they are fighting for. The bill not only denies the right to vote but one section denies the right of free speech. It places a Fascist interpretation on American rights. I shall vote against it.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for this conference report. Our State has made, I think, as good provision as it can make for absentee voting by members of the armed forces. I have believed from the beginning that Congress had the right and duty to provide a simple, direct method whereby all men and women in the armed forces of our country could cast their ballots in the forthcoming Federal election. I know the one thing men on the fighting fronts do not want is confusion, complications, and red tape. Yet, that is precisely what they get in this report.

The whole thing has seemed very simple to me and I have done whatever I could to provide the simple, direct voting method for our fighting men. That effort has not succeeded. In my judgment this report nullifies the effectiveness of sections 1 and 2 of Law 712 of the last Congress, which sections provided that neither registration nor poll tax should be required of men in the armed forces. In that respect this report is actually a backward step.

This report will create, in my judgment, great uncertainty as to just what the situation really is. So many procedures will have to be gone through by both the States and the soldiers as to render the situation just the opposite of the one that should obtain.

Public Law 712 is at least direct and simple. Provision of a Federal ballot could have been made simple, too. That is what some of us worked for. But we were unsuccessful.

These men who are fighting this war just cannot be expected to go through a long complicated procedure in order to gain a chance to vote in the coming election.

I have listened to this debate trying to get some real light on the situation. Frankly it is more confused than ever. But out of it comes this conviction—that I cannot put my stamp of approval on this measure, so complex and filled with red-tape provisions as it is, when I still believe the one important duty of Congress is to help the fighting men to have the most direct and simple possible method of registering their votes.

If this is the best Congress can do it had better honestly and frankly leave the matter to the States as Public Law 712 does, providing at the same time, as Public Law 712 also does, that no fighting man shall be denied opportunity to vote because of inability to register or failure to pay a tax.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I supported the plan of the original Worley bill. In an attempt to compromise this measure, to provide a vote for the members of our armed services, we have complicated the matter. I believe the Congress meant to simplify voting rather than get into this mixed-up situation.

I will oppose the conference report for the reason that a hodgepodge of hamstringing has developed which I earnestly feel will paralyze the processes of the ballot for the men and women who, with a minimum of red tape, shall vote in all parts of the world. It was our duty, here on the home front, to make easy that task. I cannot agree that we have done that and will therefore be obligated to vote "No."

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, under the present law that was passed in 1942, only 28,000 votes were cast by those in the service. Of course, that was a small percentage of those in the service. It must be remembered, however, that that was what we would call a byelection or off-year election, and the people generally were not as much interested as on a regular election year. In my own State the vote was comparatively light. I believe that, under the present law, thousands and thousands more votes will be cast this time than 2 years ago by the people in the armed services and particularly in view of the fact that there has been so much talk about the subject and the playing up of it by the newspapers. It would be safe to assume that those serving our country will use more effort to vote than before. In the main, the bill is so complex that it will be very difficult for any person to figure out whether he would be entitled to vote at all. I was one of those who supported the original Worley bill. I thought it presented a rather simplified form of ballot and procedure which would give the soldiers the right to vote without too much red tape. At that time I made some remarks with reference to the subject which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1944, at pages 1122 and 1123. I feel the same way now.

Personally, I doubt the efficacy of the bill as it now presents itself. I do not question the sincerity of those who have supported it. I give to them the same degree of good faith in their efforts as I would like to have accorded to my own, but I feel, as between this bill and the one that is now on the statute books, and particularly as the one now on the statute books has been used, and the soldiers are

more familiar with it, I would prefer to let the law stand as it is. In my own State we have a rather elastic absentee voters' law for the benefit of those in the armed services, and I believe that law, together with the Federal law passed in 1942, will afford those in the services from Montana an opportunity to vote, and I think that is what we are trying to do.

I have not been impressed at all with the constitutional questions raised by some Members in support of what you would call a straight State ballot to the effect that Congress has not the power to regulate the elections of Federal officeholders such as the President, Vice President, and Members of Congress. I think the Congress has that power given to it by the Constitution. I do not believe that the fact that we are at war enhances that constitutional right. I think it is clearly in the Constitution. Therefore, it is my opinion that the Congress not only has the right but that it is its duty to provide a simplified method whereby those in the armed services may exercise their right to vote. We have put them in uniform and placed them all over the world and certainly we can do no less than perform our duty and provide them a reasonable means of expressing their choice for Federal officeholders. I am not concerned about how they are going to vote. That is their business, not mine. I have read the debates that took place in the Senate on the conference report, and also heard the conferees of the House today discuss the matter. If the soldier is as confused about what this bill means as those who were trying to explain it, God help them when they try to vote.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I cannot lend my voice nor my vote to a deception which I believe we would be practicing against our soldiers and sailors if we were to adopt this conference report. I have but one yardstick which I shall use to determine whether this measure is entitled to my support; that is, will more men and women of the armed services be able to vote? On that basis I am convinced we are making an empty gesture. With a war to be fought it is evident that the minds of our boys will be centered on their military and naval duties and objectives, and they will have, first, no inclination to take their minds off the problems at hand; and, second, no time to make affidavits and follow the procedures laid down by State election laws. Men who, like myself, have passed through the routine of battle and preparations for battle agree with me when I say no large number of service personnel will vote unless we send to each ship and station, each front and military unit, a simple Federal ballot for every man and woman therein. The Army and Navy can and will return these ballots in time to be counted. No other course will suffice. I am willing to stand on this, because experience in this and other wars proves that I am right.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, after careful consideration of the conference report, and after listening to the remarks made in connection with it, especially the remarks of Congressmen WORLEY and BONNER, I have decided to vote for its adoption. I must confess that I do so reluctantly and with a distinct disappointment that this is the best the Congress can do to give the servicemen a vote.

I was very hopeful that we could adopt a short, simple, understandable method which would enable every person in service to cast his vote in the coming election and to do so easily and without a lot of red tape. When the bill was first on the floor of the House a proposal for a Federal ballot was presented. I voted for that proposal. The amendment to provide for a Federal ballot was defeated and the entire procedure for voting was left to the States. This, in my opinion, would have meant that almost no men in the service would have a chance of voting and therefore I voted against passage of the House bill. We could have, and should have, when the issue was first presented in the House, written a simple and workable measure authorizing the serviceman to vote a Federal ballot for national officers. This was the fair thing to do. Such a law, as a war measure would be constitutional in my opinion.

The question before us now is whether more people in the service would be able to vote under the provisions of the conference report than would be able to vote if no law is passed. If the conference report is not adopted, it is quite plain that no soldier-vote law will be enacted and that we will be left with only Public Law 712 of the last Congress. The question is, therefore, under which law will more servicemen be able to vote? Public Law 712 was in force during the elections in November 1942. It was of no practical assistance to the servicemen. An infinitesimal number voted under it. It makes no provision for transporting ballots and it has no provision whatsoever for any kind of Federal ballot. My firm conviction is that with all of its shortcomings and with all of its conditions and red tape a great many more men will be able to exercise their right of franchise under the bill we are considering today than would be under Public Law 712.

If I thought any further effort would be made to pass a better law, if this one were defeated, I would emphatically vote against it. If I thought the conference would further consider the matter with any reasonable expectation of improving the measure, I would vote against it. It is frankly conceded by every member of the conference committee and by every Member of the House who has spoken on the measure that it is this or nothing. Believing that the provisions of the conference report will be of some benefit to the men who wish to vote, I feel that I must support the conference report. In doing so I must say, however, that I do not have much expectation that many servicemen will be able to comply with the many requirements set forth in the measure. Not many of them will be able to vote; but if a few find it possible through this measure to cast their ballots, the law will be better than none.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD on the pending conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG].

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, when the conference report was returned to the House something new had been added. the bobtailed ballot that they bobbed out when the bill left the House bobbed in again. Title III, section 302 (b) in my opinion repeals Law 712 by implication. No member of the armed forces could vote the Federal ballot unless the Governor of his State certified that the use of ballot provided for by title III was authorized by laws of such State. Although the State of Wisconsin on January 27, 1944, enacted legislation to facilitate the voting of its qualified electors serving in the armed forces of the United States, no action was taken by the State legislature authorizing the use of a ballot cast under the Federal procedure. I wired the Governor to inform me if the State of Wisconsin would respond by holding a special session to pass a brief statute which in effect would provide that any Federal statute providing a Federal war ballot and procedure affecting voting of absent voters is authorized in this State. Here is the Governor's answer:

Reply to your wire of the 10th. The Wisconsin Legislature in January declared by resolution addressed to Congress that provision for absent soldier voting is exclusively a State prerogative and that the authority of Congress extends only to providing transportation of ballots to and from members of armed forces. An amendment to the soldier-voting bill, offered in the Senate, authorizing Governor to accept Federal ballot in place of State ballot was rejected. I have not been advised of any change in legislative attitude. Hence special session for purpose stated would not only meet with overwhelming opposition but would be futile. Our soldier-voting law seems adequate and complete to afford every Wisconsin serviceman a right to vote. Local clerks are compiling lists of absent members of armed forces with their military addresses, and ballots will be sent without application. Adjustment of all election dates provide ample time to get ballots to and from overseas servicemen with Federal cooperation to conform to transportation requirements of Secretaries of War and Navy. In view of foregoing a special session does not seem warranted. Letter and legislative records follow.

I cannot vote for the conference report knowing that the Wisconsin Republican Legislature is overwhelmingly opposed to the Federal ballot. In my opinion the present Law 712 will permit more members of the armed forces to vote than the complicated conference report stripped of its alternate Federal ballot procedure.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Members who are against the Worley bill are consistent, but it is rather

interesting to notice so many belated supporters of State rights among the Republicans. I am particularly interested in the contrast between their votes on the anti-poll-tax bill last year and their votes on this particular bill. I have asked myself the question and have not been able to get an answer, why this recent zeal for State rights among the Republicans when we take into consideration the attitude of these gentlemen on the poll tax.

I think Congress is missing the boat, for I have no doubt that this conference report will be adopted. We had it within our power, by providing a simple ballot under the war powers of Congress, to give every sailor, soldier, and marine a right to vote, and we are not doing it. We are putting our responsibilities back into the laps of the States, because in order that any Federal ballot be voted, a certificate must be obtained from the Governor of the State that the ballot is acceptable under the laws of the State. The Governor cannot give this certificate unless the State laws provide that Federal ballots will be received. This requires a special session in 46 States. Therefore, instead of having one law apply to this matter, we now have 48 laws again.

Furthermore, I do not think there is anybody in the House who can tell me with any degree of assurance whether or not sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 712 will be in effect under the proposed law. If these sections are repealed, many servicemen will be denied a vote who can vote under present laws. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] thinks that these sections are suspended. Several gentlemen on the left side of the House think sections 1 and 2 are still in effect. One of the most potent arguments made, when this matter was before the House, against the Federal ballot was the uncertainty that they would be counted. But now we have the uncertainty as to whether a man who is not registered will be allowed to vote if the conference report be adopted.

I intend to vote against this report. It is a disappointment to me, and to all who labored to extend to service men and women a real opportunity to cast their ballots. Instead of being simple and workable, it is complex and obscure. I would rather trust the present law, because there is no doubt under its provisions that soldiers can actually vote, at least in most of our States. It is not the law I wished to see pass, but it is better than the one presented here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, when the original question of the soldiers' vote first was before the House, I voted for the Green-Lucas-Worley bill and against the Rankin bill. The monstrosity which has come out of the conference committee has not altered my opinion. In fact, it is worse than the bill originally passed by this House. Therefore I propose to vote against the conference report.

Probably some people's dignity would be ruffled if this so-called compromise should be termed "a fraud perpetrated upon our fighting men." Consequently, I will not use that term, but I do state emphatically and unequivocally that the effect of this compromise is to repeal Public Law 712, 1942, which waived the poll tax and registration requirements for all those in the service.

The present conference report will disfranchise hundreds of thousands of servicemen because of that repealer. Even that law was wholly inadequate, for then only approximately 28,000 votes were cast in the Nation in the November Federal elections of 1942, and of that number only 668 effective ballots were cast in Pennsylvania. And then most of our Army was in this country. Why did such a small number vote under Public Law 712? Because it provided no central Federal voting machinery. Because the War and Navy Departments have said it will be physically impossible to collect requests for ballots, forward these requests to 48 States, and then deliver, distribute, and return to 48 States individual State ballots to the thousands of servicemen of each State who are scattered over the battle fronts of the world.

The tactics used by the proponents of the Rankin bill now before us for consideration do not reveal what they really propose. Of course, they say they are keeping faith with the Constitution and with the members of the armed forces. They explain that they are keeping faith with the people of the United States and with the principle of States' rights.

Mr. Speaker, the structure of our armed services is not based upon State lines. There are no State quotas for the maimed, the wounded, and the dead. A fighting man is not accepted or rejected on the basis of whether he is a registered voter and has paid his poll tax. The Congress of the United States called these men from their homes to fight and die for their country, but the Congress has put every obstacle in their way when they want to vote. The Congress calls them to war, but we allow the Governors of their respective States to say whether they can vote.

Some Members of both Houses have indicated that this question is being considered on a partisan and racial basis. I will not go that far, Mr. Speaker; but I am confident less servicemen will be able to vote under the Rankin bill than under existing law. Indeed, it will be impossible for Army and Navy officials—and the fighting men—to interpret this bill or even see a ballot—let alone vote.

I have had enough of pious phrases and wordy smoke screens. I want the boys to vote. I want them to have a voice in selecting the next President and the next Congress. The Rankin bill deprives them of that privilege, and I am therefore voting against it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has only 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, in that case I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if the conference report is adopted, and I think it will be, every serviceman who wants to vote will be able to cast his constitutional ballot, one that will not be inferior to that which will be cast by those of us who are at home, safe behind the firing line.

Permit me to congratulate the conferees on their fine accomplishment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the conference report. It does not satisfy all of my views. On principle, I do not like the requirement that a man overseas must first apply for a State ballot before voting a Federal ballot, and to a lesser degree I do not believe a man in this country should not get a Federal ballot if this State ballot, for reasons beyond his control, does not arrive. But rarely do we have our own way in any legislative process.

I support the report first, because I am convinced, after almost a week of constant study of existing law and the history of this legislation, that more men can vote under it than under Public Law 712; second, because it does not repeal the waiver of registration and the nonpayment of poll tax, as a condition for voting, now provided in sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712; and, third, because it has always been my considered opinion that under the Worley bill and its counterpart from the other body which went to conference, that the Federal ballot could not be counted unless the laws of the respective States validated the form of ballot provided for in those bills in the form they were presented to this Congress.

I shall discuss my second reason first. It is elemental that the act of casting a legal ballot involves two things, first, a qualified voter, second, a ballot in the form and marked and cast in the manner required by the law of the jurisdiction. The legislation presented by the conferees is an amendment to Public Law 712, the existing law, and leaves intact sections 1 and 2 of that law, which deal with the qualifications of voters.

These sections are not destroyed by any of the language of the bill recommended by the conferees. Those who have attempted to say that sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712 are repealed, to support their argument have relied chiefly upon language found in subsection (2) of subsection (b) of section 302 of title III, which sets out one of the limitations upon the right of people overseas to vote a Federal ballot. The pertinent limiting language reads:

> If he is a citizen of a State whose Governor has certified, prior to July 15 of the year in which the election is held, that the use of ballots provided for by this bill is authorized by the laws of such State.

Clearly such language only refers to the form of the ballot provided for in the proposed legislation. It goes to the validity of the ballot not to the qualification of the voter casting the ballot. The qualifications of the voter fixed by sections 1 and 2 of existing law are clearly not touched by the above-quoted language, they are not impaired, they stand as written.

Repeals by implication are not favored in the law, in fact the decided cases everywhere practically support a stronger rule, viz: that they are distinctly disfavored. The conferees did not say that the Governors should certify "that the provisions of Public Law 712, as amended by the act of 1944, is recognized in this State." Such language would clearly have repealed by implication sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712. The conferees were free to use any language upon which they could agree, including that last set out. They did not do so, they only used language authorizing in a State the "form of the Federal ballot" so that it can be counted.

Since repeals by implication are not favored in the law, it follows that no lawyer and no court can correctly hold that the legislation proposed in the conference report repeals the provisions of existing Federal law waiving registration and the payment of poll taxes by the men and women in the armed services as they touch their qualifications to vote.

A lawyer who so interprets the language of the conference report, I respectfully submit is mistaken.

My second reason for supporting the conference report is this: The conferees rendered the country a service, not a disservice, in openly and expressly declaring that which every good lawyer knew was unequivocally implied in all Federal ballot legislation introduced into the Congress of the United States after January 1, 1944, namely, that the form of the ballot, as distinguished from the qualification of voters preserved under sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712, had to be legalized in every State before they could be counted.

The copy of Senate bill 1285 ordered to be printed by the House on February 9, 1944, following amendments of the Senate to the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, on page 23, section 14 (a) of the Senate amendments, reads:

> The Commission shall have no powers or functions with respect to the determination of the validity of the ballots cast under the provisions of this title; such determination shall be made by the duly constituted election officials of the appropriate districts, precincts, counties, or other voting units of the several States, and this decision shall be final to the same extent as in the case of ballots cast by other persons.

It therefore follows that the form of this Federal ballot had to be authorized by the States, either under laws in existence at the time the Congress of the United States enacted a law containing a form of Federal ballot or, if there was no State law thus authorizing it, it had to be done subsequent to the passage of the Federal act.

We may admit, for the purpose of argument only, that the Congress of the United States, under its war powers, had the right to impose upon the States every provision contained in the amendments of the Senate to the bill as it passed the House of Representatives, that is, the bill which went to conference. But, assuming this right, it is also true that the Congress had the power either to exercise its right or to waive its constitutional right. When the bill went to conference the Congress had clearly chosen language which waived its constitutional power, assuming it had that power, and gave to the States the right to determine the validity of the ballot. Now it follows that before a vote can be cast, canvassed, counted, and certified by the certified voters of the States, the ballot in the form in which it is presented had to be authorized in some manner as a valid ballot by the laws of each State.

Every lawyer in the Congress who had paid any attention to any of the Federal ballot laws introduced in the Congress after January 1, 1944, knew that this was true; he knew that the proponents of a Federal ballot had retreated from their previous constitutional reliance upon the war powers of the Congress to force this form of ballot upon the States and that the most that was involved in any Federal ballot legislation was a proposition whereby the Federal Government would distribute the ballots, supervise the method of marking them, return them to the States, and then leave it to the States as to whether or not the ballots could be counted under the laws of the State. It is not intellectually honest now for anyone who openly and clearly adopted that position during the debate upon this subject to now say that there was anything in the legislation which went to conference which forced the States to accept the ballot in the form provided for in the legislation which went to conference.

This being true, and the proponents of a Federal ballot having willingly adopted this position do not occupy tenable ground when they complain of the conference report because it expressly sets out that a Governor of a State must certify that the form of the ballots particularly are in a form which can be counted in the State expressly so that every man in the armed services in every State may know what his State has done, when a position was expressly adopted during the debate upon the question of a Federal ballot which made it expressly necessary before a single one of these ballots could be counted for the States to authorize the form of the ballot.

I point out again that this was the position taken by the proponents of the Federal ballot legislation and not solely by the opponents of the legislation providing a Federal ballot.

It follows therefore that since the legislation which the proponents of a Federal ballot advocated required the States either to have legislation or to adopt legislation which validated the form of the ballot, then they have no right to complain when the conferees expressly made that provision in the conference report.

Any person who was a proponent of the language found in the House document of February 9, 1944, to which I have previously referred in this section of this argument, who complains about the provisions in the conference report requiring the Governor to certify that the ballots provided for in the conference report can be used in a State, has now completely reversed his position on this legislation and is complaining because the conferees have openly done that which the provisions of the language of any Federal ballot legislation introduced in the Congress of the United States after January 1, 1944, by unavoidable implication required the Governor or some officer of the State to do.

As far as I am concerned, it is much more consistent with the democratic process which require a forthright statement of that which is implied to require the Governors of the States to state openly that their States have adopted legislation authorizing this ballot before a man seeks to mark a Federal ballot than to creep up on the blind side of that man and have him mark a ballot which could not be counted in the State because it was not in the form recognized by the laws of that State.

In passing, of course, it is necessary, for the operation of any election, that ballots which are to evidence votes shall be in a form recognized by the jurisdiction in which they are sought to be cast.

I have never objected, and I do not object now, to the form of the ballot provided in the conference report. I have never denounced it as a bobtail ballot. I have never been afraid to allow a man to mark one and cast one, but I have always known that that form of ballot could not be counted as a vote in any State in the Union under the language finally adopted by the proponents of Federal ballot legislation until and unless the States had validated that form of ballot as a ballot which could be used to record a vote in the form in which it was provided for by the Federal ballot legislation.

Consequently, this is the crux of the situation: The conference report does not require the Governors of States to do anything which the State was not required to do under the language which was presented to the conferees. Someone, either the secretary of state, the attorney general, or the Governor, had to determine sometime prior to November 7 that this ballot was in a form which would permit it to be used to record a vote. In most of our States the Governors do not possess the power or have not asserted the power to act by executive edict which has been adopted by the Executive of the United States; most of the legislatures of the States have not granted them such power, particularly with reference to voting. It follows, therefore, that every State must, if it does not have such legislation now, adopt legislation between the passage of this bill and July 15 which would validate the form of ballot provided in the conference report. As far as I am concerned, any State legislature or any Governor which failed to do that, in my opinion, would render a disservice to the people in the armed services. I make that statement unequivocally. But I make also the same unequivocal statement that this same obligation was imposed upon the Governors and the legislatures of the States by the language of the other body which went to conference, and that all that the conferees have done has been to expressly declare the obligations imposed upon the State which necessarily arose from the language which was presented

to the conferees and expressly found in the language used by the proponents of a Federal ballot.

Therefore, although I have stated my reasons for disapproval of this legislation, I do not think that it is honorable or fair, and I do not think that it contributes to the unity which is necessary in this country for any person to stand up anywhere and say that when the conferees stated that the Governor of a State had to certify by July 15, 1944, that the form of ballot provided for in the conference report was in a form which could be counted in that State that the conferees have done anything more than to state expressly now the duty which was imposed upon the States by the language which went to conference—language chosen by the proponents of Federal legislation.

Finally the question then is, Will more people vote under the legislation recommended by the conference report than will vote under Public Law 712 as it now exists? To me, the answer is obviously "Yes." In the first place, the action of this Congress places a duty upon the States to validate the form of ballot provided for, and there is no constitutional provision in the law of any State other than the States of New Mexico and Kentucky—and those States are adequately taken care of by another provision of the conference report—which prevents the legislature of that State from validating the form of the Federal ballot. Certainly no constitutional provision of any State which has been brought to the attention of this Congress prevents the legislature of that State from permitting the voter to vote for Federal officers only if he so chooses.

It is true that the language of the conference report will not make it as easy for a man to vote overseas as the language which went to conference, because of the provision requiring a man to ask for a State ballot before he votes. I do not like this provision because in a sense it requires a man to mail a post card for a State ballot before he can vote the Federal ballot. This is the same thing as requiring a man to vote for a State or county officer even though he did not desire to do so. We do not, in our practice with civilians, require a man who enters a voting booth to vote for anyone. He can vote for one candidate and then cast his vote and leave the voting booth; he can do the same thing on a machine. But, there is ample time for every man overseas to meet the requirement of the conference report. The day that this legislation becomes law, he can send off a post card for a State ballot even though the ballot is not ready for him now, assuming, of course, that the States will be honest with him and enact legislation which will permit him to do it. And, as far as I am concerned, Heaven help any State officer or any State legislature which does not do that. And this includes the Democratic Governor of Indiana, Henry Schricker, who is on record by a letter dated December 31, 1943, found on page 1156 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1944, as favoring a State ballot only. If he does this before September 1, 1944, and that ballot does not reach him by October 1, he can cast a Federal ballot which will be air mailed back to the States. Clearly the man who failed to receive a State ballot by reason of some fact connected with the operation of the war or the failure of some State officer will be entitled to vote who would not be entitled to vote under Public Law 712.

I do not approve of the provision which denies a man in the United States of a right to a Federal ballot if he does not receive a State ballot, but this must be remembered that under Public Law 712, as it now exists, all that he can ever get is a State ballot, so that the men in this country have not been harmed in any way.

Reverting for a minute again to the requirement of the conference report that the States must adopt legislation legalizing the form of the Federal ballot, it must be remembered that under Public Law 712, the form of the ballot is left exclusively to the States and the laws which must be complied with in connection with obtaining that ballot and casting it are still State laws even though Public Law 712 is a Federal enactment.

Even those of us who did not get what we wanted from the conference report, if we will be honest must admit that we make it possible for more people to vote by this legislation than could vote under Public Law 712.

This final point: The conference report, if adopted, clearly acts as a fulcrum on the outer end of which public opinion can assert itself by making the several States adopt legislation simply saying: "We approve of the language of Public Law 712 as amended by the act of 1944, authorizing the use of the ballot therein provided for and make the post card therein provided for the only application necessary for any citizen of our State who comes within the purview of that act to execute and deliver to us in order to get a State ballot."

Those of us who favored a Federal ballot certainly do not get what we desired out of this conference report, but it is clear to anyone that more people will vote under it than could vote under Public Law 712. For that reason I find it possible to support the conference report.

Being convinced that this is all I can get; that more men and women in service can vote under it than under existing law and that it does not repeal the waiver of poll-tax provisions now in Public Law 712, I must support the conference report.

It is just as cowardly to refuse to act upon a conviction because of opposition from the left as it is stupid to support the forces of reaction.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I supported the committee bill which provides an opportunity for the men in our armed services to vote for all candidates, both State and Federal. I could not approve of the so-called Worley bill.

It should be pointed out that those who favor the Federal ballot or Worley bill must be in favor of limiting the soldiers to voting for only 469 candidates in the entire United States. This number is made up of 435 Members of the House, 32—or one-third—Members of the Senate, the President and Vice President. Those who favor the State or complete ballot or committee bill offer the men in the armed services the opportunity to vote not only for the 469 Federal candidates, but all State, county, and local candidates as well.

There are 3,070 counties in the United States. There will be at least 4 candidates in each county or more than 12,000 in the country. There are also State senators and State representatives to be elected in each State. There are at least 5 or 6 State officials in each State. There are Governor, Lieutenant Governor, secretary of state, State treasurer, State auditor, and perhaps other minor State officials to be elected at the November election. The total State, county, and local officials are reasonably estimated at more than 15,000 and would perhaps reach nearly 20,000.

The conference report presented to the House today is a compromise. It is so acknowledged by nearly every Member of this body. It does favor the State or complete ballot over the Federal or restricted ballot. I shall vote for the conference report. If the conference report is not adopted, no other opportunity is presented to facilitate the privilege or right of the men in the armed services to vote in the coming election. Those who still favor the Federal or short ballot must take the responsibility of preferring that those in the armed services of the Nation should vote for only 469 candidates as against their right and privilege to vote for nearly 20,000 candidates. That is the issue, and that is the difference between the two opinions expressed on this floor.

In my judgment, the greatest fraud and deception we could possibly perpetrate upon the men who wear the uniform of our Nation would be to deny them the complete ballot and given them only the Federal blank ballot. It is not easy to understand why it is supposed to be so easy to provide the men with the Federal ballot while it is argued that it is so difficult to present them with a complete or State ballot as well.

If the President vetoes this conference report should it be adopted today by the House, he alone will be the one man responsible for restricting the privilege of voting to the millions of men in the armed services of the Nation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I will not attempt to discuss the legality of the Green-Lucas bill, more

generally known as the bobtailed-ballot bill. The constitutionality of this proposal has been debated on this floor by many very able constitutional lawyers and after listening to this debate for 2 days it is clearly evident that the Federal ballot is unconstitutional and could not be legally accepted in any State of the Union.

Any constitutional defect in the method of soldiers voting would be sure to be brought up after the election—leading to a contested Presidential election, than which nothing could be more grave and dangerous. It is far better to take pains now than to have the crisis of a doubtful and contested election next November.

During my experience in this House there has not been a piece of legislation which has been so grossly misrepresented. The sponsors of the bobtailed ballot persist in stating that the question is whether or not we permit the servicemen to vote. This statement is contrary to the facts. The right and privilege of voting is inherent in citizenship and the rules and regulations are set out in the Federal Constitution and the laws and constitutions of the several States. The only function of the Congress in this instant is to facilitate or make it easy for the servicemen to cast a full and legal ballot. For the information of all concerned, I am having inserted in the RECORD a copy of the bobtailed ballot proposed by the Green-Lucas bill and the Worley amendment:

OFFICIAL FEDERAL WAR BALLOT

Instruction.—To vote, write in the name of the candidate for your choice for each office

ELECTORS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(A vote for President includes a vote for Vice President of the same party)

Write in the name of your choice for President. [ ]

UNITED STATES SENATOR

(ONLY if a Senator is to be elected in your State)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator. [ ]

UNITED STATES SENATOR, UNEXPIRED TERM

(ONLY if a Senator is to be elected in your State for an unexpired term)

Write in the name of your choice for Senator. [ ]

REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FOR YOUR DISTRICT

Write in the name of your choice for Representative in Congress for your district. [ ]

REPRESENTATIVE AT LARGE IN CONGRESS

(ONLY in the States entitled thereto)

Vote for one or two as the case may be

Write in the name or names of your choice for Representative at Large. [ ] [ ]

Your attention is called to the fact that this ballot does not contain the names of the candidates for President, Vice President, Representatives, or United States Senators. It makes no provisions whatsoever for the members of our armed forces to vote for any State, county, or other local officials. It makes no provision for voting for Presidential electors, as the Constitution requires; nor does it make any provision for voting in the primary. The position of those who would deny the service men and women the opportunity to vote a complete, legal ballot has not been successfully defended in this debate. The House committee bill, which I am supporting, will make it possible for the men and women in the services to cast a legal ballot for county, State, and Federal candidates both in the primary and in the general election. The same ballot that you and I vote at home should be made available to the armed forces. The sponsors of the Federal ballot, which would deny them this privilege, are indeed on dangerous grounds.

The statements of the Secretary of the Navy and Secretary of War that they could transfer the Federal ballot but would have difficulty transferring the State ballot breaks down when we are reminded that it was possible to transport 14,000 tons of Christmas mail overseas from the port of New York alone, and the State ballots for the estimated 5,000,000 men overseas will weigh only 250 tons.

The administration has jeopardized the opportunity of the soldier to vote in the 1944 election by contending for this illegal ballot. The States are willing and able to move forward immediately to carry into effect a practical program of soldier voting. West Virginia has already amended the voting law to accomplish this. Today a West Virginian in any part of the world can vote in the primary and the general election for county, State, and Federal candidates if he is interested enough to do so. In fact the secretary of state for West Virginia reported a few weeks ago that he was receiving absentee ballots at the rate of over 100 per day for the primary. We are already in process of voting in West Virginia, and I repeat again the only function of the Congress now is to expedite the shipment of ballots to and from the absentee voter.

In its effort to defeat full participation of voters in the armed forces the administration claims that the State voting method would be impossible. To date 43 Governors, both Republicans and Democrats, have challenged that claim. The State governments will do their part and they expect the Federal Government to do its part in transporting the ballots. No supporter of the bobtailed ballot, to my knowledge, has even attempted to justify his position in attempting to deprive the soldier the privilege of voting a full, legal ballot, the same as you and I will vote.

Only the State-distributed ballots will permit the soldiers the right to exercise their voting prerogative in full. And until the Constitution is amended, State-distributed ballots alone can enable them to vote legally for the next President and the next Congress of the Nation they are fighting for.

The legal, constitutional use of the State absentee ballots will result in an orderly election and a return that cannot be contested.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, an appalling mass of misinformation has been fed to the people on this question, not only by propagandists but by some newspapers and radio commentators. Much of this has been deliberate, while some of it has probably been in good faith based on the erroneous idea that there would be a wholesale disfranchisement of servicemen unless a streamlined ballot were authorized to be handled under streamlined procedure.

Every proposal for such streamlining by affording a so-called Federal ballot immediately ran into the question of constitutionality. And it presents a sad and disquieting commentary on the continuing perpetuity of constitutional government to observe how easily a portion of the press, the radio molders of public opinion, and even public officials in high places, are able to glide over this question of constitutionality.

I cannot believe that our fighting men who are offering their lives in the service of country in order that the country may continue to live will applaud our efforts to give them a ballot under conditions where any question might arise about the legality of their vote.

Too much has been said about disfranchising the soldiers unless resort were had to the bobtailed ballot. I rise to say a word for countless soldiers who glory in their American citizenship and their right to exercise it in the regular way, even if the fortunes of war find them far away from the usual polling place on election day. What about their disfranchisement if we deny them the opportunity of voting on a regular absentee ballot and offer them instead a piece of paper which is only a travesty of what they have a right to expect?

The soldiers who cherish the right to vote are those who take the ballot seriously, who have been in the habit of voting deliberately, and not only voting for the officials at the top of the ballot but going down the entire list to the bottom where they find the names of local candidates, fellow townsmen, and probably neighbors. They will be looking for the familiar ballot in usual form with the printed names of the candidates.

The spectacle of presenting to these men in lieu of a real ballot a blank piece of paper to be filled in, and in lieu of its being procured under the formal machinery of absentee balloting handed out and gathered in under mass conditions, affording little of the solemnity and secrecy of ordinary voting, has been repulsive to me from the beginning.

I regret that the press and the radio and the organized propagandists have placed so much stress upon States' rights. Those who have gone out of their way to place undue emphasis on a phase of the question which is only incidental would have rendered a better service if they had

talked more about soldiers' rights, and especially their right to express their choice for all officials and not for only three or four at the top of the ballot.

I am sure that our gallant men in the fighting forces expect us to so legislate and so administer that when they come back it shall be to a nation which is still "a government of laws and not of men."

I shall vote for the report of the conference committee.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to vote for the conference report on the soldiers' voting bill. From the beginning I have hoped and worked for a combination of the various bills which would make it possible and convenient for every man and woman in the armed services:

First. To vote for Federal, State, and county officials.

Second. To vote in the primaries as well as in the general election. In all the Southern States the real election is decided in the primary and all the southern soldiers would be in effect disfranchised under the Green-Lucas plan which provides ballots only for the general election.

Third. To be sure that the ballot he has cast will be legal and valid in his State and therefore counted. Otherwise it is a farce for him; and dangerous to the country because of probable contests and resultant uncertainty.

Fourth. To vote without requiring the soldier himself or the armed forces to carry out any complicated procedures which might conceivably interfere with the proper conduct of the war, or require an undue amount of airplane space for ballot transportation.

The bill as reported out by the conference committee does the above things for soldiers from those more than 40 States which can and will cooperate as recommended. Under it they can cast a complete, legal, official ballot for all Federal, State, and county officers, and in primary and special as well as general elections. The procedure is simple. All Uncle Sam has to do is be postmaster, carrying a post card in from the soldier, carrying the ballot out, and the ballot back.

I voted for an amendment which was defeated in the House but which in substance has been inserted by the conference committee. It provides a Federal ballot for President, Vice President, Senator, and Representative for the soldiers of those few States where proper, complete, legal ballots cannot be or are not provided by the States themselves. I hope some way can be found whereby the State election officials can count such ballots without violating their election oaths. If not, then at least Congress will have done all it possibly can to give a real vote to all in the armed forces, the same as we have at home, and without contests as to the validity of ballots which might cause most dangerous confusion by leaving the results of the election in doubt for months.

It seems to me that anything less than the above would be depriving the soldiers of their full right to vote, and would be indeed a "fraud."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most hopeful things, in my opinion, for the rebirth of a virile America is a constructive and cooperative rejuvenation of the principle of strong local and State governments, working together to form a stronger and more perfect Union.

The action taken by the several State governments in this matter of enabling the boys at the front to cast an absentee ballot more easily shows the resourcefulness and the civic consciousness of our States.

My own State of Washington has almost revamped our election system to achieve this. The State legislature has moved our filing date and the primary election up approximately 2 months. This, according to ample evidence, should, with a full and willing cooperation of the Federal administration, easily enable boys on any front to receive and cast a complete ballot. Their voting franchise should guarantee them this ballot, one which can be legally counted by their own States.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4414, Rept. No. 1259) making appropriations for the legislative branch, and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and with the accompanying report ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

THE SOLDIERS' VOTE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] has opened his candidacy as the Democratic candidate for United States Senator from Pennsylvania in his address today. I call attention to the fact that his leader, speaking in another body, the gentleman who runs the New Deal political affairs in Pennsylvania, and hands out the patronage, threatens that the soldiers may stage a revolt and march on the Capital if they do not get the kind of ballot the Pennsylvania new dealers think is good for them. This reckless and unwarranted threat of a revolt upon the part of the soldiers indicates how frantic these gentlemen are in their need to pressure the soldiers into writing in the name of President Roosevelt, if they can manage it.

I think they are wrong in their anticipation. My friend from Pennsylvania and the others preceding him are all wrong in their anticipation that they can ride in in this election on the soldiers' vote. In Philadelphia, in 1942, in November, 1,600 soldiers voted. There would have been more if they had had this ninth amendment permitting the transmission of the ballots by the Army and Navy. If the President vetoes this bill he will take away the opportunity to transmit these ballots by high priority. Now these 1,600 votes which were cast are a greater number of citizens of Philadelphia than are covered by the usual Gallup poll or any other survey in a city of its size. It was a good poll of the soldier vote. This body would be interested in knowing that the soldiers did not vote Democratic in that election. Their vote was 53.83 percent Republican, and I, for one, am not the least afraid of how the soldiers are going to vote. I certainly hope they can all vote.

This fight on the conference report is being made in the hope of a presidential veto.

Opponents of this conference report are not afraid the soldiers will not be able to vote; they are afraid that the soldiers will vote, that they will vote the legal State ballot, and the soldier vote may throw out of office the majority party, because many soldiers feel that in letting them down on the home front, in the confusion due to maladministration of domestic affairs, in the costly diplomatic defeats sustained in foreign affairs, the party in power is unfit to govern.

This amendment No. 9 presents the same priority in transmission which is claimed for the bobtailed ballot. If the President vetoes this bill he will take away the right of the soldiers to receive a ballot; the right to have the help of the Army and Navy in the prompt distribution of a legal ballot in time to vote it. A veto means that the President does not want the soldier to get a ballot from his home State. Without this bill the prompt distribution of legal ballots can be blocked by tying the hands of the Army and Navy agencies of transmission, as was done in 1942.

If the President vetoes this bill, he says to the soldier: "This bill would send the ballot to you. I have vetoed it because I do not want you to have the right to vote a full ballot. I just want you to vote for me. If you are going to have a choice, I have got to see that you do not get it."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROGERS] 2 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are many things wrong with this conference report. I would like to confine myself to one matter which is not a legal matter at all. Under this conference report there is a discriminatory treatment of men in the continental limits of the United States and those outside the continental limits of the United States. It is assumed automatically that everyone inside the United States would be able to vote his own State ballot.

That I fear, is a very incorrect assumption and any of you who have had contacts with the Army will know how incorrect it is. As you know, there are 10,000 transfers a day in the United States Army. At least 10,000 of those men are going to be transferred on the day that their State ballot is going to arrive for them. They are not going to be able to vote the State ballot because of the circumstances of war beyond their control. If a Federal ballot is legal overseas, it is legal at home. The only reason I can see for this unfair and rather heartless discrimination is an attempt to keep more soldiers from voting. Now, in the Army there is a phrase, "snafu," which has been translated by Time magazine, but I will not go into it here. This particular bill is a "snafu" bill. It will create such confusion and such chaos that I feel it should be vetoed. I hope the President will be a friend of the soldier and veto it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on February 1, 1944, I voted "nay" on House Resolution 412, ordering the "previous question," the effect of which was to force the Members to go on record, or, as the President said, "Stand up and be counted," on the soldier-vote question. Those who opposed the extension of a simple Federal ballot for the use of the members of the armed forces were thereby forced to establish a recorded vote.

On February 3, 1944, I voted to recommit S. 1285—the States' rights bill—to its committee with instructions to bring out the text of H. R. 3982—Worley-Federal ballot bill—which would have made possible a simple Federal ballot for the use of the members of the armed forces. The motion to recommit was lost and by the rules of the House, we then voted on the original S. 1285, States' rights bill. This bill had been branded a fraud by the President of the United States and condemned as impractical and impossible to administer by both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Those who felt that this bill was a fraud were defeated; the States' rights bill was passed by the House and sent to conference with the Senate conferees. After many weeks of heated debate by the House and Senate conferees, an amended, complicated agreement was reached and the conferees' report was presented to the House for approval or rejection today, March 15, 1944.

In my opinion, the bill in its present form, is even more fraudulent and hypocritical than in its previous form. It is composed of pious recommendations to the Governors of the 48 States. It still makes it necessary for the individual soldier to comply with the complicated forms and, in many instances, impossible time requirements of the various State laws. This law in its present form is a triumph for the States' rights advocates against those who believe that every American boy and girl in the armed forces should be allowed to vote. It is a pious gesture made by those who, with their tongues in their cheeks, loudly claim they want the soldiers to vote, but refuse to make it possible for them to vote, by passing a simple Federal-endorsed ballot.

As I said in my speech on this subject December 18, 1943, in this House, when I advocated the passage of the Worley Federal ballot amendment:

> Many of the States' requirements are so severe that for all practical purposes absentee voting is impossible. Especially is this so when global distances and time limits are complied with or considered. These factors and many others which space does not permit me to inscribe will prevent the members of our armed forces from voting if the matter is left to the action of the 48 States. As I see it several imperatives exist:
>
> (a) A uniform Federal ballot, approved by Federal law;
>
> (b) Full cooperation of our Federal military facilities and personnel in the, first, transportation and distribution of the ballots; second, operation of polls; and third, collection and returning of the cast ballots to their respective States.
>
> Here the Federal cooperation ceases and the States distribute to their respective election boards the sealed ballots. The local precinct election boards then perform their usual services of counting, tabulating, and certifying the results.

Because of the failure of the Senate and House conferees to bring back a bill which is simple and practical and which will actually effectuate the voting of our boys and girls in the armed forces, I shall vote against this bill—S. 1285—today. I trust that the President will veto it and if he does, I shall vote to sustain his veto. Behind the banner of States' rights the Congress of the United States has played politics with the voting rights of the men and women who are fighting and dying in far-flung battlefields. Yes, they are fighting to protect and perpetuate the Congress which refuses to give them a practical, simple method of voting. I cannot in good conscience vote for such an ineffectual, hypocritical subterfuge.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I supported the original Worley Federal ballot bill, which provided a means by which every man and woman in the armed services would be given an opportunity to vote. The present conference report accomplishes nothing. It is full of high-sounding phrases that are meaningless. It is just as confusing as the present income-tax law. If we are sincere in our desire to give our men and women in the service the right to vote we will vote down this conference report so that we can get a real Federal ballot law.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the study that I have given this question, I cannot bring myslf to the point where I feel I would be justified in supporting this conference report. I have made statements on the floor in reference to the soldiers vote bill and some felt that I was impugning the motives of Members of this House. That is something that I never want to be accused of.

I am fully aware of the situation that developed among the conferees and while I hope that I am wrong, nevertheless, I feel that millions of the men and women in the armed forces will not have an opportunity to cast their ballots if this bill becomes a law. I have maintained from the outset that we should eliminate as much red tape as possible and, above all, provide for a Federal ballot. I know the question of constitutionality has been raised but I do not agree with those who hold that a Federal ballot would in any way violate the provisions of the Constitution. I read some of the debate in the Senate on this conference report and in the end I was more firmly convinced than ever that it should not be adopted.

I have repeatedly stated that I wanted every person in the armed forces to have the right to cast a ballot. The failure to do so on our part is certainly going to interfere with the morale of those in the armed forces. I regret to say some of the mail I have received indicates that not only those in the Army and Navy but some of their relatives feel that the Congress is denying the soldier the right to vote. Regardless of our opinions upon that phase of it, nevertheless, that opinion does prevail to a great extent.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] 10 minutes.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that I was one of those who fought long and diligently for the Worley bill. It will also be remembered that we had a considerable following, particularly on the right side of the aisle. It will be remembered that we had some following on the left side of the aisle. We must stop and consider that in a body of this kind when questions of this sort arise, there is a wide divergence of opinion respecting the constitutionality of the subject under consideration. I regret that all the fire that took place in the original consideration of this bill, when it was reported out of the committee, has to some extent sprung up again here today. It is to be regretted during the consideration of the bill that was reported out by the committee that insead of considering it calmly and quietly, the House more or less did otherwise. Nevertheless I feel that the House conferees, to the best of our ability, diligently worked and endeavored to reach a conclusion that we hoped might be acceptable and satisfactory to the membership on both sides of the aisle. The question now is whether or not you will vote the conference report up or vote it down; whether or not, under the conference report, more men will be offered the advantage, opportunity, and assurance of voting in the coming election than would be the case under the act of 1942. I contend, and I am thoroughly convinced, Mr. Speaker, that more men will have an opportunity to vote under the conference report than would be able to vote under Public Law No. 712.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I would prefer to continue my statement, but I cannot refuse

to yield to my good friend the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I just want to ask at this point if it was not a fact that the conferees definitely considered whether or not they would vote to repeal sections 1 and 2 of Public Law No. 712 and definitely decided that they would not vote to repeal those two sections?

Mr. BONNER. It is my recollection that it was considered in conference or mentioned. I know it was considered in the Committee of the House when we had the original bill under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, in comparing the conference report with Public Law No. 712, the latter merely provides that poll tax and registration should be eliminated with respect to those States which had such a requirement. Public Law 712 then directed the States to prepare and use a certain type of ballot, and went so far as to say that the States could include in that ballot their State officials. Public Law 712 paid the expenses of printing, mailing, and such additional expenses incident to the carrying out of the act. That is just about all that Public Law 712 did, with the exception of some surrounding aids or trivial minor assistance. When we reached the conference date we were deadlocked. I held out for some form of a Federal ballot. Others at the conference held out for some form of Federal ballot. The Senate, as you know, was insistent on a liberal Federal ballot. The majority of House conferees were persistent against any form of a Federal ballot. So there we stood for 5 or 6 days. It should be possible for 10 good men to get together, give and take, and thereby work out something that could be satisfactory to both Houses, or certainly to a majority of both Houses. So we returned with a form of Federal ballot in title III of the conference report.

The question boiled down is whether greater opportunity is given service people to vote under the existing provisions of Public Law 712 than under the provisions as set forth in the conference report. Public Law 712, in sections 1 and 2, eliminated the requirement of registration and poll tax. In section 5 it provided the type of ballot to be used in connection with Public Law 712, and went so far as to include State, county, and other local offices, in addition to Federal offices. Public Law 712, with the exception of the post card for making application for the ballot and financial assistance in preparing and mailing the ballot, afforded no other feature in assisting the absentee voter.

Under provisions set forth in the conference report, the benefit and privilege of not being required to register and pay poll tax is retained. A Commission is established to facilitate the handling of the ballot in all divisions of the armed services, and coordinates the entire services into one unit. In addition, it furnishes free postage and priority air-mail service. These features alone will expedite and facilitate the rapid transit of the ballot to and from the voter in a far shorter time than was provided in Public Law 712.

Therefore it is apparent that through the additional assistance that is provided in the conference report, and not provided in 712, the voting of the regularly prepared State ballot will be greatly expedited.

I desire to point out that there is no difference between the ballot authorized in section 5 of Public Law 712, and in a regular State ballot, if all the provisions of section 5 are taken advantage of. In addition to the improved facilities I have pointed out, it is the intention of the proponents of the Federal ballot, as provided in title 3, to further facilitate and aid service people to vote where the ballot provided in other sections of the act failed, and it is the contention of the proponents of this section that the certification spoken of only applies to the Federal ballot designated in title 3. It was the desire and intent of the proponents of title 3 that it could be applied under existing State absentee-voting law for service people where the intent of the State act was to grant every possible aid to absentee voting by soldiers and sailors.

Therefore, notwithstanding what the argument may be against the conference report, it without a doubt will afford greater opportunity than has heretofore been accorded absentee service people.

There is great disagreement as to sections 1 and 2 being applicable to the State absentee ballot. I hold that they are applicable. I point out to you that under section 302 requiring the Governor to certify that title III is satisfactory or comes within the purview of State law; the Governor is only asked to say with reference to the ballot mentioned in title III—and no additional certification is required of the Governor or whoever may be vested with the authority in the State to make the certification, as to any other part of the bill. So, therefore, I hold that section 1 and section 2 are not in question as to the certification required by the Governor.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. Would the gentleman admit that the interpretation is doubtful, however; that another person interpreting the act might hold that sections 1 and 2 are not repealed?

Mr. BONNER. You will probably interpret this entire conference report one way. I probably will interpret it another.

Mr. WRIGHT. That is my opinion.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. DIMOND. I would like to inquire about the result of the action of the House conferees in receding on amendment 9, which embraces the Farrington amendment. That amendment includes the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska within the definition of States.

Mr. BONNER. That question has been asked before. It is my recollection that free postage and free transportation is given to such ballots as you have.

Mr. DIMOND. For the Territories just as for the States?

Mr. BONNER. Yes.

Mr. DIMOND. We of the Territories will have the assistance of the armed services and the Post Office Department, just the same as the States, for our residents of the Territories in the armed forces, in distributing our Territorial ballots and bringing them back to the Territories?

Mr. BONNER. And such other cooperation as the Federal Ballot Commission can give you.

I ask the friends of the Worley proposal to look on this as an effort, and the best effort that those of us who ardently supported the proposal, could bring back to you. I insist that under the State absentee act in the various States, more men will be permitted to have an opportunity to vote than would under Public Law No. 712.

With respect to title III, it was the intent and it was the thought of my good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LE COMPTE] that the provisions we were writing into title III, would be more liberal than they now appear to be in this section. But, nevertheless, that is water over the dam. The title speaks for itself. It is my contention and my belief that where the States have made every possible effort by legislation for absentee voting for service people, and such legislation fails, then the Federal ballot provided in title III, with very little difficulty, can be used. I believe that an equal part of this responsibility should be shared by the States.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the conference report will be voted up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOCH].

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this proposition.

I find that it still contains a number of recommendations to the States.

Perhaps I might overlook this indiscretion on the part of Congress. However, what prevents me from supporting the proposition is that it seriously reflects upon the honesty of our soldiers and insists upon such an amount of red tape that, in disgust, the soldiers will refrain from voting.

In order to get a ballot a soldier must take three distinct oaths. He must literally swear his life away. Then, after all this swearing, if the ballot reaches home in time and is satisfactory to the Governor of his State it will be counted.

Somebody must have been lying awake at night to bring forth such a splendidly efficient plan to prevent the soldier from voting.

If I were a soldier I think that in disgust I would give it up and would not vote.

Moreover, I would take one great big oath—not three oaths but one big oath—that would be something like this: "By the eternal, when I get home I'll get even with the schemers who, under the guise of being States' rights men, prevented me from casting my ballot. I can't vote as a soldier, but I will be able to vote when I am again a civilian."

What a satisfaction it must be to the enemies of democracy when they learn to what lengths the Congress of the

world's greatest democracy would go to prevent the soldiers of that democracy from voting.

"What must I do that I may vote?"
And the soldier swung his lance.
"I'm willing to fight and if needs be die,
But to vote I want a chance."
Then Congress said: "Yes; you may vote,
But three times you must swear,
Then you may send your ballot in
And we'll see how it will fare.
If your Governor says that all's O. K.,
That there's nothing in the way,
Then, if your ballot lands in time,
It may count on election day."
"Too much red tape," the soldier said,
"I'll neither vote nor swear,
But when fighting ends we'll be coming home,
Then see if we don't care.
No States' rights pretext to hamper us,
No recommends in the way,
But then we'll vote like other men,
We'll get square that election day."

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, having voted against the conference report or the so-called soldiers' vote bill, I merely desire to say that my reason for so doing was that the final result of the conference between the two bodies was so confused as to present a measure under which even an Einstein could not intelligently secure his right to vote, if he had one.

Of all the hodgepodge, mixed-up measures that have ever come before this body for final determination, this so-called soldier-vote bill is the ultima Thule.

It is full of more "ifs" and "ands" than a dog is of flees. It recommends and then it further recommends, but each and every recommendation is hedged round with a restriction that renders it possible for anything to happen. As a matter of fact, it is as clear as mud.

If the Governor of a State so desires he may do so and so. If he fails to do so and so then the soldier has to do such and such. If the soldier, desiring above all things to vote, desires to cast his ballot and makes application to what he is led to believe is the proper authority, it may so happen, and probably will, that the alleged proper authority cannot comply with the soldier's request because any of a number of things may intervene.

Taken all in all, if this measure represents the combined intelligence of the Congress, then God help these United States when it comes to the final settlement of the peace problems that will, of necessity, come before that body for final solution.

But then this measure does one thing. It protects State rights. It also does other things. It absolutely abrogates a far more important thing—human rights in a democracy. I hope the Congress that approves it is proud of its achievement.

Since this matter has been dominated by the Republican minority I wonder if the country, when it finally comprehends just what has been accomplished will want to put the minority in control of the next Congress. I doubt it.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this will close the debate on one of the most important issues that has come before the Congress since I have been a Member of this body, and one that involves one of the most serious constitutional questions that has ever vexed the membership of a representative body.

In developing this conference report we tried to provide for every member of the armed forces to vote in a constitutional election, scrupulously avoiding anything that would violate the Constitution, and at the same time preserving the rights of the States.

This conference report meets that test. There will be infinitely more members of the armed forces get to vote under this bill than could possibly vote under Public Law No. 712. This conference report is so drawn that if the court should set aside Public Law No. 712, as it probably will, it will not disturb this law seriously or adversely affect the elections held under it.

The question was raised in the conference about repealing sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 712. I was opposed to Public Law No. 712, but it was agreed by the conferees not to disturb it at this time. It is not repealed by this act.

Some Members have said there are one or two States whose constitutions forbid them from passing laws to enable them to comply with this act. If their constitutions forbid their own States from doing those things, how in the name of common sense do you think the Federal Government can do it for them?

Under this act every State that has an absentee voters' law may send those ballots by free air mail and get the assistance of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission in getting those ballots to the soldiers and back. If a State does not have an absentee-ballot law, all it has to do is to certify that these Federal ballots are authorized under the laws of the State and then they can be sent anywhere inside or outside of the United States to the voters of that State.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Then why not add those two words "or Federal" so the Governors could certify that the ballots would be legal?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, the gentleman is young; that would change the entire meaning of the act.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Is that an answer?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of California. That is what I expected.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman wants to change the entire meaning of the act and probably render the measure unconstitutional by adding two words.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard some Members get up here and attack my State of Mississippi. That State has already passed an absentee-voting law. It repealed the poll tax for the duration of this war insofar as it applies to these servicemen and also waived the registration requirements. They are getting ready to send ballots to every voter from the State.

They continue to attack us for being, they say, in alliance with northern Republicans—we southern Democrats, who are fighting for constitutional government and States' rights.

I want to call your attention to the fact that about 107 years ago there were two tall, gangling Americans out on the frontier in the Black Hawk war. Col. Jefferson Davis swore in Capt. Abraham Lincoln, and they joined in fighting a common enemy. Abraham Lincoln later became the leader of the Republican Party and Jefferson Davis became the leader of the Democratic Party. If they were here as leaders now, there would not be enougn votes against this conference report or for the Green-Lucas bobtail ballot bill to wad a shotgun.

Some gentleman from Pennsylvania attacked me for my stand on this measure. But I am not dominated by, I am not even intimidated by, the C. I. O. or by Sidney Hillman, the foreign-born, communistic crackpot, who is now raising money and threatening to beat Members of Congress he cannot dominate.

This morning there came to my desk from a former Member of Congress from Pennsylvania, one of the real patriots with whom I served in this House, a man who is now on the European front, Col. Charlie Faddis, of Pennsylvania. In it he said exactly what we have been saying. Listen to this: "I hear the strikes mentioned a thousand times where I hear the soldiers' vote mentioned once." Yet the same influences that have promoted strikes throughout this country have not only demanded that we vote for this bobtailed Federal ballot bill but, as I said, have raised more than a million dollars to use to defeat the Members of Congress they cannot control. Well, let them come. I hope they come down into Mississippi. All I want is for the people I represent to get sight of them one time.

We have done the best we could. I am not trying to run the Republican Party as these radicals contend. They are capable of running themselves, but I want to tell you now that as long as they are within the Constitution and standing up for American principles, I am not going to run out on my convictions and oppose them merely because of the party line. Now, let me say another thing to you and then I am going to close. I have been here through the long lean years when the southern Democrats held the party together. We went down the line and fought the battles during all those years, and all the Frankfurters and all the Hillmans and all the Winchells and all the radicals in the C. I. O. cannot run us out of the Democratic Party now. We will be there to carry on this battle.

Mr. BUCKLEY rose.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; we carried my State for Al Smith when you could not carry your State of New York for him.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Is the gentleman from Mississippi insinuating that the Democratic Party is made up entirely of the Jewish race?

Mr. RANKIN. Why, no.

Mr. BUCKLEY. The gentleman insinuated that.

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly did not. What is the matter with the gentleman? Nobody intimated such a thing except the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Mr. BUCKLEY. Then why are you insinuating?

Mr. RANKIN. Have a seat; I do not even know what nationality the gentleman belongs to.

Mr. BUCKLEY. Boys of every nationality are over on the other side fighting for this country.

Mr. RANKIN. Sit down. We all understand that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one more word. I want to say to you that we southern Democrats have not only borne the burdens in the heat of the day for the last half a century but the Democratic Party had its birth in the South. It sprang from the very bosom of the Constitution of the United States.

It was created, if you please, in the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, who expressed those eternal truths that will live long after our critics have gone to forgotten graves.

Truth never dies. The ages come and go.
The mountains wear away, the stars retire.
Destruction lays earth's mighty cities low;
And empires, states, and destinies expire;
But caught and handed onward by the wise,
Truth never dies.

Those political truths expressed by Jefferson in his first inaugural address will live forever—

Till the sun grows cold,
And the stars are old,
And the leaves of the
Judgment Book unfold.

If I may be permitted to borrow from the lips of a great statesman of a century past and gone an apostrophe to liberty, revise it and appropriate it to democracy, which, to use his own words, are "one and inseparable," I would say that in the South, sir, where the Democratic Party raised its first voice, where its youth was nurtured and sustained, there it still lives in the strength of its manhood and full of its original spirit. If discord and dissension shall wound it, if religious strife and blind ambition shall hawk at it and tear it, if folly, if madness, if radicalism, if reaction, if fascism, if nazi-ism, if communism, if uneasiness under salutary, necessary, or imaginary restraints shall succeed to separate it from those principles by which alone its existence is made sure, it will stand in the end by the side of that cradle in which its infancy was rocked and it will fall at last, if fall it must, amidst the proudest monuments of its own glory and on the very spot of its origin.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 273, nays 111, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—273

Abernethy	Graham	Mruk
Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ala.	Mundt
Allen, La.	Grant, Ind.	Murray, Tenn.
Andresen, August H.	Green	Murray, Wis.
	Gregory	Norman
Angell	Griffiths	Norrell
Arends	Gross	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arnold	Gwynne	O'Konski
Barden	Hagen	Pace
Barrett	Hale	Peterson, Fla.
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Peterson, Ga.
Beall		Philbin
Beckworth	Hall, Leonard W.	Pittenger
Bell		Plumley
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Poage
Bennett, Mo.	Hancock	Poulson
Bishop	Hare	Powers
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Pracht, C. Frederick
Bland	Harris, Ark.	
Bonner	Harris, Va.	Pratt, Joseph M.
Boren	Hays	
Boykin	Hébert	Price
Bradley, Mich.	Heidinger	Ramey
Brehm	Herter	Ramspeck
Brooks	Hess	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Hill	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Hobbs	Reed, N. Y.
Bryson	Hoeven	Rees, Kans.
Buffett	Hoffman	Richards
Burch, Va.	Holmes, Mass.	Rizley
Burgin	Holmes, Wash.	Robertson
Busbey	Hope	Robsion, Ky.
Butler	Horan	Rockwell
Camp	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon, Fla.	Jeffrey	Rohrbough
Carlson, Kans.	Jenkins	Rolph
Carrier	Jensen	Rowe
Carson, Ohio	Johnson, Anton J.	Russell
Carter		Sasscer
Case	Johnson, Calvin D.	Satterfield
Chiperfield		Schiffler
Church	Johnson, Ind.	Schwabe
Clason	Johnson, J. Leroy	Scott
Clevenger		Scrivner
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Luther A.	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.		Sikes
Colmer	Jones	Simpson, Ill.
Cooper	Judd	Simpson, Pa.
Costello	Kean	Slaughter
Courtney	Kearney	Smith, Maine
Cravens	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	Kefauver	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Kerr	Smith, Wis.
Curley	Kilburn	Sparkman
Curtis	Kilday	Springer
D'Alesandro	Kinzer	Stanley
Day	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Dewey	Knutson	Stefan
Dies	Kunkel	Stevenson
Dirksen	LaFollette	Stewart
Disney	Landis	Sumner, Ill.
Domengeaux	Lanham	Sumners, Tex.
Dondero	Larcade	Sundstrom
Doughton	Lea	Taber
Douglas	LeCompte	Talbot
Drewry	Lemke	Talle
Durham	Lewis	Tarver
Dworshak	McConnell	Taylor
Eaton	McCord	Thomas, N. J.
Elliott	McCowen	Thomason
Ellis	McGregor	Tibbott
Ellison, Md.	McKenzie	Towe
Ellsworth	McLean	Treadway
Elmer	McMillan	Troutman
Elston, Ohio	McWilliams	Vinson, Ga.
Engel, Mich.	Maas	Vursell
Engle, Calif.	Mahon	Weaver
Fellows	Maloney	Weichel, Ohio
Fenton	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Fish	Martin, Iowa	Whelchel, Ga.
Fisher	Martin, Mass.	White
Fulbright	Mason	Whitten
Fuller	May	Whittington
Gale	Merrow	Wickersham
Gallagher	Michener	Wigglesworth
Gathings	Miller, Mo.	Willey
Gavin	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson
Gearhart	Miller, Pa.	Winstead
Gerlach	Mills	Wolcott
Gillette	Monkiewicz	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gillie	Morrison, La.	Woodruff, Mich.
Goodwin	Morrison, N. C.	Woodrum, Va.
Gossett	Mott	Worley

NAYS—111

Anderson, Calif.	Forand	Myers
Anderson, N. Mex.	Ford	Norton
	Furlong	O'Brien, Ill.
Andrews	Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.
Barry	Gore	O'Connor
Bates, Ky.	Gorski	O'Neal
Bender	Granger	O'Toole
Bloom	Hart	Outland
Bolton	Hartley	Patman
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Patton
Buckley	Hoch	Pfeifer
Bulwinkle	Holifield	Priest
Burchill, N. Y.	Hull	Rabaut
Burdick	Izac	Randolph
Byrne	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Canfield	Johnson,	Rogers, Calif.
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Capozzoli	Johnson, Ward	Sadowski
Celler	Lyndon B.	Sauthoff
Chapman	Kee	Scanlon
Clark	Kennedy	Sheppard
Cochran	Keogh	Sheridan
Coffee	King	Snyder
Compton	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Cooley	Lane	Spence
Crosser	Lesinski	Sullivan
Davis	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Dawson	Lynch	Tolan
Delaney	McCormack	Torrens
Dickstein	Madden	Vincent, Ky.
Dilweg	Magnuson	Voorhis, Calif.
Dingell	Mansfield, Mont.	Walter
Eberharter		Weiss
Fay	Marcantonio	Welch
Fernandez	Merritt	Wene
Fitzpatrick	Miller, Conn.	Wolverton, N. J.
Flannagan	Murdock	Wright
Folger	Murphy	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—44

Andersen, H. Carl	Hendricks	O'Leary
	Jarman	Phillips
Auchincloss	Jennings	Ploeser
Baldwin, Md.	Jonkman	Rivers
Baldwin, N. Y.	Kelley	Rodgers, Pa.
Chenoweth	Klein	Rowan
Cox	Lambertson	Short
Feighan	LeFevre	Smith, W. Va.
Fogarty	Luce	Stearns, N. H.
Fulmer	McGehee	Stockman
Gamble	McMurray	Vorys, Ohio
Gibson	Manasco	Wadsworth
Gifford	Monroney	Ward
Gilchrist	Newsome	Wasielewski
Harless, Ariz.	O'Hara	Winter

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Ploeser for, with Mr. O'Leary against.
Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Short for, with Mr. Kelley against.
Mr. Baldwin of Maryland for, with Mr. Feighan against.
Mr. Gilchrist for, with Mr. McMurray against.
Mr. Newsome for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Lambertson for, with Mr. Wasielewski against.
Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. Rowan against.

General pairs:

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Harless with Mr. Rogers of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Manasco with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Ward with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Gibson with Mr. LeFevre.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Jonkman.

Mr. MCCORD changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ORGANIZATION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement upon House Joint Resolution 192, to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, for printing, under the rule.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of all business and other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a joint memorial passed by the legislature of my State and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in toto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun entitled "Who Dares To Adjudge the Value of Lend-Lease."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein resolution adopted at meeting held in Chicago, Ill., on February 6, 1944, under the auspices of the Polish National Alliance.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent article from the Leominster Enterprise.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], be granted indefinite leave of absence on account of the serious illness of his father.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two letters and a statement in a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the regular business and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA], who is unavoidably absent, be granted leave of absence on account of serious illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, President Roosevelt electrified the Nation with the statement that one-third of the surrendered Italian Fleet was to be given to Russia.

On March 9, Prime Minister Churchill stated in Parliament that the disposition of the Italian Fleet must wait until after the war.

On March 10, the President, in commenting on Mr. Churchill's statement, said that both he and Mr. Churchill were right, and on March 13, Premier Stalin extended the hand of friendship by recognizing the government of Marshal Badoglio as the government of Italy, to which the ships belonged.

Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent from this confusion that the three Allied Governments are operating under three separate foreign policies and that the policy of each is foreign to the other.

I would, therefore, suggest that the three chiefs again get together and decide where they are going—then start marching there three abreast.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an excerpt from a statement by Col. Spencer B. Eddy before the Committee on Foreign Affairs on lend-lease and reverse on March 7, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. LUCE, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), indefinitely, on account of illness.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 754. An act for the relief of Iver M. Gesteland; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1006. An act to authorize the condemnation of materials which are intended for use in process or renovated butter and which are unfit for human consumption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Rebecca A. Knight and Martha A. Christian; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1305. An act for the relief of Anne Rebecca Lewis and Mary Lewis; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1355. An act for the relief of Robert C. Harris; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1553. An act for the relief of J. M. Miller, James W. Williams, and Gilbert Theriot; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1588. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Eugene Holcomb, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1590. An act for the relief of the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1660. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Minnesota department of highways and the county of Crow Wing in Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at Mill Street in Brainerd, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1665. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, chief disbursing officer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Col. William Mitchell a commission as a major general, United States Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. J. Res. 112 Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to conduct a survey of the marine and fresh-water fishery resources of the United States, its territories, and possessions; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 16, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the land-grants subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, March 16, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 4184 entitled "To amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on S. 1225, entitled "An act granting a pension to Constance Eager," which was introduced by Senator TYDINGS, and S. 662, entitled "An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes," which was introduced by Senator BILBO.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 16, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 2328 and House Joint Resolution 49 (to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable). Hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on House Joint Resolution 148 (joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health) on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1295. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the part of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1920, as amended, relating to the conservations, care, custody, protection, and operation of the naval petroleum and oil-shale reserves; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1296. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1297. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1298. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1944, for the Navy Department and naval service, amounting to $1,081,000,000 cash and $1,500,000,000 contract authorization, together with proposed provisions affecting certain naval appropriations for the fiscal years 1942 and 1944 (H. Doc. No. 493); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1299. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Office of Scientific Research and Development for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $121,135,000 (H. Doc. No. 499); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1300. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the War Production Board of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, amounting to $69,894,000 (H. Doc. No. 500); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1301. A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, transmitting a copy of the report Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements called for by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget under Circular 421 dated May 31, 1943; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4410. A bill to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'NEAL: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4414. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 4327. A bill to regulate boxing contests and exhibitions in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4415. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States and the naturalization of natives, and descendants of natives, of India; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 4416. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 4417. A bill to provide additional compensation for certain civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4418. A bill to amend Public Law 816, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 4419. A bill to permit official mail of the American Red Cross to be transmitted free of postage under the penalty privilege; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 254. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution to provide for appropriate commemoration of the centennial of the telegraph on May 24, 1944; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to put the same restriction upon rum being imported into the United States as we did on molasses; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to favor the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5267. By Mr. LANE: Resolution adopted by the New England Zionist Emergency Council March 6, 1944, at a dinner at the Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass., urging that the British White Paper of 1939 should be revoked, and that a home for the Jewish people be established in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

5268. By Mr. WILLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Delaware favoring House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as morning climbs to noontide we pause in the heat and burden of the toiling day, that prayer for a sense of Thy presence and assurance of Thy guidance may rise like incense from the altar of our hearts. Cleanse us, we beseech Thee, from secret faults which may mar our public service. We cannot be the prophets of world peace if in our own hearts are entrenched the very things which make for war. We cannot call mankind to put aside the weapons of carnage and destruction if our own lives are arsenals of hatred and of prejudice and of a selfish passion to rule. Disarm our own spirits. May Thy kingdom of love and righteousness come within us

that we may contribute worthily to mankind's abiding peace.

As the battle against the massed battalions of darkness sweeps on to its fiery climax and so many of our homes are already desolate at the dread tidings that one dearer than life has gone beyond recall, may the awful price of preserving liberty bought with such a cost subdue our pride, shame our selfishness, and intensify our devotion. Deliver us from the evil of national policies whose fateful consequence will be still another war. May we clearly see and faithfully follow the things that belong to our peace. We ask it in the Name above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 14, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 14, 1944, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 391. An act for the relief of Jack Lecel Haas;

S. 397. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Svend J. Skou;

S. 1427. An act to authorize the appointment of Gregory Boyington, a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps;

S. 1563. An act for the relief of W. E. Dowdell and June Dowdell; and

S. 1668. An act authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1285) to amend the act of September 16, 1942, which provided a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the place of their residence, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy; and

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty.

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.;

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner;

H. R. 1488. An act to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2419. An act to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2880. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 2956. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3199. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson;

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; and

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who perfor ned postal duties after induction into the military service.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Buck	Downey
Andrews	Burton	Eastland
Austin	Bushfield	Ellender
Bailey	Byrd	Ferguson
Bankhead	Capper	George
Barkley	Clark, Idaho	Gillette
Bilbo	Clark, Mo.	Gurney
Bone	Connally	Hatch
Brewster	Cordon	Hawkes
Bridges	Danaher	Hayden
Brooks	Davis	Hill
Holman	O'Mahoney	Tobey
Jackson	Overton	Tunnell
Johnson, Colo.	Pepper	Tydings
Kilgore	Radcliffe	Vandenberg
La Follette	Revercomb	Wagner
Langer	Reynolds	Walsh, N. J.
McCarran	Robertson	Weeks
McClellan	Russell	Wheeler
McFarland	Shipstead	Wherry
McKellar	Stewart	White
Maloney	Taft	Willis
Mead	Thomas, Idaho	Wilson
Millikin	Thomas, Okla.	
Murray	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] are detained on public business. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR CHARLES L. McNARY, OF OREGON

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 269) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the legislative business of the Senate be now suspended to enable tributes to be paid to the life, character, and public service of Hon. CHARLES L. MCNARY, late a Senator from the State of Oregon.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the United States Senate not only does credit to its own sensibilities, but it also does justice to authentic history, when it temporarily suspends its regular proceedings this afternoon to make the RECORD speak in final tribute to the memory of a deeply cherished comrade and a stalwart, sterling public servant who has been gathered to his fathers.

The sudden and untimely death of Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, at the very moment when we all were encouraged by reports of his confident and early convalescence, bespeaks a loss which defies the successful use of words to measure. It is the loss to the Republic of a great and effective statesman. It is the loss to Congress of a great and

skillful legislator. It is the loss to his associates of a great and precious friend.

Senator MCNARY came to his high responsibilities in the midst of the first World War. He leaves them in the throes of the second and what we pray may be the last. In this epochal, intervening quarter century, when History has been writing with a rushing pen, he was one of the wisest, soundest, and ablest public men of his generation. In his quiet, modest, and totally unassuming way, he exerted major influence—and always constructive influence—on the legislative history of his times. Indelibly he leaves his vivid mark upon the story and the statutes of his mourning country.

Through a perilous and perplexing decade, he ably guided the Republican Party as its greatly loved and highly competent leader upon this Senate floor. He was the master of all parliamentary techniques. Behind his unfailing kindliness and courtesy were strength, astuteness, and an iron will. He led by persuasion rather than by force. Common sense was ever his prime counselor, as the Constitution and the law were his unfailing lamps. His Party's faith was reflected when it enthusiastically named him for the Vice Presidency of the United States. His integrity, his vision, his talents and his honor were worthy of this or any other accolade.

But he was never just a partisan. In the finest sense of the sacred word, he was a great American. Whether as a jurist in his earlier career, or as a legislator in the climax of his devotion to his country, he was true to the finest instincts of a deeply conscientious public servant, and to the best traditions of the Constitutional Republic which he loved so much and served so long and so well.

Amid all his honors, he remained as friendly and considerate a soul as ever gave gentle companionship to his fellow men. He was never touched by the pomp of power. He was never lured from the realities of human fellowship. His popularity with his colleagues was matched only by their granite confidence in him. I shall not soon forget the unique and moving demonstrations of this poignant fact enacted on the funeral train as it sped across the western plains on its way to his last, long home. Twenty of us—colleagues all—gathered in one car; and each of us—one by one—rose spontaneously to speak simply, frankly, and from the heart, about our associate and friend. It was a rare and unusual tribute, without a precedent within my time.

It was as recently as last November that the late distinguished Senator from Oregon stood at his accustomed corner seat on yonder aisle, in the full vigor of his splendid faculties, so far as any of us knew, and in complete command of his great responsibilities. Little did any man among us remotely sense that we were looking upon our living friend for the last time as he strode vigorously from the Senate forum that final afternoon, never to return. But he never for an instant left our hearts nor was deserted by our anxieties. "What's the news from Charley?" was the constant, intimate, daily question upon all our lips, eloquently testifying to the bond that bound him to his fellow men. Life affords few greater triumphs.

He was devoted to the soil. It was the key to his wholesome character. All things of agriculture were his deep attachment. He was happiest when close to nature and when lingering upon the fertile acres of his beloved country home. Always his heart was turning westward to the Oregon Trail. His was the spirit of those rugged pioneers from whence he sprang. He was a builder of the new West as they were of the old. We followed him, and his mourning family, in stricken grief—but with gladness that we could have known him and his genius and his kindly ways—as he took to the Oregon Trail for the last time.

The Republican Party has lost a faithful and effective leader. America has lost a powerful and devoted Senator. I humbly add that I have lost a cherished friend who has been my closest legislative associate for 16 years. Hail. And farewell.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, "An honest man's the noblest work of God."

My former colleague, Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, of Oregon, has been called to the house of his fathers. On Friday, February 25, at Fort Lauderdale, in Florida, where it was believed he was recuperating satisfactorily from a then recent operation, he suddenly departed this life. We mourn his passing, revere his memory, and honor his good name.

CHARLES L. MCNARY was possibly the most universally loved Member of this honorable body. On all sides and in every quarter only words of affectionate regard for him, and expressions in praise of his public work and private life, are heard. His kind disposition, unerring tact, consummate wisdom, and patriotic zeal for the best interests of his State and Nation, and his deep devotion to the welfare of the American people, were inherent in him, and were recognized by all who knew and understood him.

CHARLES L. MCNARY, the last of 10 children, was born in 1874 at the farm home of his maternal grandparents, Charles and Mary Claggett, in the beautiful and fertile Willamette Valley, near Salem, the capital of Oregon. In this pleasant environment he spent his childhood and youth.

Unhappily, at the early age of 4 years, he lost his mother, and a year later his father also. A kind and loving elder sister assumed the care of this orphaned boy, directed his early conduct, and guided him in the formation of his habits and character. "As the twig is bent, the tree's inclined." His later successes and achievements are a monument to her intelligent, faithful, and affectionate care of her little brother Charles.

As a boy, and as a youth, CHARLES L. MCNARY had his chores to do and he did them, reliably and well. By dint of his own persevering efforts under great difficulties, which were indicative of his self-reliance throughout his entire life, he went to college and studied law. The time came when he sat upon the Supreme Court of Oregon as a justice of that court.

The McNarys and the Claggetts were of good—the best—American stock, and this native son of Oregon had within him by inheritance and by breeding the finest qualities of his race and Nation. For generations his people had been pioneers, frontiersmen, and farmers. They had come to America in colonial days, had fought in the American Revolution against British oppression, and later they had followed Daniel Boone and the earliest settlers into the Ohio Valley. The States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, and Illinois knew them prior to his immediate forebears joining the covered-wagon trains of the early emigrants to Oregon.

Just 100 years ago his grandfather, James McNary, determined to cross the plains with his family to Oregon, and began making his plans accordingly. Early in the year 1845, the McNarys were on the long, long Oregon Trail. The first wagons had arrived in the Willamette Valley in 1843 but 2 years previously.

Only after 6 long months on the overland route did the creaking, worn, oxen-drawn covered wagons and the tired and weary emigrants at last descend the rugged western mountain slopes to the beautiful Oregon country. Often, only by following the courses of the mighty rivers of that western country, and at times actually using the beds of the smaller streams for their only roadways, did the Oregon pioneers, foremost among whom were the McNarys, finally come to rest in the finest and fairest of fertile valleys—the promised land of the western pioneers—the valley of the beautiful Willamette.

Only the survivors of the fittest of all those American emigrants who started across the plains in the 1840's and 1850's finally got through to Oregon. The faint of heart turned back and the weak of body perished on the way. Only the resolute of spirit and those of dauntless courage, fortified by the muscle and sinews of centuries-old breeding, persevered to found an empire in the wilderness beside the western sea. The Oregon pioneers may, at times, have been destitute, and were; but they never were poor.

From such stock our beloved colleague sprung. He had the ways of his forebears. He was of them. His perseverance through difficulties and his helpfulness to others less fortunate than himself were his characteristic traits. He knew and practiced the industry, thrift, and economy of the empire builders. He did not stand by the side of the road wagging his thumb. He always could walk, and walk on his own feet, and he could walk alone.

CHARLES L. MCNARY was the son of the Oregon pioneers. For his homely ways, his direct and efficient resolution of complicated problems and situations into their simple elements, and for his honesty and cooperation, he was loved and respected by all those who knew him best. He was a great American, a leader in the Senate of the United States, an honest man, a real friend, and Oregon's favorite son.

May God bless and keep him. His life exemplifies the biblical admonition that

"A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches, and loving favor than silver and gold."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, we commemorate today the life and death of one of America's greatest public servants.

Senator MCNARY served in the Senate of the United States from May 29, 1917, to November 5, 1918, and from December 18, 1918, to the time of his death. In 1933, he was chosen minority leader of his party in this body. In 1940, he was the nominee of his party for the office of Vice President of the United States. This period of political activity and legislative service included the epic years of the First World War, the postwar period, the years of economic depression which followed, and the trying days which preceded our entry into the present war, and many months of our participation therein. There has been in the life of our Nation no like span of time in which a public man has been confronted by such complex problems and has made such soul-trying decisions. Senator MCNARY shared in full measure the responsibilities of these years and their momentous events.

Before entering public life, Senator MCNARY had been a practicing lawyer; an educator in the law; and a justice of the Supreme Court of Oregon.

In these two principal fields of endeavor our late colleague served with rare distinction. In them he brought honor to himself and made great contribution to the welfare of his State and the Nation.

Senator MCNARY was a profound student of all political and governmental questions, but of particular interest to him were the difficult problems of agriculture, of hydroelectric development and associated irrigation and reclamation projects. His efforts in their behalf were impressive aids to all that has been accompanied in these fields.

Procedure in the Senate is governed by precedents and by written rule. Senator MCNARY was the master of both. His familiarity with parliamentary principles and with the correct application of them, with Senate practice and its sustaining precedents, was both comprehensive and detailed. He was one of the great parliamentarians of this generation. This knowledge and skill were used, not obstructively, but always in furtherance of legislative progress.

He was never an extremist in his views or in in his legislative efforts. He sought to embody in law the principles which responded most completely to the common judgment of the American people and which he believed would therefore best serve them. He was a clear and logical thinker, firm in his adherence to the conclusions to which his reasoning mind led him. However strongly held and however positively expressed were his views, his kindliness and graciousness made impossible any suggestion of intolerance on his part. He was a wise counselor and patient leader. In his relations with his fellow Members and men elsewhere he was tolerant, courteous, and kindly.

No Member exerted greater influence in the Senate than he. No Member held in greater degree the affection of his associates. No Member commanded greater respect. His death brings to unnumbered friends and to his colleagues here a sense of tragic loss. His party suffers grievously in the termination of his thoughtful and steadying leadership. The country will miss in this high place his keen sense of public duty and his ideals of public service.

An able, kindly, courteous, courageous, Christian gentleman has gone from among us, but we are comforted with the knowledge that he has found deserved rest, peace, and joy everlasting.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is said that as men grow in years they look with equanimity upon the approach of death. I do not know whether that is true. I might well express the hope that it is; but I have not yet reached the status in my own life where I look with equanimity upon it, insofar as I am concerned or insofar as my friends are concerned. That is peculiarly true as I rise to pay in a few words a feeble but an abundantly deserved tribute to Senator MCNARY.

It is strange how fate sometimes plays tricks upon the lives of men. In conversation one day with Senator MCNARY, talking about our ancestry and about the romantic history of migrations among American people in the settlement of our country, it developed that his grandfather and my grandfather were born and reared within 5 miles of each other, in the State of North Carolina. My people went from there into Tennessee, and up into Kentucky. His went across Tennessee, tarried for a while in Kentucky, and found their way on to the Pacific coast in the State of Oregon. Then, as if two sunken streams reappeared on the surface of the earth, he and I appeared here in opposition stations across this aisle in the Senate of the United States. That is strange; but no more strange than the fate of many others, by the millions, who no doubt could recount similar ancestral experiences.

That circumstance, of course, drew us closer together than would be true otherwise, because of the parallel of our families. We were drawn together by reason of our position here in the Senate; and our relationship was more intimate, more confidential, and, I might say, more cooperative than was ever known by the Members of this body as a whole. In the very nature of things, two men occupying the stations he and I during the past 7 years occupied across the aisle must necessarily confer with each other daily, and sometimes more frequently. Not only is it necessary that that should be done, in order that we might as much as possible smooth the pathway of legislation, but it is in the interest of the country, I believe; and I am sure that he felt the same way, that those who take any leading part in guiding the legislative process here should very frequently indulge in confidential conversations and relations and plans in order that each might be helpful to the other, and that both might be helpful to the Senate and to the country. Senator MCNARY not only was courteous; he would have been that unavoidably, for he came of a race of cultured, refined, broad-minded, magnanimous people whose roots sprang out of the very pioneer days of our country. All his personal inclinations were in that direction. But in a broader and deeper sense his responsibility to the Senate, to his political party, and to his country, and even in a broader sense his responsibility to mankind, in the position which he held, impelled him to that high-minded attitude toward his duties and toward our duties here.

There are many things I might say about him in tribute to his legislative genius; his knowledge of the procedures, not only from study but from experience; his interest in agriculture, from which his ancestors, as mine, sprang, and in which they engaged practically all their lives. While he was a specialist on agricultural problems, his mind was broad enough and deep enough to encompass all the problems which face us as a Nation industrially, economically, politically, and socially. He was frequently of very great value and assistance to me, not only in advice and counsel which I sought freely, but in smoothing the pathway of legislation, not only that of a nonpartisan character, but legislation in which partisan difference might be supposed to exist legitimately. I am under a deep and abiding obligation to Senator MCNARY for the great, valuable, sometimes indispensable assistance I received from him, and also for the high example of nonpartisan consideration, without regard to party differences, of the problems which face us as a whole. I mourn his loss. I shall always cherish his memory. I shall always acknowledge freely the profound obligation which I am under to him, and which the country as a whole is under to him, for the magnificent services he rendered as a United States Senator and as an American citizen.

I do not know how to express my feeling in the sense that I have experienced this deep, personal loss. For his State, for his family, for his country, I join in the expression of deep sympathy and appreciation for his life and for his example. I felt so strongly about it that it was my desire to attend the funeral, in order that I might pay a last tribute to him; but circumstances over which I had no control forbade that.

Peace to his ashes, to his memory. May those of us who are to remain for a season, but who in time will join him in that innumerable caravan, take with us through the remainder of our lives and into our graves the happy and reassuring knowledge that here was a man in every sense of the word.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I came to the Senate on March 4, 1917. Senator MCNARY came to the Senate by appointment of the Governor of Oregon in May 1918, and served a short term. He was again appointed and served another term; and in 1919 he came to the Senate by the vote of the people of Oregon and remained here until his death.

Shortly after he came to the Senate, one day he asked me if we did not have some McNarys in Tennessee. I told him that we had. We had a very distinguished family of McNarys in Tennessee in our early history. One of them had

been one of the most distinguished judges in our State, and a county had been named for him. Senator MCNARY traced his relationship to that distinguished citizen of Tennessee. In that way we became friends almost from the beginning.

Senator MCNARY had several outstanding characteristics. One of the most important of them was his unswerving honesty and integrity. CHARLEY MCNARY was as honest a man as I ever knew in my life. No one ever questioned or could ever question his integrity.

Another of his outstanding qualities was his ability as a legislator. He was quiet, reserved, unobtrusive, and apparently unambitious; and yet few Members of this body kept up with legislation as well as did CHARLEY MCNARY, and none any better.

To my mind the most outstanding of all his splendid qualities was his gentlemanliness. He was one of the most courteous, delightful, good-humored, and all-the-time agreeable gentlemen I ever knew. I never knew him to do an ungentlemanly thing; and so far as I now recall, I never heard him say an ungentlemanly thing. I think he was one of the most perfect gentlemen I ever knew.

He had a wonderful career in the Senate. He served for nearly 27 years. He took a leading part almost from the beginning. He did more for his State than perhaps any other man who ever represented it in Congress. In helping to establish the Bonneville Dam and other dams, not only in his State, but in adjoining States, he did a magnificent piece of work.

Like the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], I shall feel eternally grateful to Senator MCNARY for his cordial and warm support, not in talk, but in kindly, generous action. He helped me build the dams on the Tennessee River. CHARLEY MCNARY did a thousandfold more than many of those who had much more to say about the building of those dams. I shall ever be grateful to him.

In the strictest sense, Senator MCNARY was not a partisan. He was a good Republican; he believed in the principles and doctrines of his party always; but he was fair and kindly disposed toward those of us on this side of the aisle, and worked with us for the benefit of the country whenever the interest and progress of the country were at stake. He was a progressive Senator. He believed in building up, and not tearing down. He believed in doing things in his kindly and quiet way.

Incidentally, let me say to Senators on the other side of the aisle that he was a very fine leader of the Republican Party. That was proved by the great confidence Republicans showed in him when he was chosen as their candidate for Vice President in the last campaign. He was worthy of such a mark of distinction or any other mark of distinction.

CHARLEY MCNARY was one of the best men who ever sat in this body since I have been a Member of it—and I have been here a long time. When it came to a show-down, perhaps no man on either side of the aisle had more real influence than had CHARLEY MCNARY.

In his quiet, gentle, generous, well-disposed, and kindly way, he did more for his State and for his country than most of us realize until we look at the record. He was as fine an American citizen as ever lived. When I think of such a man as he dying suddenly, I realize what a terrible thing it is, especially for those who are left behind. Again I say that this body never knew a finer gentleman, a better legislator, or a better American than CHARLES L. MCNARY. He and I were warm personal friends from the beginning. I revere and esteem his memory. I rejoice in the good works which were his, and am proud that I knew such a grand man, for he was a man, every inch of him.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, by designation I am directed to report that yesterday the Republican minority conference, by unanimous action, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our beloved colleague the Honorable CHARLES LINZA MCNARY, late senior Senator from the State of Oregon; and

Whereas throughout his more than 27 years in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service, which will ever grace his name in the annals of history; and

Whereas he was our affectionate friend and trusted counselor, ever ready to give of himself, of his efforts, and of his judgment for our guidance, and hence became our leader and the spokesman for the Republican Party in the United States Senate during a most critical period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Republican colleagues in the United States Senate of the Honorable CHARLES LINZA MCNARY, express our sense of loss at his passing and join in asking that this evidence of our regard for him and for his memory may be caused to be printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and

Further, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Mrs. Cornelia M. McNary, at Salem, Oreg., that she may be assured of our deep respect for her and of our condolences to her upon the passing of our friend, her husband.

In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands at Washington, in the District of Columbia, this 15th day of March 1944:

A. H. VANDENBERG, WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., WARREN R. AUSTIN, CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, ROBERT A. TAFT, JOHN A. DANAHER, C. WAYLAND BROOKS, STYLES BRIDGES, JOHN THOMAS, CHAS. W. TOBEY, OWEN BREWSTER, RAYMOND E. WILLIS, E. V. ROBERTSON, A. W. HAWKES, WILLIAM LANGER, C. D. BUCK, HOMER FERGUSON, GEORGE D. AIKEN, GUY CORDON, RUFUS C. HOLMAN, HAROLD H. BURTON, E. D. MILLIKIN, HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, SINCLAIR WEEKS, JAMES J. DAVIS, ARTHUR CAPPER, HENRIK SHIPSTEAD, CHAN GURNEY, KENNETH S. WHERRY, GEO. A. WILSON.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to cover the public services of Senator MCNARY except by general reference. The record of his services is already engraved on the public annals of the Republic. I wish to say a word of a personal nature with reference to Senator MCNARY. It is among the sweetest memories of my life that I was privileged to enjoy a rather intimate relationship with him. What the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has said about his gentleness and the high standards of his intercourse with other Members of the Senate is eminently true. Senator MCNARY appealed to me as a man of a very high conception of ethics and of professional and official conduct. He was a modest man. He carried modesty to the point of a weakness. Instead of flamboyantly pushing himself into the public limelight he was shrinking. He was entirely modest in every respect.

Mr. President, I entertained for him a very deep personal affection and a very high admiration. Today I wanted more than anything else simply to lay upon his tomb, figuratively speaking, a flower in recognition of the great love which I bore him.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the sands of a great and distinguished life have run out in the hourglass of time. CHARLES L. MCNARY has been summoned home. Eternal peace has come at last to one who labored always to bring tranquillity into a troubled world.

CHARLES MCNARY devoted his full and gentle life to the service of mankind, and the implicit worthiness of his character must inevitably come to be recognized in the reckonings of time.

History will record for all generations to come that this good and faithful servant was a great legislator, an incisive leader, and a skilled parliamentarian. But CHARLES MCNARY was much more than these, Mr. President. CHARLES MCNARY was a man who was loved and respected by all who knew him.

There is something about a truly great leader, Mr. President, which counsels and calms, which strengthens and sustains, and so it was with "CHARLEY MAC." His keen mind, his kind word, and his understanding heart brought a mellow gentleness into these halls which they have rarely known in all their long history.

It was inevitable that the mantle of leadership should fall upon his shoulders, for his abiding patience, his clear counsel, and his unfaltering devotion to justice gave to him a quality of rare balance which is seldom found in equal degree in any man.

The years which he devoted to his labors here were among the most eventful and historic years this Nation has ever known. Sharp and crucial issues were raised and settled upon the floor of this Chamber during those years—issues which ofttimes burned deeply into the very heart of this cherished man.

Yet never, in all those storms of strife and disagreement, did CHARLES MCNARY rage at the opposition; never did he attempt to browbeat or coerce any member of his own party; never did he refuse advice, and never did he falter in his solemn trust.

We who are brought together here learn in time to know and evaluate our colleagues, and I can name no man who really came to know CHARLES MCNARY who was not proud to number him among his friends.

As minority leader, CHARLES MCNARY knew well the strength and weakness of those who labored with him. But no matter how bitter the issue may have been, MCNARY never made light of the

shortcomings of others. He was the companion and compatriot of all, the overseer and tormentor of none.

Life wears best, Mr. President, when it is smoothed by a friendly spirit. And how gently, how fully, flowed the life of this man. The fires of good will which he kindled in the hearts of men will linger always as an inspiring and ennobling light.

We come here today in deep solemnity, for the passing of this man lies heavily on our hearts. His life was, as near as any mortal life could be, a reflection of the eternal truth.

It is as Chaplain Harris said in the Senate a few days ago, "He was a man who could differ without anger, who could debate without bitterness, who could be defeated without rancor, who could win without exultation."

And now, after many full and faithful years of public service, our beloved colleague, who brought to these Halls the wisdom and the strength of pure humanity, has been laid to rest in the homestead of his heart, the rustic, rugged lands of Oregon, whose people paid him immortal tribute by five times selecting him to come to these Halls and labor in their name.

The name and the achievements of CHARLES L. MCNARY shall be forever graven on the heart of Oregon and in the annals of time. But the essential goodness, the innate gentleness of his character, will cause men to speak his name with reverence so long as the honor and the history of America endure.

Mr. President, yesterday I sat in the conference of the minority party where the temporary officers recommended, and the full membership concurred, that no permanent officers be selected by the minority until the end of the present year.

This gesture of respect and honor will live in time as a clear and enduring tribute to the name of CHARLES L. MCNARY, for it is such a citation of merit as could come only to one whose courage, character, and conduct had brought a profound respect to his Nation and his name.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, words are inadequate to express my deep sense of personal loss when CHARLEY MCNARY passed on.

He had been my friend and close associate in the Senate for a quarter of a century. For the past 7 years he had been my seatmate in the Senate. We had talked together, argued together, voted together most of the time, worked together, and played together for the better part of 25 years. I recall that I played my last game of golf with him, I think it was the day before he went to the hospital. And he played a square game of golf just as he played the game of life. Looking back over these years in the Senate, I can recall the Saturday afternoon golf foursome of the 1920's and early 1930's—Charley McNary; Pat Harrison, of Mississippi; Jim Couzens, of Michigan; and myself. Charley and Pat and Jim have passed on—good friends all. I have had the privilege and the pleasure of knowing and working and playing with many well-beloved friends in my lifetime. I think that of all those I have known and loved during my time in the Senate of the United States, there was none who held a warmer place in my affections than CHARLES L. MCNARY. I do not expect to see his like again.

Neither can I put into words my appreciation of the loss to my country in the passing of one of the ablest, one of the broadest-minded, and one of the statesmen with the greatest vision, of his day and generation.

I lost a beloved friend, the Nation lost a valued leader, when our colleague was called from his labors here to what I feel is his reward in the unknown world that lies beyond.

CHARLEY MCNARY had already made a place for himself in the Senate when I was sworn in, only a few days short of a quarter of a century ago. In the years that followed, we served together on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senator MCNARY as chairman of that committee, and later as ranking minority member.

During nearly all that quarter of a century we were closely associated as colleagues, as members of the so-called farm bloc, and as intimate friends. I have never known him to hold an unworthy thought, say an unkind word, nor lend his support or cast his vote for a measure which he did not believe was for the best interest of his State and his country.

I have never known a more devoted champion of the farmer in the Congress. But he never proposed special favors for agriculture at the expense of the national welfare. He was not a factional leader; he was a statesman who had a proper measure of the place the farmer holds, and must maintain, in a balanced economy that is necessary if the dream the forefathers had of a representative democracy, a real republican form of government, is to become and remain a reality.

CHARLES L. MCNARY was a Republican in politics. But he was not a hide-bound partisan. His republicanism was a national republicanism, not merely a loyalty to a party name. When an immediate partisan advantage in politics, in or out of the Senate, clashed with the national welfare, it seemed to me he submerged his republicanism in the interest of the Nation. This was true of CHARLEY MCNARY as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture, as a member of the Senate, and as Republican floor leader of the Senate.

I think CHARLES L. MCNARY was a liberal in the true sense of the term. He believed in the cooperation of individuals and of political parties to promote the general welfare. But his liberalism did not cause him to denounce and impugn the motives of those who disagreed with him; neither was it the loose-thinking, so-called liberalism, that precludes one from reaching a decision and bringing others to agree on it. And always he was a gentleman in the true sense of that word.

The honors that were bestowed upon him were not gifts from his colleagues nor from the party leaders who nominated him for the Vice Presidency in 1940. They were earned, and to his party and his people and the Nation he gave a leadership that was wise, beneficent, and, I believe, effective.

He served his people and his State and his Nation well and ably. The number of his friends was limited only by the number of us who knew him personally and were acquainted with his works. We shall not soon see his like again.

I join today with the other Members of the Senate in mourning the passing of an esteemed and beloved friend, an able and distinguished colleague, and a national leader in the truest sense of the term. May his reward in the beyond be commensurate with his labors and his kindnesses in this world.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have not prepared a suitable address, but I am not content to permit this occasion to pass without some manifestation of my very high esteem for the great and good man whose memory we are commemorating at this time. I was unusually fond of CHARLEY MCNARY, and I have good reasons to believe he liked me. Mutual esteem, of course, is essential to true friendship.

When I entered the Senate in 1931 I was assigned to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Senator MCNARY at that time was chairman of that committee. From that time until his death we served together on that committee. He made a wonderful chairman of the committee. He was at all times fair and just and enjoyed the confidence and respect of each member of the committee regardless of political affiliations.

We never had much political party alinement in that committee; we do not have it now, and I sincerely believe that much of that spirit of helpful cooperation which has characterized the committee is due to the philosophy and to the actions of CHARLEY MCNARY. He held the committee together, and his influence with the members of the committee was as great after he yielded the chairmanship to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] as it was before.

We all know that Senator MCNARY's heart was with the farmers of this country. He realized that they had not had justice in our economic structure. He did not render merely lip service; he did not come to the floor of the Senate and proclaim from time to time that he was a friend of the farmer, but he worked for their welfare. He was a constructive statesman who devoted much of his efforts and talents and energy to the cause and to the betterment of rural life.

My friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has pointed out, probably better than I can do, much of the personal characteristics of CHARLEY MCNARY. Anyone who knew him intimately over a period of years, as many of us did know him, could not fail to be impressed with the fact that Senator MCNARY at all times was a gentleman, truly a gentleman, courteous, kindly, and gentle in his relations with everyone.

This center aisle divides physically the Members of the Senate according to political party affiliations. Senator MCNARY, of course, took his place upon

the side occupied by his political party. Time gradually developed his proper place in the Senate, and after the test of a long period of years, many of them through the most trying periods of our history, finally, as a result of his colleagues' acquaintanceship and friendship and knowledge of the man, he was promoted to the highest place of confidence and power at the disposal of his political party, notwithstanding the fact, as has been pointed out, that he was never an objectionable political partisan.

He loved his country. He loved to render service to his fellow man, and he never stopped to consider whether one was a Democrat or a Republican in his personal relations, not only with his acquaintances, but with his fellow men in general.

Senator McNARY has been well characterized here, and I shall not detain the Senate long. He was a familiar figure in the Senate. He was regular in his attendance. He had strict ideas about the performance of his duties and his responsibilities both as a Senator and as a party leader.

Senator McNARY and I for a number of years had arranged to be paired when either of us found it necessary to be absent from the Senate in the performance of his duties. We rarely renewed that pair, because we had an understanding that we would take care of each other when either was absent. I had his confidence that I would do that, and I did it, and he had mine that he would protect me. That is the sort of relation that prevailed between CHARLIE McNARY and a number of southern Senators.

Not long before he left Washington, in talking about our pair relations, he said, "I am not sure we have an effective pair, because we vote the same way about 90 percent of the time." That shows the broad-mindedness of the man. Many of the questions coming before the Senate for vote have properly no political complexion, and the parties as such should not be divided on them.

Senator McNARY, because of his kindly attributes, because of the big, broad-minded qualities of the man, because of his generous, sympathetic heart, will be missed by the Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle as will very few men who have served as Senators. I know that I shall miss him, and I regret his passing almost as much as though he had been a blood relative of mine.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would not be true to my appreciation of one of the finest and sweetest associations of my life did I not add my humble tribute to the beautiful sentiments expressed here today on the life and services of our lamented colleague, Senator CHARLES L. McNARY.

Though one of the truly great leaders of his day and generation, Senator McNARY was withal a modest gentleman of the old school. Not one act of his during 27 years of service in the Senate of the United States was ever designed to catch a newspaper headline or to attract public attention to himself. When basic principles were involved he was utterly indifferent to public applause. In my 23 years of political life I have met thousands of public men. I have never known a man who had a higher conception of the true ethics of public service than CHARLES McNARY. There is much to extol in his public record and private life, but I do not think that under any circumstances he would care for fulsome praise.

For years he was the leader of his party in this body. He was a loyal party man, but he had only contempt for that kind of partisanship, on either side of the aisle, which blinds men to their higher obligation to the public interest.

He was a hard and tenacious fighter, but whether he won or lost he felt no bitterness or rancor toward those who differed with him. His was a kindly heart and he loved his friends.

If my colleagues will pardon a personal allusion, I became a Member of the Senate a couple of months before the change in administration in 1933. For some years Senator McNARY had handled the agricultural appropriation bill. When the political tide turned and the Democratic Party came to power, it fell my lot to take over this duty. I was a new Senator, without experience in handling such complicated measures as appropriation bills. Though he was a member of a different political party, I went to Senator McNARY before opening hearings on the bill to seek the benefit of his advice and counsel. He could not have been kindlier or more cooperative had I been not only a member of his party but an intimate friend or relative.

For 10 years I leaned heavily upon him, and he gave freely of his great ability and rich experience in solving the many unusual and complex problems which have been before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations during the past decade. I shall miss him in my work here in the Senate as much as any other Member of this body, or more.

Senator McNARY was a lawyer. He was at one time dean of a law school. He had served as a justice of the supreme court of his native State. Nothing better exemplifies the great heart of this man than that he should interest himself primarily in assisting the farmers of this Nation in their unequal struggle for economic equality. He was interested in the welfare of the farmer without regard to section or party affiliation. In his passing the farmers of this Nation have lost one of their best and most powerful friends. He will be as sorely missed and as sincerely mourned in the farm homes of Georgia and the South as he will be among those who till the soil of his own beautiful Willamette Valley in the great Northwest.

Mr. President, I cannot express any hope for the future more calculated to promote the welfare and progress of the people of the United States and the preservation of our cherished institutions than that providence may vouchsafe that more men possessed of the ideals and vision of CHARLES L. McNARY may find their way to service in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, during my nearly 12 years of service in the United States Senate it was my pleasure and privilege intimately to know the late Senator McNARY, who so ably represented the great State of Oregon in this Chamber. During all these years his office adjoined mine in the Senate Office Building, and not only were we office neighbors but the very nature of the problems of the Northwest country we represented made it both necessary and desirable that we should frequently confer, because the interests of our two States were similar in many fields of human activity.

My long and close association with Senator McNARY made me realize his worth as a statesman and an effective public servant. He was a genial and kindly man, and he never permitted the unending pressure of work confronting him to make him impatient with those who sought his counsel and advice. He was possessed of an unusually fine mind and an unerring sense of values.

During all the years he served as the leader of his party in the United States Senate I have never heard a word of criticism of his capacity for leadership, but, on the contrary, he was universally regarded as not only exceedingly capable, but also as one who guided his party brethren with unerring skill and with great diplomacy. To this may also be added the just tribute that in his leadership he brought to his task the highest sense of personal honor. In his death the State of Oregon lost a stalwart friend and a brilliant and intelligent spokesman, and the United States Senate one of its most beloved Members. I know that every Member of the Senate will join me in saying that his passing brought sincere sorrow to all of us and a great loss to the Nation which he served so many years.

My own life was enriched because I had known him as a friend, and as I utter these words I am deeply conscious of the personal loss I have sustained. The words that any of us utter here today are but a feeble tribute to a great man who possessed a fine and gentle soul.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to say a brief word of farewell to a friend and great leader whose character is glorified by the record of his deeds, of his sentiments, and of the very tender relationship which existed between him and all his colleagues in this great deliberative body.

First of all, I want to record my gratitude to him for the opportunity which was afforded me from time to time through many years to serve my country and my political party by virtue of his appointment. The relationship created by that appointment and my service in it was unique. I have been an advocate of causes almost all my life, for I began to practice law in my father's name before I was admitted to the bar, and I am accustomed to finding my fellow man tolerant, considerate, and able to get along with me in spite of the fact that he and I may represent opposing views on a controversial subject. But, Mr. President, I never in my life met

such a character as CHARLES MCNARY for poise, equanimity, breadth of vision, judicial temperament, and utter willingness that I, though acting as his assistant, should hold views upon controversial subjects which were diametrically opposed to his. That relationship was one of the most beautiful things in my experience here of 13 years. I thank him for it, and I shall always appreciate it as one of the sustaining memories of our service in this great body.

That was a quality which enabled him to hold together a group of men who differed upon vital questions that were made prominent by the fact that we were either approaching war or that we were indeed in war. No man here has sought to escape responsibility in this terrible situation created by the war, and no man here has been able to escape some of the wear and tear caused by the stresses of the war. I regret to say that I believe that perhaps our friend might have been able to live longer and continue to contribute his marvelous services to his country had it not been for the great pressures which were brought upon him by the circumstances that grew out of the war.

Our mourning for him is filled with praise, and if we can by what we say erect a memorial to his honor, we do it here and now.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that no words of mine would avail to add anything to the splendid tributes which have been paid Senator MCNARY. At the same time I feel that in honor to his virtues and in honor to his great services it would be proper for me to call the attention of the Senate to one service which Senator MCNARY rendered for which he will always be held in high regard. He and I served for many years as vice chairmen of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission. In the erection of the memorial to Jefferson it was the aim of Senator MCNARY that while it should honor Jefferson it should also be a memorial to the American people. Senator MCNARY strove and worked to cause the memorial to reflect the ideals which have always been America's, so that posterity might understand them, and so that the memorial, which represents America at its best, may be a shining beacon for the whole world to see and to honor.

When it came to constructing the statue, Senator MCNARY was interested in seeing that Jefferson the citizen should be honored. So the statue represents the great American after his retirement from public life, but when he was still serving his country in an advisory capacity, giving of his wisdom and his experience, and passing his ideals on to his fellow men.

Mr. President, mankind needs men who can stand alone, and in CHARLES MCNARY we saw such a man. Representing as he did the best of American ideals, he always appeared in our presence as one who could stand alone and he received the honor that was due him because he could and did stand alone.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, as one of the junior Members of the Senate, I wish to pay a personal tribute to the leadership of Senator MCNARY, and to express appreciation of the helpfulness which Senator MCNARY uniformly displayed toward me and toward all others who have come to the Senate in recent years. During the 3 years I have been a Member of the Senate, he gave me advice and guidance which have been invaluable. More than that, he demonstrated to me what a Senator can do for his Nation through his service in the Senate. He earned, deserved, and enjoyed the confidence of the Senate and of the Nation, and he served in the Senate in a manner which enabled him to become a recognized leader in the Nation in the field he had chosen for his special service.

I had occasion recently to look up the nature of his committee service in the Senate. It is impressive in its lesson. During 14 consecutive Congresses he served as a member of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and during 4 of those Congresses he served as its chairman. During 13 consecutive Congresses he served as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and during three and a fraction of those Congresses he served as its chairman. His chairmanship of that committee came to an end only when the majority of the Senate changed. From that time on, for 6 Congresses, he served as minority leader in the Senate. In addition, he served for 13 consecutive Congresses as a member of the Committee on Commerce.

By means of that continuity of service during practically a full generation he became an authority in the field of agriculture and its related fields in a manner which enabled him to render to this Nation a distinguished service. He thereby added to the confidence which the Nation feels and, I believe, which it has a right to feel in the Senate.

Also illustrative of the contribution which a man of that kind renders through his service to the Senate, I may add that he served as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Commerce, the Committee on Fisheries, the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on the Library, the Committee on Manufactures, the Committee on Mines and Mining, the Committee on Pacific Railroads, the Committee on the Philippines, the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine, the Committee on Public Lands, the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the Select Committee on Government Organization, the Special Committee to Investigate Executive Agencies of Government, the Special Committee on Wildlife Resources, the Special Committee on the Survey of Land and Water Policies of the United States, the Special Silver Committee, the Special Committee to Investigate Agricultural Labor Shortages, and the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning.

Senator MCNARY was a symbol of integrity, fairness, kindness, modesty, tact, and friendship. He was a competent and intelligent public servant. He honored the Senate by his service in it. He honored the Nation by his service to it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, the announcement of the death of CHARLES L. MCNARY came on that fateful Friday as a surprise and a shock to his colleagues in the Senate and to the people of the United States. We knew of his serious illness, but recent reports reaching us had led us to the fond hope that he was well on the road to recovery and would soon be filling again the seat which for many years he had occupied with so much honor to himself and credit to the party whose chosen leader he was upon this floor.

I was among countless others who looked upon CHARLEY MCNARY as a true and sympathetic friend. When first I came to the Senate, in 1933, I was, just as the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has today stated as his own experience, the recipient of his courtesy, his kindnes, and his sympathetic counsel. I have more than once had occasion to appreciate the wise advice he gave me shortly after I entered this body. Speaking from a long legislative and public experience, his admonition was, in summary, that he who uses persuasion, rather than criticism, and who deals kindly, rather than harshly, with his colleagues will accomplish more and travel longer and farther than those who employ denunciation and abuse as their weapons.

To use the words of the tribute Hamlet paid to Horatio, I may say of CHARLEY MCNARY that he was "e'en as just a man as e'er my conversation cop'd withal."

CHARLEY MCNARY was a living exemplification of his own philosophy of life. He was firm but gentle, and mellowed his sternest opposition with a sweetness and kindness that left behind no sting, but only respect and esteem.

He readily distinguished between the good and the bad, and adhered to what was good, regardless of party or factional politics. He always placed his country above party, and his death marks the passing of a truly great American.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the death of CHARLES MCNARY the common people lost a true friend, a farsighted leader, and a relentless, untiring battler for agriculture. In his search for farming facts he visited the State of North Dakota 12 times.

The greatest tribute ever paid to him was his almost frantic selection as the Vice Presidential candidate. He was selected because those in control realized the tremendous hold he had on the minds and affections of the agricultural and laboring masses. He was not only absolutely honest but he was entirely fearless. Exceptionally well informed on economic and political matters, he gave the Republican Party a leadership which is greatly missed now, and will continue to be missed for a long time to come.

This Nation's leaders will be sorely pressed in trying to find leadership that will come anywhere near having the love, esteem, and confidence of the common people enjoyed by Senator MCNARY for so long.

Experienced in statesmanship, entirely devoid of demagoguery, diplomatic and tactful, but realistic, in his approach, this great American citizen has left a record which will be an inspiration to the youth of America, and a career which every father will be proud to have his son copy.

Mr. President, this Christian gentleman was my reliable friend and counselor, and I mourn with the common people of this great country at our great loss of this heart-stirring, lovable character.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am one of the newest Members of the Senate. Nevertheless, I join with all those who by their statements today have shown their great respect for CHARLEY MCNARY. It was not necessary for one to know CHARLEY for a long time. His great qualities of friendliness, human kindness, and leadership made one feel instantly his great understanding and willingness to be helpful at all times. I valued his friendship and his always good counsel.

CHARLEY MCNARY was a great friend of my father, who also has gone to the Great Beyond. I know this because I have been aware of their exchange of ideas for the past 20 years. Each of them understood the problems of those who till the soil, and each was always working for the benefit of the agriculturists and horticulturists. From South Dakota, since the untimely death of our leader, have come many letters of regret at the passing of this great and good man. Therefore, I know that all the people of my State join in the expression of sympathy to his family and share the feeling of great loss in his passing, as set forth in the resolution which I now present for the RECORD at this point:

Whereas the end of earthly life has come to the Honorable CHARLES MCNARY, who has been the guiding hand of the Republican Party in the United States Senate: Be it

Resolved by the Beadle County, S. Dak., Republican Committee, That an expression of appreciation for his splendid party service be hereby made, as well as appreciation for his outstanding life as a successful American and Christian gentleman; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the South Dakota Members of the United States Senate, with the request that they inform the family of Senator MCNARY regarding this expression of appreciation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I wish to add my word of tribute to the memory of one whom we have loved long since and lost awhile—our friend CHARLEY MCNARY.

Coming here as a new Senator, as I did 6 years ago, and having offices adjacent to his, it was often my privilege to consult with him on matters of legislation and procedure. I never knew a wiser counselor, and I never had a better friend.

Two outstanding characteristics marked the man's life and influenced the lives of his fellows—graciousness and kindness. They were outstanding attributes of the man. Those attributes, coupled with a rare judgment of men and issues, and a fine toleration for the other fellow's point of view, will live in memory down through the years.

Today I listened to ALBEN BARKLEY speak of the imminent approach to death and a man's viewpoint as the years pass by. As I grow older, it is not the transition of death which bothers me when those I have loved pass on, but rather it is the finality of the thing—the fact that never again in this world shall I look upon the face of mother, or friend, or loved one. So, when troubled by that thought, as I have been many times and very recently, there come to my mind words which I learned years ago, written by an anonymous author, which I leave with you:

A good man never dies;
In worthy deeds and prayer,
In helpful hands and honest eyes,
If smiles and tears be there;
Who lives for you and me
Lives for the world he tries to help;
He lives eternally.
A good man never dies.

CHARLEY MCNARY was a good man in every sense of the word. So in a time of tragic sorrow, as we sit today in this Chamber, where he was wont to sit amongst us as our friend, counselor, and leader, it is not enough to go to earthly things for our comfort, but we turn to the eternal verities. So I sound a triumphant note that has blessed my life in times of sorrow, uttered by a great Christian 2,000 years ago, St. Paul, in his epistle to the Romans:

For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.

So may we comfort one another with these words.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, when word of the passing of our late colleague, Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY, reached the Senate, the opening prayer was delivered by our Chaplain, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris. While the prayer itself appears in the RECORD, there was comment on it in a column which appeared in the Atlantic (Iowa) News-Telegram of March 7, written by E. P. Chase. It is so deserving of perpetuation that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD following this morning's eulogistic ceremonies.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH E. P. CHASE AT THE NATION'S CAPITAL

WASHINGTON, D. C.—More often than not the opening prayers in both the House and Senate are routine affairs and very few, if any of the Members know what is said. On occasion, however, the chaplains rise to considerable heights. That was true one day last week in the Senate when the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, chaplain of that body, was most eloquent in his opening prayer. Senator CHARLEY MCNARY, of Oregon, had just died and with simple dignity and most fitting words the chaplain arose to the occasion.

"Our Father God," he intoned, "we come with the solemn consciousness that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day, as once again in the passing of an honored Member of this body we bow before the mystery of death."

Then he continued on to his eulogy of a fellow Member all Senators had loved and respected. "The one clear call," said the chaplain, "has taken from us Thy faithful servant and our beloved friend with whom we took sweet counsel and whose tolerant outlook often turned the discords of dispute into the music of understanding. But the sorrow of our hearts pleads with us to bless Thee for the close ties which have been severed, for the sanctified wisdom and the pure humanity which made this radiant personality as the candle of the Lord.

"We remember with gratitude that for him party loyalty was ever but an altar of devotion in the greater temple of his undefiled patriotism. We remember today with joy his long and fruitful years as a public servant, his patient courage, his gentle courtesy, his constant consecration to his great trust. We remember gratefully now one who held his convictions firmly without questioning the sincerity of others whose quest of truth led them along other paths. We think of him today as one who could differ without anger, who could debate without bitterness, who could be defeated without rancor, who could win without exultation.

"So, one by one, Thou dost gather the scattered families out of the earthly light to the heavenly glory, from the distractions and strife and weariness of time to the peace of eternity. Vouchsafe unto his loved ones Thy tenderest mercies and the consolations of Thy sustaining grace. In Thy great mercy bring us all at last to the homeland of Thine eternal love. In the name of That One who hath brought light and immortality to life."

A great many fine things have been deservedly written and said about the late Senator McNary, but I question that any encomium more beautiful will be pronounced for this very good man.

With his simple, yet eloquent, words this Senate chaplain unerringly cataloged the character of McNary, enumerating the many qualities which endeared him to his fellows. And I was intrigued by that statement that "we come with the solemn consciousness that swift to its close ebbs out life's little day." That has all the rippling grandeur of the Elegy and the Essay on Man.

In the hurly-burly of legislative turmoil sometimes really big moments are often overlooked. To my notion this chaplain's tribute to a fine Senator and a good man was unforgettable.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I know that the people of Oregon in their sorrow are grateful for the eloquent and heartfelt tributes here paid to the memory of their most beloved and distinguished citizen. They are comforted in the knowledge that their loss and their grief are shared.

Mr. President, I have come into membership in this body with a heavy heart, for I know that death, which came first and opened the door, took so much and I can bring so little. I am heartened when I remember that there is before me—set by him who was your colleague, your friend and mine—a record of friendship and service and pure patriotism toward which it is a privilege for any man to aspire; and this is true though I realize that my feet may stumble where his were sure.

In my short time here many Members of both Houses have come to me to express their sense of personal loss in the passing of my distinguished predecessor, and each has spoken of some intimate personal memory, sacred to him alone; but they have been one in this regard, that all have spoken—and there was wonderment in their voices that it was

so—all have spoken of a great capacity for understanding and tolerance of men, men in their strength and their weakness, that was given CHARLES MCNARY in so generous measure. They said it was an affirmative thing that flowed out from the man to quiet and subdue and to beget love.

I have faith that in the ominous days ahead, when we of this body, striving to fulfill to the utmost our duty as we severally see it, shall find ourselves with convictions opposed, with wills that clash and hot words that seek utterance, the memory of CHARLES MCNARY may come and abide in this Chamber, to chasten and soften and again point the way.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DAMAGE CLAIMS, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 167)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, amounting to $75,286.98 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. DOC. NO. 168)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, records of judgments rendered against the Government by district courts, amounting to $3,625 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 169)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages incident to the operation of vessels in the Navy, amounting to $5,994.03 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS, COAST GUARD (S. DOC. NO. 170)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay a claim for damages incident to the operation of vessels of the United States Coast Guard, amounting to $500 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPERTY DAMAGE CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 171)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriations to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, amounting to $6,756 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGE TO ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OF STATES (S. DOC. NO. 172)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay a claim for damage to roads and highways of States, amounting to $4,093.62 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 173)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $362,387.16 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 174)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, amounting to $9,397.37 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 175)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1944, amounting to $6,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATION BY A MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report of the operations of the Farm Credit Administration during the calendar year 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS OF A COMMISSION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in Europe, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for that Commission for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, Navy (4), Interior, and Agriculture (3), and the National Archives which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Metropolitan Council of Exchange Clubs, Detroit, Mich., protesting against the enactment of the bill (H. R. 3420) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, or any other legislation affecting aviation until at least 6 months after the termination of the present war; to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from Raymond F. Wade, SK 3/c, United States Navy, Port Hueneme, Calif., relating to the matter of dependents' allowances to motherless children; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Albert L. Sklar, of Baltimore, Md., praying for the adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 247) favoring action by the United States looking to the restoration of Palestine as a homeland for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 6

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation simplifying income tax return blanks

"Whereas the income tax return blanks now required to be filled out by the public are not only complicated and difficult to understand, but almost impossible for the people to file without the assistance of experts; and

"Whereas taxation, although a proper burden on the public and one the public is willing to bear, should be so imposed that the taxpayer understands the tax he is paying; and

"Whereas no confusion should exist with respect to the filling out of income tax returns, in order that the public may understand the tax being paid, and the Government may receive needed revenues: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the members of the Michigan Legislature earnestly urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation simplifying income tax return blanks so that the public may understand the tax being paid and may be able to comply with the requirements incident to the preparation of the return; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives in Congress; and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress."

RESOLUTIONS BY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, recently the House of Representatives of the State of Washington adopted two resolutions. They were sent to me and I should like to have them printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred and I ask unanimous consent that such procedure be followed.

One of the resolutions asks Congress to reduce the voting age of young men to 18 years of age. The other resolution is a request to Congress for assistance in the creation of a four-lane Pacific highway from Seattle to Vancouver, Wash., the purpose being to seek Federal funds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions will be received, appropriately referred, and under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas Senator HARVEY KILGORE has introduced into the United States Senate S. Res. 89, calling for the submission by the Congress of the United States to the various State legislatures of a constitutional amendment providing for lowering the voting age to 18; and

Whereas of the 7,000,000 young men and women in our country between 18 and 21, nearly 3,000,000 of them are in the armed forces, and of the other 4,000,000 the majority

are working in the war plants of our Nation, buying bonds, paying income tax, and in many other ways assuming the full responsibility of adulthood; and

Whereas passage of such a constitutional amendment will demonstrate to these 18-year-olds in the Army the recognition by their country that if they are "old enough to fight they are old enough to vote," and will contribute directly to building their morale and devotion to and interest in American democracy, and the same will apply to the 18-year-olds in war plants and other jobs; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives go on record calling upon the House and Senate of the United States Congress to pass S. Res. 89, and submit to the various State legislatures the lowering of voting age to 18 as a constitutional amendment.

To the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in extraordinary legislative session assembled:

Whereas the completion of the four-lane Pacific Highway from Seattle to Vancouver, Wash., is of paramount importance to the successful prosecution of the war insofar as it serves as the major transportation route in the Northwest; and

Whereas Members of the United States Congress from the State of Washington are urging the project's completion; and

Whereas the War Department and the War Production Board must certify the project as essential before Federal funds for use on the project are allocated; and

Whereas the Department of Highways of the State of Washington and the Washington State Good Roads Association are using all possible influence to secure the allocation of said Federal funds and the certification of the project's essentiality: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled go on record as urging all possible support be given the department of highways toward the securing of project certification and an allocation of Federal funds; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be directed to transmit to the Department of Highways of the State of Washington, the Washington State congressional delegation, and the War Production Board a copy of the foregoing resolution.

PALESTINE, THE JEWISH HOMELAND—RESOLUTION FROM LEGISLATURE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. BONE. Another resolution from the Washington State Legislature came to me which was in the form of a memorial to the Congress to reaffirm its position that Palestine should be opened as the Jewish homeland, but I note that one of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, Representative MAGNUSON, has caused this resolution previously to be inserted in the RECORD, and, therefore, I merely make reference to it now.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

From the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3847. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; without amendment (Rept. No. 753).

From the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 2618. A bill to regulate the placing of children in family homes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 754).

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, a few years ago the Congress was deluged with protests from businessmen of the country asserting that they were being virtually smothered by a flood of demands from Government agencies for reports, inventories, and questionnaires on nearly every conceivable subject relating to their business activities, or remotely connected therewith. Small concerns with meager bookkeeping facilities were being asked to render complicated reports relating to their business operations. They were required to give the most detailed explanations consuming much of their time and attention. These demands were frequently unnecessary and created such a burden on small business that they appealed to the Congress for relief.

In response to this public clamor, the Senate Special Committee on Small Business Problems entered into a study of the situation and reported a bill to the Senate known as the Federal Reports Act, which was enacted into law approximately 18 months ago—Public Law 831.

This legislation was designed to put an end to demands for unnecessary reports and questionnaires, and provide a system by which the various Government agencies would be enabled to secure all necessary information they required without placing such a burden upon the business concerns of the country. At that time the whole country seemed to be wincing under the burdens of the demands of these inquisitorial Federal agencies seeking information which in many instances appeared to be already available to them in the filing cabinets and on the shelves of other Government departments and bureaus.

It has been quite some time now since Senators have been bothered by these complaints, which were so numerous just a few months ago. The explanation is in the Federal Reports Act itself. In this connection, let me read a single paragraph from the letter of transmittal by Harold D. Smith, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who has sent this report to me in response to my request for periodic information on the administration of the act. Mr. Smith makes this statement:

> I should like to add to these reports my own observation that the Federal Reports Act has been highly successful in getting at the reporting problems facing the country as a result of the war emergency. The burden on respondents has been greatly reduced during the year, Government operations have been simplified, and the quality of information has been improved. It has become increasingly clear that the legislation was both wise and timely.

Mr. Smith, in his appraisal of the act, has not alone accepted the favorable manifestations which are so apparent in Washington. He sent investigators out into the industrial field to determine in an impartial way the effect produced by the law's operations. These men have returned with reports to the effect that without a single exception every person contacted expressed the opinion that there has been "a remarkable reduction and improvement in questionnaires and in record-keeping or reporting requirements."

Moreover, these examinations in the field have demonstrated that the requests emanating from the Capital have become more reasonable, forms have been simplified, and the burden correspondingly reduced. But, best of all, there is a distinct reflection that business and industry is now better equipped and adapted to keeping records of the kind currently being required by the Government.

All in all, the intelligence conveyed in this report is pleasing not only to myself, as chairman, but to the entire membership of the Senate Special Committee to Study Problems of Small Business. The Federal Reports Act, as Senators know, was one of the first pieces of legislation to be formulated by our committee and receive the sanction of Congress and the administration. We will be, I trust, pardoned if we take our portion of credit and indicate a modicum of pride in the beneficial results already obtained.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report—brief for a document of this importance—be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

REPORT OF PROGRESS UNDER THE FEDERAL REPORTS ACT

The Federal Reports Act, signed on December 24, 1942, has been in effect almost exactly 1 year. We are, therefore, presenting a summary picture of the results achieved during this period.

Three principal assignments were given to the Bureau of the Budget by the Federal Reports Act as means of effectuating its broad function of coordinating the Federal statistical services: (1) The elimination of duplication in and the simplification of Federal reporting requirements; (2) the establishment of central collecting agencies to serve the needs of two or more agencies; and (3) the development of arrangements for the joint use of data. It is upon the first of these that the Bureau has concentrated attention and made the most progress during the first year of operation under the act. The pressure of administrative needs for data on which to base urgent war programs has required that our limited staff time be principally devoted to the review of report forms and reporting requirements, and to the development of controls over the issuance of requests for information. Several measures have been adopted to establish effective control.

1. Approval number system: The approval number system is the most important procedure in the Bureau's control mechanism. The fact that all authorized forms carry an approval number gives respondents some assurance that the forms are necessary to the war effort and request a minimum of information. It is true that business concerns and individuals still have to reply to many report forms, but the criticism of report forms has subsided in large part with the realization that there is an orderly review

process and that forms are subject to a careful screening process before they are issued. The wide publicity given to the system has resulted in referral of forms which lack approval numbers to the Bureau for investigation. Although Government agencies, principally field offices, have issued some unauthorized requests for information, they have been cooperative in withdrawing the forms upon investigation by the Bureau.

2. Internal control units: In order to locate initial responsibility close to the scene of operations, the Bureau has actively promoted the establishment of a unit in each of the larger operating agencies to provide for internal clearance and control over report forms originating in subordinate units. Only forms approved by these units are submitted to the Bureau for final approval by the agencies where the control units have been established. At present there are 15 such control units which give an initial screening to 90 percent of all forms received for review.

3. Advisory committee on Government questionnaires: The advisory committee, composed of representatives of national business organizations and established at the request of the Director of the Bureau, has contributed materially to the Bureau's accomplishments by making practical recommendations with regard to important reporting programs, particularly those of the war agencies. Special attention is devoted to the availability of data in business records. The committee's experience has demonstrated that this kind of cooperative relationship and constructive advice can do much to further a satisfactory solution to the problem of Government questionnaires. Approximately 40 special subcommittees have been appointed by the advisory committee on Government questionnaires to study special problems or problems affecting particular industries. These subcommittees have enlisted the active participation of more than 200 businessmen. The entire expense of the advisory committee on Government questionnaires has been met by industry in recognition of the joint interest of business in the improvement of reporting forms.

SUMMARY OF OPERATIONS

The Bureau's records show that during the calendar year 1943 it acted upon 7,484 forms. This figure does not, of course, include the forms which were disapproved by the internal control units of Federal agencies in accordance with the Bureau's standards. The following table summarizes the Bureau's actions:

	Total actions	Approved	Disapproved	Percent disapproved
New repetitive forms	1,934	1,660	274	14.2
Revised repetitive forms	4,063	3,699	364	9.0
Single-time forms	1,487	1,218	269	18.1
Total	7,484	6,577	907	12.1

The following table summarizes the above actions by general purpose or type of form:

	Total actions	Approved	Disapproved	Percent disapproved
Application forms	1,351	1,262	89	6.6
Forms providing administrative data	3,285	2,825	460	14.0
Reporting requirements in orders, etc.	516	483	33	6.4
Forms providing data for general uses	2,332	2,007	325	13.9
Total	7,484	6,577	907	12.1

The 364 revised repetitive forms proposed for further use which were disapproved represent an existing reporting burden which has been eliminated. In addition to this number of forms for which extension was refused by the Bureau of the Budget, almost 800 forms were discontinued by the agencies themselves. Most repetitive forms now in use in the important war agencies are reviewed every 6 or 12 months to insure that collections of information once necessary are not routinely continued beyond the real need for them. Disapprovals of new repetitive forms and of single-time forms, designed for use only once, likewise represent a reduction in reporting burden.

It must be emphasized again that the number of formal disapprovals does not include the number of forms disapproved by the internal control units, and hence never submitted to the Bureau for formal action. Nor does it include cases in which the Bureau is consulted informally about a proposed project before it has reached the stage of formal drafting. An expression of disapproval at this point frequently leads to the abandonment of the plans without a formal submittal. The increasing understanding on the part of Federal agencies of the standards set by the Bureau leads to more critical scrutiny by the agencies themselves so that the number of poorly planned projects which would inevitably be disapproved has declined. The very existence of an exacting control mechanism has in itself brought about a reduction in the number of requests for the Bureau's approval. This is evidenced by the fact that during the first quarter of 1943 14 percent of the forms submitted were disapproved, as compared with 9.8 percent during the last quarter, despite the fact that the standards imposed in the latter part of the year were much more rigorous than those imposed earlier.

The review activity figures also fail to reflect the many important modifications made to simplify report forms, thereby reducing the cost and burden. After the need for a particular reporting program is established and the program is shown to be generally feasible, the main work of the Bureau centers around simplification and the development of standards. More than 20 percent of the forms finally approved are changed in important respects. The application of standards of performance, the unification of uncoordinated or duplicating programs of information, and the careful scrutiny of all requests result in basic modifications.

The number of respondents may be reduced through the establishment of a cut-off point to eliminate the small businesses, or those having insignificant relationship to the problem under study; a change in the frequency may be effected so that fewer reports are required; arrangements may be made for the joint use of a form by several agencies rather than allowing each agency to collect its own information; reporting systems may be made less burdensome by the elimination of unnecessary forms or requirements or by simplifying the forms and records. Modifications of these types result directly in substantial reductions in the burden of reporting information to the Government.

The Bureau's figures show that as of January 1, 1944, there were 5,105 public use forms and reporting requirements in active use by Federal agencies. On January 1, 1943, there were 4,256 in use. These figures are not strictly comparable because figures on reporting and record-keeping requirements, which numbered 343 on January 1, 1944, are not included in the figure for January 1, 1943. The Bureau did not review such requirements in 1942, prior to the passage of the Federal Reports Act. The war agencies and the Department of Agriculture account for 95 percent of the increase in the number of report forms in use.

Because of the necessity for primary emphasis on the review and control phase of the Bureau's functions, the other two major coordinating functions have been developed more slowly. Except as individual report forms covering the same subject matter come up for review at the same time, our progress upon the development of single collecting agencies has been piecemeal. Our experience so far, however, indicates that the ultimate accomplishments from a wider application of the Federal Reports Act should be large. Orderly arrangements for the collection of information will produce more lasting economies and improvements than the day-to-day approval of individual forms.

With regard to arrangements for joint use of information, some progress has been made, particularly in respect to contract renegotiation reporting, to subcontractor reporting and to some of the price and distribution controls applied to the food program. Vigorous action is required on the part of the Bureau to promote further development in this direction and to remove the existing barriers. We expect to increase the allotment of time for this purpose as rapidly as staff time becomes available.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1779. A bill to provide for a new base period, and for considering increases in the cost of farm labor, in determining parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1780. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees of the National War Labor Board from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1781. A bill to provide for full military rank for members of the Army Nurse Corps, dietitians, and physical-therapy aides, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 1782. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1783. A bill to confer authority on the Secretary of the Interior with regard to certain reclamation repayment contracts; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1784. A bill for the relief of Leola Evans; and

S. 1785. A bill for the relief of Alex Wylie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1786. A bill to provide that members of the Florida State militia company, known as the Jasper Blues, shall be credited with service in the United States Army during the War with Spain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. TOBEY introduced Senate bill 1787, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

COMBAT PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide additional pay for members of the armed forces who engage in combat service,

and I request that the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The bill (S. 1787) to provide additional pay for members of the armed forces engaged in combat service was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 18 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such section a new paragraph as follows:

"Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard, who are not receiving additional pay under the foregoing provisions of this section, the provisions of the act of April 9, 1928 (45 Stat. 412), as amended, or the provisions of the act of April 10, 1943 (Public Law 23, 78th Cong.), shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in actual combat against the enemy or to serve regularly and frequently in immediate combat areas with troops engaged in actual combat against the enemy. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and shall, whenever practicable in their judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned."

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an article by Ernie Pyle. The article is entitled "He Goes to Bat for Fight Pay for Combat Ground Soldiers."

Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced will provide for a 50-percent increase in the pay of our combat ground soldiers. The bill is in line with common justice and appreciation, in my judgment; and under its provisions the same pay we are now giving as an increase to the men in the combat flying service will accrue to the men in the combat ground service. We call it fight pay, akin to the flight pay now authorized for flying combat men.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

ERNIE PYLE—HE GOES TO BAT FOR FIGHT PAY FOR COMBAT GROUND SOLDIERS

In Italy.—In my usual role of running other people's business I've been threshing around with an idea—honest. It's to give the combat soldier some little form of recognition more than he is getting now.

Everybody who serves overseas, no matter where or what he's doing, gets extra pay. Enlisted men get 20 percent additional and officers 10 percent.

Airmen get an extra 50 percent above this for flight pay. As a result, officer-flyers get 60 percent above their normal base pay and enlisted flyers such as gunners and radio operators get 70 percent.

All that is fine and as it should be, but the idea I was toying with is why not give your genuine combat ground soldier something corresponding to flight pay? Maybe a good phrase for it would be "fight pay."

Of any 1,000,000 men overseas, probably no more than 100,000 are in actual combat with the enemy. But as it is now, there is no official distinction between the dogface lying for days and nights under constant mortar fire on an Italian hill and the headquarters clerk living comfortably in a hotel in Rio de Janeiro.

Their two worlds are so far apart the human mind can barely grasp the magnitude of the difference. One lives like a beast and dies in great numbers. The other is merely working away from home. Both are doing necessary jobs, but it seems to me the actual warrior deserves something to set him apart. And medals are not enough.

When I was at the front the last time several infantry officers brought up this same suggestion. They say combat pay would mean a lot to the fighting man. It would put him into a proud category and make him feel that somebody appreciates what he endures.

Obviously no soldier would ever go into combat just to get extra fight pay. That isn't the point. There is not enough money in the world to pay any single individual his due for battle suffering.

But it would put a mark of distinction on him, a recognition that his miserable job was a royal one and that the rest of us were aware of it.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 4377. An act authorizing the President to present, in the name of Congress, a Distinguished Service Medal to Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 4410. An act to extend for an additional 90 days the period during which certain grains and other products to be used for livestock and poultry feed may be imported from foreign countries free of duty; to the Committee on Finance.

COMMEMORATION OF CENTENNIAL OF THE TELEGRAPH

Mr. WHEELER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39), which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

Whereas Samuel F. B. Morse, a distinguished American artist, invented the first practical electro-magnetic telegraph in the winter of 1835–36, and obtained an appropriation from the Congress of the United States in 1843 for the construction of an experimental telegraph line between Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the first telegram, "What Hath God Wrought?" was sent over this line from the old Supreme Court room in the Capitol to Baltimore on May 24, 1844; and

Whereas the sending of the first telegram marked the beginning of the telegraph industry, which has been indispensable to the country in four wars and, by linking all sections, has implemented the traditional motto, "E Pluribus Unum"; and

Whereas the telegraph was the first speedy means of communication connecting the nations of the world, bringing all peoples closer together, and promoting the dissemination of ideas as well as international trade; and

Whereas the telegraph was the first great electrical discovery and was the forerunner of our entire system of electrical communications, including the telephone, the radio, and television: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such committee shall secure an appropriate plaque or other suitable memorial to be placed in or near the room in the Capitol from which the first telegraph message was dispatched, and shall arrange for appropriate exercises, to be held on May 24, 1944, for the purpose of placing such plaque or other memorial and commemorating the centennial of the telegraph. The cost of carrying out the provisions of this concurrent resolution, including the cost of such plaque or other memorial, not to exceed $4,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the House and one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate.

INVESTIGATION OF LABOR SHORTAGE IN THE PACIFIC COAST AND ROCKY MOUNTAIN STATES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 270), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures of the Committee on Military Affairs under Senate Resolution 88, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 25, 1943 (relating to an investigation of the existing shortage of labor in the Pacific Coast and Rocky Mountain States and the effect of such shortage upon the war effort), as supplemented by Senate Resolution 113, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to April 7, 1943, is hereby increased by $2,500.

COST OF PRODUCTION OF CUT DIAMONDS

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 271), which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That the United States Tariff Commission is hereby directed to investigate, for the purposes of section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, the differences in cost of production of cut diamonds produced in the United States and like or similar foreign-produced articles; and, to take adequate steps permitted by law to protect labor standards in the diamond processing industry if its future is thereby found to be menaced.

INCREASED PURCHASING POWER—DESIRABILITY OF THE TOWNSEND PLAN BILL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, America is winning this war on all fronts, thanks to the foresightedness and the judgment of her national leadership. We are heading—rapidly, we hope—into an era of peacetime when our boys and girls will come home from the fighting fronts to resume their rightful places in our society.

To what sort of society will our boys and girls return? Will it be a society in which factories have closed down for lack of further war orders; in which defense industries close down and hold up reconversion because they can see no market for consumer goods; in which our returning veterans will be compelled to sell apples on street corners for a living? Or will it be to an economy of scarcity—planned for and legislated for in exactly the same way we approached our war problem? For peace and plenty are things that can be planned for and legislated for.

If we act now to provide a constant stream of purchasing power passing through the hands of those laid off by industry, we will assure a market for the goods of business and industry, and will give our defense plants good reason for hurrying their reconversion when that wonderful day of peace arrives.

We can provide a big, growing stream of purchasing power every month to our aged, our incapacitated, our blind, and our chronically ill by passing the Townsend plan bill, House bill 1649. I urge it upon my colleagues for their careful study and consideration.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR OVERTON—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT (LA.) TIMES

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator OVERTON," published in the Shreveport (La.) Times of Tuesday, March 14, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILLIAM F. CODY—BUFFALO BILL

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him at Cody, Wyo., on February 26, 1944, on the occasion of the celebration of the anniversary of the birth of William F. Cody which appears in the Appendix.]

ANDREW JACKSON—ARTICLE BY SENATOR HATCH

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on Andrew Jackson, written by Senator Hatch and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GRADUATION ADDRESS BY VICE ADMIRAL RANDALL JACOBS, UNITED STATES NAVY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Vice Admiral Randall Jacobs, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Personnel, at the graduation and commissioning exercises of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps and V–12 Units at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, February 25, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH PROVISIONS OF THE WAGNER-MURRAY-DINGELL BILL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of questions and answers prepared by him dealing with the provisions of the so-called Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOUR FREEDOMS ON THE HOME FRONT

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to United States Senators and Representatives, dated February 22, 1944, from Four Freedoms on the Home Front Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

WILL THEY VOTE?—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEWARK EVENING NEWS

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Will They Vote?" from the Newark Evening News of March 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOURTH TERM—DEBATE IN PRINT BETWEEN SENATOR MEAD AND SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a debate in print between himself and Senator MEAD on the suoject Should There Be a Fourth Term? published in Town Meetings in Print, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTECTION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOVERNMENT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Detroit Times of March 10 entitled "BRIDGES Asks Crusade To Protect Our Congressional Government," which appears in the Appendix.]

DEMOBILIZING THE NEW DEAL—EDITORIAL FROM LOS ANGELES EXAMINER

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Demobilizing the New Deal," published in the Los Angeles Examiner, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN CONTRIBUTION TO THE WAR EFFORT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resume of the booklet entitled "Bill Bailey Got the Credit, But the Man Behind the Gun Was Mr. Dooley," recently published by the General Cable Corporation in New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

COTTON AND THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY O. F. BLEDSOE III

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cotton and the Federal Government," by O. F. Bledsoe III, of Greenwood, Miss., which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIDGES in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Stewart
Bone	Hill	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Kilgore	Tobey
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Bushfield	Langer	Tydings
Byrd	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Weeks
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Cordon	Mead	Wherry
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Murray	Willis
Downey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Eastland	Overton	
Ellender	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Bureau of the Budget", on page 3, line 18, after the word "reference", to strike out "periodicals and newspapers (not exceeding $500)" and insert "and periodicals"; in line 19, before the word "maintenance", to strike out "teletype news service"; in line 21, after the word "use", to strike out "and not to exceed $55,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, $2,290,340" and insert "$1,830,400", and on page 4, line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which $44,940 shall be allocated to the Federal Board of Hospitalization."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 8, after the word "available" to strike out the comma and "and including the temporary employment (not exceeding $65,000) of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended"; and in line 19, after the figures "$879,800", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That upon the expiration of 60 days after the cessation of hostilities between the United States and the principal enemy powers or after the date of an armistice between the United States and the principal enemy powers, this appropriation shall cease to be available for obligations unless Congress shall otherwise provide by law."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 5, to insert:

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Bureau of the Budget shall be used for the maintenance or establishment of regional, field, or any other offices outside the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 7, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500"; and on page 8, line 4, after the word "charts", to strike out "purchase."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, in line 6, after the word "binding", to strike out "$6,056,473" and insert "$5,516,223."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on page 8, in lieu of the committee amendment appearing in line 6, the committee has authorized me to present another amendment, which I now do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8, line 6, after the word "binding", it is proposed to strike out "$6,056,473" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,766,000."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, the amendment now submitted by the Senator from Tennessee is a compromise which was arrived at in the committee and it is a figure in between the House figure and that previously adopted by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct. It was arrived at at a subsequent meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from Tennessee to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$113,000" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 11, after the word "binding", to strike out "$12,995,504" and insert "$8,000,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. In lieu of the amendment just stated, I am authorized by the committee to offer an amendment, which is likewise a compromise adjustment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the committee amendment, on page 9, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$12,995,504" and insert "$8,840,000."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that this amendment carries a new figure which was agreed upon in the committee at a second meeting.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to object to the amendment. Will it go over or what will be the disposition of it?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate will vote on it, unless the Senator desires to make a speech.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations——

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as this is a very important matter, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Stewart
Bone	Hill	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Jackson	Thomas, Okla.
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Kilgore	Tobey
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Bushfield	Langer	Tydings
Byrd	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Weeks
Connally	Maloney	Wheeler
Cordon	Mead	Wherry
Danaher	Millikin	White
Davis	Murray	Willis
Downey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Eastland	Overton	
Ellender	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations, in reporting to the Senate the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 4070, proposed an amendment on page 9, line 11, which would have the effect of reducing the Civil Service Commission's appropriations for "Salaries and expenses, national defense" from $12,995,504 to $8,000,000.

Since reporting the bill to the Senate the Committee has given further consideration to this item, and its acting chairman has just proposed an amendment which would increase the amount proposed for the Commission from $8,000,000 to $8,840,000.

If the Senate accepts the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee and appropriates only $8,840,000 to the Civil Service Commission for its national defense activity, it is my understanding that the Commission will be in the position that at least $1,890,000 will no longer be available for its activities in connection with the recruiting of persons for the war agencies.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am proposing that we strike out the amount of $8,840,000 and substitute for it the amount of $10,730,000.

This would put the Civil Service Commission in a position where it could continue to render the service in the field of recruiting and placement which is so desperately needed by the war agencies of the Government.

As chairman of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate, I am in a position to know that, throughout this war period, the Commission has, if anything, been undermanned in connection with its recruitment and placement work.

As a result of several investigations in California, I am especially familiar with conditions in my State. The Commission's office, located in San Francisco, which serves the State of California, has carried a far heavier load in connection with its recruiting work than any group of human beings should be called upon to carry. They have done an amazingly effective job, operating under severe handicaps, and without adequate resources. It is my understanding that what is true in connection with this office is likewise true in connection with the work of many of the Commission's other offices.

In asking for funds for its recruiting and placement work for the war agencies, the Commission has always predicated its request on the estimated number of placements it would be called upon to make in the Federal service over a given period. Not once since the war began has the Commission overestimated its anticipated work load. In every instance it has underestimated that load.

It is in the light of this record that I desire to have the Members of the Senate consider the basis for the Commission's request for funds for recruiting for the fiscal year 1945.

In submitting its request for funds for 1945 to the Bureau of the Budget, the Commission estimated that it would be called upon to make 1,548,000 placements for 1945. Between the time when these requests were submitted and hearings were held on the Commission's request before the House Committee on Appropriations, the Commission decided, on the basis of its current experiences, that in all probability it would be called upon to make 1,485,000 placements in 1945. Consequently, on its own initiative, the Commission asked the House Committee on Appropriations to approve $272,043 less than the amount submitted to the Congress as a result of the hearings before the Bureau of the Budget.

I refer to this for the purpose of indicating that the Civil Service Commission does make a conscientious effort to keep its requests for funds in line with its anticipated workload.

In estimating the number of placements which it feels will be made in 1945, the Commission has assumed that there will be a decrease in total Federal employment of approximately 250,000, as compared with the peak reached in June 1943. Consequently, the Commission believes that virtually all its recruiting work in 1945 will be for the purpose of making replacements. Under such circumstances the important factor in determining just what the work load will be is the turn-over rate. The Commission estimates are based on the assumption that this turn-over rate in 1945 will average 4½ percent a month. Actually, the Commission's experiences up to the present time reflect an average turnover rate of better than 5 percent a month.

Having made what it seems to me is a very conservative estimate of the number of placements which will be made in 1945, the Commission's justifications then indicate that the cost per placement for 1945 will be $4.42. To my mind, this is a low cost, when we consider the difficulties all employers are having at the present time in obtaining qualified personnel. At no time in the hearings before either the House Committee on Appropriations or at the hearings before the Senate Committee on Appropriations have these cost figures been called into question.

Unless the amount of $1,890,000 shall be restored, as proposed by the amendment which I am offering, it will mean that the Civil Service Commission, instead of making 1,485,000 placements, will be able to make only 1,000,000 placements. In other words, we will be putting the Commission in a position where it will be virtually impossible for it to make 500,000 replacements in key war agencies.

Let us remember that this is not a question of providing the Commission with funds to recruit persons to take care of any proposed increase in Federal employment. This estimate rests on the premise that Federal employment will decline 250,000 as compared with the peak reached in June 1943. These funds are being requested solely for the purpose of making replacements in key war agencies.

Right now, for example, the Civil Service Commission is engaged in an intensive recruiting program in order to find persons for work at the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard. Certainly there is no question in the mind of anyone about the absolute necessity of meeting the Navy's needs as far as the staffing of this yard is concerned. Furthermore, this is not a need that is going to be taken care of once for all during the next few months. Literally thousands of persons now working in the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard will ultimately be inducted into the armed forces. Others having spent 18 months or more working in the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard will return to the mainland.

The Civil Service Commission will be expected to find the replacements for these workers. If it does not, it will be criticized and criticized in a vigorous manner by the Members of Congress. And yet, right now, we are proposing to take away from the Civil Service Commission the funds which it desperately needs in order to render this kind of a service to the Navy Department. And, incidentally, I happen to know that the Navy Department would be willing to state to any Member of the Senate that without the services of the Civil Service Commission it would not have been able to carry on its work in the navy yards in the way in which it has.

There have been times, for example, when the manpower situation has been desperate insofar as the west coast navy yards are concerned. The Civil Service Commission has been able to respond effectively to insistent demands for help and assistance, and, working with the War Manpower Commission, has been able to produce the men that were needed. Anyone conversant with the war situation knows that the pressure for persons in these yards is not going to become less. It is obviously going to become greater as time goes on.

Over a period of the past few months, the Members of the Senate have become thoroughly familiar with the fact that it is very difficult to meet the personnel needs of the Veterans' Administration, including, of course, the hospitals which are maintained and operated by this agency of Government. The primary responsibility for meeting these needs, needs which must be met if our returning veterans are to be cared for in the proper manner, rests upon the Civil Service Commission. And yet, if the Commission is not provided with the funds which it has requested and which the House of Representatives has already passed upon favorably, it will be virtually impossible for it to meet these demands.

In addition to this, the Civil Service Commission must assume the primary responsibility of making sure that government, as an employer, does what all employers should do, namely, provide job opportunities for returning veterans. And yet, just at the time when this load is beginning to mount, we propose to make a drastic reduction in the Commission's funds. If we do, and if the returning veteran is not given the help and assistance which he should receive as he seeks employment with the Federal Government, the blame will rest on our shoulders and not on the shoulders of the Civil Service Commission.

The Civil Service Commission says that it needs money to make 1,485,000 placements. For my part, I believe this is a conservative estimate. The House of Representatives, after extensive hearings before its Appropriations Committee, believes that it is a sound estimate. No testimony was presented to the Appropriations Committee indicating any basis for the Senate arriving at a different conclusion. Surely, on the record as it stands at the present time, there is no justification for our taking action deliberately designed to cripple the Federal Government's central personnel agency.

I urge, therefore, that the Senate vote to strike the amount of $8,840,000 on page 9, line 11, and substitute for it the amount of $10,730,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. On page 56 of the bill there is an appropriation for the United States Maritime Commission. That is an item in which many of us are exceedingly interested. As a member of the Appropriations Committee it has been my desire to see that this all-important Commission should have the money necessary to enable it to go forward with its work. I wish to say that there is no work in all the war effort which is more competently or more capably carried on than that of the United States Maritime Commission.

Sometime ago it was my privilege to write an article to be published in the publication known as Shipmate, entitled "Looking Ahead," with the subtitle, Navy's Peacetime Job To Be Biggest in History. It is a short article and I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD at this point in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING AHEAD—NAVY'S PEACETIME JOB TO BE BIGGEST IN HISTORY

(By PAT McCARRAN)

The United States Navy today is doing its biggest wartime job.

When that job is over and a grateful country says, "Well done," the Navy will face a far bigger peacetime job than ever before.

The end of this war will find the United States the biggest maritime power in the history of the world.

Entering this war, the United States had about 12,000,000 dead-weight tons of merchant shipping. The other United Nations, altogether, had about 43,000,000 tons.

Great Britain, starting with about 22,000,000 dead-weight tons of shipping when she entered the war, lost about one-third of that total during the first 2 years of hostilities, and has been unable to balance losses with new construction, at least, until very recently. Probably the maximum strength of the British merchant marine at the end of the war will be no more than 20,000,000 tons.

We have had losses, too, but new bottoms launched since Pearl Harbor from American shipyards exceed 20,000,000 tons. Our shipbuilders have done a magnificent job. Of all world powers, only the United States has more shipping today than before the war. It seems a safe guess we shall emerge from the war with about twice the dead-weight tonnage of merchant shipping Great Britain will have.

These figures are no war secrets, being based on public releases from the Office of War Information.

In taking cognizance of this situation, in outlining the facts and giving thought to their implication, we must avoid any semblance of boasting. While we are properly proud of the skill, ingenuity, and success of our shipbuilding industry, there is no question but that we should be even more pleased if circumstances had enabled the British and our other allies to do as well. We want this war won, and won as soon as possible, and it could be won faster if the United Nations had more ships. In calling attention to our country's complete ascendancy on the seven seas there is no intention to brag but only to provide essential background for some serious thinking about the responsibilities which we as a country will face, and which our Navy will face, in the post-war world.

Holding the primary place among maritime powers, which seems assured us, we shall be confronted with many problems and with many duties, both to ourselves and to the world. A large share of the responsibility for solving those problems and for meeting those obligations will fall inevitably to the United States Navy. We must bear this fact in mind in all our post-war thinking, through all the discussions and negotiations concerning naval disarmament which we know will come.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in reference to the amount of $8,840,000 for this item which the committee has reported I wish to explain to the Senate that there are two appropriations here for the Civil Service Commission. Last year Congress appropriated $6,011,000 for the ordinary work of the Commission, that is, its usual work. Last year we appropriated for salaries and expenses of the national defense part of the Commission $13,285,362. The Commission this year asks for a like sum, but the hump of the work of the Commission has passed by. The Commission cannot use as much money as it used last year, and the very arguments made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], show that to be so, for he does not ask for the full amount which the House provided, but for $2,265,000 less than the House provided. Our committee went into this matter. We had the House hearings before us. We knew that the hump had been passed.

Mr. President, the action of the committee is not to be construed as a criticism of the Civil Service Commission at all. I suppose the Commission is doing the best job it can in both its war work and regular work. We have given the Commission substantially the same amount it had last year for its regular work. I think there is a difference of $206,000, a comparatively small difference between what the Commission had last year and what we propose to provide for the Commission this year. The Civil Service Commission cannot possibly need as much as it has asked for, and it could not use it if we provided it, because it cannot get the employees it wants. The Commission has gotten over the hump of its work for military purposes. Therefore the committee saw fit to cut down the amount to $8,000,000 at first. However, after we had agreed on the matter in committee, the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] came forward with three or four items—I do not remember the exact number—for which he felt appropriation should be made. The committee went into the matter very carefully and, after examination, the $840,000 the Senator from Ohio asked for was granted. So that amount is now in the bill. The very fact that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] desires $2,265,000 less than the House allowed shows that the House provisions ought to be changed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator

from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would the Senator mind repeating the purpose of the $840,000 which he recommends be added to the $8,000,000? I happened to be called out of the Chamber just as the Senator was explaining that item.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will do very much better than explain the matter myself. I will refer the Senator to our distinguished colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who is now standing immediately behind the Senator from Vermont and who will explain the matter fully.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am glad to respond to the request for an explanation of the $840,000 proposed to be added to the committee amendment. As the subcommittee recommended originally to the general Appropriations Committee, the cut was from $12,995,504 to $8,000,000. I was not a member of the subcommittee, but being a member of the general Committee on Appropriations and also of the Committee on Civil Service, I made a special examination as to where that cut would fall if it were applied to that extent. In that connection I obtained from the Civil Service Commission an analysis of where the entire cut would fall. It would fall upon eight items. Of those eight items, I picked out three and a fraction of a fourth which seemed to me absolutely essential. I presented those four items to the full Committee on Appropriations, of which the distinguished acting chairman, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], had called a special meeting in order that we might be sure to cover the whole subject.

Those four items are as follows: The first is an item of $350,000. This $350,000, if not appropriated here, would not be available for working with the departments and agencies in order to improve what they call the utilization of personnel now on the Federal pay roll.

After presentation of the Commission's program in this field to the House Committee on Appropriations, Representative JOE STARNES, of Alabama, asked the following question in the House:

> Do you not feel that that—
>
> Referring to personnel utilization—
>
> is probably the biggest problem that we have in dealing with the matter of personnel during the war period—the proper utilization of manpower?

The Commission concurred in that expression by the Representative from Alabama. Apparently his views were concurred in by the entire committee, in view of the fact that the total amount requested for this item was granted by the House of Representatives. The Commission's program in this field is also in line with the recommendations made by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman. The program is an attempt properly to utilize the manpower already in civil service. If the funds available for this activity are reduced by $350,000, the effectiveness of the Commission's work in this area will be seriously impaired.

The Appropriations Committee felt that was really an attempt to bring about greater efficiency and a measure of economy recommended by the committee headed by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. We felt that to omit that item would be short-sighted economy.

The second item is an item of $150,000. If this $150,000 is not appropriated it will not be available for classification of positions in Washington, D. C., and in the field. As a result of funds appropriated by the Congress, the Civil Service Commission has just begun to set classification standards for field positions in an effort to eliminate the chaos in the field, insofar as salaries are concerned, to which the House Committee on Appropriations referred in reporting the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1945. I shall read a paragraph from the report of the committee. This paragraph is the convincing paragraph upon which our committee acted. The House committee points out that in the field there is chaos as between the employees of different departments. The quotation from the House committee report is as follows:

> A number of the agencies appropriated for in this bill have presented requests for increases in their appropriations to cover the cost of the reclassification of certain positions in the field service. The committee is informed by representatives of these services that other agencies in the Government have classified similar positions in grades paying higher salaries and they find they are unable to keep their employees, who are naturally attracted by the offers of higher pay in other agencies for the same work. While the law governing reclassifications places the final authority for the making of such reclassifications for positions in the District of Columbia exclusively in the Civil Service Commission, it has dispersed this authority and responsibility with respect to reclassifications in the field service among the heads of the several departments and agencies. The natural result of such a law is a reasonable degree of uniformity in the matter of reclassifications in the departmental service, but a very wide variance in reclassifications in the field service. This condition promotes a very unhealthy competition among the departments for personnel, which is especially acute during periods of manpower shortage such as the present. It not only promotes confusion among the various field services, resulting from the constant transfer of employees from one service to another, but it creates a constant upward trend in salary levels in the implementation of this competition among the several departments. The committee believes the appropriate legislative committee of the House should give careful study to the unsatisfactory situation in the field service resulting from the provisions of the existing law, with a view of bringing about suitable amendment of the law to remedy this situation.

If $150,000 is withdrawn from this work, it will mean that the Commission's activities in connection with the classification of field positions will be cut in half.

Again, the Appropriations Committee felt that to keep the field positions on the same basis as between the different departments was a constructive measure of economy.

The third item is an item of $200,000. At least $200,000 would no longer be available, under the proposed original cut, for the Commission's work in connection with the administration of the retirement system. I think it is perfectly clear that this item should remain in the appropriation. The proposed cut would mean, for example, that on a conservative basis at least 250,000 claims for refunds of amounts deposited in the retirement account would be awaiting action at the end of the fiscal year 1945. It also would mean that there would be delays running from 6 months to a year in the handling of these claims for refunds. In addition, there would also be delays in connection with the settling of death claims and in the placing of retired Federal employees on the annuity rolls.

The justification for those three items seemed to be clear, beyond question. The remaining $140,000 of $840,000 is merely for the overtime allowance of 20 percent in order to keep up with the $700,000 thus restored to the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if this $840,000 is added, it will provide an appropriation about $4,000,000 less than the House allowed for the Civil Service Commission. Will the Senator explain what that $4,000,000 is taken from? I suppose the Senator from Tennessee explained that matter while I was called out of the Chamber.

Mr. BURTON. I have the corresponding material here, if the Senator would like me to proceed with it.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know what it was.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to have the Senator proceed with the explanation. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. BURTON. This material relates to the remaining four items which the Committee on Appropriations omitted after further consideration. It includes the one which the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is now moving to restore.

Mr. AIKEN. What are those four items?

Mr. BURTON. The first item is the one to which the Senator from California referred. It amounts to $1,890,000. That is the amount urged by the Commission in connection with the recruiting of personnel for the war agencies. If the Senator would care to have me read a brief statement into the RECORD, that will explain it, although the Senator from California already has done so.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Civil Service Commission itself recruit personnel for the war agencies?

Mr. BURTON. So I understand.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that these agencies are fairly capable at recruiting their own personnel.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I do not know who has the floor, but I ask whoever has the floor to yield to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I can speak with certainty only as to the conditions on the Pacific coast, in Alaska, and in Hawaii. In those areas our war agencies throw almost entirely upon the

Civil Service Commission the burden of recruitment and replacement. The representatives of both the Army and the Navy have told me that the Civil Service Commission has done a most excellent job, and that they will feel most unhappy if these funds are cut and if the service which has been rendered by the Commission is injured.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that I have had detailed and rather exhaustive knowledge of conditions existing in the West. I believe the personnel of the Civil Service Commission have done an excellent job in replacement and recruitment work. I know they have worked long hours. I know they have insufficient staffs. So far as the West is concerned, the most critical days still lie ahead of us, we fear, because we do not think the war with Japan is yet over. We think the burden will increase.

I can say from my own personal knowledge—I say this with some humility, but yet with certainty—that the cutting of the total fund by one-third, which is what the proposed reduction amounts to, will so increase the burden on the Civil Service Commission in connection with the replacement of personnel in the war agencies, that the Commission simply will not be able to perform the work it will be called upon to do. The result will be a most serious injury to the war effort.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio know whether that recruiting practice is followed over the entire country?

Mr. BURTON. I understand that practice is carried on. In the report which I have here, a further statement is made with respect to it which may interest my colleague on the Civil Service Committee.

Mr. AIKEN. In connection with the proposed cut in the appropriation for that purpose, what did the committee have in mind with respect to the matter of replacements? Did the committee take the position that the various agencies would do their own recruiting?

Mr. BURTON. Perhaps the acting chairman of the committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], will state what the committee had in mind. Of course, two-thirds of the fund would remain; but the fact is that the committee had in mind reducing the amount by one-third.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission asked for substantially what it had last year. It is apparent to everyone that it does not have the work to do this year that it had last year. If it were to undertake to do this year the amount of work which it did last year, there would not be enough employees in the country. The Commission would have more money than it could possibly use That is shown to a very large extent by the amendment of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], who stated that he offered an amendment providing for $10,730,000, which is $2,265,000 less than the House allowed for this item. There is no charge of inefficiency or incompetency on the part of the Commission. It simply has not that much work to do.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the committee believe that the Commission does not need the money, and would not spend it if it had it?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have no doubt that it would not spend it. It could not spend it if it had it. There is a very great difference of opinion as to how much is needed. It is purely for war purposes. In the appropriation for its regular and ordinary work the Commission would receive about $6,000,000. The Civil Service Commission would receive substantially all it had last year or asked for this year.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Let me offer some further figures to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. In reaching the figure of $10,730,000 which I have placed in the amendment I have offered as a substitute for both the House and Senate provisions, I have considered only the expected replacements, and no new hiring. Replacements in the United States civil-service work are now running at about 5 percent a month. To be safe, we calculated the replacements at only 4½ percent a month. Then we took the most conservative figure that could be agreed upon as to the cost of making each replacement under those conditions. That brings the total to $10,730,000. I am told that there was no detailed information before the Appropriations Committee by which it reached its figure of $8,840,000. The figure I am submitting, of $10,730,000, was based upon what we conservatively believe will happen.

I should like to add while I have the floor that literally hundreds of thousands of civil-service workers have been brought into the western part of the United States, principally into Army and Navy installations. They were brought in by cooperation with civil-service agencies in the various regions throughout the United States. I know that a great many arrangements have been worked out in the New England region, for example, and in the Middle West. So I know that the Civil Service Commission is performing a valuable function.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose this appropriation is not sufficient to do what the Senator from California feels might be required. Is there any reason why deficiency appropriations could not be made at a later date? Would it interfere with the work if the appropriation were made on the basis that if the amount were insufficient, a deficiency appropriation could be made later?

Mr. DOWNEY. As I understand, if the figure is fixed at $8,840,000 instead of $10,730,000, immediately about one-third of the workers who are at the present time engaging in recruitment and replacement work will have to be discharged. I am trying to speak conservatively and realistically. I think that would be a most serious injury to the war effort of the Nation. I know that would be true on the Pacific Coast.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, to comment on the matter a little further, my distinguished colleague from Vermont is a member of the Civil Service Committee, together with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY]——

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The committee had the benefit of all the hearings before the House committee on this subject. It had all the facts. We are all aware of the fact that the hump in civil-service employment is over. It would not be possible to obtain as many employees during the coming year as have been obtained this year. It would be impossible to get them. They do not exist.

Mr. BURTON. To complete the discussion of this particular item, I wish to emphasize to my colleagues on the Civil Service Committee that in presenting these matters to the Appropriations Committee I selected the four which seemed to be the most striking and vital of the group. This one involved a reduction of one-third of an item. If the question were sent to conference, the House would be enabled to discuss that question on its merits. Even that one-third impressed me as not being all in the same class. For example, a reduction of one-third would involve two kinds of activities. It is stated on behalf of the Civil Service Commission that its activities in connection with recruiting for Pearl Harbor and for other key navy yards, for War Department manufacturing establishments, and for the Veterans' Administration, including, of course, hospitalization facilities, would be crippled. That is the vital factor in the argument.

On the other hand, it has been stated that this would come at just the time when Congress has under consideration the enactment of veterans' preference legislation, which will place upon the Commission important responsibilities designed to protect the rights of veterans to preference for Federal jobs. The Commission states that if these proposed cuts are made it will be absolutely impossible for it to discharge its responsibilities in an expeditious manner.

The Commission is anticipating something which does not now exist. It might very well be that if legislation were enacted, and there were more preference work to be done, the Commission would have a stronger claim at that time than it has at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, it is a dreary and dismal fact, but, in my opinion, the Nation is failing in its responsibility toward returning veterans. That is true in California, at least. Hospitalization, veterans' service, and veterans' reemployment are not functioning as they should. It is a sad thing that while we talk so patriotically, we cannot, by our energy and vision, measure up to our responsibilities. I know of hundreds of sad cases of veterans who have been wounded or made sick in the service of their country, who are not receiving proper attention in California. I have

no doubt that there are tens of thousands of such cases in the United States. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Ohio that this appropriation goes directly to that problem. The number of nurses and interns in veterans' hospitals, at least in California, is not sufficient to afford decent treatment. We have not been able to obtain the number of Federal employees we need there. The employees of the Commission have been working overtime. I dread to think what would happen if a reduction were made in the personnel.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, to complete the reply to the Senator from Vermont on the other three items involved, which are not presented by the Senator from California, they may be briefly summarized as follows:

One of them is $1,000,000, which will not be available to investigate the suitability and loyalty of persons selected for key war positions.

Another is an item of $200,000 which will not be available for use in connection with studies which the Commission constantly makes in an effort to improve its methods of doing business in connection with personnel, budget, purchasing, and other staff and administrative services.

The final item is $500,000, which will not be available for travel in connection with investigating activities for carrying on the special recruiting programs for such establishments as Pearl Harbor, navy yards, and so forth, which are related to the other items.

I am recommending that we approve the committee recommendation of $8,840,000, but that the rest of the matters go to conference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that the committee has gone very carefully into this subject, as shown by the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. We did not act capriciously in any way. When the Senator from Ohio, who is a member of the Civil Service Committee, brought before the Appropriations Committee the items which were important, and made his argument to the committee, the committee agreed to them, and we increased the amount from $8,000,000 to $8,840,000.

In my opinion, the committee has acted with great care. We have not disapproved what the Civil Service Commission has done. We wish to help the Commission in every way; but there is no use in appropriating for it money which admittedly it does not need. It does not need as much as the House has allowed. Therefore, I hope that the committee amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a very brief word about the situation. I was absent from the city most of the time while this bill was before the committee. I was a member of the funeral committee which went to Oregon. My experience, I believe, is the experience of every other Senator. When we are away and miss something it is almost impossible, with the burdens of daily work, to go back and pick up the threads and bring ourselves up to date.

I do not pretend to know what is the precise amount which should be provided with respect to this matter. My impression was that the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio of lifting the original Senate committee figure from $8,000,000 to $8,840,000 was eminently fair.

What impresses me is that if we accept the amendment now offered by the committee, and originally sponsored by the Senator from Ohio, it will give to the conference committee the very widest latitude. There is a gap there between the sum of $8,840,000 and approximately $13,000,000. That would present to the conference committee the fullest opportunity again to consider the matter, weigh the evidence before the House committee, and later before the Senate committee, and reach what would be a fair figure.

I have one other thought in mind. I think this is an illustration—we meet it over and over again—of the complete unwillingness of any agency of the Government to let go of a dollar which it has ever received. I do not blame the Civil Service Commission for being reluctant to take any cut. I doubt if they would be qualified for their jobs if they were not earnest and zealous in their work. However, I feel that there is a tremendous obligation resting on the Congress to cut expenses wherever it is possible. I urge that in the present instance as an additional reason why the whole matter, with wide range of authority, should be in the conference committee, and I have faith that the conference committee will do justice to all concerned. I very much hope that the amendment of the Senator from California will not be agreed to, but that the figure recommended by the committee will have the approval of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] to the committee amendment, as modified, on page 9, line 11.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 11, as modified.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what is the question now before the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 9, line 11, as modified, changing the figure to $8,840,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1285) to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment of the committee was on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order No. 9358 of July 1, 1943.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like respectfully to object to the amendment. It was discussed in our committee meeting, and, although it was not reconsidered at the time we held a special meeting on this subject, I reserved the right to raise the question on the floor of the Senate for two reasons:

First, allow me to state what the substance of the amendment is. I object to it on its merits, and particularly on the ground that it should be handled through the Civil Service Committee as regular legislation, rather than as a part of an appropriation bill.

What this amendment does is to prohibit the spending of any money for the Legal Examining Unit in the Civil Service Commission; that is to say, it prohibits from now on any civil-service examinations of lawyers. It seems to me that it amounts to a matter of substance. Some lawyers employed by the Government now take civil-service examinations and some do not. The amendment would require a change in that policy; and it would seem to me that in line with the steps taken about a year ago the matter should be left to the civil-service committees and the other standing committees of Congress to make recommendations upon the subject.

A few years ago there was appointed by the President a special committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Stanley Reed, to make recommendations for civil-service improvement. That committee made a recommendation that lawyers be put under civil service.

There was a division in the committee as to the mechanics for handling such examinations. One group recommended that there be a board which would have priority over the Civil Service Commission, and another group recommended that the procedure be through the Civil Service Commission. The Appropriations Committee of the House, I believe it was, objected to acting upon an appropriation for the board of examiners until after the matter had been passed upon as a question of substantive law.

A bill was thereupon introduced in the House and passed by it to authorize the creation of a board of legal examiners. When the bill reached the Senate it was

referred to the Civil Service Committee of the Senate. It was considered at length by that committee. There was divided opinion in the committee, and a majority of its members was against a recommendation of the bill. Therefore, as the matter now stands, there is no appropriation pending to provide for the creation of a board of legal examiners, and that is as it should be.

On the other hand, there are funds available for continuing the work of the regular legal examining unit. It seems to me that the Appropriations Committee is reversing its policy when it now undertakes to pass upon the subject as a matter of law, abolish the existing procedure of examining by a legal examining unit, and prevent civil-service examinations being held without first referring that matter to the Civil Service Committees of the House and the Senate for the purpose of letting them pass upon the merits of the legislation. Therefore, I believe it would be consistent with the previous action of the Appropriations Committee not to act on any change proposed in the legal examining method until it had been first acted upon by the standing committees dealing with that particular subject. Therefore, I believe we should vote down any such action, at least in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio has stated the history of this particular board. There has been a difference of opinion about it. Most lawyers, I believe, correctly feel that lawyers employed by the Government should be selected by men who are learned in the law and who know something about the legal profession.

How in the world can a civil-service agent sent to New York, or to Memphis, or to any other city in the country, determine as to the ability and qualifications of lawyers who are to work for the Government? To my mind it is idle; we are just throwing away time and money in making such investigations as that. Therefore, the Department of Justice was very much in favor of a board of legal examiners; such a board was established by Executive order and, if it had been allowed to operate under the Department of Justice, in my judgment it would have done a splendid work. I hope that the problem may be solved along that line, but the idea of the Civil Service Commission reporting on lawyers and their ability and fairness and their relative qualifications, to my mind, is something that cannot be done. Probably it ought to be left to lawyers to ascertain what kind of lawyer should be employed in the Government service.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I recall that the matter came before the Civil Service Committee, and I may say that I agreed with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did and we voted together.

Mr. BURTON. I supported the board of legal examiners, but that was voted down. Now what I understand has taken place is that a board of legal examiners is, as a matter of fact, acting in an advisory capacity to the Civil Service Commission, and the Civil Service Commission is having the benefit of that procedure, although the Commission is not now under the control of the board as it would have been under the plan originally proposed. So I believe we are getting the benefit of examination by lawyers, but, if we cut off all civil-service examination, it seems to me that we then throw the whole matter open, do away with veterans' preferences, and create a position which is not sound.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Departments of Justice, State, and Commerce and Labor appropriation bill is before the Appropriations Committee at this time, and I hope it may be worked out in the Department of Justice section of the appropriation bill in such a way that the question may be properly settled. But surely we ought not to have legal examiners, from another State ordinarily, going into a city to find out about lawyers. It is very difficult for such an examiner to pass upon the ability of lawyers. It is wrong, according to my opinion.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, when the bill establishing a board of legal examiners came before the Civil Service Committee I did not agree with the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Ohio on it, because I could not see why lawyers should be set aside as a privileged class, to be selected by a board of their own members, and particularly when the board had powers greater than the Civil Service Commission itself. If that is done for the lawyers, there is no reason why accountants should not say that their members in Federal employ should be selected by a special board of accountants, and why employees of the Department of Agriculture should not be selected by a board of farmers, and so on. So I opposed the entire bill, and I believe we will be very wise to oppose also this proposed amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I recognize that there are arguments on both sides of this question as to how legal talent to be taken into the Government service should be secured. It seems to me, however, that that matter should be determined by the legislative committees of the respective Houses. The effect of this amendment will be to strike down the only method which we now have in existence for the selection of lawyers for employment in the Government service. I think it should be pointed out that the Civil Service Commission is now passing upon and is the screening agency through which come many of the other professional and scientific persons employed by the Government. It seems to me, especially in view of the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], that the Civil Service Commission is securing the benefit of the advice of the examining board, that we should not in the interim while this controversy is going on as to what method should be employed put a stop to the only machinery which is now in operation for the selection of legal personnel for the Government service on a merit basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment. [Putting the question.] By the sound the ayes seem to have it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

Mr. EASTLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Pepper
Andrews	George	Radcliffe
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Gurney	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Shipstead
Brewster	Hayden	Stewart
Bridges	Hill	Taft
Brooks	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Kilgore	Tobey
Bushfield	La Follette	Tunnell
Byrd	Langer	Vandenberg
Capper	McCarran	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Walsh, N. J.
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Weeks
Connally	McKellar	Wheeler
Danaher	Maloney	Wherry
Davis	Mead	White
Downey	Millikin	Willis
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Ellender	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair state the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division was called for on the committee amendment at the bottom of page 9.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the committee amendment at the bottom of page 9, I believe, should not be adopted for two reasons: First, I believe it should be acted upon by the proper legislative committee of the Senate before it is presented to the Senate; and, second, I believe that on its merits it is not a sound provision. The substance of the provision or amendment is that—

> No part of the appropriations herein made for the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission.

In other words, by failure to appropriate it abolishes all civil-service examinations in the selection of lawyers for Government service.

Mr. President, this is a matter which has been under consideration by the Congress for some time. The history of it explains the situation simply, I think. In 1941 the President received a report from a special committee on civil-service improvement, headed by Mr. Justice Stanley Reed. That committee recommended that lawyers be brought under the civil-service system. There has been a controversy over the manner of examination.

In connection with the first appropriation made to carry out the plan advocated by a majority of the special committee, provision was made for a board of legal examiners, but the Appropriations Committee of the House pointed out that they would decline to appropriate further until the legislative com-

mittees of the Houses of Congress had acted upon the matter, and a bill had been passed which would authorize the creation of a board of legal examiners. Since that time the House has passed and authorized the creation of a board of legal examiners. When the bill reached the Senate, the Senate committee turned it down. Therefore at the present time the lawyers are being examined by the regular agencies of the Civil Service Commission, with the members of the board of legal examiners acting in an advisory capacity, thereby giving the Commission the benefit of their advice, but not controlling their final action.

If, however, the appropriations bill contains this provision abolishing even that form of examination, then the appropriations bill itself will abolish all examinations for lawyers. This would be contrary to the recommendations of the Reed committee, and would result in the return of lawyers to a patronage basis, making impossible the application to them of the veterans' preference provisions already in the statutes.

For years there have been some lawyers who have been chosen through civil-service examinations. They would no longer be chosen under civil-service procedure. The amendment would also eliminate the services of lawyers more recently placed under the civil service. Therefore I believe this provision should not be approved in the pending bill, because it has not yet had the approval of the legislative committee of the Senate, and I believe that on the merits it is not sound to abolish all civil-service examinations for lawyers in the Federal service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this provision does not interfere with the civil-service status of lawyers already in the service. It merely provides that no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used for the purpose of conducting such examinations.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. BURTON. I did not mean to say it would affect those already in the civil service, but it would affect any new applications for appointments to positions in the Federal service which for years have come under civil-service examination procedure.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would affect them. The Senator will recall that there was great doubt on this question in the minds of the members of the first committee appointed. Mr. Justice Reed and some of his associates looked at the matter one way, and some the other way. The fact is that the legislative committee of the Senate did not act on the subject, did not present it to the Senate, and it has not been presented to the Senate, and we are merely going along getting lawyers for the Government selected by civil service.

To my mind, it would not have been possible to choose a way more improper than by the ordinary civil-service examiner going into a town and undertaking to ascertain anything about a lawyer, in an effort to find whether he should be in the civil service or not. We have seen some of the results of that kind of procedure.

Furthermore, I have no doubt that if the provision proposed shall be agreed to, as it should be agreed to, the proper legislative committee will report a bill providing for a legal examining board, and that hereafter good lawyers will be secured through examination before that board.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I recall, when a year or two ago we passed a bill broadening the civil service, taking into the civil service nearly everyone in the Government employ, we exempted from the provisions United States district attorneys and their assistants.

Mr. McKELLAR. We did.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the theory that the best way to select a good lawyer was not to put him through the ordinary civil-service examination.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which might not always reveal a man's capacity for dealing with the duties of a legal position.

I do not know that the lawyers chosen in the manner now provided are required to go up against the ability of the bar in the trying of cases in court, as in the case of United States attorneys and assistant attorneys, but I imagine that perhaps some of them are. I do not wish to have the legal profession assume that the appointment of lawyers is a matter of patronage.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nor do I.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that would be most unfortunate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think a board should be appointed in the Department of Justice.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think there should be a legal examining board somewhere to pass upon the qualifications of applicants, and pass upon them in the light of the special ability required of lawyers to do given jobs. If I can feel sure that that will be done in the regular way, whether in the pending bill or in some other measure, I shall be inclined to vote for the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall do everything in the world possible to have a board legally established, and with the proper grade of employees, to examine lawyers, so that the very best possible attorneys may be obtained for Government work.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall vote for the Senator's amendment, because I do not think the Civil Service Commission is in any way competent to pass on the qualifications of lawyers. But I hope the Senator will pursue the suggestion made by the Senator from Kentucky and the suggestion he himself has just made, because I am frank to say that I am no better satisfied with Justice Frankfurter selecting all the lawyers in the Government than in having the Civil Service Commission select them. I think there should be some board somewhere competent to pass on the qualifications of lawyers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think so.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am not satisfied with either the Civil Service Commission or Justice Frankfurter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. Unquestionably, in my opinion, the amendment should be agreed to. I can only say to the Senate that I shall use my best endeavors to see that a legal board of examiners is established, one which can select properly qualified lawyers to provide for the Government's necessities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. This is a substantial matter, one of importance, and I think we should have a yea-and-nay vote on it.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say before the vote is taken that the vote is on the committee amendment, and those who desire to sustain it, and not have lawyers examined by the Civil Service Commission, will vote "yea." I hope the amendment will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, beginning in line 18, on page 9. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I do not know how he would vote on this question if he were present. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I understand that if he were present, he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. I am not advised how he would vote if present and voting. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in various Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has been called from the Senate to attend an important conference. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GORDON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. GORDON] would vote "yea" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—49

Andrews	Gurney	Russell
Bailey	Hatch	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hawkes	Stewart
Barkley	Hayden	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Kilgore	Tobey
Bushfield	McCarran	Tunnell
Byrd	McClellan	Walsh, N. J.
Capper	McFarland	Weeks
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Wheeler
Connally	Maloney	Wherry
Davis	Millikin	White
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Willis
Ellender	Overton	Wilson
George	Revercomb	
Gillette	Robertson	

NAYS—15

Aiken	Danaher	Langer
Austin	Downey	Mead
Brewster	Ferguson	Pepper
Burton	Hill	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	La Follette	Wagner

NOT VOTING—32

Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bilbo	Jackson	Reynolds
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Butler	Lucas	Smith
Caraway	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Moore	Truman
Chavez	Murdock	Tydings
Cordon	Murray	Wallgren
Gerry	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Glass	O'Daniel	Wiley
Green	Radcliffe	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission," on page 11, line 18, before the word "maintenance", to strike out "purchase (not to exceed seven"; in line 20, after the word "expenses", to insert "not to exceed $39,000"; and on page 12, line 2, after the word "amended", to strike out "$2,209,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 18, before the word "not", to strike out "not to exceed 20 passenger-carrying automobiles."

The amendment was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. James A. O'Leary, late a Representative from the State of New York, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4073) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 1, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$4,491,143" and insert "$4,-191,143."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have an amendment——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the amendment in line 2, on page 12, was agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. That amendment is involved with the amendment which the Senator from New York now proposes to offer.

Mr. MEAD. I have an amendment, Mr. President, which covers that matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee amendment having been agreed to when it was reached, and it being involved in the same situation as the amendment which the Senator from New York proposes to offer on page 13, I think the vote by which the committee amendment on page 12, line 2, was agreed to should be reconsidered so the whole subject may be considered together.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have referred to only one amendment, but I think the Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot agree to an amendment and then later agree to another amendment which nullifies our action on the first one. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment on page 12, line 2, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am about to offer an amendment which I trust will be given consideration by this body, and which affects the various reductions which have been made both by the House and the Senate committee in the appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission. The amendments by which the House reduced the appropriation for this agency includes the following: $1,000,000 from the Radio Intelligence Division; $500,000 from the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; $113,607 for new positions requested; $21,897 for the Personnel Division; $19,353 for the Budget and Planning Division.

The Senate committee further reduced the appropriation by $209,000, which is recommended to be taken from the regular appropriation to be applied to unspecified activities, and $300,000 from the national defense appropriation to be applied to unspecified activities.

Altogether, the total reductions resulting from the seven Senate committee and House amendments amount to $2,163,857.

Mr. President, at this point I send to the desk and offer an amendment on page 13, line 1. I propose that in lieu of the matter proposed the figure "$6,146,000" be inserted, as against "$4,191,143." I should like to have the clerk read the amendment for the benefit of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 1, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert "$6,146,000."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, if the amendment is adopted there should also be adopted an amendment to the committee amendment on page 12, line 2, namely, the figure "$2,000,000" in line 2 should be stricken out, and the figure "$2,209,000" inserted in lieu thereof.

I shall discuss the entire question now, and then shall return first to the amendment on page 12, and later to the amendment which I have offered, which encompasses practically all the amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Washington. I yield now to him. Next I will yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, before the Senator explains the purport of his amendment I should like to understand one matter clearly. I understand that the Senator from New York has indicated that the total reduction in the appropriation for this agency, both as the result of the Senate committee action and as the result of the House action, is approximately $2,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. That figure includes the $500,000 cut recommended by the Senate committee; does it?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; approximately.

Mr. BONE. I wish to have that point made clear, so that as we approach this matter we shall understand that the Federal Communications Commission has had $2,000,000 cut from its budget by the action of the House and of the Senate committees.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. In effect, what the Senator's amendment would do would be merely to add $2,000,000 more to the funds which will be used by an agency which, as has been clearly shown in the Appropriations Committee hearings, is duplicating the work of other agencies, and which is opposed by the War Department, the Navy Department, and other departments which have the winning of the war under their direction. Is that not correct?

Mr. MEAD. It is not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well; I ask the Senator to explain why.

Mr. MEAD. That is what I was about to do when the Senator asked the privilege of the floor, in order to tell me where he stood. If I may have the patience and the attention of the Senator, I shall do my best to explain why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator will not convince me; I assure him of that.

Mr. MEAD. I should like to have the Senator's patience and forbearance until I explain what I have in mind.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly, but in this matter I shall go along with the recommendations of the men who are handling our part in the war.

Mr. MEAD. That is fine. I am very glad to have that information.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. Since the Senator from New Hampshire is going along with the recommendations of the War Department and the Navy Department, it might be pertinent to suggest that the President of the United States, to whom those suggestions were made, did not go along, but declined to transfer this activity from the Federal Communications Commission to them, for reasons which he stated in his letter.

Mr. MEAD. And the high-ranking military officer in charge of our Signal Corps, after an investigation of the subject, made a very commendable report on the activity of this agency.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to yield to the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that it was the opinion of the committee that there was a difference of opinion between the President and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and that, as a matter of fact, it was shown that this work is done by the Army and the Navy, and it was undoubtedly shown that there was duplication. We gave Mr. Fly 2 or 3 days before the committee to establish his claim, with maps, plans, specifications, and testimony. I am sure the Senator will recall that he was given every possible opportunity to submit reasons why there was no duplication. Such reasons were never presented to the committee. I do not think anyone would deny that there is duplication.

Mr. MEAD. I know that the distinguished acting chairman of our committee gave Mr. Fly unlimited time; and I am sure he would satisfy Mr. Fly a little better if he gave him less time and more money to operate the agency.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure of that.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I do not wish to guide this discussion into other channels, but I was tremendously intrigued by the statement of my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I hope he will come closer while I delicately suggest a little fact of Senate history to him.

My able friend from New Hampshire suggested that in this matter he wished to follow the advice of the executive heads of the defense departments, the Army and Navy. I assume that he feels that their judgment is not to be challenged, and that the infinitude of their wisdom and the plenitude of their powers are such as to induce immediate compliance on our part with their suggestions.

Let me say to my good friend that a few years ago in the Senate—and I think he was then a Member—I made bold to rise on the floor of the Senate and to defend a proposal which I had introduced in the form of a bill. At that time, when war clouds were hovering ominously over the world, and every sane person knew that there was a strong possibility of this country being incontinently plunged into war, I was deeply impressed with the belief that war was near. I then suggested to my Senate brethren that we immediately expand our arsenals and navy yards to such a degree as at least to be able to take care of the peacetime needs of the country. This would have given us a great back-log of preparedness in the way of new and vitally needed equipment and war facilities.

I proposed that we at once get rid of all the old machinery, old buildings, and old equipment, and modernize our arsenals and navy yards. I suggested, furthermore, that we lay in an enormous stock of jigs, dies, tools, and machine fixtures, and store them in warehouses, so that on a moment's notice we could tool factories and arm this country to the teeth. Men connected with the machine-tool industry came to me at that time and said that that would be manna from heaven for them. Thousands of machinists were walking the streets. They would have been more than glad to have jobs producing vital machine tools. I wanted to see the machine tools fabricated and stored in warehouses so that if we should be plunged into war, as we finally were at Pearl Harbor, we could proceed to arm the country overnight by putting those machine tools to work immediately.

I now ask the Senator from New Hampshire who he thinks opposed that proposal? Perhaps he knows.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know.

Mr. BONE. I am curious to know what sort of a guess he would make as to who opposed what I then thought and now know was a very sound and patriotic proposal. I wanted my country armed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Based upon my experience in 1937, when, in conjunction with the then Senator Berry, of Tennessee, I introduced a bill to prohibit the shipment of scrap iron and steel to Japan, which was opposed by the administration and by certain appeasers in this country, I should say that probably it was the administration which opposed the Senator's proposal.

Mr. BONE. Let me digress to say to my good brother from New Hampshire that if he can find any Member of this body more eager in his efforts to stop that sort of business and more eager to suppress men who were making money out of that bloody kind of traffic than his humble friend from Washington I wish he would name him.

I have repeatedly stood on this floor and with a fervor that registered 800 in the shade denounced arming our potential enemies. I saw millions of tons of scrap steel going through the ports of the Pacific coast to arm Hirohito and give him a navy that now menaces this Republic. I saw oil and many other things going to Japan, and I denounced such traffic as a vicious thing. The same thing was true about our helping to arm Germany. But businessmen in this country were making money out of it. It was officialdom in the Army and Navy which objected to my proposal to arm this country long before the war hit us, by bigger and better arsenals and navy yards. My machine-tool proposal fell on deaf ears.

So when the Senator says to me that the Army and the Navy are opposed to something, I merely refresh his memory by some interesting sidelights on this war picture. If my advice had been followed at that time, we should have had arsenals and Navy yards with vastly increased capacities. We should have had great stocks of machine tools stored away so that we would not have run into the machine-tool bottleneck which we experienced when war hit us.

This is not an argument against the Army and Navy leaders, but it is at least a persuasive argument, in my judgment, against the impeccability of their views. I will not accept the view of any department as a finality. There is no such thing. What our businessmen sold to Hitler and Hirohito is now coming back to us in bloody "bundles for America."

I think the Federal Communications Commission has done a good job in this war. I know that it has done a good job in monitoring and chasing down the elusive shadows of dangerous ideologies and important foreign broadcasts. I do not believe we should indict the Commission's work as being something not worth while. It has made a valuable contribution to our war effort. No one knows how many boys' lives may have been saved by its efforts.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me ask the Senator from Washington who he thinks is better qualified to say whether or not the Federal Communications Commission has been rendering good service in aid of the war effort—the War and Navy Departments, or the Senator from

Washington and the Senator from New York?

Mr. BONE. I think there is room in this pattern of war for exactly what the Federal Communications Commission has been doing, and I cannot agree with the Senator that because the War and Navy Departments object to something, that position is necessarily sound. I think our experience has demonstrated that it is not. The Senator is not accurate in saying that the War and Navy Departments are a part of this political administration. Those Departments are largely headed by West Point and Annapolis men, many of them prominent Republicans. The heads of these two Departments are also old-line Republicans.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I appreciate this contribution. I wish to take this opportunity to insert in the RECORD some information which will indicate that some of the authorities interested in the prosecution of the war, including the Commander in Chief himself, have passed on this question and have approved the position taken by the Federal Communications Commission, and have commended that agency for its splendid services and for its cooperation with the agencies of Government having to do with the war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator say that Mr. Roosevelt, to whom he refers as Commander in Chief, is running the war, or that General Marshall, Secretary Stimson, Admiral King, and Secretary Knox are running it? Have we political domination in conducting the war, or are the military and naval chiefs conducting it?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not know whether this is a collection of "$64" questions, or whether it is merely another evidence of the impatience of my distinguished colleague. At the outset I said that I would try to answer him. I did not have an opportunity to do so. I again stated that I would take the floor, deviate from my prescribed course, and answer the Senator, when, lo and behold, I was inundated with another flood of questions. Now, if I start to answer those questions, I trust that I shall enjoy the patience of my colleagues until I shall have answered them.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish the Senator would start with the last question, because it is fundamental. Are the Army and Navy chiefs conducting this war, or do we have political direction from the White House?

Mr. MEAD. There is evidently no political association so far as the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is concerned. The Senator would not admit that there is any political affiliation so far as either the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is concerned. Of course, they are above politics; but I take it from the Senator's statement that there may be some politics so far as the Commander in Chief is concerned. I am only trying to discern the inferences in the Senator's statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not believe that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and their chiefs of staff, and the various generals and admirals are playing politics. They are trying to win the war. I want Mr. Roosevelt to let them conduct the war without interference and I do not want to see him on an issue like this go over the heads of those in actual direction of the Army and Navy.

Mr. MEAD. Therefore, it is the Senator's opinion that so far as the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, are concerned, there is absolutely no politics whatever, but that so far as the Commander in Chief is concerned there is altogether too much politics. I am very glad to have that information because it will have some effect on what I am trying to say.

Mr. President, the statement was made that there was duplication, that all this work was done by the War Department. I wish to say in connection with that suggestion that when the House cut the appropriation by $1,000,000, on the sole basis that the Commission was engaged in military radio intelligence work which duplicated the work of the armed forces, the record did not support that position. The record indicates that the Commission is not engaged in radio intelligence of a military character. It is not engaged in a work of a military character. That is left entirely to the military. There is no duplication. Military radio intelligence is concerned with information as to the plans of the enemy and the disposition of its military forces insofar as that information can be intercepted by means of radio facilities.

In the early days of the war the inadequacy of our military preparation extended into the radio intelligence field. The Commission experts who were engaged in the job of guarding against subversive, illegal radio operations were at that time urgently requested by both the Army and the Navy to lend them a helping hand. They did so. That was not duplication. It was an invitation which was extended at that time, and the Commission responded admirably.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New York has made the point I wanted to emphasize, namely, that the F. C. C. does not enter the field of military intelligence unless the Army or the Navy specifically requests it to enter that field in order to assist or to serve the Army or the Navy.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. President, as I said before, there is no duplication. There have been in times past, and there may be in the future, isolated cases of the armed services requesting the Commission to do a specific job. Only when it is requested to do so, only when it is invited to do so, will it join in the task assigned to it by the Army and the Navy. But, certainly, that does not involve duplication.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. TOBEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MEAD. I yield first to the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that if that is all this agency is going to do, the appropriation requested is a tremendous price to pay. Both the Army and the Navy have a perfect system of monitoring, radioing, and doing all this work themselves. As the Senator will remember, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Marshall, and the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral King, entered into an agreement that they would take over the whole thing. But that agreement died. So, as a war effort, if the Chief of Naval Operations and the Chief of Staff of the Army can not be trusted to say what should go in, I do not see how anyone else could. However, for the Federal Communications Commission to set up an additional establishment for the purpose of rendering a service to the Army and the Navy, when the Army and the Navy have given the most perfect service of that kind in the world, would seem to me to be duplication. I merely wished to call the Senator's attention to those facts.

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad the distinguished acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee has called my attention to those facts; but I believe that upon review, while we should like to have it understood and universally acknowledged that the Army and the Navy have this all-inclusive service which the Senator claims, namely, this monitoring and radioing service, it will be found to be a fact that the Army and Navy must occasionally depend upon the Federal Communications Commission for the performance of certain tasks, military in character, which are assigned to the Federal Communications Commission as a result of the fact that for a long period of years, from the very beginning of the use of radio, they built up the organization. They have the experts. They are capable of performing the service required. They have sufficient manpower to do certain types of work which the military is not equipped to do.

Another point is that it is the Federal Communications Commission, not the military, which does the monitoring of broadcasts coming from enemy countries. It is the United States Federal Communications Commission which does the policing of the United States radio network. If there is any subversiveness by means of the radio, if there is an agent representing any foreign country, either in the United States or in any of its Territories, who uses the radio, it is the Federal Communications Commission which runs him down and brings him to justice. So the Federal Communications Commission has a monitoring service. The Federal Communications Commission has its own radio espionage service. The Federal Communications Commission has its all-embracing radio police service, while the military has a distinctly military service which has to do with the movement of troops, and the military actions of the enemy nations. So there is no duplication.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. Is the Senator from New York familiar with a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, written by Admiral Leahy on February 1, 1943, and later concurred in by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and which was later endorsed by a letter to the President of the United States, signed by Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; I have a copy of both those letters, and I have a copy of the President's reply to them.

Mr. TOBEY. I also have a copy of the reply.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. I am trying to reconcile the various statements which the Senator has made. Of course, I know that we accept at par all that he says, but we are all apt to err. In the letter sent to the President of the United States by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, and the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, reviewing the situation from a military standpoint, and citing the powers which the F. C. C. is now exercising, they came to the conclusion that those powers should be transferred to the Army and the Navy for better prosecution of the war. I quote one paragraph of the letter:

> In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi-military radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy.

Is the Senator familiar with that quotation? There is a definite statement that the better prosecution of the war will be served by the transfer of these facilities from the F. C. C. to the Army and Navy. That letter went out on February 4 to the President of the United States. For many months it went unanswered. It was written on February 4, but it was September 7 before an answer was received from the White House—7 months. The answer that came back to the Army and Navy from the Commander in Chief turned down the request which had been made and stated:

> Your suggestion has been given careful study by the staff of the Executive offices. After full consideration I have determined that the transfer should not be made.

I shall not read the remainder of the letter.

So we have hanging in the balance like the sword of Damocles for a period of 7 months a great important issue which existed in the Army and Navy. In all that time no reply was made to the letter by the President and then he said he had made up his mind on the advice of the White House staff. Who does the Senator think composed the White House staff which turned down the request of the Army and Navy? I should like to have his professional opinion upon it.

Mr. MEAD. Is that the end of the question?

Mr. TOBEY. No; it is only series 1.

Mr. MEAD. I see.

Mr. TOBEY. The worst is yet to come.

Mr. MEAD. If I have an opportunity to answer the question, let me say that it is my understanding that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy wrote the letter to the President without a personal investigation, so far as they were concerned, into the subject matter contained in the letter. They in turn wrote the letter for someone who brought the matter to their attention. The President of the United States, the Commander in Chief, however, discussed the matter with every agency of the Government involved and with the members of the military that are attached to the White House. He also discussed it with other military officers. In his widespread consideration, he referred it from one agency to another, and when the matter was thoroughly considered he brought it to the attention of the Secretaries in the letter which he wrote. If the Senator will let me read from the President's letter it will be only fair, in view of the fact that I let the Senator read in my time from other letters.

Mr. TOBEY. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do that, but may I interpolate a question?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire to read from the President's letter.

Mr. TOBEY. Did that conference with the President take in the distinguished military genius, Harry Hopkins?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I want to be very courteous, and I will ask my distinguished colleague to allow me to conclude my answer.

Mr. TOBEY. I acknowledge my error.

Mr. MEAD. With that in mind, I want to read from the President's letter just as the Senator read from letters directed to the President. This is a letter directed by the President to the Secretaries. I quote from the President's letter:

> DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in response to your letter of February 8, 1943, signed by you and Secretary Stimson—

This letter is addressed to Secretary Knox—

> proposing an Executive order transferring the radio intelligence functions of the Federal Communications Commission to the War and Navy Departments. Your suggestion has been given careful study by the staff of the Executive offices. After full consideration I have determined that the transfer should not be made.
>
> The work of the Radio Intelligence Division of the Commission was founded upon the long existing radio-monitoring functions carried on by the Commission as a part of its essential peacetime work. The need for the expansion of these functions was brought to my attention prior to our entry into the war and I approved the general set-up.

So this was the second time the President went into it.

Quoting the President's letter further:

> Expansion has been made to meet the wartime needs of the Commission itself and of other agencies of the Government.

Continuing the President's letter, I read:

> The Radio Intelligence Division serves important wartime needs of several of the civilian Government agencies in the radio intelligence field, including the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Censorship, the Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Weather Bureau, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and others. In addition—

The President goes on to say—

> I understand that the Commission stands ready to perform for the Army and Navy such services as are expressly requested by them. The Commission and its Chairman have expressed to me their desire to cooperate with the Army and Navy in every possible way.

I quote further from the President's letter:

> It is my desire that matters of the kind presented by the present proposal be dealt with at the outset by conferences between the interested agencies. If differences should occur, the matter should be reviewed by the Board of War Communications, which is the responsible interdepartmental body I have charged with the responsibility in the field of wartime communications.

So the President concludes by setting up a system whereby all these matters of interest to so many departments can be thoroughly discussed and ironed out.

Now I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. In response to the Senator's last statement that the President was setting up this agency to adjudicate these matters, let me point out to the Senator that that is a matter of tweedledee and tweedledum. The F. C. C. is practically a one-man Commission. James Lawrence Fly dominates the Board. I know that to be a fact. The Board to which the Senator referred, the Board of War Communications to which to make appeals, is also dominated by James Lawrence Fly. So Mr. Fly acts in both capacities.

Now coming back to the statement of the Senator from New York—and I know he will realize that there is nothing personal in what I now say—he brings in a statement that attempts to justify the President turning down Secretary Knox's and Secretary Stimson's request that these powers be returned to them, and he says to the Senate, in effect, that Secretary Knox and Secretary Stimson acted merely in a pro forma way, that some dummy in some office, some subordinate, put a letter before them which they signed without knowing the contents of the letter, and sent it to the President. That is what the Senator implied, did he not?

Mr. MEAD. I wish the Senator would withdraw that word. I said that the Secretaries did not make a personal investigation of the matter. I pointed out that the President went to great lengths in making a study of the matter. The President reviewed it twice. I infer that the Secretaries personally did not review it. I left the thought that the officers under them took the matter up and brought the letter to the attention of the Secretaries.

Mr. TOBEY. There are in Washington what are known as "dummies," and I have found them and so has the Senator from New York. I will, however, if the Senator wishes, substitute the word "subordinate."

The Senator, to me, seemed to imply that the letter was signed without their knowing the substance of it. Is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. I would not go that far.

Mr. TOBEY. How far?

Mr. MEAD. I said they sent a letter to the President and the letter was prepared for their signature by some very fine men associated with them in the Army and Navy.

Mr. TOBEY. They read the letter before they signed it, did they not?

Mr. MEAD. I would not infer that they did anything they ought not to do.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me read from the text of the letter which they wrote and to which they signed their names.

In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi-military radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission and confining such activities to the Army and Navy.

There is a very definite statement, asking for the transfer, and after putting that in writing on February 4, some 7 months elapsed before they got an answer and the letter embodying the request of the Army and Navy, who are charged with prosecuting the war, was nullified. That is the net result.

Mr. MEAD. The chances are, if we went into it thoroughly, we would find that a very deep study was made, and we would also ascertain that, in view of the fact that a half dozen if not a dozen Federal agencies utilized these facilities, the use of this service is more effectively and efficiently carried out by the plan outlined in the President's letter after an exhaustive study was made, and is the best plan. That is my judgment. It may not be the judgment of my colleague, but, if it is not, I am sorry and I shall be glad to have his views.

Mr. TOBEY. I am sure the Senator will agree with me on one thing, namely, that the text shows, and the record shows, that February 4 a letter was written to the President by the Secretary of the Navy, concurred in by the Secretary of War, and the answer came back under date of September 8. Does not the Senator agree to that?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; if the Senator will agree with me that during the intervening time there was a clear knowledge of the fact that the matter was being studied, there was conference after conference, a system was set up, and everybody knew the system was there, and, above all, the service was working, and working efficiently and effectively.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from New Hampshire has referred to Mr. Fly as dominating the F. C. C. I think the Senator will agree with me, however, that Mr. Fly is one of the ablest and most intelligent men in the public service today. He has had an extremely difficult job to perform, as every one who has had anything to do with the Federal Communications Commission ever since its beginning in the city of Washington knows.

I have served upon the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate for about 20 years, and have been chairman for 10 years or so, and I know something of the work that a man who is Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, or a member of the Commission, has to do. While I have not always agreed with Mr. Fly, indeed, I have violently disagreed with him at times, in my opinion he has been one of the most maligned men in public service in Washington during the last few years.

Mr. Fly has had one of the most difficult jobs to perform in this city. When it comes to regulating radio, and radio communications, and to dealing with those engaged in the industry, with all the selfishness displayed by them, one must recognize what an extremely difficult job the Chairman of the Commission has.

In regard to the particular matter now under discussion, my understanding is that it not only deals with the war effort, but the Commission furnishes information for various other departments in Washington. Is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. That was my understanding. Whether or not this particular service to the Army and the Navy has been most efficient, nevertheless, an organization has been set up, which possibly has been too large, but certainly there could not be any excuse for cutting it to the extent to which it has been cut in the appropriations, both in the Senate and in the House committees.

Mr. HILL and Mr. BRIDGES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Montana has had the most intimate insight into the work of Mr. Fly and the Communications Commission. He is now engaged in hearings, I understand, which have been proceeding for some time, covering the work of Mr. Fly and the Communications Commission. There is no man who can speak with more authority about Mr. Fly and his work than the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

It seems to me the important feature is that the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended that the activities and facilities under discussion be transferred to the Army and the Navy, but they did not recommend that the work be discontinued. Because their recommendation to transfer the work to the Army and the Navy was not adopted certainly does not mean that the work should be discontinued or that the Congress should now refuse to appropriate the funds with which to carry on the work. I think both the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Federal Communications Commission, recognize that the work must be done. The Commission is now doing that work, and the Commander in Chief and the Commission have asked Congress to provide the money with which to do this necessary war work.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. MEAD. In a moment I shall yield.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which committee has more to do with the Federal Communications Commission than any other committee of the Senate, with the exception of the Committee on Appropriations, made the statement that this agency probably aids a number of other agencies, and I wish to give him a correct answer as to the number of agencies it actually serves.

It can be seen that there is ample reason for the President's set-up when there are agencies which are both military in character and civilian in character which require the services of this one agency.

The Radio Intelligence Service serves important wartime needs of several of the civilian Government agencies in the radio intelligence field, including the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Censorship, the Bureau of Economic Warfare, the Weather Bureau, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and other agencies. So there is ample evidence that there is reason for the set-up set forth in the President's letter. I desired to answer the Senator's question more fully by telling him of those agencies.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what my distinguished colleague from Alabama has said, and to add that the statement of the Senator from Montana relative to the Chairman of this Commission squares with my estimate of him. I think Mr. Fly is endeavoring to do a patriotic job, that he is deeply concerned with the well-being of the people of America, and is attempting to administer the affairs of his agency as capably as is possible. I am pleased to have this opinion coming from one who is so closely associated with the work of Mr. Fly and the Commission as is the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does not the Senator think we are getting down to a rather fundamental issue, namely, who is running the war; whether the President in a political way is running it or whether the Army and the Navy are running it; whether the President is going to superimpose on the Army and Navy his will insofar as the Federal Communications Commission is concerned? Is not that a fundamental question?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I do not suppose the Senator and I could ever get together on the question of the President's ability to handle not only the big war job he is called upon to administer but any other job. I have an idea, from what the Senator has said in the course of the debate, that he has a firm and fixed opinion. I am merely trying to point out that I believe the efficiency of the Federal Communications Commission and of other agencies will be better served if the appropriation that was approved by the Bureau of the Budget shall be restored. If that has anything to do with the President and his political affiliations, I do not recognize it, even though my distinguished colleague may.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the Senator wishes to go on record as putting the President's say-so as to the Fed-

eral Communications Commission and their war intelligence work ahead of the opinion of the Combined Chiefs of Staff, ahead of the War Department, ahead of the Navy Department. In other words, he superimposes the political on the military in the conduct of the war. Is not that the fundamental issue here?

Mr. MEAD. That is not my position, and that is not the fundamental issue. If my colleague will wait until I complete the record, I believe I shall be able to produce a great deal of evidence which will indicate that high military authorities have time and again commended the Federal Communications Commission, so much so that we can all rely upon it to do a great job in the field where it has been developing experienced and expert personnel since the early twenties.

Mr. President, I have here a letter from Earle F. Cock, lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps. This was for the chief signal officer, is dated April 6, 1943, and reads:

SECURITY OF CIPHERS

SECRETARY, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C.

Through: Commander G. B. Myers

1. In compliance with J. C. S. 138/3 dated December 1, 1942, subject: "Security of ciphers" and in accordance with the allocation of Government agencies made to the Army and Navy security sections respectively, the following summary of findings at the Federal Communications Commission is submitted:

(a) Cryptographic security—excellent.

(b) Physical security (cryptographic systems)—excellent.

(c) Documentary and information security—excellent

(d) Qualification of personnel—excellent.

(e) Cooperation was given fully and willingly.

2. In view of the above, it is considered that no concern need be felt over communications originating or passed in the Federal Communications Commission organization at this time.

3. The established contact between Signal Security Service and the Federal Communications Commission will be continued.

For the Chief Signal Officer.

EARLE F. COOK,
Lieutenant Colonel, Signal Corps.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. No, Mr. President; I must read another letter or two for the benefit of my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why does not the Senator tell the Senate who Mr. Cook is?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us what the word "c yptographic" means, the word used in the letter which the Senator just read? My distinguished colleague the Senator from New Hampshire and I do not understand what the meaning of that word is

Mr. MEAD. While we are busy with the debate——

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator want me to find out what the meaning of the word is and tell the Senator?

Mr. MEAD. I do not.

Mr. LANGER. I will look it up and tell the Senator what it means if he wants me to.

Mr. MEAD. It pertains to the deciphering of codes.

In reply to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, let me say that Mr. Cook is a lieutenant colonel in the Signal Corps. He addressed the letter for the chief signal officer.

Mr. President, the second letter comes from William J. Donovan. That letter is addressed to the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, chairman of the Appropriations Committee. William J. Donovan, by the way, is a high military authority, and one very closely associated with work of this character. He wrote:

We understand from a letter dated 18 February 1944, addressed to this office by the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, that your committee is interested in learning of the manner in which the F. B. I. S. wire service is utilized by subscribers.

This Office is a subscriber to the Service. We receive daily, by ticker, transcripts of foreign broadcasts as recorded by the Service. These transcripts, which, of course, include those emanating from enemy and enemy-occupied countries, are used by us in two ways: First, they reveal the particular propaganda line being followed by the nation in question at any time. Second, they often reveal, unintentionally at times, bits of information which can be put together by our experts with facts derived from other sources to give us valuable political and economic intelligence concerning the enemy. We then turn such knowledge to our own purposes in carrying on the duties assigned to us by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I hope that this explanation of the manner in which O. S. S. uses the facilities of F. B. I. S. will be of assistance to the committee in its deliberations.

That is testimony that there is close cooperation and close harmony between the military and the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I must read another letter from a high military authority so that we will be sure that it is not the President alone on one side and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War on the other side; that it is a question as to how this organization can best serve the best interests of all the agencies of government interested in the services they are able to furnish.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall yield as soon as I finish this letter, because it is in part an answer to one of the Senator's former questions.

Mr. President, this letter comes from the headquarters of the Seventh Air Force, the office of the Air Force commander. The subject of this letter is assistance rendered by Federal Communications Commission in locating lost airplanes. It is one of a large number of letters I have from military leaders, and it goes on to explain the very close teamwork that exists, the harmony that exists, and the effectiveness that is always evidenced whenever they are called upon to do a job.

Mr. President, when I finish reading this letter and several others I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will not the Senator explain——

Mr. MEAD. I shall yield, Mr. President, as soon as I finish this letter:

1. In the past months numerous calls have been made upon the Federal Communications Commission radio facilities to obtain bearings and fixes upon lost airplanes. These bearings and fixes have proven accurate and most helpful. In one particular instance on March 5, 1943, the assistance rendered by the Federal Communications Commission resulted in the prompt locating and rescuing of the crew of a bomber forced to land at sea. On another occasion, March 19, 1943, bearings received from the Federal Communications Commission assisted in locating a plane which was in imminent danger of being forced to land at sea. Largely as a result of these bearings this forced landing was averted.

2. Other instances too numerous to mention have occurred in which the assistance given by the Federal Communications Commission has been of inestimable value. The facilities of Federal Communications Commission have been, and still are, absolutely necessary to the successful operation of the Army's lost-plane procedure in the Hawaiian area.

3. I wish to commend the Federal Communications Commission and its men responsible for this assistance. It has been of great value and in numerous cases directly responsible for the saving of lives and valuable equipment.

WM. J. FLOOD,
Brigadier General, United States Army,
Chief of Staff.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. MEAD. I will have to read several other letters.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator one simple question.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator has asked me a number of questions, and I wish to read several letters in reply.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there is a question I wish to ask the Senator which has a bearing on these letters.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, these letters have a bearing on a previous question asked of me by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I feel that I am inadequately answering the Senator's question unless I read one other letter. I will ask the Senator to be patient with me for a moment, and then I shall yield.

This letter is addressed to S. W. Norman, Acting Chief, N. D. O. Section, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C. I believe this letter will bring to mind the quick, ready response and the very happy cooperation which exists between all these services.

This letter is in the nature of a blanket acknowledgment—

Think of that, Mr. President, a blanket acknowledgment.

This letter is in the nature of a blanket acknowledgment of the usefulness which your intercepts have been to Army radio security. A considerable number of intercepts which you have forwarded have indicated careless, superfluous or actually obscene transmissions made by Army radio stations. I wish to advise that each and every one of these cases, wherein it has been possible to trace the transmission to an Army station, has been thoroughly investigated and definite action taken to prevent recurrence. The results of these actions are already evident in the

diminishing number of reports of improper operation.

Sincerely yours,

W. T. GUEST,
Lieutenant Colonel, Signal Corps.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield now?

Mr. MEAD. Before I read another letter, Mr. President, I will now yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to have the Senator tell us exactly what proportion of the time of Mr. Fly and the Federal Communications Commission has been spent in the campaign or crusade to obtain these endorsements from minor Army officers all over the country? Why does not the Senator read a letter from Admiral Leahy? We all know his name. He is assistant to the President of the United States on military and naval matters. Why does not the Senator read the letter which Admiral Leahy wrote in 1943 to the Federal Communications Commission about how they were interfering with the war effort? Why does not the Senator read letters from General Marshall and Admiral King? Why read letters from lieutenant colonels and other minor officials who have been solicited to write letters?

Mr. MEAD. May I make the suggestion that the Senator from New Hampshire read them into the record in his own time?

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. Will the Senator now answer the first part of my question, which is, How much time has the Commission spent in conducting the campaign to secure these endorsements?

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from New Hampshire probably wants the information detailed by days, weeks, minutes, and all other details?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. MEAD. I have no way of tracing the activities of the Federal Communications Commission or any other commission with reference to matters of that kind. I have many other letters here, letters which come from men high in governmental affairs. I have some very valuable endorsements. It was not my intention at the beginning of my remarks to read them, but, in attempting to answer the question, I read those letters. I do not know whether it took any time to obtain them. I do not know whether they were spontaneous. But if there are any further letters on that side of the subject, or any letters on the other side of the subject, I think my distinguished colleague should read them if he cares to have them in the RECORD.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. As everyone knows, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is a member of the Appropriations Committee and a very valuable one. I have the greatest respect for his views. However, I wish to call his attention to several things which he may have overlooked.

The first is that our committee has tried as hard as it was humanly possible to do, to meet every requirement for this war. We have appropriated every sum that the testimony has shown to be necessary. The Senator will recall that for this very year we appropriated $28,000,000,000 more than the War Department has used, and the War Department is going to return it. The officials of the War Department are honest, and on July 1 they are going to return that money to the general fund of the Treasury. I commend them for their action.

As the Senator knows, our committee, the Senate, and the Congress wish to give the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps every opportunity in the world to win this war as quickly as possible. But when the Army officers and the Navy officers tell us they believe they are doing a work which an independent, nonmilitary agency is also doing, and when they say the performance of the work by the nonmilitary agency is unnecessary, it seems to me we should follow what is said by the highest officers we have, with the exception, of course, of the President, who is the Commander in Chief—and he is doing a fine job as President of the United States. However, the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations have said that this activity by the Federal Communications Commission is virtually a duplication of what they are doing; and they have ample money with which to do their work. They have ample material. They have every material under heaven. They are obtaining and are giving out all the radio news. They tell us that their system is virtually perfect. I believe that system is today the most perfect system in the world. I really believe that the American radio system is the most perfect radio system in the world.

When we have those assurances from such high authorities, it seems to me that before we appropriate more than $2,000,000 for a nonmilitary agency to maintain a duplicate system, we should be very careful.

The Senator will recall that in the committee we gave the representatives of the Federal Communications Commission every opportunity in the world to present their case. They did so in the most elaborate fashion. By the way, Mr. President, their presentation was most interesting to me. The hearing was one of the most educational ones I have ever attended. It taught me more about radio than I ever knew before, and I was very happy about it.

Nevertheless, after all was said and done, the evidence was that the work done by the Federal Communications Commission's system was a duplication of the work done by our Army and Navy. For that reason, I wish to say that I hope no Member of the Senate and no one in the country will think that any member of the Appropriations Committee is not in favor of doing everything in the world and furnishing every dollar in the world that is necessary to help the operations of our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps in this great war.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I desire again to state that there is no duplication, and that if this appropriation is not increased there will be a diminution of the service. The War Department and our military agencies maintain a service which has to do with the movement of enemy troops and matters of that nature. The service rendered by the Federal Communications Commission is a different one. It is a monitoring service. It is a service which ferrets out sabotage and espionage in this country and in territories belonging to this country. It is a service operating under a system which is already set up. If we take away $1,000,000 from the appropriation for that service, $1,000,000 worth of such work will not be done. It does not make any difference how much money we appropriate for the Army; that will have no effect on this work. We shall either have to have this work done by means of making appropriations for it or it will not be done.

There is no duplication. It is a distinct work done by the Federal Communications Commission under a system which is already set up, a system which is serving half a dozen agencies of the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is charging, then——

Mr. MEAD. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator should not say——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator should wait just a minute. He has yielded to me, and I had not finished my statement.

Mr. MEAD. But, Mr. President, I am not charging the Senator or anyone else.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, yes; the Senator is. The Senator has charged that the War Department and the Navy Department would close their eyes and would not carry on a very necessary war effort if the money referred to is not appropriated.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, without any argument, I deny that statement.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is not that what the Senator said?

Mr. MEAD. I deny that I said it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator said that if the increased appropriation is not provided the service will not be performed. If it is necessary to the war effort, I say it will be performed, and the Army and the Navy will perform it.

Mr. MEAD. The Army and the Navy will do it if we authorize them to do it, and if we give them the money with which to do it, and if the system already set up is altered in such a way that they can do it. But when an agency is already set up to handle the work, at the instance of the President of the United States, we cannot expect the work to be done if we withdraw the appropriations with which that agency is to engage in that particular kind of work. Certainly the War Department will go on with its military activities, but the Federal Communications Commission will not go on with the services they are charged with

the responsibility of rendering if we take away the necessary appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that the Federal Communications Commission now has many facilities, both mobile and stationary, through which it is engaged in the detection of spies and others who are attempting to convey information to the enemy, and that it is also engaged in many other activities which either would become ineffective or would have to be transferred to the War Department or the Navy Department, which would have to set up for themselves systems for performing such work?

Mr. MEAD. That is undoubtedly true. For instance, Mr. President, no other agency monitors foreign broadcasts. That is done by the Federal Communications Commission. The Commission is constantly listening to broadcasts emanating from enemy countries. That is its responsibility. If it needs a certain amount of money in order to do that work, and if we refuse to appropriate that money, it simply will not be able to do the work.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are hundreds or perhaps thousands of such broadcasts occurring each day, all over the world, and the Federal Communications Commission is listening to them and in that connection is interpreting broadcasts spoken in almost every language used in the world, and thus is obtaining information which may be invaluable to our Army and Navy and our other armed services.

Mr. MEAD. In order to show the situation more clearly, let me say that the Foreign Broadcast Service of the Federal Communications Commission is a war agency, and is the only agency of the Government charged with the responsibility of listening to and reporting on what foreign government propaganda lines are. Certainly, if we take away the appropriations for the Commission, it cannot do that work. The Federal Communications Commission has the sole responsibility of providing American war and diplomatic agencies with the monitored results in such form and at such places as those users desire. Without proper appropriations, much of this work will come to a standstill. No other governmental department or agency is either equipped or trained to take over this work. A thorough check reveals not an iota of duplication of effort in the Government in this work.

The important question then arises, Who is to do this highly valuable work for the various governmental departments, such, for example, as the Foreign Economic Administration? I quote Mr. Leo Crowley:

> Because the F. E. A. uses this essential service, I want to register our concern for its continuation.

The State Department wants the coverage extended. How can that be done if we curtail the appropriation?

The commanding general in Hawaii has the material of this agency flown to him daily in bombers leaving San Francisco, and that is at his instance.

The letter of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which is answered by the President, and the security survey of the Chief Signal Officer on behalf of the Joint Chiefs, had no mention to make of this phase of the communications activity.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I urge the restoration of ample funds for this work, for the sake of those governmental agencies, military and civilian, which require and utilize this vital service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have looked through the hearings before the Appropriations Committee. If there is any statement or evidence in those hearings that the work which the Federal Communications Commission is doing is a duplication of work being done by other agencies—the Army, Navy, or any other agency—I should like to know where the statement or evidence is. I fail to find in the hearings any evidence that there is any duplication.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, there is no duplication.

Mr. HILL. Not only is there no duplication, but I can find nothing in the hearings, either in the form of a statement or testimony of any kind, that even tends to show that there is duplication.

Mr. MEAD. The War Department has a similar service, and I want it continued. I would vote to increase its appropriation, because I value this kind of work. The Federal Communications Commission has a system which is not duplicating the military system, and unless we restore these appropriations we shall curtail its services which are so valuable to the military and civilian agencies of the Government.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have understood from what the Senator has said that this Commission is doing certain war work. Was there any testimony before the committee which would justify the abandonment of this war effort which is being performed by the Commission?

Mr. MEAD. It is my opinion that there was not sufficient evidence that this agency ought to be eliminated from the field or curtailed, as is proposed by the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I have understood the Senator, the Commission is doing certain war work which no other agency is doing or is authorized to do.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct; and in doing so, in my opinion, it is not duplicating any existing work.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then why, in the Senator's opinion, is it proposed to eliminate this work? Is it because the Appropriations Committee has determined that the war effort is too great, and that a part of it should be curtailed? What is the purpose?

Mr. MEAD. There is an honest difference of opinion existing among the members of the committee. I am convinced that it would be a serious mistake, and that it might imperil the war effort, if we were to reduce the effectiveness of this agency. I think it is rendering a very valuable service on the psychological warfare front and otherwise, in running down spies, in discerning the activities in foreign countries, in conducting a monitoring service, in preventing the loss of planes in rescuing the crews of other planes. It is doing a remarkable job in a number of instances, and I hope it will be continued.

Mr. TUNNELL. Curtailing these appropriations would result in the curtailment of certain war efforts, would it not?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

I should like to add to the RECORD the names of some of those who have written recommending a continuance of this service.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The question was asked a while ago as to how much time Mr. Fly consumed in obtaining these letters. Let me say to the Senator that I happen to know that Mr. Fly was attacked before one of the committees of the other House, and certain statements were made. I assume that when those statements were made he possibly asked persons who were familiar with the work he was doing to write letters. It will be recalled that he was not permitted to testify before the House committee in answer to the charges. I assume—and I think it is true—that he did ask certain persons in various executive departments who had been using the service to say what they thought about it, and these letters were in response to that request.

Mr. MEAD. I should have added at the time that perhaps in some cases the agencies were requested by Members of the House or by members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to communicate their views in the matter.

Mr. WHEELER. Some of these things may be duplications; some of this work may possibly be duplication; but there is a great deal of it which is not duplication. Can we divide it and say what part is duplication and what is not, when we are monitoring radio messages from all over the world? The War Department may be doing some of the same monitoring, but certainly it does not do all the same work that this Commission does. The fact that one branch of the Government is doing some of the same work is no reason why we should eliminate the appropriation, because the Federal Communications Commission could not do the work it is doing without duplicating some of the work that is done by the Army. In other words, its work is broader.

Mr. MEAD. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether it needs this particular amount of money; but I do not want to take the responsibility, at a time like this, for arbitrarily reducing the appropriation by cutting off one and a half million or two million dollars in the midst of war. Even though it were proved that there was duplication, it could not do any harm to have two separate agencies tracking down spies and determining what stations were operating in this country in violation of the law, or performing the many other duties which

this Commission and the War Department are trying to perform.

Mr. MEAD. The more information we have on that aspect of the war, the better it will be for the successful prosecution and early termination of the war.

Mr. President, in a moment I shall be through for the present. I have read letters from the President of the United States; the commander in chief of the Army; from Brig. Gen. William J. Donovan; from the colonel acting for the chief signal officer; from Brig. Gen. William J. Flood, of the Office of Chief of Staff; from Lt. Col. W. T. Guest, of the Signal Corps; and from Lt. Col. Earle F. Cook, of the Signal Corps, for the chief signal officer.

I have a number of other communications, the signatures to which I wish to read into the RECORD. They include communications from those who have written letters complimentary of the work of the Federal Communications Commission. They include communications from Elmer Davis, Director, Office of War Information; Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State; Leo T. Crowley, Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration; Carlos P. Romulo, colonel of Infantry; Francis A. Jamieson, Assistant Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs; T. L. Tsui, First Secretary of the Chinese Embassy; Jack Winocour, Director of British Information Services; a communication from L. W. Knoke, vice president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, addressed to Robert D. Leigh, Director of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; a communication from David L. Glickman, Acting Chief, Australia, New Zealand, and Afghanistan Section of the Foreign Economic Administration, who addressed a letter to the Chief of the Foreign Broadcast Analysis Division; also, a letter from William L. Langer, Director, Branch of Research and Analysis of the Office of Strategic Services. These are all commendatory letters.

I have a letter from S. N. Moore, captain, United States Navy, Administrative Office, Office of Naval Intelligence; one from Harold R. Shaw, lieutenant colonel, Army of the United States, district postal censor; also, a letter from Lt. Gen. Robert C. Richardson, Jr., the commanding military officer in Hawaii. He commends the service very highly.

I have also a letter from Maj. Gen. George V. Strong, Military Intelligence Division of the War Department.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. General Strong is chief of all the intelligence services of the Army.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. I wanted to read these letters because they are from lieutenant generals and major generals, from heads of departments, and from others concerned directly with the question. Here is one from Harley A. Notter, Chief, Division of Political Studies of the Department of State. Here is one from H. R. Stark, United States Fleet, United States naval forces in Europe. He is not a minor naval officer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I shall yield in a moment.

Here is one from Robert C. Richardson, Jr., lieutenant general. That is considerable rank above a colonel. He is a lieutenant general of the United States Army, commanding the central Pacific area. At his insistence this service is flown to Hawaii every day by bomber.

Mr. President, before finishing I wanted to put those letters in the RECORD, and to say that some of them were written at the request of the Federal Communications Commission, and others perhaps at the request of interested Members of this body. However, they are all highly commendatory. They are from a number of agencies of Government, and from military officials of high rank.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I knew that my distinguished colleague, when he said I was quoting minor officers, would want me to quote from the statements of any other officers, and put them in the RECORD. As I have said, he probably will have an opportunity to do so when his turn comes.

I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Did the Senator put into the RECORD any volunteered letters?

Mr. MEAD. I have no way of determining the interest of anyone who wrote. The letters are here. They were presented to our committee. I did not question any of the writers. I do not believe they were bludgeoned into writing and I presume they were writing of their own free will. I assume that when a major general, or the head of a great public agency, with a reputation for integrity behind him, writes a letter to a committee of the Congress he expects the committee to give the letter consideration, and I am sure he would not send it if the writing of it had been forced upon him as a result of expediency.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly everyone who is acquainted with General Strong, who is the head of the Intelligence Department of the Army, knows that he could not be bludgeoned into writing a letter for anyone.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator is correct. I would be impugning the motives of the writers of the letters to question them, and I do not wish to do so.

Mr. WHEELER. We all know that General Strong is one of the ablest and best men in the service.

Mr. MEAD. I would not even raise the issue. I take the letters at their face value because, as the Senator has said, these men have very responsible positions. The writer of this particular letter has a reputation for honesty and integrity which goes back to the day of his birth.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. If a request is sent to a certain subordinate official in the Army or Navy, or any of the governmental services, and that officer knows that his Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, feels strongly in the matter, does not the Senator believe that he would rather hesitate to refuse to write an endorsement?

Mr. MEAD. I know that a man of profound integrity would not.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. I will tell the Senator that certain individuals have written letters and made statements, and have had to take a position in public which they privately did not feel.

Mr. MEAD. There is no doubt about that. That may happen sometimes.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator knows it has happened many times.

Mr. MEAD. I have no knowledge of it insofar as this record is concerned.

Mr. President, I understand that we are not to have a vote on this question tonight. If that be true, I am willing to yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand there are other speeches to be made on this subject. I do not wish to take the Senator from the floor, but am willing to allow him to retain the floor when we recess over until Monday, which I understand to be the program. However, I should like to have him yield long enough for me to read a couple of telegrams into the RECORD dealing with an entirely different subject.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Delaware.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to ask the Senator if he has any reason to suspect that any of the letters which he has read were not written in good faith.

Mr. MEAD. I know most of the men who wrote them. They would not write a letter that was not in good faith. These letters, in my judgment, are letters which can be relied upon. The information contained in them can be substantiated. They are letters which were given to a congressional committee as a substantial contribution to the work of the committee.

Mr. TUNNELL. And, so far as the Senator knows, there is no reason for anyone charging that any force was applied in having the letters written?

Mr. MEAD. I should be surprised if there were a scintilla of evidence that these men would yield to force of any kind.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then the Senator believes that the letters, whether written at the request of someone else or at the volition of the writers, represent the ideas of the men who wrote them so far as the Senator knows.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Under the circumstances I am now very glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] with the understanding that I shall have the floor again when this subject comes up.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I expected that we would complete consideration of this bill to-

day. I thought certainly we would reach the item known as the T. V. A. provision of the bill, but we have not reached it, and we are a long way from it.

I have before me a telegram from a constituent newspaper, together with my reply, which I wish to read, because I should like to have the truth known to the Senate and to the country.

Mr. President, I received the following telegram from Bill Hagan, city editor of the Chattanooga News-Free Press, concerning the T. V. A. The telegram was addressed to my secretary, and reads as follows:

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., *March 14, 1944.*
DON MCKELLAR,
Care Senator K. D. McKellar:

We think Senator MCKELLAR'S viewpoints on some of the questions arising from the T. V. A. amendments would be interesting to our readers and their publication would give the Senator fair expression of his views. It is charged here by T. V. A. supporters that the amendments would cripple T. V. A., hurt its contribution to the war effort, and would be injurious to Chattanooga by moving personnel and offices to Muscle Shoals area. We invite Senator MCKELLAR'S full expression on these and any other pertinent matters including his purpose in sponsoring this legislation. Please wire collect soonest.

BILL HAGAN,
City Editor, Chattanooga News-Free Press.

That is signed by Mr. Hagan.

Mr. President, that was a very proper inquiry, I thought, and I wired immediately to the Chattanooga News-Free Press, as follows:

Your telegram this date received. I shall be happy to give you my viewpoint on the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments. The statements made by Lilienthal or others that these amendments would cripple or destroy the Tennessee Valley Authority or hurt its contribution to the war effort or hurt it in any other way are wholly without foundation in fact. These amendments are all intended and will help to make a more honest, a more economical, a more effective, and a less political organization out of the Tennessee Valley Authority. They will simply require honesty and integrity in administering the greatest governmental institution that ever came to Tennessee.

I stop the reading long enough to say that one of these directors continually charges that I am opposed to the T. V. A. Let me say to my colleagues that in my own judgment I built the T. V. A. of Tennessee. I was instrumental in getting all the appropriations; and it takes money to build such plants. For that reason I do not think I can be successfully charged with being opposed to it when the contrary is the truth. That by way of parentheses.

I have devoted the best years of my life and the best abilities of which I am capable to the building of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I was fighting vigorously for the Tennessee River dams when Lilienthal was a boy in school.

My distinguished colleague, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] sitting by me, asks in an aside whether he was in short pants. [Laughter.] I do not know whether he was in short pants, but he was a boy in school when I was here on this floor fighting, against the most tremendous odds, to get an appropriation to start the Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals.

I am just as strong for it as I ever was. I got most of these dams built, notably the Chickamauga in which Chattanooga is so much interested, the Hiwassee and Guntersville Dams nearby which were built over the joint personal and lobbying opposition here in Washington of both Lilienthal and Arthur Morgan.

I digress here to say that I had to notify them to get out of town or that I would denounce them on the floor of the Senate for lobbying. I had a man at the depot that afternoon at 4 o'clock, and they were there and took the train at 4 o'clock.

At that time they were obsessed with the idea that T. V. A. was not to go into competition with private power companies, but should just produce enough power to be used as a yardstick to show the private companies what they must charge for current.

These two directors fought for the yardstick idea for years, and were opposed to the building of any other dams except the first three dams that were erected.

They went to the homes of the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee—

I do not believe any of the present members of the committee were on the committee at that time, among the members then being Senator Byrnes and Senator Adams, of Colorado.

They went to the homes of the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to lobby against the building of any other dams except the Wilson, Wheeler, and Norris. These three were enough for their yardstick, so they said.

So they said.

They did not recommend the building of these other dams.

They never have recommended the building of any other dams, except one, which was known as the Douglas Dam.

The President did not recommend the building of these other dams. The House of Representatives did not recommend the building of these other dams. These additional dams with one exception, the Douglas Dam—

As I said before—

were all built by amendments offered by me and gotten through both Houses of Congress despite the fiercest fights by Arthur Morgan and David Lilienthal against those dams. Lilienthal is not an engineer; he is a lawyer by profession, or he was educated as a lawyer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did he ever practice law?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not know, but his biography says he was educated as a lawyer. The telegram continues:

I do not know that he ever practiced. Now, as to injuring Chattanooga, by moving the principal offices to the Muscle Shoals area, I beg to say that the original act provided that the principal offices should be at Muscle Shoals. Without getting Congress to change the act Lilienthal of his own motion and contrary to the law moved the principal offices to Knoxville and Chattanooga. In the committee I offered an amendment to authorize these principal offices to remain at Knoxville. My good friend Senator BANKHEAD—

One of the finest men I ever knew, the colleague of the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—

My good friend Senator BANKHEAD, who took and is taking the Lilienthal side of this question, offered a substitute requiring that the offices be moved back to Alabama, and that substitute passed.

The substitute prevailed in the committee.

I am going to offer a bill to provide by law for keeping the offices at Knoxville. They should be kept there. But the committee turned me down on that, and decided in favor of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The only reason it could have possibly passed the committee was because Lilienthal had illegally moved the offices in the first place. If he had had any respect for the Congress, he would have had it done legally. I intend to offer an amendment to make the head office at Knoxville, and, of course, other offices where they are necessary. It developed in the recent hearings before our committee that Lilienthal had reported—

And I hope Senators will listen to this, that Lilienthal had reported in his report to the Congress last July—

that he had paid $13,148,000 into the Treasury of the United States. Lilienthal was obliged to admit that this was a falsehood. It also developed at the hearings that he was selling current at a cheaper rate to the Aluminum Co. of America than he was to the Reynolds Metal Co., which was also an aluminum company. When asked directly if that were true, he directed his assistant, Mr. Wessenaur, to answer the question.

As the record will show.

Mr. Wessenaur answered that he was selling at a lower price to the Aluminum Co. of America—

That should be "to the Metal Co. than to the Aluminum Co."—

and thereupon Lilienthal was confronted with a letter that he had written to Mr. McIntyre of the White House stating that he was selling two-tenths of a cent less to the Aluminum Co. than he was to the Reynolds Metal Co., and tried to explain it on other grounds. This two-tenths of a cent differential against the Metal Co. in the 20-year contract amounts to $7,000,000. That Lilienthal is engaged in political matters is perfectly apparent from the testimony in the hearings which I am sending you a copy of under separate cover together with the bill and reports. He was hotly engaged against me in 1940 and no doubt he will be similarly engaged in 1946 if he is still with the Authority.

And I ought to have added "and if I were living at that time."

I continue to read:

Dr. A. E. Morgan and Senator Norris have both charged him with being a deceitful falsifier and I have reluctantly reached the same conclusion about him.

Mr. President, I now wish to quote what those two gentlemen said about him. My telegram continues:

Dr. Morgan said: "There is a practice of evasion, intrigue, and sharp strategy, with remarkable skill in alibi and the habit of avoiding direct responsibility, which makes Machiavelli seem open and candid. The marble claims, in my opinion, were an effort at deliberate, bare-faced steal."

That word is spelled s-t-e-a-l. I am quoting the very words of Dr. Morgan.

They are not mine. I now quote from former Senator Norris. We all remember Senator Norris, a fine Senator and a fine gentleman. But things have occurred this morning which, when I looked at the newspapers, made me sit up and take notice. I saw there a statement that he sided with Lilienthal in this matter. But I wish to read what Senator Norris said at the time. He said:

"People generally have an idea that when these marble claimants and Mr. Lilienthal and the other Morgan"—

Meaning Dr. H. A. Morgan, of course, who was a member of the Authority—

"were about to rob the Government of millions of dollars, Dr. Morgan"—

Meaning Dr. Arthur Morgan—

"stepped in and called a halt and saved the day."

Mr. President, that is not my statement respecting Lilienthal. Former Senator Norris called his name. Let me read that again.

"People generally have an idea that when these marble claimants and Mr. Lilienthal and the other Morgan were about to rob the Government of millions of dollars, Dr. Morgan stepped in and called a halt and saved the day."

My telegram continues:

So far as I know these statements of Morgan and Norris have never been answered by Lilienthal.

I have hunted to find out if Lilienthal had ever answered the statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HILL. Since the Senator has quoted former Senator Norris, I think I ought to call attention to the fact that I received a telegram this morning from Senator Norris, without any suggestion or solicitation in any way, shape, or fashion on my part. The telegram is as follows:

McCOOK, NEBR.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I have absolute faith in the integrity, honesty, and ability of Lilienthal. He has been a faithful, honest public servant.

G. W. NORRIS.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am quoting what Senator Norris said at the time of the so-called steal.

Mr. HILL. This telegram is under date of March 15, and reached me this morning.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. HILL. As I said, I did not solicit it in any way whatever. It was sent to me, and I think in justice to Lilienthal it ought to be read at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know the Senator from Alabama did not solicit it. But do not all of us know that it was solicited just the same by someone else?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. Everyone knows that what Dr. Morgan said applies at this point. He said:

There is a practice of evasion, intrigue, and sharp strategy.

The telegram which the Senator just read—sharp strategy? Sharp strategy?

Dr. Morgan continues:

With remarkable skill in alibi and the habit of avoiding direct responsibility.

He does not deny it himself, but he asks his friends to deny it for him.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Tennessee a few moments ago paid tribute to Dr. Morgan, formerly chairman of the board of T. V. A., and pointed out that Dr. Morgan, as I understood his language, "saved the day" by showing up the effort of Lilienthal and somebody else to steal millions of dollars. Is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I was merely quoting Senator Norris.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes. And in the quotation the Senator brought that truth out, did he not?

Mr. McKELLAR. That statement came out, yes.

Mr. TOBEY. Exactly. I now point out to the Senator that so far as virtue being its own reward is concerned, in this instance it does not apply, because shortly thereafter Dr. Morgan was thrown out on his ear, in spite of the fine, heroic work he had done; is that not correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. He was thrown out.

Mr. TOBEY. Where did he land?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know where Dr. Morgan is.

Mr. TOBEY. I leave that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know where Dr. Morgan is, but the man he described here, and that my good friend Senator Norris described here, landed in Morgan's place and is supposed to be taking his place.

Mr. TOBEY. And Dr. Morgan, who saved the day, who showed this thing up, goes out, and the other man stays in; is that correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. That is one of the happenings.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It ought to be stated that Dr. Morgan's separation from the position as chairman of the T. V. A. and as a member of the T. V. A. Board had many ramifications wholly independent of and disconnected altogether from this episode to which the Senator from Tennessee refers. We all understand what happened at that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not. I was not consulted, and do not know what happened at that time. I had built the dams. Of course I had very little to do with it. After the House refused to appropriate any money, when the matter came before our Appropriations Committee, my good friends on that committee were more generous to me than I ever deserved in all my life.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree that the members of the committee were generous with the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for agreeing with me. They were more generous to me than I ever deserved, and at my earnest request they granted the money to me to build those dams, and I feel I am under an obligation to see that that money, and that all money which we appropriate for that activity, shall be honestly administered, and with the greatest integrity and care.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I merely desire to say that I withdraw myself from any encomium the Senator from New Hampshire is paying Dr. Arthur E. Morgan. I was opposed to his confirmation in the first place, and held it up here for 2 weeks until the former Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, and the Senator from Tennessee talked me into withdrawing my opposition and letting him be confirmed. I did not think he was fit to be on the board in the first place. I still do not think he was. My views had nothing to do with any activity of his as a member of the T. V. A. They had to do with some general flood-control views he had announced from the grandstand before he was ever appointed on the T. V. A. But it seems to me that the important element in this matter is as to whether or not, in connection with the quotation which the Senator from Tennessee has just read from my dear friend, former Senator Norris, the two gentlemen that he mentions there, to wit, Mr. Lilienthal and Dr. H. A. Morgan, still constitute a majority of the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. They do constitute a majority of the T. V. A.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In other words, Senator Norris, in the quotation the Senator has read, accused Mr. Lilienthal and Dr. H. A. Morgan of what is known in my section of the country as skulduggery—not necessarily criminal offense, but just general skulduggery.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, sir; that is it. I continue to read from the telegram:

It is estimated that the House appropriated in unexpended balances and in receipts $87,791,000.

That is in this last appropriation.

And of this sum $8,600,000 was to be a reserve. The committee thought that this reserve should be eliminated and it was. They cut down other small items amounting in the aggregate to $2,000,000 and left $77,931,000 appropriated to the Tennessee Valley Authority for the ensuing year. In other words, all this propaganda that Lilienthal is sending out, 99 percent of which is false, arises over the cutting of his appropriations of about $2,000,000 out of a total of $79,000,000, and yet he is falsely stating to the people of the valley that the reduced appropriation and his manner of getting it from the Congress will cripple or hamstring the Tennessee Valley Authority. The United States Government has got nearly a billion dollars invested in the Tennessee Valley Authority which is managed dishonestly, improvidently, and, as Dr. Morgan says, "with evasion, intrigue, and sharp strategy."

The Congress of the United States has been marvelously generous to me in giving me the appropriations to build these magnificent dams on the Tennessee River and I want to say with the utmost sincerity that as long as I am a Senator in this body those funds are going to be used honestly and openly for the benefit of the people, rather than to turn them over to this man Lilienthal to be run into waste that certain of his associates have denounced as dishonest and corrupt. He has made the Tennessee Valley Authority a member of the private power trust, against which Senator Norris and I fought so long. Lilienthal today is lobbying by sending out falsehoods all over the State—

I am not so sure but some of these come directly or indirectly to Senators, a fact concerning which I wish to pay my respects on Monday.

Lilienthal today is lobbying by sending out falsehoods all over the State, using the Government's money for the purpose of circulating this propaganda trying to save himself from an ignoble end which he knows is facing him. Surely no one in Tennessee believes that at my age I am trying to obtain patronage.

That is the only answer they had, that because Senator McKELLAR has added the $4,500 provision to the bill, which applies to Tennessee Valley and to all other activities of Government and departments of Government, he is trying to obtain patronage.

Good heavens! What would I do with patronage, at my time of life? What in the name of God could I do with it? They must think I am simple-minded, to charge me with trying to get patronage, at my time of life.

The telegram concludes, as follows:

Lilienthal's statement to that effect is a willful, deliberate, and malicious falsehood. I thank you very much for your request for the facts.

Mr. President, I have taken the time to read those two telegrams because they have given the facts concerning what we have done. The original Tennessee Valley Authority Act provided that the Tennessee Valley authorities should pay their receipts into the Treasury of the United States, just as every other governmental agency of the United States is required to pay its receipts. By some marvelous means, Lilienthal got the House to insert a provision that he need not pay those receipts into the Treasury, but that he could simply take the receipts and run that great, almost billion-dollar plant as he is doing—a plant which is bringing in $65,000,000 or $70,000,000 a year. I know the Senator from New York will excuse me for taking his time at this late hour in the afternoon. I would have waited until tomorrow to make the opening remarks of the statement I expect to make; but I understand that the majority leader and minority leader believe the Senate should take a recess until Monday. For that reason I felt that this much of my statement should go into today's RECORD, so that Senators could have it. I know that Senators are being communicated with by Lilienthal's ally, associate, and great friend, a man by the name of Silliman Evans, who is running the Nashville Tennesseean. I suppose most Senators have read the vicious and outrageous falsehoods he has written in editorials. I am sure he has done me a great service by sending those editorials to Members of the Senate, because I am confident no Member of the Senate will believe I am the kind of man he has charged me with being. At any rate, I hope Senators will not believe his charges; because, as God is my judge, Mr. President, I have but one desire in this matter, and that is to do what I honestly and sincerely believe to be right. I do not believe that Government money, amounting to almost a billion dollars invested in that great institution in Tennessee, should be turned over to Lilienthal, for him to use as he sees fit, without regard to another living soul.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FINANCE COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT DURING RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to file during the recess of the Senate its report on Senate bill 1767.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If the bill is to be reported during the recess, can the Senator give any information as to when consideration of the bill will be begun?

Mr. BARKLEY. It had been the purpose to commence consideration of the bill on Monday, if we were able to conclude consideration of the pending bill today. However, I imagine the consideration of Senate bill 1767 will follow consideration of the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that the Senator desires that the Senate take a recess until Monday. Is that correct?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] very graciously gave me the privilege of making an interpolation in the RECORD this afternoon. I hope it will be understood that the Senate will take a recess, not an adjournment, until Monday, so that the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] will have the floor on Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes; that will be the course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Avra M. Warren, of Maryland, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Panama;

Leland B. Morris, of Pennsylvania, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran;

Orme Wilson, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 assigned to the Department of State, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti;

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now serving as counselor of embassy at Madrid, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Paraguay;

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, now serving as counselor of embassy at Habana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Dominican Republic;

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr., of California, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iran, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Iceland;

Gen. Thomas Holcomb, of Delaware, United States Marine Corps, retired, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa;

Kenneth S. Patton, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and consul general at Calcutta, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to New Zealand; and

Rudolph E. Schoenfeld, of the District of Columbia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to act as Chargé d'Affaires near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Harold Doolittle to be lieutenant general in the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg to be major general in the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE JAMES A. O'LEARY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 474) was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
March 16, 1944.

Resolved, That he House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of six Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, in connection with the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 272) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Senate Resolution 272

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Vice President appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of February 7), 1944.

THE JUDICIARY

Claude P. Stephens, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky, vice John T. Metcalf, resigned.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening, of New York, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska. (Reappointment.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from February 9, 1944

Lt. Col. Hubert Reilly Harmon, Air Corps (temporary major general).

To be colonel with rank from March 1, 1944

Lt. Col. Benjamin Greeley Ferris, Infantry (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Charles Samuel Ritchel, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Thomas Guerdon Hearn, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. Donald Henley, Infantry.

Lt. Col. Joseph Daly Coughlan, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Reese Maughan Howell, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Henry Jervis Friese Miller, Air Corps (temporary major general), subject to examination required by law.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Donaldson Fleming, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 6, 1944.

Lt. Col. Samuel Demetrius Avery, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 9, 1944.

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Clune, Medical Corps, with rank from April 10, 1944.

Lt. Col. George Edward Lindow, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 16, 1944.

Lt. Col. Jaime Julian Figueras, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 20, 1944.

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. William Elder Sankey, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 17, 1944.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. James Harvey Pence, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 1, 1944.

To be captain

First Lt. S. Kingdon Avery, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 19, 1944.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Herbert Kelly Moore, Veterinary Corps, with rank from April 1, 1944.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Harry Dubois Southard, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from April 4, 1944.

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Henry Hingson, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1944.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Thomas L. Sprague, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of April 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

James Harold Doolittle

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we praise Him who hath granted unto us exceeding great and precious promises that through them we might become sharers in the divine inheritance; to these let us add strong faith, self-control, endurance, and godliness. Inspire us to hallow our gifts, time, and influence. Thou, Lord of the temple, reveal Thyself in light, in grace, and in all goodness, full of blessings.

Impress us, blessed Master, that the measure of our labor and diligence is the measure of our success. Every earnest endeavor to serve God and man and every temptation mastered is added strength in that chamber where a man meets himself. As legislators, chosen by a free people, our responsibilities are outstanding and tremendous; we pray that they may be marked by loftiness of purpose and distinguished by the moral law and not by the rigor and rudeness of selfishness. Heavenly Father, let our sense of truth and honor be on the very highest plane, as a lamp shining in a dark place until the day dawns and the morning star rises in our hearts. Grant that the glorious realities of patriotic citizenship may dominate and be reflected in every group throughout our broad land. Unto our Saviour be glory both now and to the day of eternity. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

FEBRUARY 29, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Sincerely yours,

EMORY H. PRICE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

MARCH 15, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation from the following committees: The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and the Committee on Accounts.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN D. MCWILLIAMS.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 470), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That EMORY H. PRICE, of the State of Florida, and WILLIAM A. ROWAN, of the State of Illinois, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Naval Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 471), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That JOHN D. MCWILLIAMS, of Connecticut, is hereby elected to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

LABOR'S PERFORMANCE IN PRODUCING IMPLEMENTS OF WAR

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter I have received from Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUDLOW addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HOCH and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the record.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and any other special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SOUND FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. I assume that most every Member in this Chamber reads David Lawrence, the columnist. I wish to read into the RECORD an article by him, as it is commendable to Congress. It appears in the Washington Star of March 6 and reads as follows:

CONGRESS DOES A GOOD JOB—ANALYSIS SHOWS FINANCES OF THE UNITED STATES SOUNDER THAN ANY COUNTRY IN THE WORLD

When American people do a good job they should be commended for it. When Congress does a good job it should be commended too, and the facts are that the finances of the Government of the United States are in better shape than those of any other government in the world, and better still, than they have been since the outbreak of the war. The story should be broadcast as widely as possible.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

SIMPLIFIED INCOME-TAX RETURN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I notice present on the floor the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], ranking member on the minority side. There is a great deal in the newspapers about simplification of tax returns. I understand the Treasury Department has extended the time until April 15 for the filing of tentative returns on 1944 income. In the event this Congress fails to simplify the returns before that date, I believe there will be further reaction against the Congress for having led the people to believe that a simplification would be forthcoming, and then the returns have to be filed under the same old rules.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The Ways and Means Committee is working on simplification now, and we hope to have the basic points agreed upon this week, so that we will be ready to report a bill to the House within the next few weeks.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I am interested in, so that we will get it passed before April 15.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a newspaper article quoting Dr. Ruthven, president of the University of Michigan, regarding the effort of Federal agencies to build political power through the public schools.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the Polish question, which appears in a magazine printed in England, entitled "The Nineteenth Century and After," by Mr. F. A. Voigt, its editor. I have taken this matter up with the Public Printer, who advises me it exceeds the amount allowed under the regulations, and that the total cost will be $195. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GAVIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short radio address delivered by a young man at the Malvern Preparatory School on the soldiers' vote bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

JEWISH HOMELAND IN PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his remarks on the subject of the Wright-Compton resolution.

Unfortunately my views on the Wright-Compton resolution have been misinterpreted. Ofttimes in the heat of debate gratuitous remarks are injected, which, uncorrelated with definite aims heretofore expressed, may give erroneous impressions. I am and ever have been for the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

As to the pending resolution, I shall oppose any amendment that militates against the establishment of such a commonwealth.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by Mr. Walter Lippmann appearing in the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CEILING PRICE ON STRAWBERRIES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. FULBRIGHT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF PRICE CONTROL ACT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I recently spent a few days in my district and I returned to Washington with a clear impression that the people almost unanimously favor an extension of the Price Control Act. I am glad to learn that the chairman of the Banking Committee [Mr. SPENCE] has introduced a bill to provide for such extension. I also wish to endorse in its entirety the statement issued during my absence by three of my colleagues on that committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG], and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN], urging prompt and full hearings on the bill.

I join them in urging that the administration of the act be fully considered so that the agency may meet its real purpose of preventing runaway prices and at the same time avoid needless and oppressive hardships upon our people. In my opinion the public will be greatly interested in these hearings and will fully approve efforts to correct legislative and administrative weaknesses in this program.

WASHINGTON, N. C., FIRST TOWN NAMED AFTER WASHINGTON

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. BONNER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a short speech by me.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from a very conscientious constituent of mine which reads in part, as follows:

I guess it is foolish of me in my declining years to be so concerned about our freedom and future. But I wish more people were more sensitive to our real position in the world. Our Nation now bankrupt and the planners and spenders still looking for ways to spend. When the final day of reckoning comes the children will begin to cry and those responsible will be gone and the generation responsible for having the Belshazzer feast today will bemoan their fate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Houston Chronicle on the subject of lend-lease aid to Russia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor on lend-lease.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include therein a short article from the Washington Star of March 15.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. DEWEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by printing therein an editorial written by former Governor Cox, of Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THANKS AND APPRECIATION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity of expressing my sincere gratitude to the many colleagues of mine in the Congress who communicated with my office and with me during my recent illness. It is a source of much gratification to have your friends interested in you when you are sick. I am certainly happy, however, to be back with you and to be again associated with such fine colleagues.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] expressed apprehension and alarm over an alleged agreement that has been entered into between the United States and several of the larger United Nations pertaining to post-war finance. As I recall, the Speaker appointed a special committee some months ago to which the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and myself were appointed. The able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] was named chairman. That committee was to keep track of post-war planning, which I presumed would embrace post-war financing abroad. To my knowledge that committee has never held a meeting. It would be shocking indeed for this administration to enter into fast and binding agreements with other countries without at least doing the Congress the courtesy of advising in advance what it is proposed to do.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize very much with what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] have just said. Under our present rules of congressional procedure, and especially under the constitutional requirement of a two-thirds vote of the Senate for ratification of treaties, we must expect the Executive more and more to act in international matters without consulting the Congress. It occurs to me that all these committees investigating post-war collaboration will become absolutely futile unless and until the constitutional provision requiring a two-thirds vote in the Senate to ratify treaties is changed.

This Congress in effect has no voice now whatsoever concerning international dealings and more and more in the future will be inept and impotent in these matters. The constitutional provision as to a two-thirds vote in the Senate is an obstacle to congressional expression, it handicaps this country in the administration of international affairs.

Let us remove this stump upon which our international affairs will continue to be wrecked and change that provision to a simple majority of the House and Senate in the matter of treaty ratification.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein letters from two constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

STABILIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, regarding the proposals of the administration for so-called post-war monetary collaboration, I wish to announce that I have just completed a second study of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme which I expect to present to the House next Wednesday, March 22.

Members will recall that I gave to this body the first study dealing with this subject November 1, 1943, under the title "British Plot to Seize Control of United States Gold."

The paper which I shall present to you next Wednesday will clearly demonstrate that the alleged capital formation of the Keynes-Morgenthau scheme is a fraud.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram and a statement and to print the same in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOFFMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INCREASE IN COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is a bill that we have had in conference and the conferees have reached a unanimous agreement. The bill was passed by the House and provided that after a substitute had served as much as 5 years or more he could be made, should a vacancy occur, a regular of the fifth class.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Do the minority members of the committee know this is going to be called up at this time?

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered (2) and (3).

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (1).

And agree to the same.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHEL,
D. J. WARD,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
WILLIAM LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2836) to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment limits credit for adjustments of the increases in the rates of pay of substitute employees in the Postal Service to 3 years of past continuous service and the hourly rate of compensation is adjusted accordingly.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment requires 3 years of continuous active service to qualify for allowable service; whereas, under the original bill 1 year of continuous active service is sufficient.

Amendment No. 3. This amendment provides that allowable service shall be only such service as has been rendered immediately prior to the approval of this act; whereas the original bill does not contain such requirement.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHEL,
DAVID J. WARD,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial showing how Minnesota has altered its laws to conform to the soldiers voting bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein copies of two letters from the Comptroller General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from a soldier in the armed forces and to include also a letter I have written to Chester Bowles, head of the O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article appearing in this morning's New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONKIEWICZ]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART]?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 473), as follows:

Resolved, That CECIL R. KING of the State of California be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILL S. 1285

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House the Speaker may be authorized to sign the enrolled bill, S. 1285.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4414) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 1½ hours, one-half of

that time to be controlled by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4414, with Mr. RICHARDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the annual supply bill for the legislative branch and for the judiciary. In previous bills we have explained to the Congress the workings of the various units of organization under this bill, and I am not going into any extended explanation at this time.

I would like to state that we have been fortunate in the preparation of this bill to have the services of the somewhat new clerk of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Orescan, who has done a very satisfactory job. Although this is the smallest regular bill coming from the Appropriations Committee, there is no more pleasant committee to serve on than this committee. The associations have been most worth while, and the cooperation of the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. GORE, and Mr. KIRWAN on the Democratic side and Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. PLOESER, and Mr. TIBBOTT, a new member on the committee, has made very pleasant the few weeks we have spent in examining the requests for appropriations.

As you gentlemen know, the Bureau of the Budget does nothing in the way of preparing and examining appropriations for the legislative branch. It merely transmits them to the Congress. The same is true as to the judiciary appropriation, with the exception that the Bureau of the Budget is authorized to make comments and recommendations if it cares to do so.

The bill this year, as it has been for the last several years, is cut to the bone. I do not want to brag about the judiciary and legislative committee, nor do I want to praise Congress, but I must state that Congress governs itself as far as expenditures are concerned in a very close, economical way. We function up here on the Hill, in my opinion, on as small an amount of money as really is practicable, and I am proud of the fact that the Appropriations Committee which has cut the appropriations of so many of the executive departments has been and is now equally zealous in controlling appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government.

The total amount carried in this bill is approximately $59,606,000. Of this total, the amount of $46,000,000, in round numbers, is for the legislative branch and $13,000,000 for the judiciary.

Of the total of $46,000,000 carried in the bill for the legislative branch, the amount of $21,165,000 is chargeable as the total expense of the Congress. This, one of the three great branches of the Government, is run on $21,000,000 annually. There is a slight increase due to overtime, but the entire operation of running the legislative branch is approximately $21,000,000. The balance of $25,000,000 is for the Library of Congress, the Botanic Garden, and the Government Printing Office. Of the $21,000,000-plus chargeable to Congress, the amount of $9,602,000 is for the House of Representatives and $4,057,000 for the Senate.

Just as a matter of information, the amount recommended in the bill is an apparent increase of $1,467,000 over the current year's appropriation. However, when the cost of additional compensation in lieu of war overtime, which we are required to pay by law, still to be appropriated for the current fiscal year, is added to the appropriation already made, the net result is a decrease of $37,325 under the requirements for the fiscal year 1944.

The amount of $59,606,000 carried in the bill is $2,027,000 under the Budget estimate. The decrease of $37,325, when compared with 1944 requirements, indicates—and correctly so—that the principal reason for the increase is the additional war compensation.

As much as we would have liked to grant increases in salaries here on the Hill, there are only two slight increases in the bill, one for $600 and one for $300, and they were very meritorious.

We increased the amount for the Architect, who is in charge of the physical upkeep and maintenance of this building and other buildings. We allowed this year the amount of $40,000 for painting the dome of the Capitol. Heretofore this has been done every 4 years but in the interest of economy the item was omitted from the bill last year. Provision for this work had to be made this year because the dome has gone unpainted for 5 years and is deteriorating, or will soon deteriorate, due to the fact that the paint is sloughing off, and good business dictates that that money be spent.

In the operations of the power plant we have had to grant an increase because of the increased price of coal. In the Library we gave a few increases in positions Fourteen were requested. We allowed seven, and those seven are of a very unusual character. I think every one is for work in connection with some foreign field, principally the Near East and the Far East, dealing with languages and areas that very few people in this country know very much about, and developing information necessary and helpful to our military operations. We have therefore allowed these positions to build up that part of the Library, which needs help and support for the purposes of the war. However, even the cost of these positions will have to be defrayed out of savings that may accrue during the fiscal year. We have allowed a small sum for printing and binding to take care of the accumulation of binding work in the Library. We declined to appropriate $300,000 for a new building which was very badly needed. The space in which a cafeteria was previously located cannot be used due to the fire hazard. There are other needs which were very well justified, but we felt it was an expensive proposition at this time, and more expensive now than it probably would be later.

The Government Printing Office had to have this year an increase in its revolving fund, its working capital, and the Deficiency Committee increased the working capital from $3,000,000 to $20,000,000. We, in turn, have done the same thing for 1945, because with the vast amount of business they are doing there, it is necessary to have more working capital. It is not a loss, because at the end of 12 months, after the fiscal year is over, that amount must be returned to the Treasury. It is merely working capital.

As to the judiciary part of this bill, practically every increase recommended is due to overtime and to additional expenses required by law. There were some things that we had included under the judiciary items which the full committee struck out, and today I believe the judiciary, presided over by a very marvelous group of men, is performing its work at a minimum of expense, and I personally feel that sometime common justice will demand that we give this important branch of our Government more help than it has at the present time.

I would like to say in conclusion that I think the departments on the Hill are in excellent hands.

On the business side Mr. Shanks and his organization have impressed us with the thoroughness, the interest, and the devotion that they have shown in all matters pertaining to the proper handling of money on the Hill.

The Government Printing Office is a remarkable institution and one that every citizen in this country can be proud of.

The Library of Congress is the largest and greatest library in the world. The Librarian in my opinion, is one of the ablest and most devoted public servants in the employ of the Government today. He is doing a tremendously important job as Librarian, and I think it is time for us all to recognize that fact, and I know that we will continue to be more and more proud of our Library.

There are many other men whom I would like to mention, but time does not permit. I am very confident that the committee has done a sound and conscientious job, and that this Congress can feel gratified in the work being done by the Congress as a legislative department. The Members of this body may feel sure that the most careful and conscientious studies of every kind are conducted by their legislative committees in the interest of good legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. I think that the trouble with most of this is that we do not utilize the tools that we have. I know that I am to be criticized myself in that respect and it is only recently that I have learned to use the legislative reference.

Mr. O'NEAL. I commend everybody to the use of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library. That service can do the Members inestimable good in research work on subjects to which they themselves have not the time to devote. I believe that possibly in time we may be able to increase the amount given in this bill for this purpose, to the benefit of the Congress itself, and to the people of America, who get much of their information through Congress and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, recently I gave the House information that came to me relative to the sale of dry-cell batteries at the Ogden, Utah, Army Depot. I told the House that I had taken this matter up with Under Secretary of War Patterson, and added he was greatly exercised when he called me on the telephone. He assured me that the Inspector General of the Ninth Service Command would make a complete investigation of the sale of these batteries.

A preliminary investigation was made and then the Inspector General of the Army decided to make a more extensive investigation to definitely fix the responsibility for the sale, so that appropriate action may be taken by the War Department.

Let it be distinctly understood that the War Department in no manner, shape, or form attempts to defend the sale of the batteries at the prices which were received. It admits that there was a serious lack of business judgment. As a result of the preliminary investigation remedial changes have already been instituted to provide for the enforcement of all existing regulations governing the sale and disposal of salvaged property.

I have stated on numerous occasions that there is going to be billions of dollars of surplus property in this country after the war. However, there is a tremendous amount of surplus property at the present time, goods of every description which cannot be purchased in the open market. My contention is that where this class of goods is available, whether it be trucks, motorcycles, all types of consumer goods, or what not, and it has been declared surplus it should be placed on the market because if sold now it in no way interferes with private industry. Then again, when a situation exists that only through the Government can certain items be purchased, certainly we should receive what we paid for the commodities if they are in first-class condition.

I am pleased to say that as a result of the Executive order issued by the President on February 21 which resulted in the appointment of Hon. William L. Clayton as Administrator of the Surplus War Property Administration, an organization is being set up which in the end should certainly result in the proper distribution of surplus property, and further than that, see that that surplus property is not disposed of at ridiculous prices such as occurred in connection with the sale of the batteries.

Reports of the Inspector General are considered confidential records of the War Department but I have been furnished with a brief of the preliminary investigation of the sale of the batteries. Of course, everyone is going to be greatly disturbed when they read a report of the investigation as it has so far progressed, especially when the information contained in this report confirms the statement I made at the outset. It will be hard for one to understand how an individual, who was a civilian employee of the depot, could purchase surplus property in his own name, especially when it is a violation of an Army regulation to dispose of surplus property in that manner. It is my understanding this employee has been discharged.

The report shows that in one case 25,891 batteries cost the Government $17,762, and 1,199 batteries cost the Government $237.55, but the amazing feature is that this civilian employee at the depot offered $15 for the lot and his offer was accepted. A second lot consisting of 65,909 batteries cost the Government $142,934. A third lot consisting of 324 batteries cost $231; 23,587 out of the second and third lots were sold for $65 to the same civilian employee, and 42,646 were sold to a resident of Utah for $50. Others, besides this civilian employee, participated in the sale and resale of the batteries. Part of the batteries purchased by the civilian employee were disposed of through a salesman employed by another individual. So far the price received has not been determined. It has been determined, however, that this civilian employee interested his brother in the transaction and that his brother sold part of the batteries for $20,000. I think that the House and the country are entitled to know the facts in connection with this sale. It is my opinion that when situations such as this are disclosed it will be beneficial to the Government in the handling of surplus property in the future. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will include as part of my remarks, the information that has been sent to me. The statement in reference to the preliminary investigation that I received follows:

1. This report contains the results of the investigation thus far of the sale of dry-cell batteries at the Army Services Depot, Ogden, Utah. The investigation has not been completed and the results reported at this time must therefore be regarded as tentative only.

2. During the period April 17 to May 1, 1943, the salvage officer at Utah Army Service Depot, Ogden, Utah, received 27,090 dry-cell batteries of various sizes pursuant to the terms of two inventory and inspection reports both dated April 17, 1943. One covered 25,891 dry-cell batteries at a cost to the Government of $17,762.63 and the other covered 1,199 batteries at a cost to the Government of $237.55. These batteries were all over-age and therefore no longer suitable for military purposes.

3. On or about April 28, 1943, Mr. J. W. Harbertson approached the salvage officer and asked permission to buy these batteries which were lying out in the open and were about to be destroyed. He offered a price of $15.00 for the lot. The salvage officer states that he accepted this offer after securing authority from headquarters, Ninth Service Command, to make the sale. Payment was made in cash by Mr. Harbertson and the money turned into the finance officer at Ogden, Utah. Mr. Harbertson removed the batteries on May 1, 1943.

4. A second lot of dry-cell batteries consisting of 65,909 batteries costing $142,934.76, and a third lot consisting of 324 batteries costing $231.06 were received by the same salvage officer in September 1943 pursuant to Reports of Survey dated August 31, 1943, and September 20, 1943, respectively. All these batteries were also over-age and therefore unsuitable for military purposes.

5. The second and third lots were sold by the salvage officer to Mr. J. W. Harbertson, who purchased 23,587 on September 20, 1943 for $65.00 and Mr. W. W. Grothe of Bountiful, Utah, who purchased 42,646 on September 23, 1943, for $50.00. These sales were also made by direct negotiations pursuant to authority granted by headquarters, Ninth Service Command.

6. The salvage officer explained to both purchasers that the batteries were over-age and unsuitable for military purposes.

7. Mr. J. W. Harbertson was a civilian employee at the depot. This fact was not developed by the salvage officer at the time of the first sale; whether or not the fact was known by the salvage officer prior to the second sale has not been established. Sale to an employee of the Government is contrary to Army regulations. Some of the batteries acquired by Mr. J. W. Harbertson were disposed of through salesmen employed by one A. W. Schryber. The number so sold and the amounts received for them have not been determined. Mr. J. W. Harbertson interested his brother, James M. Harbertson, of Ogden, Utah, in attempting to dispose of the remaining batteries. Mr. James M. Harbertson sold most of the remaining ones to Jake Hayutin & Sons, of Denver, in November 1943, for $20,000. On instructions from the Hayutin firm, some or all of the batteries purchased by that firm were shipped to Burstein-Applebee, of Kansas City.

8. The disposition of the batteries purchased by Mr. Grothe is not known. He is not employed by the Government and has not been questioned.

9. There is no evidence thus far of fraud or collusion on the part of the salvage officer or any other employee of the Government.

10. The batteries were turned over to the salvage officer because they had passed the predetermined shelf life which had been established to reflect deterioration due to age.

11. An error was made in disposing of the batteries at prices not in keeping with resale values. Without attempting to change the fact that an error was made, it may be pointed out, however, that the resale value of these batteries appears to be an abnormal situation arising from the shortage of batteries. Dry-cell batteries have little or no salvage value so far as the metal or other material components are concerned. The extent of deterioration resulting from age varies, however, and civilian purchasers were obviously willing to experiment with uncertain quality and indefinite age because first-class goods were not available.

12. The salvage officer had occupied his post for about 1 month only at the time of the first sale, had had no previous experience with batteries, and believed that he was not only avoiding the expense of removing worthless articles but also securing some revenue. The original purchaser seems to have been equally unaware of the real resale value.

13. The error might have been avoided if the Ninth Service Command had not granted special authority to sell without asking for

written bids. They were authorized, however, to grant special permission for "spot sales" in appropriate cases and did so without being aware of the substantial resale value of the items.

14. Dry-cell batteries are a peculiar item of supply in that they must be stored in sufficient quantities to be available to meet any tactical condition, notwithstanding the fact that they are of a perishable nature. The rate of issue depends on the tactical situation at the particular time and supply must be ample to meet any given situation. Overage batteries cannot be shipped for overseas use, but limited quantities can be issued in the zone of the interior for training purposes. The amount of life left in a given battery depends on the type of battery, the condition under which it was manufactured, and storage conditions. The batteries produced by a competent manufacturer and stored under ideal conditions may have considerable remaining life, while others will be completely dead. The amount of life in any particular battery can be determined only by testing each battery. The cost of such testing would normally be excessive.

15. The following corrective action is being taken as the result of the facts developed thus far concerning this transaction:

a. Discussions are being had with Procurement Division, Treasury Department, for the purpose of determining whether or not it would be practical to turn over to that agency over-age batteries no longer suitable for military purposes. It may be possible for that agency to test and price items in a more satisfactory manner.

b. If the discussions referred to result in the conclusion that it is not practical to dispose of over-age batteries through Treasury Procurement, an attempt will be made to publish for the guidance of salvage officers price lists to be worked out with the assistance of the Office of Price Administration.

c. The possibility of returning over-age batteries to manufacturers on some agreed price basis is also being investigated. It is believed that this procedure would not be as effective as either of the two alternatives previously mentioned, but the possibility of effecting a satisfactory arrangement is being explored.

d. The necessity of having experienced officers assigned as salvage officers will be emphasized again by the publication of a directive to the service commands. The facts developed in this case will be cited as an illustration of necessity for selecting experienced officers.

e. The service commands are being advised again that property will be sold only on widely circulated written invitations for bids, unless the facts submitted clearly demonstrate that special permission to effect sale by some other method is in the best interest of the Government.

f. The Ninth Service Command is being advised of the contents of this report and requested to advise headquarters as to corrective action taken and to be taken in that Command.

16. The investigation is being continued for the purpose of determining responsibility for the errors made and what further corrective action should be taken.

Mr. Speaker, Washington is full of individuals hungry to get their hands on surplus property. Undoubtedly they recall what happened when surplus property was disposed of during and after the First World War. I am sure many of the old Members of the House recall the scandals that developed as a result of the disposition of that surplus property and as Under Secretary of War Patterson says, "That must not happen again."

Why, Mr. Speaker, one individual advertised in the New York Times seeking clients that he desires to serve in connection with the purchase of surplus Government property stating that he had had 6 months' experience and indicating in the advertisement that he understood the procedure. In my opinion surplus property should be sold in the open market and bids should be received. Where the prices offered are ridiculous they should not be accepted.

It is not only certain groups that seek to secure surplus property at ridiculous prices. Strange to say, Mr. Speaker, some of the corporations likewise follow such a policy. For instance, there are 4,000 motorcycles available now and I have learned they have never been used. The official in charge offered those motorcycles to the manufacturers, and although the Government paid the manufacturers $400 apiece for them, their top offer was $130 apiece. These motorcycles are in the hands of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department and I have learned from the Chief of that Division, Hon. Clifton Mack, that he will not sell the motorcycles at the price offered, but he has gone out in the field to secure higher bids and at the time I talked to him he had bids as high as $300 apiece. But why should we not receive what we paid for those motorcycles in view of the fact that you cannot purchase them in the open market?

The House in the last session passed a surplus property bill, but that bill, I understand, does not go far enough. The bill has been reported by the Senate committee and is on the calendar. It is my hope that bill will be passed at an early date by the Senate and sent to conference and there a real law, with teeth in it, could be agreed upon.

While the President has set up by Executive order this Surplus War Property Administration as a result of the report by Mr. Baruch and Mr. Hancock, still Congress has a duty to perform and legislation should be speedily enacted. I urged the President, because I could not see that Congress would expedite legislation on this subject, to set up a special agency to handle surplus property. My communication reached him however on the very date he issued the Executive order.

My contacts with Mr. Clayton and with Mr. Mack of the Procurement Division, whom I am pleased to know will handle the disposition of consumer goods that are declared surplus, convinced me that we have two excellent administrators.

In conclusion I want to again emphasize the feeling of the Under Secretary of War and his associates with respect to the sales that have already been disclosed, such as the sale of certain tools in Michigan and the sale of these batteries, and to know that the investigation is being continued and corrective action will be taken when they determine the responsibility for the mistakes.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] rendered assistance in pressing the investigation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to tell the gentleman from Missouri that he is bringing to us a great contribution. In my State of Nebraska we had demands for batteries on the farms for many, many months. Many of my farmers who are isolated from railroads and the telephone, depend upon the radio for their information and the dealers out there cannot supply them with batteries. There was a sale of N. Y. A. goods in my home town. We were told that the surplus materials were going to be advertised and sold to the highest bidder. Yet many of the people in my locality were unable to get information as to how to bid, with the result that many pieces of valuable material were sold for a ridiculously low sum of money. There were trucks, typewriters, and many other things. The price which the Government received for this material was so small that the people were very much disturbed. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is doing us a great good here today in bringing this out into the light because the people of America will not stand for this surplus material getting into the hands of one monopoly or one individual. We think it ought to be advertised for bids and go through the regular channels of trade, so the people who need batteries can have them. They are producing food out there and they need this information. We need these batteries for the radios.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman it is my contention that where the Government has surplus property in good condition that cannot be purchased in the open market, then we certainly should receive the price we paid for it when the Government sells it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to compliment the gentleman and thank him for his contribution in thus turning the fierce light of publicity on this sort of thing, which will help to prevent it until we can get further legislation to control it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. I would further call his attention to this observation which I wish to make, that within the shadow of this House there have been surplus goods disposed of by the Treasury Department of an item that ordinarily calls for a price of $20 to $30 on the market, which has been purchased by a Member of the House brand new, for 80 cents apiece.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know nothing about any such transaction.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his disclosures. I would like to have his reaction as to whether or not this ridiculously low price was due to the dishonesty of the men handling it, or was it due to the system we have for getting rid of our surplus property?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. I wil say to the gentleman that as a result of this disclosure, the Army already has changed its regulations, which will be beneficial in the future. The Army wants to protect itself against criticism. It wants to stop all such deals as this. But I will also say in reference to the statement that the gentleman from Arizona made, that the House passed the surplus property bill in the last session. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] handled that bill. It is still over in the Senate. We should get action in the Senate, I hope, at an early date. If the Senate will pass that bill and send it back to the House and let it go to conference, then we can write a real law in conference. That is what we need to protect the taxpayers of this country and to prevent having their surplus property sold at ridiculous prices.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. We had a similar scandal in Arkansas about the sale of surplus property. We had two or three investigating committees go down there and the net result was that a lot of property was given away, but it was done under the present existing laws and there was no other course for them to take. If that is true, I think it is up to Congress, and I hope the Senate will pass some kind of bill so that we now could enact proper legislation which is so needed for the disposal of this property.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. All of these matters were pointed out when the House passed the bill for the orderly disposition of surplus property last year. At that time it was shown there are probably more than 100 statutes of various kind authorizing the disposition of surplus property.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes, and the gentleman from Mississippi is to be complimented for reporting that bill and securing its passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a few minutes to discuss the bill under consideration. As our chairman has so well said, this bill is probably the smallest appropriation bill that comes before the Congress for consideration, although it is a very important bill and carries items of great importance. The committee worked hard and conducted the hearings to the fullest degree possible in an attempt to bring out all the information bearing upon the various items in the bill before the House that it was possible to get. I cannot pay too high a compliment to the members of the committee. We are very happy that in this committee we have had no division along partisan lines. We have worked hard trying to write a bill that was a good bill. While I take no particular pride in recommending this as a good bill, I will say that under the circumstances, and in view of our means of getting information, it is as good a bill as we could arrive at. But until such time as we are able to get information from sources other than the people who request these funds and determine what the function of their particular department shall be, we probably will not be able to do it any better than we have. The clerk of the committee, Mr. Ruskin, has been very helpful and very diligent in his efforts to assist the committee. Taking it all in all I believe that we do have the best sort of bill that it was possible to bring out under the circumstances.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, for more than a year now, I have been trying to help the several manufacturers of work gloves in my State and district in their struggle to supply the critical and steadily increasing demands for their products. This whole industry has been so completely bogged down in the swamp of bureaucratic regulations and restrictions that it simply has no hope of providing the millions of gloves that workers in war plants, on farms and on railroads must have to do heavy and difficult work with their hands.

Let me recount some of the glove manufacturer's troubles. First, W. P. B. sharply restricted the available materials, and forced drastic changes in almost every company's line. The manufacturers, however, took that hurdle pretty well in stride. Next, O. P. A. stepped in with price ceilings and quality formulas which added greatly to the manufacturers' burdens. Everything else being favorable, however, the average company would have survived these restrictions. But the Administration's wage stabilization program has proved to be the final straw.

Wage scales in the glove industry at the time of the freeze were far below scales in most war industries, and it was perfectly obvious from the start that the glove manufacturers could not hope to recruit new help or even keep their normal working forces unless they were permitted to increase their pay schedules sharply.

All these problems of this industry are as old as the emergency. The inevitable failure of the industry should have been apparent to any intelligent schoolboy. And it should have been equally obvious that work gloves are an absolute essential in the war effort.

But today, vital war work everywhere is suffering because men and women simply cannot buy satisfactory work gloves. Hardly a day passes that I don't receive letters of protest from men in steel mills, glass plants, on farms, and on railroads, and their complaints are certainly justified.

Without adequate protection for their hands, men simply cannot handle hot steel and glass, or a thousand different rough, heavy, or dangerous objects which must be handled; and nobody with an ounce of common sense would expect them to do so.

These glove manufacturers and I, however, have so far failed to find a single official in a position of authority here in Washington who seems to have that necessary ounce of common sense or foresight.

Considered in the superficial manner, the problem of supplying gloves to our millions of essential workers may seem trivial. Maybe it is asking too much to expect bureaucrats, whose hardest work has been heavy thinking, to know what burned, blistered, or lacerated hands can do to a workingman's efficiency.

So this looks like another one of the little oversights which may loom up surprisingly large in the final cost.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, we have just learned that the English House of Parliament has extended an invitation to Members of the United States Congress, to visit and observe that body. I think this is an appropriate thing to do. Not only could we profit by studying and observing the procedure of the British Parliament but we could profit by doing the same thing in the case of similar nations—for instance the South American Governments.

It was my privilege and pleasure some months ago to be invited to sit in a session of the British House of Commons—not as a spectator from the Gallery—but as an observer from the floor of the Chamber — accompanied by a well-equipped parliamentarian who explained the procedure as they went along. In many respects the Congress of the United States and the House of Commons have many angles of procedure in common, but I observed one phase that is entirely different from our procedure here in the House of Representatives. On the day I was there, November 21, they submitted a series of questions to be answered by the Secretary of State for War at the first sitting of that body after the 23d of November. In other words, they gave the Secretary of State for War at least 2 days to prepare the answers.

I am here including these questions that were asked that day. I am sure they will be of interest to Members interested in this procedure.

QUESTIONS FOR ORAL ANSWER

1. Sir William Wayland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, if officers quartered in towns where their homes are situated can be allowed to reside with their families instead of having to live in barracks, or, in some cases, where barrack accommodation is not available, to pay for accommodation in hotels.

2. Sir William Wayland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, why there is no prospect of promotion to noncommissioned rank for privates in the Army Dental Corps at

Army dental centers, casualty clearing stations, and military and base hospitals; why the sole exception is made for clerk orderlies in field ambulance units; and is he aware that the ordinary service clerk orderly in the Army Dental Corps who carries no rank has important duties to carry out and responsibilities equal to those of a battalion orderly-room sergeant or battalion quartermaster sergeant.

3. Mr. Hannah: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he can hold out any hope of widowed mothers of soldiers being put on the same footing as soldiers' wives in the matter of allowances.

4. Mr. Thorne: To ask the Secretary of State for War, how many civilian doctors have passed through an Army school of hygiene course; and how many have taken courses for treating mechanical warfare casualties.

5. Mr. Gordon Macdonald: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he is aware that the holding of mock invasions sometimes interferes drastically with war production; and will he take such steps as will reduce such interference to a minimum.

6. Sir Richard Acland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, for how long was the Army Forms Depot without stocks of the form for making application for allowances to dependents of men serving in the Army; and what is the position now.

7. Sir Richard Ackland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether any instructions or advice has been sent to commanding officers of units on the subject of the new allowances to dependents of men serving in the Army.

8. Sir Richard Acland: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he will equip the London Regional Education Committee, and other similar committees, with magic lanterns so as to facilitate the giving of interesting lectures to military units.

9. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, whether he has considered the organization and publicity methods adopted by the Royal Air Force in recruiting for the Air Training Corps; and what proposals he has for adopting a similar system in connection with the Army.

10. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, what instructions have been issued to paymasters where soldiers who have received an overissue of pay, due to their names wrongly appearing in part II, Orders, have incurred substantial debits, as considerable hardship is being caused in innumerable cases of this nature through no fault of the soldiers concerned.

11. Mr. Bellenger: To ask the Secretary of State for War, what arrangements are made for journalists and photographers to accompany Army units on active operations against the enemy; and whether any similar procedure is adopted to that employed by the German Army whereby journalists and photographers are incorporated in the ranks of the army for the purpose of recording operations, either to be utilized in instruction of troops in tactics or by way of making documentary films for release to the general public.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. In that connection, not necessarily in connection with the questions propounded on the floor of the House of Commons, but in connection with the invitation that is to be extended to this body that we send representatives of our group to London to fraternize, as it were, with members of Parliament and the House of Lords, what is the gentleman's opinion on that?

Mr. SNYDER. As I said in my opening remarks, I think this is the appropriate thing to do. That is, to visit, sit in, observe, and listen to the procedure in bodies similar to ours, such as the British Parliament.

Mr. CELLER. Then I take it you are in fullest accord with the resolution that has already been adopted by both houses of the British Parliament. Does not the gentleman think we should take appropriate action as soon as the invitation has been formally extended to us?

Mr. SNYDER. I would not want to express an opinion about when we should take appropriate action. I would rather leave that to the leadership.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE (H. RES. 462)

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, on February 17 I presented a question to the House involving the privileges of the House and presented a resolution—House Resolution 446—which on motion of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. On March 6, 1944, I presented an amended resolution—House Resolution 462—which was also referred to the Judiciary Committee.

The discussion of the question, which I shall make today for the RECORD, has already been presented to the Judiciary Committee in the nature of a preliminary brief. My discussion must be incomplete in detail at this time but I am prepared to amplify the points on the appropriate occasion, and present additional authorities.

IN SUPPORT OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 446, AS AMENDED AND AMPLIFIED IN HOUSE RESOLUTION 462 (BY MR. HINSHAW) ON THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE AS AFFECTED BY THE PROPOSED MEXICAN TREATY

The resolution — House Resolution 446—refers to the House Judiciary Committee the question of whether or not the proposed treaty with Mexico which the President transmitted to the Senate of the United States on February 15, 1944, invades the constitutional prerogatives of the House of Representatives. In the amended form—House Resolution 462—the resolution suggests 10 questions which may be grouped under 5 principal headings:

First. Does the proposed treaty undertake to dispose of "property belonging to the United States" in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution of the United States?—First to sixth questions inclusive.

Second. Does the proposed treaty undertake to authorize diversions from and obstructions in the navigable waters of the United States in violation of paragraph 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States?—Seventh question.

Third. Does the proposed treaty undertake to commit or obligate the United States, without action by Congress, to raising, appropriating, and expending money for the construction of public works in violation of any provision of the Constitution vesting such powers in Congress?—Eighth question.

Fourth. Does the proposed treaty undertake to fix and determine what taxes, duties, imposts, or excises may or may not be laid and collected, in certain instances, in violation of paragraph 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution of the United States?—Ninth question.

Fifth. Does the proposed treaty undertake to fix and determine, without action by Congress, who may enter the United States without any immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements in violation of any provision of the Constitution vesting legislative powers in Congress?—Tenth question.

I

THE TREATY UNDERTAKES TO DISPOSE OF PROPERTY BELONGING TO THE UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF PARAGRAPH 2, SECTION 3, ARTICLE IV OF CONSTITUTION

This question should be considered under two heads: First, "property belonging to the United States" which the treaty undertakes to dispose of without action by Congress; and second, property which the treaty undertakes to dispose of to the prejudice of the claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada. The first heading in turn will be treated under two heads according to the kind of property affected by the treaty, to wit: (a) Water or the right to the use of water belonging to the United States and given to Mexico and also (b) the right given to Mexico to the beneficial use of dams, canals, works, and structures belonging to the United States.

A. Property belonging to the United States is disposed of by the treaty since it gives Mexico, first, water and water right; and second, the right to the beneficial use of reservoirs, canals, and structures of the United States; and third, makes disposition of the electricity generated at said works.

First. The water or the right to the beneficial use of water belonging to the United States which this treaty undertakes to give to Mexico is property within the meaning of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution and a lawful disposal thereof can be made only by Congress and not by the President and Senate alone.

(a) While it is generally true that there can be no title or ownership of the corpus or body of running water in the natural flow of a stream, yet the usufruct or right to use such water is capable of ownership and is property.

(b) When, however, the running water has been reduced to possession by being impounded and stored in a reservoir, its corpus then becomes the subject of ownership and it, too, is property.

(c) Furthermore, the fact that the water once stored is subsequently released and returned to the stream bed does not change its character or impair the title thereto if the owner intends thereby to adopt the stream channel as

his means of transportation to place of use lower down on the stream.

These general rules are set forth in 2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights 1339-1341 as follows:

No man, State or Nation can receive or give an absolute title to it (water) while it is still flowing naturally in the streams.

It therefore follows from the other principles that the sale of a water right by its owner does not convey any specific quantity of water itself, but only sells the right to the use of the water for the reason that the only property owned by an appropriator is the right to use it. * * * But after the water itself has been actually diverted from the stream and taken into the possession of the appropriator in his ditches, canals or reservoirs, the title to the same changed and it becomes the absolute property of the appropriator. * * * After it has been captured, as it were, or diverted from the natural channel of the stream by an individual and taken absolute possession of by him in the ditches, canals, reservoirs of other receptacles constructed or prepared by his work and labor, it is as much his private property as anything else that is reduced to possession which otherwise would be lost to the uses of man.

Right to the use of stored water: After water has been once stored in reservoirs it becomes personal property and may be sold, contracted for, and disposed of as such property. (2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights, 2d ed., 1484-1485; 1 Wiel Water Rights in Western States 755-758.)

The use of developed water belongs to the persons who by their own exertions discovered and developed the water, so far as their needs and necessities require. The water thus developed may be turned into a natural stream and conducted therein to the place of use and there recaptured by the parties developing the same." (2 Kinney, 2187-2188.)

To same effect see 1 Wiel Water Rights in Western States 37-41.

However, it makes little difference in the present inquiry whether we consider that the treaty disposes of specified quantities of the "corpus" of the waters of the Colorado River, as released by the United States from its reservoirs on that stream, or that the treaty accords Mexico the rights to the beneficial use of so much water of the Colorado River. In either event the subject matter is "property" and within the provisions of paragraph 2, section 3 of article IV of the Constitution vesting the power to make such disposition in Congress.

Second. The right to the beneficial use of dams, canals, works, and structures of the United States which the treaty bestows upon Mexico is property within the meaning of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution and a lawful disposal thereof can be made only by Congress itself.

The treaty undertakes to bestow on Mexico the beneficial use of the following properties of the United States:

(a) Boulder Dam and Reservoir, although not specifically named therein, because without this great storage reservoir—capacity twice the average annual flow of the river—the treaty guaranties could not be fulfilled.

(b) The Davis Dam and Reservoir—article 12 (b) of treaty.

(c) Imperial Dam and All American Canal—article 11 (c), article 12 (c), and article 14 of treaty.

(d) Rockwood heading and Alamo Canal—article 11 (c) and article 12 (c) of treaty.

(e) That the use for the benefit of Mexico of other works not specifically named is contemplated by the treaty is evident by the first sentence of article 10 and by general provisions obligating the United States to "construct or acquire works that may be necessary to convey a part of the Colorado River to Mexico."

Fifty, C. J. on Property defines "property" to include or mean—page 729:

In law—generally. The term "property" is in law a generic term of extensive application. It is a term of large import, of broad and exceedingly complex meaning, of the broadest and most extensive signification, a very comprehensive word and is the most comprehensive of all terms which can be used.

Page 730 as right or interest:

Primarily in its appropriate sense, in the broader sense, in legal conception, in a legal sense, or in the strict legal sense, the term "property" signifies valuable right or interest considered primarily as a source or element of wealth or any civil right of a pecuniary nature or as an aggregate of rights which are guaranteed and protected by the Government.

Page 732:

The right of user is an essential quality or attribute of absolute property without which absolute property can have no existence. There can be no conception of property aside from its control and use and upon its use depends its value. In fact it has been stated that the right to enjoy the beneficial use of property is the most real and practical idea of the nature of property, that property in anything consists in the use, the legal right to use and derive a profit from lands and other things is property, and that the use of property is property.

Ditches, canals, flumes, and reservoirs used for the conveyance or storage of water courses, lakes, or ponds are real property and the rules of law governing the same are in general the same as the rules governing other real property. (2 Kinney on Irrigation and Water Rights, 2d ed. 1462).

Third. By article 19, the treaty undertakes to make disposition of electric power which the two Governments may develop at international plants. The treaty, in article 2, defines the meaning of the words "two governments" in such a manner as to entirely exclude Congress. It there says:

Wherever there are provisions in this treaty for joint action or joint agreement by the two governments * * * it shall be understood that the particular matter in question shall be handled by or through the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

But in *Ashwander* v. *T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 330) the Court said:

The water power which was an inevitable incident of the construction of the dam (Wilson Dam) the right to convert it into electric energy and the energy thus produced constitute property belonging to the United States.

The express power of Congress under the Constitution to dispose of property belonging to the United States is not abridged or withdrawn by the 9 or 10 amendments.

And again in *Ashwander* v. *T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 333) the Supreme Court declared:

That the water power, and the electric energy generated at the dam, are susceptible of disposition as property belonging to the United States is well established.

Therefore, any disposition of electricity belonging to the United States must be made by Congress as provided in article IV, section 3, paragraph 2.

B. The treaty and the disposition of property proposed thereunder operate to prejudice the claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV and amendment 5 of the Constitution.

By the terms of the Boulder Canyon Project Act the United States could not commence construction of Boulder Dam until contracts were first obtained assuring the repayment of its cost.

CONTRACTS

First. California power contracts: In 1930 and 1931 the United States executed contracts for the sale of "falling water" for the generation of electricity at Boulder Dam with various California municipalities, including Los Angeles, Burbank, Glendale, and Pasadena, with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California and with private power corporations, including the Southern California Edison Co., Los Angeles Gas & Electric Corporation, and the Southern Sierras Power Co.

California water contracts: Later the United States also executed contracts for the delivery of water out of Boulder Dam and Reservoir for domestic and irrigation uses at various points on the river below Boulder, with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, the city and county of San Diego, Imperial Irrigation District, Palo Verde Irrigation District, and Coachella Valley County Water District. These contracts for power and water were sufficient in amount to assure the Government the repayment of its costs in building Boulder Dam. The aggregate annual net diversions from the river covered by the California contracts is 5,362,000 acre-feet.

For contracts see Wilbur & Ely; the Hoover Dam Contracts, pages 291-369.

Second. Nevada contracts: The United States in 1942 executed a contract with the State of Nevada for the delivery of water out of Boulder Dam and Reservoir of 100,000 acre-feet per annum, and in February 1944, executed a second contract with Nevada for an additional 200,000 acre-feet per year.

Third. Arizona contract: On February 10, 1944, the United States entered into a contract with the State of Arizona for the delivery to it, for use in that State, of 2,800,000 acre-feet per annum of Colorado River water.

Fourth. Summary of water supply and required uses: The total water supply is subject to alternating wet and dry cycles of from 7 to 11 years. It is estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation, based on studies of stream flow over a period of 44 years, that the total average releases of water available from Boulder Dam in the future, during critical dry cycles extending over 10 or more years, will

be 8,500,000 acre-feet per year. The supply and draft thereon is estimated as follows:

Annual supply of water

	Acre-feet
Outflow from Boulder Dam	8,500,000
Reservoir and other river losses below Boulder Dam	600,000
Available for use	7,900,000

Annual requirements for withdrawal and use

	Acre-feet
Nevada contracts	300,000
California contracts	5,362,000
Arizona contract	2,800,000
Proposed Mexican treaty	1,500,000
Total	9,962,000
Available supply	7,900,000
Requirements	9,962,000
Deficit	2,062,000

These figures show that any water guaranteed to Mexico must be taken from United States commitments heretofore made to our own communities and States.

Fifth. The contractual claims of the States of California, Arizona, and Nevada are prejudiced and will be seriously injured by the proposed treaty. Relying upon said contracts executed with the United States pursuant to an act of Congress, the California communities have committed themselves to the expenditure of over a half billion dollars for the construction of works with which to utilize Boulder water and power. These obligations are:

Boulder Dam and power plant	$125,000,000
Metropolitan aqueduct	274,000,000
All-American Canal	78,000,000
San Diego aqueduct	16,000,000
Power transmission lines of the city of Los Angeles and private power companies	56,000,000
Total	549,000,000

Of the foregoing, more than $400,000,000 have now been actually expended and are represented by bonds and contracts to repay.

The contracts and commitments made by the United States to furnish water to the States of Nevada and Arizona have led to large commitments and expenditures by and in those States.

Now the executive department reports to the Senate a treaty with Mexico which in its disposition of Colorado River water, water rights, electric power, and property would mean that the United States repudiates its contracts with its own communities and States to their serious injury and damage, in violation of paragraph 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

Sixth. There is little discussion of, and not very much light which can be thrown upon, the part of the Constitution forbidding prejudicing claims of States. However, in 2 Cooley on the Constitution, at page 202, under chapter 31, headed "Powers of Congress," that authority states:

> The next clause of the same article is: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to prejudice any claims of the United States, or of any particular States" (art. IV, sec. 3, clause 2).
>
> The proviso thus annexed to the power is certainly proper in itself and was rendered necessary by the jealousies and questions concerning the western territory which have been already alluded to under the preceding head. It was perhaps suggested by the clause in the ninth article of the confederation which contained a proviso "that no State should be deprived of its territory for the benefit of the United States * * *." The power is not confined to the territory of the United States but extends to "other property" belonging to the United States; so that it may be applied to the due regulation of all other personal and real property rightfully belonging to the United States. And so it has been constantly understood and acted upon (204).

We think that the author could have added with equal force "and subject to the same proviso and limitation."

II

The proposed treaty does authorize substantial diversions from and permanent obstructions in the Colorado River, part of the navigable waters of the United States, without action by Congress, in violation of paragraph 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

A. If this proposed treaty becomes effective, the United States guarantees Mexico the delivery of 1,500,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water per annum, which in some years of drought will be all the water that will ever reach the international boundary line. Furthermore, under the terms of this treaty, Mexico may take all the waters of the river available to her and leave the bed of the river dry. The treaty provides further that a substantial part of the 1,500,000 acre-feet of water directly allocated shall be diverted at points within the United States and permits all the remainder to be diverted "in the limitrophe section of the river"—the 20-mile section where the river is the common boundary—at a point where the easterly half of the Colorado constitutes navigable waters of the United States.

First. The navigable capacity of a river can be injured, obstructed, or destroyed by diversions from the channel of the stream—*Sanitary District* v. *United States* (266 U. S. 405, 426); *United States* v. *Rio Grande Co.* (174 U. S. 690–708–709).

B. By this treaty Mexico is permitted to construct and maintain a permanent dam in the limitrophe section of the river—where it is common to both countries, article 12 (a) of the treaty—and in addition, during the 5-year period following the treaty going into force and effect, Mexico is given the privilege of constructing, maintaining, and operating a "temporary diversion structure in the bed of the Colorado River in the territory of the United States for the purpose of diverting water therefrom into the Alamo Canal"; article 27 of the treaty.

In *Ashwander* v. *T. V. A.* (297 U. S. 288, 328), the Supreme Court said:

> Commerce includes navigation. "All America understands and has uniformly understood," said Chief Justice Marshall in *Gibson* v. *Ogden* (9 Wheat. 1, 190) "the word 'commerce' to comprehend navigation." The power to regulate interstate commerce embraces the power to keep the navigable rivers of the United States free from obstructions to navigation and to remove such obstructions when they exist. "For these purposes," said the Court in *Gilman Philadelphia* (3 Wall. 713, 725), "Congress possesses all the powers which existed in the States before the adoption of the National Constitution and which existed in the Parliament in England."

In *United States* v. *Appalachian Power* (311 U. S. 377, 405), the Court said:

> Congress has power under the Constitution (commerce clause) to regulate navigation. It may legislate to forbid or license dams in the water, its power over improvements for navigation in rivers is "absolute."

In *Arizona* v. *California et al.* (283 U. S. 423, 453) the Supreme Court found the Colorado River a navigable river and said:

> We know judicially, from the evidence of history, that a large part of the Colorado River south of Black Canyon was formerly navigable and that the main obstacles to navigation have been the accumulations of silt coming down from the upper reaches of the river system and the irregularity in the flow due to periods of low water. Commercial disuse resulting from changed geographical conditions and a congressional failure to deal with them, does not amount to an abandonment of a navigable river or prohibit future exertions of Federal control (*Economy Light & Power Co.* v. *United States*, 256 U. S. 113, 118, 124).

Since the Colorado River is a navigable river by the declaration of Congress in the Boulder Canyon Project Act and by the decision of the United States Supreme Court and so acknowledged to be by Mexico in existing treaties, Congress is the department of government vested by the Constitution with the supreme and absolute power to regulate the same.

III

The treaty unquestionably commits the United States to raising, appropriating and expending large sums of money for the construction, operation, and maintenance of projects and work unauthorized by Congress. As examples note the following:

First. By article 5 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to participate in the construction, operation, and maintenance on the main channel of the Rio Grande of, first, three dams which the treaty says are required for the conservation, storage, and regulation of the waters of that river; and, second, dams which may be required for the diversion of its waters. The number of diversion dams to be built is not specified but is left to be determined in the future by the Commission. The share of the costs of all these works which the United States must pay is fixed, for storage dams, proportionate to the capacity therein allotted to our country and for diversion dams the cost is divided "in proportion to the benefits which the respective countries receive therefrom, as determined by the Commission." The cost estimates for these structures is not given and probably is not now known by anyone but the share which the United States must pay will certainly run into many millions of dollars.

Second. By article 7 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to pay half the cost of constructing certain hydroelec-

tric generating plants on the Rio Grande. By that article "each Government agrees to construct through its section of the Commission such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments. Both Governments through their respective sections of the Commission shall operate and maintain jointly such hydroelectric plants." "Two Governments" is defined in article 2 to be, for the purposes of "joint action or joint agreement" the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

Third. By article 12 (b) of the treaty, the United States is obligated to construct the Davis Dam entirely at its own expense.

Fourth. By article 23 of the treaty, the United States is obligated to pay the entire cost of acquiring any and all private property within the United States which may be required for the construction of works proposed by the treaty or determined by the Commission with the approval of our State Department as being "required for the execution and performance of this treaty."

Where are the millions of dollars required for the above public works coming from? The money is not now in the Treasury. It must be raised for this purpose by Congress either by revenue bills which must originate in the House—article I, section 7 of the Constitution—or by borrowing, which is a power vested in Congress—article I, section 8, paragraph 1 of the Constitution. But the determination of what projects the money shall be used to build is reserved, by the treaty, to the Commission with the approval of our State Department. The Constitution is clear that these things can be done only by Congress and not by the President and the Senate acting by themselves.

IV

The treaty unquestionably undertakes to determine, fix, and decide without action by Congress matters relating to duties, imposts, and excises, and to provide for the free entry into our country of "all materials, implements, equipment, and repair parts intended for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such works" as are proposed to be constructed and operated in the execution of the treaty—article 20 of the treaty. This certainly violates paragraph 1 of section 8 of article 1 of the Constitution, which vests this power in Congress.

V

The treaty unquestionably authorizes the migration into this country of all persons, whether Mexican citizens or other nationals, who are employed "either directly or indirectly" on the construction, operation, or maintenance of the works proposed for the execution of the treaty, "without any immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements"—article 20 of the treaty. Some of these persons may be highly objectionable from the standpoint of our laws or our national policy. Immigration regulations have long been considered a proper subject for legislation by Congress under paragraph 1 of section 9 of article I and the last paragraph of section 8 of article I, which vests in Congress power "to make all laws which shall be necessary or proper for carrying into execution" the express powers granted to Congress.

VI

CONCLUSION

First. I believe that the pending inquiry has a broader significance than the subject matter of the present resolution, important as I believe that to be. Our people and our Nation are now contemplating the post-war era. It is evident that sooner or later treaties are going to be suggested which may affect deeply our economic life and well being, the political structure of our Government, and even our preconceived ideas of government in relation to its citizens within and to the people of the world without. Will the House of Representatives play a rightful part in any such world movement, exert its proper influences on any such important and far-reaching treaties by the full discharge of the constitutional powers entrusted to it, or will it as the peoples' representative body be content to stand idly by as an onlooker while all the world about us, including our own American way of life, is changed by treaties?

Second. I do not contend here that the Congress has or should have treaty-making powers, but I do contend that in order to be valid and effective any treaty which intends by its terms to accomplish matters which are entrusted to the Congress, or which the Congress is charged to perform, requires either prior authorization by the Congress or that it be subject to subsequent act of Congress.

If that is not the clear intent of the Constitution, then the treaty-making agencies can by treaty both amend any laws enacted by the Congress and effectively enact new statutes, thereby annuling the powers of the House of Representatives and amending the Constitution itself. The Constitution would, indeed, have created a Frankenstein that could, and would ultimately, destroy its creator.

But no responsible authority has yet contended that the treaty-making power is unlimited. All agree that the treaty-making power is limited. Nevertheless, the treaty-making agencies are now going beyond their acknowledged limitations by undertaking to operate on subjects and within legislative fields declared by the Constitution expressly to be entrusted to the Congress.

Shall the House of Representatives supinely and silently submit now to this whittling-down process of its admittedly constitutional powers and prerogatives? If the treaty-making agencies of the Government can effectively discharge, in this instance, some of the powers which the Constitution vests in Congress, why can't they do it in other instances, and, finally, why can't they do it in all instances where it serves their purpose or meets their desires?

I believe there can be no distinction made in the degree of encroachment upon the rights of Congress. In principal there can be no difference between a large and a small trespass, for if the treaty-making agencies can invade the constitutional powers of Congress and of the House of Representatives in one particular, they can invade those powers in all particulars.

Rights which are not defended will soon cease to exist. Putney on Constitutional Law, at pages 292 and 293, says:

> Foreign countries dealing with our own are supposed to be acquainted with the general nature of our Government and of the limitations of the powers of each department. The greatest disgrace or danger with which our country can be threatened is the cowardly surrender by one department to any usurpation of powers by another.

Again at page 293 Mr. Putney says:

> The treaty-making powers of the President and Senate together is not unlimited. The Constitution provides: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land."
>
> Treaties, therefore, are not the supreme law of the land by themselves but in connection with the Constitution and law of the United States. What is the order of precedence among these three? It is almost unnecessary to state that the Constitution of the United States must come first. An instrument which requires the vote of two-thirds of both Houses of Congress and of three-fourths of the States for its amendment cannot be changed by the President and Senate.

Third. From the discussion which has gone before, it must be apparent that the proposed Mexican treaty undertakes to operate on subjects and within legislative fields declared by the Constitution to be expressly entrusted to Congress. In three instances, to wit, the disposal of property belonging to the United States, the control over the navigable waters of the United States, and the regulation of duties, imposts, and excises, the treaty makes a direct invasion of the express powers of Congress and of the House of Representatives. Again, the United States is obligated to raise and expend large sums of money for public works unauthorized by Congress, which certainly constitutes an indirect invasion of the powers expressly given to Congress and to the House of Representatives to raise revenue, to pay debts, and to appropriate money. In another instance, the treaty regulates migration of aliens into this country which, if not a direct invasion of an express power, is certainly a direct invasion of an implied power of Congress and of the House of Representatives to deal with the subject of aliens.

Fourth. I believe that for the protection of the rights of the House of Representatives, the proposed Mexican treaty should be protested as an invasion of its constitutional prerogatives.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] 5 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand an editorial from the Weymouth Gazette, of Weymouth, Mass., in the district which I represent, reading in part as follows:

> Never, in our rather lengthy newspaper experience, have we observed such a tidal

wave of public resentment as that which developed on Monday within a few brief hours over the summary ousting of George E. Lane as chairman of the Weymouth Price and Rationing Board by the Regional (Boston) O. P. A. Office. And the wave increases in proportion with every passing day.

The O. P. A. Regional Office threw Mr Lane out on the grounds that he violated regulations stipulating that rationing board members cannot participate in politics by holding public office. Specifically, he was charged with running for the office of town meeting member. It is understood that he was given the opportunity of resigning, but refused on the ground that the Hatch Act does not apply to unpaid volunteer Federal appointees like himself. Furthermore he holds that being a town meeting member is not a political office and therefore in holding such membership he was not participating in politics. Following his refusal to resign he was notified that his term of office on t e local rationing board had ceased.

* * * * *

Everyone seems to agree that the Hatch Act has nothing whatever to do with the question at issue, developed in Mr. Lane's refusal to resign. Running for public office such as salaried jobs certainly could be classified as running for a political office. But town meeting members — No. They are elected by ballot, to be sure, but to classify this position in our town government as being a political office is utterly absurd. And whoever has ruled that such an office is political doesn't know what the score is. It's an absurd ruling and one that needs clarifying at once.

Mr. Chairman, immediately after the removal of the chairman of the local rationing board the entire board resigned in protest. The board of selectmen joined in the protest. The town of Weymouth, in town meeting assembled, unanimously adopted a resolution condemning the action of the O. P. A. and calling on Washington officials to review the entire matter immediately. The community seems to be solidly back of the rationing board in its position.

As stated in the editorial, the action taken by the O. P. A. regional director was not taken under the Hatch Act. The Hatch Act as amended specifically exempts a part-time officer without compensation, serving in connection with the existing war effort.

The action was taken by the regional director purely as a matter of policy, designed to restrain all O. P. A. personnel including volunteers from political activities regarded as within the spirit of the Hatch Act, even though the act as amended is not applicable to them. The application of the policy is delegated by the O. P. A. authorities in Washington to regional and district offices.

What is a town meeting member, Mr. Chairman, and what are his duties? Town meeting members in New England are chosen each year in those towns which have become so large that it is impossible for all the townspeople to attend the annual town meeting in person.

The duties of a town meeting member are to attend the annual town meeting normally a year after his election and such special town meetings, if any, as may be necessary in the meantime to deal with strictly local affairs. In the town of Weymouth there are some 249 town meeting members elected as individuals on a nonpartisan basis.

The absurdity of the ruling in this instance is emphasized by the fact that the chairman of the rationing board has served for several years both as a member of the board and as a town meeting member, rendering efficient service to the town in both capacities, drawing no compensation from either office and encountering no objection whatsoever heretofore from O. P. A.

If the proposed ruling is to stand, it will, logically apply to all rationing boards throughout Massachusetts and other New England States having town meeting members. If the ruling is to stand, it should logically apply to town meeting members holding positions with selective-service boards and other similar activities.

I am in hearty sympathy with the broad objectives of the Hatch Act. I commend its enforcement.

I believe that the ruling in this instance however, is absurd and without justification. I cannot believe that the duties of a town meeting member bring it in any sense either within the letter or the spirit of the Hatch Act.

I again condemn the action taken by O. P. A., Mr. Chairman. I demand immediate reconsideration, in order that the town of Weymouth, may continue to have the services of its rationing board and that other communities in New England and elsewhere may not be subject to similar action.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD a copy of the editorial referred to, three of the many communications received in this connection, and a copy of a joint letter of protest adressed to O. P. A. Administrator Bowles by members of the Massachusetts delegation.

[From the Weymouth (Mass.) Gazette and Transcript of March 9, 1944]

LANE'S OUSTING STIRS TOWN'S FIGHTING SPIRIT

Never, in our rather lengthy newspaper experience, have we observed such a tidal wave of public resentment as that which developed on Monday, within a few brief hours, over the summary ousting of George E. Lane as chairman of the Weymouth price and rationing board by the regional (Boston) O. P. A. office. And the wave increases in proportion with every passing day.

The O. P. A. regional office threw Mr. Lane out on the grounds that he violated regulations stipulating that rationing board members cannot participate in politics by holding public office. Specifically he was charged with running for the office of town-meeting member. It is understood that he was given the opportunity of resigning, but refused, on the ground that the Hatch Act does not apply to unpaid-volunteer Federal appointees like himself. Furthermore he holds that being a town-meeting member is not a political office and therefore in holding such membership he was not participating in politics. Following his refusal to resign, he was notified that his term of office on the local rationing board had ceased.

When his fellow board members heard this news they were incensed that regional O. P. A. officials could take such a senseless and absurd attitude and they resigned as a body. Their action was in protest to thme ousting of their chairman.

Incidentally, it took a good deal of courage on their part to take this action and they are to be complimented in backing their convictions with united action. What they did, not only showed how they feel on the matter at issue, but it is at the same time a personal tribute to Mr. Lane and one in which he can take pardonable pride. They knew better than anyone else in town what a superb job Mr. Lane has done as a board member since the inception of O. P. A. here in town and particularly as chairman since he succeeded Attorney William J. Holbrook. Their solid backing certainly demonstrated what they thought about the action of the regional O. P. A. office.

This fighting spirit was again displayed a few hours later (early Monday evening), when the selectmen met to consider the resignations of the rationing board members. The selectmen declined to accept the resignations.

Later that evening, at the annual town meeting, J. William O'Donnell, of South Weymouth, rose for the purpose of advising the meeting that Mr. Lane had been "fired" as chairman of the rationing board, and pointed out that the action was taken because Mr. Lane was running for town meeting member in next Monday's town election. He presented a resolution condemning the O. P. A. for its action, and calling upon Washington officials to review the matter at once.

Everyone seems to agree that the Hatch Act has nothing whatever to do with the question at issue, developed in Mr. Lane's refusal to resign. Running for public office such as salaried jobs certainly could be classified as running for a political office. But town meeting members—no. They are elected by ballot to be sure, but to classify this position in our town government as being a political office is utterly absurd. And whoever has ruled that such an office is political, doesn't know what the score is. It's an absurd ruling and one that needs clarifying at once.

If being a town meeting member is something which rationing board members cannot be, at one and the same time, then the same logic must of necessity follow through to selective-service boards. Their members are nonpaid, volunteer workers. They are Federal appointees.

Some of our Weymouth's Selective Service Board's members are also town meeting members. If the same line of reasoning is pursued in relation to them, then they too much resign one position or the other—or be ousted by some $12,000-a-year understrapper sitting at a polished desk in Boston—or Washington—who has a dwarfed notion of the fitness of things.

This situation, as it relates specifically to Weymouth, must also apply in 37 other towns in this Commonwealth which also have adopted the limited form of town meeting government, like we have here. And there are selective service boards having jurisdiction over all of these towns. When we contemplate a situation like this, with the possibilities it presents for wholesale oustings or resignations, you can begin to see what a tangled mess a stupid decision can create.

Here in Weymouth, Mr. Lane and his fellow rationing board members have the solid backing of the community. He and the others have been deluged with phone calls and messages. In every case, their fellow-townspeople were incensed over the regional O. P. A. raising such a silly issue in the first place, and pledged to support in any way possible, whatever move that might be taken next.

THE TOWN OF WEYMOUTH, MASS.,
East Weymouth, Mass., March 8, 1944.

Representative RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a meeting of the board of selectmen held this evening it was voted to write to the Office of Price Administration headquarters explaining our predicament in regard to our rationing board, all of whom have resigned, as you may know, in protest of the removal of their chairman, who is a can-

didate for a town meeting member from precinct 8.

We have a situation in Weymouth quite unlike most other towns or cities in Massachusetts or any other State in the Union. We have what is called a representative town meeting consisting of 240 elected members, a certain percent of the voters in each of the 9 precincts. These members are elected from their own precinct and not by vote of the whole town. This type of government was necessary, owing to the large population, approximately 27,000, and no hall suitable to hold such a gathering.

According to the ruling of the Massachusetts Office of Price Administration, the members of our rationing board cannot run for town meeting membership, therefore being deprived of their rights. Neither can we appoint any of the 240 members of the representative town government to the rationing board. In our neighboring towns members of the rationing boards may, and do, attend town meetings, taking an active part in same, but in Weymouth that privilege is denied the membership of the rationing boards. The net result is that we have 10 or more members of the rationing board who cannot take part in our town affairs, and 240 town meeting members, plus other elected officials, that cannot be rationing board members. In our opinion this is not fair to the rationing board members or to the board of selectmen who have to make the recommendations for appointments, especially when your paid officers and employees can take part in their town meetings with no strings attached.

The State officials of the Office of Price Administration inform us that they do not know where they can draw a line. We believe that the State is correct in keeping politics out of the rationing board membership, but we do not consider a town meeting member as being in politics, therefore why not draw the line there and give your rationing board membership the rights that they deserve?

Very truly yours,

MARY J. SHEEHAN,
Clerk, Weymouth Board of Selectmen.

BICKNELL SCHOOL,
North Weymouth, Mass., March 10, 1944.

Hon. RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH,
United States Congressman.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the Weymouth Teacher's Association I would like to register their protest concerning the recent action of the Office of Price Administration. This protestation is not for any personal reason but rather a complaint against the fineness of the interpretation of the rule set up in Massachusetts concerning those who aspire to what the Office of Price Administration consider a political office.

We cannot rest with their assumption that a town-meeting member is a political office. It is in our opinion a numerical factor and not a political factor that has forced Weymouth to accept the limited form of town meeting.

Therefore we urge that the necessary steps be taken immediately to correct this injustice in Massachusetts or anywhere else in New England that this might exist and that all members of the dismissed Weymouth board be restored to their former status.

Very truly yours,

E. LEO MADDEN,
President, Weymouth Teachers' Association.

STETSON SHOE CO., RATIONING BOARD,
South Weymouth, Mass., March 7, 1944.

Mr. STEPHEN EARLY,
Secretary to the President,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: George E. Lane, chairman of the Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board, has been removed by O. P. A.

This removal is based, as we understand it, on the fact that Mr. Lane is desirous of retaining his status as a town-meeting member* (see explanation attached). That office has been classified by O. P. A. as a "Political" office. It is our further understanding that the entire panel of ration board members has resigned in a body in protest to this ruling.

George Lane was a former selectman of the town of Weymouth and passed up the opportunity to run again for that office, undoubtedly feeling that the time given to the Weymouth War Price Rationing Board would be a substantial contribution to the war effort. Mr. Lane was a candidate for town-meeting member in 1943 and no action was taken by O. P. A. at that time. The fact that he continued as a town-meeting member for the 1944 election has apparently caused this ruling to be made.

We should like to enter our protest against this ruling, for we have felt, as an industrial organization in the town of Weymouth, that the members of the Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board have done good work and that they deserve commendation and not condemnation.

May we respectfully request that everything be done to reinstate as promptly as possible the entire panel of Weymouth War Price and Rationing Board members as a vote of confidence in the work that they have done for their country and their community?

Respectfully yours,

ALBERT VINAL,
Treasurer.

Copies to Hon. DAVID I. WALSH and Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH.

The town of Weymouth, as well as all of the other towns in New England, holds an annual town meeting. In addition to this annual meeting, it sometimes is necessary to hold special (extra) town meetings during the year. Years ago all of the people who wished attended these town meetings, voted the necessary money to run the town and then went home. As the population grew there was no meeting place available which was large enough to hold all of the people who wished to attend. Thus, all who wished could not get inside and vote.

Today, in order to treat every citizen fairly, Weymouth and many other towns, holds its town meetings under what is known as the proportional representation plan.

Thus, a town-meeting member today is one of a body of approximately 249 unpaid citizens chosen by the rest of the citizens to vote for them the appropriations necessary for the operation of the town, in the same manner as all of the citizens did years ago.

Unless special town meetings are necessary these members attend town meeting for either one or two evenings each year. They have no other duties to perform, no other functions, and are not political in the common usage of that term.

MARCH 14, 1944.

HON. CHESTER BOWLES,
Administrator, Office of
Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BOWLES: Our attention has been called to the removal of the chairman of the rationing board at Weymouth, Mass., by direction of O. P. A. Regional Director Shoup because of the chairman's decision to run for reelection as a town meeting member, which position he has held for several years, and to the unanimous protest of the town of Weymouth in a town meeting assembled over the action taken.

Those protesting point out that provisions of the Hatch Act have no application to the case inasmuch as by amendment to that act, a member of a war price and rationing board is a part-time officer without compensation, serving in connection with the existing war effort and therefore specifically exempted from the provisions of the act. They indicate that the action has been taken under the policy of the O. P. A. to refrain from political activities within the spirit of the Hatch Act even though the act as amended is not applicable to them, decision having been delegated by the National O. P. A. Office to regional and district offices.

They believe that the classification of a town meeting member's duties as political duties is without justification and that if adhered to would have wide application to all rationing boards throughout the Commonwealth.

They point out that the duties of a town meeting member, of which we understand there are some 249 in the town of Weymouth, are to attend one town meeting a year after his election and such othe special meetings, if any, as may be called in the meantime in respect to strictly local affairs and indicate that in their judgment, those duties can in no sense be classified as political within the letter or spirit of the Hatch Act. They indicate further that in this particular instance, the member in question has served consistently, both as a member of the rationing board and as a town meeting member, giving the town excellent service in both capacities, receiving no compensation in either position and without any objection heretofore on the part of the O. P. A. regional office.

All members of the rationing board resigned in protest over the action taken but have been prevailed upon to withdraw their resignations temporarily pending decision by O. P. A.

We are in hearty sympathy with the broad objectives of the Hatch Act and commend its enforcement, but we feel that the action of the O. P. A. in this instance is outside of the scope of the act. We protest against it and earnestly urge that the matter may be reconsidered with a view to reinstatement of the Weymouth rationing board and assurance of its continued service to the town.

Sincerely yours,

R. B. WIGGLESWORTH, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., ALLEN T. TREADWAY, EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, PEHR G. HOLMES, CHARLES R. CLASON, ANGIER L. GOODWIN, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read an Associated Press quotation of Walter Winchell as follows:

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., March 13.—Walter Winchell said here today that he had been asking various Members of Congress to be investigated for many years. "Dies is the kind of man who does not like any kind of criticism. Some time ago he asked Drew Pearson to please ask Walter Winchell to lay off him. When I told Pearson to tell him to go to hell I expected him to use the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to even matters," Winchell said.

Mr. Chairman, this utterly false statement by Mr. Winchell and the fact that he has demonstrated an unwillingness to find out the truth about a given situation convinces me that he is not concerned with the truth and that he deliberately and intentionally spreads falsehoods over the airways. Last December after Mr. Winchell had used certain false statements repeatedly I wired him and wired the Blue Network advising them that the statements were utterly false. I asked the officials of the Blue Network and Mr. Winchell to meet with me either in

Washington or in New York, that I would permit them to serve as a jury to consider the facts and if they concluded that the evidence was conclusive that the statements used by Mr. Winchell over the air were absolutely and completely false then I expected an opportunity over the same facilities to the same audience to deny those statements. Those wires were sent last December. More than 2½ months elapsed and neither the officials of the Blue Network nor Mr. Winchell saw fit to accord me an opportunity to be heard and to present the facts to them. When we consider their refusal to afford me an opportunity to present the real facts involved, and when Walter Winchell makes a deliberate falsehood to the press it must be obvious to every fairminded citizen that he is not interested in ascertaining the truth.

I wanted to be very careful to find out whether or not he made these misstatements because he did not have the correct information and it was for that reason that I gave to Mr. Winchell and the Blue Network full opportunity to investigate the facts. It happened that most of the evidence was in documentary form and it would not have taken the officials of the broadcasting company and Mr. Winchell more than 30 minutes to acquaint themselves with the facts.

For instance, Mr. Winchell said over the air that our committee had given access to our files to one Joe Camp. I have in my files a letter replying to Joe Camp's request for the information in which I told him that it was the policy of our committee not to permit private individuals to have access to our files and that we would not permit him to see these files. That is only one instance of the falsehoods that Mr. Winchell used over the radio.

Mr. Chairman, since this controversy has arisen I have received thousands of letters from people everywhere who are anxious to appear before our committee to give concrete proof of the deliberate falsehoods that Mr. Winchell has used over the radio. An eminent man in New York who has made a careful survey of all of the Winchell scripts wants to submit proof that only 40 percent of his statements over a period of time are truthful and that 60 percent constitute deliberate falsehoods. Another man in possession of similar evidence is anxious to be heard. I have written to the Blue Network, and said in effect:

> Since I have given you every opportunity to demonstrate to the Congress and to the Nation whether or not you are interested in finding out the truth, and since you have declined to avail yourself of the evidence which I am prepared to submit to you, since you are unwilling to act as a jury to pass upon the truth or falsity of these matters it is becoming increasingly apparent to the American people that you are a party to this scheme to malign and smear and discredit American public officials and American citizens as a part of an insidious propaganda program that you are carrying on over the airways of the United States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. All I know about Winchell is that he is an outstanding American who formerly came from my neighborhood. He was very helpful in the very thing that my distinguished colleague is doing, unearthing un-American activities. I think there must be some misunderstanding, some confusion about his efforts, although I do not know all the facts.

Mr. DIES. Let me answer the gentleman. If I made a statement about the gentleman and repeated that statement and if the gentleman came to me and said, "Now, Mr. DIES, these statements are not correct, I want you to afford me an opportunity to prove this to you conclusively and I will leave it up to your sense of fairness, Mr. DIES, whether or not those statements are true or false," and if I denied that request and then after the gentleman had given me every opportunity to ascertain whether or not I wanted to be fair I were to give to the press of this country a statement as vicious, and insulting, and as indicative of an arrogance which equals, if it does not exceed, Father Coughlin's, what would the gentleman think? Why, Mr. Chairman, when Coughlin was using the airways of this country to spread misunderstandings and promote hatred, leading Catholics were very deeply concerned. I was in communication with some of these Catholic leaders of the Catholic Church. They were as much concerned about that matter as anyone could possibly be, and they exercised their influence to restrict and restrain him and to prevent him from using the airways of this country for the purpose of promoting hatred in the United States.

I regret that there has arisen another man evidently drunk with the praise and the power he thinks he enjoys, who believes he can imitate the methods and technique of Father Coughlin and use the radios of this country for the purpose of spreading deliberate falsehoods.

Mr. Chairman, when Walter Winchell first advertised the book Secret Army, Members of Congress called attention to the fact that Spivak, the author of that book, was a member of the Communist Party, and there was a great deal of criticism of Mr. Winchell at that time, but Mr. Winchell then entered into a period in which he came out openly and aboveboard against the Communists. I believed then that Mr. Winchell was prepared to deal fairly and courageously with all of these issues. But he took Sabotage, Mr. DICKSTEIN, a book which was copied to a large extent from the reports of our committee on Japanese and Nazi activities—and there is no question about that—Mr. Winchell gave his endorsement to that book and declared it was one of the finest books ever published in the United States, that every American citizen should read it. In other words, while he did not know it, perhaps, he was endorsing the work of our committee as the finest work that had been accomplished in the history of this country. Then he proceeds to use an excerpt from the book, much of the material of which was stolen from our reports, for the purpose of smearing and discrediting me and the committee I have the honor to head.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say that Mr. Winchell should not have the right to criticize me as a public official. Long ago I ceased to be sensitive about anything that anybody said about me. I am not contending that we should abridge freedom of speech. I do not propose that the broadcasting companies of this country censor the fair and truthful statements of commentators. What I am trying to say is that when a man uses the airways for the purpose of promoting hatred, whether that hatred is directed against the Jewish people, the Catholic people, or other people in the United States, he is imitating the dangerous technique of Hitlerism, fascism, and all other forms of totalitarianism.

I have analyzed some of his scripts. I wish I had the opportunity to show you the insidious way in which he seeks to create false impressions. I wish I could show you how that method of propaganda is similar in every respect to the method used by Goebbels and the propagandists of Germany. It is inconsistent, Mr. Chairman, for anyone to brand and condemn intolerance, then be guilty of it himself. If we condemn intolerance, we must set an example of tolerance ourselves. It is as wrong to condemn people of one race as it is to condemn people of another race. Yet here is a man who because he is intoxicated with the flattery and applause that greets him at Miami, Fla., has grown so bold that he does not hesitate to tell public officials who have never criticized him, who in all of their statements have been dignified and respectful, "Go to hell." Now that is a fine way to meet an issue.

Mr. Chairman, remember that I did not condemn Mr. Winchell when I spoke the other day. I merely answered the statements that he had made over the radio about me and the committee I serve as chairman. I said nothing that could have reflected upon him; yet with that arrogance, that confident belief that because he has the radio facilities of the country at his disposal, he can use innuendoes, inferences, and falsehoods to destroy public officials and the committees of this Congress. It is a repetition of the Coughlin incident in almost every detail. I want to say to him that bigger men than he have sought to discredit this committee. Smarter and more clever propagandists have sought to smear us, and they have not succeeded. If Mr. Winchell could see the thousands of letters that are pouring into my office, he would realize that he has just gone too far. The people of this country are sick and tired of radio commentators of any stripe who use the airways for the purpose of promoting hatred and spreading falsehoods.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

THE TRUTH ABOUT THE TAX BILL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is probable that in the en-

tire history of this Nation there has never been a period, long or short, in which more information to which the people are entitled has been denied them than has been the case under the New Deal administration in the last 12 years. There has been no period in the history of our Nation when more misinformation calculated to deceive the people has been disseminated, than has been the case in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration. There has not been a time in the history of our Nation when an organized, cunningly devised, governmentally inspired, politically designed, cooly calculated propaganda has ever been more fully employed to confuse the people, to cover up the facts, to popularize fallacies, and to hide misadministration than in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration.

There has been no period in the history of this Nation when more pseudo emergencies and fake crises have been foisted upon the American people to justify on the part of the Executive demands for power and more power, which could not be justified in fact and in truth, than in the last 12 years under the New Deal administration.

One of the most widespread, unjustified and calculated deceptions practiced on the people has been in regard to the revenue bill which the Congress enacted and which the President vetoed in an insulting and unjustified message to the Congress and which both Houses of the Congress promptly and overwhelmingly passed over the President's veto.

A good deal of the misinformation about this revenue bill has been spread unintentionally by newspapers which fell into the habit of tersely describing the President's demands on the Congress for a ten-and-a-half-billion-dollar-tax bill, and the bill passed by the Congress as a two-billion-dollar-tax bill. There has, however, been a very great deal of cleverly designed propaganda, calculated to cover up the enormous expenditures which are being made, and the enormous tax load which has been placed upon the people, while the internationalists are insisting on giving away what we have to other peoples in the world.

The people should be informed and should keep very clearly in mind the difference—a very fundamental difference, by the way—between military strategy and humane impulse in our feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, and sheltering the homeless in other nations who have been rendered helpless by the war, and the efforts of international adventurers in world-power politics to impoverish the American people by appropriating their substance in the form of machinery and manufactured goods to be used in what is now admittedly a struggle for world power and world domination. These people—these super-internationalists—who are engaged in this desperate game of world-power politics, apparently have neither conscience nor shame. They appear to be willing utterly to impoverish the American people in an effort to buy and bribe acquiescence in their political plots to secure world domination.

Of course, we in America are ready and eager to use bread instead of bullets to secure military cooperation, save human lives, and prevent casualties. The damage which is being done is occurring because these international power adventurers and plotters are utilizing these military and human requirements as a cover for their schemes to make Uncle Sam put up the money for a world-wide W. P. A. unlimited. Some idea of what the American taxpayers will be up against provided these international political power schemers can get away with their designs, can be gained when we realize that the total population of the world is around 2,169,000,000, of whom probably more than one-half, judging by our standards, would fall into the category of ill-fed, ill-clad, and ill-housed.

Added to these outpourings of our substance under lend-lease are the extravagance and the avoidable waste which this administration is permitting in the war effort. The Pentagon Building in Washington is a case in point. Such instances can be multiplied time and time again. There is not the slightest reason in this world why our hard-earned dollars should be squandered in a war effort any more than they should be squandered in peacetime. Certain extravagances and a very great deal of waste are unavoidable in a war effort such as we are engaged in at this time. That is bad enough. But when we have added to that terrible burden of waste and extravagance the deliberate and calculated waste and extravagance of bureaucrats who are determined to wreck the American Government, socialize American industry, make serfs and peons of American farmers, and keep the people in subjection to bureaucratic regimentation after the war ends, it is time the American people were told the facts so they can do something about such an outrageous state of affairs.

Apparently it is for the purpose of hiding these designs, the waste, the extravagance, the corruption, which are rampant in the executive branch of the Government today, that the propagandists and the New Deal press keep spreading the impression that the President asked for ten and a half billion dollars in taxes and that the Congress gave him only a $2,000,000,000 tax bill.

In my years of service on the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I have become acutely conscious of the terrible tax burden which has been growing by leaps and bounds under this New Deal administration. The bureaucrats, sensing that the people are getting fed up with excuses, broken promises, visionary schemes, alien ideologies, and political waste and corruption, have begun to exert every effort to cover up and conceal from the knowledge of the people the tremendous sums of money which are being taken from the pockets of the citizens by taxation both visible and hidden.

This is the picture which lies behind this general impression being thrust upon the Nation, in terms of ten billions and two billions as representing the tax bill, instead of the real amount. I now shall tell you the facts. They are as follows: The estimated revenue of the Federal Government from all sources for 1943 was $42,500,000,000. With the $2,300,000,000 of added revenue which the Congress passed over the President's veto in the last revenue bill, the estimated revenue for 1945 would stand at $44,800,000,000. What the President was asking for was not a tax revenue of $10,500,000,000, but additional tax revenues of that amount to be imposed upon the $42,500,000,000 of revenue already assessed against our people. This, if the Congress had been bludgeoned into passing it, would have run the Government's revenues for 1945 to $53,000,000,000.

Every citizen knows when he stops to think about it that all taxation in the end is and must be paid by the man or woman who buys things across the counter. All this New Deal talk about making the rich pay the proposed additional taxes is just so much political "bunk." Big incomes, corporate revenues, are now taxed to the utmost. The fact is that an income of $500,000 a year in the State of New York, one of the States having a State income-tax law, would leave the individual receiving it in debt when he had paid his Federal taxes and his State tax, the total amount of which would be more than his total taxable income. Any individual having a million-dollar income in the State of New York would be deeper in debt than the possessor of a $500,000 income, after his Federal and State taxes were paid. Even in the States having no State income-tax law, no taxpayer, regardless of the size of his taxable income during this year and next, can have left after paying his taxes, a sum greater than $24,261.76. In other words, we have already reached a point of practical confiscation of all big incomes. So, when Mr. Roosevelt proposes to take an additional $10,500,000,000 in revenues out of the American people, he is proposing to take it out of the pockets of the poor people to a very great extent, and of those with smaller incomes, because that is the only place additional revenue can be secured to finance the waste and extravagance of the huge political bureaucracy which this administration has built up to bestride the shoulders of the taxpayers like an "Old man of the sea." The protestations of the administration, especially those of the Treasury Department, under Mr. Morgenthau, that they are trying to protect the poor people from this load of taxation is intentionally deceptive, and entirely erroneous, and one of the best authorities I can pick out at this moment for that statement is Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself when, in 1932, he said:

> Taxes are paid in the sweat of the man who labors, because they are a burden on production and are paid through production.

Mr. Roosevelt, when he made that statement, was running for the office he still holds. That was before he had run our national debt from $19,500,000,000, when he took office, up to about $49,000,000,000 before we entered the war. No citizen can tell now what the national debt is, because it increases so enormously from day to day that he cannot keep track of it, and the Treasury avoids talking about it.

Mr. Roosevelt was not the first man, by any means, who discovered that waste means taxes, and taxes mean misery for

the people. Thomas Jefferson, in his day, pointed out the dangers of excessive waste and the consequent excessive taxation when he said:

> Having seen the people of all other nations bowed down to the earth under the wars and prodigalities of their rulers, I have cherished their oppositive—peace, economy, and riddance of public debt—believing that these were the high roads to public as well as private prosperity and happiness. * * * Taxation follows public debt, and in its train wretchedness and oppression. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them they must become happy. * * * The same prudence, which, in private life, would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects forbids it in the disposition of the public money. * * * We must make our election between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude.

Let us stop a moment and ponder the hundreds of millions of your money squandered on the Canol pipe-line project in British Columbia; the Pentagon Building project in Virginia, adjacent to Washington, so ably exposed in its terribly wasteful ramifications by my good friend the gentleman from Michigan, Representative ALBERT J. ENGEL; the Alaska Highway, and the proposed oil pipe lines in Saudi Arabia. Ponder these along with the extravagances under cover of lend-lease, and the plans of the world-power politicians to take your substance—your goods and services—away from you, to bribe other people into acquiescence with the plans of these power politicians lusting for world domination—these men and women who would put their own people and all the other peoples of the world in economic slavery in order that their own passion for power may be gratified.

And then remember, my fellow citizens, that Mr. Roosevelt was demanding not a ten-and-a-half-billion tax burden of you, but a fifty-three billion tax burden of you. And remember, too, that it was your Congress, your representatives in the legislative body, who stood between you and that extravagant and extortionate demand and whittled these new raids on your pocketbook from ten and a half billion dollars down to two and a third billions.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

ALASKA, ELK HILLS, AND ARABIA

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is another speech about oil.

First, I want to express profound satisfaction over articles recently appearing in the press and other information which I have received to the effect that at long last real exploration is to be undertaken in the oil resources of Alaska. The Navy is dispatching a party of experts to the vicinity of Point Barrow at Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. In the near future it is reported that the War Department will undertake investigation of fields in Southern Alaska.

I do not know how much oil there is in Alaska, Mr. Chairman. But there are those who believe there is a very great quantity indeed and certainly there is every reason why Congress should do everything within its power to encourage and facilitate the exploration of our own American resources in Alaska. Indeed my only regret is, it was not done long ago. For I think there is at least the possibility that had we found out accurately what Alaskan resources actually are some other mistakes and blunders might have been avoided. We might readily have avoided the mistakes of the Canol project, which understandable though it may have been in the beginning as a military measure, should certainly have been carried out in a very different manner and which as presently set up can only result in the long run in great benefits to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, through its 70 percent owned subsidiary Imperial Oil, Ltd., at American taxpayers' expense. For since Imperial holds all the leases, only Imperial can use the pipe line in the future. How much better it would have been had these Alaskan fields been developed instead with the whole project on American soil all the way through.

I wish I could continue on this constructive note, but I cannot. For on yesterday there was introduced in the other body of Congress, a bill to permit the Secretary of the Navy to enter into unit operations contracts with private oil companies for the exploitation of naval reserves. The purpose of this bill, of course, is to legalize the contract between the Navy and the Standard Oil Co. for the operation of Elk Hills Naval Reserve. Should this bill pass it will mean that not only that portion of the Elk Hills field where Standard owns sections of land checkerboarded with Navy sections, but also the entire western and southern portion of the field where the Navy owns the entire acreage will be thrown into a unit operations plan constituting a partnership in the exploitation of this oil between the Navy on the one hand and the Standard Oil Co. on the other.

It will be recalled that a year ago last November the first contract between Navy and Standard Oil Co. was quietly put into effect and continued in operation until last summer when as a result of congressional efforts on the part of other Members and myself, as well as the action of the Justice Department through its Lands Division, in declaring the contract illegal, that first contract was canceled. Something at least has been accomplished by our efforts for some of the worst features of the original contract do not appear in the new proposed contract. But the Attorney General has stated that this new contract would not be valid unless the basic law is changed. Congress, therefore, has this question squarely in its own lap as I see it, and will have to decide whether or not it wants to empower the Secretary of the Navy to go into partnership with the Standard Oil Co., giving it operation of the greatest oil reserve in the Western Hemisphere or not. I know it will be said that under the terms of the proposed new contract the Navy is free to deal with some other company than Standard if it sees fit to do so, but to anyone who is at all familiar with the actual situation in the Elk Hills areas, it will be clear that this is a meaningless provision. The Standard Oil Co. of California owns all the pipe lines leading from Elk Hills, and under the California law these pipe lines are not common carriers. When the contract states that either party can dispose of its oil as it sees fit, therefore it virtually means that the Navy can either sell its oil to the Standard Oil Co. or else attempt to carry it out in buckets. This contract, furthermore, contemplates passage of this bill changing our whole policy and authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to enter into unit-operations-plan contracts, not only at Elk Hills but elsewhere as he sees fit.

I still believe, Mr. Chairman, as I have from the beginning, that the only right solution of this problem is by condemnation by the Navy of the Standard holdings in Elk Hills. That is the only way, in my judgment, that on any reasonable basis at all, Elk Hills can be made a true Navy reserve. At this very moment some of the very same people who are shouting that our oil resources are dangerously near exhaustion are complaining very loudly, indeed, because the Navy will not permit the Standard Oil Co. to pump more oil out of Elk Hills than it is now permitted to do. This is urged in spite of the fact that it is well known that an increase of the amount of oil taken by Standard from Elk Hills will inevitably deplete the oil under the Navy's land even more seriously than has already taken place by the drilling operations of Standard along the Navy section lines. I am opposed to this unit-operations plan because I am convinced it will immeasurably strengthen the monopolistic position which the Standard Oil Co. already holds. Five hundred and eighty thousand acres of California's potential or proven oil land is now either owned in fee, under lease, or with mineral rights, held by the Standard Oil Co. For years Standard has virtually controlled the price of crude oil in California and will be in an even better position to do so if it gains control of the Navy's Elk Hills field.

I want to ask the question as to just why the whole of the Elk Hills field is included in the unit plan of operation. It is clear from the map that only in the eastern and northern portions of the field does the checkerboard-ownership situation pertain. Through the southern portion and the entire western half of the field Standard owns only one or two quarter sections, and yet it is proposed, without our knowing with any degree of accuracy what lies underneath the rest of the field, to draw this whole business into the unit-operations plan with an oil company, which in the physical nature of the case can only be the Standard Oil Co. of California. Were Standard's holding condemned and purchased by the Navy, the Standard Oil Co. would still be able to get along quite well. But our Navy's oil could then be definitely produced and handled in whatever manner it was best to handle it from the national point of view. If this contract proposed to include only those portions of the Elk Hills field where Standard does own part of the land, I would not feel quite so strongly about the matter. But as I see the present proposal, it

boils down to one which would without any reason or necessity give the Standard Oil Co. a very greatly increased control of the oil of the United States.

Now, I am quite frank to say that the new contract is much better than the original one was, and if nothing else had been accomplished by our efforts, we would have at least the right to feel a certain satisfaction over the results so far obtained. For under the new contract, although the original participating percentages of 64 percent for Navy and 36 percent for Standard are still included, nevertheless it is provided that changes in participating percentages will be retroactive to November 1942. Under the old contract these changes would not have been so retroactive and to whatever extent oil was discovered on Navy lands, which is about the only place it can be discovered since Standard lands have already been pretty heavily exploited, Standard would still have retained any excess oil over its fair percentage which it has taken. As I say, in this contract that feature has been corrected, and, as a matter of fact, it is altogether likely that long before Elk Hills has stopped producing it will be found that well in excess of 64 percent of the oil will come from Navy lands.

In the second place, the new contract does make the Secretary of the Navy the final arbiter, which he was not under the old agreement, as to changes in these percentages of participation. Even so, however, the United States is starting out at a great disadvantage, for the percentages are based on the area of commercial production which is defined on the map. This area of commercial production includes only about 9,000 acres out of a total of 42,000 acres in the whole Elk Hills field. The area includes those sections belonging to Standard Oil Co. in which the encroachment of water has become a serious problem. Most important of all, however, the western line of this so-called area of commercial production is, as anyone can see, a completely arbitrary one, for it is nothing more or less than a section line. Any one man knows that oil is no respecter of section lines. Furthermore, this western line of the so-called area of commercial production is the west line of section 36 on which already a number of successful wells have been drilled and the land to the west of that line belongs to the Navy. It is almost certain that there is additional oil west of the line which would materially change percentages if the line were made to accord with the real facts of the situation instead of arbitrary section lines.

The very fact that so much stress is laid upon the matter of revision of the participating percentages is proof that no one knows adequately what the facts are, and even though these percentages are subject to revision, or rather, I should say, because they are subject to revision, we are running into a situation where it will be required, as I see it, to have as large an accounting staff and staff of lawyers as was ever had in the history of the oil business, or in any other business, for any readjustments made in participating percentages must be made retroactive, as they should be, to November 1942. This means constant readjustments all along the line. It will probably mean constant litigation. It will require every time a change is made that the whole system of accounts will have to be altered.

In the next place, it is to be remembered that the oil company involved in this unit agreement is to be paid its costs of operation out of the Navy's share of the oil. Originally those costs will be shared on a 64–36 basis. They are to be settled periodically and in the end there must be a readjustment of the allocation of these costs in accordance with the division of participation in the oil. It will be virtually impossible, as I see it, to ever get these costs in balance. All these difficulties can be multiplied by at least two when I point out that there are at least two zones, namely, the shallow zone and the so-called Stevens zone, where it is known that oil exists in Elk Hills. It will be virtually impossible to find out where the Navy stands in this matter under the unit-operations plan at any given time.

I want to emphasize that the services of the oil company may be paid either in oil or in money. If they are paid in oil no appropriation will be necessary on the part of Congress, and, therefore, no check by Congress on the operations of the deal will be possible. I have not tried to go into any technical detail, Mr. Chairman. I am for condemnation and not for the unit-operations plan, first, because under the unit-operations plan the monopolistic control of the Standard Oil Co. will be immeasurably enhanced by governmental action; second, because at the very least I believe those portions of the Elk Hills reserve which are wholly owned by the Navy should be left wholly in the Navy's hands and should not be subjected to this unit-operations proposal; third, because of the terrific complications involved in attempting to even come close to telling where the Government stands with regard to the matter at any given time; fourth, because of the present outcry that the Navy release its restrictions on production at Elk Hills in order to let Standard pump more oil from there. This sort of thing would, in my judgment, continue just as long as this oil was being made available to a private corporation; and finally, because I do not believe there is any other way except condemnation whereby we can have a true reserve for naval oil at Elk Hills. I believe there are manifold reasons why it is a matter of the greatest importance that we should make this a true Navy reserve.

I now come to the proposed deal for construction of a pipe line across Arabia at Government expense, but without any sort of governmental control over the oil or over the policies to be pursued in its disposition. It is interesting I think that the same oil company which is so anxious to get into partnership with the Navy with regard to the Navy's rich Elk Hills reserve, has consistently refused to permit the Government to purchase any interest in its Saudi Arabia leases. Everything appears to depend upon which foot the shoe is on. I have spoken against this pipe-line agreement for a number of reasons. It has been defended on only one ground, and that is the allegation that it is a war measure and one of military necessity. This, I contend once again, it cannot conceivably be—at least so far as the present war is concerned. For it will take as long to build the pipe line as anyone believes this war is going to last. Then they fall back on the argument that it is supposed to be for the next war. To which my reply is that under the present proposed agreement it appears to me that in attempting to get oil clear on the other side of the world in order to have it for "the next war" that these gentlemen are talking about so much, we are altogether likely to be at the same time putting ourselves in a position where we will be forced into that next war for which we are supposed to need this oil. In other words, instead of an investment in national security, it looks to me like an investment in national insecurity.

As I have explained in a former speech, my position is that either the Government should have nothing whatsoever to do with the construction of this pipe line, or else it should insist as it did insist in the beginning of negotiations that if it is to assume all the risk and get itself involved in all the dangers of an international sort which will inevitably result, it should then be in a position of having a substantial interest in the oil itself and of being able to exercise control over the policies to be pursued in order to prevent this oil falling into the hands of a huge international cartel, which in the absence of the United States Government opposition, is, I believe, quite inevitable.

I have believed from the beginning, Mr. Chairman, and I believe now, that it is utterly impossible to consider this Arabian pipe line without taking into account those features of the situation which it will create which have so vital a bearing on future peace and the security of our own Nation, as well as other parts of the world.

This is a job for the State Department, and I have made an earnest effort to secure information from the State Department about the matter. This effort was completely without success. Mr. Raynor, the petroleum adviser of the State Department, gave me absolutely no real information about the matter and simply told me that he approved the deal for the State Department without independent consideration or study on the part of the State Department and only because the President and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were insisting upon it as a military measure. I cannot conceive of the State Department, which is the Department of government that has responsibility for the foriegn affairs of our country, permitting a thing of this sort to go through without insisting upon taking into account its implications bearing on the future international relations of the United States. And yet I am informed that that is precisely what happened. Not only that, but I was dealt with in a manner far from straightforward, an experience which has deepened and strengthened my suspicions about this whole affair.

The State Department did have a representative who went to Arabia to look over this project. He did make a report on it. I asked to see this man and was told at first that he was out of town. I now find this was not true; that he was in Washington at the time I was told he was not in Washington. Further, I was informed that this report was only a technical report dealing with the amount of oil that might be developed in the Arabian area. I subsequently find, however, that this is not true, either, but that the report does deal with the proposed pipe-line agreement, and, furthermore, that it is adverse to the agreement in its present form. I am compelled to conclude that this must have been one of the reasons Mr. Raynor refused to let me see the report. I am also informed on authority which I consider absolutely reliable that the report tendered to the War Department by its representative who went to the Middle East was also adverse to the terms of the present pipeline construction agreement. I should certainly think some congressional body should find out about all this—and at once. For this pipe line is going forward just as fast as it can be pushed right at this moment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a matter where at the very least Congress is going to appropriate several hundred millions of dollars not only for the pipe line but for the necessary additional construction of a refinery, without which the pipe line can hardly be of much use. More than that it is a matter which may well have a vital bearing on the world peace which every last one of us is promising the fighting men of our country will be built after victory has been achieved.

Some weeks ago I introduced a resolution for a thorough investigation of all facts concerning the petroleum industry by a special House committee selected from the Military and Naval Affairs Committees, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Public Lands Committee, and the Agriculture Committee. If I am wrong about this matter, I am the first man who wants to know it. But the only way to find out is for a congressional committee to get all the facts regarding the matter, including reports made by men who have been actually on the ground and who know intimately the problems involved.

Members of Congress frequently express concern over domination of this body by the executive department. We become so extremely agitated when the President sends up a message to the Congress which is couched in terms which we do not like. On a number of occasions Presidential vetoes have been overridden. But here are matters connected with what is perhaps at the moment the basic natural resource of the Nation with regard to which Congress will either have to take a positive direct action of its own, insisting upon a decent coordinated policy calculated to build peace in the world in the future and to construct the security of our country on a really firm foundation, or else share the responsibility for whatever the consequence may be of things that are now being done.

Mr. Chairman, let us explore and develop our oil resources in Alaska as it is now planned to do. Let us free the independents in the oil industry from the domination of the majors. Let us conserve the oil in our naval reserves by making them in truth and in fact naval reserves and by condemning private holdings in those reserves. But let us insist that if ventures on the other side of the earth after oil are to be undertaken, they be undertaken on the terms of the American people and only in a manner which will promote the future peace and security of the American people, instead of leading them into a situation where they will be committed to huge international oil cartels and the very sort of practices in the handling of natural resources which the Atlantic Charter declared against.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, last year the subcommittee that prepared the pending bill graciously afforded me an opportunity to testify in behalf of an additional appropriation for the Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress. I had no opportunity to avail myself of the grace of the subcommittee this year and since the matter is closed, I do not propose to offer any amendment. I do want to allude to the matter, because I believe it is quite imperative and important. It has some bearing upon the recent unpleasantness in the legislative and executive branches of the Government. It appears to me that in proportion as we make our own operation in the legislative branch more efficacious, we can always meet the administrative agencies on their own ground weaponed with necessary facts and figures and try to develop a better cooperative relationship between the two branches of government.

After all, the Constitution, while it contemplates three independent branches, does not contemplate three hostile branches of government. So the Congress must take its place in the sun and be adequately equipped. One of the weapons or instrumentalities which I think needs strengthening is the Legislative Reference Service. At the present time it consists of 66 people, of whom only 16 are specialists. Imagine, only 15 specialists in that agency of government that is under the direction and control of Congress, serving the requirements and needs of 531 Members of the House and Senate. They are inadequately compensated. The man who does work for Congress in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress on monetary matters, as I recall, on banking and fiscal matters, receives $2,600 a year. He is expected to be a fiscal expert for $2,600 a year. There are more than 40 experts in the Treasury and in the Federal Reserve Board who are receiving from $5,600 to $8,000 a year. The same thing is true in the field of social security and labor. In those appropriate executive agencies they have scores of men drawing $4,200, $4,600, $5,400, $5,600, $6,500 and even $8,000 a year, who are specialist-advisers in that particular field of governmental activity. Yet over in the Library of Congress are men serving this body today, ostensibly as experts, who are working for as little as $2,600 a year. How do we expect to command specialists in an expert service at salaries of that kind? I think men in the older age brackets who are not amenable to the requirements of selective service would be available for that kind of work, especially in this period when we are preparing already to begin the transition from hostilities to peace, when so much is necessary from this Congress by way of appropriations, authorizing legislation, and commitments in order to deal with the manifold problems which will be on the threshold of this body in the future. So we must be weaponed and equipped for it. One of the best things we can do to serve the taxpayers and serve the general welfare of the country is to take unto ourselves those aids and instrumentalities whereby we get the facts, whereby we get an unbiased and impartial view of every question that will be a great guide and a great directive in finding the right answers to the problems that are before us. I shall not offer that amendment today. I want to make the record here now in the hope that when the bill goes over before the Senate that perhaps they will give some attention to it also.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, last week I was in Wisconsin at the annual meeting of the livestock breeders of that State. The food-production program is marching on. There is a patriotic desire to produce the food for this war. It appears that they will continue to exert every energy they have to produce this food even if unnecessary obstacles are placed in their pathway by Washington.

One fact was very apparent. That is that the promises of the War Food Administration were being questioned. The promises to the dairy farmer, the egg producer, the hog producer, and now the potato grower have not been sufficiently well carried out to meet their approval. The programs of the A. A. A. and the Extension Service workers and other agencies is made less effective due to the fact that the commitments to producers have not been sufficiently well fulfilled. There isn't much use to pour funds into any program where the commitment is not carried out. They are in hopes that the LaFollette amendment to the act extending the life of the C. C. C. will remedy this situation. They cannot see, however, why it should be necessary to pass a law to make any individual or agency to carry out the provisions of law already a part of the law of the land.

I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks at this point in the RECORD, the address I made at the livestock meeting at the agricultural college on March 8, heretofore referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The address is as follows:

It is indeed a pleasure for me to have the opportunity of meeting so many old friends and also to meet so many people who are so vitally interested in wartime agriculture.

Wartime agriculture has met an unprecedented demand for food for our armed forces, lend-lease, and for our domestic population. This demand has been made in the face of machinery shortages, equipment shortages, restricted transportation, and ever-increasing manpower shortages. Our armed forces are the best-fed of any army in the war, and our food products have not only gone to the armed forces of our allies but in large amounts have been distributed to the civilians as well.

The results have spoken for themselves. The patriotic desire to produce has resulted in a national food production during 1942 and 1943 that is comparable to the industrial production of the implements of war that American labor and management have made during this same period.

During these 2 years of war we have had an increase in total cattle from 75,000,000 on January 1, 1942, to an estimated 82,000,000 on January 1, 1944. Dairy cows have increased from 26,398,000 to 27,607,000, although the increase in cow numbers has not given a comparable increase in milk production. In fact, in 1943 with a half million more cows we produced over a billion pounds less milk than in 1942.

Hogs have increased from 60,000,000 to 83,000,000, or over one-third; chickens have increased from 474,000,000 to 572,000,000 during these same 2 years. Sheep have decreased in number from 56,000,000 to 51,000,000 for reasons I shall discuss later.

It is unnecessary for me to remind you of the contribution made by Wisconsin to the national production of livestock products and food crops during this period.

THE OVER-ALL PICTURE

We have some 500,000,000 acres of cropland in the United States, although only about 340,000,000 acres are usually harvested. Many of these idle acreas are marginal but will raise crops such as beans, that are now rationed. The past 2 years have been years of above-normal weather conditions and the Food Administrator has asked for an increase in crop acreage in 1944 in the hopes of obtaining even the 1943 total production of food products.

Did you ever stop to consider where the great food-producing areas of our country really are located? Many States do not produce enough food to provide their own population. Much of our agricultural leadership has come during the past 10 years from States that produce a very small part of the Nation's food products. We wouldn't, otherwise, have had an agricultural program appropriation of $400,000,000 to $800,000,000 a year, wherein a soil-conservation program was for years carried on where the payments went largely to soil-depleting crops. This situation was a result of the leadership and of the legislation and should not be interpreted as critical of the men who had the responsibility of administering it. They followed the provisions of the legislation and they should not be criticized for the legislation. The incentive payment and Cannon amendment controversy of the last session of Congress is a concrete example.

Chicago is the food capital of the world—and a comparatively few States surrounding this city produce a very high percentage of the food of the Nation. These States include: Iowa, Minnesota, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, and Wisconsin. Iowa and Illinois produce one-third of the corn and one-third of the pork of the Nation. Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin produce over 40 percent of the butter, and Wisconsin alone, as you well know, produces over half of the Cheddar cheese and a higher percentage of the foreign types of cheese of the Nation.

Although Wisconsin produces 12 percent of the milk of the Nation it produced in 1942, 13,000,000,000 of the 98,000,000,000 pounds of milk that went into commercial dairy channels. In fact, in 1942 Wisconsin alone produced more milk than all of New England with New York and New Jersey included.

The February 1944 price for milk ranged from $2.60 per hundredweight in North Dakota to $4.75 per hundredweight in Florida, with Iowa receiving $2.65, Minnesota $2.70, and Wisconsin $2.75 per hundredweight. The new feed subsidy ranges from 50 cents per hundredweight in the largest milk-producing States like Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa to 80 cents in Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, where milk in Florida is already bringing over 75 percent more than in the Midwest. This situation is not as serious as it sounds because these Southern States produce such small amounts of the milk of the Nation.

During wartime with controls on new equipment and transportation, the transforming of the raw materials of the farm into commercial food products should of necessity be increased and fostered in the States and counties in the areas already engaged in the particular branch of farming that had been previously practiced in these areas. Greater effort could well have been expended and now expended to increase the production of milk in the natural milk areas instead of fostering a high subsidy program in areas with high production costs.

Some expansion of products such as peanuts in the Cotton Belt and the hemp and soybean growing in the Midwest have for other and logical reasons not been in keeping with this general plan.

THE BEEF SITUATION

I am sure you have followed the beef situation, especially when 40 percent of the beef and veal comes from the dairy farms. The stated purpose of the beef program is to produce as much good meat as possible but not give a price sufficiently high to encourage the production of the choice meats of peacetime. It would take more than the time allotted me here today to even get started on a discussion of this subject. Beef-cattle numbers have been expanding, but when one realizes that we have been on an import basis as far as beef is concerned for 30 years, I am sure you can see how tight the beef situation could be if any appreciable increase in demands should take place, or if a reduction in the production of beef should confront us.

On February 15, 1944, the price of beef cattle varied from $8.50 per hundredweight in Vermont to $12.60 per hundredweight in Pennsylvania, with an average price of $10.10 per hundredweight in Wisconsin, and a national average of $11.80. The February 1944 parity price is $9.20. The fairness of the beef parity, as you know, has always been questioned.

THE HOG SITUATION

When Secretary Wickard, in April 1942, asked for the increase in hogs and put the floor of $13.75 Chicago basis on them he obtained a great response in production. War legislation guaranteed farmers 90 percent of parity during the war and 2 years thereafter. This has its legislative controls, however. Support prices like the support prices on the hogs weighing from 200 to 240 to 270 to 300 to 330 had nothing to do with the 90-percent parity guaranty. However, recently when the Commodity Credit Corporation Act was extended Senator LA FOLLETTE added an amendment that provides that this 90-percent parity promised the producer be paid and that all commitments to producers be fulfilled without fail.

Most people could never see any reason to ration pork, especially since December 1, 1943. A few months ago 128,000,000 pounds of lard were turned over to the soap manufacturers for soap making. Within the last few days another 50,000,000 pounds have been allocated to these soap manufacturers. This was done at a time that the housewife was paying points for lard, but these were removed on March 1.

The importance of pork production is known to everyone that has interest enough to study the situation. The hog is a very efficient animal in the conversion of feeds to human food when both calories and proteins are considered. No one has yet found out why it was more patriotic to eat chicken than pork.

Hog prices in February 1944 varied from $10 per hundredweight in Florida and $10.20 per hundredweight in Mississippi to $14.10 per hundredweight in California. The average for Wisconsin was $12.80 and the parity price of February is $12.40 per hundredweight.

THE EGG SITUATION

The parity price of eggs was 35 cents for the year 1943. The parity price of eggs was 44 cents in December 1943, and 90 percent of parity guaranteed by law was 39.6 cents per dozen, when the farmers in many sections were receiving from 24 to 28 to 30 cents per dozen right in the face of advancing feed prices. The LaFollette amendment should guarantee that commitments in the future are fulfilled so that such occurrences cannot be repeated.

Egg prices in February 1944 varied from 28 cents a dozen in North Dakota, 41 cents per dozen in Arizona, with Wisconsin showing an average of 30 cents per dozen. The national average price for February was 31.9 cents per dozen and the parity price for the month is practically the same, or 31.8 cents per dozen.

THE DAIRY SITUATION

The attack on this industry during wartime has been from many angles. The oleomargarine interests put their demands for a removal of the one-fourth-cent-per-pound tax, the 10-cent coloring tax, and the licensing on the basis of war needs. This was soon shown a fallacious approach because the facts were that all the oleomargarine was being made for which the War Production Board had allocated the oil. The oleomargarine interests are still on hand to try to find some way to promote their wares. They claim they have a new and much better product now. They even want to change its sex. They used to call it Ole and now they want one to call it Margy. The oleomargarine tax plus Federal licensing brings in around $2,000,000 a year to the United States Treasury. Vegetable-oil and cottonseed-oil processors are being subsidized for somewhere between forty and fifty million dollars in 1943 and the subsidy on vegetable oils is estimated at $65,000,000 in 1944. Between two and one-half and three billion pounds of vegetable oil is being subsidized, so you can see that the vegetable oils in the oleomargarine are being subsidized more per pound than the Federal taxes on the product. The subsidy may be twice the tax collections.

The filled-milk makers obtained 6,700 tons of tin and steel for their concoction in 2 years when it was next to impossible to get enough tin to line a vat in a corner cheese factory. The product is not rationed. Incidentally, this filled milk sells for 9 cents per can, and three cans of natural evaporated milk can be bought even in Washington for 26 cents. When the butterfat is removed and sold as cream, which is not rationed, at 75 cents to $1 per pound, and when cottonseed oil, which is subsidized and has a 13-cents-per-pound O. P. A. ceiling, is squirted

in the can to replace the butterfat, do you really think this is being done to help the war effort? This filled milk is the handmaiden of oleo. All these synthetic dairy products belong in the same class. The oleo is to the butter producer what the filled milk is to evaporated milk and whole-milk industry and what synthetic cheese is to the cheese industry.

Creamola is a new one. They take unrationed cream and mix it with vegetable oil and sell it unrationed. There are other "gyp" set-ups in food products springing up during wartime. Also among these are the low-fat and high-moisture cheeses.

THE WOOL SITUATION

One of the perplexing problems of the present day is the embarrassment of the wool accumulations in our country. Most people agree it would be both more perplexing and embarrassing if it were a shortage instead of an abundance.

At the time of Pearl Harbor no one knew exactly what the shipping situation really would be. We were accumulating stock piles of many strategic materials of war at that time. We produce in the United States around four hundred to four hundred and fifty million pounds of wool per year. We have a peacetime consumption of some 600,000,000 pounds. In early 1942 some military leaders expected to see a Japanese attack on Australia. England moved 400,000,000 pounds of its own wool into the warehouses of the United States. This is supposed to be in bond.

It appears that our Defense Plant Corporation advanced the freight and other charges and holds the warehouse receipts on this wool. In addition, the Defense Plant Corporation purchased outright some 300,000,000 pounds of wool. In addition to the purchases of this national agency, individual dealers and manufacturers during 1943 alone imported some 500,000,000 pounds. The Commodity Credit Corporation purchased the 1943 United States clip of 450,000,000 pounds and the estimated 1944 clip is about the same, or 450,000,000 pounds.

Adding the 400,000,000 pounds of British wool in bond, the Defense Plant Corporation storage stock of 300,000,000, the 900,000,000 1943 and 1944 clip, and the accumulations as a result of the imports of domestic individuals and manufacturers on a 500,000,000 annual import basis, one can visualize a billion-pound wool stock pile. Wartime demands may take 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 pounds annually. This situation has no doubt resulted in a weakening of the sheep position in the United States. It may have been a contributing factor to the reduction of sheep numbers from January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1944, of some 5,000,000, or from 56,000,000 to 51,000,000.

The foreign wool can be bought in Australia, have the duty added onto it, and still be purchased under the United States fixed price.

The Agricultural Committee had hearings on the problem and it is hoped that some workable plan will be evolved without too much hardship. To date the recommendations have been: (1) That one agency deal with the situation and be responsible for disposing of the stock pile in as orderly manner as is possible; (2) to use some of the stock pile in lend-lease; (3) use of this wool stock pile through United Nations relief and rehabilitation, and furnish goods in lieu of cash where feasible; (4) by licensing imports in the future; and (5) by making an acceptable agreement as to the amounts imported on an import quota basis the same as we have on wheat.

The February 1944 farm price of wool varied from 33 cents a pound in Oklahoma to 48 cents a pound in Virginia, Maryland, and Delaware, with Wisconsin receiving 42 cents per pound. The February parity price is the same as the price received by farmers on a national average. In February 1944 it was 39½ cents per pound.

From the above one can see the problems in regard to price adjustments. We need a constructive approach rather than a destructive criticism in meeting many of these problems. Another example, Oklahoma in 1943 received 34 cents a pound for its wool, while Virginia received 50 percent more, or 51 cents a pound. It is apparent that adjustment for one of these States may not be satisfactory to the producers in the other States. Many factors must be taken into consideration in connection with all agricultural commodities in order to arrive at and follow a constructive approach in our efforts to make the best contribution to the war-food program.

SUBSIDIES

Wartime agriculture could not be considered without a few remarks about subsidies. From 1925 to 1940, regardless of party, there were plans put in operation to lift or raise agricultural prices. Many devices were put into effect. However, in 1939, after these many years of adjustments, we had wheat at 54 cents, 5-cent hogs, 6 months of 11-cent cheese and other prices that were not fixed, correspondingly low. Wisconsin in 1939 had the largest number and the highest percentage of foreclosures ever foreclosed in the history of the Federal land bank.

Now we have a program to hold prices down. It was difficult to raise these prices, as you well know, and it has been difficult and will continue to be difficult to hold prices down and still obtain high production totals. One fact is disturbing as well as confusing. It is, How can administration spokesmen advocate roll-back food subsidies in the face of the highest individual and national incomes in our history? If agricultural parity is worth consideration in any sense of the word how can administration spokesmen publicly admit that our citizens cannot pay their grocery bills when food prices are parity or the goal?

Since this subsidy issue has been under consideration for a year, it would take hours to discuss it from all angles. First of all, it isn't a question of subsidy or no subsidy. No responsible voice has been raised against subsidies resulting from an effort to increase food production. No voice has been raised against providing funds needed to support the support prices. The arguments arise as to subsidies to increase production and the roll-back or consumer subsidies.

THE POTATO SUBSIDY

Take the potato program as an example. The parity price of potatoes for 1943 was $1.16 per bushel. The February 1944 parity price is $1.22 a bushel. A support price of 90-plus cents a bushel was placed on potatoes in Wisconsin last year. The floor at the present time should be $1.09 per bushel, which is 90 percent of the present parity price.

Due to the weather, the patriotic desire to produce and other factors, we had in 1943 a 461,000,000-bushel crop with an average production of 139 bushels to the acre. This crop was grown on a less number of acres than the acreage of many previous years. Also, some years the national average production has been under 100 bushels per acre.

Potatoes are selling in eastern cities at 3 to 4 cents a pound. This indicates the spread which is greater than the producer receives. In supporting the support price a large loss is being entailed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The new southern crop is adding to this embarrassment. No one knows exactly how much the subsidy will be but for this example let us use twenty million. Here is a subsidy as a result of supporting the support price which support price was 90 cents-plus per bushel or 26 cents per bushel below the parity price for 1943. Who pays this $20,000,000 subsidy? The answer is, as you know, the general public in this and future generations.

With all respect, I would like to ask anyone in this college at whose feet I worshipped, or anyone else for that matter, to tell us why in the name of fairness and common sense one should advocate a roll-back or consumer subsidy to the potato consumers of this country? Before anyone answers though, I want him to take two facts into consideration—first, the fact that the producer received 26 cents per bushel less than parity price for producing the potatoes because, due to the large crop the support price became the ceiling price and the market price as well, and, secondly, the fact that the producer will be called upon to pay his share of the $20,000,000 used to support the support price.

Potatoes are being distributed free to low-income groups at this time. This is justified, but why should future generations be asked to pay the potato bill of high-income people?

THE WHEAT SUBSIDY

Let us analyze the wheat situation briefly. The United States was, formerly, a great wheat-exporting Nation and exported up to 30 percent of the national production. We gradually lost this export market until in 1940 we exported only 3 percent of our national production and paid an export subsidy of 25 to 30 cents per bushel to dispose of it. We paid millions per year and nearly a billion in total during the past 10 years to control the wheat production, though we imported more wheat than we exported in 2 years during this time of large payments for controlling the domestic production. In 1930 there was a 42-cent-bushel duty put into effect. In 1940, by agreement, a quota arrangement was made whereby only 800,000 bushels of wheat can be imported annually. This is practically an embargo when considered in the light of our annual domestic production of seven hundred to nine hundred and fifty million bushels. Up until April 1943, we were still paying 25 to 30 cents per bushel export subsidy. The same month the Commodity Credit Corporation started subsidizing imports of wheat for feed purposes. Recently they announced a $125,000,000-subsidy to the millers, which is supposed to be a consumer subsidy in order to hold down the price of bread. If the embargo were lifted millions of bushels of wheat would enter our country even with the 42-cent-per-bushel duty. If there is anyone that believes in this roll-back subsidy, I would like to ask him just one question: It is:

Since a commodity has the protection of a duty of 42 cents per bushel, and since a near embargo has been put into effect to implement the benefits of the 42-cents-per-bushel duty, can you justify a $125,000,000 bread subsidy without giving your approval to the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, with the added protection of the near embargo? I say in all frankness, who wants to take a bite out of that one and try to justify the $125,000,000 subsidy now going to the millers, though supposed to go to bread consumers? Do you wish to be in a position of advocating a consumer subsidy for bread under these conditions?

You ask, How about the lower-income group who pay such a larger percentage of their income for food in comparison to the higher-income groups? The proposal to meet this problem was the Aiken-La Follette-Herter bill that would have provided the lower- and fixed-income groups with a fair fixed food cost. This had rather weak W. F. A. support, and could not be passed by its sponsors. It appeared to me that a majority of the Members of Congress were favorable to this legislation. There should not be any stigma attached to such a food subsidy as long as Federal employees receiving $10,000 to $15,000 a year accept the $628.32 cost of living bonus

under the guise of overtime was passed and was so gleefully accepted even by the very men whose purported task was to fight inflation.

This cost-of-living overtime pay increase to Government employees was passed with the implied understanding that the number of nonwar civilian employees was to be reduced.

There is one outstanding fact that seems more apparent each day, and that is that the only time we hear about inflation is when the low income groups are involved or when the American farmer is in the picture. Otherwise it apparently isn't very disturbing. Eight cents per hour to the railroad men would cause inflation although one-third of them receive 57 cents per hour or less, and later after much unnecessary criticism it wasn't. A 5 cents per bushel advance in the price of corn would cause inflation but later 9 cents per bushel wouldn't.

We have current surpluses of potatoes and wool and could quickly have a surplus of wheat. We have thousands of acres of good onion land not producing onions although there is a shortage of onions. Why? We have sufficient land to have a surplus of all these crops and could have the same surplus we have of potatoes. One reason we haven't a surplus of all foods is because we haven't had a maximum food production program as yet. We cannot get this maximum domestic production if we continually drain our farms of manpower and if we do not furnish the necessary machinery to produce it. We cannot expect to have a maximum food production program with too many conflicting changes, nor can we hope to have one unless we have a program that keeps faith better with the producer.

There are many complicating features in connection with any program that could be suggested. For example, is it logical to give South Carolina dairymen 30 cents a hundredweight more as feed payments than is given Illinois dairymen when the February fixed price in South Carolina was $1.10 a hundredweight more in South Carolina than in Illinois and especially when cottonseed meal is $10 a ton less in South Carolina than in Illinois? These are Government fixed prices and indicate the factors that must be considered. You can readily see why Mr. Walter Katterhenry our State A. A. A. chairman, when he was in Washington a couple of weeks ago, was interested in advocating a feed payment program that went right straight across the board.

Sometimes in my more irritated moments I think that they muddy the waters just so that they can get the credit for purifying the stream.

CONCLUSION

These are serious days. Congress has appropriated every dollar and given every power to most effectively carry on this war. The future with an expected $300,000,000,000 national debt requires the conscientious study and the constructive approach of every American. The farms of the United States on January 1, 1940, had a value of only $35,000,000,000. However, the old saying that every cloud has a silver lining is no doubt as true today as ever.

I shall not take a defeatist attitude toward the future. Everyone realizes that in our country there is still elbow room. When people have elbow room the problems of government are easier to solve. We have millions of acres of land in our country to be drained; we have other millions of acres that will show increases in production by following approved farm practices now known; we have millions of acres still to be irrigated; we have millions of acres in the United States to be developed, for new crops for new uses such as drug plants. The 30 to 50 percent increase in production of many food products during this war is conclusive evidence of the fact that the food production of our Nation could be doubled if all idle acres were put to work and if the consumption demands would justify the expansion.

We are now seeing a greater appreciation of trees as a crop. Evidently, the use of wood or pulp is going to take a larger place in the feed, plastic, and fiber economies of the future. Millions of acres are adapted to this wood and pulp crop and I personally expect to see a keener appreciation of the possibilities in wood and pulp production as its uses multiply in number. Apparently, it is soon to be considered the same as other farm crops.

Secondly, when you realize the scientific discoveries that have taken place during this generation who are we to say that our sons and daughters will not come forward with additional scientific discoveries for the well-being and the welfare of the human race? In agriculture alone in our own State we have the Babcock, Russell, Hart, Farrington, and Steenbeck discoveries as well as their followers carrying on in their footsteps. We have the manufacture of urea—now being used for plastics—where the nitrogen of the air is combined with gases of the coke oven to make urea that is being used as a source of protein in livestock feed. We can picture sawdust piles transformed into dextrose stock piles or into alcohol or into rubber without having anyone question our sanity.

Many of you here at this great institution are in a much better position than I am to see the expanded opportunities for science to make in its forward march for the welfare of all mankind.

Thirdly, education contributes to making men free. Though some States like Iowa and Oregon have only 4 or 5 percent illiteracy, other States have over 30 percent illiteracy. Wisconsin has 9 percent. Our national interest will require at least a grammar-school education for every child in America. Social progress goes hand in hand with education. For example, it takes an educated country to have wage-and-hour legislation. The Wages and Hours Act with its maximum hours and minimum wage has the universal approval of our country. A permanent support-price program to agriculture could afford another large group of our society advantages comparable to the benefits of the wage-and-hour legislation to labor. These support prices could not be too high or embarrassing stock piles would accumulate, and we must keep in mind that the Wages and Hours Act does not provide a man a job either. My contacts with labor lead me to believe that they are most interested in a permanent job at a fair wage level. My observations in agriculture convince me that farmers are more interested in a continued fair price than they are in the feast and famine prices which they have been forced many times to accept. A farmers' cooperative gives the producer a bargaining agency and an approach to collective bargaining. This is comparable to the collective bargaining of a labor union. Thus more attention to security of the individual and the family is in the picture for every individual and for every group. However, the individual may take a more constructive interest in his own security and also the family he has the responsibility to protect. Such processes can only be successful in a country where education is the rule rather than the exception.

Finally—and the most important—I wish to call your attention to the fact that after the war we will have had some twelve to fifteen million men and women who have been in the war. From your acquaintance with the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and World War No. 1 veterans you know that these millions will come home with a patriotism and love of country that will not only be a part of them during their lifetime but will carry on to their children and their children's children. We should have confidence in their leadership. With this confidence we can look forward to the future of our country regardless of any obstacles that may appear.

In conclusion, may I again express my appreciation of having been able to be with you. I appreciate the opportunity. I have made every effort as a Member of Congress to be a credit not only to my family, but also a credit to this great institution to which I owe so much, and to its professors, whom I still hold in such high esteem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, the reclassification of doctors of veterinary medicine in the field services of the Bureau of Animal Industry and the Meat Inspection Division as authorized by the Classification Act of 1923 as amended has been completed and the War Food Administration and the Department of Agriculture have requested Congress to appropriate sufficient increases in the appropriations for the prevention, control, and eradication of animal diseases and for meat inspection for the payment of employees in these essential field services in accordance with the reclassification. These increases were requested after thorough study and consideration of the previous salary status of these services as compared with other groups in Government employ performing duties of like difficulty and responsibility and has the approval of the Civil Service Commission and the Director of the Budget.

The added compensation planned for these services would not give them a preferred position among Federal employees. It would merely give to them the same opportunities for advancement in pay, corresponding to the performance of tasks requiring special skill, that are afforded to others. As an example of this, I am informed that, although among other professional groups in the Department only 21.2 percent are in the beginning grade, 61.5 percent of the doctors of veterinary medicine are in this grade. Under the Classification Act of 1923 as amended, it is provided that employees should progress to the next grade, the regular "operating" grade, after satisfactory service in the beginning or "training grade." The proposal of the Department is to advance these employees in accordance with this principle. Because of a lack of funds to carry out the provisions of the Classification Act, 299 doctors of veterinary medicine have been in the beginning grade from 5 to 10 years; 82 have been in that grade from 3 to 5 years; and 150 have been in the beginning grade up to 3 years.

By way of contrast I would like to call your attention to status of attorneys in O. P. A., as revealed before the Subcommittee on Appropriations last year. Attorneys, like veterinarians, are subject to the provisions of the Classification Act respecting professional employees. I find that only 3.5 percent of the 1,412 attorneys were in the beginning grade, and only 2.5 percent in the next higher grade. Fully 96 percent received $3,200 or more per annum, whereas only 10 percent of veterinarians receive that much. This contrast becomes more striking when one considers the many years of experience

which the veterinarians have to their credit.

It is not as well known as it should be that continued vigilance by veterinarians is required to protect food animals against the ravages of infectious disease, or that veterinary inspection of animals before slaughter, and of their carcasses after slaughter, provide the only means by which it can be determined whether meat for food is free from disease. You may not realize that the steady flow of cattle, hogs, and sheep to market is dependent upon the prevention of the spread and the eradication of animal diseases by veterinarians, and that the rate of kill by slaughterers in our meat-packing centers is strictly limited by the number of veterinarians furnished by the Meat Inspection Service to inspect food animals at the time slaughtered.

Animal-disease control and meat inspection require veterinary skill under the most trying and adverse conditions, with long hours of exacting work. The detection and determination of disease processes in herds of livestock or in animals presented for slaughter call for the application of specialized veterinary knowledge and sound veterinary judgment. The production and growth of millions of animals and the acceptance or rejection of billions of pounds of meat rest upon the decisions which must be made daily by the doctors of veterinary medicine. They must be ready at all times to back up their decisions with sound principles of veterinary medicine.

The livestock industry has never had a greater need for the services of veterinarians to enforce the quarantine laws and other laws passed for the prevention, eradication, and control of the diseases of farm animals. There are being sent to slaughter many more millions of food animals than ever before in our history. A large percentage of these animals must be slaughtered under Federal inspection. Numerous Federal purchasing agencies, such as the Army, Navy, and Lend-Lease are demanding more and more meat, all of which must be federally inspected. In addition, the demand by civilians for "U. S. inspected and passed" meats continues at a high level. The standards of inspection that have been developed during the past 35 years must be maintained. There is no such thing as halfway or limited veterinary inspection. The alternative to inspection by skilled veterinarians and well-trained assistants is no inspection at all.

No enterprise can long endure which fails to make provision for replacement of those who have devoted their lives to its service. Our veterinary colleges have for several years past discouraged their graduates from entering the Federal service, mainly because of the meager cpportunities for advancement. Surely the young men who have devoted 5 years of college study to acquire the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine do not look with favor upon the prospect of remaining as long as 10 years in the beginner's grade. It is essential to the maintenance of these services that the better type of veterinary college graduates and lay assistants may be influenced to enter the Federal services. They must some day replace the highly trained employees of today with long experience in these services.

These doctors of veterinary medicine and their lay assistants receive benefits under the overtime pay bill of last year. You should realize, however, that the overtime pay is predicated on the regular or base pay of the employees. Here is a group of employees whose base pay is not on a par with others according to the provisions of the Classification Act provided by the Congress. They cannot have full enjoyment of the overtime provisions until their base pay is put on a level with other Federal employees doing equal work. The proposed reclassification is designed to accomplish this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] may extend the remarks he made previously this afternoon and include an editorial and certain letters and telegrams.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE].

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, the matter has come to my attention in an attempt to distribute certain publications that are made available to Members of the House for their respective constituents, of the apparent inequity with which they are allotted or allocated to the Members. I believe I represent at least the third or fourth largest congressional district in the United States in population. In my attempt to obtain certain publications that are made available to the Members of this House intended ultimately as a public good this apparent inequity became obvious to me. I refer particularly to a little book put out by the Marine Corps, known as Our Flag. That book, I am sure, was never intended that Congressmen should have in unlimited numbers without regard for other Members as a matter of possession. The Congressman is merely the office or facility whereby books and pamphlets such as this are distributed through the schools and to different people, so that the knowledge thereby disseminated will result ultimately in some benefit to the whole country. There are congressional districts which Members represent in this body, with a population around a quarter of a million, and in many instances even less than that. There are other congressional districts in which the population runs up to nearly a million.

It is not difficult to see the obvious injustice of allocating to a Member who has one hundred and fifty thousand or two hundred thousand the same number of these books or editions as is allocated to a Member who has a million, if the intent was to have that publication equitably distributed among the people.

I do not know what is to be done to secure the proper distribution of this material, but I would like to see a rule put into effect in this House providing that the distribution would be made on the basis of the last Federal census. If the publication is intended for the public, and the Representative in Congress is the facility whereby the public is to obtain different pamphlets, it seems to me they should be distributed according to the population of the congressional districts as evenly as possible.

I encountered this rather embarrassing situation: The most populated city of my district has 37,500 school children alone. In my attempt to get some of these books, Our Flag, to be distributed for the benefit of knowledge that might be inculcated in the minds of the school children concerning our great flag and its worth which they should come to know and appreciate, I find I can only make partial distribution within limited grades. If I do that it will probably result in criticism of me because I have not impartially distributed them because of limited numbers. I have to forego distribution of any of them in order that there will not be any partiality shown. I am limited, according to a letter received from Lieutenant General Vandegrift, to 10,000 of these books, yet there are nearly 800,000 people in my congressional district and 52,000 school children in 1 of 5 cities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROWE] has expired.

All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Salaries: Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, $8,000; 2 secretaries (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at $5,400 each and $1,500 additional each so long as the respective positions are held by the present respective incumbents; 2 assistant secretaries (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at $4,320 each and $480 additional each so long as the respective positions are held by the present respective incumbents; Deputy Sergeant at Arms and storekeeper, $4,800 and $1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; clerks—1, $3,300; 1, $3,120; 1, $2,200; 1, $2,120; and 1, $1,800; 1 to the secretary for the majority $2,280 and $120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 1 to the secretary for the minority, $2,280 and $120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant doorkeeper, $2,800; messengers—3 (acting as assistant doorkeepers) at $2,400 each; 1 at $1,740 and $260 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 29 (including 4 for minority) at $1,740 each; 4 at $1,620 each; 1 at card door, $2,640, and $240 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; clerk on Journal work for CONGRESSIOAL RECORD to be selected by the Official Reporters, $3,360; cabinetmakers—chief, $2,780; 1, $2,300; 1, $2,040; finisher, $2,300; upholsterer, $2,040; janitor, $2,400 and $300 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 5 skilled laborers, $1,680 each; laborer in charge of private passage, $1,740 and $120 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 4 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at $1,500 each; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, Senate Office Building, at $1,500 each; telephone operators—chief $2,460 and $280 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 14 at $1,620 each; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in old library space, $1,200; press gallery—superintendent, $3,660; assistant superintendent, $3,000; as-

sistant superintendent, $1,920; messengers for service to press correspondents—2 at $1,560 each, 2 at $1,440 each; radio press gallery—superintendent, $3,000; assistant superintendent, $1,960; laborers—3 at $1,380 each, 28 at $1,260 each, 3 at $480 each; special employees—7 at $1,000 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of $4 per day each, during the session, $15,204; in all, $273,944.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. You know it is almost sacrilegious for any of us today to talk about our discomforts here when we consider what our boys are suffering on the various battle fronts. Last evening I heard Eddie Rickenbacker tell of his experiences and the experiences of our armed forces throughout the world. It was one of the most amazing revelations that I had heard. The thing that amazes me is how little the people back home know about what is happening everywhere throughout the world to our men in the armed forces, what difficulties they are enduring, and how complacent we are in face of it.

Being mindful of the foregoing, I hope my colleagues will forgive me if I reopen a matter which I am sure causes us some degree of discomfort. I am still hopeful that an effective remedy will be found for ridding these office buildings of the cockroaches which infest them, and which you will admit are a nuisance at times. I might suggest that instead of our having to keep cockroach pills strewn around our offices something be done about it, starting with the basement floors.

This is the time to call attention to this problem, when we appropriate money for cleaning purposes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not do so now, but I am greatly tempted to offer an amendment to the appropriate clause of the bill to increase the salaries of the Members of this body to $15,000 a year. It is high time somebody started the ball rolling in that regard; and I make the pledge here and now that when the next appropriation bill comes along for the legislative branch I shall have the temerity, if I may use that word, to offer an amendment to increase our compensation. Ours is the only case where there is a successful ceiling on salaries, despite the fact that the cost of living has gone up tremendously. Superimposed upon the expenses which we, for example, from the State of New York have to pay, is a State income tax at a very high rate; and if anyone happens to be so unfortunate as to have fixed charges that he must regularly meet he is in a deplorable state indeed. I refer to fixed charges such as interest on mortgages on homes or farms or on business properties, fixed rental charges, the payment of interest, and reductions of principle on indebtedness, insurance premiums.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a simple question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman appreciate the fact that this Congress has raised the salaries of all Federal employees more than enough to offset the increased income tax, but has made no increase whatsoever in the salaries of the Members?

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that since Tom Dewey has been Governor of New York our New York State income tax has been reduced 25 percent.

Mr. CELLER. That is due in part to the fact that we have stood in the rostrum here and others have stood in the rostrum of the New York State Legislature and said in no uncertain language to that gentleman that he must reduce the income tax because of the vast amount of surplus we have in New York State. I would that he reduce the income tax to an even greater degree.

Mr. HANCOCK. Yes; but does the gentleman recall any Governor in recent years who has left a surplus?

Mr. CELLER. Accrediting the State income-tax reduction to Governor Dewey is ignoring the actual factors that were in the main responsible for such deduction. It is quite apparent that the Governor of the State of New York is no financial expert. Certainly, the decrease was due to nothing he contributed, either by word or deed. He had no choice in the matter. The prosperity of New York is not of his making; rather it is of the period through which we are now passing. He may have social grace and charm, but he is no more a financial expert than he is a constitutional law expert. Witness his castigation of our great Commander in Chief on the matter of a Federal ballot for our armed forces, and his deeming such ballot unconstitutional. He probably never heard of the First and Second War Power Acts which gives almost supreme powers to the President and amply justifies a soldiers' vote bill federally controlled. Our work in this chamber and outside this chamber, too, as the Members realize, has greatly increased. There is a greater strain on us, and beyond the peradventure of a doubt, our medical and dental bills have greatly increased in the last few years because of that strain, and I think it is high time we gave some attention to paying adequate compensation to ourselves.

I may be called that one who rushes in where angels fear to tread for making this statement, and I may be severely criticized for it at home. My opponent in the next election may seize avidly upon what I say here this afternoon as being what he calls a good campaign missile against me. I care not, Mr. Chairman. I am sure the good people of my district, when they view the work I have done over the years—for almost 22 years—will realize that I am speaking truly and adequately, and if I may be so bold as to say so, wisely, with reference to what we so thoroughly deserve, namely, an increase to at least $15,000 in salary.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries: Seven official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House at $7,500 each; clerk, $4,000; assistant clerk, $2,000; six expert transcribers at $2,000 each; in all, $70,500.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, about 2 weeks ago I discussed on the floor the workings and operations of the War Manpower Commission as it relates to my own congressional district. I said at that time that the regulations and orders of the War Manpower Commission were, in my humble opinion, retarding the war production program in that area. The truth of this statement is available in my office. I turned the data I had in my possession over to the Smith committee and have received the assurance of the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, Congressman SMITH, that just as soon as they complete an investigation they are now conducting they will look into this situation. I thought, however, that Members of the House might be interested in a small part of the report made by the secretary of the Hartford County Manufacturers' Association on March 14. I have in my hand here a rather interesting chart showing both the man-hours and the number of employees employed in that area from August 1939 to 1944. The number of employees has gone up from 59,000 in 1939 to 135,000 as of January 1, 1944. It is rather interesting to note that each year, in fact each month, from September 1939 to date, or in reality up to February 1, 1943, the number of man-hours and the number of employees increased. At that point the War Manpower Commission came into the picture with their restrictive regulations. It is enlightening to note that each month of the year 1943 up to March 1, 1944, the trend has been downward from a high of 245 percent to 212 percent of normal. As a further indication that their regulations are retarding progress I want to quote from this report of the manufacturers' association.

A company, which through its own representatives solicited housewives in the immediate vicinity of the factory, discovered 46 who were willing, because of the proximity of their homes, to enter into a contract of employment which would enable them to put in a full day, after they had bundled their children off to school before 8 in the morning, until they get home to receive them, just before 5.

The United States Employment Service and the Manpower Commission refused to issue certificates of availability to these women to work in that specific factory. The result—they are not working.

A company which because of cut-back in contract, released a large number of its employees is faced now with a charge of unemployment insurance for 27 of them who refused work in companies

where they believed their talents could not be used, or for personal reason, or where the distance from home was great enough to offer a hardship. They obviously are walking the streets of Hartford, because the State unemployment commission has granted them compensation.

It certainly is ridiculous in an area declared by the War Manpower Commission as a group 1 critical labor scarcity area that hundreds of people are drawing unemployment compensation. It does not make sense and I am hopeful that I can convince the House Military Affairs Committee or the chairman of that committee that there are various phases of this program that merit the attention of that committee.

In the columns of the Hartford Times, under date of March 7, an employer, given permission to advertise, states that he curtailed a 3-day advertisement in 2 days because he was able to recruit in Hartford, 25 people—the sum total that he needed, who were idle. The manufacturer involved is quoted as saying that some of the applicants who responded had been hanging around the United States Employment Service a couple of afternoons for hours at the time and they carried their registration cards from the Employment Office to prove it.

Another plant, where cut-backs permitted a release of 179 persons, discovered through investigation that 77 of them after a month's time, are not employed in any factory in Hartford County.

Thirty-seven women, recruited from homes in the immediate vicinity of an industrial plant for part-time work—the designation of part time, by the United States Employment Service, is 30 hours or less per week—after acquiring a greater knowledge of their duties, requested the company to put them on full-shift operation. The blanket request by the company, so the workers could make more money and increase production, was refused by the United States Employment Service—on the grounds that if they were full-time workers, they would have to be discharged, receive certificates of availability, and be sent to so-called more critical industries. These are actual cases. How many similar situations exist, or the number of persons they would include must of course be developed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. This title may be cited as the "Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1945."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 19, committee employees, in order to offer an amendment to that section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 4, after the word "clerk", strike out "$2,760" and insert "$3,300."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this has to do with the work of one of the most important committees of the House, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which I have the honor and the responsibility of being chairman.

This committee is charged with a tremendous amount of work. We have to deal with legislation affecting all the policies of reclamation throughout the whole of the United States and particularly the Northwest. We have to deal with authorizations involving irrigation projects, we have to deal with all legislation affecting those projects, we have to deal with the policies of the Government in the development of this country, we have to search out the provisions of the laws and know their application in connection with the formation of these projects and their effect and bearing on the rights of the Federal Government and the constitutional rights of our States.

I submit that the paltry salary of $2,700 which is paid at the present time to the clerk of our committee, which has a membership of some 22 Members of this House, is not adequate pay for such clerk and, in my opinion, it is time that we give a salary that will bring to the service of that committee a clerk equipped with the necessary qualifications to study the laws, do the research work that is necessary, and handle the business of our Members so that we may adequately protect the interests of the Government and the water users on the lands throughout the country. Here we have a $2,700 clerk for the Congress and the people we represent to deal with a whole set of executive and administrative officials in the departments who get three times that salary with much less to do.

Mr. PLOESER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman realizes, of course, that such an authorization should come from the Committee on Accounts? It does not originate with the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITE. I may say to the gentleman that an authorization coming direct from the House would have just as much weight as coming from any minority committee. I am submitting this to the Congress in order to bring the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in line with a lot of the other committees of the House. Our committee is in the lowest brackets. The clerks to the main committees get a much higher salary and they have more clerks. This committee is doing a fine work, yet its clerk is on the lowest scale of all the committees and for that reason I am taking the opportunity at the present time to ask the House in the case of this particular committee to give a sufficient amount of remuneration so that the committee can bring to its assistance a qualified clerk to do the work that it is required to do and handle it in a way that will be a credit to the House and to the country.

Mr. Chairman, I submit this is an important amendment and I ask for its support by the Members of the House.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. Chairman, there are over 2,000 employees here and every year the committee and individual Members of the Congress are importuned by hundreds of people to change their salaries. We are asked to change this salary, and that salary, we are told that this man is not getting what he should get and that the other fellow should get more. The only way to handle the situation is to have the matter thoroughly considered by the fine Chairman of the Committee on Accounts, which is the legislative committee for this Appropriations Subcommittee. That committee goes into those matters carefully. If it recommends an increase to us the chances are it will be in the bill but you cannot on the floor of the House adjust all the salaries and do justice to all the employees deserving of consideration, because if you give it to one, there may be 10 others who are as much justified in getting an increase. Therefore, this should be done by an independent investigation and that is the way it is handled by the Committee on Accounts. I trust the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] will be defeated.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Just to keep the record straight, I will say to the gentleman from Idaho that half of the committees of the House today are paying their clerks $2,760. That includes the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Committee on Insular Affairs, the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, and other committees.

If you are going to do that for one committee you are going to upset the applecart.

The Committee on Accounts has had a special committee trying to work out some method to satisfy some of those who have been complaining over a long period.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will say to the gentleman that they also get their additional 15 percent in lieu of war overtime.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows there are many secretaries in Congress and in other offices that are getting paid far in excess of the amount authorized by law.

Mr. O'NEAL. I will say to the gentleman there may be inequalities all the way through, but I say it ought to be done by the proper committee and not on the floor because some Member is particularly interested in some one person.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman knows that by law the Congress can pay up to $3,900 a year for one secretary.

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes; I know that.

Mr. WHITE. Many of them are doing it, but we are bound, we cannot do a thing with $2,700.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 3, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that some of us are not convinced that the men who dig the coal in this country should have portal-to-portal pay, the coal miners, in other words. I think that some people do not understand what "portal to portal" means.

May I call your attention to it in this light? I happen to live about 13 miles from a plumber. If a washer goes bad in my sink I have to get this plumber to come from the other town. He starts out at 9 o'clock on Sunday morning. He takes his helper with him. He gets $1.50 an hour, and the helper gets 90 cents an hour. They get out in the sun and drive down to my place and go in and look it over. It takes 20 minutes to put on a washer. Then they drive back the 13 miles, and when they get back they look at the clock and they find that it took them 3 hours, they charge me $9.82 for that trip, for 20 minutes' work.

The miner goes to the pit mouth, or the shaft, and he may have to go in 1 mile, 2 miles, 3, 4, or 5 miles, and some think he ought not to be paid for going in there to the place where he is going to actually start to dig, as it were, or use his machine. I say he should be paid from the time he enters the pit mouth till he comes out.

I am not kicking about the plumber being paid. That is perfectly all right with me. I am just trying to draw a comparison, that, if the plumber is paid, why should not the miner be paid when he starts into that pit mouth, especially in these days when all the care in the world cannot be taken, the mines are many times cold and dreary and slushy and sleeting, electric wires are liable to be hanging loose some place and bad conditions prevail, yes he takes his life in his hands. Sometimes they go in only half a mile, some places 2 miles, 3 miles, and in my district, up to 5 miles.

I think it is altogether humane that coal miners should be paid portal-to-portal pay from the time they step into the mouth of the pit or the top of the shaft when they start down till they come back to the same place.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I am glad to hear the gentleman saying something on behalf of the work of the coal miners.

Mr. SNYDER. I have said quite a bit in the last 12 years for them.

Mr. WRIGHT. I know the gentleman has. He is a friend of the miners and has spoken in their behalf.

May I remark also that, as the gentleman knows, the occupation of coal-mining is difficult, dangerous, and requires a lot of skill, and the compensation which the miner gets, contrasted with the wages in other industries, has always seemed to me to be out of line with the type of work he has to do. I certainly feel that when they ask for more money they have not been unreasonable in doing so.

Mr. SNYDER. I said 3 months ago that they should have an increase. I did not know the scale of wages and did not know what the increase should be, but they should have had a liberal increase at that time.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I gladly yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. STEFAN. I come from a country where we do not mine coal. We have to buy it and burn it for heat. I have visited coal mines. I agree with the gentleman. I have seen those miners come to work in the evening or in the morning. They report to the office and they get aboard these cars and are shunted into the pit. I think it is reasonable that they should be given portal-to-portal pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Printing and binding: For printing and binding for the administrative office and courts of the United States, $89,000.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, it is naturally with a great deal of satisfaction that I announce to Congress that the Navy is today starting a preliminary reconnaissance group to Alaska by air to ascertain the potentialities of its Oil Reserve No. 4, which comprises 35,000 square miles in the northernmost part of Alaska. I am the only Member who has advocated the development of these great oil prospects, based on all geological reports.

The need for the development of new fields is recognized today to be most urgent. The personnel of this group comprises the most technical men experienced in both oil production and general construction, who are members of the Seabees, which organization has played a great part in this present war. All of these men have had experience in the far Arctic regions and the Aleutians, another place where the Seabees have been so instrumental in our success.

It is indeed gratifying to state that the man heading this expedition is none other than William T. Foran, who originally convinced me of the great possibilities in this area, he having been a member of the geological survey group of the Government, which made the original survey in 1923 and 1924.

The eyes of the world will be on the findings of this group. They have a logical and practical program outlined and will proceed on a sound basis, namely that they will make a survey of all problems of transportation, housing, provisionary, and general working conditions, in addition to obtaining further geological findings. In other words, this time we will not be drilling wells, building pipe lines and refineries until we have these preliminary findings.

I am herewith quoting a Navy release:

The departure for Alaska of a reconnaissance engineering group marks the beginning of an exploratory program by Navy to determine the ultimate usefulness of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 at Point Barrow.

Little is known as to the potentialities of this area of 35,000 square miles at the northernmost tip of Alaska except that oil seepages have been found in several places, but the belief is that it holds large quantities of oil.

The reconnaissance party will begin at once preliminary work on the job of ascertaining what the oil resources are. It will study and report upon problems of transportation, housing, provisionary, and general working conditions which will confront geological parties and drilling crews which it is expected to send into the reserve later in the spring and summer. Appropriations are being sought currently to provide for this work.

Alaska has not yet produced much satisfactory evidence of possessing substantial quantities of recoverable oil. Several private companies have carried on explorations at various places with somewhat disappointing results but, despite this, the Territory remains generally regarded as geologically promising. Development of the fields and transportation of the oil when produced present many problems, and much exploratory and experimental work will have to be done before the real petroleum possibilities of the Territory will be definitely known. It is frankly expected that much of the drilling in the Point Barrow reserve will be of a speculative nature.

Harold Ickes, as Petroleum Administrator for War, and the Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior have been fully advised of Navy's exploratory program for Point Barrow. Navy expects to take full advantage of the technical abilities and services available in other Government agencies, and duplication of effort is to be avoided.

The Alaskan exploration now set in motion is a part of a broader program which Navy has formulated for its petroleum reserves in line with the resurgence of interest in oil as one of the Nation's key problems. Another of Navy's reserves about which relatively little is known is No. 1, located in the Elk Hills region of California. The only substantial exploration of this reserve has been in the shallow oil zone in the eastern end of the field. The large area to the west and the deeper Stevens zone are unexplored. The Navy has plans there, too.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RICHARDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4414) making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be the Consent Calendar, to be followed by the rivers and harbors bill. On Tuesday we will consider the Private Calendar, to be followed by the rivers and harbors bill. On Wednesday I expect the agricultural appropriation bill will be taken up and remain the order of business for the remainder of the week. Of course the conference report upon the U. N. R. R. A. bill will be taken up when the Senate disposes of it. If there is any change in the program, if any other legislation comes up, other than by unanimous consent, I shall advise my friend from Michigan and the House, in ample time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman tell us when the U. N. R. R. A. conference report is likely to come before the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot. As we have already gone over until Monday, it surely will not come up until next week anyway.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

MARCH 15, 1944.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the following committees of the United States House of Representatives, to be effective when accepted: Rivers and Harbors, World War Veterans' Legislation, Education, Claims, Public Buildings and Grounds, District of Columbia, and Patents.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM A. ROWAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], may have unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, in one instance and include a short article, and also to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include certain excerpts in the extension of my remarks made in committee this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a release issued by me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order today for 30 minutes. I yield back that time, and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FERNANDEZ, for 15 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HOCH, for March 20 and 21, on account of death in family.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1618. An act to amend the acts of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), June 15, 1938 (52 Stat. 699), and June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), which authorizes the appropriation of receipts from certain national forests for the purchase of lands within the boundaries of such forests, to provide that any such receipts not appropriated or appropriated but not expended or obligated shall be disposed of in the same manner as other national-forest receipts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1634. An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1682. An act to provide for the payment of compensation to certain claimants for the taking by the United States of private fishery rights in Pearl Harbor, Island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1748. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States," approved October 16, 1941, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1749. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940, as amended, to continue it in effect; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner;

H. R. 1488. An act to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2419. An act to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2880. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 2956. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. R. Wilson;

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; and

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1285. An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes; and

S. 1589. An act for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JAMES A. O'LEARY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sadness that I announce the death of our late lamented colleague, Mr. JAMES A. O'LEARY, from the State of New York. I have known Jim personally, as we familiarly called him, for a great many years, and I and others in this Chamber over the years have learned to respect and have for him a most affectionate regard. I repeat the words of Genesis, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Nonetheless, it is indeed very sad to note the parting of this good and loyal friend. It is difficult to say farewell to one as loyal as he, to one as sincere. He has gone to that undiscovered country, from whose bourne no traveler returns. As I grew to know JIM I always felt that he followed most religiously the teachings and admonitions of the great prophet Micah, who said that he always loved mercy, did justice, and walked humbly. Jim by his deeds and by his words did indeed walk humbly and he loved mercy and did justice. He was ever kind, benign, and gentle. Though quiet in demeanor, he had great stability of character. In his very meekness there was great strength. I would say that he knew the soft, sad music of humanity. He never feared death. He was sick for an undue length of time. He said to me, "Why fear that which is inevitable, and death is inevitable?" I agree with the poet, "What is death? At most it is a journey for a season, and a sleep longer than usual. If thou fearest death, thou should fear also sleep." Jim had no fear in his heart. I would say, in conclusion, that God has put His finger upon him; and he sleeps.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, in the first sad hour of shock it is always difficult for me to express the emotions that I feel coursing through my mind. Such a shock has come to me twice in the last 2 weeks, once when I lost a friend in Tom Cullen, who served in this House for 24 years, and now again when I lose another who has been close to me for 8 years, JIM O'LEARY. I was very fond of him. I shall always remember with great pleasure the many happy hours that we spent together when I would refresh myself in his sound, American philosophy. To talk to JIM O'LEARY reminded me of the way Amos must have felt when he said, "When I want strength I kiss the earth." When I wanted strength it was nice to feel that I could, in a manner of speaking, kiss the hand of my friend, JIM O'LEARY. I do not know that I would be exaggerating at all, Mr. Speaker, if I were to say more sincerely Jim was one of the finest characters I ever knew, simple and sweet. He had the three characteristics that I think make the measure of a man. He was courageous, he was tolerant, and he was kind. He was courageous even in these days when courage is not always too evident. He was courageous because he never failed to announce his conception of Americanism He believed in this country, in this country above all things. I am sorry to say that in many realms of society that is not too popular today. But JIM O'LEARY never faltered in his devotion to his country. Therefore I think that at this moment we have lost a man whom we can ill afford to lose. The Nation suffers. I in my personal life suffer. Strange, is it not, how lonely life grows as the years accumulate? We see snatched from us from time to time the things we have grown to love, the things that become actually a part of us. They are snatched from us through no act of ours and they leave us tremendously saddened. The loss of JIM O'LEARY will leave an ache in my heart that nothing that I can conceive of will ever fill.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, every Member of the Congress has heard with deep regret of the demise of our dear friend and colleague, JIM O'LEARY.

He was my dear friend and, with many Members of the House, I shall miss him very much. He was a credit to his city, State, and Nation. As Chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments he did a splendid job and reflected great credit on his ability as a leader and an executive.

The fine work he did as a member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries is well known to the Members of this House. Although ill at the time, he, in the pursuit of his duties, went on a long and tedious trip to the west coast to get a true picture of the marine situation there.

To his family go the sympathy and condolence of all of us in the Congress.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, God in His wisdom has seen fit to reach out and take from our midst one of our very dear and loyal friends, a valuable asset to the House of Representatives; JIM O'LEARY was a true friend and a good American. A man who at this moment has one son giving his very best so that we can continue in this deliberation in which we are taking part this afternoon. The things that Jim stood for were pronounced by his every deed and his every action up until this present moment. His suffering was tremendous, not only his physical suffering, but his mental suffering as well, having just suffered the loss of his dear wife. I am sure his son and daughthers will be happy in the knowledge that he has left behind him many, many friends. We stood here no more than 2 weeks ago and uttered practically the same words in behalf of another departed colleague. But, just as often as we repeat those words, just as often are we that much more sincere in our eulogy of the passing of a great and dearly beloved friend.

Jim's absence is a tremendous blow, not only to the constituents in his district, and to his family, but especially to his friends, among whom I am happy to know that I was numbered.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the grim hand of death has again visited this body. For 10 years our late friend, JIM O'LEARY, as his friends knew and called him, labored in this body, giving a character of service to his people and his country which it will be difficult for anyone who succeeds him to surpass. We who knew him personally, we who were numbered among his friends, feel keenly the passing of JIM O'LEARY and we are going to miss him greatly from among our ranks.

I remember well seeing him last fall on two occasions in Boston when he was there undergoing medical treatment in connection with the illness which brought about his death this morning. With full knowledge of the seriousness of his condition, as was evidenced in my talks with him, he viewed it from a fine, high, noble, philosophical, and religious angle. Those two talks which were among the last I had with him, the philosophical way in which he considered his illness, made a very strong impression upon me.

For 10 years he gave the best that was within him to his people and to his country by sincere and faithful and loyal service in this body. As previous speakers have well said, he was sincere. We can all subscribe to that beautiful trait possessed by our late friend. But more than sincere, he was kind. He was a man who encouraged others. He was a man of understanding. The passing of JIM O'LEARY leaves another gap in our ranks.

To his children I extend my profound sympathy in their bereavement. To the people of his district I extend my feeling of sympathy in the loss of their great Representative. I know that they appreciate the character of service that he so ably gave to them. And to our colleagues of the New York delegation I also express my sympathy because each and every one of them were not only personal friends of our late colleague, JIM O'LEARY, but he also was one of their delegation.

The New York delegation has had two visitations of death with in a few weeks. There is no finer delegation in this House than the New York delegation. I deeply sympathize with them in the loss from their ranks of a sincere and kindly character, a man of understanding, our late friend and colleague, JIM O'LEARY.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may care to use to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY].

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time in 30 days that death has visited the ranks of the New York delegation. Only 2 weeks ago we attended the funeral of the venerable Tom Cullen, of Brooklyn. Today we mourn the loss of Congressman JIM O'LEARY, of Staten Island. He was a businessman of fine accomplishments. Last summer I spent 2 months in the hospital on Staten Island, in his district. I came in contact with the civilian personnel who lived on Staten Island. Everyone spoke highly of JIM O'LEARY as their Representative. He exerted considerable influence in developing Staten Island as a great port in the harbor of New York. He brought business and manufacturing to Staten Island, and it now stands today as a great important section of our city.

We shall miss JIM O'LEARY. I extend to his family my profound sympathy and respect for a great father and husband who typified the qualities of a gentleman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. BENDER. We all know how futile mere words are on an occasion like this. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Expenditures and I knew JIM O'LEARY well. He was all that the distinguished majority leader stated. He was kindly and friendly and generous to a fault. He was a good friend. He was a strong partisan. No man served the Democratic Party better as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures than JIM O'LEARY, and he was always fair and considerate of every minority member of the committee. I join the New York Members in mourning his passing. I am sure if any man deserves a place in the heavenly throng, JIM O'LEARY does.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BURCHILL] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURCHILL of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with deepest sympathy and a sense of the greatest loss that I join with my colleagues in announcing to this body the passing of my beloved colleague, the Honorable JAMES A. O'LEARY, of Staten Island, N. Y. JIM O'LEARY has been, in addition, my dear friend and neighbor, as we had the distinction of representing adjoining districts in the State of New York. This enabled me to appraise his character and abilities from observations as well as association. His legislative record and judgment were unsurpassed during his term of service in this body and his character, demonstrated as a Member of this House and his community, was beautiful in its simplicity and dignity.

Jim knew the sorrow that follows the irreplaceable loss that comes with the passing of a close and dear one, having suffered the loss of his beloved wife a short time ago. Since that time he has devoted his life to his lovely family of two daughters and one son, Lt. James A. O'Leary, Jr., now serving his country. There is so little I can say to them in their hour of sorrow that would in the smallest measure approach the adequate. I can only extend my personal sympathy and hope that God will give them that supernatural strength He sends to all of us at some time in our lives when the need for it arises. The memory of their father will rest with this House throughcut the years to come. It is a memory which will hallow and revere his many years of loyal and faithful service. The high regard in which he was held by the leadership and his colleagues on both sides of the aisle, who sat in stricken silence today at the grave announcement of our loss, serves as mute and golden evidence of the great esteem in which JIM O'LEARY has always been held by this honorable body.

Because of the location of his district, JIM O'LEARY's greatest interest and most of his life were devoted to maritime matters. In memoriam I am reminded of those famous and beautiful words of the epitaph of Robert Louis Stevenson which might well have been uttered by JIM O'LEARY as he went to his Heavenly resting place:

> Here he lies where he longed to be;
> Home is the sailor, home from the sea,
> And the hunter home from the hill.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRIS] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, one of my first committee assignments on coming to the House was to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. At that time, JIM O'LEARY was one of the ranking Democrats on the committee. I came to know him exceedingly well through a common interest we had in more than one project concerning our respective districts. Through this association I quickly came to recognize his great ability, to respect his judgment, and to admire and have great affection for him personally. He was an independent thinker, a man of courage, and of courageous action. He is another of our beloved colleagues who have gone down fighting on the legislative firing line. We can ill afford to spare his like. We sorely shall miss him. His memory ever will remain green in our minds. Our hearts fully of sympathy go out to his children.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TORRENS] such time as he may care to use.

Mr. TORRENS. Mr. Speaker, although I did not have the honor of knowing Congressman O'LEARY but slightly, still I knew of the splendid work he did as a Member of Congress.

With his colleagues I join in offering my sympathy and my condolence to his bereaved family.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS].

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I made the acquaintance of JAMES O'LEARY when he was first elected to this House. It so happened he was assigned as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I was then the chairman. He served on that committee during the entire time he was in Congress, and when I resigned the chairmanship to accept my present assignment he became chairman and occupied that position at the time of his death.

He was always kind and helpful and was blessed with a personality that made friends for him with everyone he came in contact with. The people of his district, the State of New York, and the Nation have lost a faithful public servant.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the death of our colleague from New York, Representative JAMES A. O'LEARY.

During my term as a Member of the House I became rather well acquainted with him. His quiet and unassuming attitude seemed to be a magnet that drew people to him. During his 10 years of service in the House of Representatives he devoted himself wholeheartedly to the best interests of the people of his district. His loss will be deeply felt not only by the people of Staten Island and lower Manhattan, which he represented, but also by all the New York delegation.

To his family I extend my sincere sympathy.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 474) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of six Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following members of the committee: Mr. CELLER, Mr. FISH, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. POWERS, Mr. O'BRIEN of New York, and Mr. BURCHILL of New York.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, March 20, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Land Grants Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, March 17, 1944.

Business to be considered: To begin hearings on H. R. 4184, entitled "To amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic."

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on House Joint Resolution 148 (joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health) on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1302. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the War Relocation Authority of the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1945 containing an estimate of appropriation amounting to $40,100,000 (H. Doc. No. 501); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1303. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 14, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Intracoastal Waterway throughout Broward County, Fla., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 22, 1936, and by an act of Congress approved on June 26, 1936; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1304. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated December 10, 1943, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Waimea, Hanapepe, Wailua, and Hanalei Rivers and their tributaries and Kapaa Swamp on the island of Kauai, T. H.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1305. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; one copy each of various legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1157. An act to amend section 61 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, for the purpose of providing such training of State and Territorial military forces as is deemed necessary to enable them to execute their internal security responsibilities within their respective States and Territories; without amendment (Rept. No. 1262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1250. An act to repeal section 2 of the act approved May 17, 1926, which provides for the forfeiture of pay of persons in the military and naval service of the United States who are absent from duty on account of the direct effects of venereal disease due to misconduct; without amendment (Rept. No. 1263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4420. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act by adding a new title thereto relating to the sale or other disposition of surplus property of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4421. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 4422. A bill relating to certain Japanese residents of the United States and to certain citizens of Japanese descent found to be unfriendly to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 4423. A bill to establish State offices in the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R 4424. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 so as to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 4425. A bill to incorporate the Regular Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 472. Resolution to create a special committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of race relations in the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By The SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to express to Congress of the United States its respectful and firm opposition to have the people of Puerto Rico deprived of its revenue on rum; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry of Jews into that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 20, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we turn to Thee, driven by our drained lives, with tension of the present, anxiety about the future, deep concern about ourselves, our dear ones, our Nation, and our world. As we play our part in days of destiny, with all mankind standing in the valley of decision, we seek the sanctuary of prayer. Entering its gates of peace, we bow for this dedicated moment at a shrine of the spirit, apart from the clamor of the world, from the pull of conflicting opinions, and from the rivalry of personal loyalties. In Thy loving kindness and in Thy tender mercy look upon us; empower us, sustain us, as, toiling feverishly, our strength unequal to our task, we turn again to respond to the call of the world's great need.

In the midst of the dismaying circumstances of our times, open for us the crystal fountain whence the healing waters flow. Towering o'er the wrecks of time, may our eyes behold the conquering sign of a rugged cross and our ears, attuned to the infinite, catch the clear accents of the inevitable Christ, declaring, "I will draw all men unto me." We ask it in His ever-blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 16, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 16, 1944:

S. 776. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Louis H. Pink, superintendent of insurance of the State of New York, or his statutory successor, as statutory liquidator of New York Indemnity Co., against the United States;

S. 1357. An act to extend the time within which the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming may negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; and

S. 1549. An act for the relief of Vern M. Stanchfield.

On March 17, 1944:

S. 1146. An act to amend section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The VICE PRESIDENT affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1285) to

facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

ACTION BY VERMONT TO ASSURE VOTING BY SOLDIERS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the arrangement arrived at last Friday the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from New York if he is willing to let me take about 2 minutes in order that I may place certain matter in the RECORD?

Mr. MEAD. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont, with the understanding that I may resume the floor after he shall have concluded.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, one of the matters I wish to read: In the Burlington Free Press of March 18 appears the following news item:

Vermont becomes first State authorized by State law to use the Federal ballot.

Governor Wills signs servicemen's vote bill—

Then there are other matters before I come to the following text:

The soldier vote bill provides three methods of voting for service men or women in the regular or auxiliary forces. Application for ballots may be made by a member of the family or household to the town clerk and forwarded to the voter; the service men or women may apply directly for a ballot; or by Federal ballot, if available.

"Vermont has kept the faith."

In signing the soldier ballot bill, Governor Wills issued this statement:

"Final enactment today—

Which was March 17, St. Patrick's Day—

"Final enactment today of amendments to our election laws makes available to Vermonters serving in the armed forces the same advantages that will be available to civilian voters who enter the polling booth on election day.

"The use of the Federal ballot was authorized in Vermont by the bill passed by the Vermont Legislature and signed by me today.

"No Vermonter, therefore, will be denied the full voting opportunity to which he is justly entitled unless the President decides to veto the soldier ballot measure now before him.

"The State ballot will be available, of course, irrespective of the action the President may take.

"I strongly feel that Vermont has kept the faith."

Governor Wills further pointed out that Vermont was the first State to recognize, officially, that "a state of war existed"—this in September of 1941, 3 months before Pearl Harbor and the formal declaration of war by the Congress.

Now, the Governor pointed out, Vermont is the first State in the Union, after passage by the Congress of the Federal ballot law, to authorize the use of the Federal ballot.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. From the article which the Senator has just read, as I understand, Vermont has provided a State ballot, but in addition to that Vermont has authorized the use of the Federal ballot if the State ballot is not available to the soldiers.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Is the use of the Federal ballot confined to soldiers overseas?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; if I understand correctly the action which has been taken, it is an undertaking by the legislature of the State to recognize the ballot provided by the Congress. It is a matter of recognizing and counting the Federal ballot which the Congress has provided for and which would be available to the soldier under the provisions of that law, as inquired by the Senator from New Mexico, but I understand that there are no additional conditions imposed upon its use.

Mr. HATCH. If I understand the Senator correctly, then, so far as the Federal ballot is concerned, Vermont has made effective title III of the act as it was passed subject only to the conditions pertaining to that title.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think that is all.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXCHANGE STABILIZATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943, of the Exchange Stabilization Fund, including a summary of operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, reporting, pursuant to law, all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 131 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

FUTURE STATUS OF FUNCTIONS AND PERSONNEL TRANSFERRED TO THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the future status of certain functions and personnel transferred to the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN ANNUAL LEAVE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for lump-sum payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave and current accrued annual leave to certain officers and employees, and authorizing the appropriation of funds for that purpose (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, for several offices under the Interior Department (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of Virginia; to the Committee on Finance;

"House Joint Resolution 44

"House joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation to provide counties, cities, and towns with compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of acquisition of property by the Federal Government

"Whereas Virginia counties, cities, and towns are suffering tremendous losses of tax income by reason of acquisition of property by the Federal Government and its removal from the local tax ratables; and

"Whereas a tabulation of tax-exempt property in Virginia made in 1943 shows that the Federal Government had acquired at that time property in various parts of the State aggregating over 2,100,000 acres, and with a total value in excess of $250,000,000; and

"Whereas the costs of war should be borne by the citizens of the Nation as a whole, but in the case of Federal acquisition of real property for war purposes a heavy tax burden is unjustly imposed upon those taxpayers remaining in the community from which taxable areas have been removed by Federal acquisition; and

"Whereas the loss being suffered in Virginia is constantly increasing through Federal acquisition of additional property, and the growing seriousness of the problem calls for speedy action and early solution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia, the Senate concurring:*

"1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to give its earliest possible attention to the adoption of legislation which will provide counties, cities, and towns with compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of Federal Government acquisition of property for war purposes.

"2. That the clerk of the house of delegates is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Members of the United States Senate representing Virginia, to the Virginia Members of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

Senate Resolution No. 3 of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Resolution 3

"Resolution to request the President of the United States of America, and the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, to prescribe whatever may be necessary for the purpose of continuing the system of food distribution in Puerto Rico during the period of war, under the responsibility of the institution O. D. (formerly F. D. A.) and to continue also the appropriation which was passed by the Senate of the the United States to provide subsidies for the basic food products exported to Puerto Rico under Government responsibility, and for other purposes

"Whereas it has come to the knowledge of the people of Puerto Rico that importing interests of Puerto Rico, and United States exporters of food products for Puerto Rico, are active in the executive and legislative branches in Washington to have the control of the distribution of food during the war returned to Puerto Rican importers;

"Whereas the harm that the consumers of the island would suffer by the return of the control of foods during the war to Puerto Rican importers would be considerable;

"Whereas it is generally known that such interests have secured the attention of sev-

eral Congressmen, of persons influential in the administration, and of executive officials, to the extent that several such persons have made statements favorable to the end sought by the vested interests of Puerto Rico and the United States in regard to foods for Puerto Rico;

"Whereas if the demand of these interests, which concern scarcely several dozen importers, should become a reality, Puerto Rico would run the risk of losing the assistance that it is receiving from the Federal Government—assistance that in Puerto Rico is fully justified by the extremely low level of income of the great majority of the population—which would carry with it a rise in the prices of basic foods, to the prejudice, very especially, of the poor classes of this country, because of the increase in the cost of living in serious disproportion to the earning power of the people;

"Whereas it would be practically impossible for the office of the O. P. A. in Puerto Rico to keep control of prices adequate to the prevailing condition among the poor classes, if the importation and distribution of the basic foods most necessary for the consumption of the island should escape from the reins of the Federal Government while the war emergency lasts, with a very possible threat of the black market;

"Whereas it cannot be guaranteed, upon the Government's giving up of the control of food during the war emergency, that Puerto Rico would be assured a sufficient amount of foodstuffs, since the only security of furnishing foodstuffs in an island like Puerto Rico during the war depends on the control and the facilities of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, etc.:

"1. To request the President of the United States of America, the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the Senate and the House of the United States, that the present system of food distribution in Puerto Rico be kept under the control of the Departments of the Interior and of Agriculture in Washington, during the emergency condition caused by the war.

"2. To request that subsidies which up to the present have been given to the basic products for the food of our people be maintained, thus keeping prices at a level compatible with the limited incomes of the poor classes of Puerto Rico.

"3. That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the House and of the Senate of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Territories of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House, to the Chavez committee, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Governor of Puerto Rico, and to the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington."

A resolution by the City Council of Cambridge, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to substantially reduce the cost to policyholders of war-damage insurance; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TAFT:

The petition of members of the Overseas League and sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to make effective a plan of rotation of troops in foreign service whereby all men who have served abroad for 1 year or more may be returned to the United States for a like period, being replaced in such foreign service by men now stationed in this country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF VERMONT LEGISLATURE—VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I ask leave to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, with the accompanying letter.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF VERMONT,
Montpelier, March 17, 1944.

Hon. WARREN R AUSTIN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR AUSTIN: Enclosed herewith is a certified copy of House Joint Resolution 10, "Joint resolution relating to Federal legislation providing benefits for veterans of the present war," approved March 16, 1944.

Sincerely yours,

RAWSON C. MYRICK,
Secretary of State.

Whereas there are many and varied bills now before the United States Congress, the object of which is to provide diverse types of benefits for the veterans of the present war; and

Whereas after careful study there has been sponsored by the American Legion and introduced in the Congress a comprehensive bill known as the GI bill of rights, in which are incorporated provisions that will be of immediate benefit and lasting value to the service men and women upon their separation from service: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Vermont delegation in the Congress be urged to support the principles incorporated in this particular measure; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he hereby is, instructed to forward to each Senator and the Representative of this State in the Congress, and to the national commander of the American Legion, a copy of this resolution.

ASA S. BLOOMER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
MORTIMER R. PROCTOR,
President of the Senate.

Approved March 16, 1944.

WM. H. WILLS,
Governor.

RESOLUTION OF BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION

Mr. WHEELER. I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution sent to me from Montana on behalf of the Bataan Relief Organization.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of the United States Army, in his report of September 11, 1943, published in Army Time, a daily news bulletin, Washington 5, D. C., stated that on July 1, 1941, the international situation was extremely critical and that menacing preparations of Japan in the Pacific prefaced attacks upon the British and Dutch possessions and the Philippines, and that in view of these potentialities orders had been issued in February 1941, to evacuate dependents of Army personnel stationed there; and

Whereas in the late summer of 1941 troops were ordered to the Philippines; and

Whereas pertinent statements of our Chief of Staff show beyond any doubt that those in authority knew that war with Japan was inevitable and in view of these potentialities and the American-Japanese negotiations in process in the late summer and fall of 1941, the American people naturally assumed that the administration, Army and Navy officials entrusted with the guarding of our Nation's safety would be on the alert sufficiently to prevent any possibility of such an attack as occurred at Pearl Harbor, as was their duty, according to their oaths of office; and

Whereas the removal from active duty of two high-ranking Army and Navy officers entrusted with the defense of Pearl Harbor can obviously be rightfully taken by the American people as an admission of criminal negligence since that negligence jeopardized the life and freedom of our entire Nation and it is beyond question of doubt that their dereliction of duty brought about the extent of the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor and the needless loss of many thousands of American lives and there is a question in the minds of American people as to whether that dereliction of duty ended with the responsibility of those two officers or whether it extends to other military and naval officers or of some civil authorities in high position; and

Whereas the problem of responsibility for the catastrophe at Pearl Harbor must be solved if the Nation is to obtain the highest degree of morale, which is necessary for a complete, all-out war effort; and

Whereas a train crew in charge of a passenger train would at least be charged with manslaughter if it neglected its duty to the extent of the loss of one human life, men under oath of office entrusted with the Nation's safety neglect their rseponsibility to the extent that thousands of lives are lost directly and thousands of others are needlessly sacrificed to the fate of years of imprisonment in Japanese prison camps as a result and yet after 2 years a thorough investigation has not been made or responsibility fixed or the American people advised as to where the responsibility lies; and

Whereas it cannot now be asserted as a reason for not fixing the responsibility as to do so might hamper the war effort and it is most obvious that the removal of the men responsible for the many defeats in the Pacific in the early days of the war emanates from the primary defeat at Pearl Harbor, is imperative if we are to obtain and maintain the most efficient direction of the war effort, and that the removal of those responsible will raise the morale not only on the home front, but also among our fighting forces, who are required to serve under provided leadership; and

Whereas denial of food, medical, and other supplies to our fighting men at Bataan and Corregidor, who were sent to the Pacific to defend the American right and protection of our flag resulted in needless sacrifice and torture at the hands of a known ruthless enemy and the veracity of all statements made at that time and since, that it was impossible to send them aid, is seriously questioned by us; and

Whereas it is our opinion that adherence to the prescribed duties of those charged with the protection of America and in accordance with traditional humanitarian principles of America would have prevented the enormous loss of life before and after the surrender of Bataan, Corregidor, Guam, and Wake, and it is our further opinion that the dereliction of duty of those in authority constitutes the writing of the blackest page in American history and the resulting torture of the mothers, wives, and other relatives of the heroes of Bataan and Corregidor, caused by the diabolical atrocities so heartlessly described in the Army and Navy release of January 28, 1944, is the acknowledged signature of that black page. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Bataan Relief Organization (B. R. O.) and its affiliates representing the mothers, fathers, wives, and other relatives, sweethearts, and friends of our sacrificed men in our armed forces in the Pacific, who lost their lives and the others who are left and who are suffering the most intense mental and physical anguish, are entitled as free Americans to petition the Congress of the

United States, in accordance with the Constitution, for an immediate and thorough investigation to fix the responsibility and guilt of those in authority in order to bring about the speedy conclusion of this case, regardless of whom it may involve; and be it further

Resolved, That after termination of such investigation that trial by court martial proceedings, impeachment, or any other means necessary to bring about immediate justice and thorough punishment of those found guilty of the dereliction of duty which they accepted when they took their oaths of office, shall be instituted.

BATAAN RELIEF ORGANIZATION,
OPAL I. BARTHOFF, *President*.

Attest:

JOE FAMACHE, Sr.,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY WICHITA (KANS.) INDEPENDENT SERVICE STATION OPERATORS' RELIEF ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution adopted on February 29, 1944, by the Wichita (Kans.) Independent Service Station Operators' Relief Association which protests against action taken by the O. P. A. Commissioner without any right of appeal to the courts.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas in wartime it is necessary that good citizens submit cheerfully and patriotically to regulatory laws such as the Price Control Act which is operated by the Office of Price Administration; and

Whereas it is un-American, unnecessary, and unreasonable that such acts be enforced by star-chamber methods and that citizens of the United States be deprived of their constitutional rights, including their day in court; and

Whereas it is unconstitutional, un-American, unpatriotic, and unfair for said act to be enforced by an O. P. A. commissioner who acts as judge, jury, prosecutor, and bailiff all rolled into one without any right to appeal to the courts of the State or Nation; and

Whereas such "kangaroo" courts suspend citizens from business as a penalty for alleged violations of regulations and this suspension without recourse to duly constituted courts denies the citizen his right to his livelihood in violation of the fifth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing that no citizen shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law—such trials before a hearing commissioner not being due process of law; and

Whereas it is the duty of all good citizens to maintain freedom on the home front while our boys are fighting and dying for it on the battle fronts: Now, therefore, be it hereby

Resolved by the Wichita Independent Service Station Operators' Relief Association:

1. That Congress be petitioned to amend the Price Control Act so that all alleged violations of said law or regulations promulgated thereunder will be prosecuted and tried in the duly constituted courts of our State or Nation.

2. That we enlist the support of all other interested citizens in bringing this matter to the attention of Congress and in attempting to obtain prompt, proper, and effective congressional action; and

3. That we keep faith with our boys who are offering their lives on foreign seas and shores to prevent despotism from being imposed upon us from without by pledging our consecrated efforts, our fortunes, and our sacred honor to prevent tyranny from being imposed upon us from within while they are away.

K. H. BURTON,
President.
PAUL JESSUP,
Vice President.
FRANCES MARKOWITZ,
Secretary-Treasurer.

PROTEST AGAINST THE ENACTMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LEGISLATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present a letter containing a statement which I have received from John D. O'Brien, secretary of the Topeka (Kans.) Federation of Santa Fe Railroad Shop Crafts, informing me of the action of that organization in taking a stand against the national service bill. I request that the letter be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA LOCAL FEDERATION OF
SANTA FE RAILROAD SHOP CRAFTS,
Topeka, Kans., March 6, 1944.

Mr. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a well-attended meeting of the above body which, as the name implies, represents the large number of machinists, boilermakers, blacksmiths, sheet-metal workers, carmen, firemen, oilers, and shop laborers, together with their helpers and apprentices, employed in the local shops of the Santa Fe Railway Co. it was decided after mature consideration to communicate with you and express our unanimous opposition to the enactment of the above proposed legislation, and to respectfully request and urge that you oppose it in the Senate by every legitimate means. Thanking you, I remain,

Yours truly,

JOHN D. O'BRIEN,
Secretary.

RESOLUTION BY SENATE OF PUERTO RICO—TAXES FROM SALE OF PUERTO RICAN RUM

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the secretary of the Senate of Puerto Rico, together with a resolution adopted by the Puerto Rican Senate.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE OF PUERTO RICO,
March 3, 1944.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: By direction of the Senate of Puerto Rico, I have the honor to transmit herewith copy of Senate Resolution 2, approved March 3, 1944.

Said resolution was unanimously adopted with the votes of all Senators present from all political parties represented at the Senate of Puerto Rico.

Respectfully yours,

Y. SOLÁ MORALES,
Secretary, Senate of Puerto Rico.

Whereas there is pending in the Congress in Washington, legislation to deprive Puerto Rico of the taxes collected on the sale of Puerto Rican rum in the United States;

Whereas for more than 40 years the people of Puerto Rico have enjoyed the right to use and dispose of these taxes in accordance with the laws of its legislature; and

Whereas the increase in these taxes is practically the only favorable factor caused in Puerto Rico by the war, in the midst of the many sufferings which the war has caused our people and which our people are bearing in a spirit of sacrifice and comprehension in defense of the great democratic principles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico, To express to the Congress of the United States its respectful and firm opposition to having the people of Puerto Rico deprived of the right, which it has enjoyed for more than 40 years, to dispose of those taxes through the legislature and for such purposes as the legislature, in representation of the people, believes of the greatest utility and benefit to Puerto Ricans.

RESOLUTIONS BY DISTRICT CONFERENCE OF UNITED PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the district director of district No. 2, United Packinghouse Workers of America and several resolutions adopted by the conference.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, as follows:

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

UNITED PACKINGHOUSE WORKERS
OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., March 14, 1944.

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Enclosed find copies of the resolutions passed at the district conference of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, C. I. O., on March 12, 1944.

This action was taken by the delegates attending this conference, and I hope that you will give this matter serious consideration.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN CHINANDER,
District Director, District
No. 2, U. P. W. A.–C. I. O.,
South St. Paul, Minn.

Resolution 7

Subsidies for price control

Whereas—

(1) The control of prices and living costs is a basic necessity to keep food and other vital commodities within the reach of the people of the Nation, and to preserve the health and morale of the home front; and

(2) The control and reduction of price levels require that funds be available for subsidies to keep production of food and other cost-of-living commodities at highest levels while protecting the people of the Nation against exorbitant prices; and

(3) Powerful groups in the Halls of Congress, operating in opposition to the best interests of the working farmers, the war workers, and all of the people of the Nation, have been actively engaged in sabotaging and knifing measures which would make funds available in accordance with the request of the President for subsidies to prevent increases in the price of such vital commodities as milk; and

(4) A group of Members of Congress responsive to the needs of the Nation have joined together under the leadership of Con-

gressmen SCANLON, MCMURRAY, and others, to organize effective congressional action in support of real price control, and in apposition to the activities of those Congressmen seeking higher prices: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

(1) That district No. 2, U. P. W. A.-C. I. O., hails the activities of those Members of Congress who have rallied together in support of the price-control program; and

(2) We call upon all Members of Congress to join in the fight for effective price control; and

(3) We call upon Congress to reject the efforts of the inflation-bent bloc, and to enact the measures nesessary to assure full control of prices of cost-of-living commodities, including measures to make available adequate funds for subsidies or other payments to prevent any increase in prices and to protect the farmers and the small businessman; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and all Senators and Congressmen in the States of Minnesota, Montana, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

Ordered to lie on the table:

Resolution 3

Poll tax

Whereas the elimination of the poll-tax requirement, which in eight of our States places a price tag on the right to vote, has long been recognized as a necessary step toward the perfection of our democratic structure. In the war period it becomes more and more apparent that this step is a military necessity, and that our failure to take this step is playing into the hands of our enemies: Therefore be it

Resolved, That District No. 2, U. P. W. A.-C. I. O., calls upon the Senators of the State of Minnesota to discharge their obligation to the people of the Nation, and enact forthwith this legislation eliminating the poll tax, and not to permit or tolerate any unscrupulous filibuster on the part of the clique of poll-tax Senators intent on preserving their personal political position with a callous disregard of the national emergency and popular will; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Senators of the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and northwest Wisconsin.

Resolution 4

Social security

Whereas—

(1) Bills have been introduced in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress by Senators WAGNER, MURRAY, and Representative DINGELL which provide for an improved program of social security;

(2) These bills expand the scope of and provide for increased benefits for unemployment compensation which would be placed on a Federal basis, old-age security, permanent disability, and for a program of health insurance which meet immediate needs, in addition to making provision for the postwar period: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved—

(1) This conference of District No. 2, U. P. W. A.-C. I. O., endorses wholeheartedly the benefit program incorporated in the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill;

(2) It calls upon Congress to incorporate in the presently pending tax legislation, the provisions of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill with appropriate changes to provide for an equitable allocation of the increased cost between the employees, the employers, and the Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Senators and Congressmen in the States of Minnesota, Montana, Wisconsin, North Dakota, and South Dakota.

Resolution 8

Whereas over 11,000,000 men and women serving in the armed forces of which more than 2,000,000 are members of organized labor, having the constitutional right to vote in the 1944 elections.

2. The only adequate assurance that our soldiers will be given the chance to vote is through the passage of a unified simple Federal ballot, as provided in the Green-Lucas bill now before Congress.

3. The Rankin-Eastland bill which throws the problem of the soldiers' vote back on the States, is a fraud and has been so characterized by President Roosevelt, and is supported only by those Members of Congress who admittedly wish to prevent the soldiers' vote from being cast.

4. State action to provide absentee ballots for soldiers such as has recently been provided by a special session of the Minnesota Legislature is commendable, but not adequate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this conference of district No. 2, U. P. W. A.-C. I. O., meeting in South St. Paul, Minn., March 12, 1944, representing 16 locals and 8,000 members in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and northwest Wisconsin, goes on record emphatically in favor of passage of the Green-Lucas bill providing for a unified Federal ballot for soldiers; be it further

Resolved, That we members of the C. I. O. invite all other groups and individuals in these States, A. F. of L., railroad workers, farmers, businessmen, professional, and other groups to cooperate with us to bring about the passage of this bill, thereby assuring our soldiers the right to vote; be it further

Resolved, We urge delegates of local unions represented at this conference to get their members to write or send suitable letters and telegrams to their Representatives in Congress, to circularize this resolution as a leaflet to the general public, and to use it to secure cooperation of other labor and nonlabor groups in mobilizing support for the Federal soldiers' vote; be it finally

Resolved, Copies of this resolution be sent to all Senators and Representatives in Congress from the five States, and to Senators GREEN and LUCAS, and Representative WORLEY, chairman of the House Elections Committee, and to the appropriate newspapers for publication.

REPORT OF FINANCE COMMITTEE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 16th instant,

Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, reported it with amendments on March 18, 1944, and submitted a report (No. 755) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 17, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1589) for the relief of C. Guy Evans, Garland Mineral Springs, Index, Wash.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 1788. A bill to provide for the future status of certain functions and personnel transferred to the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. 1789. A bill for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and Memphis Park Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. MCCARRAN introduced Senate bill 1790, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1791. A bill to provide a night differential for employees of the Government of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1792. A bill to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 1793. A bill to permit the naturalization of foreign seamen who serve on American-owned vessels for a period of at least 3 years while the United States is at war; to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is necessarily out of the city on important public business. He has asked me in his behalf to request unanimous consent to introduce a bill for disposing of certain lands which have been taken by the Government for public purposes which are about to be disposed of to private ownership. I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce the bill for the Senator from Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for Mr. LUCAS):

S. 1794. A bill to provide that, in disposing of lands which have been acquired by the United States for national defense or war purposes, a preference shall be given to the former owners of such lands or their successors in interest; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 1795. A bill to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1796. A bill for the relief of Ellen R. Riley and Harriot C. Riley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 1797. A bill relating to the granting of commissions to members of the armed forces who have had training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration war-training service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] and myself, I ask consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require that all appointees to positions in the Federal Government shall be qualified voters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. GUFFEY (for himself and Mr. CLARK of Missouri):

S. 1798. A bill to require that appointees to positions in the Federal Government shall be qualified voters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am grateful to the Senator from New York for yielding to me at this time that I may make a few brief preliminary explanatory statements with reference to a bill I am about to introduce.

Mr. President, my first assignment to a committee, after I became a Member of the Senate, was to a special committee known as the Ocean Mail and Air Mail Subsidy Committee. The chairman was Senator Black, of Alabama, who is now distinguishing himself upon the Supreme Court of the United States.

For a year we went into an intensive study of ocean-mail and air-mail subsidies, in the course of which the matter of aviation became a subject exceedingly interesting to the Senator from Nevada.

In 1934 I set about to write what I thought would be a proper law for aviation. Between 1934 and 1938 I prepared and introduced a number of bills in an attempt to write the law of aviation for the United States. Those bills were variously referred. The first went to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Hearings were held on the bill, and a measure was reported to the Senate. The Senate considered it, but for one reason or another it was not finally adopted.

Again we wrote a measure embodying the law of aviation as we thought it should be. Finally, in 1938, after a long study of the subject, we had the privilege of seeing our bill in part adopted, and it is now, although much changed by Executive order, the law of aviation of the United States.

The conference committee which dealt with that bill engaged in that which is always essential in bringing about legislation, namely, compromise. Many parts of the legislative proposal, when they came to the floor of the Senate by way of report from the conference committee, were not satisfactory to the author of the bill.

From 1938 until the present time, I have given my untiring efforts to a study of the subject of aviation. I have called to my assistance for conference and advice nearly every agency and individual engaged in or interested in aviation. From every standpoint the senior Senator from Nevada has attempted to make a thorough and comprehensive study to determine what should be the law of aviation for a nation which should go forward with that great instrumentality for commerce.

With that in mind, during the last several years, and especially since last August or thereabouts, I have devoted much of my time to an effort to formulate what to my mind would be the best law for aviation for the future, and today I am about to introduce for proper reference the bill I have finally worked out.

Mr. President, I think it is due to my colleagues on the floor of the Senate that a very brief statement be made of the bill and its general policy. The bill would set aside the present arrangement of the Civil Aeronautics Administration anld would abolish the Civil Aeronautics Board as it now exists, and in place of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, as at present constituted by this bill, there would be set up an independent agency, known as the Civil Aeronautics Authority, composed of seven members, to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. That Civil Aeronautics Authority would be an independent agency, independent of all other departments, and the Administrator, as he now exists, would be appointed as an executive officer by the Civil Aeronautics Authority, and he would assume such duties and responsibilities as the Civil Aeronautics Authority may assign to him.

Mr. President, there is no need for question as to the policy which the author of the bill would establish. The bill defines States' rights in no uncertain terms, both by way of declaration of policy and by way of legislative prescription. The bill would clarify the atmosphere so that the rights, privileges, and immunities which belong to the States and the people thereof, and do not belong to interstate commerce, would be retained by the States insofar as civil aviation is concerned. The rights which by constitutional prescription belong under interstate commerce are assigned to and are recognized to be in the Federal Government.

Many controversies have arisen as to what, under existing law, are the rights of a private flyer. Many who are interested in private flying throughout the country have questioned why they should be curtailed in their activities. So the bill would definitely define a private flyer, and what his rights are under the law. In the bill we write for him a bill of rights so that the private flyer, so long as he abides by the rules and regulations with respect to safety, may, generally speaking, have freedom of activity.

In the bill we again set up an air safety board, independent in its creation and in its action, to be appointed by the President, each member to have certain qualifications fitting him for his position in that great work. The safety board is definitely defined and its powers are definitely set out in the bill.

The bill in clear and distinct language states what the author believes should be the policy for the United States of America. It provides that the United States of America shall retain sovereignty in the air over the continental United States and its waters and Territorial possessions. It sets it forth in language which he who runs may read, so that the people of the United States may know that our policy is to retain in the United States sovereignty in the air over the United States, its waters, and its Territorial possessions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, I understand the Senator is striving for the philosophy of sovereignty of the air as opposed either to the philosophy of freedom of the air or the right of innocent transit?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator states it correctly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to say to the Senator from Nevada that I join him in his position.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am glad to have the Senator's cooperation. I hope the Senator may have time to read the bill, and to read the statement which I hope by unanimous consent may be printed in the RECORD. A reading of the statement would take longer than the amount of time I desire to use in detaining the Senate at this time.

Mr. President, I wish to say one further word. We have been—and I say this without any tinge of criticism of anyone—more or less a laughing stock to foreign countries because we have no defined foreign policy as regards commercial aviation. It is high time that a policy be established. It is high time that we look to the advantages which our country should have in the great industry of air commerce, if we ever hope to have paid to us the debt which is being created by reason of our taking care of, feeding, clothing, and furnishing munitions to those nations which are fighting on the same side with us in this great war. In my judgment, Mr. President, we must not forget the fact that we should send the products of this country into the markets of the world by the swiftest possible agency.

So with that in mind, and in order that something may be before the people and before the Congress which looks to that accomplishment, we have by this bill set up an instrumentality in which every American air carrier doing business at the present time may participate, whether he be an air carrier to foreign countries or a domestic carrier. We propose to set up what we have chosen to term "the all-American-flag air line" in which every carrier now doing business, either domestically or in foreign commerce, may participate, but which will have the sole sanction of the Federal Government and will receive the sole support financially of the Federal Government, and will receive the sole and only sustenance and support from the agencies of the Government. In other words, by the proposed law, we would set up an instrumentality to carry the commerce of this country into the markets of the world with the sanction and approval and backing of the Federal Government.

By the bill we will create no monopoly. We leave the road wide open for those who would venture their own fortunes in foreign commerce by air, but we put behind the proposed instrumentality the power and force of the Government of the United States. In our judgment, speaking after 10 years of study of the subject, the way proposed by the bill is the only way by which the United States of America can hope to enter into competition with the flag lines of other countries. We are not alone in that thought, and experience has given us a wide field to consider. Great Britain had at one time a number of lines, and she found that it was impossible to have certain of

her own lines competing with others of her own lines and at the same time competing with the lines of other governments. So she centered on one line to carry the British flag and to receive the British national support. France before the war had several lines. She also abandoned that policy and centered on one line. Italy also went through that experience. Japan also went through that experience. Germany also went through it. Other nations went through it. We have their experience before us, and it is time that we act, and act affirmatively and positively, so that the world may know and so that the people of the United States may know that we are interested in the commerce of America by that swift and sure agency which in my judgment is destined to go through as many changes and as many progressive steps within the next 10 years as it has in the past 10 years.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me inquire whether it is not true, in line with the Senator's observations, that if in the post-war aviation world we confront chosen governmental instrumentalities by way of competition on behalf of every other great air power, and if we confront them with a divided, competitive, external air power of our own, we shall have simply invited them to apply to us the adage, "Divide and conquer."

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator expresses the situation splendidly, and expresses my thought on the subject exactly.

Mr. President, we must take an affirmative stand for ourselves in the commercial world of the future. This great instrumentality of commerce has been developed by American industry, by American ingenuity, and by American determination; and we should not fail to persist now in our thought that America should be to the air what other countries have been to the waters of the world in times past.

Mr. President, the one way, if not the only way, by which we can bring encouragement to the people of this country is for Congress to say, "We have a foreign policy, and we are going forward with that policy so that the commerce of this country may reach the markets of the world by the fastest possible means."

In view of the pending business, Mr. President, I do not wish to take up further of the time of the Senate. I have prepared a detailed statement by way of explanation of every provision of the bill. The statement is a little lengthy, but it is very much worth while that those who read the bill may have a view of what the author of the bill is thinking of in the use of the terms found in the bill. The statement is as brief as it could be, in view of the magnitude of the subject and the manner in which we sought to deal with it. I now ask unanimous consent to have this statement, which is explanatory of the bill, printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CIVIL AERONAUTICS BILL

(Statement by Senator PAT MCCARRAN)

GENERAL STATEMENT

I have today introduced a bill which, if enacted at this session, will become the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1944.

This bill has not been written by the Air Transport Industry, the Civil Aeronautics Board, or any other person or group; it was written by me.

No person other than those working for me in my office have ever so much as seen this bill, despite published reports to the contrary.

This bill rests upon the cumulative experience of the aviation industry and the Government, and represents a sincere effort to embody the best of that experience in legislative language.

While short of perfection, as all legislation must be, this bill offers, in my opinion, a sound framework for progressive legislation.

In writing this bill I have attempted to collect and correlate the experience since 1938 of the Federal Government, the air-transport industry, commercial pilots, the aviation manufacturing industry, private flyers, and others who participate in or are affected by aviation in all its phases.

Each State was asked for a copy of its laws and regulations on aviation, and these laws were analyzed carefully to determine what the States have done in aviation. This material was supplemented by an exhaustive study of State experience in the aviation field and by conferences with State aviation officials.

Having conferred at length with leaders in all phases of aeronautics, I wish to express my deep appreciation of the splendid assistance they have rendered in advising me of the legislative needs which their experience has indicated.

On the basis of these studies, which began in 1934, and have been intensified since last August, I determined that the best plan was to work toward a complete rewriting or codification of all Federal legislation for civil aviation so as to incorporate the experience referred to above, and so as to write into basic law the correct interpretations of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 by the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Civil Aeronautics Board. I have not failed to study the decisions of the courts which have involved or affected aeronautics.

This bill deals with ideas, and certain perfections of language may be necessary to express these ideas clearly. All suggestions for clarification of language, as well as all suggestions of new ideas and new language, will be sincerely welcomed and appreciated.

I want this bill to represent the very best in aviation experience and the best thought and planning for the benefit of this country, its entire aeronautical industry, and all its citizens who will engage in or derive their livelihood from post-war aviation.

Realizing quite well that achievement of this end will require the assistance and constructive criticism of many leaders in the aviation field who have not yet presented their suggestions to me, I bespeak for the bill the most earnest study and consideration, and for its aims and purposes the unselfish and unstinting support and cooperation of all who share with me complete confidence in the limitless future of aviation; unshakable faith in the ability of American ingenuity, courage, and enterprise to achieve for this country, if given an even break with foreign competition, unquestioned leadership in post-war world aeronautics; and an abiding conviction that proper fulfillment of the destiny of the United States of America requires that it shall achieve and maintain such leadership.

EXPLANATION OF THIS STATEMENT

This statement is separated into two parts: (1) A discussion of the major points of this bill and (2) an analysis of the bill, title by title.

Major points

1. International aviation

The bill creates a federally chartered private corporation with potential working capital in excess of $1,000,000,000, to be known as the all American flag line. This corporation will be composed of air carriers now holding certificates under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, except air carriers whose operations are wholly within the Territory of Alaska.

Creation of this corporation will effect a pooling of all the resources, both domestic and foreign, of the air transport industry, to forge a new agency which will make the commerce of the United States first in the air all over the world. This new agency will have back of it not only the full strength of this unity of all factions of the air transport industry of the United States concerned with foreign air transportation, but also all available facilities of the Government of the United States, to enable it to carry out the purpose for which it is being created.

This corporation will, therefore, have active partners operating throughout the United States who will funnel international business into designated points of entry or departure. Likewise, these interstate air carrier partners will pick up and disperse throughout the United States the international air traffic which is brought to our shores by the all American flag line, or by any foreign air carriers. I believe this offers an unbeatable combination.

The bill prohibits the all American flag line, or any foreign air carrier, from engaging in interstate air transportation.

Specific provisions of the bill prevent any one air carrier from owning a controlling interest in the all American flag line.

While the idea of such a corporation as this bill proposes may seem both novel and daring, I am convinced it presents the most sound solution to our national problem of insuring the United States its proper place in world aviation.

The pace of the world is geared to transportation, and aviation is the instrumentality which will set the pace in the foreign trade and passenger field after the war. We cannot afford to come out second best in the race for air commerce in the markets of the world. That is why this bill proposes to put the entire facilities of the air transport industry and the full weight of the Government of the United States back of the all American flag line. It must and it shall be the leading air carrier in foreign air transportation throughout the world.

2. States' rights

Under this bill, States' rights are given the fullest protection consistent with necessary Federal control over interstate traffic and safety in air navigation. Instead of being excluded from all control over aeronautics, the States are given control of intrastate air carriers and intrastate air contractors. With respect to these two types of operations, States can exercise all the traditional powers which they have exercised in the public-utility field. The bill covers this idea specifically both by definition and by declaration of policy, so that the intent of Congress not to interfere with States' rights will be clear.

Before formulating the provisions of this act which assure States of the retention of their legal powers in the aviation field, I made an exhaustive study of all State legislation in this field and the experience thereunder, so that I could understand the problems and viewpoints of State aviation officials.

In the airport and airport zoning fields, the bill provides specifically for a system of cooperation and mutual aid between States and cities on all phases of aviation in which they have mutual interest, so as to bring about a real spirit of mutual helpfulness rather than conflict between these different levels of government, all of which certainly do have a part to play in the development of aviation.

3. Experimental certificates

To open up the whole development of air transportation to new enterprise and keep it open for our returning soldiers, and to assure the greatest possible development of feeder lines for existing trunk-line operators, the bill creates a new type of certificate of public convenience and necessity, known as an experimental certificate.

This new type of certificate will be issued without the requirement of any proof other than of ability, including financial responsibility, to operate the new line and to comply with necessary safety regulations. The bill provides that experimental certificates may be issued on any route which is not already covered by a certificate held by an air carrier.

Language of this section preserves to the holder of an experimental certificate the advantages which may flow from any air traffic which he develops by operations under such certificate at his own financial risk.

4. Private flyers

The bill gives private flyers a new recognition and a "bill of rights" which they have never had under previous Federal legislation.

Private flyers are given specific assurance against interference by the Federal regulatory body which is created under this act through a new section which prohibits the application to them of any provisions of the act other than those relating to safety. For the first time private flyers are by this bill specifically given the right to perform mechanical work on their own planes without securing a separate certificate from the Civil Aeronautics Authority authorizing them to perform this type of work.

5. Civil Aeronautics Authority re-created—Administrator abolished

A Civil Aeronautics Authority composed of seven members is created as an independent agency of the Government, and the office of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is abolished, as is the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Having an Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to perform certain functions, with other functions assigned to the Civil Aeronautics Board, and with no clear distinction and definition of the functions which each should exercise, has resulted in endless confusion, duplication of effort, and delay in carrying out proper programs for the benefit of aviation. It is this situation which the bill attempts to cure by setting up an executive officer within the Authority, who, subject to the orders of the Authority, will carry out the executive functions formerly exercised by the Administrator.

Creation of the C. A. A. as an independent agency also eliminates the top-heavy situation under which normal functions of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics cannot be performed without clearance with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air, as well as with the Secretary of Commerce on important matters.

The idea of splitting the separate functions of a quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, and executive agency, as originally written into the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, looked very good as a theory, but it simply has not worked out in practice. That the President felt it necessary to completely reorganize the C. A. A. and bring it under the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce is merely one of the indications of this fact.

In abolishing the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, the bill takes all civil aviation functions out of the Department of Commerce and vests the Federal Government's civil-aviation activities and regulation in one new agency—a seven-man Civil Aeronautics Authority. This implies no criticism of the splendid work of the Secretary of Commerce and his most able Assistant for Air. They have done much for aviation. But it must be apparent that the endless confusion and bickering which indicated to the President the necessity of reorganizing the original Civil Aeronautics Authority and Air Safety Board by Executive order is a strong argument for a single repository of power to head up all governmental activity in this field. The Secretary of Commerce is a very conscientious man, and since the President directed him to supervise certain civil-aviation functions he of necessity must exercise a substantial amount of supervision and control over the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. Since there is no clear line of demarcation between the functions of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Administrator, and the Secretary, a series of conferences between busy high officials is absolutely necessary on all the many important questions and programs which require consideration in such a rapidly developing field as aviation. If the Board, Administrator, and Secretary do not confer, they are not doing their duty; if they do confer, much time of busy high officials is consumed in resolving conflicting ideas or opinions. If no unanimous agreement is reached, a meritorious program may be dropped.

As pointed out above, the idea of separating the quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions in the aviation field from the executive functions in this field looked good on paper but has not worked out in practice. The three functions require one boss to assure efficiency in planning, regulation, and execution of aviation programs. Such a boss this bill creates in the Authority; and it gives to this Authority a $10,000-per-year executive officer to carry out the policies which the Authority determines. The bill also contains a section giving the Authority broad discretion in delegating jurisdiction to subordinates. I hope this discretion will be exercised to the utmost degree so that the Authority will not—as it now does—bog itself down with detail of minute importance, but will leave itself free to decide broad objectives and pass upon important cases. This bill makes possible a real streamlining of functions in a field where the most rapid changes are taking place. I feel it is pointed in the right direction.

I sincerely believe that the new authority, as created herein, will make possible: (1) Maximum efficiency in carrying out all aviation programs; (2) the creation of a real sense of public responsibility in members of the new authority as no "buck passing" is possible—they cannot escape responsibility for action or inaction; (3) elimination of duplication of functions, effort, and personnel; (4) clarification of ambiguities and uncertainties to the end that the great amount of war work of the authority can go forward with maximum speed.

6. Independent air safety board

An independent air safety board is created with the sole function of investigating accidents in which aircraft are involved, and making recommendation looking toward prevention of such accidents in the future. This board is to be composed of persons with actual experience in the operation of aircraft so that they will understand fully from their own experience the functions which they are to perform. The board is made absolutely independent, since it may on occasion be required to fix on the Civil Aeronautics Authority or on another governmental agency the blame for accidents involving aircraft.

7. Administrative burdens removed

This bill removes some of the unnecessary administrative burdens under which the aviation industry must now operate. For example, it allows mechanics employed by airplane manufacturers—men who build airplanes—to make necessary repairs to such airplanes without obtaining certificates as airmen. The bill also removes the requirement for unnecessary administrative hearings by the C. A. A., by directing hearings only when there is a request for a hearing from a party in interest.

8. National airport survey

The bill provides for a national airport survey, and for keeping this survey up to date in order that the foundations may be laid for necessary legislation in this field. With the rapid expansion of aviation which everyone anticipates in the post-war period, we will need more and better airports throughout the Nation, and it is certainly one of the responsibilities of the Federal Government to help provide these airports so that the public may enjoy to the fullest the advantages of air transportation, and so that we will have the airports we need from the viewpoint of national defense.

9. Airport zoning

Most accidents involving aircraft occur at or near airports and obstructions to aerial approaches are in many instances responsible for such accidents either directly or indirectly. An airport can be rendered worthless by a high building, tree, or other structure in one of its approaches, so that the millions of dollars invested therein will be lost. In the interest of safety and to protect the millions of dollars which city, State, and Federal Governments are investing in airports, a program of airport zoning is essential.

This bill provides for cooperation between Federal, State, and city governments in formulating and carrying out a Nation-wide program for the clearing and protection of aerial approaches to airports. Zoning is a peculiarly local function and the Federal Government should not seek to usurp such a local function. This bill provides for the use of Federal planning experience and funds, with the actual zoning to be carried out under State and local police powers, to meet local problems. I have no doubt but that such a cooperative program will accomplish the most in this field.

Recent legislative recommendations by the Federal Government for consideration by State legislatures include a model airport zoning act which was drafted by the joint efforts of representatives of the Federal Government, State governments, and municipal governments, and States have shown themselves receptive to this model act, under which States and cities may work with the Federal Government in carrying out an airport zoning program.

Notable by absence

Mention should be made of matters not covered by this bill which have been in the past included in other legislation or proposed legislation in this field.

No provision is included in this bill for a study of the possibilities of post-war aviation. In my opinion this is not a subject for permanent legislation, but should be covered by a separate bill or joint resolution.

This bill makes no provision for a study of the carriage of all first-class mail by aircraft—like the study of post-war aviation possibilities, this is not a matter for permanent legislation.

The Civilian Pilot Training Act and the question of amendment or continuance of that act is left for separate consideration, since legislation on this subject already is pending before the Congress.

This bill does not touch upon the subject of tax exemption of air carriers. My study of the laws and practical experience of the

States, in the field of aviation taxation, has convinced me such taxation places no real burden on commerce. Air lines are no more entitled to a tax haven than any other citizen. I realize that air carriers have particular problems that are arising in the tax field, but I believe that experience will gradually indicate the proper solution to such problems.

DETAILED EXPLANATION

The following is an explanation, title by title and section by section, of the provisions of this act.

Title I

This title contains definitions and a declaration of policy by the Congress.

Section 1 of this title embraces definitions.

At the outset it must be stressed, and it cannot be emphasized too strongly, that definitions are not legislation. In framing this section every effort has been made to preserve definitions already in use which have stood the test of time, and where new definitions have been phrased no effort has been spared to make them clear, unequivocal, and readily comprehensible. No tricks, hidden meanings, or cover-ups are to be found in these definitions, and no hidden meanings should be read into them.

There is no legislation in this section, and the definitions are not to be considered except in connection with the use of the terms defined in the context of the bill. A reading of the definitions alone will not result in any comprehension of the provisions of the bill, and it is entirely improper to attempt to draw any conclusions from the language of the definitions alone. They must be read in connection with the whole of the bill in order to be understood.

Properly used, in legislation, a definition is a tool whose purpose is to avoid unnecessary repetition. The definitions employed in this section have been phrased, and are used in the bill, in the light of that principle.

Concerning individual definitions in section 1, therefore, little need be said; but it appears desirable to identify the source of some of these definitions, and in some cases to explain the reasons for the language used.

Air commerce

In the definition of "air commerce," the reference to "overseas air commerce" which was included in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 has been deleted. This was done because it was desired that the act should make no distinction between overseas and interstate air commerce.

In the 1938 act, the Civil Aeronautics Authority was given the power to fix rates for transportation of persons and property in interstate air commerce, but was given no authority to fix such rates in foreign air commerce. Overseas air commerce, which embraced only air commerce between the mainland and Hawaii, and by the ocean route between the continental United States and Alaska, was a sort of twilight zone to which some provisions applicable to interstate commerce did not apply. The present act gives the Authority power to control the rates of all air carriers, and the need for any distinction between overseas and interstate air commerce has thereby been eliminated.

Air contractor

Because of the expansion of civil aviation, it is necessary that some control be exercised over commercial operations in air commerce other than the operations of air carriers. To facilitate provision for such control, the bill contains a definition of "air contractor."

This definition is set up so as to avoid inclusion of persons engaged in air navigation as noncommercial private flyers, or engaged in wholly intrastate operations not a part of interstate commerce.

Airman

The definition of "airman" is carefully worded so as to except from the control of the Authority individuals employed outside the United States, mechanics employed by manufacturers of aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers and appliances, and private flyers performing mechanic work on their own planes. These are complete exceptions and relieve such persons of unnecessary and burdensome regulation without the slightest relaxing of safety requirements.

Air navigation

"Air navigation," a new definition not found in previous legislation, has been inserted as an aid in delimiting the application of the safety regulations authorized in title VII of the bill.

Air transportation

The definition of "air transportation" splits the whole aviation field into just two parts: Foreign air transportation and interstate transportation.

Appliances

"Appliances" is redefined by slight changes in the definition previously used, in the interest of conciseness.

Citizen of the United States

The definition of "citizen of the United States" has not been changed because a study of the regulations and decisions of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Civil Aeronautics Board under this definition reveals that they have properly carried out the intent of Congress as embodied in the 1938 act.

Conditional sale, conveyance

The definitions of "conditional sale" and "conveyance" are taken from the Uniform Conditional Sales Act.

Foreign air carrier, foreign air commerce, foreign air transportation

"Foreign air commerce" is a new definition used in connection with the new regulations of air contract carriers The definition limits the term to foreign business as distinguished from interstate commerce The 1938 act defined separately "interstate air commerce," "overseas air commerce," and "foreign air commerce." In this bill a clear line of demarcation is drawn between foreign and interstate commerce, and overseas air commerce is eliminated, both as a definition and as a separate sphere of operations.

In considering the definitions of "foreign air carrier," on the one hand, and "foreign air commerce" and "foreign air transportation," on the other, it should be noted that the former definition is concerned with the origin of citizenship of the carrier, whereas the latter two definitions rest upon the sphere of service performed.

Interstate air commerce

The definition of "interstate air commerce" should be read carefully prior to a reading of regulatory sections of the bill, and it should be borne in mind that this definition does not include operations in air navigation wholly within any State and not a part of interstate commerce. This definition, and the use in the bill of the phrase defined, constitute one of the means used to preserve to the sovereign States their right to exercise their traditional jurisdiction over the persons and property within their borders. The definition has been so phrased that applicable court decisions will control any disputed jurisdictional questions. States' rights are thus preserved without the necessity of attempting a new and untried definition of what constitutes interstate commerce.

Interstate air transportation

The same considerations just mentioned apply with equal force to the definition of "interstate air transportation."

Private flyer

Because it was desired to make this act explicit as to the rights of private flyers, it was necessary to have a definition of "private flyer." The definition used covers those persons who fly for pleasure and not for profit. This is the first time the term "private flyer" has been defined and the use of this term as defined gives the private flyer, for the first time, a real bill of rights.

Possessions of the United States

The definition "possessions of the United States" is a technical one, necessary because of provisions of other acts, interference with which had to be avoided. This definition is identical with the definition of the same term in the 1938 act.

Underwriter

The term "underwriter" is defined so as to lay the foundation for regulation by the Authority of persons in the financial field who may exercise control over air carriers, but who have up to this time exercised such control outside the sphere of any regulations which the Authority could prescribe under the 1938 act. A careful reading of the definition will show clearly that it bears no relationship to the insurance field.

I am still studying the problem of whether the Authority should have the power to pass upon the issuance of all securities by air carriers and air contractors, in order that overcapitalization, such as has occurred in the railroad field, might be prevented. When my study of this subject has been completed, I may propose an amendment to the bill covering this subject.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 2 of title I is a declaration of policy, painstakingly rewritten so as to embody most clearly the intent and purpose of the legislation. This section of the bill fixes and lays down the policy of the Congress, which the Authority must take into consideration in connection with exercising any of its functions and performing all of its duties. Specific policies are expressed as well as certain general aims desired to be accomplished by this legislation.

In considering the policy laid down with regard to competition, it should be understood that in foreign air transportation, the competition will be between the United States on the one hand, and foreign nations and foreign air carriers on the other; and it will be the duty of the Civil Aeronautics Authority to administer the act so as to strengthen the arm of American aviation and enable it more effectively to meet such foreign competition. In the sphere of interstate air transportation, the competition referred to will be between the several aviation interests engaged in such transportation; and a condition of healthy competition is desirable to the end that internal development of aviation in the United States shall be fostered and speeded.

Subsection (g) of this section expresses one of the major objectives of the bill. It is this objective which underlies creation of the All American Flag Line, Inc., in title V.

Section 3: This section, besides containing the declaration of the public right of transit, contains a new subsection specifically guaranteeing to private flyers the right to operate in air navigation subject only to necessary safety regulations.

Section 4: The declaration of national sovereignty has been amended by insertion of the words "with respect to foreign aircraft," so as to make clear the intent which originally sought expression in the similar declaration included in the Air Commerce Act of 1926. There is no possibility that this declaration can be construed as an attempt to arrogate to the Federal Government any powers properly reserved to the States.

Title II

This title covers creation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and assignments of its powers and duties.

Qualifications of members

201 (b) covers the qualifications of members of the authority: Citizenship, fitness, a provision that not more than four of the members shall be appointed from the same political party, and a provision against ownership by any member of the authority of any financial interest in any civil air enterprise.

Term and salaries of members

Members of the authority are given 7-year terms but initial appointments are to be made for shorter periods so as to provide for staggered terms.

Executive officer

Subsection 202 (a) creates the job of executive officer of the authority at a salary of $10,000 per year. The executive officer is given power to exercise all of the functions now performed by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics Authority, but only upon assignment of such functions to him by the authority, and subject at all times to control of the authority.

Condemnation of airports

Subsections 207 (a) and 207 (c) specifically provide that the authority may not condemn airports or air space.

Exclusive rights of airports

Subsection 209 (b) contains clear language prohibiting the granting of any exclusive right for the use of any civil airway or for the use of any airport or other air-navigation facility upon which Federal funds have been spent.

Airport aerial approach protection program

Section 212 covers the formulation of a program for protection of the aerial approaches to airports, and cooperation of States and cities, through the use of their police powers, in carrying out this program. The discussion under "major points" amply explains this section.

Airport-development plan

This section of the bill sets up the basic frame work from which the airport legislation of the future can be formulated by providing for the preparation and yearly revision of a national-airport plan. The explanation of this subject under "major points" covers this section.

Title III

This title covers granting of certificates of convenience and necessity to air carriers. Every attempt has been made to include all of the best of previous legislation, including the 1938 act, and of proposed legislation in this field. Here, as throughout the bill, wherever provisions of previous legislation have stood the test of time and have been properly interpreted, such provisions have been left undisturbed except where changes were necessary to effectuate new purposes; and where provisions of proposed legislation have fully met the intent and purpose of this bill, there has been no hesitancy in adopting them. Some provisions have been carried forward with the minor changes in language which were necessary to clarify certain doubts as to congressional intent which have been raised.

Section 301 (c)

This is the section which provides for hearings only if requested by a party having an interest in an application, thus avoiding unnecessary hearings on purely formal applications and proceedings, such as are required in many instances under the present law. This policy of eliminating unnecessary formality and proceedings has been followed throughout the act.

Section 301 (b) 2

This section is so phrased as to take care of citizenship questions which may suddenly arise, as in the case of the death of a large shareholder in an air carrier whose heirs or legatees are noncitizens.

Section 301 (e)

This is the subsection providing for a grant of experimental certificates as outlined in the discussion of major points.

Section 301 (f)

This subsection provides that the Authority need not specify exact terminal or intermediate points if it is impracticable to do so in the certificate granted any air carriers. This subsection also contains a provision making it clear that an air carrier does not become an air contractor merely by reason of making charter trips. Another provision of this subsection covers the point that an air carrier not directly engaged in air transportation shall not be authorized by implication to operate planes. An example of such a carrier is the Railroad Express Agency.

Section 301 (h) 3

This subparagraph has been included to make certain that the Authority has power to require reasonable extensions of service by air carriers. It has been a point of contention in the past whether the Authority had this power. The subparagraph restricts extensions of service to the continental United States, since under the bill all necessary extensions in foreign air transportation will be provided by All American Flag Line, Inc.

"Grandfather" clauses

It will be noted that provisions of existing law embodying the so-called "grandfather" clauses have been eliminated from this bill. Such provisions are no longer effective.

Section 301 (h) 3

This is the subparagraph authorizing a requirement for any necessary extension of service by All American Flag Line, Inc., and containing provisions for enforcing any such requirement under equitable conditions.

Section 302

Subsection (a) of this section prohibits foreign air carriers from engaging in interstate air transportation and interstate air commerce, thus plugging a "hole" in the 1938 act.

The familiar "grandfather" clauses are not included since more than 5 years have elapsed since enactment of the C. A. A. Act of 1938 and there are now no unasserted rights under such clauses.

Section 302 (d)

Like the comparable section concerning air carrier regulation, this section makes hearings mandatory only upon the filing of a written request by a party to the proceeding. Hearings upon applications for certificates covering foreign air carriers are required under the 1938 act, but the proceedings are purely formal, since all the details have of necessity been worked out in advance by State Department, the President, and the foreign government concerned, under the requirement for Presidential approval of certificates to foreign air carriers.

Section 303 (a)

This subsection relieves air carriers and foreign air carriers from being required to print unnecessary tariff information. The relief is to be granted in the discretion of the Authority and under regulations of the Authority.

Section 303 (b)

This section tightens the provisions of the 1938 act with respect to the persons to whom passes may be issued for air traffic.

Section 304 (a)

This subsection requires all air carriers in interstate and foreign air transportation to furnish just and reasonable fares and to furnish joint through rates.

Section 304 (c)

This subsection expressly authorizes the sale of air-carrier tickets on credit. The so-called Universal air travel plan is not specifically written into this bill, as some of the advocates of the plan have proposed. It seems clear that the plan is a reasonable, nondiscriminatory rate based on a real classification, and section 304 (a) is therefore adequate to cover approval of this plan by the authority.

Transportation of mail

Provisions of this title beginning with section 305, which relate to the transportation of mail, are not changed substantially from the form in which they appear in the existing law. These provisions are working well, and have been the subject of a great deal of sound interpretation which would be upset, with considerable resultant uncertainty, if substantial changes of language should be made.

Section 306

The formula set forth in the 1938 act concerning rates for transportation of mail has worked well and appears here substantially unchanged. It should be noted that the Civil Aeronautics Board has consistently reduced mail pay as the income of air carriers has gone up so that on the whole, mail subsidy as such no longer exists in the interstate commerce field.

Section 307

This section, concerned with acts, records, and reports, is the same as the similar section of the 1938 act

Section 308

This section contains substantially the same language as section 408 of the 1938 act. The Civil Aeronautics Board has properly interpreted this language as an exclusion of surface carriers from the air-transportation field. The air-carrier industry is still in its infancy as compared to surface carriers, and the public interest would best be served by preventing surface carriers from gaining such control that they could stifle air transportation to prevent it from injuring their investment in surface-carrier equipment or property. The Congress expressed this protective policy in the 1938 act, and no good reason has yet been advanced for a change in this policy.

Section 309

This section clarifies and tightens within the intent of existing law, provisions governing interlocking relationships between air carriers, and between air carriers and common carriers. Authority approval of interlocking relationships between air carriers and underwriters is also provided for by this section.

Section 312

This section allows air carriers to escape the burden of unnecessary filing of agreements. The authority will specify the agreements which must be filed so that the public interest will be amply protected.

Section 312 (c)

This subsection puts real teeth in the provision of subsection 312 (a) by making it unlawful to carry out any contract or agreement which has been disapproved by the authority.

Section 313

This section embodies the exact language of the present law. Proposed language purported to clarify this provision was rejected in view of the fact that the United States Supreme Court in the Rochester telephone case has held that the language used covers all types of control which it is intended to reach. Having been judicially interpreted in accordance with the intent of the Congress, the language should not be traded for new language which might, in its turn, require interpretation.

Section 316 (a)

This subsection carries over to the present bill language found in section 416 of the

1938 act. The power to classify carriers, covered by this language, has been used in the past for the protection of smaller carriers and for the relief of such carriers from undue burdens. It is desirable that these provisions remain the law so that they may continue to be so used.

Section 316 (b)

Subparagraph 2 of this subsection carries over into this bill the provision (of particular interest to carriers opeating in Alaska) authorizing an exemption of daylight carriers from some of the wage provisions.

Title IV

This is the title providing for economic regulation of air contractors.

Provisions of this title follow in general the comparable provisions of the title covering the economic regulation of air carriers, but procedure has been streamlined in order to eliminate, so far as possible, all oppressive or unnecessary formalities or regulation which might hamper proper development of air commerce.

To provide for proper development of the carrying of persons and property by contract carriers, and to prevent cutthroat competition, it is necessary to provide for reasonable regulation by the C. A. A. Such regulation will protect those air contractors who build up air contract business from unscrupulous persons who might come in and take it away by cutting charges below cost.

With full knowledge of the necessity of avoiding unnecessary Federal regulation, I considered, including a provision classifying air contractors into groups according to their gross earnings (as the I. C. C. has done for railroads), but abandoned that idea for one vesting broad discretion in C. A. A. to make such classification. If the C. A. A. does not act to prevent unnecessary red tape, I will introduce a resolution to carry out my first idea. Air contractors must not be hampered in their business by unnecessary bureaucratic action or overregulation.

Subsection 401 (c)

This subsection embodies the principle previously referred to of requiring hearings only upon proper request by a party in interest. In the event a hearing is requested upon any application, the Authority is by this subsection directed to dispose of its proceedings in the matter as speedily as possible.

Subsection 401 (d)

It should be noted that this subsection does not require a showing of public convenience and necessity by an air contractor in order to be eligible for a certificate, but requires instead only a showing that the proposed service is not contrary to the public interest. I believe the requirement as written is an eminently proper one, whereas to require an affirmative showing of public necessity for each proposed new operation by an air contractor would be certain to inhibit to a substantial degree the proper and desirable development of air commerce.

Section 402

Consistent with the philosophy already expressed that air contractors should be protected against unfair competition through rate cutting, but should not be hampered by unnecessary regulation, this section provides for approval by the authority of minimum rates and fares and for maintenance of such minimums, but does not prohibit any air contractor from charging more than the approved minimums.

Section 403

This section does not lay any duty upon an air contractor, with respect to tariffs, otherwise than to establish, observe, and enforce reasonable minimum rates and fares and reasonable classifications, rules, regulations, and practices.

Section 404

This is the section which directs the Authority to set up reasonable classifications of air contractors, to relieve them of undue or burdensome regulations.

Title V

This is the title which creates the Corporation to be known as "All American Flag Line, Inc."

Section 501 (b)

This subsection defines the general purposes of the Corporation.

Section 501 (c)

This subsection provides for establishment by the Corporation of branch offices or agencies.

Section 501 (d)

This section sets forth the powers of the Corporation. Included are all of the usual corporate powers necessary to carry out the purposes of this Corporation. Also included, is the power to acquire or control subsidiaries in the furtherance of its corporate purposes without regard to the provisions of the anti-trust laws.

Section 501 (e)

This subsection puts back of the Corporation all of the aid, other than direct financial assistance, available from any department or agency of the United States Government.

Section 502

This section covers issuance of stock by the Corporation.

Capital stock is divided into two classes: Class A stock, which will be issued in the amount of $200,000,000 and which will be the voting stock of the Corporation; and class B stock, which will be issued only in exchange for assets owned by class A stockholders, used in foreign air transportation, and useful to the Corporation.

Class A stock will pay dividends at the rate of between 6 and 8 percent, depending on earnings.

Class B stock will pay reasonable dividends based upon the earnings of the corporation.

Section 502 (e)

This subsection limits the holder of class A stock to licensed air carriers, not including air carriers operating wholly in Alaska.

Section 502 (f)

This subsection sets up a minimum of $5,000,000 and a maximum of $50,000,000 on the amount of class A stock which any eligible air carrier may purchase.

Section 502 (g)

This subsection provides for reallocation of any stock for which an eligible air carrier fails to apply. It also provides that no stockholder shall at any time hold more than $50,000,000 worth of class A stock.

Section 502 (h)

This subsection provides for cash payment of subscriptions to class A stock and prohibits class A stock from being traded on any stock exchange or curb market. It also prohibits sale or transfer of class A stock without approval of the Civil Aeronautics Authority.

Section 502 (i)

This is the subsection limiting issuance of class B stock to the purchase of assets of class A stockholders.

Section 503 (a)

This subsection requires that a subscriber to class A stock must agree to sell to the Corporation upon demand any of its assets used in foreign air transportation, at fair market value, in exchange for class B stock.

Section 503 (b)

This subsection provides for appraisal of the fair market value of properties to be sold under the provisions of the previous subsection.

Section 504

This section provides the board of directors of the corporation shall consist of 1 member designated by each class A stockholder plus 10 additional members to be elected annually by all class A stockholders.

Section 505

This section governs issuance of notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations by the Corporation, and fixes the limit on such obligations at three times the amount of issued capital stock. It provides that any issue of securities by the Corporation shall require approval of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. It requires that all obligations of the Corporation shall be secured by assets of the Corporation. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase securities issued by the Corporation.

Section 506 (a)

This section provides for organization of the Corporation.

Section 507

This section directs the Authority to issue the Corporation a certificate as an air carrier in foreign air transportation. (It will be recalled that subsection 401 (d) (2) prohibits the Corporation from operating in interstate air transportation.)

Section 508

This section provides for extension of service by the Corporation where required in the Nation's interest. The Authority is empowered to require any such extension upon certification by the Secretary of State that such action is necessary either for the maintenance of cooperative relationships between the United States and any foreign country or in the furtherance of national policy or for the performance of a treaty obligation. Where an extension of service is so required, this section makes provision for direct payments to the Corporation within the limitations of appropriations made by the Congress for such payments so as to guarantee to the Corporation reasonable compensation for the service it is required to perform.

Title VI

This title governs the nationality and ownership of aircraft and is identical with the similar title of the present law, except that a new section has been added. It continues the provisions of existing law which have been working well and which have been interpreted and apply in accordance with the intent of Congress.

Section 602

This is the new section, the purpose of which is to open the door to reciprocal agreements with foreign nations on the subjects covered by this title.

Title VII

This title covers the general safety powers and duties of the authority.

This title has been completely rewritten to incorporate the views of the Civil Aeronautics Board as to desired provisions to make administration of the title easier.

Section 701 (a)

This subsection lists the classifications, rules, regulations, and standards which the authority is to prescribe. Specific provisions is made that such rules, regulations, and standards shall be reasonable and shall be directly concerned with or necessary in the interests of safety.

Section 701 (b)

This subsection directs the authority to make proper distinctions between commercial and noncommercial operations and among the various types of such operations.

Sections 702 and 703

These sections cover the issuance of airman certificates and aircraft certificates.

Section 703 (b)

The language of this subsection has been very carefully drafted so as not to constitute any impediment to progress of invention and improvement in the aviation field. The subsection specifically provides that the authority shall not refuse to grant an experimental certificate solely because it would cover a new or previously unused or unapproved principle or invention

Section 704

This section covers air carrier or air contractor operating certificates.

Section 705

This section follows substantially the language of the existing law in making provision for the rating of air-navigation facilities.

Section 706

This section follows substantially the language of existing law governing the rating of air agencies.

Section 709

This section is carried over from the Air Commerce Act of 1926 as part of the codification of air law which this bill represents.

Section 710 (b)

This is a new subsection to provide relief in special cases where enforcement of some order, rule, regulation, or standard set up by the authority is by reason of unusual circumstances an undue burden and where such enforcement is not required by the public interest

Title VIII

This title creates an air safety board.

It should be stressed that the board as created is completely independent. It is not, as was the case, under the 1938 act, a part of the authority. It will submit its own report directly to the Congress, rather than reporting to the authority.

This air-safety board is to be a panel of air accident investigators and safety experts. These men must accept full public responsibility for their work, and a panel of five is provided so as to let them divide up assignments by sitting in divisions.

Section 802

This section covers qualifications for membership on the air safety board.

Section 803

This section stipulates a 6-year term for members of the air safety board, with a salary of $9,000 per year.

Sections 804 and 805

These sections give the air safety board jurisdiction to appoint and control its own personnel and to control its own expenditures subject to appropriations by the Congress.

Section 806

This section prescribes the duties of the board in detail. Summarized, these duties are to investigate accidents involving aircraft, to report thereon, to make recommendations for prevention of such accidents, to make technical special studies concerning safety in air navigation; and to make recommendations to other Government agencies concerning regulations and practices and other matters looking toward reduction or elimination of accidents involving aircraft.

Section 807

This section removes any possible doubt concerning the complete independence of the safety board.

Title IX

This title includes provisions concerning governmental authorities other than the Civil Aeronautics Authority. It contains, in addition to some completely new material, a rewrite of provisions of the Air Commerce Act of 1926 and of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Subsection 901 (a)

This subsection requires Presidential approval for issuance of certificates for foreign air transportation, to foreign air carriers, or to air contractors if authorizing operations outside the continental United States or in Alaska.

Subsection 901 (b)

This section is a provision for air space reservations, carried over from the Air Commerce Act of 1926.

Subsections 902 (b), (c), (d)

These subsections authorize the Secretary of State to negotiate agreements with foreign governments for the benefit of the All American Flag Line; place the full facilities of the State Department at the disposal of the All American Flag Line in connection with its negotiations with foreign governments or foreign nationals; and prohibit the Secretary of State from negotiating agreements for the benefit of any other air carrier engaged in foreign air transportation.

Subsection 902 (e)

This is a very important provision. It is effected to require that any agreement respecting the formation of any international organization for regulation or control of world aviation, or respecting the participation of the United States in such an organization, shall not be entered into by this country except by treaty. This assures that the Senate will be consulted in connection with any such agreement and will have the power to approve or disapprove it.

Subsection 902 (f)

This subsection puts the Authority in on negotiations of any agreements with foreign governments in connection with air commerce or air navigation.

Section 903

This section conforms to the language desired by the Weather Bureau in order to facilitate performance of its duties in connection with air navigation.

Section 904

This section directs the Authority to make recommendations to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, thereby putting the Authority on the same basis as the War and Navy Departments.

Section 905

This section has been brought over from the Air Commerce Act of 1926.

Title X

This title is concerned with both civil and criminal penalties.

Section 1001

This section brings under the civil penalty provision violations of rules or regulations properly issued by the Authority, and provides for compromise of civil penalties, for violation of rules and regulations, by the governmental agency and Authority under which the rules and regulations were issued.

Section 1002

This title brings violations of rules and regulations under criminal penalties in the same manner as the previous title brought such violations under civil penalty provisions.

Section 1003

This section follows substantially the language of the existing law with respect to venue and prosecution of offenses.

Title XI

This title governs conduct of proceedings and assignment of functions by the Authority.

Section 1101 (a)

This subsection is the same as the corresponding provision in existing law except that the direction for conduct of proceedings speedily and fairly is made mandatory rather than permissive.

Section 1101 (b)

This subsection contains provisions for the assignment of work and functions within the Authority. In substance it is the same as similar provisions in the Interstate Commerce Act. Successful experience of the I. C. C. in operating under these provisions has been correlated with difficulties encountered by the Civil Aeronautics Board in operating without any such assigned provisions, and this subsection has been adapted to the specific needs of the civil-aeronautics field. This system of assignment has worked very well for the Interstate Commerce Commission and may be expected to work well here.

Section 1102

Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section are carried over from the present law.

Subsection (d) has been rewritten to give the Authority power to fix rates for both interstate and foreign air commerce and air transportation.

Subsection (e) is substantially the same as the provisions of existing law except that a new subparagraph has been added requiring the Authority, in exercising its powers over rates, to recognize "The right of every person, under the American system of free enterprise, other considerations aside, to risk his capital or forego possible profits in an endeavor to build his business or establish, develop, or expand a new enterprise."

Subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i) are substantially the same as the corresponding provisions of existing law. A new subparagraph has been added in subsection (g) to implement the control given the Authority or tariffs of air contractors. While a provision of this nature is necessary to make such control effective, it should always be borne in mind, as previously stated, that the primary purpose of providing for regulation of air contractors is to afford them protection and not to hamper them in the conduct of their business, and the Authority will be expected to exercise its powers under this subsection in accordance with that purpose.

Sections 1103, 1104, and 1105

These sections are carried over from the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 substantially unchanged, except that a new subsection (g) has been added to section 1105 to provide for reconsideration by the Authority of any order previously entered, and upon application by a party to the order.

Section 1106

This section grants a right of appeal to the courts from any order of the Authority, excepting only orders relating to foreign air carriers subject to the approval of the President. This right of appeal may be exercised by any person having an actual substantial interest in the order, regardless of whether such person was a party to the original proceeding or is named in the order. Adequate time limitations are provided so that a request for reconsideration by the Authority under the previous section may be filed, if desired, and thereafter appeal may be had to the courts.

Sections 1107, 1108, and 1109

These sections are substantially the same as the provisions of existing law. In section 1109, language has been inserted to require the Authority to permit the intervention in any proceeding of all persons having a substantial interest in the matter under consideration.

Title XII

This title includes miscellaneous provisions.

Section 1201

This section grants to air carriers and air contractors power to take action necessary for safety reasons. In this respect, it puts the commanding officer of an aircraft in substantially the same position as the captain of a ship at sea under the shipping laws.

Sections 1202 to 1205, inclusive

These sections are carried over from the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

Section 1206

This section limits sale of fuel, oil, equipment, and supplies, and the furnishing of mechanical service or other assistance to aircraft, from Federal stores or by Federal personnel, to cases of real emergency.

Title XIII

This title contains necessary provisions for the repeal of prior aviation legislation.

Section 1301

This section replaces the Air Commerce Act of 1926, with a saving clause avoiding abolition of the office of Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Provisions of the 1926 act not previously repealed and desired to be retained have been incorporated in this bill.

This section also replaces section 7 of reorganization plan No. 3 and section 7 of reorganization plan No. 4, and repeals the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, which this bill, if enacted, would replace.

Title XIV

This title is concerned with the preservation of provisions of existing legislation and existing rights thereunder.

Section 1401

This section concerns the transfer, from the Secretary of Commerce to the Commissioner of Customs, of functions relating to the entrance and clearance of aircraft.

Section 1402

This section preserves programs previously authorized for construction and improvement of airports.

Section 1403

This section covers necessary transfer to the new Civil Aeronautics Authority created by this bill of personnel and property of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the Department of Commerce; saves unexpended balances of appropriations already made; and provides for continued effectiveness of safety rules and regulations prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board until amended, replaced, or superseded under this act, and for completion of safety investigations already commenced.

Section 1404

This section continues in effect orders, regulations, etc., issued or promulgated under existing legislation, until modified, superseded, or otherwise acted upon under this bill.

Subsection (b) of this section provides that this bill shall not affect any pending administrative proceedings; while subsection (c) makes similar provision with regard to pending judicial proceedings. Subsection (d) covers transfer of records.

Section 1405

This section is the usual separability clause.

Section 1406

This section provides for the effective date of the bill, if enacted, and authorizes extension of the applicability of any provision of the act at the discretion of the authority if necessary in the public interest.

SUMMARY OF STATE AVIATION LEGISLATION

State aviation commissions

Seventeen of the 48 States do not have an aviation commission. Regulatory authority in these States is in various State agencies. For example, in Idaho the department of public works makes aeronautical regulations and rules; in North Dakota the railroad commission is empowered to makes rules and regulations and enforce them.

Thirty-one of the States have an aeronautical commission. Only 8 of these commissions serve with compensation. Only 7 of the 31 commissions have a full-time executive head, or director who receives compensation. Five of the State commissions receive a per diem compensation, the provision usually being that compensation shall not be over a certain figure a year. For example, Wisconsin allows $10 per diem, not to exceed $150 per annum, and Illinois allows $15 per diem, not to exceed $500 per annum.

Five of the States have aeronautical advisory boards, three of them without compensation, and in Iowa the department of the adjutant general acts in an advisory capacity.

Administration

The regulatory powers of the State aviation commissions vary in almost every State. A few States have very broad powers with respect to safety and economic regulation, the legislation recently passed in Alabama being an example. The majority of the States have given their aviation commissions a general or somewhat limited power, the emphasis being on safety regulation, but also including the right to make reasonable economic regulations.

In the case of California, authority with respect to aeronautical matters rests with the State legislature, excepting airports, which are under local control. In several other States the power to make rules and regulations is vested in various State agencies, such as in North Dakota, where the railroad commission has that authority.

Over 10 of the States have adopted most or all of the Federal rules and regulations as their own. Ten other States have specific provisions in their aeronautical legislation that rules and regulations must conform as closely as possible to Federal rules and regulations.

Licenses

Thirty-five States require a Federal license for both airmen and aircraft.

Five States require Federal or State license for both airmen and aircraft.

Two States require Federal and State license for both airmen and aircraft.

One State requires only a State license for both airmen and aircraft, although a Federal license is acceptable.

One State requires a Federal license for common-carrier aircraft only.

One State requires a Federal or State license for airmen, and only a Federal license for commercial planes.

One State requires no license for aircraft and a Federal license for airmen.

Two States require only a State license for airmen and aircraft.

Property taxation

The air lines are subject to real property taxes in all States with the exception of Pennsylvania. However, they generally lease rather than own their hangars and traffic solicitation offices, and operate from municipally owned fields, with the result that their direct payments of this type of tax are small in volume.

Personal property taxes are payable on at least the tangible personalty such as planes, offices equipment, spare motors, etc., in all States except, (1) Delaware, New York, and Pennsylvania, where all personal property is tax free, and (2) Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, and New Hampshire, where planes are exempt, but some or most other tangible personalty is taxable. However, tangible personal property, like other property, is taxable only where it is held to have its tax situs, and few local assessors have asserted jurisdiction over the planes of commercial carriers. As a matter of fact, the tax situs of planes is subject to considerable question and will remain so at least until the Supreme Court decides the case of *Northwestern Airlines* v. *Minnesota*, which is now under deliberation. There are at least three conflicting theories on this subject. Some believe that planes operating in more than one State are taxable only at the corporation's domicile; since most of the air lines are domiciled in one of the States which exempts planes, this is about the equivalent of holding that the planes of the interstate carriers are not taxable. Others believe that planes are taxable only at the head office of the air line, the "commercial domicile." This theory exempts planes of several large companies whose head offices are in New York and Pennsylvania, two of the States which tax no personal property. A third theory holds that a State may tax as property a fractional part of the fleet of any air line using a port within the State, the fraction being computed as the ratio of route miles in the State to total route miles or in some other fashion reasonably designed to divide the fleet fairly among the States of operation.

The last theory of tax situs is the one which is likely to result in the most complete taxation of air-line property. Its standing before the Supreme Court will probably be made clear by the forthcoming decision in the Northwestern Airlines case. Thus far, only eight States have laws providing for this type of taxation on air-line property. These States are: Kentucky, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, Utah, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming. In these eight States, the property, both real and personal, is assessed by the State tax department rather than by local assessors, although most of the taxes collected on the assessments go to local governments.

Corporations operating air lines are subject to net income tax in 30 States and the District of Columbia. Most of the remaining 18 States do not have corporation net income taxes on any corporation; however, 3 States, New York, Oregon, and West Virginia, tax some corporations on this base but not air lines. There has been some question, however, whether a State could tax the net income of an air line which engaged in no intrastate commerce, with the result that there has been less taxation on this base than might be expected from the above figures. Furthermore, several of the most important air fields in the country are in States which have no corporation net income taxes, such as Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Texas, and Washington.

Capital stock taxes are just about as widespread as corporation net income taxes. There is also the same constitutional question concerning an air line which engages in no intrastate commerce. For this reason and for the further reason that capital stock taxes are usually moderate in rate, the States derive very little from this levy on air lines.

Gross earnings taxes are believed to be applicable to air lines in only eight States—Arizona, Indiana, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Washington, and West Virginia. It has been assumed by all of these States they could not tax receipts from interstate commerce, and only a few of them, notably New York and Pennsylvania, have enough intrastate commerce to derive appreciable revenues from this source.

The air lines are subject to State unemployment compensation taxes on the same basis as other employers of the requisite number of persons. Aside from the fact that this tax accounts for the largest segment of the air

lines' State and local tax bills, there is nothing peculiar about its application to these carriers.

Taxation of privately owned planes follows the general pattern of taxation concerning commercial air lines. However, it is usually more efficient, because there is less confusion as to situs, and the assessment is done by local assessors and not tax commissions, as is the general rule with commercial equipment.

Gasoline taxation

Forty-three States impose a tax on gasoline used in aircraft. However, 29 of those States have provisions granting refunds of the tax paid. Some of the refunds, though, are only partial.

For example, in Kentucky there is a refund on gasoline used in interstate commerce; in Michigan there is a 50-percent refund made for gasoline used in scheduled interstate commerce; Virginia allows a refund for gasoline to be used outside of the State.

Five States have no tax on aviation gasoline; of those five, Kansas and Oklahoma have arrangements for an annual exemption permit which exempts the holder from the tax.

Fourteen States have no provisions for refunds and the money is used in various ways. Alabama, for instance, divides the money derived from gasoline tax equally between the highway department and counties and municipalities. Idaho, Maine, and South Carolina law provides that the money derived from such tax shall go into the State aviation fund.

In a few States—Georgia, Nebraska, and Oklahoma—gasoline used in aircraft that is being used for United States cadet-training purposes is exempt from taxation.

Airports

Every one of the States has legislation authorizing cities to construct and maintain airports. In some few instances an agency of the State itself has been authorized by the State legislature to own, construct, and operate airports. Most of this legislation expressly authorizes cities to accept grants of funds from the Federal Government and to further cooperate with the Federal Government in carrying out airport programs.

Airport zoning

There are now 28 States which have legislation authorizing airport zoning. Most of this legislation is not as comprehensive as the model act referred to under the section of this statement entitled "major points."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask consent to introduce what I hope will be the aviation law for the United States in the future. The bill is not perfect, but it is, we hope, possessed of certain recommending qualifications and conditions which will finally bring about its approval by the Congress of the United States. We ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1790) to create an independent civil aeronautics authority and an independent air safety board, to promote the development and safety, and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to assure to the United States world leadership in aviation, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

FEDERAL AID FOR READJUSTMENT OF VETERANS IN CIVIL LIFE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1767) to provide Federal Government aid for the readjustment in civilian life of returning World War No. 2 veterans, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I submit a proposed amendment which I ask to have printed. The amendment would require all agencies and corporations owned or controlled by the Government to be audited by the General Accounting Office.

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate I give notice in writing that I intend to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing the amendment to House bill 4070, in order that the amendment may be taken up and voted upon after the committee amendments to the pending independent offices appropriation bill shall have been disposed of.

The amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. AIKEN to House bill 4070, the independent offices appropriation bill, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

At the proper place insert the following additional section:

"SEC. —. (a) The financial transactions of every agency or corporation of the Government of the United States, or created under its authority, either directly or indirectly (including any agency or corporation the majority of the capital stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States), except as provided in subdivision (d), for which an appropriation has been or shall hereafter be made by the Congress, shall, beginning with the fiscal year 1945, be audited annually by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. A report of such audit shall be made to the Congress, together with such recommendations as the Comptroller General may deem advisable.

(b) The expenses of such audit shall be paid from moneys advanced therefor by each such respective agency or corporation, or from any appropriation for the General Accounting Office; and any such appropriation so used shall be reimbursed promptly by such agency or corporation as billed by the Comptroller. For the purpose of such audit the representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all paper, books, files, accounts, financial records, and property belonging to or under the control of any such agency or corporation and shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances in depositaries and with fiscal agents: *Provided*, That the certified financial reports and schedules of the fiscal agents of any such agency or corporation based on commercial audits in the usual course of business may be accepted by the General Accounting Office in its audit of the financial transactions of any such agency or corporation as final and not subject to further audit or verification.

"(c) Any examination of the corporate records shall be made at the place or places where the records of such agency or corporation are normally kept in the transaction of its business.

"(d) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any agency or corporation of the Government the financial transactions of which are otherwise required to be audited under authority of Congress."

SPECIAL ASSISTANT, COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 273), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Resolution 142, agreed to June 12, 1943, authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to employ, during the fiscal year begining July 1, 1943, a special assistant to be paid at the rate of $3,300 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1944.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I observe that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is present. I should like to ask a question of him concerning Senate Resolution 196, which was submitted by me. The resolution has been in the hands of the Committee on the Judiciary for some time. It deals with a request that the Committee on the Judiciary examine and make a determination as to the various Executive orders, for the purpose of determining the force of the authority upon which they are based. The resolution calls for an inquiry by the committee. I have been awaiting a report from the Committee on the Judiciary on the resolution. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada if he expects to secure some action on the resolution within the near future.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt, I think I probably can answer the question. The resolution was brought up in the Senate a week ago by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which committee the resolution had been referred. When unanimous consent was requested for consideration of the resolution that day, I asked that the resolution go over until I could look into it myself. I did so on my own responsibility. In view of the fact that various newspapers connected that action on my part with a visit I made that morning to the White House, I will say that the President had nothing to do with it. I do not know whether he even knew such a resolution existed. I thought the resolution was of such character that I should be allowed to look into it before it was brought up. My request for an opportunity to do so was granted, and the resolution automatically went to the calendar.

I have no desire at all to delay consideration of the resolution, but I desire to look into it. I think we probably can take it up one day this week, and dispose of it.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I thank the Senator.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator O'MAHONEY at the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick

at Washington, D. C., on March 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR PROSPECTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Post-War Prospects" delivered by him in Milwaukee, Wis., March 16, 1944, before the Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESS AFTER THE WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BURTON

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Must Government Controls Be Continued After the War to Protect Small Business? delivered by him to the American Business Congress in New York City, March 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

EQUAL JUSTICE UNDER LAW: TOLERANCE ESSENTIAL TO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Equal Justice Under Law: Tolerance Essential to Democratic Government" delivered by him before the Akron Chamber of Commerce on March 3, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF FOREIGN OIL RESOURCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MOORE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Should the United States Government Develop Foreign Oil Resources?" delivered by Senator MOORE at America's Town Meeting of the Air on March 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY PEARL S. BUCK AND ADMIRAL H. E. YARNELL IN COMMEMORATION OF SUN YAT-SEN

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses in commemoration of Sun Yat-sen delivered, respectively, by Pearl S. Buck and Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, at the Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, on March 12, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley under the auspices of the Catholic Club of St. Louis, at St. Louis, Mo., on the 17th day of March 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHURCHILL AND THE ATLANTIC CHARTER—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Churchill Buries the Atlantic Charter" by William Henry Chamberlin, from the Progressive, La Follette's magazine, for March 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

BARUCH'S BONUS FOR BIG BUSINESS—ARTICLE BY ADDISON STEELE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Baruch's Bonus for Big Business," by Addison Steele, from the Progressive for March 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUBBER AFTER THE WAR—ARTICLE BY HARVEY S. FIRESTONE, JR.

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "What About Rubber After the War?" written by Harvey S. Firestone, Jr., and published in the Saturday Evening Post of March 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

GUARD DUTY IN NAVY YARDS BY EX-SERVICEMEN

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Earl J. Thomas, commander, Navy Yard Garrison No. 508, Army and Navy Union, to Vice Admiral Adolphus Andrews, member of the Navy Manpower Survey Board, on the subject of guard duty in Navy yards by ex-servicemen, together with the reply thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

SENATOR McNARY—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "Senator McNary," written by Horace C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF FOOD—ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE HOPE, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, last Thursday night I had the pleasure and profit of attending the food forum dinner in this city and listening to the food problem discussed from several different angles. There were present some 700 persons.

One of the most interesting speeches of the evening was made by Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Garden City, Kans., Member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth District of Kansas. When all is said and done, Mr. President, the food problem is basically a problem of production, food has to be produced before it can be distributed and consumed.

During this emergency the farmers of Kansas and of the Nation generally have done a magnificent job. With a serious labor shortage, with inadequate supplies of machinery, with his marketing problems complicated by tire and gasoline shortage, the American farmer nevertheless increased the food production of this country one-fourth in 3 years, measured by volume. Representative HOPE tells the story of the American farmer and the war in his address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Here in America, we are accustomed to taking food for granted. We overlook the fact that in all the history of mankind there has never been a period when a large proportion of the human race did not suffer for lack of food. Recorded history is full of stories of famines, one after another, coming right down to A. D. 1943. For a large part of the human race, life has always been a constant struggle to get enough to eat.

It is only in a time of stress like this, that Americans give much thought to food. Today, the rationing of certain important foods has made us food conscious. This is not because we are suffering from hunger or any possibility of actual hunger in the United States. The American people as a whole have lived better during the past 3 years, as far as food is concerned, than during any period of similar length in our history. That is, in spite of rationing, we have consumed more good, wholesome, nourishing food during that time than ever before. Furthermore, the distribution of this food among the people has been wider and more general than ever before in our history.

In addition to feeding its own people well, this country has produced sufficient food to supply our armed forces with the most generous and adequate food supply ever consumed by any army since time began and has had an excess to export to our allies and those living in occupied territory. For the year 1942, 13.6 percent of our food production went for military purposes and lend-lease; and for 1943, 25 percent went for this purpose.

Since the beginning of the war much publicity has been given industry and labor for our tremendous achievements in war production. This publicity is deserved. Too much credit cannot be given to this miracle of production. Much of it is spectacular and dramatic, and all of it is unsurpassed in the world's history.

The farmer's part in war production has not been dramatic. It has been given little publicity, but everyone familiar with the facts knows that the farmer's achievements in war production have been in many ways more remarkable than those of industry. It must be remembered that our increase in industrial production was possible because of tremendous expansion in plants and plant capacity, because of greatly increased personnel, and because of priorities which made it possible for war industries to secure the materials which they needed. Not so with the farmer. He secured an increase of 21 percent in total farm production between 1939 and 1943 and a 24-percent increase in food production during that time. The significance of this achievement is apparent when it is recalled that this increase was in spite of the fact that the farmer had less labor, less machinery, less fuel, and less transportation equipment in 1943 than he had in 1939. That is the miracle of farm production. It has been possible only because of the patriotic, untiring, everlasting work of the American farmer and every member of his family. Reports by the Department of Agriculture on the length of the farm day in Middle Western States show farm operators working from 12 to 13½ hours per day and hired workers almost as long. In many cases this is a 7-day week. Farmers out in my district jokingly refer to their 8-hour day—8 hours in the forenoon and 8 hours in the afternoon.

Since the war began the number of workers on the farms has declined 4 percent, but this does not begin to tell the story. From the beginning of the national defense program in 1940 to July 1, 1943, 2,600,000 actual or potential farm workers left farms and more than a million others took nonfarm jobs while continuing to live on farms. Those who left, particularly those called into the military service, were the younger workers, highly skilled in the use of farm machinery. All of them were experienced. Their places have been taken by unskilled workers, by women and children, by older men and women, all of whom have patriotically contributed their best to farm production but, of course, they cannot compare in skill and experience and physical strength with those who have been taken away by the war effort.

The same handicap has existed from the standpoint of machinery. The allotment of material for machinery for 1943 was 40 percent of the production for 1940. That doesn't mean, however, that farmers got 40 percent of the machinery they got in 1940. As a matter of fact, it is doubtful if they actually received 20 percent of the 1940 production. Allotments of material in many cases were not made until too late for delivery in 1943. In many other cases the allotments were not for the type of machinery most needed. For 1944

the allotment is 80 percent of the 1940 output, but no one believes that 80 percent will be delivered, and, as a matter of fact, right now several types of machinery needed in planting are unavailable. Prospects for harvesting machinery seem better. With ample labor, the shortage of machinery would not have been such a handicap. With ample machinery, the shortage of labor would not have been so serious. But what was accomplished was done in spite of serious and appalling shortages along both lines.

Attention must be called also to the fact that in many cases the farmer, at the request of his Government, has produced crops with which he had had no experience and for which he did not have suitable machinery. This is because the war effort required important shifts in production. We needed more fats and oils to replace the loss of imports. We needed more dairy products, eggs, pork, and lard to supply our allies. We needed more feed grains to take care of our increased livestock production. From 1939 to 1943 we increased our oilseed crops 145 percent, a considerable part of it produced by farmers who had never grown those crops before. The number of our beef cattle increased 27 percent between 1939 and 1943. Not only did we increase the number of hogs tremendously, but we grew them to greater weights so that pork production for 1943 was 68 percent more than 1939. Never in all our history have we produced anything like the quantity of meat which was made available during 1943. A statistically minded friend tells me that if all the cattle which were slaughtered in this country in 1943 could be represented by one gigantic steer, he could put his hind feet in the Arctic Circle, get a drink out of the Gulf of Mexico, and wrap his tail around the aurora borealis; and that if all the hogs could be made into one enormous hog, he could dig a ditch as big as the Panama Canal in two roots and a half. Then let's take a look at eggs and chickens, because there again is something to crow about. Between 1939 and 1943 egg production increased 39 percent and chickens 53 percent. We've come close to having two chickens in every pot.

Let's not forget that while the weather has a lot to do with the production of crops, when it comes to livestock it is all the result of good hard work. Let's not forget that these long hours of the American farmer were not spent in comfortable factories with all modern conveniences, but that most of them were spent under a broiling summer sun or in the Arctic winds of winter. Also, let's not overlook the fact that when we wanted war production, we not only gave the manufacturer adequate labor and whatever priorities were necessary for plants and machinery, but we arranged to pay whatever price he thought necessary to get production. The fabulous profits of industry are being cut down through taxes and renegotiation but, nevertheless, no manufacturer of war materials took any chance of a loss in his operations, and in many cases a large part of his operations were conducted on Government capital. Not so with the farmer. He has been held to a rigid price structure. In some cases he has had the assurance of support prices, but in all cases he has been limited to fixed ceilings. Along with this he has taken the risks as to weather, insect pests, and plant and livestock diseases, against which there is no insurance. In most cases he hazarded a large part of his capital in his season's operations. Yet few farmers have hesitated at these risks, and in almost all cases the goals set by the War Food Administration have been equaled and in many cases exceeded.

We hope the time will soon come when the war's end will make it possible for us to send some of our bounteous production to the undernourished people of the war-torn countries. The American farmer shares the willingness of all Americans to relieve this distress. He produced the food which fed the children of Belgium, France, and Germany after the other World War and, like all other Americans, he is willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to help the people of the occupied countries who have suffered most in this war.

We do not know when that time will come but when it does, the American farmer will be ready. He can be pardoned, however, for feeling some anxiety and uneasiness as to just what will happen when the war ends, especially if it should end suddenly, causing a decline in military and export demands. If this should be followed by widespread unemployment, incident to a change-over from war to peace, thus reducing the buying power of American workers, the problem might be serious. It is true that Congress has passed legislation guaranteeing a support price of 90 percent of parity on the most important agricultural commodities for 2 years after the war. This, however, does not necessarily solve the problem. If we should end that 2-year period with large surpluses, the effect on prices might be disastrous.

In the meantime, and as long as production is needed on a war-time basis, the American farmer is entitled to more assurance than he has had up to date as to his ability to secure labor, machinery, and transportation. Those things can and must be made available in greater amounts than in the past. If food is given the priority which it should have as an essential war requirement, there is still time to do much during this crop year along those lines.

I was asked to discuss the farmer's part in war food production. I cannot refrain in concluding from making a brief reference also to the splendid achievements of the food industry in processing and distributing this great food supply. It has done a magnificent job and the fact that there has been no profiteering by either farmers or the food trade is pretty well attested by the fact that there has never been a time in the history of this country when the American people were spending as small a proportion of their national income for food as they are today, only 21 percent. And, as heretofore mentioned, during the past 3 years our people have consumed more good wholesome nourishing food than ever before. If we were consuming the same quality and quantity of food that we did as a Nation in the period from 1935 to 1939, we would be spending only 16 percent of our national income for food.

One thing that is needed now, by both agricultural producers and processors, is a clear statement of our Government's policy on surplus disposal and on relief and rehabilitation following the war. All Government discussion of post-war programs up to date has failed to include agriculture. The Baruch report, while admirable in many ways, does not even touch upon the problem of agriculture except a brief reference to the disposition of surplus stocks. No post-war program can be considered adequate in any sense which does not take fully into consideration the fact that there will have to be an adjustment in the character and quantity of agricultural production following the war. There will have to be a carefully worked out plan for disposing of surplus stocks in order to protect both the processor and the farmer. The sooner definite programs can be worked out along these lines the better it will be for everyone.

NORWAY PAYS ITS WAY—ARTICLE FROM THE SATURDAY EVENING POST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt I have taken from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Norway Pays Its Way." This is a short but remarkable article, showing how the little Nation of Norway, which before the war was not only paying its way but was creating a surplus each year, now that the war is on is utilizing its merchant marine, and with that not only maintains the interest charges upon its bonds, but is paying the cost of government, though Norway is occupied by the Nazis.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORWAY PAYS ITS WAY

(By Leslie Roberts)

The check said to pay the Royal Norwegian Air Force $1,000,000, and Director General Erling H. Samuelsen, of the Norwegian Shipping and Trade Mission in Canada, signed with a flourish, as he does for equal or larger amounts whenever the Norse fliers ask for money. More goes from the mission in New York, for its merchant navy has been paying for Norway's war effort ever since German warships steamed up Oslo Fjord on April 9, 1940, and "Quisling" became another name for traitor.

At Little Norway, the airdrome in northern Ontaria where young Norwegian falcons learn to be fighter pilots, the commandant had talked about the war aims of the youngsters who have escaped from the homeland to fight. What they have on their minds, he said in back-of-the-throat English, is to set Norway free, nothing else. That is enough to occupy them for the present, because, to each youngster, freeing Norway means freeing his own family, his own girl, his own village, from the Nazi yoke. Focusing on such an objective leaves no time for abstract speculations. Gripped by an obsession, thousands of young Norwegians have escaped across the North Sea to Britain and Canada, thousands more through the back door into Sweden, thence overland across Siberia to take ship to North America. Before Pearl Harbor, many journeyed down through Japan in search of ocean passage. Others went by way of India, and some even trekked from Sweden to ports on the African coast. Often they took a year to make the base in Canada.

They were training under Norwegian instructors to do a special job for Norway. after polishing off in a Canadian service flying school, they would be shipped to Britain for induction into Norwegian squadrons which retain their national identity from C. O.'s office to cookhouse. They fly with the R. A. F., and up to the late fall of '43 had won 170 awards for bravery while amassing an ominous record in enemy aircraft destroyed, for which circumstance they give full credit to team flying.

EARNING FREEDOM THE HARD WAY

The commandant bristled visibly when asked, "Who pays the bills? Does the Canadian Government provide the air stations, hangars, aircraft, uniforms, food, and pay?" The query prompted the visit to the shipping mission, where the director-general provided answers which every citizen of the United Nations should paste in his hat to remember when judgment day comes and war's accounts are tallied.

At the time of invasion, Norway's merchant fleet tallied almost 5,000,000 tons and was the world's fourth largest. More important, almost 50 percent of the ships were less than 10 years old and many of them were fast Diesel-driven tankers and ships specially designed to carry perishables. Even before invasion, 54 ships, under charter to the British, had been lost by enemy action. Now wireless orders went to every Norse master, instructing him to make for the nearest friendly port and go to work for his own government.

Without one exception, the captains complied. Through 1941 and 1942 they carried half the oil and a third of all the foodstuffs which reached Britain. Throughout the battle of the North Atlantic a ship went down every second day. But the merchant fleet kept on slugging, taking such replacements as it could get and working the whole fleet under forced draft. By such devices less than 30,000 Norwegian sailors have footed the bill for their country's war effort, while the homeland itself has been locked in bondage. The sailor even pays his taxes as he would at home. Every krone of revenue, every öre of compensation, has gone into the government's coffers, alongside the country's gold reserves, which were sneaked out of Norway while the battle was at its height.

Paying for the war effort is not the only job. Other commitments are met on the nail. In 1943, a loan of $20,000,000, floated in 1923 in the United States, was paid in full on maturity. Norway is ready to send its check for a similar loan which will come due this year.

The result is a serious case of hero worship of the merchant seamen on the part of the youngster in a Norwegian uniform. Without them, he says, "we would have been fighting on the charity of our allies." You gather that the last thing any upstanding young Norseman wants is any part of any man's charity. He has a job on his hands—to set his beloved Norway free and to pay the bills as he goes.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] to the committee amendment on page 13, line 1, inserting in lieu of the figures "$4,191,143", the figures "$6,146,000."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	Overton
Andrews	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Austin	George	Revercomb
Bailey	Gillette	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Shipstead
Bone	Hayden	Stewart
Brewster	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Utah
Buck	Kilgore	Truman
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Bushfield	Langer	Tydings
Byrd	McCarran	Vandenberg
Capper	McClellan	Walsh, N. J.
Chandler	McFarland	Weeks
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wherry
Connally	Mead	White
Davis	Millikin	Wiley
Downey	Murray	Willis
Eastland	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on Thursday last we were discussing the amendment which I offered with reference to the appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission. I shall not require much time to complete my argument. I merely desire to sum up what I deem to be the essential points in support of my amendment.

The agency for which I plead for reasonable appropriations began the work involved in this appropriation in the early 1920's. It was not only a pioneer in the field of policing the air waves but it was alone in the field, and as a result it developed the only expertness in the field at that time.

There are two essential divisions of the Federal Communications Commission involved in these appropriations. One has to do with policing the industry or the air waves in this country and in our Territorial possessions. Speaking of transfers of activities to the War Department, in my judgment it would be just as reasonable to assume that we should transfer the F. B. I., the Secret Service, and the Postal Inspection Service to the War Department in time of war as to transfer this policing service of the air waves. The policing of the air waves is inherent in the activities of the Federal Communications Commission. It locates illegal stations. It keeps the industry functioning legally and smoothly. It furnishes aid to a dozen or more Federal agencies.

The other activity is that of monitoring—not monitoring the military statements or speeches emanating from enemy countries, but monitoring the propaganda emanating from enemy countries, monitoring the speeches delivered by representatives of lay agencies, not military agencies, and furnishing a report of its monitoring activities and results to many Federal agencies and numerous foreign governments.

If we deny the Federal Communications Commission the right to continue in this field, it is my judgment that duplication and quadruplication will result, and that the appropriations will be increased, not by a few hundred thousand dollars here and there, but by millions of dollars, in order that this work may be carried on by the several agencies to which these services are indispensable.

These two divisions, the monitoring division, having to do with broadcasts emanating from civilian agencies located within enemy countries, and the policing of the air waves to prevent illegal activities, eliminate espionage, and keep the industry within the law, have nothing to do with duplicating the efforts of the military agencies. They have their own services, which deal primarily with the movement of troops, the action of the military forces of the enemy, and such other matters as are primarily military in character.

These two civilian activities of the Federal Communications Commission render invaluable service to the Civil Aeronautics Authority, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Office of Strategic Services, the O. W. I., the State Department, and the new agency now in formation, referred to as U. N. R. R. A., and also in connection with our inter-American activities. In order that those agencies might receive efficient service, the President, after a review of the subject, created what may be termed a "policy board", a board on which all these agencies, including the Army and Navy, enjoy representation. This board has to do with the matter of the delegation, dissemination, and distribution of the services performed by this pioneering agency, the Federal Communications Commission.

On Thursday the statement was made in the debate that the President was interfering with the war effort, and that he should respect the letter received at the White House from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. Mr. President, there is no politics involved in this activity, because, after all, it was the President who appointed Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox. It was the President who assigned all the leaders having to do both with our military and our civilian agencies. When he appointed Secretaries Knox and Stimson, the cry went up that their appointments were political in character. Opposition among members of their own party was heard throughout the Nation. How can the President be consistently charged with political interference, at the same time that Knox and Stimson, who were criticized by members of their own party for taking these important assignments, are suddenly to be considered above and beyond all partisan influence and considerations? For my part, I am willing to believe that the President, as well as

the Secretaries, is above partisan considerations so far as the war effort is concerned.

Of course, the military agencies should have all the services they require, and they are provided for in their own appropriations. The military should have—and it does have it—all the cooperation this agency can give. But, Mr. President, the military may at times make mistakes. If I may cite but two, let me say that in the Truman committee report there was some meritorious criticism of the activity of the military in connection with the Canol project in Canada. If I were to cite another error which was probably made by one or the other of the military agencies, let me say, again referring to the Truman committee report, that a long controversy raged with respect to the construction of small boats. For months the Navy insisted on the design and production of its own small landing boats. Finally, after long delay, it joined the Army and followed the example of foreign countries by adopting the small landing craft built in this country by private enterprise.

Mr. President, in summation, allow me to say that the long history of the Federal Communications Commission in these particular fields, namely, the policing of the air waves, and the monitoring services, as well as their expertness as the result of long experience, should lead us, I believe, to the support of this agency and the appropriations which they require to carry out the functions to which I have referred.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that unless we provide them with adequate appropriations we will provide the military and civilian agencies with enlarged appropriations entirely out of proportion to the appropriations contained in the amendment which I have offered. Therefore, Mr. President, I trust that the appropriations for the Federal Communications Commission will be restored.

That is all I have to say on the subject except to ask permission to add to my remarks at this point in the RECORD a statement on the subject which I have prepared.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the statement which the Senator from New York has asked to have incorporated in the RECORD a statement which he himself prepared?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; it is a statement with reference to what I said in the debate last Thursday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME OF THE THINGS RADIO INTELLIGENCE DIVISION HAS DONE DURING THE PAST 3½ YEARS

ILLEGAL AND ESPIONAGE RADIO OPERATIONS

1. It has uncovered more than 360 cases of unlicensed radio operations—some of these were serious—one was in the German Embassy 2 days after Pearl Harbor—others have been Japs in internment camps.

2. It has been called upon by other agencies to clear up tens of thousands of cases—9,000 of these required field investigations by mobile units equipped with special detection devices, about half of these cases were referred to F. C. C. by Army, Navy, and F. B. I. and about one-third were reported as subversive operations.

3. It helped convict the spies in the Brooklyn trial a couple of years ago by showing that the station which the spies were communicating with was in Germany.

4. It first uncovered Axis espionage radio operations in Latin America, intercepted the traffic thereby informing our Government of the vital information Germany was getting by this means and enabling our Government to make representations to South American governments, fixed general locations of espionage stations in South America from its direction-finding stations in this country, at request of State Department sent engineers to South America who determined exact location of the transmitters. As a result many powerful transmitters have been closed out and hundreds of Nazi spies rounded up.

5. Has located hundreds of Axis espionage circuits throughout the world.

6. Right after war began when Army reported every unidentified radio signal it heard on the west coast as a Jap spy, R. I. D. men were called and brought order out of chaos.

7. Cooperates fully with F. B. I., British, and Canadians, as well as other agencies of United States Government in work in this field.

INTERFERENCE

1. Has kept order in spectrum by keeping stations licensed by F. C. C. to their proper frequency, power, etc.

2. Many complaints are received every day by police, industry, commercial, safety, and governmental radio services that there is some signal interfering with important communications. Same facilities R. I. D. needs for work on espionage and illegal operations are used to track down the interfering signals and eliminate them.

3. Army and Navy rely on R. I. D. to do this work and are constantly calling on it to determine the signal interfering with one of their circuits. Not only are Navy transmitters repeatedly found to interfere with Army circuits and vice versa, but Navy transmitters with other Navy stations and Army stations with other Army stations. This work of R. I. D. constantly receives the highest commendation of armed services and others.

4. Two thousand cases involving interference to some circuit have required investigations by mobile units. Other tens of thousands have been handled by R. I. D. experts, who from experience can identify most any signal on the air merely by hearing it and by taking bearings over long distances from fixed R. I. D. direction-finding stations.

LOST AIRCRAFT

1. R. I. D., on request, has given emergency bearings to more than 400 lost aircraft—requests now come in to help military aircraft at a rate of at least 2 a day. Same service is also rendered Civil Aeronautics Authority and air lines.

2. R. I. D. appropriations over last 3½ years have been about $2,000,000. Lost aircraft saved by R. I. D. much more than make up for this, when it is considered a big bomber and crew in terms of investment run to $750,000 apiece.

INTERCEPTS

Other Government agencies including State Department, Federal Economic Administration, Office of Strategic Service, Federal Bureau of Investigation, Weather Bureau, Office of Censorship, and even Army and Navy rely on the Radio Intelligence Division to intercept much foreign radio and telegraphic traffic for the very important intelligence it includes.

TRAINING

R. I. D. men are recognized as the experts in the field and they have trained personnel in the armed services, men from South American countries as part of a hemispheric plan to combat Axis espionage, and men from other Government agencies.

MILITARY

On specific request, and only on specific request, R. I. D. has helped Army and Navy do jobs which they have not been able to do or which R. I. D. men can do better. Quantitatively this work has been rather small.

Mr. MEAD. If there is to be no further discussion, Mr. President, I ask for favorable action on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from New York concluded?

Mr. MEAD. I have concluded. I now yield the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, one of the provisions contained in this amendment was gone into very fully by the other House and also by our committee. I refer to the item of approximately a million and a half dollars for conducting the Radio Intelligence Division and the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. It was found by the House and by the Senate committee as well, that this service was a duplication of what the Army and Navy is doing today. It seems that some time ago the authorities of the War Department and of the Navy Department got together and said that this activity should all be under the Army and the Navy. Unquestionably, in my judgment, that is true. In the judgment of the committee it was true. The committee was overwhelmingly of the opinion that there was a duplication of service which was not warranted by the facts presented.

It is true that Mr. Fly, the very energetic and able Director of the Federal Communications Commission, has been exceedingly active. He testified before our committee, and the committee heard his testimony for a day or two. During his testimony he pleaded very earnestly for the continuation of this service the appropriation for which the House left out, amounting to more than a million and a half dollars. After hearing him with the greatest of care, and with every consideration, the committee determined that there was almost entirely a duplication of effort, and that it was not necessary in the war effort. As we are in a very expensive war the committee agreed with the House of Representatives that this item should be eliminated.

As to the item of $300,000, the committee felt that during the war, during a time when it is very necessary to conserve our resources, this activity could get along with $300,000 less. There was a provision on page 12 of the bill to purchase "not to exceed 20 passenger-carrying automobiles." We thought that that would be extravagant at this time, and it was stricken out. After going into the matter very thoroughly we felt that of the House item of approximately $4,491,000 about a million and a half dollars should be eliminated and the amount of approximately $300,000 in the general appropriations should be cut down. The amendment of the Senator from New York is to restore both items. He has put them both together—the $300,000, which our committee cut out, and the item of $1,500,000 which the

House cut out. I think the amendment should be defeated.

We heard the testimony on behalf of the Federal Communications Commission. It has a very interesting activity. In times of peace we might well afford to be liberal with the people's money and give the Commission more money with which to experiment. Many of its activities comprise experimental work in the field of radio. Under other circumstances it might be proper to give the Commission these extravagant appropriations, but under the present circumstances it seems to me to be almost a willful waste of the people's money to grant these large appropriations. I am very hopeful that the Senate will vote down the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am sorry to find myself in disagreement with the able chairman of the committee and with the majority of the committee insofar as the issues involved in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are concerned. As I understand, the House struck from the Budget estimate $1,000,000 for the Radio Intelligence Division, $500,000 for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, $113,607 for new positions requested, $21,897 for the Personnel Division, and $19,353 for the Budget and Planning Division, making a total of $1,654,857.

Reading from the letter of the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission to the committee:

> The Commission is impelled to request the restoration of (1) the $1,000,000 cut off the estimate of the Radio Intelligence Division; (2) The $500,000 cut off the estimate of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service; $46,369 for 15 new positions in the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service for expanding the coverage of Japanase broadcasts; and (3) $52,965 for 14 new positions in the Engineering and Accounting Department for rate and integration work required principally because of the recent merger of the domestic wire-telegraph carriers.

Mr. President, as I see it, the activities carried on by the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service and the Radio Intelligence Division are of vital importance. The Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service monitors the broadcasts of enemy radio stations. Every Senator within the sound of my voice knows that propaganda is one of the new and modern weapons of war. It is new and modern because of the development of short-wave radio transmission, which permits the enemy to broadcast directly into the countries that are alined against them and every Senator knows full well that our enemies have made very important use of this new technique in attempting to reach the countries of the Allied Nations in an effort to create dissension within those countries and, insofar as possible, to break down the morale of the home front in the Allied Nations.

So far as I am able to ascertain, the Federal Communications Commission is simply a service agency insofar as its Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Division is concerned. It was set up at the specific request and suggestion of the State Department; and, if we pause a moment for consideration, it seems quite natural that the State Department should be the one Department which would primarily be interested in the propaganda which is filling the air waves 24 hours a day from innumerable radio stations located in the Axis countries and beamed directly to the Allied Nations. After this service was established other agencies of the Government became interested in it. Originally, the Board of Economic Warfare, because it was endeavoring to utilize the moneys made available to it to buy up strategic materials in the neutral countries of the world in an effort to prevent our enemies from obtaining them, naturally became vitally interested in enemy propaganda. I do not know how many Axis stations there are that beam propaganda to South and Central America, speaking in the language of the countries to which the broadcasts are beamed, but I should say that there are numerous stations which are on the air 24 hours a day trying to create dissension and to undermine the effort and unity of the nations in this hemisphere in their war effort. Naturally, any agency such as the Bureau of Economic Warfare, now, under the new Executive order, the Foreign Economic Administration, would be concerned to have the essential portions of the various Axis propaganda broadcasts monitored, that is, listened to, translated, and furnished to them at the earliest possible moment.

This service is also furnished to a large number of other agencies of the Federal Government now engaged in the war effort. I assert that there is no duplication whatever insofar as the monitoring of foreign propaganda broadcasts is concerned, and, if the amendment of the Senator from New York is not adopted, this service will be either crippled or completely eliminated. Mr. President, if we want to be an ostrich, if we want to take the position that we are not going to recognize the importance of enemy propaganda insofar as this war is concerned, then let the Senate vote down the amendment.

Furthermore, I wish to point out that since the war has progressed this work of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service has been integrated with that of our allies, because, obviously, for geographical reasons, in a global war it is not possible to monitor all enemy stations from any one country, and, therefore, our activity in this field, having been commenced, as I have said, at the request of the State Department, has been integrated with that of the British and other allies and this information is merged each day by cable. The British have no good listening stations, for example, so far as the Japanese propaganda is concerned. Do Senators think it is unimportant to know what the Japanese propaganda short-wave stations are saying to the people of Burma when our troops are making some effort, feeble though it may be, to attack through Burma.

Mr. President, every person who knows anything about the war must be aware that the enemy propaganda had softened up the native population, so to speak, so that in the early stages of the war against Japan they were at least indifferent, if they were not hostile, to the British military operations.

The foreign propaganda is synchronized; it is a part of the common whole of our enemy's war effort; and yet we are now confronted with such a situation that if this amendment is not agreed to the one agency of this country which is prepared to carry on and has been carrying on this work, will find its work crippled or completely eliminated.

We will then either have to furnish more money to set up another agency in the Government to carry on this monitoring service, or we will have to be without the benefit of it, and I unhesitatingly assert that for us to take any such action as that proposed would be the height of stupidity, for our ears would then be closed to the propaganda efforts of the enemy being carried on by a myriad of high-powered short-wave radio stations which are a network in the Axis propaganda efforts. I cannot believe that the Senate of the United States would want to take any such action at this time.

Mr. President, the Radio Intelligence Division is another activity of the Federal Communications Commission. It was set up when the Commission was organized. It is the police arm of the Federal Communications Commission, insofar as the regulation and control of domestic broadcasting is concerned. Every Senator who is at all familiar with the subject of radio must know that, because of the way in which original licenses were granted, they were issued very freely. Under the Department of Commerce procedure in the early days, licenses were issued in the order in which they were filed, and while I do not know whether it was a facetious story or not, I was told about a man years ago who wanted a radio station in his home town who came to Washington and kept the taxi waiting while he went into the Department of Commerce, got his license, put it in his pocket, went back to the train, and returned home to establish his station. That is not in criticism of the Department of Commerce. First of all, we were in the early years of this art, and, secondly, the courts had rendered a decision which indicated that applicants were entitled to licenses.

As a result, the broadcast band of the radio spectrum is jammed, and every Senator who listens to the radio must know that to be a fact.

The only way by which the ether can be kept in a condition so that the listener may get fairly decent service will be as a result of the Radio Intelligence Division activity in keeping the domestic broadcasters within the terms of their licenses so far as wave bands, power, and other operating features are concerned. The only way that can be accomplished is by having a network of monitoring stations, as well as portable monitoring outfits which can go into the various areas and make certain that the broadcaster has not expanded his band, is not broadcasting on a broader

band than he is entitled to use, or that he is not feeding more power into his broadcasting equipment, thus creating more interference than would otherwise be the case.

Furthermore, the Radio Intelligence Division polices the ether to prevent unnecessary interference because of faulty electrical equipment, such as X-ray equipment, diathermic machines, faulty transformers, leaky high transmission lines, and other things not related to radio which cause electrical disturbances, but because of the high frequency with which those electrical devices throw off their interference they destroy the effectiveness of any particular radio broadcast band.

Mr. President, if we reduce the appropriation as drastically as the House has reduced it, and as the Senate committee has recommended that it be reduced, we will be crippling the police arm of the Federal Communications Commission, which it has established in order that it may discharge the responsibility which it has to discharge as the result of an act of Congress.

I do not make any invidious charge, so far as broadcasters are concerned, that they will take advantage of this situation if they know that the Senate and the House have decided to impair this police service, but I do say that we all know that in every line of business—in every activity in the country—there are those who will take advantage of such a situation, and in the crowded condition which exists in the broadcast band or segment of the radio spectrum I say that such violations might seriously impair the service rendered to the people of the United States by the radio broadcasters. Certainly in time of war we should not do anything to impair that service. It is of vital importance that the people of the United States shall have the best possible reception from their broadcast stations in time of war.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator has been dealing with two separate subjects.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. The appropriation for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, amounting to half a million dollars, and the appropriation for the Radio Intelligence Division, involving a million dollars. As I understand, the proposal before the Senate will require that we act on both subjects at the same time. Does the Senator intend to afford us opportunity to act on each separately?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have not any control of that. The pending amendment is sponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. I have merely been seeking, since there are not many Senators present, to make it plain for the RECORD that there is a fixed responsibility in this matter, and I merely took up and discussed those two separate divisions, so that I could attempt to eliminate what I fear is some confusion in the thinking of Senators who are not on the committee, and who have not had opportunity to go into this matter.

I may say as an aside, that I think that in all probability, in view of our subsequent involvement in war, the Commission probably chose bad names for both these divisions by incorporating the word "Intelligence" into them, because that immediately arouses in the minds of Senators and other interested parties the idea that they have something to do with military or naval intelligence. I shall show, as I proceed, that it is only incidentally, and only as they are specifically requested to do so by the Army or Navy, or divisions thereof, that any military or naval intelligence service is rendered by either one of these divisions of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BURTON. Am I to understand that there is any necessary relationship between these two items? Might it not be possible that Senators who wish to preserve the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service with an appropriation of $500,000 would like to vote to do so, and yet be opposed to using $1,000,000 against the recommendations of the War and Navy Departments? Yet the pending question requires us to approve the $1,000,000 as well as the $500,000 in order to save the $500,000 item.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, Senators may have a feeling about either one of these services. So far as I am personally concerned, I think they should both be continued in operation. But Senators may differ about that. As I say, however, the amendment is sponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and is not in my control.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, with that brief statement in a preliminary way I wish to discuss this matter in a little more detail. I listened to the entire debate on Thursday, and the only basis that I understood to be advanced for the proposal to cut $2,163,857 from the appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission was that its war activities duplicated the work of the Army and the Navy. I have been unable to find any evidence in either the record of the House committee or in the record of the Senate committee, or in the debate on last Thursday, to support that contention, unless it be the letter made public by the Cox committee of the House, from Admiral Leahy addressed to the Secretary of the Navy, and before I conclude I shall make further reference to that letter. But there is no other evidence that I am able to find in either the testimony taken by the House committee or the testimony taken by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

As to $1,163,857 of the amount proposed to be cut, it has not even been suggested by anyone that any duplication is involved. The House reduced, as I have said, by $500,000, the amount which is necessary for the work of the Commission's Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. That is a purely war activity, and one established at the request of the Secretary of State.

The Commission is engaged 24 hours a day in listening to and recording foreign radio broadcasts and reporting on them to several hundred offices throughout the Federal Government—in the Office of War Information, in the State Department, in the Foreign Economic Administration, in the Office of Strategic Services, in the Army, in the Navy, and others. The Army and Navy do not do this work. No other agency in the Government does this work. The Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service is the only agency which we have for finding out what the enemy is saying over the radio to its home population, and, what is more important, Mr. President, what it is saying to our population and to the populations of every other country in the world, Allied or neutral, outside the Axis.

The Army and Navy have not asked that this work be transferred from the Commission, and so far as I am able to ascertain—and I have gone to the trouble of making some inquiries—they are completely satisfied with the service which they receive from the Commission.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], during his discussion on last Thursday, put in the RECORD letters from various Army and Navy officials indicating complete satisfaction and in many instances enthusiastic approval of the work being done by the Federal Communications Commission. I heard it whispered around the Senate off the record that those letters had been solicited by Mr. Fly or by someone in the Federal Communications Commission. I do not believe that to be a fact, and if Senators will read Dr. Leigh's testimony they will see that he pled with the chairman of the committee to make a genuine effort to find out on the initiative of the Appropriations Committee what the various branches of the Army and Navy felt about its work. But the chairman did not feel that that was in his province. However, I will digress long enough to say that in my opinion, before striking down or crippling these two Divisions, it would have been better if the Appropriations Committee had made a thorough investigation of the matter. The blind swinging of the appropriations ax, Mr. President, may turn out to be of benefit to our enemies rather than to that of the taxpayers of the United States.

The balance of this $1,163,587 portion is taken from the Commission's regulatory functions which no other agencies perform. Therefore we can eliminate any question of duplication in connection with the work covered by that amount.

That leaves $1,000,000 as to which even a question of duplication has been raised. This concerns the work of the Commission's Radio Intelligence Division. Even here we have been given only general and unsupported statements. No facts whatever are cited in support of it, so far as my reading of the House and Senate committee hearings and the debate on last Thursday are concerned. The Radio Intelligence Division monitors the radio spectrum.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator

from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Wisconsin began to speak, but I should like to ask him how he divides the increase called for by the so-called amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, the House cut out $1,000,000 from the Radio Intelligence Division. The House cut $500,000 from the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. I am now reading the figures from Mr. Fly's formal letter requesting restoration of funds cut by the House. New positions requested, $113,607. Personnel Division, $21,897. Budget and Planning Division, $19,353. Which makes a total of $1,654,857 cut by the House below the Budget estimates.

In his letter the Chairman asked for the restoration of the $1,000,000 cut off the estimate of the Radio Intelligence Division. He asked for restoration of the $500,000 cut off the estimate of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, $46,369 for 15 new positions in the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service for expanding the coverage of Japanese broadcasts, and $52,965 for 14 new positions in the Engineering and Accounting Departments for rate and integration work required principally because of the recent merger of domestic wire telegraph carriers.

Then, as I understand, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, instead of restoring any of these items, made a further cut. I hope the Senator from New York will correct me if I am mistaken, but my understanding is that his amendment provides for the restoration of the amounts asked for by Mr. Fly in his letter, insofar as the cuts of the House are concerned, and the restoration of the cut of the Senate Appropriations Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. That is correct, except on page 12, line 2, there is one amendment which is not included in the amendment I sent to the desk. That can be restored by merely eliminating the figure recommended by the Senate committee, and by accepting the figure "$2,209,000" which came from the House. But other than that, I have restored in my amendment the five items the Senator has set forth, except the one item on page 12, line 2, which can be restored, as I have said, by merely eliminating the Senate committee's figure, and accepting the figure "$2,209,000."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In other words, except for the amendment on page 12, my statement was correct, and the net effect would be as I stated, if the Senate committee's amendment on page 12 were rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, what I was referring to, if the Senator will permit me to say so, was the amount of the so-called Mead amendment which would be applied to the regular functions, as segregated from the special functions referred to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is my understanding that $1,163,587 is the portion taken from the Commission's regulatory functions—namely, the functions of the Radio Intelligence Division. I previously said, before the Senator entered the Chamber, I think, that the Commission made a mistake when it selected that name, because during war it immediately creates in the minds of people the impression that military and naval intelligence activities are referred to. However, the record shows, and my personal checking also shows, that the Radio Intelligence Division does no military or naval intelligence work unless it is specifically requested to do so by someone in the Army or in the Navy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it the Senator's thought that the Radio Intelligence Division, so-called, is a permanent function of the Commission, and would continue, regardless of the emergency period through which we are now passing?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think that in response to some requests from the Army and Navy the Federal Communications Commission has expanded that service as a part of the wartime activity. But according to my understanding of the subject, the Commission had a Radio Intelligence Division—it may not have been called by that name, but performed the functions of the Radio Intelligence Division—practically from the time when the Congress passed the Federal Communications Commission Act. That Division is the police arm of the Commission. It is the branch of the Commission which keeps broadcasters within the terms of their licenses, insofar as their wavelength bands, their antenna systems, and the amounts of power used are concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, can the Senator cite evidence or authority as to who requested the Commission to expand that service in wartime?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The only evidence I have is that contained in the hearings. The Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, as distinguished from the Radio Intelligence Division, was set up at the request of the Secretary of State. The wartime activity of the Radio Intelligence Division, as I understand it, was undertaken at the request of various sections of the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator refer to any specific statements in that connection? I have heard that statement made on many occasions but I have not been able to locate any authority for the statement to that effect which the Senator and others have made.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The statement was made by Chairman Fly and by Commissioner Jett, and was not contradicted by any other person or by any testimony or by any documents or letters in the hearings of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. If the Senator from Wisconsin, able and searching as he is, is unable to find any evidence of a direct request for the service, or if there is none in the record, would it not be fair to assume that none existed?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I do not think that would be fair at all, in the face of the uncontradicted testimony by the Chairman of the Commission and by Mr. Jett, a member thereof.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. In a moment I shall read from the testimony of the heads of the Army and the Navy as to this point; I shall read from the House committee report. I understood the Senator to say a while ago that the military intelligence service was to be for the use of the Army and the Navy, when the Commission was called upon by them. I believe Mr. Fly so testified, and I think the Senator is correct in that statement.

I desire to call the Senator's attention to the following language by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy:

> Since radio intelligence develops information as to the movements and dispositions of the enemy, it is essential, for reasons of coordination and security, that there be full military control.
>
> Since the responsibility for military action rests with the armed forces, the responsibility for obtaining the technical information governing that action must also be in the armed forces.
>
> Military activities have been hampered by severe shortages of trained personnel and critical equipment essential to radio intelligence.

And so forth. So, Mr. President, we have the head of the Army and the head of the Navy saying that this military intelligence must be under the control of the Army and the Navy. Certainly, that should meet with the approval of Mr. Fly. Then, who in the Army or the Navy will call upon Mr. Fly or the Federal Communications Commission for military intelligence?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I think we are again confused because of the unfortunate name which has been attached to this Division. It is called Radio Intelligence; and, naturally, many persons jumped to the conclusion that the activity of the Division was in the field of military and naval intelligence. Such is not the case. The main activity of the Radio Intelligence Division has been to discharge the responsibility, fixed upon it by statute, to police the domestic radio wave bands. Incidentally in the course of that activity—for, as every Senator knows, broadcasting stations are operating all over the Nation, and in our Territories—it is necessary for the Commission to monitor radio stations; and for many years the Commission has had set up fixed monitoring stations, as well as portable monitoring stations which go from place to place, to make certain that the broadcasters are keeping within the terms of their respective licenses, as I have said before, insofar as their power, their antenna systems, their equipment, and the use of their particular kilocycle assignments on the radio wave-bands are concerned. When the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, the Army and the Navy had

no such system. In monitoring the broadcast spectrum and the short-wave broadcasting stations—Senators must bear in mind that there are private concerns which are licensed short-wave broadcasters—it is true that the Commission has picked up military information. In listening to what came over the air the Commission inevitably obtained such information. For instance, the Senator knows that the Commission obtained a "fix" on a radio station located in the German Embassy in Washington, which it was successful in locating, fortunately, so that the station never had an opportunity to communicate with Germany. But, Mr. President, I think the evidence shows, as I previously stated—with the exception of Admiral Leahy's letter, which I shall come to—so far as the testimony before the House committee or the Senate committee is concerned, that there is not one scintilla of either oral or written testimony, or documents, to contradict Mr. Fly's unequivocal statement, supported by that of Commissioner Jett, that the Radio Intelligence Division does not perform any military or naval intelligence work unless requested to do so; and it has been requested to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will be glad to yield in just a moment.

One other thing which this agency must do is to make certain that merchant ships at sea have proper radio equipment, and to make certain that when it is desired to use it for emergency purposes, any interfering broadcasts which are taking place from our private broadcasters in the United States shall be discontinued.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish the Senator would let us know what military leader has asked for this service. The Secretary of War has not asked for it. The Secretary of the Navy has not asked for it. The commanding generals of the Army have not asked for it. We had no evidence before us to show that anybody was asking for it. I believe Mr. Fly said that some general said he wanted it, and some colonel said he wanted it; but I believe that was only a casual conversation. Those gentlemen are under the control of the military leaders, and our military leaders have certainly not asked for it. Indeed, they have signed a statement to the effect that they have all the military intelligence service that is necessary. They think that such activities ought to be under their control. They are now under their control, and this other service is not needed. That is the reason why the committee acted as it did.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I recall the statement that they were specifically requested to monitor ship traffic for the Coast Guard since the beginning of the war. I remember specifically that they have been asked to assist the Air Corps in the location of lost aircraft. According to my recollection of the testimony, more than 400 lost aircraft have been located at the specific request of the particular branch of the service under whose direction those planes were flying, in order that they might get what is called a fix by taking the waves from transmitters from different angles. The statement was made in the record that, entirely aside from the personnel saved, the value of the equipment saved for the various armed services and for the Coast Guard is more than the amount of this appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. No Army officer or Navy officer testified to that effect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, that does not disturb me at all. This testimony was given by Mr. Fly. It was given by Mr. Jett, and there was no evidence introduced into the record before either the House committee or the Senate committee to refute that testimony. So far as I am concerned, I think that under any proper rules of evidence the burden of proof should be upon the committee, or upon someone else, to show that this service should be crippled or stricken down.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wisconsin always assumes a fair attitude in debate. Does he not believe that if Mr. Fly, Mr. Jett, or anyone else made the statements which he attributes to them, such statements should be substantiated by a showing that someone in authority in the Army or Navy requested the service? I have not been able to find such a request in the evidence, and I should like very much to have the Senator from Wisconsin point out anything in the record which shows that someone in authority formally requested the service. I mean by that the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the combined Chiefs of Staff, Admiral King, General Marshall, or someone with like authority.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. On the second day that Mr. Fly appeared before the committee, he testified that on the previous day, while his testimony was in progress, the Radio Intelligence Division had been asked to take a bearing on a plane lost at sea. In the record there are several letters mentioning specific instances of planes which have been thus discovered, at the request of some branch of the military service. Without such a request, the Federal Communications Commission might not even know that the plane was lost. It is obvious that it must be requested to take this action, because as the Senator knows, the flight of military, naval, and Coast Guard aircraft is a matter of the highest military secrecy. The Federal Communications Commission could not be brought into the picture unless a request were made for its assistance.

So far as I am concerned, I am assuming that Mr. Fly and Mr. Jett were telling the truth before the House committee and the Senate committee, there being no substantive evidence to disprove their statements.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is proceeding on the assumption that the testimony which they gave was correct. It is fair to assume, then, that he knows, from reading the testimony, that there are certain informal examples, but that he knows of no formal request from the Army or Navy for this specific service of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me refer to one letter which is in the record. It reads as follows:

HEADQUARTERS, SEVENTH AIR FORCE,
OFFICE OF THE AIR FORCE COMMANDER,
A. P. O. No. 953, May 15, 1943.

Subject: Assistance rendered by Federal Communications Commission in locating lost airplanes:

To: Federal Communications Commission, Supervisor Radio Security Center, P. O. Box 3886, Honolulu, T. H.

1. In the past months numerous calls have been made upon the Federal Communications Commission radio facilities to obtain bearings and fixes upon lost airplanes. These bearings and fixes have proven accurate and most helpful. In one palticular instance on March 5, 1943, the assistance rendered by the Federal Communications Commission resulted in the prompt locating and rescuing of the crew of a bomber forced to land at sea.

So far as I am concerned, that one instance is enough to justify every dollar of the appropriation. If Senators are not interested in saving flyers for the sake of their wives and families, they certainly ought to be interested in them from a monetary standpoint, because we have spent thousands of dollars in training every one of them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not at the moment. I wish to finish reading the letter:

On another occasion, March 19, 1943, bearings received from the Federal Communications Commission assisted in locating a plane which was in imminent danger of being forced to land at sea. Largely as a result of these bearings this forced landing was averted.

2. Other instances too numerous to mention have occurred in which the assistance given by the Federal Communications Commission has been of inestimable value. The facilities of Federal Communications Commission have been, and still are, absolutely necessary to the successful operation of the Army's lost-plane procedure in the Hawaiian area.

3. I wish to commend the Federal Communications Commission and its men responsible for this assistance. It has been of great value and in numerous cases directly responsible for the saving of lives and valuable equipment.

WM. J. FLOOD,
Brigadier General,
United States Army, Chief of Staff.

Mr. President, as I stated while I was reading the letter, if the Commission's activities in this field were carried on as a result of its own necessary duty in monitoring the radio spectrum, and it found these lost planes as an incident to such activities without a request of the Army or Navy, so far as I am concerned, I am glad to see those men and that equipment saved. This letter clearly shows that the Seventh Air Force in Hawaii has been making requests, in the general's own language, "too numerous to mention."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator does not mean to infer that anyone who is against

this appropriation wishes to see American flyers killed or American planes lost, does he?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course not, but I wish to bring the facts before the Senate, and I should like to have this matter considered, if possible, on its merits. I do not believe it is being considered on its merits. I want the RECORD to show, before Senators vote, exactly what the facts are insofar as I have been able to obtain them. Thereafter, of course, any Senator who votes another way I shall assume is voting because of his judgment and his belief that it is the wise thing to do. However, with regard to the important phase of the activities of the Federal Communications Commission in policing the domestic radio spectrum, in the service they are performing in assisting in locating lost planes and in eliminating and preventing the activities of enemy agents utilizing short-wave transmission, I want to see them continued. I do not wish to see them struck down for reasons other than those which are here in the record.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what other reasons the Senator could have. We were told by Chairman Fly, when he came before our committee, that he wanted to be heard, and I think we heard him with fairness and consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not making any complaint about the hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. We gave him every consideration.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have made no complaints about the hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thought perhaps the Senator was complaining.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] asked me whether I thought Senators would not be interested in the saving of lives, and I simply wanted to say that I was putting the facts in the RECORD so that every Senator would at least be presumed to know what he was doing when he voted on this amendment, and that I did not want to see the amendment defeated for reasons which are not in the public record.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator refers to a lone instance in which a plane cracked up.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I quoted the general's letter in which he said, among other things, that in addition to these specific instances—

> Other instances too numerous to mention have occurred in which the assistance given by the Federal Communications Commission has been of inestimable value. The facilities of the Federal Communications Commission have been, and still are, absolutely necessary to the successful operation of the Army's lost-plane procedure in the Hawaiian area.

Mr. President, I do not wish to divulge anything which by direction or indirection might be considered to be military information, but I do wish to say that all any Senator needs to do is to look at a map of the Pacific in order to realize that in the operations in the Pacific there lies the greatest hazard from the loss of planes and equipment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that many times private radio companies have saved lives in exactly the same way, but I should doubt the wisdom of subsidizing private radio companies under such circumstances, just as I am opposed to subsidizing this particular civilian activity of the Government.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this is not a subsidy. This is an appropriation to carry out the statutory functions of the Federal Communications Commission. They are charged with the responsibility of seeing that all licensed broadcasters in the United States, and in all the Territories of the United States, operate in accordance with their licenses so far as radio frequency, their antenna system, their equipment, and the amount of power fed into the system is concerned. Every Senator who listens at all to the radio in the United States, especially if he is located near a metropolitan center, knows that it is absolutely essential to keep every broadcaster within the terms of his license lest the already confused situation in the broadcasting spectrum be made more so by unauthorized utilization of power or of frequency.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. In addition, the Federal Communications Commission have the second duty, namely, to protect the broadcasting system of the country from illegal interference.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly. I have mentioned that. For instance, if a transformer at a subpower station near Philadelphia on the Pennsylvania Railroad System begins to leak it may upset the entire reception of radio signals for miles around, because of the leak being of a high-frequency character. It is the duty of the Commission, under the law, to locate that leak and have it corrected. They do that all the time. I have before me a map which shows where these stations are located. I shall be glad to show the map to any Senator who desires to look at it. It will be seen that the stations are scattered at strategic places all over the United States, and are located at those places for the reason that broadcasting extends all over the United States. It is necessary for the Commission constantly to monitor those stations in order to make certain they are operating according to their licenses. It is also necessary to locate unnecessary interference as a result of transmission lines, and transformer or power-station leaks. It is also necessary to locate the use of equipment of a high-frequency character such as X-ray, diathermy, and other machines of a similar nature.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The statement has been made that military experts have casually made mention of this service, and the Senator has just touched upon a very vital area. I hold in my hand a letter which is not in the record or in the hearings, and, because of its confidential nature, I cannot quote it in its entirety, but it bears on the activities indicated on the mapped area which the Senator has just mentioned. It commends the Federal Communications Commission for their services in the west coast-Hawaiian areas. It concludes by saying:

> Insofar as it will not interfere with the continued functioning of this service, the Army Air Forces are pleased to have the opportunity to make emergency use of your present direction-finding facilities.

The letter is signed by H. H. Arnold, lieutenant general, commanding general of the Army Air Forces.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Are we to understand from the excerpt which was read by the Senator from New York that neither the Army nor the Navy deems this service to be essential?

Mr. MEAD. We are to construe it, if I may say so, as a commendation by the Army and Navy of the Federal Communications Commission for its cooperation in the past, and as an expression of their desire to make continued use of these direction-finding facilities.

Mr. McCARRAN. But nothing in the excerpt read by the Senator from New York is to be construed as an expression of the Army or the Navy that this service is not essential.

Mr. MEAD. Nor is it to be construed in any way to take issue with the findings of the Commander in Chief, who took issue with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the Radio Intelligence Division monitors the radio spectrum to detect any unlicensed radio activity; and it is engaged in running down and eliminating radio signals from the improper operation of authorized transmitters and many medical, commercial, and industrial devices which interfere with our essential radio circuits. This work has been lodged by the Congress in the civilian agency charged with regulation of radio since the first Radio Act of 1910—the Department of Commerce until 1927, the Federal Radio Commission from 1927 to 1933, and the Federal Communications Commission since 1934. Through the years in the past and through the years to come it has been and will be the duty of the Commission to license stations, to see that they are operated so as to avoid interfering with other stations, and to patrol the ether to detect any unlicensed operations. This is the necessary and continuing function of this regulatory Commission.

Yet if the action of the House and the recommendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee shall be accepted, the activities of the Radio Intelligence Division will be crippled and rendered practically ineffective.

Even if the question were presented here, which clearly it is not, it would be wholly unwise to turn this Commission's regulatory work over to the military agencies and have them carrying on this regulatory work throughout the length and breadth of this land. As the Senator from New York suggested this morning, because we are engaged in war and

because the Interstate Commerce Commission, in its control of the railroads, regulates an essential war activity, we might just as well, and for the same lack of reason, turn over the activities and the regulatory functions of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the armed services. When the F. C. C. has the job of running down the unlicensed transmitters, necessarily it has the job of running down the unlicensed transmitters which are operated by spies—in other words, the clandestine stations. There is not only no other feasible way to do this job, but the fact of the matter is, there is no other way to do it.

In other words, if the Commission monitors the ether from this network of stations [indicating on map] established over the United States for the purpose of policing the ether so far as the domestic broadcasters are concerned, both on the broadcast band and on the short-wave band, of necessity the F. C. C. has to and should pick up any activity by any unlicensed espionage agent who may be trying to communicate with his principal in an Axis country. The record shows that 360 unlicensed activities have been found; one was found by this service in the German Embassy here, immediately after Pearl Harbor.

I firmly believe that it is because of this efficient activity that there has been so little effort made by the Axis to establish unlicensed and illegal operations of an espionage character. If we cripple the activities of the Commission in this field, we will invite the Axis agents to set up such stations.

No other agency of the Government does this work. The Army and Navy make no claim to doing it. The trial of the large group of spies in New York City a couple of years ago, which was so effectively prosecuted by the Department of Justice, was largely a radio trial. And it was the Radio Intelligence Division men who did the radio-location work involved and who monitored the circuits to pick up and record the traffic, and who testified at the trial leading to the conviction of those spies. Does the Senate want to vote to make that service less efficient; does the Senate want to vote to cripple it so that spies can more freely communicate with their principals in the Axis enemy countries?

I have referred to the transmitter in the German Embassy on Massachusetts Avenue in this very city, but I want the Senate to know that the Radio Intelligence Division had that transmitter located before it had even succeeded in establishing contact with Germany.

Mr. President, I cannot find any contention in the record that the armed services have done a single thing about closing out the espionage nests in Central and South America. The record is very clear, and it shows that the very same radio-location stations on United States territory were utilized to "fix"—that is a technical term—the approximate location of each one of those stations. Commission representatives went to those neighboring countries under the general direction of Secretary Hull and there, cooperating with the local governments, effectively assisted in closing out the espionage radio operations in Central and South America. I may say, Mr. President, that more important than eliminating and preventing the reopening of any illicit, illegal radio communications in Central and South America with our enemies, is preventing their reopening here in the United States and elsewhere in our territory.

In fact, the Army and Navy have continuously in the past recognized and today recognize that this work is the responsibility of the Commission. When in 1940 it was found advisable to expand the facilities for doing this work to meet the needs of national defense, the Commission was furnished a large amount of key equipment by the Navy and sites for 40 secondary stations at Army posts throughout the country by the Army. At that time Rear Admiral Ingersoll, Acting Chief of Naval Operations, recognized the Commission's responsibility in this field when on August 31, 1940, he informed all naval ships and stations:

> The Federal Communications Commission is generally responsible for the surveillance of unlicensed radio stations. * * * The Navy should accord the greatest cooperation to the Commission in this surveillance which is of great importance to national defense.

And when war came, the responsibility of the Commission for this work was specifically confirmed. On December 31, 1941, Rear Admiral Noyes, Director of Naval Communications, wrote the Commission's Chief Engineer as follows:

> The Federal Communications Commission has a very important assignment in detecting, locating, and suppressing clandestine radio stations in the United States.

Similarly General Arnold wrote the Commission on October 21, 1942:

> The Federal Communications Commission has performed an excellent service in preventing or detecting unlicensed radio operation and subversive communications.

The Army and Navy, like the other Government agencies, including the F. B. I., rely on the Commission to run down illegal and clandestine operations and to eliminate signals interfering with their radio circuits in this country.

That is the point I should like to drive home, Mr. President. It is entirely possible that if faulty electrical equipment throws out interference, it not only will interfere with domestic broadcasters in this country, in their particular areas or localities, but it may very well interrupt the most important military traffic being carried through the ether by the Army or the Navy or the Coast Guard. Do Senators want to curtail and injure and reduce the efficiency of this division, and have that happen?

Would the Army and Navy report these cases to the Federal Communications Commission for investigation if they were already doing the work themselves? Of course not; yet in the past few years thousands of such cases have come to the Federal Communications Commission from the military services. Just a few days ago Senators may have noticed the news account of the arrest of three Japanese internees who were operating a transmitter at a prison camp. Had the Army been able to cover this, it is passing strange that it relied upon the Commission to do the job.

The simple fact is that the Federal Communications Commission is the only agency doing this work in this country, and if we want it done—and it must be done—we must make the necessary funds available to the Commission for doing it.

One other point I want to stress is that the same stations which are necessary to running down unlicensed and clandestine operations and to eliminating interference are used most effectively in carrying on other related work. In other words, the Commission must have these stations to fulfill the duties we have explicitly placed upon it. But at the same time, these same Commission facilities—as I have shown them on the map, scattered over the United States and located in our Territories—are used extensively by other Government departments, including the Department of State, the Foreign Economic Administration, the Weather Bureau, the F. B. I., the Office of Censorship, and others. For example, the Army and Navy, as well as the Civil Aeronautics Administration, have found these facilities most valuable in helping to save aircraft which have lost their way. The Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Army Air Forces have even asked to have special procedure set up for invoking the aid of the Commission's facilities.

On May 29, 1943, after one particularly spectacular case, Major General Giles, Acting Chief of the Air Staff, wrote Chairman Fly:

> General Arnold wishes me to tell you that he genuinely appreciates the splendid assistance which the Radio Intelligence Division of the engineering department of your Commission gave to the Air Transport Command in connection with the rescue and recovery of the marooned flyers and their planes from northern Quebec. The emergency direction-finding service rendered by the Radio Intelligence Division is an excellent example of the direct aid which a civilian agency may give to the Army in the prosecution of this total war.

In all, the record shows the Commission has rendered emergency direction-finding services to more than 400 lost aircraft. It is now being called upon at least twice every day to give aid to Army aircraft which have lost their bearings. It takes the saving of but one or two planes to get back for the Government the million dollars which the Radio Intelligence Division needs to carry on its present work.

Mr. President, that does not even bring into consideration our urgent responsibility to save every one of these young men who can be saved. We owe it to their families, we owe it to their friends, we owe it to the United States. It takes a long time to train these men for combat, bomber, and transport flying.

Mr. TRUMAN. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. I approve what the able senior Senator from Wisconsin has said. It seems absurd to train these young men and to build these planes, and

then, in case of emergency, take away a chance to save not only the young men, but the planes, and contribute to the welfare of the whole country.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator; I knew he would feel that way about it.

For the life of me I cannot understand why an effort should be made to cripple this service, which is required by statute, which must be carried on if the broadcasting spectrum is to be policed, and there is to be any order in it whatsoever; and God knows there is not enough order in it now, because of the multiplicity of stations, and their close proximity on the wave bands.

As a part of its general activity, the Commission is able to render this service. Senators can ignore a statement such as that contained in Brig. Gen. William J. Flood's letter if they wish to, but, so far as I am concerned, it would be worth every dollar involved in the amendment if only one bomber and its crew, or even just the crew, were saved. I go further; it would be worth more than a hundred times this appropriation if we could save only one of these fine young men, who represent the cream of America's youth.

I say again, Mr. President, that the burden of proof is upon those who wish to strike down this service, and there is not a scintilla of evidence in the record, aside from Admiral Leahy's letter, to which I am coming, upon which to predicate and to justify this action.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For what purpose?

Mr. HATCH. I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, because the Senator from Wisconsin is making a very able argument on this all-important matter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to be entirely frank with the Senator. I shall not yield for that purpose, because the Senate is not interested in this subject. The votes have already been lined up to kill this amendment. But I want the record made here, so that when some one of these planes, or more, go down at sea, and the crews are not rescued, those who are primarily concerned may be able to turn to the roll call on this amendment and find out who is responsible for it.

I also wish to say, Mr. President, that, in my humble opinion, the defeat of this amendment is not going to build up political sentiment for any group that takes part in such action.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. I am not going to make that suggestion now. The Senator has said that the Senate is not interested in the question he is discussing. I am afraid the Senator is wrong in that statement. I think Senators would be interested if they could be present and hear the discussion which the Senator from Wisconsin is making. For that reason I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I must decline to yield for that purpose.

I believe that not only one or two lost planes but many planes will be saved if this money is made available. There will be many planes lost if it is not made available. In the brief time the debate on the floor proceeded last Thursday the Radio Intelligence Division was giving emergency aid to two B–24 bombers.

As I have said, the facilities necessary to track down the radio spy and an interfering signal are most effectively used in related work for other Government agencies. If the Senate should kill these very related uses of these same facilities, it not only would not be eliminating duplication but it would be requiring duplication; for in this respect, I repeat what I said in the beginning, the Federal Communications Radio Intelligence Division and its Foreign Broadcast Division are simply operating as service agencies, in addition, so far as the Federal Radio Intelligence Division is concerned, to complying with the statutory requirements that it police the ether.

Suppose the Senate kills this service. Is it not obvious that General Arnold will be forced to duplicate these stations and these operations? In the name of economy are Senators going to vote to build up a new set of these stations all over the United States, perhaps two or three sets of them, one to serve the Army, and one to serve the Navy? Is that economy? Senators cannot deny that the Commission must continue carrying on as best it can the business of policing the broadcast bands.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am very much interested in what my colleague has said. He is a member of the Appropriations Committee——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I wish to disabuse the Senator's mind. I do not have that honor.

Mr. WILEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I should like to ask my colleague one question. Apparently the House has taken action differing from what he suggests should be done. The Senate committee has also taken action different from what my colleague suggests. Could the Senator briefly enlighten me as to what were the reasons for the action thus taken by the House and by the Senate committee? In other words, how would they answer the argument which my colleague has made?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in all fairness I do not think the Senator should call on me to make an argument in support of the committee's position, to which I am opposed. As the Senator knows, I am not a lawyer, but I believe even a good lawyer would be embarrassed if he were asked to change clients in the midst of his argument and instead of being for the defense, go over to the prosecution. But I will say to my colleague that a diligent search of the House committee testimony and a diligent search of the Senate committee testimony does not show one scintilla of evidence to justify the action of the House or of the Senate committee, with the exception of Admiral Leahy's letter to the Secretary of the Navy, which I shall discuss before I take my seat. I wish again to emphasize that, although that letter was marked "Highly Secret," it was made public by a committee of the other House, and therefore is a matter of public property and I feel at liberty to discuss it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Was that letter written before or after the President's reply?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was written before the President's reply. It was written back in the spring of 1943. It was written February 1, 1943, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] tells me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly, of course, the President not only took into consideration all that Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox said to him, but also what Admiral Leahy had said.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course. There was an exhaustive investigation made. The charge was made here last Thursday in the form of a question by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], that this proved that the President was running the war on a political basis and interfering with the military and the naval authorities, but Mr. President, this letter and the action of the President in this regard, so far as a civilian agency is concerned, certainly do not prove that contention. I do not want to go into that letter now, but I shall digress long enough to say that although I have the highest admiration for Admiral Leahy, it is my firm conviction that he did not personally make the investigation and that the person who made it was not sufficiently informed concerning the situation. The subsequent investigation and study of the situation ordered by the President after he received the letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy lasted for many months. He did not reply until some time in September of 1943. In his letter he denied Admiral Leahy's contentions, and then created an agency better to coordinate the activities of the various agencies in the radio field. But I do not want to go into that at the moment. I have nearly concluded.

Mr. President, I want to iterate what I have said before, that the Commission has not rendered any of these services to the military—and that includes the Army, the Navy, and Coast Guard—except by specific request in each and every instance. It does not make sense to me that the military authorities would request these services in these hundreds of instances, accept the services, and express their gratitude for the result attained, and then continue to call for additional services, if in fact they had their own duplicating facilities to do this work. I do not believe that the Senate will believe that when it comes to consider the question.

The Federal Communications Commission has worked in cooperation with all the departments of Government which rely upon its services. The inevitable effect, as I suggested a few moments ago,

of accepting the action of the House and the recommendations of the Senate committee will be to invite these agencies to set up duplicating services which in the end will cost many millions of dollars more than is involved in the amendment of the Senator from New York. At the same time it should be pointed out that in connection with this initial action we are not supplying the money to provide these services anywhere else. So the net effect of our action, if the Senate rejects the amendment of the Senator from New York and adopts the committee amendment, will be to cripple or to destroy this service, and not set up anything in its place. That is why I want to emphasize that if we take such action the majority of the Senate must accept responsibility for the consequences, including the failure to rescue military planes lost at sea. These operations will die, and the ether will be thrown open to the enemies of this country. Mr. President, I submit that we could ill afford to indulge in such folly at the most critical and crucial period in our history.

I now wish to refer to the letter of Admiral Leahy, which apparently is the only authority which could be obtained by appropriations committees; at least, it is the only authority I have been able to find in the record of either the House committee or the Senate committee. The letter is dated February 1, 1943. As I have said, the responsibility for releasing it was assumed by the House committee, so I feel free to discuss it. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In response to your memorandum to the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated September 11, 1942, on the subject of responsibility for the conduct of security of military communications activities, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have had made a thorough and comprehensive study of the problems referred to therein in which full consideration has been given to the views of the military and naval commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence. A summary of the findings is given in the following paragraphs—

Mr. President, I wish to digress from the reading of the letter long enough to say that I am informed that no member of the Federal Communications Commission or, insofar as the Commission could ascertain, none of the Commission's employees engaged in either one of these two activities, namely, the Radio Intelligence Division and the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Division, was ever contacted by anyone representing either the Army or the Navy, and no examination was made of the Commission's facilities, except for a survey of the Commission's security methods, namely, its methods of preventing its information from "leaking" out to unauthorized persons. That record has already been read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But the report of the inspecting officer was that the security methods of the Commission were excellent. If I can put my hand on the report, perhaps I should make it a part of my own remarks at this point. The report is to be found on page 111 of the Senate committee record. It is directed to the Secretary, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, D. C., through Commander G. B. Myers, and is signed by Earle F. Cook, lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps. It reads as follows:

1. In compliance with J. C. S. 138/3, dated December 1, 1942, subject: Security of Ciphers, and in accordance with the allocation of Government agencies made to the Army and Navy Security Sections, respectively, the following summary of findings at the Federal Communications Commission is submitted:

(a) Cryptographic security—excellent.

(b) Physical security (cryptographic systems)—excellent.

(c) Documentary and information security—excellent.

(d) Qualification of personnel—excellent.

(e) Cooperation was given fully and willingly.

2. In view of the above, it is considered that no concern need be felt over communications originating or passed in the Federal Communications Commission organization at this time.

3. The established contact between Signal Security Service and the Federal Communications Commission will be continued.

For the Chief Signal Officer:

EARLE F. COOK,
Lieutenant Colonel, Signal Corps.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me inquire what is the date of that communication?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. April 6, 1943. That was 2 months after Admiral Leahy's letter was written. I read further from the admiral's letter:

In general, radio intelligence is the method of determining the enemy's plans and dispositions through observation of his radio communications. The facilities used for this are also used to assist our own forces through monitoring of communications channels to enforce security standards and to render assistance to our own craft.

Mr. President, in that paragraph Admiral Leahy was referring clearly to military and naval intelligence in the narrow sense of the expression. Neither the Federal Communications Commission nor any of its divisions does any military or naval intelligence work, unless it is specifically requested to do so by someone in the armed forces of the United States.

I read further from Admiral Leahy's letter:

Both the Army and Navy are engaged in radio intelligence and related activities. In addition, the Federal Communications Commission has set up an elaborate system of its own which is engaged in—

(a) The location of enemy units at sea and abroad.

I repeat that the Federal Communications Division does not do such work, except in isolated cases, and then only at the specific request of the Army or the Navy.

The admiral's letter continues:

(b) The interception of enemy army, navy, and diplomatic traffic.

The Federal Communications Commission does not intercept enemy army and navy traffic.

The letter continues:

(c) The location of clandestine stations.

The Federal Communications Commission does locate espionage stations, and has done this job efficiently and well, as I believe the record shows. That work is a responsibility, Mr. President, I reiterate, of the Federal Communications Commission, under the organic act creating it.

The letter continues:

(d) The giving of bearing aids to lost planes.

Mr. President, I wish to state at this point, as I have stated before, that that work is done only at the request of the Army or the Navy, insofar as military aircraft are concerned; and I cited the letter of Brigadier General Giles, the Chief of the Air Corps Staff in the Hawaiian area, saying that this service in helping to locate lost planes in that area is indispensable.

I read further from Admiral Leahy's letter:

(e) The maintenance of a "marine watch" at distress frequencies.

Mr. President, that is a responsibility of the Federal Communications Commission, under the organic act creating it. It has to maintain these marine watches, because if some ship at sea sends out a distress signal, it is the responsibility of the Federal Communications Commission to clear off the air all other traffic in the broadcast band, so that it cannot interfere with efforts to secure aid. Does the Senate wish to cripple that work? The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] suggests that it is also an international obligation under our treaties with other nations.

Continuing to read from Admiral Leahy's letter:

(f) The monitoring of military radio circuits.

Any monitoring of the United States military radio circuits has been done at the request of the Army; and a letter was placed in the RECORD on Thursday by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] commending the Federal Communications Commission for having done this work, thanking it, and saying that it had helped to suppress some obscene matter going over the air from military stations, and that in each and every instance those who were responsible and who could be proved guilty had been disciplined.

These activities of the Federal Communications Commission are constantly expanding and are a substantial drain upon available material and personnel.

Mr. President, the expansion was coordinated with and approved by the Army and Navy at every step. There was no drain on personnel. The Radio Intelligence Division has only 700 men, compared to the thousands of men in the Signal Corps. There is no drain on material, as the Radio Intelligence Division equipment is a mere drop in the bucket compared to that of the Signal Corps, and is not designed to military specifications.

Admiral Leahy's letter continues:

Radio-intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission tend to be less and less useful as the art progresses. This is due to integration into proper radio-

intelligence systems of large quantities of secret military information accumulated through special processes by the armed forces, including exchanges of military information with our allies, knowledge of present and proposed disposition of forces, and other special information which for obvious reasons cannot be disseminated to an agency such as the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that the portion of the paragraph which I have just read is based upon the erroneous assumption that the Radio Intelligence Division of the Federal Communications Commission is engaged in military radio intelligence work. It is not, and the record shows that it is not. It does not perform such work.

Continuing to read from Admiral Leahy's letter:

Moreover, information obtained by the Federal Communications Commission through its own radio-intelligence activities is not, in the military sense, secure, due to inherent tendencies toward publicity of Federal Communications Commission activities, the use of nonsecure methods of reporting and correlation, and the necessarily close relationship of the Federal Communications Commission military intelligence activity with other phases of the agency's work.

Mr. President, I have already read from Lieutenant Cook's letter, written to the Joint Chiefs of Staff after Admiral Leahy's letter was written. On every score, the Colonel found the Commission's security methods, in the narrow military sense, to be excellent, and commended the Commission for its cooperation in that respect.

Coming back to the Admiral's letter:

Because of the essential differences between military and Federal Communications Commission standards and methods, it has not been possible to integrate their information, with the result that the attempted duplication by the Federal Communications Commission of work that is being more effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence.

Mr. President, I repeat that the Federal Communications Commission does not engage in military radio intelligence, and therefore there is neither opportunity nor occasion for the integration of its work.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the record is replete with letters from men in important positions in the military, attesting to the effective and valuable service rendered by the Radio Intelligence Division. As the record shows, General Strong, who is at the head of G-2 of the Army, has commended the work of the Commission in regard to its other activities.

Continuing to quote from Admiral Leahy's letter:

In view of the foregoing it is concluded that the better prosecution of the war will be served by terminating all military and quasi-military radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commisison and confining such activities to the Army and Navy.

As I have said, Mr. President—and I repeat—there is nothing to terminate, because there is no radio intelligence service, in the narrow military sense of the word, being carried on by the Federal Communications Commission, unless and except in those rare instances in which the assistance of the Commission is requested by responsible personnel in the Army or Navy.

Quoting further from Admiral Leahy's letter:

Since the Army's present need for personnel and equipment in the field of radio intelligence is greater than that of the Navy, all of the radio-intelligence facilities of the Federal Communications Commission should forthwith be transferred to the Army entirely. The personnel of the Federal Communications Commission heretofore engaged in radio intelligence should be made available initially as civilian employees of the Army, pending decision by the Army as to which shall be placed in military status, which replaced by military personnel, and which would be best retained in the Army as civilian employees.

The chief of the Signal Corps of the Army does not want the facilities of the Federal Communications Commission transferred to the Signal Corps. Senators will find his letter in the hearings.

Continuing to quote from Admiral Leahy's letter:

The foregoing conclusions are supported by the views of the Army and Navy commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff therefore request the Secretaries of War and Navy to join in a recommendation to the President that he transfer to the Army personnel and equipment now used by the Federal Communications Commission in the field of radio intelligence. A proposed Executive order is enclosed.

From the standpoint of the present problem, the promulgation of this Executive order would leave the Federal Communications Commission in the radio field, with the responsibility for monitoring, processing, and disseminating foreign voice news, and propaganda broadcasts (its Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service), the monitoring and inspection of stations licensed under the Communications Act of 1934, all necessary licensing procedures, including revocation and suspension, and the institution of prosecutions of licensed stations and operators for violations of treaty, statute, or regulations.

Mr. President, if I correctly understand it, that was a recommendation made by Admiral Leahy that the entire civil functions of the Federal Communications Commission, so far as licensing of radio and its policing, and all the rest of it is concerned, should be turned over to the armed forces. I submit, Mr. President, that I do not believe any Senator would be in favor of such a proposal. As I stated a moment ago, we might as well transfer to the Army all the activities of the Federal Power Commission and of the Interstate Commerce Commission merely because electric power and railroad transportation are vitally important activities in our war effort. Yet I am sure there would be no proposal to cripple those agencies or to turn their machinery over to the armed forces. Yet that is what, in effect, the admiral recommends. If that action were to be taken, we might just as well abolish the Federal Communications Commission.

The remainder of the letter is as follows:

The Army and Navy—in accordance with divisions of function between themselves—would have full and exclusive responsibility for the conduct of military radio intelligence as described in the present report.

Mr. President, after that letter was sent to the respective Secretaries of War and of the Navy they sent a joint letter to the President of the United States asking him to carry out this recommendation, and also asking that an Executive order be issued which would effectuate the recommendations contained in the letters of the Secretary of War and of the Secretary of the Navy. When their letter was received, the President of the United States caused an investigation to be made of this entire question. Following the usual procedure in the Executive Office when conflicting questions of an administrative character arise, the President called upon and utilized the Bureau of the Budget to make the inquiry. I noticed in reading the hearings that there was some criticism of the Bureau of the Budget indulging in this activity. It may be that the Bureau of the Budget has gone outside of the field which was contemplated when it was created, but every Senator familiar with the development of administrative procedure in the executive arm of the Government knows that the Bureau of the Budget had become the operating arm of the Executive Office insofar as the organization of governmental agencies and structures is concerned. Be that as it may, I assume no Senator questions the right of the President to utilize the Bureau of the Budget to conduct this inquiry. But in any case a very thorough study was made of the whole question by the Bureau of the Budget. The investigation presumably continued for some time.

The President then wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, dated September 7, 1943. Senators will bear in mind that Admiral Leahy's letter was dated February 1, 1943. After having this investigation made, and after having received the recommendation from the Bureau of the Budget, the President wrote the following letter:

SEPTEMBER 7, 1943.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in response to your letter of February 8, 1943, signed by you and Secretary Stimson, proposing an Executive order transferring the radio intelligence functions of the Federal Communications Commission to the War and Navy Departments. Your suggestion has been given careful study by the staff of the Executive offices. After full consideration I have determined that the transfer should not be made.

The work of the Radio Intelligence Division of the Commission was founded upon the long existing radio-monitoring functions carried on by the Commission as a part of its essential peacetime work.

I interrupt the reading of the President's letter long enough to say that it is a statutory obligation which the Congress has placed on the Commission.

The need for the expansion of these functions was brought to my attention prior to our entry into the war and I approved the

general set-up. Expansion has been made to meet the wartime needs of the Commission itself and of other agencies of the Government.

The Radio Intelligence Division serves important wartime needs of several of the civilian Government agencies in the radio intelligence field, including the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Office of Censorship, the Bureau of Economic Warfare—

Which has since become the Foreign Economic Administration—

the Weather Bureau, the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, and others. In addition, I understand that the Commission stands ready to perform for the Army and Navy such services as are expressly requested by them. The Commission and its Chairman have expressed to me their desire to cooperate with the Army and Navy in every possible way.

It is my desire that matters of the kind presented by the present proposal be dealt with at the outset by conferences between the interested agencies. If differences should occur, the matter should be reviewed by the Board of War Communications, which is the responsible interdepartmental body I have charged with the responsibility in the field of wartime communications.

Very sincerely yours.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to say that the service which is being performed, insofar as it is outside the field of actual Commission's statutory responsibility in policing the ether, is performed for a large number of agencies and departments of Government solely upon their specific request. Therefore, it seems to me that the President was correct in his conclusion that the entire regulatory functions of the Federal Communications Commission should not be turned over to the armed services, because, with all due respect to the armed services, it must be obvious to anyone that if that were done they would be solely concerned with the matters directly related to the military, and that they would not render the service which the Federal Communications Commission is now rendering to other agencies and departments of Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noted the date of the letter from the President was September 7, 1943.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator refresh my memory by stating the date of the letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, in which they stated that they did not need this service?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was dated February 8, 1943, and was based on the letter of Admiral Leahy dated February 1, 1943, which I read paragraph by paragraph, and answered paragraph by paragraph.

Mr. AIKEN. I note that there was a difference in time of about 8 months between the letter from the President and that from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. The Bureau of the Budget made a thorough investigation of the matter. If the Senator has had any contact with the Bureau of the Budget, he knows that whatever else they may be charged with, they are extremely thorough.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the Senator's argument is that the Federal Communications Commission has far better facilities for doing this work than the Army and the Navy have.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is not any question about it. It is quite natural that, so far as the Radio Intelligence Division was concerned, they should have been brought into the consideration through helping to find lost planes, helping to prevent espionage stations from being set up in this country, and helping to eliminate them in Central and South America, because they had this monitoring system scattered all over the United States which had already been set up. It was their duty to have it, and they had to have it in order to police the ether, insofar as the domestic broadcasters were concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know whether any testimony on this subject has been given by the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and by the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, since last February?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is not one scintilla of evidence in either the House or the Senate hearings to justify the action, except the letter of Admiral Leahy. Concerning that letter, I submit that it was written on an erroneous assumption that the Federal Communications Commission was dealing with military radio intelligence in the narrow sense of the word, whereas the record and the facts show that they were doing no such thing. As I have already said, I have great respect for Admiral Leahy, but I feel convinced, after making a study of this matter myself, that he did not make the investigation himself, and that the person who submitted the material in the draft of the letter for Admiral Leahy's signature was laboring under a misapprehension, largely due, probably, to the fact that the Commission made the mistake of labeling these two divisions, one the "Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service," and the other the "Radio Intelligence Division."

Mr. AIKEN. Was there any testimony from either the Army or the Navy on this particular appropriation bill in regard to this item?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There is no direct testimony. The only testimony that was adduced, as I say, was the letter of Admiral Leahy which the House committee had made public and letters submitted by Mr. Fly from various generals, colonels, and other officers of the armed forces, commending specifically the activities which the Radio Intelligence Division or the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service had undertaken at the request of the Army or the Navy or particular branches of those services, or the Coast Guard.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, there was no direct testimony?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There was none whatever. Remember that the letter upon which the House committee relied, namely the letter of Admiral Leahy, was written more than a year ago, in fact, it was written a year ago last February.

Now, Mr. President, to sum up, there are two items involved here. One is the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, which is the division which is monitoring the foreign propaganda of our enemies, the propaganda which is beamed over the air not only to their own people, but to the people in this country and in every other Allied or neutral nation on earth in their own language, respectively.

Propaganda has become one of the most important weapons of war. Its objective is to mislead, to confuse, to divide, to break down the morale of the enemy or of neutrals. This is the only agency in the Government that is monitoring this foreign propaganda of our enemies and the ether is full of it, Mr. President, night and day, 24 hours a day; the Axis stations are never silent.

Now, because this is a global war, it is impossible for any one of our allies to set up listening or monitoring services which can hear all the stations of our enemies. They, too, are scattered around the world. Since this service was inaugurated—and it was inaugurated at the request of Secretary Hull—it has been integrated into the monitoring systems of our allies, and daily information picked up by the British monitoring service for example is sent here by cable, so that it may be interlarded with information obtained by our service, and similarly the information which we gather is cabled abroad, since the British do not have access and cannot listen as well as we can to the broadcasts of Japan.

One of the items involved in this matter is an increase in the appropriation for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service so that it may send agents to Hawaii, which, of course, is closer to the Orient, and set up a monitoring service there, which would be less liable to static or other interference than are the stations located along the Pacific coast.

Mr. President, the House cut $500,000 from that item and the Senate committee has confirmed the action of the House. Do we want to stick our fingers in our ears and fail to know what the propaganda line of the Axis is? Do you think, Mr. President, it is unimportant to know what is being beamed to North America from Germany and Japan? Do you think it is unimportant to know what is being beamed to Central and South America by our enemies? Do you not think it is important to know what the Japanese are saying to the Burmese in their propaganda broadcasts? Do you not think it is important to know what the Japanese are saying to the people of China?

Mr. President, we might as well say that we will have no tanks in our Army; it would be just as retrogressive, just as unjustified for us to refuse to recognize the effectiveness of enemy propaganda as a military weapon as it would be to fail to recognize the contribution of the German staff to the use of mechanized forces in warfare. Yet if the Senate shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from New York, it

will be voting to cripple the Service, if not to destroy it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that Hitler has won more victories and far greater victories with his propaganda than he has won with his mechanized troops or his air power or any of his lethal weapons? His greatest victories have been won by propaganda; have they not?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am not able to answer that question, but I am able to say that a man must be deaf, dumb, and blind if he does not know that enemy propaganda is a part and parcel of their military strategy, and that it changes from day to day and from week to week as the exigencies of the military situation require. If anyone does not believe it is effective, let him recall what happened to the British in Singapore and in Burma, and to the Dutch in Java. If there is anyone who thinks that foreign propaganda and the cry of the Japanese of "Asia for the Asiatics" had not softened up the civilian populations of areas in Asia and the south seas, then he has not read the story of Singapore and Burma and the Javanese campaigns.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In Norway, Denmark, Belgium, France, and other countries that Hitler overran he first softened them up, as the Senator so well has expressed it, by his propaganda, and thus made it easier for his air forces and army.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. They have tried to soften up the American people. I do not think they will do that; but if you knew, Mr. President, that there were 200,000 Axis agents in the United States distributing pamphlets to the American people 24 hours a day, would you not be concerned about knowing what the pamphlets were and trying to answer them? The enemy do not have to do it with pamphlets, they do not have to do it with the printed word any more; they do it with the short-wave radio beamed to this country, beamed to Central America, beamed to South America, beamed to every one of the Allied Nations and to every neutral nation of the world, trying to create dissension, trying to appeal to the emotions of people, trying to divide, trying to mislead. Yet it is proposed, Mr. President, that we stick our fingers in our ears and refuse to know or to ascertain what they are doing.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Wisconsin have been talking about things that are in the past. I am thinking about things that are to come in the immediate future; I am thinking of the time when the second front starts, when the invasion begins, when the loss of life is going to be extremely heavy and the propaganda is going to emanate, God knows to what extent and where it will reach. Why should we cripple ourselves in the face of the things that we know are coming?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator has said. I hasten to add that I am interested in what will happen in the future. We will not be able to intercept any foreign propaganda such as went over the air last night, when this service is crippled. I was only citing what had happened in the past in the hope I could cause Senators to consider this situation on its merits.

I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from New Mexico. It leads me to go one step further. There are, I do not know how many young men and women from the United States, who will be involved in the great military operation now impending. There will be scarcely an area in the United States which will not have a flesh-and-blood interest in it. Do not Senators think it is important to know what the Berlin radio may be saying about those operations, and about the casualties, so that we may give out all the facts, and whatever may be necessary to meet any of those statements?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to add that I did not want the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senator from Alabama to think that I was finding fault with them for giving instances from the past.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I felt sure of that.

Mr. HATCH. I do not want to be misunderstood.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So much for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator is making such an able speech that I apologize for interrupting him.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is all right.

Mr. HILL. I am sure the Senator has emphasized the fact that the Japs and Nazis record every broadcast they can pick up anywhere from our country, or from any of the other Allied countries.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly. Now one more word on the foreign-broadcast situation. Monitoring helps to pick up a certain amount of information which may be invaluable in other respects, aside from the standpoint of propaganda.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Alabama just asked a question as to what Germany was doing. I wonder what the Senator from Alabama or the Senator from Wisconsin would say as to what the Signal Service of the United States is doing. We have the grandest system of communication by radio among all the nations in the world today, and we are spending more money on it. I shall give the figures in a few moments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator has any figures or any information to show that the work the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service of the F. C. C. is being performed by any other agency of the Government, it is not to be found in either the House or the Senate committee hearings, and that is all I have to go on.

So far as the Radio Intelligence Division is concerned, as distinguished from the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, the Radio Intelligence Division is the Division which is discharging a statutory responsibility which Congress has laid upon the Federal Communications Commission, namely, to police the ether here at home, to make certain that there is no interference caused by either inadvertent or deliberate violation of the broadcaster's license through the broadening of his kilocycle band, through the use of imperfect or defective equipment, or some faulty utilization of his antenna system.

Likewise the Commission is charged with locating, and constantly, through the Radio Intelligence Division, it has located and has corrected the interference created by commercial, industrial, or physiotherapy apparatus. That portion of their work is important to the Army and Navy, because it can interfere with their communications just as much as it can with the domestic broadcasters' service.

In connection with carrying out its work, and because the Commission already has this system of monitoring stations, the Commission, through the Radio Intelligence Division, has been effective in suppressing and in preventing enemy agents from utilizing radio as a means of communication with their principals in the Axis countries. It likewise has been very effective through the Department of State in helping to eliminate and to suppress and to prevent future establishment of espionage stations in Central and South America operated by Axis agents.

Thirdly, it has rendered invaluable assistance to the armed forces in obtaining radio "fix," as they call it, upon lost planes at sea or planes which are lost in the air and, because they send out from their own equipment a message, it is possible, through these stations, to take bearings on them and practically to locate them. The testimony shows that there have been more than 400 instances of the Radio Intelligence Division rendering such assistance.

The Chief of Staff of our Air Corps in the Hawaiian Islands has stated that this service is indispensable in the Army Air Corps lost-plane activity. Therefore, if this service is crippled or if it is destroyed, it will be more difficult to find such planes and to find the pilots when they have had the misfortune to go down at sea.

Mr. President, I want no part of any such responsibility. So far as I am concerned I shall vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, because I believe that these activities are of vital importance in relation to the war and in relation to the discharge of the statutory obligation by the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin. He always makes a good speech on any subject he undertakes to discuss, and he made a good one on the subject now before the Senate.

The Senator says there is no evidence that the Army uses this radio service. Dr. Leigh so testified, as appears on page 121

of the record, and Dr. Leigh is a member of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service.

Furthermore, I wish to call attention, in a few moments, to a quotation from a letter to the Secretary of the Navy from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. If there is anyone in the world interested in foreign radio it is the Army and the Navy of the United States. The Army and the Navy are not in favor of the continuance of this service, and they believe it is a duplicating service.

The Senator from Wisconsin had much to say about the lack of proof. There is a woeful lack of proof that this service is necessary or essential at this time. There is no proof to that effect. The evidence is of the most shadowy kind. I believe the proof shows that Chairman Fly at one time rather invited the committee to send out and obtain evidence from the Army and the Navy. There was some trouble about getting that evidence, it seemed, or he could not have gotten it, because no Army or Navy officer testified before our committee. On the other hand, it is shown indisputably by the record that the Army and Navy do not want this service. They regard it is an interference with their services. The Army and the Navy have the best radio services, monitoring and intelligence services of every kind, in the world today. I will show the appropriations we have made for those services in the past. The Army and the Navy do not want other services. In view of the fact that the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission himself says that he does not furnish the service except upon the application of the Army or the Navy, why should we provide that it be furnished, when it appears by the record that no request has been made by the Army or the Navy for the service? Why should we do it? If we were to do it it would simply be to accommodate a friend.

I read from a letter to the Secretary of the Navy from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, dated February 1, 1943, a little over a year ago:

> Radio intelligence activities of the Federal Communications Commission tend to be less and less useful as the art progresses.

Does that indicate that they want the radio service of the Federal Communications Commission?

> This is due to integration into proper radio-intelligence systems of large quantities of secret military information accumulated through special processes by the armed forces, including exchanges of military information with our allies, knowledge of present and proposed disposition of forces, and other special information which for obvious reasons cannot be disseminated to an agency such as the Federal Communications Commission.

Is that good sense or is it not? That letter comes from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from the leaders of the Army and the Navy. They have the best kind of service, up-to-date service, they are using the latest in radio, and they say they do not need the more or less out-of-date service of the Federal Communications Commission. Then they proceed:

> Moreover, information obtained by the Federal Communications Commission through its own radio-intelligence activities is not, in the military sense, secure, due to inherent tendencies toward publicity of Federal Communications Commission activities, use of nonsecure methods of reporting and correlation, and the necessarily close relationship of Federal Communications Commission military-intelligence activity with other phases of the agency's work.

Is that an idle statement? Remember this—and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin reiterated it a half dozen times—that the Federal Communications Commission was not to furnish any information except upon application of the Army and Navy. Here we have a letter from the Army and the Navy, speaking through their highest officers, saying that it is not necessary for the Federal Communications Commission to perform this service at all. As a matter of fact, as I have previously said, the Army and the Navy have the best radio service in the world today.

The letter continues:

> Because of the essential differences between military and Federal Communications Commission standards and methods it has not been possible to integrate their information, with the result that the attempted duplication by the Federal Communications Commission of work that is being more effectively done by the military has in fact endangered the effectiveness and security of military radio intelligence.

Not only is the Commission not a help to them, but it is an actual hindrance to them. Are we to proceed and disregard what the heads of our Army and Navy say about this matter? Shall we say, "We are going to give you this information whether you want it or not"? We cannot make them take it. I continue to read:

> The foregoing conclusions are supported by the views of the Army and Navy commanders in the field who are charged with responsibility for military action based on radio intelligence.

Are we to go against the military commanders in the field and give them this service which they say only interferes with the service they already receive? Why should we do that? I should like any Senator who feels that we should do that to rise and give us a reason why it should be done. Why should we insist upon giving them this service when they say they do not want it?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is only one question which perplexes me. I should say that the Senator was on incontestable ground if the letter were dated February 1944. The thing that puzzles me is why in this one city of ours we are so far apart that we have to have information 13 months old?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will read the different letters of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the President he will find the answer.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It is true, I take it, that there is not in the record, from its beginning to its end, any evidence that Admiral Leahy and the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the officers in the field have ever changed their minds about this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not a scintilla of evidence. On the other hand, every indirect bit of evidence there is shows that they still entertain the same view. They say they have already built up the best system of radio that can be devised.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then it is the Senator's opinion, is it not, that the statement made 13 months ago still stands as current so far as the opinion of the War and Navy Departments is concerned?

Mr. McKELLAR. Entirely so. The House has so determined, and our committee, after hearing very extended testimony, so determined. I simply wish to show the Senator the character of the evidence.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I call to the attention of the Senator from Tennessee as well as the Senator from Michigan that these views of the Chiefs of Staff, of Admiral Leahy, and of the Secretaries of War and Navy, were transmitted to the President only in September of 1943.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I asked Mr. Fly to give me the instances in which he could help the Army and the Navy. I asked him why the private radio companies could not give all the information necessary. Everyday we read in the newspapers information furnished by them. The newspapers publish what the private radio companies transmit from all over the world. The Army permits the publication of only what it wants published; and what it wants published is released. I asked Chairman Fly why we should have another service. He said his service was fuller and more complete. I asked him if he would give me an illustration of the fuller and more complete service. I shall read what I asked him and what his replies were:

> Senator McKELLAR. We are at war, and we want to show some substantial contribution to winning the war. You talk about Hitler's speeches, and some of these other speeches. That information is not worth a tinker's hurrah. That is all given out for the purposes of getting as wide circulation as possible. It is all printed and the radio carries it. So why duplicate things in that way?
>
> Mr. FLY. Let me say there is really no duplication of even that simple work, in the sense that anyone gets those speeches completely. For example, you take Hitler's speech.

This is the argument in favor of carrying on this service:

> The newspapers generally come out promptly with what purports to be quotations and comments on Hitler's speeches; but almost invariably they are not only partial excerpts, but they are inaccurate in the various quotations they give—and the most responsible newspapers have those inaccuracies. The American Government wants Hitler's speech, and wants it accurately.
>
> Senator McKELLAR. I don't see how it makes a particle of difference to the American Government what Mr. Hitler says. We are fighting Mr. Hitler and we are going to lick him. What he says or doesn't say is a matter of very small interest in the United States.

Dr. LEIGH. The main interest, I would say, aside from the text of the speech, has to do with changes in Hitler's line, and that is what the Office of War Information wants, being engaged in propaganda all the time. What they want to know is what the other side is saying.

Senator MCKELLAR. We would know that if there were no radio service.

Dr. LEIGH. Yes; in part, but we are set up to do the complete job.

Senator MCKELLAR. So what good does it do? We have radio concerns in this country who can furnish that by radio. We have the telegraph and other agencies that give it in the newspapers. We have gotten used to that. This is a semiprivate thing, sent to certain governmental agencies that may or may not be reading it.

Mr. FLY. I think, Senator, the regular press and radio do not give one-fourth of 1 percent of this material.

Senator MCKELLAR. If they don't give one-fourth of 1 percent of it, it must be as big as all the world.

Mr. FLY. It is. It runs to a couple of million words a day. They don't scratch the surface on it.

* * * * *

Senator MCKELLAR. I was just wondering if you could give us one subject that was of benefit to our Government by reason of your fuller reports of that which the other radio companies get and distribute.

Dr. LEIGH. We are doing what? We are doing what the Military Intelligence, what the State Department, want us to do. For just one thing, there is the request for biographical data on the Japanese Army and Navy personnel, as something they have asked us for. No newspaper would think of getting that.

Senator MCKELLAR. What good would that do? Suppose you have the fullest data as to Hirohito himself, or Tojo, or any other man; what good would it do?

Finally they got around to saying that they had given a fuller detail as to what Hitler had said in a speech, evidently for the purpose of having it repeated in America, and what Ramirez, of Argentina, I believe, had said for the same purpose. How it can benefit the American people to have more propaganda provided for them is simply a mystery to me; I cannot understand it. I do not think the committee understood it. It was for that reason, among other reasons, that the committee reported as it did.

My good friend the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] said that no other activity of government had this responsibility, and that we would have to place it in the hands of some other agency or activity of government. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin is mistaken about that. That responsibility is already in the hands of the Army and the Navy, the War Department and the Navy Department. As I have said, they already have a complete system which is up to date, modern, and the last word in radio, in radio monitoring, and in radio intelligence; and this work on the part of the Federal Communications Commission is declared by the Army and the Navy to be antiquated to some extent, and to be not useful to them in any event.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, why should we appropriate this money to enable the Commission to maintain at work a large force to provide a service which the Army and the Navy do not want? The Army and the Navy say it is their work and their responsibility, and we know that to be so. Under such circumstances, why should we undertake to put it in the hands of a civilian commission?

Mr. President, it is simply plain, good, hard, common sense to ask why we should spend all this money for a service which the Army and the Navy not only admitted but declared to be useful only if the Army and the Navy want it, and when there has been no evidence that the Army and the Navy want it. Why should we insist on providing it regardless of whether the Army and the Navy want it, when they declare it is an interference with the work they already are doing? It seems to me that it would be sheer nonsense to recommend an appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. VANDENBERG rose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I come back to my question, for I think the whole matter, instead of taking 3 hours, could be settled in 3 minutes on the basis of the single question whether the Army and the Navy, the War Department and the Navy Department, would say today what they said 13 months ago. I shall vote with the Senator on the theory that he is correct in believing that they have not changed their minds. If they have changed their minds they can come in within the next 90 days and have a deficiency appropriation with my approval. The sole question is, Do they still hold today the opinion they asserted 13 months ago?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, they have not asserted any other opinion, and their opinion was very positively asserted at that time. Since that time they have built up one of the best services in the world. I think there can be no doubt that they still hold that opinion.

I wish to say to my distinguished friend the Senator from Michigan, whom I admire very extravagantly, that I have not taken anything like 3 hours. I have taken only approximately 15 minutes; and I am afraid I have now taken more time than the matter deserves, because it is contended by some that none of this appropriation should be made. In the committee we cut it down. We did so because when we cut off the funds for a million and a half dollars' worth of work, we realized that there should be some lessening of the personnel of the authority or agency. For that reason we cut out $300,000 from the $4,491,000. I think that is a very small amount by which to reduce the appropriation because of the lessening of the responsibilities and work the Commission will have.

Mr. President, I very much hope that all Senators will vote against the amendment, and will let the matter be thus settled. I know it is in the interest of the people of America. I know it is in the interest of the Army and the Navy and of all other agencies involved in our military effort.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I wish to say a brief word about this situation. I wish to let it be known, first of all, that I shall vote against the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and shall vote to sustain the committee, which has brought the result of its study and deliberations before the Senate.

The amendment is a single amendment, but it deals with four subject matters. First, it undertakes to increase by $209,000 the amount to which the Senate committee reduced the appropriation of the House for certain purposes. I think the action of the committee in reducing that appropriation by that amount is wholly justified. We had previously eliminated from the bill the provision for approximately seven passenger-carrying automobiles, the expense of which would come out of the $209,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. We eliminated 20 passenger cars.

Mr. WHITE. I think that was in a later provision.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No. It is on page 12—"not to exceed 20 passenger-carrying automobiles." What they could be used for I do not know.

Mr. WHITE. I was referring to the item on page 11, line 18.

Mr. MCKELLAR. This item is on page 12.

Mr. WHITE. The item on page 11 says "purchase (not to exceed seven)" passenger-carrying vehicles. The Senate committee cut that out of the House provision, as I understand; but it is relatively unimportant.

Mr. MCKELLAR. There is another provision on the next page, for 20 more.

Mr. WHITE. I will come to that in a moment.

So we reduced the appropriation by whatever seven passenger automobiles would cost. It is to be borne in mind that notwithstanding this reduction of $209,000, the Commission is being given the amount to which it is currently entitled under a previous act of Congress.

So with the purchase and maintenance of seven automobiles eliminated, and with the certainty that the Senate provision gives the Commission the same amount which it currently has, I feel compelled to support the action of the Appropriations Committee in reducing the appropriation.

The second particular reduction is the $300,000 item. Here again we confront very much the same situation. Twenty passenger-carrying automobiles, the purchase of which had been authorized by the House language, have been eliminated from the bill. That certainly accounts for a substantial part of the $300,000 by which the committee reduced the appropriation.

Beyond that is the firm belief on the part of the committee that economies in personnel and in other particulars can be put into effect. Quite beyond the question of these two particular items, I think the great motivating force upon the committee was its conviction that it faces a stern obligation to exercise every possible economy if the fiscal affairs of this Nation are to be kept upon a sound basis. I know how easy it is for departments to ask for money, and I know how difficult it is to raise the money by the processes of taxation, and how

unfortunate it is to raise it by means of borrowing. So what the committee has done with respect to these first two items is a challenge to the Senate to stand by its Appropriations Committee in its effort to force governmental bureaus to effect economies. It sometimes seems that governmental agencies entirely lose sight of the cumulative effects of resistance to appropriation cuts, when spread over the entire organization of the Government. So I ask Senators to support the committee in this small effort in behalf of economy.

There are two other items which have been discussed at some length. I wish to refer to them briefly. There is a provision in the House language, in which the Senate committee has concurred, for a reduction by $500,000 of the amount provided for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service. There is a reduction of $1,000,000 made by the House, in which the Senate committee has concurred, with respect to the other activity about which we have heard so much today.

Personally I have a very substantial respect for the character of work carried on in the monitoring field. It is an activity which is necessary if radio is to be maintained at a high state of efficiency. But when the whole reduction is put into effect, the Federal Communications Commission will still have $4,491,000 out of which the cut can be absorbed. In my opinion that is adequate for its essential services.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the Commission is rendering a service, to be sure. It is rendering a service today to ships of the sea and surface craft over the world; it is rendering a service to our airplanes of the Army and Navy; it is rendering a service to many forms of governmental transportation and communication, but it is not doing it in its own behalf. It is doing it with facilities and agencies very largely under the control of the Army and Navy.

Today the Army and Navy have broadcasting on a short-wave system of communications which reaches to every part of the world. I have a firm belief that the Army and Navy are adequately prepared to carry on their monitoring service as to all matters and things which have to do with national defense. I think for the time being we can put aside every consideration other than national defense. I firmly believe that the Army and Navy are qualified to carry on, to locate their planes which may be threatened with disaster, to locate ships, and to perform every other service in the field of monitoring which may be performed by the Federal Communications Commission.

The other subject has to do with radio broadcasting. The service which the Federal Communications Commission renders is really a listening service. It listens to probably several thousand broadcasts a day, coming from 50 or 60 political units scattered over the world. It has a force of translators, who translate all this material. It is then printed. Let me tell the Senate what use is made of it. Before I do so, I wish Senators to have in mind that what the monitors listen to may be as much that which the alien enemy wants us to hear as what we ourselves may be interested in knowing.

What is done with all this information? Is it sent to the Army and Navy? Is it surrounded by a wall of secrecy? Not at all. Every day the Commission publishes in mimeographed form from 160,000 to 170,000 words, and that material is sent out to whom? It is sent to three or four hundred departments of the Government, and hundreds of persons within those departments. It is sent to representatives of foreign governments in the United States. It is sent to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. It is sent to columnists, commentators, and newspapermen throughout the country. Some of this material is civilian in character and some military. It is publicized to all America and to all the world. That is the thing which so greatly disturbs the Army and Navy. They say that they are better qualified to judge of the significance of broadcasts coming in from enemy countries or from Allied countries. They feel that when a broadcast has to do with the disposition of our troops in the field or the movement of our troops, such material should be gathered together and should be within the control of the Army and Navy, and not made a matter of public record for the possible embarrassment of our military forces.

There is no question as to where the Army and Navy stand on this question. Admiral Leahy, speaking for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Navy, which has been read, in which he urged, on military grounds, that this service should be rendered by the Army and Navy, and not by the Federal Communications Commission. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy concurred in that recommendation. They said that not only did our military authorities here believe in it but that the commanders in the field concurred in it. They sent a letter to the President of the United States asking that those functions be transferred. What happened? Whom did the President consult? He did not consult the military authorities of the Government or those who are making the plans for the prosecution of this war. But he turned to that meddling organization, the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget advised the President of the United States as to who should have this responsibility and should carry on this service. The Bureau of the Budget prevailed over all our military authorities charged with the responsibility of conducting and winning the war. One cannot help asking the question, Has the Bureau of the Budget mapped out the war in Italy? Has the Bureau of the Budget, notwithstanding the views of our Army and Navy officials, determined when, where, and how the invasion of Europe shall be undertaken? If the Bureau of the Budget is to be substituted for the military officers of this country, then I say, God help this Government in the prosecution of the war. It is beyond me.

Mr. President, that is all that is involved in this whole situation. I want the Army and the Navy, because of their responsibilities in the prosecution of the war, to have control over all information which comes from the battlefields and areas of military activity. I want them to determine what the significance of such information may be. I want them to determine and make known what part of it may be given to the people of this country, and what part of it must remain a military secret.

Mr. President, to me that sums up the whole situation. I think the Army and the Navy, with their services scattered over the whole world, are competent to do this work. I think that in a military matter Congress should give heed to the Army and Navy officials, and should let the Bureau of the Budget concern itself with the things with which it is primarily charged.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote against the Mead amendment, and I shall vote to sustain the committee in the action which it has taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] on page 13, line 1.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Radcliffe
Andrews	George	Revercomb
Austin	Gillette	Robertson
Bailey	Guffey	Russell
Ball	Hatch	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hawkes	Stewart
Barkley	Hayden	Taft
Brewster	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Utah
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Buck	Kilgore	Tunnell
Burton	La Follette	Tydings
Bushfield	Langer	Vandenberg
Byrd	McCarran	Walsh, N. J.
Capper	McClellan	Weeks
Chandler	McFarland	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	White
Connally	Mead	Wiley
Davis	Millikin	Willis
Downey	Murray	Wilson
Eastland	O'Mahoney	
Ellender	Overton	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], on page 13, line 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, during the course of the debate the action of the Federal Communications Commission in counter-espionage work and in locating spies and illegal radio stations outside the United States was brought to the attention of the Senate. I have before me, in an annual report submitted to the governments of the American republics, some interesting information on that very same subject. On page 86 of the report, under the heading "German espionage agents in Chile—Memorandum dated June 30, 1942, submitted by

the United States of America," there appears the following:

The existence of a clandestine radio station in Chile has been known for some time to the Federal Communications Commission of the United States Government and, through use of directional finding equipment, this station has been located in Valparaiso. Through these same tests—

That is, tests made by the Federal Communications Commission—

the corresponding station has been definitely located in Hamburg in Germany.

Mr. President, on page 95 of the same report, I read the following:

At the request of the Chilean Government, the Federal Communications Commission of the United States dispatched an agent with the necessary equipment for definitely determining the location of PYL. This technician has made several tests which have indicated rather conclusively that at the present time one of the transmitters over which the information is being sent to Germany is located in the house of Guillermo Zeller, Avenida Alemana 5508, Cerro Alegre, Valparaiso. It is known that Zeller is an expert radio technician and a licensed amateur operator. He has in his possession a modern transmitting set absolutely capable of communicating with Germany, and it has been observed that the antennas used by him are specially adapted and directed for such transmission. Observations have further revealed that Zeller has often been seen in the company of Hans Blume, heretofore mentioned in this memorandum.

Mr. President, in the same report submitted to the governments of the American republics I read the following:

After the sudden arrest of most of the German agents operating in Brazil during the month of March the intercepts indicated that Germany was very concerned over the safety of its agents, as well as assuring itself of a possible means of having radio communication with its agents in Chile. To afford the latter, the intercepts indicate that the PYL organization has employed the service of another transmitting station which was to be operated by an individual referred to as "Pedro." PYL told Germany that "Pedro" would be ready for transmission on March 11, 1941. A report was received by the Embassy from the United States Government that a new clandestine station had been heard operating in Chile on March 11 and that directional findings by the Federal Communications Commission indicated that this station was located in or around Antofagasta. It is believed that this station heard in the United States is the new station employed by the PYL organization and is being operated by this individual referred to as "Pedro."

Mr. President, as the able Senator from Wisconsin pointed out, there are two important services of the Federal Communications Commission involved in this discussion. One of them relates to its Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, whose work is primarily that of monitoring. The other is its Radio Intelligence Division, and the nature of its work is primarily that of policing the airwaves. There exists no duplication. The military has its own military functions to perform. The military does not monitor the speeches and propaganda emanating from Nazi countries. The military is not held responsible by statute for either the protection of broadcasting in this country or for compelling broadcasters in this country to operate within the law.

If we are going to set up these services in the military, which we would have to do if there exists no duplication, then we ought to set them up, and we ought to provide an appropriation for them. If all we do is to reduce and refuse, and reduce appropriations, we eliminate and eliminate and eliminate services. I hate to contemplate the awful, the terrifying consequences as a prelude to the invasion by our forces of the continent of Europe of any action that may be taken which has for its effect the diminution or the reduction or elimination of any services which, in my judgment, are essential.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. MEAD. I shall yield in a moment.

So, Mr. President, I reiterate what the able Senator from Wisconsin has already well said that there is no duplication; there are two essential services involved; one has to do with the monitoring of foreign broadcasts emanating from civilian agencies, not military agencies, abroad; and the other has to do, as the able Senator from Wisconsin well said, with the enforcement of the statute and policing the airways of this country and those in the Territories of this country.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator put his judgment and the judgment of Mr. Fly ahead of that of the Army and Navy? That is the issue.

Mr. MEAD. Is that the question in its entirety?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is the first question.

Mr. MEAD. That question was asked before.

Mr. BRIDGES. But it has not been answered.

Mr. MEAD. That question was answered before, Mr. President, I think to the satisfaction of many Members of the Senate. But to answer it again, let me say, Mr. President, as was said by the able Senator from Wisconsin, there is not a scintilla of evidence in the report or in the hearings of the House committee or the Senate committee to indicate that there is any objection to the services which are being rendered or that the services which are being rendered are not eminently satisfactory to all the agencies of the Government receiving and depending upon such services.

With reference to the attitude of the Army and Navy, there is a rich amount of evidence from military leaders, from the Office of Strategic Services, from Signal Corps officers, from the commanding general of the Hawaiian division, commending the services of the Federal Communications Commission. There is over and above that, to offset what the opposition may say in its reliance upon the letter of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, the letter of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. While those who oppose the amendment may offer as support the argument, the letter from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, those of us who are on the other side of this argument believe in fortifying the Federal Communications Commission with all the appropriations they may reasonably need. I say the letter of the President is, in my judgment, an unanswerable argument that a system has been set up and a board has been created whereby to the very maximum all the services can be dispensed to each of the agencies which require such services.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. MEAD. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator produce a letter or any communication from the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Combined Chiefs of Staff, from Admiral King or General Marshall, asking for these services or asking to have the Federal Communications Commission do this work? The Senator has dodged around this issue and so has every other proponent of the amendment.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator has asked for a great many letters.

Mr. BRIDGES. And I have not received them.

Mr. MEAD. As I said before, the Senator has asked for a great many letters and for a great deal of evidence but the Senator to this moment has not taken on himself the responsibility of presenting any evidence. I have submitted one letter after another, but the Senator continues to ask for more and more letters without feeling in the least the obligation that he ought to present something of a constructive nature before this debate is concluded.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I shall not undertake to resolve the conflict of opinion, but I do think the record should be made clear, since there is a certain implication in the remarks of my colleague from New York that we are not desirous of intelligence in the conduct of our services. I am sure that, so far as this side of the aisle is concerned, that is what we have been very earnestly desiring very much more of for a long time. Anything that would insure our getting more intelligence into the conduct of the operations of the entire Government would be entirely in accord with our views.

As to the specific issue before the Senate, I cannot furnish the evidence for which the Senator from New York asks, but I think it appropriate to call attention, before we conclude, to one additional fact.

Mr. MEAD. Will my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I am not asking for the submission of any letters or added information. That request came after I had submitted, in the debate last week, all the evidence and all the letters which I thought ample to support my argument. So I am not asking for any additional information.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thought there was a suggestion that the Senator was making such a request. I merely call attention to the fact that there is a conflict of opinion, and that this body has the benefit of the opinion in this matter of the one who was selected by the President of the United States as presumably the most competent man in the field of communications, namely, my own colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Maine [Mr. WHITE], who was chosen by the President to be chairman of the last international radio delegation from America to the world conference held at Cairo a few years ago. Recognizing the long service in this field of my colleague, the senior Senator from Maine, on the committees of the House and the Senate dealing with this matter from its inception, he was chosen for this distinction by the President of the United States. With all deference to the President, and the very great responsibilities he is obliged to carry, I am somewhat more inclined to accept the conclusion of the senior Senator from Maine as to whether or not this service may be adequately performed with the appropriations provided, with due regard to all the responsibilities of the war, than for the opinion of the President, on the basis of an opinion from the Bureau of the Budget, in conflict, apparently, with his own military and naval advisers. At any rate, I shall resolve my action on the basis of the opinion of my colleague, believing that it is as competent and as disinterested as any we should be able to secure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate on this question, but I wish to utter just a brief word as to my position in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. The Senator from New York and the Senator from Wisconsin have gone into the whole question in detail; they have covered it exhaustively, from the standpoint of those who favor the amendment, and it would be merely a repetition if I were to attempt to cover that field, and I shall not do so.

I merely wish to say that it seems to me unfortunate that the affairs of the Federal Communications Commission have gotten into the posture of controversy and criticism back and forth on account of matters which have nothing to do with the pending amendment or the pending appropriation, and nothing to do with the war, as a matter of fact. I do not know to what extent the long-existing controversy between the Federal Communications Commission and a portion of the Congress had anything to do with the action of the House in reducing the appropriation by a million and a half dollars. It may be that it had nothing to do with it, and was not thought of in that connection. Nevertheless, it is difficult to dissociate the two things altogether, in view of what seems to me to be the drastic cut made by the House, and the even more drastic cut made by the Senate committee.

I shall not go into the question of the controversy among the services as to the desirability of having the War Department and the Navy Department take over the functions of the Federal Communications Commission, so far as concerns its intelligence divisions, either in Europe or in the United States. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy recommended, in a letter which they wrote to the President, that there be a certain transfer of authority in matters of investigation pertaining to the war, from the Federal Communications Commission to the War and Navy Departments. After due consideration and long preparation, and after what I understand was a thorough investigation from all sides, the President felt that it was wise not to make the transfer, and said so in a letter which he transmitted to the heads of the two Departments.

It may be that there are Senators and Members of the other body of the Congress who prefer to take the judgment of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to that of the President, but they certainly cannot indulge in that preference on the ground that either one of these officers is a high military or naval officer, any more than the President is. Neither of them is a military or naval officer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to take much time, but I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator consider Admiral Leahy a military or naval authority?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I am coming to that, if the Senator will permit me. Of course Admiral Leahy is a very high-ranking naval officer, enjoys the confidence of the country, and has had an outstanding record as a naval authority. But from the standpoint of the command of the Navy, the President of the United States outranks Admiral Leahy, of course.

Mr. BRIDGES. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the President's judgment in that matter is entitled to the same consideration to which it would be entitled in any other matter where the decision must be made by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator believe that in the Combined Chiefs of Staff of the various Allied countries which are waging this war we have able men, possibly the outstanding men among the United Nations?

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume they are the best naval and military men available in the various nations.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then the Senator puts the word of Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a military leader and naval leader, ahead of the combined judgment of the Combined Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. BARKLEY. The transfer of these facilities from the Federal Communications Commission to the War and Navy Departments of the United States has nothing to do with interallied command. It is purely a matter for the United States, and certainly the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, stands higher in authority and in responsibility, under the Constitution, than even Admiral Leahy, or the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. President, in view of all that has been said about this matter it seems to me to be unwise to reduce the appropriation. I myself do not propose to take the responsibility of voting to reduce it in view of all the situations which exist around the world which require the most meticulous information to be obtained, even if it is expensive, as the Senator from Wisconsin said a while ago. I am unwilling to weigh dollars against the lives of our men and women in the service, no matter whether it is a million and a half or two million dollars, the total reduction now carried in the bill.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I must catch a train in a few minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. This will take only a minute. Do I understand that we are being urged now to support the proposal upon the basis of the fact that it is the opinion of the President of the United States which is involved?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not urging the Senator——

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator does not urge support for the proposal on that ground?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not urging the Senator from Maine or any other Senator to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from New York on the ground that it is the judgment of the President that the activity ought not to be transferred. That is his judgment. I respect that judgment.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator does not always follow that judgment. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, I follow it much more frequently than does the Senator from Maine. I hope the Senator from Maine accords to me the right to differ even from the President of the United States whenever I feel that it is my duty to do so.

Mr. BREWSTER. And I am sure the Senator from Kentucky will accord us the right to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. In this particular instance my judgment coincides with that of the President, and I am just as happy or more happy to say so, than I am to say so when I disagree with him.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. For only one question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well. Am I to understand the Senator from Kentucky to infer that those who oppose the amendment are placing dollars ahead of lives?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I am not saying that at all. But I say that I am not willing to economize even to the extent of $2,000,000 if by doing so I think I am jeopardizing the lives of any of our men anywhere in the world. The Senator may have his own judgment about that. I know how the Senator from New Hampshire is going to vote. I know he is going to vote to reduce the appropriation. He is going to vote against the amend-

ment offered by the Senator from New York. Nothing I can say would change the Senator's opinion on that matter, and if I undertook to persuade him about any other matter I have great doubt whether I could do so.

Mr. President, that is all I wish to say, but I am going to vote in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], on page 13, line 1, in lieu of the committee amendment to insert "$6,146,000." The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who, I understand, if present, would vote "yea." I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who, I understand, would vote "nay" if present. I am therefore free to vote, and I vote "nay."

Mr. MEAD (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from New York, is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea." The senior Senator from New York has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is detained in a Government department, has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of West Virginia. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has been called from the Senate to attend a conference on matters pertaining to the State of Arkansas. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is paired on this question with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is paired on this question with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I am advised that if present the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—22

Andrews	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Capper	La Follette	Shipstead
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McFarland	Tunnell
Ellender	Maybank	Wheeler
Guffey	Mead	
Hatch	Murray	

NAYS—38

Aiken	Eastland	Stewart
Austin	Ferguson	Taft
Ball	George	Thomas, Idaho
Bankhead	Gillette	Tydings
Brewster	Hawkes	Vandenberg
Bridges	Holman	Walsh, N. J.
Brooks	McCarran	Weeks
Buck	McKellar	Wherry
Burton	Millikin	White
Bushfield	Overton	Wiley
Byrd	Revercomb	Willis
Clark, Mo.	Robertson	Wilson
Davis	Russell	

NOT VOTING—36

Bailey	Green	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Gurney	Pepper
Bone	Hayden	Reed
Butler	Jackson	Reynolds
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Chandler	Kilgore	Smith
Chavez	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McClellan	Tobey
Cordon	Maloney	Truman
Danaher	Moore	Wagner
Gerry	Murdock	Wallgren
Glass	Nye	Walsh, Mass.

So Mr. MEAD's amendment to the committee amendment on page 13, line 1, was rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the vote which has just been taken be reconsidered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is generally agreeable that the Senate suspend its session at this point until tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Chair announce the action on the motion to lay on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have another amendment to offer. I believe I am correct in saying that as a result of the debate, at least in my opinion, this amendment will be more generally acceptable. Therefore, I shall ask the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he will consider taking the amendment to conference. The amendment would restore item No. 2, providing $500,000 for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, which merely performs the work of monitoring foreign broadcasts. I think the Service is a very important one. I should like to know whether the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee will consider taking the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York is not in order until the committee amendment at the top of page 13 is disposed of.

Mr. MEAD. Then I shall ask that my amendment be withheld until the other committee amendment is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York may lie on the table.

The Chair finds that in reading the amendment offered by the Senator from New York the Chair was in error, and that the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York is an amendment to the committee amendment at the top of page 13, and is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the status of the amendment on page 12, line 2?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is still open.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, action on it, if I may answer the question of the majority leader, was postponed until the disposition of the amendment on page 13, line 1.

Since my amendment is in order, I send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. McKELLAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the amendment on page 13 been agreed to?

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that it has not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the amendment to the committee amendment, on page 13, was rejected, and the committee amendment has never been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understood the Chair to rule a while ago——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair's announcement was with respect to the amendment of the Senator from New York to the committee amendment. The amendment to the committee amendment has been rejected, but the committee amendment has not been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from New York to the committee amendment at the top of page 13 will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 1, it is proposed to strike out "$4,191,143" and insert "$4,691,143."

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, my amendment to the committee amendment is for the purpose of restoring the $500,000 cut made by the House in the appropriation for the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, only. I ask for a vote on my amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that I hope the amendment to the committee amendment will be rejected. We have spent all afternoon on another amendment which provided for a larger amount. The pending amendment to the committee amendment affects a smaller amount. I certainly hope the amendment to the committee amendment will be rejected. I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DAVIS. Announcing again my general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who I am advised would, if present, vote "nay." I am, therefore, at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MEAD. My colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea." He has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained in committee meetings. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is detained in one of the Government departments, has a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present and voting.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is paired on this question with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I am advised that if present the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay," and the Senator from Florida would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is paired on this question with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I am advised that if present the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has a general pair with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—24

Aiken	Ellender	Maybank
Andrews	Guffey	Mead
Austin	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hill	Shipstead
Barkley	Kilgore	Thomas, Utah
Burton	La Follette	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Wheeler
Downey	McFarland	Wiley

NAYS—32

Bankhead	Hawkes	Taft
Brewster	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	McCarran	Tydings
Brooks	McClellan	Vandenberg
Buck	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Bushfield	Millikin	Weeks
Byrd	Overton	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Revercomb	White
Davis	Robertson	Willis
Eastland	Russell	Wilson
Ferguson	Stewart	

NOT VOTING—40

Bailey	Glass	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Green	Pepper
Bone	Gurney	Reed
Butler	Hayden	Reynolds
Capper	Jackson	Scrugham
Caraway	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Lucas	Tobey
Connally	Maloney	Truman
Cordon	Moore	Wagner
Danaher	Murdock	Wallgren
George	Murray	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	Nye	
Gillette	O'Daniel	

So Mr. MEAD's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment at the top of page 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 12, line 2.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer another amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I realize that the Senate has already been very patient with me, and I appreciate the futility of offering successive amendments. This amendment would merely give the conferees an opportunity to restore $209,000 to the regular appropriation, which might be applied to emergency or unspecified activities. In view of the fact that such activities may be needed with the forthcoming invasion, I hope the acting chairman of the committee will take it to conference. If he will not, I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, following the directions of the committee, I am obliged to object to the amendment. I ask that it be rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 2, after the word "amended", in lieu of the committee amendment to strike out "$2,209,000" and insert "$2,000,000", it is proposed to insert "$2,209,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 12, line 2. The purpose of the Senator from New York would be served by disagreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 1, in lieu of the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert "$4,491,143."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's amendment is the same as the House text.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this question has already been voted upon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to reconsideration of the committee amendment on page 13, line 1?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, has not that amendment already been reconsidered on one occasion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I object to its reconsideration.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it occurs to me that that question was disposed of. So far as I am concerned, I am satisfied.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New York wish to press his second amendment?

Mr. MEAD. No. I think the question was thoroughly disposed of.

SOCIAL-SECURITY PAY-ROLL TAXES—LETTER FROM SENATOR VANDENBERG TO THE EDITOR OF THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the statement which I made a few days ago regarding social-security pay-roll taxes has been misinterpreted in some quarters. In order to make the record entirely clear, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have written to the editor of the Washington Star on this subject.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 20, 1944.

EDITOR, THE STAR,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: To keep the record straight, I respectfully make a correction in one of your Sunday feature stories regarding social security. In discussing my persistent 3-year effort to keep pay-roll taxes at their present 1-percent level (on employers and employees) it is stated that I have now reversed my position taken as recently as last February when I was successfully arguing "that it's ridiculous to pile up a huge fund in the Treasury when Secretary Morgenthau himself has estimated that a safe margin to have on hand is three times the amount that will be needed at any time during the next 5 years."

I have not reversed my position. Your writer's mistake, however, quite understandably flows from another recent news story which may have unwittingly invited this erroneous conclusion. At that time I was asked whether the social-security law should be amended to make the present 1-percent tax permanent, thus wiping out for keeps the progressive pay-roll tax increase contemplated by the statute for future years. I replied that the present 1-percent rate cannot be permanent because the time will come when heavily accumulating benefit payments will then require the statutory increases to take effect. This has been construed in several quarters, including your excellent Sunday feature story, as meaning that I believe we have already reached the point where increased benefit payments already require increased pay-roll taxes—although I successfully argued to the contrary in Congress within the last few weeks and have not in any degree changed my mind.

My position is and will continue to be precisely as heretofore urged in the Congress. I stand for whatever social-security pay-roll taxes are necessary to maintain adequate reserves for the old-age and survivors benefit payments. I would not for an instant deprive these reserves of 1 essential penny. On the other hand, I would not burden 40,000,000 workers and all of their employers with any needless increase in pay-roll taxes to build up needless reserves. The yardstick for measuring the adequacy of these reserves has been laid down by Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau himself—namely, a reserve which is 3 times the highest drain contemplated in 5 subsequent years. The reserve at present is at least twice adequate under this rule. Therefore, I have opposed a 100-percent increase in pay-roll taxes in 1944. By the same token, whenever the reserve in future years does become inadequate, I shall, for identically the same reason, favor an increase in pay-roll taxes. Only subsequent events in subsequent years can indicate when this will be.

In a word, I have not reversed my position. On the contrary, I stand squarely upon it as always. You will understand that I am not writing in any spirit of complaint. I fully realize how the error occurred. I simply deem it vitally important to keep the record unassailably straight.

Cordially and faithfully,

A. H. VANDENBERG.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Henry N. Graven, of Iowa, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Iowa, vice George C. Scott, retired;

John J. Morris, Jr., of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware, vice Charles Stewart Lynch, term expired;

Harry H. Holt, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, vice Sterling Hutcheson;

Raymond E. Thomason, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama. (Mr. Thomason is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 2, 1944);

Roulhac Gewin, of Alabama, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama. (Mr. Gewin is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 29, 1944); and

Robert W. Rabb, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (Mr. Rabb is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 25, 1943.)

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army;

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army; and

Col. Stanhope Bayne-Jones (lieutenant colonel, Medical Reserve), Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

GEN. THOMAS HOLCOMB

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, the nomination of Gen. Thomas Holcomb, of Delaware, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Union of South Africa has just been confirmed. He is a native son of my State, and his ancestors for generations were citizens of Delaware. It is a privilege to be present to witness his confirmation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Union of South Africa.

The record of General Holcomb's career is a lifetime of distinguished service as a member of the United States Marine Corps; it is a record of efficiency and valor that has reflected credit to his country and his State.

Thomas Holcomb was born in New Castle, Del., August 5, 1879. He entered the United States Marine Corps in 1900 and was promoted through grades to brigadier general. He commanded the Second Battalion, Sixth Marines, A. E. F., in 1918, and participated in the Chateau Thierry-Soissons offensives. He advanced to second in command of the Sixth Marines in the same year, and participated in St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne offensives.

For meritorious service and valor he holds the Navy Cross, Chevalier French Legion of Honor, Croix de Guerre with three palms, Purple Heart, Silver Star Medal with three oak-leaf clusters, and last month was awarded a Distinguished Service Medal by the Seventy-eighth Congress.

General Holcomb is the first man in the history of the Republic to acquire the rank of a four-star general in the United States Marine Corps.

As one of Delaware's representatives in this august body, it is an honor to attest to the high regard and deep esteem in which Gen. Thomas Holcomb is held by the citizens of his State. God willing, may he devote many more useful years to the service of his country.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

NOMINATION OF COL. STANHOPE BAYNE-JONES TO BE A BRIGADIER GENERAL IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, earlier in the day there was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs the nomination of Col. Stanhope Bayne-Jones, now a lieutenant-colonel in the Medical Reserve, to be a brigadier general in the Army of the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the nomination.

The reason I do so is that this nomination was held up for an undue length of time by an objection, which has been completely withdrawn and satisfied. There are important reasons why Colonel Bayne-Jones, who is connected with the Typhus Commission and is one of the principal aides of the Surgeon General, should receive this promotion as soon as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was one of those who asked for more time, and I objected to confirming the nomination of Col. Stanhope Bayne-Jones to be brigadier general. The objections have now been satisfied, and I join with the Senator from Ohio in asking unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Stanhope Bayne-Jones to be a brigadier general in the Army of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 20 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Francis L. Spalding, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4 of Alaska, vice Ralph J. Rivers, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

GRAZING SERVICE

Clarence L. Forsling, of Utah, to be Director of Grazing; vice Richard H. Rutledge, resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the regular corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Assistant Surgeon Harry F. White, Jr., to be passed assistant surgeon effective November 23, 1943.

Assistant Sanitary Engineer John S. Wiley, to be passed assistant sanitary engineer effective February 21, 1944.

Assistant Surgeon H. Charles Franklin, to temporary passed assistant surgeon effective March 1, 1944.

Assistant Surgeon Robert S. McClintock, to be temporary passed assistant surgeon effective March 1, 1944.

Surgeon Erwin W. Blatter, to be temporary senior surgeon effective March 1, 1944.

Passed Assistant Surgeon William H. Stimson, to be temporary surgeon effective March 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 20 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COUNTRIES PLACED OPPOSITE THEIR RESPECTIVE NAMES

Avra M. Warren; to Panama.
Leland B. Morris; to Iran.
Orme Wilson; to Haiti.
Willard L. Beaulac; to Paraguay.
Ellis O. Briggs; to the Dominican Republic.

ENVOYS EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTERS PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE COUNTRIES PLACED OPPOSITE THEIR RESPECTIVE NAMES

Louis G. Dreyfus, Jr.; to Iceland.

Gen. Thomas Holcomb; to the Union of South Africa.

Kenneth S. Patton; to New Zealand.

CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Rudolph E. Schoenfeld; near the Government of Luxemburg now established in London.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Col. Stanhope Bayne-Jones to be brigadier general.

POSTMASTERS

DELAWARE

Alton L. Brittingham, Lewes.
John E. Mayhew, Milford.

FLORIDA

S. Gary Turnley, Fort Meade.
Howard M. Daniels, Havana.
Robert Neil Durrance, Sebring.

KANSAS

Dale Graves, Healy.

LOUISIANA

Harry R. Mock, Baskin.
Lillian Causey, Bonita.
Annie M. Pyron, Collinston.

MAINE

Lizzie J. Chase, Mount Vernon.
Emma T. Allen, New Gloucester.
Henry G. Swett, Weld.
J. Vinal Hunnewell, Woolwich.

MARYLAND

John W. Hager, Damascus.
Mary K. Sharpless, Kitzmiller.
Marjorie H. Pearce, Monkton.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles L. Bevans, Harwich Port.
Carl O. F. Swanson, Rehoboth.

MICHIGAN

N. Kenneth Zeigler, Brimley.
Harry Keithan, Ceresco.
Elmer Brogan, Emmett.
Reatha M. Linke, Filer City.
Charles B. Jenkins, Fostoria.
Emma R. A. Stevenson, Gaines.
Guy H. Fowler, Goodells.
Stella B. Paul, Gulliver.
Ernest Belville, Mesick.

MISSOURI

Etha M. Word, Amoret.
Calvin Clay, Augusta.
Hazel Quick, Camden.
John C. Goodwin, Fair Grove.
Raymond L. Whited, Flemington.
Florence B. Browning, Hermitage.
Harry L. Epperson, Hurdland.
Miles M. O'Neal, Jamestown.
Dwight E. Whitten, Peculiar.
Velda G. Guidicy, Pevely.
Brownlee E. Rainey, South Kinloch Park.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Iona A. Jenness, Rye.

NEW YORK

Joseph A. McKenna, Albion.
William H. Porter, Jr., Ancram.
Katherine L. Downs, Aquebogue.
Hanna A. Williams, Belleville.
Samuel E. G. Harris, Brushton.
Laurence E. Clark, Chenango Bridge.
Charles F. Driscoll, Clay.
Edward J. Drumb, Ebenezer.
James T. Hunter, Galway.
Margaret C. Flood, Gorham.
Matilda Whitney, Henderson.
Hattie R. Ballard, Holmes.
Henry B. Goodell, Irving.
Charles E. Denison, Niskayuna.
Claude L. Wright, Painted Post.
Colletta W. Potter, Port Crane.
Beatrice F. Skinner, Portland.
Hope C. Conneely, Richburg.
Thomas J. Riley, Seneca Falls.
Jay W. Cook, Verona.
McIntyre P. Sampson, Yorkshire.

OHIO

Ella B. Morgan, Fairpoint.
Oscar D. Binkley, Gettysburg.
Neil E. Smith, Nobles.

OREGON

Maude H. Sitter, Myrtle Creek.

PUERTO RICO

Juan Figueroa, Ceiba.
Saulo M. Giminez, Orocovis.
Elias Almeda Aponte, San Lorenzo.

TENNESSEE

Marvin M. McKnight, Bemis.

WYOMING

Harley G. Murphy, Thermopolis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 20, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful Father of all the earth, in this life, the scene of victory and failure, of joy and sorrow, we beseech Thee to enlarge our conception of Thee and of Thy plan and purpose for us. Humble us in the sense of our own attainments and grant that we by faith may rest in the consciousness that wherein we are defi-

cient Thou wilt make it up through the merits of Jesus Christ the righteous. O Thou who wert a true Man, the truest the world has ever known, a great Man, the greatest among the sons of men, inspire in us the purest and the noblest thoughts, turning us toward the everlasting verities of our most holy faith.

Dear Lord, our hearts are filled with sympathy for all who are heavy laden and burdened with care. A deep, harsh-toned grief has come to one of our homes. O God, there are so many open spaces in the music of this world; be lovingly near the stricken family and enable them to hide their sorrow in the rest of Thy promise: "Fear thou not, for I am with thee; neither be thou dismayed." Loving Father, Thou art near all who call upon Thee; may they be possessed with the strength of an inner calm, as they look forward with imperishable hope, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 16, 1944, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 272):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES A. O'LEARY, late a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution, the Vice President had appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. MEAD members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. National Archives.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I did not rise to a point of personal privilege because of the fact that many sarcastic and insinuating remarks were cast at me, for I have no need to defend myself. I do, however, have something I wish to read, something I prepared to read last Friday. Although today is not St. Patrick's Day, with your kind indulgence I will give it precisely as I would have given it on Friday had the House been in session.

Mr. Speaker, I consider myself singularly privileged this 17th day of March to salute my colleagues and fellow Americans—so here goes. The top o' the morning to youse all! Erin go bragh! Be off with youse, you and your blarney.

You do know, my friends, that my congratulations to you on this glorious morning are shared with me by every Member of this House of Irish extraction, and may divine Providence shower on you His choicest blessings.

Never in the history of our great country have the Americans of Irish extraction been so thankful for the numerous and bountiful blessings which have been given them by these great and glorious United States. No nationalistic extraction has ever been given greater privileges, consideration, and protection than the two-fisted, red-blooded, fighting Irish. Yes, the pages of history have been glorified by their heroic deeds in every war and the service they have rendered on the home front cannot in any way be computed on a cold, hard basis of dollars and cents. This great love of country is motivated by a feeling of appreciation and devotion for their land of adoption.

Now let us just take a look. At my left we find a descendant of the great Welches. We have an offspring of the Kearneys, and who would want to overlook the Gavins and the Horans.

It is with profound modesty and with great reluctance that I inform you that we O'Briens were the noblest of all Irish. We were the kings—yes, we were the kings of the fighting Irish and not neutral Ireland.

We have plenty of reasons to omit this year those Deep in the Heart of Texas Irish, but because of our generosity and love of mankind we feel we would be doing a great injustice to ourselves and not to the individuals to whom I am about to allude, namely, "Lariat Slinging, Black Cattle" DICK O'KLEBERG, long, lean, rangy "Pistol Packin" MILTON MICHAEL O'WEST, and the vociferous and flamboyant "Don't Draft Them Fathers" O'KILDAY.

Now for saluting the Irish on my right. If you will give me your undivided attention, I will mention them by name, and do not by any means conclude that I am reciting a charter of the choicest names coming from the list of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. Let's start with the Merritts, the Lynches and the Curleys. Then we have the Fitzpatricks, the Keoghs, the Fays and the Barrys. To be sure there are the Kennedys, the Harts, the Flannagans, the Cochrans, and the great Fogartys, the Maddens and the Kirwins. And glory be to St. Patrick! do not omit the Bradleys, the Kellys, the Murphys, and the Delaneys; and, bless my soul, we have the Nortons, the Sullivans, and the Mansfields. I want to grasp this opportunity to give my personal salute to the one and only PAT CANNON of Florida, the only man in Congress who has his clothes made by the Cincinnati Tent Co. and who carries his constituency and voters either in the palm of his hand or in his vest pocket. The former a pair of loaded dice and the latter a deck of marked cards. If you know what I mean, and I think you do.

At this point you have a perfect right to ask if I have purposely neglected to mention the names of TOM O'BRIEN, of Chicago, and GEORGE O'BRIEN, of Detroit. Positively no, but I want no confusion. They are just O'Briens and by no means can they lay any claim to any relationship to me or my ancestors. We were the O'Briens who were the fighting kings.

My colleagues, there are many distinguished names of Irish ancestry in our great country. Did you ever hear of the name of McCormack? Is that name familiar to you? Well, according to JOE O'HARA, EMMET O'NEAL, and DON O'TOOLE it was a McCormack who was partially responsible for bringing on the Irish famine. These men tell me with all sincerity that it was a McCormack who threw the overalls in Mrs. Murphy's chowder and then they immediately emigrated to South Boston.

The McCormacks are deeply indebted to the O'Briens, but they will never be able to show their gratitude. Were it not for the inventive genius of one of my ancestors, the McCormacks would still be on all fours, because it was an O'Brien who invented the wheelbarrow. This McCormack tribe was of rock-slinging, brick-throwing, cave-dwelling origin and only after their expulsion from Ireland did they achieve prominence and fame. I might add, that it was a McCormack who twisted the tail of Mrs. O'Leary's cow that kicked over the lantern and started the Chicago fire.

It has been the extreme and distinguished pleasure of the Irish each year to honor men who have made valuable contributions to the Irish cause and in 1944 after the utmost deliberation, I wish to mention for your approval the names of BILL MONKIEWICZ, THAD WASIELEWSKI, and JOHN LESINSKI. We want these men to know we appreciate their efforts in behalf of the Irish and let me salute them in this manner:

Polski narod upiekszal stronice historyi;
Polske postanowienie i Polskie rycerskie
czyny beda zyc na wieki;
Z Boga wola, Polska zawsze bedzie zyc.

In conclusion, again, top o' the morning, God bless you, Mr. Speaker, and God bless you all.

THE LATE LT. ROBERT T. BROWN

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in his 10 years' service in the House, our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia, PAUL BROWN, is absent from the session today. He is overcome with grief on account of his son, Lt. Robert T. Brown, United States Navy, who has been reported missing in action. Last Saturday the

gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] was notified by the Navy Department to this effect.

Lieutenant Brown was the only son of Mr. and Mrs. Brown, and was 24 years of age. It was my privilege to know Lieutenant Brown personally and intimately. He was a brilliant, fearless, and courageous communications officer on a submarine operating in the Pacific. He had distinguished himself by an outstanding record and career in the Navy, which he entered 2 years ago after graduating from the University of Georgia with high honors.

While attending the university, Lieutenant Brown was editor of the university magazine and president of the Chi Phi fraternity and was also a member of the Phi Beta Kappa chapter.

In their hour of great sorrow, the entire membership of the House extends to Mr. and Mrs. Brown their deepest and most sincere sympathy.

COMMEMORATION OF THE CENTENNIAL OF THE TELEGRAPH

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 72.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Samuel F. B. Morse, a distinguished American artist, invented the first practical electromagnetic telegraph in the winter of 1835–36, and obtained an appropriation from the Congress of the United States in 1843 for the construction of an experimental telegraph line between Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the first telegram, "What hath God wrought" was sent over this line from the old Supreme Court room in the Capitol to Baltimore on May 24, 1844; and

Whereas the sending of the first telegram marked the beginning of the telegraph industry, which has been indispensable to the country in four wars and, by linking all sections, has implemented the traditional motto, "E pluribus unum"; and

Whereas the telegraph was the first speedy means of communication connecting the nations of the world, bringing all peoples closer together, and promoting the dissemination of ideas as well as international trade; and

Whereas the telegraph was the first great electrical discovery and was the forerunner of our entire system of electrical communications, including the telephone, the radio, and television: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such committee shall secure an appropriate plaque or other suitable memorial to be placed in or near the room in the Capitol from which the first telegraph message was dispatched, and shall arrange for appropriate exercises, to be held on May 24, 1944, for the purpose of placing such plaque or other memorial and commemorating the centennial of the telegraph. The cost of carrying out the provisions of this concurrent resolution, including the cost of such plaque or other memorial, not to exceed $4,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the House and one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

The House concurrent resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, May 24, 1944, will mark the one hundredth anniversary of the discovery, and the use of, the first great electrical invention. It was on that day 100 years ago that Professor Samuel F. B. Morse sent the first official message over the wires from a telegraph instrument which had been placed in the then Supreme Court room, now the law library, in the Capitol in Washington.

To commemorate that event and to do honor to the memory of the great inventor, Professor Morse, I introduced in the House, Concurrent Resolution 72. A similar resolution has been introduced in the Senate by Senator BURTON K. WHEELER. The resolution provides for a committee of 10, 5 of whom shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 by the Speaker of the House, who shall arrange for appropriate exercises to be held on the coming 24th day of May and the placing of an appropriate plaque, or memorial, to Professor Morse.

On December 30, 1842, the Committee on Commerce of the House of Representatives reported a bill which I shall within a short time read to you. This report was written by Mr. Ferris. The first two paragraphs of that report are clear and convincing as to the needs of a system of communication for the Nation:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $30,000 be, and is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for testing the capacity and usefulness of the system of electromagnetic telegraphs invented by Samuel F. B. Morse, of New York, for the use of the Government of the United States, by constructing a line of said electromagnetic telegraphs, under the superintendence of Prof. Samuel F. B. Morse, of such length, and between such points, as shall fully test its practicability and utility, and that the same shall be expended, under the direction of the Postmaster General, upon the application of said Morse.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of the aforesaid $30,000, to the said Samuel F. B. Morse, and the persons employed under him, such sums of money as he may deem to be a fair compensation for the services of the said Samuel F. B. Morse, and the persons employed under him, in constructing and in superintending the construction of the said line of telegraphs authorized by this act.

It may be of interest to the House for me to give you an idea of what happened to this bill. Toward the close of the session—to be exact, on February 21, 1843—Mr. John P. Kennedy, a Representative from the State of Maryland, who was interested in the electromagnetic telegraph, moved that the Committee take up and dispose of a bill to test the practicability of an electromagnetic telegraph in the United States.

The Committee of the Whole considered the bill, and—quoting from the Congressional Globe—these proceedings were had:

ELECTRO AND ANIMAL MAGNETISM

On motion of Mr. Kennedy, of Maryland, the Committee took up the bill to authorize a series of experiments to be made, in order to test the merits of Morse's electromagnetic telegraph. The bill appropriates $30,000 to be expended under the direction of the Postmaster General.

On motion of Mr. K., the words "Postmaster General" were stricken out and "Secretary of the Treasury" inserted.

Mr. Cave Johnson wished to have a word to say upon the bill. As the present Congress had done much to encourage science, he did not wish to see the science of mesmerism neglected and overlooked. He therefore proposed that one-half of the appropriation be given to Mr. Fisk to enable him to carry on experiments, as well as Professor Morse.

Mr. Houston thought that Millerism should also be included in the benefits of the appropriation.

Mr. Stanly said he should have no objection to the appropriation for mesmeric experiments, provided the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Cave Johnson] was the subject. [A laugh.]

Mr. Cave Johnson said he should have no objection, provided the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Stanly] was the operator. [Great laughter.]

Several gentlemen called for the reading of the amendment; and it was read by the Clerk, as follows:

"*Provided*, That one-half of the said sum shall be appropriated for trying mesmeric experiments, under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. S. Mason rose to a question of order. He maintained that the amendment was not bona fide, and that such amendments were calculated to injure the character of the House. He appealed to the Chair to rule the amendment out of order.

The Chairman said it was not for him to judge the motives of Members in offering amendments; and he could not, therefore, undertake to pronounce the amendment not bona fide. Objections might be raised to it on the ground that it was not sufficiently analogous in character to the bill under consideration; but, in the opinion of the Chair, it would require a scientific analysis to determine how far the magnetism of mesmerism was analogous to that to be employed in telegraphs. [Laughter.] He therefore ruled the amendment in order.

On taking the vote, the amendment was rejected—ayes 22, noes not counted.

The bill was then laid aside to be reported (p. 323, vol. 12, 27th Cong., 3d sess.).

The bill came up for final consideration in the House on February 23, 1843, and the proceedings of that date, as recorded in the Globe, are as follows:

ELECTRO-MAGNETIC TELEGRAPH

On motion of Mr. J. P. Kennedy, the bill making appropriations to test the value of Morse's electro-magnetic telegraph was taken up, and, under the operation of the previous question, passed—ayes 89, noes 83. (P. 339, vol. 12, 27th Cong., 3d sess.)

The bill passed the Senate on the closing day of the session, March 3, 1843, and was signed by the President on that date. From this time on Professor Morse started and completed the building of the line from Washington to Baltimore.

Mr. Will P. Kennedy, Litt. D., of Washington, has spent some time collecting the facts and the data of the sending of the first message, and I shall quote from Mr. Kennedy's manuscript:

Dr. Prime, a long-time associate of Professor Morse and his brothers, was chosen by the family and executors of Morse to carry out a provision in his last will and testament "to place his manuscripts in the hands of some suitable person for the purpose of examining and using the same in preparing a biographical or historic note." Dr. Prime wrote in 1874: "On the 24th day of May, 1844, Professor Morse was prepared to put to the test the great experiment on which his mind had been laboring for 12 anxious, weary years. Mr. Vail, his assistant, was at the Baltimore terminus in the Mount Clare depot. Professor Morse had invited his friends to assemble in the chamber of the United States Supreme Court, where he had his instrument, from which the wires extended to Baltimore."

The eye-witness account is by a venerable citizen of Charleston, as follows: "My brother, Isaac Edward Holmes, warmly supported Mr. Morse's application to Congress for an appropriation which enabled him to erect the first telegraph wires between Washington and Baltimore. These first erected wires were operated by Morse in person. I stood with him in his room under the Senate Chamber at Washington, saw him operate by dipping into a phial of quicksilver the end of one wire from the battery in the corner of the room, while the same phial held, immersed in the quicksilver, the end of the other wire from the same battery. A reel held, wound up, a paper ribbon which, as it was unwound, passed over a roller having three grooves corresponding to three prongs of a dull-pointed fork which was passed upon the paper, and according to the time, made dots or lines, which was the alphabet invented by Morse. Morse dismissed us (the spectators) that, as he said, he might assist Lieutenant (afterward Commodore) Wilkes in determining by the telegraph the relative longitude in time of Washington and Baltimore. I attempted after the exhibition to explain to one of the Senators of South Carolina, McDuffie, the mode of operation. I failed, for, though he listened, I am sure he did not heed, since at the conclusion he exclaimed, 'I don't understand one word you've said.' Which produced an explosive laugh from our other Senator, Hunger, who was quietly smoking his cigar, expecting just such a result."

An account of the occasion, in a book published by Morse's son, Edward Lynd Morse, in 1914, follows: "And now at last the supreme moment had arrived. The line from Washington to Baltimore was completed and on the 24th of May, 1844, the company invited by the inventor assembled in the chamber of the United States Supreme Court to witness the triumph. True to his promise to Miss Annie Ellsworth, he had asked her to indite the first public message which should be flashed over the completed line, and she, in consultation with her good mother, chose the now historic words from the twenty-third verse of the twenty-third chapter of Numbers. To Morse, with his strong religious bent and his belief that he was but a chosen vessel, every word seemed singularly appropriate. Calmly (all authorities emphasize his calmness) he seated himself at the instrument and ticked off the inspired words in the dots and dashes of the Morse alphabet. Alfred Vail, at the other end of the line in Baltimore, received the message without an error, and immediately flashed it back again, and the electro-magnetic telegraph was no longer the wild dream of a visionary, but an accomplished fact.

In reading of what happened on that occasion 100 years ago, I wish to call to your attention what one of the Senators from North Carolina had to say. Senator Willie P. Mangum was President pro tempore of the Senate. Upon the death of President Harrison, the Vice President, Mr. Tyler, became President and Senator Mangum was President pro tempore and occupied the Vice President's office, which was above the old Supreme Court room on the first floor. The Vice President's office later became part of the offices assigned to the Supreme Court and was occupied by the Supreme Court from 1859 until it was removed to the new Supreme Court Building. Senator Mangum said in his manuscript on the 29th day of May 1844:

Senator Willie P. Mangum, the Whig Senator from North Carolina, wrote, May 29, 1844: "The telegraph is in a room in the north end of the Capitol and under my room. Every new turn at Baltimore comes here in less than a twentieth part of a second—absolutely a miraculous triumph of science. Yesterday evening from 4 to 7 o'clock more than a thousand people were in attendance at the window, at which placards in large letters were exhibited upon the receipt of each item of news. Today from 700 to 900 were attending when the news came that Polk was unanimously nominated. I was out of my seat at a window above, observing and ready to enquire. Someone cried out "Three cheers for Clay." The air resounded with the outpourings of 500 pairs of strong lungs in three hearty cheers. A call was made for three cheers for Polk, and the feeblest wail of some 20 or 30 voices was heard in modest, subdued, and conquered strains, and they were in literal truth, a majority of them, boys who had cheered with equal zeal for Clay. (Willie P. Mangum Papers, Manuscripts.)

On the 19th day of June 1844 the National Intelligencer stated:

The magnetic telegraph continues to work wonders. Among these reports of its marvels in the Patriot of June 17 is that at 12 o'clock Chief Justice Taney, being at the Electric Register in Baltimore, sent his respects to the President (then at the Capitol) with the hope that he was well. The President (Tyler) returned his compliments immediately, stating that he enjoyed good health and felt much better since Congress had finally adjourned.

The exact place from which this message was sent is described in a book by Roland Williamson, assistant in charge, from the Law Library in the Capitol, Washington, D. C., on pages 172–173:

If the reader can picture the east front of the United States Capitol, he will see, to the right of the main steps, on the ground level, the five windows of the Law Library. The central window is interesting for the reason that through it passed the wire carrying the first telegraph message, "What hath God wrought!" Near this window Marshall sat as Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. The room is semicircular and its high ceiling is supported by fluted columns connected with graceful arches.

"What hath God wrought!"—this was the message which was sent from Washington to Baltimore and repeated from Baltimore to Washington. It was the first official message. The message which Professor Morse sent was written by Miss Ellsworth, the daughter of the Commissioner of Patents. Professor Morse had made the promise to Miss Ellsworth that she could indite the first message. Governor Seymour of Connecticut, then a Member of the House, claimed the slip of paper on which the telegraph characters were printed, on the grounds that Miss Ellsworth was a native of Hartford. It was delivered to him by Miss Ellsworth and this message is now preserved in the Archives of the Hartford Museum.

I do not have the time to speak to you fully on the successes and failures of telegraphy, but the difficulties were overcome and within a few years messages were being sent to San Francisco. A company and other companies were formed because the Government, under direction of the Postmaster General, after a few years of trial in operations, turned it over to private interests. These and other facts connected with this wonderful invention should be printed as a public document after the exercises are held on the coming 24th day of May and thereby preserved for the future, and it will be my suggestion that Mr. Will P. Kennedy's manuscript be then printed as a public document.

There are many sources from which one could gather material—the reports to Congress, the reports of committees, the newspapers of that day, and the writing of men of that time all contribute to an accurate and complete knowledge of this invention and of Professor Morse and what he accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I know that the Congress will deem it fitting to recognize the outstanding achievement of Professor Morse and his life and character because he did a great work. He spent his money and he gave his time in giving to the world a new system of communications and it is fitting that the Congress place a suitable memorial in the Capitol because the Congress of that day, 100 years ago, made this discovery a part and a product in this Capitol in which we now assemble.

This invention was a forerunner of all electric communications and today whether we use the telegraph, the cable, the telephone, the teletype, the radio, or television, we must recognize that all of these are due to the efforts of one man who toiled and worked for years to perfect an instrument over which messages could be sent.

It is my understanding that all companies engaged in electric communications will on May 24 pay tribute to Professor Morse and acknowledge the greatness of his invention a century after it was first completed, and every person, no matter where he lives, must realize that Professor Morse very largely contributed to the benefits which we are now enjoying whether those benefits are of pleasure or for business. He started to make communication easy not only in

this country which was joined together but it was only a few short years, some 17 or 18, until communication could be had within a few minutes between Washington and San Francisco and other parts of the country. Even as this country is united by this means of communication so today we can know what is happening within a short time from any corner of the globe.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the secretary of the Oklahoma Bar Association as well as a resolution relative to Oklahoma attorneys appearing before commissions and bureaus.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech I delivered on St. Patrick's Day at Franklin Square, the site of the monument to Commodore John Barry, as the Irish war veterans placed a wreath on the monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SULLIVAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein two letters about the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's table this afternoon and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DILWEG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address recently made by Mr. Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DILWEG]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS], may be granted leave of absence on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

TIME FOR A DEFINITE POLICY

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when some people somewhere in public office should decide as to the need for food in connection with the war.

We will soon have the agricultural appropriations bill up for consideration and it should be apparent to anyone that it is useless to subsidize food production if there is no one there to produce the food.

If dairy products are needed for the war effort it should be realized that milk production is a double manpower problem and it is important to give proper consideration to the manpower involved. First the crop must be raised and then additional manpower is required to convert these crops into food products to say nothing of the manpower involved in processing and packing the products into final and acceptable form so it can be shipped in the necessary channels.

I have no desire to be critical of what has been or is being done in connection with the rural manpower problem. However, I do know that the time has come when some definite understanding should be reached as to the importance of food in the war effort. We should not expect to follow the policy of pounding these elderly people and children on the back in the rural sections where the food is produced. We can subsidize milk $5 per hundredweight but it will bring no results if there is no one there to milk the cow.

No one should be criticized for asking for a definite policy as regards the importance of food production. Some definite conclusion should be reached and some announcement made as to what products are needed in the war effort.

As an indication of the seriousness of this situation and the need for a definite policy is indicated by a telegram which I have received from on of the counties in the district which I have the honor to represent. Excerpts of the telegram are as follows:

> It is a known fact that one industry in the country that has produced more with less men is agriculture. Why should the men be taken off the farm and away from the only industry which as a whole has proven itself efficient during the war? The signers of this are citizen members of the local draft board, members of the country agricultural committee and chairman of the Green Lake County U. S. D. A. War Board.
>
> FRANK D. CHAPMAN.
> WALTER A. SMITH.
> FRANK L. GIESEE.
> Dr. GEORGE N. STEPHENS.
> CHARLES F. SCHRAEDER.
> BLAINE A. DILLIE.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOWELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of the A B C's of post-war taxation, and to include a short editorial on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by H. C. Langer, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

There was no objection.

UNDEVELOPED TERRITORY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. I do not know whether the Members have noticed it or not, but there has been prepared and placed in the Speaker's lobby at the entrance to this Chamber a map of one of the greatest undeveloped sections of the United States. It is the great storehouse of min-

erals and timber and a great deal of wealth now owned by the Federal Government.

I hope the Members will take occasion to inspect the map and look carefully at this great new frontier out there in the Columbia River Basin, where many of our soldiers may find homes when they return from the war. There are out there 1,200,000 acres. Water will be delivered from the Coulee Dam. The project has already been constructed and is ready to be used for the irrigation of these lands for which it was constructed.

In the discussion on the rivers and harbors bill to be taken up today plans for this great development will be under consideration, and I hope that every Member of the House will go out and inspect this map.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, on tomorrow the agricultural appropriation bill for 1945 will be reported to the House. The Members of the House are familiar with the rule which has been observed not to release copies of the hearings on appropriation bills until after the bills are reported, nor copies of the bills.

However, there appears to be no good reason why the report of the committee, the hearings had before the committee, and the bill, which is available, should not be furnished to Members of the House for their inspection today. Of course, the information therein is to be treated as confidential.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself have presented that plan to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and he has agreed that it may be done, so that any Member of the House who now desires to procure copies of the agricultural appropriation bill for 1945, the hearings had in connection therewith, and the report of the committee, may obtain them from the offices of the Appropriations Committee.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 475), and ask for its immediate consideration:

Resolved, That during the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress the Committee on Naval Affairs shall be composed of 29 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the F. W. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial, and in the other a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FOOD PRODUCTION IN 1944

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GROSS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein correspondence between my office and the Office of the Administrator of O. P. A., Chester Bowles, on the subject of the restrictions upon the sale of butter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

SOLDIER-VOTE BILL

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this opportunity to address the House to explain my absence on Wednesday last, March 15, when the conference report on the soldier-vote bill was considered. I was back in my district in New Jersey preparing for a hearing before the Engineer Corps of the Army about the serious matter of beach erosion and the construction of a canal connecting the present intracoastal canal along New Jersey with Sandy Hook Bay. The construction of this canal would complete the last link of this all-important system from Florida to New England and indeed to Canada.

If I had been present I would have voted for the conference report, and I hope the President will delay action no longer on this important matter. New Jersey is ready and eager to see that her soldier and sailor sons and daughters have the right to vote legally the same ballot as those of us back home. Governor Edge, of New Jersey, replied promptly as follows to the President's telegram which asked for his views on the bill as passed by Congress:

Re your telegram received March 15, 7 p. m., New Jersey has enacted a comprehensive soldier-voting law. It provides opportunity for our service men and women, those in the merchant marine, Red Cross, and representatives of other recognized organizations engaged in absentee war responsibilities to vote for all officers from President to county officials.

All we need to make the law effective is the cooperation of the Federal Government in the distribution and return of the ballots.

New Jersey will assume all the expense of printing and mailing these ballots in ample time to permit every eligible Jersey man and woman to exercise their right of suffrage as required by our Constitution.

We only ask Federal assistance in securing military post-office addresses as of August 15, when all nominations will have been made, with ample time remaining for delivery of ballots to service addresses and their return from sectors at home or abroad.

It seems reasonable that if the United States Government can deliver Federal ballots and have them returned to the respective States, that it would be equally possible for it to deliver our State ballots to those in the armed forces and assure their return.

Answering your direct queries:

1. Supplementary ballots are not, in my judgment, authorized at present by the laws of New Jersey.

2. I am positive New Jersey will take any consistent steps which would increase the opportunity for absentee service voting. If the Federal bill becomes law, New Jersey undoubtedly will regard it as a supplement to our present absentee voting law, despite the confusion and possibilities of fraud the two types of ballots would entail.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report I have just received from the chief of the Army Chaplains, Gen. William R. Arnold, as to the activities of the chaplains throughout our Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. CURTIS and Mr. GATHINGS asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

EXEMPTIONS FROM WITHHOLDING TAX

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I think the Nation is pleased by the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means have taken some very definite steps to simplify the taxes. I am very much disappointed that the matter of taking care of religious and charitable gifts in connection with the withholding tax was not met and disposed of fairly. Any law that taxes the individual who gives generously to the U. S. O., the Red Cross, hospitals, orphanages, churches, and colleges, the same as one who does not give a cent, cannot be defended, and that part of the withholding law must have some further changes.

Individuals of wealth whose income comes from many sources can reduce the

amount of their tax obligation by reason of their gifts to religion and charity. Individuals whose only income is from wages, subject to the withholding tax, are denied that privilege. In order for an individual whose entire income is subject to the withholding tax to get any credit for contributions over and above what is given to the individual who contributes nothing, he must pay a tax on that exempt income and then file a claim for a refund at the end of the year. This discrimination against the wage earner is class legislation and is unfair, both to the taxpayers and the splendid institutions dependent upon the voluntary contributions of the American people.

The Government of the United States makes the dues paid to a labor union exempt from taxation as a business expense, but they go further—they compel the employer to deduct these union dues from the employee's paycheck and remit the same to the union.

The religious and charitable institutions do not ask that the employers collect their contributions, but they do ask that the individual who supports religion and charity have his taxes lessened in an appropriate amount.

I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will insist that the technical experts assisting them with the simplification of taxes make provision in the proposed amendments to the withholding tax for giving credit for religious and charitable contributions before the withholding tax is applied. A blanket provision providing for an average credit for contributions to all individuals, including those who give nothing, as well as those who contribute generously, is morally unfair and it fails to treat the taxpayers as individuals.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with reference to our late colleague, the Honorable James A. O'Leary, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a message of Governor Wills to the General Assembly of the State of Vermont; and, further, to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make later in Committee of the Whole with respect to the bill H. R. 3961.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech that I made in my district last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in order to clarify the extension of my remarks on March 14.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter received by me from Mr. Chester Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LANDIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the Governor of Idaho.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper reprint in connection with the Missouri River development program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF DONATIONS TO CHARITABLE, RELIGIOUS, AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, all efforts of the Ways and Means Committee to simplify the payment of income taxes are doomed to ignominious failure unless steps are taken to prevent the taxing of exempted incomes.

Fifteen percent of the income of individuals, if donated to charitable, religious, and educational institutions, is exempt from taxation. If we adopt a formula which compels the levying of a tax upon that exempt income it will become necessary for every taxpayer who donates to any of those worthy causes to come in at the end of the year and claim an adjustment, an adjustment which can only be accomplished by filing a detailed return, a return that will have to be handled by human hands, a return that will have to be calculated by human brains, a return which, when recalculated, will make necessary the refunding of the taxes paid on that portion of the taxpayer's income which, by law, is exempt.

Though this be but a sketchy outline of what is bound to follow a refusal to deal intelligently with this problem, it ought to be quite clear even to the most obtuse that there can be no real simplification of the tax program until those millions of income-tax payers who habitually donate to church and charity are relieved of the necessity of filing complicated returns in order to recover taxes illegally collected from them.

Unless a proper provision is made to relieve this situation in the bill which the Ways and Means Committee is now preparing, fully half of the 30,000,000 taxpayers, the ones whom the committee hopes to relieve entirely of the necessity of filing any returns whatsoever, will find themselves right back where they started from, all tangled up in the red tape, hopelessly enmeshed in a morass of technicalities.

If something is not done to protect those who habitually donate to church and charity, tithe payers, who number millions, the source of income, under our system of withholding, of many a most worthy institution will be, I am afraid, all but wiped out.

Rather than incur the necessity of figuring another return many a taxpayer will withhold his donations, throw up his hands in disgust. There must not be another ides of March.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the conclusion of legislative business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONSENT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day, and the Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

EXPEDITING PAYMENT FOR LAND ACQUIRED DURING WAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 919) to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REQUIRING THAT POLITICAL STATEMENTS CONTAIN THE NAME OF PERSONS DISTRIBUTING SAME

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2973) to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political statement relating to a candidate for election to any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That no person, association, organization, committee, or corporation shall publish or distribute, or cause to be published or distributed, any printed, multigraphed, photographed, typewritten, or written pamphlet, circular, card, dodger, poster, advertisement, or any other statement, relating to or concerning any candidate or prospective candidate for election as President or Vice President of the United States, or as Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress of the United States, unless such pamphlet, circular, card, dodger, poster, advertisement, or statement contains the name or names of the person or persons, association, committee, or corporation responsible for the publication or distribution of the same, and if an association, committee, or corporation is responsible for the publication or distribution of the same, there shall be attached the names of the officers of such association, committee, or corporation.

SEC. 2. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of section 1 of this act, or aids and abets in a violation thereof, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 3. When used in this act the term "election" shall include a general or special election, and in the case of a Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands, an election by the Philippine Legislature, and shall also include a primary election or convention of a political party.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "or prospective candidate."

Page 2, at the end of line 20, insert the following:

"The term 'candidate' means any person who has publicly declared his intention to seek election to any of the offices named in section 1 of this act or who has caused or permitted his intention to do so to be publicly declared."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, after the word "election", strike out the remainder of line 17, lines 18 and line 19, through the word "legislature."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING FERTILIZERS, FEEDS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3405) making certain regulations with reference to fertilizers, feeds, nursery stock, or seeds that may be distributed by agencies of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COOPERATIVE SUSTAINED-YIELD UNIT AGREEMENTS WITH FOREST OWNERS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

When the Consent Calendar was called 2 weeks ago, I asked unanimous consent to have this bill go over without prejudice, in order that I might send copies of the bill to certain persons who will be affected if the bill becomes law. From replies received, it seems that at three points, at least, the bill should be amended before it passes. One is to make clear that notice be given to the individual owner within the area before his land is placed in a proposed unit. This notice should be in ample time for him to ask for a hearing if he desires one.

Another objection raised is that on page 7, lines 7 to 18, the Secretary is given authority to modify the proposed conditions for a unit without further hearings, while on page 9 of the bill it is provided that "each Secretary may delegate any of his powers and duties under this act to other officers or employees of this Department."

This means that a clerk could modify the proposals made or the conditions for the sale of timber without competitive bidding, and without any further hearings in the matter. That, it seems to me, is objectionable.

Another change that should be made is to provide that where Indian lands are included, the consent of the Indians concerned should be obtained.

The language of the bill would place Indian forest lands, either tribal or individually allotted, into the hands of the Secretary, to be included in units without the consent of the Indians.

The bill should be amended to provide that wherever Indian lands are to be included, it shall be done only with the consent of the tribe or the individual Indians concerned.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice, in order that amendments may be prepared to meet these objections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman's objections can be answered, and I shall discuss the matter with him between now and the end of the call of the calendar. I think this bill has been somewhat misunderstood. It permits private owners of timber to make agreements with the Federal Forest Service, so that private timber may be taken with Federal timber on a sustained basis. If we do not protect the sale of Federal timber in some such manner, the sales policy now existing will continue to the detriment of the future yield of timber. I am hopeful that on further explanation of the bill we may take it up for consideration before the end of the call of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

CREDITING DISBURSING OFFICER FOR PAYMENT FOR SERVICES RENDERED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2908) to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

WAR SHIPPING FIELD SERVICE

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 182, to create the war shipping field service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Clerk called Senate Joint Resolution 77, to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONVEYING CERTAIN LANDS IN BROOKLYN NAVY YARD TO CITY OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1349) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer, under such conditions as may be approved by the said Secretary, to the city of New York, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of land containing three-tenths of an acre, more or less, located on the westerly side of a new street between Kent Avenue and Flushing Avenue, and in and to a strip of land 27 feet wide, located on the southerly side of Kent Avenue between Washington Avenue and Hewes Street, in the Borough of Brooklyn, city and State of New York, both of said parcels being within the boundaries of lands acquired for the expansion of the Brooklyn Navy Yard, and metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT OF 6 MONTHS' DEATH GRATUITY TO WIDOW OF OFFICERS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1428) to amend the provisions of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision contained in the act approved June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824), as amended (45 Stat. 710; 56 Stat. 146; 34 U. S. C., Supp. 943), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "Immediately upon official notification of the death from wounds or disease, not the result of his or her own misconduct, of any officer, enlisted man, or nurse on the active list of the Regular Navy or Regular Marine Corps, or on the retired list when on active duty, the Paymaster General of the Navy shall cause to be paid to the widow, and if there be no widow, to the child or children, and if there be no widow or child, to any other dependent relative of such officer, enlisted man, or nurse previously designated by him or her, an amount equal to 6 months' pay at the rate received by such officer, enlisted man, or nurse at the date of his or her death. The Secretary of the Navy shall establish regulations requiring each officer and enlisted man or nurse having no wife or child to designate the proper dependent relative to whom this amount shall be paid in case of his or her death. Said amount shall be paid from funds appropriated for the pay of the Navy and pay of the Marine Corps, respectively: *Provided*, That if there be no widow, child, or previously designated dependent relative, the Secretary of the Navy shall cause the amount herein provided to be paid to any grandchild, parent, brother, or sister, or grandparent shown to have been dependent upon such officer, enlisted man, or nurse prior to his or her death, and the determination of such fact by the Secretary of the Navy shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section or in other existing legislation shall be construed as making the provisions of this section applicable to officers, enlisted men, or nurses of any forces of the Navy of the United States other than those of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and nothing in this section shall be construed to apply in commissioned grades to any officers except those holding permanent or probationary appointments in the Regular Navy or Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall apply to the officers and enlisted men of the Coast Guard, and the Secretary of the Treasury will cause payment to be made accordingly: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of any beneficiary before payment to and collection by such beneficiary of the amount authorized herein, such amount shall be paid to the next living beneficiary in the order of succession above stated."

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in section 1 of this act shall be construed to invalidate or in any manner affect any payments of the 6-month death gratuity made prior to the date of approval of this act, but no payment of such gratuity shall hereafter be made to the representative of the estate of a beneficiary who died prior to such approval.

SEC. 3. The act approved March 17, 1941, entitled "An act extending the provisions of the act approved August 27, 1940, entitled 'An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes'" (55 Stat. 43; 34 U. S. C., Supp. 855c–2), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end of section 1 thereof the following words: "or as hereafter amended."

SEC. 4. The act approved January 19, 1942, entitled "An act to regulate the distribution and promotion of commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes" (56 Stat. 6; 33 U. S. C., Supp. 870), is hereby amended by inserting after the words "Marine Corps" in the sixth line of section 9 thereof, the words "or as hereafter amended."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF NAVY TO ACCEPT GIFTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1640) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Section 3 of this bill provides that gifts and bequests accepted by the Secretary of the Navy shall be exempt from the Federal tax. I approve of the purpose of the bill, but I do not like the language. I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee and he has no objection to an amendment which I am going to offer, putting the language more in accordance with language which should be used.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized in his discretion to accept, receive, hold, administer, and expend gifts and bequests of personal property, from individuals or others, for the benefit of, or for use in connection with, the United States Naval Academy.

SEC. 2. Gifts or bequests of money or the proceeds from sales of other property received as gifts shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States under the title "United States Naval Academy general gift fund," and any funds so deposited shall be subject to disbursement by the Secretary of the Navy for the benefit or use of the United States Naval Academy subject to the terms and conditions of the acceptance of any particular gift or bequest.

SEC. 3. Gifts and bequests accepted by the Secretary of the Navy under authority of this act shall be exempt from all Federal taxes.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, to invest, reinvest, or retain investments of the money or securities composing the United States Naval Academy general gift fund, or any part thereof, deposited in the Treasury pursuant to section 2 of this act, in securities of the United States Government or in securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States Government. The interest and profits accruing from such securities may be deposited to the credit of the United States Naval Academy general gift fund, and will be available for disbursement as provided in section 2 of this act.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: Page 2, line 6, strike out section 3 and insert a new section 3, as follows:

"For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, gifts and bequests accepted by the Secretary of the Navy under the authority of this act shall be deemed to be gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill, as amended, was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE ACT APPROVED MARCH 2, 1895, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1647, to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 807), as amended by an act approved March 8, 1928 (45 Stat. 247), is further amended by inserting in the third line of the proviso as it appears on page 247 of volume 45 of the United States Statutes at Large, after the word "employees" the following: "and bonded officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all of the bill after the word "following:" in line 8 and substitute therefor the following: "officers and employees of other civilian agencies of the United States and bonded officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE TITLES FOR HEADS OF STAFF DEPARTMENTS OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1653, to provide titles for the heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter officers serving as heads of the Paymaster's Department and the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Marine Corps shall have the title of "The Paymaster General of the Marine Corps" and "The Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps", respectively.

SEC. 2. All laws or parts of laws now in force relating to the staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, except as provided in section 1 of this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 9 OF THE PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1675, to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (Public Law 607) by providing for the computation of double-time credits awarded between 1898 and 1912 in determining retired pay.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

TO ELIMINATE A PAY DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE TEACHER OF MUSIC AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3943, to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill be substituted for the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill (S. 1635), as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to make better provision for the teacher of music, the leader of the Military Academy Band," approved May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), is amended by striking out the words "third pay period," wherever they occur in such act, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "grade of captain."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar bill (H. R. 3943) was laid on the table.

TO CODIFY AND ENACT INTO ABSOLUTE LAW, TITLE 1 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "GENERAL PROVISIONS"

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2040, to codify and enact into absolute law title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I understand this bill and three other bills on the consent calendar today are from the Committee on Revision of the Laws previously passed the House. They are codification bills and do not propose to enact any new substantive law. The gentleman from Texas is present and is familiar with that. I would like to yield to him for a brief statement.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill does exactly what the title states. It is a bill to codify and reenact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code entitled "General Provisions." It makes no change whatsoever in any substantive law. A bill identical with this bill passed the Seventy-seventh Congress and the Senate failed to act on it. The bill was reintroduced and has been again reported unanimously from the Committee on Revision of the Laws. The importance of this and similar bills was explained by Chairman EUGENE KEOGH of the Revision of the Laws Committee at the time of the original passage of this bill in the Seventy-seventh Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman from Texas advise the House what steps were taken by the committee to make certain that whatever provisions of existing substantive law may have been dropped by this codification, should have been dropped? In other words, that this codification is an exact reenactment of existing law? How particular was the committee?

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill was carefully gone over by several of the leading lawbook companies, and also by an expert employed by the committee. Every precaution was taken to make sure that no substantive provisions were changed in any particular, or deleted.

Mr. COLE of New York. Has the committee's own staff checked to make sure that the findings of the lawbook publishing companies have been correct?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes; the committee has carefully checked these bills.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title I of the United States Code entitled "General Provisions," is codified and enacted into absolute law as follows:

"TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Chap.	Sec.
"1. Rules of construction	1
"2. Acts and resolutions; formalities of enactment; repeals; sealing of instruments	101
"3. Code of Laws of United States and Supplements; District of Columbia Code and Supplements	201

"CHAPTER 1—RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

"Sec. 1. Words denoting number, gender, etc.
"Sec. 2. 'County' as including 'parish,' etc.
"Sec. 3. 'Vessel' as including all means of water transportation.
"Sec. 4. 'Vehicle' as including all means of land transportation.
"Sec. 5. 'Company' or 'association' as including successors and assigns.
"Sec. 6. Limitation of term 'products of American fisheries.'

"Words denoting number, gender, and so forth

"Section 1. In determining the meaning of any Act or resolution of Congress words importing the singular number may extend and be applied to several persons or things; words importing the plural number may include the singular; words importing the masculine gender may be applied to females; the words 'insane person' and 'lunatic' shall include every idiot, non compos, lunatic, and insane person; the word 'person' may extend and be applied to partnerships and corporations, and the reference to any officer shall include any person authorized by law to perform the duties of such office, unless the context shows that such words were intended to be used in a more limited sense; and a requirement of an 'oath' shall be deemed complied with by making affirmation in judicial form.

"'County' as including 'parish,' and so forth

"SEC. 2. The word 'county' includes a parish, or any other equivalent subdivision of a State or Territory of the United States.

"'Vessel' as including all means of water transportation

"SEC. 3. The word 'vessel' includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on water.

"'Vehicle' as including all means of land transportation

"SEC. 4. The word 'vehicle' includes every description of carriage or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on land.

"'Company' or 'association' as including successors and assigns

"SEC. 5. The word 'company' or 'association,' when used in reference to a corporation, shall be deemed to embrace the words 'successors and assigns of such company or association,' in like manner as if these last-named words, or words of similar import, were expressed.

"Limitation of term 'products of American fisheries'

"SEC. 6. Wherever, in the statutes of the United States or in the rulings, regulations, or interpretations of various administrative bureaus and agencies of the United States there appears or may appear the term 'products of American fisheries' said term shall not include fresh or frozen fish fillets, fresh or frozen fish steaks, or fresh or frozen slices of fish substantially free of bone (including any of the foregoing divided into sections), produced in a foreign country or its territorial waters, in whole or in part with the use of the

labor of persons who are not residents of the United States.

"CHAPTER 2—ACTS AND RESOLUTIONS; FORMALITIES OF ENACTMENT; REPEALS; SEALING OF INSTRUMENTS

"Sec. 101. Enacting clause.
"Sec. 102. Resolving clause.
"Sec. 103. Enacting or resolving words after first section.
"Sec. 104. Numbering of sections; single proposition.
"Sec. 105. Title of appropriation acts.
"Sec. 106. Printing bills and joint resolutions.
"Sec. 107. Parchment or paper for printing enrolled bills or resolutions.
"Sec. 108. Repeal of repealing act.
"Sec. 109. Repeal of statutes as affecting existing liabilities.
"Sec. 110. Saving clause of Revised Statutes.
"Sec. 111. Repeals as evidence of prior effectiveness.
"Sec. 112. Statutes at Large; contents; admissibility in evidence.
"Sec. 113. 'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; admissibility in evidence.
"Sec. 114. Sealing of instruments.

"Enacting clause

"SEC. 101. The enacting clause of all acts of Congress shall be in the following form: 'Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.'

"Resolving clause

"SEC. 102. The resolving clause of all joint resolutions shall be in the following form: 'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.'

"Enacting or resolving words after first section

"SEC. 103. No enacting or resolving words shall be used in any section of an act or resolution of Congress except in the first.

"Numbering of sections; single proposition

"SEC. 104. Each section shall be numbered, and shall contain, as nearly as may be, a single proposition of enactment.

"Title of appropriation acts

"SEC. 105. The style and title of all acts making appropriations for the support of Government shall be as follows: 'An act making appropriations (here insert the object) for the year ending June 30 (here insert the calendar year).'

"Printing bills and joint resolutions

"SEC. 106. Every bill or joint resolution in each House of Congress shall, when such bill or resolution passes either House, be printed, and such printed copy shall be called the engrossed bill or resolution as the case may be. Said engrossed bill or resolution shall be signed by the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be sent to the other House, and in that form shall be dealt with by that House and its officers, and, if passed, returned signed by said Clerk or Secretary. When such bill, or joint resolution shall have passed both Houses, it shall be printed and shall then be called the enrolled bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be, and shall be signed by the presiding officers of both Houses and sent to the President of the United States. During the last of a session such engrossing and enrolling of bills and joint resolutions may be done otherwise than as above prescribed, upon the order of Congress by concurrent resolution.

"Parchment or paper for printing enrolled bills or resolutions

"SEC. 107. Enrolled bills and resolutions of either House of Congress shall be printed on parchment or paper of suitable quality as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing.

"Repeal of repealing act

"SEC. 108. Whenever an act is repealed, which repealed a former act, such former act shall not thereby be revived, unless it shall be expressly so provided.

"Repeal of statutes as affecting existing liabilities

"SEC. 109. The repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing act shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability.

"Saving clause of revised statutes

"SEC. 110. All acts of limitation, whether applicable to civil causes and proceedings, or to the prosecution of offenses, or for the recovery of penalties or forfeitures, embraced in the Revised Statutes and covered by the repeal contained therein, shall not be affected thereby, but all suits, proceedings, or prosecutions, whether civil or criminal, for causes arising, or acts done or committed prior to said repeal, may be commenced and prosecuted within the same time as if said repeal had not been made.

"Repeals as evidence of prior effectiveness

"SEC. 111. No inference shall be raised by the enactment of the act of March 3, 1933 (ch. 202, 47 Stat. 1431), that the sections of the Revised Statutes repealed by such act were in force or effect at the time of such enactment: *Provided, however,* That any rights or liabilities existing under such repealed sections shall not be affected by their repeal.

"Statutes at large; contents; admissibility in evidence

"SEC. 112. The Secretary of State shall cause to be compiled, edited, indexed, and published, the United States Statutes at Large, which shall contain all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during each regular session of Congress; all treaties to which the United States is a party that have been proclaimed since the date of the adjournment of the regular session of Congress next preceding; all international agreements other than treaties to which the United States is a party that have been signed, proclaimed, or with reference to which any other final formality has been executed, since that date; all proclamations by the President in the numbered series issued since that date; and also any amendments to the Constitution of the United States proposed or ratified pursuant to article V thereof since that date, together with the certificate of the Secretary of State issued in compliance with the provision contained in section 160 of title 5. In the event of an extra session of Congress, the Secretary of State shall cause all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during said extra session to be consolidated with, and published as part of, the contents of the volume for the next regular session. The United States Statutes at Large shall be legal evidence of laws, concurrent resolutions, treaties, international agreements other than treaties, proclamations by the President, and proposed or ratified amendments to the Constitution of the United States therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

"Little and Brown's edition of laws and treaties; admissibility in evidence

"SEC. 113. The edition of the laws and treaties of the United States, published by Little and Brown, shall be competent evidence of the several public and private acts of Congress, and of the several treaties therein contained, in all the courts of law and equity and of maritime jurisdiction, and in all the tribunals and public officers of the United States, and of the several States, without any further proof or authentication thereof.

"Sealing of instruments

"SEC. 114. In all cases where a seal is necessary by law to any commission, process, or other instrument provided for by the laws of Congress, it shall be lawful to affix the proper seal by making an impression therewith directly on the paper to which such seal is necessary; which shall be as valid as if made on wax or other adhesive substance.

"CHAPTER 3—CODE OF LAWS OF UNITED STATES AND SUPPLEMENTS; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE AND SUPPLEMENTS

"Sec. 201. Publication and distribution of Code of Laws of United States and Supplements and District of Columbia Code and Supplements.
"(a) Publishing in slip or pamphlet form or in Statutes at Large.
"(b) Curtailing number of copies published.
"(c) Dispensing with publication of more than one Supplement for each Congress.
"Sec. 202. Preparation and publication of Codes and Supplements.
"(a) Cumulative Supplements to Code of Laws of United States for each session of Congress.
"(b) Cumulative Supplement to District of Columbia Code for each session of Congress.
"(c) New editions of Codes and Supplements.
"Sec. 203. District of Columbia Code; preparation and publication; cumulative supplements.
"Sec. 204. Codes and Supplements as evidence of the Laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of Codes and Supplements.
"(a) United States Code.
"(b) District of Columbia Code.
"(c) District of Columbia Code; citation.
"(d) Supplements to Codes; citation.
"(e) New edition of Codes; citation.
"Sec. 205. Codes and Supplements; where printed; form and style; ancillaries.
"Sec. 206. Bills and resolutions of Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives; form and style; ancillaries; curtailment of copies.
"Sec. 207. Copies of acts and resolutions in slip form; additional number printed for Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives.
"Sec. 208. Delegation of function of Committee on Revision of the Laws to other agencies; printing, etc., under direction of Joint Committee on Printing.
"Sec. 209. Copies of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; conclusive evidence of original.
"Sec. 210. Distribution of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; slip and pamphlet copies.
"Sec. 211. Copies to Members of Congress.
"Sec. 212. Additional distribution at each new Congress.
"Sec. 213. Appropriation for preparing and editing supplements.

"Publication and distribution of Code of Laws of United States and Supplements and District of Columbia Code and Supplements

"SEC. 201. In order to avoid duplication and waste—

"(a) Publishing in slip or pamphlet form or in Statutes at Large: Publication in slip or pamphlet form or in the Statutes at Large of any of the volumes or publications enumerated in sections 202, 203 of this title, shall, in event of enactment, be dispensed with whenever the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives so directs the Secretary of State;

"(b) Curtailing number of copies published: Curtailment of the number provided by law to be printed and distributed of the volumes or publications enumerated in sections 202, 203 of this title may be directed by such committee, except that the Public Printer shall print such numbers as are necessary for depository library distribution and for sale; and

"(c) Dispensing with publication of more than one supplement for each Congress: Such committee may direct that the printing and distribution of any supplement to the Code of Laws of the United States or to the Code of the District of Columbia be dispensed with entirely, except that there shall be printed and distributed for each Congress at least one supplement to each such code, containing the legislation of such Congress.

"Preparation and publication of codes and supplements

"SEC. 202. There shall be prepared and published under the supervision of the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives—

"(a) Cumulative Supplements to Code of Laws of United States for each session of Congress: A supplement for each session of the Congress to the then current edition of the Code of Laws of the United States, cumulatively embracing the legislation of the then current supplement, and correcting errors in such edition and supplement;

"(b) Cumulative Supplements to District of Columbia Code for each session of Congress: A supplement for each session of the Congress to the then current edition of the Code of the District of Columbia, cumulatively embracing the legislation of the then current supplement, and correcting errors in such edition and supplement;

"(c) New editions of codes and supplements: New editions of the Code of Laws of the United States and of the Code of the District of Columbia, correcting errors and incorporating the then current supplement. In the case of each code new editions shall not be published oftener than once in each 5 years. Copies of each such edition shall be distributed in the same manner as provided in the case of supplements to the code of which it is a new edtion. Supplements published after any new edition shall not contain the legislation of supplements published before such new edition.

"District of Columbia Code; preparation and publication; cumulative supplements

"SEC. 203. The Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives is authorized to print bills to codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws relating to the District of Columbia and cumulative supplements thereto, similar in style, respectively, to the Code of Laws of the United States, and supplements thereto, and to so continue until final enactment thereof in both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

"Codes and supplements as evidence of the laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of codes and supplements

"SEC. 204. In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home or abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States—

"(a) United States Code: The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of Laws of the United States current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie the laws of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, in force on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included: *Provided, however,* That whenever titles of such Code shall have been enacted into positive law the text thereof shall be legal evidence of the laws therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

"(b) District of Columbia Code: The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of the District of Columbia current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie the laws, general and permanent in their nature, relating to or in force in the District of Columbia on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included, except such laws as are of application in the District of Columbia by reason of being laws of the United States general and permanent in their nature.

"(c) District of Columbia Code; citation: The Code of the District of Columbia may be cited as 'D. C. Code.'

"(d) Supplements to Codes; citation: Supplements to the Code of Laws of the United States and to the Code of the District of Columbia may be cited, respectively, as 'U. S. C., Sup. —', and 'D. C. Code, Sup. —', the blank in each case being filled with Roman figures denoting the number of the supplement.

"(e) New edition of Codes; citation: New editions of each of such codes may be cited, respectively, as 'U. S. C., — ed.', and 'D. C. Code, — ed.', the blank in each case being filled with figures denoting the last year the legislation of which is included in whole or in part.

"Codes and supplement; where printed; form and style; ancillaries

"SEC. 205. The publications provided for in sections 202, 203 of this title shall be printed at the Government Printing Office and shall be in such form and style and with such ancillaries as may be prescribed by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives. The Librarian of Congress is directed to cooperate with such committee in the preparation of such ancillaries. Such publications shall be furnished with such thumb insets and other devices to distinguish parts, with such facilities for the insertion of additional matter, and with such explanatory and advertising slips, and shall be printed on such paper and bound in such material, as may be prescribed by such committee.

"Bills and resolutions of Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives; form and style; ancillaries; curtailment of copies

"SEC. 206. All bills and resolutions referred to or reported by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives shall be printed in such form and style, and with such ancillaries, as such committee may prescribe as being economical and suitable, to so continue until final enactment thereof in both Houses of Congress; and such committee may also curtail the number of copies of such bills to be printed in the various parliamentary stages in the House of Representatives.

"Copies of acts and resolutions in slip form; additional number printed for Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives

"SEC. 207. The Public Printer is directed to print, in addition to the number provided by existing law, and, as soon as printed, to distribute in such manner as the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives shall determine, 20 copies in slip form of each public act and joint resolution.

"Delegation of function of Committee on Revision of the Laws to other agencies; printing, and so forth, under direction of Joint Committee on Printing

"SEC. 208. The functions vested by sections 201, 202, 204–207 of this title in the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives may from time to time be vested in such other agency as the Congress may by concurrent resolution provide: *Provided,* That the printing, binding, and distribution of the volumes and publications enumerated in sections 202, 203 of this title shall be done under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

"Copies of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; conclusive evidence of original

"SEC. 209. Copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia and copies of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title printed at the Government Printing Office and bearing its imprint, shall be conclusive evidence of the original of such code and supplements in the custody of the Secretary of State.

"Distribution of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; slip and pamphlet copies

"SEC. 210. Copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title shall be distributed by the Superintendent of Documents in the same manner as bound volumes of the Statutes at Large: *Provided,* That no slip or pamphlet copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title need be printed or distributed.

"Copies to Members of Congress

"SEC. 211. In addition to quotas provided for by section 210 of this title there shall be printed, published, and distributed of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia with tables, index, and other ancillaries, suitably bound and with thumb inserts and other convenient devices to distinguish the parts, and of the supplements to both codes as provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title, 10 copies of each for each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress in which the original authorized publication is made, for his use and distribution, and in addition for the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a number of bound copies of each equal to 10 times the number of members of such committees, and one bound copy of each for the use of each committee of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"Additional distribution at each new Congress

"SEC. 212. In addition the Superintendent of Documents shall, at the beginning of the first session of each Congress, supply to each Senator and Representative in such Congress, who may in writing apply for the same, one copy each of the Code of Laws of the United States, the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and the latest supplement to each code: *Provided,* That such applicant shall certify in his written application for the same that the volume or volumes for which he applies is intended for his personal use exclusively: *And provided further,* That no Senator or Representative during his term of service shall receive under this section

more than one copy each of the volumes enumerated herein.

"Appropriation for preparing and editing supplements

"SEC. 213. For preparation and editing, an annual appropriation of $6,500 is authorized to carry out the purposes of sections 202 and 203 of this title."

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large or the Revised Statutes covering provisions codified in this act are hereby repealed insofar as such provisions appeared in title I, United States Code, 1940 edition, as shown by the appended table: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

"Statutes at Large or Revised Statutes	*Title I, United States Code, 1940 edition, section*
R. S., sec. 1	1
R. S., sec. 2	2
R. S., sec. 3	3
R. S., sec. 4	4
R. S., sec. 5	5
Act June 11, 1940, ch. 325, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 305	6
R. S., sec. 7	21
R. S., sec. 8	22
R. S., sec. 9	23
R. S., sec. 10	24
R. S., sec. 11	25
Res. Nov. 1, 1893, 28 Stat. Appendix 5; act Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 1, 28 Stat. 769	26
Act Mar. 6, 1920, ch. 94, sec. 1, 41 Stat. 520	27
R. S., sec. 12	28
R. S., sec. 13	29
R. S., sec. 5599	29a
Act Mar. 3, 1933, ch. 202, sec. 3, 47 Stat. 1431	29b
Act Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, sec. 73, 28 Stat. 615; June 20, 1936, ch. 630, sec. 9, 49 Stat. 1551; June 16, 1938, ch. 477, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 760	30
R. S., sec. 908	30a
R. S., sec. 6	31
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 1, 45 Stat. 1540	51a
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 2, 45 Stat. 1007; Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 2, 45 Stat. 1541	52
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 3, 45 Stat. 1007	53
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 4, 45 Stat. 1007; Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 3, 45 Stat. 1541	54
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 4, 45 Stat. 1542; act Mar. 4, 1933, ch. 282, sec. 1, 47 Stat. 1603; June 13, 1934, ch. 483, secs. 1, 2, 48 Stat. 948	54a
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 5, 45 Stat. 1542; act Mar. 4, 1933, ch. 282, sec. 1, 47 Stat. 1603; June 13, 1934, ch. 483, secs. 1, 2, 48 Stat. 948	54b
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 6, 45 Stat. 1542	54c
Res. Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 7, 45 Stat. 1542	54d
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 5, 45 Stat. 1007	55
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 6, 45 Stat. 1007	56
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 7, 45 Stat. 1008	57
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 8, 45 Stat. 1008	58
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 10, 45 Stat. 1008	59
Act Mar. 3, 1933, ch. 202, sec. 2, 47 Stat. 1431	60

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO CODIFY AND ENACT INTO ABSOLUTE LAW TITLE 4 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE ENTITLED "FLAG AND SEAL, SEAT OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE STATES"

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2038, to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States," is codified and enacted into absolute law, as follows:

"TITLE 4—FLAG AND SEAL, SEAT OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE STATES

"Sec. 1. Flag; stripes and stars on.
"Sec. 2. Same; additional stars.
"Sec. 3. Use of flag for advertising purposes; mutilation of flag.
"Sec. 4. Seal of United States.
"Sec. 5. Same; custody and use of.
"Sec. 6. Permanent seat of government.
"Sec. 7. Public offices; at seat of government.
"Sec. 8. Same; removal from seat of government.
"Sec. 9. Oath by members of legislatures and officers.
"Sec. 10. Same; by whom administered.
"Sec. 11. Assent to purchase of lands for forts.
"Sec. 12. Tax on motor fuel sold on military or other reservation; reports to State taxing authority.
"Sec. 13. State, etc., taxation affecting Federal areas; sales or use tax.
"Sec. 14. Same; income tax.
"Sec. 15. Same; exception of United States, its instrumentalities, and authorized purchasers therefrom.
"Sec. 16. Same; jurisdiction of United States over Federal areas unaffected.
"Sec. 17. Same; exception of Indians.
"Sec. 18. Same; definitions.

"FLAG; STRIPES AND STARS ON

"SEC. 1. The flag of the United States shall be 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; and the union of the flag shall be 48 stars, white in a blue field.

"SAME; ADDITIONAL STARS

"SEC. 2. On the admission of a new State into the Union one star shall be added to the union of the flag; and such addition shall take effect on the 4th day of July then next succeeding such admission.

"USE OF FLAG FOR ADVERTISING PURPOSES; MUTILATION OF FLAG

"SEC. 3. Any person who, within the District of Columbia, in any manner, for exhibition or display, shall place or cause to be placed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, drawing, or any advertisement of any nature upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States of America; or shall expose or cause to be exposed to public view any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign upon which shall have been printed, painted, or otherwise placed, or to which shall be attached, appended, affixed, or annexed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, or drawing, or any advertisement of any nature; or who, within the District of Columbia, shall manufacture, sell, expose for sale, or to public view, or give away or have in possession for sale, or to be given away or for use for any purpose, any article or substance being an article of merchandise, or a receptacle for merchandise or article or thing for carrying or transporting merchandise, upon which shall have been printed, painted, attached, or otherwise placed a representation of any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, to advertise, call attention to, decorate, mark, or distinguish the article or substance on which so placed; or who, within the District of Columbia, shall publicly mutilate, deface, defile, or defy, trample upon, or cast contempt, either by word or act, upon any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court. The words 'flag, standard, colors, or ensign,' as used herein, shall include any flag, standard, colors, ensign, or any picture or representation of either, or of any part or parts of either, made of any substance or represented on any substance, of any size evidently purporting to be either of said flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States of America or a picture or a representation of either, upon which shall be shown the colors, the stars and the stripes, in any number of either thereof, or of any part or parts of either, by which the average person seeing the same without deliberation may believe the same to represent the flag, colors, standard, or ensign of the United States of America.

"SEAL OF THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 4. The seal heretofore used by the United States in Congress assembled is declared to be the seal of the United States.

"SAME; CUSTODY AND USE OF

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of State shall have the custody and charge of such seal, and shall make out and record, and shall affix the same to, all civil commissions for officers of the United States, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone. But the seal shall not be affixed to any commission before the same has been signed by the President of the United States, nor to any other instrument, without the special warrant of the President therefor.

"PERMANENT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 6. All that part of the territory of the United States included within the present limits of the District of Columbia shall be the permanent seat of government of the United States.

"PUBLIC OFFICES; AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 7. All offices attached to the seat of government shall be exercised in the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere, except as otherwise expressly provided by law.

"SAME; REMOVAL FROM SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 8. In case of the prevalence of a contagious or epidemic disease at the seat of government, the President may permit and direct the removal of any or all the public offices to such other place or places as he shall deem most safe and convenient for conducting the public business.

"OATH BY MEMBERS OF LEGISLATURES AND OFFICERS

"SEC. 9. Every member of a State legislature, and every executive and judicial officer of a State, shall, before he proceeds to execute the duties of his office, take an oath in the following form, to wit: 'I, A B, do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States.'

"SAME; BY WHOM ADMINISTERED

"SEC. 10. Such oath may be administered by any person who, by the law of the State, is authorized to administer the oath of office; and the person so administering such oath shall cause a record or certificate thereof to be made in the same manner, as by the law of the State, he is directed to record or certify the oath of office.

"ASSENT TO PURCHASE OF LANDS FOR FORTS

"SEC. 11. The President of the United States is authorized to procure the assent of the legislature of any State, within which any purchase of land has been made for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards,

and other needful buildings, without such consent having been obtained.

"TAX ON MOTOR FUEL SOLD ON MILITARY OR OTHER RESERVATION; REPORTS TO STATE TAXING AUTHORITY

"SEC. 12. (a) All taxes levied by any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia upon, with respect to, or measured by, sales, purchases, storage, or use of gasoline or other motor vehicle fuels may be levied, in the same manner and to the same extent, with respect to such fuels when sold by or through post exchanges, ship stores, ship service stores, commissaries, filling stations, licensed traders, and other similar agencies, located on United States military or other reservations, when such fuels are not for the exclusive use of the United States. Such taxes, so levied, shall be paid to the proper taxing authority of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, within whose borders the reservation affected may be located.

"(b) The officer in charge of such reservation shall, on or before the 15th day of each month, submit a written statement to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia within whose borders the reservation is located, showing the amount of such motor fuel with respect to which taxes are payable under subsection (a) for the preceding month.

"STATE, ETC., TAXATION AFFECTING FEDERAL AREAS; SALES OR USE TAX

"SEC. 13. (a) No person shall be relieved from liability for payment of, collection of, or accounting for any sales or use tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such a tax, on the ground that the sale or use, with respect to which such tax is levied, occurred in whole or in part within a Federal area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect any such tax in any Federal area within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to sales or purchases made, receipts from sales received, or storage or use occurring, after December 31, 1940.

"SAME; INCOME TAX

"SEC. 14. (a) No person shall be relieved from liability for any income tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such a tax, by reason of his residing within a Federal area or receiving income from transactions occurring or services performed in such area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect such tax in any Federal area within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to income or receipts received after December 31, 1940.

"SAME; EXCEPTION OF UNITED STATES, ITS INSTRUMENTALITIES, AND AUTHORIZED PURCHASES THEREFROM

"SEC. 15. (a) The provisions of sections 13 and 14 of this title shall not be deemed to authorize the levy or collection of any tax on or from the United States or any instrumentality thereof, or the levy or collection of any tax with respect to sale, purchase, storage, or use of tangible personal property sold by the United States or any instrumentality thereof to any authorized purchaser.

"(b) A person shall be deemed to be an authorized purchaser under this section only with respect to purchases which he is permitted to make from commissaries, ship's stores, or voluntary unincorporated organizations of Army or Navy personnel, under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

"SAME; JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES OVER FEDERAL AREAS UNAFFECTED

"SEC. 16. The provisions of sections 13 to 18 of this title shall not for the purposes of any other provision of law be deemed to deprive the United States of exclusive jurisdiction over any Federal area over which it would otherwise have exclusive jurisdiction or to limit the jurisdiction of the United States over any Federal area.

"SAME; EXCEPTION OF INDIANS

"SEC. 17. Nothing in sections 13 and 14 of this title shall be deemed to authorize the levy or collection of any tax on or from any Indian not otherwise taxed.

"SAME; DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 18. As used in sections 13–17 of this title—

"(a) The term 'person' shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 3797 of title 26.

"(b) The term 'sales or use tax' means any tax levied on, with respect to, or measured by, sales, receipts from sales, purchases, storage, or use of tangible personal property, except a tax with respect to which the provisions of section 12 of this article are applicable.

"(c) The term 'income tax' means any tax levied on, with respect to, or measured by, net income, gross income, or gross receipts.

"(d) The term 'State' includes any Territory or possession of the United States.

"(e) The term 'Federal area' means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United States or any department, establishment, or agency of the United States; and any Federal area, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a Federal area located within such State."

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large or the Revised Statutes covering provisions codified in this act are hereby repealed insofar as such provisions appear in title 4, United States Code, 1940 edition, and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE OR REVISED STATUTES

	Title 4, United States Code, section
R. S., secs. 1791, 1792	1
R. S., sec. 1792	2
Feb. 8, 1917, ch. 34, 39 Stat. 900	3
R. S., sec. 1793	4
R. S., secs. 203 (first clause), 1794	5
R. S., sec. 1795	6
R. S., sec. 1796	7
R. S., sec. 4798	8
R. S., sec. 1836	9
R. S., sec. 1837	10
R. S., sec. 1838	11
June 16, 1936, ch. 582, sec. 10, 49 Stat. 1521; Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 7, 54 Stat. 1060	12
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 1059	13
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 2, 54 Stat. 1060	14
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 3, 54 Stat. 1060	15
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 4, 54 Stat. 1060	16
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 5, 54 Stat. 1060	17
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 6, 54 Stat. 1060	18

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO CODIFY AND ENACT INTO ABSOLUTE LAW TITLE 6 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "OFFICIAL AND PENAL BONDS"

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2039, to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds," is codified and enacted into absolute law, as follows:

"TITLE 6—OFFICIAL AND PENAL BONDS

"Sec. 1. Custory.
"Sec. 2. Examination as to sufficiency of sureties.
"Sec. 3. Renewal; continuance of liability.
"Sec. 4. Notice of delinquency of principal.
"Sec. 5. Limitation of actions against sureties.
"Sec. 6. Surety companies as sureties.
"Sec. 7. Same; appointment of agents, service of process.
"Sec. 8. Same; deposit of copy of charter.
"Sec. 9. Same; quarterly statements.
"Sec. 10. Same; jurisdiction of suits on bonds.
"Sec. 11. Same; nonpayment of judgment.
"Sec. 12. Same; estoppel to deny corporate powers.
"Sec. 13. Same; failure to comply with the law.
"Sec. 14. Rate of premium on bond; premiums not to be paid by United States.
"Sec. 15. Bonds or notes of United States in lieu of recognizance, stipulation, bond, guaranty, or undertaking; place of deposit; return to depositor; contractors' bonds.

"CUSTODY

"SEC. 1. All bonds of the Treasurer of the United States, collectors of internal revenue, collectors, comptrollers of customs, surveyors, and other officers of the customs, either as such officers or as disbursing officers of the Treasury, bonds of the Secretary of the Senate, Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, shall be placed in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury and filed as he may direct; and the duties required by law on March 2, 1895, of the Comptroller of the Treasury in regard to such bonds, as the successor of the Commissioner of Customs and First Comptroller of the Treasury, shall be performed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"EXAMINATION AS TO SUFFICIENCY OF SURETIES

"SEC. 2. Every officer required by law to take and approve official bonds shall cause the same to be examined at least once every 2 years for the purpose of ascertaining the sufficiency of the sureties thereon; and every officer having power to fix the amount of an official bond shall examine it to ascertain the sufficiency of the amount thereof and approve or fix said amount at least once in 2 years and as much oftener as he may deem it necessary.

"RENEWAL; CONTINUANCE OF LIABILITY

"SEC. 3. Every officer whose duty it is to take and approve official bonds shall cause all such bonds to be renewed every 4 years after their dates, but he may require such bonds to be renewed or strengthened oftener if he deem such action necessary. In the discretion of such officer the requirement of a new bond may be waived for the period of service of a bonded officer after the expiration of a

4-year term of service pending the appointment and qualification of his successor. The nonperformance of any requirement of the provisions of sections 1 to 3 of this title, or of that part of section 27 of title 19 relating to transmitting copies of oaths to the Secretary of the Treasury, on the part of any official of the Government shall not be held to affect in any respect the liability of principal or sureties on any bond made or to be made to the United States. The liability of the principal and sureties on all official bonds shall continue and cover the period of service ensuing until the appointment and qualification of the successor of the principal. Nothing in said sections shall be construed to repeal or modify section 38 of title 39: *Provided*, That the payment and acceptance of the annual premium on corporate surety bonds furnished by postal officers and employees shall be a compliance with the requirement for the renewal of such bonds within the meaning of sections 1 to 3 of this title.

"NOTICE OF DELINQUENCY OF PRINCIPAL

"SEC. 4. Whenever any deficiency shall be discovered in the accounts of any official of the United States, or of any officer disbursing or chargeable with public money, it shall be the duty of the accounting officers making such discovery to at once notify the head of the department having control over the affairs of said officer of the nature and amount of said deficiency, and it shall be the immediate duty of said head of department to at once notify all obligors upon the bond or bonds of such official of the nature of such deficiency and the amount thereof. Said notification shall be deemed sufficient if mailed at the post office in the city of Washington, D. C., addressed to said sureties respectively and directed to the respective post offices where said obligors may reside, if known; but a failure to give or mail such notice shall not discharge the surety or sureties upon such bond.

"LIMITATION OF ACTIONS AGAINST SURETIES

"SEC. 5. If, upon the statement of the account of any official of the United States, or of any officer disbursing or chargeable with public money, by the accounting officers, it shall thereby appear that he is indebted to the United States, and suit therefor shall not be instituted within 5 years after such statement of said account, the sureties on his bond shall not be liable for such indebtedness.

"SURETY COMPANIES AS SURETIES

"SEC. 6. Whenever any recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking conditioned for the faithful performance of any duty, or for doing or refraining from doing anything in such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking specified, is by the laws of the United States required or permitted to be given with one surety or with two or more sureties, the execution of the same or the guaranteeing of the performance of the condition thereof shall be sufficient when executed or guaranteed solely by a corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or of any State having power to guarantee the fidelity of persons holding positions of public or private trust, and to execute and guarantee bonds and undertakings in judicial proceedings. Such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking shall be approved by the head of department, court, judge, officer, board, or body executive, legislative, or judicial required to approve or accept the same. No officer or person having the approval of any bond shall exact that it shall be furnished by a guaranty company or by any particular guaranty company.

"SAME; APPOINTMENT OF AGENTS; SERVICE OF PROCESS

"SEC. 7. No such company shall do business under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title beyond the limits of the State or Territory under whose laws it was incorporated and in which its principal office is located, nor beyond the limits of the District of Columbia, when such company was incorporated under its laws or the laws of the United States and its principal office is located in said District, until it shall by a written power of attorney appoint some person residing within the jurisdiction of the court for the judicial district wherein such suretyship is to be undertaken, who shall be a citizen of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia, wherein such court is held, as its agent, upon whom may be served all lawful process against such company, and who shall be authorized to enter an appearance in its behalf. A copy of such power of attorney, duly certified and authenticated, shall be filed with the clerk of the district court of the United States for such district at each place where a term of such court is or may be held, which copy, or a certified copy thereof, shall be legal evidence in all controversies arising under sections 6 to 13 of this title. If any such agent shall be removed, resign, or die, become insane, or otherwise incapable of acting, it shall be the duty of such company to appoint another agent in his place as hereinbefore prescribed, and until such appointment shall have been made, or during the absence of any agent of such company from such district, service of process may be upon the clerk of the court wherein such suit is brought, with like effect as upon an agent appointed by the company. The officer executing such process upon such clerk shall immediately transmit a copy thereof by mail to the company, and state such fact in his return. A judgment, decree, or order of a court entered or made after service of process as aforesaid shall be as valid and binding on such company as if served with process in said district.

"SAME; DEPOSIT OF COPY OF CHARTER

"SEC. 8. Every company, before transacting any business under sections 6 to 13 of this title, shall deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a copy of its charter or articles of incorporation, and a statement, signed and sworn to by its president and secretary, showing its assets and liabilities. If the said Secretary of the Treasury shall be satisfied that such company has authority under its charter to do the business provided for in sections 6 to 13 of this title, and that it has a paid-up capital of not less than $250,000, in cash or its equivalent, and is able to keep and perform its contracts, he shall grant authority in writing to such company to do business under sections 6 to 13 of this title.

"SAME; QUARTERLY STATEMENTS

"SEC. 9. Every such company shall, in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year, file with the said Secretary of the Treasury a statement, signed and sworn to by its president and secretary, showing its assets and liabilities, as is required by section 8 of this title. The said Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power, and it shall be his duty, to revoke the authority of any such company to transact any new business under sections 6 to 13 of this title whenever in his judgment such company is not solvent or is conducting its business in violation of sections 6 to 13 of this title. He may institute inquiry at any time into the solvency of said company and may require that additional security be given at any time by any principal when he deems such company no longer sufficient security.

"SAME; JURISDICTION OF SUITS ON BONDS

"SEC. 10. Any surety company doing business under the provision of sections 6 to 13 of this title may be sued in respect thereof in any court of the United States which has or may have jurisdiction of actions or suits upon such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking, in the district in which such recognizance, stipulation, bond or undertaking was made or guaranteed, or in the district in which the principal office of such company is located. For the purposes of sections 6 to 13 of this title such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking shall be treated as made or guaranteed in the district in which the office is located, to which it is returnable, or in which it is filed, or in the district in which the principal in such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking resided when it was made or guaranteed.

"SAME; NONPAYMENT OF JUDGMENT

"SEC. 11. If any such company shall neglect or refuse to pay any final judgment or decree rendered against it upon any such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking made or guaranteed by it under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title, from which no appeal or supersedeas has been taken, for 30 days after the rendition of such judgment or decree, it shall forfeit all right to do business under sections 6 to 13 of this title.

"SAME; ESTOPPEL TO DENY CORPORATE POWERS

"SEC. 12. Any company which shall execute or guarantee any recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title shall be estopped in any proceeding to enforce the liability which it shall have assumed to incur, to deny its corporate power to execute or guarantee such instrument or assume such liability.

"SAME; FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LAW

"SEC. 13. Any company doing business under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title which shall fail to comply with any of its provisions shall forfeit to the United States for every such failure not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, to be recovered by suit in the name of the United States in the same courts in which suit may be brought against such company under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title, and such failure shall not affect the validity of any contract entered into by such company.

"RATE OF PREMIUM ON BOND; PREMIUMS NOT TO BE PAID BY UNITED STATES

"SEC. 14. Until otherwise provided by law no bond shall be accepted from any surety or bonding company for any officer or employee of the United States which shall cost more than 35 percent in excess of the rate of premium charged for a like bond during the calendar year 1908. The United States shall not pay any part of the premium or other cost of furnishing a bond required by law or otherwise of any officer or employee of the United States.

"BONDS OR NOTES OF UNITED STATES IN LIEU OF RECOGNIZANCE, STIPULATION, BOND, GUARANTY, OR UNDERTAKING; PLACE OF DEPOSIT; RETURN TO DEPOSITOR; CONTRACTORS' BONDS

"SEC. 15. Wherever by the laws of the United States or regulations made pursuant thereto, any person is required to furnish any recognizance, stipulation, bond, guaranty, or undertaking, hereinafter called 'penal bond,' with surety or sureties, such person may, in lieu of such surety or sureties, deposit as security with the official having authority to approve such penal bond, United States Liberty bonds or other bonds or notes of the United States in a sum equal at their par value to the amount of such penal bond required to be furnished, together with an agreement authorizing such official to collect or sell such bonds or notes so deposited in case of any default in the performance of any of the conditions or stipulations of such penal bond. The acceptance of such United States bonds or notes in lieu of surety or sureties required by law shall have the same force and effect as individual or corporate sureties, or certified checks, bank drafts, postoffice money orders, or cash, for the penalty or amount of such penal bond. The bonds

or notes deposited hereunder, and such other United States bonds or notes as may be substituted therefor from time to time as such security, may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, a Federal Reserve bank, or other depositary duly designated for that purpose by the Secretary, which shall issue receipt therefor, describing such bonds or notes so deposited. As soon as security for the performance of such penal bond is no longer necessary, such bonds or notes so deposited shall be returned to the depositor. In case a person or persons supplying a contractor with labor or material as provided by section 270 of title 40 shall file with the obligee, at any time after a default in the performance of any contract subject to said section 270, the application and affidavit therein provided, the obligee shall not deliver to the obligor the deposited bonds or notes nor any surplus proceeds thereof until the expiration of the time limited by said section 270 for the institution of suit by such person or persons, and, in case suit shall be instituted within such time, shall hold said bonds or notes or proceeds subject to the order of the court having jurisdiction thereof. Nothing herein contained shall affect or impair the priority of the claim of the United States against the bonds or notes deposited or any right or remedy granted by said section 270 or by this section to the United States for default upon any obligation of said penal bond. All laws inconsistent with this section are hereby so modified as to conform to the provisions hereof. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of courts over the security, where such bonds are taken as security in judicial proceedings, or the authority of any administrative officer of the United States to receive United States bonds for security in cases authorized by existing laws. The Secretary may prescribe rules and regulations necessary and proper for carrying this section into effect. The term 'person' in this section means an individual, a trust or estate, a partnership, or a corporation; the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury. In order to avoid the frequent substitution of securities such rules and regulations may limit the effect of this section, in appropriate classes of cases, to bonds and notes of the United States maturing more than a year after the date of deposit of such bonds as security. The phrase 'bonds or notes of the United States' shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to mean any public-debt obligations of the United States and any bonds, notes, or other obligations which are unconditionally guaranteed as to both interest and principal by the United States."

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large covering provisions codified in this act, insofar as such provisions appear in title 6, United States Code, 1940 edition, and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE	*Title 6, United States Code, Section*
Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 5, second paragraph, 28 Stat. 807; June 17, 1930, ch. 497, sec. 523 first paragraph (1), 46 Stat. 740	1
Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 5, third paragraph, 28 Stat. 807	2
Mar. 2, 1895 ch. 177, sec. 5, fourth paragraph, 28 Stat. 807; Mar. 8, 1928, ch. 148, 45 Stat. 247	3
Aug. 8, 1888, ch. 787, sec. 1, 25 Stat. 387	4
Aug. 8, 1888, ch. 787, sec. 2, 25 Stat. 387; as modified by June 10, 1921, ch. 18, sec. 301, 42 Stat. 23	5

STATUTES AT LARGE—continued

Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 1, 28 Stat. 279	6
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 2, 28 Stat. 279	7
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 3, 28 Stat. 279; Mar. 23, 1910, ch. 109, 36 Stat. 241	8
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 4, 28 Stat. 279; Mar. 23, 1910, ch. 109, 36 Stat. 241	9
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 5, 28 Stat. 280	10
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 6, 28 Stat. 280; as modified Jan. 31, 1928, ch. 14, sec. 1, 45 Stat. 54	11
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 7, 28 Stat. 280	12
Aug 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 8, 28 Stat. 280	13
Aug. 5, 1909, ch. 7, 36 Stat. 125, first paragraph under "Department of Commerce and Labor"	14
Feb. 24, 1919, ch. 18, sec. 1320, 40 Stat. 1148; Nov. 23, 1921, ch. 136, sec. 1329, 42 Stat. 318; Feb. 26, 1926, ch. 27, secs. 2, 1126 (a) (1) (6), 44 Stat. 9, 122; Feb. 4, 1935, ch. 5, sec. 7, 49 Stat. 22	15

With the following committee amendment:

Page 14, line 4:

(Line 2 of tabulation) strike out "(1)" after "paragraph".

(Line 23 of tabulation) strike out "349;", "1200", and "125"; and insert between "2" and "1126"—"(a) (1), (6),"; and strike out "(a) (1) (6)" at end of line.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO CODIFY AND ENACT INTO ABSOLUTE LAW, TITLE 9 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE, ENTITLED "ARBITRATION"

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2037, to codify and enact into absolute law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration", is codified and enacted into absolute law, as follows:

"TITLE 9—ARBITRATION

"Sec. 1. Maritime transactions and commerce defined; exceptions to operation of title.
"Sec. 2. Validity, irrevocability, and enforcement of agreements to arbitrate.
"Sec. 3. Stay of proceedings where issue therein referable to arbitration.
"Sec. 4. Failure, and so forth, to arbitrate under agreement; petition to United States court having jurisdiction for order to compel arbitration; notice and service thereof; hearing and determination.
"Sec. 5. Appointment of arbitrators or umpire.
"Sec. 6. Application heard as motion.
"Sec. 7. Witnesses before arbitrators; fees; compelling attendance.
"Sec. 8. Proceedings begun by libel in admiralty and seizure of vessel or property.
"Sec. 9. Award of arbitrators; confirmation; jurisdiction; procedure.
"Sec. 10. Same; vacation; grounds; rehearing.
"Sec. 11. Same; modification or correction; grounds; order.
"Sec. 12. Notice of motions to vacate or modify; service; stay of proceedings.
"Sec. 13. Papers filed with order on motions; judgment; docketing; force and effect; enforcement.
"Sec. 14. Contracts not affected.

"'MARITIME TRANSACTIONS' AND 'COMMERCE' DEFINED; EXCEPTIONS TO OPERATION OF TITLE

"SEC. 1. 'Maritime transactions', as herein defined, means charter parties, bills of lading of water carriers, agreements relating to wharfage, supplies furnished vessels or repairs to vessels, collisions, or any other matters in foreign commerce which, if the subject of controversy, would be embraced within admiralty jurisdiction; 'commerce', as herein defined, means commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation, but nothing herein contained shall apply to contracts of employment of seamen, railroad employees, or any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce.

"VALIDITY, IRREVOCABILITY, AND ENFORCEMENT OF AGREEMENTS TO ARBITRATE

"SEC. 2. A written provision in any maritime transaction or a contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce to settle by arbitration a controversy thereafter arising out of such contract or transaction, or the refusal to perform the whole or any part thereof, or an agreement in writing to submit to arbitration an existing controversy arising out of such a contract, transaction, or refusal, shall be valid, irrevocable, and enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract.

"STAY OF PROCEEDINGS WHERE ISSUE THEREIN REFERABLE TO ARBITRATION

"SEC. 3. If any suit or proceeding be brought in any of the courts of the United States upon any issue referable to arbitration under an agreement in writing for such arbitration, the court in which such suit is pending, upon being satisfied that the issue involved in such suit or proceeding is referable to arbitration under such an agreement, shall on application of one of the parties stay the trial of the action until such arbitration has been had in accordance with the terms of the agreement, providing the applicant for the stay is not in default in proceeding with such arbitration.

"FAILURE, AND SO FORTH, TO ARBITRATE UNDER AGREEMENT; PETITION TO UNITED STATES COURT HAVING JURISDICTION FOR ORDER TO COMPEL ARBITRATION; NOTICE AND SERVICE THEREOF; HEARING AND DETERMINATION

"SEC. 4. A party aggrieved by the alleged failure, neglect, or refusal of another to arbitrate under a written agreement for arbitration may petition any court of the United States which, save for such agreement, would have jurisdiction under the judicial code at law, in equity, or in admiralty of the subject matter of a suit arising out of the controversy between the parties, for an order directing that such arbitration proceed in the manner provided for in such agreement. Five days' notice in writing of such application shall be served upon the party in default. Service thereof shall be made in the manner provided by law for the service of summons in the jurisdiction in which the proceeding is brought. The court shall hear the parties, and upon being satisfied that the making of the agreement for arbitration or the failure to comply therewith is not in issue, the court shall make an order directing the parties to proceed to arbitration in accordance with the terms of the agreement. The hearing and proceedings, under such agreement, shall be within the district in which the petition for an order directing such arbitration is filed. If the making of the arbitration agreement or the failure, neglect, or refusal to perform the

same be in issue, the court shall proceed summarily to the trial thereof. If no jury trial be demanded by the party alleged to be in default, or if the matter in dispute is within admiralty jurisdiction, the court shall hear and determine such issue. Where such an issue is raised, the party alleged to be in default may, except in cases of admiralty, on or before the return day of the notice of application, demand a jury trial of such issue, and upon such demand the court shall make an order referring the issue or issues to a jury in the manner provided by law for referring to a jury issues in an equity action, or may specially call a jury for that purpose. If the jury find that no agreement in writing for arbitration was made or that there is no default in proceeding thereunder, the proceeding shall be dismissed. If the jury find that an agreement for arbitration was made in writing and that there is a default in proceeding thereunder, the court shall make an order summarily directing the parties to proceed with the arbitration in accordance with the terms thereof.

"APPOINTMENT OF ARBITRATORS OR UMPIRE

"SEC. 5. If in the agreement provision be made for a method of naming or appointing an arbitrator or arbitrators or an umpire, such method shall be followed; but if no method be provided therein, or if a method be provided and any party thereto shall fail to avail himself of such method, or if for any other reason there shall be a lapse in the naming of an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, or in filling a vacancy, then upon the application of either party to the controversy the court shall designate and appoint an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, as the case may require, who shall act under the said agreement with the same force and effect as if he or they had been specifically named therein; and unless otherwise provided in the agreement the arbitration shall be by a single arbitrator.

"APPLICATION HEARD AS MOTION

"SEC. 6. Any application to the court hereunder shall be made and heard in the manner provided by law for the making and hearing of motions, except as otherwise herein expressly provided.

"WITNESSES BEFORE ARBITRATORS; FEES; COMPELLING ATTENDANCE

"SEC. 7. The arbitrators selected either as prescribed in this title or otherwise, or a majority of them, may summon in writing any person to attend before them or any of them as a witness and in a proper case to bring with him or them any book, record, document, or paper which may be deemed material as evidence in the case. The fees for such attendance shall be the same as the fees of witnesses before masters of the United States courts. Said summons shall issue in the name of the arbitrator or arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be signed by the arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be directed to the said person and shall be served in the same manner as subpenas to appear and testify before the court; if any person or persons so summoned to testify shall refuse or neglect to obey said summons, upon petition the United States court in and for the district in which such arbitrators, or a majority of them, are sitting may compel the attendance of such person or persons before said arbtitrator or arbitrators, or punish said person or persons for contempt in the same manner provided on February 12, 1925, for securing the attendance of witnesses or their punishment for neglect or refusal to attend in the courts of the United States.

"PROCEEDINGS BEGUN BY LIBEL IN ADMIRALTY AND SEIZURE OF VESSEL OR PROPERTY

"SEC. 8. If the basis of jurisdiction be a cause of action otherwise justiciable in admiralty, then, notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the party claiming to be aggrieved may begin his proceeding hereunder by libel and seizure of the vessel or other property of the other party according to the usual course of admiralty proceedings, and the court shall then have jurisdiction to direct the parties to proceed with the arbitration and shall retain jurisdiction to enter its decree upon the award.

"AWARD OF ARBITRATORS; CONFIRMATION; JURISDICTION; PROCEDURE

"SEC. 9. If the parties in their agreement have agreed that a judgment of the court shall be entered upon the award made pursuant to the arbitration, and shall specify the court, then at any time within 1 year after the award is made any party to the arbitration may apply to the court so specified for an order confirming the award, and thereupon the court must grant such an order unless the award is vacated, modified, or corrected as prescribed in sections 10 and 11 of this title. If no court is specified in the agreement of the parties, then such application may be made to the United States court in and for the district within which such award was made. Notice of the application shall be served upon the adverse party, and thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction of such party as though he had appeared generally in the proceeding. If the adverse party is a resident of the district within which the award was made, such service shall be made upon the adverse party or his attorney as prescribed by law for service of notice of motion in an action in the same court. If the adverse party shall be a nonresident, then the notice of the application shall be served by the marshal of any district within which the adverse party may be found in like manner as other process of the court.

"SAME; VACATION; GROUNDS; REHEARING

"SEC. 10. In either of the following cases the United States court in and for the district wherein the award was made may make an order vacating the award upon the application of any party to the arbitration—

"(a) Where the award was procured by corruption, fraud, or undue means.

"(b) Where there was evident partiality or corruption in the arbitrators, or either of them.

"(c) Where the arbitrators were guilty of misconduct in refusing to postpone the hearing, upon sufficient cause shown, or in refusing to hear evidence pertinent and material to the controversy; or of any other misbehavior by which the rights of any party have been prejudiced.

"(d) Where the arbitrators exceeded their powers, or so imperfectly executed them that a mutual, final, and definite award upon the subject matter submitted was not made.

"(e) Where an award is vacated and the time within which the agreement required the award to be made has not expired the court may, in its discretion, direct a rehearing by the arbitrators.

"SAME; MODIFICATION OR CORRECTION; GROUNDS; ORDER

"SEC. 11. In either of the following cases the United States court in and for the district wherein the award was made may make an order modifying or correcting the award upon the application of any party to the arbitration—

"(a) Where there was an evident material miscalculation of figures or an evident material mistake in the description of any person, thing, or property referred to in the award.

"(b) Where the arbitrators have awarded upon a matter not submitted to them, unless it is a matter not affecting the merits of the decision upon the matter submitted.

"(c) Where the award is imperfect in matter of form not affecting the merits of the controversy.

"The order may modify and correct the award, so as to effect the intent thereof and promote justice between the parties.

"NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO VACATE OR MODIFY; SERVICE; STAY OF PROCEEDINGS

"SEC. 12. Notice of a motion to vacate, modify, or correct an award must be served upon the adverse party or his attorney within 3 months after the award is filed or delivered. If the adverse party is a resident of the district within which the award was made, such service shall be made upon the adverse party or his attorney as prescribed by law for service of notice of motion in an action in the same court. If the adverse party shall be a nonresident then the notice of the application shall be served by the marshal of any district within which the adverse party may be found in like manner as other process of the court. For the purposes of the motion any judge who might make an order to stay the proceedings in an action brought in the same court may make an order, to be served with the notice of motion, staying the proceedings of the adverse party to enforce the award.

"PAPERS FILED WITH ORDER ON MOTIONS; JUDGMENT; DOCKETING; FORCE AND EFFECT; ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 13. The party moving for an order confirming, modifying, or correcting an award shall, at the time such order is filed with the clerk for the entry of judgment thereon, also file the following papers with the clerk:

"(a) The agreement; the selection or appointment, if any, of an additional arbitrator or umpire; and each written extension of the time, if any, within which to make the award.

"(b) The award.

"(c) Each notice, affidavit, or other paper used upon an application to confirm, modify, or correct the award, and a copy of each order of the court upon such an application.

"The judgment shall be docketed as if it was rendered in an action.

"The judgment so entered shall have the same force and effect, in all respects, as, and be subject to all the provisions of law relating to, a judgment in an action; and it may be enforced as if it had been rendered in an action in the court in which it is entered.

"CONTRACTS NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 14. This title shall not apply to contracts made prior to January 1, 1926."

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the statutes at large covering provisions codified in this act, insofar as such provisions appear in title 9, United States Code and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE

	Title 9, United States Code, Section
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 1, 43 Stat. 883	1
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 2, 43 Stat. 883	2
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 3, 43 Stat. 883	3
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 4, 43 Stat. 883	4
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 5, 43 Stat. 884	5
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 6, 43 Stat. 884	6
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 7, 43 Stat. 884	7
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 8, 43 Stat. 884	8
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 9, 43 Stat. 885	9
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 10, 43 Stat. 885	10
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 11, 43 Stat. 885	11
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 12, 43 Stat. 885	12
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 13, 43 Stat. 886	13
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 14, 43 Stat. 886	14
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 15, 43 Stat. 886	15

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPATRIATING OR EXCLUDING CERTAIN PERSONS FOR EVADING MILITARY AND NAVAL SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4257, to expatriate or exclude certain

persons for evading military and naval service.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in order that the full membership might be advised of the provisions of this bill, I suggest that some member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization undertake to explain it, since the operation of the bill would result in depriving certain citizens of their citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I shall be very glad to explain what this bill does. The bill simply would denaturalize any citizen who for purposes of evading military service left the country and went to some other country. It would prevent any more Bergdolls, for instance. It also would remove the right to reenter from any alien who did such a thing during time of war. Those are the two things that the bill does.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is the gentleman from Illinois absolutely correct when he says that the provisions of the bill are limited to wartime only?

Mr. MASON. Yes, it is.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reading on line 10, it says:

> Departing from or remaining outside of the jurisdiction of the United States in time of war or during a period declared by the President to be a period of national emergency.

Mr. MASON. That is true, but when the President declares a period of national emergency, then you are leading to war, and our Selective Service Act was put into effect during that period and before we were at war. Anyone who left the country during the period of national emergency when the Selective Service Act was in effect would lose his right to reenter if he was an alien, and would lose his citizenship if he was a natural-born citizen.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman has said that a proclamation by the President establishing a national emergency leads up to war. I am sure the gentleman is aware of the innumerable proclamations of national emergency that have been issued by the President within the past 8 or 10 years. I am curious to get his view, if the gentleman thinks all those proclamations have followed inevitably the path to the present conflict.

Mr. MASON. All we can judge by is past history. Every single one of those proclamations of national emergency which were issued did lead up to this war.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. In the testimony we found that in the city of El Paso alone over 800 Mexicans escaped to Mexico to evade service. We feel that as long as they want to evade service, they should not have the right to come back as citizens of this country.

Mr. COLE of New York. I should like to inquire further of some member of the committee if the provisions of the selective-service law do not cover situations like this where a citizen leaves the country for the sole purpose of evading responsibility under that act.

Mr. MASON. It only covers that in the same way that we took care of Bergdoll for doing the same thing. They can be punished, but his citizenship could not be taken away from him under the old law.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does not that punishment operate to deprive him of his citizenship, if he is found guilty?

Mr. MASON. I do not believe it does.

Mr. COLE of New York. Would the gentleman care to explain what judicial proceedings are preserved to the person accused of having left the country in order to evade the draft? What protection has he got? Who says he is guilty or not—the courts or the Secretary of State?

Mr. MASON. I think it is the Attorney General, under his powers in the Department of Justice, who decides this.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the interested party have a right to appeal to the courts to review the decision of the Attorney General?

Mr. MASON. I do not believe so.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman is sure of that, then I think the bill should go over without prejudice, because certainly we should not put into the hands of any administrative officer the power to arbitrarily deny citizenship to any individual, without giving that individual the right to have the decision reviewed in the courts.

Mr. MASON. I do not believe that it does preserve to him the right to appeal to the courts.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4271, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] to make a brief explanation of this bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under our present law, a naturalized citizen who is living abroad in the employ of a foreign government or in any other employ must, under the law, preserve his citizenship by appearing before an official of the Federal Government and stating his reasons for living abroad, and therefore have his time extended, before his naturalization can be taken from him.

During wartimes that has been found to be impossible in many, many instances in those countries that are occupied by Germany. So this preserves that right to them. It does not do away with the law that requires it, but it does hold it during wartimes, and this 6-year period is allowed him.

Mr. PRIEST. If I understand it correctly, the time is extended to 1946. Is that correct?

Mr. MASON. That is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That chapter IV of the Nationality Act of 1940, section 409, is amended to read as follows:
>
> "SEC. 409. Nationality shall not be lost under the provisions of section 404 or 407 of this Act until the expiration of 6 years following the date of the approval of this Act: *Provided, however*, That a naturalized person who shall have become subject to the presumption that he has ceased to be an American citizen as provided for in the second paragraph of section 2 of the act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1228), and who shall not have overcome it under the rules in effect immediately preceding the date of the approval of this act, shall continue to be subject to such presumption for the period of 6 years following the date of the approval of this act unless it is overcome during such period."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 334 (c) OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4140, to amend Section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734).

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734), is hereby amended to read as follows:
>
> "(c) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this chapter, no final hearing shall be held on any petition for naturalization nor shall any person be naturalized nor shall any certificate of naturalization be issued by any court within 30 days after the filing of the petition for naturalization. This period may be waived by the Commissioner in his discretion."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the calling of the bills on the Consent Calendar today.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of the Clerk to the first bill on the calendar which carries the No. 3 on the calendar. Actually that number should be 193.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the calendar will be corrected accordingly in the next printing.

There was no objection.

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS, REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT FROM THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House, which was read:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1944.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. GEORGE W. ANDREWS as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-eighth Congress from the Third Congressional District of the State of Alabama, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RIVERS AND HARBORS ACT

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 464), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

I now yield myself 10 minutes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule to make in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 3961, which is a general authorization bill for river and harbor projects. This is the first general authorization bill which has been presented to the House in 6 years. It contains a provision which I desire to read to the House:

That the projects are to be prosecuted as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements, no project to be appropriated for until 6 months after termination of the present wars unless necessary in the interests of the national defense and security.

This bill, as I said, is the first general authorization bill in 6 years. It provides for authorizations totaling approximately $450,000,000 as compared with $600,000,000 plus, carried in the last general authorization bill.

As the excerpt from the report says, it is not contemplated that money will be made available at the present time to carry on these projects unless some project is necessary for national defense.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Who determines whether a project is necessary for the national defense?

Mr. DIES. I presume that will be determined by our War Department and by the Appropriations Committee. Is that not the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not have any understanding. The Appropriations Committee certainly would have no jurisdiction to determine whether or not national defense required the authorization of the appropriation.

Mr. DIES. I assume, however, that the appropriate agencies in charge of national defense would make their recommendations to the Appropriations Committee and that this committee would have to hear the facts, and then if they determined that a given project was necessary for national defense they would make an appropriation and the House would have an opportunity to pass upon it.

Mr. MICHENER. The language in the bill is uncertain and nebulous. My own thought would be that it would pretty nearly require an Executive order by the President or a statement by the President that the project was in the interest of national defense, in which case the Committee on Appropriations would then have jurisdiction to appropriate the money so that the decision, if I am correct, would really rest with the President.

Mr. DIES. I think the gentleman's conclusion perhaps is not justified, because the Appropriations Committee and the House would finally have to pass upon whether or not the projects should be undertaken.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. I want to say as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that this bill, as I understand it, is in the same form as other bills that have come before this body and in no way interferes with the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations; it is an authorization bill.

Mr. DIES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. We of course understand, Mr. Speaker, that every project in this bill has been carefully surveyed by the Corps of Engineers, a nonpartisan and very efficient organization of our Government, that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has considered the merits of each project and reported the projects in the bill.

I want to take occasion, Mr. Speaker, to compliment very much the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and especially the chairman of this committee, my colleague the gentleman from Texas. We in Texas call him "the grand old man of our delegation," but he resents the inclusion of the adjective "old," so I should strike that from my remarks. I believe this committee has demonstrated to the Congress that it is truly a nonpartisan, efficient committee of this House interested only in meritorious projects; in fact, under the leadership of my beloved colleague from Texas this committee has earned and retained the respect and the confidence of the Congress of the United States and of the American people by placing the committee and its work upon such a high, nonpartisan plane of efficiency. The chairman of that committee has rendered a great service not only to the development of waterways in the United States but to the American people.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. The gentleman is absolutely correct in what he has just said in reference to the chairman of this committee and in reference to the work of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. On every bill that comes before this committee representatives of the War Department Corps of Engineers appear before us. The work of that committee is as nonpartisan as the work of any committee can be. The gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I understood the gentleman to say that this Committee on Rivers and Harbors was a nonpartisan committee. This is not true; it is a bipartisan committee made up of high-grade Democrats and Republicans who work and act in a nonpartisan manner.

Mr. DIES. I thank the gentleman for his correction. The purpose, of course, Mr. Speaker, in reporting this bill to the House is to provide in advance for post-war planning. It is believed, and properly so, by the committee that now is the time to plan for improvements and construction and development of our waterways in the United States so that when the war is over the engineers will have before them a well-developed and carefully considered plan under which they can furnish employment to people who need employment and can continue to improve our waterways. The report of the committee shows what a tremendous part our waterways are playing in the war effort. It shows the tremendous increase in tonnage on many of our waterways.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Do I understand that one of the purposes of this authorization is to provide employment in the post-war period?

Mr. DIES. I will say that is one of the purposes, probably secondary, but it is certainly one of the purposes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Where will the funds come from to provide this employment? Is it not a fact they will have to be taken from private sources?

Mr. DIES. All public funds come from private sources. The point is that these projects are meritorious, that it has been demonstrated that by the improvement of our waterways we increase the efficiency of our transportation system and we do something that is constructive and worth while. I am sure the gentleman

will agree with me that it is far better for the Congress to spend money upon constructive, worth-while projects than it is to spend that money on certain other types of projects that are of no such benefit to the country.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But there will be no income from this development for a long time; is not that correct?

Mr. DIES. No direct income, but a great deal of indirect income. For instance, let me give the gentleman one illustration: In my congressional district probably 70 percent of all the oil that is moved from the area of Oklahoma, Louisiana, Texas, and New Mexico is moved through our ports. The tonnage in that waterway has increased tremendously.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As a matter of fact, answering the question of the gentleman from Ohio, this improvement of waterways will stimulate commerce, and by developing commerce will cause much money to be paid to the Government in the form of taxes.

Is it not a fact that the digging of a canal from Houston, Tex., to the sea has built a great community down there and greatly increased and stimulated business in the State of Texas?

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish to say in reply to the gentleman from Ohio that we are going to have a great many unemployed veterans after this war. It will be better to employ them on projects of this kind that are useful and necessary than it would be to put them to work on raking leaves and chasing mosquitoes, as we did in some instances a few years ago. What we want to do is to build America. You have just passed $1,300,000,000 for U. N. R. R. A. This is "I. N. R. R. A." We are trying to do something now for the American people.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not also true that the United States Corps of Engineers has passed upon every one of these projects before they were recommended to the committee and the Corps of Engineers justified them from the standpoint of income? Every single one was financially justified before it received the approval of the Corps of Engineers or by our committee.

Mr. DIES. That is absolutely correct. I know that during the time I had the honor to serve on this committee under the leadership of our distinguished colleague from Texas I was impressed with the efficiency of the Corps of Engineers. I found them to be concerned only with the merits of projects. The fact that we have gotten completely away from the old pork-barrel process by which projects were approved is a great advance for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to subscribe to what the gentleman from Texas has said about the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I do not believe there is a chairman presiding over any committee in either House who has been more fair and impartial and who has labored harder, not only for the protection of the Treasury but for the upbuilding of the country, than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. DIES. I thank the gentleman for that statement. We in Texas are proud of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], we love him, and we think that he has rendered a great service to his State and to the Nation by the fair and efficient manner in which he has presided over this important committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, there is no opposition to the granting of this rule. The members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors who appeared before the Rules Committee all stated that they wanted the rule granted in order that the bill might come before the House for consideration and action.

I, too, want to commend the Rivers and Harbors Committee for the job it has been doing, which is not to say that I am in complete accord with all of the items and provisions of this bill. I do say, though, that the members of that committee, I am quite convinced, have tried to avoid those items that sometimes are referred to as "pork barrel" in an effort to fairly and constructively bring about a rivers and harbors improvement program in the country.

I suppose it is fair to say that the Congress should be constantly on guard against so-called pork-barrel measures or items, particularly at a time like this, when we are spending so much money in the war effort, when it is becoming more apparent every day that when the war ends we will have to meet in some way the greatest debt that ever confronted any nation. So there is undoubtedly a great responsibility on us in times like these to avoid expenditures that cannot be clearly shown to be in the public interest and economically feasible. I believe that every item in this bill should be proved up and considered on its merits, and if there are some items that do not meet this test, they should be stricken out of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, reference has been made to the fact that the bill specifically provides that the work hereby authorized shall not be undertaken until 6 months after the termination of the war unless recommended by defense agencies as being essential in the war effort. A question was raised by the gentleman from Michigan, addressed to the gentleman from Texas, with reference to the responsibility of the President in this regard. The bill specifically provides for a finding by the President and also for a report by the President to the Congress in connection with that finding.

As I understand it, there is serious opposition to two or three of the projects contained in this bill. I do not claim to be an expert in reference to all of them, but as to one or two I have heard the arguments pro and con in years gone by when those same projects have been before the House for consideration. At the moment I have serious doubt in my mind as to the feasibility of two or three of them. However, the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors are in a much better position to argue the relative merits of these items than I am, and I will not go into that except to point out, apropos of a suggestion heretofore made in connection with the consideration of this rule, that the economies to be effected by the construction of these various projects is the consideration that should govern. I have looked at the minority report and I discover it is contended there in respect to the Tombigbee project in order to justify its construction that resort has been had to alleged values apart from the rule that has heretofore been used in considering projects of this sort by referring to certain intangible or speculative results that it is said will accrue from the construction of the project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that it was not necessary for them to even include those intangible benefits to which he refers, for the simple reason that this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway furnishes a slack-water route up to the Tennessee and a downstream route from there down to Cairo. This will save the average barge load from $2,400 to $3,000 in fuel cost alone, which is more than the profits realized from the average barge trip. The traffic that is now moved on the Mississippi, the Tombigbee, the Ohio, and upper Missouri without this intangible benefit even will far more than justify the project.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman this is the first time I have heard that contention made. I refer to the report of the Chief of Engineers in which it is specifically stated:

> All these intangible or indirect benefits must be considered in addition to the direct savings in transportation cost in order that this project will show a substantial excess of benefits over costs.

I am just one Member of the Congress, but it seems to me that when the Chief of Engineers makes such a statement as that it certainly is pretty good evidence of the necessity of resorting to these intangible benefits that have not heretofore, as I understand it, been considered in determining the feasibility of

such projects in order to support this particular one.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say that the Army engineers did not come to the conclusion that the gentleman from Mississippi has stated here in giving those figures on the amount of savings. No such figures as those are in the record.

Mr. RANKIN. At the time this survey was being made it was for the purpose of establishing the physical feasibility of the proposition. If you will turn to the statement of Colonel Farrington, who represents the Army engineers and represented them before our committee, the gentleman will find that he makes the statement I have just quoted.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not doubt that; but, as far as I am concerned, when the Chief of Engineers makes that statement it strikes me that it speaks for the expert judgment of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. RANKIN. The Army engineers at that time were making their survey, and that is what we were asking them to make it on—the physical feasibility of this project.

Mr. HALLECK. The members of the committee will undoubtedly discuss that further.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on to another provision of this bill about which I have serious doubt and which I think every one of us should read and consider very carefully. I refer specifically to certain language found on page 2 of the bill, wherein it is provided as follows:

> The Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to construct powerhouses and install power machinery and appurtenances for the development of hydroelectric power at any dam heretofore or hereafter authorized by any act of Congress.

It strikes me that that is a tremendously broad grant of authority. It strikes me that language of that sort represents a considerable departure by the Congress of the United States, if it should be adopted, in the direction of an abdication of the continuing power and responsibility and duty that should be that of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. It strikes me also that it attempts to take every flood-control dam that has ever been constructed in the past or any program that the Congress may set up for flood control in the future, and use it as the basis for power projects, whether or not they are needed.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me state this in response to what the gentleman has said. To my mind the issue goes much deeper and much further than any question of the production and sale of electrical energy and power by the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

As I say, to me it involves the continuing responsibility of the Congress to assume and discharge its proper functions, duties, and obligations. Congress, I like to think, has in recent times been getting away from blank checks of money or blank checks of authority. I think for that the country feels better about the Congress of the United States. I think the people in the country generally want the Congress of the United States to assume its fair responsibilities and to discharge them without granting to any executive agency the blanket authority that should be ours. We are going to be here in session. No one knows how soon these projects will come up for actual consideration. Rather than go along with such a broad grant of authority, would it not be better for us to strike that provision out of the bill and if, in respect to a certain project, Congress, in its considered judgment, deems it desirable to provide for the creation, distribution, and sale of electrical power, then Congress can do so with respect to that particular item. I believe that is the only way we can fairly and well legislate.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if the gentleman will not agree with me that this provision is far more extensive and grants more widespread authority to do the very thing that has been done on a limited scale in other instances.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it does. Very frankly, I was amazed when I read the language. Possibly there are some things about it that I do not know, but they have not yet been pointed out to me. They were not pointed out before the Rules Committee when the members of that committee were there. I suggest, in all seriousness, that we should all be looking at that language right carefully to the end that if it is an unwarranted delegation of legislative power we should see to it that those words are stricken out and that the duties and responsibilities be kept in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I notice also that the language that follows what the gentleman read is even broader.

Mr. HALLECK. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. It strikes me that is just as reprehensible as the language to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. HALLECK. I hope that the Members will read all of that proviso and section because, as the gentleman from Wisconsin has pointed out, it seems to me that all of that language does violence to my idea of legislative responsibility.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important legislative provisions that can come before this Congress, the improving of our waterways, to provide for cheap, low-cost transportation and stimulation of commerce. When you look at the record of accomplishments that has been made by reason of water transportation—take little Holland, for example; a country without minerals; a country without timber; a country with no waterfalls, with a system of canals and waterways, which has become rich and opulent by the use of its land and its water and has become the money lender to the rest of the world. That will give you an idea of what water transportation means and the full utilization of its canals in connection with water transportation.

You gentlemen know, in studying the history of the United States, many of us have never learned the real forces that have made America great and which gave America one of the most liberal and free and easy civilizations in the world, especially in that period of development between the Revolutionary War and the Civil War. It was in that period that things were so easy and people made money so easily as the result of American ingenuity and the utilization of our streams for transportation.

Whitney invented the cotton gin. While the rest of the people of the world, over a billion people, were tediously picking cottonseed out by hand, we were knocking the seed out with the cotton gin wholesale.

Then with the invention of the steamboat by Fulton, we utilized the sluggish navigable streams of the South and gave America preeminence in the cotton trade to all the world and built up the country by use of the southern streams for navigation and the production of cotton. It was in that period that cotton was king, and it gave to the South one of the most easy and free civilizations that the world has ever known.

That condition can be credited to two things: American ingenuity and the use of our navigable streams.

I wonder, in talking about navigation, if we have ever realized the dominant position it plays in the location of our great cities. We find St. Louis at the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. I am wondering, if today we would close the Ohio River to navigation in the State of Pennsylvania, in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, what it would cost American industry just to close that one river to the movement of iron ore and coke and coal. I wonder what it would cost the American people if we were to close the Mississippi River today to transportation, particularly from Baton Rouge down to tidewater.

The great Standard Oil companies, in utilizing the petroleum resources of Kansas, Texas, and Louisiana, saw fit to establish their great refineries and their plants at places on the first high land above the mouth of the Mississippi near the town of Baton Rouge, where the great oil tankers of the world can come in and take petroleum cargoes. This company also brought in a great concentration of pipe lines carrying petroleum, all dependent for an outlet by navigation on the Mississippi River. I have sat on the bank of the river at Baton Rouge and watched these tankers from all parts of

the world come in to take cargoes from these refineries. It is navigation that has made America great and it is navigation that in this bill will carry forward the development of our economy and give us the resources and the strength that will keep America in its preeminent position. We must remember that in stimulating commerce in our whole country we are enlarging the sources of taxable revenue available to the Government, and we are building a greater America.

I hope this rule will be adopted and the bill will pass.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], I want to say that there is not a more feasible or a more necessary project in this bill, or one ever proposed, than this inland waterway connecting the Tennessee and the Tombigbee Rivers. It is the only project of its kind in the world, with the exception of the one connecting the Don and the Volga in Russia, where you can transfer traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little cost, and so much saving in distances and transportation costs.

This project, taking Cairo as the base, going down the Mississippi to New Orleans and across to Mobile, back up the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway to the Tennessee, then down the Tennessee River to Paducah and down the Ohio back to Cairo, is 1,768 miles.

Of that 1,728 miles, 1,121 miles of it are downstream—almost two-thirds of the way—and the rest of it is in still or slack water. There is no other project on earth that has all those advantages. It really sounds fantastic. But here is the map, and here are the facts. It is downstream all the way from Cairo to New Orleans, and all the way from the Tennessee River, where this project joins it, to Cairo, Ill. The rest of the way is slack water, because on the Tombigbee you have 18 locks and dams that give you slack or still water, from Mobile, Ala., to the Tennessee River, and you have slack water in the intracoastal canal from New Orleans across to Mobile.

Let us see what this all means. Colonel Ferringa, the Army engineer, testified that a tow of one 1,200-horsepower Diesel engine, with eight barges carrying 3,500 tons, going from New Orleans up to Cairo, fighting the terrific current, would use $6,273 worth of fuel. But going across to Mobile in slack water, and in slack water up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee and then downstream to Cairo the cost would be only $3,868, or a savings on every trip of $2,405. There is not a barge line in America that makes that much profit on a trip of that distance.

But suppose you are going on the upper Ohio, from New Orleans, and that means every barge that is going to Pittsburgh, Pa.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Wheeling, W. Va.; the saving would be $2,800.

If you are going from New Orleans to Chicago, Ill.; Indianapolis; St. Paul; Minneapolis; Sioux City, Iowa; Omaha, Nebr.; Kansas City or St. Louis, on every single up-bound trip you would save $2,405, but if going up the Ohio, as I said, you would save $2,800. That means that such savings would accrue on every such tow with eight average barges that come from any of those points down the Mississippi—and that would be the proper course for downstream traffic in order to take advantage of the swift current going down—and then in order to avoid it going up returns via the Tombigbee route. This would bring benefits to every one of those States in the entire Mississippi Valley, from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Galveston, Tex.; from Minneapolis and St. Paul to Mobile, from Sioux City to New Orleans. All that great area between the Alleghenies and Rocky Mountains will be aided by this project.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. What part of Tombigbee River is now in slack water?

Mr. RANKIN. It will practically all be slack water, with the possibility of a short stretch just above Mobile. These locks begin at the mouth of the Warrior, and there are locks up the Warrior to Birmingham, and let me show you what it means there.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose you are shipping your wheat or beef or manufactured articles—automobiles from Detroit or machinery from Pittsburgh? You have to have a load for the return trip, something to take back—lumber, oil, fruits, or other raw materials. Going from Mobile to Cairo you would save $3,290.

Going from Mobile to Paducah, Ky., and that means to any point on the Ohio up to Pittsburgh, Pa., you would save $3,688.

But if you are going from Birmingham or from the mouth of the Warrior to Cairo, you would save $5,448 on every trip. If you are going to Paducah or to points on the upper Ohio, the savings would amount to $3,688.

There is not another project on earth that would save as much as this one will save the people of that great area—the States of Pensylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Kentucky, West Virginia, and other States in that area—so much money. Every one of those States will benefit, and benefit immeasurably by the development of this project. As to the amount of benefit, local benefits, leave them out if you want to, but there are at least 9,000,000 tons of that traffic now that will go up that stream, and it will save an average of a dollar a ton. It will save enough in 3 to 7 years to pay for the entire project. Besides that, you are opening up this Tennessee Valley area, where today we are manufacturing planes and machinery and munitions with which to fight this war. The savings on such a barge load from New Orleans to the Tennessee River would be $4,507. If going from Mobile, the savings would be $5,392.

From Birmingham to the Tennessee River the savings would be $7,551.

We now have a 9-foot channel from Knoxville to Cairo. By cutting through that sand ridge between the Tennessee and the Tombigbee you will reduce the water distance from Cairo to the Gulf by a hundred miles, from Paducah by 200 miles, and from the Tennessee River to the Gulf by 630 miles.

As I said, there is no other place in the world where you can bring such savings in distances and transportation costs with so much ease and so little expense. It will be worth more to any of the States I have mentioned than it will to that area of Mississippi, but it will give us an outlet for our raw materials and an inlet for those things you desire to ship us. I trust this proposition will be adopted, because if you vote it down, you kill the most valuable part of the bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I favor the adoption of House Resolution 464, making in order H. R. 3961, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors.

The bill, an omnibus bill, presents 271 harbor-improvement and inland-waterway projects for authorization, not appropriation. The committee of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is chairman has worked hard on this measure and I feel that the rule should be adopted so that the bill can be discussed. While I am not familiar with all of the items in the bill, I am familiar with the proposed project on the Missouri River.

I feel that I know much about the Missouri River because I grew up very close to it. I know of the great damage that river has caused to valuable farm land in times of flood. The Missouri River bounds my congressional district on the north and east and I know many of the farmers and land owners along the river who have been victims of its floods. I am informed that the damage done by the flood waters of the Missouri River last year exceeded $43,000,000. I personally visited many of the flooded areas along the Missouri River last year. I saw, first-hand, the damage done. Therefore, I feel that the recurrence of such floods should be prevented and that for all time the river should be reduced to control and its waters put to beneficial use.

I have complete confidence in the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and in the other members of the committee. I have talked with the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, about this bill. I have read the bill carefully and have attended many hearings in reference to river control. The portion of this bill dealing with the Missouri River Basin should be helpful to those of us who want this river controlled. As I understand that portion of

the bill it would authorize an expenditure of about $6,000,000 for revetment of banks, cut-offs to eliminate long bends, closing of minor channels, dredging, and so forth, so that the stream may be confined to a fixed channel and so that vagrant floods will not, year after year, tear loose and carry to the sea the valuable topsoil from lands paralleling the course of the river.

I have seen, first-hand, what floods have done to farm lands, not only in our own country, but in foreign countries. I have seen the floods of China and the top soil of China washed away and carried into the Yellow Sea. That is why the Yellow Sea is yellow. I have seen the starvation and hardship that followed those floods. If we can prevent that in the Missouri River Basin, we should do it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. RANKIN. This project, so far as it goes, will do that very thing, will it not?

Mr. STEFAN. This project, as I understand it, will confine the stream to a narrower and fixed channel and reduce flood erosion.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman from Nebraska is confining his remarks to the Missouri River.

Mr. STEFAN. I am, sir.

Mr. DONDERO. And what the gentleman from Mississippi is referring to is the Tombigbee project.

Mr. RANKIN. No, I am referring to the Missouri River. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska, I was for the development of the Sioux River and also of the Platte and I would not do anything or I would not support a measure which I thought would in any way injure the people of Nebraska so far as these rivers are concerned. But in my opinion this development on the Missouri River will benefit the people of Nebraska and not injure them.

Mr. STEFAN. As I understand it, it will aid the conservation of valuable topsoil.

The chairman of the committee has assured me that this proposed improvement of the Missouri River south of Sioux City will not impose additional demands upon water storage at Fort Peck Reservoir or otherwise decrease the volume of water for use west of Sioux City. Another bill will come from the Committee on Flood Control dealing with Missouri River problems that are attributable to irrigation and flood control.

We in Nebraska, naturally, are first interested in irrigation because we need the water to grow our crops. We are interested, too, in flood control, hydroelectric power and navigation. We feel that legislation that will help to keep the Missouri River from doing harm and make it a useful agent should be supported.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3961, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I first want to extend my thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] for the complimentary terms in which he has referred to me on this occasion. I have long since made up my mind that if I ever enter another Congressman's congressional district to have debate with him on his renomination there are two Members of this House whose districts I will never invade. One is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and the other is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that I have heard the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and I subscribe to his statement most heartily. I have served for nearly 20 years on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors with the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is now addressing the Committee. He has for a considerable portion of the time been chairman of that committee. He has been a man who has presided over that committee in a fair and square manner. He has an unusual knowledge of the waterways of this country, and I concur in the statement in regard to him made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Chairman, the bill presented here embraces 271 projects for improvement, the ultimate cost of which is estimated at $420,675,000. It has been nearly 6 years since a general river-and-harbor bill has been enacted. Consequently, there is great need for the improvements here recommended. A few special bills have recently been enacted for projects urgent in the war, and several projects embraced in this bill have already been constructed by the War or Navy Departments, their need being considered too urgent to await congressional action. At the suggestion of the President, those projects already completed are now recommended for authorization in order that their maintenance may be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers as regular civil functions of the War Department.

All projects in the bill have been thoroughly studied by the Army engineers under surveys duly authorized by Congress, and no project has been included that does not have their approval. Every project in the bill has the recommendation of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and except in a few instances this approval has been unanimous.

The bill is recommended for post-war consideration, when it is expected that there will be an acute labor situation. Except for projects that may be urgent in the war effort, no appropriations will be authorized until 6 months after the close of the present war.

Our program of river-and-harbor improvement, as it has been carried out for many years under the Corps of Engineers of the War Department, has become remarkably efficient and successful. It has been practically free of partisan political influence, and sectionalism has been disregarded. Our national and commercial needs have been the controlling motives, while the so-called pork-barrel methods that once prevailed have been completely eliminated.

Not only have our peacetime commercial needs been taken care of, but our war needs have not been neglected. Our port improvements on the Atlantic, Pacific, and Gulf coasts, as well as those in Alaska, Hawaii, Midway, and other possessions, have rendered indispensable service in the present war. Our ports and connecting channels on the Great Lakes have performed a service too well known to need repetition here.

Our inland intracoastal channels have moved many millions of tons of materials essential in the war effort and more than 1,000 naval and commercial ships and other boats of various types for use upon the high seas have been towed down the Mississippi River to the Gulf from the yards where constructed on the Great Lakes and on the upper Mississippi system.

This waterway carried, in addition to ocean-borne traffic, an increased tonnage in 1941 of 37 percent over 1940, and in 1942 an additional increase of 23 percent over 1941. The figures for 1943 have not yet been compiled, but insofar as available they show further substantial increases. Of this tonnage, Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of War Transportation, in a speech in St. Louis on October 19, last, said:

> Today there are in operation on the system, embracing not only the (Mississippi) river but its tributaries, about 5,000 barges, ranging in size from about 100 to 3,000 tons in capacity, and about 1,000 towboats ranging from 200 to 2,500 horsepower. With that fleet the river system has been able to render a service which it was wholly unable to render in the last World War and which has been of invaluable aid in the war effort. The barges transported in 1942 the very sizable

total of 16,500,000,000 revenue ton-miles, which has afforded the railroads much relief.

After Pearl Harbor the character of the traffic on the river system changed, so that today it may be stated, without fear of contradiction, that as much as 95 percent of the entire movement is of commodities which are directly related and essential to the war effort. One of the largest movements is of petroleum and its products. In 1942 that movement aggregated slightly more than 24,000,000 tons, and it has since been increasing steadily.

The Mississippi River and its principal tributaries have been under almost continuous navigation in some form from the time of the first explorations a century before American independence. Hennepin, Marquette, and Joliet traversed its upper branches in bark canoes in the seventeenth century. La Salle explored portions of the Ohio, and afterward the Mississippi to its mouth, reaching the passes on the Gulf in 1682.

The great humorist, Mark Twain, in his younger days, spent much time on the Mississippi River steamboats, becoming an expert pilot. It is said that he knew every detail of transportation on the river, including its history. He tells us that the earliest commerce on the river was in a type of barge known as keelboats or broadhorns. These boats had no power for propulsion, but were floated or sailed down the river from the upper branches to New Orleans. With their return loads they were then tediously poled back up the stream, sometimes requiring 9 months to make the round trip. For 15 or 20 years after steamboats were in operation keelboats continued to be used for downstream traffic, the boats then being sold in New Orleans. In due time the steamboats became very popular for both passenger and freight service.

Steamboats were in operation upon the Mississippi and its tributaries long before Congress ever made appropriation for their improvement. Vast settlements and colonizations sprang up along the banks of the streams, which on account of the favorable transportation facilities afforded, developed into cities of great commercial importance. Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville, Memphis, New Orleans, St. Louis, Kansas City, Omaha, Peoria, and St. Paul-Minneapolis are notable examples.

In 1861, after the Southern States had passed ordinances of secession, Stephen A. Douglas, who had been the political adversary and critic of Mr. Lincoln, in a famous speech sought to impress upon the people of the North the consequences of being deprived of the free right to navigate the Mississippi as an outlet to the markets of the world. His speech had wonderful effect in solidifying sentiment.

In the decade beginning about 1845, efforts were made to have the Government construct a railroad as a connecting link between the Mississippi inland waterway system and the Pacific. The thought was that this combined rail and water connection would afford an ample transportation system to the vast region extending from the Pacific to the Alleghenies, and also as an outlet for our export trade to the Orient.

Trade with China had begun to develop and much traffic coming from the Gulf up the Mississippi by boat was transferred at St. Louis to overland routes for San Francisco, where there was a natural harbor which needed no improvement by the Federal Government. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH], who is quite familiar with the early traffic history of that section, advises me that prior to the railroad era these freights from the river boats were hauled over the trails from the Mississippi to San Francisco in the so-called prairie schooners so famous at that time.

Mr. Benton in the Senate in 1849 introduced a bill for a public road from the Mississippi to the port of San Francisco. In his discussion he made reference to trade with China, and quoted extensively from the reports of Frémont on the different routes investigated in his explorations. He also called attention to the proposal of the British to make the Columbia River the dividing line between the United States and Canada, and improve it for navigation to be free to both countries as a part of the connecting line between the navigable waters of the Mississippi and the Pacific Ocean. Of this bill Mr. Benton said:

The bill which I ask leave to bring in, Mr. President, fixes the termini of this road—the beginning and the ending. After what I have said, it is hardly necessary for me to add that the starting point is the bay of San Francisco, and the ending point is the city of St. Louis. The road is to connect the ocean navigation at the bay of San Francisco with the Mississippi, near the confluence of the Missouri. From St. Louis it is in communication with all the States and cities of this Union.

In the Thirtieth Congress a resolution was offered in the Senate for military purposes which was, in part, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee be appointed to consist of ____ members to inquire into and report upon the expediency of establishing a railroad by the Government of the United States, for military purposes, between San Francisco, on the Pacific, and the most suitable point which may be found on the navigable waters of the Mississippi.

The author of this resolution was one of the most outstanding characters in American history, Sam Houston. General Houston had been a Member of Congress from Tennessee; chief of an Indian tribe; Governor of Tennessee and Governor of Texas; President of the Republic of Texas, and a United States Senator. He was a soldier of great distinction, who, in early life, as colonel of his regiment was severely wounded in a battle with the Creek Indians. Later, as Commander in Chief of the Army, he secured the independence of Texas at San Jacinto in one of the most brilliant victories ever achieved upon a field of battle. In the Senate of the United States, after the annexation of Texas, he saw the importance of this great river system as a military asset for the preservation of this Nation.

It has never been deemed practical to secure an all-water channel for the movement of traffic between the Mississippi and the Pacific. That accounts for the many efforts made to secure that end by a combination of water, rail, and highway routes. Water-channel connection between the inland waterway and the Atlantic, however, has been deemed practical and seriously considered—even by George Washington. President Washington established the District of Columbia at the head of navigation on the Potomac. He then promoted the Chesapeake and Potomac Canal with a view to forming a connection with the great Mississippi system.

For many years the proposal has been before Congress to complete an adequate connection of the inland river system with the Great Lakes at Chicago, and the present bill contains the Calumet-Sag project which, if adopted, will forge the last link in that chain. Its completion will afford the suitable connection of the inland river system with the connecting channels and ports of the Great Lakes, where, in addition to other traffic, more than 90,000,000 tons of ore were moved the past year, supplying the Army and Navy with 85 percent of the steel so essential for ships, tanks, trucks, guns, and other equipment so necessary in the war.

It is needless to remind you that the Great Giver of all good gifts and graces, in the dispensation of His divine providence, has, without the assistance of man, formed the connection of this great inland system of transportation with the Gulf of Mexico, which for more than a century and a half has served the needs of the people in war as well as in peace.

Our inland system now embraces several thousand miles of connected and improved waterways. These channels of trade have performed an important part in the development of the country and have added many billions of dollars to the common wealth. But, if they had never performed any peacetime service, it cannot be reasonably said that their improvement, if for wartime use alone, has been in vain.

The Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway has performed one great service for which credit has been given to other methods of transportation. The operation of the ocean tankers having been stopped by the war, the major portion of the oil and gasoline shipments to the eastern seaboard have been by rail and by pipe lines. The praise of these carriers has been proclaimed from the hilltops and in the valleys. The public was not told of the part performed by the waterway in these operations.

There is no pipe line up and down the Atlantic seaboard. The oil and gasoline comes in by pipe line to certain points on the intracoastal waterway, principally at Philadelphia, Richmond, and Jacksonville. The major portion of it is then loaded in barges for shipment over the Atlantic intracoastal waterway to points of consumption from Trenton, N. J., to Miami, Fla., a distance of 1,356 miles. In fact, the distance shipped by water has, in some instances, been greater than the distance shipped by pipe line.

The Gulf Intracoastal Canal from Florida to the Mexican border has been completed as far as Corpus Christi. It

crosses the Mississippi at New Orleans and with its connection with the Warrior River adds more than a thousand miles to the connected inland system. This intracoastal channel has become so congested with barge traffic that Congress, as a war measure, has found it necessary to give the channel additional width and depth. This work of enlargement is now nearing completion, and on the last lap from Galveston to Corpus Christi 11 powerful dredges are now at work. The traffic on this channel each year of its operation has been far in excess of the estimates made by Gen. George W. Goethals upon which it was authorized. The tonnage has increased enormously under war conditions. The War Department advises that in 1942 there was an increase of 22 percent over the volume for 1941, which, in turn, exceeded the 1940 tonnage by 49 percent. I am now advised by the Chief of Engineers that the increased traffic on this waterway amounts to 269 percent.

This intracoastal channel places the inland-waterway system, including the Great Lakes, in direct communication with every port and harbor on the Gulf, from Florida to the Mexican border. In the post-war period these ports will be found to be in readiness to take part in the redevelopment of our coastwise and intercoastal trade, as well as trade with Central and South America, over both the Atlantic and the Pacific. Our European trade, of course, will continue to be handled largely through our ports on the Atlantic seaboard, and trade with Alaska and the Orient through our Pacific ports.

The dreams of those who a century ago had visions of a great commerce with China may be realized to the fullest extent. When the people of that country are released from the bondage imposed upon them by their nearest neighbor they will, of course, seek trade alliance with this country and become our customers as well as our friends.

When peace is restored we will have at our disposal the largest and most efficient merchant marine in all the world, embracing ships suitable for every line of trade. The great ports on our coasts will be in readiness for their accommodation, and our products should be transported principally in American bottoms to all the markets of the world. With such an efficient merchant marine, and with our splendid system of inland transportation by water, rail, highway, and pipe line, America should be in position to lead the world in trade and commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce that in the preparation of this bill the Committee on Rivers and Harbors for the first time in many years has been deprived of the counsel and assistance of one of the ablest Members who ever sat in this Chamber, Judge Francis D. Culkin. It was my privilege to have served with him on this committee during the whole of his congressional career, and, for a numbers of years on the Committee on the Merchant Marine. He was an expert upon all matters pertaining to transportation, and his courage, honor, and integrity were above reproach. He has passed from us, but much of his good work remains for the use and benefit of mankind.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if during the consideration of this bill he proposes to offer any committee amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; we have quite a few.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will they be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Members?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I suppose they might be by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have no desire to insist that the gentleman do that, but it strikes me it would be helpful.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have quite a number of amendments to offer from the committee. In view of the fact that we cannot get through the bill today, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments may be printed in today's RECORD for consideration tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The committee amendments are as follows:

Committee amendments to be offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas to H. R. 3961, a bill authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes:

Page 2, lines 19 and 20, strike out "authorized by any act of Congress," and insert "constructed and maintained under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers."

Page 14, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following paragraph:

"St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney: House Document No. 445, Seventy-eighth Congress."

Page 19, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following paragraph:

"Lavon Reservoir on East Fork of Trinity River, Tex.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated February 10, 1944."

Page 19, line 5, after "Congress", insert "and in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated August 21, 1943."

Page 20, lines 18 and 19, after "Seventy-sixth Congress", strike out the comma and the word "and", and insert a semicolon in lieu thereof; and after the semicolon at the end of line 19 insert "and 449, Seventy-eighth Congress."

Page 21, line 13, after "Congress", strike out the semicolon, insert a colon, and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That such improvement when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri Basin over that now authorized by existing law."

Page 21, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following paragraph:

"Coasts of the Great Lakes: Harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels; House Document No. 449, Seventy-eighth Congress."

Page 21, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following paragraph:

"Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wisconsin; House Document No. 421, Seventy-eighth Congress."

Page 23, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following paragraph:

"Sackets Harbor, N. Y.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 6, 1944."

Page 26, line 11, after "Congress", strike out the semicolon, insert a comma in lieu thereof and add the following: "With such modifications as the Secretary of War may find advisable after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and such other agencies as may be concerned."

Page 27, line 9, after the word "Congress", strike out the semicolon, insert a colon in lieu thereof and add the following proviso: *"Provided,* That said dam shall be so constructed as to provide a pool elevation of 340 feet above sea level if a dam of that height is found to be feasible. In the design, construction, and operation of the Umatilla Dam adequate provision shall be made for the protection of anadromous fishes by affording free access to their natural spawning grounds or by other appropriate means. Studies and surveys necessary for fish protection shall be made by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and designs for structures and facilities required for fish protection shall be prepared in cooperation with that agency. Funds appropriated for the design, construction, or operation of said dam shall be available for transfer to the Department of the Interior for the foregoing purposes."

Page 29, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following paragraph: "Electric power and energy generated at projects authorized by this act and not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives, the rate schedule to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. At dams or works authorized by this Act which are suitable for the production of electric power and energy the Secretary of War shall provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such structures, machinery, equipment, facilities, and supplies as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to develop power and energy for existing and potential markets and for the proper reception, handling, and dispatch of electric power and energy; and operations of all such machinery and facilities shall be scheduled in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior so far as consistent with requirements for the use or control of water for the other purposes of said projects as may be determined by the Secretary of War. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire such transmission lines and facilities and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements as he deems necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities herein conferred upon him."

On page 29, after line 21, insert new section as follows:

"SEC. 3. That (a) the consent, permission, and authority granted to the commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, a municipal corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois to exercise jurisdiction over the navigable waters of Lake Michigan which lie within the following-described boundaries:

"Beginning at a point at the intersection of the existing bulkhead along Lake Shore Drive in Chicago, Ill., with the existing pier which is parallel to and north of Ohio Street extended and south of Ontario Street extended; thence easterly along said pier to a

point in a line parallel to and 350 feet easterly of said bulkhead along the Lake Shore Drive; thence northwesterly along said last-described line to a point in a curve of 200 feet radius and tangent both to said last-described line and to a line 350 feet southerly into Lake Michigan from a point near the from the southerly side of and parallel to the shore arm extension breakwater extending intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive; thence along said curve to a point in said line last described; thence easterly along said line to a point in a line at right angles with said shore arm extension breakwater at the eastern extremity thereof; thence northward along said last-described line to said shore arm extension breakwater; thence westward along said shore arm extension breakwater to the shore line: and (b) the right granted to said the commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, to destroy the navigability of the above-described waters altogether, and (c) the right granted to said the commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, to erect an additional breakwater to connect the said shore arm extension breakwater near the intersection of Oak Street and Lake Shore Drive with the shore line, and (d) the transfer of possession of said shore arm extension breakwater to said the commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, and the obligation for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore arm extension breakwater by the commissioners of Lincoln Park, now superseded by the Chicago Park District, all as provided for by the act entitled 'an act granting to the commissioners of Lincoln Park the right to erect a breakwater in the navigable waters of Lake Michigan, and transferring jurisdiction over certain navigable waters of Lake Michigan to the commissioners of Lincoln Park,' approved March 3, 1931, be rescinded.

"The United States of America hereby resumes jurisdiction over the above-described waters and the above-described shore arm extension breakwater and hereby discharges the Chicago Park District, successor to the superseded the commissioners of Lincoln Park, from its liability for the permanent care, custody, and maintenance of said shore arm extension breakwater.

"Said Chicago Park District shall signify its acceptance of this act by written notice to the Secretary of War within 60 days after the passage of this act, and this section shall become effective immediately upon its acceptance by said Chicago Park District. In the event of nonacceptance within 60 days this section shall become null and void."

Page 29, after line 21, insert the following section:

"SEC. 4. The excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not be applicable to lands which will receive a water supply from the Central Valley project, California, reauthorized by section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved August 26, 1937."

Page 29, line 22, strike out "3" and insert in lieu thereof "5."

Insert the following items on the pages and places hereinafter designated:

Page 31, after line 13:

"New Bedford and Fairhaven Harbors, Mass.; particularly with a view to providing greater depth in the eastern portion of the anchorage basin."

Page 31, after line 17:

"The southern coast of Long Island, from the New York City line to Montauk Point, N. Y., with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along said coast, such examination and survey to be made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and the act entitled 'An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States,' approved June 26, 1936."

Page 32, after line 6:

"Arthur Kill, N. Y. and N. J., between a point 1,000 feet north of the mouth of Smiths Creek and a point 1,000 feet south of Buckwheat Island."

Page 32, after line 7:

"Coast of New Jersey, from Sandy Hook to Cape May, with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along said coast, such examination and survey to be made under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act approved July 3, 1930, and the act entitled 'An act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States,' approved June 26, 1936."

Page 32, after line 17:

"Mispillion River, Del., up to Milford."

Page 32, after line 22:

"Pocomoke River, Md., from Old Rock Buoy to Williams Point."

Page 36, after line 25:

"For a system of interlocking open-river and canalized channels having a depth of 12 feet, and of suitable width, to be constructed through rivers and lakes, and by land cuts, as follows: From Palatka, Fla., to the Indian River at Sebastian, Melbourne, Eau Gallie, Cocoa, or such other locality as may be found most suitable; from Titusville westerly to the St. Johns River, thence to Lake Tohopekaliga; from Lake Tohopekaliga to Leesburg, on Lake Harris; from Lake Harris to the St. Johns River near Dexter Lake or alternately from Lake Harris to the Wekiwa River, thence to the St. Johns River; and from Lake Tohopekaliga via the Kissimmee River and Lake Okeechobee to a connection with the Okeechobee Cross-Florida Channel; all with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation, flood control, and water conservation."

Page 38, after line 2:

"Hillsboro Inlet, Fla., in the vicinity of Pompano."

Page 39, after line 5:

"Aucilla River, Fla.

"Bayou Texar, Fla."

Page 41, after line 2:

"Dickinson Bayou, Tex.

"Jones Creek, Tex., with a view to improvement in the interest of navigation and flood control."

Page 42, after line 3:

"Allegheny River, up to Warren, Pa."

Page 42, after line 4:

"Grand Portage Harbor, Minn."

Page 42, after line 11:

"Harbor at St. Ignace, Mich.

"Mackinac Harbor, Mich."

Page 42, line 12: Strike out "Algoma Harbor, Mich."

Page 42, after line 15:

"Clinton River, Mich."

Page 42, after line 21:

"The coast of Lake Erie, with a view to the establishment of harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels for commercial and, or, recreational purposes."

Page 43, after line 6:

"Oswego Harbor, N. Y."

Page 43, after line 17:

"Monterey Harbor, Calif.

"Carquinez Strait and Alhambra Creek, Calif., with a view to providing harbor improvements at, and in the vicinity of, Martinez."

Page 43, after line 22:

"Willapa Harbor, Wash., with a view to providing a channel to, and turning basin at, Tokeland Dock; also with a view to providing a mooring basin and breakwater at and near Nahcotta Dock, Nahcotta."

Page 44, after line 9:

"Valdez Harbor, Alaska, with a view to its improvement, and particularly with respect to the expansion of facilities for harborage of small boats.

"Cook Inlet, Alaska, with a view to improvement for navigation, providing harbor facilities for the city of Anchorage, and the development of hydroelectric power.

"Anchorage Harbor, Alaska, with a view to its improvement, and with the view of determining the advisability of providing additional harbor facilities for small boats."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 26 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. I believe the chairman was on the floor a moment ago when the question was raised as to whether or not some of these projects might not be justified from a financial standpoint. I should like to ask the chairman if it is not a fact that every one of these projects has been approved by the United States Corps of Army Engineers? Each one has been carefully surveyed and in every single instance is justified from a financial standpoint—that is, that the revenues to be saved will justify the expenditure by the Federal Government.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman is entirely correct. For many years we have adopted a rule in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors not even to permit a hearing on a project until it comes before us with a favorable report of the Corps of Engineers of the War Department.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. There has been, however, some difference of opinion in regard to one of the largest projects in this bill—that is, the Tombigbee—where the Chief of Engineers and the Corps of Engineers have not agreed; is not that true?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. There have been many instances. The engineers, of course, reserve the right each one to express his own views and opinions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact, the question of "pork barrel" did not enter into the compiling of this bill, but each project was placed on its own merits. The Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway project was taken up after all the rest of the bill had been adopted, and it was adopted by a vote of 13 to 5. There were three proxies sent in by members authorizing that their votes be cast for it, and three members who were not present said they would have voted for it if they had been present. There was no question about "pork barrel" in this bill at all. Every one of these projects, just like the project the gentleman has been interested in up there in Michigan, has been adopted on its own merits and on the recommendation and showing of the Army engineers.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it is fair to say to the Members of the House, however, that it was the desire of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors to keep out of this bill just such projects as the Tombigbee River project in order that we might get through a rivers and harbors bill, which we have been unsuccessful in doing for the last 5 years.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Six years.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. This will not hurt it.

Mr. DONDERO. This will meet the same fate as the other bills.

Mr. RANKIN. It will not hurt it at all. It will help the bill. I would certainly hate to wait to develop the rivers or the water power of this Nation until we could get the consent of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. You would not have to wait very long if you would justify the project economically before the American people.

Mr. RANKIN. We could get the St. Lawrence project.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; and because we have the approval of the Army engineers.

Mr. RANKIN. So did this. You would get the St. Lawrence project in Michigan, you would get anything that affected the Great Lakes, but I submit that if I had to depend on the gentleman from Michigan for the development that we have adopted in the last 10 years, I fear we would not have gotten very far. If his policy had been adopted on the Tennessee and Columbia Rivers we would be deprived today of that great wealth of aluminum and aluminum projects that we are now producing which are helping to win the war.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Michigan may say that he is not persuaded by the oratory of the gentleman from Mississippi, although I have great respect for the gentleman and his ability.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman the facts argue a great deal more eloquently than I can.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have had opportunity to examine this bill most carefully. As a matter of fact, I appeared before the Rivers and Harbors Committee in support of various items therein. Particularly was I concerned with an item known as the Clarks Hill Reservoir project, which is situated in the district represented by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. PAUL BROWN.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD in reference to the Clarks Hill Reservoir project.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I shall discuss briefly the project for improvement of the Savannah River for navigation below Augusta by construction of the Clarks Hill Reservoir project on that river 21 miles above Augusta, as recommended by the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission and favorably reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The bill, H. R. 3961, if enacted into law, will authorize construction of this project.

The Clarks Hill project has not been the subject of controversy in any respect. It is recognized without exception as having outstanding merit both for the improvement of navigation and for the production of hydroelectric power, and, incidentally, the flow regulation to be provided by the reservoir will be conducive to the control of floodwaters.

This is strictly a self-liquidating project. Its construction may properly be termed an excellent investment for the people of the United States. This is not my testimony, but I am quoting from the engineers and others who have made a thorough study of this project. In addition to this, recently Mr. McWhorter, Chief Engineer of the Federal Power Commission, testifying before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors stated:

> I want to tell the committee something about the economic possibilities of the Clarks Hill project. It is just as sound as a gold dollar. The public can never lose a cent by constructing it, and I might say that immediately after the war, if Congress is disposed to build such projects, the Clarks Hill project should be among the first to be constructed.

Every dollar of the investment will be repaid to the Government, together with interest thereon. The power revenues are expected to repay the entire investment, including the part properly allocable to navigation, as well as the direct power investment; but, quite naturally, it will take somewhat longer to amortize the entire investment than to amortize only the part chargeable to power.

The various Government agencies and all who made thorough study of this project reported that the project was practical, sound, economically justified, and should be constructed as soon as possible.

The Clarks Hill project has been approved and recommended by the following various Government agencies:

First. Brig. Gen. G. B. Pilsbury, Acting Chief of Engineers, November 9, 1934. See Three Hundred and Eighth Report, Savannah River, House Document 64, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, published January 3, 1935.

Second. The Savannah River Special Board created by the President. Report dated February 29, 1936.

Third. National Resources Committee, November 5, 1036.

Fourth. Federal Power Commission Power Market Survey, April 1937.

Fifth. Army Engineers, January 25, 1938.

Sixth. Federal Power Commission, March 1938.

Seventh. National Resources Committee, April 1938.

After the entire cost of this project is paid for, which the witnesses of the Government stated could be done in 30 years, the dam and plant would be in excellent condition and the Government then would realize all the profits from that time on, which certainly justifies the witnesses in stating that it is an excellent investment for the people of the United States.

The estimated cost of the project, as shown in Senate Document 66, Seventy-sixth Congress, is $28,000,000, in round figures, of which $21,408,000 is chargeable to power, $5,740,000 to navigation, and the remainder to flood control and other purposes. The reservoir will be one of the largest in the eastern part of the United States, being rivaled only by the great Norris Reservoir in the Tennessee River Basin. The gross capacity of the Clarks Hill reservoir will be approximately 3,000,000 acre-feet, of which 1,500,000 acre-feet will be usable storage. After operation of the reservoir is commenced, the minimum regulated flow in the Savannah River below Augusta will be three times the natural ordinary low-water flow and approximately five times the extreme low flow. This regulated flow will provide minimum navigable depths of 7.3 feet below Augusta, thus enabling steamboats drawing from 5½ to 6 feet to navigate the river to Augusta every day in the year. In contrast, the channel in its present condition has a controlling depth of 6 feet about 80 percent of the time and controlling depths of from 4 to 5 feet the remainder of the time. Thus the Clarks Hill reservoir would convert the present part-time, uncertain, and unsatisfactory navigation channel into a transportation route of importance, capable of accommodating relatively large-scale tonnage. For a great many years the United States has been committed to the improvement of the Savannah River for 6-foot navigation to Augusta, but to provide the required depths continuously without the benefit of storage would be inordinately expensive. The regulated flow from the Clarks Hill reservoir will render unnecessary large expenditures which would otherwise be necessary for navigation improvements and, moreover, will provide for 100 percent of the time greater navigable depths than could otherwise be secured except by canalization methods; that is, by the construction of locks and dams.

This project is exceptional in that a very large reservoir may be created with only moderate flowage damage. The reservoir site is well down on the main stem of the river so that a large volume of water for filling purposes each year is definitely assured. Railroads would be affected only to a minor extent, if at all, and the damage to improved highways would be relatively small. The lands that would be flooded are largely uninhabited, sparsely wooded tracts and uncultivated fields, with only a small proportion of farm lands in high state of cultivation, and with very few farm buildings. Thus it is seen that the entire flowage damage would not greatly exceed the bare cost of the project lands. This situation is indeed very unusual, and accounts in part for the economic at-

tractiveness of this project. In many fine reservoir sites in various parts of the country, the necessity for extensive railroad relocations and for the relocation of other valuable works of men render water-control projects economically infeasible. But such is not the case at this time with respect to the Clarks Hill project. If construction is delayed, the situation may be different at some time in the future.

Referring again to Senate Document 66, the Army engineers have estimated the annual output of the Clarks Hill power plant at 444,000,000 kilowatt-hours of primary energy and about 100,000,000 kilowatt-hours of secondary energy; and have estimated the cost of the primary energy at 2.77 mills per kilowatt-hour. Primary or continuous energy can be produced at this cost by only the best hydroelectric plants, and by no steam-electric plants.

The Chief Engineer of the Federal Power Commission and the resident member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors both appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors at the request of that committee, and both commented at length on the merits of the Clarks Hill project, and otherwise stressed the importance of constructing the project as soon as practicable.

The Chief Engineer of the Federal Power Commission gave assurance that the expanding power market in Georgia and South Carolina would soon absorb the output of the Clarks Hill plant, and it is definitely known that the opinion of the private power interests in that region is the same. He also expressed the opinion that the power investment could be amortized in the short period of 30 years, if that were desirable; and that thereafter, within a period of a few years, profits derived from the sale of power would pay off all of the remaining investment. Moreover, after returning the entire cost to the Government, the power plant and all other project works would still be in excellent condition, and serviceable. The reports and testimony of the Army engineers have consistently been equally favorable to the project, as may be seen by reference to Senate Document 66 and to the reports of hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors dated March 13–18, 1941, and October 27, 1943.

In conclusion, I desire again to remind my colleagues from all sections of the country that there has never been any difference of opinion regarding the merits of this project among the Federal agencies which have considered and reported upon it, or between the Federal agencies and the private power interests. All are agreed that it is a highly meritorious project, and that the public interests would be well served by its construction. In March 1936 a special board of engineers, created by the Departments of War and Interior and the Federal Power Commission, by direction of the President, made a careful study of the Clarks Hill project, found it to be exceptionally attractive from the economic viewpoint, and recommended its construction. More recently both the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Federal Power Commission have reported favorably on the project and recommended its construction. In 1928 an affiliate of the Georgia Power Co. obtained a Federal license for a large power development at the Clarks Hill site, but the license was surrendered in December 1932 at the depth of the business depression. The same interests, assuming that the Clarks Hill dam and reservoir would now be constructed by the United States as a multiple-purpose water-control project, have expressed their readiness to take such part of the power output as might be made available to them. These facts and circumstances show conclusively that the merits of this project have never been questioned from any source. I commend the project to the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I want to join other members of the committee in paying a just and deserving tribute to our very able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]. During my entire service in this House I know of no Member who serves as chairman of a committee with greater impartiality, uniform kindness and consideration of the members of his committee than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He knows more about the waterways and navigation projects of this country than any Member of the House. It has always been a pleasure to serve on his committee. I want to concur in what has been said on this floor today in regard to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not mention on this floor another gentleman who has been one of the most faithful and efficient public servants in the employ of the Government of the United States. To my right here on the floor of the House sits the clerk of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, Mr. McGann. He has been the clerk of that committee for 42 years. You can call up any time for any information you desire regarding the smallest creek, the largest lake, or the widest river in this Nation, and Mr. McGann will have the information for you at his fingertips. I think I express the opinion and the feeling of every Member of the House when I say that we are greatly indebted to him for much of the help that comes to us.

Mr. Chairman, in regard to the bill now before the committee, may I say at the outset that I am in favor of water transportation and of the development of the waterways of the United States. I wonder if the Nation really knows how much we owe to the waterways of this country in this critical period of our history? I will only refer to but one example to demonstrate their importance.

At the risk of repeating what has been said on this floor many times, I call attention to the fact, coming from the Great Lakes area as I do, that we can ship a ton of coal from Buffalo, N. Y., to Duluth, Minn., a distance of 1,000 miles, for about the same price as it would cost to move that same ton of coal from the curb in front of your house to your cellar window. Through four narrow ribbons of water at Soo, Mich., there comes to the American Nation the iron ore that is needed for 85 percent of the steel industry of the United States, which means that 85 percent of the tanks, guns, shells, and everything that goes into the building of munitions of war comes through those four ribbons of water, the locks in the St. Mary's River at Soo, Mich.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. And about 10,000,000 tons of grain also come down through there annually.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; in addition. In 1942, 92,000,000 tons of ore came through those locks and, as the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has just reminded me, 10,000,000 tons of grain. There is no other way that this country could bring the ore from the Mesaba Range in Minnesota to the blast and steel furnaces of Ohio and Pennsylvania except by the ships that travel over the Great Lakes. We do not have railroads or cars enough to bring down the enormous amount of ore that is required for the steel industry of the United States and which we need so badly in this critical period of our history.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Can the gentleman not offer a similar parallel in connection with every other industry in the United States in which water transportation has contributed 90 percent to its success?

Mr. DONDERO. I think it has a great bearing on all the other industries of the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman might also add that the coal used in the Northwest would cost the people double or more than double what it is costing them now.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; because the same ships that bring down the ore take back the coal to the North, the Northwest, and the interior of the United States.

I am in favor of the projects included in this bill, with a few exceptions: I regret that two or three have been included in the bill of a controversial nature. I shall offer an amendment to strike out only one, because it was the understanding of our committee—and I do not think I am talking off the record or out of school—to present to this House a bill containing projects over which there would be no serious controversy, in order that we might pass an omnibus rivers-and-harbors bill without any difficulty and without any opposition—as the chairman has already pointed out, it has been 6 years since a rivers-and-harbors bill has become law—the majority of the committee thought otherwise, and has placed two or

three projects in this bill over which there has been much controversy. I desire to speak about one, and that is the one in which the gentleman from Mississippi is so greatly interested, and quite naturally, because he comes from that section of the country, and that is the Tombigbee waterway, which represents $66,000,000 or $67,000,000 in Federal expenditure and six or seven million dollars of State contribution.

It is not a new project to this House. It has been here before, and this House rejected it on the 19th of May 1939, by a vote of 204 to 160. That means a majority of 44 on a roll-call vote. I think it was rejected because the Army engineers did not agree in the report that had been filed with this committee. It is one of the most voluminous reports that I have ever seen on a rivers-and-harbors project. The report contains items justifying it economically that have never been included in any other project since I have been a member of that committee, during the past 11 years.

I have had occasion to look up the history of the reports on this project. They go back to 1871. I find that in every case an unfavorable report has been filed, with the exception of this one, which was filed by the Board of Army Engineers in 1939 and to which the Chief of Engineeers could not lend his wholehearted support. He used language in this connection that ought to challenge the attention of every Member of this body.

The first report on this river goes back to 1871. Then there is one in 1873, 1875, 1882, 1888, and a second one in 1888, 1890, 1911, 1923, 1928, and 1939. Nine were unfavorable. Only one, the 1939 report, comes to us in what I call a divided report, that brings this project before the House of Representatives today.

Now, what does the Chief of Engineers say in regard to this Tombigbee waterway? The Board of Army Engineers try to justify this project by calling attention to the fact that the savings would amount to $4,143,000 annually, while the maintenance, overhead, and the interest on the bonds or net carrying charges would amount to, according to the report, $3,561,000. But in the items of saving of $4,143,000 are four items to which I object and to which the Chief of Engineers, Major General Schley, did not give his wholehearted approval and used the language that I want to report to this House.

Here are the four items, and I am going to ask you older Members of this body if you can remember any project coming to you heretofore containing items of this kind to justify a river-and-harbor project economically.

The first one is a diversion of traffic from the Mississippi River of $1,000,000.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. One million tons.

Mr. DONDERO. It is used here as $1,000,000 instead of 1,000,000 tons. They take $1,000,000 in traffic off the Mississippi River and credit it to the Tombigbee River. Undoubtedly that same $1,000,000 worth of tonnage was credited to the Mississippi River at the time that was presented to the House in order to justify the improvement of that river, so that when you take it off of the Mississippi and credit it to the Tombigbee you are simply robbing Peter to pay Paul and nothing else. I believe that item is open to attack and is vulnerable.

The second item is for national defense, $600,000. If you apply the same reasoning to that $600,000 that was applied to the money we spent on the Boston Navy Yard, the Brooklyn Navy Yard, or the Charleston, S. C., Navy Yard, you might say that those projects in those localities must be credited with millions of dollars, but this one of $600,000 for national defense, in my judgment, is taking an item for economic justification out of thin air. There may be some national defense in it. Who can measure it in the shape of dollars and cents? I do not think it can be done.

The third item is $275,000 for the increase in the value of real estate. Mind you, these items are to be credited every year, not 1 year, in order to justify this project before the country. Here is an increase in the value of real estate. Who gets that? Nobody but the people who own the real estate along this stream—not the American people at all. I never heard of a project before where real estate value was justified as an item of credit.

The fourth item is recreational value, an item of $100,000, and the total of the four items is $1,975,000. When that amount is deducted from the items of savings of $4,143,000 claimed for this river and take the balance from the overhead of $3,561,000, it would cost the American people, a loss, not a gain, but a loss of $1,393,000 annually.

In my opinion, from that record this project is not justified.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BOYKIN. Has the gentleman read the letter to Judge Mansfield from the Chief of the Army Engineers showing that since this report has been made the Mississippi River has gained 146 percent more than they had at the time the report was made, that this report was made before this emergency, and that the Tennessee and the Tombigbee River traffic has increased 126 percent? We do not need that land and we do not need that recreation.

Mr. DONDERO. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this project.

Mr. BOYKIN. That is signed by the Chief of the Army Engineers. The gentleman does not expect to get one Chief of Army Engineers to go back on what another said a long time ago, before the Tennessee River was fixed up.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me say to the gentleman that this is the only report before this House.

Mr. BOYKIN. But here is the report signed by the Chief of Engineers, which I will be glad to hand to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. I shall read now to the House, language used by the Chief of Engineers in regard to this project, to which I ask every Member to listen carefully, and you will see from what he says that he has never given his approval or endorsement to this project. This is the language used by Maj. Gen. J. L. Schley, on February 27, 1939, 5 years ago. I quote him:

> The estimate of savings of a million dollars on up-bound traffic on the Mississippi River results from a thorough study, and I do not doubt that such a saving would result, but I doubt the wisdom of dependence upon diversion of any considerable part of the Mississippi River project, to justify this new project, even though the credit is confined to the additional saving in transportation cost.

Then he goes on to say this generally about the four items:

> All these intangible or indirect benefits must be considered in addition to the direct savings in transportation costs in order that this project will show a substantial excess of benefits over costs. They are difficult to evaluate, and appear to me to be questions falling within the realm of statesmanship, to which the Congress can best assign the proper values.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. DONDERO. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Chief of Engineers would not take it upon himself to be responsible for endorsing items of that kind, because they fall within the realm of speculation. With that language in the report, in spite of the recommendations of the Board of Engineers, we are asked to endorse this project. I do not believe we are justified in doing so until we can have the unanimous approval of the Army engineers, and when I say that, I want to pay my tribute to the engineers. I have always respected their ability, and the information they bring to us. I think they have the confidence of every member of our committee. Having that confidence in the Board and the Chief of Engineers is the reason I am objecting to this project, the Tombigbee River. Therefore I am going to offer an amendment to strike it out, and I hope this House will be of the same opinion it was on the 18th of May 1939, when by an overwhelming vote the House rejected it.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Not now. I have only 2 or 3 minutes left. I want now to call the attention of the House to one other thing, and that is the letter which came to our committee from the President, making several suggestions in regard to amendments to the bill. I assisted in amending one of those amendments, namely, No. 5, which transfers or delegates to the Secretary of the Interior all power and authority over the power that might be generated at the locks and dams in the projects in this bill.

I do not refer to section 2 of this bill. I refer specifically to proposed amendment No. 5, which the chairman of our committee has been authorized to offer from the floor. I am going to object to that amendment.

On February 7 the Committee on Rivers and Harbors received a letter from the President requesting that we add to this bill certain amendments which would in

effect revolutionize American industrial economy. Under this proposal all of the Federal power projects of the Nation would be placed under the control and operation of the Secretary of the Interior.

The President has been very strenuous in his objection to attaching riders to important measures which he cannot in good grace veto—riders which he considers against public policy but which he cannot overrule without destroying even more important legislation. Yet in this instance we are asked now to pass a bill which amounts to a social and political revolution in this country as a mere side issue. An amendment to the very necessary and important rivers and harbors bill.

If the truth is known, it is my opinion that the President, busy with his duties intimately connected with the war, merely signed a letter that was handed to him by the Secretary of the Interior and that he did not have the time or the opportunity to digest the import of these recommendations. Nor am I criticizing him for so doing in full realization of the enormous burdens which he must bear. The guilty party is the self-seeking person who has taken advantage of the President's busy hours to put over an enormous coup and to present to Congress in the name of the President a bill which would put the billion and a half dollars' worth of Federal investment in electrical power in the hands of politicians.

This is not the first time that the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, has sought to grab the political power that goes with the economic power of control of electrical utilities owned by this Nation.

There was a vigorous campaign by the Secretary in 1938 to have the Tennessee Valley Authority included in the Reorganization Act of that year.

This proposed amendment No. 5, in the President's letter, would make the Department of the Interior a more important political grab than the Post Office. The chairman of the national committee of the party in power would not be the Postmaster General but would be the Secretary of the Interior. His would be the power to give and to withhold. He could blanket whole areas with the blight of high rates and shower with munificence another area with low rates. He could trade rates for votes. He could reward and he could punish with an economic power beyond the grasp of any political officer in this Republic. No one man should ever be endowed with such power if we want to preserve and perpetuate our Republic. To call these amendments in the public interest is a fraud upon the people, designed as a self-serving motive by a power-hungry bureaucracy. The Secretary has tried time and again to achieve these powers but on every occasion he has been rebuffed by Congress and I hope he will not succeed in this ill-timed afterthought measure.

These amendments were proposed nearly a month after the bill was reported out. No public hearings were held on them.

There is no urgency that these amendments be adopted now. Let them be introduced as a separate bill. Let them receive full and comprehensive hearings that such a measure deserves. And then, if it is the wish of Congress, after full and free discussion in committee and on the floor, we can pass them. But let us refrain from submitting to any devices of the Executive or any department of government to ramrod legislation.

If this bill is passed, of course Secretary Ickes personally will be responsible for the operation of the power empire of the Federal Government. But the actual personal operation will rest in the Power Division of the Department of the Interior. In this branch of the Department of the Interior we find a man named Stephen Raushenbush as one of the vital, behind-the-scenes personalities. Thereby hangs a tale.

On March 24, 1942, our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] revealed to this House the communistic background of Mr. Raushenbush. On the following day, March 25, on a motion of our colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], the House adopted an amendment to the then pending Interior appropriation bill specifically removing Mr. Raushenbush from the Federal pay roll. When the bill reached the other body, however, Mr. Raushenbush, when called as a witness, explained that he had not meant what he said in his previous writings and that he was an honest-to-goodness capitalist. Acting in good faith, that body restored him to the pay roll and Mr. Raushenbush continued to occupy his position in the Power Division of the Department of the Interior. At that time, however, the draft board was, in street language, "breathing down his neck" inasmuch as his wife was also on the Federal pay roll at a salary of $5,600 a year in the Bureau of Economic Warfare. Rather than be drafted, Mr. Raushbenbush accepted a commission in the Navy. Perhaps that is stating the case unfairly for Mr. Raushenbush. Perhaps he did have a patriotic desire to serve his country. But the fact remains that after the 38-year-old limitation was promulgated, Mr. Raushenbush was therefore exempt from the draft and the Navy graciously retired him and he returned to the Department of the Interior. Perhaps his patriotic enthusiasm evaporated simultaneously with the promulgation of the 38-year-old age limitation. I hope I am not being unfair to Mr. Raushenbush, but there is a singular coincidence there. It is also unfortunate that Mr. Raushenbush is hiding his light under a bushel. His name is not listed in the Department of the Interior directory, nor does his name appear on the office directory in the Department. But if you will proceed to room 6323 in the Department of the Interior you will find a small typewritten card with his name posted on the door.

Now who is this man Raushenbush and why is he important in connection with this bill?

Mr. Raushenbush wrote a thesis at one time in a symposium entitled "The Socialism of Our Times," printed by the Vanguard Press of the League for Industrial Democracy, a document edited by Norman Thomas, who was the Presidential candidate of the Socialist Party. Mr. Raushenbush entitled his thesis "Some Measures in Transition." Our colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] ably expressed the case against Raushenbush in his speech. I shall not repeat the argument which caused this House to single him out of the entire Department of the Interior pay roll as the one man who, on the basis of his Communist record, was so inimical to the American form of government as to reject him from the Federal pay roll. I should like to remind you, however, that this very man said—and I quote:

> The very subject Transitional State implies that we have accepted the alternative of encroaching control in place of the dream of cataclysmic socialism which has engrossed people dissatisfied with the world for so many years. There is an acceptance here of our own realities. The drama of conflict—the last of the great St. Petersburgs of the world—does not represent the world we live in. It is not pleasant to give up that dream of a violent triumph. We are sensitive about it. We hear the charge of cowardliness, of the unheroic quality of compromise. Let us face that and have it down. It is a conflict and extends into all phases of life. In literature people who wish to escape from the world are romanticists. Those who have the same desire but more sense of truth and actuality become our realists, bitter that the world is so little like what they want it to be.
>
> To refuse to face the fact that we live in a dynamic world rather than in the Hegelian world of Marx, is cowardly. And if we are aware that there is no longer any prophetic destiny in Marx and still (for want of a better cause and because we like or are unable to detach ourselves from the dreams of our youth), preach revolution, and get other men to spend their efforts toward the fulfillment of a prophecy that is not divinely inspired—that is a cowardly compromise. It is playing fast and loose with the rank and file who starve and strike upon the leaders' say-so.

And again he said, in the same document:

> The carrying drive of any movement or organization in this country today is simply pragmatic. This side of revolution (Russia, Italy, Germany) we can only take what opportunities we can make ourselves or are offered for illustrations in Socialist practice, to convince both the workers and the middle class that we are right—that the abolition of the profit system is to their interest and will result in higher real wages, greater security, freedom from wars, and other forms of autocracy. Unless we can show workers results from day to day, they will turn to someone who can, or who can promise to. Meanwhile, the local machines give them small favors and protection. The Socialist candidate for President gives them only the glory of shaking his hand. Marx has convinced his thousands, but the Ontario Hydro-electric Commission has convinced its hundreds of thousands. We need more leverage places like the latter. And there are parts of our political life today where we have such a wedge.
>
> The students coming from the colleges today can do something more than be filled with wholesome and cleansing indignation. They can be of enormous use to the movement as government officials, starting in small and definitely working on the reasonable hope that in the course of another 10 years we shall have government control of a much more definite kind over our trusts, banks, and general industries; that there will be government corporations operating

and managing, not only the port of New York and Muscle Shoals, but many other developments. There is a chance here for young men not only to keep the liberal groups informed about the dirty work going on and on and times and ways to prevent it, but also to look forward to careers of usefulness in executive positions, making the government control over industry more adequate, pioneering in a field of essential importance.

Government officials in the bureaus and departments at Washington, Albany, Trenton, Harrisburg, and other State capitals are of great importance. The wages are not high. That is one reason why so many of them go over to private industries and favor private industries before they do go over to them—earn their jobs ahead of time. Yet the problem of Government officials is a major problem of immediate socialism. In Germany, after the revolution, the bureaucracy was nationalist and nearly sabotaged the republican government, until it had been replaced. One good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, inside the Department—whether it be the Interior, where the oil scandal started and the Boulder Dam bill received most active support, or the Treasury, where the taxation scandals breed and the Government tax policies originate—can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside.

Mark that language:

One good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, inside the Department * * * can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside.

And Raushenbush today is one good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, inside the Department of the Interior, who knows so well that he can "do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside."

Raushenbush and many others of his kind are the power behind the throne. Raushenbush is the man who will carry out and effectuate the purposes of those amendments to the rivers and harbors bill.

If this Congress wishes meekly to surrender its prerogatives, its duty to the public and to the common man, this is the way to do it. Vote for the amendment and surrender public power to public politics. I should expect a united front from the real friends of public power, together with the opponents of public power, in opposition to this attempted coup by Harold Ickes to grab off and inject into politics the political pap and pork barrel that will go with surrendering the marketing of electric power generated by the Federal Government.

The R. E. A. at one time was an independent agency and free of politics. The day R. E. A. went under the control of the Department of Agriculture was the day R. E. A. went into politics. It was also the day when the R. E. A. Administrator, Mr. John Carmody, resigned his post in protest. We have only to read the record of the hearings of the investigating committee of the subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee, to realize the enormity of power that might be wielded by the Secretary of the Interior if this move to socialize America without a blood revolution—which Raushenbush would really prefer—is enacted into law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. McMURRAY. Could the gentleman answer this question? Why was not the St. Lawrence waterway project in which the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from Wisconsin are alike interested placed in this bill?

Mr. DONDERO. For the same reason that I stated at the beginning of my remarks, that we did not want to include in this bill projects which were highly controversial, so that we might secure the passage of an omnibus river bill through this Congress. The St. Lawrence waterway is controversial. There are other projects that could have been put into the bill in the same category, but for the same reason they were left out.

Mr. McMURRAY. Does the gentleman from Michigan think that is the best, the wisest course to approach this by? Does the gentleman from Michigan think that it would be bad policy to include the St. Lawrence waterway in a bill of this kind?

Mr. DONDERO. I favor the St. Lawrence seaway, and everyone knows it.

Mr. McMURRAY. And so do I.

Mr. DONDERO. But let every project stand on its own merits and let the House vote it up or down.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Let me state further that the St. Lawrence project is bound up with a foreign country, and it is the only project we have ever considered in that light. When I first introduced the bill in Congress at the request of the President it was introduced as an independent billl. It was afterward placed in an omnibus bill, but was not thought of at the time the bill was first introduced.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. I am interested in the gentleman's remarks regarding the amendment to be offered by the committee, to place the power generated in these projects in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior for disposition. As I understand it, the committee first decided to place that power in the hands of the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. As has been done heretofore in the case of Muscle Shoals and perhaps in other cases?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Was there any evidence before the gentleman's committee that the Corps of Engineers has misused that authority?

Mr. DONDERO. I never heard of any.

Mr. TARVER. Why should we follow this policy of putting these projects, which normally should be within the control of the Corps of Engineers, into the hands of the Secretary of the Interior in all cases?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is in error, entirely. The only project where the Army engineers have had charge of the distribution of power was at Muscle Shoals, which was strictly a war measure. At Bonneville and Grand Coulee and other places the Army engineers have charge of the works in the river, but deliver the power at the switchboard to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. TARVER. Prior to the time when the President's letter came to the gentleman's committee, had that committee so formulated the bill as to put this power in the hands of the engineers?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; we did that.

Mr. DONDERO. I might say as to some of the other projects that the power is left in the hands of the engineers; this is true of the Soo locks in Michigan.

Mr. ANGELL. In the Columbia River development, both at Bonneville and at Grand Coulee, the engineers have control only of the manufacture of the power, and at the switchboard the power is turned over to the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Also at Fort Peck.

Mr. ANGELL. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. The power generated should be sold by the Federal Government at the bus bar, and let private enterprise distribute it to private industry and for domestic use, and not leave it in the hands of the Federal Government, to be in competition with our own citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

PORK AND POISON

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, we have before us for consideration what is known in Congress as the pork-barrel bill, which, as Shakespeare said with respect to the rose, under any other name would smell as sweet; perhaps. In it are many projects which deserve and will have my support and that of many others whose motives are not selfish but patriotic.

The trouble with this bill as submitted, however, is that within its provisions is insidiously concealed poison enough to deprive all the States of the last drop of their lifeblood, weakened as they already are by loss of power and the threat of being entirely swallowed by the gargantuan octopus of centralized government to which eventuality this committee should not be, and I know its membership does not wish to be, a conspirator sub rosa.

Of course I will not vote for the bill as written for all the reasons offered by the minority and for additional reasons which I now propose to give.

The bill must be amended in four or five particulars in order to justify its passage. The committee substantially admits that this is so, for, as I am advised, it will accept or offer two or three amendments itself. All the amendments which have been shown to me as proposed to be offered should be accepted.

It is well to remember that kings will be tyrants from policy when subjects are rebels from principle. So let it be understood that I am a rebel as against the unlawful recommendations by way of provisos in this bill contained.

While the attention of the Congress should be directed to all the amendments which will be offered, particular attention should be called to the provisos on page 2, lines 19 and 20, and on page 3, lines 5 and 6, wherein it is suggested that we should legislate with respect to dams "heretofore or hereafter authorized" and to "modify the plan for any dam or other work heretofore or hereafter authorized."

And then, Mr. Chairman, the proposition in the proviso which undertakes to delegate the use of congressional discretion is such an unheard of surrender and abrogation of the legislative and discretionary powers reserved to the Congress itself, as not to be considered seriously. It should not be done. It cannot lawfully be done. It should never have been proposed to be done.

Mr. Chairman, it is only fair and right that I say here and now that while my opposition to the provisos in this bill is general, nevertheless, it is particularized by the fact that the three flood-control dams constructed in Vermont since the flood of 1927 are involved in these provisos. While Federal funds were used under the supervision of the Army Corps of Engineers in constructing these dams, the State of Vermont not only procured additional needed lands and rights, but cooperated to the limit to effectuate the desired result so far as flood control was concerned. I emphasize the fact, however, that the State of Vermont still owns the land. This was a cooperative enterprise entered into between the Federal Government and the State of Vermont. The State was not ignored.

VESTED RIGHTS

So it follows that I object to the surrender by my State, or any other, of its vested rights under retroactive provisos impossible of conclusion under the law of the land.

Let me remind you that should we tolerate such a travesty on republican-democratic government as is suggested by the provisos some of us will smart for it, and rightly so.

Reduced to this day, such provisos cannot be tolerated among men who assume to represent their constituencies under an oath of office. They are ultra-constitutional in their inception and purely military in their desire for consummation. It is high time we saved to the people what is now left of their rights before we are completely regimented by those who would take advantage of a state of war to do that which in time of peace would not be allowed.

Mr. Chairman, these suggestions and these provisos undertake to impair in a very real way the rights of parties to legislation heretofore enacted authorizing the construction of the dams in question. Therefore, these provisos are unconstitutional, in that they are retroactive and retrospective in law and in fact. I do not know how many dams heretofore constructed may be affected, for there is no time nor geographical limitation imposed or suggested. They must be many and in many States.

The proposed provisos undertake to impair vested rights of States, of people, of compacts between States approved by Congress, and, in respect to dams heretofore constructed, to give the right and power to the Federal Government to do that which Congress under the Constitution cannot do. They are therefore unconstitutional per se.

CONGRESS CANNOT LEGISLATE EFFECTIVELY UNCONSTITUTIONALLY

Such retroactive legislation cannot now or at any time be enacted constitutionally. It is axiomatic that the Congress cannot legislate unconstitutionally. It follows, therefore, that it cannot delegate unconstitutional power or authority to anybody else, not even to the War Department, as is proposed in the provisos.

THE CROSSROADS

The fact is we are at the crossroads of our dual system of government. Shall such form of government as has been maintained be continued, or will we accumulate and aggregate all power over the land, the water, and the air in a centralized bureaucratic government? That is the real question involved in these provisos. Shall Congress unlawfully continue to strip itself of its power and prerogatives? It cannot do it if it would be inclined so to do. Our courts have held to the contrary as to its right.

THE STATES—DO THEY STILL LIVE?

Shall the States as political entities be deprived and denuded of the powers and the rights they reserved to themselves in the Constitution and Bill of Rights by an act of Congress, which is retrospective and retroactive and ex post facto? That is what confronts us, and the answer is "No."

As you know, the Constitution expressly prohibits and proscribes against the passage of laws impairing the obligation of contracts. How sensible.

Retrospective operation of legislation is not favored by the courts. Naturally such laws disturb feelings of security in past transactions and violate the rights of people to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness the Bill of Rights seeks to guarantee. The law books of the world and the decisions of the courts of the United States are full of matters and things which support the proposition for which I contend. I need not quote decisions.

EX POST FACTO AND RETROACTIVE LAWS BLOOD BROTHERS

Moreover, and this is important, there is a recognized kinship, which is not to be overlooked for a minute and which our forebears foresaw with their keen eyes looking to the future, between ex post facto laws and civil retroactive laws. They were not fooled for a second. That very kinship is realized now and has been recognized over and over again by the court, protected from improper retroactivity, and included within the due process clause of the Constitution in decisions too numerous to mention.

THE OBLIGATION OF A CONTRACT

In brief, Congress may not pass laws violating the obligation of contracts. A whole world of controversy is decided in that sentence.

The fifth amendment provides that the Federal Government shall not deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. That provision has been construed to operate against the impairment of contracts by the Federal Government. What wise forebears we had.

The Federal Government can do no more or other, if as much, than can the States, and by the fourteenth amendment it is provided that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. Think that over.

It has been well said, and I reiterate, that there is something inherently bad in retroactive legislation. When it comes down to where it impairs vested rights, it has been so often held as not to need repetition that a retroactive statute cannot interfere with or divest vested rights. That is good law and common sense. It is for the respect of these rights I now contend.

WHAT ARE VESTED RIGHTS?

That brings us to a consideration of what are vested rights, of course from a legal standpoint.

I venture to assert that in law and fact rights originally acquired or asserted under a contract or the compact under and by virtue of which a dam was erected and constructed after full and complete hearings and after all the issues had been solved and determined as between the States and the Federal Government, and/or between the States and other States, and/or between individuals and the States and the Federal Government, are vested rights. There can be no successful contradiction of my position.

Therefore, it follows that any attempt by way of a proviso which would permit or allow the Federal Government, by virtue of the alleged authority of any act of Congress, unconstitutional in conception, to undertake to disrupt or to devastate vested rights is forever unconstitutional and of no force and of no effect at law and, therefore, should not be included in this bill.

That is exactly what is confronting us today under these provisos so insidiously shot into this bill insofar as they refer to those matters and things heretofore decided and concluded involving vested rights. As for me, I do not propose to tolerate for one minute such attempted rape of the Constitution, obliteration of the laws, or invasion or violation of the

rights of the States reserved by them to themselves.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact that the proviso is in the bill is evidence that it is assumed and recognized by its proponents that without its inclusion in the bill the program set up therein cannot be accomplished as against the rights of the States. That is the answer. It just cannot be done, anyway. The proponents labor under a misapprehension of the law.

I submit therefore, that the program which is suggested should not be projected until at least the rights of the States which are undertaken to be violated, abrogated, and ignored, are recognized and the States are heard.

Let me say again that the proposition involved in these provisos undertakes to impair vested rights, invalidate contracts and compacts hitherto entered into as between the States and the Federal Government, as between States and States, and as between States and individuals, and it is unconscionable.

Let me invite your attention also to the fact that these provisos undertake to delegate the power of Congress to an individual in the Government, an engineer of the War Department, who shall be thereby empowered to disturb and to violate and destroy States and States' rights, disrupt countries and counties and people, disinter the dead, and devastate situations now existing by reason of contracts and compacts heretofore entered into conclusively, and terminated, involving dams heretofore erected. Such power cannot be lawfully delegated under this bill or any other.

EX POST FACTO, CIVILLY

Mr. Chairman, while not so intended, perhaps, it is nevertheless a fraud prima facie and per se on the people of the States and on the States themselves to inject these provisos for they undertake to impose, ex post facto and retroactively, and to take advantage of, conditions which did not exist nor obtain at the time the contracts with respect to the erection and construction of the dams in question were under consideration and were entered into by the parties to the construction thereof.

So, unless you stand ready to surrender to the socialized, centralized Federal Government all control of the earth and the air and the water within and above and under your States, and are willing to take the responsibility for your vote to that intent at this time, you cannot, and neither can any man under his oath of office, vote otherwise than in opposition to the provisos and in favor of the amendment which will be offered.

Unless, I say, you are ready to surrender your State, its reserved rights, the rights of your people, the control of everything which you reserved as the rights of the States for your own control and operation, under the Bill of Rights, to a centralized bureaucracy, under an attempted delegation of power to the War Department, through its Chief of Engineers, there is only one way for you to vote. The provisos should be deleted.

THE CROSSROADS AGAIN

The other amendments which will hereafter be offered and to which I have not referred, are equally as important, locally. I say to you that as the amendments may be read they are entitled to your very careful consideration. Not only is the national life of the country you and I have known involved in each and all of them—that is, so far as our present form of Government is concerned—but your responsibility as a representative of your State is at issue as well.

We have come to the crossroads in representative government. You may take your choice and take the responsibility therefor. I have assumed mine.

I do not undertake to say what any man's conscience shall direct him to do under the circumstances. I do say that none of the measures which have been presented to Congress since I have been a Member of it has ever involved so closely, so acutely, so drastically the fate of this Nation and our form of Government as do the questions involved in the provisos to which I have called your attention.

Shall the States still function? Are you for the States whose representatives you are, or are you for a centralized, socialized, totalitarian fascist government? Your answer will be found in the vote you register when the amendment to strike out these provisos is offered. There is no neutral ground.

A SOCIALIZED GOVERNMENT

We shall live and continue to do business as a democratic Republic so long as, and no longer than, those States, yours and mine, are protected, by you their representatives, with respect to the rights which they reserved and which are seriously and critically threatened by the provisos suggested in this bill. It is too serious a situation to be treated lightly or covered by an insidious proviso.

Mr. Chairman, I insist that—

First. The provisos in question completely and perfectly ignore, disregard, usurp, abrogate, violate, and invade the province of States' rights reserved to the States under the Constitution.

Second. They disregard the vested rights of the States, and of all the people of the States, in and to the property utilized and in them vested under contracts and compacts and condemnation proceedings of every type and nature, by virtue of purchase and by every other means by which title to property may be acquired incident to the construction of the dams heretofore erected and affected by the provisos permitting alteration thereof by the Federal Government in complete contempt of hearings by people and by States, which heretofore may have been had and determined.

Third. They offer an opportunity to the Federal Government with its strong hand to choke the life out of every citizen, however humble, and out of the States themselves, as they invade the provinces and the prerogatives of the reserved rights of the States under the Constitution. To this we should put a stop, and now, for it cannot be done without a fight—and that is not a threat, for the States must fight from this day on for that place in the sun to which they are entitled in order to save themselves from an inundation by an overflowing and overpowerful centralized government which we must resist to the last letter of the law. This matter involves a principle which should be and is the concern of every person in every State.

Fourth. The fact that the proponents assume that the end sought to be attained by and through the provisos in this bill cannot be reached unless they be incorporated in the bill is the best reason in the world why we should strike the provisos from the bill.

Fifth. In these provisos is involved a very real danger to this Government. They involve the extension of Government control over the economic life of the country with the resultant loss of the liberties of the people of the United States and the end of American democracy.

Mr. Chairman, this question of the extension of Federal control over our economic life is one of tremendous importance, for in order to preserve the control once centralized it becomes necessary to deprive the individual of his civil and political rights including freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to be governed by representatives of his own choosing.

This is the road down which we have rapidly traveled of late. These provisos are only signposts along the way but point to the same destination toward which we have been and are headed, namely, a completely socialized or Fascist or totalitarian government.

It is time to stop and look and listen before it is everlastingly too late.

TIME FOR RECAPTURE

Mr. Chairman, now is the time and this is the place for us, as Members of Congress, to recapture some of our power, prerogatives, and prestige.

It is the time and place for us to realize and to resolutely insist that there shall be no further toleration of a program which involves and permits arbitrary acts of a centralized government to insidiously destroy the States; deny them their rights; deprive the individuals of their rights to civil liberties—free speech, free associations, free press, free justice, and polictial freedom to protect these rights.

INESTIMABLE LEGACIES

They are the inestimable legacies which are either ours to transmit to posterity and to ages yet to come, or to permit to be buried in the ignominy of our inglorious failure to protect and to conserve.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, while listening to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] attacking this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway, the greatest and most desirable project of its kind ever proposed in this country, and at the same time putting the stamp of his approval upon the St.

Lawrence inland waterway, having listened to him recently pleading, with tears in his eyes almost, for the Sault Ste. Marie project in his own territory, I suppose, in his own district——

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a correction?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I beg to call to the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi that the Sault project is 300 miles from my district.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but the folks who benefit from it reside down in that area—I was reminded of Byron's immortal lines:

'Tis sweet to hear the watchdog's honest bark
Bay deep-mouth'd welcome as we draw near home.

If this Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway connected the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] with the Atlantic Ocean or with the Gulf of Mexico, he would undoubtedly be singing its praises. I am sure, also, that he would be more eloquent, more logical, and more forceful, and more impressive than he was in his attacks.

He calls attention to the fact that this project has been surveyed many times and that until the last time it had always been turned down by the Army engineers. But he did not point out the changes that made this project both feasible and necessary. I will point them out in a moment.

As I said a few moments ago, there is no other project under the shining sun, and the Army engineers verify this statement, with the exception of the one connecting the Don and the Volga Rivers in Russia, where you can transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and with such enormous saving in transportation costs and distances. The Tombigbee River rises in northeastern Mississippi, within 20 miles of the Tennessee River. The Tennessee River is on a plateau about 100 feet higher than the bed of the Tombigbee. It is contended by some archeologists, I am told, that in prehistoric times the Tennessee flowed down the Tombigbee Valley. But where the Tennessee strikes the northeast corner of Mississippi, it turns northward and flows into the Ohio River at Paducah. Always before this project has been turned down for various reasons that no longer exist. In the first place, in 1866, 1871, 1873, 1875, and 1882, a gasoline engine or a motorboat was undreamed of. My people lived on the Tombigbee River 100 years ago, and the steamboats navigated that stream to within 20 or 25 miles of the Tennessee River. They were heavy, cumbersome steamboats and were fired with wood. But even then men dreamed of this connection. But there would have been no outlet from the junction with the Tennessee River for the traffic after it got there, because there was no channel above that point to Knoxville and none downstream to the mouth of the Tennessee River at Paducah. But when the Tennessee Valley Authority was developed, it provided a 9-foot channel all the way from Paducah, Ky., to Knoxville. Therefore this traffic will not be going into a dead end, but it will be connecting up with the greatest system of inland rivers to be found on the face of the earth, covering the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the Ohio, the Wabash, the Mississippi, the Missouri, and the Illinois, into the Great Lakes.

Another reason was that there is a sand ridge separating the Tennessee River from the Tombigbee. If this project had been constructed 10 years ago they would have had to have lifts coming out of the Tennessee up to the top of the ridge, and also lifts from the Tombigbee up to the top of the ridge going the other way, and there was no water supply at the summit. Why did not the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] tell you that? He knew it, because it was brought out by the Army engineers before the committee.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Just let me finish my statement and I will yield in a moment. But, when the Pickwick Dam was built just below the place where this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway will connect with the Tennessee River, it raised the water level at that point 55 feet. Then the Army engineers found it was feasible to cut through that sand ridge, as is indicated on the map, and the summit of the project would be in the Tennessee River, in the Pickwick Lake, and we would have all the water we would ever need.

Coming on down through that cut you drop down a hundred feet to the Tombigbee, and then you have 18 locks and dams from there down to the mouth of the Warrior. The building of Pickwick Dam and the opening up of a 9-foot channel from Knoxville to the mouth of the Tennessee River at Paducah made this great project both feasible and necessary. Therefore the Army engineers approved it and recommended its construction. The more they study it the more enthusiastic they become over it.

Some men have said that this will injure the Tennessee River by taking the water out of it. All the water it will ever take out of the Tennessee will be just enough to run that first lock. I asked one of the Army engineers the other day how much that would amount to in lowering the Pickwick Lake. If there ever was a man interested in Pickwick Lake it is your humble servant, because it was my efforts in this House that not only brought about the building of the Pickwick Dam but that saved the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, that provided for the building of all the dams from Norris to Gilbertsville. So he said, if you were to put through a barge every hour——

Mr. BOYKIN. Who said that?

Mr. RANKIN. The Army engineer—for the next 50 years the lowering of the water on the lake would amount to just about as much, comparatively, as if you took a stack of papers 10 feet high and slipped one or two sheets of them out. You could not even tell it. Yet they have used that argument to try to frighten the people of Tennessee into thinking that this project would injure the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I do not know whether the accomplishment of the project which the gentleman mentions would draw any water from the Mississippi or the Missouri Rivers.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no; not at all. It would be absolutely impossible to get a drop of water out of the Mississippi River or the Missouri.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in trying to control floods at Cairo, Ill. Would there be any possibility of diversion of water from the Tennessee at the time the Ohio and Mississippi are at flood stage?

Mr. RANKIN. No. That is not involved in this project. There is no provision for that. And there is no provision for the generation of hydroelectric power, because that is all taken care of on the Tennessee River. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] comes back and talks about a few little incidental benefits that would be derived from this project by people in that particular area. They are so small compared with the enormous benefits it will bring to all the people of the great Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, and Tennessee Valley areas that I would not mention them.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. In regard to the flood situation at Cairo, Ill., it might possibly relieve that to a small extent.

Mr. RANKIN. But it would be very small.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It would be very small because a portion of the water would go down another channel, which otherwise would go down the Missouri River.

Mr. RANKIN. Whatever they took out would relieve the flood situation at Cairo, Ill., to that extent, but it would be so small that so far as this project is concerned—I do not want to deceive the distinguished gentleman on that proposition—it would be so infinitesimal that you would not miss it, but these dams on the Tennessee have contributed to controlling those floods.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that the large dam at the mouth of the Tennessee is the one that really keeps most of the floods back from the Tennessee River?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes; but, in fact, they all help.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. It would be of inestimable value to the people of lower Illinois if some of this water could

be diverted through the Tombigbee and other courses.

Mr. RANKIN. I am giving you the facts. This project will not do that. Therefore it will not deprive the Tennessee River of its necessary water nor will it flood the Tombigbee Valley.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I just wanted to add that I appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON] in the question of lowering the flood stages, and I just wanted to observe that if this proved to be a diversion, then it might do what we had been warned in Tennessee, on the other hand, and we do not want that.

Mr. RANKIN. It will not be a diversion, but here is what it will do: Let us take Cairo as a base, because all the traffic that goes down the Tennessee or the Ohio or the Missouri or upper Mississippi or Wabash, to the Gulf goes through Cairo. From Cairo, Ill., down to New Orleans is a distance of 860 miles. Across to Mobile, along the intercoastal waterway, it is 156 miles; then from Mobile to the Tennessee River, up the Tombigbee Inland Waterway, it is 491 miles. From that point to Cairo down the Tennessee and the Ohio, it is 261 miles, making a total of 1,768 miles for the round trip. Of that 1,768 miles it takes to make the entire loop, 1,121 miles of it is down stream, because you go down stream from Cairo to New Orleans, and you go down stream from where you strike the Tennessee River to Cairo. The balance of the route is in slack water. You will travel through the Intercoastal Canal from New Orleans to Mobile, up through the slack water of the Tombigbee behind those locks and dams on the Tombigbee to Pickwic Lake on the Tennessee. Therefore it would be worth more to the people of that area, from a transportation standpoint, than if you were to move an arm of the Gulf of Mexico to Cairo, Ill. Why? Because transportation down this river and back through this Inland Waterway, would be cheaper than it would to go the same distance through the Gulf of Mexico or along the Intercoastal Waterway, because from Cairo to New Orleans you would be going down a swift stream, and from the junction of the Tennessee down to Cairo you would be going downstream, and the rest of the route would be in slack water.

Who gets the benefit of that? Talk about recreation, talk about the little incidentals that one man happened to mention, of all these engineers. I will tell you who it will benefit. It will benefit every shipper in the States of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Arkansas, and every other State between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not true that the four items amount to 50 percent of the savings that is claimed for this project?

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no. The gentleman is talking now about a report made years ago when we were asking the engineers to make a scientific investigation to show whether or not this project was physically feasible.

Mr. BOYKIN. The project which the gentleman is for, the St. Lawrence project, would cost much more than all you are talking about, would it not? What would it amount to?

Mr. RANKIN. I supported the St. Lawrence project, because I wanted that water power developed that is now going to waste; but it would have cost $184,000,000. This one will cost only $66,000,000, and it will save enough in transportation costs to pay for itself in anywhere from 3 to 7 years. In the first place it will put Cairo, Ill., 108 miles nearer the Gulf of Mexico. It will put Paducah, Ky., 200 miles nearer the Gulf of Mexico. It will put Pittsburgh, Pa., 200 miles nearer the Gulf of Mexico; and Minneapolis, St. Paul, Sioux City, Omaha, Chicago, Kansas City, and St. Louis, all 108 miles nearer the Gulf. But that is not all. It will save 786 miles between the Tennessee River and the Gulf of Mexico at Mobile.

Let us see what else it will do. Your traffic will move counterclockwise down the Mississippi River, taking advantage of that swift current, and then across through the intercoastal waterway to Mobile, then up through the Tombigbee waterway to the Tennessee and then downstream to Paducah or Cairo. Let us see what it means. Here is what the Army engineer thinks of it. He thinks, as all do who have investigated it, that it is the greatest project of its kind ever proposed to the American Congress. Let us see what it will do. I am giving his figures here now: A tow of 1,200 horsepower, which is the average, with eight barges of 3,500 tons load going from New Orleans to Cairo fighting the terrible current of the Mississippi River will cost $6,273, in fuel costs alone. To go across to Mobile then up the Tombigbee and then down the Tennessee and the Ohio to Cairo the fuel costs and charges for going through the locks, all told, will amount to only $3,868, a saving of $2,405 on every trip. There is not a barge line in the world that makes $2,400 profit on such a trip. But let us go a little further. That is the traffic that goes to St. Paul, Minn., that is the traffic that goes to St. Louis, to Kansas City, to Omaha, and Sioux City, that is the traffic that goes to Chicago and to St. Louis.

Now, let us see what it will do for traffic that goes up here to Wheeling, W. Va., to Cincinnati, to Louisville, and to Pittsburgh, Pa. Going from New Orleans up the Mississippi River to Paducah the cost would be $6,472, but by way of the Tombigbee the cost would be $3,669, or a saving of $2,803. Every bargeload of material going from Pittsburgh, from Wheeling, from Cincinnati, from Paducah, or from Louisville, or from any of those points on the Ohio River, or the Alleghany River, the Monongahela, or the Cumberland River to New Orleans on its return trip, the average tow of eight average barges would save $2,803.

Who would get the benefit of that? The people in this great area here, known as the Mississippi Valley, between the Alleghany Mountains and the Rockies. But let us turn over and see what else it will do. Suppose the commerce is going into the Tennessee; and I submit to the gentleman from Michigan who talks about there being no war or defense element involved in this great project—I wonder if he knows of the great war industries now in operation in the Tennessee Valley, the munitions plants, the aluminum plants, the plane parts that are being manufactured there, and the amount of bauxite and other raw materials being shipped in. For him to say there is no war or defense element involved is like denying that there is a war going on.

They would save in going from New Orleans to the junction of the Tennessee, and that means to every place on the upper Tennessee—Sheffield, Guntersville, Chattanooga, Knoxville, and all other points—would save on each such bargeload $4,507 a trip—that is, going from New Orleans, if you please, not from Mobile.

But let us turn over and suppose you are going from Mobile. You people ship your wheat, you ship your meat, you ship your dairy products, you ship your corn, you ship manufactured articles down the Mississippi. You have a right to ship something back, and you have to ship something back or you would be operating at loss.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Mississippi 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. If you are going from Mobile to Cairo, as I said, you would save $3,290. But suppose you are going to the upper Tennessee: You would save $5,392.

Suppose you were going from Birmingham to Cairo or anywhere in that area: You would save $5,448; and if you were going into the upper Tennessee River you would save $7,551 each trip. If you were going from Columbus, Miss., to Cairo, you would save $6,564 each trip, and to points on the upper Tennessee you would save $8,667 each trip. Going from Aberdeen to Cairo you would save $6,920 and to points on the upper Tennessee, $9,043.

From a standpoint of savings in distances and transportation costs, this project has never been equaled by any other ever proposed on this floor.

This is not only a most feasible project, but it is most necessary. The gentleman talks about the few things that it will save in the way of recreation and land values. That is chicken feed. Forget them. I have a letter here from one of the Army engineers that shows there would be at least 9,000,000 tons of upbound freight each year, based on previous years' records. Let us assume that the saving is $1 a ton. If that traffic moved counterclockwise and it went back through the Tombigbee it would save enough to pay for the entire project in about 7 years, to say nothing of this

traffic that will move into the Tennessee River and that will move up and down the Tombigbee. I am not talking about the great resources that are there that you need. One of the greatest iron-ore deposits in the world is at Russellville, Ala., near this project. Some of the greatest asphalt fields in the world are in the area traversed by this project.

The greatest hard-timber belt left in America is found in this area. A new oil field has just been brought in on both sides of the Tombigbee. This project connects with the intercoastal waterway that extends all the way to the border of Mexico.

The traffic that goes into Central and South America would all go up and down this inland waterway, down the Mississippi and return by the Tombigbee inland waterway; and in 5 years from the day it starts it would probably be paying for itself every year. Besides, it would employ four or five thousand men for several years in its construction. Those men who are now fighting the battles of this Nation are going to want work to do when they come home. I do not want to see them put on relief, I do not want to see them raking leaves; I want to see them put on some profitable work, and I know of nothing that would be of greater value to the American people than to put those young men to work building America by constructing projects of this kind. While you are spending $1,300,000,000 for U. N. R. R. A. for such developments in other countries let us spend a few million dollars for "I. N. R. R. A." While you are doing so much for the rest of the world, let us do something for the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN].

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the arguments of the Rivers and Harbors Committee that the St. Lawrence seaway should, because of its size and importance, be in a separate bill by itself, and I recognize that there is merit to that contention. I also appreciate that this bill before us seeks to cover a great many necessary improvements to the rivers and harbors of the country, most of which are very small items. I thought, however, that the committee and the House would like to know that a few days ago another step was taken toward the accomplishment of the St. Lawrence seaway and water-power project when the New York State Legislature went on record in favor of the power development early in the post-war period. I am not an advocate of public ownership of the power industry, but I have steadfastly supported this particular development as being uniquely in the public interest.

This project is an old subject to the Congress, but it has never been a partisan one. Both Democratc and Republican administrations have supported it in the national administration and in the New York State government. The surveys were first made in the administration of Woodrow Wilson. The project was pursued by Herbert Hoover. Mr. Roosevelt has pressed it. This would seem to dispose of the contention that it is a socialistic enterprise seeking to destroy private industry.

Harnessing of the power potentialities of the St. Lawrence will bring cheaper power rates and increased industry to the area.

I can appreciate the opposition of Metropolitan New York interests to the development of the seaway. It is a selfish opposition, a naturally selfish one. The fear is that it will reduce the traffic of the port of New York. It is my earnest belief that it will make for increased industry which will redound to the benefit of all New York State as well as to the country as a whole.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include certain tables prepared by Colonel Farringa.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get permission in the House to include the tables.

Without objection he may revise and extend his own remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, the blame for lack of progress on the St. Lawrence waterway project rests squarely on the shoulders of Congress in its failure to pass the omnibus rivers and harbors bill which included this project, in the Seventy-seventh Congress. Failure to act on that bill was a tragic error. The passage of that bill would have been of great benefit to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this pending rivers and harbors bill. Every item in this bill has the approval of the War Department engineers. They have carefully investigated every project. Throughout the years no Government agency has ever shown greater efficiency, or used better judgment than those men in the War Department who are charged with responsibility for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of this country.

The various items in this bill were included in the omnibus bill, which was not permitted to come for a vote in the Seventy-seventh Congress. I think a great disservice was rendered to the American people when we were not permitted to pass the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. One of the sections in that bill provided for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway power project, and in my opinion that project should have been contained in the pending legislation. Those in control of this matter, however, have thought differently, and it has been omitted.

During my service on the Rivers and Harbors Committee I have been impressed with the fact that when one section of the country benefits by the development of its rivers and harbors other sections of the country, either directly or indirectly, will likewise receive a benefit. What is good for one section is good for all of the people of this great country of ours.

I do not believe in approaching legislation of this character from a sectional standpoint, and I am supporting this measure in spite of the fact that these large projects are in other sections of the United States, and in some cases a long, long distance from Minnesota.

I would not support the bill if any of these projects could not be defended from the standpoint that they are of benefit to the American people, and will contribute to the sum total of our national wealth and efficiency.

As I have indicated, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway power project, like these other projects, will be of immense benefit to all of the American people. I do not here take the time to enumerate its advantages, and the fact that it is a necessary improvement. I just want to point out that if you will study the map you will get a bird's-eye view of a great marine highway for commerce, providing deep-draft navigation from the ports of Duluth and Superior, at the western end of Lake Superior, a distance of 2,687 miles in length to the Atlantic Ocean. Ninety percent of this project is already completed, because it consists of transportation facilities on the Great Lakes.

The completion of the small remaining parts is necessary in order to have a depth of 27 feet in those small sections so as to permit oceangoing boats to travel to the ports on the Great Lakes. At the present time the channel is only 14 feet.

Favorable action of the St. Lawrence seaway project has been delayed throughout the years because of powerful opposition from certain selfish and sectional interests. In spite of the fact that our Army engineers have acted favorably, and in spite of the fact that every President since Woodrow Wilson has given the St. Lawrence seaway power project their approval, various interests have, directly or indirectly, shaped or defeated legislation that would bring about this development.

I hope that my colleagues will have the time and the occasion to investigate the facts.

After a hearing that extended many months the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives acted favorably, and reported this measure for consideration in the old omnibus bill.

Congress can render no greater service to the American people than to put its stamp of approval thereon.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, on November 17 I introduced a bill (H. R. 3672) to put an end to any present or future claims by Germans and Japanese to assets we have seized as enemy property and to open our courts to American

nationals to prove, in accordance with the principles of Anglo-Saxon law, their losses arising out of enemy action during the course of the instant war.

Since then we have been waiting on the executive departments of the national administration to express their views on the merits of the bill I have offered. What they may think, I do not yet know, but I do know that the public reaction to my bill has been wholly favorable, with the exception of but two or three people who have raised the false cry of confiscation, a cry which so misled us following the First World War that $100,000,000 of losses suffered by Americans as a result of German war action remain unpaid to this day.

There is not even a color of confiscation of private property in my bill and there is nothing complicated about it. It contains only about 100 printed lines. But it says in no uncertain terms, clearly and unequivocally, that we are not going to give this seized property or any part of it back to the Japanese or Germans. As it is, there is not enough of it to cover more than a fraction of the private losses which American citizens have suffered from German and Japanese ruthlessness.

Why should we delay the adoption of a definite alien-property policy? The adoption of my bill would simplify the administration and greatly reduce the cost of handling these assets, prevent depreciation in their value and facilitate their transfer to American ownership where, in the inevitable contest for world trade and commerce which impends, they will contribute much toward turning the tide in our favor.

The Alien Property Custodian, Mr. Crowley, in his annual report, has all but petitioned Congress to take this action, and to take it now. In his recent report to the President, dated February 14, he says:

> The problem of uniformity of treatment in the final settlement of equities will actually arise when the ultimate disposition of controlled property or the proceeds of controlled property is determined. * * * And while this issue is one for the post-war period, some preliminary indication of future policy would clarify certain aspects of the control problem.

That is precisely what my bill, introduced 3 months before this report was released, would accomplish: It emphatically terminates foreign ownership of, and enemy control over, all seized enemy assets; it vests title to them, irrevocably and unconditionally, in the United States Government; it directs their prompt sale to bona fide American citizens and provides for the deposit of the proceeds in the United States Treasury to be thereafter divided among such American claimants as have suffered proved losses through enemy action, this as Congress shall hereafter determine is fair and equitable.

It does one thing more: It would permit those injured Americans to go now, without waiting for the war to end, into our Federal courts to prove their losses, so that, when the time comes, Congress will have the necessary facts upon which to determine what is fair and equitable in the distribution of the funds realized from the sale at public auction of the enemy properties previously seized.

Why delay the enactment of this bill, unless some people, by sleight of hand, would palm off on Uncle Sam and the American taxpayers the obligation of compensating our fellow citizens for their losses resulting from German and Japanese war action so that the war criminals, those responsible for American losses, can get their properties back scot free.

Why delay the enactment of this measure, unless some people are hoping to again catch Congress asleep, to again fool us into giving up this enemy property in reliance on worthless Jap and German promises or the deposit with us of long-term bonds; gold bonds of which the Treasury now has a bundle of the face value of $500,000,000; worthless German bonds deposited in the United States Treasury in 1928 to secure the payment of the private losses of Americans in the last war?

Why delay the enactment of my proposal, unless it be to help the same forces that were able to hold up the freezing of Axis assets long enough for them to get hundreds of millions of dollars of German assets out of the country, to transfer them to Argentina, Switzerland, and parts unknown, before they could be seized?

Why raise the cry of "confiscation" unless it is to delay the adoption of this measure, when there is not a suggestion of confiscation in my bill, a bill which merely puts American nationals first and subrogates Japanese and German nationals to the American claims against their own Governments?

Anyone who says there is a touch of confiscation of private property in the bill I have introduced is either not familiar with its provisions or is deliberately misrepresenting the facts. It was introduced to protect American citizens against those crafty creatures, some of them, I am afraid, paid German agents, who would be so generous with other peoples' property, our American claims, and so cosmic in their love of our enemies that they would give back to their original owners the assets of our enemies and let our own people, who have suffered private losses at the hands of our enemies go unpaid, or, failing in that, to unload the claims on Uncle Sam, that is, upon our American taxpayers who, through taxation, would have to raise the money to pay the claimants.

My bill requires Germany and Japan, as a condition of peace, to pay their own nationals the full value of any property which they had in this country at the outbreak of the war. If we are going to use words like "confiscation," let us use them honestly. If the word "confiscation" is honestly defined, I challenge anyone to show where there is any confiscation under my bill. There can be no misunderstanding unless the word is purposely used to mislead and befuddle.

If it is read in the light of established legal principles, my bill will be revealed as one based on the centuries-old principle of "subrogation," a principle of law quite the opposite in meaning from that which "confiscation" implies.

And what do we mean by "subrogation"? If the correctness of the following facts is assumed, the applicability of the principle will become quite clear, even to those untrained in the law. Assuming that innumerable American citizens have suffered losses as a result of war action by our enemies, they, of course, would have, as all will agree, valid claims for damages against Germany and Japan. Because these losses were caused by the war action of Germany and Japan, these countries are, in effect, debtors of the American claimants, who, in turn, occupy the status of creditors of the offending enemy powers. Now, we, that is, our Government, has property and assets of German and Japanese nationals in its possession or under its control which the Governments of Germany and Japan could and would sell, if they had the physical control of it, for the benefit of their respective war chests.

Applying, as my bill would, the principles of subrogation to these facts and their legal consequences, a principle approved of in world jurisprudence, our American claimants would be subrogated to the rights of the German and Japanese Governments against their respective nationals and the nationals of Germany and Japan would be subrogated to the claims of the American claimants against their own respective governments.

In other words, the American claimants, by American legal action, would be compensated for their losses out of the proceeds from the sale of the private properties and assets of the German and Japanese nationals now under the control of the Alien Property Custodian or of the Secretary of the Treasury. And, in turn, the nationals of Germany and Japan would be compensated for their losses by reason of American legal action by their own respective governments, this by the application of the internationally recognized principle of subrogation, implemented by conditions to be imposed by the victor nations upon the vanquished aggressors in the making of the peace.

Though there is no legal responsibility requiring us to see to it that our enemies deal fairly with their subjects, we can, and undoubtedly will, obligate Germany and Japan, by conditions that will be written into the treaty of peace, to reimburse their own nationals for any losses they may suffer by reason of the deprivation of any property or assets which they owned in this country when the war broke out.

If anyone is disposed to argue that, possibly, Germany and Japan would not live up to their promise to compensate their own nationals, the answer is that, as between the two sets of claimants, the German and Japanese nationals, certainly not our American claimants, should assume that risk. To assert that Germany and Japan would not live up to their obligation is to declare them in advance quite unworthy of the confidence of even their own people. But that, Mr. Speaker, is not a matter of concern to those in whose interest we legislate.

Be that as it may, my bill protects both the American claimants and the alien enemy nationals against confiscation of private property insofar as any law of the United States can do it. Therefore, we can well dismiss this cry of confiscation as unworthy of further consideration. It is but a weapon of obstruction, nothing more.

This Congress, as the Supreme Court has repeatedly held, has today the indisputable and unquestioned right to say what shall be done with enemy-owned properties. A long-drawn-out administration of enemy assets, imposed upon us by this policy of do nothing, constitutes a heavy burden on our already overburdened Government, one of which it should be relieved as quickly as possible. Prolonged Government administration will most certainly diminish the value of these assets, whereas their prompt sale, private management, and aggressive commercial development would arrest depreciation and to that extent benefit all parties concerned, save those who plot profits upon the ruins of a war-torn world.

Upon these undisputed facts there can be no sound reason to delay the action my bill proposes. This matter is too important to be delayed while men quibble over the meaning of words, or even to prolong the jobs of the more than 1,000 Government employees whose names already appear on the pay roll of the Office of the Alien Property Custodian, a governmental agency yet to round out its second year.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the time has arrived when it is proper to inquire: Just what influences adverse to this bill are militating against its early and favorable consideration?

Is it possible that enemy influence, German and Japanese, can still, even during the days of war, make itself felt in high official circles?

Frankly, I do not know, but I do intend to find it out if it is true. Let there be no mistake about that.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, unless there is a definite effort to bring about a realinement of laws already on the statute books we will be faced with a situation following the war that will bring confusion to the point of resultant hardship and injustice in thousands of cases involving service personnel, veterans, and their dependents.

At present there are a multitude of laws covering benefits to veterans, and their dependents, of every war. Each war represents a different category of benefits, with no approach to any over-all equitable policy. It is safe to say that adequate benefits to fit every case will never be possible, but an effort to maintain as nearly as possible an equality of benefits would do much to reduce inadequacy. The most desirable rehabilitation program to follow this war would include a general policy of benefits for all veterans and their dependents, and entirely replace the present conglomeration of laws.

As to the possibility of such a program, entailing a task of great magnitude requiring much time, study, and effort, I desire to withhold an opinion at this time. But I do consider it worthy of the serious consideration of Congress.

For the present some inadequacies can be adjusted simply, and without adding to the existing confusion. For example, there is the discrepancy between benefits to children of service personnel of the present war, and benefits to dependent children of World War No. 1 veterans.

Under the Allowance and Allotment Act of 1942, amended, the wife of a serviceman receives family allowance of $50 per month. Where there are children the first child receives $30 per month, and $20 per month is payable to each additional child. Compare this with the pension payable to the widow and children of a veteran of World War No. 1 whose death was due to service. Under provisions of Public Law 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, the widow is entitled to receive $50 per month, but for the children the rate is $15 for the first child and $13 for each additional child. The discrepancy is obvious.

For example take two American families living side by side, or just across the street, in any American community. In each family there is a wife and two dependent children. The head of one family is at present in the armed forces, and his dependents are receiving family allowance totaling $100 per month under the Allowance and Allotment Act. The other family are dependents of a deceased World War No. 1 veteran, and under veterans' laws they receive a total pension of only $78 per month. The difference in assistance is even greater when it is considered that in most cases there is an age difference in the mothers that has an effect on their earning ability.

There is another phase regarding the two sources of assistance or benefits. Suppose the serviceman loses his life in action. Family allowance immediately ceases, and his dependents must then apply for pension under the veterans' laws, and are placed in the same category as the other family. The mother will continue to receive $50 per month, but assistance to the first child will be reduced by half, and that to the second child nearly as much.

As a step toward realinement of benefits I intend to introduce legislation affecting this one situation I have illustrated. My bill will provide for increasing benefits to dependent children under Public 144 to an amount equivalent to assistance provided under the Allowance and Allotment Act. It will serve two worthy purposes. First, equalize benefits and assistance in such cases. Second, provide that in case of the death of servicemen in this war his children will not suffer a loss of assistance, but continue to receive the same amount of benefits that they have been provided during the period of their father's service.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal said on the floor of this House from time to time as to the amount of propaganda that has been going overseas to our armed forces in behalf of the bobtailed Federal ballot that the administration was so anxious to put over on the soldiers.

Last Saturday I received a copy of the Mediterranean issue of the Stars and Stripes dated March 4, and I believe that the one-sided presentation contained in this article should be called to the attention of the people of this country. This is a good example of how the soldiers may be propagandized in favor of whatever the administration might want. This article is entitled "G. I. Vote Compromise Bill Ready for Final Action." It was sent overseas by the Stars and Stripes United States Bureau. The article is as follows:

NEW YORK.—A compromise Federal ballot plan for service men and women won approval by an 8 to 2 vote of the Senate-House conference committee Thursday night and will go to both Houses of Congress for final action next week.

The soldier-vote bill as it emerged from committee hearings would restrict use of the Federal war ballot to overseas service men and women who have not received a State ballot by October 1. (Ballot application by overseas service personnel must be made by September 1.) The measure further provides that the Federal ballot will go to such service personnel only if the Governors of their home States have declared the Federal ballots acceptable for counting under State law.

Earlier in the week, when the first agreement was reached, Representative JOHN RANKIN (Democrat, Mississippi), advocate of the State's rights bill, was the sole dissenter. Today he voted with the majority. Two Senate conferees—THEODORE F. GREEN (Democrat, Rhode Island) and CARL A. HATCH (Democrat, New Mexico)—voted against its acceptance and denounced the bill.

Senator GREEN said it would have been better "to have no bill at all than one like that" and indicated that he would fight actively against the Senate's acceptance. Senator HATCH said he opposed the bill because "it does not simplify but complicates and does not extend the Federal ballot but curtails it."

The much-amended bill also stipulates that the Federal War Ballot Commission would consist of the Secretaries of War and Navy and the War Shipping Administrator.

I am going to quote these editorials and I wish gentlemen to listen particularly because they are important. They are quotations from editorials all against the conference report, and not one word in favor of the conference report.

Editorial comment in the Nation's press following the announcement of the first agreement Tuesday generally agreed that the conferees did not reach a simple solution for enabling servicemen to vote overseas. The final agreement which came late tonight retained the major points upon which the

newspapers editorialized. The last 2 days were spent wrangling over minor points.

The New York Herald Tribune observed: "If Congress last fall had sincerely faced the service-voting question, if it had laid aside politics and begun from the simple principle that representative popular government cannot afford to exclude some millions of its citizens from the political process because it has drafted them to fight for the survival of that process, it is certain that some better solution would have been found."

After explaining the terms of the bill, the New York Times pointed out that it was a matter of simple justice to obtain and record the service vote and that "anything less would be undemocratic and wickedly unfair."

The Atlanta Journal called the soldier-vote compromise a "collection of crumbs" and deplored the prospects that the "majority of our service men and women will be deprived of their ballot rights."

That the compromise would go further toward saving "political face than toward increasing the number of potential votes by members of the armed forces" was the observation made by the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

"This flabby compromise should be rejected," the Chicago Sun declared, "and an honest bill passed giving every serviceman a uniform Federal ballot and the right to choose whether he shall use that or the State ballot if he prefers."

The compromise bill was described by the Denver Post as a "buck-passing measure." The Denver Post editorial also contended that the Constitution does not give Governors the right to certify that a Federal ballot will be as acceptable as a bona fide absentee ballot.

Mr. Chairman, I think this conclusively proves just what is happening to give the men in the service, especially those overseas, a wrong impression of this whole soldier-vote proposition.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I refuse to yield. I have not the time. I think I can speak a little bit about the minds of the soldiers. I was on the front in the last war when we had an election, and I believe their minds today are about the same as ours were at that time. Two things were on the minds of those men. One, they wanted to do everything possible to win the war as soon as possible; and two, they wanted to get home to the good old United States of America as soon as possible. In proof of that, up until the time the conference report was adopted, notwithstanding the fact, I believe, I represent the third largest congressional district in the entire United States, I have not received one single letter from anyone in the service regarding the rights or the disfranchisement of soldiers or any other thing pertaining to the soldiers' vote bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I am reminded this afternoon of advice given to me by a distinguished former Member of this House, Mr. E. Hart Fenn. He called on me shortly after the election in 1938 and gave me some excellent advice. He pointed out that here in the House I would be called upon to deal with problems that affect every part of the United States, as well as other projects of national and general interest. He added that after a few years down here I would meet men from the Pacific coast, from the great Northwest, and the Southwest, and the deep South, men that I could go to and consult with and from whom I could get sound advice. He suggested that I follow that plan, and immediately attempt to make such contacts.

I have tried to follow his advice. I think it was sound, it was particularly good in reference to river and harbor bills. We in New England cannot understand all the wherefores and whys of projects that affect Louisiana or Mississippi, or that peculiarly affect Oregon or California. Therefore I tried to do the best I could, and when men from those parts of the country convince the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House that their project is sound, and in this bill it has the approval of the Army engineers, I have tried to follow those recommendations. I think that the views expressed in the minority report follow that same policy. I am not going into the merits or demerits of any particular project that is in the bill. I do want again, as I am sure others have, to call the attention of the House to language in the second page of the bill. I quote this last proviso:

> That penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to the possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission, and such recommendations shall be based upon consideration of the proper utilization and conservation in the public interest of the resources of the region and the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to construct powerhouses and install power machinery and appurtenances for the development of hydroelectric power at any dam heretofore or hereafter authorized by any act of Congress: *And provided further*, That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made, the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations.

I certainly hope that that language will be stricken from the bill before we are called upon to finally pass the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman know that in the great Northwest, when reclamation projects are developed, it has been necessary to move small towns?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am not objecting to that. If you want to move a town come in with a bill and get the approval of Congress. I am not willing to give the power to Army engineers to do it.

Mr. WHITE. Frequently those towns have fared far better because of their removal.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Come to Congress. That is all I say. It seems that in both rivers and harbors and flood-control bills I have seen things in the last few years, language that tends to make easier the taking away of any approval of the Congress on future power developments. If the language which I read is left in the bill, then the Army engineers, on the recommendation of the Federal Power Commission, can go ahead and build dams and powerhouses and establish lines, move towns without coming back to Congress for any further authority. These things quite often start out as small projects. I recall one that was in a flood-control bill relating to the Connecticut River. As part of that project they proposed to build a dam and reservoir at a cost of $5,000,000. That $5,000,000 project has grown to $30,000,000, and only $10,000,000 is actually for flood control. The other $20,000,000 is properly chargeable to future development of power in a region that does not need power or will not for some time, but if it should need power there are companies that have ample resources to provide it. I think we should read the language in these bills very carefully in view of some things that have happened in the past as a result of legislation passed as flood control and rivers and harbors improvement.

I believe every Member of the House has received a brief on H. R. 3961, prepared by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, and Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America. In this brief they suggest that every Member ask himself the following question: "Would the people of my State agree to purchase bonds expressly for the purpose of constructing these individual projects?" That seems to me to be a very reasonable question, providing first of all that we consider the over-all national interest.

According to the table prepared by this group of railroad brotherhoods, the State of Connecticut would be called upon to buy bonds in the amount of $1,164,000 as its share of the cost of the Alabama-Coosa River, $1,280,400 toward the Tennessee-Tombigbee River, and $543,200 as its contribution toward the Savannah River-Clarks Hill Reservoir.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, in H. R. 3961, the bill now pending before the House, are four important projects in the Eleventh Congressional District of California. Three of these projects, the ones at Santa Barbara Harbor, Morro Bay, and Monterey Harbor were reported in previous Congresses; the fourth, at Moss Landing, was introduced during the current session. All of these projects are important and are fully justified in harmony with "the interest of national security" phrase as stated in the preamble to H. R. 3961. I should like to comment briefly upon each of them.

First. Santa Barbara Harbor—House Document 348, Seventy-seventh Congress: The provisions of this part of the bill will authorize the War Department to dredge sand before it gets into the harbor. At the present time, such dredging has taken place inside the breakwater, in cooperation with local interests. In the words of General Kingman:

> The recommendation is that the existing project for Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif., be modified to permit maintenance of the harbor by means of a fixed sand-intercepting plant to be provided and operated by and at the expense of local interests; the United States to make available for the operation of the plant an amount not exceeding $30,000 annually, the present approved estimated annual cost of maintenance, whenever funds have been allotted for such purpose: *Provided*, That there shall be deducted from such funds the actual cost of harbor maintenance, found necessary if and when the intercepting plant has been installed.

This project calls for no additional funds; it is simply an authorization that such funds may be spent in dredging the sand before it gets into the harbor.

Second. Morro Bay—House Document 283, Seventy-seventh Congress: Before the outbreak of war, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the War Department made a thorough study of Morro Bay, Calif., and recommended improvements there to the amount of $756,000 and a maintenance cost estimated at $20,000 annually. At that time the following reasons were set forth in justification of this project:

> (a) Preserving a deteriorating natural waterway of considerable value.
> (b) Providing a needed harbor suitable for a large number of pleasure craft and for fishing boats and recreational activities.
> (c) Providing a harbor which will materially assist the fishing industry.
> (d) Developing a suitable port of call and a harbor of refuge for pleasure and fishing boats and other smaller craft.
> (e) Increasing local business, with resultant increase in development of the region.

After the outbreak of hostilities the Navy, feeling that the project as outlined in House Document 283 was not adequate to give an all-weather entrance to the harbor, commenced work on widening of the channel and on the construction of a south breakwater and on lengthening the north breakwater. At the present time that particular work has been discontinued; the Board of Engineers of Rivers and Harbors for the War Department strongly recommends that the project be completed. All of the peacetime justifications are still present, but they are greatly augmented by wartime justifications.

It should be pointed out that Morro Bay is about halfway between Santa Barbara and Monterey Bay, a distance of about 200 miles, and one where a harbor for small vessels is badly needed. Unlike the east coast, our west coast has few potential harbor sites; the one at Morro Bay is an excellent one and should by all means be developed, both as a war measure and from a long-time planning standpoint for its permanent value to California.

Third. Moss Landing—H. R. 2949, Seventy-eighth Congress: I introduced H. R. 2949 in this Congress because of its definite importance to our national defense program. It has been recommended by the Bureau of Fisheries, as well as by the War Department. The former has recommended that work be started at the earliest possible moment, both because the protection is needed for the fishing fleet in that area and because such improvement will materially increase protein production. Because of the increased congestion at the inner harbor of Monterey Bay there is inadequate refuge for the fishing fleet there. The improvements contemplated at Moss Landing under this bill would not only give the necessary shelter and protection to the fleet, but it would also permit the establishing of repair facilities, thus saving a considerable amount of time, and again assisting in the increase of fish and fish byproducts. From all conceivable sources—fishermen, packers, and others—are coming pleas that Moss Landing Harbor be completed at the earliest possible moment in order that the disastrous effects of last December's storm—when more than a million dollars worth of damage was done to the fishing fleet—will not be repeated this coming winter.

Some 24 operators of fishing boats wrote me that—

> A harbor at Moss Landing will give us the finest kind of protection, will relieve us of the ever-present fear that our means of livelihood may be destroyed within a few hours at any time, will assure us of performing our part in the battle against the Axis.

The Secretary of War has stated that—

> In view of the wartime need for increase in the production of fishery commodities the Department considers the proposed legislation desirable and recommends its early enactment.

An identical bill, S. 1233, has already passed the Senate without a dissenting vote. I cannot overestimate the importance to our war effort of early enactment of this particular portion of our rivers and harbors bill; its importance will be tremendous, and will greatly encourage our west coast fishermen and packers who have been making such great contribution already to that war effort.

Fourth, Monterey Bay—House Document 266, Seventy-sixth Congress: The present bill calls for the dredging of areas 8 feet deep on each side of Municipal Wharf No. 1 at an estimated cost of $74,000 with $2,500 for increased cost of annual maintenance. It is not to this project that I wish to direct my remarks, but to the potential values at Monterey Bay itself. This great harbor is potentially one of the most important harbor sites on the entire Pacific coast. The city of Monterey has recently formed a post-war planning committee, one of the best of its kind that has yet come to my attention. Its chairman, Dr. Hugh Dormody, has written me at length about the possibilities of this particular harbor, and I should like to include his letter, as it states clearly and in detail the potentialities of Monterey Bay. I am hoping that thorough exploration will be given to these potentialities, in the light of the war effort as well as in the light of prospects for intensive commercial development on the west coast after the war has been won.

JANUARY 11, 1944.

Mr. GEORGE OUTLAND,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OUTLAND: The citizens of California have made a coordinated effort to organize and develop every resource of the State which will be beneficial to the war effort. Everyone is fully aware of the tremendous tasks which must come to and be carried out on the Pacific coast if our naval and military forces are to be properly supplied for the launching of a victorious offensive in the Pacific.

With the natural resources of the Pacific coast thoroughly inventoried there is one particular outstanding and indisputable fact, namely, that there are comparatively few well-developed harbors on the Pacific coast—Seattle, Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego. The distances between these harbors is in practically every instance several hundred miles. Seven hundred and fifty miles from Portland to San Francisco. Five hundred miles from San Francisco to Los Angeles. For many years additional harbor facilities should have been developed which would have brought great wealth to the Nation in addition to providing needed offensive and defensive facilities in the event of war. One outstanding, adequate, natural, and undeveloped harbor is Monterey Bay, which, more than ever before through the development of highways, rail, and air transport facilities is a natural water gateway for all of central California. It is the one seaport where a common terminal for land, sea, and air can be developed. In addition and of inestimable value is the already established Tidewater Associated Oil, major pipe line connecting the oil fields of central California with the oil tank farm on the shore of Monterey Bay, just east of the city of Monterey. The proper development of harbor facilities at Monterey would relieve congestion at other ports if it were only used for the fueling of ships and the shipment of petroleum products to our armed forces in the Pacific. More than its natural strategic location of this pipe line is the fact that if used it will release hundreds of tank cars now being used to transport petroleum products by rail to other ports on the Pacific coast.

During the years 1919 and 1920 the commandant of the Twelfth Naval District made surveys and prepared plans for a very necessary breakwater just east of the city of Monterey. The proposed breakwater provided wonderfully protected, deep-water harbor facilities for central California. By its construction it also made available an opportunity for the development of a land-locked inner harbor by using what is known locally as the Laguna del Rey.

The surveys, plans, and proposals made at that time were referred to the United States Congress, and a congressional committee was appointed, which made an investigation of the proposed development. The committee's report was against the development at that time; not because the development was impractical, but because, about that time, we had won World War No. 1 and had ended all wars for the future. Our Navy was scrapped and added protection and shipping facilities for the Pacific coast were considered fantastic.

A few months ago very specific requests from our Federal Government were directed to our State government and private citizens alike to prepare for an all-out war effort in the Pacific. A careful investigation, together with preliminary plans and estimates

of a proposed harbor development on Monterey Bay, were made by Mr. William E. Hansen, senior utility engineer, Corps of Engineers, Fort Ord, Calif. These plans and estimates prove that the fine natural facilities of the Monterey Bay could be made available for the great war activities we all foresee when the naval and military action take on a greatly increased offensive in the West and Southwest Pacific. This entire development would, from a dollar-and-cents cost, be entirely in keeping with costs of such developments elsewhere and can be completed in 6 months' time. It would complete the offensive and defensive resources of central California. It would provide an adequate deep water harbor immediately adjacent to the Presidio of Monterey and to Fort Ord. It would provide a strategic base for seaplanes, submarines, destroyers, and commercial shipping in a land-locked harbor. It would provide a common terminal for land, sea, and air transport facilities.

In March 1941 with the cooperation of the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the United States Navy a very large modern airport was developed on a 455-acre tract of land almost immediately adjacent to the proposed inner harbor development of Laguna Del Rey. The United States Government has a contract with the airport district for the use of these modern airport facilities for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter. The United States Government purchased a large tract of additional land adjacent to the airport upon which housing facilities, operations buildings, and so forth, for use of the airport as a naval airbase. The airport was dedicated and commissioned as a naval auxiliary air station by Admiral Greenslade on May 24, 1943, and has been in full operation as such since that date. At the present time further development of the base is under way, which will considerably increase its importance and usefulness.

Facts of great value in the actual construction of the harbor project are the minimum amounts of essential material necessary and the presence in the immediate area, 3 miles from the actual site of the proposal, several mountains of granite with proven quarries which will be available and will adequately provide the granite rock necessary for the breakwater. Motortrucks can haul all of this material without using any rail facilities at all.

No doubt in addition to planning for the war effort there will likewise be Federal planning for the post-war period. It is reasonable to state at this time that if the cities and the State of California are to do their part in planning, there must be some commitments from the Federal Government at an early date. The future of all California and the Nation depends upon the attitude of the United States with respect to international dealings. Will we continue to develop industries and manufacturing on the west coast for shipment of goods to the Far East and China? If absorption of labor from men returning from the war as well as those now engaged in purely war industries is to take place, then there must be a special and definite policy of the United States set up to prevent unemployment on the Pacific coast of some 3,000,000 workers who will be unemployed when hostilities cease.

The far-reaching value of the proposed harbor development for Monterey will not only make a tremendous contribution to the efficiency of the war effort on the Pacific coast, but it will provide a future development for the entire central section of California in meeting post-war problems. Exhaustive studies to determine the rational of the Monterey Bay harbor proposal as a peacetime enterprise have likewise proven economically sound.

For example, it would serve as the nearest seaport for a major portion of the upper San Joaquin Valley, including the agricultural districts of Merced, Turlock, Madera, Fresno, and Bakersfield in Kern County. It would offer complete service to the great Salinas Valley, the Pajaro Valley, and the southern portion of the Santa Clara Valley. All of these areas are served by major highways which connect directly with the proposed harbor site.

Located in the city of Monterey is the multimillion dollar cannery industry, the largest single fishing industry in the world. The canneries pack the Monterey sardines, they produce fertilizer and fish meal, and hundreds of thousands of gallons of fish oil. The packing season is from September to February. For the remaining months the canneries are essentially unused. This is a tremendous economic waste, as the canneries and cannery works could be continuously employed in packing vegetables, fruit, and fish and fish products if shipping facilities were available at a reasonable rate to transport the finished product to market.

The present intense program to conserve petroleum products vividly illustrates this economic waste of a vital war material, because at the present time all sardines packed in Monterey are transported by motortrucks to the docks of San Francisco. The round trip is approximately 260 miles instead of 4 miles, if a commercial harbor were available in Monterey.

From the Salinas Valley, where vast vegetable dehydrating plants have been built for processing foods for our armed forces, motortrucks again have to convey the products to San Francisco or Los Angeles, a distance of several hundred miles instead of 20 miles to the port of Monterey.

The humanitarian benefits would likewise pay large dividends in human relationships as you can readily understand if you have ever studied the life and problems of the cannery worker. All such labor is migratory. During the fish-canning season, approximately 4,000 substandard human beings migrate to Monterey, and in February they are forced to migrate again to some other section of the Pacific coast. Those who are too old or feeble or shiftless remain and go on relief, or otherwise become a burden to society. All of this would be eliminated if our canneries could be economically operated throughout the year, which will be possible if a commercial harbor is provided.

In the event that Congress approves this harbor, at least 4,000 people will have an opportunity to live normal lives, establish their homes, raise and educate their children in a manner conforming to decency according to our American standards of living.

If time would permit it would be a minor task to more thoroughly reveal the details of the benefits from the development of this project. To reveal statistics of actual dollars wasted throughout all of central California in overcoming the barriers of distance which now exist between the great wealth-producing valleys of this area and the commercial seaports available for transporting our products to coastal and overseas markets. They will not be presented in this letter, as we know that you are keenly aware of their existence.

There are other factors which we wish to call to your attention, which more than justify the immediate construction of the proposed breakwater and harbor. In this regard your attention is called to the photographs accompanying this communication. This photographic evidence proves beyond all doubt the necessity of this project, but more important they likewise prove that the construction of this project will be a sound Federal investment. Had the harbor been in existence in December 1943 over $1,000,000 loss of small fishing craft and equipment would have been prevented. More important, several hundred individuals, old and middle-aged fishermen, would still be able to pursue their normal gainful occupation. As it is, they have lost their entire life's savings by losing their own uninsurable fishing launches. Not only have they been impoverished by this catastrophe but they are now out of work and unemployable, because they cannot secure new boats and have no funds for such a purchase if new boats were available. To each individual fisherman the loss of his boat represents the total, complete loss of his entire savings for 20 years of hazardous effort. Although it may not concern the Federal Government to protect the individual fisherman, nevertheless the loss of this fleet has a tragic bearing upon the war effort. The hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of fish, a vital, necessary food for soldiers and civilians alike, tons of fish meal and fertilizer for agriculture, shark's liver oil for its rich physiological vitamin contents, is lost forever—a tragedy worth millions of dollars to our enemies in World War No. 2.

The only fortunate great factor of this major catastrophe at Monterey in December 1943 is the fact that 60 of the large purse seiner vessels were at sea. Had they been in the Bay of Monterey, these vessels representing a cost of $2,937,000, would likewise have been completely destroyed. With their destruction also would have taken place the destruction of all municipal piers and other waterfront improvements now existing at Monterey. This loss in physical equipment, including boats and gear, would have added an additional loss of approximately $5,000,000 to the $2,000,000 damages suffered. In the event this had taken place, the following consequences would have followed as a result of the loss of the sardine fishing season from December to February.

Six hundred and sixty thousand cases of sardines to the armed forces.

One hundred and thirty-three thousand tons of fertilizer for agriculture.

One hundred and thirty-thousand tons of fish oils for vital war industries.

Two million two hundred and thirty-nine thousand dollars to the sardine fishermen.

One million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars to cannery workers.

In addition, the merchants, the professional men and women, and every individual residing in this area would have been deprived of the principal source of his income. It would have impoverished the entire community.

It is because the citizens of this section of the Pacific coast are conscious of their responsibilities and are realistic about the needs at present and for the future, that we seek the cooperation of the Federal Government in the development of the harbor of Monterey.

We believe that the Congress of the United States will act favorably upon this proposal, not only because of its tremendous value to the war effort, but likewise because of its unmistakable potentialities in the post-war period, in the future development of the Nation and the international relationships and commerce of the Pacific.

We ask your immediate and favorable approval of this project.

HUGH F. DORMODY,
General Chairman, Monterey
Post-War Planning Council.

I am personally fortunate to represent a congressional district which has several hundred miles of seacoast between Los Angeles and San Francisco; a section of the United States which will be playing an increasingly important role in our national economy. I am convinced that

when the war is over there will be a tremendous increase in our industrial development there, and especially in our commercial relations with the Orient. More and more is the economic life of this country going to be related with that of Asia and Australia.

If we are going to play that role well we will need to evaluate and capitalize on our potential harbors in California. Los Angeles and San Francisco and San Diego are all important, but increasingly important will be the smaller and as yet undeveloped ones. Monterey Bay and Santa Barbara Harbor I have already cited. Morro Bay, too, will play an important part in the larger picture. Ventura, county seat of the county of that same name, is an important oil-exporting port, and its general importance to the economy of the west coast will be more and more stressed. Port Hueneme, only recently come to full growth through the tremendous development of the naval base there, will likewise be one of the important ports of California long after the war has been won. We should currently be placing our entire emphasis upon the war effort, when we expend our funds for harbor development; we also should keep in our minds the long-range possibilities of the assets with which we shall have to work in our total planning. I am certain that Congress and our various administrative agencies recognize this fact, and so recognizing it will explore fully into the tremendous potential assets that are only awaiting development in that long stretch of coast line between Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN].

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Chairman, everyone talks now about post-war plans. It was recounted recently, in the column of one of the well-known humorists, that a woman was very much embarrassed when she went to a meeting of her club and found out she was the only woman there whose husband did not have a post-war plan. It seems that everybody is talking about post-war plans and nothing very much is being done about it. We members of the committee are happy to say that our chairman not only talks about post-war plans, but with all deference to Mark Twain, he is actually doing something about it. He has given to the Congress a post-war program of something over $400,000,000 to provide a number of projects which can be started 6 months after the termination of war. Most of these improvements can be put under way providing the Committee on Appropriations recommends for passage a bill authorizing the expenditure of that amount of money. If authorized and appropriated for, the work can be started very quickly because, in the preliminary stages not very much critical material will be required. Many of these projects require dredging and there is available in this country now a vast amount of machinery developed and improved during the war period. So here you have a program that can be put into effect very quickly without the use of large amounts of critical material in the early stages, and we can have some post-war work and employment for the men returning home from the service. As a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I have attended many hearings called by the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] on post-war plans. Before that committee came members of great commercial organizations including Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and several others who are vehemently opposed to expenditures of public money for local and State projects. But it was stated by most of those appearing, that if Federal money is to be expended on post-war projects it should be limited to such works as highways, waterways, and reclamation. So this fits into that type of improvement. You are offered a post-war program that is prepared to provide employment in the readjustment period after the war. Naturally there is a project somewhere in the vicinity where I reside. It will benefit two States, both Indiana and Illinois. Six or seven years ago, the Government appropriated $2,300,000 and local interests provided almost $1,000,000 to start that project. It was mighty fortunate that the work was under way and partially completed because in the early days of the war—and I am not revealing any naval or military secrets—many of our tankers and freighters were sunk off the east coast of the United States. A message was sent to the Great Lakes to take all the available boats of 300 feet length and strip them to the deck and float them down to the Mississippi River. If it had not been for the preliminary work done at that time, it would have been almost impossible to get these boats down to the Mississippi. I think at least 20 or 25 boats were shipped down the Mississippi as a result of the preliminary work done on this Lake-to-the-Gulf project which directly and indirectly benefits my territory and the adjoining State of Indiana.

We have had a period of unprecedented production up to date. Production has gone beyond the wildest dreams of any optimists in America. We have produced more than any nation thought we could produce. But with mass production comes the question of distribution. In order that we may have adequate distribution it will be necessary to utilize every mode of transportation that we have. That includes airways, railways, highways, and waterways. We must have a comprehensive system of transportation to aid in the distribution of mass production in this country. Whether God-made or man-made, we should develop all the facilities for transportation. That is what it is being sought to do in this program. We are providing for that heavy strain on distribution facilities which will follow the peace.

I want to say just a word about organized labor. My district in Chicago and in Indiana, known as the Calumet, will be among the beneficiaries of this program. Organized labor in that district, South Chicago Trades and Labor Assembly and the Calumet Joint council of the American Federation of Labor, plus practically all the local C. I. O. unions, have endorsed that waterway development. They endorsed it years ago. They have been urging its passage ever since. The Chicago Federation of Labor at the behest of the Calumet Joint Trade and Labor Assembly, and the South Chicago Trades and Labor Assembly, have endorsed this Gulf-to-the-Lake waterway project so far as Chicago is concerned. They have done it after very careful study, because they realize in a great steel center like that, if our waterways facilities are taken full advantage of, it will bring more business and in the end will be beneficial to the railroads. It will aid the railroads because in that territory in Chicago where millions of tons of ore are brought in every year, there is a great amount of manufactured material which must be taken away. The waterways will not interfere seriously with the railroads, with the airplane lines, or with highways. In the first place, there is no competition between the waterway and any other mode of transportaton so far as passengers are concerned. There is no competition so far as the transportation of perishable goods is concerned or so far as express service is concerned. A waterway only takes bulk freight, the least remunerative type of business, and carries it from port to port. It aids the railroads. The history of this Nation and of the whole world reveals that practically all great cities were located on natural waterways, and as the cities developed the railroads came to take off their manufactured goods or to have the raw material. So we are looking forward to a system of transportation which includes every means of highways, airways, railways, and waterways.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As a matter of fact, the movement of Minnesota iron ore across the Lakes to Gary, Ind., by water transportation has greatly stimulated the business of the railroads. They get business originating in Gary for the whole world and all of the United States, do they not? If they did not have cheap transportation of ores, that business would not have grown up.

Mr. ROWAN. I might say to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] many years ago there were no steel mills in Gary, Ind., and some agencies in the city of Chicago sought to prevent the development of steel mills. The corporation went to Gary and built a plant which now requires millions and millions of tons of ore transported by water every year, and there are vast railroad developments where there were no railroad facilities before the building of that plant.

Mr. WHITE. If the railroads had been successful in throttling boat transportation of ores across the Great Lakes, they would have stood in their own light and cut off their own revenue.

Mr. ROWAN. That is exactly my opinion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman stated a moment ago that this project will benefit the States of Illinois and Indiana.

Mr. ROWAN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. It will benefit all the other States touched by this great inland-waterway system, because all of them will use it.

Mr. ROWAN. Most assuredly. The terminus of this Lake-Gulf waterway will be a twin port in Chicago and Indiana, but all States all the way down the Mississippi and the Gulf will be benefited by this great waterway project.

In conclusion, let us do something about post-war planning today. Let us do something about it now. Let us vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROWAN] has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Chairman, I question the advisability of H. R. 3961 at this time. It authorizes over $400,000,000 for various river and harbor improvements all over the country. The bill provides that—

> Such projects shall be prosecuted as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements * * * provided that no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged, unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interests of the national defense and security.

In view of that situation, why not postpone the authorization also until after the war? Why not concentrate now on projects necessary for the national defense or which directly aid in fighting our enemies?

After the war we shall undoubtedly be confronted with the great problem of unemployment. Millions of men discharged from the fighting forces will be looking for work. Jobs must be provided either by private industry or by the Government. The national debt, however, will be so high that it will be difficult to add to it by made work. Therefore we must look to private industry. There is no reason to believe that it cannot handle the situation if it gets the proper cooperation from the Government.

Some of the projects included in this bill are of doubtful value and have heretofore been rejected by the House. It should be remembered, too, that all of this work will be done with borrowed money. What justification is there for considering in time of war projects which have been rejected even in days of peace?

The minority report calls attention to the delegation of powers to the Secretary of War and the Federal Power Commission contained in this bill. It is impossible to justify such a sweeping grant of power. One of the growing evils in this country is the constantly increasing competition by the Government with its own citizens. The purpose of the Government is to govern and not to go into business. In the first place, it is a foolish program from a purely dollars-and-cents standpoint. Everything received by the citizen, whether it be food, clothing, housing, or electric power must eventually be paid for regardless of whether he gets it from the Government or from a private citizen. Can the Government provide these things cheaper than industry can? Our experience in many Government projects furnishes the complete answer to that question. It is true by the use of subsidies and complicated bookkeeping a creditable showing may be made for awhile but the bill must eventually be paid by the consumer himself. If we believe there should be further competition with private industry Congress should expressly say so after giving consideration to the facts of each particular case. The power to make such important decisions should not be delegated to the executive branch.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CARTER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman has in California the Golden Gate Harbor, said to be one of the greatest harbors in the world.

Mr. CARTER. I think it is. I have seen a great many harbors. The only thing I have seen that approaches San Francisco Bay Harbor is Rio de Janeiro.

I want to say to the gentleman it has been my pleasure, while a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to have assisted in putting through a number of projects that improved the great harbor of San Francisco.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It never did need very much, did it?

Mr. CARTER. No; the Almighty did quite a good deal for San Francisco to start with. The harbor itself did not need much improvement.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield briefly for one other question.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that in the gentleman's own State of California the great humorist, Will Rogers, in discussing the enterprise of Los Angeles, said that when they did not have a harbor they went out and built themselves a harbor and are enjoying international commerce as a result?

Mr. CARTER. Will Rogers undoubtedly said that. The city of Los Angeles did exactly that thing. They had little but imagination and a will to do to start with, and they have a very wonderful harbor at San Pedro.

Mr. Chairman, as this bill stands at the present time it provides for authorization of $447,080,531 in harbor projects. I understand certain amendments will be offered in an endeavor to cut out some of the projects, but that is the total of the bill at the present time. Certain contributions are required by local interests on some of the projects and those contributions amount to $11,150,150. Those improvements will entail additional maintenance work on the part of the Corps of Engineers, and the annual additional maintenance is estimated to cost $3,589,600. As has been stated, with some exceptions where there is war urgency, none of these projects will be started until 6 months after the close of the hostilities. In fact, there is a provision in the bill itself which provides that work on any of these projects, unless there is war urgency, shall not begin until 6 months after the close of hostilities. As a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors I voted to report out this bill, but I stated at the time and I have stated before, that there is a grant of power beginning on page 2, which has been referred to this afternoon in debate here, which I do not favor. Tomorrow when the bill is being considered under the 5-minute rule I propose to offer an amendment striking out that unusual grant of power which this bill contains. My amendment will begin on page 2, line 16 after the word "region."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I entertain the same view in regard to that matter.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the Chairman for his support, and, knowing his trend of thought for many years, I am not at all surprised.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The amendment is on page 2, line 16. I propose to put a period after the word "region" and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

This grant of power is to the Chief of Engineers. I have the utmost confidence in the Chief of Engineers and the Corps of Engineers. It happens to be in regard to the generation of electric power, but I would be opposed to it regardless of the subject involved. I would not be for a grant of that kind. I think it is too broad a grant of power. I think the Chief of Engineers or any other executive body should come back to this Congress from time to time for the authority to do the things it is proposed to give them here in this bill. It is a blanket authority by which the Congress divests itself of power far beyond what I think they should do in one single act. I have voted for these grants of power to the Executive branch in the past. I have felt they were necessary, but I believe we have gone just about as far as we should go in this unlimited granting of power. Let the various bureaus and departments come back for the specific thing that they desire to have granted them, and I am sure the Congress will be generous and liberal in granting power if they think it is necessary for carrying out what is best for the people generally.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As a matter of fact in the gentleman's own State, in constructing the great Central Valley project, all the things which had to be done were authorized. Towns had to be moved; railroads elevated; they had to come to Congress for specific and definite authority. Do not the laws of our country protect the owners in their vested rights for compensation for losses and damages sustained as a result of what the Army Engineers might do?

Mr. CARTER. I want to say to the gentleman that in the Central Valley project in my State it was necessary to move miles of railroad, miles of highway, and the Bureau of Reclamation was given that authority without any hesitation or argument.

Mr. WHITE. And did they not operate under a blanket authority?

Mr. CARTER. No. I want to say that they did not do it under a blanket authority. That is exactly the way I want the business of this country carried on in the future. Now, the gentleman from Idaho, if he desires, can vote away the rights of this Congress, but I do not share those views. I am going to offer an amendment to cut out that provision. I am going to ask the assistance of the gentleman from Idaho in putting through that amendment tomorrow. I trust he will think it over tonight and come back tomorrow, and we will be unanimous on this proposal, because there are many fine things in this bill, and I want to see the good things enacted into law.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman from Idaho says that if it is a constructive amendment it will have his support.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman and I desire to assure him that, in my opinion at least, it will be very, very constructive.

There are others who desire time, and I will yield back the remainder of my time in order that they may be privileged to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California yields back one-half minute.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill, as has been said, is an omnibus rivers and harbors bill covering a number of projects which are designed for post-war activities. As has been said, in the last 6 years there has not been a general bill out of the Rivers and Harbors Committee which has been enacted into law. During my entire service on the committee, almost 6 years, we have not as yet had a general bill. The projects involved in this general bill however are not projects which have been worked up in order to provide made work for the people of our country, much as they may need work following the cessation of this war; these are all projects which have had the consideration of the Army engineers for a period of years, most of them several years. Each project has been thoroughly examined, surveyed, and resurveyed, estimates made as to the money savings and the work that will be required, the amount of land that will have to be condemned, the number of farms that may be overrun by water, the building of dams, the amount of hydroelectric power that may be produced. All of these matters, which are technical and which require study and which require careful examination by experts have received this care, study, and attention and have all been reported to our committee, and this committee has been many, many weeks, even months, in considering these projects. As was said earlier in the day there is not a single project in this bill of over $400,000,000 which has not had the careful consideration of these hard-headed Army engineers, and had their approval. I doubt if there is a body of men in our Government anywhere which has the respect accorded this organization by the people of America, I refer to the Corps of Army Engineers. They are not politicians, some of them are graduates of our technical schools, all of them from West Point and many having taken additional education. Many of them have had a great number of years of practical experience as well as Army experience. They as a board pass upon these projects in detail and submit to us the merits and demerits if any of the projects which the committee takes up for consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I may state to the gentleman from Oregon that the engineers of the War Department have had charge of river and harbor improvement legislation for more than a hundred years and in only one instance has there ever been a charge made against any of them and that charge was made against one member by the other members of the board.

Mr. ANGELL. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. That just bears out what I said a moment ago, that there is no body of experts in our scheme of government that has the respect of the American people to any larger degree than this distinguished body of Army engineers who pass upon these projects.

We present these projects, as has been said by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], for post-war activity. There is a provision in the bill that none of them shall be taken up prior to 6 months after cessation of hostilities unless some particular project is needed for war operations; so this will not be a drain upon our Treasury during the progress of the war; it will not be taking funds that may be needed for war purposes, but it will be putting on the shelf a very considerable amount of public projects which have been held up, many of them for years owing to the war, ready to be taken up following the cessation of the war, not only that the projects themselves may be developed and the country be improved by these very fine outstanding improvements, but that they may be in readiness, secondarily, to provide work for the returning soldiers and the men and women released from war activities.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that right between the gentleman's own State, Oregon, and the great State of Washington, in fact, the boundary between them, the Columbia River, is one of the biggest waterways in the country and is still undeveloped but will be the source of a great movement of freight when it is fully developed?

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. Chairman, owing to lack of time I have asked leave to extend some remarks on some specific problems included in the bill and on some projects in which I am personally interested in my own district and the Pacific Northwest, particularly Umatilla Dam on the Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss the Umatilla Dam and I may say that in April 1939 our Committee on Rivers and Harbors held hearings on this same project, and we printed reports of those hearings here. They pertain to the Columbia River in Oregon and Washington and to the Umatilla Dam.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that this whole interior country—the Inland Empire, as we call it, comprising eastern Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and some portions of adjoining States—is an immense territory which drains down through the Columbia River to tidewater and then out into trade and commerce. It comprises one-tenth of the area of the United States. It is larger in area than France, and it abounds in immense natural resources. As has been stated here by the gentlemen who preceded me, there are immense areas of land, suitable for agricultural development in eastern Oregon and eastern Washington, and Idaho. Wheat and other grains, hay, livestock, and great quantities of fruit are raised in that region. Sugar beets are also being raised for the production of sugar. A considerable portion of that territory is already irrigated, and many thousands of acres—hundreds of thousands of acres, in fact—are susceptible of irrigation with waters from the Columbia when they are made available and when the additional lands are required to be brought under cultivation and irrigated.

In addition to that, there is a vast area covered with timber. I personally have had a great deal of experience with that, because for some 20 years I was in the survey department of the Government, surveying those lands in Washington, Idaho, and Montana. The finest stands of growing timber to be found anywhere in the world are in that area, not only in the eastern portion of this area, but along the western slope toward the Pacific Ocean, in Oregon and Washington. Much of these lands are owned by the Federal Government. Private operators also own large bodies of timber. About 50 percent of the lands in Oregon are owned by the Federal Government, so the Government is not only interested in this from the standpoint of developing the country as a whole, but also in developing its own properties.

Mr. Chairman, the Columbia River, and its tributaries, is a key to the opening up of the whole Pacific Northwest area which, as I have said, is an empire

in its proportions containing one-tenth of the area of the United States. It not only furnishes cheap water transportation to the sea but it also furnishes water for irrigation as well as hydroelectric power. The Pacific coast has had the greatest increase in population since 1940 of any section of the United States, and it is destined to continue increasing in the same proportion in many years to come. This is due to the fact that it is still to a large extent in the process of development and contains all of the natural advantages which are necessary for the sustaining of a large and prosperous population. It has immense natural resources in forests, minerals, nonmetallics, clays, hydroelectric power, water, equable climate, and fertile soil.

With the Columbia River open for ocean-borne commerce, the wealth of this immense territory lying between the Rocky Mountains and Pacific Ocean may be carried by cheap river transportation to tidewater in the port of Portland and from there to all of the ports of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I call to your attention the following statistics with reference to the part the Pacific coast area is taking in our industrial and commercial developments:

California, Oregon, Washington, and Arizona produce the greatest comparative farm wealth in the United States.

Of the first 10 United States farm counties, 9 are on the Pacific coast.

Of the first 20 United States farm counties, 16 are on the Pacific coast.

Of the first 100 United States farm counties, 29 are on the Pacific coast.

In this area is found:

Two-fifths of all United States lumber, two-fifths of all United States gold in peacetime, one-third of all copper—one-twelfth of world production, one-sixth of all United States petroleum, one-sixth of all United States natural gas, one-seventh of all United States silver in peacetime, one-fifth of the Nation's mercury, one-fourth of the tungsten, two-fifths of total United States fish catch—all sources—marine, river, lake, and so forth.

The following comparison of lumber production of the five leading States of the Union is interesting in this connection:

Latest available figures, 1941—from U. S. Bureau of the Census

Rank	State	Production (feet, board measure)
1	Oregon	6,346,165,000
2	Washington	5,239,224,000
3	California	2,331,040,000
4	Alabama	1,798,383,000
5	Georgia	1,522,311,000
Total United States		33,476,165,000

The Columbia River is the second largest river in the United States, but it is the largest in terms of potential electric power in the United States, and perhaps in the world. My information is that it has more than 40 percent, perhaps nearer 50 percent, of the hydroelectric power in the United States. So, there is that vast potential hydroelectric power in the Columbia River and its tributaries. Of course, much of that power is not needed at the present time, but, as Colonel Feringa said in his presentation of the matter to our committee, all the electric power that is now being produced in that area is being utilized. A great portion of it is being used in the war industries, but that is true everywhere throughout the United States in these war days. We are devoting our manpower and our facilities everywhere in the United States, so far as is practicable, to the war industries, to these great industries that are utilizing this power, such as the aluminum, shipping, and metallurgical industries of various kinds. These industries needing large blocks of electric power have established modern plants in the Pacific Northwest. Unquestionably in the post-war period, if we are going to continue prosperous and to employ 10,000,000 soldiers who will be released and 20,000,000 people who will be released from the war industries, we must continue to operate these great plants. We will have the power, and it is the cheapest electric power to be found anywhere in the world. It is true that power is being sold cheaper in Canada—Quebec, for instance—but as far as cost of development is concerned, I do not think there is any power development anywhere that is producing power any cheaper than ours in this Columbia River area, by reason of the continuous, even flow of the Columbia River. If we combine these immense natural resources that we have in minerals, metallics, clays, forestry products, and plastic products, all of which we will need after the war is over, with this vast pool of hydroelectric power right at our door, we can insure prosperity to this area in the post-war period. This electric energy requires practically no cost of maintenance after generators are once installed, for it goes on indefinitely.

Above Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams are two big pools or lakes of water that are used when the water is low to help maintain prime power. So, the river keeps fairly uniform prime power the year round.

We on the coast know that this Columbia River development is not a boondoggling or wildcat scheme. The development of hydroelectric power on the Columbia River and the utilization of the water for irrigation and for navigation, and the dams for flood control, will eventually bring to the United States immense quantities of revenue, more than we will ever put into it.

If there are projects anywhere in the United States that will justify themselves, the Columbia River projects will. The utilization of our natural deposits of minerals and other deposits and the products of forests and fields in connection with cheap hydroelectric power developed from the Columbia River and its tributaries will return to the Government manyfold the funds expended.

The Grand Coulee reclamation project contains 1,200,000 acres for agricultural utilization by reclamation, and the water is now available. The Grand Coulee Dam is already completed. The hydroelectric power generated is used to pump water up out of the pool above the dam and up over the brow of the hill, where it is turned into the old bed of the Columbia River. I am told that this vast acreage with water will produce as well as any agricultural land anywhere in our country. It is rolling upland, consisting of a fertile volcanic-ash soil.

Not an acre is being farmed. It is all lying there, ready, waiting for the time when the Federal Government feels that it is propitious to go ahead with the reclamation project. After the war, when we need additional land for our soldiers and men who will be released from war industries, we will have the water and the land available; all we need to do is build the conduits and irrigation ditches.

Some of it is owned by the Government, but the Government in its program has frozen the values, so the private owners cannot take advantage of the water that is furnished and speculate on the land. The large owners have to turn it in at a certain fair appraisement, and they can utilize only a restricted acreage themselves and can get water to utilize only such portions of the land as is brought within the regulations laid down by the Government. So we have there the possibilities for an immense development. The Columbia and the Snake will provide water transportation for this project.

I was born in that country and have lived there all my life, although later in life I went to live in Portland, on the lower part of the Columbia. So I know from first-hand information the possibilities of this inland empire, not alone from being reared in that country, but also from 15 to 20 years spent in the Federal service as a surveyor in going over it, as far as eastern Montana. I want to tell you gentlemen who are my colleagues on the committee that I personally feel we will make no mistake in approving the project for the development of the dams at Umatilla and on the Snake River.

Mr. Chairman, in considering the Umatilla Dam project, I want to call to the attention of the committee that the engineers' report submitted when the project was last before us, shows that the development was amply justified economically providing the power to be generated from the hydroelectric facilities to be installed were sold. Colonel Feringa, who has presented to the Rivers and Harbors Committee the report and recommendations of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, in response to an interrogation I submitted to him, said that all of the power now being generated by the Grand Coulee and Bonneville projects is being utilized. This I know to be true from my own observations. There is a dearth of power in that area at the present time. It is true that war activities are taking the bulk of the power now generated. It is also true that in the post-war period the utilization of our natural resources and reclamation of our farming areas in order to provide employment for our returning soldiers and laborers released from war activities, it will be necessary

to keep these projects working. This will require electric energy.

The total load in the area served by Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants is, in round numbers, 2,000,000 kilowatts. The past history shows that this load is increasing at the rate of about 100,000 kilowatts per year. In the time required to construct a dam and power plant like the Umatilla project, the normal load increase in the area would be about 300,000 kilowatts, and by 1950 would equal the capacity of the Umatilla project.

Congress has appropriated and authorized funds for nine main units at Grand Coulee. Six of these nine are now in production. The limit of prime power capacity at Grand Coulee is in the neighborhood of a million kilowatts, and the authorized Grand Coulee projects are within one machine of the prime power capability of the Coulee Dam. The balance of the power at Grand Coulee is secondary power, which can be used during the high flow season extending from June to October, for irrigation pumping.

Unquestionably there will be a demand in the next decade for, not only all of the power generated by existing projects, but the Umatilla Dam as well, in addition to many other similar developments.

The Bonneville Advisory Committee, provided in the Bonneville Act, which has made a study of the power requirements of the area, have gone on record urging the construction of the Umatilla Dam in order to prevent a power shortage by 1945 or 1946.

The minutes of the Board showing this action are as follows:

EXCERPT FROM MINUTES, BONNEVILLE ADVISORY BOARD, MEETING IN WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 12–13, 1943

Whereas at its meeting on February 9–10, 1942, this Board unanimously adopted a resolution urging upon the War Production Board and other appropriate agencies that immediate action be taken to increase the power supply in the Pacific Northwest by installation of additional generating units at the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams, raising the city of Seattle's Ross Dam on the Skagit River, completing construction of Rock Island Dam and hydroelectric plant on the Columbia River, and expediting construction of the city of Tacoma's Nisqually hydroelectric project; and

Whereas the Board requested that appropriate agencies of the Federal Government complete their surveys and investigations of water-power possibilities in the Pacific Northwest with a view of determining which of the many attractive undeveloped power sites are most desirable for early construction to provide additional power for war purposes; and

Whereas the developments with respect to power requirements and war loads during the present emergency in the Northwest have confirmed the findings and recommendations of the Board adopted at its meeting of February 9–10, 1942, regarding expansion of existing hydroelectric projects; and

Whereas only part of the Board's findings and recommendations were carried out, and as a result the Pacific Northwest is confronted with a more critical power situation than existed a year ago; * * *

* * * * *

8. Take the necessary steps to insure immediate construction of substantial additional power supply for 1946 and subsequent years by construction of the Umatilla project for navigation, irrigation, and power development on the Columbia River with reservoir at elevation 340 feet above sea level; such Umatilla project, which will involve approximately 3 years for construction, even considering the advance state of the plans, studies, and investigations of the Corps of Engineers, War Department, requiring immediate authorization for construction in order to secure additional power supply in 1946 and to obtain the substantial benefits to navigation and irrigation.

Mr. Chairman, one problem to be determined by the engineers when the Umatilla Dam shall be constructed is its elevation.

An amendment will be offered by the committee tomorrow to permit the Army Engineers to determine the height of the dam up to 340 feet. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

From time to time three different pool elevations have been suggested for the proposed Umatilla Dam, namely, elevations 310, 330, and 340.

The present bill before both Houses, calling for an elevation of 310 was based on the first preliminary surveys of the Corps of Engineers.

The current report of the Chief of Engineers (H. Doc. 103, vol. 2, 73d Cong., 1st sess.) provides for a pool elevation of 330 feet.

I understand that drillings and surveys are now in progress to establish the feasibility and cost of a pool elevation of 340 feet.

From a check of the physical lay-out it is obvious that the higher the pool elevation (within the limits of feasibility and cost) the greater are the possibilities for the proposed structure to accelerate the development of the region. Therefore, the consideration of pool elevation warrants the closest attention. In such consideration we must approach any evaluation from two standpoints, namely, navigation and industrial development.

At present the only substantial transportation avenues between the upper and lower Columbia River areas are given by two transcontinental railroads, which are located along the Columbia River, one on each side.

Any construction at Umatilla will not injure existing rail facilities. With the development of this inland region the railroads will secure increased collateral traffic benefits as well as structural improvement. To insure the fullest development of the region, low cost, high volume transportation facilities must be provided. The completion of the Bonneville Dam has given deep-sea navigation facilities as far as The Dalles. Above The Dalles, because of the existence of rapids, shallow navigation is both limited and hazardous.

The proposed pool elevation of 310 feet will only provide satisfactory navigation as far as Pasco, Wash., a distance of 330 miles from the mouth of the river.

The higher suggested pool elevation will extend slack-water navigation to the foot of the proposed Five Mile Rapids Dam on the Snake River, whereas the existing bills would leave an intervening reach of swift water between Pasco and the Snake River. The long-range development of the region requires long-range consideration.

Through inquiries, I have been advised that growth calculations indicate that by 1950 it is anticipated that the power load on the Bonneville system will be in the neighborhood of 3,000,000 kilowatts. Of this amount of power, about one-fourth will be used west of Bonneville, one-eighth in northeastern Oregon and southeastern Washington areas, and one-sixth adjacent to the dams.

By 1950, these calculations also show that demands on the Bonneville plant will exceed its capability by approximately 300,000 kilowatts.

Experience has shown that the power outputs from multipurpose dams are directly proportional to the pool elevation or varies directly with what has been termed "head." A pool elevation of 310 feet will only provide an average head of 45 feet, whereas a pool elevation of 340 feet will give a head of 75 feet. It then follows that a 330-foot pool will give about 45 percent more continuous power than the 310-foot pool, and a 340-foot pool about 65 percent more.

In addition there are other points requiring attention. Under flood flows the 310-foot pool will provide a plant which will have its capability reduced to 61 percent of normal because of tail water elevation, whereas with a 340-foot pool the reduction from this cause would be less than 20 percent. Expressing this idea in another way, the 330-foot pool will give 70 percent more power per machine than the 310-foot pool, whereas a 340-foot pool will produce over double the prime power per machine.

Repayment of the Federal investment depends largely on the quantity of available prime power. Therefore, further consideration is necessary in order to avoid the mistake of providing a secondary power producer instead of a prime power producer. Secondary power has little sale value in the Northwest.

There are other factors also contributing to prime power, such as pondage and machine efficiency. The higher head naturally provides more pondage and also increases machine efficiency. These two contributing factors compound the prime power increases resulting from direct head comparisons.

The 340-foot pool would give a plant similar in type and proportion to the Bonneville plant, whereas the 310-foot pool will only provide a plant of lower capability than given by the direct relationship of pool elevations. Again the higher head also makes it possible to build a generating machine with greater speed and a lower resulting cost per kilowatt installed. The latter consideration has an important relationship with electric rates, which in turn controls the possible amount of future industrial development.

The higher speed machines also will fit the present constructed Federal transmission lines better than a lower speed machine, and thus provide a greater utilization of the existing investment.

A 310-foot pool will have a continuous output of about 60 percent of that of Bonneville, whereas with the 330-foot

pool elevation this factor becomes 95 percent, and with a 340-foot pool becomes 110 percent. A 340-foot pool elevation at Umatilla will provide a power potentiality of 500,000 kilowatts, under existing river flows.

In offering these suggestions, I realize that other conditions, such as possible foundations, pool damages, and resulting costs have a pronounced influence on the final decision. No information is presently available to evaluate these other factors; however, when present surveys are completed I trust that the points I have mentioned will be included with the findings, so that in the end the best possible structure will be authorized.

I also realize that finances may dictate step development. However, each step can fit in with the best ultimate structure.

The purpose of these suggestions is to contribute to the best possible solution, as I realize that progress only comes from the fullest consideration of all applicable factors.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the report of the Corps of United States Army Engineers when this project was considered by us last year showed that in their judgment it was justified from an economic standpoint, when there was a market for the power to be generated by the hydroelectric facilities which are part of the project, I asked the Bonneville Administration, which is in charge of the marketing of electricity in the Columbia River area, and particularly Bonneville and Grand Coulee, to give me a report as to the market situation for power, and I am in receipt of a telegram from Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, which points out that all of the power now being generated is urgently demanded for civilian activities and war production and that present forecasts indicate for the Bonneville system, which includes Grand Coulee, that a peak load for December 1946 of 45,300 kilowatts in excess of system capacity will be reached, and that in December 1947 the excess will be 324,400 kilowatts. The Administrator also reported that in the Umatilla load district there will be a deficiency of 172,500 kilowatts in December 1946, and 431,250 kilowatts in December 1947, according to present estimates, and that as a result of these demands for power, in the opinion of the Bonneville Power Administration, the Umatilla generating units should be placed in operation as promptly as construction will permit. The telegram received from Mr. Raver, the Administrator, is as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
November 2, 1943.

Hon. HOMER D. ANGELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

With reference to your inquiry to our Washington office I believe that construction of Umatilla Dam is logical next step in development of the main stem of the Columbia River and one of the most important projects in Pacific Northwest post-war development program. Umatilla Dam is in a very strategic location in Northwest power grid and particularly in relation to lower Columbia market and to emerging heavy industries in middle Columbia area. In this project navigation and power must each be developed on most efficient basis. Power and navigation are a mutually supporting combination. Basis to further development of the area and to development of the power market. Both power and transportation must precede in development of resources, industries, communities, and the promising potential power market. We cannot wait for guaranteed sales in these long-term development projects. Navigation benefits will be provided by low-cost river transportation from Pasco, Wash., to mouth of Columbia, 330 miles. Dam should be of sufficient height to provide power facilities. Present forecasts indicate for Bonneville system a peak load for December 1946 of 45,300 kilowatts in excess of system capacity. Corresponding figure for December of 1947 is 324,400 kilowatts. In the Umatilla load district a deficiency of 172,500 kilowatts in December 1946 and 431,250 kilowatts in December 1947 is presently estimated. Our studies thus indicate that Umatilla generating units should be placed in operation as promptly as the 3-year construction period will permit.

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator, Bonneville
Power Administration.

Mr. Chairman, tomorrow when the bill is taken up under the 5-minute rule, I will hope to have the opportunity to discuss some of the specific projects included in it which time now will not permit me to consider.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, when we go back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent to have included as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the New York Sun of March 17.

Mr. Chairman, when U. N. R. R. A., the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation bill was before the Congress, I indicated that I would like to have the War Department, the military, continue the reconstruction and relief in liberated countries as they are doing today. It seems to me they are doing a good job, and then instead of having a "superduper" board such as the administration of U. N. R. R. A. would provide to go into these countries we would have one organization; that is, the military, continue its work and then turn it over to the Red Cross, a recognized organization already established, one which always has done a remarkable job. I tried also to secure as an amendment to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation bill a section that would prohibit the spending of any money for the control of religion or education. That failed in the House. Senator WILLIS in the Senate succeeded in getting a somewhat similar amendment in the Senate bill. The bill went to conference and unfortunately the Willis amendment was thrown out by the conferees. I sincerely hope the Senate will insist, when the bill goes back from conference, upon keeping the Willis amendment.

The New York Sun editorial is headed, "What will America pay for?" And in speaking of this education and religion phase it goes on to say:

But that is not all. In Washington on Tuesday conferees of the Senate and the House reached an agreement on the bill that will authorize an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 as the share of the United States toward the payment of the costs of running U. N. R. R. A. An amendment from the Senate would have forbidden the use of such funds to promote religious, educational, or political programs in liberated territories in war areas. This amendment was killed in conference.

In 6 months, therefore, the original purposes of U. N. R. R. A. as first set forth by th State Department have been stretched to include relief of the destitute and ' 'ne anywhere as well as relief in countries affected by war. It has been stretched further to include by lack of restriction on the use of U. N. R. R. A. funds for political, religious, or educational programs in those foreign areas to be freed from the Axis. Under this program endorsed by 44 nations the share of the United States is 75 percent of the total cost. Our share will average almost $3,700,000 a day for 1 year.

I should like to have the American public and the Congress think just what our grocer bill is likely to be. We are sending a good many provisions and supplies to foreign countries under lend-lease. We will be sending large supplies for feeding the hungry in Europe and many other places through military appropriations. In my opinion, under U. N. R. R. A. the amount that will be spent for rehabilitation and relief will be staggering and I think the American public should be reminded constantly of just what this is going to mean, because in my opinion the military will be forced to allow the U. N. R. R. A. group to go into these countries while the military are still there, so it will mean two relief agencies plus supplies that are going in to be operated under lend-lease. The Army is supposed to be handling relief under lend-lease. I should like to have the American public also consider just what it might mean so far as the giving of harmful information, that should not be given in these liberated territories in war areas, is concerned, through the sending of persons who have not had experience in dealing with foreign nations, and the possibility that sabotage may creep in. The Army is used to dealing with foreign nations. There is no danger of their giving unwise information. The Army is used to dealing with pestilence and famine. The Army knows just how much reconstruction work is necessary and knows how to do it. There is no danger of the Army trying to control religion or education. The Army is fair and unprejudiced. Let us have our cooperation with other nations, and our relief administration for them administered by the well-known and well-organized military and the well-known and tried Red Cross.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for a list of the persons who are already operating in connection with U. N. R. R. A. and the background of these persons.

The complete text of the editorial in the New York Sun I have referred to is as follows:

WHAT WILL AMERICA PAY FOR?

Six months ago the State Department first published the text of the proposed agreement

for United Nations relief and rehabilitation. At that time no formal organization such as the U. N. R. R. A. had been set up. Article 1 of the agreement, however, gave the purposes and functions of such an international relief agency. Its primary purpose was defined as follows:

"To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and other basic necessities, medical and other essential services; and to facilitate in such areas, so far as necessary to the adequate provision of relief, the production and transportation of these articles, and the furnishing of these services."

This seems clear enough, yet since last September, when the State Department first issued this draft of the agreement, the main purpose of the U. N. R. R. A. has been undergoing an alarming process of stretching to cover numerous needs not originally in view. At the organization conference in Atlantic City last November the delegates from 44 countries agreed that the funds of the U. N. R. R. A. could be used to relieve suffering from want not directly caused by war. This would make available money for relief of famine or disease in various countries, such as India, not overrun by the Axis.

But that is not all. In Washington on Tuesday conferees of the Senate and the House reached an agreement on the bill that will authorize an appropriation of $1,350,000,000 as the share of the United States toward the payment of the cost of running the U. N. R. R. A. An amendment from the Senate would have barred the use of such funds to promote religious, educational, or political programs in liberated territories of the war areas. This amendment was killed in conference.

In 6 months, therefore, the original purpose of the U. N. R. R. A., as first set forth by the State Department, has been stretched to include relief of disease and famine anywhere, as well as relief in countries affected by war. It has been stretched further to include, by lack of restriction, the use of U. N. R. R. A. funds for political, religious, or educational programs in those foreign areas to be freed from the Axis. In this program endorsed by 44 nations the share of the United States is 75 percent of the total cost. Our share will average almost $3,700,000 a day for 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I very strongly urge the passage of this measure. Unquestionably it is time that we give thought to post-war bills and post-war plans. This bill, in my opinion, constitutes one of the greatest post-war programs that I have ever seen advanced.

Mr. Chairman, we are in the third year of war, and we are spurred by the grim determination to wage war relentlessly on all fronts and on all seas until those who have chosen to live by the sword shall have perished by it. We have seen America's war machine grow into a powerful striking force, prepared to meet our enemies on any ground, and carrying the war to our foes on every front. Our forces are courageous, well trained, competently led, and impelled by the knowledge that they fight for the right.

Yet we know in our hearts that the successes of our arms are only an indication of the greater, costlier victories which must lie ahead. There remain long months and years of toil for those who are producing the food and material of war; long months and years of the greater sacrifices required of those who bare their chests to enemy fire.

Then after the war, there is the post-war period, with the readjustments which inevitably must follow. They will not be easy. Industry now is booming. Business is good. Jobs are plentiful. Farm prices are up, and there are no limits on production. The seafood industry finds a redy market for its catch. War production requires all our facilities.

But what of the post-war period. Will there be jobs then? When war orders are canceled, what of the people now employed in the war plants? What of the returning soldiers? Where will they find work? Will the demands for farm products again drop to the blighting depths of pre-war days?

Obviously we must make every effort to be ready for the post-war period. Careful planning and hard work might have averted the depression of the thirties. By doing nothing now we may experience another equally as devastating. Northwest Florida, which I represent, is particularly susceptible to the ruinous effects of a post-war slump. Our prosperity is the greatest in history, but a great part of it is founded on war activities.

We who have the good fortune to live in Florida have seen our State progress in recent years at a rate unparalleled in the Nation. Its development has been a many-sided one. Shipyards, pulp and paper plants, clothing mills, furniture plants, and other industrial activities have held public attention along with a varied agriculture and a tremendous military and naval training program. The war has greatly stimulated Florida's progress. Will the cessation of hostilities stop that growth? These are matters which we cannot pass over lightly. Florida is essentially made up of small businesses, small industries, and small farms. They are representative of that sound backbone of enterprise which throughout the Nation relies on the initiative and resourcefulness of their individual proprietors. Each of them is vitally concerned by what happens to his State.

There are means by which post-war adjustments can be made less damaging to our economy. We should explore them now, not after we are in the midst of the readjustments.

Perhaps one of our greatest opportunities lies in the development of our ports and waterways. River and harbor projects, including the inland waterways, have demonstrated their importance and worth time and again during the present war emergency. For instance, the tonnage on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in 1942 increased 22 percent over the volume for 1941, which in turn exceeded the 1940 tonnage by 49 percent. The post-war construction program must include useful and meritorious employment. Testimony based on records maintained by the Chief of Engineers reveals that 75 cents of every dollar expended on rivers and harbors projects goes to direct or indirect employment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that no further time be lost in making complete preparations for the construction of a vast network of waterways in the post-war period. For years the development of these waterways has proceeded toward the time that they can be joined in one great Nation-wide system. There are still many gaps, both in coastal and inland waterways. When they are joined, so that there can be an unimpeded flow of commodities benefiting from low-cost transportation, we shall find stimulus for trade as well as incentive for greater use of our ports.

The actual construction of these projects will serve a valuable purpose in providing work and in encouraging industrial activity during a period of transition from war to peacetime production. But aside from this important consideration, the relatively small cost of completion of the waterways program will be justified many times over by the savings which will be made possible in the costs of transportation and the resulting benefits to the people of our entire Nation.

In 1942 we provided for the completion of the intracoastal waterway from Carrabelle to Corpus Christi to a depth of 12 feet and a width of 150 to 200 feet. Pipe lines from St. Joe northward and from Carrabelle eastward, plus expanded barge-line facilities have made it possible for upper Gulf-coast ports to play a key part in coastal and foreign shipments of essential war materials. As the result it is not too much to say that Florida's coastal waterways made possible the success of the tremendous task of supplying oil to the East. Pensacola, Freeport, Panama City, Port St. Joe, Spalachicola, Carrabelle, and St. Marks all have had a hand in this great work and in the distribution of other essential materials. Conversely the importance of post-war shipping to these ports cannot be overemphasized.

With full realization of the value of waterway and port development I have worked for the inclusion of a number of items in the Rivers and Harbors bill now before the Congress. The authorization of construction of these items will go far to connect many presently uncompleted waterways and strengthen the economy of Florida and the Southeast. I wish to list the northwest Florida projects which have been placed in the bill for action by the Congress.

A project for St. Marks River as provided in House Document No. 345 calls for the elimination of critical bends at the mouth of the river and at a point opposite Big Bayou. Total estimated cost is $172,000.

The Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to the St. Marks River is an authorized but unconstructed link in the Gulf intracoastal waterway. Authorization calls for the expenditure of approximately $512,000, which figure includes $32,500 for a removable-span railroad bridge across the Ochlockonee

River near McIntyre. The annual maintenance cost of this waterway has been estimated by the United States engineers at $15,400.

An alternate route possessing certain very desirable advantages will also be considered. The improvement of Watson Bayou, on St. Andrews Bay at Panama City, contemplates a channel 10 feet deep and 100 feet wide from the bay to the head of navigation in Watson Bayou, a distance of approximately 1¾ miles. The cost of dredging is not a major item in this project, and the annual maintenance is estimated at $1,000. Initial aids to navigation will cost an estimated $4,000 with an annual maintenance cost of $320.

There is a proviso in the bill which calls for great improvement in St. Josephs Bay, including a bar channel 32 by 300 feet, an inner harbor channel 30 by 200 feet, a turning basin 30 by 300 by 871 feet. The total cost of this work has been estimated at approximately $267,000, and the annual maintenance cost $25,000. My bill for the improvement of the Gulf County canal and its acquisition by the United States was passed last year. The improvement of the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers in Georgia and Florida in the interest of navigation, flood control, and power development, and other purposes has been proposed at an estimated cost of $6,500,000. Annual maintenance cost has been estimated at $200,000. Few projects can match this one in importance to the entire southeast. Panama City, with its new industrial importance, will benefit markedly from cheap transportation to the Chattahoochee Valley. Preliminary work has been done by the United States engineers with a view to improving the Chipola River in Alabama and Florida in the interest of navigation, flood control, and power development.

A resolution calling for the improvement of LaGrange Bayou at Freeport includes the construction of a turning basin in the docking area which will greatly facilitate the discharge of oil and other cargoes at this point. The cost of this turning basin has been estimated at $12,000.

Extensive improvements are provided for in the bill for Pensacola Harbor, including deepening and widening the channels.

A waterway from the Intracoastal Waterway south across Santa Rosa Island to a point near Deer Point Light is proposed.

Improvement of the entrance to Perdido Bay—Alabama and Florida—from the Gulf of Mexico to deep water in the Perdido Bay is included in the bill.

There is a resolution in the bill which calls for a waterway which will connect the Escambia and Alabama Rivers—Florida-Alabama.

These latter four items should be considered in their entirety for they contribute jointly to port and shipping developments at Pensacola. This is one of the few ports of Florida strategically located to drain the rich and vast area of Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and the industrial empire known as the Tennessee Valley.

The proposal to connect with the Alabama is to enable Pensacola to have a link with the proposed $100,000,000 Alabama-Coosa waterway project from Mobile to Rome, Ga.

With this connection, Pensacola would be able to obtain competitive rail rates because of the water competition, which would be another great advantage for water-borne commerce.

The Alabama and Georgia territory is rich in such products as coal, steel, cement, cotton, and textiles. The Escambia link would place Pensacola closer to Selma, Montgomery, Gadsden, Anniston, and other points on the waterway to Rome, Ga., than competing ports. About 25 towns ranging from 3,000 to 25,000 are situated in the river basin.

With the development of the Escambia link and the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee waterway a gateway to northwest Florida ports would be opened from one of the most rapidly advancing industrial areas in the Nation.

Major activities of that area which have been stepped up by the war are steel, textiles, and chemical products. Mineral products include bauxite, Selma chalk for cement, coal, iron, arsenic ores, fluxing materials, lead, granite, marble, and slate.

In 1929 a survey of the United States engineers showed 2,000,000 tons of freight potentially available annually. Now it is estimated that from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 would be available.

Direct connection with the Mississippi Valley and its great agricultural production and with the oil-producing areas of the Southwest could lead to a trade and manufacturing revival of unprecedented proportions. The opportunity is there if we will capitalize on it.

Florida and the Nation stand to gain enormously by the logical development of its waterways. I urge again that the Congress lose no time in completing plans for this development.

My statement would not be complete if I were to fail to speak for the other projects proposed for the Southeast. I strongly endorse each of them. I have the utmost confidence in my colleagues who sponsor these waterway developments. In particular do I pay tribute to the outstanding service rendered by the able and distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable JOSEPH J. MANSFIELD, and to the splendid efforts of my great and good friend the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN. They have labored unceasingly for this important measure and their service is statesmanship of the highest order.

I respectfully urge and request the approval of this measure as the greatest post-war project yet submitted to the House.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, following the gentleman from Florida I also want to compliment the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee and all the members of the committee on a splendid piece of work over the matter of so great importance to the Nation. Certainly our rivers and harbors—however they may be classified by the writers on economics—constitute a great national asset. The more they are developed the greater becomes their total asset value. It takes men, such as the chairman of this committee, with vision and wide understanding to carry on this development under a proper plan looking to the greatest national good.

As a student of our economic history I have noted with pride the great significance of rivers in the expansion of the American people. I have been greatly interested in the various uses of these rivers, particularly of their changing usefulness and the heightening importance of that changing usefulness. Navigation in an early day and in the eastern part of our country furnished the greatest usefulness, but as the American people moved toward the West other uses vied with navigation in rank of importance.

In the humid eastern section of our country, where wood and coal were so abundant for fuel and where irrigation was undreamed of for crops, rivers were not needed for power and therefore found their greatest usefulness as carriers of commerce. However, when you get to the great intermountain sections of the West, with their treeless plains and semiarid climate, the situation is vastly different. There the rivers are different, too, being unsuited in most of their length, and for the larger part of the time, for any kind of navigation. By that very fact they become far more useful as the givers of life with their waters.

In my own State of Arizona I find that famous jurists, men educated in eastern law schools, like Judge Kent, Judge Kibbey, and Judge Sloan, men well acquainted with the law of riparian water rights, forgot or laid aside the water law of the land where they were born and adapted themselves to new principles of water law—that is, new to Anglo-American experience. So we find Arizona, along with Colorado, Utah, and many other Mountain States in the semiarid West, creating the new water law of beneficial use. Our friend and former colleague, the late Edward Taylor, of Colorado, has been an outstanding leader in the development of these new principles of water utilization.

Purposes of living for man and beast, such as domestic uses and the growing of crops, constitute with us the highest degree of beneficial use of water in a thirsty land. We need every drop of water that falls from heaven in that vast intermountain area first for such beneficial uses.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss in my duty in the consideration of a rivers and harbors bill, or in the consideration of a flood-control bill, if I did not point out these highest uses of western rivers. For that reason we from the Rocky Mountain region urge such a treatment as will guarantee that the

waters of those rivers and portions of rivers, which rise in or flow through the semiarid portio of our country, shall be first utilized with a view of their greatest beneficial use to sustain life.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, this bill involves the making of improvements to many important rivers and harbors in our country. I am vitally interested in the bill and I support it wholeheartedly. These provisions to improve the eastern rivers I support, and I am also impressed by the importance of the Tombigbee development.

Mr. Chairman, while we talk about the development of the United States, and particularly the Northwest, I want to call the attention of the members of the committee and of the Congress to the tremendous stake the people of the United States have in the development of the Northwest. In the Northwest, west of the Continental Divide, we have, as you know, the bulk of the holdings of the United States in the form of the national forests. We have in the State of Idaho alone 20,026,353 acres in national forests. The heart of the national forests is in central Idaho, one of the great undeveloped sections of the United States rich in both timber and minerals. It is the Nation's unopened storehouse. Flowing across southern Idaho and north to make the dividing line between Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, and then leading out of central Idaho from the Idaho-Washington line, at Lewiston, Idaho, we have the Snake River where navigation is possible from its confluence with the Clearwater River at Lewiston to tidewater at Astoria during the high-water period. Here we have the picture of the boats and barges that ply the Snake River in high water to bring up California oil in barges and take back Idaho wheat to coast markets. The present improvements of the Columbia River give year-round transportation to the Umatilla Rapids—when the Umatilla Dam is built and these four dams on the Snake River authorized in this bill are constructed we will have year-round navigation from Lewiston to the ocean and Government-owned timber and minerals will find an outlet to our eastern markets.

In this bill there is a simple provision to improve the Snake River to this store of resources located in central Idaho. I would like to read to you from page 26, a little section which means so much to the people of the whole United States, and more particularly to the development of the Northwest. I will read the provision:

> Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho: The construction of dams Nos. 1, 4, 7, and 10 and open-channel improvement for purposes of navigation and irrigation in accordance with the plan submitted in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress.

Now, just what does this mean? That means the construction of four dams to bring navigation of the Columbia River into the Snake River and up to the confluence of the Snake and the Clearwater Rivers at Lewiston to provide an outlet for the abundance of resources, raw materials of every kind, minerals, timber, lime, and portland cement, awaiting the opening of that country to low-cost transportation.

The United States Geological Survey has provided a list of the mineral deposits in this area which I will enumerate as shown on this map. We have gold, silver, lead, copper, zinc, antimony, tungsten, mercury, molybdenum, cobalt, manganese, phosphate, iron, and portland cement. This list is taken from the records and surveys of the United States Geological Survey. We are dealing with one of the greatest mineral sections of the United States.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that if these four dams on the Snake River were put in, it would provide the improvement of navigation on the Columbia River from its mouth clear up to the city of Lewiston, and it would also then make complete and whole the development of Bonneville and the Umatilla Dam, which is included in this bill? These four would be the complete development of the whole Columbia River, which is the second largest river in the United States, clear up to Lewiston, in Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is entirely correct. But what would be accomplished by that development? We would open up land and timber resources owned by the Government itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman from Oregon said, "the second largest river." He means in the volume of water?

Mr. ANGELL. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. As to power it is first.

Mr. ANGELL. First, yes.

Mr. WHITE. What we are particularly interested in is the movement of the tremendous amount of resources owned by the Government. We have in this section here over 20,000,000 acres of timber, practically all in Government ownership. Every hill in that country is forest-clad. The whole area is covered by national forests. This area in the circle indicated will be opened up. This national unopened storehouse is land owned by everybody in the United States. It is Government owned.

When you walk down the streets of Washington, when you walk down the streets of Chicago, or when you walk down the streets of New York and you see the big paper trucks rolling by, hauling newsprint for the big newspapers, you will find that every pound, every roll of this paper comes into this country from Canada and that the Canadian gets our money and the Canadian government gets the tax money from the paper industry which we support.

When you go to Chicago and go into the offices of the great Chicago Tribune, you will find the walls decorated with big maps and enlarged pictures showing their paper mills in Canada and pictures of steamboats plying the Great Lakes bringing Canadian paper into the United States.

When you read the appropriation bill that comes before this House every year in connection with the Department of Agriculture, you find that millions and millions of dollars are being appropriated out of the pockets of the taxpayers to maintain the national forests, locked up, if you please, waiting for the day when we will have low-cost transportation to utilize that timber, to supply pulp mills and paper mills to make our own newsprint from our own forests that are being supported by the Government. It is high time that the Congress and the Government of the United States take cognizance of the utilization of its tremendous pulp timber resources. We have 20,000,000 acres of timber in this central area, most of it in Idaho, overripe, falling down, growing up again, standing there, waiting to be developed and waiting to be utilized. When we can provide low cost water transportation to market.

You know our great Secretary of the Interior has made a bid to take the forests under his wing. I have endeavored to have some liberal policy established on the part of the Government in fostering our mining industry and to open up this country, and I have met with nothing but opposition both from the Interior Department and the Department of Agriculture. I am unable to get any of these heads of Government Departments to go in there and see what we have or what the country needs. I would just like to see the Secretary of the Interior do one simple thing, try to fly across central Idaho in an airplane, and when he got over here back of Thunder Mountain or back in the wilds of Idaho have to make a forced landing. If he had to make a forced landing and come out under his own power, he would know something about the magnitude and the immensity of the national forests and the timber stands owned by the Government in the State of Idaho.

We cannot get any Government officials to go into that country, but those of the Forest Service who appear determined to keep things as is. I even tried to get the Governor and Senator Borah to go up here to this place—Dixie. It is about 75 miles from the railhead into Dixie. But there are no votes up there, nothing but timber, and most of that is owned by the Government, timber and mining claims. For that reason there are very few people in the policy-forming branch of the Government that know very much about what we have in central Idaho. The records of the Geological survey are growing musty on the shelves and the Forest Service is holding the country back. But I do not want to discuss that with you.

I want to talk for a minute about the development of the Columbia Basin project, the 1,200,000 acres all ready for development. The Grand Coulee Dam has

been built to put water on this land. The water will be lifted out of the Columbia River into canals and from there it will flow into this tremendous country of 1,200,000 acres, which will probably provide future homes for our returning soldiers. That country has to be built up, farms and towns have to be laid out and built, roads and streets must be constructed, orchards and vineyards set out where sagebrush is growing now, and everything else that goes to develop a new country. Now, with an abundance of lumber already being manufactured at Lewiston, and Portland cement at Orofino, these building materials are all ready to move from Lewiston down the Snake River to the threshhold of the great Columbia Basin, to build one of the great new frontiers of the Northwest.

When this bill comes before the House I hope that this provision will be sustained and this authorization will be made that we may have river navigation from Astoria clear up the Columbia River to Lewiston.

Here we have a picture of the beautiful city of Portland, one of the finest cities around the rim of the United States, a great seaport built at the junction of the Willamette River and the Columbia.

Here we have the city of Lewiston at the confluence of the Snake and the Clearwater Rivers. When the day comes that we have river nagivation to that point, it will open one of our Nation's greatest storehouses of natural wealth and build our best and last frontier.

THE SNAKE RIVER NAVIGATION PROJECT

In presenting to the Members of the House of Representatives the need for the improvement of the Snake River from its confluence with the Columbia River near Pasco up to its junction with the Clearwater River at Lewiston, Idaho, may I review briefly the history of navigation on these waterways?

WESTERN NAVIGATION IN COVERED WAGON DAYS

As the coast of California was settled after the gold rush of 1849 and the covered wagon migrations brought settlers to the Oregon country long before the coming of the transcontinental railroad, wheat and grain were in demand from the dry country up the Columbia, and steamboat transportation got its start on the lower Columbia River in this period.

PORTAGE TRANSPORTATION AROUND THE COLUMBIA RIVER DALLES

The Dalles proved to be an impassable barrier to navigation. The struggle to control portage transportation around The Dalles between the boats that navigated the lower Columbia and the boats that plied the river above The Dalles is one of the epics in the history of the development of the great Northwest country.

WHEAT FOR THE EARLY SETTLERS

This navigation and development gave an outlet to the wheat fields of the Walla Walla country and the land tributary to the Snake River in Idaho and Washington to the head of the high water navigation at Lewiston.

BUILDING PANAMA CANAL TO OPEN THE RESOURCES OF THE WEST

In digging the Panama Canal a program was started to develop and utilize the vast resources of the West by providing low-cost transportation to eastern markets. The opening of the Panama Canal was to be complemented by the improvement of western rivers for navigation, and a start was made in carrying this program to completion by improving the lower Columbia River by the construction of the Cascade Locks and Celilo Canal around The Dalles to provide for river navigation to the rapids at Umatilla—a plan which gave an outlet to the wheat produced in the areas tributary to this part of the river.

RIVER TRANSPORTATION NEEDED TO OPEN THE NATION'S STOREHOUSE

We now have seasonal navigation on the Snake River above Umatilla in the high-water period, but the great bulk of material and potential river freight awaiting cheap water transportation to market is farther up these rivers, comprising the immense Government-owned timber stands of central Idaho tributary to the Clearwater, Salmon, and Snake Rivers; the iron ore, lime, and cement products of the Clearwater Valley; vast stores of metallic and nonmetallic raw materials in eastern Washington and northern Idaho; all awaiting the improvement of the Snake River for navigation to find an outlet. Linked with this navigation development will be the upbuilding of one of the country's largest reclamation projects, the Columbia Basin in central Washington, already provided for by the construction of the Grand Coulee hydroelectric power project.

TRANSPORTATION OF WESTERN PRODUCTS NEEDED TO BUILD UP OUR LAST AND BEST FRONTIER

In building the farm homes and urban communities on this land, boat and barge transportation can float the construction materials from central Idaho to the threshold of the Columbia River Basin at Pasco and Umatilla.

In viewing the conditions as we find them, it can be clearly seen that the project to build the necessary dams to provide river navigation in the Snake River is one of the most important and most beneficial river improvements for the advancement of the whole country that this Congress can authorize at this time.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to join others who have preceded me in paying my respects to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and to its great chairman, the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD. I think they have done a very fine job in bringing out this bill at this time.

I think it is well for us to get these projects lined up for construction as the times may call for them, and certainly as a backlog of post-war projects for those that need to wait until after the war to be built.

I want to speak particularly with reference to a project that is very close to me, very close to the district that I represent, and very important to the section of the country from which I come, but one which I think meets the test as inuring to the national good.

I refer to the Tennessee-Tombigbee connecting canal. I am not going to discuss that in any great detail, because others who have gone ahead of me have shown you the map, and have given you the detailed information regarding it. I know that people sometimes say that it is of doubtful value to build a project of that kind. That same thing was said with reference to the improvement of navigation on the Tennessee River, and I think I would be safe in saying that the same thing has been said with reference to the improvement of every navigable stream where a project has been initiated. I think the development of the Tennessee River, for instance, is now beginning to pay dividends. That river has not yet been opened up all of its 650 miles in length, with a 9-foot channel, but that will be accomplished when the Kentucky dam is finished next year. With the exception of that one pool on the Tennessee River, there is now 9-foot navigation all the way from Knoxville down. There is now a 9-foot channel from Knoxville to the Pickwick Dam, and when the Kentucky dam is finished, it will be all the way to the conjunction of the Tennessee River and the Ohio River. But even in its unfinished state we have seen a remarkable increase in river navigation.

Not so long ago T. V. A. released a statement giving the result of navigation on the Tennessee during the year 1943, and it was quite revealing to discover that for 1943 all the records for freight on the Tennessee River had been broken, records for all time, both in tonnage hauled, and in the ton-miles. In 1943 there were 3,088,635 tons hauled on that river as against 2,886,605 in 1942, or an increase of 8.9 percent. The ton-mileage for 1943 at the time the statement was given out—the figures were not all available—and therefore it is an estimate, but a very close one—amounted to 224,290,264, exceeding the 1942 all-time record by 38.9 percent. Very often when the increase in freight movement on a stream such as that is brought up, someone raises the question that the majority of that freight consisted of building material being used on the river itself, sand and gravel and things of that kind. Excluding sand, gravel, stone, and relatively low-value freight, moving usually a very short distance, the tonnage increase in 1943 over 1942 amounted to 49.7 percent.

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. BOYKIN. I have a letter here from Major General Reybold, Chief of the Army Engineers, in which it is stated that the increase on the Tennessee River alone is 106 percent, and on the Tennessee and Tombigbee it is 126 percent, and on the intercoastal canal it is an increase alone of 209 percent. This letter I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A1249. I hope everyone will read it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was simply comparing 1943 with 1942; 1942 established an all-time record, and 1943 broke that record. The comparison I was giving was as between those 2 years, when the tonnage increased by 49.7 percent, ex-

cluding sand and gravel, stone, and such freight and the ton-mileage increased by 46.2 percent.

Mr. BOYKIN. Many of the things were not mentioned by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. He did not have a chance to mention these wonderful things that have happened since the Army engineers made this survey, but all of these things have happened since the Army engineers made that survey, and I believe if the Chief of the Army Engineers who turned it down once was the Chief now, he would O. K. this proposition.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the gentleman is certainly correct. Take the 5-year average over that river and there was an increase of ton-mileage of 300 percent, and tonnage 200 percent, and if you exclude short hauls, sand and gravel, and material of that type, the ton-mileage increase was 330 percent and the tonnage increase more than 260 percent. That increase is going to continue to step up. Within the last year, in fact within the last few months, there have been built on the Tennessee River 4 public-use terminals—1 at Knoxville, which was dedicated only 2 or 3 weeks ago, 1 at Chattanooga, 1 at Guntersville, and 1 at Decatur, Ala. On February 3 I saw a newspaper report to the effect that the public-use terminal at Decatur had received its first shipment, which consisted of 500 tons of pig-iron, requiring 10 railroad cars to haul it from Birmingham to Decatur, 500 tons to be transshipped to the East through the Tennessee River from Decatur. If this Tennessee-Tombigbee connection were open, even that much haulage would not be necessary. The pig-iron furnaces at Birmingham could ship their pig-iron to Birmingham port on the Warrior River and send it on by canal to the Tennessee and Ohio and on to the East.

Less than a month ago the public-use terminal at Knoxville, 650 miles from the mouth of the Tennessee, was dedicated and that day the first commercial tow ever to be taken to Knoxville tied up there after having traveled 900 miles by waterway. In tow were two large barges loaded with 70,000 bushels of wheat from the Midwest shipped to a milling company in Knoxville. Other barges brought two oil drums 150 feet long and 30 feet in diameter to be used as pontoons for an emergency bridge at the Clinton Engineering works.

Thousands of jeeps, ambulances, Army trucks, and other types of military vehicles have been shipped through the Guntersville port, brought from Evansville, Ind., and other points for distribution to the armed services throughout the Southeast.

At Decatur seagoing boats are being built. Only last week one was completed—one of the largest ever to be built on an inland stream—destined for European service under Polish command.

There is a steadily increasing use of the river and the facilities made possible by its improvement. These various uses may well presage the use that can reasonably be expected of the canal connecting the two great rivers, the Tennessee and the Tombigbee, through an area rich in natural resources.

Our part of the country is rich in natural resources. A great many of the raw materials are to be found there. In my own district there is a great aluminum plant. I am not sure this is true, but I have heard it said, that it is the only complete aluminum plant in the world, a plant where the bauxite goes in at one end, and comes out as aluminum sheets at the other end.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Will the gentleman tell us what proportion of production of aluminum in the Nation is on the Tennessee River?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I could not tell the gentleman, but it is very high. The Alcoa is there, as well as Reynolds, their competitor, which is in my district, on the Tennessee. I do not remember the percentage, but it is very high. The shipment of bauxite from our own country, from sections of our country, down in the southeast of Alabama, and in Arkansas and some other places where it may be found from time to time as transshipments from South America could very well use this connection as can so many other industries that are being developed in that sector.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have an agreement with the minority, with the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], that we will read section 1 of the bill; and, as there are many amendments to be offered to it, committee amendments, and perhaps others, we ask unanimous consent that they may be postponed until tomorrow for the consideration of the amendments when we have more present.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, that will be in order.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the first section of the bill, which goes down to page 29, and when the Committee resumes tomorrow, amendments will be in order with reference to any part of that first section of the bill from page 1 to page 29.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following works of improvement of rivers, harbors, and other waterways are hereby adopted and authorized in the interest of national security and the stabilization of employment, and shall be prosecuted as speedily as may be consistent with budgetary requirements, under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers, in accordance with the plans in the respective reports hereinafter designated and subject to the conditions set forth therein: *Provided*, That no project herein authorized shall be appropriated for or constructed until 6 months after the termination of the present wars in which the United States is engaged unless the construction of such project has been recommended by an authorized defense agency and approved by the President as being necessary or desirable in the interest of the national defense and security, and the President has notified the Congress to that effect: *Provided further*, That penstocks or other similar facilities adapted to possible future use in the development of hydroelectric power shall be installed in any dam herein authorized when approved by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and of the Federal Power Commission, and such recommendations shall be based upon consideration of the proper utilization and conservation in the public interest of the resources of the region and the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to construct powerhouses and install power machinery and appurtenances for the development of hydroelectric power at any dam heretofore or hereafter authorized by any act of Congress: *And provided further*, That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made, the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations. The Chief of Engineers is also authorized in his discretion to modify the plan for any dam or other work heretofore or hereafter authorized so that such dam or work will be smaller than originally planned with a view to completing a useful improvement within an authorization: *And provided further*, That the smaller structure shall be located on the chosen site so that it will be feasible at some future time to enlarge the work in order to permit the full utilization of the site for all purposes of conservation such as flood control, navigation, reclamation, the development of hydroelectric power, and the abatement of pollution:

Northeast Harbor, Maine; House Document No. 132, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Isle au Haut Thoroughfare, Maine; Senate Document No. 15, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Hendriks Harbor, Maine; Senate Document No. 40, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Portland Harbor, Maine; House Document No. 560, Seventy-sixth Congress; and the maintenance of Soldier Ledge Channel in Hussey Sound, Casco Bay, at a depth of 40 feet, in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Josias River, Maine; House Document No. 227, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Newburyport Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 703, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Gloucester Harbor and Annisquam River, Mass.; House Document No. 329, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Manchester Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 447, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Salem Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 701, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Marblehead Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 85, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Boston Harbor, Mass.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 28, 1943;

Dorchester Bay and Neponset River, Mass.; House Document No. 394, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Weymouth Fore River, Mass.; House Document No. 291, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cohasset Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 425, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Duxbury Harbor, Mass.; Senate Document No. 115, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Chatham (Stage) Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 456, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Wellfleet Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 557, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Hyannis Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 98, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cape Cod Canal (Onset Bay), Mass.; House Document No. 431, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Nantucket Harbor, Mass.; House Document No. 115, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Menemsha Creek, Marthas Vineyard, Mass.; House Document No. 365, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Wickford Harbor, R. I.; Senate Document No. 105, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Great Salt Pond, Block Island, R. I.: House Document No. 330, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Pawcatuck River, R. I. and Conn.; House Document No. 829, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Mystic River, Conn.; House Document No. 349, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Thames River, Conn.; House Document No. 367, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn.; House Document No. 368, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Clinton Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 240, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Guilford Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 149, Seventy-seventh Congress;

New Haven Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 307, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Bridgeport Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 819, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Norwalk Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 220, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Greenwich Harbor, Conn.; House Document No. 125, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Larchmont Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 697, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 14, 1942;

Jamaica Bay, N. Y.; House Document No. 700, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Jones Inlet, N. Y.; House Document No. 409, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Northport Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 109, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Peconic River, N. Y.; House Document No. 237, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Lake Montauk Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 369, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Orowoc Creek, N. Y.; House Document No. 126, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Passaic River, N. J.; House Document No. 430, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N. J.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 20, 1942;

Way Cake Creek, N. J.; House Document No. 624, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Compton Creek, N. J.; House Document No. 673, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Shark River, N. J.; House Document No. 102, Seventy-sixth Congress;

New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway; House Document No. 133, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Manasquan River, N. J.; House Document No. 356, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Toms River, N. J.; House Document No. 393, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cold Spring Inlet, N. J.; House Document No. 262, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Delaware River, Philadelphia to the sea; House Documents Nos. 580, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 340, Seventy-seventh Congress; and the maintenance of enlarged channel opposite the Philadelphia Navy Yard in accordance with the report on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers;

Delaware River at Camden, N. J.; House Document No. 353, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Inland waterway between Rehoboth Bay and Delaware Bay, Del.; House Document No. 344, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Indian River, Del.; House Document No. 330, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Nanticoke River, Del. and Md.; Senate Document No. 69, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Susquehanna River, above and below Havre de Grace, Md.; Senate Document No. 67, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Baltimore Harbor and channels, Md.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 30, 1942; and channel in Curtis Creek in accordance with plans on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers;

Mill Creek, Md.; House Document No. 100, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Broadwater Creek, Md.; House Document No. 622, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cadle Creek, Md.; House Document No. 465, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Channel to Island Creek, St. George Island, Md.; House Document No. 99, Seventy-sixth Congress.

St. Catherines Sound, Md.; House Document No. 242, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Black Walnut Harbor, Md.; House Document No. 217, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Town Creek, Md.; House Document No. 219, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Duck Point Cove, Md.; House Document No. 241, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Lower Thoroughfare, Deals Island, Md.; House Document No. 238, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Crisfield Harbor, Md.; House Document No. 457, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pocomoke River, Md.; House Document No. 429, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Waterway on the coast of Virginia; House Document No. 268, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Occohannock Creek, Va.; House Document No. 223, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Oyster Channel, Va.; House Document No. 716, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Onancock River, Va.; House Document No. 358, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Tangier Channel, Va.; House Document No. 141, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cranes Creek, Va.; House Document No. 687, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Totuskey Creek, Va.; House Document No. 686, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Hoskins Creek, Va.; House Document No. 129, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Urbanna Creek, Va.; House Document No. 285, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Whitings Creek, Va.; House Document No. 582, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Broad Creek, Va.; House Document No. 381, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pamunkey River, Va.; House Document No. 671, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Appomattox River, Va.; House Document No. 223, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Hampton Creek, Va.; House Document No. 559, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Cape Charles City Harbor, Va.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 12, 1942;

Norfolk Harbor, Va.; House Document No. 224, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Little River, Va.; maintenance work in accordance with the report on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers;

James River, Va.; House Document No. 738, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va., to Beaufort Inlet, N. C.; House Document No. 117, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Chowan River, N. C., and Blackwater River, Va.; House Document No. 101, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pembroke Creek, N. C.; House Document No. 235, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Channel from Pamlico Sound to Rodanthe, N. C.; House Document No. 234, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Channel from Pamlico Sound to Avon, N. C.; House Document No. 316, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Rollinson Channel, N. C.; House Document No. 236, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Waterway connecting Swan Quarter Bay with Deep Bay, N. C.; House Document No. 239, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Neuse and Trent Rivers, N. C.; House Document No. 623, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Channel connecting Thoroughfare Bay with Cedar Bay, N. C.; Senate Document No. 87, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Waterway connecting Pamlico Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C.; House Document No. 99, Seventy-seventh Congress, and Senate Document No. 247, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Channel from Back Sound to Lookout Bight, N. C.; House Document No. 746, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Beaufort Harbor, N. C.; House Document No. 334, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Inland waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, N. C., including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C.; House Documents No. 660, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 346, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington; House Document No. 131 and Senate Document No. 83, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N. C.; Senate Document No. 170, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to Winyah Bay, S. C.; House Document No. 327, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Winyah Bay, S. C.; House Document No. 211, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Beresford Creek, S. C.; House Document No. 602, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Charleston Harbor, S. C.; House Document No. 156, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Abbapoola Creek, S. C.; House Document No. 97, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Russell Creek, S. C.; Senate Document No. 41, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Savannah River below Augusta, Ga.; Senate Document No. 66, Seventy-sixth Congress: *Provided*, That whenever any power project, not under Federal license, is benefited by the Clarks Hill Reservoir project, the Federal Power Commission, after notice to the owner or owners of such unlicensed project and after opportunity for hearing, shall determine and fix a reasonable and equitable annual charge to be paid to the United States on account of such benefits by said owner or owners or other recipients of such benefits;

Savannah Harbor, Ga.; House Document No. 283, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.; House Document No. 610, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway from Cape Fear River, N. C., to St. Johns River, Fla.; House Document No. 114, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Fernandina Harbor and Amelia River, Fla.; House Document No. 284, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean; House Document No. 322, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Johns River, Fla., Palatka to Lake Harney; House Document No. 603, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla.; House Documents Nos. 261 and 336, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Canaveral Harbor, Fla.; House Document No. 367, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Lucie Inlet, Fla.; House Document No. 391, Seventy-seventh Congress;

New River, Fla.; House Document No. 553, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Miami Harbor, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 24, 1942;

Miami River, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated March 19, 1942;

Intracoastal Waterway from Miami to Key West, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee Drainage Areas, Fla.; House Document No. 696, Seventy-sixth Congress; and in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated June 5, 1943;

Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River, Fla.; House Document No. 371, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Little Manatee River, Fla.; House Document No. 552, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Tampa Harbor, Fla.; Senate Document No. 16, and House Document No. 119, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Anclote River, Fla.; House Document No. 243, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pithlachascotee River, Fla.; House Document No. 86, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Marks River, Fla.; House Document No. 345, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachicola Bay to Saint Marks River, Fla.; House Document No. 442, Seventy-sixth Congress:

Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Georgia and Florida; House Document No. 342, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Saint Josephs Bay, Fla.; Senate Document No. 17, Seventy-seventh Congress; and in accordance with the report on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers;

Watson Bayou, Fla.; House Document No. 555, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pensacola Harbor, Fla.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 3, 1943;

Alabama-Coosa River, Ala.: Initial and ultimate development of the Alabama-Coosa River and tributaries for navigation, flood control, power development, and other purposes, as outlined in House Document No. 414, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby authorized substantially in accordance with the plans being prepared by the Chief of Engineers with such modifications thereof from time to time as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable for the purpose of increasing the development of hydroelectric power; and that for the initiation and accomplishment of the ultimate plan appropriations are authorized in such amounts as Congress may from time to time determine to be advisable, the total of such appropriations not to exceed the sum of $60,000,000. The aforesaid authorization and approval shall include authorities for all powerhouses, power machinery, and appurtenances found to be desirable by the Secretary of War upon the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission.

Mobile Harbor, Ala.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Warrior and Tombigbee Rivers, Alabama and Mississippi: House Documents Nos. 276, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 382, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Waterway connecting the Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers in accordance with the recommendation of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors in the report submitted in House Document No. 269, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Dauphin Island Bay Channel, Ala.; House Document No. 333, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Bayou Coden, Ala.; House Document No. 824 Seventy-seventh Congress;

Bayou La Batre, Ala.; House Document No. 281, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Biloxi Harbor, Miss.; House Documents Nos. 258 and 326, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Pass Christian Harbor, Miss.; Senate Document No. 214, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Bayou Galere, Miss.; House Document No. 112, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Bayous LaLoutre, Saint Malo, and Ysclosky, La.; Senate Document No. 116, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico; House Document No. 215, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Calcasieu River and Pass, La.; House Document No. 465, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway; House Documents Nos. 428, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 383, Seventyseventh Congress;

Louisiana and Texas Intracoastal Waterway to Harlingen, Tex.; House Document No. 402, Seventy-seventh Congress; the depths and widths to be the same as authorized for the main stem of the waterway in Public Law No. 675, enacted July 23, 1942;

Sabine-Neches Waterway, Tex.; House Document No. 685, Seventy-sixth Congress, and Senate Documents Nos. 60 and 158, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex.; Senate Document No. 98, Seventy-sixth Congress;

The improvement of the Trinity River and tributaries, Texas, for navigation, flood control, and allied purposes is hereby approved and authorized in accordance with the reports contained in House Document No. 403, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Houston Ship Channel, Tex.; House Documents Nos. 226 and 256, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Clear Creek and Clear Lake, Tex.; House Document No. 319, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Chocolate and Bastrop Bayous, Tex.; House Document No. 337, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated December 10, 1943;

Lavaca and Navidad Rivers, Tex.; House Documents Nos. 314, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 659, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Guadalupe River, Tex.; House Document No. 247, Seventy-sixth Congress: *Provided*, That whenever any power project, not under Federal license, is benefited by the Canyon Reservoir project, the Federal Power Commission after notice to the owner or owners of such unlicensed project and after opportunity for hearing, shall determine and fix a reasonable and equitable annual charge to be paid to the United States on account of such benefits by said owner or owners or other recipients of such benefits;

Brazos Island Harbor, Tex.; House Document No. 335, Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Document No. 347, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.; House Document No. 104, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers; House Document No. 231, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis: The existing project for lock and dam No. 2 is hereby modified in accordance with the recommendation in House Document No. 432, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis: The construction of lock and dam No. 26 at Alton, Ill., is hereby declared to be in accord with the project authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis; House Documents Nos. 103 and 547, Seventy-sixth Congress, and 263, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis: The existing project is hereby modified to provide for remedial works in accordance with the recommendation of the district engineer in the report submitted in House Document No. 137, Seventy-sixth Congress, and for such remedial works or land acquisitions in any levee or drainage district, with respect to which payments, remedial works, or land acquisitions were recommended in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 34, Seventy-fifth Congress, and authorized by the Act of August 26, 1937, as the Chief of Engineers deems advisable, in addition to or in lieu of the payments, remedial works, or land acquisitions so recommended and authorized;

Illinois Waterway, Ill., and Indiana Harbor and Canal, Ind.; House Document No. 145, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth; House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Baudette Harbor, Minn.; House Document No. 216, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Harbor at Knife River, Minn.; House Document No. 686, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Ashland Harbor, Wis.; House Document No. 337, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis.; House Document No. 228, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Green Bay Harbor, Wis.; House Document No. 95, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Milwaukee Harbor, Wis.; Senate Document No. 29, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Racine Harbor, Wis.; House Documents Nos. 816, Seventy-seventh Congress, and 255, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Waukegan Harbor, Ill.; House Document No. 116, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.; House Document No. 233, Seventy-sixth Congress;

St. Joseph Harbor, Mich.; House Document No. 129, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich.; House Document No. 661, Seventy-sixth Cong.;

Manistee Harbor, Mich.; House Document No. 380, Seventy-seventh Congress;

St. Clair River at Southeast Bend, Mich.: The widening of the existing project channel, in accordance with alternative plan B, as outlined in the report of the district engineer in House Document No. 309, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby authorized;

Detroit River, Mich.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Sandusky Harbor, Ohio; House Document No. 328, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Lorain Harbor, Ohio; House Document No. 161, Seventy-seventh Congress; and in accordance with the report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Cleveland Harbor, Ohio; House Document No. 232, Seventy-sixth Congress; and the extension of the channel in the Cuyahoga River in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 14, 1942;

Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio; House Document No. 321, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Erie Harbor, Pa.; protection of that portion of the peninsula south of the waterworks settling basins at an estimated annual cost of $15,000 is hereby authorized;

Erie Harbor, Pa.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated October 26, 1942;

Buffalo Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 352, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 16, 1942;

Wilson Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 679, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Rochester Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 139, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y.; House Document No. 363, Seventy-sixth Congress;

San Diego Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 390, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Newport Bay Harbor, Calif.; Senate Document No. 138, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Santa Barbara Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 348, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Morro Bay, Calif.; House Document No. 283, Seventy-seventh Congress; and further harbor development as desired by the Navy Department in accordance with the plans on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Monterey Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 266, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Monterey Bay (Moss Landing), Calif.; in accordance with the report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Redwood Creek, Calif.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated November 3, 1941;

Oakland Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 466, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Oakland Harbor, Calif.; in accordance with the report on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Richmond Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 715, Seventy-sixth Congress;

San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif.; House Document No. 217, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Noyo Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 682, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Crescent City Harbor, Calif.; House Document No. 688, Seventy-sixth Congress, and the construction of an inner breakwater in accordance with the plans on file in the office, Chief of Engineers;

Chetco River, Oreg.; House Document No. 817, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Coquille River, Oreg.; House Document No. 672, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Umpqua Harbor and River, Oreg.; Senate Document No. 86, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Umpqua River, Oreg.; Senate Document No. 191, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.; Senate Document No. 119, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Depoe Bay, Oreg.; House Document No. 350, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Salmon River, Oreg.; House Document No. 551, Seventy-sixth Congress;

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $120,000, to be immediately available as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for repairing damage to and checking erosion on the Bayocean Peninsula, in Oregon, caused by a storm in January 1939, in order to provide adequate protection to property on such peninsula and in Tillamook, Oreg.;

Willamette River, Oreg.; The construction of the New Willamette Falls lock and navigation works in accordance with the plan submitted in House Document No. 544, Seventy-fifth Congress;

Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho: The construction of dams Nos. 1, 4, 7, and 10 and open channel improvement for purposes of navigation and irrigation in accordance with the plan submitted in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress;

Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg.: The Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to acquire lands and provide facilities in the State of Oregon to replace Indian fishing grounds submerged or destroyed as a result of the construction of Bonneville Dam: *Provided*, That not to exceed $50,000 may be expended for this purpose from funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: *Provided further*, That such lands and facilities shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for the use and benefit of the Indians, and shall be subject to the same conditions, safeguards, and protections as the treaty fishing grounds submerged or destroyed;

Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to the mouth of Snake River, Oreg. and Wash.; Senate Document No. 28, Sixty-sixth Congress; and House Document No. 324, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash.: The construction of the Umatilla Dam for purposes of navigation, power development, and irrigation in accordance with the plan submitted in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress;

Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and Bonneville, Oreg.; House Document No. 218, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Columbia and Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.; House Documents Nos. 341 and 630, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Baker Bay, Columbia River, Wash.; House Document No. 443, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.; House Document No. 481, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Quillayute River, Wash.; House Document No. 218, Seventy-eighth Congress;

Port Angeles Harbor, Wash.; House Document No. 331, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Olympia Harbor, Wash.; House Document No. 699, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Tacoma Harbor, Wash.; House Document No. 124, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Stillaguamish River, Wash.; House Document No. 286, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Lake Crockett, Wash.; House Document No. 303, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Metlakatla Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 138, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Craig Harbor, Alaska: House Document No. 558, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Meyers Chuck Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 222, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Wrangell Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 284, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Wrangell Narrows, Alaska; House Document No. 260, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Skagway Harbor, Alaska; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated April 11, 1942;

Petersburg Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 670, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Port Alexander, Alaska; House Document No. 578, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Gastineau Channel, Alaska; House Document No. 325, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Elfin Cove, Alaska; House Document No. 579, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Seldovia Harbor, Alaska; House Document No. 702, Seventy-sixth Congress;

Keehi Lagoon, Oahu, T. H.; House Document No. 379, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Port Allen Harbor, T. H.; House Document No. 160, Seventy-seventh Congress;

Ponce Harbor, P. R.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated May 21, 1942; and

Fajardo Harbor, P. R.; House Document No. 280, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SPARKMAN, having assumed the chair, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PLACING POSTMASTERS ON AN ANNUAL SALARY BASIS

Mr. BURCH of Virginia, from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks made this afternoon an editorial from the New York Sun of Friday afternoon, March 17, entitled "What Will America Pay For?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRODUCTION OF DOMESTIC RABBITS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4404) to transfer Government activities in connection with domestic rabbits to the Department of Agriculture, and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to include therein an article from the Boston Sunday Globe entitled "Some Social Gains in War."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address which I delivered last Tuesday evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next and also on Thursday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and after other special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on each day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, including therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise the remarks I made in Committee this afternoon, and to include therein a letter from the chairman of the City Planning Commission of Monterey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress has been deluged with communications relative to S. 1161, the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. It seems to me that thus far there has been a maximum of heat and a minimum of light shed on this whole problem of providing better medical care for the great mass of the American people. It is cer-

tainly true that there are segments of our population, especially in the middle-income brackets, and in rural areas, that do not have adequate medical and hospital care even in peacetime. Taking steps to provide such care is an important challenge to the American people and especially to the medical profession itself. Unfortunately, many well-meaning individuals who have seen this problem have advocated cures that do not consider some of the other elements in the situation. To me it is tremendously important to preserve the professional standards and practices in the field of medicine, standards and practices which have been built up over a great many years. Moreover, any comprehensive program for medical improvement should be carried out with the active cooperation of the medical profession; it should not be something which is forcibly imposed upon them by legislative dictation. I am optimistic enough to believe that the great majority of American doctors are fully cognizant of the problem and that they are more than willing, yes, anxious to help solve it. Unfortunately, a few short-sighted ones have sometimes given a different impression. In harmony with this belief, I am further of the opinion that the leaders of the medical profession throughout the country should now be taking active steps to put forward a positive program of their own, a program that frankly acknowledges the difficulties to be met and as frankly sets forth, step by step, ways and means of meeting these problems that are in harmony with sound medical ethics.

In California we have been watching with a great deal of interest the development of a plan sponsored by the doctors themselves for the spreading of the cost of illness. We see in that plan a nucleus of a sound, fundamental method of allowing the middle-income worker to insure himself against the expenses of ill-health through an organization which the doctors themselves operate, which is organized not for profit, and which enables the common man to enjoy the best possible medical care at a fixed rate which he can prepay on a monthly basis.

I am referring to California Physicians' Service, which was established in the fall of 1939 and which has gradually been getting its feet on the ground since that time.

There are numerous such plans in many States and countries, plans which are operated by the doctors themselves through their local or State medical associations. We all know that none of these plans is perfect, that all of them have some drawbacks. They are not ideal, but they most certainly show the desire and the determination of many of the leaders of the medical profession to extend their services to the ordinary working man on a basis which he can afford. California Physicians' Service is such a plan and one which many people in California believe to be the best of the various plans already offered because it gives to its members probably the broadest coverage of any of the professional plans so far developed.

Mr. POULSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. I want to compliment my colleague from California, because we in California fully realize that the doctors there do realize the necessity for something to meet the need of proper medical care for low-income groups, and the idea which the gentleman undoubtedly is going to develop, and about which the gentleman is informing the Congress is a substitute which is a practical one for socialized medicine. The California Physicians' Service has been successful and will not destroy professional standards, nor will it destroy the one thing which is called the personal ability of the doctor, by regimenting him or discouraging any development of medical science. I think the gentleman should be complimented for bringing to the attention of the Congress a system which is definitely proving successful.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman. In many respects he has anticipated some of the points I was going to make.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to my distinguished friend from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I, too, wish to compliment my colleague from California on his presentation of this service, which no doubt is not available in many of the States of our Nation. I feel that insofar as possible the doctors of California are trying to work out this problem that faces them both as to their profession and as to the needs of the people in the low-income groups in California. Furthermore, they are working it out in such an equitable way that it will not be a detriment to the professional standards and personal relationship between the private physician and his patient.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman is correct. In other words, the plan, as it is being developed by the physicians in our State, is simply trying to accomplish two things at the same time. One, to take a great step forward in providing better medical care for the large masses of our people, and, second, to take that step in harmony with the best practices and traditions of the medical profession.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I want to join with my colleagues from California in complimenting the gentleman on his very splendid address. The medical profession in San Francisco will be very much interested to hear about this praise of their efforts, and to learn of this discussion which the gentleman is bringing forth. I have received many communications from San Francisco expressing great interest in this question, and I think the gentleman is performing a splendid service in bringing it definitely before the Congress at this time.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

If we look for a moment at what California Physicians' Service has already accomplished and at what has similarly been accomplished by similar plans in other States, we can readily see that the doctors have gone a long way in experimenting in the provision of high-grade medical care through prepayment plans. We can see a definite program for providing medical care for the great moderate-income group of our citizens and providing it on a budget basis which falls well within the means of this group. Further, we see a plan under which the type of medical care provided is the best that the medical profession has to offer to its patients, rich or poor.

No longer are the rich man and the extremely poor man the only ones who can receive the services of the best-qualified specialists. The school teacher, the policeman, the clerk, the truck driver, or any employed person in the same income group is allowed to choose his own doctor from a State-wide panel which includes the best medical practitioners in California. Once the employed person is a member of California Physicians' Service he has only to name his own doctor from more than 5,000 members and to go to that doctor for treatment when he needs it.

There have been criticisms voiced in various quarters that this plan and similar ones are caring for only a limited number of people and that the great bulk of the moderate-income workers of the country are not similarly provided for. It is true that the progress of California Physicians' Service has been relatively slow. And it is also true that only a small percentage of the employed persons in California are today covered by the California Physicians' Service program. But it is a step in the right direction—a big step.

On the other hand, let us look for a moment at the obstacles which the physicians of California had to overcome in bringing their service plan to its present stage of development. First of all, let us not lose sight of the fact that this has been a pioneer movement. There have been no statistics, no actuarial data, for the physicians to rely upon. There has been no experience of earlier programs to furnish a guide to the doctors of California. Each step has had to be taken on the best possible estimate of the consequencies. When a full coverage medical-care service was offered to employed persons who knew how many of those enrolled in the plan would visit the doctor each month and require service? Would it be 10 out of every 100, or would it be 50? No one had the answer to that question. No one had ever been offered such a service.

That and hundreds of similar questions have had to be answered by California Physicians' Service on the basis of their own experience in the last 4 years. It is no more than natural that the answers to these questions are evolving slowly. Meanwhile, the doctors who are members of the service are paying the cost of this experimentation. In my opinion, we cannot blame these doctors if they are reluctant to extend their experiments beyond reasonable financial bounds until such a time as they may be

more certain of the ultimate effects of their program.

The doctors of California do not have unlimited resources, and they must necessarily proceed carefully in order not to bankrupt themselves. An error of a few cents a month in dues charged the individual subscribers can result in the loss of millions of dollars in the aggregate. As it is, the earlier experimental stages of California Physicians' Service have already cost the doctors of California more than $1,350,000 in reduced fees for service. When the income for the service was insufficient to pay for medical bills, the doctors voluntarily took half pay so that the plan could survive and grow. They have done this as a means of developing a program which will serve the citizens of California and which may well be used for the service of the citizens of any and all States.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I yield to the gentleman, who is himself a distinguished member of the medical profession.

Mr. JUDD. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing this matter before Congress. I want to commend the doctors of his State for approaching the problem in such a practical way. There are very few physicians who are at all progressive, who will deny that there is maldistribution of medical care. We have two problems. One, the best grade of medical care; and second, the more equitable distribution to the people, not on the basis of where the money is greatest, but on the basis of where the need is greatest. The easiest way to solve the problem is to run to Washington and get a blueprint that will answer the question. I am convinced that this is like a pilot plant in a new industry. The doctors in your State are blazing the trail by sitting down and taking the losses, if necessary, and planning on the basis of trial and error, a program that will preserve the splendid things in the American system of medical practice, which has given a majority of the people better medical care than any other system in the world, and yet will permit them the growth necessary to meet modern urban civilization and modern industrial civilization. I think all the doctors in the country, as well as the common people, are watching with great interest this experiment in California, and those in other States, including my own State, are learning from it. My own State led the Nation. It tried a whole series of programs or plans. A few counties here, a few counties there tried another plan, and another few counties tried a third plan. I think this one that has been worked out in California and another one in Michigan have been more satisfactory. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in this subject, which is very close to my heart.

Mr. OUTLAND. I thank the gentleman very much. The subject is one that is very close to me personally, as well as being one of the greatest importance to the people of our own State. I thank the gentleman on behalf of our California doctors for his complimentary remarks. I know they are well deserved.

These contributions by the doctors are still mounting, month by month. In my opinion, the doctors of California are doing a noteworthy piece of work in developing a comprehensive program of medical care which is saving the American public millions of dollars in experimental costs.

With the background of information already gained by California Physicians' Service and by similar plans in other States, it is evident that we may look forward to a much more widespread development of health insurance in the near future. It is certain also that when a final plan is fully worked out it will contain the necessary physician-patient relationship, without the interference of an intermediary third party. This is true today of California Physicians' Service.

We all know how the cost of medical care has been placed on a budget basis by the hospitals. By grouping themselves together and forming nonprofit insurance companies, the hospitals have been able to offer the public a prepayment plan for meeting hospital costs. Today there are hundreds of plans in operation throughout the country, under the banner of the Blue Cross and similar national organizations. They offer hospital service in any one of thousands of member hospitals, here or anywhere in the world, at a cost to the subscriber of from 60 to 90 cents a month. Here is a budget plan which has been worked out by the medical and hospital groups themselves and which today is a going business, serving more than 12,000,000 subscribers in every State in the Union.

These hospital plans point the way to a further development of medical-care plans. The doctors of the country have been intimately associated with the growth of the hospital plans, and in many cases the doctors have joined forces with the hospitals in providing both hospital and medical care for subscribers.

In California there has been another development which is worthy of note. We have seen California Physicians' Service make contracts with the Federal Government for the care of thousands of persons who are, directly or indirectly, charges of the Government. The first development of this type was among the low-income farm families who were borrowers from the Farm Security Administration. California Physicians' Service provided a plan whereby these farm families could obtain, at a nominal monthly cost, a complete medical and hospital care service. This service has been acknowledged as having maintained the health of these farm families at such a high level that vital farm production has been continued practically without interruption by illness.

More recently California Physicians' Service has entered into contracts with Government housing authorities in half a dozen California cities. In these war-disrupted areas, this service has established medical centers where early and complete diagnosis of illness has been possible and where the resident families have been able to obtain medical care which otherwise would have been denied them because of the boom-town nature of the communities. More than 50,000 of our essential war workers are today being provided with the best medical care under this program. The war workers are happy about it; the doctors are cooperating in it; the Nation's war effort is being well served by it.

It will be noticed that I have not mentioned the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill. I have purposely refrained from going into that piece of legislation at this time. I have no doubt that after hearings have been held there will be ample opportunity for discussion in both Houses. In the meantime, I have tried to bring out some of the advantages of what to me is one of the longest steps forward in the direction of achieving what we all desire—better medical care for the American people.

It so happens that I was a member of the California Physicians' Service for a considerable period of time. I have had intimate knowledge of its operations and have seen what it has accomplished for many of its beneficiary members. On the basis of my knowledge of this organization and with confidence in the integrity and leadership of the medical profession of this country, I believe that the doctors of this land should lead the way in providing prepaid medical care for our citizens.

MRS. MARIA VIRTUDES TORRES STEERE

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to restore to the Private Calendar, H. R. 1715, a bill in behalf of Mrs. Maria Virtudes Torres Steere. I have spoken to the objectors and they have no objection to this request.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article on Jewish war veterans.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, indefinitely, on account of death in the family.

To Mr. LARCADE, for this week, on account of official business.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did, on March 17, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 929. An act for the relief of Irving L. Jones;

H. R. 1062. An act for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart;

H. R. 1201. An act to permit prosecutions after the lapse of a temporary statute for offenses committed prior to its expiration;

H. R. 1273. An act for the relief of the heirs of Simon M. Myhre;

H. R. 1469. An act for the relief of Robert Beckwith, Julius Buettner, and Emma M. Buettner;

H. R. 1488. An act to provide a right-of-way for an oil pipe line over the Ogden Ordnance Depot Military Reservation;

H. R. 1518. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Pike and Mrs. Estelle Rosenfeld;

H. R. 1847. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Richard Zielinski, a minor;

H. R. 2091. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased;

H. R. 2183. An act for the relief of Mathilde B. Meister;

H. R. 2189. An act for the relief of Kenneth E. Shepard;

H. R. 2385. An act for the relief of Nadine Gorman;

H. R. 2419. An act to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2440. An act for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy;

H. R. 2459. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Carl Oplinger, City Hospital, of Akron, Ohio, and to Dr. Walter A. Hoyt;

H. R. 2772. An act for the relief of Edwin Foley;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Adelard Demers;

H. R. 2880. An act for the relief of H. G. Tooley;

H. R. 2956. An act for the protection of the water supply of the city of Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 2993. An act for the relief of John W. Booth III;

H. R. 2999. An act for the relief of Leo Gullo;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of Henry Grossi;

H. R. 3173. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Lorraine Novak, a minor;

H. R. 3195. An act for the relief of Willard Kerr, Jr.;

H. R. 3371. An act for the relief of the dependents of Dr. Arthur B. Wyse, and others;

H. R. 3387. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Jason McVay Austin;

H. R. 3547. An act for the relief of Carl F. Wilson;

H. R. 3618. An act to authorize the War Food Administrator to sell and convey to Mrs. Andrew J. Frey, and her heirs, a certain tract of land, situated in the county of San Joaquin, State of California, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3701. An act for the relief of Clinton A. Clauson; and

H. R. 3763. An act to relieve former postal employees who performed postal duties after induction into the military service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 21, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Tuesday, March 21, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on House Joint Resolution 148 (joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health) on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Shipyard Profits will meet in open hearing on Wednesday, March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold an executive meeting on Thursday, March 23, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2994.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1306. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the future status of certain functions and personnel transferred to the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1307. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to the Smaller War Plants Corporation for the fiscal year 1945, limiting the amount that may be expended from their corporate funds for administrative expenses to $10,448,536 (H. Doc. No. 503); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1308. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, of the exchange stabilization fund created by section 10 (b) of the act, including a summary of operations of the fund from its establishment to June 30, 1943; pursuant to section 10 (a) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, approved January 30, 1934, as amended by the act of April 29, 1943; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

1309. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for lump-sum payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave and current accrued annual leave to certain officers and employees, and authorizing the appropriation of funds for that purpose; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1310. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1311. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend that portion of the act approved June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 697, 750), authorizing the settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1312. A letter from the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of letters to the Bureau of the Budget requesting changes in personnel ceilings for the quarter ending March 31, 1944, for the following bureaus and offices of this Department: Government in the Territories, United States Board on Geographical Names, and Solid Fuels Administration for War; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1313. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 131 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1314. A letter from the Administrator, National Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the report Quarterly Estimate of Personnel Requirements; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1315. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 13, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Kentucky River and its tributaries, Kentucky, for flood-control and other purposes, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 504); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1316. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 13, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pajaro River, Calif., authorized by the Flood Control Acts approved on June 22, 1936, and August 28, 1937 (H. Doc. No. 505); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1317. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 14, 1943, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Kanawha River Basin, with a view to flood control on Chestnut Creek, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on November 19, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 506); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1318. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 24, 1944, submitting an interim report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Turtle Creek, Pa., made under the provisions of the River and Harbor Act approved on January 21, 1927, which authorizes a survey of the Monongahela River and tributaries (H. Doc. No. 507); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON of Florida: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 866. An act to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 221. Resolution favoring action looking to relief for starving peoples of Europe; without amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3022. A bill to provide authority to the Secretary of War to use funds now or hereafter appropriated for adjustment of contracts, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 4433. A bill for the relief of sundry aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1715. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Virtudes Torres Steere; with amendment (Rept. No. 1270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 4426. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4427. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey to be made of the Pajaro River and its tributaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 4428. A bill to restore standard time during the months of January, February, November, and December; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 4429. A bill authorizing the mixed bands of Bannocks and Shoshones of the Shoshone Nation of Indians to sue in the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 4430. A bill to provide for the acquisition and maintenance of a home for Capitol pages; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 4431. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions and increases of pensions to certain soldiers, sailors, and nurses of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition, and for other purposes," approved May 24, 1938; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 4432. A bill to amend section 14 (a) of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 233, first session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. STARNES of Alabama:

H. R. 4434. A bill to provide for the payment of accumulative or accrued leave to certain members of the military and naval forces of the United States who enter or reenter civilian employment of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, before the expiration of such leave; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. J. Res. 255. Joint resolution to amend section 1 of Public Resolution 126, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 2, 1931; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mrs. LUCE:

H. Res. 476. Resolution to investigate the status of the Negro and other minority groups in the armed services and in affiliated auxiliary military organizations for women; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 477. Resolution providing for the expense of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 476; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 478. Resolution declaring policy for National War Labor Board; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULLER:

H. R. 4435. A bill for the relief of J. E. Harroun & Son, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 4436. A bill for the relief of William Milton Hecht; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LAMBERTSON:

H. R. 4437. A bill for the relief of Edward Lawrence Kunze; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 4438. A bill granting a pension to Pablo Billi; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4439. A bill for the relief of Dennis C. O'Connell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 4440. A bill for the relief of Edith Bock; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 4441. A bill for the relief of estate of Mary Alice Borden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 4442. A bill for the relief of Albert B. Weaver; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5269. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of 28 residents of the Eighth New Jersey Congressional District, endorsing House Resolutions 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5270. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of about 150 residents of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District, New York, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5271. By Mr. FULMER: Concurrent resolution submitted by Inez Watson, clerk, house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., protesting against the recent change made by the Selective Service Authority in changing the number of units that a farmer must produce in order to defer a farm worker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5272. Also, concurrent resolution submitted by James H. Fowles, clerk, the senate, Columbia, S. C., requesting the South Carolina Members of Congress to support an amendment to the Social Security Act permitting the inclusion of public employees in the old-age and survivors insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5273. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 40 residents of Lebanon, Maine, favoring the enactment of House bill 2082 in order that there may be greater efficiency and less absenteeism in defense plants, and that men in training camps may be better protected from the effects of alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5274. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of 51 members of the sixth district of the Washington State Nurses' Association, of Yakima, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 3761, a bill to establish a nurse corps in the Medical Department of the Army and authorizing the appointment of officers as nurses in the Army of the United States under the act of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728), and assignment to the Army Nurse Corps, and so forth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5275. By Mr. KEARNEY: Petitions containing the signatures of 55 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District of the State of New York, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5276. Also, petition containing the signatures of 282 citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District, State of New York, protesting against the enactment by Congress of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5277. By Mr. MERROW: Resolution from the directors of the Portsmouth (N. H.) Chamber of Commerce, opposing bills pending in Congress which would tend to harm the existing over-all equality of freight rates in the Nation, or remove sovereignty over freight rates from the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5278. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of some 48 citizens of East Craftsbury, Vt., and vicinity, and some 66 residents of Rutland, Vt., favoring the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to prohibit the whole beverage liquor traffic in this country for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5279. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the United Automobile Workers of America, No. 271, of San Francisco, endorsing the Scanlon Resolution 198; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5280. Also, petition of the San Francisco Post Office Clerks' Union, Local No. 2, requesting that one of the new Liberty ships be named in honor of Thomas F. Flaherty; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5281. Also, petition of the Jewish Mothers Alliance of San Francisco, urging abrogation of Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5282. Also, resolution of the Pacific Coast Garment Manufacturers, regarding the price-control resolution as a definite check to inflation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5283. By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania: Petition of Arthur Parker and 810 other residents of Delaware County, Pa., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5284. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the United Steelworkers of America, Local 1299, Congress of Industrial Organizations, River Rouge, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the soldier vote bill; to the Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5285. Also, petition of the office of the city clerk, Cambridge, Mass., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to readjustment of war damage insurance premium rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5286. Also, petition of Bryson, petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to permitting the inclusion of public employees in the old-age and survivors insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5287. Also, petition from Charlotte Amalie, Virgin Islands, petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to House Resolution 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg, D. D., minister, First Baptist Church, Syracuse, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we thank Thee that Thou hast given to us the privilege of living today another 24 hours in Thy beautiful world, a world so beautiful that sometimes we feel that we can reach out our hands and touch Thy face, but a world so sinful that it stoned the prophets and crucified our blessed Lord. Because one day in Thy sight can be as a thousand years, we pray Thee that before the sun goes down this day Thou wilt advance us centuries of time toward the goals and objectives of the kingdom of God, and hasten the day when the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ.

While we pray for all mankind, we pray most of all for that dear part of the earth that we call our native land. Whether it be the President in the White House or the wounded soldier on the battlefield thinking of the little house beneath the elms where he was born, gather all Thy children, we pray Thee, into the fold of Thine embrace. Establish our churches, we beseech Thee, in Christian faith and freedom, our schools in truth and learning, our industries in righteousness of relationship between capital and labor, our homes in tranquillity and affection, our statesmanship in wisdom and integrity.

Bless these Thy servants of the United States Senate, O God. May their judgments be true and righteous altogether; and speed the day when the oceans that wash the shores of our land shall make a sweeter music than before—the music of ships turning again home; of nations whose warfare is accomplished, and of Thine own voice within our souls saying, "Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God."

We ask it through Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 20, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MCKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bone	Capper
Andrews	Brewster	Clark, Idaho
Austin	Brooks	Clark, Mo.
Bailey	Buck	Connally
Ball	Burton	Danaher
Bankhead	Bushfield	Davis
Barkley	Byrd	Downey
Eastland	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McFarland	Truman
Ferguson	McKellar	Tunnell
George	Maybank	Tydings
Gerry	Millikin	Vandenberg
Gillette	Murray	Walsh, Mass.
Green	O'Mahoney	Walsh, N. J.
Guffey	Overton	Weeks
Hawkes	Radcliffe	Wheeler
Hayden	Revercomb	Wherry
Hill	Robertson	White
Holman	Russell	Wiley
Kilgore	Shipstead	Willis
La Follette	Stewart	Wilson
Langer	Taft	
McCarran	Thomas, Idaho	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is leaving for New Mexico tonight and is transacting business in Government departments.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES ON CONSERVATION OF WILDLIFE RESOURCES AND POST-WAR ECONOMIC POLICY AND PLANNING

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as members of the Special Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, to fill the existing vacancies thereon; and also appoints the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] as a member of the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, to fill the vacancy created by the death of Hon. Charles L. McNary, late a Senator from the State of Oregon.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND—EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING INCOME-TAX RETURNS

Mr. GREEN presented a joint resolution of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 826

Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the Collector of Internal Revenue for the State of Rhode Island, to move to institute an extension of time until the 1st of April 1944, for the filing of income-tax forms

Whereas there are now available a limited number of tax experts and advisers and the number of persons from Rhode Island required to file income-tax returns has greatly increased this present year; and

Whereas an extension of the date for the filing of income-tax forms would be beneficial to the filer and to the Federal employees who are now greatly overtaxed with the monument of business: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the final filing date for the year 1944 of income-tax forms be advanced to the 1st of April 1944, and the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and the collector of internal revenue for the State of Rhode Island are hereby urgently requested to give this matter immediate attention to expedite this requested action; and be it, further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of State to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States, to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and to the Collector of Internal Revenue for the State of Rhode Island.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a petition from members of the churches of Mitchell County, Kans. I ask that the petition calling for the passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States, be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

Whereas there are millions of people in the world hungry for bread; and

Whereas there are millions of lives being cursed by alcoholic beverages; and

Whereas the conservation of all energy, the best intelligence, clear reasoning, and righteousness are needed in this time of crisis: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend to the Congress and the President of the United States of America, that legislation be enacted immediately diverting all grains and fruits now used for the manufacture of all distilled, fermented, and malt beverages to the manufacture of bread and the preserving of fruit juices for food, and convert all plants now used for the manufacture of liquors and malt beverages to the manufacture of materials for the good of man and not for the curse of man, with adequate provisions for the

compensation of the owners of such plants and the enforcement of such legislation; further be it

Resolved, That an immediate passage of the Senate bill No. 860 be enacted.

The undersigned members of the churches of Walnut Township, Mitchell County, Kans., heartily endorse the above resolution: Rev. Ludlow Corbin, Northbranch, Kans.; Mrs. Ruth Corbin, Northbranch, Kans.; Roy W. Clark, Northbranch, Kans., and sundry other citizens of Mitchell County, Kans.

DEFERMENTS IN ESSENTIAL INDUSTRY—PETITION RELATING TO FARM LABOR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, much has been said in the last few days relative to deferments in essential industry. In the press of yesterday there was a statement from the Director of Rubber Production. It will be impossible to take from his department men who are needed there and at the same time enable the department to maintain rubber production.

We have also heard the statement of other directors of war production that in the drive being made to take men between 18 and 26 years of age, if we wish to have full production we must proceed with care.

I should like to call attention to the fact that in my State there is a large farming industry. Eighty percent of our industry in Nebraska is farming. Farmers are very apprehensive of whether or not they will have the necessary labor to harvest the crops which are now being planted. All of us believe there should be taken every available man who can be spared, of course, for the military service, as has been requested by the Commander in Chief and by General Hershey. However, at the same time, we wish to call the attention of the Members of the Senate, and of the public generally, to the fact that to take irreplaceable men out of the farming industry will be to rob an essential industry of its ability to produce food. Food is just as necessary in the war effort as are munitions or machines which are used at the front line.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a petition which came to me from a number of farmers of Richardson County, Nebr., and which sets out in detail the allegations which confirm the statements I have just made. I think the petition will be of information to the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We the undersigned farmers actively engaged in the occupation of agriculture in Richardson County, Nebr., do hereby urgently petition our United States Senators to make an intercession for us to protest and seek the repeal of the recent order which will take from the farms all men between the ages of 18 and 26 years of age, for the following reasons:

1. A most pronounced shortage of farm workers already exists upon the farms in the agricultural areas of the Middle West.

2. Agriculture has already been asked to produce more crops and livestock in the year of 1944 to feed the United States and her allies, and we as farmers certainly cannot be expected to produce more with less help.

3. That the farms have already been virtually stripped of any men that could be sacrificed.

4. That it is virtually impossible to secure farm machinery at the present time to replace that which is constantly wearing out, and therefore every worker on the farm is urgently needed to assist in the present crop season.

5. That the continued drafting of farm labor in the past resulted in such a catastrophe that the Government itself took the initiative and deferred farm workers, and if any other farm workers are taken from farms that have yielded up all the men that they could sacrifice in the past a definite and pronounced crisis will result upon the farms in the Middle West.

6. That with the present crop season approaching, this certainly is the most illogical time to attempt to drain the farms of those workers that are attempting to care for the coming crop.

7. That food is realized as being as important to the war effort as bullets themselves and unless a bumper crop of livestock and crops are produced in the year of 1944 a serious food shortage will inevitably result, which will prolong the war, rather than shorten it.

Loyd Sailors, John H. Buchholz, Cleon Sailors, Roy C. Davis, Lee Roy Slagle, Delbert Howard, Jim Bowers, John Sailors, Ervin Powell, Elmer Shafer, John I. Koso, Earl E. Clark, Perry Palmer, John Knobbe, Arthur Kirkendall, Melvin H. Martin, Lloyd Birdsley, L. F. Palmer.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 1708. A bill to amend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, relating to travel allowances; without amendment (Rept. No. 756);

S. 1714. A bill to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 757);

S. 1720. A bill to vest title to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (ex-*Michigan*) in the Foundation for the Original United States Ship Michigan, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 758);

S. 1741. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and civilian personnel for personal property lost as the result of a fire in hangar V-3 at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on November 12, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 759);

S. 1771. A bill authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ordnance manufacturing and production facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 760);

S. 1772. A bill to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil; without amendment (Rept. No. 761);

H. R. 2337. A bill for the relief of John Joseph Defeo; without amendment (Rept. No. 762); and

H. R. 3247 A bill for the relief of Joseph Langhorne Walker; without amendment (Rept. No. 763).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1757. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia"; with amendments (Rept. No. 764).

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on the Library:

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution to provide for appropriate commemoration of the Centennial of the Telegraph on May 24, 1944; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. TRUMAN (for Mrs. CARAWAY), from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on March 20, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1285) to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1799. A bill to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil service status under such act; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

S. 1800. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of Moore Air Field; and

S. 1801. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, for railroad yard enlargement purposes, a parcel of land of the Camp Allen Reservation at Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SOCIAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on social security delivered by him before the United Automobile Workers, at Detroit, Mich., March 10, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATION'S NEED: EXECUTIVE COOPERATIVE LEADERSHIP—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Nation's Need: Executive Cooperative Leadership, delivered by him before a Republican group in Waukesha, Wis., on March 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE PHILBIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Representative PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, at Lawrence.

Mass., on March 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FUTURE PETROLEUM POSITION—ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of our future petroleum position, delivered by Secretary of the Interior Ickes, on the Town Hall of the Air program, New York City, March 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

VICTORY RECIPE-MENU CONTEST

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the rules of a victory recipe-menu contest conducted by the union label trades department of the American Federation of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANNUAL SALARY BASIS FOR FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (2), and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"Less than $50	$72
$50 but less than $100	144
$100 but less than $150	216
$150 but less than $200	288
$200 but less than $250	360
$250 but less than $300	432
$300 but less than $350	492
$350 but less than $400	532
$400 but less than $450	572
$450 but less than $500	596
$500 but less than $600	672
$600 but less than $700	748
$700 but less than $800	824
$800 but less than $900	892
$900 but less than $1,000	960
$1,000 but less than $1,100	1,028
$1,100 but less than $1,500	1,100"

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
WILLIAM LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHEL,
D. J. WARD,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator from Tennessee give us the benefit of a brief explanation?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the bill agreed upon puts fourth-class postmasters on a salary basis. There were very slight differences between the House and the Senate, and those differences were settled by compromise and adjustment. The salary provided is a little more than that the postmasters now receive, but not a great deal more. The bill is recommended by the Department, and I believe it is a proper step.

Mr. WHITE. The Senate conferees were in agreement about it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; all the conferees were in agreement, but they reached the agreement through compromise and adjustment all the way down the line.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MEETING OF FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK AT PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, last Friday night the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Pennsylvania held their annual dinner in Philadelphia. The Pennsylvania society is the second oldest society of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick in America, the oldest being in Savannah, Ga. Usually after such a meeting we hear what a great day it was for the Irish, but on this occasion we should say what a great night it was for the Welsh, because the two principal speakers were my Welsh colleague, who was born in Wales, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS], and a justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, George W. Maxey. I shall read from newspaper articles certain statements about that dinner which are very interesting, entertaining, and instructive. On this occasion a new candidate for President of the United States appeared in the field.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania addressed the meeting first, and the Republican newspaper, the Philadelphia Inquirer, carried this much concerning his speech:

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS responded to the toast "The United States."

Declaring he favored an "international league to establish peace" after this war, Pennsylvania's senior Senator said the United States shunned the World War No. 1 League of Nations because of possible British control of the League.

Then the distinguished jurist from Pennsylvania took the floor and spoke at great length. I read from the Inquirer article:

Justice Maxey, reviewing the history of the Republican Party, especially from the standpoint of its selection of candidates for the Presidency, gave two reasons for its failure to nominate a Pennsylvanian in the 90 years of its history.

For one thing, he said, the party leadership in this State has too often failed or neglected to place men of outstanding ability in such offices as Governor and United States Senator.

Secondly, he added, the people of the country, rightly or wrongly, have come to regard the Republican organization in the State as made up of proprietors rather than leaders.

PENNSYLVANIA PASSED UP

"The American people," said Justice Maxey, "have never elected and never will elect to the office of President of the United States any man they think is controlled by any organization or by any person."

Then he went on to recite how many Presidents had come from Ohio and from New York and from Virginia. The article in the Inquirer continues:

"Why has Old Man Destiny gone all around us to select our Presidents? People who oversimplify say that the reason is that before 1936 Pennsylvania was always safely Republican and that nominees must come from doubtful States. The answer to that is (1) that the nomination of Presidential candidates from doubtful States serves little or no purpose, for such candidates lose their own States about as often as they carry them."

* * * * *

"That a Presidential candidate from a certain State is almost sure to carry that State is a political myth."

* * * * *

"My view is that the Republican party in its 90 years of history has never nominated a Pennsylvanian for President for two reasons: (1) The party leadership in this State has too often refused to place in the conspicuous positions of Governor or United States Senator, Pennsylvania's ablest public men.

VIEWED AS PROPRIETORS

"The second reason for Pennsylvania's neglect by the Republican National Convention is that our State Republican organization has always been regarded by the American people more as party proprietors than as party leaders, and it has been assumed by the American people, whether rightly or wrongly it is now not material to decide, that a Governor or a United States Senator from Pennsylvania is in large measure controlled by these proprietors."

* * * * *

"The American people have never accepted and will never accept a 'stooge' for President."

That is where, as I am advised, my friend and colleague walked out of the meeting, but he has told me, and I am sure he told me correctly, that he heard the call of the wild and went to the Moose Temple.

The article in the Inquirer continues:

"POLITICAL PARTIES ARE NECESSARY"

* * * * *

"A great leader, whether he deals with statesmanship or with 'practical' politics, distinguishes between the people's passing emotions and their settled convictions.

"I would like to say something in behalf of all the States. The foundation of the American system of government is the right of every State to regulate its own affairs. These rights of the several States are rapidly being destroyed by the Federal Government."

Mr. President, Justice Maxey wrote an opinion a few years ago, and I made a statement concerning it at the time, which was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if any of Leon Henderson's friends wish to refer to it they will find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 9, 1941. I will quote a few paragraphs from that statement:

The choice lay between law and politics. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, faithful to a tradition extending back more than half a century, chose politics. It reversed the election board and the common pleas court. It reversed its own decision in *Winston* v. *Moore*. It overruled, ignored, or dismissed historic precedents which have been honored by the courts since the founding of the Republic. And it produced, as an apology, one of the most amazing opinions ever handed down by a court of last resort.

The court admitted that the city charter, "construed literally," required an election

this year. But it pointed out solemnly that the German authority Puffendorf, who died in 1694, had found something different in the laws of medieval Bologna. Likewise, said the court, there was a ruling cited by Plowden from the statute of Edward II, who, as history records, was murdered in 1327. And, as a final touch, there was the famous decision of Walla Walla against Walla Walla Water Co.

The net result of the Bolognian law, Puffendorf's interpretations, Plowden's citations, the statute of the unfortunate Edward, and the litigation in Walla Walla, all taken together, appears to have convinced the court that it would be absurd to construe the city charter literally.

On that basis the case was reversed, and the election given to the present mayor of the city without a contest.

I should now like to read from an editorial published in yesterday's Philadelphia Record. It is headed "Puffendorf for President?"

I forgot to say, Mr. President, that Mr. Justice Maxey is willing to run for President, and the newspaper containing an article to that effect was placed on the streets of Philadelphia 3 hours before Justice Maxey delivered his speech. The statement was contained in a special edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer, published by Mr. Walter Annenberg. It is the great Republican organ in Philadelphia. The editorial is as follows:

PUFFENDORF FOR PRESIDENT? MAXEY CAN DREAM CAN'T HE?

The title of this editorial ought to be: "How To Skiffle Up a Candidate for President in 24 Hours."

At midnight Thursday night, March 16, 1944, not more than six people knew that Mr. Justice George W. Maxey was even thinking about becoming President of the United States. By midnight Friday, March 17, Mr. Justice Maxey had keynoted his own candidacy before several hundred members of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick and had actually been placed in nomination for President.

Now those things, boys and girls, just do not miraculously happen—even on St. Patrick's Day. They are arranged—and how.

Here is how Mr. Justice Maxey became a candidate for the Republican nomination for President of the United States:

At 7 o'clock on the evening of March 17, the "bulldog" edition of the Philadelphia Inquirer for March 18 was on the street. In it appeared the speech of Mr. Justice Maxey which was not made at the Friendly Sons banquet until more than 3 hours later.

In the Inquirer's page 1 article about the speech was the sentence: "Not a few diners interpreted the speech as an indication of the jurist's willingness to become a candidate for the G. O. P. Presidential nomination."

That sentence appeared in an edition printed an hour and a half before any of the diners sat down to eat, about 4 hours before Mr. Justice Maxey r'ared back and threw his high hard one in the direction of the Chicago convention.

The edition was distributed to some of the diners at the Friendly Sons banquet before they had even been served the fruit cup and long before they heard the Maxeyan keynote.

So when the big moment came, the diners at least knew how they were supposed to "interpret" the words of wisdom that poured forth from Pennsylvania's eminent jurist.

And just when the jurist sat down, with his words properly interpreted, Judge Clare Gerald Fenerty (the toastmaster) officially unveiled the candidacy of the eminent Maxey by looking the good chief justice squarely in the eye and thundering:

"We nominate you." [Cheers, applause, stomping.]

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the remainder of the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thus was a candidacy born without benefit of obstetrics.

Only one error was made in the delivery. Apparently somebody forgot to tell Senator "Puddler" JIM DAVIS—another speaker at the Friendly Sons—of the Maxey candidacy. And quite obviously "Puddler" JIM hadn't read the "bulldog" edition of the Inquirer and therefore didn't know how to interpret the Justice's remarks.

When he heard Mr. Justice Maxey casting aspersions upon the low grade of Senators, Governors, and such spawned by the Republican "proprietors" of Pennsylvania, the Senator walked right out of the banquet hall.

He explained the next day that he had a date to meet a few of his brother Moose, that it was a free country, that Mr. Maxey had a right to say anything he wanted to say, that he wasn't paying attention to Maxey anyhow.

Neither Fenerty nor the "Puddler" troubled to remind the crowd that Maxey wrote the famous Puffendorf decision of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court—which went back to sixteenth-century law for a way to make Barney Samuel acting mayor of Philadelphia in 1941 without an election.

The crowd realized, of course, it was only a coincidence that the "Puddler" left at the very moment Justice Maxey was getting warmed up on the theme of grade D Senators. They understood JIM had a date with a Moose and excused what otherwise might have been interpreted as a bang at the Maxey boom.

So-o-o-o-o, the Philadelphia Inquirer has a candidate for President. "Puddler" JIM has explanations to make. Perhaps Wendell Willkie, Tom Dewey, Governor Bricker, Joe Pew, and John Hamilton have a slight headache.

But we doubt it.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have just listened to the remarks of my distinguished colleague and I do not need to tell the Senate that I am not at all surprised at his conduct here today. Neither do I need to tell the Senate that I am not at all surprised at the nature of the editorial which he has just inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is the type of editorial that one would expect from a publication which is so closely bound up with the present administration. These are the types of comment one would likewise expect from a Senator who is a total devotee of the present administration.

It is regrettable, Mr. President, that one with the distinguished record of public service which Justice Maxey possesses should be subjected to such unfortunate publicity. His record as an attorney, as district attorney of his own county, as a judge in the lower courts of Pennsylvania, and as chief justice of the Supreme Court of the Keystone State, is well known. And for that record he need apologize to no man.

As for me, Mr. President, it is true that I had another engagement in Philadelphia that night, but that engagement was not the type of engagement alluded to in the editorial my colleague has just read. That night I was substituting at the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick dinner for the senior Senator from North Dakota; and at 11 p. m. on the same evening I had an engagement with the Westinghouse Employees' Association, comprised of more than 2,500 sincere and patriotic workmen.

The record of war production achieved by the employees of that great industrial enterprise founded by George Westinghouse, who from humble beginnings developed the air brake, and later extended his work throughout the entire field of electricity, stands as an outstanding example of the great work which American management and labor are performing on the production front.

These workers are performing their daily tasks with complete competence and continuing determination that the system of free enterprise which sustained the organization in which they are now employed might be continued in the postwar years, notwithstanding the dangerous trends of repression and regimentation which have marked the present administration since its very inception. Here, Mr. President, let me say that during my own lifetime, because of the American way of free enterprise, I have seen Westinghouse grow from an organization of a single manager and a few employees to one which now employs tens of thousands of American workers and managers.

I was proud to have the honor of meeting and speaking with these American soldiers of war production, and for that honor and privilege I apologize to no man.

Going back to the Republican Party, Mr. President, I should like to point out that it is the essence of American democracy that every member of every party should remain free to make his own analysis and to support the candidates whom he feels are worthy of his support. I can only say that the Republican Party—yes, and the Democratic Party, too—could do far worse than to nominate a man of Justice Maxey's character, integrity, and ability.

The Republican Party, Mr. President, as is true of every sound and progressive organization, is now considering more than a dozen outstanding American men for the Presidential nomination this fall; for the Republican Party recognized that all men of ability should be carefully and fully considered for the outstanding positions of public service throughout the Nation.

It is a sad commentary on American democracy and American constitutional government today, Mr. President, that the party in power, far from encouraging the development of the men of ability within its ranks, repeatedly strikes them down because that party is committed to the policy that one man, and one man only, can carry the standard of its organization, regardless of the long-range damage that such a policy may do—and in some measure has done—to the fundamental concepts of American constitutional government.

I know, Mr. President, from the comments which have been made on this floor and from the articles which I have read in various publications, that today there are many Democrats who yearn to cast their ballots for certain outstanding members of their own party, but who

have repeatedly suffered their desires to be thwarted because of the powerful and ruthless political organization which has been built up in the Democratic Party to sustain one-man government.

I could speak at great length, Mr. President, regarding the "keepers" of the Democratic New Deal Party, but I shall defer that to another day. I only wish to assure my colleague at this time that I have never been found near the swill barrel of politics, as others whom I could mention have been. I further wish to assure my colleague that the Republican Party will choose its candidate without either his advice or his consent, and that the Republican Party will place its candidate before the American people in order that they may choose freely between the alternatives of constitutional government and the unsavory sort of government which they have received at the hands of the present administration for the past 12 years.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I am sorry my colleague becomes so excited over my reading a speech delivered by a distinguished Republican jurist from Pennsylvania and published in a Republican newspaper. I added nothing myself, but merely read direct quotations.

I wish to say now to my colleague that, instead of becoming so excited over what the Republicans say about him, he should wait until his young Democratic opponent takes the stump this fall. Then he will have cause for excitement.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, let me say that if he does it will be under the leadership of the Democratic Party in Pennsylvania, headed by the gentleman himself [Mr. GUFFEY], and the present State chairman; and if he does do so under that leadership, I will then tell what they said about each other. I welcome the contest.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, that is a public record, and the Senator has a right to use it and has a perfect right to refer to it.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I regret very much to interrupt a discussion on a matter of such national interest. I call up the conference report on the so-called U. N. R. R. A. bill and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations relief and rehabilitation organization, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 7, and 8; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: At the beginning of said amendment insert "Sec. 5."; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the section number "5" and insert in lieu thereof "6"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 7. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

"That it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution numbered 12 adopted at the first session of the council, referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution and reading 'The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief', contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 8. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

"That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake or incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made under this authorization and by other countries and receipts from other sources."

And the Senate agree to the same.

TOM CONNALLY,
WALTER F. GEORGE,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
SOL BLOOM,
LUTHER A. JOHNSON,
CHARLES A. EATON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in the conference the Senate conferees had their way about every amendment with the exception of the so-called Willis amendment. We modified very slightly one of the Senate amendments, but did not change its effect or its meaning. One of the proponents of those amendments was the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. Let me say that the Senator from Tennessee has expressed to me privately—he is here if he wishes to deny it publicly—his agreement with what the Senate conferees have done in that respect.

Mr. MCKELLAR rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I did not ask the Senator to yield to me, but I shall be delighted to have him do so.

Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I told him in private that, although I would have preferred that the one amendment, I believe, which was changed somewhat might not have been changed, nevertheless I favored it. I say so publicly in the same way. I try never to say anything in private that I will not stand by in public.

If the Senator from Texas desires to have my opinion, I will say I am inclined to think that the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] was a very excellent one, and I was very sorry that it was omitted in the conference. But, so far as my own amendments are concerned, I understood the Senator to say that the conferees did not change their meaning. That is what I was principally concerned with. I have no objection so far as my own amendments are concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I was sure he would confirm what I said.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the distinguished Senator from Texas inform us what the objection was on the part of the House conferees to my amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator available a copy of his amendment?

Mr. WILLIS. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Indiana that his amendment was strenuously objected to by the House conferees. They advised the conference that the question had been voted upon in the House Foreign Affairs Committee a number of times, and that each time the proposal had been overwhelmingly defeated. The House conferees were absolutely adamant in their objection to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, principally on the theory that there was nothing in the joint resolution which would authorize the acts which the Senator's amendment denounced, and that the U. N. R. R. A. would have no authority, without the amendment, to do any of the things which the amendment would prohibit. The Senate conferees concurred in that construction. The U. N. R. R. A. would have no authority to do any of the things which the Senator's amendment would prohibit.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator state how many meetings of the conference committee were held on this subject?

Mr. CONNALLY. I recall two. I do not remember whether we had more than two.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the Senator state how much time was given to the discussion of this amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not have a stop-watch.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not ask for the exact time. Was it 15 minutes or an hour?

Mr. CONNALLY. I should say it was even longer than an hour. Both Senators and Representatives were present, and, of course, 15 minutes would have been an unreasonable limitation. We discussed it for more than 15 minutes.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator believe that there was full and free discussion of the amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I believe it was thoroughly understood.

Mr. WILLIS. Was it fully and freely discussed?

Mr. CONNALLY. It was fully and freely discussed. There was no time limit, and every member of the conference committee could talk as long as he desired. Other members of the conference committee are present. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] was a member of the conference committee, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] was also a member.

Mr. WILLIS. I should like to ask the Senator on what he bases his statement that this question was considered in the House? The amendment originated with me.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was considered by the House committee.

Mr. WILLIS. But it was never passed on by the House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not that I know of. However, I was assured that it was considered by the House committee several times, and that on each occasion the committee voted it down.

Mr. WILLIS. Did the Senate conferees suggest that the amendment be taken back to the House for action by the Whole House?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that we suggested it, but that question was discussed, and it was indicated that the House conferees did not care to do so. It had already been acted upon in committee, and the House conferees were determined in their opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in my opinion this is an example of democracy in reverse. This amendment was offered in the Senate in good faith, and supported by a vote of 45 to 18. Then it went to conference. It was never considered on the floor of the House. The Senator says it was considered in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. I am not advised as to that, but I accept his word. I do not know how it was brought before the House committee in the form in which it was passed by the Senate. The amendment was supported in the Senate by all three of the Senate conferees when the vote was taken.

That brings us to the situation in which an amendment agreed to by a vote of nearly 3 to 1 in the Senate, and supported by the three Senate conferees, is blocked by a vote of three Members of the House. That certainly is a perversion of democratic processes. Under those circumstances it seems to me that it would have been only just for the Senate conferees to have insisted that the amendment be taken before the House for acceptance or rejection by the House. Does the Senator have any objection to that philosophy? Would he be willing to take the joint resolution back to conference, and ask the House to vote on the amendment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the Senator from Texas has no objection to that philosophy; but I certainly would object to rejecting the conference report and going back to conference and asking the House to have a separate vote on something on which it has already expressed itself rather determinedly. In my view, the matter is of little importance, because there is nothing in the joint resolution which would authorize such activities.

Mr. WILLIS. I will come to that in a moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as democracy in reverse is concerned, the Senator must be advised that in order to become a law a measure must be passed by both Houses.

Mr. WILLIS. That is correct; but this amendment has never been before the House for consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. The joint resolution was passed by the House without the amendment.

Mr. WILLIS. I take it that three Members of the House blocked the acceptance of this amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know about that. When the House acts and sends us an official report, I do not try to go behind it and examine all the internal arrangements by which the House arrived at its conclusion. That is not our province. When the House sends a bill or joint resolution to the Senate with the certificate of the Clerk, that is the action of the House, and it is not the province of the Senate to analyze the action of the House and tell the House wherein it erred. That would be a violation of the proper comity which should exist between the two bodies.

Mr. President, I have great sympathy with the Senator from Indiana. He acted in perfect good faith; but many of us act in good faith, and yet do not succeed in achieving our desires and ambitions. That is about all I can say to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I repeat it is a strange perversion of democracy when three members of a conference committee can block an amendment which was adopted by the Senate by a vote of 45 to 18, and which has never been considered on the floor of the House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that the House conferees were only three in number, but they represented the entire House. They were the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives, whether their number was one or a dozen. So it is not quite fair to pick out three conferees and say that they are the culprits.

Mr. WILLIS. I think it is fair to say to the Senator that from a democratic standpoint, this amendment should have had full consideration by the House. It was agreed to in the Senate by a wide majority, and it certainly should have been considered by the House of Representatives. I say that merely as a statement of a broad principle of democracy, without going into the details of the rules. On the basis of general principle this amendment should have been considered by the House, and I believe the conferees on the part of the Senate would agree that it would be only fair to insist on a vote in the House.

As to the need for the amendment, it was offered in absolutely good faith on my part, and I believe it was supported in good faith by all Members of the Senate who voted for it, including the three Senate conferees. I believe that they felt it of sufficient importance to cast a well-considered vote on it. If they had thought that it was of no importance, they should have protested at that time.

Mr. President, in order that we may further intelligently discuss the amendment, I ask that it be read by the clerk. It is Senate amendment numbered 6.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment, Senate amendment No. 6, as follows:

SEC. 8. None of the funds appropriated in pursuance of this authorization shall be expended in the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program in any country in which rehabilitation is carried on.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I think all of us want America to extend a charitable, generous, and helpful hand to our allies in a wise manner, and to those who have suffered from the devastations of this great war. In doing so, I believe that we should start from the beginning with the boundaries of this aid clearly outlined, with a chart clearly drawn, so that everyone, not only in our own land but in the countries to which we send aid, may know what our purposes are. I do not like to use this comparison; but we are appropriating $1,350,000,000 into a fund in which we are to have one forty-fourth of the expending power. That we can do. We are, in plain words, unpleasant as they may be, entering into an international W. P. A. for relief. Already we have allocated 500,000 separate implements of agriculture, some to be delivered by July of this year, while our own farmers here at home are daily denied the request of implements which they sorely need to produce food for America.

We saw the W. P. A. operate in times past in this country. We know that the power to subsidize also carries with it the power to regulate. No matter how honest may be the intentions of the men who may be designated to administer the relief, we know that throughout the course of its administration there will be some who will say that certain educational, religious, and political programs must be carried out as a prerequisite to the relief so sorely needed. We had such an experience in our own country in connection with our own relief methods, and there is every reason to make it crystal clear that this will not be the purpose of America in its relations with other countries.

Senators, we are attempting to establish a program to take to the world the idea that America is a great and generous country of freedom-loving people. In carrying that thought to every nation, let us make it absolutely clear to them that there will be no effort on our part to restrict their religious, political, or educational ideologies. So it seems to me to be very necessary that this amendment be included in the joint resolution, and in the restrictions surrounding the resolution, before it is enacted into law.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In order that the conference report may be properly

before the Senate, the Chair will inquire, Is there objection to its present consideration?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, when I presented the conference report I asked for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the conference report is before the Senate, and the question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays on the adoption of the report.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIS. I wish it to be stated, Mr. President, that in voting to reject the conference report we would not in anyway be expressing opposition to the objectives of the joint resolution. We would merely be asking that a further effort be made to include this delineating amendment in the report of the conference committee, and that it be taken back to conference with the understanding that the conferees should expend every effort to have the amendment submitted to the House of Representatives.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am in no disagreement whatever with the able Senator from Indiana regarding the fundamental objective to which he subscribes, and which he has defined. This great international relief agency should not and must not degenerate into any activities in the field of education, religion, or politics. However, I am in deep disagreement with my distinguished friend respecting the procedure which he recommends in arriving at this result.

I think it is very unfortunate that this phase of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation agreement should have an emphasis placed upon it which might invite someone, somewhere, somehow, to believe that there is in the U. N. R. R. A. agreement some sort of a hidden license to permit the promotion of educational, religious, or political programs in the countries involved.

Mr. President, I had some responsibility in connection with the formation of this agreement, and that is the reason why I primarily feel it to be necessary to speak very plainly and frankly about it. I assert that by no stretch of anyone's imagination is there at any place in the agreement anything by which the power and authority of this organization could be used directly or indirectly in educational, religious, or political programs in any country on earth, anywhere, or at any time.

Mr. President, when we redrew the U. N. R. R. A. agreement in consultation between the State Department and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations we scrupulously took literally months in which to circumscribe the authority which we were creating in order to be sure that it would involve nothing beyond the naked essentialities of relief in the areas behind our military lines as our Army moves on in its victorious forward march.

The only rehabilitation to which we gave any license whatever—and it is textually stated—is rehabilitation related exclusively to the administration of successful relief itself.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Supplementing what the Senator has said, I hold in my hand a memorandum from the State Department in which it is stated:

> The U. N. R. R. A. has no power whatever to enter into educational, religious, or political activities.

It confirms what the Senator has said.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is so primary, so elemental, and so axiomatic, Mr. President, that I dislike to see an issue drawn here in a formal fashion which, in the event that the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana were approved, might invite the inference that there is some sort of authority involved in the agreement for the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. What would be the objection, then, to clearly stating it in the joint resolution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, there was no objection on my part when the issue originally arose, and I voted for the Senator's amendment. I was one of the 45 Senators who voted in the affirmative. However, I so voted solely because I thought the amendment was surplusage and could do no harm. I still think it could have done no harm. If I had been a member of the conference committee, I should have voted to retain it in the joint resolution. However, I think it is totally needless. I do not think it adds anything to the inherent precautions which are already apparent in the agreement itself. I do not believe that if the amendment had never been proposed we would find this organization even remotely approaching the promotion of educational, religious, or political programs. If it should ever do so, whoever may be responsible for it should be impeached, because it would squarely defy the purpose of the entire undertaking.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I am in entire sympathy, I will say to the able Senator from Michigan, with such action as he has suggested being taken in case the program referred to were attempted. However, I can see no harm in the amendment, and I can see a very great need for including it in the joint resolution. I believe we should make further effort to have it put in so that there may be no misunderstanding in the future in reference to this provision.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I fully understand the earnestness with which the able Senator from Indiana presents his point of view, and I have no complaint or criticism to make of it. I sympathize with his attitude. I would have no part in creating any international function of a character which had any license, by any possible indirection, even, to deal in any educational, religious, or political program. The difference between us is that since the conference report omits the textual prohibition which was inserted by the Senate, I am not in favor of jeopardizing the entire conference report, or emphasizing this one particular thing to the exclusion of everything else, by proceeding as indicated in the suggestion of the Senator from Indiana, because I would not under any circumstances lend any color at any time in any way, or at any place, to any remote thought that there can be any promotion of educational, religious, or political programs under the authority of this agreement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I certainly appreciate the Senator's confidence, but there is no authority whatsoever for any such procedure. I wish I might share the Senator's confidence that no one associated with this administration will ever do anything that is not authorized within the law. I have heard the able Senator from Michigan at times express considerable doubt upon that score; and in order that there may be no misapprehension, I think the more clear we make our intent the less possibility there is that any of the administrators may proceed under a misapprehension. It is for that reason that I welcome this language.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me say to the Senator that if he is asking me to underwrite the fact that this administration never exceeds its authority and never goes beyond the congressional intent as expressed in statutes, he has asked me to do something which I decline to have any part of, because I have seen the crime committed too often. But I submit to the Senator that if we are to confront that sort of maladministration of this act, then the mere inclusion of these few additional words will not stop the maladministrators.

Mr. BREWSTER. It at least will render it so that no man of any integrity or intelligence can possibly ignore its existence. It is for that reason that I welcome it. I should like to ask the Senator——

Mr. VANDENBERG. Before the Senator goes any further, I do not want to forget those words of his, because they are good. I agree that no man of intelligence or integrity can find one scintilla of authority in this agreement to proceed 1 millimeter in the direction of the promotion of any educational, religious, or political program.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to go one step further. It has come to my attention, and I think I am accurately informed, that four of the chief countries of Europe, with which I think we are most concerned, France, Belgium, Holland, and Norway, or Denmark, have, for reasons which seem good and sufficient unto themselves, felt sufficient concern regarding the possibility of some ideological penetration that they have taken the full responsibility of buying out of their own funds all the supplies which could be available or required in those countries in order that there might be no question as to their complete control of the distribution for fear of the

very things which we have in mind. Has the Senator any information regarding that situation?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; but I can understand why such fears might exist in respect to the broad problems involved in post-war reconstruction. I assert, however, that we have met the situation ourselves in the construction of this agreement and this act, and we have put the limitations upon the managers of U. N. R. R. A. so definitely and so specifically in respect to their functions and their obligations and their responsibilities that it is beyond my comprehension that any American official could by any stretch of the imagination, I repeat, lend himself to any such prostitution of this statute; and if the existing limitations are insufficient then we cannot write limitations that will be sufficient.

I remind the Senate that this whole thing is created on such a basis that there is nothing authorized except as it is authorized by specific appropriations of the Congress from time to time; and we can write what limitations we please upon those appropriations when they are made and we have not violated the spirit of this agreement when we do it. If we cannot take care of ourselves in this particular instance, after having erected these safeguards, then God help us when we confront the major problems of the post-war contemplation.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understand that the Senator has no objection to the House at least having an opportunity to express itself upon this score if it could be secured with due regard for parliamentary proprieties.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would have no objection whatever to an expression by the House on the subject, but I know of no way by rejecting the conference report that a vote can be produced in the House.

Mr. BREWSTER. Except, if the House are as interested as we are in the charitable aid of foreign countries, the conferees of the House, I assume, would, following a rejection, be willing to take this to the House in order to permit 435 Members of the House to express themselves, as we have here, and as three conferees of the House have. I assume that is the purpose of the vote we are about to take. We simply politely ask them, "Will you consider this?"

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I have not made it plain to the Senator why I shall not vote for that process, I shall make one further attempt. I am sure it is my fault and not that of the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wanted the Senator to be clear why I would vote for the proposal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am unwilling by my vote in connection with this issue to indicate that there is one scintilla of doubt in my mind——

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator has already indicated that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Or one reservation of any nature whatsoever that anybody in connection with this undertaking can do the thing the Senator is talking about.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator has already indicated that by one vote on this very amendment. Is he not willing to vote a second time for what he voted for the first time?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was perfectly willing to accept it in the original routine; but I am not willing to make it an issue which, when thus made an issue and if adopted after being made a major issue, would invite the suggestion that there is somewhere involved here the authority to promote educational or religious or political programs. I am not willing in any way whatsoever to create any situation which concedes that U. N. R. R. A. can touch the question of educational or religious or political programs.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President——

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I call attention to the fact that this is a mere authorization and that every dollar that is hereafter appropriated can be hedged about by any limitation the Congress wishes to put upon it. But we do not stop at that in this conference report. In the Senate and in the conference we insisted upon the amendment which is numbered 3, which was adopted, and which is clear and which in express terms is a reservation to the agreement itself creating U. N. R. R. A., not merely an amendment to this joint resolution but a reservation to the agreement which all the nations party to the agreement must accept. The reservation is this:

> That in the case of the United States the appropriate constitutional body to determine the amount and character and time of the contributions of the United States is the Congress of the United States.

Not only that, but we insisted upon a further amendment which the conferees on the part of the House accepted, by way of a reservation to the U. N. R. R. A. agreement itself, and not merely to this joint resolution of the Congress. The reservation appears as section 6, and reads as follows:

> In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:
>
> That it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution numbered 12 adopted at the first session of the council, referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution and reading "the task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief."

Note this reservation, which all the parties to the U. N. R. R. A. agreement must accede to or accept:

> The provision * * * contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief.

The amendment which was offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana related to rehabilitation only, and here is a positive affirmative reservation which goes down to the very heart of the whole U. N. R. R. A. organization, which in affirmative language says that rehabilitation contemplates, means, and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief.

We have another reservation in the measure which provides that the authorities in administering U. N. R. R. A., the responsible organization set up under the agreement, cannot change it so as to bind the United States without the consent of the Congress of the United States expressed by joint resolution. So we concluded that there was no need to insert a negative, a mere limiting provision, in lieu of these positive, direct declarations confining U. N. R. R. A. to the doing only of the one thing, to wit, affording relief.

Of course, no one can guarantee that appointed agents of the Government, or of an international organization such as this, may not abuse their powers or their authority. That they could do under any sort of an appropriation that was made by the Congress. The point is that we have safeguarded this matter as far as we can safeguard it, by insisting upon reservations, not mere amendments made to a resolution, but insisting upon reservations to the organic agreement of the several powers which are now contributors to U. N. R. R. A., to its support and to its maintenance. We have hedged it around certainly so that there can be no abuse of the power which we are granting except by the deliberate act of an agent who does not correctly and properly and honorably represent his country. We would not, of course, attribute to those who are called on to administer U. N. R. R. A. any intent or purpose of that kind.

Above everything else, before a single dollar can go out of the Treasury of the United States for this purpose, the identical language which appears in this rejected section can be offered as an amendment to any appropriation bill, because it would be a proper limitation on the use of the money. Every dollar can have attached to it the identical limitation which was contained in the amendment offered, in all good faith, by the Senator from Indiana, an amendment for which I suppose I voted. I do not think I would have been disposed to vote against it. But here we have the affirmative declaration of precisely how far anything can be authorized, with the added assurance that no change in the constitution of U. N. R. R. A. can be made, so as to bind us or affect us, except upon a ratification of the change made by the Congress of the United States by appropriate resolution. So we can fix the limitation.

I should like to say to the Senator from Indiana that I have no great enthusiasm for U. N. R. R. A., and if I had had any authority or power in bringing about the setting up of the relief organization, it would have been a relief organization, so far as the United States is concerned, that would have acted on its own, and would not have been tied up with agreements on the part of other nations. But, while I have no great enthusiasm for U. N. R. R. A., I think we have hedged it about as far as is necessary, and especially when it is remembered that this is a mere authorization of a total appropriation for a period limited until June or July 1946. When our Appropriations Committee brings in an appropriation bill containing any amount for U. N. R. R. A., this limitation can be inserted.

Mr. WILLIS and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I will yield in a moment. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement. He confirms the analysis which I have made of the situation, and I think the analysis is invincible.

He brings up one point which I had intended to advert to briefly in respect to the language in the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. The language itself is most unfortunate, because it applies only to countries in which rehabilitation is carried on. We have sought throughout the creation of this instrumentality to limit the rehabilitation so far as possible, and to justify only such rehabilitation as is intimately and indispensably related to the administration of relief. Yet the Senator's amendment applies only to rehabilitation, and does not apply to relief.

That is an utterly secondary and inconsequential consideration, but I submit that it indicates once more that this is, after all, not the Ark of the Covenant, and that we have not lost everything if we lose this amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to say that the language can very well be made to read "relief and rehabilitation." It is to be regretted that the Senator from Michigan did not insert the language when we adopted the amendment. I appreciate his long experience and his ability, and he probably could have drafted the amendment much better than I, in my inexperience, drafted it. I shall be glad to have that included in the conference agreement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the comments of the Senator from Georgia, who was on the conference committee, and particularly to his statement that this limitation could be added to an appropriation bill when it comes up later, and we are asked to appropriate for the U. N. R. R. A. It does not seem to me that in fairness to U. N. R. R. A. itself we can do that. They should not be required to wait until that time before they know what they can do. As I understand, the officials in charge of U. N. R. R. A. are now making their plans for the expenditure of these funds, and they will come in later and tell us from time to time how much they need. It may be that they are planning for an educational program in connection with the distribution of food. I may say that in my mind there is some question whether they should not be permitted to indulge in a little educational program covering the use of this food. But they are making their plans now, and if they come in with plans calling for an educational program, as our W. P. A. did, and we say to them, "Not a dollar of this can be spent on an educational program," they will have to retrace their steps and make their plans all over again.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I may say, in reply to the Senator from Vermont, that they contemplate nothing of the sort. They are already on notice. They have said in a letter which the Senator from Texas has just read that they know they have authority to do no such thing, and in the letter read they have said they contemplated nothing of the sort. So I am not at all fearful about their being misled. No man who had anything whatever to do with the formation of this undertaking could be misled about any license for the promotion of educational, religious, or political programs under it.

Mr. President, I sum up by saying that I think we are better off, we are safer, in respect to the objective which the able Senator from Indiana appropriately embraces, in not sending this matter back to conference seeking to make a major issue of this particular amendment, because if we send it back and the Senator's amendment is then formally rejected, it will be rejected, so far as legislators are concerned, because they say it is surplusage and unnecessary, but rejected perhaps with the result that somebody hereafter may say, "Congress declined to prohibit the promotion of educational, religious, or political programs."

Now if we accept this conference report, I want to say finally that we have not rejected a prohibition against educational, religious, or political programs under U. N. R. R. A. We have simply confirmed the fact that nowhere, at no time, under any circumstances directly or indirectly is there any remote authority in the document itself or in the agreement or in the administration for the promotion of educational, religious, or political programs anywhere on earth.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the Senate has already inserted this amendment in the joint resolution, and now it is proposed that we remove the restriction provided by the amendment. I think the time for such action has passed. If we desire to make such restriction plain and secure, it is absolutely necessary that we include the amendment in the joint resolution.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for whose great ability no Senator has higher regard than have I, said that we can place the provision in the appropriation bill. But it can be taken out of the appropriation bill as easily as it is now proposed to take it out of the joint resolution. Let us not begin such a practice. Let us say in the beginning that we mean what we say by the amendment, and stand by it. I think it highly important that the amendment be carried in the final form of the joint resolution.

I agree with what Senators much more able than I have said, that perhaps there is nothing in the joint resolution which gives any authority to any agency or to any administrator to use the fund for the purposes in question. But we have seen in recent times a strange perversion of the interpretation of the laws of our land, and we do not know how in the future some administrator may interpret the provisions of this resolution. So let us set out the restriction in language so plain that everyone can understand it.

Mr. President, in the interest not only of our good will to the people we desire to aid, but for the protection of the people of America, we should write this restriction into the joint resolution, and say that we are going to extend relief in such a way that we shall not in any way restrict the ideologies which to the people involved are dear, or do anything which, if we were in their place, and the situation were reversed, we would not want them to do to us. Let us practice the golden rule with respect to these people and say, "We will not do anything to you that we would not want you to do to us," and let us put it in the measure in language so plain that no one can misunderstand it.

Mr. President, I realize that it would be embarrassing to some who want to vote for the amendment to vote against the conference report. Therefore I should like to move that the conference report be recommitted to the committee for further consideration on the basis of the discussion which has been heard here today.

Mr. President, I move to recommit the conference report to the conference committee with the request that the committee use every effort to have the amendment before the House of Representatives. On this motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The plain motion to recommit is in order. The yeas and nays on the motion have been asked for. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words before a vote is taken. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have very clearly set forth the lack of necessity for the amendment and its undesirability. I wish to suggest now what the Senate will be doing if the measure is sent back to conference. The Senator from Indiana seems to think we can send it back to conference, and that the conferees can simply fix up a little generator and the whole thing will work all right. That would seem to him to be very simple. But when the Senate sends the measure back it means that we reject every amendment for which we secured the consent of the House. What are those things? Do Senators suppose the House is simply going to say, "Yes; we accept all the amendments which the Senate proposed, and we recede on all our proposals"?

What are the amendments? Let Senators read the report and note the amendments we succeeded in getting the House to agree to—amendments which really are vital to the whole project.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. There has been no objection to the other amendments carried in the report of the committee, has there?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; but the House is a party to this proceeding. When the measure is sent back to conference the whole subject which was in conference

is opened up again. The House Members can renew their objection to every amendment which was agreed to in conference, and the House can do the same.

Mr. WILLIS. There is not much likelihood that they will do so, is there?

Mr. CONNALLY. If I were a House conferee I think I would have some views concerning the Senate getting what it supposedly wanted and then demanding, after a full and free conference, that the House reconsider the matter in order to vote separately on one amendment. The House has some conception of its dignity and its power.

Mr. President, what have we obtained in this conference? Here is one of the very vital amendments to which we secured the consent of the House, though it was not secured on the first vote. The matter had to be argued and debated, but finally we did secure the consent of the House conferees. I refer to the reservation contained in section 7. As pointed out by the Senator from Georgia, it is a reservation to the very vitals of the original agreement between the nations. They must all consent to it. I read it:

SEC. 7. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservation:

That it is understood that the provision in paragraph 11 of resolution numbered 12, adopted at the first session of the Council, referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution and reading "The task of rehabilitation must not be considered as the beginning of reconstruction—it is coterminous with relief."

That is the language that was contained in the amendment, and then we added, interpreting that language:

Contemplates that rehabilitation means and is confined only to such activities as are necessary to relief.

By reason of the acceptance by the House of that amendment of the Senate we tie all this organization's activities down to relief only. We exclude rehabilitation. We exclude the activities which the Senator would prohibit in his amendment, because the State Department, which is sponsoring this matter, officially has advised me as follows:

U. N. R. R. A. has no power whatever to enter into educational, religious, or political activities.

When this measure is sent back to conference in order to adjust the amendment of the Senator from Indiana, it is sent back for all purposes, and none of these amendments are then adopted unless we obtain a renewal of the action of the House, and get the House to agree. Do Senators think House Members are going to be in very good humor to agree, after we have obtained practically everything we asked for in conference, and then go back to them and say, "Wait a minute now, you must take this amendment back. There must be a separate vote on this amendment just as we want it, and you have got to accept it just as we say it should be worded."

What other things did we obtain in the conference? I ask Senators to read the report. I read section 8, as follows:

SEC. 8. In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the following reservations:

That the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall not be authorized—

This is vital, it goes to the fundamentals of the authority of the Congress, the control of the purse. We are tying the whole Administration, not simply our contribution, but we are tying the whole U. N. R. R. A. to the proposition—

shall not be authorized to enter into contracts or undertake to incur obligations beyond the limits of appropriations made under this authorization and by other countries and receipts from other sources.

That is what we have done. We secured the consent of the House conferees to that provision. If the conference report is adopted by the House and the Senate, it will be provided in the law that the U. N. R. R. A. itself cannot make its plans, cannot assume obligations, or cannot make commitments beyond the limitations of the appropriations made by the Congress of the United States and the limitations in connection with the funds which it has received from other countries. Is not that sound? Are we not tying their hands? Are we not delimiting their authority?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I should like to ask the Senator a question. The pending motion is to recommit the conference report. Is it not true that no action is taken on the conference report until the Senate acts upon it?

Mr. CONNALLY. Action of what kind?

Mr. BROOKS. Action by the House. Does not the House wait until the Senate acts upon the conference report?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; I assume that to be correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Then if the Senate should ask the House to reconsider, could it not be reconsidered in conference, without going back to the House for a vote?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BROOKS. Is it not possible, then, for the three conferees on the part of the Senate to go to the conferees on the part of the House in the same spirit in which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has presented the matter, and to say, "The Senate feels very strongly on this matter, and we wish you would accept it. We are not insulting the House, and we are not challenging the House, but we are merely asking the House to cooperate."

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, yes; all that is possible; the millennium is possible; a great many things are possible, which are not going to happen. I say to the Senator from Illinois that of course the Senate conferees could go back to the conference with the House conferees. When we went back to the conference, what would we say? We would say, "Well, we appreciate your agreeing to all these other amendments in which we are really interested, and which are vital; but here is another little amendment. The Senate has rejected the report, and has sent it back to conference, and we want you to accept this amendment."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I respectfully submit that in some men's eyes it may be a very little thing, but in my judgment it is a very large thing. This is a step by which we are moving out into the world's domain, and are contributing more than 60 percent of the funds which are to be used for relief. The people of America, if I understand their present temper, want this Congress to write out, to spell out, and to define to the last dotting of an "i" and the crossing of a "t" what we are going to do in these foreign relations affairs. In the report which was made here the distinguished chairman of the committee said:

The signing of the United Nations relief agreement is a milestone in the development of the foreign policy of the United States.

That is exactly what I believe it is going to be; and I, for one, would like to have it limited, and, now that the question has been brought up, I would like to have a double limitation that it be confined to relief, not used for educational, political, or religious purposes which would lead us into any foreign complications in the future. The resolution is not a trivial one.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I respect the views of the Senator from Illinois. I realize his interest in the matter, and I realize the interest of the Senator from Indiana. I wish to say that so far as the foreign-relations angle of this matter is concerned, I rather share the view of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that there was no enthusiasm about our voting to extend relief.

I view this measure, however, as a part of the program of the war. We do not wish to have chaos in Europe, because chaos in Europe would mean that the waves which would there be set in motion would wash our shores. We do not want in Europe communism generated by hunger and want, and fomented by the agitation of politicians from other countries and the propaganda of other lands. We want this war to be successfully waged, and then we wish to have a just and durable peace, and the possibility of setting up an agency which we hope will prevent our enemies from again bathing the earth in blood.

But let us see. The Senator wishes to have every "i" dotted and every "t" crossed. How can we do that without having the dictionary inserted as an amendment to practically every measure? An authorization is an authorization. It does not extend beyond the grant of powers contained in the authorization. If we are going to adopt negative prohibitions—"you shall not do this; you shall not do that; you shall not do the other," every imaginable thing which occurs to our minds—the measure will be impracticable and impossible. Sup-

pose someone says, "Why do you not put in the resolution a provision that the U. N. R. R. A. shall not furnish anything but dairy products, and shall not use any other kind of fats except dairy fats? Why do you not prohibit the use of anything else, and prohibit the use of any kind of wheat except wheat from the United States?"

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator from Texas would not compare dairy products with political, educational, and religious matters; would he?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; and I do not.

Mr. WILLIS. I merely wanted to make that point clear.

Mr. CONNALLY. But it helps a fellow meet his religious engagements if he has dairy products.

Mr. WILLIS. We desire to make sure that the funds contributed by the United States are not used for religious, political, or educational purposes.

Mr. CONNALLY. No provision authorizing the use of the funds for such purposes is contained in the joint resolution, and no authorization for such use is contained in it. I challenge the Senator from Indiana, if he wishes to be meticulous, to put his finger on a phrase or a clause or a word in the measure which authorizes the use of the funds for religious, political, or educational purposes. The Senator is a very able gentleman. He is a journalist. He burns the midnight oil, no doubt; and if such a phrase or clause or word is contained in the resolution, he will find it.

But, Mr. President, above all that, are these amendments whose adoption we have secured, and which guarantee to the present Congress and to all future Congresses the right in passing upon the appropriations to tie upon every dollar, every dime, and copper within such appropriation any limitation which may be desired. The Congress can insert a limitation that the U. N. R. R. A. may not use a dollar of the money appropriated to buy calico, but must buy broadcloth. Future Congresses can insert in the appropriations any denial or limitation as to the purpose for which the money shall be spent. That is our power; that is our authority. It is the power to control the purse. Senators talk about the power of the Congress to do this, to do that, and to do the other thing, but so long as we hold the reins on appropriations, so long as we turn on or turn off the spigot of money coming from the Treasury, the Congress of the United States will remain the governing power in this Republic because, under the power to control the purse, the Congress can deny money to the President of the United States; under the power to control the purse, the Congress can, if it so desire, paralyze the Supreme Court by refusing to appropriate for the salaries of the judges of the Court. Under the power to control the purse the Congress can interdict the operation of any department of the Government until it does the bidding of Congress. The cases are extreme ones, but they illustrate the magnitude and the wide sweep of the control of the Congress over the purse. We have such control in connection with this conference report.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am impressed by the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas, as I was by the remarks of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. A moment ago the Senator challenged the Senator from Indiana to point out one word or phrase——

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not challenge the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I invite the Senator's attention to the language on page 3. This is the section which gives U. N. R. R. A. the power to do what it may do. This section provides that U. N. R. R. A. shall have the power—

To plan, coordinate, administer, or arrange for the administration of measures for the relief of victims of war in any area under the control of any of the United Nations—

This is the significant part—

through the provision of food, fuel, clothing, shelter, and other basic necessities, medical and other essential services—

During the time I have been a Member of the Senate I have seen all kinds of interpretations, far from what Congress intended in legislation, placed upon acts of Congress by agencies of the Government. I do not care to have Judge Rosenman decide what "other essential services" means. I want the Congress to state what may be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. I appreciate the interruption of the Senator from South Dakota, and his generous comment respecting the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from Michigan. I feel sure that I am authorized to speak for them. However, frankly I do not see anything objectionable in the language of which the Senator complains. It says "other basic necessities." What is a basic necessity?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Under the provisions of the joint resolution, who is to interpret what the words "other essential services" mean?

Mr. CONNALLY. Initially, the administrators of the program. If they should determine upon something that we did not think should be done, we could stop it by means of limitations on appropriations.

The Senator from South Dakota made some reference to Judge Rosenman. I do not happen to hold a brief for Judge Rosenman. He needs none. I do not know what he has to do with this measure. I never heard of him in connection with it. We held hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senate passed the joint resolution, and we have had conferences for 3 or 4 days with the House conferees. Frankly, I never heard Judge Rosenman's name mentioned. I looked under every desk and table in the room, but he was not under any of them. [Laughter.] What has he to do with the joint resolution? I do not know.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Was the Senator looking for him?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought perhaps the Senator from South Dakota might inquire, when the conference report was under consideration, what Mr. Rosenman had to do with it; and merely as a matter of precaution, I looked carefully under every desk, but I did not see Judge Rosenman anywhere. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Did the Senator look under the President's desk?

Mr. CONNALLY. That was the shot that got me. [Laughter.] No; we did not look under the President's desk. The President was at the White House, and we held these meetings in the committee room of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which the Senator from South Dakota is welcome at all times. If our search is not thorough enough, we will ask him to come and bring a flashlight, a telescope, and a magnifying glass.

I do not know what Judge Rosenman has to do with this question. So far as I am concerned, he has nothing to do with it. He is not doing the thinking for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]; he is not doing the thinking for the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]; and if I may modestly say so, he is not doing the thinking for me. He has never talked with me about the joint resolution. He has never spoken to me about any other measure pending before the Senate. He has never made any suggestion to me about anything on earth connected with this Government. That is all I know about Judge Rosenman.

Mr. President, I do not care to consume more of the time of the Senate. Under provisions to which we have secured the consent of the House, we establish a perpetuity of control by the Congress over every dollar that may be appropriated. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana is not necessary. It would not do any harm; but the House conferees were adamant. They told us that the question had been voted upon in the committee three or four times. There are persistent Members in the House as well as in the Senate. They kept bringing it up and urging it. The committee voted against it repeatedly, and the House conferees were determined not to accept the amendment. So I hope the Senate will reject the motion to recommit so that the conference report may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] to recommit the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McKELLAR. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is leaving for New Mexico tonight, and is transacting business in some of the Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—22

Aiken	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Holman	Weeks
Brooks	Langer	Wherry
Buck	Millikin	Wiley
Burton	Revercomb	Willis
Bushfield	Robertson	Wilson
Danaher	Shipstead	
Ferguson	Taft	

NAYS—36

Andrews	George	Maybank
Austin	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gillette	Overton
Barkley	Green	Radcliffe
Bone	Guffey	Stewart
Capper	Hayden	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Hill	Tunnell
Connally	Kilgore	Tydings
Davis	La Follette	Vandenberg
Downey	McCarran	Walsh, Mass.
Eastland	McClellan	Walsh, N. J.
Ellender	McFarland	White

NOT VOTING—38

Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Jackson	Reed
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Reynolds
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Butler	Lucas	Scrugham
Byrd	McKellar	Smith
Caraway	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Moore	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Wagner
Cordon	Murray	Wallgren
Glass	Nye	Wheeler
Gurney	O'Daniel	

So Mr. WILLIS' motion to recommit the conference report was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the motion to agree to the conference report. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement which I made in connection with the previous vote, as to the transfer of my pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. HAYDEN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent from the Senate because of illness. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JACKSON] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is leaving for New Mexico tonight and he is transacting business in some of the Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in various Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from New Hampshire is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public matters.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS 47

Aiken	Ferguson	O'Mahoney
Andrews	George	Overton
Austin	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bark'ey	Gillette	Robertson
Bone	Green	Stewart
Brewster	Guffey	Taft
Burton	Hawkes	Truman
Byrd	Hayden	Tunnell
Capper	Hill	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Holman	Vandenberg
Connally	Kilgore	Walsh, Mass.
Danaher	La Follette	Walsh, N. J.
Davis	Langer	Weeks
Downey	McFarland	White
Eastland	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	Murray	

NAYS—9

Brooks	Millikin	Wherry
Buck	Revercomb	Willis
McClellan	Shipstead	Wilson

NOT VOTING—40

Bailey	Hatch	Reed
Ball	Jackson	Reynolds
Bankhead	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Bilbo	Johnson, Colo.	Scrugham
Bridges	Lucas	Smith
Bushfield	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	Mead	Tobey
Chavez	Moore	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Murdock	Wallgren
Cordon	Nye	Wheeler
Glass	O'Daniel	
Gurney	Pepper	

So the conference report was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. AUSTIN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 30, 1940, with the recommendation that the Senate concur in the House amendment. I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1410) to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940, which on motion of Mr. AUSTIN on November 29 had been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

On page 1, strike out all after line 4 over to and including line 6, on page 2, and insert:

"SEC. 4. That hereafter brigadier generals of the line shall be appointed from among officers of the line commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel who are credited with 28 years' continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army as hereinbefore provided and whose names are borne on an eligible list prepared annually by a board of not less than five general officers of the line, not below the grade of major general: *Provided, however*, That not more than 25 percent of the total authorized number of brigadier generals of the line may be appointed, without regard to length of service, from among officers of the line commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel and whose names are borne on such eligible list. Hereafter appointment as chief of any branch shall be made from among officers commissioned in grades not below that of lieutenant colonel who are credited with 28 years' continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army as hereinbefore provided, and who have demonstrated by actual and extended service in such branch or on similar duty that they are qualified for such appointment."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the amendment of the House to Senate bill 1410.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, for the sake of the RECORD, I ask to have inserted a memorandum for the President of the Senate, signed by President Roosevelt, dated October 1, 1943, which explains the occasion for the amendment of section 4. It explains it just as well as I could explain it, and since this bill has already been thoroughly considered and a full explanation made at the time it passed the Senate, I will refrain from further discussing the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The memorandum is as follows:

Attached is a list of nominations to fill vacancies among the permanent general officers of the line. The names of these particular officers are well known for the conspicuous services they have already rendered the Nation in the present emergency. Five of them, however, Lieutenant Generals Kenney and Clark and Major Generals Handy, Eaker, and Smith, have less than the legally prescribed 28 years of continuous commissioned service in the Regular Army which is required by the National Defense Act as a prerequisite to appointment as a brigadier general of the line of the Regular Army. The provisions of the National Defense Act quite evidently had in mind peacetime conditions because it is not conceivable that a lieutenant general, for example, in highly successful command of our Air Forces engaged with the enemy in the Southwest Pacific is not qualified for appointment as a brigadier general of the Regular Army.

I hope you will arrange for the necessary modification of the law to meet this situation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I understand that the action taken by the Senate in concurring in the House amendment passes the bill. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is concurred in, and the bill is passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1349. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of New York certain lands within the Brooklyn Navy Yard in the city of New York;

S. 1428. An act to amend the provision of the act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to widow, child, or dependent relative of officers, enlisted men, or nurses of the Navy or Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 1635. An act to eliminate a pay discrimination against the teacher of music at the United States Military Academy; and

S. 1653. An act to provide titles for heads of staff departments of the United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1640. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to accept gifts and bequests for the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; and

S. 1647. An act to amend the act approved March 2, 1895, as amended.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2037. An act to codify and enact into absolute law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2038. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 2039. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 2040. An act to codify and enact into absolute law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions";

H. R. 2973. An act to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political statement relating to a candidate for election to any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution;

H. R. 4140. An act to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734);

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; and

H. R. 4414. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 72) to provide for appropriate commemoration of the Centennial of the Telegraph on May 24, 1944, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2037. An act to codify and enact into absolute law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 2038. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 2039. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds";

H. R. 2040. An act to codify and enact into absolute law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions"; and

H. R. 2973. An act to provide that no person shall publish or distribute any political

statement relating to a candidate for election to any Federal office which does not contain the name of the person responsible for its publication or distribution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4140. An act to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734), and

H. R. 4271. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 4414. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch and for the judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 72) to provide for appropriate commemoration of the Centennial of the Telegraph on May 24, 1944, was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4070) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission—Salaries and expenses," on page 13, line 24, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$1,997,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 8, after the word "lithographing", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Trade Commission," on page 15, line 20, after the word "act", to strike out "$2,011,070" and insert "$1,978,707."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, at the end of line 2, to reduce the appropriation for printing and binding for the Federal Trade Commission from $48,900 to $43,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Public Buildings Administration," on page 19, line 13, after "(45 Stat. 533)", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 11, after the word "conductors", to strike out "and the purchase of two motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; $29,532,400" and insert "$29,530,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 4, after the word "employees", to strike out "purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors, the purchase of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle"; and in line 11, before the word *"Provided"*, to strike out "$10,581,000" and insert "$9,581,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal-aid highway system," on page 24, line 23, after the word "probation", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That not to exceed $55,000 of the funds provided for carrying out the provisions of the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (23 U. S. C. 21, 23), shall be available for the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Inter-American Highway," on page 27, line 11, after the words "Revised Statutes", to strike out "including the purchase of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Strategic highway network," on page 28, line 5, after "(23 U. S. C. 104)", to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Surveys and plans," on page 28, line 24, before the word "to", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 2, to insert:

All funds heretofore appropriated to the Public Roads Administration for the construction of roads but impounded or withheld from obligation or expenditure by any agency or official are hereby released and made available for obligation or expenditure for the purposes for which they were originally appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Foreign-Service pay adjustment," on page 29, line 23, after the word "therein", to strike out "$722,390" and insert "$640,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office," on page 30, line 8, after the word "periodicals" and the semicolon, to strike out "the purchase of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle"; and in line 10, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,198,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission, salaries and expenses," on page 34, line 15, after the word "services" and the semicolon, to strike out "purchase (not to exceed seven)"; and in line 19, after the word "act", to strike out "$3,260,000" and insert "$3,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics," on page 36, line 3, before the word "maintenance", to strike out "purchase"; and in line 10, after the words "in all", to strike out "$23,220,130" and insert "$23,218,830."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Archives," on page 37, line 9, after the word "vehicle", to strike out "$1,042,340" and insert "$1,084,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Housing Agency, Federal Housing Administration," on page 43, line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,484,635" and insert "$10,184,635."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on that amendment I wish to call the attention of the Senate and of the Senator from Tennessee to a situation in regard to the Federal Housing Administration which it seems to me should justify the Senate in rejecting the amendment.

What the amendment does is to reduce by $300,000 the appropriation for the Federal Housing Administration. As we know, the Federal Housing Administration is one of the agencies of the Federal Government that is really self-sustaining. All its expenses are paid out of its income, and, in addition to that, money is turned back into the Treasury.

We know that while the Federal Housing Administration is not now as active in the matter of financing the construction and repair of houses as it was prior to the war, yet I think we can all look forward to a very great increase in the construction and repair of houses throughout the United States when the war is over. Of course, no houses can be built now and very little repair work can be done because of the scarcity of building materials and because of priorities which are unobtainable in regard to building material of all kinds. I have no doubt that, just as there will be Nation-wide road building inaugurated at the conclusion of the war under the provisions of legislation which I think we may anticipate to the same extent and along with it will come a resurgence of house building in the United States, because by the time this war is over and materials become available there will no doubt be a general desire and need for more houses in the United States to shelter people who are now being housed in various war areas by facilities which the Government has built. Those facilities will not be available in widely scattered sections of the country and there will undoubtedly be a great need for more housing facilities, affording an outlet for house-building material, and for the employment of carpenters, plumbers, and the like. It seems to me unwise to reduce by $300,000 the appropriation for this self-sustaining agency, so that it will have to disband part of its organization in order to meet the reduced appropriation. It should be encouraged to be looking forward to the time when the Federal Housing Administration will be more greatly needed than it is now, and in my judgment even more so than it may have been when the organization was set up.

I am wondering whether the Senator from Tennessee does not realize the importance of this situation. I have here a copy of a letter furnished me by the Commissioner, which is a copy of a letter sent to the Senator from Tennessee. I was hoping really as much to persuade the Senator from Tennessee not to insist on the amendment as to have the Senate reject it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, how does the amount $10,184,635 compare with former appropriations for the same purpose?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the appropriation for the fiscal year 1944, which ends the 30th of next June, is $11,159,830. That is $929,000 plus per month, or $6,509,000 for the first 7 months of the fiscal year. The appropriation carried in the bill as it passed the House was $10,484,635, which is a reduction of about half a million dollars in the House bill from the current appropriation. The Senate committee amendment reduces it further by $300,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] spoke to me about this amendment. I do not see him in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have sent for the Senator from New Jersey so that he may be present during the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Jersey spoke to me about this matter, and I had it investigated. I found that the amendment was reported by the subcommittee and was agreed to as a matter of course. There is some overtime which necessarily will have to be taken care of in the appropriation, and, so far as I personally am concerned, I shall not ask that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry the Senator from New Jersey is not present, because I told him I would let him know when we reached this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. LANGER. On what page is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On page 43, lines 10 and 11.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I had desired to ask what justifies increasing the amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not an increase. There is a question of overtime, which has arisen under the law.

Mr. HOLMAN. I was merely interested in the question of dollars and cents.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, rejecting the amendment merely restores the amount provided by the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and if it is not restored, I am informed, there will be a question as to paying for overtime.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Public Housing Authority," on page 46, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,782,440" and insert "$2,772,940", and in line 13, before the word "maintenance," to strike out "purchase (not to exceed 10)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission," on page 51, line 1, after "1330–1341)", to strike out "$930,000" and insert "$980,000."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to go back to page 48 and ask for an explanation of the item in line 7. I desire to know how many rubber gloves we are buying for the Securities and Exchange Commission, and why we are buying any.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it is a very small quantity. They are used by those doing photostatic work in the laboratory.

Mr. LANGER. There is no provision for a laboratory.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, but they have photostatic apparatus. When I said "laboratory" I was speaking very broadly. They carry on photostatic work, in which it is necessary to use rubber gloves.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator give us an idea as to what the appropriation amounts to?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a very small amount. I can ascertain the figure and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. LANGER. May we pass it over temporarily?

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no amendment involved.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from North Dakota would have to offer an amendment, if he desired to take out the word "gloves."

Mr. LANGER. I do not want to take it out, but I do want an explanation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will find out about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 51, line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 51, line 17, after the name "Kentucky" and the semicolon, to strike out "Watts Bar steam plant; Fort Loudoun Dam (including an extension to bring the waters of the Little Tennessee River within the pool of this project)."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does this amendment and do the following amendments relate to the T. V. A.?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Gillette
Andrews	Capper	Green
Austin	Clark, Idaho	Guffey
Bailey	Clark, Mo.	Hawkes
Ball	Connally	Hayden
Bankhead	Danaher	Hill
Barkley	Davis	Holman
Bone	Downey	Kilgore
Brewster	Eastland	La Follette
Brooks	Ellender	Langer
Buck	Ferguson	McCarran
Burton	George	McClellan
Bushfield	Gerry	McFarland
McKellar	Shipstead	Walsh, N. J.
Maybank	Stewart	Weeks
Millikin	Taft	Wheeler
Murray	Thomas, Idaho	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah	White
Overton	Truman	Wiley
Radcliffe	Tunnell	Willis
Revercomb	Tydings	Wilson
Robertson	Vandenberg	
Russell	Walsh, Mass.	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we have now reached the point in the bill where we have before us for consideration the amendments with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority. If these amendments affecting T. V. A., sponsored by the Senator from Tennessee and approved by the committee, are adopted, every substantial decision with respect to the operation of this great enterprise will be moved to Washington. Under these amendments, absentee management in Washington, remote control of the details of operation of the T. V. A.'s vast power system, would be substituted for management by technicians in the Tennessee Valley, where responsibility now is lodged by act of Congress.

I cannot now recall a more dangerous step toward centralization in Washington than that before us. I am against these proposals. Senators who do not now speak out can never with good conscience rise to cry out against the evils of overcentralization in Washington. No Senator who votes now to approve the Senator's amendments can ever again complain about inefficiency and extravagance in the executive branch of the Government. For by the adoption of these amendments the Senate will have approved the impossible, wasteful, and unbusinesslike step of managing from the Halls of Congress a huge power system, 500 miles away from where we sit.

What is here proposed is a gross perversion of our system of constitutional Government. Congress was established to determine the policies of a great Nation, not to decide such technical questions as whether a transmission line should be of 154,000- or 66,000-volt capacity. These amendments depart from the great traditions of our democracy; for, by adopting them, we would remove to this far-off Chamber control over the details of a power operation. Mr. President, the Constitution intended that Senators be legislators, not electrical engineers.

It is an ironic circumstance that amendments that foster centralization in Washington should come from my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Tennessee, a Senator from a state that, like Alabama, stoutly opposes overcentralization.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows of any other department or activity of Government which collects money and which is not required by law to pay the receipts into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HILL. There are a number of departments of the Government which are

accorded certain discretionary powers and certain flexibility and independence in the operations they carry on.

Mr. McKELLAR. Which ones are they?

Mr. HILL. The R. F. C. has certain flexibility and certain independence, as also do the Export-Import Bank, the War Shipping Administration, and the Maritime Commission. However, there are a number of other agencies which have similar powers. If the Senator would like to have me do so, I could read a list of them into the RECORD.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have a list of them read into the RECORD. I looked up the question, and the only one which was suggested to me was a small activity in the city of Washington, the Alley Dwelling Authority. I found that the Congress had either at the time of its creation or subsequent thereto required it to pay its receipts into the Treasury.

The R. F. C. is in a very different situation. It lends money. That is very different from collecting money for the Government. The Senator from Alabama knows—and the Senator voted for the T. V. A. Act, I am sure, if he was then a Member of the House or of the Senate—that the original T. V. A. Act of 1933, as passed by the Congress, required all receipts to be paid into the Treasury of the United States. The only reason why that provision of the act is not operative today is that in appropriation bills Mr. Lilienthal secured the enactment of a provision that he might use the receipts of the previous year. However, as a matter of fact, the original act contained a provision requiring the T. V. A. to pay the receipts into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in response to what the Senator has said, let me say that, of course, all receipts taken in by the T. V. A. and all receipts of other Government corporations finally go into the Treasury, as they should go. However, the Senator from Tennessee is in error, if he will permit me to say so, in his reference to the original act. I was not only a Member of Congress when the original act was passed but I was a member of the House committee which had jurisdiction over the matter in the House, and I sat on the conference committee as one of the House conferees. The original section 26 of that act contained the following provision:

The net proceeds derived by the Board—

That is to say, by the T. V. A. Board—

from the sale of power and any of the products manufactured by the Corporation, after deducting the cost of operation, maintenance, depreciation, amortization, and an amount deemed by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital, or devoted by the board to new construction, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year.

That is exactly the language used in the original act, as that act passed the Congress of the United States. It gave to the T. V. A. Board the power to withhold operating capital. That is what I am contending for today, namely, that the Board may have certain leeway and certain flexibility with reference to operating capital.

The truth of the matter is that the language of the appropriation bill which the Senator now seeks to change and amend is more stringent than section 26 of the basic T. V. A. Act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has spoken of what I propose to change and amend. The Senator is wholly mistaken. The House provision amends the organic act of the T. V. A. by permitting the money to be retained and used by the T. V. A. Board. My amendment or the amendment proposed by the committee is merely one to restore the original provision.

Now, I desire to read into the RECORD——

Mr. HILL. Just a minute, Mr. President. The Senator is entirely in error when he says that his amendment is merely one to restore the original provision. If the Senator from Tennessee will read the language of the original provision, as I have read it into the RECORD, he will observe that his amendment is nothing at all like the language of the original bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. It goes further than the language of the original bill.

Mr. HILL. No; it does not read anything like the language of the original bill. The language of the original bill permitted the Board to withhold receipts for operating capital or, as the language provided, to be devoted by the Board to new construction.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if that had been correct——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that the question is not one of what is correct or what is not correct. The language I have read to the Senate is taken verbatim, ad literatim, from the original act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me read section 26 of the present law.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. It reads as follows:

Commencing July 1—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there the Senator is in error again. What the Senator is seeking to read now is not what was contained in the original act. He has commenced to read section 26 as amended in 1935. However, if he wishes to read section 26, as amended in 1935, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator is going to yield to me——

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator, if he will permit me to do so, and then I shall yield to him, that he must remember that in 1933 the Congress passed the original act with section 26 in it. I have read to the Senate the language of section 26 of the original act. Subsequently, in 1935, the Congress amended the original act, and, in 1935, amended section 26 of the original act. If the Senator wishes to read section 26, as amended by the act of 1935, I shall be glad to yield to him. I shall read to the Senate section 26, as amended in 1935—in other words, section 26 as it now stands in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, as amended. It provides as follows:

Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section and may be withheld by the Board to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation.

That is section 26.

Mr. McKELLAR. And that is the present law.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator that that is not the present law, for this reason: In the various appropriation bills which have been enacted during the past 7 years, we have changed section 26, so that today the T. V. A. is really not operating strictly under section 26 as amended. Under the language of section 26 originally, and section 26 as amended, the T. V. A. could deposit its receipts anywhere it saw fit, withholding the receipts under the powers granted in section 26. In appropriation bills we provided that the T. V. A. should pay its receipts into a special fund in the Treasury. The T. V. A. receipts have gone into a special fund in the Treasury, and each year Congress has reappropriated the funds which have accumulated in the special T. V. A. fund, together with any other moneys which the T. V. A. needed for the operation of its projects.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the present procedure, which the Senator has outlined, are all funds expended by the T. V. A. now required to be appropriated by Congress from year to year?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I interpreted the Senator's statement, it implied as much.

Mr. HILL. The T. V. A. now has the power to draw on those funds for operating expenses or to meet emergencies.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does this fund ac-actually go into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. HILL. No; it actually goes into a special T. V. A. fund in the Treasury.

Mr. McCLELLAN. A special fund set up in the Treasury?

Mr. HILL. A special fund set up in the Treasury.

Mr. McCLELLAN. After the money is paid into that fund by the T. V. A., can it withdraw it at will without an appropriation by Congress?

Mr. HILL. It can withdraw it to meet operating expenses, or to meet emergencies.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can it withdraw all of it, or any part of it it may desire to withdraw, without an appropriation or affirmative action by Congress?

Mr. HILL. It can during that particular fiscal year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And it is doing so now?

Mr. HILL. It is doing so now. It can do so for that particular fiscal year. To make that money available for the next fiscal year, Congress has reappropriated whatever might be left in the fund, and in addition appropriated any other moneys which might be necessary for the T. V. A.

Mr. McCLELLAN. During any particular fiscal year, it can withdraw any money it pays in, before the year is concluded.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. It has a great transmission line running from Tennessee into the Senator's State of Arkansas. If there should be a tornado and that line should be blown down, the T. V. A. could withdraw from this fund whatever might be necessary to rehabilitate and restore the line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Aside from emergencies, can it withdraw money from the fund for any other purposes?

Mr. HILL. It can withdraw money from the fund only to meet emergencies, and for such other purposes as are set out in section 26—"in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients."

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the purpose for which it functions?

Mr. HILL. That is the purpose for which it functions.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So it can withdraw money from the fund for any purpose for which it operates.

Mr. HILL. It has done some other work. It has conducted certain experiments. As the Senator knows, it has conducted experiments with reference to obtaining alumina from the clays of Arkansas. Instead of having to send to South America or the Far East to obtain aluminum clays, it has carried on experiments to ascertain if it is not possible to obtain alumina from the clays in Arkansas. If it should need extra money for those experiments, I doubt if it could take it out of the special fund. Those experiments have been directly appropriated for.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is what I was about to ask. Has the money which it has expended for those purposes been directly appropriated?

Mr. HILL. Most of it has been directly appropriated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator mean to say that funds for experimental purposes have been directly appropriated by Congress?

Mr. HILL. I do not mean to say that the Congress specifically used the words "alumina investigations," but it has made appropriations for investigations. In the language of the bill the Senator will find the word "investigations."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has stated that some of the funds of the T. V. A. are appropriated by Congress. Does he not refer to such funds as may be left over from year to year?

Mr. HILL. They were funds which were left over; and, particularly in the early days, there were large appropriations, because there was not much income.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator referred to funds left over from one year to another.

Mr. HILL. Funds which had been taken in as receipts, and which the Congress reappropriated for the next fiscal year. Some other funds have also been appropriated directly out of the Treasury. That was particularly true in the early days, before the T. V. A. had much income. In the early days the T. V. A. had a very small income and very large expenditures, because of the construction of many dams.

Mr. ELLENDER. I had reference to the income of T. V. A.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am seeking information. Is there any other independent agency of the Government which operates in the same manner, and has a special fund from which it can make expenditures from time to time without direct appropriations by Congress?

Mr. HILL. Of course, there is no other agency operating exactly as the T. V. A. operates. It operates a power system, and also carries on work in the development of fertilizers. However, there are a number of agencies which are given flexibility, discretion, and independence in the handling of their funds.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is by specific language, either in the basic acts creating such agencies, or in the appropriations made for their benefit.

Mr. HILL. That is correct. For example, this is the language of the Commodity Credit Corporation Act:

> The Corporation is hereby authorized to use all its assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom and all moneys which have been or may hereafter be allocated to or borrowed by it, in the exercise of its functions as such agency, including the making of loans on agricultural commodities.

In the same way, certain flexibility and independence are given to the Export-Import Bank, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Inland Waterways Corporation. I am sure the Senator is familiar with the Inland Waterways Corporation, because it operates on the Mississippi River in his State. A similar flexibility exists in the operations of the War Shipping Administration, under the Maritime Commission.

When we have created a Government corporation and then have imposed upon the corporation duties and functions of a private corporation, we have given to the corporation the flexibility and independence which it had to have in order to function as a private corporation. The fact is that when the President sent his message to Congress back in 1933 asking for the T. V. A. legislation, he used the following words:

> To create a corporation clothed with the power of government—

Clothed with the power of government—

> but possessed of the flexibility and initiative of a private enterprise.

That is exactly what we sought to do in setting up the T. V. A.—to give those powers to the T. V. A., just as I have said we have given kindred or similar powers to other corporations which carry on the business of a private corporation.

I wish to emphasize, Mr. President, that in the original act, and in the original act as amended in 1935, as well as in the language which has been carried in appropriation bills up to the present day, the T. V. A. has had this flexibility, this right, and this power to use the receipts for the purposes which I have previously stated and read from the act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If what the Senator says is correct, why did the T. V. A. ask for and receive from the other House an amendment to the bill? The amendment is somewhat different from what has been offered heretofore. The House is undertaking to change the law, and that is the only reason why the amendments which the committee has offered are in order. They would not be in order unless the House had endeavored to change the law.

Mr. HILL. I shall tell the Senator exactly why that was done.

Under the original section 26 of the T. V. A. Act as amended, there was no provision or requirement with reference to where or how the T. V. A. should deposit its funds. Under the original section 26, and under section 26 as amended, the T. V. A. could deposit its money in a bank at Knoxville, Tenn., or at Sheffield, Ala., or at any place it saw fit. It could put its money in many different banks.

The T. V. A., after operating for a little more than 2 years, and after many conferences with the Comptroller General and with the members of the House Committee on Appropriations, and more particularly with the then chairman of the House committee, Mr. Buchanan, Representative from Texas, concluded that it would make for better auditing by the Comptroller General, and that it would make for better reporting to the Congress, if, instead of the T. V. A. depositing its money, amounting to many millions of dollars in private banks, it should have a special fund in the Treasury, put the money into such special fund, and use the Treasury of the United States as its bank instead of using many different private banks. That was the reason for its practice, and I invite attention to the fact that in this very language on page 52, line 23, we find the words "subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 as amended." Those

words were incorporated in the provision for the express purpose of retaining in the Tennessee Valley Authority Board the power given by section 26 to use the receipts for the purposes enumerated in section 26. So, when the money went into this special fund in the Treasury, the Board would not lose control of it, as it would lose control unless this particular language were in the bill. However, at all times, under section 26 originally, and as amended, under the language which has been carried in appropriation bills for the past 6 or 7 or 8 years, under all these provisions, the T. V. A. Board has had the power to check on these funds, to use them for the current expenses enumerated in section 26, in order to carry on its power operations and fertilizer manufacturing operations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator mentioned the Tennessee Valley Authority being audited by the General Accounting Office. Am I correct in understanding that there was some question raised as to whether auditing by the General Accounting Office was required by law, and that an agreement was reached between the T. V. A. and the General Accounting Office looking toward the auditing of the Authority by the Comptroller General?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. There is still some question whether such auditing is required by law, is there not?

Mr. HILL. There was no question about it being required by law. Questions rose in the early days because, as we must recall, the T. V. A. project was a vast, new undertaking in our Government. We had never before had a great corporation such as the T. V. A. Some question arose in the early days about certain powers of the Comptroller General, but I say to the Senator that those questions have long been resolved, and there is no conflict at the present time whatever between the Comptroller General and the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. On the contrary, does not this bill provide for an appropriation of $30,000, or an allotment of $30,000, with which to pay for the auditing by probably a Montgomery auditing firm? It is a firm located in that neighborhood.

Mr. HILL. To which city of Montgomery does the Senator refer?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am referring to Montgomery, Ala.

Mr. HILL. No; the Senator is entirely in error. It was not any firm in Alabama.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was a firm located somewhere.

Mr. HILL. The T. V. A. has ordered that an audit be made by the Comptroller General, but it has also had a separate audit made by commercial auditors. I do not know that I wish to go into all the details at this particular juncture in my remarks. The kind of audit the T. V. A. receives at the hands of the Comptroller General is different from that made by a commercial auditing concern. A commercial auditing concern goes into questions of depreciation, amortization, and all the many other questions which affect private corporations, matters with which the Comptroller General does not attempt to deal. The Comptroller General primarily goes into the question of whether or not the money was expended as the law provided it should be expended, and whether there has been an honest expenditure of the money. An audit made by a commercial auditing concern is a different kind of audit. The truth is that an audit made by a commercial concern is similar to calling in financial engineers, shall we say, for advice, to make sure that depreciation is properly being taken care of, that amortization is being properly taken care of, and to look into various matters of that kind.

In this connection I may say that the chairman of the Committee on Governmental Accounting of the American Institute of Accountants, and the executive secretary of the American Institute of Accountants, came to see me. They had no personal interest, for neither one of those gentlemen had ever been employed to audit the T. V. A.; neither one of them had ever made a dollar out of the T. V. A. However, they thought it was important that the Members of Congress realize there was a vast difference between the audit the Comptroller General makes of the average governmental agency and the business audit made by a private auditing concern. The truth is that a private concern goes over the whole system and provides a financial chart and compass by which to check on the many details and questions which must enter into sound and business-like operations of a great system such as the T. V. A.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It is true, however, is it not, that an organization which is Government sponsored, known as the Tennessee Valley Cooperative Association, or some such name, is not audited by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. HILL. What is the name of the organization?

Mr. AIKEN. There is an organization known as the Tennessee Valley Cooperative Association. It is listed as a Government agency. I do not know what it is.

Mr. HILL. There may be some organization by that name in that section, but I may say to the Senator that any association or organization down there which is spending any Government money is certainly audited by the Comptroller General. There may be some kind of private R. E. A. outfit or some other association of farmers or even people in cities or towns that use the name Tennessee Valley Cooperative Association, but they are not in any way expending any Government money. They may be purchasers of the power. We have cooperative associations that purchase T. V. A. power, but they are not in any way expending Government funds and they are not under the control of the T. V. A. They constitute purchasers from the T. V. A.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand this Tennesee Valley Cooperative Association is an organization of consumers of power furnished by the T. V. A.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and they would not be spending any Government money and they would not be under the control of the T. V. A.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is as I understand it.

Mr. HILL. Their only connection with the T. V. A. would be that they would buy power from the T. V. A., just as there are a number of rural electric cooperatives among the farmers in Tennessee and Alabama who buy power from the T. V. A., but those cooperatives constitute separate organizations entirely from the T. V. A. and are not under the control in any way of the T. V. A.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I think I shall ask to have placed in the RECORD the statement submitted by Mr. George P. Ellis, chairman of the Committee on Governmental Accounting of the American Institute of Accountants. If any of the Senators interested in this subject would like to know about the independent audit, I shall be glad to read the whole statement; otherwise, I shall put it in the RECORD, and proceed with my remarks.

I may say, however, that if the Senate had heard the statements of these gentlemen about what an independent audit would do for T. V. A. and what it would mean to T. V. A. from the standpoint of sound financing and efficient and businesslike operations the Senate would want the independent audit made; I think there can be no question about that.

I notice that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Georgia, seems to be in agreement. I hope he is in agreement with me that it is a thing that ought to be done, and is done by every good businessman.

Mr. RUSSELL. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that I think it is tremendously important that such an audit should be made, because it would reach many funds in this operation that would not be touched at all by the Comptroller General.

Mr. HILL. Exactly. As the Senator from Georgia says, there is no doubt that an independent audit ought to be made.

Mr. President, I do not want to be critical of my friend from Tennessee or the committee which adopted his amendment, but here is a perfect illustration of what is encountered when a committee in Washington undertakes to operate the T. V. A. I know how it is with committees of which I am a member. They are under great pressure of time and under great stress and strain. The committee did not go into this; perhaps it did not have time to go into it, and on the face of it it looked as if it were a wasteful expenditure in that there would be two audits. The question might be asked why it is not sufficient to have one audit, an audit by the Comptroller General, who is paid by the Government and

has employees who are paid by the Government. Naturally, in the minds of many Senators the question arises, Why should we spend $30,000 for another audit? The reason is that the audit made by commercial auditors becomes an entirely different kind of audit from the audit made by the Comptroller General, and is a very necessary audit for the operation of any business of the size and magnitude of the T. V. A.

I ask, Mr. President, that this statement in full be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL ACCOUNTING, AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ACCOUNTANTS ON ELIMINATION OF APPROPRIATION FOR INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF T. V. A. FROM INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1945

We believe the appropriation for independent audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority should be restored for the following reasons:

1. (a) The audit conducted by the General Accounting Office does not accomplish the same purposes as the audit conducted by independent certified public accountants. The word "audit" is used in different senses. The type of audit conducted by the General Accounting Office is primarily designed to determine whether expenditures are legal and within the authorized appropriations. The type of audit conducted by independent certified public accountants is entirely different. It is designed to determine whether the balance sheet and income statement fairly present the financial position and results of operations of the corporation.

(b) Independent audit involves an extensive examination based on tests and samples of the accounts underlying the financial statements and a review of the internal control of the corporation to ascertain whether (1) the accounts are reliable, and (2) they fairly reflect the transactions.

(c) This type of examination conducted by independent certified public accountants requires a consideration of whether the accounting methods employed by the corporation are in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles, and whether or not they have been consistently applied from year to year.

(d) The form of independent accountants' report (or certificate) appended to financial statements of the Tennessee Valley Authority is the conventional form customarily found in conjunction with financial statements of large industrial enterprises. The wording of this report or certificate has taken on special meaning because of its relation to pronouncements of the American Institute of Accountants, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the New York Stock Exchange, and the courts. The independent certified public accountant who signs this form of auditors' report or certificate assumes the responsibility of demonstrating, if necessary, that he satisfied himself as to the fairness of the items in the financial statements by means of an examination made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards applicable in the circumstances. These standards are well known in the accounting profession and the financial world, and are outlined in some detail in bulletins of the American Institute of Accountants, notably Examination of Financial Statements by Independent Public Accountants and Extensions of Auditing Procedures, as well as others of the series of bulletins, now numbering 18, known as Statements on Auditing Procedure.

2. (a) The Tennessee Valley Authority, while a Government corporation, engages in activities similar to those of privately owned enterprises. Its management is entitled to the assistance derived through an independent audit by professional certified public accountants just as it is entitled to legal counsel of the type available to privately owned industrial enterprises of the same nature.

(b) A comparison between the results of operations of the T. V. A. and privately owned enterprises of the same type would be more difficult if financial statements of T. V. A. were not audited in the manner customary among privately owned enterprises. The absence of the independent auditors' report or certificate would leave question as to whether generally accepted accounting principles had been followed in the presentation of the financial statements, and as to whether the underlying accounts and records had been tested and internal control reviewed in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards. It is believed that the type of audit conducted by the General Accounting Office does not lead to conclusions on these questions but rather on the legality and propriety of expenditures.

3. The standards and methods of governmental corporations ought not to be inferior to those of privately owned enterprises. It is significant that the Securities and Exchange Commission and the New York Stock Exchange require audits of corporations subject to their jurisdiction similar to the type of audit of the T. V. A. conducted by independent certified public accountants. Both the S. E. C. and the New York Stock Exchange accept the conventional short form of independent accountants' report or certificate which has also been utilized by the independent accountants who have audited T. V. A.

Respectfully submitted.

GEORGE P. ELLIS,
Chairman, Committe on Governmental Accounting, American Institute of Accountants.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the people of the State of Andrew Jackson, like the people of Alabama, have never looked with favor upon absentee control. They have been wonderfully well satisfied with the system Congress provided for the management of T. V. A. in 1933. They want major policies to be determined by the Congress. They want Congress to decide whether rivers should be developed and the general policy for their development. But the people want the day-to-day decisions through which management carries out those policies to be made close to them, responsive to their needs. If these amendments should become law, they will bring an end to the only real accomplishment in decentralization to which we can point.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. For information, let me ask can expenditures be made in the further development of a river, such as the construction of new dams, without the dams having first been authorized by the Congress?

Mr. HILL. No; I should say that the dams have to be specifically authorized by the Congress.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the funds collected in the form of receipts by the T. V. A. from its operations, once deposited in this fund in the Treasury, cannot then be withdrawn and used for the construction of new developments, such as dams on streams, until and unless such dams have been specifically authorized by the Congress?

Mr. HILL. I should say so. The Authority might use certain receipts to repair a dam or to do some small work of rehabilitation or restoration around a dam or something of that kind, or they might install additional transformers, but, so far as building a great dam on the river is concerned, I should say that T. V. A. would have to come to Congress and the dam would have to be specifically authorized.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is nothing in this proposed act by which T. V. A. would have to come to Congress.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing in the proposed act that would change the situation with reference to a dam. I have no complaint about the Authority having to come to Congress to construct dams. I think they ought to come to Congress if they are going to build a great dam, but I think they ought to be allowed to operate the power business on a businesslike, efficient basis, and in order to do that they must have a certain flexibility and leeway with reference to their receipts.

When the Senator from Arkansas pays his electric bill to the Potomac Electric Power Co., of Washington, he not only pays an obligation for electricity he has received, but he pays it on the basis that he will know that he is going to continue to obtain electricity; that if a storm comes or a tornado comes, or even if Washington should be bombed, the private power company will fix its lines and make such repairs as will enable him to continue to obtain electricity, without the company being compelled to come to Congress and get an appropriation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the power is granted to operate such installations and facilities as the Authority may have already constructed, and the Congress makes appropriations for their continuous maintenance and repair, I do not see that there is any particular argument that a fund should be set aside with which the Authority can do just as it pleases, when an appropriation can be made to meet contingencies.

Mr. HILL. The T. V. A. cannot do as it pleases with the fund. It is limited to the power granted in section 26 as amended. I will say, however, that when the appropriations are arrived at no man can foresee what the months are going to bring. I shall refer to that a little further on if I may go ahead, not that I do not want to answer the Senator's questions, for I shall be glad to do so. However, let us see what happens. The T. V. A. will go to the Budget Bureau along in August or September and submit an estimate. The money appropriated according to the estimate will not be available until the following July, and it will have to last through the whole fiscal year. So they submit their estimates more than 18 months in advance for

their appropriations, and no man can foresee that far ahead.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I do not want to cut off the Senator from Arkansas, but I intend to speak upon that later.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I merely want to make one further observation. If a contingent fund is needed for emergencies and for operation expenses, the point I make is, Do they need all the revenues they take in and hold in such a fund, which they can use at will? Would it not be better governmental procedure to make a special appropriation to meet such contingencies from time to time?

Mr. HILL. It is my very definite opinion that they should be allowed to use their receipts, rather than be dependent upon action by the Congress. I do not mind saying to the Senator from Arkansas that my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama, and I have had this matter of appropriations brought very close home to us. The Tennessee Valley Authority, on the recommendation and approval of the War Production Board, came to the Congress to ask for money with which to provide a phosphate plant, to be built for war purposes primarily, and secondarily for the production of fertilizer. The Tennessee Valley Authority selected Mobile, Ala., as the site for this plant because of its proximity to the Florida phosphate rock. Due to the long delay in the Congress in getting the appropriation through, that plant never has been built, and may never be built. It was delayed for so many months here in the Senate of the United States that the War Production Board made other plans, and had to use other facilities, and I am not sure that the plant will ever be built.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I make one observation on that?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It may have been the wise thing to construct that plant, but we do not want to turn over such normal and proper functions of the Government and of the Congress to some independent agency, and take the position that the Congress cannot function with respect to the enterprise of building a new plant or not building it. That would not be sound policy.

Mr. HILL. I may say to the Senator, as I stated earlier in my remarks, that so far as the policies are concerned, of course Congress should fix the policies.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama if it is not true that when the T. V. A. has come to the Congress for an appropriation for new construction, as it did 3 years ago, there has been deducted from the amount which is required for the new construction the amount which it has on hand which is available and which it could take from its pockets?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It contributed about $15,000,000 toward permanent new construction from the profits which it had made, did it not?

Mr. HILL. That is true. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. To that extent its operating income can be used for construction purposes, but with the consent of the Congress?

Mr. HILL. That is correct. The Senator is exactly right.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to make a statement, then to ask a question.

The T. V. A., without consulting Congress, or without asking permission of the Congress, spent between seven and eight hundred thousand dollars, as I recall, in purchasing a phosphate farm in Williamson County, Tenn., for the purpose of manufacturing phosphate. A short time later they bought another phosphate farm costing a little less—upward of $500,000 in Maury County.

The Senator now says that the purpose of the T. V. A. is to go to Mobile and build a plant there for the purpose of producing phosphate from Florida rock. I ask the Senator, is it not remarkable that the T. V. A. is buying phosphate lands in Tennessee, and is going to build a phosphate plant in southern Alabama for the purpose of manufacturing phosphate from Florida rock? Buying those lands merely shows the utter disregard the present Tennessee Valley Authority has for the Congress.

Mr. HILL. No. Did the Senator in his committee go into the question of the purchase of the lands in Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. HILL. That is the point, exactly. The committee did not go into that question. The Senator raises it here on the floor. He had every opportunity in the world to go into it.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is a statement in the record about the Tennessee lands and the Mobile plant.

Mr. HILL. It was referred to without any real exploration into the matter as to when these lands were bought, why they were bought, whether or not they were bought at the instigation of the War Production Board, or why they should have been bought at all. I do not hesitate to say that if the purchase of these lands were investigated, and all the facts were brought to light, the overwhelming chances are that the Senate would say that those lands should have been bought.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In explanation of the statement of the Senator from Tennessee that the T. V. A. acquired phosphate lands arbitrarily, and without authority of Congress, as I understood him to say, I call attention to the fact that application for this action was made to the Committee on Appropriations, and there was included in the bill before the Committee on Appropriations 2 or 3 years ago—I presented the request myself—authorization for the construction of the phosphate plant which has been referred to, and that has been carried continually in the appropriation bills since, because the Authority was unable to carry out the original provision because of priority orders, and the matter is still in that situation. The authority is contained in the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. HILL. Certainly; there is provision in the bill now for that.

Mr. BANKHEAD. So that there is no occasion for criticism about the phosphate plant being decided on without authority of Congress, or arbitrarily by the Authority.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I do not know the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and should like to ask a question for information. As I understand, the Government has entered into an immense business. I take it that there must be thousands of operations yearly in the transaction of this business.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. Under the method by which the business has been conducted, the receipts are used in the operation of the business. Does the Senator think it would be possible to have a separate appropriation for each transaction incident to that business?

Mr. HILL. I do not.

Mr. TUNNELL. So that in the actual operation of the company there must be reliance upon somebody's judgment, some executive's judgment.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand, it is now a question of whether the amounts of money referred to should be appropriated in advance and then used, or whether they should be taken in by the Authority in the transaction of its business and used by the executive. I wish to ask the Senator whether in each case the actual expenditure would not be left to the judgment of the same individuals.

Mr. HILL. It should be left to the managers of the T. V. A.

Mr. TUNNELL. And it would be, would it not?

Mr. HILL. I do not know whether it would be or not. If there were a Congress which was not in sympathy with the T. V. A., it might not be left to them.

Mr. TUNNELL. It never would be spent, under the plan suggested by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. Let me ask a further question. Are repairs made from the money which is obtained from the operation of the business?

Mr. HILL. They are.

Mr. TUNNELL. According to the plan of the Senator from Tennessee, would there have to be an appropriation for the repairs?

Mr. HILL. There would have to be.

Mr. TUNNELL. If there were no appropriation to fit a particular repair, it would have to wait until Congress met, perhaps?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct, and I thank him.

Mr. McKELLAR. If we did not make appropriations for the Army of the

United States, the Army could not function, could it?

Mr. TUNNELL. If I may answer that suggestion, I should say that I do not think the purpose of the Army of the United States is to manufacture and sell an article.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; but they do much of that very thing.

Mr. TUNNELL. No; they sell only what is left over. That is not their business. Their business is destruction, rather than manufacture.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the junior Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The income of the Army of the United States is not greater than the expenses, as is the case with the T. V. A.

Mr. HILL. I thank both Senators.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I further interrupt?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Delaware suggests that this enterprise would not be able to function if it had to come to Congress for appropriations as all other governmental agencies do. Do we not make appropriations now for the Army and the Navy to operate our locks and dams and flood-control installations on the different streams? We do not make appropriations for each little item of repair or for each little dredging operation on this or that particular curve in the river. It is more or less done where such operations are carried on under the specific appropriations of Congress.

Mr. HILL. That is true. As the Senator knows there has been a great variance in the past. Sometimes Congress has made very liberal appropriations for such items and at other times it has made more meager appropriations for them. There has been a very great variance. I myself have seen great dredges tied up, not doing anything, when a job was needed to be done. "Why are these dredges tied up? Why is this job not being done?" "We have no money with which to do it."

Mr. McCLELLAN. That poses this question: Are we taking the position now that in these matters the Congress cannot function efficiently, or that we are going to yield to the more expedient way of doing it and delegate more of our powers, and not retain the responsibility in the Congress?

Mr. HILL. No, not at all. As I said in the beginning, the Congress ought to lay down the general policies, but so far as operating or managing a power system is concerned, the Congress cannot do it and ought not to try to do it; it was not created or established to do it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understood the Senator awhile ago in his illustration to indicate that he felt that some things are being done which can be done now under the present flexibility of operations and authority granted, whereas if it were left to Congress there might be an unfriendly Congress, and therefore the work might never be done. The point I am making is, that an unfriendly Congress might be the Congress which represented the will and sentiment of the people at that time.

Mr. HILL. Of course, that is so.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And to keep government what it ought to be, final decision as to whether the work should be done or not done should rest with the Congress and not some board or commission.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator exactly that the fundamental question as to whether or not this power system ought to be operated or ought not to be operated should be determined by the Congress. Of course, the Senator knows that the Congress today, if it wanted so to do, could repeal the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and could offer its properties to the highest and best bidder. It could make any disposition it saw fit of these properties. It has that power. But I say that, so long as Congress has this agency operating as a power system, with thousands of consumers, and hundreds of industries, and great cities dependent upon the power it furnishes, the Congress ought to set the broad policies and permit the day-by-day management and operation of the system to be conducted by the technicians on the job at the power system.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to say to the Senator that I agree exactly with what he has said. I do not want to see the T. V. A. crippled. I do not want to see the law repealed. I do not want to see the operations hampered. That is not what I have in mind. But at the same time, I do not want to agree with the implication of the Senator that we should simply turn over the control and operation without taking the responsibility for what is being done.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct. We have the prime responsibility and we should determine the policies and see that the policies are carried out. But the detailed operation should be in the hands of the managers on the job with the power systems.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I take it from the argument of my able friend, the Senator from Alabama, that his view is that in a major operation such as the building of a great dam for power purposes or flood control the Congress in such an instance should determine the policy, but for the mechanics of operation, the physical process of turning the turbines and generators and selling power, and putting out power lines, that function should be the function which we have created by the act. Am I correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator has stated the matter much better and much more definitely than I could have stated it.

Mr. BONE. I should like to make one comment at this moment which I am sure touches a matter that all lawyers who have been in active practice in the utility field will readily recognize. The courts of my State, and I think the courts of most of the other States where this question has been at issue, have held that where a public body, such as a city or a State, or a county, goes into the power business, it is performing thereby not a government function as it is commonly understood, but it is performing the function of a private proprietor. Therefore, we are forced, if we are realistic, to consider the necessity of giving this instrumentality we have set up some of the necessary flexibility of a private corporation if we expect it to perform a useful function and do it efficiently.

I can understand the difficulties we all face in a legislative body in deciding some of these problems, such as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has referred to. He wants Congress to keep a finger in the pie, so to speak, and have control. On the other hand, we are turning wheels in the Tennessee Valley and producing a commodity. We might as well be producing sugar or cement or something else. We all want to have this project operated as efficiently as possible. Therefore the T. V. A., as well as the Bonneville project in my section of the country, in addition to whatever check the General Accounting Office has on them, called in private accountants and had them make a commercial audit, which goes, as the Senator from Alabama suggested, much deeper and over a wider field than a strict audit by the Comptroller General, which deals only with the legality of expenditures. The commercial audit dips its fingers into crevices and crannies which are not touched by a strict audit of the Comptroller General. Therefore, anyone curious about the functioning of the Corporation would find in the pages of the commercial audit much more meat, much more factual material than he would find in the cold audit of the Comptroller General.

I myself think it is an excellent idea to have both types of audits. The Comptroller General by his audit would say whether the money involved was spent lawfully. The private audit would establish whether value was received for the money expended.

Mr. President, when we had before us the matter of establishing the Northwest Power Authority, I attempted to insert in the law provision for a commercial audit, because I think it is a splendid idea to place the results of such a commercial audit in the hands of Members of the Senate and the House. Anyone in Congress who is familiar with the A B C's of a commercial audit could find out from it exactly what was going on. It is a much more revealing sort of record than that which we obtain from the Comptroller General.

I think the T. V. A. has done Congress a service in providing a commercial audit. I think it is an excellent idea, and I think we should not repeal the provision for such an audit. The expenditure of $30,000 for the purpose is as nothing compared with one's ability to place his finger on some leak which might cost 20 times as much.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to make one observation based on the statement made by the Senator from

Washington. The audit of the General Accounting Office, the Comptroller General, determines the legality of the expenditures and reveals whether the money has been spent within the authority delegated by the Congress. The private audit may reveal the wisdom of such expenditures.

Mr. BONE. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So I think that together they serve the whole purpose.

Mr. BONE. I think it is an excellent idea to have both audits.

Mr. HILL. Yet under the committee amendment the T. V. A. could not have the private audit.

Mr. BONE. I think that is correct. I think they complement one another. They rather give us a chance to check the commercial audit against the Comptroller General's audit, and vice versa; and if some error shows up, we can easily catch it.

Commercial audits are liable to take up items such as obsolescence, depreciation, and many other elements which would not be touched by the Comptroller General, as I understand his activities. I may not be too well informed about the matter; but so far as I know, the Comptroller General does not touch many angles which are vital to the success and welfare of any organization or corporation. As I understand the operations of organizations such as Bonneville and Coulee, I should want to know what their transactions were. If I were sitting in the saddle of authority over them, I should want to know what they were doing, the physical condition they were in, and all the other matters which a commercial audit probably would reveal to a large extent.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but, Mr. President, as I have said, under the pending amendments the Tennessee Valley Authority is denied the right to have such a commercial audit made.

Mr. BONE. Yes; I understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to preface what I shall say by a word about the policy of which the Senator has spoken. The Senator has said that the Congress should confine its activities to policy making. The Congress has invested—and did so quite largely at my request—between $750,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 in the Tennessee power plants. The Congress has furnished all the money. Is it not a policy of the Congress to say whether the receipts of that concern shall be turned into the Treasury of the United States, as was provided in the original law, in part, at least? Is not that a policy, namely, to say whether the receipts shall be turned into the Treasury, so that the Congress can at all times fix the policy?

Mr. President, if that is not done, we shall have no authority at all over the Tennessee Valley Authority; we shall have no means of determining what it is doing.

We have spent this money. It is our duty to safeguard it. I am in favor of giving the Tennessee Valley Authority every dollar it needs. But to build up reserve funds, to allow the Tennessee Valley Authority to use its receipts, constituting enormous sums of money, without coming to Congress and telling Congress what it wishes to use them for, without a word about their expenditure——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to yield to my friend, of course——

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator believe we should have such a policy?

Mr. HILL. Of course, I do not; and I wish to say that for all the years since 1933, when we established the Tennessee Valley Authority—and this is the year 1944—the T. V. A. has been coming to the House Committee on Appropriations and to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and has been giving those committees full and complete information respecting all its operations and the details of its operations. We have had our hands and our check and our control on the Tennessee Valley Authority during the past 11 years. The check has been a good one. The control has been a good one. No Member of the Senate will rise on this floor to say that under that system the Congress has not performed its duty or that the Tennessee Valley Authority has not done a good job. Why change the system now?

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has sat all these years as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Year after year when the present system has been in operation he has sat on that committee. He raised no question about the present system until 2 years ago, when he made a motion to strike out the House provision, and to provide that the money should go into the Treasury; but before that he had gone right along as one of the best friends of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator certainly would not want me to remain silent after a statement of that kind. Two years ago——

Mr. HILL. I said until 2 years ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Until 2 years ago, the T. V. A. was not receiving money. The dams were put in operation only approximately 2 or 3 years ago. As soon as they began to make money, the Tennessee Valley Authority wanted the Congress to take its hands off. But before that, when the T. V. A. had to come to Congress for its money, the story was a very different one.

Mr. HILL. No, Mr. President. The receipts in the earlier years were not large, but the T. V. A. has been taking in money each and every year from the minute it took over the power projects in Tennessee. The T. V. A. began to receive money at once. Of course, the receipts have grown during the years, but the T. V. A. has had substantial receipts during all the years of its existence.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not quite understand the answer the Senator gave to the question of the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] about the use of this money by the Executive or by the independent office, from the reserves set up. The Senator's answer was, I believe, that an unfriendly Congress might not appropriate the money for the purpose for which the independent agency might wish to use it—money which otherwise would go into a reserve fund. Am I correct about that?

Mr. HILL. There might be much delay and much thwarting on the part of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. But the Senator is not advocating that an independent agency set up reserves, is he?

Mr. HILL. Of course not. Under the present law the Congress, through the appropriations committees, has the whole picture before it. For the last 11 years the Congress, through the appropriations committees, has had the full and complete picture of the expenditures made under the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have before me the Bureau of the Budget estimates for the year 1945. They give the full and complete story of the expenditures and of what is proposed for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is not asking that an extension of power be given to this independent agency, in order to enable it to set up reserves which it might spend, but which it could not otherwise receive if it came to an unfriendly Congress and requested the appropriation; is he?

Mr. HILL. Not at all. I am asking that the T. V. A. be permitted to operate in the future just as it has been permitted to operate in the past.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that, insofar as reserves are concerned, the bill as passed by the House contains a provision for a little more than $10,000,000 of reserves. Under that provision, the T. V. A. will receive in receipts and in unexpended balances $10,000,000 more than it expects to expend during the coming year. It is requesting that, in addition to the money which is required for its own operations, the Congress set up a reserve of $10,000,000, or a little more, for it to use as it likes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not agree at all with the Senator on that proposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will look at the bill, he will see that the provision is as I have said.

Mr. HILL. The T. V. A. does not request $10,000,000 for it to use as it likes. The T. V. A. wishes to have the reserve available in the event it constructs a phosphate plant or in the event it carries forward the construction of the Watauga and the Holston Dams.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I still am not clear about what the Senator meant when he answered the Senator from Delaware. What did the Senator from Alabama mean when he said that an unfriendly Congress might not appropriate the money which the executive or the agency

might require in order to carry on the operations of the T. V. A.?

Mr. HILL. There might be a storm, a tornado, or a flood.

Mr. WHERRY. Could not the T. V. A. now repair such damage?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. That does not answer my question. What does the Senator mean by saying that an unfriendly Congress might not grant an appropriation?

Mr. HILL. I am not trying to change the system. What I am fighting for is to let the system remain as it is, that is, with authority in this board to make repairs and do such other things as may be necessary for the maintenance and operation of the power system.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean that, if the amendment of the committee were adopted, the T. V. A. would have to come to Congress and ask for appropriations to repair lines?

Mr. HILL. The T. V. A. might have to come to Congress and ask for an appropriation to put one additional transformer on a power line.

Mr. WHERRY. The authority which the Senator is asking for is authority to use the funds of the T. V. A. in the manner described if an unfriendly Congress should not grant an appropriation. There would be a reserve to take care of it.

Mr. HILL. No. The Senator speaks of an unfriendly Congress——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator brought that up.

Mr. HILL. There might be a friendly Congress which was busy with many other things. It takes time to get appropriation bills through Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator made the remark about an unfriendly Congress. I am trying to find out what limitation would be imposed on the T. V. A. by an unfriendly Congress which might make it desirable to establish reserves.

Mr. HILL. Today the T. V. A. can use its receipts for the operation of its power business. If it had to come to Congress to get all its money, and could not use its receipts, if there were an unfriendly Congress it might delay and hamper the T. V. A. It might dally with the requests for appropriations. I say that the power consumers of the Tennessee Valley have the right to have constant delivery of power, just as they would have the right to have constant delivery of power from a private company.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think there is a middle ground between the two extremes. One extreme is to allow the T. V. A. directors—namely, Mr. Lilienthal and company—to treat these funds as their own private funds, and to do with them as they please, possibly even to the extent of opposing the senior Senator from Tennessee or the junior Senator from Tennessee in a campaign for reelection. There is quite a difference between allowing them to treat those funds entirely as their own private funds, to do with as they please, and establishing a reasonable discretion for them to use the funds for repairs, as the Senator has described, to keep the T. V. A. in operation as a going concern. It seems to me that there is a tremendous difference between the two extremes which have been presented to the Senate.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No one wishes to hamstring the Tennessee Valley Authority as a going operation.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is entirely correct in what he says. There is a vast difference between the two extremes. Certainly, the Tennessee Valley Authority has no right, and no employee of the Authority or any member of its Board has the right, to use any of its funds for the purposes indicated by the Senator from Missouri.

At the beginning of my remarks, when the Senator was absent from the Chamber, I called attention to the only purpose for which the Tennessee Valley Authority can use its receipts, as set out in section 26, in these words: "In conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients."

That is the power which we fight to preserve in the Tennessee Valley Authority Board. We are not asking for any additional power, but we do think that the Authority ought to have the power now granted in the basic law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So far as I am concerned, I have no complaint as to the business operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority. From what I know about it, I think it has done a splendid job. However, I do object very much to the political activities of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] has told me that Mr. Lilienthal, who is on a salary in the Tennessee Valley Authority, went into Tennessee, where, of course, he is a carpetbagger, and has no status as a citizen of Tennessee, as a Government employee—at least, I assume that an employee of the T. V. A. is a Government employee, despite the fact that the T. V. A. is able to control its own funds—to make speeches against the junior Senator from Tennessee. Whatever Mr. Lilienthal might say as a carpetbagger temporarily sojourning in Tennessee would have no influence; but when Mr. Lilienthal, the head of the T. V. A., makes speeches which might be calculated to coerce such of the army of employees of the T. V. A. as are qualified voters in Tennessee, to my mind that presents a very serious question. It is to that question that I am addressing myself.

So far as I am concerned, for some of these amendments I would not be inclined to vote; but if Mr. Lilienthal has been using the prestige and power of his position as head of the T. V. A. to coerce his army of employees and engage in Tennessee politics, then I will vote for any restrictive amendment on the T. V. A. which may be suggested. Otherwise, so far as the business administration of the T. V. A. is concerned, I have no complaint to offer.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BONE. I should like to say to my able friend from Missouri that I am constrained to agree with him. Abuses such as he has described might grow up; but I do not wish to be compelled to accept a great number of amendments which are unpalatable merely in order to achieve one objective which may be desirable. There is no distinction. The amendments are lumped together and we are asked to vote on the whole group of them, and, nolens volens, we shall vote on them. I do not wish to have to take 40 kinds of medicine in order to take 1 particular brand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that he will have ample opportunity to vote on each and every amendment separately. I think they ought to be voted on separately.

Mr. HILL. If I may have the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], I will say to him that I do not condone any such political activity as he has described.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My information on the subject comes entirely from the two Senators from Tennessee.

Mr. HILL. I wish to be perfectly candid with the Senate—

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Inasmuch as my name has been mentioned by the Senator from Missouri in connection with the political activities of Mr. Lilienthal, let me say that it will be recalled by the Senator from Missouri, and possibly by other Senators, that more than a year ago, when a colloquy occurred on this floor in which several Senators participated—I do not now recall what evoked the colloquy—I related what had happened in the political campaign of 2 years ago with respect to Mr. Lilienthal, who I believe was then the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and is now the Chairman. Quoting from memory, I will repeat what I said on that occasion.

About 3 weeks before the August primary in 1942, in which I was a candidate, Mr. Lilienthal, in a speech which he delivered before the Kiwanis Club of Knoxville, Tenn., stated that "We have defeated them on the Washington front." A T. V. A. amendment had been defeated by the House only a few weeks before that. "Now I warn the people of the valley against the establishment of a second front in Tennessee."

I saw that article on the front page of the Chattanooga Times, as I recall, on the day I spoke in Chattanooga. I stated in my speech that I and others who read the article construed it as a challenge to my candidacy. I stated that I believed that Mr. Lilienthal was

subject to the Hatch law, and to other statutes preventing political activities on the part of certain Government employees; that his speech was a political statement, made to arouse opposition to me; that I accepted his challenge; and that if I misconstrued his statement, the press was still open to him to correct it. I received no reply from him.

That is what occurred, and that is what I previously related on this floor.

I shall make a statement before the debate on the T. V. A. amendments is concluded. I shall support some of the amendments, and some I cannot support. However, I shall certainly support any amendment which would prevent political activity on the part of T. V. A. employees.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. This amendment deals with the receipts of the Corporation. From what the Senator has said, I do not infer that what Mr. Lilienthal did on the occasion referred to violated any moral principle, or the rules of the T. V. A. It seems to me that what the Senator has referred to was not related in any way to the disposition of or the proper handling of the funds of the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has referred to me. Bless his soul, the political activities against my colleague are a mere zephyr compared to what this remarkable employee of the Government has been doing to me for many years. He has been fighting me day and night, in almost every speech he has made throughout the State. My friends have written me for several years concerning his extreme opposition to me. He wants a better Senator from Tennessee. He wants someone to be elected in my place. Perhaps he is right. I admit to being a very poor Senator, but, by heavens, I do not like to have the head of the T. V. A., who was imported from some other State, come to Tennessee and take sides in politics against me. He did that in 1940. He has constantly done so all over the State in speeches he has made. I do not know what my colleague thinks about it, he may think it is all right. He may think it will do him good. However, I do not want it to be done, especially while the Hatch Act is in force. I am sorry the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is not present, because I think this is the only good word I have ever spoken for the Hatch Act. I understand that Mr. Lilienthal is a policy-making official of the Government, and claims not to be under the Hatch Act. He will claim anything on earth which will be of any benefit to him.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should be the last man in the Senate to want Mr. Lilienthal to engage in any kind of politics, or make any kind of an attack on the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator has said that Mr. Lilienthal has been fighting him for many years, and as I understand the Senator, Mr. Lilienthal has been making speeches against him. Am I correct?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; he attends meetings of the Rotary Club and of chambers of commerce. His favorite organizations, I believe, are chambers of commerce, Rotary Clubs, Kiwanis Clubs, and various noonday clubs which exist all over the country. He acts in a way similar to that which was referred to in reference to Mr. A. E. Morgan, his former associate. He eases in and eases out, but condemns me all the time. [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Allow me to ask the Senator a question. Can the Senator give us a quotation from some speech which Mr. Lilienthal has made in which he has attacked the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not understand the Senator's question.

Mr. HILL. Can the Senator give us a quotation from some speech which Mr. Lilienthal has made concerning the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not have with me a copy of any speech of Mr. Lilienthal. I shall be very happy to furnish the Senator letters showing various places in my State where Mr. Lilienthal has been. Citizens of my State have written me and told me that he has been in those places fighting me. They have called me on the telephone. I have received telephone calls within the last few days in which I was told about the fight Lilienthal has been making upon me. That may be all right for this great head of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He has not hurt me thus far, and I do not believe he will hurt me in the future. However, it does not make me like him any more [Laughter.]

Mr. HILL. Of course, Mr. President, Mr. Lilienthal has no right to make any attack on the Senator from Tennessee, or, for that matter, on any other Senator. I myself have never seen any statement from Mr. Lilienthal which in any way brought the Senator from Tennessee into question. I have never seen any statement which anyone purported to believe brought the Senator into question. It is true, Mr. President, that Mr. Lilienthal makes a great many speeches. He comes into Alabama occasionally and makes speeches there. However, if he has ever said anything in Alabama of a political nature, I do not know what it was.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope he does not make speeches against my friend, the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I hope not, and I would condemn him just as strongly for making any kind of a political statement against the Senator from Tennessee as I would condemn him for making any kind of a political statement against myself. But the Senator from Tennessee has said that Mr. Lilienthal has been traveling all over Tennessee fighting him and making speeches against him. In view of the standing of the Senator from Tennessee, the high esteem in which he is held, and the great affection which his colleagues entertain for him, naturally such a statement against the Senator from Tennessee would raise resentment on the part of all Senators against Mr. Lilienthal. Naturally, such a statement would have its effect on the consideration of these amendments. I think that if Mr. Lilienthal has made any such attack on the Senator from Tennessee as the Senator has indicated, or in any way questioned the Senator's actions, or cast aspersions upon him, the Senator from Tennessee should let the Senate know what it is upon which he bases his statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to give what my file shows. I hold in my hand a letter from Dr. A. E. Morgan, who thus describes Mr. Lilienthal:

> There is a practice of evasion, intrigue, and sharp strategy, with remarkable skill in alibi and the habit of avoiding direct responsibility, which makes Machiavelli seem open and candid * * * and man for man directness was a mask for hard-boiled, selfish intrigue. * * * The marble claims, in my opinion, were an effort at deliberate barefaced steal. * * * The public and the Congress do not yet know the extent to which that was improperly handled.

The Senator wants to know how I know Mr. Lilienthal is fighting me in Tennessee. Has the Senator any doubt about a candidate in Alabama being against him?

Mr. HILL. No; I have no doubt about it, because every day he is making speeches in which he declares that he is against LISTER HILL. What I want the Senator from Tennessee to do is what I think he ought to do, namely, to submit a bit of evidence of some kind to the Senate upon which he predicates his statement that Mr. Lilienthal is fighting him. Certainly the statement which the Senator from Tennessee has just read has nothing to do with the Senator from Tennessee. It is an attack on Mr. Lilienthal by Dr. Morgan. The Senate, of course, recalls all that controversy, the feud which existed between Dr. Arthur Morgan and David E. Lilienthal. The Senate knows that not only did the President of the United States find in favor of Mr. Lilienthal, but that a special committee of the Senate of the United States, headed by the then Senator from Ohio, Senator Donahey, investigated the matter and found in favor of Mr. Lilienthal. I think that all that Morgan said about Lilienthal had nothing to do with any alleged statements of Mr. Lilienthal concerning the Senator from Tennessee.

I do not think that in a debate on this floor when we are trying to act on these amendments on their merits, the Senator from Tennessee should make the statement that Mr. Lilienthal has been fighting him through the years, and yet not give us some basis for his statement. The Senator from Tennessee spoke of his campaign in 1940. I remember it well, because at the time I was staying at the Mayflower Hotel where the Senator from Tennessee was also staying, and I rejoiced with him when there was no opposition to his election in 1940. The Senator from Tennessee was renominated without any opposition whatever. I remember the beautiful statement the Senator from Tennessee issued expressing his appreciation to the people of Tennessee because he had no opposition.

I remember that the Senator from Tennessee quoted from the beautiful Twenty-third Psalm—"The Lord is my shepherd," and so forth—and drew a parallel showing how good and fine the people of Tennessee had been to him. I rejoiced with the Senator from Tennessee that he had no opposition.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suppose the Senator is referring now to Lilienthal. He is the man who has been operating against me. I do not know that he is from Tennessee; I do not know whether he ever voted in Tennessee; he may claim not to be a Tennessean, and the other day in the committee he claimed that he was not opposing me; but that would be equal to nothing on earth in view of the reputation he has with his colleagues of being elusive and indirect. That is the kind of speeches he makes. I never heard Lilienthal make a speech in my life, but I know, as every other sensible person would know, when a man of that kind, traveling around the State, is undertaking to undermine and discredit me in every possible way. That is what Lilienthal has been doing. I say that when a man who is sent down there from another State to direct the work of an Authority such as the T. V. A. thus conducts himself against the two Senators from that State, it is unworthy of him; his attitude is improper, and this body ought not to uphold him.

Mr. HILL. It seems to me that if Mr. Lilienthal has been for years making a fight on the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, somewhere, some place, in some newspaper or some article or some periodical, there would be some word, some line, or some thought expressed that the Senator from Tennessee could point his finger at as evidence that Mr. Lilienthal was fighting him. To quote what Dr. Morgan, who had a feud with Mr. Lilienthal, had to say about Mr. Lilienthal is certainly no evidence that Mr. Lilienthal has in any way ever said anything uncomplimentary about the Senator from Tennessee or in any way has taken any action by word or deed or even by thought against the Senator from Tennessee. I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee let the Senate know what is the basis for his statement that Mr. Lilienthal is fighting him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to make such a statement if I ever get the opportunity.

Mr. HILL. Let the Senator from Tennessee make the statement, because, as I say, it is only fair to the Senate that he should do so. The Members of the Senate are sitting here as judges in this matter; we have to pass on these amendments on their merits, and when a man like the Senator from Tennessee, for whom I have a deep affection and whom I hold in such high esteem, tells me that a man has been fighting him for years, naturally it makes me react unfavorably against that man, and in such a case, whether I wanted it to be so or not, it would affect, perhaps, my position on the amendments. So I think if the Senator is going to make the argument that one reason these amendments ought to be adopted is that Mr. Lilienthal has been fighting him for years, the Senator from Tennessee ought to be able to find at least some little bit of evidence, one little thread of evidence upon which he predicates his statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly shall do so.

Mr. HILL. If Mr. Lilienthal has been speaking to Kiwanis clubs, Rotary clubs, Civitan clubs, Lion clubs, and other clubs, certainly his speeches have been reported; somebody has taken them down. If they were not printed in the newspaper, somebody who was present made a note of what he said. If Mr. Lilienthal has been fighting the Senator from Tennessee for years, there must be some evidence somewhere. The truth is when Mr. Lilienthal comes into Alabama to make a speech he generally has a mimeographed copy of it. I have a number of copies of such speeches. Whenever he comes to Alabama I usually write him requesting a copy of his speech, and he sends me a mimeographed copy of it. Now I want the Senator from Tennessee to submit one little bit of evidence upon which he predicates his statement that Mr. Lilienthal has been fighting him for years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama said he wanted the Senator from Tennessee to make a categorical answer as to where the speech was printed. The Senator from Alabama knows that sometimes the most effective opposition is not that of the enemy who comes out with a broadside right in front, where everybody can see him, and makes a speech, but it is the insinuating and devious methods these functionaries employ to stir up somebody else, to stir up the local Rotary president with the idea that if Mr. Lilienthal is not let alone the T. V. A. will be destroyed, or to stir up the local banker, who is afraid that if he does not look out some funds will not get into his bank, and so he begins to become alarmed and works up sentiment. Is it not possible that the opposition to which the Senator from Tennessee refers is of that kind, the sly insinuating fox-like opposition, that is very potent, rather than the brass-band type that says, "Yes, we are all against McKELLAR." If Lilienthal did that, he knows there would be an uprising, and that even the President of the United States would say, "Here, Mr. Lilienthal, you cannot do that openly; you cannot come out openly and say, 'To hell with McKELLAR'; you have got to do it with a fine Italian hand; grease the skids, get Mr. McKELLAR where his wool is short, and ease him out."

Mr. HILL. Let me say to the Senator from Texas that in all the speeches of Mr. Lilienthal that I have seen, and in all the conversations I have had with him, he has certainly not indulged in any such tactics as that. He is not making that kind of an attack, indeed, not making any kind of an attack. The Senator from Texas knows——

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a word.

Mr. HILL. The Senator knows this about it——

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know Mr. Lilienthal, never saw him; but I know methods.

Mr. HILL. If he is making that kind of an attack, a covert attack, or, as the Senator says, an insinuating attack, is sticking him from the curtain, from behind, rather than ripping him from the front, surely the Senate of the United States knows that kind of attack. We would have no difficulty in discerning or in properly understanding that kind of attack. If the Senator from Tennessee has any evidence of that kind of an attack, I want him to submit it to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator brought this matter up by referring to me. I never would have brought it up myself.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] brought it up. I did not bring it up. I would not have brought it up. To tell the truth, if I may say so, I have regretted that the Senator from Missouri brought it up, but he referred to it, and it having been brought up, I think the Senate should go into it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want the question before the Senate settled on the basis of whether the action is favorable or unfavorable to me. Mr. Lilienthal has a right to be against me, and I would not have any of these questions settled on the consideration of whether his actions were unfavorable or favorable to me. As a matter of fact, when the proper time comes, when I get an opportunity to speak, later on, after the Senator shall have concluded, I hope to make a statement about the matter, and I shall certainly give the Senator from Alabama, and every other Senator, ample evidence to show that the statement I have made is correct.

The Senator does not have to have someone tell him when a man is silently against him. He knows when a man of any note in his State is against him, and here is a man who has been against me ever since he came into the State, and has been fighting me at all times.

I appeal to my colleagues to decide this matter on its merits, and not on Mr. Lilienthal's opposition to me. I do not ask that it be decided on that ground. I ask my brother Senators to settle it on its merits entirely, and not because of any interest they may have in me personally or politically.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator from Alabama yield in order that I may ask the Senator from Tennessee a question?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is it or is it not the attitude of the Senator from Tennessee that so far as Mr. Lilienthal personally is concerned, the Senator agrees he has a right to vote as he pleases, but the Senator from Tennessee does not propose to arm him with Government funds and control over thousands of employees, to employ them and use them for political purposes. Is that the Senator's attitude?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly my position.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think no Senator would disagree with that premise, no Senator would want to arm any Government employee with thousands of dollars of Government funds, or even a

few hundred dollars of Government funds, I will say to my friend the Senator from Texas, with which to engage in politics either to elect or defeat a Senator. But I do not think that fundamental questions of policy with reference to the T. V. A. should be determined on the basis of the actions or sentiments of any one member of the Board of Directors, or on some position the Board of Directors may have taken. If we are to legislate wisely and well, we must legislate having in mind something greater than personalities or individuals. If Mr. Lilienthal be guilty of the things the Senator from Tennessee says he is guilty of, then Mr. Lilienthal should be removed as a member of the Board of Directors of the T. V. A. If he is going around doing all these many things, we should take steps looking to his removal. As I recall the original act, it specifically provides that a member of the Board of Directors can be removed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress. If Mr. Lilienthal be guilty, if he has done things he should not have done, then we should pass on Mr. Lilienthal, and not pass on great fundamental questions of policy with reference to the operation of this great power system, on an ad hominem or personal basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. A little while ago the Senator charged me with having been on the Committee on Appropriations and allowing certain things to happen, and now he charges me with not taking proper steps to have Mr. Lilienthal removed.

Mr. HILL. No, Mr. President. Let me say this——

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator——

Mr. HILL. I have the floor, and I want to extend every courtesy to the Senator, but he must not say that I have charged him with these things. I have not charged him with anything.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator came very near it. Perhaps I inferred that he did, rather than that he made the actual statement, but the Senator so inferred, as I gathered what he meant from what he said. I wish to say that, so far as Lilienthal is concerned, when I found he was not running the plant in accordance with law, as I shall undertake to show tomorrow when the time comes for me to speak, I went to the President of the United States, who is my friend, who is the man who should know about the matter first, and I told him the facts, and urged him to dismiss Mr. Lilienthal from the service. He took the matter under consideration, and I had rather supposed that he would make some other disposition of Mr. Lilienthal than to keep him in Tennessee, where he was doing the things of which I complained. But it has not been done. So I feel that I am within my rights now in undertaking to see that Mr. Lilienthal not only complies with the law in Tennessee, but that he pays into the Treasury of the United States the money which he takes in, as the law intended that he should do. That is all I want to see done.

I repeat, I do not want any Senator to vote because of how he may regard me personally. I am tremendously interested in this matter, because I have given the greater part of my life to the building of the Tennessee dams, as I propose to show tomorrow. The greater part of my public life has been given to that purpose. I have been with them from the beginning, since 1916, when I offered the first amendment that became law providing for the building of these dams. I want to see them prosper. I want to see them honestly administered. In very large measure, I caused the Government to put its money down there. I should be untrue to my duty as a Senator if I did not take every precaution to see that the Government money was honestly accounted for, and that there was paid into the Treasury of the United States all that should be so paid. It is for that reason that I am laying before the Senate frankly my whole course in regard to the matter. I have not taken anyone by surprise. I have been open and frank before the committee, before the Senate, and before the President of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say again that what I seek is not any change of the basic law at all, but that the T. V. A. be allowed to operate this great system just as it has been allowed to operate it under the basic law from the very beginning, in 1933.

Today more than two and a half million people depend on this power system in their daily lives. When the Tennessee Valley Authority Act was adopted, there was a capacity of 244,000 kilowatts of power turned over to the T. V. A. to manage. Today T. V. A. is operating 24 major generating plants—18 hydro and 6 steam—having a total installed capacity of over 1,800,000 kilowatts. Over 11,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours are supplied from this system to some 540,000 consumers. Over 5,700 miles of transmission lines have been constructed or acquired to carry the power to 84 municipalities and 45 farm cooperatives who own their distribution systems, to 11 great industries all in war production, and to 10 military establishments.

Over 75 percent of the power produced by T. V. A. today is going directly into war production. During the period from September 1939 to December 1941 the T. V. A. delivered to the various war industries in the area a total of 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours in excess of its contract commitments. This was made possible by efficient management and by T. V. A.'s ability to meet emergencies by using its revenues. This was the power that went directly into bombers and fighters at the very time when the need for them was greatest.

This is the size of the job the Congress of the United States would undertake to manage under the Senate amendments. Every Senator knows we are not equipped to do it. Federal budget and appropriations procedures are not designed for such operations. And no matter how gifted, how industrious, and how devoted to the public service members of the Appropriations Committees may be, they are not selected for their experience in electric system operation nor do they have the time to learn the craft. And they are 500 miles away from the problem.

What kind of management decisions did these new managers propose?

This would be the total effect of their recommendations: They are not the effects set out in the committee report. The savings to which the committee refers are an illusion. Actually the result of the committee's recommendations would be to reduce revenues, to limit power capacity below contractual commitments, to jeopardize the continuity of electric service throughout the area, to freeze war production.

These are some of the committee's recommendations for the management of the T. V. A. power system next year:

First, stop work on Watts Bar steam plant.

The appropriation bill as it passed the House, based on recommendations of the present management of the T. V. A. power system, provided for continued construction at Watts Bar steam plant. The text of explanation provided by T. V. A. for use of the committee members showed that the continued construction referred to involved the installation at this existing project of a new generating unit. The Senate Committee on Appropriations decided to strike it. I find little discussion on this important managerial decision in the record of the hearings. I wonder if the committee knew the facts. This is the situation:

This would be the fourth unit to be installed at the Watts Bar steam plant. It was reinstated in the Authority's construction program by special action of the War Production Board late in 1943 because more power was needed for war production. Earlier, in October 1942, although funds had already been provided by the Congress, work on this unit had been stopped. But when a sudden and substantial increase occurred in the power requirements of War Department projects in this area, the installation of this unit became essential. It happens to be one of the few increases in generating capacity approved by W. P. B. for 1945 for the entire interconnected power system of the east-central region of the United States, and, fortunately, required relatively little manpower or materials because the building and the boiler had been largely finished when completion was deferred in October 1942 by W. P. B. order.

The steam turbine and the generator are now in process of manufacture, and most of the material has been fabricated. Taken as a whole, the fourth unit and appurtenant facilities will be over four-fifths completed by the end of this fiscal year, and will have a rated capacity of 60,000 kilowatts, capable of producing about a half billion kilowatt-hours per year. But it will be useless and idle—incapable of earning any return on the $4,000,000 already paid out—if it is stricken from this bill, and if receipts are turned into the Treasury and the Authority must depend on appropriated money.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator estimate for us to what extent this project was completed or will be completed by the end of this fiscal year?

Mr. HILL. It will be nearly completed, but it is necessary to have this additional money for final completion.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand, by the end of this fiscal year——

Mr. HILL. Which fiscal year?

Mr. BURTON. The one that expires on June 30 next.

Mr. HILL. No; it would go over into the next fiscal year.

Mr. BURTON. Is the additional money with which we are now dealing required to complete the units?

Mr. HILL. To finish the units; yes.

Mr. BURTON. And if this additional money is not appropriated, then to what extent will the work be left uncompleted?

Mr. HILL. It will be left uncompleted to such an extent that all the power or benefits from it would be denied. In other words, none of the 60,000 kilowatts of power which the project would be capable of producing or would produce would be obtained.

Mr. BURTON. Am I correct in this picture of the matter, that there is about 10 percent more to be done, and that about 90 percent has been done?

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator is approximately correct.

Mr. BURTON. So if the additional amount provided in the bill is not appropriated we might actually lose the benefit of the 90 percent which has been spent, including the critical materials that have gone into it?

Mr. HILL. It would be lost so far as getting any power is concerned. There is no question that it would be lost. In other words, if the committee amendment is adopted one-half billion kilowatt-hours a year would be lost to war production, in the manufacture of rubber, phosphorus, steel, or aluminum—for tanks, ships, planes, smoke screens, and bombs.

Mr. BURTON. May I inquire further if the appropriation with which we are dealing relates to an additional unit or to an original installation?

Mr. HILL. It relates to an additional unit in the plant, and the additional unit would produce one-half billion kilowatt-hours of power a year. If we fail to provide this money we will not get the additional one-half billion kilowatts of power.

Mr. BURTON. And approximately $4,000,000—is that the figure the Senator is using—would be in the project, but would not be usefully employed?

Mr. HILL. On which there would be no return.

Mr. BURTON. So the Senator's point is that if this item of appropriation were omitted we would not be serving the purpose of economy, but by our failure to proceed with some 10 percent we would be losing the use of some 90 percent of an investment in an additional unit for this plant?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask what unit that is?

Mr. HILL. It is the additional unit at the Watts Bar steam plant.

Mr. President, this illustrates one of the dangers of the Appropriations Committee trying to manage this great power project in the Tennessee Valley; in other words, this amendment, if adopted, will mean that this unit cannot come into operation, this power will not be available, and guns, planes, ammunition cannot continue to go out from this river valley to the other valleys of the world where our boys are fighting and dying.

Under the present management of T. V. A. there has been no interruption. In other words, these investments have been used in the wisest and most economical and most efficient way. We have not permitted, as is now proposed, a project on which $4,000,000 have been expended, to stand idle, thus denying the power which is needed for war production. That is what the amendment suggested by the committee would do.

The committee recommendation, as embodied in the amendment, is an effective answer to those who try to tell us that Congress will always appropriate the money required to carry on the power operations, that the consumers of power need have no fear of dependence on annual appropriations. This is the first time the committee has faced the problems of managing a power system. What is the result? By the very first amendment in the bill the committee stops construction of a system extension urgently required to carry a critical war load.

I am not suggesting any lack of patriotism or concern for war production. I am simply illustrating the fact that the details of a power business in the Tennessee Valley cannot be run from an office in Washington, even if that office is as important as the room of the Committee on Appropriations.

The situation would be almost as bad in peacetime. Suppose, for example, that this unit, instead of being installed to meet increased war requirements, were under construction to meet the expanding power requirements of a city like Chattanooga, Tenn.? Chattanooga is entirely dependent on T. V. A. as its source of power supply. Suppose Chattanooga, happy in an increased population, a more prosperous people, advised the T. V. A. that it was going to require more power for new factories, new homes, new stores. The titular manager of T. V. A. would say: "I will go to Congress and see if we can put in a new unit at Watts Bar." While he came with his figures to prove that such an investment would pay out some of the stores or factories or citizens might make other plans for installations at other locations. But assume that, full of faith in their Government, they waited, and did not seek other locations. And let us assume that the manager made out a good case, and that in due time funds were appropriated to pay the estimated expenses of manufacturing such a unit for the next fiscal year. Contracts would be entered into, not only contracts for power supply, but contracts for building construction, for air conditioning, for the purchase of refrigerators and stoves, the kind of business activity that is good for a city to have. All plans would be made. But then suppose that the next year, when construction was incomplete, as construction is incomplete now at the Watts Bar steam plant, the committee changed its mind, and that funds to complete the unit were not allowed. Can you picture a prosperous and happy area dependent on such a power system, run by such vacillating managers?

There is nothing theoretical about my assumption that the committee might well be variable. This is exactly what has happened. The Watts Bar generating unit was once approved by Congress. That unit is almost completed. It is needed to supply commitments solemnly entered into by an agency of the United States. The unit is needed for power for victory. And now, without any testimony, without technical inquiry or advice, provision for it is stricken from the bill.

I need offer no further proof that the adoption of this amendment would mean the impairment of the T. V. A. power system, that it would halt war production, and would affect adversely the interest of taxpayers all over the country, who would receive no return on their investment. But I have further proof.

Let me cite another example, one directly affecting power-system operation, to prove that these Washington managers in the first year they have proposed to assume the responsibility for running this power system have made a terrible error. Under the committee's recommendations under the committee amendments, the bill contains a limitation of $600,000 on the construction and purchase of transmission lines and related facilities. I find no word of explanation in the committee report with respect to the method by which this amendment was agreed upon.

Power service can be rendered only by means of transmission lines. Annually, every large transmission system requires replacements, additions, and alterations to provide adequate and reliable service. With the new power capacity at the Kentucky and Fontana Dams, additional transmission facilities are required during the next fiscal year to take that power to the market. Detailed knowledge and engineering skill are needed to determine whether $600,000, $1,000,000, $10,000,000, or any other fixed sum will be required. The men on the job who are operating the system estimated that in order to transmit its power from its generating plants to its customers, a total of $9,696,591 would be required for transmission lines and related facilities in the fiscal year 1945. The new managers—the committee—decided $600,000 would be enough, a discrepancy of more than $9,000,000 for which I find no explanation in the committee report or in the hearings. This limitation actually means that the result of adopting this amendment would be that no transmission facilities at all—not a single mile of them—could be constructed in the fiscal year 1945. For, as it happens, the

$600,000 is not enough to complete projects already under construction in the current fiscal year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator asked for some newspaper articles or, as he said, something which would give him an inkling as to Mr. Lilienthal's actions. I am now prepared to produce some.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. The first article I have found—and I am having others looked up—is taken from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of July 10, 1942:

T. V. A. CHAIRMAN WARNS OF POLITICAL THREAT

KNOXVILLE, TENN., July 9.—Chairman David E. Lilienthal, of the T. V. A., Thursday struck out at what he described as "indications of an effort to infiltrate politics into the municipalities and cooperatives distributing T. V. A. power," declaring:

"The people of the valley must be on guard against the opening of a second front in the battle to make this region the spoils of a narrow and old-fashioned kind of politics."

WASHINGTON FRONT HELD

The Chairman, in an address—

He was referring to a different kind of amendment, the $4,500 amendment, at that time—

prepared for delivery at a Knoxville Kiwanis luncheon, said the issue of political management versus business management had been before the people in recent months, and added, "That attack has been turned back."

"We have been promised that it will be resumed, and I doubt not it will. But for the present it certainly has failed. The first front—the front at Washington—has been held."

In a second article, this one coming from Chattanooga, a meeting was described. The article reads, in part, as follows:

Responding to Lilienthal's attacks on him and Senator K. D. MCKELLAR, Senator STEWART challenged the T. V. A. Director to show that he was more interested in T. V. A. than in the Tennessee Senators, and branded him as a dictator of the giant Federal power project.

Mr. President, those are two——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator, if he will permit an interruption, that I am familiar with the speech to which the Senator has referred. It was a speech to which the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] took exception, and which the junior Senator from Tennessee felt was an attack upon him.

Mr. McKELLAR. The newspaper article said it was an attack upon me, also.

Mr. HILL. Did the newspaper article say that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Where in the newspaper article is such a statement to be found?

Mr. McKELLAR. I just read it.

Mr. HILL. I did not hear the Senator's name mentioned in the article he read.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the attack was on both of us. My name also was mentioned, and the article was in regard to the attack. That is the way Mr. Lilienthal proceeds. He has an eely, oily, insinuating, ingratiating way of attacking. His attack is not an open one. He has not the manhood to make an open attack. It is always an eely, oily, ingratiating attack. In my judgment it is well known to every informed person in Tennessee that he has bitterly fought me from the time he went into office. The Senator asked for the documents, and I have furnished them to him. I can find others as well.

Mr. HILL. I am familiar with that particular speech. Both clippings refer to that one particular speech. I have it before me. It was made on July 9, 1942, before the Knoxville Kiwanis Club, at the Andrew Johnson Hotel in Knoxville, Tenn. That is the speech which the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] felt was an attack on him, and he so stated. If the Senator can find any other speeches, I wish he would do so, and bring them to the attention of the Senate. This particular speech was made on July 9, 1942. The junior Senator from Tennessee felt that it was an attack on him, and so construed it. But I do not find anything in the speech which constitutes a particular attack on the senior Senator from Tennessee. If he has anything which contains a particular attack on him, I hope he will bring it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I wish to ask a question on the subject of transmission lines. The Senator was discussing the proposed committee amendment, which would limit to the specific sum of $600,000 expenditures for the construction or purchase of transmission lines. Of course, transmission lines are the heart and veins of any electrical system.

Mr. HILL. They are the arterial system.

Mr. BURTON. Did I correctly understand the Senator to indicate that $600,000 might not be sufficient to maintain the safety of the system in the event of a disaster calling for reconstruction, or does this relate to new construction?

Mr. HILL. I stated that $600,000 would not permit a single mile of new line to be constructed, and would not even finish the construction now under way.

Mr. BURTON. But is it the interpretation of the Senator that this would not limit expenditures for reconstruction or replacement of lines which might be destroyed by tornadoes or something of that sort? A disaster of that kind is a vital factor to the whole community, and such damage is very difficult to estimate. I wondered what provision was made for it.

Mr. HILL. If the disaster should occur early in the fiscal year, there might be sufficient funds. If it should occur at a later date, there might not be sufficient funds if the Authority had to rely entirely on appropriations from the Congress.

Mr. BURTON. That is the point which I wished to reach.

Mr. HILL. That is one of the values of the right to expend their receipts, because the receipts are coming in all the time, and if emergencies occur they have the receipts available to meet the emergencies.

Mr. BURTON. I can see that there might be some reason for limitations as to new lines, based upon the facts of the case, but to establish an arbitrary figure of $600,000 for reconstruction of lines might involve serious danger to the community.

Mr. HILL. What would be the result of the limitation of $600,000? Fontana Dam, one of the largest dams constructed, could not be connected to the system. Not a single kilowatt of the 135,000 kilowatts to be installed at Fontana for operation in 1945 would be available to support the war load that capacity is being installed to serve. This dam will have cost the taxpayers a total of about $70,000,000. Under this amendment limiting transmission-line construction to $600,000 it could not be put to use and there would not be a dollar in return. Similarly, an additional line to make power available from Kentucky Dam could not be built. This is the kind of cut the committee calls a saving. In other words, this power could not go into the T. V. A. system. There would be no money to build a transmission line to take the power into the T. V. A. system.

Mr. BURTON. Do I correctly understand that this item might fall into the same category as the preceding item, that is, by limiting transmission-line construction to $600,000, might we be depriving ourselves of the beneficial use of properties which we have and for which we have expended a large amount of money, which would not be economy, but the opposite?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If the money were not available to build a transmission line from the Fontana Dam to connect it with the T. V. A. system, would there be any other market for the power?

Mr. HILL. No; there would be no other market. If that power could not go into the system, there would be no market. I take it that no one would build with his own funds a power line all the way from North Carolina to the Fontana Dam to obtain that power. The power would go to waste.

Mr. AIKEN. I mean some private utility.

Mr. HILL. There is no private utility operating in that field which could take it.

Mr. President, if such decisions as these represent the quality of managerial competence to be provided for this system, I fear that power consumers in the Tennessee Valley will find little to prefer in management from Washington, over the system of management in New York, a scheme they enthusiastically abandoned. The stockholders, taxpayers from Maine to California, should revolt against such gross mismanagement of their investment.

Let me cite another example of the carefree spirit in which in its remote headquarters the Senate committee has slashed this appropriation.

Third. Carry out the program approved by the Senate committee, but providing total funds $40,000,000 short of that necessary to do so.

Two years ago the question before us now was debated. Then, when I argued as I argue now, that power service would be jeopardized under such a system, I was reproached for my misgivings. A long history of generous treatment was cited as evidence of the fairness with which Congress would appropriate to meet the needs of the people of the Southeast. We need discuss history no longer to see what the realities are. Just examine the text of this bill. By a series of amendments this bill leaves T. V. A. short of funds by at least $40,000,000 to carry out the program approved in the bill.

In line 16, on page 52, the committee proposes to make a direct appropriation of $76,081,872, supposed to be sufficient to finance the program. The bill as it passed the House appropriated no new money. It reappropriated the unexpended balance, which, together with estimated receipts, was expected to be adequate to cover all outstanding commitments as of June 30, 1944, and to finance the approved program of T. V. A. for the fiscal year 1945. That program, approved on the basis of detailed examination, was estimated to require $79,134,882 for fiscal year 1945. Receipts were estimated to total $68,528,882. The unobligated balance to be carried over from 1944 was estimated to be $19,262,298. That gave a total of $87,791,180, enough to finance all projects and operations of the Authority now underway, and to leave a balance of $8,656,298 which would be on hand in the event resumption of work were ordered on war projects authorized by Congress but ordered stopped by W. P. B. Chief among these are the Watauga and South Holston Dams and the phosphorus plant at Mobile. Unless work on these authorized projects were ordered resumed, the money would not be expended.

In place of that accustomed procedure, the Senate committee, proposing to deprive T. V. A. both of its receipts in 1945 and its unexpended balance, offers the figure of $76,981,873 as adequate to meet the year's total fund requirements. This amount is inadequate by approximately $40,000,000 to finance the expenses of T. V. A. even as approved by the Senate committee. The trouble is this: In making its estimate, the committee ignored some $30,000,000 of commitments outstanding on June 30 of this year by confusing the T. V. A. estimated unobligated balance with the unexpended balance. They are very different things. These are things managers should be familiar with.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill as it passed the House approves the expenditure of $89,000,000. The Senate version approves an expenditure of $76,000,000. That is a difference of $13,000,000. How in the name of heaven can the Senator claim that the Senate committee provision is $40,000,000 short?

Mr. HILL. The House bill approves expenditures of $89,000,000 during the next fiscal year, which is the fiscal year beginning July 1, next, but also makes provision to pay the commitments, which the Senate committee evidently overlooked. It did not distinguish between an unobligated balance and an unexpended balance. The T. V. A. might have $100,000,000 in its fund as an unexpended balance; but if it had commitments up to $75,000,000 against that fund, it would really have an unobligated balance of only $25,000,000. That is the difference.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has just admitted that of the $89,000,000, eight-million-dollars-plus could be put into a reserve fund.

Mr. HILL. No; not to be put into a reserve fund. It was allowed by the House in order to provide funds for the completion of the Watauga Dam, the South Holston Dam, and the phosphate plant at Mobile, Ala., if the War Production Board should approve the completion of those two dams and the construction of the phosphorus plant at Mobile.

All the money proposed to be appropriated is needed to finance the program approved by the Senate committee for 1945. In fact, the amount provided is still short of that required to meet obligations approved in the bill as amended by the Senate committee, because no funds are provided for construction of South Holston, Watauga, or the Mobile plant, although construction is authorized. This leaves nothing to meet outstanding commitments against 1944 funds, totaling approximately $30,000,000.

That is where the rub comes. There is no provision for the commitments which have been made and which, of course, the T. V. A. must pay.

Therefore by the failure to provide funds for these approved projects, and by failure to understand the difference between unobligated and unexpended balance, what is the result? T. V. A., a war agency, is left somewhere between $30,000,000 and $40,000,000 short of being able to do the very work the Senate committee approves.

POWER FOR WAR PRODUCTION IN THE TENNESSEE VALLEY WILL BE SHORT IN 1945 UNDER THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The new Washington managers were not finished when they ordered work stopped on the fourth unit at Watts Bar steam plant, a unit for which Congress has already appropriated funds, which W. P. B. has ordered installed, which will be almost completed by the 1st of July, and the production of which is already committed to support war loads, and which, without this action, would soon be on its way to paying out the $4,000,000 already invested. They were not content when they prohibited the construction of any transmission lines in 1945, thereby keeping power from Fontana and Kentucky dams from going out to increase war production. By these two amendments the committee proudly claims to have saved $1,000,000. What they have done is to remove 255,000 kilowatts from war production in 1945, and they have lessened estimated income for that year by approximately $1,500,000, an item of interest to taxpayers. They were not even satisfied when they left the whole T. V. A., of which the power system is a part, short by $40,000,000 of funds to do the work they themselves directed. That was only a beginning.

With these major items decided, the committee felt free to go into details. They decided how many automobiles T. V. A. could economically use and how much maintenance should cost, without any regard to the number that might be required for this revenue-producing operation. They decided just when the surplus should be disposed of without any regard to what might be the most profitable place of disposal. They decided that T. V. A. should no longer advertise to secure workmen. Nearby power systems can. All war industries can. They are under private management. But, according to this managerial decision, there is no way in the world that T. V. A. can get word to the general public if linemen, switchboard operators, transmission crews are needed. Yet this is war. That system must be kept going in a manpower shortage.

Mr. President, I am not impressed with the sagacity of these newly self-appointed managers of our power system. I am against the unnecessary centralization of power in Washington. I think that this is just one more example of the ineptness of decisions reached far away from the people those decisions affect.

The present management of T. V. A. is down in the valley, close to the people it serves. It has been an honest, businesslike, efficient management, and it should be permitted to continue. The people do not want this legislation.

CENTENNIAL OF FIRST TELEGRAPH MESSAGE

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, for the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, House Concurrent Resolution 72 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I may say that the concurrent resolution, which was submitted in the House by Representative BULWINKLE, was adopted by the House of Representatives unanimously, and a similar concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) submitted by me and which is identical with the House concurrent resolution, has been reported today from the Committee on the Library. The concurrent resolution provides for the creation of a joint congressional committee to secure an appropriate plaque or other suitable memorial to be placed in or near the room in the Capitol from which the first telegraph message was dispatched and to arrange for appropriate exercises to be held on May 24, 1944. There is a preamble to the resolution which sets forth certain interesting facts in connection with the invention of the telegraph.

I may say that I have spoken to the leader on the other side of the Chamber, and I hope there will be no objection to the consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 72) as follows:

Whereas Samuel F. B. Morse, a distinguished American artist, invented the first practical electromagnetic telegraph in the winter of 1835–36, and obtained an appropriation from the Congress of the United States in 1843 for the construction of an experimental telegraph line between Baltimore, Md., and Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the first telegram, "What hath God wrought?", was sent over this line from the old Supreme Court room in the Capitol to Baltimore on May 24, 1844; and

Whereas the sending of the first telegram marked the beginning of the telegraph industry, which has been indispensable to the country in four wars and, by linking all sections, has implemented the traditional motto, "E Pluribus Unum"; and

Whereas the telegraph was the first speedy means of communication connecting the nations of the world, bringing all peoples closer together, and promoting the dissemination of ideas as well as international trade; and

Whereas the telegraph was the first great electrical discovery and was the forerunner of our entire system of electrical communications, including the telephone, the radio, and television: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such committee shall secure an appropriate plaque or other suitable memorial to be placed in or near the room in the Capitol from which the first telegraph message was dispatched, and shall arrange for appropriate exercises, to be held on May 24, 1944, for the purpose of placing such plaque or other memorial and commemorating the centennial of the telegraph. The cost of carrying out the provisions of this concurrent resolution, including the cost of such plaque or other memorial, not to exceed $4,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the House and one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Montana was good enough to speak to me about the matter, and so far as I know there is no objection to the concurrent resolution. It seems to me altogether appropriate that there should be exercises marking the centennial date of the use of the telegraph, and I join with the Senator from Montana in asking for the consideration and adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it is apparent that we cannot complete consideration of the pending bill tonight.

If there is nothing further at this time, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Robert W. Hayler, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of January 1943;

Capt. Allan E. Smith, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 5th day of November 1942;

Capt. Thomas L. Sprague, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of April 1943;

Sundry chief warrant officers and warrant officers to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from January 14, 1944;

Sundry chief warrant officers to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from January 14, 1944;

Several warrant officers to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from January 14, 1944;

Sundry chief pay clerks to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from January 14, 1944;

Chief Pay Clerk Edward J. Hagen to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from January 14, 1944;

Sundry pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from January 14, 1944;

Several acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from January 14, 1944;

Several officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy;

Asst. Surg. Delphos O. Coffman to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from September 8, 1939, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed; and

Sundry officers of the Naval Reserve, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

Ernest Gruening, of New York, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska (reappointment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the judiciary.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the judiciary nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the judiciary are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

That concludes the calendar.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. McKELLAR. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 22, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Henry N. Graven, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Iowa.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

John J. Morris, Jr. to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware.

Harry H. Holt, Jr. to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Raymond E. Thomason to be United States marshal for the northern district of Alabama.

Roulhac Gewin to be United States marshal for the southern district of Alabama.

Robert W. Rabb to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

First Lt. Burnis Mayo Kelly, to Signal Corps.

First Lt. Vernon Price Mock, to Infantry.

First Lt. Thomas Henry Muller, to Infantry.

Second Lt. Benjamin Willis Mills, Jr., to Infantry.

First Lt. William Bailey Crum, to Air Corps.

First Lt. Newton Elder James, to Air Corps.

First Lt. Robert Belden Kuhn, to Air Corps.

First Lt. Robert Morris, to Air Corps.

First Lt. Arthur Tilman Williams 3d, to Air Corps.

Second Lt. Jerald Morris Davies, to Air Corps.

Second Lt. James Edwin Foley, to Air Corps.
Second Lt. Thomas Terrell Jackson, to Air Corps.
Second Lt. Martin Cadenhead McWilliams, to Air Corps.
Second Lt. Irving Richard Perkin, to Air Corps.
Second Lt. Boone Seegers, to Air Corps.
Second Lt. James McIndoe Winterbottom, to Air Corps.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonels, with rank from December 1, 1943

Hume Peabody, Air Corps.
Martin John O'Brien, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Joseph Cumming Haw, Coast Artillery Corps.
Earl Larue Naiden, Air Corps.
Henry McElderry Pendleton, Cavalry.
Iverson Brooks Summers, Adjutant General's Department, subject to examination required by law.
Edmund DeTreville Ellis, Quartermaster Corps, subject to examination required by law.

To be majors with rank from January 22, 1944

Earl Clinton Robbins, Air Corps.
Andrew Joseph Kerwin Malone, Air Corps.
Russell Keillor, Air Corps.
Ernest Harold Lawson, Air Corps.
John Edward Bodle, Air Corps.
Russell Scott, Air Corps.
Burton Murdock Hovey, Jr., Air Corps.

To be majors with rank from January 23, 1944

Dale Davis Fisher, Air Corps.
Henry Weisbrod Dorr, Air Corps.
Carlisle Iverson Ferris, Air Corps.
Elwood Richard Quesada, Air Corps.
Willard Roland Wolfinbarger, Air Corps.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Martin Robert Reiber
Forrest Ralph Ostrander

To be captains

Matthew Anthony Surrell, Jr.
Donald Withers Lyddon, subject to examination required by law.
Orland Stenberg Olsen, subject to examination required by law.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be a colonel

William Harvey Kernan

Chaplains

Max Walker Foresman to be a captain.

To be colonels with rank from January 1, 1944

Robert William Strong, Cavalry.
Clifford Randall Jones, Coast Artillery Corps.
John Beugnot Wogan, Field Artillery.
Clesen Henry Tenney, Coast Artillery Corps.
Frank Edwin Emery, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Joseph Francis Gallagher
John Murray Welch
Harry Aloysius Bishop
Luther Remi Moore

To be captains

Percy Hall Sutley
Otto Albert Wurl
Raymond Lancing Pendleton

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonels

Thomas Floyd Davis
John Nelson White
William Ferdinand Scheumann
Campbell Hopson Glascock
William Frederic Wieck

PHARMACY CORPS

To be captains

George Henry Wilson, subject to examination required by law.
Ernest William Bye, subject to examination required by law.
John Valdo Painter, subject to examination required by law.

CHAPLAINS

Frank Pearson MacKenzie to be a colonel.

To be captains, United States Army

James Joseph McMahon
Harold Francis Donovan

To be colonels with rank from February 1, 1944

Edward Caswell Wallington, Chemical Warfare Service.
Carl Ernest Hocker, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.
John William Leonard, Infantry.
Richmond Trumbull Gibson, Coast Artillery Corps.
John McDonald Thompson, Ordnance Department.
James Alward Van Fleet, Infantry.
Edward Gill Sherburne, Infantry.
Walter Wood Hess, Jr., Field Artillery.
Michael Frank Davis, Air Corps.
John Fuller Davis, Cavalry.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Carl Randolph Mitchell
Michael Gerard Healy
Martin Fred DuFrenne
Philip Lewis Cook
Charles Fremont Snell

To be lieutenant colonels

Howland Allan Gibson
Edward John Kallus, subject to examination required by law.
Otis Blaine Schreuder

To be major

Robert Purcell Rea

To be captains

Alf Torp Haerem, subject to examination required by law.
Stanley David Burton

DENTAL CORPS

Warren Charles Caldwell to be a colonel.
James Melvin Epperly to be a lieutenant colonel.

CHAPLAINS

Philip Francis Coholan to be a colonel.

To be captains

Marvin Earl Utter
Loren Thomas Jenks
Ralph Henry Pugh
James Clarke Griffin
John Bartholomew Day
Charles Edwin Brown, Jr.
Steve Pettie Gaskins, Jr.
Gervase George Sherwood, subject to examination required by law.

POSTMASTERS

DELAWARE

Howard R. Elliott, Laurel.
Albert I. Stafford, Middletown.

IDAHO

Madge D. Becker, Hayden Lake.

ILLINOIS

Ralph Lavere Douglass, Adair.
William G. Richardson, Astoria.
John H. Keest, Jr., Middletown.

MAINE

Henry L. Holden, Jackman.

MINNESOTA

Evelyn E. Boyer, Beltrami.
Edwin O. Benthagen, Borup.
Judd R. Grout, Elbow Lake.
Aida B. New, Floodwood.
Joseph T. Samuelson, Grasston.
Marvin T. Giles, Holland.
Edward A. Roser, Kandiyohi.
Ida A. Gonsolin, Kelly Lake.
Alice Gillespie, Kilkenny.
Clarence D. Zillgitt, Lake City.
Earl D. Wills, Nassau.
Arno C. Jenner, Nerstrand.
Clarence I. Jonason, North Branch.
Harry S. Matteson, Olivia.
Emma V. Berglund, Pennock.
Herman O. Hoganson, Perley.
Henry C. Moe, Ranier.
Frank C. Erkel, Rockford.
Marguerite Linquist, Springpark.
Frank B. Clarine, Tamarack.

MISSISSIPPI

Reid R. Williams, Arcola.
Sidney B. Spencer, Bogue Chitto.
William C. Sharbrough, Holly Bluff.
Nell T. Liddell, Learned.
Helen Persell, Madison Station.
Harriett G. Shirley, Money.
Judson S. Defoore, Sidon.

MONTANA

Bernard R. Carey, Crow Agency.
Orville C. Hanson, Gildford.
John C. Abrahamson, Roberts.
Gertrude M. Neese, Savage.

NEBRASKA

Milared I. Onstot, Riverton.
J. Wilbur Brawner, Wilcox.

PENNSYLVANIA

Frank X. Harmuth, Bridgeville.
Mary E. Angley, Glen Olden.
Francis J. Plocinik, Gilberton.
Dorothy K. Eagen, Jermyn.
Leo A. Clavin, North East.
Michael V. McFadden, Summit Hill.
Emma R. Eakins, Wynnewood.

VIRGINIA

Charles F. Simpson, Arlington.
William C. Pulman, Fort Belvoir.
Ruth O. Griffin, Newsoms.
Alice L. Paxton, Oceana.
Robert M. Bradshaw, Rice.
Margaret V. Reid, Triangle.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We praise Thee, O Saviour of the world, that upon these shores where so often the shadows cling Thou hast a message for mankind. As we emerge from conflicting doubts, O give us the evidence of the aggressive movement that the sad earth is rising to something higher for which the human heart hungers and throbs. Chafing under the failure of our dependence on Thee, we pray that we may be ever conscious of our ignorance and may we seek to know Thy way and be filled with the patience and forbearance as exemplified by our Saviour as He sought to emancipate all struggling spirits.

O God, at times peace and security are endangered by the rush of the elements of disunity and misunderstanding. This sinful world needs a plain way out of the depths of its desolation; O give us a defiant faith that shall hurl its assurance into the face of every trial, every defeat,

and every loss, believing that "The Lord of hosts is with us, the God of Jacob is our refuge." O let America more and more forsake the common routes of ease and pleasure and, reaching out into the dimness, kindle anew the fires of her great soul with the glories yet to be—steadfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord and unto Thee in the name of our Master shall be praises forevermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—1945

Mr. TARVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4443) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1271), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the consideration of the bill just reported, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1945, points of order may be waived against any language and appropriations contained in the bill which would be authorized by H. R. 4278, which passed the House on March 7, 1944, in the event of its final enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that would leave the bill open to any points of order as to affirmative legislation that has been placed in the bill by the committee and would only waive points of order as to authorization of items that are covered in the Pace bill which was passed about 2 weeks ago?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the request does not go beyond the provisions of the Pace bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to also extend my own remarks in the RECORD in another instance and to include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Democrats of the Ninth District of Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a very short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and in one to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from last night's Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KILBURN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a bulletin issued by the Civic Association of America, located in Denver, Colo.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

DRAFT DEFERMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH SECURING FARM MACHINERY

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Members are aware of the fact that the A. A. A. is being used for the purpose of determining whether farmers are entitled to draft deferments or are entitled to secure farm machinery.

I hold in my hand a card sent out from one of the county committees in my district which reads in part as follows:

> Your community committeeman will be in Hawley on March 17 to assist you in executing your 1944 farm plan sheet and to explain 1944 practice payments that can be earned on your farm.

Then further on:

> These plan sheets will be used to secure information for draft deferments and securing farm machinery.

So far as I know neither the Congress, the Selective Service, nor anyone else with authority has ever made signing up for the triple A program a condition precedent to qualify for deferment as an essential agriculturalist, or to secure necessary farm machinery. This should be immediately investigated.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio speech delivered by me, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein a poem by a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief article from the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAGEN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks and that the same may appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the text of a resolution I have introduced, and two or three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by me in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY SYSTEM OF NOMINATING PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times reports that our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] urged that the South unite to compel the Democratic National Convention to return to the two-thirds majority system of nominating Presidential candidates. I think this is sort of a stop-Roosevelt proposal. Our gallant and distinguished Member may be woefully misguided in that regard. I say, as delegate myself to the convention, and as dean of the New York Democratic delegation, I would oppose any such proposal. It would be trying to make progress by going backward. The gentleman from Georgia, either willingly or unwillingly—I am hopefully sure unwillingly—plays into the hands of Roosevelt baiters like Woodring, former Senator Reed, of Missouri, and former Congressman John J. O'Connor and other disgruntled, frustrated, and revengeful former Democrats, all sappers and underminers of our Democratic Party. They are Pharisees, and must be denied admission as Democrats to the Chicago convention. The Republicans are welcome to them. I fear that Gene has the wrong sow by the ear.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Willard H. Dow, president and general manager of the great Dow Chemical Co. I have submitted this document to the Government Printer, and I find, Mr. Speaker, that it will take three and three-quarter pages of the RECORD, the cost of which will be $168.75. I ask that, notwithstanding the cost, I be permitted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein this document.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a petition from the Bataan Relief Organization of Missoula, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the hearings of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, and include therein a letter and a news release.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice on the gentleman from California that he stuck some stuff in the RECORD yesterday that somebody else wrote that contains a miserable lying attack on me, and I expect to answer it tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUSTAINED-YIELD FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 250) to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the stability of forest industries, of employment, of communities, and of taxable forest wealth, through continuous supplies of timber; in order to provide for a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and in order to secure the benefits of forests in maintenance of water supply, regulation of stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are severally authorized to establish by formal declaration, when in their respective judgments such action would be in the public interest, cooperative sustained-yield units which shall consist of federally owned or administered forest land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary establishing the unit and, in addition thereto, land which reasonably may be expected to be made the subject of one or more of the cooperative agreements with private landowners authorized by section 2 of this act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to forest land under his jurisdiction, and the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to forest land under his jurisdiction, are severally authorized, for the purposes specified in section 1 of this act, to enter into cooperative agreements with private owners of forest land within a cooperative sustained-yield unit, established pursuant to section 1 of this act, providing for the coordinated management of such private forest land and of federally owned or administered forest lands within the sustained-yield unit involved.

Each cooperative agreement may give the cooperating private landowner the privilege of purchasing without competitive bidding at prices not less than their appraised value, subject to periodic readjustments of stumpage rates and to such other conditions and requirements as the Secretary may prescribe, timber and other forest products from federally owned or administered forest land within the unit, in accordance with the provisions of sustained-yield management plans formulated or approved by the Secretary for the unit; shall limit the time, rate, and method of cutting or otherwise harvesting timber and other forest products from the land of the cooperating private landowner, due consideration being given to the character and condition of the timber, to the relation of the proposed cutting to the sustained-yield plan for the unit, and to the productive capacity of the land; shall prescribe the terms and conditions upon which the cooperating private landowner may sell

to any person timber and other forest products from his land, compliance by the purchaser with such conditions to be required by the contract of sale; shall contain such provisions as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the reasonable interest of other owners of forest land within the unit; and shall contain such other provisions as the Secretary deems necessary to protect the reasonable interest of other owners of forest land within the unit; and shall contain such other provisions as the Secretary believes necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Each cooperative agreement shall be placed on record in the county or counties in which the lands of the cooperating private landowner covered thereby are located, and the costs incident to such recordation may be paid out of any funds available for the protection or management of federally owned or administered forest land within the unit. When thus recorded, the agreement shall be binding upon the heirs, successors, and assigns of the owner of such land, and upon purchasers of timber or other forest products from such land, throughout the life of such cooperative agreement.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior are further severally authorized, whenever in their respective judgments the maintenance of a stable community or communities is primarily dependent upon the sale of timber or other forest products from federally owned or administered forest land and such maintenance cannot effectively be secured by following the usual procedure in selling such timber or other forest products, to establish by formal declaration for the purpose of maintaining the stability of such community or communities a sustained-yield unit consisting of forest land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary establishing such unit, to determine and define the boundaries of the community or communities for whose benefit such unit is created, and to sell, subject to such conditions and requirements as the Secretary believes necessary, federally owned or administered timber and other forest products from such unit without competitive bidding at prices not less than their appraised values, to responsible purchasers within such community or communities.

SEC. 4. Each of the said Secretaries is further authorized in his discretion to enter into cooperative agreements with the other Secretary, or with any Federal agency having jurisdiction over federally owned or administered forest land, or with any State or local agency having jurisdiction over publicly owned or administered forest land, providing for the inclusion of such land in any coordinated plan of management otherwise authorized by the provisions of this act when by such a cooperative agreement he may be aided in accomplishing the purposes of this act; but no federally or publicly owned or administered forest land not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary establishing the sustained-yield unit concerned shall be included in any such plan except in pursuance of a cooperative agreement made under this section.

SEC. 5. Before any sustained-yield unit authorized by section 1 or section 3 of this act shall be established, and before any cooperative agreement authorized by section 2 or section 4 of this act shall be entered into, advance notice thereof shall be given by publication in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the vicinity of the place where the timber is located, and the costs incident to such publication may be paid out of any funds available for the protection or management of the federally owned or administered forest land involved. This notice shall state: (1) The location of the proposed unit; (2) the name of each proposed cooperator; (3) the duration of the proposed cooperative agreement or agreements; (4) the location and estimated quantity of timber on the land of each proposed cooperator and on the Federal land involved; (5) the expected rate of cutting of such timber; and (6) the time and place of a public hearing to be held not less than 30 days after the first publication of said notice for the presentation of the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed action to the community or communities affected.

Before any sale agreement made without competition and involving more than $500 in stumpage value of federally owned or administered timber shall be entered into under this act, advance notice thereof shall be given by publication in one or more newspapers of general circulation in the vicinity of the place where the timber is located, and the costs incident to such publication may be paid out of any funds available for the protection or management of federally owned or administered forest land within the unit concerned. This notice shall state: (1) The quantity and appraised value of the timber; (2) the time and place of a public hearing to be held not less than 30 days after the first publication of said notice if requested by the State or county where the timber is located or by any other person deemed to have a reasonable interest in the proposed sale or in its terms; and (3) the place where any request for a public hearing shall be made. Such requests need be considered only if received at the place designated in the notice not later than 15 days after the first publication of such notice. If a request for a hearing is received within the time designated, notice of the holding of the hearing shall be given not less than 10 days before the time set for such hearing, in the same manner as provided for the original notice.

The determination made by the Secretary having jurisdiction upon the proposals considered at any such hearing, which determination may include the modification of the terms of such proposals without further hearing thereon, together with the minutes or other record of the hearing, shall be available for public inspection during the life of any coordinated plan of management or agreement entered into in consequence of such determination.

SEC. 6. In addition to any other remedy available under existing law, upon failure of any private owner of forest land which is subject to a cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to this act to comply with the terms of such agreement, or upon failure of any purchaser of timber or other forest products from such land to comply with the terms and conditions required by such agreement to be included in the contract of sale, the Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary concerned, is authorized to institute against such owner or such purchaser a proceeding in equity in the proper district court of the United States, to require compliance with the terms and conditions of said cooperative agreement; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon said district courts to hear and determine such proceedings, to order compliance with the terms and conditions of cooperative agreements entered into pursuant to this act, and to make such temporary and final orders as shall be deemed just in the premises. As used in this section the term "owner" shall include the heirs, successors, and assigns of the landowner entering into the cooperative agreements.

SEC. 7. Whenever used in this act, the term "federally owned or administered forest land" shall be construed to mean forest land in which, or in the natural resources of which, the United States has a legal or equitable interest of any character sufficient to entitle the United States to control the management or disposition of the timber or other forest products thereon, except land heretofore or hereafter reserved or withdrawn for purposes which are inconsistent with the exercise of the authority conferred by this act; and shall include trust or restricted Indian land, whether tribal or allotted, except that the timber and other forest products on such land shall not be sold without the consent of the Indians concerned.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior may severally prescribe such rules and regulations as may be appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act. Each Secretary may delegate any of his powers and duties under this act to other officers or employees of his Department.

SEC. 9. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to abrogate or curtail any authority conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior by any act relating to management of federally owned or administered forest lands, and nothing contained in any such acts shall be construed to limit or restrict any authority conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior by this act.

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as the Congress may from time to time deem necessary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 9, line 17, strike out all of section 10 and insert the following:

"SEC. 10. Funds available for the protection or management of federally owned or administered forest land within the unit concerned may also be expended in carrying out the purposes of this act, and there are hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums for the purposes of this act as the Congress may from time to time deem necessary, but such additional sums shall not exceed $150,000 for the Department of Agriculture and $50,000 for the Department of the Interior for any fiscal year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I offer some amendments which are at the desk, and which I have submitted to the chairman and the objectors on both sides, and they are agreeable to them.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. CASE:

On page 3, line 14, after the word "conditions", insert " but not the price."

On page 5, line 21, after the words "shall be given", insert "by registered mail to each landowner whose land is proposed to be included and."

On page 6, line 16, after the word "publication", insert "once weekly for 4 consecutive weeks."

On page 7, line 14, strike out the words "without further hearing thereon."

On page 8, line 24, strike out the words "the timber and other forest products on."

On page 9, line 1, strike out the word "sold" and insert the word "included."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Will the gentleman explain the amendments for the RECORD and for the benefit of the Members?

Mr. CASE. I will be very glad to. These amendments are designed to overcome the objections which I voiced yesterday at the time the bill was under consideration. In each case the purpose of the amendment is to give ample notice to the persons concerned whose lands might be included in either sale or in these cooperative agreements. It will do nothing as far as destroying the major purpose of the bill is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has taken up the amendments with the members of the committee?

Mr. CASE. Yes; with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Vermont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

DANIEL D. O'CONNELL AND ALMON B. STEWART

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1962, for the relief of Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart, both of Bangor, Maine, the sums of $544.16 and $1,732.22, respectively. Payment of such sums shall be in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by them by the failure of George E. Glunt, of Altoona, Pa., to pay said Daniel D. O'Connell and Almon B. Stewart for labor and materials furnished as subcontractors under said George E. Glunt, who held a contract with the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the construction of an airways communication station building at the Bangor (Maine) Airport: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Payment of such sums shall be."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSCOE McKINLEY MEADOWS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1232, for the relief of Roscoe McKinley Meadows.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, Roscoe McKinley Meadows shall be held and considered to have served as an officer of the Navy of the United States during the World War other than as an officer of the Regular Navy.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIA VIRTUDES TORRES STEERE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1715, for the relief of Mrs. Maria Virtudes Torres Steere.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GRANT of Indiana and Mr. McGREGOR objected; and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the call of the calendar for today.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 46]

Andresen, August H.	Furlong	Monroney
Baldwin, Md.	Gamble	Morrison, N. C.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gathings	O'Connor
Barden	Gearhart	O'Toole
Barry	Gibson	Pfeifer
Bates, Mass.	Gifford	Phillips
Bender	Green	Pracht,
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	C. Frederick Pratt, Joseph M.
Bonner	Hancock	Ramey
Buckley	Harless, Ariz.	Rivers
Burgin	Heffernan	Sabath
Busbey	Hendricks	Sadowski
Byrne	Judd	Scanlon
Camp	Kee	Short
Chenoweth	Kelley	Smith, Va.
Cox	Keogh	Snyder
Curley	King	Somers, N. Y.
Dawson	Klein	Stearns, N. H.
Dingell	Lambertson	Taylor
Disney	Lane	Treadway
Eaton	Larcade	Vorys, Ohio
Engel, Mich.	LeFevre	Vursell
Feighan	McGehee	Weaver
Fernandez	McLean	Whelchel, Ga.
Fish	Maas	Winter
Fogarty	Manasco	Woodrum, Va.
Folger	Marcantonio	Zimmerman
Fulmer	Merrow	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 345 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Time Card.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and an article by Mr. Crowley.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast which I intend to make next Sunday over WSOO.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEICHEL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RIVER AND HARBOR ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3961, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has concluded the reading of the first section of the bill. That section is now open to amendment. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] desire to offer any amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the various amendments that are proposed by the committee will be

offered first to the section which has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. BLAND. That leaves the rest of us who are not on the committee sitting on the outside looking in. I wonder if we could not have some greater semblance of order on the consideration of those amendments by considering the bill by pages, so that the amendments of the committee to a particular page might be offered, and then those on the outside who have amendments to be considered, might offer their amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Virginia that undoubtedly the amendments to be brought before the Committee will be offered in sequence according to pages, but it has been the standing rule of the House that members of a committee handling legislation shall be given preference in recognition.

Mr. BLAND. There are some 32 amendments to be offered by the committee. I have an amendment on page 10 which I wanted to offer. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered by pages.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. It is my understanding that the procedure under which amendments would be considered today was agreed upon last evening by unanimous consent. Am I right?

The CHAIRMAN. There was simply an understanding that that would be the method under which the Committee would proceed. No unanimous-consent request was submitted, but that has been the order in which amendments have been recognized, preference being given to members of the committee handling the legislation. Other Members having amendments are recognized following the recognition of members of the committee.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correct, I think the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings will show that unanimous consent was asked and given for a certain procedure to be followed today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Idaho that the Committee will proceed, under the rules of the House, and the chairman of the committee in charge of the legislation will be recognized first to submit amendments.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I presume the amendments as published in the RECORD this morning will be considered in sequence.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer them at this time?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I offer the first committee amendment. I may say this appears at page 2764 of the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 2, lines 19 and 20, strike out "authorized by any act of Congress" and insert "constructed and maintained under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. I have an amendment at the Clerk's desk that, in line 16, page 2, inserts a period after the word "region" and strikes out the remainder of the paragraph. Is my motion to strike out the paragraph, which would be amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, in order at this time as a substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from California that his amendment would not be a substitute in view of the fact it incorporates additional language as well as that which the gentleman from Texas is offering. The gentleman may offer his amendment subsequently as a separate amendment and it will be considered by the Committee at that time.

Mr. CARTER. The Chairman means after the consideration of the pending amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No; it would follow the consideration of all the committee amendments. Does the gentleman from Texas desire recognition?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment follows the usual form in which all river and harbor work has been handled throughout the years. This inserts the usual language used for that purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. This amendment just limits it to those projects which come under the supervision of the Army engineers.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; it eliminates flood control, reclamation, and other projects.

Mr. RANKIN. It eliminates those projects built under the supervision of the Interior Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes; it confines it to the projects in this bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated a few moments ago, I shall offer an amendment to strike out language beginning on line 16 on page 2 immediately after the word "region," strike out the remainder of the paragraph, including the part that has been offered by the gentleman from Texas should his amendment prevail. I have no objection to the inclusion of the language he suggests, for I shall move to strike out the whole thing on the ground that it is an unusual grant of power, a power of which I think the Congress should not at this time divest itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I may state to the gentleman from California that my amendment will not prejudice his amendment when it is offered.

Mr. CARTER. No; it will not. May I say further, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of this committee who is offering this amendment at this time stated here in the House yesterday that he favored an amendment to strike out such as I propose to offer a little later.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That is correct, but if that amendment should fail to carry, then it is important to have this language in the bill.

Mr. CARTER. That is true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make this request—perhaps it is an unusual one under the circumstances—because I am in receipt of a memorandum from an officer of general rank who has taken an active part in the military operations in the Mediterranean area and who in his memorandum describes an incident that occurred upon the battlefield, and enclosed with it a copy of a poem written by a soldier. I am not at liberty to give the name of the soldier-author of the poem, but I thought my colleagues in the House would bear with me just a moment while I read to them a very brief description of this incident and the poem itself.

According to the general officer who communicated with me, this man wrote this poem after being wounded on the battlefield. He led his tank platoon in a gallant and successful attack on a certain German station and was later decorated for his action in this attack. His foot was badly mangled when his tank was knocked out by a German 88. A fellow officer amputated it while they were hiding from the Germans in a ditch. He lay there for hours. He thought he was dying when he wrote this poem. The poem is entitled: "What Did You Do Today, My Friend?" and it reads as follows:

What did you do today, my friend,
From morn until dark?
How many times did you complain
The rationing is too tight?
When are you going to start to do
All of the things you say?
A soldier would like to know, my friend,
What did you do today?

We met the enemy today
And took the town by storm.
Happy reading it will make
For you tomorrow morn.
You'll read with satisfaction
The brief communique.
We fought, but are you fighting?
What did you do today?

My gunner died in my arms today;
I feel his warm blood yet.
Your neighbor's dying boy gave out
A scream I can't forget.
On my right a tank was hit,
A flash and then a fire;
The stench of burning flesh
Still rises from the pyre.

What did you do today, my friend,
To help us with the task?
Did you work harder and longer for less,
Or is that too much to ask?
What right have I to ask you this?
You probably will say.
Maybe now you'll understand;
You see, I died today.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to a situation that has developed in New York Harbor, which is quite pertinent to this bill, because we are appropriating or will appropriate under the authorization of this bill millions and millions of dollars. We can dig, we can dredge, we can reclaim, we can abate all pollution in all the rivers and harbors of the country, but if the administration of the officers having to do with those rivers and harbors is inadequate, inefficient, shortsighted, or illiberal, then the bill that we pass and the appropriations that we provide are utterly useless.

I draw attention to a situation in New York Harbor at the port of Newark. One Major General Farthing is in charge of the port of Newark, a very distinguished soldier and a very fine administrator, but nonetheless quite stubborn and quite unwise in a certain respect. By his activities he has set up a monopoly of all the lighterage business in New York Harbor emanating from the port of Newark so that the private lighterage concerns are practically in the doldrums. For example, General Farthing has given a contract without public bidding, he has given it privately, to a certain concern called the Christie Scow Corporation, which incidentally, and this is passing strange, is headed by a major in the armed forces. This constitutes a monopoly of the lighterage from the port of Newark to other points in the New York Harbor area.

Mr. Chairman, there is no need for New York Harbor improvements, Hudson River improvements, East River improvements, Newark Bay improvements, if the views of Major General Farthing are to prevail, because he will eventually succeed in driving from the harbor and those rivers tributary to the harbor all the independent lighterage concerns in those waters. I have warned the General that that situation must stop and that if there are any contracts to be let, all lighterage companies and all scow companies should be invited to bid, so that the Government may get the competitive benefit and the competing wisdom of all those companies in New York Harbor. Finally the one offering the lowest port services should get the bid—be the successful bidder. Undercover or private bidding should have no place in such a situation as important as lighterage in New York Harbor.

I have sent a communication to the Smaller War Plants Corporation with reference to the setting up of this monopoly. I have yet to hear finally from the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The letter which I sent will indeed be grist to the mill of that Smaller War Plants Corporation. I am informed that Assistant Secretary of War Patterson has had made known to him the setting up of this monopoly and the baneful effect it will have upon the harbor of New York.

I here and now warn General Farthing that that practice of setting up such monopolies must cease here and now. I say all this despite General Farthing's ability. He should see the light and make his record even better.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 14, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following paragraph:

"St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney; House Document No. 445, Seventy-eighth Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 19, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following paragraph:

"Lavon Reservoir on East Fork of Trinity River, Tex.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated February 10, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 19, line 5, after "Congress;", insert "and in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated August 21, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 20, lines 18 and 19, after "Seventy-sixth Congress", strike out the comma and the word "and" and insert a semicolon in lieu thereof, and after the semicolon at the end of line 19 insert "and 449, Seventy-eighth Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer another committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 21, line 13, after "Congress", strike out the semicolon, insert a colon, and the following proviso: *"Provided,* That such improvement when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri Basin over that now authorized by existing law."

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARRETT as substitute for the committee amendment in lieu of the matter proposed by the committee amendment: Page 21, line 13, after the word "Congress", substitute a colon for the semicolon and insert the following: *"Provided,* That the use of waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for municipal, domestic, or livestock water supply, for irrigation of arid or semiarid lands, and for mining and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby and that any use of such waters for the maintenance of a navigable channel shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any of the aforesaid uses heretofore or hereafter established."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. My point of order is that the amendment is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution places interstate commerce and improvements for that purpose under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. This amendment would subordinate it to an act of a State legislature.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Texas that it is not within the province of the Chair to rule upon the constitutionality of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming; therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, the State of Wyoming is tremendously interested in this section of the bill. Three-fourths of our State drains into the Missouri River. We furnish more than 5,000,000 acre-feet of water to the Missouri River Basin each year. We have in our State 1,800,000 acres of adjudicated water rights. Last year we irrigated 1,000,000 acres because there was an insufficient supply to irrigate the other 800,000 acres. We have an additional 600,000 acres that can be irrigated when we have the water stored for that purpose. The development of this great resource will create over 10,000 new farms and will increase our population by nearly 200,000 people. It will provide homes for thousands of our boys and their buddies when this war is over. If Congress by its action here takes our water, the development of our State is at an end. Today we must determine the proper use of the waters of the Missouri and its tributaries. The amount of water available is limited. It must be set aside for the greatest benefit of all the people of this and future generations in the basin, and for the Nation. Of course, we favor flood control. The Missouri River is the longest river in the country. It is about the only river of consequence that has not been harnessed and developed. The loss of human life and the destruction of property on the

Missouri River must be ended for all time. By the wise utilization of the waters of the Missouri and its tributaries, we can achieve flood control, irrigation, and adequate power development in aid of irrigation. The requirements of navigation must be considered, but only in its proper relative place in a comprehensive plan for the whole Valley. Most assuredly we must raise the foodstuffs first, before they can be transported. To my way of thinking, the problem is just this. The recorded average discharge of the Missouri River at Yankton is 15,768,000 acre-feet. To service a 6-foot channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri will take 11,600,000 acre-feet a year. The Bureau of Reclamation states that above Yankton, in the Upper Basin States, there are 3,200,000 acres of potential irrigable land. In order to irrigate that it will take 4,160,000 acre-feet of water each year. It is reliably estimated that when the water is applied to that land it will make homes for 500,000 people. That is more than twice the population of my State. Now, if this proposed 9-foot channel will not take any more water than is needed for a 6-foot channel, then obviously there is water enough for all purposes. The great and distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, stated on the floor that the plan for a 9-foot channel does not call for any additional water from the Missouri River Basin, but will be achieved by extension of contraction systems, bank revetment, cut-offs, closing of channels, removing of snags, and dredging.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question is, How can the rights of people in the Upper Basin States be protected? No reasonable man can expect the people in the arid sections to send water downstream 2,000 miles to an area with an abundance of rainfall, in order to sail a battleship. The committee amendment is wholly inadequate. That amendment reads:

Provided, That such improvements when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri Basin over that now authorized by existing law.

Under the commerce clause of the Constitution, the Congress has control of rivers for navigation. Under Supreme Court decisions, any stream tributary to a navigable stream is declared to be navigable. Therefore under the supreme law of the land, and under existing law, any waters that are needed may be used for navigation purposes. This centralized Federal control supersedes State laws for appropriation for irrigation, domestic, and industrial purposes. The committee amendment therefore dedicates all water needed for navigation purposes. Congress has recognized the rights of the State to appropriate its own waters for these purposes, but this amendment renders that control wholly ineffective. The conclusion is irresistible. By this amendment we are wholly unprotected. Now the Congress has recognized a 6-foot channel. All we ask is that we be protected before this proposal for a 9-foot channel is authorized. We are entitled to that protection. The amendment I offered reads:

Provided, That the use of waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for municipal, domestic, or livestock water supply, for irrigation of arid or semiarid lands, and for mining and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby and that any use of such waters for the maintenance of a navigable channel shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any of the aforesaid uses heretofore or hereafter established.

It is fair and reasonable, and should be adopted.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I come from an irrigation State. If irrigation was taken out of California it certainly would be very badly damaged. Thousands of fertile acres would revert to a desert. Having that interest in irrigation and reclamation work, still I am opposed to the amendment that has been proposed here by my good friend from Wyoming. He cannot cite me one single instance in the history of this country where the improvement of navigation has in any way injured the irrigation interests. In every case that I know of by improvement of navigation, by the building of a dam to help navigation, the irrigation interests have also been helped.

So, as one who comes from a State whose very destiny is bound up in irrigation, I have supported here over a period of many years appropriations for improvement of navigation, because I knew it supplemented the irrigation work.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, the whole controversy raised by this proposed amendment has been gone into very extensively by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, both sides had an opportunity to be heard, and the committee amendment seeks to protect everybody fully; is that not right?

Mr. CARTER. What the gentleman from Minnesota states is correct. We heard this whole argument there, and I am sure there was a very sympathetic understanding of the situation by the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

We do not want to injure irrigation in any way. I challenge anyone in this Chamber to rise to state one instance where an irrigation project has ever been injured by any navigation improvement.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield if the gentleman can cite me an example.

Mr. BARRETT. I can cite you the facts by the Army engineers themselves. They contend that it will take 16,000,000 acre-feet of water at Yankton, S. Dak., to provide a 9-foot channel. The United States Geological Survey shows that there are only 15,768,000 acre-feet of water at Yankton. Accordingly, the 9-foot channel will take all the water for navigation and leave none for irrigation.

Mr. CARTER. The Fort Peck Dam and Reservoir provides a storage of 19,600,000 acre-feet. Even admitting everything the gentleman has said, we are going to have ample storage there to take care of navigation and have a surplus for irrigation.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that the committee will place an amendment in the bill to the effect that this bill shall not be construed to authorize the appropriation of any additional water that is not already allowed by law?

Mr. CARTER. That is the amendment we are considering at the present time. We are not trying to take anything away from these irrigationists, and I thank the gentleman from Oregon, for I know that he too is interested in irrigation. His State is dependent upon it. If I thought for a moment that these improvements were in any way going to interfere with, retard, impede, or destroy our irrigation efforts, I certainly would not be for this amendment. But as has been stated here, after a thorough hearing in which several people from irrigation States were present, the committee decided upon the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Barrett amendment, which we of Montana feel will give us more security. In our State we are just becoming aware of how important our water is to us, and I think it would be well to bring to the attention of the House the future need for irrigated lands and the part that we in Montana hope to play in that respect. Before I start in on my subject, though, I should like to state that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is ill in the hospital and, therefore, unable to be here to express in person his support of our stand in the question under discussion.

Food requirements of the Nation now consume the production of 530,000,000 acres of improved farm land or 4 acres per capita.

Census reports show that while our population is increasing at the rate of about 1,000,000 annually the acreage of improved farm lands in the 31 Eastern States is steadily decreasing and our recent production has been maintained by the large increase in acreage and volume of crops from the 17 Western States.

During the past 20 years our foreign agricultural commerce has changed from a large surplus of exports to a present excess of imports over exports approaching a billion dollars annually.

In the same period the effects of farm mechanization on farm feed required has been absorbed, higher living standards are requiring more vegetable, fruit, and dairy products, and new industrial developments are demanding a larger share of farm production.

Favorable growing conditions for the past several years, aided by the incentives of the war effort, have furnished national food supplies far greater than

can be expected in normal years from the same lands.

If the health and strength of the Nation is to be maintained and increased in the years to come more good land must be brought into cultivation.

The 20,000,000 acres of irrigated lands in the West produce much higher yields than humid-region soils, maintain and improve their fertility, and are adapted to many vital specialty crops.

Probably the largest remaining area of undeveloped irrigable land lies in the upper drainage of the Missouri River and is primarily centered in Montana, North and South Dakota, and Wyoming. In these regions there are now 4,410,000 acres supplied with water and exporting vast quantities of basic foods and livestock. Extensive surveys of the Bureau of Reclamation now being completed show that an additional area of 4,560,000 acres of good land can be successfully irrigated by the construction of reservoirs and canals to more fully utilize the waters of the streams originating in this region.

The production of crops on irrigated land requires the consumption of part of the water that is diverted from the streams and applied to the land.

Careful studies in various localities in the region show that this consumptive use varies from 1.10 acre-feet per acre to 1.55 acre-feet per acre depending on soil texture, kind of crops, and other factors, and that the average use is about 1.30 acre-feet. At this rate the 4,560,000 acres of future irrigation development will require 5,928,000 acre-feet of consumptive use water to produce the crops.

As present irrigation uses are already reflected in the flows of the Missouri River, this additional amount will be slightly over one-third of the average flow at Sioux City and less than one-fourth of the discharge of the Missouri at Kansas City.

According to recent studies of the Bureau of Reclamation about 3,200,000 acres of the 4,560,000 acres of future development would be located on the Missouri River or its tributaries above Yankton, S. D., and at the rate of 1.30 acre-feet per acre for the irrigation use would reduce the average flow at that point by about 4,160,000 acre-feet.

The recorded average discharge of the river at this point is 15,768,000 so there would still remain an average of 11,600,000 acre-feet to serve any justifiable navigation or other uses.

On the other hand, as demonstrated in the statement by Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of Reclamation, before the Flood Control Committee of the House on February 17, 1944, that while the requirement of 11,600,000 acre-feet for a 6-foot navigation channel from Yankton to the mouth of the river could be filled and still leave approximately enough water on the average to supply prospective irrigation demands, the requirement of 16,800,000 acre-feet for a 9-foot channel would consume all of the flow of the stream and leave no water at all for further irrigation development.

The Barrett amendment means much to us of Montana and I sincerely hope the House will see fit to uphold our stand. Water is our greatest asset and we need it to develop our State for our benefit and that of the Nation as a whole.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is unavoidably detained because of illness, and I ask unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, the pending rivers and harbors bill, H. R. 3961, contains an item for the Missouri River which reads as follows:

> Missouri River between Sioux City, Iowa, and the mouth; House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress.

An inadequate amendment to that item was reported out by the committee on February 22. The committee amendment would not afford the protection that the Upper Basin States must have if they are to grow through increase in their beneficial consumptive use of water.

I appeared at the hearing of the Rivers and Harbors Committee held on February 19, and proposed an amendment that would afford real protection to the Upper Basin States. My proposed amendment to the Missouri River item reads as follows:

> *Provided*, That the use of waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for municipal, domestic, or livestock water supply, for irrigation of arid or semiarid lands, and for mining and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby and that any use of such waters for the maintenance of a navigable channel shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any of the aforesaid uses hereto or hereafter established.

It was stated at the hearings by the proponents of the 9-foot channel that the improvements proposed for the Missouri River would be accomplished by revetment and similar work and would not require any additional draft on the waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries other than what is now authorized. Naturally, however, we in Montana and the other Upper Basin States want to make sure that beneficial consumptive use of the waters which rise in our States shall be unhampered by any navigation project in the lower reaches of the Missouri River. We cannot afford to have our future jeopardized by what is proposed nor by any uncertainty as to what is presently authorized.

I have examined the Army reports and the existing legislation to determine what is now authorized in the way of a navigation project on the Missouri River. The Rivers and Harbors Act of 1935 (49 Stat. 1028 at p. 1034) provides the existing authorization. It reads:

> Missouri River, completion of improvement from mouth to Sioux City, Iowa, and construction of Fort Peck Dam; House Document No. 238, Seventy-third Congress.

Since the existing authorization was made in accordance with House Document No. 238, I examined that document. It is the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated September 30, 1933, officially described as "containing a general plan for the improvement of Missouri River, for the purposes of navigation and efficient development of its water power, the control of floods, and the needs of irrigation." It contains the reports of the district engineer, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, and it requires that you read from the back to the front, for starting with the district engineer and proceeding upward in the hierarchy, each report refers to the reports below it. The Chief of Engineers' report apparently is the last word in the document. After summarizing the reports of the others, he concluded—page 12, paragraph 26:

> After due consideration of the above-mentioned reports, I concur in the general plan of improvement formulated by the district engineer, and recommend that it be developed into execution as economic conditions may warrant in the future.

As described by the Chief of Engineers—page 8, paragraph 15—the district engineer's comprehensive plan of development for the maximum utilization of the streams of the basin included, among other things, a total of 80 additional irrigation projects embodying an irrigable area of about 2,844,000 acres. The Chief of Engineers in his conclusion further recommended:

> That the project for navigation on the main stem as heretofore authorized [6-foot channel], namely from the mouth to Sioux City, Iowa, be vigorously pressed to completion, and that, in addition, the reservoir at the site of Fort Peck be built to the maximum practicable capacity and be operated primarily for navigation.

In passing, I should note that to find the start of the 6-foot channel authorization, the 1933 report—House Document No. 238—refers back to the years 1912 and 1927 to another collection of reports.

Thus I found that the 1935 act authorized a comprehensive plan providing, among other things, for additional irrigation in the upper basin, the completion of the 6-foot channel, and the construction of Fort Peck Dam to the maximum practicable capacity.

In the pending bill, H. R. 3961, the Missouri River item makes reference to still another report, House Document No. 214, Seventy-sixth Congress. In that report the Chief of Engineers concurred in the views and recommendations of the Board of Engineers, namely, that there be adopted—

> A project for Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth to provide for a channel of 9-foot depth and width not less than 300 feet, to be obtained by revetment of banks, construction of permeable dikes to contract and stabilize the waterway, cut-offs to eliminate long bends, closing of minor channels, removal of snags, and dredging as required.

As stated in the report of the Board of Engineers, the project as presently authorized by Congress is one—

> To provide in the 795 miles below Sioux City, Iowa, a channel 6 feet deep, with a minimum width of 200 feet and reasonable additional width around bends, to be obtained by construction of works to contract and stabilize the low-water channel, supplementing as necessary by dredging, and aided by the operation of the Fort Peck Reservoir to assure an adequate minimum flow.

The committee's report on the pending bill—Report No. 1000—indicates that the committee recognizes that the presently authorized project is one for a 6-foot channel 200 feet wide.

It seems clear enough after examination of a multitude of reports that the Congress in 1935 authorized completion of a project for a 6-foot navigable channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the river. It is equally clear that at the same time the Congress authorized a comprehensive plan which contemplated additional irrigation development in the upper basin.

But is the comprehensive plan's provision for increase in upstream use of water consistent with the authorization of Fort Peck Dam and the Chief of Engineers' recommendation that it "be built to the maximum practicable capacity, and be operated primarily for navigation"? The capacity of Fort Peck Dam, as actually built, exceeds 19,000,000 acre-feet. The Army's report in 1933 said that a Fort Peck Dam of 17,000,000 acre-feet capacity could service a 9-foot channel. They also then said that 20,000 cubic second-feet of flow at Yankton, S. Dak., would be required for a 6-foot channel and that 30,000 cubic feet per second flow would be required for a 9-foot channel.

However—and here comes the most troublesome fact—the Geological Survey's stream measurements show that from 1929 to 1942 the average annual flow of the Missouri River at Yankton was only 21,780 cubic feet per second.

Irrigation depends on water. If Fort Peck Dam could call repeatedly for 19,000,000 acre-feet to be stored, regulated, and released primarily for navigation, what would the future of the Upper Basin States be in a period like the recent one from 1929 to 1942? It would be pitiful. I assure you it would produce little, if any, freight traffic for a 9-foot or even a 6-foot channel.

It has been suggested that since the 1935 Rivers and Harbors Act authorized Fort Peck Dam, the Congress might be said to have committed the flow of the Missouri, to the extent of the reservoir's capacity of 19,000,000 acre-feet, to navigation purposes.

I have not heard any such position argued by the Army engineers, nor by any member of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, and I do not know whether the Army engineers or the committee believe in such an argument. The Army reports bearing on this matter are too many and too voluminous to give a clear and easy answer. Should such a position be taken, it certainly would be unconscionable. It would have one part of the 1935 authorization give the lie to another part of the 1935 authorization, namely, the authorization of a comprehensive plan for additional irrigation development upstream.

I am sure that had Senator WHEELER thought for 1 minute that the 1935 item for the Missouri River in the river and harbor bill had a remote chance of being construed to commit 19,000,000 acre-feet for navigation, he and the entire congressional delegation from the Upper Basin States, probably joined by all the delegations of all of the other Western States, would have insisted on protection against any such possibility. Certainly the Upper Basin States were lulled into a sense of security by the representations of the Army report in House Document No. 238 that there was to be much additional development upstream of beneficial consumptive uses of the waters of the river.

I understand that the Army engineers say that the 9-foot channel proposed can be accomplished and maintained merely by revetment and other works and without any additional draft on the waters rising in the upper basin. The proposed project will have to be accomplished merely by such works, for we in Montana and the other Upper Basin States insist on legislative protection of future as well as present consumptive use of the waters of the upper basin for which future development was authorized in the 1935 act. In other words, navigation projects heretofore, now, or hereafter authorized for the Missouri River must not jeopardize in any way the present or future beneficial consumptive use of waters in the upper basin.

The amendment to the Missouri River item in H. R. 3961 reported by the committee and any other language that might be suggested which ties into what is "presently authorized," in my judgment, is entirely unsatisfactory and must be rejected by the Upper Basin States and by all the Western States that are interested in preserving for use within those States the beneficial consumptive use of the waters that rise in those States. We should prevent any interference with developments in these upstream States, whether the interferences be intended or unintentional. We must have such protection as would be afforded by an amendment such as I have proposed. We cannot be satisfied with any vague assurances that may be found by exhaustive analysis of report on report on report that are bound up together and become a House document referred to in a river and harbor item. We want, we must have, and I am sure that the Congress will agree we should have, the specific legislative assurance that the waters in our Upper Basin States can be put to beneficial consumptive use there to the maximum practicable extent.

Consider the specific beneficial consumptive uses which are enumerated in my amendment.

Municipal uses: Would Congress deny us an assurance that our cities, as they grow, shall have an adequate water supply?

Domestic uses: Would the Congress deny us assurance that there shall be adequate water for domestic life?

Livestock water supply: Would the Congress deny us an assurance of whatever water supply we need to supply our growing livestock industry?

Irrigation of arid or semiarid land: Would the Congress deny us the assurance of sufficient water to change our sagebrush lands into homesteads where returning soldiers and other worthy American citizens can find an opportunity to earn their own living by their own work on their own land?

Mining and industrial purposes: Would the Congress deny us an assurance that we shall have sufficient water to make possible the growth of our mining and industrial life, on which a substantial part of our war production is now dependent and which may be necessary again for the national defense?

All we ask is an assurance that we shall have in that great upper basin—in the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming—where water is the prime essential, the beneficial consumptive use of the waters that rise in our own States so that we can live and grow and be an even more solid and substantial part of this Nation.

It is merely these assurances which we insist on in the amendment I proposed. Again I read it:

Provided, That the use of waters of the Missouri River and its tributaries for municipal, domestic, or livestock water supply, for irrigation of arid or semiarid lands, and for mining and industrial purposes shall not be adversely affected thereby and that any use of such waters for the maintenance of a navigable channel shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with any of the aforesaid uses heretofore or hereafter established.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We are told that this bill does not interfere with irrigation. If that statement is true, then why do you object to this simple amendment? Then why not accept it and allay our apprehensions? I speak for my State, as well as the other States in the drought area, when I speak for this amendment. I shall also support the amendment that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] will offer later.

These amendments in no way interfere with navigation, provided there is enough water for all concerned. However, we are vitally concerned in having first claim on the water for local and domestic purposes. We are for irrigation because it affects the Nation's food supplies. We are for water conservation in the States where it emanates. We are for navigation only after we have protected the property and lives of the lower Mississippi from floods.

This bill not only affects the western part of the United States, but affects the eastern part fully as well, because we all want an abundance of food. Unless we can increase our food supplies as our population increases, as Marvin Jones said the other day, we will not have enough food to go around.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. This amendment was so worded that it would not take one more drop of water for navigation than the law permits, and does the gentleman not think that that protects his State, and the Northwestern States?

Mr. LEMKE. No; it does not, because during the dry years it would take every drop of water that we have up there in the Missouri River, and especially so in the State of North Dakota. For instance, I remember the time when we

had to drive 40 miles to get water for cattle. We also want to build up our water resources, and rebuild the ground water levels. We can do this by keeping water for irrigation and domestic use.

Mr. DONDERO. Under this amendment we cannot take one drop of water that is not now permitted by existing law, and if the gentleman wants to do what he suggests, we will have to repeal some of the laws on the statute books.

Mr. LEMKE. If we pass this amendment we will conserve the water at least for the Western States for irrigation and domestic purposes. That should be the first claim of the water within any State. I am not concerned with the existing law, or what has been. I am concerned with what is going to be in the future, and this amendment will accomplish the thing that we need and want. It will assure us water for irrigation and after we get through with that, we would gladly give it to your 9-foot channel. But if you refuse us this amendment, then we might again have to haul water 40 miles for our livestock.

This amendment will not hurt your bill, if you are sincere in your statement that you agree with us that irrigation and water for domestic uses should have the first claim on the rivers arising and flowing through our States.

I am more interested in irrigation, flood control, and water conservation than in navigation. Navigation is useless unless you have something to navigate for. At this time, when the Western States and the Nation are thoroughly aroused—when we have become thoroughly water conscious—because of the appalling loss of human life and property occasioned by last year's floods, I wish to assure Congress that both the administration and the people are ready to join hands with you in order to prevent the recurrence of these catastrophes.

Let us strike while the iron is hot. We are going to control disastrous floods. We are not only going to solve the flood problem, but we are going to conserve and make use of this water for the people of the Western States and the Nation. The waters that are now wasted and permitted to run to the ocean, leaving destruction and misery in their wake, are going to be utilized. They are going to be harnessed, not only to furnish electrical power, but for irrigation and industrial purposes. After that you can have them for navigation.

We are going to impound the unused and uncontrolled flood waters. We are going to prevent disastrous floods in the Missouri and lower Mississippi Valleys. We will not only prevent the destruction of millions of dollars worth of property together with human lives, but we will also restore the ground water levels. This will lessen extreme droughts and dust storms. We are going to do tsis before we are going to navigate.

Few realize that our loss in crops, livestock, and other property caused by drought is many times greater than that caused by floods. For every million dollars worth of property lost by floods at least fifty million has been lost because of drought. Let us impound the unused and uncontrolled floodwaters emanating in the interior of the United States. If we do this we will not only prevent floods permanently but we will be able to make use of these waters for productive and industrial enterprises and also for navigation.

Only those of us who live in the central part of the United States know that droughts have been far more destructive than floods. Unless we act now and keep the surplus water here where it belongs the periodical droughts will return. Nature repeats itself. We know to what extent ground waters and water supplies had disappeared a few years ago. Less than 10 years ago one-fourth of our livestock between the Continental Divide and the Missouri and the Mississippi Rivers was either sold or died of thirst and starvation because of a lack of water and moisture.

Do you know that during that period some farmers hauled water 10 to 30 miles for household use and for livestock? Do you know that thousands of cattle, horses, and sheep died because they ate dust-covered grass—that human beings not only choked in dust storms but died because they inhaled the dust?

In every State west of the Mississippi and east of the Continental Divide ground-water levels have fallen from 10 to 48 feet since 1878. The rainfall during the last 3 years has replaced some of the surface water, but they have not replaced the ground waters to any great extent. In 1878 Devils Lake was 35 feet deep and covered over 135 square miles. It was 60 miles long, with a steamboat running from Devils Lake to Minnewaukan. Today this lake is less than 7 feet deep and it covers less than 10 square miles.

The people of my State for many years asked the Federal Government to construct a dam at Big Bend in the Missouri River near Garrison and divert the floodwaters into Devils Lake. These waters now find their way into the Atlantic Ocean, with devastating destruction at times along the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys. Just why the Federal Government favored projects of less value over this more worthy one is, of course, a question that we may attribute to human shortcomings and lack of understanding.

This project was perhaps neglected because heretofore the Army engineers reported that it was not financially feasible; that it required too much money. In the past official Washington always shied away from projects that required a considerable sum of money. The real projects were generally overlooked and millions spent on so-called lesser projects, or should we say "pork barrel" projects.

Washington was penny-wise and pound-foolish. Circumstances have forced a change in the official attitude at Washington. The destructive floods last year and the demand for increased food supplies have aroused Washington from sleeping at the switch. The people demand action. The Army engineers have been busy making surveys. They have prepared their report for Congress. It is known as the Pick report. That report is encouraging and favorable. It provides for multiple-purpose dams. The unused and floodwaters of the Missouri River will at last be utilized—they will be conserved and used for the production of wealth.

The people of North Dakota have been the first to advocate water conservation as a means to control floods. Years ago our State legislature appropriated money for a survey in connection with water conservation. Our State was a pioneer along this line. We owe a debt of gratitude to the men who had vision and who for years worked for water conservation. We are grateful to our Governor and our State water conservation commission who are now so actively engaged in bringing this vision of our pioneers to a successful realization.

Now that the Federal Government is on the job with its Army engineers and is ready to help, we must not lay down on the job. Congress must act. The Army engineers made their report. By a united demand of the States affected Congress will act and appropriate sufficient funds. But remember, even after Congress has acted, and the water has been empounded and is ready for use, there still remains the question of proper distribution among the States through which the Missouri River flows and also those which border on it. That use must be irrigation, domestic and industrial as well as for navigation.

That problem is still ours. There still remains the problem of proper utilization of this water so that it will produce wealth. The Western States will do their part, but they must have our active cooperation and support. The byproducts of this flood-control program are so many and so great that if properly made use of they will repay not only the expense but additional dividends by the daily use of these waters.

A few of the uses to which these waters can be put are irrigation, electric power, prevention of soil erosion, diminution of silt now carried to navigable streams. It will improve the general climate of the entire Missouri River Valley. It will give employment to thousands of men and add billions to the general wealth of the Nation. It will produce wealth not only today and tomorrow but through all the years yet to come.

Not only will Devils Lake again become a real lake, but it will enable us to add many more small lakes and irrigation projects to the already 1,400 artificial lakes that have been established in my State. It will help us to develop our agricultural and industrial resources. Early records show that there was once an abundance of water in more than 5,000 lakes and flowing streams in my State. There was an abundance of game and fish and wildlife. But during the past two or more decades many of these lakes, springs, and water holes disappeared, and the lowering of the ground water levels a few years ago caused an alarming situation.

Ten years ago many cities and towns faced the problem of obtaining an adequate water supply. Nearly all of the

streams, lakes, and water holes in my State and surrounding States had gone completely dry. Even the larger streams, such as the Yellowstone, the Missouri, the Red, and the James Rivers, ceased to flow. About 10 years ago I saw farmers attempt to raise vegetables in South Dakota in the bed of the James River. The attempt was unsuccessful because there was not enough moisture, even in the river bed.

I have presented these facts because human memory is short. After 2 or 3 years of sufficient rainfall we are likely to forget about the drought and the necessity of abundant water supply for irrigation. We are likely to forget the effect that this supply will have on the rainfall and climatic condition. In order to have rain you must have moisture. In order to have moisture you must have ground water. The floods and the droughts are largely man made. They are the result of overcultivation; the result of our shortsightedness. But the human race is generally shortsighted.

The reason for the recent floods is that by cultivation we have destroyed the natural reservoirs and water basins, as well as the grass and the timber that held the water's mad rush to the ocean in check. So also the reason for the gradual decrease of the water supply some 10 years ago was the result of overcultivation and drainage of the natural water basins, thus removing the grass and vegetation that retained the moisture caused by summer rains and winter snows.

This damage was done not deliberately but because of our ignorance of the final results. But now we know that water conservation and flood control is one of the most important problems confronting our Nation, ranking in importance over reforestation or forestation, because without water there can be no forest or vegetable life. Without water there can be no animal or human life. Everything in this world that grows or lives must have water. Unless we have water you will have nothing to navigate for.

This is a national, as well as a local, issue. It concerns every State and the very future welfare of our Nation. Floods and droughts have alternately become a national catastrophe. They can be controlled and prevented. We are now on our way and we shall not rest until we have accomplished our purpose. Our request is just and you ought to grant it without further opposition.

When this program has been completed the youth of my State and the Nation will be given a new opportunity. They will build homes and pursue agriculture on irrigated lands, as well as enter into industrial fields. It will give a new frontier to our State and National life. It will utilize and save the waters of the Nation where they are needed for irrigation, power, and navigation. It will harness the rivers and streams at their source and use them for the good of mankind, rather than to allow them to destroy millions of dollars worth of property, as well as human lives. It will add to our national defense by assuring a permanent and adequate food supply.

For the first time the eight States comprising the Missouri River Valley are thoroughly water conscious—they are cooperating. They are determined to prevent the destruction caused by floods. They are equally determined to utilize the surplus waters. The Federal Government is water conscious and the people of the Western States always have been water conscious.

The time is ripe. By united action of the people of my State and of these eight States affected, the dream of our pioneers will come true. The water of my State and the adjoining States will be used in such a way as to create billions of wealth in years to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and in support of the Barrett amendment.

Mr. Chairman, having appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors during the time when this amendment which they have offered was under consideration, I think possibly I can clarify the situation a little bit. The amendment which the committee has offered is substantially the amendment which I suggested as the irreducible minimum of what should be adopted. At the time I appeared before the committee I said, however, that I regarded it as the minimum, and preferred an amendment substantially in the form of the one which has been offered by the gentleman from Wyoming, and that is my feeling today.

I regard the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] as preferable to the committee amendment. But it seems to me there is some confusion here with regard to the effect of the amendment proposed by the committee and with regard to the meaning of the commerce clause in the Constitution.

As I understand it, neither of these amendments is in violation of the Constitution. They are merely an exercise of the constitutional provisions.

The commerce clause of the Constitution merely says that the Congress, the Federal Government, shall have control over navigable streams. Then clearly it is within the power of Congress to declare, as a matter of policy, either that navigation shall have preference or that irrigation shall have preference. The effect of the committee amendment, it seems to me, would be altogether good, that is, it is certainly better than leaving this project without the amendment, because it provides that if this project should be accomplished, it should be done without increasing the demands on the water resources of the Missouri Basin above Sioux City over those in projects authorized by existing law.

There has been some confusion because some people have assumed that the word "authorized" meant the Constitution authorizes the use of all water for navigation. If that were the case, there would be little we could do about it here today. Now the Constitution does not necessarily authorize navigation and navigation only any more than it authorizes the Congress to declare a policy upon navigation and other forms of interstate commerce on navigable streams. If the Constitution gave navigation an exclusive authorization to use navigable waters, we would be powerless here to adopt any effective policy unless we amend the Constitution, rather than simplify the bill before us.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE. I am sorry, but my time is limited.

The word "authorized" in the committee amendment is used in the sense of "authorized projects," and projects that are now authorized by law are the authorizations referred to, not previous declarations of congressional policy. The amendment is restrictive and limits the water demand that can be created by the project proposed to be authorized here.

However, as a matter of exercising the power of the Congress and the power of the Federal Government over navigable streams, why should the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming not be accepted? Does it harm anybody?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I prefer not to yield inasmuch as I have such a limited time.

Can anybody seriously contend that the States where the water comes from should not have a prior right to use the water as they see fit?

Can anyone seriously contend that the States to which the water goes should have a prior right in determining the proper use of the water over and above the States where the water falls?

Now, if the States where the water originates feel that for their best interest and for the best interests of the country the prior right to the water should be established in favor of the use for reclamation or livestock water in industrial use, why should not that policy be here enunciated? It is certainly within the power of Congress to do so and that is all that is involved in this issue.

The upper States on the Missouri River are simply asking that the Congress declare that if a conflict ever should arise as to the use of this water, the right of the upper States to first use will be recognized. That is all there is to it.

Personally I do not expect in my lifetime, or in the lifetime of anyone here, that any conflict would ever arise because the projects that can be developed within our lifetime would not exhaust the water resources of the Missouri River Basin. But that question might arise, and if it ever did arise it would arise in the most critical years, in the drought years, when it is true, as the gentleman from North Dakota has said, we have had to go 40 or 50 miles for drinking water.

I grew up on a homestead in western South Dakota. During the dry years in 1910 and 1911 I used to drive stock to water and I used to haul water for the

family in a barrel on a stone boat. I know something of what it means when water runs short. In this amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming, we simply seek to make it clear that if a conflict ever does arise, that human needs and livestock needs will come first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I must vote against this bill. This is the worst piece of "pork barrel" legislation that I have seen in the more than 5 years that I have been a Member of this body. I do not believe that we have any bona fide points which entitle us to the pork this measure would provide. It seems to me the points we are offering for this tempting, luscious, political meat are phony.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to answer my distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] when he calls this a "pork barrel" bill.

Shortly after the War between the States there was a judge trying a Negro down in Alabama for stealing a hog. The judge said, "Stand up, Bill, and receive the judgment of the court; do you have anything to say?"

The Negro said, "Yes'm, captain." He said, "I went through the war with you and we went out and stole hogs. You called it 'foraging' then, when you was hungry. How come it is stealing now, when my children is hungry?"

When is a project legitimate improvement and when is it pork?

I want the distinguished gentleman from Ohio to get this distinction. Congress has just provided $1,350,000,000, I believe, for U. N. R. R. A.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman from Mississippi is not insinuating that the gentleman from Ohio voted for U. N. R. R. A.?

Mr. RANKIN. No; the gentleman from Ohio did not, as I understand it.

That was for rehabilitation of foreign countries. This is "Inrra." This is for the benefit of the American people. I wonder when it ceases to be "pork" and when it becomes a legitimate project. Is it when it crosses the border line?

There is no "pork" in this bill. Every single project was investigated and passed on its own merits, and they were put in this bill because the majority of the members of the committee thought they were for the benefit of all the American people.

I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that there is no State in the Union that will derive more benefit from these projects than will the State of Ohio. We did not call it "pork" a few years ago when we were building all those dams on the Ohio River under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. It was not "pork" then. We were simply developing the Ohio River for the benefit of the people of the country. That is what is being done here on every stream involved in this piece of legislation. I hope the gentleman from Ohio and those other gentlemen who are prone to cry "pork" every time we bring out a bill to try to develop the natural resources of America will take an inventory and study these questions before they make such charges. They will find this legislation is "Inrra." This is legislation for the benefit of all the American people.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Army engineers say that the only thing they want to do is to widen the stream from Sioux City to the point where the Missouri empties into the Mississippi to the extent of 300 feet. It is now 200 feet and they want to deepen the channel from 6 feet to 9 feet and they say they will not use any more water than is now available and going to waste. Well, if that is true, then no one ought to oppose this amendment. The only provision in this amendment that means anything to us who live in the arid west is that we do not want that channel to take away from us the water we need for livestock and the little irrigation plants that this Congress has already established along the Missouri River.

They say it will not take any more water. Why not put in the bill that they shall not take any water. That will dispose of this matter.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not a fact that the very situation which the gentleman has in mind would be taken care of by a subsequent amendment that has been agreed upon by a group of Members of this House, which will be offered at the proper time?

Mr. BURDICK. I think the gentleman from Idaho is stating the truth about that.

Mr. WHITE. There is a general amendment coming along that will take care of that principle.

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. Assuming that the original flood season will provide sufficient water to take up the extra space in this channel, that is not what concerns you. It is when the low season comes that requires other water, when you want protection?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right. We want protection so that we will not be stranded out there and have to drive our stock long distances to water. The largest round-up in our country comes in the drought time. The largest round-ups in our country come when the water fails.

Mr. ANGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. The amendment which the chairman of our committee the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, offered is in this language:

Provided, That such improvement when accomplished shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri Basin over that now authorized by existing law.

That is identically what you are pleading for.

Mr. BURDICK. There is a little difference. I do not know just exactly what provisions are in existing law in that respect. But whether they are in existing law or not, the only thing the western people ask for is that you do not interfere with the water which is necessary for the life of the West.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors had real sympathy with the viewpoint expressed by the gentleman from North Dakota and for that reason the committee accepted the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], which is the amendment just read by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], in the hope that we could protect the interests of the people living in the arid States of the Northwest. That was the purpose of the committee in accepting that amendment.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. LEMKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. The record shows the amount of water they are now authorized to use at Sioux City would take every drop of water in the Missouri River during dry years.

Mr. BURDICK. Then the gentleman does not have any confidence in the report of the engineers that they will not use any more water than is now available?

Mr. LEMKE. That report is absolutely impossible under existing conditions unless they accept this amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The purpose of the Barrett amendment is to give us some security for rights which we think are ours under the Constitution?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes, sir. I want to say that I am satisfied the sentiment of the House is such that it will protect the people in the West, but you are not always united on just what that amendment should do.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. There is a misunderstanding on the part of these gentlemen as to what is now authorized under existing law. For the information of the gentleman from North Dakota, the amendment offered by the committee prohibits taking any more water than they are now taking.

Mr. LEMKE. But it says "now authorized." There is a difference between "taking" and "authorizing."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. They are now taking all that is authorized. The Chief of Engineers has authorized that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but feel that there is some misunderstanding on the part of some Members as to just what is proposed here. If you will read the report that has been presented along with this bill, together with the hearings before our committee, you will find that under the present authorized projects there is provided a 6-foot channel from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River. Under that authorization and under that project, four-fifths of that channel will be 9 feet in depth. The Chief of Engineers came before our committee with the proposition that by making certain alterations in that channel the entire distance from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River can be made 9 feet in depth, just as four-fifths of it will be made without this proposal.

I wish to read to you what is contained in the report in this connection:

> Completion of the authorized project for regulating works and operation of the Fort Peck Reservoir to maintain a low-water flow of 32,000 cubic feet per second at Kansas City will assure a navigable depth of 6 feet below Sioux City, with a depth of 9 feet available intermittently over four-fifths of the entire distance. At this additional cost, relatively small in comparison with that already incurred under the 6-foot project, and at no increase in annual maintenance costs, necessary extensions of some of the controlling works can be made that will assure a minimum depth of 9 feet throughout. A substantial commerce is already developing on the partially completed 6-foot channel with indications of steady increase as general economic conditions improve. The savings in transportation charges on the additional commerce that would be attracted to an assured 9-foot depth, savings from elimination of the cost of transshipment of freight to and from points on the connecting deeper channels, and the reduced operating costs resulting from movements in deeper waters are ample justification of the additional expenditure required to carry the improvement to the same standards as are authorized for the other major waterways of the Mississippi system.

When this question of the fear of the people of that section arose that the effect of making one-fifth of this area a 9-foot channel might mean more water, our committee had extensive hearings and went into this matter thoroughly, entirely in sympathy with the views and suspicions of the people of that area. After considering this matter at length we arrived at the amendment which, in the unanimous opinion of members of the committee, took care of this proposition. I would like to read that in order to make this absolutely clear.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield right there before he reads the amendment?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] comes from an arid region of this country and no one in this House is more zealous about protecting the interests of the people of his country than the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and this is his amendment?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. That is correct. I appreciate the gentleman calling that to my attention. I would like to read this amendment:

> *Provided*, That such improvement when accomplished, shall not create any demand on the water resources of the Missouri Basin over that now authorized by existing law.

If you folks would get a 9-foot channel instead of a 6-foot channel without the use of any more water, that will be of tremendous economic benefit to you, and we have written in an amendment here which protects you. It appears to me that we have more than answered every request that has been made.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What do you mean by "authorized by law"? That is where we part company.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. What the engineers have already authorized.

Mr. HILL. What law do you mean? Do you mean laws set down by the United States Government, or do you mean laws provided in the States where the water arises? If you will explain that to me, we would have no argument here this afternoon.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. The Government on these projects is using all the water authorized now.

Mr. HILL. What do you mean by "government"? Do you mean the Government of the United States or do you mean the State governments as they have provided for the use of that water in these original rights?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Of course, the law limits the amount of water that may be used from the Fort Peck Reservoir by the Federal Government on these projects.

Mr. HILL. Of course, you do not dare to answer my question. This whole thing hinges around the idea whether the States control this water or whether you want to give it over to the Army engineers under a Federal department. It is about time this Congress came to life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] has expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this controversy rather divides itself into the question on the one hand of the navigators and on the other hand of the irrigators. According to the testimony of the Army engineers there is going to be enough water for everybody. The Army engineers perhaps have been the most respected body of authority along those lines that has been developed in the United States in the last 150 years. Long experience has taught us that we can rely upon the statements they make to us in their reports; so I believe that there is enough water for everybody.

Then we get to the question of what we are going to do in case there should not be enough. Some of you may not agree with me that there is enough water for everybody. Then what should we do? Mr. Chairman, if you will look at a map of the United States or, for that matter, the map of any country in the world, you will see that the great cities are spotted along the streams and harbors. No great city can exist except in proximity to a body of water. It must have plenty of pure water. So if you will look at the streams here in the great central valley, the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, and the other streams tributary to that system, you will find along them great cities that have grown up. Those cities have grown up in the last 150 years because they were located upon those water systems. Cities like Kansas City, St. Louis, New Orleans, and these others have grown in their dependence upon water; they have to have it to exist. You folks up there in the so-called arid regions would have no markets for the things you grow if you destroyed these cities, and that is what you would do if you denied them that water they have gotten from the streams and the transportation that has been developed upon the streams in the last 150 years.

We have in every Anglo-Saxon civilization a system of rights established and recognized by long usage; it has been here a part of our common law from time immemorial—we recognize rights long established. When the folks up in North Dakota were fearing the Indians, the city of New Orleans was old. When Kansas City was a thriving metropolis there were great sections of the Northwest undeveloped. That was the situation long established prior to even the remotest dream of irrigation. So if you have any respect or consideration for the common law of your country you are bound to agree with me when I say that if there is a dispute as to whether there is enough water, priority must go to those cities which have their rights long established by custom and usage. It was just within the last year and a half that Kansas City, the city where I live, was threatened with a shutting down of their great power plants, serving great war industries, because we were not getting enough water from the Missouri River to furnish the steam to keep those plants in operation. There was a threat of disrupting the city's power and water systems.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I cannot; I have not time. The city authorities and the people responsible for the operation of the war industries are faced with that ever-present threat of a shortage of water in the event that more water is taken out for irrigation. For these reasons, I am saying, Mr. Chairman, whether a Member lives in Missouri or up in North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, or wherever he may live, if you want to maintain the economy of this country on the basis of the last 150 years, if you want a market for your goods, if you want a place where things are manufactured that can be given you in return for the things you sell, do not disturb the orderly life in these great valleys.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Missouri was a learned circuit judge and is a great lawyer. The question that seems to perplex the Committee this afternoon is this: Does Federal law or State law take priority in the question of who shall have the water first? What is the gentleman's opinion on that?

Mr. BELL. In my opinion, if a stream is navigable, it becomes a Federal stream, and Federal law, of course, takes precedence. That has been the rule in this country since the writing of the Constitution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Answering the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] with regard to the question of prior law, does not the amendment now before the House limit it to projects that have been constructed and authorized under provisions of existing law?

Mr. BELL. The gentleman means does that amendment refer to Federal law or State law?

Mr. WHITE. No; the language of the amendment reads "under existing law." Is not that limited to projects that have been authorized and have been or are being constructed?

Mr. BELL. That would be my opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was interested in the interrogation presented by the gentleman from Michigan to the gentleman from Missouri as to whether Federal law or State law would take precedence in these problems such as we are considering here today. The response of the gentleman from Missouri was that if a stream were a navigable stream Federal law would take precedence. I believe if we examine recent decisions of the Supreme Court, however, we shall find that practically any stream in the country today could be considered navigable from the standpoint of coming within the purview of Federal legislation, because the Supreme Court has held that a navigable stream is one which is navigable or which flows into a stream which is navigable; so, clear up the mountain slope to the little tricklet can be found some justification for saying it comes under Federal control under these far-reaching decisions.

The problem confronting us, it seems to me, does not go to the distinction between State and Federal control, because we are considering here today various and diverse methods of Federal approach to this problem of preserving to the upper States in the river valley, specifically the Missouri River Valley, rights and access to the water, and there has been some legitimate reason for concern over the original amendment proposed by my colleague to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors which he now says he would prefer to have altered and modified by the provisions of the Granger amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CASE. At the time I appeared before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors I spoke in favor of an amendment substantially like the one offered by the gentleman from Wyoming but said that as a minimum I wanted to have at least the protection which was offered by the amendment which I suggested and which has been offered by the committee. I think we should have the protection given there, thereby recognizing that the other is preferable.

Mr. MUNDT. That is the thing I was going to say, that my colleague suggested his amendment as—I think he used the words "irreducible minimum"—as an irreducible minimum.

It is very true, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] has stated, that the cities farther down the valley should prosper and function well and that we of the upper regions want to sell them the produce which we raise. However, raising produce in the upper regions of the valley takes precedence over the marketing of the products, and to raise the produce many times it is necessary to supplement nature's rainfall by irrigation, and consequently we must protect our rights of irrigation or we may have nothing to sell either to the markets farther down that river, to markets on the seaboard, or even to foreign markets. Consequently we are deeply concerned that adequate provision be provided in the law which will guarantee to the people in the semiarid and arid regions of the country access to and use of this water for irrigation purposes. We believe with the Army engineers that there is water enough for all. We believe, too, that there are various ways of engineering a 9-foot channel. The width of the channel could be less, thus guaranteeing to the people who need water for irrigation purposes that the water will be available to them. It is conceivable that the channel could be a little narrower but still of 9-foot depth and thus take care of both the navigation and the irrigation interests by supplying adequate depth without making undue demands upon the water supply.

In H. R. 3961 the Congress is building the framework for the utilization of the waters of large river systems. This involves in many cases conflicting uses of water. Such conflict in turn precipitates questions of the future economic welfare of vast regions of the Nation. Some of the rivers on which projects are proposed by this bill rise in and are capable of furnishing water for irrigation of arid and semiarid areas. Agriculture in the arid region is limited by the availability of dependable water supplies. There is present in the whole problem the matter of a fair and reasonable balance between the economic benefits resulting from works authorized by Congress and designed to bring about one use or another. It is only sound policy that there should be a well-considered plan for the preservation of these uses in fair balance and in relation to the greatest economic good for various sections of a river basin. This result can only arise from an integration of studies and investigations intended to encompass all of these often divergent uses of water.

Any act of Congress which would authorize projects which, when constructed and in operation, will have the effect of requiring water for one use in unreasonable and unnecessary disregard of another use is neither sound nor does it represent a fair consideration of the present economic needs or potential development of different areas of a river basin.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The Bureau of Reclamation agrees with the plans of the Army engineers in reference to the availability and sufficiency of water for irrigation of lands up in the Northwest arid and semiarid country.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe the Bureau of Reclamation is working on an over-all engineering report for that area which is due the 1st of May; so that it is not in position finally to agree or disagree, but it does raise the question. The Bureau will not be able to give the final answer until it completes its report about the 1st of May.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. But it does appear there is a very strong difference of opinion about the quantity of these waters both for irrigation and for navigation and other domestic purposes.

Mr. MUNDT. At least the Bureau of Reclamation raises the question.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say I am in favor of the Case amendment and shall support it as the bill is much better with it than without it. I prefer the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], but I think there is still a better amendment to be proposed by gentlemen from the Rocky Mountain area which is much better than either of those two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute in order to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. With reference to the amendment presently under consideration, which reads:

Page 21, after "Congress" strike out the semicolon and insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That such improvement when accomplished shall not create any

demand on the water resources of the Missouri Basin over that now authorized by existing law."

I wonder if the gentleman would agree with my interpretation which is that the authorization by law is limited to projects constructed and now under construction?

Mr. MUNDT. I think that would be a fair interpretation of the legislation which, in turn, gives additional reason for my favoring the Barrett amendment over the amendment which the gentleman has just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I have such a high regard for the distinguished chairman and the members of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that I am reluctant to interpose myself in this controversy; but, frankly, I am a little disturbed and I am a little confused. First, there seems to be a general unanimity of opinion as to the objective that the members of the committee and those from the Western States try to achieve. The difference then apparently is one of language.

Mr. Chairman, I can see no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. It provides two things. It says that in the course of the construction and maintenance of this project, water for irrigation purposes, for livestock, and for human purposes shall not be adversely affected, and, secondly, that water for navigation shall be subordinate to water for irrigation, livestock, and other purposes. That is just ordinary sound common sense. Why worry about the depth of water, the width of the channel, and the number of barges that are going to carry commerce up and down this proposed project if you have not any commerce to carry?

The first and most important thing is the subsistence of the people out there and the water that is necessary for the purpose of irrigating their land so that feed, food, fiber, and other things may be produced in order that commerce may be generated, for, otherwise, your waterway will be of very little consequence. It will be only a barge canal at best. There will be towboats and barges to take the bulk and heavy commodities up and down, but you have to produce them first.

Mr. Chairman, I never had such an appreciation of what water means to the Western States until I got out there. My thinking heretofore on the subject may have been somewhat provincial. I make that confession openly here today. Too often in the Middle West and in the Eastern States we do not recognize that water is virtually as precious as gold; it means so much to the people of the Western States. It is a commodity that is on the tongue of every man constantly when they are thinking of the development of those great open spaces of the West.

I see no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. The committee and everyone else is agreed on the main objective. Why not vote for the amendment, why not adopt it, why not say here and now that the rights of irrigation and of subsistence and livestock shall not be adversely prejudiced and that navigation shall be subordinate to the No. 1 impulse in human life, which is self-preservation?

I have tried to resolve this confusion for myself, but it has been reasonably difficult; so I say to you frankly, out of what I regard as a better appreciation of the problems of that great section of the country, which is something of a new frontier today, that I want their apprehensions to be allayed and for that reason I shall vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] because, if it fails, it may be that the amendment that our brethren will offer later, which they regard as a better amendment, will fail too. Then the case is lost. I submit to you in common sense that we support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming in which all of the Members from the Western States are interested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, some of our friends here are endeavoring to make a mountain out of a mole hill. The present law and the present proposal before the House is whether or not the Army engineers shall be permitted to insert some revetment work in the Missouri River nearly 2,000 miles below the Fort Peck Dam. That is all there is to it.

Now, here is the law and here is the language. It makes no difference about all this matter of discussing the engineering features. Here is the final report of the Chief of Engineers which was made the law. It covers everything else and wipes out all else ahead of it. This is the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers which comes adopted:

> After full consideration of the report of the division engineer, the Board recommends the adoption of project for Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth to provide for a channel of 9 feet depth and width not less than 300 feet to be obtained—

How?—

> by revetment of bands, construction of permanent dikes to construct and stabilize the waterway, cut-offs to eliminate long bends, closing of minor channels, removal of snags, and dredging as required, at an estimated cost of $6,000,000.

That is all there is to it. That is the proposal. When these gentlemen came before us and objected to it, we put a further provision in the bill by the amendment which I have here offered, by which we say that they shall not take any additional water over that authorized under existing law.

Mr. Chairman, they talk to me about irrigation. I have over 300,000 acres of land in my district under irrigation every year. For more than 50 years I have been officially connected with all of that irrigation in the various positions I have held. I have been connected with it in my own personal capacity. Therefore I think I am about as good an authority as most any jack-leg lawyer you could secure from the crossroads section down there.

How can we from Sioux City to the mouth of the Missouri River take any water away from the people in the upper sections? It is impossible. We can only take that which the Lord sends down to us, and it will come there whether they use it for irrigation or not. Of that which they use for irrigation, they admit in some of their reports 40 percent goes back into the stream.

There is no ground for controversy here. They just fear something will take place in the future, I presume. In order to allay that fear, we have gone to the extent of providing that no additional water shall be taken from that basin.

To show you whether they can accomplish it, the present project existing there now is only a 6-foot project, and by placing these works on the lower section of the river, the evidence shows that they have gained 9 feet under a 6-foot project on three-fourths of the distance. There are just a few little sections where they do not have it. I am told that the district engineer from Omaha, who was down here a week or so ago, stated that now 91 percent of the stream has 9 feet.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think we have a parallel case or a comparable case on the Great Lakes when the connecting channels were deepened. Compensatory works were established in order that the lake levels should not be reduced in this way. We are trying to do the same thing on the Missouri River.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Absolutely. The gentleman will remember when we had that matter under discussion here years ago it was held that the water being diverted at Chicago, if eliminated, would flow down the Niagara and St. Lawrence, where those people would be entitled to it for power purposes and for navigation.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I will yield briefly for a question.

Mr. ROWE. I am just curious to know if the Barrett amendment proposes to use water only for human and other necessary needs, what damage it will do, if any.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. There is the situation. It takes this river out from under the jurisdiction of the War Department, separate and distinct from other navigation. It makes one law applicable to this river, which is the longest river in the world, while another law prevails as to all other navigable channels. It is something the railroads have been trying to do for years, long prior to the time some of you gentlemen were in Congress. I was approached on this thing years ago many times.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska for a question only.

Mr. CURTIS. In that regard are there other streams where the water is needed both for agricultural and domestic purposes?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. You are taking up all of my time.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has just said this asks for a special law as to the Missouri.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. On your lower Mississippi you have no demand for irrigation and for domestic uses.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Oh, please ask me a question.

Mr. CURTIS. I have.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I only yielded for a question.

Mr. CURTIS. I am waiting for a reply.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. What is the question?

Mr. CURTIS. I asked the gentleman if there was any other stream where you had a conflict over the use of the water in this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. No, sir; none that I know of, I will say.

I call your attention to the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has been looking out for the interests of the people up there in the upper States when they were asleep themselves.

In the law we passed with reference to the Fort Peck Dam, for instance, we placed the power to be produced there under the Bureau of Reclamation. A law reported by this committee—and I, as chairman of that committee, reported it myself—provided that power should be installed there by the War Department whenever it was demanded by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Chief of the Bureau. We have already installed one power plant there, one unit, and the law provides that more shall be done by the Secretary of War whenever the Chief of the Bureau of Reclamation demands it and asks for it. They have never asked for any more than that one.

We now have approximately 15,000,000 acre-feet of water there, enough to water the whole State of Montana, for irrigation. They are not using a drop of it. They are not asking for any more installation of power, although it is there for them and has been for years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. St. Joseph, Mo., is in my district. North Kansas City is in my district. I know of instances since the building of Fort Peck Dam where, until water was released from that dam, the water of the Missouri River, as it passed by St. Joseph and Kansas City, was so low as to almost jeopardize our water system and our sewage system. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not this amendment is going to affect that situation?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. It will not take any more water than they are taking now and will not take as much, for this reason. It was built for navigation. I reported the bill from this committee for that purpose. It was adopted for navigation, and the Bureau of Reclamation never put a cent into it. The War Department and the navigation interests have paid every cent of the cost, more than $100,000,000, with $5,400,000-odd for power only, free of cost to the Reclamation Bureau.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Should they use this water for irrigation up there at the source or beyond Fort Peck, would not that divert water that we need in St. Joseph and Kansas City for our water supply and sewer system?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I will state to the gentleman he will not live long enough to see that take place.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I am a little at a loss here because it seems to me we are arguing something that is illegal. Does the chairman know of any way by which this Congress can pass an act which would make navigation on a navigable river subordinate to other uses?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I will state that I do not know of any instance of that kind. In the case of the diversion of water at Chicago the Supreme Court prohibited the taking of any more water there than was necessary for navigation. That opinion was rendered by Chief Justice Taft, on the ground that the natural flow would serve the Great Lakes navigation and would serve the power interests at Niagara and down the St. Lawrence; that nature would send the water through to them and that nobody else had a right to take it away from them except for the purpose of navigation. That is the substance of the decision.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Let me finish. Three-fourths of the water that is being diverted now is not for navigation on the Missouri River. It is for a condition brought about by the war. This chain of rocks in the Mississippi River below the mouth of the Missouri is the difficulty. They have hauled approximately 1,000 ships down there for use in the war. It was such a dangerous proposition that they had to release more water from Fort Peck than was necessary for navigation on the Missouri River. That condition of course will cease when this chain-of-rocks situation is taken care of, and there is a provision in this bill for that purpose. They have hauled approximately 1,000 new ships for overseas use in the war down over this dangerous place. It took additional water. The Coast Guard has been sent up there by the Secretary of the Navy to help pilot those ships over this dangerous place, and even with this additional water, in January, I am informed by the Army and the Navy Departments, when ice interfered with the release of water from the Missouri, they obtained water temporarily through the Sanitary District of Chicago from Lake Michigan, for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3961 is of interest to the people of the Eighth District of Iowa as it affects the proposed improvement of the Missouri River. It has been 6 years since a general river and harbor act was passed by the Congress. No appropriation of money is involved at this time but I do think that it is in order to anticipate our country's needs now so that a constructive program of river improvement may be inaugurated when the war is over. Our blueprints should be prepared at this time so that there may be no delay in the construction of the projects which this bill authorizes when they are considered necessary in the public interest.

Each and every one of the projects covered by the bill, including the Missouri River project, has been recommended by the Corps of Engineers of the War Department after exhaustive surveys and studies. In addition, they have all been carefully considered and approved by the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

The Missouri River project is of the highest importance to the people of the Missouri River Valley. It is not a flood-control plan or an irrigation plan or a power-development plan or a navigation plan but a plan of river development taking in all these fields in which a great river can be made of maximum service. I believe that there is enough actual water and potential water in the Missouri River Basin to meet the needs of every section along the river. Nor do I feel that any particular section of the country along the river has any right or priority on the rainfall which ultimately gets into the channels of the river. As long as the waters of the Missouri River are not controlled, water that should be available for irrigation in the dry seasons when it is needed on the land is going to continue to be wasted in disastrous floods during wet seasons.

If and when the Missouri River is controlled, the use of its water will be augmented for the purpose of irrigation as well as for the purposes of flood control, navigation, and power. Col. Lewis A. Pick, United States Army Corps of Engineers, who is perhaps as well acquainted with the Missouri River as any man in the country, takes the broad viewpoint of river development. In a report on the program and activities of the Missouri River States committee made by Colonel Pick at Sioux City, Iowa, last year, he said:

Flood control is only one phase of the development which, in my opinion, should take

place in this valley. We should construct multiple-purpose projects. I mean by multiple-purpose projects—store up the destructive water and make it work for us rather than to allow that enormous amount of energy to go down this valley every few years. We can then turn it out as we see it. We can use it for navigation. We can use it for irrigation. We can develop power and we can have space in those reservoirs to take care of this excessive flood flow. * * * We can irrigate large blocks of land. We can develop power.

Any program of Missouri River development will be a big program. It calls for the cooperation of all the people along the river. We must become Missouri River conscious instead of State conscious. This is necessary if we are going to be able to secure a sound development program based upon the safeguarding of the interests of all our people. I am convinced that the problems which are the common problems of this tremendous valley can be solved when there is a definite understanding thereof on the part of all the people who must participate in the final settlement of the problem.

Our ultimate objective is a full utilization of all the water of the Missouri River Basin. It is not a question of sectional interest. Development programs should be devised to provide the most equitable distribution of benefits among those concerned so far as consistent with sound economic and engineering procedure.

In my judgment it is highly desirable and highly necessary that the States along the Missouri River cooperate very closely in the development program. The Supreme Court of the United States in the so-called New River case, which was decided in January 1941, holds in fact that under the commercial clause of the Constitution the ownership of all waters of navigable streams rests with the United States Government. This decision indirectly serves notice on the States that if the development of the various river basins, such as the Missouri and others, is not accomplished in a reasonable length of time by the States themselves, the Federal Government may find a legal right and most certainly a moral right to step in and do what the States have long neglected.

The States have not taken advantage of their rights to divide equally the waters of interstate streams by entering into compact with neighboring States. Therefore, this is not the time to quibble or quarrel about the provisions of this bill. It is to the common interest of all the States along the Missouri River to cooperate in seeing that the over-all improvement of the Missouri becomes an actual fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARRETT), there were—ayes 63, noes 59.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. PETERSON of Georgia and Mr. BARRETT to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 84, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 21, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following paragraph:

"Coasts of the Great Lakes; harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels; House Document No. 446, Seventy-eighth Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 21, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following paragraph:

"Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal, Wisconsin; House Document No. 421, Seventy-eighth Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 23, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following paragraph:

"Sackets Harbor, N. Y.; in accordance with the report of the Chief of Engineers dated January 6, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 26, line 11, after Congress", strike out the semicolon, insert a comma in lieu thereof, and add the following: "with such modifications as the Secretary of War may find advisable after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior and such other agencies as may be concerned."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 27, line 9, after the word "Congress" strike out the semicolon, insert a colon in lieu thereof, and add the following proviso: *"Provided,* That said dam shall be so constructed as to provide a pool elevation of 340 feet above sea level if a dam of that height is found to be feasible. In the design, construction, and operation of the Umatilla Dam adequate provision shall be made for the protection of anadromous fishes by affording free access to their natural spawning grounds or by other appropriate means. Studies and surveys necessary for fish protection shall be made by the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior, and designs for structures and facilities required for fish protection shall be prepared in cooperation with that agency. Funds appropriated for the design, construction, or operation of said dam shall be available for transfer to the Department of the Interior for the foregoing purposes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas: Page 29, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following paragraph:

"Electric power and energy generated at projects authorized by this act and not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such manner as to encourage the most widespread use thereof at the lowest possible rates to consumers consistent with sound business principles, and preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives, the rate schedule to become effective upon confirmation and approval by the Federal Power Commission. At dams or works authorized by this act which are suitable for the production of electric power and energy the Secretary of War shall provide, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such structures, machinery, equipment, facilities, and supplies as the Secretary of the Interior may deem necessary to develop power and energy for existing and potential markets and for the proper reception, handling, and dispatch of electric power and energy; and operations of all such machinery and facilities shall be scheduled in accordance with the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior so far as consistent with requirements for the use or control of water for the other purposes of said projects as may be determined by the Secretary of War. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and acquire such transmission lines and facilities and to enter into such contracts, agreements, and arrangements as he deems necessary to carry out the duties and responsibilities herein conferred upon him."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut will state the point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill. This bill deals with rivers and harbors projects and with the powers of the Secretary of War. This amendment attempts to legislate and define the powers of the Secretary of the Interior. It is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to carry out just what has been done in all laws pertaining to these other dams that have been constructed. The War Department operates the works in the river and delivers the power at the switchboard where we turn it over to the Secretary of the Interior for distribution and sale. The same law has been carried out at Fort Peck. It has been carried out at Bonneville. It has been carried out at Grand Coulee and, in fact, in all of the large dams that have been con-

structed under the War Department. The production of power is one of the chief purposes of this project, as much so as navigation. It is a general purpose dam. It is a tremendous dam. It will cost $60,000,000 or $70,000,000 when completed. We also have to install fish ladders for the fish to go up and spawn, and all that. It is all embraced in the report of the engineers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] makes the point of order against the amendment, that it is not germane to the bill in that it deals with matter concerning the Department of the Interior. However, the bill deals entirely with the matter of the construction of dams and the distribution of water, and actually the generation and disposition of power on various rivers and various projects. It appears to the Chair it would be futile to create these dams and not also allow for the distribution of the power that is being generated at these dams, and that, therefore, the amendment is germane to the legislation before the Committee.

The Chair overrules the point of order and recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment attempts to turn over to the Secretary of the Interior all of the power that will be generated by the dams included in the pending legislation. If we want to build up or create a czar over the empire of Federal power this is one way to do it. I am of the opinion that the power to be generated at these dams included in this bill should be placed with the War Department and the Army engineers. It is not true that all the power is turned over to the Secretary of the Interior, as claimed here this afternoon, because, in my own State of Michigan at the Soo, the power generated at the dams, excepting that amount which is used to operate the locks, is sold by the War Department or the Secretary of War to private enterprise. The Secretary of the Interior has nothing to do with it whatever. In the case cited by the chairman of the committee, at the Fort Peck Dam I understood him to say that the power is turned over to the Reclamation Bureau. I did not understand that the Secretary of the Interior directly had anything to do with the sale and distribution of the power generated at that dam. If Congress wishes meekly to surrender its prerogatives and fail in its duty to the public and the American people, this is the way to do it, by transferring all the power into the hands of one man who will become a power czar in this country. It does not make any difference who the Secretary of the Interior might be, Republican or Democrat, if the power is vested in him he can use it, and he can use it for political purposes.

It might be interesting for the House to know something of the personnel that deals with the distribution of power in the Department of the Interior. Many of the Members on this floor this afternoon will remember that sometime ago we removed from the pay roll of the Federal Government one individual by the name of Raushenbush, because of his communistic writings and his philosophies of government. That matter went over to another body and apparently he convinced that body that he did not mean what he said and he was left on the pay roll. Where is that individual today? He is in the Power Division of the Department of the Interior.

If the power or electric energy to be produced under the provisions of this bill is to be turned over to that Department, the chances are that this man will have something to say about the distribution of it.

I want you to listen to some of the theories and philosophies of this man. He wrote an article on the subject of gradual socialization. Here is what he has to say:

> The students coming from the colleges today can do something more than be filled with wholesome and cleansing indignation. They can be of enormous use to the movement as Government officials, starting in small and definitely working on the reasonable hope that in the course of another 10 years we shall have Government control of a much more definite kind over our trusts, banks, and general industries; that there will be Government corporations operating and managing, not only the port of New York and Muscle Shoals, but many other developments. There is a chance here for young men not only to keep the liberal groups informed about the dirty work going on and on and times and ways to prevent it, but also to look forward to careers of usefulness in executive positions, making the Government control over industry more adequate, pioneering in a field of essential importance.

That is part of the philosophy of a man in the Power Division of the Department of the Interior to whom we are asked to turn over the power of these dams in the pending bill.

He says further:

> Government officials in the bureaus and departments at Washington, Albany, Trenton, Harrisburg, and other State capitals are of great importance. The wages are not high. That is one reason why so many of them go over to private industries and favor private industries before they do go over to them—earn their jobs ahead of time. Yet the problem of Government officials is a major problem of immediate socialism. In Germany, after the revolution, the bureaucracy was nationalist and nearly sabotaged the republican government, until it had been replaced. One good man with his eyes, ears, and wits about him, inside the department—whether it be the Interior, where the oil scandal started and the Boulder Dam bill received most active support, or the Treasury, where the taxation scandals breed and the Government tax policies originate—can do more to perfect the technique of control over industry than a hundred men outside.

I think it would be wiser and better for the people of the United States if we placed the distribution of the power to be produced by the provisions of this bill under the wise discretion of the Army engineers, who have done a magnificent job wherever their control has been exercised.

When this amendment came before our committee in executive session, I offered the suggestion that this power should not be distributed at the lowest possible price, but only at the lowest possible price consistent with good business usages. That suggestion was adopted and is in the amendment. But still I think it is a mistake to turn all this power over to one man, the Secretary of the Interior, and build up a power empire in the United States.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in behalf of the amendment.

The work proposed on these dams is all on the Columbia River. We now have the Bonneville Dam there, one of the largest in the world, costing about $80,000,000, with tremendous power. The Umatilla will be a mate to it; then the three or four dams authorized on the Snake River, a tributary.

Bonneville power is already under the Secretary of the Interior. It was adopted in the river and harbor bill of 1935. It was put in the river and harbor bill as a Senate amendment by Senator JOHNSON of California. The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], and myself were conferees on that bill, I believe the only members of the present committee who were members of the committee at that time.

The Secretary of the Interior wanted to have charge of the entire works in the river that produced the power. We would not stand for that. We wanted the Secretary of War to have charge of everything in that great navigable stream, but we finally compromised by saying that the power would be delivered at the switchboard by the Secretary of War, and from that point it would be turned over to the Secretary of the Interior to inaugurate transmission lines, and to sell the power to the cities and districts which were organized under the law for the purpose of using it. That policy has been carried out at all projects we have adopted since that time. Why do we want to make a change from that, unless you change all of them? Let us have uniformity.

Let us keep all of the navigable propositions under the War Department and all of our reclamation projects under the Interior Department. I like to try to be consistent in these matters if I can. I am no defender of the present Secretary of the Interior. I have had controversies with him that many of you gentlemen do not know anything about, and some of them have not been the most pleasant controversies either. But he may not be Secretary of the Interior always. I presume you gentlemen hope to make a change in the program at some distant future time—how distant in the future, I do not know, of course. But aside from that, let us be consistent. Let us have it all alike. Let us have all

the power distribution under one department of the Government and all of our navigation projects under one department. I like to have uniformity. I like to have it so that people can know what they can depend on. I would like to have the same kind of a ruling from the Supreme Court. Whether their laws and their decisions are good or bad, if they will just let it stand and if they will stick to them so that the people will know it, it would be better than if we are here today and there tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is not the power generated at Grand Coulee and Bonneville one of the strongest defenders we have, in building our ships and airplanes and smelting aluminum ore and supplying our war needs, all handled by the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes. That is the case, as I understand it. The work of the War Department ceases when they produce the power and deliver it at the switchboard on top of the river bank.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield to my good friend from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. But all of the power is not in the Department of the Interior; some of it is operated by the War Department.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I do not know of any.

Mr. DONDERO. I call the gentleman's attention to Sault Ste. Marie, Mich. There the power is generated at Federal dams, and there the engineers of the War Department have complete control over such power as they do not need for the operation of the locks. They sell it to private industries.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. That is true; I believe the gentleman is correct, but it is not the case with any of the power projects we have been building in these rivers.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement as to a limitation of time on debate on this amendment?

I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have all deference for my good friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], a member of my committee. We usually see alike on problems, and I think I look down the same alley with him with reference to crackpots in various Government departments, but I remind my good friend that if he is not going to lodge power in this Department because there is a crackpot in it, he will not be able to go to any department perhaps and might not be able even to get into the Supreme Court sometime.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANGELL. If it is brief; my time is short.

Mr. CASE. Under the language of the amendment does the gentleman believe that any agency within a State, any irrigation district, or other association, or any State agency could ever purchase or get the power generated at a Federal dam to distribute the power itself?

Mr. ANGELL. Oh, yes; they can do that under this very amendment, which follows the Bonneville Act, and they are doing that now under the Bonneville Administration.

Mr. CASE. How would the gentleman interpret this language:

> The electric power generated at projects authorized by this act and not required in the operation of such projects shall be delivered to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall transmit, dispose of—

And so forth. And this further language:

> And preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives?

Mr. ANGELL. Public bodies are the very bodies the gentleman has already mentioned. They have the first opportunity.

Mr. CASE. That would be retail.

Mr. ANGELL. I will explain that briefly later if time permits. I cannot yield further; I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Under the language of the amendment, how would the power generated under these authorizations contribute to the taxes or to the reduction of costs for water users on irrigation projects?

Mr. ANGELL. I will explain that if I have time. I will say, in passing, taxes are provided for under the existing law.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not represent any change from the present program we are following. Practically all, or the greater part of the power that will be developed under these projects is going to be developed on the Columbia River and the Snake River by the Umatilla Dam and four dams on the Snake River. They are all within the Bonneville territory. The Bonneville power is delivered to the Secretary of the Interior and the bus bar, and he is now marketing the power which is produced at Bonneville at Grand Coulee, not at retail, however. This amendment follows language of existing law that will permit the power generated by these new projects to be marketed under the same administration, under the same rules and regulations in force now. That, Mr. Chairman, is the purpose of it, just as the chairman of our committee said, to unify control instead of having one plan here and another plan there. The sole purpose of this is to provide marketing facilities for power largely on the Columbia River and the Snake, because there is where the big power is going to be generated and will be offered for sale. It is being marketed very wisely now by the Secretary of the Interior. I have not heard any complaint with reference to any of the power distribution there. Bonneville is in my district, as you know. Answering my good friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in the marketing of power in that area, public bodies, States, counties, municipalities, public-utility districts, public organizations under the language of the bill take precedence, and they are supplied first, and the Bonneville Power Administration is not retailing power. It markets the power through existing agencies. It is not going into the power business. The Secretary of War turns the power over at the bus bar to the Bonneville Power Administration, which is the Secretary of the Interior, which sells it to these distributing concerns. Some of them are private concerns, private utilities, but the power will be marketed by private industry and these local public institutions like P. U. D.'s, counties, municipalities, and State organizations.

Mr. CASE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oregon yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. ANGELL. I am sorry; I have not time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. ANGELL. In my judgment, therefore, it would certainly be unwise to break up the marketing facilities in this great area of the Columbia River Basin, which you will do if you do not adopt this amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. And they already have the organization.

Mr. ANGELL. It already has the organization, it already has the staff, it already has everything necessary to market this additional power and it is doing a good job. Why take it away from the existing sales organization because, as my friend says, there may be a crackpot in the organization? There are crackpots in every organization, maybe right here; who knows?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PETERSON of Georgia and Mr. ANGELL) there were—ayes 55, noes 48.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. DONDERO and Mr. PETERSON of Georgia.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 74, noes 102.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, did I understand that on yesterday there was

an agreement reached that the committee amendments would first be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, would it be proper to ask unanimous consent that subsequent amendments from now on be taken up by page?

The CHAIRMAN. The ordinary rules of the House provide that members of the committee be recognized first, then other Members are recognized immediately following. That will be the method which the Chair will pursue and, for that reason, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] at this time to offer his amendment.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: On page 2, line 16, after the word "region", place a period and strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I may say for the benefit of those who have not read this bill that if they will turn to page 2, line 16, the amendment begins immediately after the word "region" and strikes out this language:

And the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to construct powerhouses and install power machinery and appurtenances for the development of hydroelectric power at any dam heretofore or hereafter authorized by any act of Congress.

There are some other provisions that I am going to offer amendments to strike out, but before passing on, I call your attention to the fact that this is a most unusual grant of power. It grants that power to the Chief of Engineers in connection with any dams that he may have constructed or in connection with any dam hereafter authorized by the Congress of the United States. That in itself should be sufficient for striking out the entire paragraph.

But I want to read on further the matter that I propose to strike out:

And provided further, That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made, the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way.

Let me call your attention to the fact that by this bill, which is not an appropriation bill, the Chief of Engineers is authorized to make any expenditures and, so far as the purposes of this bill are concerned, those expenditures are unlimited in amount so long as they go for the purposes thereafter enumerated.

These are some of the things that the Chief of Engineers is authorized to do:

Readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations.

Mr. Chairman, in the progress of this work and in the prosecution of this work it may be necessary to do some of these things at times and I have voted to have them done, but I am unwilling, and I believe this House is unwilling, to give any person blanket authority to do all of those things to an unlimited degree.

Let the Congress of the United States retain the power, and when it becomes necessary to move these towns, to change the highways, to realine the railroads, and so forth, let the bureau or department that is concerned come back here, make the proper representation to the Congress of the United States, and let the Congress then grant the authority to do the specific thing involved. That is my attitude in regard to this bill and I may say that it is an attitude shared by the distinguished chairman of this committee. He has so expressed himself on the floor of this House on various occasions.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. And in the committee, too.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman has told me so privately.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this entire section as I have indicated should be stricken from the bill. I have no desire to impede any of this work but I do have a very strong desire to see that it is carried out according to the plans that this Congress may set up rather than according to plans which some bureaucrat may get up and carry through if we grant him such blanket authority as is contained in this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, would you still retain the installation of pen stocks?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. I want to say to the distinguished chairman that I am in favor of the installation of pen stocks in every dam that this Government builds, whether it be for flood control, navigation, reclamation, or whatever the purpose is, because some day, even though we may not need it at the present time, we might need it, and then the pen stock is there.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. In the last Congress an amendment I offered was adopted that prevented an increase in an authorization that would enable power dams to be constructed on the White River in southwest Missouri and Arkansas. If this language remains in the bill, would the Army engineers have a right to go ahead with that?

Mr. CARTER. They certainly would. This being later in enactment would repeal the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. The House adopted my amendment.

Mr. CARTER. The House adopted the gentleman's amendment, but this is in direct conflict with it, having been adopted at a later time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I am sure the gentleman has misunderstood the gentleman from Missouri. The gentleman from Missouri struck out an amendment providing for building the dam.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no. The dam is already built. It has pen stocks in it. Right at this time it is being built and it has pen stocks in it.

Mr. RANKIN. The water just runs through the pen stocks.

Mr. CARTER. I think there would not be any doubt but that, notwithstanding the gentleman's amendment, the Chief of Engineers, under this bill as it stands, without my amendment if adopted, would be authorized to go ahead with the construction of that.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a portion of the language the gentleman proposes to have stricken from the bill constitutes an appropriation and cannot be reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. It should be stricken from the bill.

I call attention to clause 4, rule 21, which states:

No bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations shall be reported by any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations, nor shall an amendment proposing an appropriation be in order during the consideration of a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee not having that jurisdiction. A question of order on an appropriation in any such bill, joint resolution, or amendment thereto may be raised at any time.

I invite the attention of the Chair to the following language on page 2 of the bill:

And provided further, That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made, the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations.

The Chair certainly will agree with me that in all the precedents of the House concerning the making of appropriations, an authorization to make expenditures constitutes an appropriation, and the language here, "and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns," and so forth,

including "the construction of foundations," constitutes an appropriation. Therefore, I make the point of order that the language beginning with *"And provided further,"* in line 20 on page 2, and concluding with the word "foundations," in line 4, page 3, constitutes an appropriation and is not in order in this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Mississippi on the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from South Dakota is entirely wrong. This is not an appropriation, and his own reading of this language shows it is not an appropriation, but merely an authorization.

Let us read the language again that he objects to:

And provided further, That in any case where the total authorization for a project heretofore or hereafter authorized by Congress is not sufficient to complete plans that may have been made, the Chief of Engineers is authorized in his discretion to plan and make expenditures on preparations for the project, such as the purchase of lands, easements, and rights of way; readjustments of roads, railroads—

And so forth. That does not mean that he can spend public money without an appropriation. This merely authorizes him to do those things, and is not an appropriation. If it were an appropriation, it would state the amount appropriated. It is not an appropriation; it is merely an authorization. The point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might inquire of the gentleman from South Dakota as to the specific language he refers to in lines 24 and 25 where the expression "and make expenditures on preparations," and so on, is used.

The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from South Dakota from what funds these expenditures would come. There are no funds actually provided in the bill pending before the Committee. In other words, it appears to the Chairman an appropriation would have to be made apart from this bill before the funds referred to here would be available to the Chief of Engineers in order that he might make such expenditures as are set forth here.

Mr. CASE. If I may I would call the Chair's attention to the fact that lump-sum appropriations for construction of river and harbor projects as well as flood control are given to the Chief of Engineers in the annual appropriation bill made for the civil functions of the War Department. There is also a special fund carried for the preparation of plans and specifications and things of that sort. The general funds ordinarily expended on projects that are listed in a break-down submitted to the committee at that time. Under the language here, "authorized to make expenditures," and "in his discretion" the Chief of Engineers could clearly use that fund to make expenditures for these various purposes.

Mr. RANKIN. It would have to be appropriated.

Mr. CASE. This, of course, would not be in harmony with the justification made for this appropriation at the time the request was made, because they are submitted on the basis of a list submitted to the committee at that time, but the language proposed here would let the Chief of Engineers expend the money in his discretion beyond existing authorizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota in making the point of order refers to this language regarding the making of expenditures, and refers to other legislation. It appears to the Chair that the Chief of Engineers would not have any authority to expend any of that money except for those purposes for which it was specifically appropriated, and that there is actually no appropriation being made under the terms of this legislation.

As the result of that, the Chair is of the opinion that the language here does not constitute an appropriation and that, therefore, the point of order of the gentleman is not well taken. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. However, that does not affect the motion to strike the language out.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is still pending before the Committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago we adopted an amendment offered by the committee that took out those words, "authorized by any act of Congress," and inserted "constructed and maintained under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers."

This language, which the Carter amendment would eliminate, was specifically requested by General Reybold, the Chief of Army Engineers. He came before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and asked for it.

A moment ago you took the Department of the Interior out—away from the bus bar. Now you propose to take the Army engineers away. You propose to build pen stocks for the water to flow through, but you are going to deny the Government the right to develop this power to be used for the benefit of the American people. In my opinion, General Reybold was entirely correct. I supported him before the committee and I supported him when attempts were make to strike these amendments out, even after the bill was developed, and I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] now.

We built these dams. You have already restricted them to the dams that are constructed and maintained under the direction of the Secretary of War, and the supervision of the Army engineers. You now come along with another restriction and propose to deprive them of the right of developing this power that you have already provided pen stocks for, and let this water go to waste. Probably some of you want to turn it over to the Power Trust, as you did at Muscle Shoals 15 years ago.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Is it not a fact that all of these power dams that have been installed and in operation were constructed without this language?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, and we got into one miserable mess, on account of it.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. And I will show you what it was. We had the same situation at Muscle Shoals, and the power companies—the Power Trust, if you please—was buying that power for less than 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, and selling it in sight of the dam for 10 cents per kilowatt-hour. What you are doing here is taking the hands of the Army engineers off these projects, and inviting the Power Trust to step up and plunder the American people on the power produced at these dams, built at Government expense. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. These dams have been built in the past without this language, and is there any reason why they cannot be built in the future?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and I will say to the gentleman from California that you have this battle going on right now, or a similar battle, at the Shasta Dam in California, and if you deny the Army engineers this authority that General Reybold has asked for, that he came before the committee and sustained his position on, then you simply paralyze this Government so far as the generation and use of the hydroelectric power is concerned, power produced at dams built at Government expense. The electricity in these streams belongs to the American people. Chief Justice Hughes so held in the Ashwander case, and I am not willing to drive the Army engineers out and say to these racketeers who were plundering us a few years ago, "Come in and take the people's power and charge them whatever you please," because that is what they were doing, and that is what they will be doing again whenever you take the hands of the Army engineers off these projects, and do not permit them to build the facilities to generate this power.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a fact that the question is whether the Army engineers shall come back to Congress for this authority?

Mr. RANKIN. No, it is not; and every time they came and asked for it, the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from California would both be opposing them. This is a battle whether or not the American people will enjoy the benefits of this power, or whether it will be gathered in by the utility monopoly.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman

from California [Mr. CARTER]. I cannot see anything in the language that he proposes to strike out that will interfere with any legitimate operation of the Army engineers, but I do see the possibility, in fact, the probability, that if that language stays in the bill, and at some future time this Congress should authorize the building of a dam across the Connecticut River, in my district, this language, and nobody will deny it I am sure, would give the Army engineers the right, without coming back to Congress, without further authority, to move towns, cemeteries, to move State highways, and to move railroads. Beyond that, I see no further need of argument. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman is a layman, but profound in his knowledge of the law as I have ascertained by frequent conferences with him. Will he tell me if he can find any authority in the law anywhere for the right of Congress to undertake to delegate its discretion to anybody?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There is none in the law of the land or common sense.

The remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] are in nowise related to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. All the speeches in the world attacking the so-called Power Trusts will not change the undisputable fact that the language which the gentleman from California seeks to strike from this bill would delegate to the Chief of the Army Engineers both discretion and decisions that should be made by the Congress and by nobody else. It is pretty far reaching to propose that without the approval of Congress, the Army engineer may "make expenditures on preparations for projects such as the purchase of land, easements and rights-of-way; readjustments of roads, railroads, and other utilities; removal of towns, cemeteries, and dwellings from reservoir sites; and the construction of foundations." I doubt if there are 10 Members of the House who would record themselves in favor of such a delegation of power to any agency of the Government.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only that I may seek some light in view of the statements made by the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. As I understand it, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] proposes to strike out, beginning on line 16, page 2, after the word "region" all the rest of this paragraph. I am somewhat confused, because the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] raised a point of order against the proviso appearing in line 20 and thereafter, and his point of order was overruled, because it was stated by the Chair that there is no appropriation contained in this bill that the Chief of Engineers could or would expend for any of the purposes set forth in this language that is proposed to be stricken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. If the Chief of Engineers has not any funds and there are no funds available to him that he can expend for any of these purposes, which you are delegating to him here, in the name of conscience why is this delegation of authority contained in this bill? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. RANKIN. I will answer that. It is just as all authorizations are made by legislation and when it comes for appropriations for this purpose, they will come later.

Mr. KEEFE. I could not for the life of me see why this Congress should, in a statement of delegation of power, transfer to the Chief of Army Engineers the right to make and determine this fundamental right and the fundamental duty of the Congress of the United States.

This is the most amazing proposal that I have seen advocated in any bill presented to this Congress since I have been a Member. You say in substance in this proposal, we are going to give the Chief of Engineers the right to his discretion to plan and to make expenditures, preparations for the projects, such as the purchase of land, easements, rights-of-way, readjustments, removal of towns, cemeteries, railroads, and everything else—projects for which this Congress has not yet appropriated any money.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. And yet when the appropriation comes in we will then find, no doubt, that by reason of this action proposed in this bill, we have tied our hands to have any voice in the way in which the appropriation shall be expended. We have got the cart before the horse, and we are doing the very thing that this Congress ought not to do. I yield.

Mr. POULSON. In reply to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] stating it would be necessary to come in and get an appropriation, is it not true that the War Department has not paid much attention to appropriations, according to the construction of the Pentagon Building?

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. With all due respect to the decision of the Chair, I think there are always funds available that the War Department seems to be able to put its hands on which it can spend under the language of this bill without further action of the Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I would like to answer the gentleman's question propounded a while ago by saying that the Congress has gotten into such a habit of delegating its authority that it just wants to keep it up.

Mr. KEEFE. All I want to say to the Members of this House is if you pass this bill in its present form then you ought to have to answer to your constituents upon this delegation of power and abject surrender by the Congress, not only of its power, but of its plain duty in the future to scrutinize each and every one of these projects. I feel sure that the Congress of the United States at this late date will not flaunt before the people of this country such an amazing proposal as is contained in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Chairman, I want to add this thought to the discussion—namely, that by the amendment proposed here and in the delegation of power so proposed—we delegate the planning of any future power project in any dam heretofore built or which may be hereafter built; and if that planning is developed by the Army engineers and the project planned is far enough along, as the previous speaker suggested, our hands are substantially tied, and we are presented with only one consideration, and that is whether or not we shall appropriate the money for it. It seems to me if I came here charged with one responsibility it was that I should scrutinize, from the very beginning, the possibilities of the expenditures of the taxpayers' money. In order to do that intelligently, if I am so charged with that responsibility from the section of the country which I represent, it is to consider the plans as well as the expenditure. When the Army engineers or anyone else to whom we may suggest delegating powers brings a plan back before the House that they are going to do something at great cost to the country, I want to sit down and consider with the committee charged with the responsibility of considering that matter as to whether or not it is advisable. If it is advisable we ought to, at that time, consider the development of the potential hydropower of the country. No one appreciates better than I do the zeal with which the gentleman from Mississippi approaches a subject such as this. But I do want to consider if the Army is going to build a power project at some place where, in the estimation of the representatives here of the taxpayers, it is not necessary, I want to exercise my privilege and right at that time to say, "No."

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROWE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like, if I may, to point out, in line with what the gentleman has explained, that under the interpretation of the Chair that this language does not constitute an appropriation, that unless the language is now stricken from the bill we will be running into conflict with the well-established principles of the rulings and previous decisions on this matter. The language proposes to authorize the Chief of Engineers to exceed project authorizations and expend funds for the construction of foundations. Under the established Rules of the House, when a work is once started and is in progress, then no further authorization is needed to make appropriations in order to complete that project. Consequently, unless this amendment prevails to strike this language from the bill, there will exist here an interpretation that the Chief of Engineers can use money available to him out of his plans funds or out of his construction funds

for the construction of foundations which exceed what is authorized by law. Then if that is done the House will be confronted by the fact that subsequent appropriations to complete that work will be in order and will not be subject to a point of order and will not require further authorization.

Mr. ROWE. I personally choose to believe that there is a great deal of substance in what the gentleman says. But in addition to that I would like to think of it in this way, that the engineer and the other gentlemen who are charged with this delegated responsibility have found it rather easy in the past decade.

I know we did not intervene, that is, we the people's representatives here in studying the question. I do not blame them for it especially. But it is that safeguard by which we charge ourselves with the responsibility to carefully go into all the things that are proposed. This is the policy that has measured the pathway by which we have progressed, in my opinion. We can get out of balance if we charge the policy to a certain few. They get engineering theory and engineering opinion and develop things out of balance. I think when you get a cross section of expression as you do from the Representatives of the House, it is probably a little safer than in any other way as has been proven by practice.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to cross bridges until we get to them. I have lived long enough to try to cross as few of them as I possibly can. This language, as I understand it, gives to the Chief of Engineers authority to legislate and bind us in advance to approve that legislation, although it is sight unseen. It is not limited to the projects in this bill. It is general. I do not believe we ought to confer such authority upon anybody.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is a flood-control dam in progress at the present time down in Arkansas. The pen stocks are being put in there. Under the terms of that language, the Chief of Engineers would have the power to turn that into a power dam rather than a flood-control dam; is that not true?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I believe so.

Mr. COCHRAN. Then could he not use part of the money that is appropriated in a lump sum for various projects which he thinks are most needed at the moment?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Under the law, appropriations are made to him in a lump sum and he has the right to allocate them where, in his judgment, it is necessary for commerce and navigation.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have great confidence in the present Chief of Engineers.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. There is no person living who has more confidence in the engineers than I have, and my whole record in Congress of 27 years will bear that out, without exception. It is the principle here involved that concerns me. I just do not believe in conferring that authority upon myself and Lord knows I trust myself as far as I will trust most anybody else.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman has gone so far that I think he ought to say he knows as well as I do that you cannot delegate the authority of Congress to legislate to the Chief of Engineers and neither can Congress delegate its power for the use of discretion to anybody.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Even if it could I do not like to see it done. I do not believe in it.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not true also under the interpretation put on this, they will have to come to Congress for an appropriation anyway, and if we do nothing they will have to come back too for an authorization?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. I agree that we ought not to delegate any more powers to individual bureaus.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I suppose that the Members all understand the situation. We still retain the pen stocks. The purpose of that is this: If Congress should hereafter decide to install power at these dams when it is not authorized in the original acts, the pen stocks will save tremendous costs. Otherwise, if you would have power, you will have to start from the beginning. That provision is still retained in the bill. That has been in the former bills. Why do we want to go further? We have produced power at many of them by additional legislation and we can do it for this, if it becomes necessary, and when it becomes necessary, not before. I think we ought to begin to draw the line and keep our feet on the ground as nearly as we can.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The question involved in this amendment in accordance with the thought of the chairman of this committee is not whether we are for or against the distribution of power by hydroelectric dams, but the principle of the delegation of authority by this Congress to a project which may not have been approved? This Congress, which has regained the respect of the American people in assuming its proper legislative role, can continue its good record by opposing this delegation of authority. I shall vote for the Carter amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman has my thought entirely.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand that the present law provides for the installation of pen stocks in all such dams for flood control? May all such dams later be used, if feasible, for power production?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. They have been inserted, as I understand, in all flood-control bills and we have inserted them in river-and-harbor bills.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Under the language of this amendment, wherever it is recommended by the Federal Power Commission, as well as the Chief of Engineers?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, if there is any time remaining I would like to claim it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what scholar it was who long ago described "discretion" as the arbitrary exercise of power by a tyrant.

I do not mean to imply that the Chief of Engineers would be tyrannical in the application of this power, but let me ask you this question: Would you delegate to him now by your vote the authority and discretion to build a powerhouse or more powerhouses of unknown capacity in unknown places for unknown amounts? That is what this says. Would you give him discretion to buy and to install an undefined amount of power machinery for installation at an unascertained place? For, after all, this bill says, "heretofore or hereafter authorized." That makes it permanent. Would you confer upon him a discretion to purchase and to install appurtenances, whatever they are, undefined as to this bill, undefined as to amount and quantity and capacity, for installation in an unascertained place at some future time? Well, I have a different idea about my legislative responsibilities and I do not propose to delegate that kind of power to be exercised in the discretion of one man at some time in the future, for an unascertained amount which becomes a charge on the Public Treasury. We are still the stewards of the public purse.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 17, strike out all of lines 10 to 14, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to strike out what is known as the Tombigbee River project. It amounts to $66,000,000. It is not a new project to this House. It was here 5 years ago, and 5 years ago this House,

on a record vote, rejected this project by a vote of 204 to 160.

If you will turn to page 17 of the bill you will notice that this project is submitted to the House in a report of the Army engineers No. 269. It is the same report that was filed 5 years ago. There is no other report.

I spoke on this matter yesterday and called the attention of the House and gave figures as to why I was opposed to this project and why I think this House should again reject it.

We all have faith and confidence in the Army engineers and the Chief of Engineers, and it is because of that confidence in the Chief of Engineers and his expressed opinions in relation to this project that I opposed it 5 years ago and I am opposing it today for the same reason.

The Board of Army Engineers adopted this project and said it was feasible. The Chief of Engineers in his letter and in his report, used language that ought to raise a doubt in the minds of any Member of this body. He did not endorse this project. Before I quote him, I want to cite some figures to you.

It is claimed this project will save $4,143,000 a year to the people, and that the carrying charges will be $3,561,000. If those figures are correct then this project is economically sound. But in the figure of $4,143,000 of savings are four items used to justify this project economically, which have never been used to justify any other project that has come before this body during my more than 11 years of service in this House. Here they are. They use $1,000,000 for traffic diverted from the Mississippi River. If you take that million dollars away from the Mississippi River you are simply robbing Peter to pay Paul, as I said yesterday, because that $1,000,000 undoubtedly was used in order to justify the improvement on the Mississippi River. That is one item. The Chief of Engineers takes that item to task and says "I doubt the wisdom of using the diversion of traffic from one river to another river and claiming it as an item of savings to the people."

The second item is an increase in the value of real estate of $275,000. Remember, these items are not chargeable in 1 year. They are to be credited every year, in order to justify this project. Did you ever hear of Uncle Sam getting the benefit of an increase in real estate for a Federal project? No one will be benefited by that except the people who own the real estate along that river. That item is questioned by the Chief of Engineers.

The third item is $100,000 for recreational value. Who can measure recreational values in dollars and cents? I have never found it defined in terms of dollars and cents on any other project. That item is also questioned by the Chief of Engineers.

The fourth item is $600,000 annually for national defense. If you can apply $600,000 a year as national defense on this project, how many million dollars a year could you apply to such national defense projects as the Brooklyn Navy Yard, the Charleston Navy Yard, or the navy yards on the Pacific Coast?

They simply cannot be measured by money and, therefore, those four items are questioned by the Chief of Army Engineers. He doubts the wisdom of using them. If you take those four items which total $1,975,000 away from the savings of $4,143,000 it leaves a net savings of $2,168,000 against an annual carrying charge of $3,561,000, resulting in a loss, not a gain, of $1,393,000 annually. That is what it would cost the people every year if you adopt this project. Therefore this project is economically unsound and should not be adopted. What does the Chief say about these items? I am quoting from the only report before this House. In his letter dated February 27, 1939, the Chief of Army Engineers has this to say:

> Under the estimate a saving of $1,000,000 to up-bound traffic on the Mississippi River results from a thorough study and I do not doubt that such a saving would result, but I doubt the wisdom of dependence upon diversion of any considerable part of the Mississippi River traffic to justify this new project.

As to all four items I have cited, this is what the Chief of Army Engineers said:

> All these intangible or indirect benefits must be considered in addition to the direct savings in transportation costs in order that those projects will show a substantial excess of benefit over cost. They are difficult to evaluate and appear to me to be questions falling within the realm of statesmanship to which the Congress can best assign the proper values.

The Chief of Engineers is saying to us that those four items begin to move in the direction of speculation and therefore he fails to approve them. He says that maybe the statesmanship of Congress can better evaluate them than he. He therefore leaves it up to us to say whether we can charge against a project real-estate values, recreational values in dollars and cents, national defense, and diversion of traffic from one river to another river in order to justify it. That is my objection to this project and I believe the House again should vote it down and affirm what it did 5 years ago. The picture is exactly the same today as it was 5 years ago, there is nothing new before the House, and I hope that the amendment which I have offered to strike it out will be sustained and that we will save the people $67,000,000.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I wonder if the gentleman has taken into consideration the fact that the Treasury is in much better shape now to take care of this kind of item than it was before the war?

Mr. DONDERO. We do not speak of that which does not exist.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has done just what he did on yesterday, he has gone back and picked up the chicken feed, the little stuff, concerning this Tombigbee project, mentioned inferentially by the Chief of Army Engineers 5 years ago.

He tells you that the picture has not changed in those 5 years and intimates that the Chief of Army Engineers is still opposed to this project. That is not true. The report recommending this project was signed by Brig. Gen. M. C. Tylor, Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, who made the investigation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman give to the House the number of that report to which he alludes?

Mr. RANKIN. Which one?

Mr. DONDERO. The one the gentleman says is favorable.

Mr. RANKIN. The one by the Corps of Army Engineers was made in 1939.

Mr. DONDERO. The same report from which I read.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has quoted verbatim almost the words of a railroad lobbyist who has been nagging the committee for years not to authorize this project.

Mr. DONDERO. But I ask the gentleman to read the statement of the Chief of Army Engineers himself.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out before that the reason former reports were not favorable was that there was no 9-foot channel in the Tennessee River prior to the construction of the dams built by the T. V. A. Today there is a 9-foot channel provided—or it will be finished by the 1st of July—all the way from Cairo, Ill., to Knoxville, Tenn. Again, at that time we would have had to have lifts coming up from the Tennessee and then lifts coming up from the Tombigbee, and there would have been no water supply at the summit. But when Pickwick Dam was built just below the point where this project joins the Tennessee it raised the water 55 feet and eliminated the necessity for those lifts coming up from the Tennessee River. The Army engineers propose to cut through this sand ridge and place the summit of the project in the Tennessee River—in Pickwick Lake—so it makes it entirely feasible.

Now, let us see what the gentleman says. He says that the picture has not changed in 5 years. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that in the last 5 years the world has been plunged into the greatest war of all time and in that area now, in that very Tennessee Valley area, are many of the greatest war plants on earth. They are of such stupendous magnitude that I would not even recite the details on the floor of the House. Much of the material that goes into the manufacture of those war munitions must go up either the Mississippi or the Tombigbee. This inland waterway would be entirely protected from the sea, and if the Mississippi should be closed at

any time we would have an additional outlet through which to reach the Gulf.

The gentleman from Michigan attempts to tell you that all it would benefit would be the value of the land, and a few things of that kind, and divert a small amount of traffic from the Mississippi River.

Let us see what it would do. All the traffic in this great area from Sioux City, Omaha, Minneapolis, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Louisville, and on the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Ohio, and the Tennessee all comes down through Cairo, Ill. This project would place Cairo a hundred miles nearer the Gulf; it would place Paducah, at the mouth of the Tennessee, 200 miles nearer the Gulf; it would place the Tennessee River at the junction of this project with that river 630 miles nearer the Gulf and 787 miles nearer Mobile. Take Cairo as a base and move counterclockwise, go down the Mississippi River to New Orleans, across through the intercoastal waterway, which is thoroughly protected from the sea, to Mobile, then up to the Tombigbee to the Tennessee, and then down the Tennessee and the Ohio to Cairo, and you have gone 1,768 miles. Of those 1,768 miles, 1,121 of it is downstream—almost two-thirds of the way will be downstream and the rest of it in still or slack water. There is not another project under the shining sun that for such small expenditure can transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another and with so much ease and with such great saving in time, distance, and transportation costs.

Here is what the Army engineers say today—and we have Army engineers today as fine as we have ever had. I do not believe we have ever had a man on that Board that surpasses Colonel Feringa who appears before the committee on these projects. Here is what he says: That on traffic going from Cairo to New Orleans, downstream—of course, that would be the way to travel because it is cheaper. You get the swift current of the stream there—but when you start back it would be 100 miles nearer, to go around by Mobile, up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee, and then down to Cairo. It would also cut the cost, and I am speaking of an 8-barge one-tow, with the average load, 3,500 tons of freight. It would cut the cost of that upbound trip from New Orleans to Cairo from $6,273 to $3,868, or a saving on one trip—listen to this—of $2,405, going from New Orleans to Cairo, Ill. That means such a saving on all the traffic that travels up the river, all the way up to Cairo, St. Louis, Sioux City, Omaha, Kansas City, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Chicago. On all that traffic on its upbound trip there would be a saving of $2,405 a trip.

If it goes from New Orleans up the Ohio, it would save more than that. It would save $2,803 because you would not go through Cairo but up the Tombigbee and down the Tennessee to Paducah, Ky., then up the Ohio to Louisville, Cincinnati, or Pittsburgh. It would save $2,800 on every barge load. It would benefit the entire Nation and especially the Mississippi Valley area, including the people of Michigan.

You ship your materials to us, and we want them. We buy your wheat, your machinery, your beef, and the other things that you have to sell, but you must carry something back in those barges. You want to take back oil, cotton, cottonseed meal, lumber, tropical fruits, bananas, and other products. The expense of fighting that terrific current on the Mississippi constitutes the greatest bottleneck in our transportation system.

They talk about the benefits of this project amounting to only a few thousand dollars a year. The Army engineer estimated there would be a saving of $9,000,000 a year minimum on this upbound traffic, which used this slackwater route, and there would be enough saved in 7 years to pay the entire cost of this project.

Suppose you were going from Mobile to Cairo, that barge load would save $3,290 a trip. Suppose it was going to Paducah, and then probably on up the Ohio River, there would be a saving of $3,688. Suppose it was going into the upper Tennessee, there would be a saving of $5,392. And so your traffic would move counterclockwise down the Mississippi in order to get the benefit of this current, across to Mobile, then up through the slack water route to the Tennessee, then down the Tennessee and the Ohio to Cairo.

If you were shipping a barge load from Cairo to Birmingham, and taking one back from there, you would save, going to Cairo or other points on the upper Mississippi, the Missouri or the Great Lakes, $5,448 on every barge load. If you were going from Mobile to Paducah, Ky., or on up to Louisville, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, or Wheeling, you would save $5,847 on every load.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if you were going anywhere in the Tennessee Valley, your saving from Birmingham, Ala., would be $7,551.

I submit that this will benefit not only the people along this river but it will benefit everyone else in the great Mississippi Valley, which means that vast area of country from the Allegheny to the Rocky Mountains. The trouble we have had before, and the trouble you have had before, has been that you could ship your material down the Mississippi River but you could not ship loads back, because of the tremendous cost of fighting this terrific current on the Mississippi River. With this inland waterway developed you could go back, and, as I said, save approximately 50 percent of the cost of your fuel, which would greatly increase transportation on all these streams.

This is not only the most feasible but it is the most necessary part of this bill. If you are going to knock out projects like this, you might as well kill the entire bill, and that is probably what will happen if it goes to the Senate with this project deleted. It is not only necessary from a practical standpoint but it is necessary from the standpoint of the national defense. In years to come we do not know what will happen. If wars should come again, or if the present war should continue, we are going to need that development and all those great resources that this project will reach.

As soon as this present war is over we will have to aid unemployment. This project will employ about five or six thousand men for 5 or 6 years. We have machinery standing down there idle, hydroelectric dredges and so forth, we have the power available to do the work and I submit, therefore, this is the best time to make provision for the work because, as we all know, these are postwar projects to be undertaken as soon as the war closes, to be used not only to absorb unemployment but also to build up our own internal economic condition.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Do the hearings indicate the extent of the local participation in taking care of the items that are provided for in the report of the Board of Army Engineers, such as the building of bridges and the changing of existing highways?

Mr. RANKIN. The bill provides that the Government shall take care of the changing of the railroad bridges for the reason that the railroads will claim they are not benefited by it. The other changes will be taken care of by local interests.

Mr. KEEFE. Where is that provision in the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. It is in the report. These bills are all based on the reports of the Army Engineers.

Mr. KEEFE. There is not anything in the report of the Army engineers. Does the gentleman refer to the report of the committee?

Mr. RANKIN. The report of the Army engineers. They make that statement in their report.

Mr. KEEFE. What assurance has the Congress, if this construction is undertaken, that these various expenses listed in A, B, C, D, and E of the report of the Board of Army Engineers will be taken care of, and that the Federal Government will not ultimately be called upon to pay them?

Mr. RANKIN. That is merely for changing the roads. That is a State and county affair, and the Federal Government is not charged with responsibility for it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that in the bill it is specifically provided and set out that it shall be done in accordance with the recommendations of the Board?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. The Board of Engineers has gone into that proposition and made recommendations, and I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, that similar recommendations have

been made with reference to all these projects.

I wish the gentleman from Michigan would join us in putting this project through. Let us have it authorized in order that we may go to work on it when this war is over. Instead of being a burden, it will pay for itself every few years and it will pay for itself by aiding the shippers in this area here, that we call the Mississippi Valley, as well as the ones along the Tombigbee and the Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 104, noes 105.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. DONDERO and Mr. RANKIN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes, 106; noes, 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: On page 9, line 18, after the semicolon, insert the following: "*Provided*, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of $70,000 to be immediately available as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for constructing immediately that portion near Assawoman Island, Accomack County, Va., of the inland waterway described in said House Document No. 268, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, near Assawoman Island and located across the marsh from Gargathy, Accomack County, Va., to Gargathy Narrows, the purpose of the amendment being to provide a new waterway located as aforesaid and necessary for the relief of shoaling caused by the storm of September 1943, which created at Assawoman Island, Accomack County, Va., the new inlet which has resulted in shoaling of the existing channel which has made it useless for commercial purposes and for the necessary operations of the Coast Guard in maintaining an adequate coast patrol, the link so to be constructed being a link in the inland waterway recommended in the House document aforesaid."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is an appropriation upon a legislative bill and not in order under the provisions of clause 4 of rule XXI.

Mr. BLAND. If the Chairman will hear me on that, this is distinctly an authorization. It so provides, the only purpose of the authorization being to take care of a hardship case, an emergency case, and to take it out of the provisions of this bill where the projects authorized are permitted to be begun only 6 months after the termination of the war. If this amendment is adopted, then it would permit an immediate authorization rather than a deferment, and I should like to have an opportunity to explain the reasons for that deferment.

Mr. TABER. I have no objection to reserving the point of order and allowing the gentleman to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, in the report on this project, it is accurately stated that a substantial commerce has developed in the natural waterways inside the barrier beach despite the lack of a continuous inner passage, and regardless of the hazard to life, and the loss of property that occurred from time to time. Project 268 was reported favorably in 1939 or about that time. It has been favorably acted upon by this committee in every bill since that time to the present. It was in the bill which was passed by the Senate and was sent to the President and was vetoed by him. The situation now is that one of the links in the barrier beach which had protected the natural waterway has been washed out by the ocean. It was washed out in September of last year. It has gradually opened now until the natural waterway, that is, a part of the formerly existing waterway over which considerable commerce has developed, is shoaling every day, so that the commerce that formerly used it cannot use it any longer. The project is provided for in this bill but to wait for the expiration of 6 months after the passage of this bill will completely close that important link, and what I am asking to do is to take up the project authorized by this bill and develop it at once, so that it may take care of existing commerce.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. I would like to know why the gentleman did not present this project to the Rivers and Harbors Committee as all other projects were presented.

Mr. BLAND. The matter was brought to my attention in February that the inlet had washed out and was in a serious situation.

Mr. CARTER. It was because it was too late to present to the Rivers and Harbors Committee?

Mr. BLAND. It was.

Mr. CARTER. Has the gentleman obtained a statement from either the War Department or the Navy Department that there was an actual war emergency for this improvement?

Mr. BLAND. Unfortunately the Navy and the Coast Guard came to the conclusion that it is not a war emergency, and that existing communication can be maintained, that is, the wire communication, the telephonic communication.

Mr. CARTER. I am sure the gentleman realizes that the usual procedure is to have these projects presented to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

Mr. BLAND. I am sure the gentleman who is now interrogating me knows that when time permits I always conform to all requirements of the committee and understands why I do not conform in this instance.

Mr. CARTER. I would say it is not because I am not in favor of the project if it were presented to the committee, but by reason of the fact that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors has not had a chance to consider it, as we have these other projects.

Mr. BLAND. What I am asking is to construct this link as speedily as possible at a cost of $70,000. The matter was urged upon the Chief of Engineers, but upon investigation he found they had no authority to do anything, but that it would be included in project 268.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I read now from the letter of General Robins dated November 29, 1943. I may add that this letter came in when I was unfortunately unable to attend to business in my office. I think I was in Florida or on the way to Florida at that time. The letter goes on to say:

The field representatives of the Department inspected the new inlet, which was cut through the narrow barrier beach of Assawoman Island during the storm of September 29, 1943, and they conferred with local representatives with respect to the situation. The district engineer reports that the breach is about 1,000 feet wide and located opposite the confluence of the Kegotank Creek and Gargathy Creek, some 2,500 feet north of Gargathy Inlet. The route of the inland waterway along this section of the Virginia coast follows Gargathy Creek which parallels Assawoman Island. The barrier beach has heretofore protected the waterway from the ocean, but wave action through the inlet now seriously interferes with the boat traffic on that waterway, particularly tows of monitors (flat-deck sculls) of 4-foot draft used for transporting oysters and clams from Kiptopeke and Oyster to Chincoteague, Va. During the first month following the opening of the inlet, three monitors loaded with oysters were washed on through the marsh, and at times of heavy wave action such vessels have been unable to traverse this reach of the inland waterway, resulting in decreased oyster production and a loss of income to that industry.

The reporting officers have given careful consideration to remedial measures looking toward relief for the sea-food boat operators at this locality. The most economical and permanent solution of the existing navigation hazards is the relocation of the inland-waterway route landward about one-quarter mile from the new inlet by dredging a channel about 1 mile in left across the marsh from Gargathy Creek to Gargathy Narrows. Such a channel, which is estimated to cost approximately $65,000—

I have asked for $5,000 additional to take care of any possible mistakes—

would provide safe transit for the monitors and other small craft using the inland waterway. Since this locality is not included within the limits of any project adopted by Congress, the Department is without the necessary authority at the present time to undertake this channel improvement with funds appropriated for rivers and harbors.

He goes on to say that if 268 is adopted and the bill is signed, it will then be possible to provide this inland waterway. I am simply asking that this link, which

is a part of the inland waterway described in No. 268 shall be built without waiting the termination of the war and 6 months thereafter but as soon as the bill is approved and an appropriation provided. This will save the Government money, and save these people their livelihood and provide the communications that are needed for the Coast Guard. That is the purpose of my amendment. It means the life and death of these people, and if a larger project is adopted, I cannot see where it will cost anything more to the Government, because it is simply doing now what would have to be done then. The volume of commerce consists of 45,000,000 clams, 350,000 bushels of oysters, and the report in 1939 of up-and-down traffic was 502 tons of claims, 250 tons of fish, 6,958 tons of oysters, while the down traffic was 280 tons of oysters, 800 tons of oyster shells. These people get their seed oysters for planting by way of this waterway. It is very essential to the preservation of food for the Nation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the following statement:

House Document No. 268 covers a survey of inland waterways from Chesapeake Bay to Chincoteague. It was favorably recommended to Congress April 26, 1939. It has been favorably acted upon by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors continuously since that time. It passed the Congress in the river and harbor bill that was vetoed by the President several years ago. The engineers reported that a substantial commerce had developed in the natural waterways inside the barrier beaches despite the lack of a continuous inner passage and regardless of the hazard to life and the loss of property that occurs from time to time. The report said that the savings in transportation costs justify the channel. One of the links in this chain was the channel protected by the barrier beach near Assawoman Island.

On September 29, 1943, this waterway suffered a storm which cut through the Assawoman Island, and cut an inlet which has become wider and the passageway between the marsh and the beach has become narrower. Ensign Jones of the Coast Guard reports that the passageway has become almost impassable to boats, and further, that this is the only means that the communication boats under his command in the Coast Guard have of keeping the telephone lines of the Coast Guard patrol in a working condition. It is the general duties of the Coast Guard office for the boats attached to the telephone section to travel from island to island in constructing and maintaining telephone lines, and as this dangerous point slows up the progress of communication work in this vicinity, it is necessary to remove this obstruction not only to help the communication work but also the people in that locality to make a living from the sea. He reported on February 25, 1944, that during the last few days he had had two boats run aground at this inlet and one was tied up for 3 days for insufficient water. The other boat damaged its rudder and the same must be docked and repaired before it can be safely used. While these boats were at the inlet, a number of other boats hauling oysters and seafood were also waiting for sufficient water to pass.

Many other letters have been received by me to the same effect.

Lieutenant Mister of the Coast Guard reported that prior to the cutting of the new inlet the beach protected the waterway along this section, but since this inlet has cut through there is no protection against this wave action, thus interfering with all small-boat traffic on that waterway. He says that the above condition is now seriously interfering with the continuous traffic of the Coast Guard Reserve boats operating in this section between Chincoteague Island, which is near the Virginia-Maryland line and Smith Island, Virginia, which is near the entrance to the Chesapeake Bay. He says that several incidents have come to his attention recently that have caused much concern in respect to the protection of life and property at this particular point, both to Coast Guard Reserve boats and crews and the fishing industry in general.

I took the matter up with the Chief of Engineers, but he said as the proposed improvement was not included in an approved waterway, no work could be done, and that upon the passage of the omnibus river and harbor bill authorizing the project recommended in House Document 268, Seventy-sixth Congress, measures would be taken toward the relocation of the section.

However, the river and harbor bill does not provide for immediate relief but only until 6 months after the termination of the present war. The need is urgent now, and an investigation by the Engineer's office in November ascertained that the relocating channel would cost approximately $65,000 and would provide safe transit for the craft using the waterway.

The commerce on this waterway in addition to the Coast Guard includes 45,000,000 clams per year, 350,000 bushels of oysters, in fact it is the bottleneck through which passes the large volume of commerce reported in House Document No. 268, consisting of 640 tons of oyster shells, together with up-bound traffic of 502 tons of clams, 750 tons of fish, and 6,958 tons of oysters, while down-bound traffic consisted of 3 tons of clams, 280 tons of oysters, and 800 tons of oyster shells. This is in addition to a large volume of trade in transportation of fertilizer for agriculture, coal for consumption, lumber, and builders' supplies, seed oysters for planting purposes, agricultural products, petroleum products, road-building materials, and other products.

The work authorized, if done now, will save the expenditure of thousands of dollars in the future, preserve established business from destruction, maintain the necessary communications for military defense of a coast line 21 miles long, save many lives, and preserve property. It will be of the greatest importance in providing a necessary food supply for the Nation, and maintaining the efficient operation of the Coast Guard in protecting our coastal defense.

I ask the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the amendment it will provide for immediate construction of a project that is embraced in the bill before us. The bill provides that appropriations for these purposes shall not be made until 6 months after the war unless they develop as being important in the war effort. I realize that this project is enormously important to the fish and oyster industry there. But it is not necessary—and the Department has so ruled—as being important in the war effort. If we want to make an exception with reference to this we might be called upon to make other exceptions, and there is no telling where it would lead.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I want to say I have a fishing industry in my own district and they have been clamoring also, wanting me to put through a special bill for them. I told them I thought we would all have to take our turn in the rivers and harbors bill, although it will delay things somewhat.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. I would like to accommodate our good friend from Virginia and those good people over there, but I do not feel I could do it consistently and with fairness to others. That is all I have to say.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] still insist on his point of order?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: On page 29, after line 12, add the following new paragraph, at the end of section 1:

"In connection with dams or works authorized by this act, any use of the waters of any stream or tributary thereof, having its source west of the ninety-seventh meridian, shall be subordinate to and shall not interfere with use west of the ninety-seventh meridian of such waters for domestic use, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes whenever established under State law."

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the Committee for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, with reference to this amendment; I appreciate the fact that the committee has given us their closest attention with reference to this matter. I think the committee has honestly made an effort

to help the Western States in this particularly serious question that confronts the arid West. However, the approach by the committee to the problem is wholly ineffectual, and so far as our problem is concerned, the Case amendment really does harm, in that it not only does not accomplish what it should accomplish, but even if it were a good amendment it does not solve our problem because it only deals with the Missouri River. What is the problem with which we are confronted? I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and the members of the committee, because I believe that if you men saw the problem as we see it, you would agree to this amendment. I can see that it can do no harm. Let me point out to this Committee in looking at this map you will see this country is pretty well divided into two different sections and it is divided wholly on the ground of rainfall. You see the black line, which is the ninety-seventh meridian. East of the ninety-seventh meridian, which is indicated in green, we have an entirely different amount of rainfall than we have west of the ninety-seventh meridian. The result of that has been this: In the Western States we have developed an entirely new and different law with reference to the appropriation of water.

In these Western States, where water is gold and where it is so valuable we have built up a legal theory, and I want to say to the gentleman from California that his State is one of the foremost States in the development of that legal theory, that in order to own water you must be the first to put it to a beneficial use. So that in all the States west of the ninety-seventh meridian the only way you can acquire the right to water is by putting it to a beneficial use. If you cannot show that, then you cannot own water. And if you own it and you cannot show that you are using it beneficially, it will be taken away from you. In other words, that is the yardstick by which we own water in that area. What has come about recently that we are frightened of? A few years ago under a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, it was held that so far as the streams are concerned, if any part of the stream is navigable, then all of the stream is navigable and all of the tributaries of the stream are navigable. Now, what does that mean? That means that every stream in the arid West is not subject to the State laws under which it has controlled and owned its water. It is subject to the Federal law under which we are operating in this bill.

Now you provide in this bill for water for navigation and you say, "Subject, however, to existing law." Well, what laws exist? The only law that exists so far as the Federal Government is concerned is the law built up on the history of a navigable stream. The result has been that in California and in Utah and in all of these Western States where we spent from the beginning of the States up until the present time working definitely with certain laws pertaining to reclamation, building these laws up under State law, we come now to a point where the Federal Government, mind you, and you men who are talking of States' rights get this point, where the Federal Government can come into my State and into your State and say to any farmer in that State, "Your water right that you have free and clear under your State law and which is a good title in your State is not a good title under the Federal laws. Therefore, we will drag you into court and make you prove your title under the Federal laws."

That is the condition of the law at the present time. I ask you if it would not be fair to put something in this bill which will protect those people west of the ninety-seventh meridian so that they could control their water under the State law. I want to call attention also to this fact: That the President of the United States, seeing this problem, wrote to the chairman of the committee and asked him to correct it. He said in his letter:

> I believe the bill should contain a definite declaration that the beneficial use of water in the upper-basin States shall not be affected by the proposed lower improvements.

That is all we are asking. We are simply asking that the beneficial use of our water, the title to our water that we have worked for ever since we went into that arid country, shall be determined by the States; that the States have the right to determine those rights which exist in each State, and that it be not interfered with by the Federal Government under the Constitution, which covers navigable streams.

There are hundreds of little streams. All the Federal Government has to do is to show, under the new decision, a case tried in Virginia, without any thought of ever including all this vast area, that some part of this stream, the Missouri River or some other river, is navigable. When that is shown, then the entire river is subject to Federal control under the Constitution, which provides that the Federal Government shall have control of navigation.

That is the problem that exists in this bill. This amendment is aimed to correct that. The chairman was opposed to the amendment offered previously because it picked out a certain river. This amendment does not do that. This amendment picks out a certain section of the country which by its nature, has been built up under different laws and regulations pertaining to water, than the rest of the country. It simply says, "Under these regulations we want to have it definitely understood that the laws of the States shall govern, so far as the ownership of water is concerned, when it comes to certain things."

Those things are these, "irrigation, mining, and industrial use." For those things the State shall have complete jurisdiction. We claim no State jurisdiction over waters for navigation.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Does the gentleman believe that the way this amendment is worded, we will awaken some day to find, after another group of lawyers have looked it over in our western States, that the Corps of Army Engineers could not construct dams and reservoirs, and it would be left up to the Department of the Interior?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No. I think there is no question about this amendment. This amendment has been submitted to a number of lawyers from the various States, and they agree that this amendment does about what I have said it would do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] has expired.

Mr. CARTER. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I want to ask the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON], inasmuch as this has been presented to a number of lawyers, why the gentleman did not present it to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, where we might have given it some consideration?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because I did exactly that very thing. I presented this amendment to the Rivers and Harbors Committee and made an argument along the same line I have made today. The Rivers and Harbors Committee was very gracious and they said they could see no objection to it and that, inasmuch as the President was asking for this kind of amendment, they thought it ought to be in the bill. Much to my surprise, instead of putting this amendment in the bill they put the Case amendment in the bill, which is unsatisfactory.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman says this amendment was suggested by the President?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; I did not say that.

Mr. CARTER. I misunderstood the gentleman. What did he say about the President?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I read what he said to your committee.

Mr. CARTER. Oh, yes; we received a long letter from the President telling us what to put in this bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. And he also said that the power should be under the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. CARTER. Yes. He also said that the power should be under the Secretary of the Interior. I want to say to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] that the President said a number of other things in this connection to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and that the committee paid very little attention to them.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Here is one thing he did say that the Rivers and Harbors Committee should have paid attention to, in my opinion.

Mr. CARTER. I decline to yield further for the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I will yield briefly, but I would like to use some of my time myself.

Mr. CASE. We have heard the rumor that the President subsequently withdrew that letter. Can the gentleman say

whether or not the President later withdrew that letter?

Mr. CARTER. I am not privileged to say. There is a gentleman here who can answer that question. If he desires to answer it, very well. I would feel that I would be breaching a confidence if I answered the question at this time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this question because the chairman of the committee is quite able to handle these proposed amendments. However, this is an amendment quite similar to the one that was offered this afternoon. We have not had an opportunity to study it carefully. I want to say to the gentleman from Utah, as I said earlier today, I am very much interested in irrigation and reclamation. As you know, we have the great Sacramento River that carries, for its size and length, perhaps more commerce than any river in the world. We have on either side of that river vast irrigation areas. Now we are constructing a dam out there that is a multiple-purpose dam. It is going to aid irrigation. It is going to aid navigation. It is going to control floods. Because it does aid navigation is no reason why it is going to detract one bit from irrigation. In fact, that same dam is going to store thousands of acre-feet of water that will be used for irrigation purposes.

I wonder why all this sudden fear about rivers and harbors and navigation improvements destroying irrigation. If there is any danger here it has been here every time a rivers and harbors bill was presented to this House.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I can answer the question.

Mr. CARTER. Not just now; if I have time I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes, the last 10 to be allotted to the chairman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield for a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has been recognized for the motion.

The gentleman from Georgia moves that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes, the last 10 to be reserved for the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is the time asked for by the gentleman from Georgia exclusive of that granted to the gentleman from Nebraska or is that included?

The CHAIRMAN. It is exclusive of the time allotted to the gentleman from Nebraska; he had already been recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the motion because it allots 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, and this cannot be done without unanimous consent.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion temporarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is withdrawn.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. CURTIS. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Robinson amendment. I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. I am sure the vast majority of people who understand the problem of the arid and semiarid West are in sympathy with these amendments. This is not a question of a contest between Federal agencies. We who are west of the 97th meridian want and need the Army engineers. We have a flood problem out there. They are doing a good job. I am for the so-called Pick plan for the Missouri River. We want navigation too. At the same time we want and need and must have all the irrigation that can be had.

The gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] referred to the recent Supreme Court decision in the New River case in which the Court laid down the principle that where a river was navigable all of its tributaries were navigable and therefore the Federal Government had jurisdiction. That means that every little creek, so small that you could step across it, is subject to the control of some official in Washington. In extending the program of navigation further and further—and I am for it, I am not opposed to that—there comes a time when the people of America must decide whether or not a given volume of water will be released for navigation or used for domestic, livestock, and agricultural purposes. Suppose a dam or reservoir is constructed on a stream of the West and there comes along a period of hot, dry weather in July or August when they have had no rainfall and the water stored up is needed by the farmers for their livestock, and to irrigate their corn, their alfalfa, and their sugar beets; and suppose that same identical water also is needed farther down the stream to float barges and ships.

The question is: Who shall have the water? Out in the arid and semiarid West water for irrigation means everything. It is the difference between prosperity and poverty, it is the difference between a thriving community and one that must be abandoned. Now, if a Federal official can say to the farmers in a case such as I described that the water they need for their crops, their livestock, and for domestic purposes, may not be used by them but must be released to add to the flow of the stream to aid navigation it would be disastrous. Crops would fail, entire communities would suffer, and the farmer's land would become valueless because his water was taken from him.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. Not just now.

This amendment does not take away the jurisdiction of Army engineers in the West. If it did I would be here opposing it. I am for flood-control work, we need it; the Army is doing a good job; I am for their navigation work; but the amendment says that if there is a clash of interests as between agriculture and navigation, the water cannot be used for navigation until the other needs including irrigation have been met. That is sound.

Mr. JENNINGS. If the gentleman will yield, a growing crop needs water if there is not to be a failure.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is absolutely right. The reason we have warehouses is to store things so they can wait for transportation but crops cannot wait to be watered.

Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this bill contend that in the great Missouri River Basin, which represents one-sixth of the area of the United States, there is ample water for all purposes. I hope that is true. I am not an engineer. If that is true they ought to accept this amendment. It is fair and just. I earnestly urge that the chairman of this committee agree to this amendment. In my particular area on Republican River the matter has already been settled by compact. But the entire West is entitled to this protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN and Mr. HILL objected.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. How is this time to be divided? Will it be divided equally between Members who were on their feet seeking recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The time will be divided equally between those seeking recognition of the Chair.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana) there were—ayes 80, noes 42.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having resumed the chair as

Speaker pro tempore, Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1410. An act to amend section 4 of the act approved June 13, 1940.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 324. An act to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof; and

H. J. Res. 192. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

PLACING POSTMASTERS AT FOURTH-CLASS POST OFFICES ON AN ANNUAL SALARY BASIS, ETC.

Mr. BURCH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full conference report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered (2), and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered (1): That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered (1), and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate Amendment, insert the following:

"Less than $50		$72
$50	but less than $100	144
$100	but less than $150	216
$150	but less than $200	288
$200	but less than $250	360
$250	but less than $300	432
$300	but less than $350	492
$350	but less than $400	532
$400	but less than $450	572
$450	but less than $500	596
$500	but less than $600	672
$600	but less than $700	748
$700	but less than $800	824
$800	but less than $900	892
$900	but less than $1000	960
$1000	but less than $1100	1028
$1100	but less than $1500	1100"

And the Senate agree to the same.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHEL,
D. J. WARD,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
WM. LANGER,
C. D. BUCK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 324) to place postmasters at fourth-class post offices on an annual-salary basis, and fix their rate of pay; and provide allowances for rent, fuel, light, and equipment, and fix the rates thereof, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: This amendment strikes out the scale of rates of compensation of postmasters of the fourth class and inserts in lieu thereof a new scale. The agreement reached in conference on this amendment is in the nature of a compromise and has the effect of reinstating the rates contained in the first nine grades in the bill as passed by the House, and adopting a new scale of pay with respect to all remaining grades but the last, which remains unchanged, and is arrived at by subtracting $12 from each of such grades with the exception mentioned.

Amendment No. 2: This is a perfecting amendment and merely changes the effective date from July 1, 1943, to July 1, 1944.

T. G. BURCH,
B. FRANK WHELCHEL,
D. J. WARD,
N. M. MASON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in order that the Members of the House may be acquainted with the program for tomorrow I may say that consideration of the bill that we had up this afternoon will continue until it is disposed of. At the conclusion of that matter the conference report on the U. N. R. R. A. resolution will be taken up and disposed of, after which general debate on the agricultural bill will start.

APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 479), as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Banking and Currency: GEORGE E. OUTLAND, California; THOMAS F. BURCHILL, New York.

Merchant Marine and Fisheries: EUGENE J. KEOGH, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order of 15 minutes for today. I ask unanimous consent that the speech I will make may be included in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

THE FATE OF THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, although not carried into the realm of aesthetics by its adoption, I have felt like most Americans that the Atlantic Charter was essentially a sound and basic document embodying fundamental yardsticks by which any fair and lasting peace should be measured. Undoubtedly it was as a new lease on life to the people of countries who have felt the heel of the dictator and to the people of adjacent countries as well who feared subjection to such tyranny. I think it has been regarded by people everywhere as an instrument, which if followed, would permit all nations, large and small, to live at peace with one another. Certainly, the great majority of American people have regarded it as a document of hope, the application of which would bring an end to world debacles such as this, when peace finally comes. If not a specific statement of peace aims I think the American people have at least considered it a general résumé of objectives for which they were fighting the war and for what they could reasonably expect would be the basis for permanent peace after the war.

But for those Americans who have felt that this would be a "peoples' peace" rather than a "diplomats' peace", which was given us after World War No. 1, then the course which international diplomacy has taken in the last few months must indeed be disturbing.

I speak on this subject simply as a rural American and as one who has no knowledge concerning the intricacies of international diplomacy and little knowledge about international horse trading

which is sometimes mistaken for diplomacy. I am willing to leave diplomacy to the diplomats, but if we are to have a fair, just, and lasting peace, a people's peace, then the diplomats better vanish and leave the peace table surrounded by just plain representative citizens of all nations. Citizens who would be willing to abandon diplomatic trickery and chicanery and substitute in its stead clear thinking, honest dealing with all cards on the table, coupled with a plain, simple effort to attain a just peace for all nations of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, the American people do not want to send their boys to foreign battlefields to be slaughtered every 25 years for the sake of keeping international diplomacy alive. They have every right to expect that this time a peace will be attained which can be kept for a century at least. In this war, like the last one, every soldier on foreign battlefields is being told that he is fighting so that his son will not have to do the same thing 25 years hence. This time we ought to live up to that promise, and I am one of those who think we can live up to it. But in order to end wars, our actions must be consistent with our words. We must give our cooperation to other nations to the fullest extent and we must receive that same kind of cooperation in return from nations allied with us, if lasting peace is to be had.

This brings me to the situation which I desire to discuss briefly. If the principles of the Atlantic Charter are to be applied effectively to establish a permanent peace following the war, then it is completely necessary that such principles be put into practice in international relationships during the course of the war. The Atlantic Charter was intended by its signers to take effect as of the date of its execution and not at some distant date in the future when peace finally came. In fact, the underlying purpose of the charter was to lay down rules of conduct between nations to be followed during the progress of the war so that our ultimate aims could not be distorted before its finish nor the goal which we are finally seeking obliterated by any intervening circumstances. If we do not accept it in spirit at least during the progress of the war, how can we reasonably expect that it will be used at the peace table? There are those in this country today who believe that the charter is dead and discarded. I do not believe it is dead unless the people of this country want it to be dead. In any event, they should not be deceived about it. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, we have ample means at our command to see that the charter lives and becomes the basic document for a just peace. I shall later discuss the procedure I think we should follow.

The charter was adopted by representatives of the United States and British Governments, and, although not an original signatory to it, the Soviet Union later acquiesced in and agreed to its objectives and formally adhered to it by signing the United Nations joint declaration January 1, 1942. In this joint declaration it is provided among other things:

> Each government pledges itself to cooperate with the governments signatory hereto and not make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

For some months past the Soviet Union has been discussing peace terms with several of the smaller nations in Europe, each of whom was forced into this war against the will of its government and its people. These peace negotiations have not proceeded according to either the letter or spirit of the Atlantic Charter. This document provided, among other things:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Clearly, the present attitude of the Soviet Union toward Finland and Poland and other small nations does great violence to the principles of freedom of nations desiring to live at peace with one another. Both Finland and Poland had this war thrust upon them. It was not of their choosing. They have been at all times ready to quit the war whenever they could have peace on just and honorable terms. No one, I think, could fairly expect anything more of them. When speaking of the wanton aggression on Finland on February 11, 1940, President Roosevelt said:

> Here is a small republic in northern Europe. A republic which without any question whatever wishes solely to maintain its own territorial and governmental integrity. Nobody with any pretense of common sense believes that Finland had any ulterior designs on the integrity or the safety of the Soviet Union. * * * It has allied itself with another dictatorship and it has invaded a neighbor so infinitesimally small that it could do no conceivable, possible harm to the Soviet Union, a small nation that seeks only to live at peace as a democracy and a liberal forward-looking democracy at that.

In January of the same year, Prime Minister Churchill had already voiced the same sentiments.

These words are as true today as the day they were uttered. No intervening circumstance has changed the situation in any respect. Although not included, the same expression applies with equal significance to Poland and the other small nations. The peace discussions between Finland-Poland and the Soviet Union involve the settlement of permanent questions such as boundaries and other territorial adjustments. This is no mere armistice now being considered, Mr. Speaker, because it involves the settlement of permanent problems and policies. Once established, the Soviet Union will rightfully insist they are permanently settled. Likewise, the recognition of the Badoglio government in Italy by the Soviet Union, without our knowledge or consent, involves further long-range commitments which may or may not be permanent and which may or may not be consistent with the general welfare of all our allies. This all amounts to a clear disregard on the part of the Soviet Union of the plain language of the Atlantic Charter to which it agreed, and I strongly suspect that it violates the several conferences and agreements between leaders of the several Allied Governments as well.

Are not the people of this country entitled to know whether our Government intends to silently acquiesce in such conduct on the part of one of our principal allies? Can we afford to remain silent and still be honest with ourselves? There are groups in this country who feel that Russia is fighting and winning this war for us single-handed. I give the gallant people of Russia due credit for the courageous fight they have made in defense of their own country. But where does credit for our contribution come in? Have we not been generous to Russia? The fourteenth lend-lease report shows that as of January 1, 1944, the total dollar value of lend-lease supplies to Russia amounted to $4,240,585,000. Is this an insignificant thing, Mr. Speaker? Included in this amount was some 7,800 planes, 4,100 tanks, 700 tank destroyers, 173,000 trucks, 33,000 jeeps, 25,000 other military motor vehicles and about 6,000,000 pairs of boots for the soldiers of the Red Army. Add to this 177,000 tons of explosives, 1,700,000 tons of steel, aluminum and copper, and 400,000,000 tons in industrial equipment, 740,000 tons of aviation gas and lubricating oil, 2,250,000 tons of food, including 50,000 tons of butter.

Is this not some evidence of our own generosity and of our desire to cooperate with an ally? In addition to this, we have millions of our boys fighting and dying on Europe's battle fronts to exterminate the same aggressors opposing Russia. Are not Britain and ourselves at least on an equal footing with the Soviet Union so far as contributing to this war effort is concerned?

Why then are we so meek? Is it because we dare not offend an ally no matter how basically wrong her position may be, or is it because we have given up faith in establishing the principles laid down in the Atlantic Charter?

We have groups in this country urging Finland and Poland to accept the unilateral peace terms of the Soviet as the best means out of a desperate situation. How can we in the spirit of fairness and common decency urge a settlement which will mean virtual extermination of the free and independent governments of these sturdy little countries? Why, Mr. Speaker, that is the very sort of thing that killed the treaty at Versailles. It amounts to a sacrifice of principle for expediency; it means the abandoning of human rights and liberties at a moment when we can least afford to make that sacrifice. No, Mr. Speaker, in making such assertions these people are doing irreparable damage to the cause of freedom of governments and freedom of peoples everywhere when this war is finally won. I will tell you what I think we should do, and I say this as an average American, because I am neither

statesman nor diplomat. We should insist that the Soviet Union live up to her agreements; we should insist that the Atlantic Charter be followed and adhered to now; and last, but not least, we should insist that the Soviet Union treat us as an equal ally equally concerned with the outcome of this conflict and equally concerned with the peace and future welfare of the world. Mr. Stalin will listen to our side of the story if he knows that we mean what we say; but I think it is clear that he will continue to do exactly as he pleases in his dealings with other nations unless we convey to him in plain, simple, and straightforward language of unmistakable meaning, that we expect his government to deal with its allies with all cards on the table, in the spirit of harmony and friendliness so vital to winning both war and peace.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT]?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. SMITH of Maine, for Wednesday, March 22, on account of official business.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and at the conclusion of all other special orders tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a table from the United States Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the late Francis D. Culkin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FULLER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

HOW TO LOSE FRIENDS AND ALIENATE PEOPLE—THE PRESIDENT'S DISASTROUS FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain newspaper and magazine articles which will be referred to in the course of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, by preinvasion time, it is a quarter to 12. Soon we shall be on the march. Occupied territory will become liberated territory. Enemy lands will become conquered areas. In the military sense, we are ready. In the political sense, we are not.

Has any American been told what our foreign policy is? Or whether we even have one? Stalin has one. And it is not the Atlantic Charter. Churchill has one. And it is not the Atlantic Charter. I propose to inquire, within the limitations of the time available to me, why we have lost so much territory in the diplomatic field.

What has happened in the past few years to our relations with the United Nations and the neutral nations? They have deteriorated dangerously. And everybody knows it. Why? We aren't supposed to ask, our Olympian rulers tell us. But no reasons of supposed military necessity can justify the willful refusal to tell the people of this country why it is, that during the past 2 or 3 years we seem to have gotten in bad with just about everybody.

It was some years after the last war before we reached the Uncle Shylock stage. But now this is an age of speed. We are being distrusted sooner in this war. The war is nowhere near won, and we find the administration floundering around, making mysterious noises but still entirely unwilling to take the country into its confidence. A decade of failure in the field of foreign policy accounts for, but does not excuse, continued secrecy on the part of the President.

Before the war, there were many who said: "I do not approve of the President's domestic policies but his foreign policy seems to work well." Much of this approval operated in the President's favor after he made his famous promise at Boston on October 30, 1940:

> And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers, I give you one more assurance.
>
> I have said this before, but I will say it again and again and again.
>
> Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.
>
> They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.
>
> The purpose of our defense is defense.

Since we are in fact closely and desperately engaged in two foreign wars at the same time, for the first time in our history, one may be entitled to wonder whether our "faultless" foreign policy had anything to do with it.

In any event, we entered the war with numerous friendly allies. When we come out at the other end of the long dark tunnel and return some day to the ways of peace, will we have any friends left? Who will they be? Russia? France? China? Italy? Argentina?

Would anyone be so sanguine as to predict it?

What kind of a policy have the President and the State Department been following that we have come to this pass?

Why will they not confide in the American people?

What kind of people do they think we are?

Mr. Speaker, nearly everyone is familiar with the story of the three stonemasons who were engaged in the construction of a massive edifice.

To an inquiring stranger, who asked of the three men: "What are you doing here?" the first replied, "I am just putting one stone on top of another."

The second man said: "I am working in order to get such and such amount as my pay."

But the third stonemason, with pride in his craftsmanship and the inspiration which comes from an understanding of what one is about, made this answer, "I am building a cathedral."

We are, all of us, engaged in the building of a cathedral—the high-spired, great-vaulted cathedral of liberty. This is no less true of the citizen, whether in the armed forces or contributing his effort on the home front, who will tell you that he is merely doing the day's job as it comes to hand, but to the soldier and his fellow citizen at home, the job he does will bring greater recompense, and perhaps be sooner finished if he knows what he is fighting for. Then may he say with the wise stonemason: "I, too, am building a great cathedral; I see in my mind's eye the outlines taking shape, the things which we must know and the deeds which we must do, if we are to build an enduring edifice for the free."

As of today, however, it is safe to say that there are more Americans who feel about this war that they are living in ignorance of its long-range purposes than there are with any clear sense of why we fight.

We are well aware that we have reached in this war's progress the time of the steel's last tempering—the moment just before Americans and their allies will storm the barricades of the European fortress.

We have come to this tomorrow's eve with our armed forces prepared for the prosecution of the war to absolute, final victory.

After the victory is won, do we, the people of the United States, have any clear idea about what we are going to do with our victory? Not that the war is anywhere near won. Far from it. But its end must not find us without a foreign policy.

Have we a foreign policy? Whose? A people's foreign policy?

Will our foreign policy be dictated by American public opinion? Not unless we get to work on it now by free and open public debate and discussion.

Can we wait until the war is won? Yes, we can, if we wish our foreign policy to be determined for us by our allies, or even by our enemies. By Germany. Does that sound too farfetched? Let us see. A number of American newspaper correspondents have just returned after

more than a year's confinement in Germany.

Hear the report of Philip Whitcomb, of the Baltimore Sun:

> Germany is working at top speed on the construction of a new Europe, with endless international commissions, conferences, trade agreements, institutes.

A returned reporter for the Christian Science Monitor adds:

> Newspapers in 17 languages support a "New Socialist Europe" under Nazi leadership.

Oh, we can wipe out the Nazi leadership—if we preserve enough determination to go through with it, as we should—but deep down into the thought stream of the 200,000,000 now under German hegemony have been planted schemes for the reconstruction of the kind of Europe the Germans want, and these ideas will recur and be presented most plausibly by spokesmen pretending to speak in the interest of non-German countries. Shall we be able to recognize these spokesmen as Quislings with delayed fuzes?

We shall not be able to combat these ideas, or perhaps even to recognize their origin, unless we have a better idea as Americans of what our stand is going to be on some of the foreseeable problems which will involve American decisions—decisions we will be better equipped to make if we have had some preparation for them by publication of information not essential to military security which we are entitled to have. The publication of much concealed information is long overdue.

The inescapable fact is that our foreign policy is now being handled exclusively by Franklin D. Roosevelt as President and Commander in Chief. His failure to recognize any clear line of demarcation as between his two responsibilities contributes to the confusion as to what is happening to our foreign policy.

The President has no exclusive power to make foreign policy or even to commit the United States to any policy whatever.

The Constitution does not even mention the words "foreign affairs" and sets definite limits on the President's sphere of action. The President cannot declare war or sign a peace treaty or send an Ambassador or consul to any part of the world without the concurrence of Congress. He may send a personal representative, and has done so, to the further confusion of our foreign policy. As was so well stated in the March 20, 1944, issue of Life magazine, on page 26:

> In fact, foreign affairs are so closely intermingled with domestic affairs that any President who took absolute power over foreign affairs would automatically become a complete dictator over domestic affairs.
>
> The President, therefore, has two devices. He can either (1) work with the Congress or (2) give it the run-around. If he is going to work with Congress, then the fact to remember is that Congress and the people must be told clearly what the President's proposals are in order that they may pass intelligent and honest judgment thereon. If the President tries to act without a full understanding of his purposes by Congress and the people, then he is bound to fail—unless the people really want a dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the Members of Congress have noted, and the American people have noted, concurring and significant unanimity on the part of qualified analysts of foreign affairs as to the continuing lack of American foreign policy.

Mr. Arthur Krock, who has long defended the State Department, recently insisted that "only a clear and candid statement by the President and Mr. Hull can remove these apprehensions." Further quotations from Mr. Krock revealed the apprehensions to which he referred:

> Because of the fog that masks our policy and has produced diplomatic inaction * * * Soviet Russia will dominate the post-war structure * * * that domination exists superficially already.
>
> Since Mr. Hull's moral triumph at Moscow, the United States seems to have abandoned the diplomatic leadership of the United Nations—except with the swing-back movements in South America.
>
> If we have a post-war policy toward Europe, including the disposition of Germany, the time is overdue to state it. If we have not yet formulated such policies, it should be done at once lest events, including strong moves by Soviet Russia, render them obsolete and ineffectual before they can be stated.
>
> The third-term campaign of 1940 delayed the rearmament program by many months, impelled the President to give assurances against war involvement that the world situation refuted, and contributed disastrously to the unpreparedness psychology of the people. If the same political considerations, geared now to a fourth-term effort, are permitted to postpone or obscure candid post-war statements of national policy, the eventual cost may be even greater.

Another recognized voice on foreign affairs, Miss Dorothy Thompson, reveals some information of which the American public was unaware, to the effect that Mr. Churchill had applied a death blow to the Atlantic Charter:

> Mr. Churchill buried the Atlantic Charter. Since the President, co-author, has not taken issue * * * we may take it the abandonment of the charter is established policy.
>
> Presumption of the Atlantic Charter was that its basic principles applied to all—victor and vanquished alike. * * * But (Mr. Churchill) made the flat statement that the Atlantic Charter does not apply in any sense to the enemy. "Unconditional surrender" means we end the war, he explained, with no promises of any kind.
>
> Why do we want to free our hands? Is it because we have a plan for Germany and Europe which we prefer not to publicize? Or is it because we have no plan at all?
>
> Has the Soviet Union a plan? Yes—no doubt, several plans. * * * If we enter Europe without a plan, while the Soviets have a clear one in reserve, we stand to become caught in situations for which we are completely unprepared.

Another foreign-affairs expert, Anne O'Hare McCormick, states a belief that the relations among Russia, Great Britain, and the United States have deteriorated since Tehran and expressed the view that "unless the British and American Governments reach joint decisions now there will be no chance of a joint guardianship of the peace."

This unanimity has found expression through the writings of many another sincere and informed expert. I include at this point a quotation from the March 20, 1944, issue of Time magazine, in which are summarized the opinions of some of these writers:

THE PROBLEM OF TOMORROW

> At the same time the New York Times' London bureau chief, James B. Reston, managed to send through censorship several articles reporting concern that the United States is not taking a leading role in defining the shape of post-war Europe. He noted that "the great power of Soviet Russia in the political field is active, while the power of the American Republic is much more passive. * * * The silence of the United States on (European) topics is a source of a considerable amount of questioning" among Allied diplomats who must plan for the future.
>
> The Times' military expert, Hanson W. Baldwin, simultaneously has discovered that the political factors in the war today are more important than the purely military factors. Pondering this, he wrote: "The major political problem of Europe is the problem of tomorrow. * * * Since Teheran there have been many disturbing trends * * * the war strategy may be affected." Among such he cited Russia's insistence on "multilateral settlement of problems in western Europe but unilateral settlement—her own—of affairs in eastern Europe."
>
> The Scripps-Howard foreign expert, old (62) William Philip Simms, has been brooding in Washington over the mysterious vagueness of United States foreign policy. Of the Balkans, he wrote: "Anglo-American policy has reached such an obscure, undecipherable stage that United Nations circles here regard it as the prize mystery of the war."
>
> He reminded readers of a United Press report from Ankara that the Turkish price for entering the war was 300 planes and 500 tanks, and that this absolutely picayune payment, this inconsequential dribble, had not been made. "So far," the Ankara authority told United Press, "not a single tank or plane has been delivered. All we got were beautiful words."
>
> Columnist Simms did not have to search far for a reason. He reported the Washington belief that "Russia is opposed to Anglo-American activities in the Balkans, and London and Washington deferred to her wishes." This seemed to him further evidence of Russian dominance, and American vagueness.
>
> Mr. Simms considered the newest Polish partition, too, and then stated flatly: "If the Atlantic Charter is something that members of the Big Three can take or leave to suit themselves, but which smaller nations must accept whether they like it or not, the announced war aims of the United Nations become a shabby business."
>
> These were only a few of the minds that by various paths were reaching the same conclusions. Even Columnist Sam Grafton, who blames President Roosevelt's State Department but never President Roosevelt, was expressing concern over the enigma of United States foreign policy. (This time Mr. Grafton blamed the United States people.) And such a heavyweight pundit as Walter Lippmann, apostle of power politics and exponent of expediency, was so freighted down with the seriousness of the crisis that he retreated, in a column tilted "Jitter-Making," into a jitttery statement that since no one knows all that is going on—not even he himself—no one should say anything in particular.
>
> The United States citizenry might not yet be able to piece it all together. But they had at least been told—not by their still silent Government—that the Atlantic Charter is dead; that the relations of the Big Three are worse, not better, since Tehran; that the administration's persistent inability to for-

mulate a foreign policy was based on term IV politics; and that this lack was so serious that it had begun to seem that World War No. 2 would settle nothing.

What are some of the questions on which information is available but withheld? Just to state some of them will exhibit the need for more information, unless we are prepared to surrender, by default, our right to any share in the making of the conditions precedent to an enduring peace.

What goes on behind the scenes with regard to the kind of Germany Europe must bear after the war?

Was it decided at Teheran that Germany is to be kept strong and substantially intact, a buffer between Great Britain and Russia?

What of the German Army? Were not some decisions made on its continuation in strength, after surrender?

Were not the terms of an eventual German armistice agreed on in principle?

If this is so, what are the chances for the survival of France? Was "Vive La France Eternelle" but a fireside phrase?

General de Gaulle, like Marshal Badoglio, has already been recognized by Marshal Stalin, who pursues a policy of recognizing—and thereby gaining the good will of—any government which is now exercising the powers of government or can be put in the position to govern, by the United Nations. As a result there is reason to anticipate a pro-Russian Europe after the war, one over which Russia's sphere of influence policy stands more than an even chance of prevailing over the British balance of power policy, which latter we seem to be ineptly seeking to further.

I believe that the American people are convinced that the people of France are behind General de Gaulle and are prepared to support his movement. I believe that further delay on the part of our Government in recognizing General de Gaulle's regime as the true provisional government of France may cost us the friendship of the French people after the war. The President ought immediately and without qualification or equivocation recognize General de Gaulle as head of such a government.

In line with these views, I include at this point an article by the temperate and highly regarded Mr. William L. Shirer, appearing in the Washington Post of Sunday, March 19, 1944:

UNITED STATES ATTITUDE TOWARD FRENCH COMMITTEE IS STUBBORN AND UNWISE

(By William L. Shirer)

The news revealed in the New York Herald Tribune last Sunday by Mr. Frank Kelley that the President has decided to have as little as possible to do with the French Committee of Liberation after the Allied invasion of France will not greatly aid our American propaganda to France, or, for that matter, to the other occupied lands.

For it confirms the worst fears of these already downtrodden peoples that they are to have, after all, a considerable period of Allied military government which though a million times preferable to the brutalities of Nazi rule is not what they had hoped and prayed for. Quite simply, they want a temporary civil government of their own as soon as each region has ceased to be a zone of military operations. The President, however, has decided they must put up with our military rule until that distant day when, under our supervision, they will be free to elect their own form of government—a ridiculous and impossible proposition since it assumes that a people can make political decisions in a vacuum.

OUR POLICY IS INEPT

In the case of France, by far the most important country to be liberated, this decision by the President represents, of course, merely a continuation of our inept—if not disastrous—political policy in north Africa and Italy. It seems to indicate, too, a curious stubbornness that is not very politically enlightened.

We bet on the losing horse in French affairs when we put our money on General Giraud. But we will not admit it, we will not face the fact or the consequences of General de Gaulle's triumph in north Africa. Nor—and this is more serious—will we recognize that his French Committee of Liberation represents the overwhelming mass of the French people who are on our side, who have done all the resisting to the Nazis and the Vichy Fascists, and who, therefore, are the only possible people whom a wise Allied political leadership would trust with civilian government behind our lines.

Instead, Mr. Kelley informs us from Washington, we are going to burden General Eisenhower with the political responsibility of deciding whether to deal or not with the committee in the setting up of civilian authority behind the Allied lines. Indeed according to my information, our commanding general will be instructed to deal with any group in France he chooses, not excluding the Vichyites!

Naturally in the zone of military operations Allied military rule will be supreme. Every Frenchman will understand that. But the President's decision governs those zones which eventually will lie far behind the fighting front. It is in these regions that the French committee had asked to be recognized as the provisional government. This request has now been turned down in Washington.

COMPLEX, URGENT JOB AHEAD

Few of us in this country realize the complexity and the urgency of the temporary political job that must be done in France as soon as the troops have passed on. The French committee in Algiers, as it happens, has been working out with the French underground detailed plans for this very task—plans, alas, which will now have to be scrapped in favor of those of our well-meaning but inexperienced A. M. G. officers.

In the realm of justice, emergency civil courts will have to be set up quickly in every liberated town. The immediate danger of a wild inflation must be met, currency called in, new currency issued, and an equitable arrangement worked out for the supplies and labor which the invading armies will purchase. There will be urgent problems of food and clothing, public health, transportation.

The Fascist police force organized by Vichy and the Nazis must be quickly replaced by a reliable one. There will be the matter of new newspapers to replace the current collaborationist journals. There will be the problem of mobilizing French labor and of its demands that the old free unions or new free unions be recognized. There will be a hundred and one problems that are bound to crop up when an old and spirited people is suddenly released from a savage slavery they have never known in all their history.

Should General Eisenhower or military subordinates with no background of politics or even of France be made to frit away their time trying to solve these matters? Or would it be wiser to turn the job over to Frenchmen who have lived under the occupation and helped fight our battle against the Nazis, and who, therefore, can be trusted?

COMMITTEE REPRESENTS FRANCE

Most of the 17 members of the French committee and of the 100 members of the consultative assembly worked first in the French underground against the Nazis and against Vichy. Forty-five of the representatives in the assembly did not leave France until last fall.

The underground is united in France under the leadership of the Central Council of Resistance and it includes every group from extreme conservatives to Communists. The central council is in close touch daily with the committee in Algiers.

The French committee, which asks only for provisional authority to help lead its own people out of the chaos and ruin, has solemnly promised to lay down its job as soon as the French people are ready to choose their own new constitutional system.

But in so doing the French will have to start from something, however small. This the committee could provide them. If we keep France under Allied military rule, how do we propose to hold an election in which the French would decide their future? For what would we have the people vote? For whom? The old parties? New parties? Under some reconstituted framework of the Third Republic? Under no framework at all? It simply can't be done. If we try, we shall inevitably fail, and in doing so make a pretty mess of this part of the peace.

One wonders whether we have learned that wars are fought—and won—not only by military action but by political action. The promise of our military might in the coming invasion is bright. But politically we seem to be almost deliberately trying to make an unholy mess of our affairs. Since political and military action are complementary, making a mess of one will inevitably harm the other.

Was the Fourth Partition of Poland decreed at Teheran, the Atlantic Charter to the contrary notwithstanding?

Was not Hong Kong denied to Chiang Kai-shek at Cairo, the Atlantic Charter to the contrary notwithstanding?

LATIN AMERICA

The stress and strain of war has brought out many evidences of weakness in our foreign policy toward Latin America.

For over a decade our foreign policy in this hemisphere has been ballyhooed as evidence of this administration's skill in foreign relations. It has been argued that we have been so successful in our foreign relations with Latin America as to warrant confidence that this administration can handle with equal verve and skill foreign relations with any country in the world.

In the beginning, let us admit frankly, the good-neighbor policy appeared to have much to recommend it. It was certainly better than the arbitrary use of superior force and as long as the United States seemed so ready and willing to buy the friendship of Latin America by large expenditures of moneys in their domains, much of the resentment against the "Colossus of the North" appeared to be melting away. The great difficulty with any attempt to buy friends, however, is that you may run into a change of climate when you attempt to collect on past beneficences.

Another latent defect in our policy of open-handed generosity toward some of our neighbors to the south has manifested itself in two ways: First, the neighbors who got the money are beginning to

complain that we have disturbed their internal economic system. Second, the neighbors who did not get the money, or who did not get as much as someone else, are complaining of partiality and are telling their people that we are attempting to drive wedges between the good neighborliness of Latin neighbors.

Our supposedly felicitous foreign policy in Latin America rolled along fairly well during peacetime, since we appeared to expect very little in the way of return for anything done by Uncle Sam for the benefit of other countries. After Pearl Harbor, however, this country needed to be sure not only of friendly expressions of good will but of active collaboration on the part of Latin-American nations in the war against the Axis. Some of our drafts against the good will banked away in Latin America were honored; some of them were not. When we shipped tanks to Guatemala we undoubtedly increased our good will with the "ins" in that country, but it is questionable what the "outs" now think of "El Coloseo del Norte." We no longer call it armed intervention, you will note, but we send lend-lease tanks, planes, and war materials for the support of the existing regime and for "defense of the Americas"; we pick good solid dictators in many of the countries and we reinforce them mightily. In this way we do not let the Atlantic Charter know what the good neighbor doeth.

Our so-called good-neighbor policy has recently cracked very badly under the stress of war. The Government of Chile, hailed in this country with much fanfare as the most democratic government in South America, has been counted on to give us strong evidence of its friendship and cooperation. Yet, it was our friend Chile, publicized as a paragon of democratic government, which led all South American countries in very promptly recognizing the Farrell regime in Argentina.

We have in fact sustained in Argentina our worst diplomatic defeat of the war.

The President and the State Department have been trying to form a united hemisphere front against the anti-United States Vice President of Argentina, Señor Edelmiro Farrell. Our Government and the British Government have abstained from entering into official relations with the Farrell regime. Our supposed hemisphere front was broken wide open by the prompt action of Chile, a supposedly friendly democratic country, which nevertheless extended recognition to that government in the Argentine which we have been told is pro-Fascist and which is certainly anti-United States.

One result of our dubious pan-American policy: cheering Argentine pro-Fascists surrounding the Chilean Embassy and gleefully confident that other South American countries will follow the example, not of the United States and Great Britain but of our supposedly strong friend, the Government of Chile.

A news report this week states:

Argentine nationalists put on a show last week in front of the United States Embassy in Buenos Aires, waving flags of Argentina, Spain, Bolivia, Paraguay, and Chile, they shouted, "Down with the Yankees." Loud were the cheers for the new President, Edelmiro Farrell, stooge of Fascist-minded Col. Juan Domingo Perón. Loud were the jeers for the United States, which had failed to form a united hemisphere front against his recognition.

All in all, we have been made to look very foolish in South America, partly because nobody really loves a sucker and partly because blood is thicker than water.

We seem to have made good neighbors of Chile and Argentina as between themselves, but it is doubtful whether this is what the President meant by the "good neighbor" policy. The same thing goes on all through South America.

Following our President's policy of secret covenants secretly arrived at, we helped through our Ambassador Boal the entrenched capitalists of Bolivia against the downtrodden peons and underfed Indians of that country, justifying the injustice to the people of Bolivia by our need for tin at any cost. It does not seem to have occurred to this administration that had we thrown our weight into the balance in favor of the common man in Bolivia we might have gotten more tin and more good will in the end. As it worked out the common man got a nice visit from Vice President WALLACE, and the continuance of Bolivian dictatorship.

Reverting to Argentina, I think it should be pointed out that never before in the history of any previous administration have our relations with that country deteriorated to the point of actual open hostility toward the United States. In no other administration has our South American policy led to anti-United States demonstrations and parades. Prior to this administration it is true that we were regarded as too powerful for the comfort of our neighbors and that mistrust expressed itself from time to time in various Latin countries. But we sought to buy off that distrust, after the New Deal, with large expenditures of money and extravagant promises by the President and Vice President of this country. We have seen as the fruit of our policy of buying friends, the growth of greater distrust than ever before and the rise of active hatred against the United States in more than one Latin-American country.

The truth is, we have evolved no foreign policy whatever so far as Argentina is concerned. For fear of colliding with British interests we have alternately badgered and cajoled. We have risked the future of our whole pan-American policy in order to satisfy the undoubted need of Britain for Argentine exports. But bad blood and hatred for generations to come directed at the United States but not at Great Britain is a high price to pay for these exports, particularly since it is clear that they are not at this time critically needed nor essential to keep Great Britain going.

After the coming of victory in Europe, it is presumed that the Government intends to turn its full force upon Japan.

That will be a time in which there should be no distractions or confusion in Congress or in the minds of the American people as to our reasons for fighting this war or what we expect to do with the victory once gained. If we have no clear idea of what our foreign policy is either in Europe or the Pacific, we can expect with the end of the European war a great deal of turmoil when we seek to improvise our policy toward the fashioning of a peace in Europe. We will run up against other Nations with much clearer ideas of what they want and what they want done. By crystallizing public opinion now we can avoid the dangers inherent in the President's habit of improvising foreign policy, as well as domestic policy on a 24-hour basis.

One of the great drawbacks of personalized government, operating on the principle of all knowledge retained in the minds of three men, is that much delay and indecision necessarily ensues in the interludes between the meetings of the big three.

The old American custom of doing foreign business through ambassadors and ministers enabled Presidents to keep themselves constantly informed through information furnished by competent and trusted men on the spot. The unwillingness of the President to operate in the traditional American fashion has resulted in a series of highly dramatic conferences attended by public hand-shaking and private head-shaking, followed by another decline and deterioration of the relationship between our allies and ourselves. This phase is then followed by another sudden and dramatic patching up of our relationship to our allies. It has not resulted in any clear or even reasonable specific statement as to our intentions toward our enemies.

Americans are not used to having other nations know what they want, while we are told that no information is available. We are tired of being beaten to the gun again, and again, and again. We are entitled to expect that our President, in paraphrase of the words of President Washington, will raise a standard of foreign policy to which Americans may repair.

Our foreign policy up to now has been so much worse than our pitifully unfortunate domestic policy that there is not even adequate ground for comparison. There is one thing to be said for an inadequate and unfortunate domestic policy: Mistakes made on the home front can be corrected and the damage undone by a succeeding administration headed by competent men. Damage done in foreign affairs wrought through ignorance, vanity, secretiveness, or plain incompetence may lead us, without the consent of our people, into such deep involvement with other nations as to be irreparable.

A wise and clear-sighted foreign policy is the need of the hour. The American people should be told, as specifically as possible, what our war aims are, what our relations are with our allies, what our intentions are as to our enemies, and how we expect to avoid the catastrophe of another war through an acceptable form of international organization, established within the powers of the con-

stituent governments and dedicated to the maintenance of the peace.

It is up to the President of the United States to take the people of the United States into his confidence.

It is later than we think.

SUSTAINED-YIELD FOREST MANAGEMENT

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the action of the House in passing S. 250, to promote sustained-yield forest management in order thereby (a) to stabilize communities, forest industries, employment, and taxable forest wealth; (b) to assure a continuous and ample supply of forest products; and (c) to secure the benefits of forests in regulation of water supply and stream flow, prevention of soil erosion, amelioration of climate, and preservation of wildlife, this morning be vacated, and that the bill may come up in its regular way on the Consent Calendar, or on the Union Calendar. When the bill came up yesterday the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] asked that it go over for further consideration, but this morning before I got here the bill was put through by unanimous consent.

Mr. CANFIELD. I ask the gentleman to defer that request until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Inasmuch as it was done only this morning, I think that the gentleman should agree to my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A TRIBUTE TO MONTE CASSINO

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, today, March 21, is the feast day of St. Benedict. As the time of Easter draws near, our thoughts inevitably turn toward higher things; our hearts take new hope and new courage in the contemplation of the eternal miracle of rebirth, in the victory of love over death, in the triumph of the spirit.

Our faith in the indestructibility of spiritual values has withstood many shocks, even in a world grown accustomed and callous to horror. And yet, hardened as the conscience of humanity has become, who can forget the thrill of horror that shook us when, on the morning of February 15, the newspaper headlines announced the destruction of the Abbey of Monte Cassino.

It is good that we should feel shocked. For it is proof, if proof were needed, that the treasures of the spirit are still tenderly cherished among men, and that we are still capable of weeping, as Christ did, over the beauty of doomed Jerusalem. To be sure, tears will not restore the Monastery of Monte Cassino; but out of our grief and agony of spirit will emerge the solemn resolution to rebuild that venerable shrine to greater glory. Rebuilding is the theme of Easter, the time when the faith that moveth mountains dedicates itself anew to the labor of the spirit.

It is not inappropriate, at this point, to recount some of the glories of this great Christian monument. The huge gray-brown stone buildings that loomed, for more than 15 centuries, 1,700 feet above the fertile Liri Valley halfway between Rome and Naples have seen many wars come and go. They have looked down on vineyards and dusty herds of sheep, on the clash of swords and the roaring mouths of cannon. And, finally, on February 15, a great splatter of bombs struck squarely in the central courtyard buildings, the huge dome disappeared, and black smoke rolled high above the crest of the hills.

Monte Cassino was one of the oldest monasteries, and certainly the most famous of them all. Deeply reverenced by Catholics, it was sacred as well to all Christians, and indeed to all mankind who revere our inheritance of learning, of ancient manuscripts, and sculpture in ivory and gold and rich marbles, of paintings and holy relics which were preserved there.

St. Benedict, the founder of Monte Cassino, was the patriarch of the western monks. Born in A. D. 480, of the renowned family of the Anicil in Nursia, near Umbrian Spoleto, he was sent by his father to school in Rome. The shocking licentiousness of the great city drove him away. He fled to Subiaco and there, in a cave opposite the ruins of Nero's palace, he spent 3 years of his early manhood in solitary prayer, meditation, and austerity. His fame spread; disciples flocked to him, and gradually he established 12 monasteries in the vicinity, setting 12 monks in each, though he remained the head. Soon Roman nobles and senators were sending their young sons to him to be brought up in the monastic discipline.

Later, accompanied by a small band of disciples, he journeyed south until he came to Cassino. Legend has it that he was led by two birds and two angels, and those who understand the language of legend tell us that this means that he came here because of his love for the beautiful things of earth as well as heaven.

St. Benedict climbed the high mountain that broods majestically over the little town of Cassino, and established on the summit the monastery with which his fame is forever joined, and which for centuries was the chief fountainhead of religious life and learning for western Europe. He eradicated the lingering remains of paganism round about, and, by his preaching, won the countryside to Christianity. Here, surrounded by the faithful, in the fullness of time, he died, leaving behind him a great light in the darkness.

The rule of St. Benedict, "Laborare est orare," means interchangeably, "To work is to pray" and "To pray is to work." Either way, it expresses succinctly the unity between man's highest aspirations and his most wholesome needs. The depth of the religious fervor of the Benedictines cannot be questioned; as to their labors, in a time when wars and plagues were rife in the land, and when the foundations of our civilized life seemed about to be swallowed up by the Dark Ages, the Benedictine monks conserved and practiced the art of agriculture, and taught it to the barbarian folk around them; developed weaving and other handicrafts; ferreted out the very rudiments of science; explored and expanded the art of music, without which our magnificent symphonies could never have been created; studied and copied and saved for posterity the ancient scrolls of wisdom and poetry and Sacred Scriptures; developed much of the majestic liturgy which exists even in the church today; and, at the same time, served as shepherds of the flock, instructing all who would come to learn.

And here they continued to build and to beautify the monastery which crumbled on February 15. The ancient vaulted entrance dated from the days of St. Benedict himself, but the cloister courtyard was built by Bramante, the architect of St. Peter's in Rome. Here the ravens stalked and flew at will, in memory of the birds which led the patriarch to this spot. In the seventeenth century, the magnificent marble church itself was erected, and in our own time the ivory and bronze and silver tombs of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica were built by the monks.

Kings and statesmen and scholars have flocked to the monastery, from the sixth century to the present day, to ponder the precious rolls of pagan and Christian antiquity and find spiritual solace. Up to the time of Dante, in the fourteenth century, about 800 years after the founding of Monte Cassino, the rule of St. Benedict was practiced in several thousand monasteries, and the list of canonized saints has been enriched by over 1,500 Benedictine names.

Our own beloved American poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, has written immortal lines about Monte Cassino, and now that the bricks and mortar and marble have fallen, we are a thousandfold more grateful to him for preserving for future generations this beautiful description of the calm and noble monument:

And there, uplifted, like a passing cloud
That pauses on a mountain summit high,
Monte Cassino's convent rears its proud
And venerable walls against the sky.

Well I remember how on foot I climbed
The stony pathway leading to its gate;
Above, the convent bells for vespers chimed,
Below, the darkening town grew desolate.

Well I remember the low arch and dark,
The courtyard with its well, the terrace wide,
From which, far down, the valley like a park
Veiled in the evening mists, was dim descried.

The day was dying, and with feeble hands
Caressed the mountaintops; the vales between
Darkened; the river in the meadow lands
Sheathed itself as a sword, and was not seen.

The silence of the place was like a sleep,
So full of rest it seemed; each passing tread
Was a reverberation from the deep
Recesses of the ages that are dead.

For, more than thirteen centuries ago,
Benedict, fleeing from the gates of Rome,
A youth disgusted with its vice and woe,
Sought in these mountain solitudes a home.

He founded here his convent and his rule
Of prayer and work, and counted work as prayer;
The pen became a clarion, and his school
Flamed like a beacon in the midnight air.

Monte Cassino has survived several destructions. Between 580 and 590 it was pillaged by the Lombards. The monks patiently rebuilt it in 720, and in 884 it was sacked by the Saracens. Seventy years later the "work through prayer" of St. Benedict restored it again. It has been imperiled by political crises as well as wars; indeed, as late as 1867, the monks were nearly expelled and the treasures confiscated by the Italian Government for public sale.

In 1929 Monte Cassino celebrated its fifteenth centennial by building a lighthouse on the roof of the monastery. On February 15 last that lighthouse was extinguished by our bombers—a grievous necessity—and will not soon be lighted again. But the spiritual flame burns all the brighter. As the number of lamps is diminished, the height of the flame is increased. Most of the glories of Monte Cassino were built, and its holy tradition established, during those terrible Dark Ages, when it seemed that the lights of civilization might vanish forever. Today, in the new Dark Ages, let us rededicate ourselves to rebuilding Monte Cassino—all the Monte Cassinos of the world that have suffered through the wrath of man—Coventry and Kiev, Madrid and Ghent and Rotterdam. God willing, we shall in His good time behold a new Monte Cassino arise like the phoenix from the ashes of the old, and it shall be a place of toil and prayer for the new sons of Benedict, who shall teach men the ways of peace and the abundance of the spirit.

"Succisa virescit."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein resolutions adopted by the annual meeting of the second district of the Polish-American Council, assembled at New Haven, Conn., on February 27, 1944.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter addressed by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to the representative of the Polish National Alliance, of Chicago. The letter bears on the Polish-Russian question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

CONTRACT TERMINATION SETTLEMENTS

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the subject of contract-termination settlements which now looms before the American people is gigantic in proportions. In its possible effect on the national economy it dwarfs former depressions and the peaks of prosperity of other years as well. The success of peacetime industrial undertakings will be closely bound to the success with which these settlements are made. Counting dollars, manpower, and the taxpayers' interest, it is greater than the aggregate of such elements in all our previous wars combined. The estimates of the probable money value of settlements of war contracts by termination proceedings in the course of the war and following immediately after the cease-firing command have ranged as high as $100,000,000.

Many war contractors have expanded their facilities to such an extent that cancelation of war contracts without immediate partial payments and speedy settlement of their claims would cause bankruptcy. The freezing of working capital of great numbers of American manufacturers would impede the Nation's rapid reconversion to full employment in peacetime pursuits. The Nation is now geared largely to war production. It cannot suspend war production overnight without very serious dislocations unless an adequate, sensible, speedy plan for contract-termination settlements is in operation.

In order to understand clearly the problem of termination, we must know what is involved in a canceled contract. In the case of the termination of a sizable war contract, a contractor finds himself with (a) hundreds of idle employees, (b) idle plant and equipment, (c) partly finished products which no one wants, (d) raw material which may be of no use to him, (e) work in process consisting possibly of hundreds of thousands of parts in various stages of completion and worth in most instances only what they will bring as scrap, (f) unamortized preproduction expenditures (tooling, and so forth) made in good faith which must be prorated equitably over the finished and unfinished portions of the contract. A great amount of borrowed capital is almost always involved. The plant is usually expanded many times over its normal operating size.

Finding himself with contracts canceled, the contractor must clear his plant of the things which are of no further value in his production program, rearrange and reconvert his facilities to accommodate the production which is to come, hasten through the preproduction and tooling stages as quickly as possible to again put his idle manpower and plant facilities to work. Delays can be ruinous to him. This multiplied many hundreds of times over is a picture of what will happen on V-day. That is why the national economy in the immediate postwar period is directly geared to reconversion.

In order to determine quickly what is a just claim on the part of the contractor in case of termination and in order to permit him to speedily reconvert to other production, it follows that termination procedures must be established to provide for speedy verification of claims and for their prompt settlement to both prime and subcontractors. If this is not done, wholesale unemployment and economic chaos may be the result. Any legislation which is enacted should stress the quick and equitable settlement of contractors' claims so that industry may speedily reconvert to peacetime pursuits, and not be paralyzed by long drawn-out processes for verification of claims.

The experiences in this field in the First World War are not without their value. By Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, the War Department had entered into contracts aggregating $22,000,000,000 in value of which 66 percent had been completed. Not a hand had been raised by the Government in preparation for the suddenly called armistice. It fairly telescoped the headlong train of our war economy and for some time business was stunned by the shock. All eyes had been on the war, almost none on the peace. It was not until April 30, 1921, nearly 2½ years later, that practically all war-contract claims recognized by the War Department as deserving had been settled. These totaled 26,000 claims regarded by the Government as deserving, or 84 percent of the 31,000 claims filed.

But when we come to cast up the accounts of contract-termination settlements growing out of World War No. 2, we shall find that it multiplies many times over those of World War No. 1. Already substantially as many contracts have been canceled as were canceled in the whole of World War No. 1, yet we have scarcely reached peak production. It is the huge volume of terminations which will come after peak production that we have to fear. The industrial dislocations, unemployment, and added loads upon the tortured backs of our taxpayers can precipitate an economic crisis of frightful proportions unless terminations are handled in wise and careful fashion. The prospect of a sane approach to and an efficient handling of the problem is, however, brighter than it was in 1918. We are profiting by the experiences of that period, although we realize that the job is many times larger, even in view of the considerable expansion of industry since 1918. Had the entire $7,500,000,000 of uncompleted products awaiting manufacture under contract November 11, 1918, been consigned to the scrap heap, the country, though hurt, would not have been confronted with disaster. But our ability to survive the ordeal consequent to mismanagement and selfish manipulation of a hundred billion dollars worth of contract terminations following hard on the tremendous financial drains of the present war is questionable. The job is so big that unless we map out a procedure with due caution and with fairness to all concerned, we may find that, having won the war, we so conducted our contract termination settlements that we are unable to enjoy the fruits of victory. They will have turned into Dead Sea apples.

Today the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I have the honor to be a member, finds itself in the role of referee in a contest between major agencies for control of contract-termination settlements. The decision which is rendered may go far toward determining the success of contract-termination settlements

in post-war years. On the one side are the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and the Maritime Commission. They seek to place their war contracting agencies in possession of complete authority with respect to handling contract-termination settlements. On the other side is the Comptroller General as head of the General Accounting Office, created by Congress in 1921 as its representative, who insists that his agency shall have arbitral and final authority in arranging these settlements.

The main ground on which proponents of the contracting agencies base their argument is speed, expedition, dispatch in handling termination settlements. That of the General Accounting Office is providing of safeguards in the handling of public funds. If the proponents of the contracting agencies fail to convince the Congress that they can adjust the claims in materially less time than will be required if the General Accounting Office participates, their case goes by the board. Up to this moment they have failed to convince me. I know that speed is important, but there are other considerations than haste in closing the accounts. I want to know that sufficient heed is given to questions of accuracy, equity, and propriety of claim. Overpayment of contractors may or may not become an issue, but taking chances with the complacent taxpayer on the theory that he will grumble, pay, forgive and forget is already an issue.

I do not want to leave the impression that the proponents of final settlement by the contracting agencies do not have a case. To restate, they ask that settlement of a terminated contract be made by the procurement agency which made the contract and that such settlement be final. Reconversion may easily be speedier under this arrangement and speedy reconversion is important. I quote from a manufacturer's letter:

> In order to get production quickly and in incredible volume, Congress authorized the suspension of established safeguards in Government procurement. Contracting officers were given almost unlimited authority to buy. Within a few months an organization was recruited to do a far bigger job of purchasing than was being done by long-established purchasing departments of scores of the world's largest corporations. Naturally the opportunities for fraud, for extravagance, for errors in judgment, and for stupid blunders were vastly greater than ever before. These risks were necessitated by the emergency. If we had not risked wasting a few hundred millions to secure a few hundred billions in valuable ships, planes, munitions, and cantonments we might today be fighting a defensive war in the Alleghenies and Rockies.
>
> The money loss that might possibly result from swift final settlement of terminated war contracts could not be more than a small fraction of the losses that have already been suffered as a result of emergency procurement. But the need for speed in settling terminated contracts is quite as great as the need for speed in making those contracts. At V-day it will be just as urgent to replace the machines that make munitions with machines that make the products of peace as it was in 1942 to replace the machines of peace with the machines of war.

This manufacturer is saying that the losses to the Nation's economy may be greater from slow contract termination settlements than losses to the taxpayer from waste or dishonesty which are concealed more readily under speedier processes.

One organization made up of the officials of large industrial concerns wants a contract settlement board established, and says:

> We recommend the delegation of clear cut authority to the contracting agencies to make final settlements with contractors within the framework of policies and procedures established by the contract settlement board. Such settlement should not be subject to review by the Office of the Comptroller General.

Certainly this organization, the research committee of the Committee for Economic Development, is frank about it. The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is another organization which has espoused the cause of the contracting agencies, recommending that when the question of terminations arises, those agencies and those alone shall pass on the contracts which they negotiated. The Illinois Manufacturers Association wants the settlement claims "discharged by the particular procurement agency with which the contract was entered into." A number of other industrial concerns and organizations subscribe to similar views. For good or bad, this appears to lead to a condition in which the contracting agencies shall be judge, jury, and prosecuting attorney in passing on the merit of their own work.

Directly counter to the position of the agencies quoted stands the Comptroller General, who in a statement to the House Committee on Military Affairs, on October 18, 1943, declared that the War Department's attitude is "to hell with the General Accounting Office or anyone else who dares to challenge an inept and inefficient contracting officer who is dishing out and giving away the property and money of the United States with reckless abandon. And these are the contracting officers who the War Department insists must have the final and conclusive authority to negotiate contract termination settlements."

The cost-plus process under which procurement and construction programs have been carried on in wartime is substantially a blank-check process. In no sense does it encourage economies. Please do not understand me to question the necessity for obtaining results. But a layman finds himself puzzled and not a little worried when a hundred-million-dollar contract is given for a new, light, fast tank, which, upon being manufactured, turned out to be a medium tank no better than the medium tanks already in production. Thirteen tanks were delivered before Ordnance found out it had made a bad guess and canceled the contracts. But that bad guess is costing the taxpayers some $35,000,000, to say nothing of irreplacable time, material, labor, and management. The Pentagon Building, which cost twice the amount authorized by Congress—another unexplained thirty-five millions—has not strengthened our faith in Army economy.

With due regard for the fact that production has been tremendous, and with full respect for the very great part of the Army's personnel which has done the best job it possibly could, I see no sound reason why the people's money should not have the double safeguard which can be provided through the Comptroller General's office. I do not want to see the ugly head of scandal rear up in after years to destroy the great record of this war's production achievements. Some men are weak, even when in uniform. Some are careless. Some are inefficient, even in the high places. Safeguards are as important to them as to the taxpayer.

Not all manufacturers attest to the essentiality of continuation of termination settlements by the contracting agencies. I quote from a letter:

> Most of the material we have on the floor now is of absolutely no use to us except for Government contracts, and the experience we have had up to this time is not very encouraging. We had an order cancelled 6 months ago. The material was all fabricated and everybody admits it is worth nothing except scrap, and yet we have not been able to get any action from the Government. We have between 80 and 90 tons of special material on the floor, which not only takes up our floor space but involves an investment in material and labor which we feel justified in asking payment for.
>
> I certainly hope that Congress will take some action to protect those of us who have our money invested in these contracts, in the event of terminations. A great many of us could not convert to civilian business unless the Government paid us promptly for these canceled contracts. I know we are only one of thousands of companies in the same position. The Government should cut out all the red tape that is possible, so that we can take up our civilian business without delay.

The first inkling of what the various departmental contracting agencies, led by the War Department, had in mind with respect to preempting termination settlements came on June 23, 1943, when the first draft of H. R. 3022 was placed before the Committee on Military Affairs. This draft concerned the War Department only, proposing to give to that Department and its delegated authorities unlimited powers in handling contract terminations. The first draft was quickly superseded by the second, which extended the authority to the other three agencies mentioned. Both drafts contained a clause which was galvanic in its effect on the committee, and which prompted the members to searching inquiry and careful study. The clause read "without regard to any provision of law relating to the making," and so forth, of contracts or for advances or loans to contractors. A broader grant of power could not be conceived. It may be mentioned at this point that an attempt had been made to put through Congress without study or hearings the principles of the first H. R. 3022 by way of a rider to the $71,000,000,000 war appropriation bill, an attempt which was quietly stifled by the able chairman of the committee.

H. R. 3022, as it stands at present, sets up under section 6 a War Contracts Settlement Board, to consist of not less than three and not more than nine members,

who shall be appointed by the Comptroller General of the United States. By explicit wording, the work of this Board should be confined solely and only to the speedy auditing of contract terminations. It is believed that acceptable settlement of claims under the provisions of section 4 of the bill would be still further expedited if a local representative, designated by the Board, should participate with the war contractor and the contracting agency in the consideration of contract termination settlements. Under paragraph (b) of section 6, it may be found possible, without further formality, to designate such local representative. With conferences such as these in operation, wherever contract terminations are being settled, it should not be difficult to agree on amounts to be allowed initially on nonauditable items, such as profits, liquidating damages, depreciation, amortization of engineering expenses, and other items classifiable as intangibles. Section 4 (a), paragraph (1), provides for 100-percent payments of amounts arrived at through these negotiations and these payments can be made immediately, no decision to be reopened except in case of fraud. Paragraph (2) provides for payment to the war contractor of an amount equal to 90 percent of the minimum amount due on all items, with respect to which an agreement is not made under paragraph (1), and the contracting agency must make payment within 30 days after application by the war contractor for payment under this paragraph.

Under such modus operandi, plus the guaranteed loan, the contractor claimant would be practically certain of securing, with the minimum of delay, liquid assets amounting to 100 percent of his total claim. The Baruch plan, recently reported for use in contract termination settlements, appears somewhat less favorable both as to application and amount of payment and safeguarding of the taxpayers.

A large number of the proponents of the contracting agencies feel that the General Accounting Office cannot handle the responsibilities outlined because of lack of personnel, unfamiliarity with the questions in dispute or under negotiation, and inability to escape from the strict interpretation of the law. It does not appear, that after 23 years of operation the General Accounting Office will find it difficult to familiarize itself readily with any claims questions to which this Government may find itself a party. As for personnel, the Under Secretary of War, outlining the methods by which termination settlements are now handled says:

> By these methods, the negotiators for the Government have available reliable accounting data and other information on which to reach a fair settlement with the contractor. These negotiations are assisted at all stages by Government accounting, engineering, legal, fiscal, and technical personnel, all of whom participate in the negotiations and are consulted where their assistance may be helpful. The settlement eventually reached thus reflects the deliberations and advice of many different Government representatives, each a specialist in some particular field. * * * For each termination settlement appropriate records are kept of all important steps in the negotiations and all important actions by the contracting officers in order to indicate the essential data on which the negotiations were based.

However the apparent negation of this statement is taken from Procurement Regulation No. 15, which lays down the procedure to be observed by contracting officers in dealing with termination settlements. Subparagraph 5 reads as follows:

> Government accounting personnel will prepare a report containing their comments and recommendations and computations made on the bases hereinafter mentioned of the indicated equitable negotiated settlement of the uncompleted portion of the contract. This report and the recommendations and computations made in it will not bind or control the discretion of the contracting officer in negotiating such settlement.

Throughout the entire pamphlet, which is exhaustive, it is made manifest that the contracting officer possesses in nearly every instance plenary power to deal with contract terminations as he sees fit, and the accounting and other personnel at his beck and call may be used or not, consulted or not, heeded or not, just as he may determine. But if this personnel were, by enactment, directed to report to, or work with, General Accounting Office personnel, its labor would never be in vain and it could materially speed—rather than delay—the day of final accounting.

That the Comptroller is willing to cooperate is evidenced by his remarks at a committee hearing in October. He said:

> If the Congress should decide in legislation of this question to chart the way for war-contract-termination settlements to include an examination and final settlement by the General Accounting Office, we would anticipate setting up a system after consultation with the departments which would bring those matters immediately to the General Accouning Office before the contracting officer acts finally and, of course, before they go to any disbursing officer for payment.

And his assistant, Mr. Francis Yates, when asked by the committee:

> Could you do it in the time the Army now does it or in quicker time? That is what we are interested in.

Replied:

> I believe that if the Congress will clearly chart the way, we can get together with the Army and other war contracting agencies and map out a program which will not only enable the contracting departments to do their work quicker than they are doing it now, but also enable the whole job to be done, including the part played by the General Accounting Office, quicker than the present time required.

Again to quote the Comptroller General, Hon. Lindsay Warren:

> You should not permit the war contracting agencies to make final settlement for war contract termination claims. There should be a review of such large and important settlements by an independent agency. The Congress has such an independent agency. It is the General Accounting Office. Its head, the Comptroller General, is the agent of Congress. It is the only truly independent office in the entire Government whose duties pertain to the checking of Government expenditures. It has no friends to reward or enemies to punish. We are strictly nonpolitical. Careful and efficient administrators in the Government welcome our audits and our inspections and give us full cooperation. It is only those who desire no restraint and who try to circumvent the Congress who desire to escape our supervision. The enormity of the task has been fully considered and the possibility of establishing with adequate funds a special staff equipped to do the job has also been considered. We can and will do this termination job if it is the will of Congress. We will have no alibis if we fail.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the vast majority of contractors and contracting officers are actuated by honorable motives. But just as a petroleum scandal will besmirch an entire administration, so can the dishonesty of a very few officials cast suspicion upon the entire structure of contract-termination settlements. I seek protection for that vast majority whom no breath of scandal should taint, and I seek protection for the taxpayer who must pay the bill down through the generations.

I fail to understand why the War Department should desire to undertake the sole responsibility of contract-termination settlements. I can understand the Comptroller General's solicitude for taxpaying America. It is a solicitude which I, too, share, and for that reason I favor the lodgment of final authority in handling contract-termination settlements in the office of the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office. That is the purpose for which that office was created. I have studied this subject exhaustively. I find no material reason why contract termination settlements cannot be made quickly and safely to the advantage of business and the protection of the taxpayer if the General Accounting Office is brought into the picture. And I so recommend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the services of our late colleague, the gentleman from New York, Mr. O'Leary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2836. An act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 22, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ROADS

Hearings will be continued on H. R. 2426 in the Roads Committee room, 1011 New House Office Building, at 10 a. m., Wednesday, March 22, 1944.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will continue its hearings on House Joint Resolution 148 (joint resolution to permit the diversion of waters from Lake Michigan to safeguard the public health) on March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Subcommittee on Shipyard Profits will meet in open hearing on Wednesday, March 22, 1944, at 10:30 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold an executive meeting on Thursday, March 23, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to further consider H. R. 2994.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 23, 1944, at 10:30 a. m., to consider H. R. 1565, relating to the appointment of postmasters; and H. R. 3688, to change the name of "watchman" in the Postal Service to that of "post-office guard." Hearings will be had.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1319. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Virginian Railway Co., a corporation, for railroad yard enlargement purposes, a parcel of land of the Camp Allen Reservation at Norfolk, Va.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1320. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one certified copy each of various ordinances enacted by the Public Service Commission of Puerto Rico, granting to the sugar companies and mills listed, the right to engage in the manufacture and processing of raw sugar; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1321. A letter from the secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a copy of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics for period ending June 30, 1944, together with copy of letter of tranmittal to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TARVER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4443. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Invalid Pensions. S. 662. An act to authorize pensions for certain physically or mentally helpless children, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 4444. A bill to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4445. A bill to authorize temporary appointment as officers in the Army of the United States of members of the Army Nurse Corps, female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such corps, female dietetic and physical therapy personnel of the Medical Department of the Army (exclusive of students and apprentices), and female persons having the necessary qualifications for appointment in such department as female dietetic or physical therapy personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4446. A bill to exempt certain officers and employees within the Office of Scientific Research and Development from certain provisions of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 4447. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States veterans' hospital for neuropsychiatric cases in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 4448. A bill to provide for free Government inspection of sea food; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 4449 (by request). A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 4450. A bill to enable intervention by a State in any suit in any court of the United States, in which it has an interest, involving the constitutionality, construction, or application of an act of Congress or an act of a State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 257. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, protesting against the recent change made by the selective-service authority in changing the number of units that a farmer must produce in order to defer a farm worker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to describe whatever may be necessary for the purposes of continuing the system of food distribution in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass a law enabling the ceiling prices on fluor spar to be increased; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation to provide counties, cities, and towns with compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of acquisition of property by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for reasonable compulsory military service by citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 4451. A bill for the relief of John McLaughlin, Sr., and John McLaughlin, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 4452. A bill for the relief of Lt. (T) P. J. Voorhis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr GOODWIN:

H. R. 4453. A bill for the relief of William H. Rouncevill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 4454. A bill for the relief of W. P. Dodds; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5288. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Don Wilson and 105 other citizens of Mansfield, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5289. Also, petition of George M. Osborne and 133 other citizens of Hurlock, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5290. Also, petition of Rev. Lowell M. Atkinson and 31 other citizens of Aberdeen, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for

the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5291. Also, petition of Violet T. Black and 114 other citizens of Dallas, Wis., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5292. Also, petition of Mrs. G. A. Shackelford and 73 other citizens of Stockton, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5293. Also, petition of Annie L. Hahn and 65 other citizens of Eaton, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5294. Also, petition of Rev. Paul E. Westburg and 78 other citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5295. Also, petition of Mrs. G. A. Lyford and 48 other citizens of Copan, Okla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5296. Also, petition of Mrs. Chryssie Jones and 606 other citizens of Loma Linda, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5297. Also, petition of Floyd B. Vane and 63 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5298. Also, petition of Mrs. S. Stearns and 128 other citizens of Pierson, Iowa, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5299. Also, petition of Rev. Merritt Earl and 65 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5300. Also, petition of Thomas H. Clapper and 60 other citizens of Denton, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5301. Also, petition of Mrs. Percy M. Smith and 146 other citizens of Birmingham, Ala., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5302. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Sandra Martin and 576 members of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, Local 1412, Oakland, Calif., urging the immediate enactment of the soldier-vote bill, which will allow the Federal Government to make it easily possible for members of our armed forces to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5303. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 208 members of the Methodist Church of West Bridgewater, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5304. Also, petition of the Beaver Valley Holiness Association of Beaver County, Pa., representing approximately 200 persons, urging the passage of House bill 2082, making unlawful the manufacture, sale, or transportation within the United States of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5305. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Communication signed by C. Don Betebenner and 29 others of the West Salem Community High School, West Salem, Ill., favoring an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the election of President and Vice President by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5306. By Mr. JEFFREY: Petition of Arminda Phillips and 30 other citizens of Dayton, Ohio, favoring House bill 2082, the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5307. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of the members of the Girls Society of Hope Christian Reformed Church, Grandville, Mich., recommending enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5308. By Mr. MYERS: Petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5309. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Ira C. Shaffer, commander, Charles Millan Post, No. 40, Inc., American Legion, and a number of citizens of Mannington, W. Va., and vicinity, urging the passage of House bill 4357 and Senate bill 1767, cited as the Servicemen's Aid Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5310. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Rev. John D. Thomas and other citizens of Skowhegan, Maine, urging action on House bill 2082 to reduce absenteeism and better protect our servicemen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5311. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Myers C. Ackerman and 196 other residents of Franklin County, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5312. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Abraham Rosenburg, of Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to our civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5313. Also, petition of Howard E. Campbell, president, Pittsburgh Real Estate Board, Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their opposition to the further construction of public housing by local and Federal governments, and their recommendation that present public housing be disposed of to private owners; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

5314. Also, petition of the administrative secretary, United Federal Workers of America, Local No. 10, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging rejection of the McKellar rider to the Senate independent offices appropriations bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.